

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

eligibility for family housing to all service members with dependents is generally well accepted, (3) VHA is having a positive impact on service members' housing affordability, (4) VHA and the extension of eligibility for military family housing are seen as having a positive effect on career intentions, (5) dissatisfaction with aspects of PCS moves are variable and generally wide-spread, and (6) military family housing residents are generally satisfied with housing office services, rules, and regulations and their enforcement.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

NPRDC SR 84-2

OCTOBER 1983

**1982 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING
PREFERENCE SURVEY: II. SERVICE MEMBERS'
FAMILY HOUSING ATTITUDES AND EXPERIENCES**

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED



**NAVY PERSONNEL RESEARCH
AND
DEVELOPMENT CENTER,
San Diego, California 92152**



**1982 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING PREFERENCE SURVEY:
II. SERVICE MEMBERS' FAMILY HOUSING ATTITUDES AND EXPERIENCES**

Judith K. Lawson
E. P. Somer
Bela Feher
Patricia M. Mitchell
Mark Coultas

Reviewed by
Robert Penn

Released By
J. W. Renard
Commanding Officer

FOREWORD

This survey was conducted in cooperation with the housing offices for the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy, under the auspices of the Defense Housing Management Systems Office (DHMSO), Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense. Results are directed primarily to those involved in setting and implementing policies that affect assignment of service members to military family housing in the continental United States.

NPRDC Special Report 83-47 provided highlights of survey results aggregated across services. The present report provides breakdowns of survey responses by services and discusses implications of those responses.

Appreciation is extended to the following persons, for their assistance in the initial development of the survey instrument:

- Mr. Stephen B. Joyce, Mr. Louis F. Bain, Jr., Mr. Donald Ponder, and Mr. David Howard, DHMSO.
- Ms. Avis Bennett, Navy Housing Office, Washington, DC.
- Mr. William Christie and LT Nettie Pinkerton, Air Force Housing Office, Washington, DC.
- CAPT William Tourek, LCOL D. P. Garner, and Mr. George Onderdonk, Marine Corps Housing Office, Washington, DC.
- Mr. Lou Binick, Army Housing Office, Washington, DC.
- Mr. John Richards and LT Dave Cathcart, Defense Manpower Data Center.
- LCOL Ronald Quayle, OSD Compensation Board.

Special thanks go to Mr. Robert L. Newhart, Office of the Secretary of Defense, (MRA&L Research and Data).

J. W. RENARD
Commanding Officer

JAMES W. TWEEDDALE
Technical Director

SUMMARY

Problem

Military family housing is an important issue to the military member and his/her family. It has an impact on satisfaction with military life and military career decisions. Military housing management needs to be kept informed of the experiences, expectations, desires, and attitudes of military members concerning family housing so they can make more informed military family housing policy decisions.

Purpose

The purpose of this effort was to obtain detailed information concerning the attitudes and opinions of military personnel toward several aspects of military family housing in CONUS. Specifically, it was concerned with the following:

1. The experiences of military members with family relocation.
2. The relationship between the location of military members' residence and their housing needs, desires, and satisfaction.
3. The attitudes of service members toward current and proposed housing assignment policies.
4. The impact of VHA on the service member and family.
5. Military members' experiences, satisfaction levels, and options regarding specific aspects of living in military family housing.

Approach

Based on a random sample stratified by pay grade and service branch, a total of 21,750 personnel was selected and mailed surveys. Respondents included in the sample were: (1) currently residing in the continental United States, and (2) eligible for or drawing basic allowance for quarters (BAQ) at the with-dependents rate. A total of 11,897 cases were analyzed, representing an overall adjusted return rate of 64.8 percent.

Major Findings

1. Overall, service members' preference for military or civilian housing could be predicted by where they were currently living. Among those living in civilian housing, as pay grade increased, satisfaction with where they lived increased. However, among those living in military housing, there was an inverse relationship between pay grade and satisfaction with current housing. Generally, as pay grade increased, satisfaction with living in military family housing decreased. Enlisted personnel generally had spent more time in "substandard" housing than had their officer counterparts. Saving money was a primary reason given for being on a waiting list to live in military family housing. Security and privacy were the most important housing characteristics and were considered to be generally satisfactory by military members living in both military and civilian housing. Overall, officers and enlisted living in civilian housing were more satisfied with the aspects of their living environment they rated as most important than were officers and enlisted residing in military family housing.

2. Service members were generally dissatisfied with (a) the reimbursement they received to move their dependents, (b) reimbursements for lost or damaged goods, (c) the ease of locating temporary civilian housing, (d) the length of military waiting lists, and (e) the availability of government temporary housing. Officers suffered more "out of pocket" costs than did enlisted when they moved. However, more officers than enlisted made a profit when they sold their houses because of a PCS move. Officers tended to use and were more satisfied with the Sponsor Program than were enlisted personnel. There was a strong preference for PCS moves being limited to every 4-5 years. High costs of relocating dependents, dependents not being allowed, and long waits for military housing were the three primary reasons given for not having dependents accompany service members at their current duty station.

3. Support for the unconditional proposal to extend housing eligibility to the E-1 to E-3 families and to accommodate such families within the military housing system was high among both enlisted and officers. Conditional housing assignment proposals that had the potential to establish construction priorities, decrease residence size, or increase waiting lists were considerably less favored by the groups most likely to be adversely impacted by these proposals. Housing eligibility extension was perceived as a positive career motivator for the E-1 to E-3 group and generally as having no effect on career motivation of the other pay-grade groups.

4. "Having more places the family can afford to live," and "able to have dependents accompany service member at current duty station" were the two main effects of VHA indicated by respondents. The latter effect was much more pronounced for enlisted than officer personnel. VHA was perceived as making a military career more attractive.

5. Prior experience with mobile/manufactured home living increased the frequency of those preferring it relative to other styles of housing. Preference for on-base mobile/manufactured homes increased as the density of the alternative styles of housing increased.

6. A strong majority of military housing residents felt that the number of housing rules and regulations was "about right" and a majority judged them to be correctly enforced. Housing office services generated satisfaction among most family housing residents. Perceived division of responsibility between family housing residents and housing management with regard to upkeep of the units varied, depending on the nature of the maintenance.

Conclusions

1. Extending eligibility for military family housing to all service members with dependents, regardless of pay grade, seems to be an acceptable proposal to service members at all grade levels, especially in light of VHA.

2. Constructing smaller family housing units and the possible alternative of mobile/manufactured homes may be less expensive but acceptable approaches for increasing the inventory for pay grades E-1 to E-3.

3. VHA is increasing the affordability of civilian housing for service members, giving them more options for locations where their families can live, and making it possible for more families to accompany the service member to his/her current duty station.

4. Career motivation has been positively affected by the implementation of VHA. The possibility of extending eligibility for family housing to lower grade enlisted is also likely to have overall positive effects on career motivation.

5. Reimbursement for the expenses incurred by the service member associated with relocating their dependents may be inadequate for some service members to bring their families to their new duty stations.

6. Military family housing residents are generally satisfied with the services provided by the housing office and with the number of housing rules and regulations and their enforcement.

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Problem and Background	1
Purpose	2
APPROACH	2
Study Model	2
Questionnaire Development	3
Interviews	4
Pretests	4
Sampling Strategy	4
Data Collection	5
Data Analysis	7
SURVEY RESULTS	7
Respondents' Background and Demographics	7
Discussion	7
Air Force	8
Army	8
Marine Corps	9
Navy	9
Summary	9
Descriptions and Experiences with Military and Civilian Housing	22
Housing Type, Style, and Size	22
Air Force	22
Army	23
Marine Corps	24
Navy	25
Civilian Housing Rentals and Housing Demographics	26
Air Force	26
Army	26
Marine Corps	26
Navy	27
Waiting Lists and Housing Referrals	27
Air Force	27
Army	28
Marine Corps	28
Navy	28
Importance of/Satisfaction with Housing Aspects	29
Most Important Aspects	29
Moderately Important Aspects	30
Least Important Aspects	31

	Page
Experiences Related to Relocation	46
Satisfaction with Relocation Aspects	46
Air Force	46
Army	48
Marine Corps	50
Navy	52
Relocation Experiences	54
Air Force	54
Army	54
Marine Corps	54
Navy	55
Unaccompanied/Overseas Tours	55
Air Force	55
Army	55
Marine Corps	56
Navy	56
Proposals Affecting Military Housing Assignment Policies	74
Ranking of Housing Policy Proposals	74
Air Force	74
Army	74
Marine Corps	74
Navy	75
Proposal 1: Extend Eligibility for Military Family Housing to all Service Members With Dependents Regardless of Pay Grade	75
Air Force	75
Army	76
Marine Corps	77
Navy	78
Proposal 2: Assign Military Housing Solely on the Basis of Bedroom Requirements, Regardless of Rank	79
Air Force	79
Army	80
Marine Corps	80
Navy	81
Proposal 3: Maintain Existing Housing Assignment Procedures for Military Family Housing	82
Air Force	82
Army	82
Marine Corps	83
Navy	84
Proposal 4: Offer All Families a Choice of Military Family Housing Units at Prices Comparable to Civilian Housing, With Rent to be Paid Out of Housing Allowances	84
Air Force	84
Army	85
Marine Corps	86
Navy	86

	Page
Proposal 5: Construct New, Possibly Smaller, Military Family Housing	
Units Specifically for Pay Grades E-1 to E-3	87
Air Force	87
Army	88
Marine Corps	88
Navy	89
Proposal 6: Have Only One of Dual-career Couples Forfeit BAQ for	
Military Family Housing	89
Air Force	89
Army	90
Marine Corps	90
Navy	91
Proposal 7: Continue Present Policy of Designating Separate Housing	
Areas for Officers and Enlisted	91
Air Force	91
Army	92
Marine Corps	92
Navy	93
Proposal 8: Extend Housing Eligibility to Pay Grades E-1 to E-3, Even	
if Time on Waiting Lists is Increased for Everyone	94
Air Force	94
Army	95
Marine Corps	95
Navy	96
Proposal 9: Construct Additional Housing for Pay Grades E-1 to E-3	
on a Priority Basis	96
Air Force	96
Army	97
Marine Corps	97
Navy	98
Summary	98
Air Force	98
Army	99
Marine Corps	100
Navy	101
Variable Housing Allowance (VHA)	125
VHA Impact on Housing Situations	125
Impact on Service Member	126
Other Opinions Concerning VHA	127
Attitudes Toward Living in On-base Mobile/Manufactured Homes	138
Opinions of Military Family Housing Regulations and Housing Office Services	144
Housing Aspects	144
Mandatory Assignment	144
Housing Classification	144
BAQ Forfeiture for Housing	144
Housing Value	144
Maintenance	145
Responsibility for Major Maintenance/Repairs	145
Self-help Program	145
Allocation of Maintenance Responsibilities	145

	Page
Rules and Regulations	147
Degree of Enforcement	147
Number of Rules and Regulations	147
Least Enforced/Most Frequently Broken Regulations	148
Enforcement Responsibility	148
Housing Office Services	149
Assistance in Obtaining Government Housing	149
Orientation to Government Quarters	149
General Helpfulness on Problems	149
Help in Demonstrating and/or Suggesting Energy Conservation Procedures ...	149
Write-in Comments	166
DISCUSSION	168
CONCLUSIONS	174
REFERENCES	175
APPENDIX A--INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	A-0
APPENDIX B--SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	B-0
DISTRIBUTION LIST	

LIST OF TABLES

1. Respondents Selected by Branch of Service	5
2. Obtained Sample by Service Branch and Pay Grade	6
3. Background and Demographic Characteristics by Service Branch	11
4. Respondent Percentages with Employed Spouses by Service Branch	12
5. Respondent Percentages by Level of Gross Annual Income and Service Branch	14
6. Percentage of Income Contributed by the Spouse of Respondent by Service Branch	16
7. Respondent Percentages by Age Group and Service Branch	18
8. Total Number of Dependents and Number Living with Service Member by Service Branch	19
9. Mean Ages and Numbers of Dependents	21

	Page
10. Respondent Percentages Living in Housing Types and Styles by Service Branch	32
11. Current and Preferred Housing Type by Service Branch	33
12. Housing Type Preferred by Military and Civilian Housing Residents by Service Branch	35
13. Current and Preferred Housing Styles by Military and Civilian Housing Residents	37
14. Current and Preferred Housing Styles by Service Branch	38
15. Family and Residence Size Differences by Service Branch	40
16. Response Percentages to Items on Civilian Rental Housing and Housing Demographics	42
17. Response Percentages to Waiting List and Housing Referral Items by Service Branch	44
18. Mean Importance and Satisfaction Ratings of Housing Aspects by Type of Housing	45
19. Rank Order of Relocation Items by Percentages Dissatisfied by Service Branch	57
20. Correlation Matrix for Responses to Items Concerning Satisfaction with Relocation Aspects by Service Branch	58
21. Response Percentages to Reimbursement and Service Items by Service Branch	60
22. Responses of Career-motivated Personnel to Reimbursement/Service Items by Service Branch	64
23. Responses to Housing Items by Service Branch	66
24. Responses of Career-motivated Personnel to Housing Issue Items by Officer/Enlisted	70
25. Response Percentages to Items on Relocation Experiences by Service Branch	72
26. Response Percentages to Items on Unaccompanied/Overseas Tours by Service Branch	73

	Page
27. Percentage of Respondents in Favor of Housing Policy Proposals by Service Branch	103
28. Responses to Policy Proposal 1 by Service Branch	104
29. Effect of Extending Eligibility for Military Family Housing to Pay Grades E-1 to E-3 on Career Intention by Service Branch	106
30. Effect of Eligibility Extension on Career Intentions	108
31. Responses to Policy Proposal 2 by Service Branch	109
32. Responses to Policy Proposal 3 by Service Branch	111
33. Responses to Policy Proposal 4 by Service Branch	113
34. Responses to Policy Proposal 5 by Service Branch	115
35. Responses to Policy Proposal 6 by Service Branch	117
36. Responses to Policy Proposal 7 by Service Branch	119
37. Responses to Policy Proposal 8 by Service Branch	121
38. Responses to Policy Proposal 9 by Service Branch	123
39. Service Members Presently Drawing VHA by Service Branch	128
40. Respondents Indicating that VHA had Affected Housing Situations	129
41. Impact VHA has had on Service Members' Housing Solutions	130
42. Percentages Agreeing on VHA Impact on Service Member	135
43. Effect of Perceived Impact of VHA on Career Intentions	137
44. Percentage of Respondents With Experience in Mobile/Manufactured Homes by Pay Grade	140
45. Housing Preferences (Other Styles vs. On-base Mobile/Manufactured Homes) by Respondents With or Without Experience Living in Mobile/Manufactured Homes	141
46. Housing Preference (Apartment-type vs. Mobile/Manufactured Home) by Service Branch	142
47. Housing Preferences (Other Styles vs. On-base Mobile/Manufactured Home) by Pay Grade	143

	Page
48. Nature of Assignment to Military Family Housing by Pay Grade	150
49. Official Classification of Respondents' Housing by Pay Grade	151
50. Percentage of BAQ Forfeited for Family Housing by Pay Grade	152
51. Opinion of Respondents' Military Housing as Compared to Affordable Housing in the Nearby Civilian Community	153
52. Attributed Responsibility for Major Maintenance and Repair by Pay Grade	154
53. Opinion of the Self-help Maintenance Program	155
54. Most Preferred Improvement in Self-help Maintenance Program by Pay Grade	156
55. Ideal Attribution of Responsibility for Maintenance Categories by Pay Grade	157
56. Judged Enforcement of Rules and Regulations in Respondents' Military Family Housing Site by Pay Grade	160
57. Number of Rules and Regulations in Respondents' Military Family Housing Community by Pay Grade	161
58. Rules or Regulations Least Enforced/Most Frequently Broken	162
59. Agency Primarily Responsible for Law Enforcement and Police Protection ...	163
60. Rated Satisfaction with Family Housing Office Services	164
61. Number of Write-in Comments by Service Branch	166
62. Comments Provided by Survey Respondents	167

INTRODUCTION

Problem and Background

Family housing is of great concern to military members and their families. For example, Trejo (1979), who conducted a retention study of Navy Pacific Fleet units, found that respondents felt that housing was the most serious of all economic factors they had encountered. Farkas and Durning (1982), in a survey of male and female enlisted and officer personnel with dependents, found that more than 20 percent regarded obtaining family housing as a serious family problem. Further, results of a previously reported DoD family housing preference survey (Stumpf & Kieckhaefer, 1975) indicated that housing satisfaction was related to career intention. For some personnel, dissatisfaction with housing adversely affected their desire to make the military a career.

Because of rising rental and purchasing costs in the civilian market place, it is increasingly more difficult for service members and their families to find satisfactory civilian housing. To complicate the issue, being in the military requires frequent changes in duty location, sometimes causing family upheaval, financial hardship, and many other inconveniences. It is necessary to identify and understand the problems concerning family housing so that the quality of life of service members and their families can be improved.

It is likely that changes in family composition in society are reflected, at least to some degree, in the military. Although many Americans are choosing to remain childless, about 51 percent of all Navy personnel are married to a civilian spouse; and an additional 2.5 percent, to another military member. In more than 70 percent of these marriages, there are one or more dependent children (reflecting the national average of less than two children per household). About 1 percent of Navy families (about 4500) are headed by single parents. Because the Navy now includes increasing numbers of older recruits, women volunteers, and single parents, its housing needs are likely to be different than those of 8 years ago when the last DoD family housing preference survey was conducted (Stumpf & Kieckhaefer, 1975). Since older recruits may be more likely to have children than are their younger counterparts and single parents meeting minimum requirements (E-4s with 2 or more years of service) are eligible for military housing, it is likely that the military's changing composition does and will continue to affect military family housing needs, preferences, and satisfaction.

In 1976, approximately 15 percent of all eligible military personnel occupied military family housing at any point in time. This meant that 85 percent either chose or were forced to locate housing in the civilian community. However, because of turnover, over 25 percent of the military population lived in family housing at some point in their careers (Lemon, 1977). In 1982, between 25 and 39 percent of eligible military families were housed in government quarters. Although personnel residing in adequate military family housing forfeit their basic allowance for quarters/variable housing allowance (BAQ/VHA), their utilities and major maintenance service are provided. Hence, choosing to live in military family housing when it is available, particularly in these inflationary times, can mean a substantial savings in housing costs for many families. This is one reason why the General Accounting Office (GAO) looked into the policy concerning military family housing eligibility. The resultant GAO report (1979) stated that family quarters are assigned to those personnel who can best afford to live in the civilian community and denied to the lowest graded personnel (pay grades E-1 through E-3) who earn the least pay. It showed that 61 percent of E-1s to E-3s and 38 percent of E-4s lived in too costly civilian housing, in housing that DoD considered substandard, or were separated from their

dependents because they were unable to obtain on-base family housing or suitable civilian housing, compared to 3 percent of the officers. Although DoD's policy is to rely on the civilian communities near a military installation to provide the bulk of housing for the military, many communities near installations cannot provide enough adequate housing for low-income families. Consequently, lower pay grade military members compete with civilians for this limited housing. The GAO report concluded that, if the DoD Family Housing Program's mission is to ensure that military families are suitably housed, it is not meeting its goal. The report recommended that the Secretary of Defense grant all military families eligibility for family housing and assign housing on the basis of need alone.

While DoD was considering the GAO recommendation, a variable housing allowance (VHA) program was implemented (in 1981) for military persons residing in the continental United States (CONUS). Various VHA-type programs have been proposed by different military organizations since 1962. The rationale behind implementing such a program was that military personnel assigned to CONUS areas with higher housing costs than others should be somehow compensated for those costs (Chipman & Rowe, 1980).

The use of mobile/manufactured housing has been proposed as a way to confront rising construction costs. However, the feasibility of using such housing for military families needs to be assessed in terms of costs, land area requirements, and acceptance by military personnel and their families. Information on how demographic and background characteristics influence attitudes of military personnel toward mobile/manufactured housing in the military is needed for future management decisions on the kind and number of mobile/manufactured homes to be constructed.

Purpose

The purpose of this effort was to obtain detailed information concerning the attitudes and opinions of military personnel toward several aspects of military family housing in CONUS. Specifically, it was concerned with the following:

1. The experiences of military members with family relocation.
2. The relationship between the location of military members' residence and their housing needs, desires, and satisfaction.
3. The attitudes of service members toward current and proposed housing assignment policies.
4. The impact of VHA on the service member and family.
5. Military members' experiences, satisfaction levels, and options regarding specific aspects of living in military family housing.

APPROACH

Study Model

The conceptual model used to design the survey questionnaire includes 10 components, which are made up of variables (survey questions) treating the same topic. While no causal predictions were made in this study, the model, shown in Figure 1, is useful in understanding the strengths of the component interrelationships.




Figure 1. Study model: 1982 DoD family housing preference survey.

Components 1 through 8 represent situational circumstances that affect respondents' housing satisfaction (9) and career motivation (10). For example, components 1 (DoD housing policy and interpretation), 2 (respondents' pay grade, number of dependents, and years of service), 3 (the perceived performance of the local housing office), and 5 (VHA and its impact) all impact on component 4 (where and what kind of housing respondents are presently living in). Component 4, in turn, has a direct impact on component 9 (housing satisfaction), along with components 6 (any changes to housing policy, especially in the way assignments are made), 7 (experiences with relocation), and 8 (experience with housing waiting lists). Finally, component 9 has an impact on component 10 (respondents' career plans or career motivation).

Questionnaire Development

Between December 1980 and May 1981, representatives from the headquarters housing office for each service branch, the VHA survey team, the Defense Housing Management Systems Office (formerly called the Family Housing System Office), and the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center (NAVPERSRANDCEN) held meetings in Washington, DC to discuss survey development. At these meetings, representatives agreed on the general scope and proposed content of the survey and provided ideas and

suggestions. Also, service housing representatives cooperated in coordinating interview and pretest sites.

Interviews

In early 1981, military family housing occupants and managers at (1) Camp Pendleton, California, (2) Edwards Air Force Base (AFB), California, (3) Fort Huachuca, Arizona, and (4) Norton AFB, California were interviewed, as were military personnel and family members assigned to NAVPERSRANDCEN. (Since housing locale did not significantly impact attitudes toward housing in the 1975 survey, these sites were chosen primarily because of their proximity to San Diego.) Enlisted and officer personnel were interviewed in separate groups for approximately 1 hour. They were questioned on a variety of housing-related topics, including housing preferences (location, style), satisfaction, relocation, perceptions of housing management, and attitudes toward housing policy. They were also asked to discuss their greatest concerns and problems concerning housing. Managers were questioned about the most frequent occupant complaints, policy, and their ideas on having improvements. Appendix A provides a copy of the unstructured interview schedules.

Pretests

A rough draft of a questionnaire, which included items developed from interview data and pertinent items from the previous survey, was pretested at the following sites: (1) NAVPERSRANDCEN, (2) Camp Pendleton, (3) Norton AFB, (4) Fort Meade, Maryland, (5) Quantico, Virginia, (6) the Human Resources Management Center, San Diego, and (7) the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California. In sites where interviews had been conducted, care was taken to ensure that different participants were involved in the pretests. Small groups (five to seven) of pretest participants completed the questionnaire and met with a representative from NAVPERSRANDCEN to discuss it. Based on feedback received, the survey was modified. These pretests served to ensure that the questionnaire items were meaningful and easily understood and that the instructions were easily comprehended. All individuals pretested reported completing the survey in approximately 30-40 minutes.

The final questionnaire consisted of 160 multiple-choice items, covering the following areas: demographics, relocation, present housing, preferred housing, housing satisfaction, VHA impact, housing policy, housing rules and regulations, and family housing office services. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix B.

Sampling Strategy

The study plan called for the data obtained to be analyzed by each service branch and by pay grade within each service branch. Where appropriate, service branches were to be combined to give an aggregate DoD total. A goal was to minimize the sampling error for percentages in each service branch pay-grade cell (within $\pm 5\%$ at the 95% level of confidence).

Service members were eligible for inclusion in the sample if they were drawing or eligible to draw BAQ at the "with-dependents" rate and were a resident in the continental United States (CONUS) at the time of survey administration. Those leaving the military (retiring or discharged) on or before the cutoff date for mailing (4 June 1982) were not included in the selection pool. In addition, 200 to 250 military-dual-career couples were

to be randomly selected from each service branch. (The Army was the only service unable to identify these individuals on their personnel master tapes.) Once the pool of service members was constructed, a random sample was drawn until the desired number of respondents were obtained for each cell. The Army and Marine Corps samples were obtained by their respective finance centers; the Air Force sample, by the Air Force Human Resources laboratory; and the Navy sample, by NAVPERSRANDCEN. Each service provided mailing labels with the selected service member's command address plus a roster of all service members selected.

Table 1 shows the total number of respondents selected for each service. The Navy sample was 23 percent larger than the Marine Corps or Air Force samples and 30 percent larger than the Army sample, because it was impossible to identify which Navy personnel would be on sea duty at the time of survey administration. All numbers take into account an anticipated return rate of 50 percent.

Table 1
Respondents Selected by Branch of Service

Pay Grade Group	Air Force N	Army N	Marine Corps N	Navy N	Total N
E-1--E-3	800	800	800	1125	3525
E-4--E-6	800	800	800	1125	3525
E-7--E-9	800	800	800	1125	3525
W-1--W-4	--- ^a	800 ^b	800 ^b	1125 ^b	3525 ^b
O-1--O-3	800	800	800	1125	3525
O-4--O-5	800	800	800	1125	3525
O-6+	800	800	800	1125	3525
Dual-career personnel	200	---	200	200	600
Total	5000	4800	5000	6950	21750

^aNot included in analysis because of small N (10).

^bIncludes W-1--W-4 and O-1--O-3 pay-grade groups.

Data Collection

Survey materials (cover letter, questionnaire, and postage-paid envelope) were mailed to respondents at their command address during the period between 1 May and 4 June 1982. Respondents were requested to return the survey within 5 days of receipt. A total of 13,101 survey forms were returned within a prescribed time frame of 6 weeks. Of these, 871 were returned because they failed to reach the addressee and 320 were returned unanswered. Approximately 1,006 were not processed due to late return. The number keypunched to tape, after careful review for accuracy and completeness, was 11,910. Further culling of cases that did not satisfy the selection parameters resulted in a final sample of 11,897 cases.

Table 2 displays the number of cases that were identifiable by both service branch and pay grade. (The difference between the entire sample, 11,897, and the sample shown in the table, 11,795, represents the 102 respondents who failed to answer both items on their service branch and pay grade. Those that answered one of these items only were, however, retained in the final sample.) As shown, the Air Force had the highest return rate (66.8%); and the Army, the lowest (44.8%). Most of the cell sizes were sufficient to meet the goal of ± 5 percent sampling error at the 95 percent level of confidence. Exceptions were pay-grade group E-1 to E-3 for all service branches and the E-4 to E-6 pay-grade group for the Army sample. These groups have a sampling error of ± 8 percent at the 95 percent confidence level. Considering the late, unanswered, and addressee unknown returns, the adjusted return rate was 64.8 percent. While this response rate is acceptable, the question of nonresponse bias is of some concern. It is conceivable that 35 percent of the original sample who did not return their questionnaire could have had different experiences and attitudes than did those who did return it. Unfortunately, there is no indication in which direction these nonrespondents may have answered the questions. It is possible that these people would have answered the questions differently than those that did respond. However, after examining the nature of the questions and the sampling procedures used, it appears that there should be no systematic nonresponse bias. Therefore, it can be assumed that the nonresponse group is random and is no different than the response group.

Table 2
Obtained Sample by Service Branch and Pay Grade

Pay Grade	Air Force		Army		Marine Corps		Navy		Total ^a	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
E-1--E-3	338	10.1	112	5.2	186	8.0	210	5.3	846	7.2
E-4--E-6	562	16.8	292	13.6	367	15.7	671	16.9	1892	16.0
E-7--E-9	639	19.1	374	17.4	431	18.5	743	18.7	2187	18.6
W-1--W-4	10	0.3	96	4.5	86	3.7	103	2.6	295	2.5
O-1--O-3	562	16.8	319	14.8	360	15.4	586	14.7	1827	15.5
O-4--O-5	607	18.2	547	25.5	575	24.7	793	19.9	2522	21.4
O-6+	623	18.6	409	19.1	327	14.1	867	21.9	2226	18.9
Total	3341	99.9	2149	100.1	2332	100.1	3973	100.0	11795	100.1
Return Rate (%) (Un-adjusted)	66.8		44.8		46.6		57.2		54.2	

Note. Percentage totals do not always equal 100 due to rounding.

^a102 respondents failed to provide information on both service branch and pay grade.

Data Analysis

Within each component of the study model, relationships were analyzed by service branch and by pay-grade group. In addition, comparisons were made between officer and enlisted personnel, between respondents living in different types of housing (civilian vs. military), and between other variables that might show any trends in the data. The primary method used for data analysis was to cross-tabulate variables and then examine the percentages for practical differences of about 8 percent or more. Because of the relatively large size of the sample, small percentage differences would be statistically significant but may not have any practical impact; thus, interpretation emphasizes practical differences.

Where appropriate, correlational analyses were performed to indicate the relationship between questions and components. Throughout this report, the following terms will denote a correlation of the magnitude indicated:

- No association .00-.210.
- Slight .211-.39.
- Moderate .40-.59.
- Strong .60-.79.
- Extremely high .80-1.00.

For the most part, the treatment of the data reported in the results section reflects the original specifications for the study design. However, after the data were processed, it was found that the Army sample did not contain sufficient numbers of respondents who lived in military housing at the time of the survey (about 4%, vs 96% who lived in civilian housing). Because of this, it was not always feasible to combine the service branch data into a DoD total sample. Where this sampling deficiency is relevant to the analysis, it is noted.

SURVEY RESULTS

The reader is advised to take into account the sampling error statistics indicated previously when interpreting the data in this section. Also, because of the large number of tables relevant to the amount of text, the tables are placed at the end of each major subsection.

Respondents' Background and Demographics

Discussion

Table 3 provides sample background and demographic characteristics by service branch. Since respondents had to be drawing or eligible to draw BAQ with dependent's rate, they were primarily male, married, and living with their spouses. Dual-career couples were represented in all service branches, with slightly fewer in the Army sample. (As mentioned earlier, the Army dual-career couples could not be identified in advance by the master tapes. However, 62 of the Army respondents identified themselves as members of dual-career couples in the final sample.) Among dual-career couples, the spouse pay-grade percentages were highest in the E-4 to E-6 pay-grade groups across services, with the Marine Corps showing the largest percentage of E-1 to E-3 spouses and the lowest percentage of officer spouses. In the Air Force, the highest percentage of officer spouses was in the O-1 to O-3 pay-grade group; in the Army, the O-3 to O-5 group; and in the Navy, the O-3 group. Across all services, dual-career couples tended to be

married to persons of the same or similar pay grades (i.e., enlisted to enlisted, and officers to officers).

In terms of the number of years on active duty, the Air Force and Army tended to have more respondents with less than 1 year of duty than did the other services, and the Air Force had less representation in the 5-8 and 9-12 year categories than did the other services. More than 30 percent of Air Force, Army, and Marine Corps respondents had had dependents in military housing at three or more duty stations, while the Navy had only 24 percent with such extensive experience and nearly one-third with no experience. It is interesting to note that the Army had the lowest percentage of respondents with dependents in military housing at only one or two duty stations and the highest percentage with dependents in military units at seven or more duty stations.

Finally, relative to the number of years spent in military family housing, the Air Force showed the highest percentages of respondents in the 8-11 years and 12 years or more categories; and the Navy, the lowest percentages. However, the majority of all respondents across services had spent 1 to 7 years in military family housing. Overall, Navy personnel were the least experienced in terms of variety of assignments with their dependents in military family housing.

Responses to items related to income and to other demographic characteristics are provided in Tables 4 through 8 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

Among the enlisted, only one third of E-1 to E-3 service members had employed spouses, compared to over half of E-7 to E-9 personnel (Table 4). Thirty-nine percent of all officers had employed spouses, with those in the O-6 and above pay grades having the lowest percentage.

Relative to gross annual income (Table 5), over 80 percent of E-1 to E-3 members (those with fewer employed spouses) fell into the lowest income category (up to \$12,500). In general, income levels increased as pay grade increased. As shown in Table 6, 40 percent of enlisted and 33 percent of officer respondents had spouses contributing up to 50 percent of the family income. Over 70 percent of the higher-ranking officers (O-6 and above) had spouses who contributed from 1 to 25 percent of family income.

Tables 7 and 8 show pay grade differences in age and in number of dependents respectively. The enlisted as a group were somewhat younger than the officers. However, the two groups were comparable in terms of total numbers of dependents and live-in family sizes.

Army

As illustrated in Table 4, the percentages of enlisted personnel with employed spouses increased as rank increased, with over half of E-7 to E-9 respondents indicating their spouses were working. Officer percentages were stable across pay grades, with the overall total being higher than that for enlisted (47 vs. 41%).

Annual gross income (Table 5) reflected pay-grade distributions across all pay grades, with the E-1 to E-3 enlisted and the O-1 to O-2 officers showing the highest percentages in the lower income category. Spousal contributions to the total family income (Table 6) were relatively high among the E-1 to E-3 and E-7 to E-9 enlisted and the O-1 to O-3 officers. The E-4 to E-6 pay grades showed the highest percentage of noncontributing spouses. Over 60 percent of higher ranking officers (O-4 and above) indicated their spouses contributed in the 1 to 25 percent category.

Table 7 shows that the enlisted respondents were generally younger than the officers. However, in terms of the numbers of total dependents and live-in dependents (Table 8), there were only small differences between the two groups.

Marine Corps

Table 4 shows that 42 percent of the enlisted respondents had working spouses, compared to 39 percent of the officers, with those in the E-1 to E-3 and O-6 and above pay grade groups having the lowest percentage. Annual gross income distributions (Table 5) reflected rank differences, with 83 percent of E-1 to E-3 respondents and 51 percent of E-4 to E-6 respondents having incomes in the lowest category (up to \$12,500). Officer income levels were higher overall, even among the O-1 to O-2 pay grades. Although 13 percent of E-1 to E-3 respondents had spouses not contributing to the family income, 42 percent of the enlisted as a group had spouses contributing up to 50 percent of the total family income (Table 6). Among officers, 62 percent had spouses whose contributions fell into the 1 to 25 percent category.

Table 7 shows that the enlisted as a group were somewhat younger than the officers; and Table 8, that the distribution of numbers of dependents did not differ greatly between enlisted and officer respondents.

Navy

As shown in Table 4, approximately the same percentages of enlisted and officers had working spouses. Among the enlisted, the percentages increased as a function of increasing rank; among officers, the highest percentage was found among the O-1 to O-2 pay grades. Total annual income (Table 5) was reflective of the pay-grade distribution, with the lower ranking enlisted and officers showing the highest percentages in the lower income categories. Although 24 percent of E-1 to E-3 respondents had noncontributing spouses, almost 40 percent of total enlisted had spouses contributing up to 50 percent (Table 6). Sixty-two percent of O-4 to O-5 officers and 76 percent of O-6 and above officers indicated spousal income contributions in the 1 to 25 percent category.

Table 7 shows that the enlisted were more often represented in the under-40 age groups; and the officers, in the over-40 groups. Differences between the pay-grade groups with respect to number of dependents (total and live-in) were negligible (Table 8).

Summary

Survey respondents were predominately male, married, and living with their spouses. Dual-career couples were represented in all service branches, with a slightly lower percentage in the Army sample.

The highest percentages with less than 1 year on active military duty were found among the Air Force and Army personnel. Overall, the majority of the respondents had between 1 and 7 years of experience living in military family housing. Navy personnel were the least experienced in terms of the number of duty stations in which their dependents had lived in military housing.

Across services, between 40 and 47 percent of enlisted service members had employed spouses, with the percentages tending to increase as pay grade increased. Among officers, the Navy respondents showed the highest percentages with employed spouses; and the Air Force and Marine Corps, the lowest. In the Air Force and the Marine

Corps, the average percentages of enlisted with working spouses were higher than those for the officers. In the Navy and Army, the officers had more working spouses. In general, fewer higher ranking officers had employed spouses.

Income distributions generally reflected pay-grade differences across services. E-1 to E-3 enlisted and O-1 to O-2 officers had the lowest total incomes. The Marine Corps and Air Force had the largest percentage of enlisted in the lowest income category (up to \$12,500); and the Army and Navy, the highest percentage of officers. Among the enlisted (except for Army respondents), spousal contributions to the total family income generally increased in magnitude and frequency (up to contributions of 50%) as a function of increasing rank of the service member. Among the E-1 to E-3 pay grades only, the highest percentage with noncontributing spouses was in the Navy (24%), followed by the Air Force (18%) and the Marine Corps (13%). For the Army respondents, a higher percentage of the E-4 to E-6 pay-grade group had noncontributing spouses than did the E-1 to E-3 group. Among the officers, spousal contributions up to 50 percent of the total annual income were more frequent in the lower ranks; and contributions up to 25 percent, in the higher ranks.

As shown in Table 9, the mean age of the enlisted respondents was 31.4 years, with the Marine Corps respondents being the youngest, and the Air Force respondents, the oldest. Across services, enlisted personnel had an average of 3.5 total dependents and an average live-in family with 3.2 dependents. For officers respondents, the average age was 39.1 years, with the Marine Corps respondents being the youngest; and the Navy respondents, the oldest. No appreciable service differences were evident in the number of dependents; the average total number of dependents was 3.8, with the average live-in family including 3.4 dependents. In all services, the enlisted sample was younger than the officer sample and had slightly fewer total and live-in dependents.

Table 3
Background and Demographic Characteristics
by Service Branch

Item	Percentages				
	Air Force	Army	Marine Corps	Navy	Total
Q5: Sex of the service member:	(N=3353)	(N=2165)	(N=2348)	(N=3992)	(N=11858)
Male	95.0	95.8	96.8	96.5	96.0
Female	5.0	4.2	3.2	3.5	4.0
Q2: Marital Status:	(N=3357)	(N=2164)	(N=2351)	(N=3989)	(N=11861)
Married	94.8	93.1	94.2	93.8	94.0
Separated, divorced, or widowed	4.7	6.5	5.5	5.5	5.5
Single	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.8	0.5
Q3: Presently living with spouse:	(N=3160)	(N=2001)	(N=2201)	(N=3697)	(N=11059)
Yes	97.2	94.1	96.0	95.1	95.7
No	2.8	5.9	4.0	4.9	4.3
Q4: Spouse on active military duty:	(N=3176)	(N=2007)	(N=2208)	(N=3724)	(N=11115)
Yes	5.3	3.1	6.1	5.4	5.1
No	94.7	96.9	93.9	94.6	94.9
Q10b: Spouse pay grade:	(N=145)	(N=46)	(N=98)	(N=182)	(N=471)
E-1--E-3	10.3	4.3	20.4	7.1	10.6
E-4--E-6	43.4	43.5	54.1	30.2	40.6
E-7--E-9	4.1	10.9	7.1	3.3	5.1
W-1--W-4	0.0	2.2	2.0	0.0	0.6
O-1--O-2	14.5	4.3	4.1	13.2	10.8
O-3	19.3	17.4	7.1	30.8	21.0
O-4--O-5	6.9	17.4	5.1	15.4	10.8
O-6+	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Q11: Total amount of time on active duty:	(N=3333)	(N=2150)	(N=2329)	(N=3964)	(N=11776)
Less than 1 year	3.4	3.5	1.8	1.1	2.3
1-4 years	16.9	12.9	15.2	12.4	14.3
5-8 years	9.7	12.3	14.3	13.3	12.3
9-12 years	9.0	12.9	13.9	12.3	11.8
13-16 years	14.9	18.0	19.4	14.1	16.1
17-20 years	14.8	15.1	11.2	15.5	14.4
20 years or more	31.4	25.3	24.3	31.3	28.8
Q16: Number of duty stations with dependents in military family housing:	(N=3245)	(N=2141)	(N=2274)	(N=3829)	(N=11489)
None	21.3	29.8	24.9	32.1	27.2
1-2	42.8	32.4	43.4	44.1	41.4
3-4	23.2	21.0	23.0	17.5	20.8
5-6	8.6	9.9	6.3	4.6	7.1
7 or more	4.2	6.9	2.5	1.7	3.5
Q17: Years in military family housing:	(N=2547)	(N=1501)	(N=1707)	(N=2595)	(N=8350)
None	0.7	1.1	0.7	0.8	0.8
Less than 1 year	7.7	6.1	9.5	9.1	8.2
1-3 years	26.7	26.2	32.5	36.8	30.9
4-7 years	30.9	36.2	32.9	34.3	33.3
8-11 years	19.4	17.5	16.8	12.9	16.5
12 years or more	14.6	12.9	7.7	6.1	10.2

Note. Percentage totals do not always equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 4
Respondent Percentages with Employed Spouses
by Service Branch (Q22)

Group	Spouse Employed	
	Yes	No
Air Force ^a		
Enlisted (N=1447):		
E-1--E-3 (N=316)	32.9	67.1
E-4--E-6 (N=519)	46.1	53.9
E-7--E-9 (N=612)	55.4	44.6
Total %	47.1	52.9
N	682	765
Officers (N=1733):		
O-1--O-2 (N=343)	50.1	49.9
O-3 (N=196)	39.8	60.2
O-4--O-5 (N=587)	40.9	59.1
O-6+ (N=607)	30.6	69.4
Total %	39.0	61.0
N	676	1057

Overall %	42.6	57.4
Total N	1358	1822
Army		
Enlisted (N=724):		
E-1--E-3 (N=110)	23.6	76.4
E-4--E-6 (N=272)	33.5	66.5
E-7--E-9 (N=342)	51.5	48.5
Total %	40.5	59.5
N	293	431
Officers (N=1309):		
W-1--W-4 (N=91)	45.0	55.0
O-1--O-2 (N=77)	48.0	52.0
O-3 (N=229)	46.3	53.7
O-4--O-5 (N=516)	47.9	52.1
O-6+ (N=396)	47.7	52.3
Total %	47.4	52.6
N	620	689

Overall %	44.9	55.1
Total N	913	1120

^aWarrant officers not included in the Air Force Analyses due to the small N (10).

Table 4 (Continued)

Group	Spouse Employed	
	Yes	No
Marine Corps		
Enlisted (N=930):		
E-1--E-3 (N=179)	28.5	71.5
E-4--E-6 (N=349)	41.3	58.7
E-7--E-9 (N=402)	48.8	51.2
Total	42.0	58.0
%		
N	391	539
Officers (N=1308):		
W-1--W-4 (N= 80)	45.0	55.0
O-1--O-2 (N=153)	39.9	60.1
O-3 (N=199)	38.7	61.3
O-4--O-5 (N=556)	41.7	58.3
O-6+ (N=320)	34.4	65.6
Total	39.4	60.6
%		
N	516	792
Overall	40.5	59.5
Total	907	1331
Navy		
Enlisted (N=1531):		
E-1--E-3 (N=184)	38.9	61.1
E-4--E-6 (N=640)	44.2	55.8
E-7--E-9 (N=706)	51.4	48.6
Total	46.9	53.1
%		
N	718	813
Officers (N=2256):		
W-1--W-4 (N=98)	53.1	46.9
O-1--O-2 (N=112)	62.5	37.5
O-3 (N=444)	53.6	46.4
O-4--O-5 (N=763)	45.9	54.1
O-6+ (N=839)	39.2	60.8
Total	46.0	53.9
%		
N	1039	1217
Overall	46.4	53.6
Total	1757	2030

Table 5

Respondent Percentages by Level of Gross Annual
Income and Service Branch (Q21)

Group	Level of Income					
	Up to \$12500	\$12501- \$20500	\$20501- \$28500	\$28501- \$36500	\$36501 or more	
Air Force ^a						
Enlisted (N=1509):						
E-1--E-3 (N=331)	81.5	13.1	2.4	0.6	2.1	
E-4--E-6 (N=549)	41.4	42.6	12.2	2.2	1.6	
E-7--E-9 (N=629)	1.6	27.0	46.1	18.6	6.7	
Total	%	33.5	29.7	24.2	8.7	3.8
	N	507	448	365	131	58
Officers (N=1775):						
O-1--O-2 (N=353)	9.4	44.2	30.9	11.8	3.7	
O-3 (N=202)	1.5	7.4	30.2	39.6	21.3	
O-4--O-5 (N=604)	0.7	0.4	8.1	32.1	58.8	
O-6+ (N=616)	0.5	0.5	1.2	5.7	9.2	
Total	%	2.4	10.0	12.7	19.8	55.2
	N	43	176	226	351	979
Overall	%	16.7	19.0	18.0	14.7	31.6
Total	N	550	624	591	482	1037
Army						
Enlisted (N=761):						
E-1--E-3 (N=109)	78.0	12.8	3.7	1.8	3.7	
E-4--E-6 (N=284)	51.8	35.2	9.5	3.2	0.4	
E-7--E-9 (N=368)	5.2	42.9	35.6	13.0	3.3	
Total	%	33.0	35.7	21.3	7.8	2.2
	N	251	272	162	59	17
Officers (N=1351):						
W-1--W-4 (N=93)	3.2	32.2	34.4	19.4	10.8	
O-1--O-2 (N=77)	15.6	35.1	35.1	7.8	6.5	
O-3 (N=235)	0.8	7.6	45.5	28.5	17.4	
O-4--O-5 (N=539)	0.0	0.9	13.2	34.3	51.6	
O-6+ (N=407)	0.2	0.5	1.5	4.2	93.6	
Total	%	1.3	6.1	18.0	21.7	52.9
	N	18	82	243	293	715
Overall	%	12.7	16.8	19.2	16.6	34.6
Total	N	269	354	405	352	732

^aWarrant officers not included in Air Force Analysis due to the small N (10).

Table 5 (Continued)

Group	Level of Income					
	Up to \$12500	\$12501- \$20500	\$20501- \$28500	\$28501- \$36500	\$36501 or more	
Marine Corps						
Enlisted (N=960):						
E-1--E-3 (N=177)	83.0	14.1	2.2	0.0	0.6	
E-4--E-6 (N=360)	50.6	35.6	8.9	4.2	0.8	
E-7--E-9 (N=423)	5.2	46.3	32.2	12.8	3.5	
Total	% N	36.6 351	36.4 349	17.9 172	7.2 69	2.0 19
Officers (N=1330):						
W-1--W-4 (N=83)	6.0	32.5	39.8	13.2	8.4	
O-1--O-2 (N=157)	4.4	41.4	42.0	7.6	4.4	
O-3 (N=200)	0.5	6.5	44.0	33.0	16.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=566)	0.9	0.7	13.6	35.7	49.1	
O-6+ (N=324)	0.0	0.0	0.3	7.7	92.0	
Total	% N	1.4 18	8.2 109	19.9 265	23.8 316	46.8 622
Overall Total	% N	16.1 369	20.0 458	19.1 437	16.8 385	27.9 641
Navy						
Enlisted (N=1595):						
E-1--E-3 (N=201)	79.6	11.4	4.0	1.5	3.5	
E-4--E-6 (N=664)	35.4	46.1	12.8	3.9	1.8	
E-7--E-9 (N=730)	3.0	36.7	41.0	14.4	4.9	
Total	% N	26.1 417	37.4 597	24.6 392	8.4 134	3.4 55
Officers (N=2332):						
W-1--W-4 (N=101)	0.0	11.9	48.5	26.7	12.9	
O-1--O-2 (N=117)	14.5	30.8	29.0	17.1	8.5	
O-3 (N=463)	0.2	6.5	36.1	33.3	24.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=787)	0.8	0.8	10.3	30.1	58.1	
O-6+ (N=864)	0.0	0.3	0.7	3.4	95.6	
Total	% N	1.0 24	3.7 87	14.4 337	20.0 467	60.8 1417
Overall Total	% N	11.2 441	17.4 684	18.6 729	15.3 601	37.5 1472

Table 6

Percentage of Income Contributed by the Spouse of Respondent
by Service Branch (Q23)

Group	Percentage of Income					
	0	1-25	26-50	51-75	Over 75	
Air Force ^a						
Enlisted (N=686):						
E-1--E-3 (N=106)	17.9	38.7	34.0	7.5	1.9	
E-4--E-6 (N=240)	7.1	35.6	39.6	17.5	1.3	
E-7--E-9 (N=340)	5.9	49.4	41.2	3.5	0.0	
Total	%	8.2	42.6	39.5	9.0	0.7
	N	56	292	271	62	5
Officers (N=683):						
O-1--O-2 (N=172)	5.8	40.7	46.5	6.4	0.6	
O-3 (N=78)	2.6	39.7	46.2	11.5	0.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=242)	5.8	64.9	27.3	1.7	0.4	
O-6+ (N=191)	5.8	71.1	21.5	1.0	0.0	
Total	%	5.4	57.8	32.6	3.8	0.3
	N	37	395	223	16	2
Overall	%	6.8	50.2	36.1	6.4	5.1
Total	N	93	687	494	88	7
Army						
Enlisted (N=303):						
E-1--E-3 (N=27)	3.7	37.0	44.4	11.1	3.7	
E-4--E-6 (N=95)	13.7	27.4	36.8	18.9	3.2	
E-7--E-9 (N=181)	8.8	40.9	42.5	6.1	1.6	
Total	%	9.9	36.3	40.9	10.6	2.3
	N	30	110	124	32	7
Officers (N=628):						
W-1--W-4 (N=42)	4.8	50.0	35.7	4.8	4.8	
O-1--O-2 (N=37)	8.1	32.4	45.9	13.5	0.0	
O-3 (N=107)	2.8	50.5	42.0	3.7	0.9	
O-4--O-5 (N=255)	7.0	62.0	29.4	1.2	0.4	
O-6+ (N=187)	5.9	66.3	26.2	1.6	0.0	
Total	%	5.9	58.8	32.0	2.7	0.6
	N	37	369	201	17	4
Overall	%	7.2	51.5	34.9	5.3	1.2
Total	N	67	479	325	49	11

^aWarrant officers not included in the Air Force analysis due to the small N (10).

Table 6 (Continued)

Group	Percentage of Income					
	0	1-25	26-50	51-75	Over 75	
Marine Corps						
Enlisted (N=397):						
E-1--E-3	(N=54)	13.0	27.8	35.2	20.4	3.7
E-4--E-6	(N=144)	9.0	33.3	40.3	15.3	2.1
E-7--E-9	(N=199)	6.5	41.7	45.2	6.0	0.5
Total	%	8.3	36.8	42.1	11.3	1.5
	N	33	146	167	45	6
Officers (N=517):						
W-1--W-4	(N=36)	8.3	38.9	38.9	11.1	2.8
O-1--O-2	(N=61)	6.6	49.2	34.4	9.8	0.0
O-3	(N=76)	7.9	47.4	39.5	3.9	1.3
O-4--O-5	(N=234)	3.8	69.2	24.8	1.3	0.9
O-6+	(N=110)	6.4	73.6	20.0	0.0	0.0
Total	%	5.6	62.5	28.0	3.1	0.8
	N	29	323	145	16	4
Overall Total	%	6.8	51.3	34.1	6.7	1.1
	N	62	459	312	61	10
Navy						
Enlisted (N=730):						
E-1--E-3	(N=76)	23.7	31.6	28.9	10.5	5.3
E-4--E-6	(N=285)	6.0	34.4	49.1	9.5	1.1
E-7--E-9	(N=369)	5.4	50.7	36.9	6.0	1.1
Total	%	7.5	42.3	40.8	7.8	1.5
	N	55	309	298	57	11
Officers (N=1047):						
W-1--W-4	(N=51)	5.9	49.0	45.1	0.0	0.0
O-1--O-2	(N=70)	8.6	30.0	54.3	7.1	0.0
O-3	(N=243)	3.3	40.7	47.7	7.8	0.4
O-4--O-5	(N=354)	3.4	61.9	32.8	2.0	0.0
O-6+	(N=329)	4.9	76.3	17.3	0.3	1.2
Total	%	4.3	58.7	33.4	3.0	0.5
	N	45	615	350	32	5
Overall Total	%	5.6	52.0	36.5	5.0	0.9
	N	100	924	648	89	16

Table 7
Respondent Percentages by Age Group and Service Branch (Q13)

Group	Age Group					Total	
	20 and under	21-30	31-40	41-50	51 and over		
Air Force							
Enlisted	%	8.5	35.8	34.5	19.9	1.3	100.0
	N	130	547	528	305	20	1530
Officers	%	0.0	18.0	33.3	43.1	5.6	100.0
	N	0	322	595	771	100	1788
Total	%	3.9	26.2	33.8	32.4	3.6	100.0
	N	130	869	1123	1076	120	3318
Army							
Enlisted	%	7.2	35.1	43.2	13.7	0.8	100.0
	N	56	272	335	106	6	775
Officers	%	0.0	13.3	41.1	39.0	6.6	100.0
	N	0	181	561	532	91	1365
Total	%	2.6	21.2	41.9	29.8	4.5	100.0
	N	56	453	896	638	97	2140
Marine Corps							
Enlisted	%	10.4	46.7	35.2	7.2	0.4	100.0
	N	102	458	345	71	4	980
Officers	%	0.1	19.6	42.6	33.4	4.3	100.0
	N	1	263	573	449	58	1344
Total	%	4.4	31.0	39.5	22.4	2.7	100.0
	N	103	721	918	520	62	2324
Navy							
Enlisted	%	4.3	38.2	46.2	10.6	0.7	100.0
	N	70	617	745	171	11	1614
Officers	%	0.0	15.1	35.5	41.6	7.7	100.0
	N	1	352	830	972	180	2335
Total	%	1.8	24.5	39.9	28.9	4.8	100.0
	N	71	969	1575	1143	191	3949

Table 8

Total Number of Dependents and Number Living
with Service Member by Service Branch

Group	Number of Dependents							Total
	None	1	2	3	4	5		
Air Force								
1. Total number of dependents (Q14):								
Enlisted	%	3.0	21.9	27.2	28.7	12.9	6.2	100.0
	N	46	336	417	439	198	95	1531
Officers	%	3.4	14.7	19.4	35.8	18.2	8.5	100.0
	N	60	262	345	637	325	152	1781
Total	%	3.2	18.0	23.0	32.5	15.8	7.4	100.0
	N	106	598	762	1076	523	247	3312
2. Number of dependents living with service member (Q15):								
Enlisted	%	6.8	23.2	26.4	28.2	11.1	4.3	100.0
	N	101	346	393	421	166	64	1491
Officers	%	3.6	20.0	23.9	32.7	14.5	5.3	100.0
	N	62	345	412	564	251	92	1726
Total	%	5.1	21.5	25.0	30.6	13.0	4.8	100.0
	N	163	691	805	985	417	156	3217
Army								
1. Total number of dependents (Q14):								
Enlisted	%	0.6	22.4	28.4	27.2	14.1	7.3	100.0
	N	5	173	219	210	109	56	772
Officers	%	0.6	18.1	21.7	35.2	16.4	7.9	100.0
	N	8	247	296	480	224	108	1363
Total	%	0.6	19.7	24.1	32.3	15.6	7.7	100.0
	N	13	420	515	690	333	164	2135
2. Number of dependents living with service member (Q15):								
Enlisted	%	14.4	22.3	23.7	22.3	13.1	4.2	100.0
	N	111	172	183	172	101	32	771
Officers	%	6.8	22.4	23.1	30.6	12.5	4.6	100.0
	N	93	304	314	415	170	62	1358
Total	%	9.6	22.4	23.3	27.6	12.7	4.4	100.0
	N	204	476	497	587	271	94	2129

Table 8 (Continued)

Group	Number of Dependents							Total
	None	1	2	3	4	5		
Marine Corps								
1. Total number of dependents (Q14):								
Enlisted	%	5.0	25.7	28.2	24.0	11.8	5.2	100.0
	N	49	252	276	235	116	51	979
Officers	%	0.7	17.0	20.0	35.3	17.6	9.4	100.0
	N	10	229	269	475	237	126	1346
Total	%	2.5	20.7	23.4	30.5	15.2	7.6	100.0
	N	59	481	545	710	353	177	2325
2. Number of dependents living with service member (Q15):								
Enlisted	%	10.0	25.4	25.9	23.8	10.8	4.1	100.0
	N	94	237	242	222	101	38	934
Officers	%	4.1	20.5	23.0	33.2	13.7	5.5	100.0
	N	55	274	308	444	183	73	1337
Total	%	6.6	22.5	24.2	29.3	12.5	4.9	100.0
	N	149	511	550	666	284	111	2271
Navy								
1. Total number of dependents (Q14):								
Enlisted	%	3.0	19.8	25.2	28.9	15.8	7.3	100.0
	N	49	320	407	468	256	118	1618
Officers	%	4.4	14.4	19.2	33.4	18.8	9.8	100.0
	N	102	337	448	780	440	230	2337
Total	%	3.8	16.6	21.6	31.6	17.6	8.8	100.0
	N	254	742	885	1170	541	214	3806
2. Number of dependents living with service member (Q15):								
Enlisted	%	9.8	18.7	23.5	28.0	14.4	5.7	100.0
	N	153	293	268	439	225	89	1567
Officers	%	4.5	20.1	23.1	32.6	14.1	5.6	100.0
	N	101	449	517	731	316	125	2239
Total	%	6.7	19.5	23.3	30.7	14.2	5.6	100.0
	N	254	742	885	1170	541	214	3806

Table 9

Mean Ages and Numbers of Dependents

Group	Mean Age	Average Number of Dependents--Total	Average Number of Live-in Dependents
Enlisted:			
Air Force	32.53	3.45	3.27
Army	31.86	3.54	3.10
Marine Corps	29.38	3.28	3.12
Navy	31.97	3.57	3.34
Total	31.43	3.46	3.21
Officers:			
Air Force	39.12	3.76	3.50
Army	39.46	3.73	3.33
Marine Corps	37.87	3.80	3.48
Navy	39.89	3.77	3.48
Total	39.08	3.76	3.45

Descriptions and Experiences with Military and Civilian Housing

Housing Type, Style, and Size

Table 10, which provides the percentages of respondents living in housing types and styles, shows that less than 5 percent of the Army sample lived in military family housing, which is considerably less than the percentages of respondents from the other service branches. Also, the percentages of Army respondents who lived in single-family homes (74%) and owned their own homes (64%) was higher than those for the other services' respondents. These housing differences were further reflected in the higher percentage of Army personnel receiving VHA. Housing style differences were most disproportionate in the "semi-detached" category, due to the Army sampling problem discussed previously. Across services, the majority of respondents living in military housing lived in on-base units, while the majority of those living in civilian housing owned their own homes. The most frequent style of housing was the single-family residence, followed by the duplex or semi-detached style. A large number of the respondents in all services were drawing VHA. Only a small percentage lived in an ineligible area.

Responses to items on housing type, style, and size are presented in Tables 11 through 15 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

Housing Type. Of the actual population of Air Force personnel eligible for military family housing, approximately 39.0 percent are so housed. In the current sample, 36.9 percent were living in military family housing at the time of the survey.

Table 11 illustrates that the E-1 to E-3 pay-grade group was the only one in which a larger percentage preferred military housing than was currently so housed. All other groups in military housing showed disparity in the opposite direction, with preference for military housing generally decreasing as rank increased. In support of this trend, the E-1 to E-3 group was also the only one in which a lower percentage preferred civilian housing than was currently so housed (52 vs. 69%).

Table 12 shows that, among personnel currently in military family housing, the E-1 to E-3, E-4 to E-5, and O-1 to O-2 pay-grade groups were the most satisfied in terms of the percentages preferring military housing. For all other military housing residents, over half indicated preferences for civilian housing. While most personnel in civilian housing preferred civilian housing, the highest percentages preferring military housing were found in the same pay-grade groups noted above--E-1 to E-3, E-4 to E-6, and O-1 to O-2.

When responses to current and preferred housing type items were cross-tabulated against those to other survey items, results showed that current residents of military housing were more likely to have larger families, middle-level income (\$16,501--\$32,500), unemployed spouses, and large residences (up to three bedrooms) than were those in the civilian community (i.e., they were generally better housed). However, when comparing preferences, those who preferred military housing were more likely to have smaller families, be living in smaller residences, and have employed spouses. Those in the lower income categories (\$8,500 or less to \$16,500) preferred military housing more than those in the middle and high income brackets, who, regardless of their current housing, showed increased preferences for civilian housing.

Housing Style. Table 13 shows that, while 61 percent of the Air Force sample in military family housing currently reside in "other" styles, over 92 percent preferred single-family detached units. Mobile/manufactured homes was the only category of these "other" styles to show an increase from current to preferred. Although matching of current and preferred styles was considerably higher among personnel living in civilian housing, the same overwhelming preference for single-family housing was evident, with most of the percentage shift away from other styles. The condominium/cooperative was the only style category showing a very slight increase in preference, a response category that may have implied ownership.

Table 14 shows that the percentage of personnel housed in their preferred housing style generally increased as a function of increasing rank/income. Among enlisted, the preference for single-family units increased with increase in pay grade, as did the percentages of personnel currently housed in such units. Among officers, the preferences for single-family residences was consistently higher than among the enlisted. Also, the matching of current with preferred styles generally increased with rank, except for O-6 and above personnel. For this group, the current to preferred style discrepancies were greater in single-family and duplex housing than for the O-4 to O-5 group.

Housing Size. As shown in Table 15, only slight differences in family size exist between the Air Force enlisted and officers. Across housing types (military/civilian) and styles, considerably more enlisted than officers live in smaller residences.

Army

Housing Type. Although approximately 34.6 percent of Army families eligible for military family housing are so housed, less than 5 percent of the present sample currently live in military housing. This low percentage should be taken into account in interpreting the responses of this group.

Table 11 shows that, for those in military housing, disparity exists between current and preferred housing type for all pay groups, with the E-1 to E-6 and O-1 to O-2 groups showing the highest disparities. This concurs with the higher percentages preferring military family housing over the civilian sector.

Table 12 shows that respondents currently housed in military units preferred to be there, except for O-3 to O-5 officers. Generally, those in civilian housing preferred to be there, except for the E-1 to E-3 group, 51 percent of whom desired to live in military housing.

When responses to the current and preferred housing items were compared to those to other survey items, it was found that those in military housing tended to have somewhat larger families and to be housed in more one- and two-bedroom units than did those in civilian housing. Additionally, more military housing residents had unemployed spouses and they more often fell into the lower income brackets (\$8,500 or less to \$16,500). The exception to this was the highest income group (\$40,501 or more), who showed the greatest percentage preferring military housing. Comparing current and preferred percentages, all the income groups above \$16,500, except one (\$24,501-\$28,500), showed increased percentages preferring military housing.

Housing Style. Table 13 shows that, although 67 percent of military housing residents lived in other styles, 82 percent preferred single-family detached units. For those in civilian housing, the match between current and preferred styles was somewhat better, with 78 percent currently in single-family houses versus 92 preferring that style. The only

style other than single-family to show an increase in percentage between current and preferred was the condominium/cooperative style, a response category that may have implied ownership.

Table 14 shows that the number of personnel currently housed in their preferred style of housing increased as rank increased, among both enlisted and officers. For both groups, younger and lower-ranking personnel were more likely than older and higher-ranking personnel to prefer styles other than single-family detached units. Overall, however, the preference for single-family housing was overwhelming.

Housing Size. As shown in Table 15, a somewhat greater percentage of Army enlisted than officers have no dependents (14 vs. 7%). Across housing types and styles, almost 40 percent of enlisted live in residences with two bedrooms or less, compared to less than 10 percent of the officers.

Marine Corps

Housing Type. The Marine Corps houses approximately 31.2 percent of their eligible families in military family housing. In the present sample, 32.5 percent were current residents of military housing at the time of the survey.

Table 11 shows that, of those living in military housing, all pay-grade groups except E-1 to E-6 enlisted preferred civilian housing. Table 12 shows that, among military housing residents, the E-1 to E-3, O-3, and O-6 and above pay-grade groups showed the greatest percentages preferring military housing. Although over half of those in the remaining enlisted and officer groups preferred military housing, the percentage decreased as rank increased. Among civilian housing residents, between 67 percent (E-1 to E-3 group) and 93 percent (O-4 to O-5 group) indicated they preferred civilian housing. Preference for military housing was highest among the lower pay grades and decreased as pay grade increased across both the enlisted and officer groups.

Relative to selected demographic items on the survey, respondents currently in military housing tended to have larger families, more three-bedroom residences, fewer employed spouses, and fell more into the middle income category (\$16,501-\$32,500) than did civilian housing residents. No appreciable differences were found with respect to the number of live-in dependents, and only a small increase was noted among those currently in one or two bedroom residences in the direction of preference for military housing. Considerably greater preference for military housing was found among those with unemployed spouses and with lower income levels (\$8,500 or less--\$16,500).

Housing Style. Table 13 shows that, among military housing residents, the greatest disparity between current styles and preferred styles was found in single-family units and duplex styles. Among civilian housing residents, disparity was less for these styles but greater in the apartment style. Preference for single-family units was very high overall, particularly among military housing residents.

Table 14 shows that, in general, the match between current and preferred styles increased as rank increased across both enlisted and officer pay grades. Also, the younger/lower-ranking personnel indicated a wider variation in their style preferences than did the older/higher-ranking respondents, who most often indicated preference for single-family residences. The only housing style showing greater preference percentages than current residence percentages was the condominium/cooperative option, a response that may have implied ownership.

Housing Size. Table 15 shows that approximately 35 percent of the enlisted have no or only one dependent, compared to 24 percent of the officers. Across housing types and styles, 42 percent of the enlisted live in residences with two bedrooms or less, compared to 10 percent of the officers.

Navy

Housing Type. The Navy currently houses approximately 25.0 percent of their eligible families in military housing. In the present sample, 21.2 percent lived in military housing at the time of the survey.

Table 11 shows that, for military housing residents, only the E-1 to E-3 and O-1 to O-2 groups indicated greater preference for military housing than were so housed. All other groups showed greater percentage preferences for civilian housing.

As illustrated in Table 12, among military housing residents, the E-1 to E-3, W-1 to W-4, and O-1 to O-2 groups showed the highest percentages preferring military housing. Between 52 and 60 percent of all other groups preferred the type of housing in which they currently lived. Among civilian housing residents, between 64 and 96 percent preferred to be there, with the E-1 to E-6 group showing the highest percentages preferring to be in military housing, followed by the W-1 to W-4 and O-1 to O-2 groups. For all other groups, less than 10 percent preferred military housing over their current civilian-type housing.

Relative to selected demographic items from the survey, military housing residents tended to have larger families, more two- and three-bedroom residences, fewer employed spouses, and more often fell into the low and middle income categories (\$8,500 or less--\$32,500) than did civilian housing residents. Preferences for military over civilian housing were most associated with currently living in two- or three-bedroom residences, unemployed spouses, and lower incomes (\$8,500 or less--\$16,500). Responses were not appreciably different by family size.

Housing Style. Table 13 shows that, while 63 percent of military housing residents currently lived in "other" styles of housing, 79 percent preferred the single-family residence. The match between current and preferred styles was considerably better within the civilian community, with the current and preferred percentages for the single-family style both being about 92 percent. Among both military and civilian housing residents, there were slight percentage increases from current to preferred in the apartment, condominium/cooperative, and mobile/manufactured home styles. However, these figures actually represent very small numbers of respondents.

Pay-grade differences in housing styles, provided in Table 14, show that disparity between current and preferred housing styles was greater among the enlisted and generally decreased as rank increased. The E-1 to E-3, E-4 to E-6, and O-1 to O-2 pay-grade groups showed the greatest variety in housing preferences. Overall, however, the majority greatly preferred single-family detached units.

Housing Size. Family size differences were minimal between enlisted and officers. However, over 33 percent of the enlisted live in residences with two bedrooms or less, compared to approximately 9 percent of the officers.

Civilian Housing Rentals and Housing Demographics

Responses to items on civilian housing rentals and housing demographics are provided in Table 16 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

As shown, somewhat greater percentages of Air Force officer personnel spend more time commuting to work than do the enlisted, and slightly more use public transportation. Somewhat more enlisted rely on other means of transportation, such as bicycling or walking to work. More enlisted than officer respondents were receiving supplemental governmental assistance with rental expenses. Finally, over 85 percent of all respondents were required to give 30-day notices before moving out of their civilian rental.

Somewhat larger percentages of enlisted personnel had spent more time in units classified as "substantial" than did officers. More than half of the respondents, both enlisted and officers, who had lived in military housing had used "self-help" maintenance stores.

Nearly half of all the respondents indicated that their BAQ (and VHA, where applicable) covered 50 percent or more of their housing costs. It may be that more officers than enlisted fell into the less than 50 percent coverage categories because a greater percentage owned their homes, lived in single-family units, and generally lived in larger residences.

Army

The majority of Army respondents who rent in the civilian community, both officer and enlisted, have a 15- to 30-minute commute to work, with approximately 10 percent more officers than enlisted commuting longer distances. Use of private vehicles for transportation was most common for both groups, and officers more frequently used car pools.

Only 3 percent of enlisted and 5 percent of officers were receiving rental assistance other than BAQ or VHA. Finally, more officers than enlisted indicated their rentals required 30-day notices prior to moving (94 vs. 88%).

Almost 60 percent of the enlisted and 67 percent of the officers indicated they had never lived in substandard military housing. However, nearly 20 percent of the enlisted indicated that half or more of their total experience in military housing had been in substandard units, compared to 8 percent of the officers. Of those who had lived in military housing, 64 percent of the officers had used a "self-help" maintenance store, compared to 38 percent of the enlisted.

Slightly more officers than enlisted respondents indicated greater percentages of their housing costs were covered by their BAQ (and VHA where applicable).

Marine Corps

Table 16 shows that only minor differences exist between enlisted and officers renting civilian housing with respect to commuting time. About three-quarters of the respondents drive their own vehicle to work, with the enlisted using car pooling slightly more than officers. Five percent of enlisted personnel were receiving rental assistance

beyond BAQ and VHA, compared to 1 percent of officers. Finally, the majority were required to give a 30-day notice on their rentals prior to moving, with the percentage somewhat higher for officers.

Considerably more enlisted than officers in the sample had spent time in substandard military housing (44 vs. 28%). A relatively high percentage of the enlisted (11%) indicated that all of their military housing experience had been in such units. No appreciable differences were found between pay grades in usage of "self-help" maintenance stores at military housing sites.

Although fewer enlisted than officers indicated that their BAQ (and VHA where applicable) covered 25 to 75 percent of their housing costs, more enlisted than officers reported that it covered 76 to 100 percent.

Navy

The distribution of commuting times to work was similar for enlisted and officers, with the majority spending up to 30 minutes one-way during "rush hour" traffic. About 70 percent used private vehicles, and 20 percent indicated that they usually car pool.

Only 4 percent of enlisted and 1 percent of officers receive rental assistance other than BAQ or VHA. Finally, over 90 percent of all respondents were required to give a minimum of 30-day's notice before moving.

Fewer officers than enlisted in the sample had spent time in "substandard" military housing (28 vs. 35%). Also, 18 percent of the enlisted indicated that half or more of their total time in military housing had been in substandard units, compared to 11 percent of the officers. Somewhat greater usage of the "self-help" maintenance stores was indicated by the enlisted than officers (31 vs. 25%), although about half of both groups said that no store was available to them.

Waiting Lists and Housing Referrals

Responses to items on waiting lists and referrals are provided in Table 17 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

As shown, enlisted respondents were waiting or had waited for assignment to military family housing at their present location for somewhat longer periods of time than did officers. Of enlisted respondents currently on waiting lists to move in or out of military family housing, over 54 percent were waiting to move from civilian to military housing and 12 percent were waiting to move to military family housing at their next station, compared to 31 and 36 percent respectively for officers.

The principal reasons given by enlisted and officer respondents for not being on a waiting list for military housing were that they did not want to live in military housing or that they already lived there. Over 55 percent of the officers did not want to live in military housing, compared to 34 percent of the enlisted. Relatively few of the respondents were currently on military housing waiting lists, and most of these were only registered on one list. The main reason given for being on a waiting list, by both officer and enlisted groups, was to save money by living in military housing. Relative to finding civilian housing, somewhat more enlisted than officers felt the housing office was helpful.

Army

About half of Army officer respondents who were waiting for (or had waited for) military housing in their present location had waited 3 months or less and half for 4 months or more, compared to one-third and two-thirds respectively for enlisted. Of the relatively few respondents who were currently on a waiting list to move in or out of military housing, the overwhelming reason for both enlisted and officers was to move from civilian housing to military. Somewhat more officers than enlisted were not on waiting lists for military housing.

Of the relatively small numbers of respondents who were on waiting lists for military housing, 92 percent of the officers were only on one list and 7 percent, on two, compared to 76 and 16 percent for enlisted. The most frequent reason given by respondents for being on these lists was to save money by moving into military housing. Slightly more officers than enlisted were on waiting lists to move to preferred housing (11 vs. 5%), and slightly more enlisted than officers were on lists to move from substandard to adequate housing (11 vs. 3%). Over half of both enlisted and officers indicated that the local housing office was somewhat or very helpful in locating civilian housing.

Marine Corps

Differences between officer and enlisted respondents were negligible with respect to the length of waits for military family housing assignments: Considerable numbers of both groups waited over 4 months for their assignments to military housing. Of enlisted respondents who were on waiting lists to move in or out of military housing, almost two-thirds were waiting to move from civilian to military housing. For officers, 24 percent were waiting to move out of military housing, 28 percent were waiting for assignment at their next duty station, and 37 percent were waiting to move from civilian to military housing.

Of the relatively few respondents who were currently registered for military housing, the majority were only on one waiting list. Reasons for being on waiting lists varied, but the most common one was to save money by moving into military housing. Relative to locating civilian housing, approximately two-thirds of the respondents perceived the local housing office as being somewhat or very helpful.

Navy

As shown, over 39 percent of enlisted respondents had waited (or were waiting) over 6 months for their assignment to military housing, compared to 21 percent of the officers. The most common reason for being on a waiting list to move in or out of military housing for enlisted was to move from civilian to military housing; and for officers, to move into military housing at the next duty station. Another 21 percent of the officers were waiting to move out of military housing, and 30 percent were waiting to move from civilian to military housing. The most common reason given for not being on a waiting list was that they did not want to live in military housing. This reason was given by 56 percent of the officers and 38 percent of the enlisted.

Of the relatively low numbers of respondents currently registered for military housing, 88 percent of the officers were on only one waiting list, compared to 68 percent of the enlisted. Another 19 percent of enlisted were on two lists. The most frequent reason given for being on a waiting list by all respondents was to save money by moving

into military housing. Enlisted respondents were somewhat more satisfied with the helpfulness of the local housing office than were the officers.

Importance of/Satisfaction with Housing Aspects

The 40 items (Q60-Q99) addressing the importance of and satisfaction with various aspects of housing were examined by service branch, type of housing (military/civilian), enlisted/officer, and aggregately. All differences in mean responses per item emerging as a result of these analyses were found to be included within an enlisted/officer by housing type breakdown. Thus, results, shown in Table 18, are reported according to this breakdown.

Most Important Aspects

As shown, 13 items (32.5% of the total) emerged as the most important housing aspects for one or more of the respondent groups, enlisted or officers; that is, their mean response was between 3.00 and 4.00 (between the response options "very important" and "one of the most important"). Six of these 13 items, representing basic aspects of housing, were rated as most important by all respondents, in the following order: security, privacy, structural condition of the residence, appearance of the residence, adequacy of the heating system, and amount of indoor living space. More individual/situational items showed differences by rank and/or housing type. Pest control was of great importance to enlisted personnel in both types of housing and to officers in military housing; the availability of good schools was very important to both groups of officers and to enlisted living in military housing.

The greatest differences by housing type were found on the next three items listed in the table. Although the cost of housing and utilities and the general appearance of the neighborhood were all rated as very important by both enlisted and officers living in civilian housing, only one of these aspects, neighborhood appearance, was rated highly by military housing residents (officers). Finally, the availability of washer/dryer hookups was of major importance only to officers in military housing; and the financial benefits of owning a home, only to officers in civilian housing.

Examination of the satisfaction ratings of the 13 most important housing aspects revealed three main trends: (1) officers were generally more satisfied than were enlisted, (2) civilian housing residents were generally more satisfied than were military housing residents, and (3) satisfaction ratings were relatively high for all respondent groups.

Among the officers, military residents gave the highest satisfaction ratings to privacy, cost of utilities used, and the availability of washer/dryer hookups; and the lowest ratings, to the availability of good schools and financial benefits of owning a home. Officers in civilian housing gave the highest ratings to privacy, residence structural condition and appearance, appearance of the neighborhood, and availability of washer/dryer hookups; and the lowest ratings to housing and utility costs. Among enlisted, those living in military housing were most satisfied with security, availability of good schools (the reverse of the officer ratings), the cost of utilities, and washer/dryer hookups; and least satisfied with the amount of privacy they have and the adequacy of pest control. Enlisted in civilian housing were most satisfied with security, residence appearance, and availability of schools, and least satisfied with housing and utility costs (the same as for officers).

Exceptions to the trend of civilian housing residents being more satisfied than military housing residents were in the cost of housing and of utilities, with the military community rating these items as being less important to them and more satisfactory.

Also, officers in military housing were more satisfied with security than were those in the civilian community. Although neither of the enlisted groups rated the availability of washer/dryer hookups as highly important to them, those in the military housing community were somewhat more satisfied with this aspect than were those living in civilian housing.

Moderately Important Aspects

Twenty items (50% of the total) emerged as being moderately important to one or more of the respondent groups; that is, the response mean was between 2.00 and 2.99 (between "moderately important" and "very important"). As shown, 12 of these items, principally convenience and space-oriented, were rated as moderately important by all groups. Enlisted in military housing tended to place greater importance on these items than did enlisted in civilian housing, except for those concerning residence floor plan, outdoor living space, and decorating freedom. Among officers, no appreciable differences in number of items rated higher were found. However, as with enlisted, officers in civilian housing gave higher rating to amenities and freedoms than to simple conveniences, while military housing residents rated conveniences as more important than amenities.

Officers in military housing rated getting away from a military atmosphere in their homes and having fenced-in yards as less important than did the other groups; and length of waits for military housing and provided maintenance, as more important. Being able to keep a pet and having a dishwasher provided were more important to officers than to enlisted. Enlisted respondents in military housing was the only group giving moderate ratings to availability of parking and the proximity of playgrounds.

On the 12 items rated as moderately important by all respondent groups, considerably more of the items were rated higher in satisfaction by the civilian housing residents than by the military housing residents, regardless of rank. Between enlisted and officers in both housing types, officers also indicated higher satisfaction levels than did the enlisted on nearly all items.

The officers in civilian housing were more satisfied with housing amenity and freedom items (i.e., room arrangement, separate bedrooms for each child, decorating freedom) and least satisfied with the convenience of their residence to work. Officers in military housing were most satisfied with the adequacy of the trash collection and with the convenience to work, and least satisfied with storage space and their lack of freedom to decorate and/or make minor changes in their residences.

The enlisted in civilian housing were most satisfied with having a garage or carport and the convenience to civilian stores and shopping and least satisfied with the adequacy of storage space. Enlisted personnel in military housing were most satisfied with trash collection and the convenience of their residences to work and least satisfied with their lack of freedom to decorate and/or make minor changes in their residences and the adequacy of the cooling system, storage, and kitchen cupboard space.

Of the two items rated moderately important by only three of the four respondent groups (Q66 and Q90), satisfaction with getting away from the military atmosphere was high for both enlisted and officers in civilian housing. Also, enlisted and officers in civilian housing were considerably more satisfied than those in military housing with having fenced-in yards. Of the two items rated moderately important to the military housing community (Q62 and Q64), the satisfaction rating for the length of wait for military housing was near neutral for both enlisted and officers; the rating for having maintenance provided was only slightly better. Although civilian-housed personnel did not

rate the length of military housing waits as important, they were notably less satisfied with this aspect. The satisfaction ratings given to being able to keep a pet and having a dishwasher were high in both the officer and military communities, although somewhat less among the military residents. Enlisted personnel living in military housing, who rated parking availability and playground proximity as moderately important to them, were somewhat satisfied with these aspects of their current housing.

Least Important Aspects

Seven of the 40 items (17.5%) were rated as "least important"; that is, the mean response score was between 1.00 and 1.99 (between "of no importance" and "somewhat important"). Within this group of items, military housing residents, both officer and enlisted, tended to rate the items higher in importance than did the civilian residents. Ratings approaching "moderately important" were found for the adequacy of community groups (all respondent groups), and for provision of a garbage disposal in the residence (all groups but enlisted in civilian housing). Satisfaction ratings were generally high, with one notable exception. Although the availability of mass transportation was not considered very important, all respondent groups were less than satisfied with this aspect.

Table 10
Respondent Percentages Living in Housing Types and
Styles by Service Branch

Item	Air Force	Army	Marine Corps	Navy	Total
Type of housing:					
Government:					
Government-leased	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.6
On-base military	31.8	2.9	26.8	13.2	19.3
Off-base military	4.4	1.0	5.0	7.6	5.0
Total	36.9	4.7	32.4	21.3	24.9
Civilian:					
Mobile/manufactured homes	1.3	1.8	1.6	1.0	1.3
Rentals	16.1	29.4	23.2	20.1	21.3
Owned	45.7	64.1	42.8	57.6	52.5
Total	63.1	95.3	67.6	78.7	75.1
Overall Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Style of housing:					
Single-family	64.8	74.3	65.4	68.3	67.8
Semi-detached (duplex)	22.7	9.0	17.3	18.0	17.5
Apartment	7.1	9.8	10.3	8.4	8.7
Condominium/cooperative	1.0	1.3	1.6	1.7	1.4
Mobile/manufactured home	3.4	4.5	4.2	2.0	3.3
Other	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.7	1.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0
Drawing VHA:					
Yes	62.7	92.0	66.8	78.6	74.2
No, in military housing	35.1	2.7	30.5	20.4	23.4
No, ineligible area	2.2	5.2	2.7	1.0	2.4
Total	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. Percentage totals do not always equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 11

Current and Preferred Housing Type by Service Branch

Group	Military Housing			Civilian Housing		
	Current (%)	Preferred (%)	Difference (%)	Current (%)	Preferred (%)	Difference (%)
Air Force ^a						
Enlisted:						
E-1--E-3	31.4	47.7	-16.3	68.6	52.3	16.3
E-4--E-6	54.7	36.1	18.6	45.3	63.9	-18.6
E-7--E-9	41.8	22.8	19.0	58.2	77.2	-19.0
Total	% 44.4	32.8	11.6	55.6	67.2	-11.6
	N 643	453	190	806	928	-122
Officers:						
O-1--O-2	51.1	36.3	14.8	48.9	63.7	-14.8
O-3	24.9	13.5	11.4	75.1	86.5	-11.4
O-4--O-5	16.1	8.7	7.4	83.9	91.3	-7.4
O-6+	35.3	20.3	15.0	64.7	79.7	-15.0
Total	% 30.7	18.8	11.9	69.3	81.2	-11.9
	N 545	324	221	1230	1402	-172
Overall Total	% 36.9	25.0	11.9	63.1	75.0	-11.9
	N 1188	777	411	2036	2330	-294
Army						
Enlisted:						
E-1--E-3	9.9	53.4	-43.4	90.1	46.6	43.5
E-4--E-6	13.0	36.9	-23.9	87.0	63.1	23.9
E-7--E-9	4.5	19.8	-15.3	95.5	80.2	15.3
Total	% 8.3	30.5	-22.2	91.7	69.5	22.2
	N 60	207	-147	659	472	187
Officers:						
W-1--W-4	0.0	15.1	-15.1	100.0	84.9	15.1
O-1--O-2	9.5	30.1	-20.6	95.5	69.9	20.6
O-3	3.0	16.1	-13.1	97.0	83.8	13.1
O-4--O-5	2.6	14.6	-12.0	97.4	85.4	12.0
O-6+	2.0	16.1	-14.1	98.0	83.9	14.1
Total	% 2.9	16.0	-13.1	97.1	84.0	13.1
	N 36	206	-170	1306	1077	229
Overall Total	% 4.7	21.2	-16.5	95.3	78.8	16.5
	N 96	413	-317	1965	1549	416

^aWarrant officers not included in the Air Force analysis due to the small N (10).

Table 11 (Continued)

Group	Military Housing			Civilian Housing		
	Current (%)	Preferred (%)	Difference (%)	Current (%)	Preferred (%)	Difference (%)
Marine Corps						
Enlisted:						
E-1--E-3	26.5	44.8	-18.3	73.5	55.2	18.3
E-4--E-6	34.2	35.3	-1.1	65.8	64.7	1.1
E-7--E-9	39.8	28.8	11.0	60.2	71.2	-11.0
Total	% 35.3	34.2	1.1	64.7	65.8	-1.1
	N 320	298	22	586	574	12
Officers:						
W-1--W-4	39.8	33.8	6.0	60.2	66.2	-6.0
O-1--O-4	32.3	32.0	0.3	67.7	68.0	-0.3
O-3	29.4	28.1	1.3	70.6	71.9	-1.3
O-4--O-5	25.9	18.4	7.5	74.1	81.6	-7.5
O-6+	36.1	30.0	6.1	63.9	70.0	-3.7
Total	% 30.5	25.2	5.3	69.5	74.8	-5.3
	N 409	328	81	931	972	-41
Overall Total	% 32.4	28.8	3.7	67.6	71.2	-3.7
	N 729	626	103	1517	1546	-29
Navy						
Enlisted:						
E-1--E-3	16.0	42.3	-26.3	84.0	57.7	26.3
E-4--E-6	33.7	31.0	2.7	66.3	69.1	-2.7
E-7--E-9	26.8	20.2	6.6	73.2	79.8	-6.6
Total	% 28.3	27.3	1.0	71.7	72.7	-1.0
	N 440	410	30	1114	1093	21
Officers:						
W-1--W-4	32.0	30.3	1.7	68.0	69.7	-1.7
O-1--O-2	24.6	26.6	-2.0	75.4	73.4	2.0
O-3	17.4	15.2	2.2	82.6	84.8	-2.2
O-4--O-5	11.7	10.6	1.1	88.3	89.4	-1.1
O-6+	17.5	17.0	0.5	82.5	83.0	-0.5
Total	% 16.5	15.5	1.0	83.5	84.5	-1.0
	N 382	350	32	1935	1902	33
Overall Total	% 21.3	20.2	1.0	78.7	79.8	-1.0
	N 822	760	62	3049	2995	54

Table 12

Housing Type Preferred by Military and Civilian
Housing Residents by Service Branch

Group	Military Housing Residents		Civilian Housing Residents		Preference Totals		
	Military Preferred (%)	Civilian Preferred (%)	Military Preferred (%)	Civilian Preferred (%)	Military Preferred (%)	Civilian Preferred (%)	
Air Force ^a							
Enlisted:							
E-1--E-3	71.9	28.1	36.9	63.1	47.7	52.3	
E-4--E-6	54.2	45.8	14.1	85.9	36.1	63.9	
E-7--E-9	45.1	54.9	6.9	93.1	22.8	77.2	
Total	%	53.1	46.9	29.7	83.3	32.8	67.2
	N	324	286	129	642	453	928
Officers:							
O-1--O-2	59.1	40.9	12.5	87.5	36.3	63.7	
O-3	41.7	58.3	4.1	95.9	13.5	86.5	
O-4--O-5	32.6	67.4	4.4	95.6	8.7	91.3	
O-6+	45.9	54.1	6.6	93.4	20.3	79.7	
Total	%	47.7	52.3	6.2	93.8	18.8	81.2
	N	249	273	75	1129	324	1402
Overall Total	%	50.6	49.4	10.3	89.7	25.0	75.0
	N	573	559	204	1771	777	2330
Army							
Enlisted:							
E-1--E-3	75.0	25.0	51.3	48.8	53.4	46.6	
E-4--E-6	62.5	37.5	33.2	66.9	36.9	63.1	
E-7--E-9	80.0	20.0	17.0	83.0	19.8	80.2	
Total	%	69.1	30.9	27.1	72.9	30.5	69.5
	N	38	17	169	455	207	472
Officers:							
W-1--W-4	00.0	00.0	15.1	84.9	15.1	84.9	
O-1--O-2	57.1	42.9	27.3	72.2	30.1	69.9	
O-3	28.6	71.4	15.7	84.3	16.1	83.9	
O-4--O-5	50.0	50.0	13.7	86.3	14.6	85.4	
O-6+	75.0	25.0	14.8	85.2	16.1	83.9	
Total	%	52.8	47.2	15.2	84.8	16.0	84.0
	N	19	17	190	1060	206	1077
Overall Total	%	62.2	37.4	19.2	80.8	21.2	78.8
	N	57	34	359	1515	413	1549

^aWarrent officers not included in the the Air Force analysis due to the small N (10).

Table 12 (Continued)

Group	Military Housing Residents		Civilian Housing Residents		Preference Totals		
	Military Preferred (%)	Civilian Preferred (%)	Military Preferred (%)	Civilian Preferred (%)	Military Preferred (%)	Civilian Preferred (%)	
Marine Corps							
Enlisted:							
E-1--E-3		79.1	20.9	32.5	67.5	44.8	55.2
E-4--E-6		56.1	43.9	24.8	75.2	35.3	64.7
E-7--E-9		45.5	54.4	17.8	82.2	28.8	71.2
Total	%	53.9	46.1	23.5	76.5	34.2	65.8
	N	165	141	133	433	298	574
Officers:							
W-1--W-4		57.6	42.4	17.0	83.0	33.8	66.2
O-1--O-2		52.1	47.9	22.9	77.1	32.0	68.0
O-3		61.4	38.6	14.4	85.6	28.1	71.9
O-4--O-5		50.7	49.3	7.2	92.8	18.4	81.6
O-6+		65.8	34.2	9.5	90.5	30.0	70.0
Total	%	57.3	42.7	11.2	88.8	25.2	74.8
	N	227	169	101	803	328	972
Overall Total	%	55.8	44.2	15.9	84.1	28.8	71.2
	N	392	310	234	1236	626	1546
Navy							
Enlisted:							
E-1--E-3		75.9	24.1	35.9	64.1	42.3	57.7
E-4--E-6		55.5	44.5	18.2	81.8	30.9	69.1
E-7--E-9		52.4	47.6	8.3	91.7	20.2	79.8
Total	%	55.5	44.5	15.9	84.1	27.3	72.7
	N	239	191	171	902	410	1093
Officers:							
W-1--W-4		71.0	29.0	11.8	88.2	30.3	69.7
O-1--O-2		71.4	28.6	11.1	88.9	26.6	73.4
O-3		59.7	40.3	5.9	94.1	15.2	84.8
O-4--O-5		58.9	41.1	4.0	96.0	10.6	89.4
O-6+		60.0	40.0	8.1	91.9	17.0	83.0
Total	%	61.3	38.6	6.5	93.5	15.5	84.5
	N	227	143	122	1759	350	1902
Overall Total	%	58.2	41.8	9.9	90.1	20.2	79.8
	N	466	334	293	2661	760	2995

Table 13

Current and Preferred Housing Styles by Military
and Civilian Housing Residents

Housing Style	Military Housing Residents		Civilian Housing Residents	
	Current (%)	Preferred (%)	Current (%)	Preferred (%)
Air Force				
	(N = 1167)	(N = 2035)	(N = 1165)	(N = 2000)
Single-family detached	39.0	92.7	82.0	92.1
Duplex	54.7	4.2	5.3	2.5
Apartment	4.8	1.1	7.8	1.9
Condominium/cooperative	0.9	0.8	1.1	1.4
Mobile homes	0.6	1.2	3.8	2.0
Army				
	(N = 94)	(N = 93)	(N = 1944)	(N = 1916)
Single-family detached	33.0	81.7	78.5	92.0
Duplex	39.4	4.3	7.7	2.9
Apartment	25.5	6.5	7.7	1.3
Condominium/cooperative	1.1	4.3	1.1	1.8
Mobile homes	1.1	3.2	3.9	2.0
Marine Corps				
	(N = 714)	(N = 715)	(N = 1505)	(N = 1481)
Single-family detached	56.7	92.6	72.2	89.0
Duplex	36.1	3.9	9.0	3.4
Apartment	5.7	1.0	12.0	2.9
Condominium/cooperative	1.0	1.7	1.9	2.0
Mobile homes	0.4	0.8	5.0	2.6
Navy				
	(N = 790)	(N = 810)	(N = 3016)	(N = 3000)
Single-family detached	36.8	78.6	91.9	92.2
Duplex	55.2	8.8	5.7	3.6
Apartment	6.5	8.7	0.6	1.2
Condominium/cooperative	1.0	1.8	0.6	1.3
Mobile homes	0.5	2.0	1.2	1.7

Table 14
Current and Preferred Housing Styles by Service Branch

Group	Single Family (%)	Duplex (%)	Apartment (%)	Condo./Coop. (%)	Mobile Homes (%)
Air Force ^a					
E-1 to E-3					
Current (N = 287)	21.6	28.9	33.1	1.75	14.6
Preferred (N = 288)	63.9	13.2	10.1	4.2	8.7
E-4 to E-6					
Current (N = 517)	38.7	43.9	12.2	0.6	4.6
Preferred (N = 515)	89.7	4.3	2.5	1.4	2.1
E-7 to E-9					
Current (N = 620)	66.1	28.7	2.3	1.4	1.1
Preferred (N = 602)	96.5	1.3	0.3	0.3	1.5
O-1 to O-2					
Current (N = 351)	51.8	35.6	9.7	0.8	2.0
Preferred (N = 349)	92.6	4.9	1.4	1.1	0.0
O-3					
Current (N = 200)	82.5	12.0	2.5	2.5	0.5
Preferred (N = 200)	94.0	2.5	0.5	1.5	1.5
O-4 to O-5					
Current (N = 602)	91.5	4.8	0.2	0.5	0.7
Preferred (N = 592)	98.8	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.2
O-6 and above					
Current (N = 615)	88.9	9.9	0.2	1.0	0.0
Preferred (N = 609)	96.9	1.0	0.3	1.1	0.6

Total					
Current (N = 3202)	66.3	23.3	6.7	1.1	2.6
Preferred (N = 3165)	92.3	3.1	1.6	1.2	1.7

Army					
E-1 to E-3					
Current (N = 88)	28.4	11.4	42.0	0.0	18.2
Preferred (N = 89)	60.7	14.6	10.1	3.4	11.2
E-4 to E-6					
Current (N = 262)	37.8	20.2	29.4	0.81	11.8
Preferred (N = 257)	78.2	5.8	4.3	6.6	5.0
E-7 to E-9					
Current (N = 353)	73.6	10.5	8.2	1.1	6.5
Preferred (N = 345)	89.8	2.3	0.6	1.7	3.5
W-1 to W-4					
Current (N = 94)	84.0	5.3	6.4	2.1	2.1
Preferred (N = 93)	91.4	1.1	4.3	2.2	1.1
O-1 to O-2					
Current (N = 72)	48.6	16.7	26.4	4.2	4.2
Preferred (N = 71)	81.7	9.8	2.8	4.2	1.4
O-3					
Current (N = 229)	81.6	10.0	6.1	2.2	0.0
Preferred (N = 225)	96.0	2.2	0.4	0.4	0.9
O-4 to O-5					
Current (N = 534)	91.4	6.0	1.9	0.7	0.0
Preferred (N = 525)	97.3	1.5	0.2	0.8	0.2
O-6 and above					
Current (N = 406)	94.8	3.4	0.7	0.5	0.5
Preferred (N = 404)	98.3	0.7	0.0	0.7	0.2

Total					
Current (N = 2038)	76.4	9.1	9.6	1.1	3.8
Preferred (N = 2009)	91.5	3.0	1.5	1.9	2.0

^aWarrant officers not included in Air Force analysis due to small N (10).

Table 14 (Continued)

Group	Single Family (%)	Duplex (%)	Apartment (%)	Condo./Coop. (%)	Mobile Homes (%)
Marine Corps					
E-1 to E-2					
Current (N = 163)	22.1	25.2	37.4	1.8	13.5
Preferred (N = 159)	58.5	11.9	10.7	10.7	8.2
E-4 to E-6					
Current (N = 324)	38.6	26.8	25.3	0.6	8.6
Preferred (N = 322)	80.7	5.6	6.5	2.5	4.6
E-7 to E-9					
Current (N = 400)	62.2	27.0	5.8	1.8	3.2
Preferred (N = 397)	93.7	2.8	1.2	1.2	1.0
W-1 to W-4					
Current (N = 82)	73.2	9.8	7.3	3.6	6.1
Preferred (N = 83)	97.6	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
O-1 to O-2					
Current (N = 158)	52.5	26.6	14.6	3.2	3.2
Preferred (N = 156)	85.9	7.7	1.9	2.5	1.9
O-3					
Current (N = 200)	74.5	16.0	6.0	2.0	1.5
Preferred (N = 96)	95.4	2.6	0.5	0.5	1.0
O-4 to O-5					
Current (N = 568)	86.8	9.8	1.6	1.4	0.4
Preferred (N = 563)	97.0	0.7	0.2	0.9	1.2
O-6 and above					
Current (N = 324)	91.4	5.9	1.8	0.9	0.0
Preferred (N = 320)	95.9	2.5	0.6	0.6	0.3

Total					
Current (N = 1491)	67.2	17.7	10.0	2.3	5.2
Preferred (N = 2196)	90.2	3.6	2.3	1.9	2.0

Navy					
E-1 to E-3					
Current (N = 80)	27.8	23.3	43.3	0.0	5.6
Preferred (N = 180)	61.7	18.3	9.4	5.6	5.0
E-4 to E-6					
Current (N = 608)	36.8	36.5	19.1	1.6	5.9
Preferred (N = 620)	83.5	7.6	1.9	2.4	4.5
E-7 to E-9					
Current (N = 720)	65.4	26.2	5.1	1.2	2.1
Preferred (N = 717)	94.4	2.4	1.7	2.1	3.9
W-1 to W-4					
Current (N = 99)	78.8	14.1	5.1	1.0	1.0
Preferred (N = 98)	97.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
O-1 to O-2E					
Current (N = 114)	48.2	26.3	21.9	3.5	0.0
Preferred (N = 111)	87.4	6.3	4.5	1.8	0.0
O-3 to O-3E					
Current (N = 457)	72.9	16.6	7.9	2.4	0.2
Preferred (N = 458)	95.4	2.8	0.6	0.6	0.4
O-4 to O-5					
Current (N = 780)	86.7	10.1	1.2	1.8	0.2
Preferred (N = 776)	96.3	3.9	0.0	1.7	0.6
O-6 and above					
Current (N = 847)	91.6	5.9	0.8	1.6	0.0
Preferred (N = 850)	97.4	2.0	0.1	0.4	0.1

Total					
Current (N = 2663)	70.0	18.4	8.2	1.6	1.7
Preferred (N = 3810)	92.2	4.0	1.1	1.2	1.6

Table 15

Family and Residence Size Differences by Service Branch

Item	Enlisted (%)	Officers (%)
Air Force		
Q15: Number of live-in dependents:	(N = 1491)	(N = 1726)
None	6.8	3.6
One	23.2	20.0
Two	26.4	23.9
Three	28.2	32.7
Four	11.1	14.5
Five or more	4.3	5.3
Q36: Number of bedrooms:	(N = 1516)	(N = 1792)
None (studio)	0.5	0.3
One	5.2	1.0
Two	25.9	5.6
Three	50.0	44.9
Four	17.4	43.1
Five	0.8	4.5
Six or more	0.2	0.6
Army		
Q15: Number of live-in dependents:	(N = 771)	(N = 1358)
None	14.4	6.8
One	22.3	22.4
Two	23.7	23.1
Three	22.3	30.6
Four	13.1	12.5
Five or more	4.2	4.6
Q36: Size of residence (bedrooms):	(N = 771)	(N = 1358)
None (studio)	0.8	0.4
One	9.1	1.0
Two	29.7	8.1
Three	47.3	44.1
Four	11.3	38.5
Five	1.4	7.1
Six or more	0.4	0.7

Table 15 (Continued)

Item	Enlisted (%)	Officers (%)
Marine Corps		
Q15: Number of live-in dependents:	(N = 934)	(N = 1337)
None	10.0	4.1
One	25.4	20.5
Two	25.9	23.0
Three	23.8	33.2
Four	10.8	13.7
Five or more	4.1	5.5
Q36: Size of residence (bedrooms):	(N = 965)	(N = 1344)
None (studio)	0.5	0.1
One	10.2	1.2
Two	31.5	9.0
Three	43.3	45.5
Four	13.3	37.8
Five	0.8	5.7
Six or more	0.4	0.7
Navy		
Q15: Number of live-in dependents:	(N = 1567)	(N = 2239)
None	9.8	4.5
One	18.7	20.1
Two	23.5	23.1
Three	28.0	32.6
Four	14.4	14.1
Five or more	5.7	5.6
Q36: Size of residence (bedrooms):	(N = 1607)	(N = 2332)
None (studio)	0.5	0.3
One	7.5	1.1
Two	25.8	7.4
Three	47.9	38.7
Four	16.2	41.8
Five	1.5	9.5
Six or more	0.6	1.3

Table 16

Response Percentages to Items on Civilian Rental Housing and Housing Demographics

Item	Air Force		Army		Marine Corps		Navy	
	Enlisted	Officer	Enlisted	Officer	Enlisted	Officer	Enlisted	Officer
Items on Civilian Rentals								
Q43: Time of a one-way commute to work during "rush hour" traffic.	(N = 1523)	(N = 1780)	(N = 762)	(N = 1353)	(N = 961)	(N = 1337)	(N = 1592)	(N = 2327)
15 minutes or less	53.8	44.6	25.1	22.7	32.2	34.4	23.7	25.2
15-30 minutes	37.6	38.3	51.3	43.7	40.4	33.0	37.4	31.8
31-45 minutes	6.2	11.2	12.2	19.5	14.4	17.0	22.0	24.5
46-60	1.6	4.2	4.6	10.3	6.8	10.1	9.2	14.0
more than 60 minutes	0.9	1.7	6.8	3.8	6.3	5.5	7.7	4.5
Q44: Kind of transportation most frequently used to travel to work.	(N = 1526)	(N = 1789)	(N = 771)	(N = 1359)	(N = 971)	(N = 1344)	(N = 1596)	(N = 2330)
Private vehicle--alone	80.1	80.1	81.2	76.6	73.5	78.2	69.2	69.6
Private vehicle--car pool	14.2	13.6	13.0	17.2	19.9	16.0	21.5	20.8
Public transportation (bus, subway, train)	0.2	2.6	2.1	4.0	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.5
Other (bicycle, walk, run)	5.5	3.7	3.8	2.2	4.3	3.7	5.5	6.1
Q41: Receiving governmental rental assistance other than BAQ and VHA (e.g., HUD section 8)?	(N = 346)	(N = 163)	(N = 318)	(N = 272)	(N = 337)	(N = 172)	(N = 488)	(N = 259)
Yes	8.1	4.3	3.1	5.5	5.3	1.2	3.7	1.2
No	91.9	95.7	96.9	94.5	94.7	98.8	96.3	98.9
Q42: Required to give at least a 30-day notice before moving?	(N = 339)	(N = 160)	(N = 311)	(N = 266)	(N = 334)	(N = 170)	(N = 479)	(N = 256)
Yes	85.2	88.1	87.8	93.6	88.0	91.2	90.0	94.5
No	14.8	11.9	12.2	6.4	12.0	8.8	10.0	5.5

Table 16 (Continued)

Item	Air Force		Army		Marine Corps		Navy	
	Enlisted	Officer	Enlisted	Officer	Enlisted	Officer	Enlisted	Officer
Items on Housing Demographics								
Q18: Of the total time spent in military housing, how much was in "sub-standard?"	(N = 998)	(N = 1391)	(N = 358)	(N = 1025)	(N = 518)	(N = 1086)	(N = 844)	(N = 1546)
None	67.9	78.2	58.9	66.8	56.4	71.9	65.3	72.2
Less than half of the time	16.4	13.2	21.5	24.2	19.1	16.3	16.5	16.9
About half of the time	4.7	3.5	6.4	3.7	8.3	5.3	6.4	3.8
More than half of the time	3.3	2.2	5.0	2.7	5.0	3.0	3.7	2.4
All of the time	7.6	2.9	8.1	2.5	11.2	3.4	8.2	4.6
Q20: What percentage of the service member's housing costs are covered by BAQ (and VHA where applicable)?	(N = 1527)	(N = 1787)	(N = 765)	(N = 1362)	(N = 972)	(N = 1341)	(N = 1594)	(N = 2332)
Not applicable, in military housing	35.6	26.3	4.6	1.8	23.9	26.8	22.2	15.1
1-25%	5.7	3.6	11.6	4.0	6.8	3.8	6.3	6.2
26-50%	11.2	22.6	21.3	25.2	14.7	21.0	16.6	25.2
51-75%	28.9	32.7	41.8	27.0	28.9	32.3	32.1	35.5
76-100%	18.7	14.8	20.7	22.0	25.7	16.2	22.8	18.0
Q24: Has the service member ever used a "self-help" maintenance store located at the military housing site?	(N = 1495)	(N = 1772)	(N = 764)	(N = 1355)	(N = 935)	(N = 1335)	(N = 1531)	(N = 2275)
Does not apply--none available	11.5	11.4	17.9	8.1	21.7	18.0	21.7	24.2
Yes	51.2	51.2	38.1	64.2	31.3	37.1	30.6	24.6
No	37.3	37.4	44.0	27.7	46.9	44.9	47.7	51.2

Table 17

Response Percentages to Waiting List and Housing Referral Items by Service Branch

Item	Air Force		Army		Marine Corps		Navy	
	Enlisted (%)	Officer (%)						
Q45: Length of wait for military housing at present location:	(N = 869)	(N = 633)	(N = 218)	(N = 261)	(N = 435)	(N = 478)	(N = 677)	(N = 504)
Less than 1 month	35.1	39.2	14.2	21.4	25.0	35.1	21.9	35.3
1-3 months	28.8	34.1	20.2	29.5	33.1	25.9	21.0	26.0
4-6 months	14.3	14.1	28.0	18.0	15.9	12.8	17.9	17.3
7-12 months	14.0	8.0	23.8	17.2	17.7	15.1	18.8	14.1
13-18 months	4.9	2.7	7.8	7.7	5.0	7.7	11.8	3.2
19 months or more	2.9	1.9	6.0	6.1	3.2	3.3	8.7	4.2
Q46: Reason for presently being on a waiting list to move in or out of military housing:	(N = 114)	(N = 89)	(N = 65)	(N = 70)	(N = 99)	(N = 107)	(N = 113)	(N = 97)
To move out of military housing	13.2	16.8	4.6	2.8	17.2	24.3	12.4	20.6
To move into another style of housing	18.4	10.1	6.2	0.0	10.1	4.7	8.8	7.2
To move from civilian to military housing	54.4	31.5	76.9	72.8	60.6	37.4	53.1	29.9
To move from another location to military family housing at present location	1.8	5.6	9.2	4.3	8.1	5.6	10.6	5.2
To move to military family housing at the next duty station	12.3	36.0	3.1	20.0	4.0	28.3	15.0	37.1
Q47: Reason for <u>not</u> being on a waiting list to move in or out of military housing:	(N = 1387)	(N = 1677)	(N = 673)	(N = 1252)	(N = 852)	(N = 1213)	(N = 1461)	(N = 2210)
Do not want to live in military housing	33.6	55.9	42.3	51.5	31.7	39.0	38.3	55.7
Already live in military housing	40.3	27.7	5.0	2.7	31.7	29.0	26.8	15.2
Not eligible for military housing	9.9	1.2	12.8	5.5	6.9	3.2	5.9	2.1
Already settled elsewhere	2.5	2.6	5.8	5.7	5.4	4.6	3.8	4.4
The waiting lists are too long	4.0	2.6	9.4	9.3	6.6	7.1	9.5	6.0
Other	10.0	10.0	24.7	25.3	17.7	17.1	15.7	16.6
Q48: Number of waiting lists on which the family is presently registered:	(N = 113)	(N = 80)	(N = 76)	(N = 72)	(N = 93)	(N = 86)	(N = 113)	(N = 85)
One	86.7	91.2	76.3	91.7	83.9	86.0	68.1	88.2
Two	6.2	5.0	15.8	6.9	8.6	3.5	18.6	8.2
Three	6.2	1.2	3.9	1.4	3.2	2.3	7.1	3.5
Four or more	0.9	2.5	3.9	0.0	4.3	8.1	5.3	0.0
Q49: Reason for being on a waiting list for military housing:	(N = 116)	(N = 74)	(N = 79)	(N = 75)	(N = 95)	(N = 83)	(N = 128)	(N = 89)
To move from substandard to adequate housing	13.8	6.8	11.4	2.7	8.4	1.2	4.7	3.4
To move to larger housing	4.3	2.7	5.1	0.0	7.4	4.8	13.3	2.2
To move to preferred housing	12.1	8.1	5.1	10.7	13.7	19.3	11.7	9.0
To save money living in military housing	43.1	45.9	51.9	52.0	42.3	38.6	37.5	46.1
Other	26.7	36.5	26.6	34.7	25.3	36.1	32.8	39.3
Q50: Helpfulness of the local housing office in locating civilian housing:	(N = 869)	(N = 870)	(N = 327)	(N = 551)	(N = 452)	(N = 500)	(N = 779)	(N = 819)
Not at all helpful	21.5	29.0	41.0	40.5	31.4	37.4	31.2	43.6
Somewhat helpful	44.4	46.3	36.7	38.1	38.9	38.8	40.2	40.3
Very helpful	34.1	24.7	22.3	21.4	29.6	23.8	28.6	16.1

Table 18

Mean Importance and Satisfaction Ratings of Housing Aspects by Type of Housing

Item	Importance Rating ^a				Satisfaction Rating ^b			
	Enlisted		Officers		Enlisted		Officers	
	Civilian Housing	Military Housing	Civilian Housing	Military Housing	Civilian Housing	Military Housing	Civilian Housing	Military Housing
Most Important Aspects of Housing								
Q68: General security of your possessions and personal safety in your neighborhood	3.58	3.56	3.55	3.58	3.81	3.63	3.95	4.20
Q89: The amount of privacy you have	3.38	3.36	3.36	3.29	3.77	3.04	4.07	3.59
Q85: Structural condition of the residence	3.19	3.01	3.40	3.07	3.77	3.31	4.02	3.60
Q76: Appearance of your residence	3.18	3.04	3.24	3.03	3.95	3.38	4.21	3.59
Q79: Adequacy of the heating system	3.12	3.12	3.07	3.04	3.55	3.59	3.74	3.70
Q87: Amount of indoor living space	3.02	3.10	3.14	3.12	3.68	3.42	3.98	3.56
Q97: Adequacy of pest control	3.04	3.22	2.94	3.11	3.55	3.00	3.93	3.32
Q70: Availability of good schools	2.81	3.15	3.06	3.06	3.80	3.61	3.99	3.06
Q60: Cost of your housing	3.33	2.83	3.38	2.94	3.25	3.25	3.07	3.40
Q92: General appearance of your neighborhood	3.03	2.92	3.30	3.03	3.74	3.43	4.14	3.89
Q78: Cost of utilities used	3.22	2.31	3.08	2.63	2.80	3.94	2.87	4.23
Q81: Availability of washer/dryer hookups	2.72	2.95	2.96	3.06	3.78	3.97	4.10	4.08
Q61: Financial benefits of owning a home	2.78	2.46	3.25	2.93	3.80	3.08	3.83	2.81
Moderately Important Aspects of Housing								
Q65: Adequacy of trash and garbage collection	2.32	2.52	2.15	2.34	3.86	3.82	3.95	4.02
Q72: Adequacy of community facilities (laundries, stores, recreation facilities)	2.48	2.66	2.30	2.50	3.78	3.48	3.84	3.65
Q74: Convenience to your place of work	2.72	2.78	2.77	2.80	3.64	3.90	3.49	4.26
Q75: Convenience to civilian stores and shopping	2.57	2.59	2.48	2.43	3.92	3.49	3.92	3.48
Q77: Arrangement of rooms inside the residence	2.69	2.52	2.95	2.66	3.82	3.41	4.01	3.51
Q80: Adequacy of the cooling system	2.73	2.87	2.85	2.85	3.46	3.16	3.76	3.23
Q84: Adequacy of storage space	2.65	2.81	2.90	2.94	3.34	3.02	3.62	3.12
Q86: Having separate bedrooms for each child	2.37	2.70	2.59	2.63	3.84	3.68	4.14	3.80
Q88: Amount of outdoor living space	2.87	2.86	2.92	2.81	3.63	3.41	4.00	3.84
Q91: Having a garage or carport	2.36	2.64	2.90	2.85	3.94	3.19	3.91	3.40
Q95: Having the freedom to paint, wallpaper, make minor changes in the residence	2.58	2.20	2.78	2.13	3.77	2.70	4.21	3.07
Q99: Adequacy of kitchen cupboard space	2.78	2.85	2.86	2.90	3.52	3.08	3.68	3.24
Q66: Getting away from military atmosphere while in residence	2.62	2.10	2.06	1.47	4.14	3.27	4.17	3.47
Q90: Having a fenced-in yard	2.28	2.17	2.08	1.87	3.62	2.57	3.89	3.02
Q62: Length of wait for military family housing	1.42	2.90	1.31	2.78	1.95	3.06	1.96	3.23
Q64: Having maintenance taken care of for you	1.55	2.66	1.10	2.40	3.38	3.33	3.35	3.52
Q94: Being able to keep a pet	1.88	1.93	2.04	2.06	3.63	3.69	4.09	4.00
Q82: Dishwasher provided in the residence	1.28	1.50	2.22	2.07	3.70	3.31	4.06	3.56
Q63: Availability of parking	1.82	2.18	1.73	1.99	3.77	3.52	3.96	3.86
Q69: Having playgrounds near your residence	1.76	2.14	1.54	1.75	3.42	3.38	3.60	3.69
Least Important Aspects of Housing								
Q67: Having other military members in your neighborhood	0.81	1.06	0.75	1.03	3.61	3.49	3.72	3.78
Q71: Availability of day-care facilities	1.27	1.63	0.77	1.10	3.45	3.30	3.45	3.47
Q73: Adequacy of community groups like clubs and church groups	1.74	1.90	1.87	1.91	3.70	3.58	3.82	3.68
Q83: Garbage disposal provided in the residence	1.33	1.76	1.78	1.95	3.73	3.74	4.00	3.90
Q93: Availability of mass transportation	1.39	1.60	1.40	1.19	2.95	2.66	3.01	2.87
Q96: Limits on the number of dogs/cats that any one family may keep	1.34	1.65	1.38	1.46	3.51	3.39	3.85	3.64
Q98: Running a business out of the home (day care, Amway, etc.)	0.72	0.80	0.58	0.48	3.52	3.08	3.68	3.24

^aBased on responses made on a 5-point scale, where 0 = of no importance, 1 = somewhat important, 2 = moderately important, 3 = very important, and 4 = one of the most important.

^bBased on responses made on a 5-point scale, where 1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = dissatisfied, 3 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, 4 = satisfied, and 5 = very satisfied.

Experiences Related to Relocation

Satisfaction with Relocation Aspects

Respondents were asked to indicate their degree of satisfaction with nine relocation aspects, using a 5-point scale, where 1 = very dissatisfied and 5 = very satisfied (Q51--Q59). Results for each service were correlated, with the items generally grouping by reimbursements/service and housing issues.

Table 19 provides a rank ordering of the items in terms of the percentages expressing dissatisfaction; and Table 20, correlation results. Tables 21 and 22 provide results for items concerned with reimbursements/services (N = 5); and Tables 23 and 24, for items concerned with housing issues (N = 4). These results are discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

Item Rank Order by Dissatisfaction. As shown in Table 19, there were generally no differences in dissatisfaction between enlisted and officers. For reimbursement/service aspects, over 55 percent of both groups were dissatisfied with the reimbursement to move dependents (Q51); 49 percent, with the amount of reimbursement for lost or damaged goods (Q59); less than one third, with the reimbursement to move household goods (Q52); and just over one third, with the quality of the moving company services (Q58). Relative to housing issues, over half of both groups were dissatisfied with the ease of locating temporary civilian housing (Q54) and with the availability of government-funded temporary housing (Q55). Air Force respondents were most satisfied with the amount of advance notice given prior to the move (Q57); less than one in seven of both groups expressed dissatisfaction.

Correlations Among Relocation Aspect Items. For both enlisted and officers, the item on the quality of moving company services (Q58) and those related to reimbursements (Q51, 52, 59) all correlated positively; that is, as dissatisfaction/satisfaction with one increased, it also increased on the others. Similarly, as dissatisfaction/satisfaction with one housing issue increased, it tended to increase with the others. The item concerning the amount of advance notice before the move was the only one that did not correlate meaningfully with any other.

Responses to Reimbursements/Service Items. Pay-grade analyses of the reimbursement items generally showed that dissatisfaction increased as rank increased for both enlisted and officers (Table 21). Only those in the E-1 and E-3 pay grades consistently expressed being "very dissatisfied" with reimbursements.

Relative to other survey items, dissatisfaction with reimbursement to move dependents (Q51) correlated slightly to moderately with increased personal expense to the service member for the move (Q32--see Table 25) ($r = -.31$ and $-.40$ for enlisted and officers respectively). Greater dissatisfaction was found among enlisted and officer personnel who preferred civilian housing (61.9 and 60.8%) than among those who preferred military housing (52.5 and 49.8%). Enlisted respondents with employed spouses were more dissatisfied than were those with unemployed spouses (62.8 vs. 53.5%) but the opposite was found for officers (53.7 vs. 61.7%).

For enlisted, dissatisfaction with reimbursement to move household goods (Q52) correlated slightly with larger values of goods lost or damaged in transit (Q31--Table 25)

($r = -.26$) and with increased personal expense of the move (Q32) ($r = -.25$). Respondents who preferred civilian housing were more dissatisfied than were those who preferred military housing (35.1 vs. 25.7% for enlisted; 28.8 vs. 19.0% for officers).

As to the amount of advance notice given prior to the move (Q57), relatively low, but consistent, percentages of enlisted and officer respondents expressed dissatisfaction.

Regarding the quality of moving company services (Q58) dissatisfaction correlated moderately with increased amounts of goods lost or damaged in transit (Q31) for both enlisted and officers ($r = -.46$ and $-.48$ respectively).

Finally, dissatisfaction with the amount of the reimbursement for lost or damaged goods was associated slightly with greater loss or damage amounts (Q31) ($r = -.24$) for officers.

As shown in Table 22, enlisted and officer respondents were more dissatisfied than satisfied with the reimbursement to move dependents (Q51) and for lost or damaged goods (Q59). On the other items, dissatisfaction among the career-motivated respondents was lower. Less than 30 percent of these respondents were dissatisfied with the reimbursement to move their household goods (Q52); similar percentages were found with dissatisfaction with the quality of moving company services (Q58). About 80 percent of both groups were satisfied with the amount of advance notice prior to the move (Q57).

Responses to Housing Issue Items. As shown in Table 23, dissatisfaction with the length of waiting lists for military family housing (Q53) decreased as rank increased for both officers and enlisted. This supports the finding reported earlier that the lower ranking enlisted and officers show greater preferences for military housing. As further confirmation of the trend, dissatisfaction with ease of locating temporary civilian housing (Q54) increased as rank increased, except for O-6 and above officers. For enlisted, dissatisfaction with both the availability and the condition of temporary military housing (Q55 and 56) increased as rank increased, but no distinct pattern emerged for officers. All pay grades made appreciable responses in the superlative category, "very dissatisfied," when the issues were housing availability.

In regard to other survey items, dissatisfaction with the length of waiting lists for military housing correlated with selling a home at a loss (Q35--see Table 25) and with perceived lack of helpfulness of the housing office in finding civilian housing for the enlisted ($r = .25$ and $.29$). For both enlisted and officers, dissatisfaction with waiting lists was associated with actual waits for military housing; that is, as the actual wait increased, dissatisfaction increased ($r = .44$ and $-.32$ for enlisted and officers respectively). Additionally, enlisted respondents currently living in civilian housing were more dissatisfied than were those in military housing (59.9 vs. 34.6%). The trend was similar for officers, with those in civilian housing being more dissatisfied than were those in military housing (57.4 vs. 38.2%).

Dissatisfaction with the ease of locating temporary civilian housing correlated with perceived lack of helpfulness of the housing office in finding civilian housing for the enlisted ($r = .29$). Also, officers living in military housing were somewhat more dissatisfied than were those living in civilian housing (57.7 vs. 49.2%).

Regarding the availability of government-funded temporary housing, enlisted respondents with employed spouses were somewhat more dissatisfied than were those with employed spouses (56.7 vs. 47.6%). Both enlisted and officers living in civilian housing

were more dissatisfied than were those living in military housing (60.4 and 58.9% respectively vs. 45.4 and 46.9%). Also, enlisted who preferred civilian housing were more dissatisfied than were those who preferred military housing (57.3 vs. 42.0%).

Dissatisfaction with the condition of government-funded temporary housing was greater among enlisted living in civilian housing than those in military housing (42.6 vs. 32.5%). For officers, dissatisfaction was higher among those who preferred civilian housing than those who preferred military housing (39.2 vs. 30.2%).

As shown in Table 24, career-motivated respondents generally showed greater dissatisfaction than satisfaction with housing issues. Dissatisfaction with the length of waiting lists for military housing was high for enlisted (48%) and even higher for officers (51%). Also, over half of both groups were dissatisfied with the ease of locating temporary civilian housing and with the availability of government temporary housing. Both groups were more satisfied than dissatisfied with government temporary housing.

Army

Item Rank Order by Dissatisfaction. Table 19 shows that, for both officers and enlisted, dissatisfaction was greatest with government housing issues, and least with the amount of advance notice given prior to the move. Respondents were considerably less dissatisfied with the reimbursement to move household goods than with the reimbursement for moving dependents or for goods lost or damaged in transit. Interestingly, they were less dissatisfied with the quality of the moving company services than with the amount of reimbursement for goods lost or damaged during the move.

Correlations Among Relocation Aspect Items. As shown in Table 20, a moderate positive relationship was found between dissatisfaction/satisfaction with reimbursement to move dependents (Q51) and to move household goods (Q52). As dissatisfaction with one of these aspects increased, it also tended to increase with the other. The reimbursement to move dependents and the quality of the moving company services (Q58) were negatively related; that is, as dissatisfaction/satisfaction with one increased, it tended to decrease on the other.

Relative to housing issues, a strong positive correlation was found between the condition and the availability (Q55 and Q56) of temporary housing; and a moderately positive relationship, between the availability of government housing and the ease of locating civilian temporary housing (Q54).

Correlations showing overlap between the groups of items (reimbursements and housing issues) indicate that respondents tended to be more concerned with one or the other of the items but not both. Responses to the advance notice item (Q57) showed no relationship to any other item within the two groups.

Among officers, the correlations between relocation items were generally lower than for enlisted, but also showed a "halo" effect between the reimbursement/service and housing issue items. The strongest relationships were found among the reimbursement/service items, as well as among those items that specifically addressed military housing. The "halo" effect is reflected by the correlations of lesser strength within and between each of the two topic areas.

Responses to Reimbursement/Service Items. Table 21 shows that definitive trends were generally not found as a function of rank. Over 80 percent of E-1 to E-3 enlisted

were dissatisfied with reimbursements to move dependents; 54 percent, to move household goods; and 62 percent, for damaged, lost goods, but these percentages were based on very small Ns. Among officers, the W-1 to W-4 and O-4 and above groups were more dissatisfied with reimbursements to move dependents than were the O-1 to O-3 groups. The O-1 to O-2 group was more dissatisfied than were the other officers with the reimbursement for lost or damaged goods.

Dissatisfaction with the quality of moving company services increased as rank increased among the enlisted; for officers, from 35 to 40 percent were dissatisfied. Dissatisfaction with the amount of advance notice prior to the move decreased as rank increased among the enlisted, but was consistently low among the officer pay grades. Use of the response category "very dissatisfied" was most characteristic of the enlisted pay grades, most frequently in response to the reimbursement items (Q51 and Q59).

Relative to other survey items, dissatisfaction with reimbursement to move dependents correlated slightly with increased personal cost of the move to the service member (Q32--see Table 25) ($r = -.31$ and $-.38$ for enlisted and officers respectively). Enlisted personnel with employed spouses were somewhat more dissatisfied than were those with unemployed spouses (56.1 vs. 47.9%). Dissatisfaction with reimbursement to move household goods was associated with higher amounts of goods lost or damaged in transit (Q31) for the officers ($r = -.26$) and with increased personal cost of the move to the service member (Q32) for both enlisted and officers ($r = -.24$ and $-.23$ respectively).

Officers living in military housing were more dissatisfied with the amount of advance notice given prior to the move than were those living in civilian housing (25.8 vs. 12.0%). Dissatisfaction with the quality of the moving company services was moderately associated with higher values placed on goods lost or damaged in transit for both enlisted and officers ($r = -.42$ and $-.51$). Enlisted respondents in civilian housing were more dissatisfied than were those in military housing (32.8 vs. 21.9%).

Dissatisfaction with the amount of reimbursement for lost and damaged goods was slightly associated with the values of these goods for enlisted and officers ($r = -.34$ and $-.28$) and with increased personal cost of the move for officers ($r = -.23$). Also, officers living in civilian housing were more dissatisfied than were those living in military housing (46.0 vs. 36.9%).

As shown in Table 21, career-motivated personnel were most dissatisfied with reimbursements to move dependents and for lost and damaged goods. They expressed considerably less dissatisfaction with the reimbursement to move household goods and with moving company services. They were most satisfied with the amount of advance notice given prior to the move, especially officers.

Responses to Housing Issue Items. As shown in Table 23, dissatisfaction with the length of waiting lists for military family housing (Q53) and the availability of government-funded temporary housing (Q55) was consistently high across pay grades for both officers and enlisted. Although respondents were somewhat less dissatisfied with the ease of locating temporary civilian housing (Q54) and the condition of government temporary housing (Q56), the percentages were similar across pay grades. The response option "very dissatisfied" was used frequently and consistently across all pay grades for the housing items.

With respect to other survey items, dissatisfaction with the length of waiting lists for military family housing was slightly associated with individual actual waits for assignment for officers ($r = -.22$) and perceived lack of helpfulness of the housing office in locating civilian housing for both enlisted and officers ($r = +.29$ and $+.27$). Enlisted respondents currently living in civilian housing tended to be more dissatisfied than were those preferring military housing (78.5 vs. 65.4%). Relative to housing preferences, respondents who preferred military housing were more dissatisfied with housing waits than were those who preferred civilian housing (84.1 vs. 73.6% for enlisted; 85.1 vs. 61.1% for officers).

Dissatisfaction with the ease of locating civilian housing was slightly correlated with the perception of lack of helpfulness of the housing office for both enlisted and officers ($r = +.35$ and $+.27$). Enlisted respondents currently living in military housing were more dissatisfied than were those living in civilian housing (63.4 vs. 47.3%). Both enlisted and officers who preferred military housing were more dissatisfied (61.7% for enlisted and 60.1% for officers) than were those who preferred civilian housing (42.6% for enlisted and 44.5% for officers). Enlisted respondents with unemployed spouses were more dissatisfied than were those with employed spouses (52.8 vs. 42.8%).

Relative to the availability of government-funded temporary housing, perceived lack of helpfulness of the housing office in locating civilian housing was associated with dissatisfaction for both enlisted and officers ($r = +.38$ and $+.28$). Those currently in civilian housing were more dissatisfied than were those in military housing (67.3 vs. 43.5% for enlisted; 63.5 vs. 45.7% for officers).

Dissatisfaction with the amount of government reimbursement for lost or damaged goods was slightly correlated with increased value of their goods (Q31) for officers ($r = -.26$), and with increased personal cost of the move to the service member (Q32) for officers and enlisted ($r = -.23$ and $-.24$). Officers in civilian housing were more dissatisfied than were those in military housing (46.0 vs. 36.9%).

Finally, Table 24 shows that career-motivated respondents were most dissatisfied with the length of waiting lists for military family housing, followed by the availability of government-funded temporary housing.

Marine Corps

Item Rank Order by Dissatisfaction. Table 19 shows that enlisted personnel were most dissatisfied with the length of waiting lists for and availability of temporary housing and with reimbursement for lost or damaged goods (Q53-55). Officers were more dissatisfied with the four housing issues. Both groups were most satisfied with the amount of advance notice given prior to the move (Q57) and the reimbursement to move household goods (Q52). Finally, both groups were considerably more dissatisfied with the amount of loss and damage reimbursement (Q59) than they were with the quality of the moving company services (Q58).

Correlations Among Relocation Aspect Items. As shown in Table 20, the three items addressing reimbursements were strongly related; that is, as dissatisfaction/satisfaction increased on one, it increased on the others. Also, there was a moderate relationship between the loss and damage reimbursement (Q59) and the amount of advance notice given to the service member prior to the move (Q57). Relative to housing issues, the strongest response similarity was found between the availability (Q55) and the condition (Q56) of government-funded temporary housing.

For officers, the strongest positive relationships were between reimbursement for moving dependents and for moving household goods and between the quality of moving company services and the amount of reimbursement for lost or damaged goods. As dissatisfaction/satisfaction with one increased, it also tended to increase with the other. Relative to housing, the condition and availability of government-funded temporary housing were strongly related, and the condition of government-funded temporary housing was moderately related to the ease of locating temporary civilian housing. Responses to the amount of advance notice given to the service member prior to the move were not related to any other relocation item.

Responses to Reimbursement/Service Items. Table 21 shows that, except for the E-1 to E-3 group, between 37 and 50 percent of respondents were dissatisfied with reimbursements to move dependents (Q54); and between 20 and 29 percent, with the reimbursement to move household goods (Q52). Between 28 and 33 percent of all pay-grade groups were dissatisfied with the quality of moving company services (Q58). About half of the higher ranking enlisted and officers were dissatisfied with the reimbursement for lost and damaged goods (Q59), as were 67 percent of the E-1 to E-3 group and 32 percent of the W-1 through W-4 group. Finally, the enlisted were more dissatisfied than the officers with the amount of advance notice given (Q57). The "very dissatisfied" response option was used frequently only among the E-1 to E-3 group.

Relative to other survey items, dissatisfaction with reimbursement to move dependents was slightly correlated with increased personal expense of the move to the service member (Q32--see Table 25) for both enlisted and officers ($r = -.29$ and $-.34$). For officers, dissatisfaction with reimbursement to move household goods was related to the increased value of goods lost or damaged (Q31) ($r = -.28$) and increased personal expense to the service member ($r = -.28$ and $-.23$) for officers.

The quality of moving company services and the amount of reimbursement for lost or damaged goods both associated statistically with increased values of goods lost or damaged in transit for both enlisted ($r = -.39$ and $-.24$) and officers ($r = -.48$ and $-.32$).

Table 22 shows that career-motivated personnel were most dissatisfied with the amount of reimbursement for lost and damaged goods, followed closely by the reimbursement to move dependents. About 30 percent of enlisted and officers were dissatisfied with the quality of the moving company services; and about a fourth, with their household goods reimbursement. Both were very satisfied with the amount of advance notice they received prior to their relocation, especially officers (70 and 83%).

Responses to Housing Issue Items. Table 23 shows that high percentages of all pay-grade groups were dissatisfied with housing issues. Officers in the O-1 to O-3 group were most dissatisfied with the length of waiting lists for military family housing (Q52); and O-6 and above officers, the least dissatisfied. E-7 to E-9 enlisted and O-3 officers were most dissatisfied with the ease of locating temporary civilian housing (Q54); and W-1 to W-4 and O-6 and above officers, the least dissatisfied. Officers in general were more dissatisfied with the condition and availability of government-funded temporary housing (Q55 and 56). Overall, differences between the enlisted and officer groups were minimal. The response option "very dissatisfied" was used frequently and consistently across pay grades for the housing issue items.

Relative to other survey items, respondents living in civilian housing were more dissatisfied with the length of military housing waiting lists than were those living in military housing (80.3 vs. 44.6% for enlisted; 76.5 vs. 39.8% for officers). Enlisted living

in military housing were more dissatisfied with the ease of locating temporary civilian housing than were those in civilian housing (66.4 vs. 52.9%). Also, enlisted who preferred military housing were more dissatisfied with this issue than were those who preferred civilian housing (63.5 vs. 54.3%). Finally, officers living in the civilian community were more dissatisfied with the availability of temporary government-funded housing than were those in military housing (62.7 vs. 54.5).

Table 24 shows that career-motivated officers were generally more dissatisfied with the length of waiting lists and the availability and condition of temporary government housing than were career-motivated enlisted. Overall, however, career-motivated respondents were more dissatisfied than satisfied with all the housing aspects of their most recent relocation.

Navy

Item Rank Order by Dissatisfaction. Table 19 shows that over half of the respondents were dissatisfied with the length of waiting lists for military family housing, the ease of locating temporary civilian housing, and the availability of government temporary housing. Over 40 percent of all respondents were dissatisfied with the reimbursement to move dependents and for lost/damaged goods. Almost 45 percent of officers were dissatisfied with the condition of government temporary housing. Both groups were most satisfied with the amount of advance notice given prior to the move.

Correlations Among Relocation Aspect Items. Table 20 shows that, for enlisted respondents, the strongest relationships were between (1) the reimbursement to move dependents and household goods (Q51 and 52), (2) the quality of the moving company services and the amount of reimbursement for lost/damaged goods (Q58 and 59), and (3) the loss/damage reimbursement and the amount of advance notice given prior to the move (Q58 and 57). As dissatisfaction/satisfaction with one of these aspects increased, it also tended to increase with its correlate. Among the items specifically addressing housing, the strongest relationship was found between the availability and the condition of temporary government housing (Q55 and 56). The two groups of items overlapped. As dissatisfaction/satisfaction with reimbursement to move dependents increased, it also increased with the ease of locating temporary civilian housing and with the availability of temporary government housing.

For officers, dissatisfaction/satisfaction with reimbursements to move dependents and household goods were moderately correlated, as were the quality of the moving company services and the amount of loss and damage reimbursement. Some overlap, or "halo," was evident between the reimbursement items and dissatisfaction/satisfaction with the condition of government-funded temporary housing. This particular housing issue was most strongly associated with the availability of temporary government housing. Response distributions on the waiting list and advance notice items did not correlate with any of the other relocation items.

Responses to Reimbursement/Service Items. Pay-grade analyses of responses to the reimbursement/service items showed that the E-1 to E-3 enlisted were the most dissatisfied overall (Table 21). Dissatisfaction with reimbursement to move dependents generally increased as rank increased among both the E-4 to E-9 enlisted and all officer groups. A similar trend was noted with respect to reimbursement to move household goods, although at a lower level. Moderate and consistent percentages of dissatisfaction were found with moving company services across pay grades, while somewhat higher and consistent percentages were found with loss and damage reimbursements, again across pay

grades. Dissatisfaction with advance notice time decreased as rank increased among the enlisted. For officers, however, the most dissatisfied were the O-1 to O-2 and O-4 and above pay grades.

Relative to other survey items, dissatisfaction with reimbursement to move dependents was associated with increased personal cost of the move to the service member (Q32--see Table 25) for both enlisted and officers ($r = -.37$ for both groups). Dissatisfaction with the reimbursement to move household goods was slightly correlated with increased value of goods lost or damaged in transit (Q31) ($r = -.24$ for both enlisted and officers) and with increased personal expense of the move to the service member (Q32) ($r = -.22$ for enlisted, and $r = -.23$ for officers).

Regarding the overall quality of the moving company services, a moderate relationship was found between dissatisfaction and increased value of goods lost or damaged during the move for enlisted and officers ($r = -.48$ and $-.47$). Finally, relative to the amount of reimbursement for lost or damaged goods, dissatisfaction was slightly correlated with increased value of these goods for both enlisted and officers ($r = -.28$ and $-.34$) and with increased personal expense to the service member for the move for officers ($r = -.21$).

Table 20 shows that career-motivated respondents were most dissatisfied with reimbursement to move dependents and for lost or damaged goods. They were most satisfied with the amount of advance notice given prior to the move. Over all items, no appreciable differences were found between career-motivated enlisted and officers.

Responses to Housing Issue Items. Table 23 shows that, for enlisted, dissatisfaction with the length of waiting lists for military family housing decreased as rank increased. For officers, the O-1 to O-2 group was most dissatisfied; and the O-6 and above group, the least dissatisfied. Dissatisfaction with the ease of locating temporary civilian housing was consistently high (over 50%) across all pay grades except for the E-1 to E-3 and O-6 and above groups. Regarding the availability of temporary government housing, the E-4 to E-6 and O-1 to O-2 groups were the most dissatisfied, with the dissatisfaction percentages being consistently high across all groups. Condition of government temporary housing was of less concern than the other housing issues for all groups. The response option "very dissatisfied" was used with notable frequency by all pay grades only on the item concerning the length of waiting lists for military family housing.

Relative to other survey items, for the enlisted, dissatisfaction with the length of waiting lists for military family housing was slightly correlated with actual longer waits for assignment ($r = -.26$). Dissatisfaction with the length of waiting lists was also associated with perceived lack of helpfulness of the housing officer in finding civilian housing among the enlisted ($r = +.22$). Enlisted personnel living in civilian housing and preferring to live in civilian housing were more dissatisfied with waiting lists for military housing (76.0 and 65.6% respectively) than were those living in civilian housing and preferring to live in civilian housing (71.8 and 62.9%) and those living in and preferring to live in military housing (34.4 and 47.6%). The same trend was found among the officers, with those living in civilian housing and preferring to live in civilian housing being more dissatisfied than were those living in and preferring to live in military housing (71.8 and 62.9% vs. 34.4 and 47.6%).

Dissatisfaction with the ease of locating temporary civilian housing was associated with perceived lack of helpfulness of the housing office in finding civilian housing for both enlisted and officers ($r = +.28$ and $+.24$). Enlisted respondents living in military housing

were more dissatisfied than were those living in civilian housing (65.4 vs. 46.8%). Officers who preferred military housing were more dissatisfied than were those who preferred civilian housing (61.2 vs. 47.4%).

Table 24 shows that career-motivated respondents in both pay-grade groups were most dissatisfied with the length of waiting lists for military family housing and least dissatisfied with the condition of temporary government housing. Overall, dissatisfaction was higher with housing issues than with reimbursement issues.

Relocation Experiences

Responses to items on relocation experiences are provided in Table 25 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

As shown, in general, officers had made more PCS moves during the past 10 years than had enlisted, but both groups strongly agreed that the number of such moves should be limited to 1 in every 4 or 5 years. Respondents most frequently expressed this desire through the use of the "strongly agree" response option. Relative to the values of lost/damaged goods during their most recent relocation, the majority of both enlisted and officers reported that the value was "up to \$400," with the officers experiencing larger losses/damages than did the enlisted. Similarly, the personal cost of the move to the service member was high for both officers and enlisted, but the officers indicated they had spent more. For the relatively few who sold a home prior to their relocation, the officers fared the best, with 82 percent selling at a profit, compared to 48 percent of the enlisted. Only 5 percent of the officers sold at a loss, compared to 19 percent of the enlisted.

The majority of the respondents were contacted by a sponsor prior to their relocation. Of those who used the program, over three-quarters indicated the sponsor was somewhat or very helpful to them.

Army

As shown, officers had made more PCS moves than had the enlisted, and three-quarters of all respondents felt that the number of PCS moves should be limited to 1 every 4 or 5 years. Loss and damage to household goods and personal cost to the service member were high for both groups, with officers indicating higher values in both cases. Among those who sold homes prior to their relocation, over 77 percent of the officers sold at a profit, compared to 23 percent of the enlisted. Six percent of the officers sold at a loss, compared to 30 percent of the enlisted.

More than twice as many officers than enlisted were contacted by sponsors prior to their move. Of those who used the program, 78 percent of the enlisted and 86 percent of the officers felt the sponsor was somewhat or very helpful.

Marine Corps

Although officers had more PCS moves in the last 10 years than had the enlisted respondents, both groups felt that such moves should be limited to 1 every 4 or 5 years. Relative to the most recent move, both groups experienced considerable loss or damage to

their household goods during the move and personal cost to the service member, with the officers indicating greater percentages in the higher loss categories. Among those who had sold a home prior to their move, 84 percent of the officers sold at a profit, compared to 42 percent of the enlisted. Four percent of the officers sold at a loss, compared to 21 percent of the enlisted.

Nineteen percent of enlisted personnel were contacted by a sponsor in advance of their move, compared to 36 percent of the officers. Of those who used the sponsor program, over 80 percent of both groups rated the sponsor as somewhat or very helpful.

Navy

In general, officers had made more PCS moves in the last 10 years than had enlisted respondents, but nearly three quarters of both groups agreed that such moves should be limited to 1 every 4 or 5 years. Relative to the most recent PCS move, officers indicated having suffered greater losses or damage to their household goods and higher personal expenses than did the enlisted. Of the relatively few who sold homes prior to their relocation, 60 percent of enlisted and 78 percent of the officers sold at a profit and 15 and 6 percent respectively sold at a loss.

Almost 60 percent of the enlisted indicated that they had not been contacted by a sponsor prior to their most recent move, whereas 64 percent of the officers had been contacted. Very few respondents in either group declined a sponsor. Of those who used the program, better than three-quarters of both groups indicated the sponsor was somewhat or very helpful.

Unaccompanied/Overseas Tours

Responses to items concerning unaccompanied tours are presented in Table 26 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

As shown, the number of unaccompanied tours experienced by enlisted and officers was similar. Also, their reasons for being unaccompanied were similar, with the most frequent reasons being the high cost of relocating dependents, that their dependents couldn't/wouldn't move, and that dependents were not allowed. Enlisted and officers differed with respect to short-term duty, which 13 percent of the enlisted gave as a reason for being unaccompanied, compared to 5 percent of the officers. Over 80 percent of both groups overwhelmingly expressed preference for taking their families with them overseas.

Army

Although the number of accompanied tours was very similar for officer and enlisted, their reasons for being unaccompanied were quite different. The reasons most often given by enlisted were the high cost of relocating their families and the long waiting lists for military family housing, while officers most frequently said that their dependents were not allowed. Both groups were very much in favor of taking their families on overseas tours of duty.

Marine Corps

As shown, the enlisted respondents had less experience with unaccompanied tours than did the officers. Only 38 percent of the enlisted had spent more than one tour apart from their dependents, versus 53 percent of the officers. The principal reason given by officers for being unaccompanied was that dependents were not allowed, whereas enlisted indicated the reasons were the high cost of relocating dependents, the long waiting lists for military family housing, dependent's inability or reluctance to move, and the fact that dependents were not allowed. Almost 70 percent of both groups indicated that they would "very much" like to have their dependents accompany them on overseas tours of duty.

Navy

Relatively few Navy respondents had spent more than one tour of duty apart from their dependents. Of those currently unaccompanied, the most frequent reasons given by the enlisted were the high cost of relocating their dependents, the long lists for military housing, and the fact that their dependents couldn't/wouldn't move. The two most frequent reasons given by officers were the high cost of relocating their families and the fact that their dependents couldn't/wouldn't move. Both groups overwhelmingly indicated they would very much like to have their dependents accompany them on overseas tours of duty.

Table 19

Rank Order of Relocation Items by Percentages Dissatisfied by Service Branch

Item ^a	Air Force			Army			Marine Corps			Navy		
	ENL	OFF	Rank Order E O	ENL	OFF	Rank Order E O	ENL	OFF	Rank Order E O	ENL	OFF	Rank Order E O
Q51: Government reimbursement you got to move your dependents	54.0	58.8	1 1	50.7	53.0	4 3	42.4	46.4	6 6	45.4	47.4	5 4
Q52: Government reimbursement you got to move your household goods	32.6	27.0	8 8	31.1	21.8	8 8	29.1	22.4	8 8	26.5	20.0	8 8
Q53: Length of waiting lists for military family housing	45.7	47.8	5 5	76.4	70.7	1 1	59.5	58.8	1 3	63.3	59.1	1 1
Q54: Ease of locating temporary civilian housing	51.6	51.4	3 3	49.1	47.9	6 5	57.4	53.4	3 4	52.0	50.4	2 3
Q55: Availability of government-funded temporary housing	52.5	54.6	2 2	65.1	63.3	2 2	59.0	60.7	2 2	50.9	52.9	3 2
Q56: Condition of government-funded temporary housing	36.8	36.8	6 6	56.4	52.3	3 4	50.9	61.2	5 1	37.9	44.5	6 5
Q57: Amount of advance notice given prior to the move	13.9	12.7	9 9	27.3	12.4	9 9	23.0	10.8	9 9	14.6	18.6	9 9
Q58: Overall quality of moving company services	33.4	36.7	7 7	31.7	37.2	7 7	31.3	32.0	7 7	30.2	30.9	7 7
Q59: Amount of government reimbursement for lost or damaged goods	48.8	49.1	4 4	50.6	46.0	5 6	55.9	49.5	4 5	49.4	42.7	4 6

^aQ51, 52, 57, 58, and 59 concern reimbursement/services; and Q53-56, housing issues.

Table 20
 Correlation Matrix for Responses to Items Concerning Satisfaction with
 Relocation Aspects by Service Branch

Item	Enlisted Respondents										Officer Respondents								
	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	
Air Force																			
Q51	1.00	.38	.15	.18	.21	.18	.10	.20	.28	1.00	.31	.10	.18	.15	.21	.12	.18	.33	
Q52		1.00	.15	.13	.11	.09	.13	.33	.35		1.00	.02	.08	.00	.02	.10	.28	.36	
Q53			1.00	.31	.35	.22	.14	.06	.07			1.00	.22	.32	.15	.03	.09	.13	
Q54				1.00	.40	.29	.09	.18	.20				1.00	.36	.20	.10	.04	.12	
Q55					1.00	.61	.11	.15	.13					1.00	.57	.07	.05	.23	
Q56						1.00	.06	.12	.18						1.00	.12	.10	.18	
Q57							1.00	.14	.08							1.00	.14	.16	
Q58								1.00	.44								1.00	.41	
Q59									1.00									1.00	
Army																			
Q51	1.00	.57	.17	-.05	-.10	.16	-.01	-.56	.00	1.00	.48	.16	.15	.30	.17	.33	.19	.36	
Q52		1.00	.41	-.24	-.20	-.11	.04	-.31	.23		1.00	.29	-.00	.34	.38	.28	.23	.51	
Q53			1.00	-.20	-.36	-.77	.14	-.75	-.26			1.00	.18	.48	.23	-.01	.25	.17	
Q54				1.00	.54	-.01	-.25	.35	-.09				1.00	.30	.37	.00	.22	.28	
Q55					1.00	.70	-.10	.23	-.39					1.00	.53	.05	.19	.35	
Q56						1.00	-.12	-.02	-.58						1.00	.24	.33	.27	
Q57							1.00	-.09	.29							1.00	.12	.20	
Q58								1.00	-.07								1.00	.56	
Q59									1.00									1.00	

Table 20 (Continued)

Item	Enlisted Respondents									Officer Respondents								
	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59
	Marine Corps																	
Q51	1.00	.68	.04	.30	-.06	.32	-.09	.04	.09	1.00	.62	.02	.20	.16	.28	.06	.22	.19
Q52	1.00	1.00	-.09	.31	.05	.30	.11	.28	.54	1.00	1.00	-.08	.04	.20	.30	.22	.31	.32
Q53		1.00	1.00	-.08	.36	.22	.11	.27	-.10		1.00	1.00	.15	.24	.17	.07	.11	.01
Q54			1.00	1.00	.00	-.12	.07	-.01	.08			1.00	1.00	.32	.42	.08	.22	.08
Q55				1.00	1.00	.73	.13	.18	.22				1.00	1.00	.70	.13	.18	.09
Q56					1.00	1.00	.04	.36	.31						1.00	.12	.12	.25
Q57						1.00	1.00	.39	.53						1.00	1.00	.08	.19
Q58							1.00	1.00	.29							1.00	1.00	.58
Q59								1.00	1.00									1.00
	Navy																	
Q51	1.00	.66	.22	.55	.41	.03	.22	.27	.55	1.00	.47	.09	.21	.21	.31	.17	.19	.21
Q52	1.00	1.00	.10	.21	.17	-.09	.43	.46	.67	1.00	1.00	.08	.16	.21	.35	.19	.41	.44
Q53			1.00	.24	.32	.41	.23	-.08	.40			1.00	.07	.20	.16	.20	.12	.12
Q54				1.00	.33	.15	.23	.07	.31				1.00	.33	.21	.14	.18	.25
Q55					1.00	.71	.03	-.14	.00					1.00	.70	.09	.14	.16
Q56						1.00	.08	-.37	-.08						1.00	.12	.16	.15
Q57							1.00	.19	.52							1.00	.20	.15
Q58								1.00	.58								1.00	.40
Q59									1.00									1.00

Table 21

Response Percentages to Reimbursement and Service Items by Service Branch

Item/Group		Very Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied or Satisfied	Total
Air Force ^a					
Q51: Reimbursement to move dependents					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=142)		56.3	15.5	28.2	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=376)		51.1	17.6	31.4	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=567)		64.0	11.6	24.3	100.0
Total	%	58.5	14.2	27.3	100.0
	N	635	154	296	1085
Officers:					
O-1--O-2 (N=278)		37.8	16.9	45.3	100.0
O-3 (N=172)		54.1	15.1	30.8	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=569)		65.4	13.5	21.1	100.0
O-6+ (N=568)		63.9	10.6	25.5	100.0
Total	%	58.8	13.2	28.0	100.0
	N	933	210	444	1587
Overall Total	%	58.7	13.6	27.7	100.0
	N	1568	364	740	2672
Q52: Reimbursement to move household goods					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=141)		41.8	17.7	40.4	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=300)		28.3	15.7	56.0	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=452)		32.5	11.1	56.4	100.0
Total	%	32.6	13.7	53.7	100.0
	N	291	122	480	893
Officers:					
O-1--O-2 (N=256)		16.8	9.4	73.8	100.0
O-3 (N=168)		22.6	13.1	64.3	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=528)		32.2	10.2	57.6	100.0
O-6+ (N=505)		28.3	9.5	62.2	100.0
Total	%	27.0	10.2	62.8	100.0
	N	394	148	915	1457
Overall Total	%	29.1	11.5	59.4	100.0
	N	685	270	1395	2350
Q57: Amount of advance notice given prior to the move					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=171)		15.8	15.8	68.4	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=409)		14.7	8.3	77.0	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=577)		12.8	5.2	82.0	100.0
Total	%	13.9	7.9	78.2	100.0
	N	161	91	905	1157
Officers:					
O-1--O-2 (N=300)		10.3	8.7	81.0	100.0
O-3 (N=193)		10.4	6.2	83.4	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=581)		10.8	8.6	80.6	100.0
O-6+ (N=584)		16.6	9.4	74.5	100.0
Total	%	12.7	8.6	78.7	100.0
	N	211	143	1304	1658
Overall Total	%	13.2	8.3	78.5	100.0
	N	372	234	2209	2815
Q58: Overall quality of moving company services					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=66)		27.8	13.6	60.6	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=380)		29.5	11.8	58.7	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=573)		36.8	9.1	54.1	100.0
Total	%	33.4	10.4	56.2	100.0
	N	340	106	573	1019
Officers:					
O-1--O-2 (N=292)		33.9	13.4	52.7	100.0
O-3 (N=189)		34.9	10.6	54.5	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=578)		38.4	9.5	52.1	100.0
O-6+ (N=582)		37.1	8.2	54.6	100.0
Total	%	36.7	9.9	53.4	100.0
	N	603	162	876	1641
Overall Total	%	35.4	10.1	54.5	100.0
	N	943	268	1449	2660
Q59: Amount of government reimbursement for lost/damaged goods					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=41)		39.0	29.3	31.7	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=271)		47.6	23.6	28.8	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=425)		50.6	16.0	33.4	100.0
Total	%	48.8	19.5	31.7	100.0
	N	360	144	233	737
Officers:					
O-1--O-2 (N=208)		38.0	24.5	37.5	100.0
O-3 (N=139)		46.8	17.3	36.0	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=476)		54.0	14.3	31.7	100.0
O-6+ (N=452)		49.8	13.5	36.7	100.0
Total	%	49.1	16.0	34.9	100.0
	N	626	204	445	1275
Overall Total	%	49.0	17.3	33.7	100.0
	N	986	348	678	2012

^aWarrant officers not included due to the very small N (10).

Table 21 (Continued)

Item/Group	Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied or Satisfied	Total
Army				
Q51: Reimbursement to move dependents				
Enlisted:				
E-1-E-3 (N=27)	81.5	3.7	14.8	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=148)	47.3	8.1	44.6	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=249)	49.4	15.3	35.3	100.0
Total	50.7	12.0	37.3	100.0
	%			
	N	215	51	158
Officers:				
W-1-W-4 (N=70)	55.7	14.3	30.0	100.0
O-1-O-2 (N=54)	37.0	9.3	53.7	100.0
O-3 (N=200)	43.0	17.5	40.5	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=486)	58.8	13.8	27.4	100.0
O-6+ (N=361)	53.2	12.5	34.3	100.0
Total	52.8	13.8	33.4	100.0
	%			
	N	618	162	1171
Overall Total	52.4	13.4	34.3	100.0
	%			
	N	833	213	1595
Q52: Reimbursement to move household goods				
Enlisted:				
E-1-E-3 (N=24)	54.2	8.3	37.5	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=128)	32.8	7.8	59.4	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=129)	27.2	12.8	60.0	100.0
Total	38.8	13.2	48.4	100.0
	%			
	N	108	37	136
Officers:				
W-1-W-4 (N=58)	20.7	20.7	58.6	100.0
O-1-O-2 (N=52)	21.1	15.4	63.5	100.0
O-3 (N=187)	18.7	11.8	69.5	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=415)	23.1	11.3	65.6	100.0
O-6+ (N=317)	22.1	14.8	63.1	100.0
Total	21.8	13.2	65.0	100.0
	%			
	N	224	136	669
Overall Total	24.1	12.6	63.3	100.0
	%			
	N	332	173	871
Q57: Amount of advance notice given prior to the move				
Enlisted:				
E-1-E-4 (N=30)	36.7	16.7	46.6	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=173)	31.8	13.3	54.9	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=262)	23.3	7.6	69.1	100.0
Total	27.3	10.3	62.4	100.0
	%			
	N	127	48	290
Officers:				
W-1-W-4 (N=75)	9.3	8.0	82.7	100.0
O-1-O-2 (N=56)	12.5	10.7	76.8	100.0
O-3 (N=202)	13.4	6.4	80.2	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=498)	12.0	5.8	82.2	100.0
O-6+ (N=367)	12.8	5.2	82.0	100.0
Total	12.4	6.1	81.5	100.0
	%			
	N	148	73	977
Overall Total	16.5	7.3	76.2	100.0
	%			
	N	275	121	1267
Q58: Overall quality of moving company services				
Enlisted:				
E-1-E-3 (N=21)	23.8	23.3	52.4	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=149)	30.9	12.8	56.3	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=256)	32.8	12.9	54.3	100.0
Total	31.7	13.4	54.9	100.0
	%			
	N	135	57	234
Officers:				
W-1-W-4 (N=73)	41.1	11.0	47.9	100.0
O-1-O-2 (N=51)	35.3	19.6	45.1	100.0
O-3 (N=207)	34.8	8.7	56.5	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=498)	38.4	5.6	53.0	100.0
O-6+ (N=365)	36.4	9.6	54.0	100.0
Total	37.2	9.5	53.3	100.0
	%			
	N	444	114	636
Overall Total	35.8	10.6	54.6	100.0
	%			
	N	579	171	870
Q59: Amount of government reimbursement for lost/damaged goods				
Enlisted:				
E-1-E-3 (N=16)	62.5	25.0	12.5	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=105)	17.0	41.1	100.0	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=213)	54.0	10.8	35.2	100.0
Total	50.4	13.4	36.2	100.0
	%			
	N	169	45	121
Officers:				
W-1-W-4 (N=60)	41.7	21.7	36.6	100.0
O-1-O-2 (N=38)	55.3	18.4	26.3	100.0
O-3 (N=173)	40.5	20.2	39.3	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=406)	48.0	16.0	36.0	100.0
O-6+ (N=301)	46.2	14.6	39.2	100.0
Total	46.0	16.8	37.2	100.0
	%			
	N	450	164	978
Overall Total	47.2	15.9	36.9	100.0
	%			
	N	619	209	1312

Table 21 (Continued)

Item/Group	Marine Corps			Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied or Satisfied	
Q51: Reimbursement to move dependents				
Enlisted:				
E-1-E-3 (N=42)	59.5	9.5	31.0	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=198)	36.9	16.2	46.9	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=328)	43.3	17.1	39.6	100.0
Total	42.2	16.2	41.6	100.0
	%			
	N	240	236	568
Officers:				
W-1-W-4 (N=76)	44.7	11.8	43.5	100.0
O-1-O-2 (N=135)	37.8	14.1	48.1	100.0
O-3 (N=179)	45.8	13.4	40.8	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=526)	49.0	15.4	35.6	100.0
O-6+ (N=308)	46.4	10.4	43.2	100.0
Total	46.4	13.5	40.1	100.0
	%			
	N	568	491	1224
Overall Total	%	45.1	14.3	40.6
	N	808	257	727
Q52: Reimbursement to move household goods				
Enlisted:				
E-1-E-3 (N=37)	59.4	2.7	37.9	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=157)	29.3	12.1	58.6	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=273)	24.9	9.5	65.6	100.0
Total	29.1	9.8	61.1	100.0
	%			
	N	136	46	467
Officers:				
W-1-W-4 (N=59)	22.0	6.8	71.2	100.0
O-1-O-2 (N=113)	20.3	9.7	69.9	100.0
O-3 (N=158)	22.8	8.2	69.0	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=464)	22.6	11.2	66.2	100.0
O-6+ (N=269)	22.7	8.6	68.8	100.0
Total	22.4	9.7	67.9	100.0
	%			
	N	238	103	1063
Overall Total	%	24.4	9.7	65.9
	N	374	149	1007
Q57: Amount of advance notice given prior to the move				
Enlisted:				
E-1-E-3 (N=49)	34.7	14.3	51.0	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=206)	18.9	8.3	72.8	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=353)	23.8	6.2	70.0	100.0
Total	23.0	7.6	69.4	100.0
	%			
	N	140	46	422
Officers:				
W-1-W-4 (N=76)	10.5	3.9	85.6	100.0
O-1-O-2 (N=138)	9.4	8.7	81.9	100.0
O-3 (N=179)	11.2	5.6	83.2	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=539)	11.9	6.7	81.4	100.0
O-6+ (N=312)	9.6	4.2	86.4	100.0
Total	10.8	5.9	83.3	100.0
	%			
	N	135	74	1035
Overall Total	%	14.8	6.5	78.7
	N	275	120	1457
Q58: Overall quality of moving company services				
Enlisted:				
E-1-E-3 (N=34)	29.4	29.4	41.2	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=185)	28.1	17.3	54.6	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=344)	33.1	11.0	55.9	100.0
Total	31.3	14.2	54.5	100.0
	%			
	N	176	80	307
Officers:				
W-1-W-4 (N=77)	32.5	6.5	61.0	100.0
O-1-O-2 (N=137)	27.7	11.7	60.6	100.0
O-3 (N=178)	30.9	10.1	59.0	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=539)	32.8	9.9	57.4	100.0
O-6+ (N=314)	32.8	10.2	57.0	100.0
Total	32.0	10.0	58.0	100.0
	%			
	N	398	124	723
Overall Total	%	31.7	11.3	57.0
	N	574	204	1030
Q59: Amount of government reimbursement for lost/damaged goods				
Enlisted:				
E-1-E-3 (N=18)	66.7	11.1	22.2	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=114)	54.4	22.8	22.8	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=240)	55.8	10.8	33.4	100.0
Total	55.9	14.5	29.6	100.0
	%			
	N	208	54	372
Officers:				
W-1-W-4 (N=54)	31.5	33.3	35.2	100.0
O-1-O-2 (N=96)	53.1	16.7	30.2	100.0
O-3 (N=133)	52.6	10.5	36.9	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=414)	50.7	12.8	36.5	100.0
O-6+ (N=226)	47.8	13.3	38.9	100.0
Total	49.4	14.2	36.4	100.0
	%			
	N	456	131	336
Overall Total	%	51.3	14.3	34.4
	N	664	155	446

Table 21 (Continued)

Item/Group	Very Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied or Satisfied	Total
Navy				
Q51: Reimbursement to move dependents				
Enlisted:				
E-1--E-3 (N=47)	63.8	12.8	23.4	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=389)	40.9	15.9	43.2	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=598)	47.0	15.2	37.8	100.0
Total	45.4	15.4	39.2	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	470	159	405	1034
Officers:				
W-1--W-4 (N=92)	42.4	14.1	43.5	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=90)	40.0	8.9	51.1	100.0
O-3 (N=371)	41.2	16.2	42.6	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=699)	50.2	13.6	36.2	100.0
O-6+ (N=798)	49.2	11.0	39.8	100.0
Total	47.4	12.9	39.7	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	972	264	814	2050
Overall Total	46.8	13.7	39.5	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	1442	423	1219	3084
Q52: Reimbursement to move household goods				
Enlisted:				
E-1--E-3 (N=50)	62.0	12.0	26.0	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=326)	23.6	13.8	62.6	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=506)	24.9	12.1	63.0	100.0
Total	26.5	12.7	60.8	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	234	112	536	882
Officers:				
W-1--W-4 (N=81)	18.5	14.8	66.7	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=90)	12.2	11.1	76.7	100.0
O-3 (N=373)	17.4	13.7	68.9	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=651)	20.3	12.0	67.7	100.0
O-6+ (N=747)	22.2	10.0	67.8	100.0
Total	20.0	11.6	68.4	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	389	226	1327	1942
Overall Total	22.1	12.0	65.9	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	623	338	1863	2824
Q57: Amount of advance notice given prior to the move				
Enlisted:				
E-1--E-3 (N=80)	31.2	18.8	50.0	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=444)	15.5	8.8	75.7	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=617)	12.3	5.7	82.0	100.0
Total	14.6	7.8	77.6	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	167	89	885	1141
Officers:				
W-1--W-4 (N=97)	9.3	4.1	86.6	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=104)	18.3	10.6	71.1	100.0
O-3 (N=404)	15.8	8.7	75.5	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=731)	20.5	7.8	71.7	100.0
O-6+ (N=817)	19.3	7.9	74.9	100.0
Total	18.6	8.0	73.4	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	400	172	1581	2153
Overall Total	17.2	7.9	74.9	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	567	261	2466	3294
Q58: Overall quality of moving company services				
Enlisted:				
E-2--E-3 (N=38)	28.9	31.6	39.5	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=392)	33.2	14.0	52.8	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=602)	28.4	10.5	61.1	100.0
Total	30.2	12.6	57.2	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	312	130	590	1032
Officers:				
W-1--W-4 (N=95)	36.8	10.5	52.7	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=97)	34.0	13.4	52.6	100.0
O-3 (N=396)	31.3	10.9	57.8	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=738)	31.8	11.5	56.7	100.0
O-6+ (N=820)	28.9	11.2	59.9	100.0
Total	30.9	11.3	57.3	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	664	243	1239	2146
Overall Total	30.7	11.7	57.6	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	976	373	1829	3178
Q59: Amount of government reimbursement for lost/damaged goods				
Enlisted:				
E-1--E-3 (N=23)	69.6	21.7	8.7	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=278)	48.2	21.2	30.6	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=444)	49.1	13.5	37.4	100.0
Total	49.4	16.6	34.0	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	368	124	253	745
Officers:				
W-1--W-4 (N=69)	55.1	8.7	36.2	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=64)	43.8	17.2	39.0	100.0
O-3 (N=301)	40.2	19.6	40.2	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=606)	44.0	17.3	38.7	100.0
O-6+ (N=649)	41.3	14.9	43.8	100.0
Total	42.7	16.5	40.8	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	722	278	689	1689
Overall Total	44.8	16.5	38.7	100.0
	N	N	N	N
	1090	402	942	2434

Table 22

Responses of Career-motivated Personnel to Reimbursement/
Service Items by Service Branch

Item	Very Dissatisfied or Dissatisfied	Neutral	Very Satisfied or Satisfied
Air Force			
Q51: Reimbursement to move dependents			
Enlisted (N=574)	53.5	15.8	30.7
Officers (N=871)	58.4	13.4	28.2
Q52: Reimbursement to move household goods			
Enlisted (N=456)	29.6	14.5	55.9
Officers (N=808)	25.6	10.4	64.0
Q57: Amount of advance notice given prior to the move			
Enlisted (N=605)	12.4	8.8	78.8
Officers (N=910)	11.6	7.8	80.6
Q58: Overall quality of the moving company services			
Enlisted (N=541)	29.4	11.3	59.3
Officers (N=901)	36.0	10.5	53.5
Q59: Amount of reimbursement for lost/damaged goods			
Enlisted (N=380)	45.8	22.9	31.3
Officers (N=703)	48.5	12.1	39.4
Army			
Q51: Reimbursement to move dependents			
Enlisted (N=297)	48.8	11.8	39.4
Officers (N=679)	55.2	14.0	30.8
Q52: Reimbursement to move household goods			
Enlisted (N=244)	29.1	11.1	59.8
Officers (N=596)	22.1	12.4	65.5
Q57: Amount of advance notice given prior to the move			
Enlisted (N=324)	27.8	8.6	63.6
Officers (N=697)	12.2	6.3	81.5
Q58: Overall quality of the moving company services			
Enlisted (N=305)	30.5	13.8	55.7
Officers (N=696)	39.4	9.3	51.3
Q59: Amount of reimbursement for lost/damaged goods			
Enlisted (N=232)	47.8	15.5	36.7
Officers (N=576)	44.8	18.1	37.1

Table 22 (Continued)

Item	Very Dissatisfied or Dissatisfied	Neutral	Very Satisfied or Satisfied
Marine Corps			
Q51: Reimbursement to move dependents			
Enlisted (N=402)	40.8	17.9	41.3
Officers (N=708)	47.4	15.0	37.6
Q52: Reimbursement to move household goods			
Enlisted (N=320)	26.9	11.9	61.2
Officers (N=613)	21.5	10.0	68.5
Q57: Amount of advance notice given prior to the move			
Enlisted (N=418)	22.0	7.9	70.1
Officers (N=716)	10.9	6.3	82.8
Q58: Overall quality of the moving company services			
Enlisted (N=398)	29.6	13.8	56.6
Officers (N=715)	31.9	10.5	57.6
Q59: Amount of reimbursement for lost/damaged goods			
Enlisted (N=260)	56.9	12.3	30.8
Officers (N=528)	51.3	15.0	33.7
Navy			
Q51: Reimbursement to move dependents			
Enlisted (N=694)	44.1	17.1	38.8
Officers (N=930)	47.5	13.6	38.9
Q52: Reimbursement to move household goods			
Enlisted (N=590)	23.4	13.4	63.2
Officers (N=887)	18.7	12.7	68.6
Q57: Amount of advance notice given prior to the move			
Enlisted (N=765)	13.8	7.3	78.9
Officers (N=981)	18.6	7.8	73.6
Q58: Overall quality of the moving company services			
Enlisted (N=696)	28.9	12.4	58.7
Officers (N=976)	30.8	10.9	58.3
Q59: Amount of reimbursement for lost/damaged goods			
Enlisted (N=503)	48.3	16.9	34.8
Officers (N=784)	42.2	18.1	39.7

Table 23
Responses to Housing Items by Service Branch

Item Group	Response			Total
	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	
Air Force ^a				
Q53: Length of waiting lists for military family housing				
Enlisted:				
E-1-E-3 (N=92)	53.3	16.3	30.4	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=329)	48.3	11.9	39.8	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=430)	42.1	11.6	46.3	100.0
Total	45.7	12.2	42.1	100.0
	%			
	N	389	104	358
Officers:				
O-1-O-2 (N=233)	55.8	12.4	31.8	100.0
O-3 (N=85)	57.6	12.9	29.5	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=228)	43.0	25.9	31.1	100.0
O-6+ (N=263)	41.8	37.3	100.0	
Total	49.5	20.6	29.9	100.0
	%			
	N	387	161	234
Overall Total	46.7	16.0	37.3	100.0
	%			
	N	776	265	592
Q54: Ease of locating temporary civilian housing				
Enlisted:				
E-1-E-3 (N=147)	42.8	20.4	36.8	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=314)	52.2	16.9	30.9	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=396)	54.3	10.9	34.8	100.0
Total	51.6	14.7	33.7	100.0
	%			
	N	442	126	289
Officers:				
O-1-O-2 (N=230)	50.9	12.6	36.5	100.0
O-3 (N=141)	55.3	14.2	30.5	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=385)	53.8	13.0	33.2	100.0
O-6 (N=329)	47.4	35.6	100.0	
Total	51.4	14.3	34.3	100.0
	%			
	N	558	155	372
Overall Total	51.5	14.5	34.0	100.0
	%			
	N	1000	281	661
Q55: Availability of government-funded temporary housing				
Enlisted:				
E-1-E-3 (N=112)	39.3	17.0	43.7	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=321)	53.3	7.5	39.2	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=447)	55.2	5.6	39.2	100.0
Total	52.5	7.7	39.8	100.0
	%			
	N	462	63	350
Officers:				
O-1-O-2 (N=253)	55.7	10.3	34.0	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=447)	57.5	9.6	32.9	100.0
O-6- (N=437)	48.3	42.7	100.0	
Total	54.6	9.0	36.4	100.0
	%			
	N	708	117	471
Overall Total	53.8	8.5	37.7	100.0
	%			
	N	1170	185	821
Q56: Condition of government-funded temporary housing				
Enlisted:				
E-1-E-3 (N=80)	20.0	20.0	60.0	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=250)	34.8	14.4	50.8	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=346)	42.2	9.2	48.6	100.0
Total	36.8	12.4	50.8	100.0
	%			
	N	249	34	343
Officers:				
O-1-O-2 (N=183)	33.3	19.1	47.6	100.0
O-3 (N=120)	40.8	18.3	40.9	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=308)	36.0	14.9	49.1	100.0
O-6- (N=361)	38.0	50.9	100.0	
Total	37.1	14.8	48.1	100.0
	%			
	N	361	144	467
Overall Total	36.8	13.8	49.4	100.0
	%			
	N	610	228	810

^aWarrant officers not included due to the very small N (10).

Table 23 (Continued)

Item Group	Response			Total
	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	
Army				
Q53: Length of waiting lists for military family housing				
Enlisted:				
E-1--E-3 (N=12)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=109)	79.8	10.0	10.1	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=125)	71.2	9.6	19.2	100.0
Total	%	76.4	9.3	14.3
	N	188	23	35
Officers:				
W-1--W-4 (N=44)	75.0	4.5	20.5	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=36)	75.0	16.7	8.3	100.0
O-3 (N=119)	70.5	21.0	8.5	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=216)	70.4	20.4	9.2	
O-6+ (N=114)	68.4	15.8	100.0	
Total	%	70.7	18.0	11.3
	N	374	95	60
Overall Total	%	72.5	15.2	12.3
	N	562	118	95
Q54: Ease of locating temporary civilian housing				
Enlisted:				
E-1--E-3 (N=30)	60.0	16.7	23.3	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=161)	49.1	16.1	34.8	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=210)	47.6	14.3	38.1	100.0
Total	%	49.1	15.2	35.7
	N	197	61	143
Officers:				
W-1--W-4 (N=63)	52.4	7.9	39.7	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=52)	55.8	11.5	32.7	100.0
O-3 (N=171)	48.0	15.2	36.8	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=336)	48.2	20.2	31.6	100.0
O-6+ (N=222)	44.2	14.9	100.0	
Total	%	47.9	16.4	35.7
	N	404	138	302
Overall Total	%	48.2	16.0	35.8
	N	601	199	445
Q55: Availability of government-funded temporary housing				
Enlisted:				
E-1--E-3 (N=28)	57.1	14.3	28.6	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=114)	62.3	12.3	25.4	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=156)	68.6	9.0	22.4	100.0
Total	%	65.1	10.7	24.2
	N	194	32	72
Officers:				
W-1--W-4 (N=57)	68.4	14.0	17.6	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=41)	61.0	14.6	24.4	100.0
O-3 (N=146)	65.1	13.7	21.2	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=311)	65.9	12.2	21.9	100.0
O-6+ (N=211)	57.8	9.5	100.0	
Total	%	63.3	12.0	24.7
	N	485	92	189
Overall Total	%	63.8	11.7	24.5
	N	679	124	261
Q56: Condition of government-funded temporary housing				
Enlisted:				
E-1--E-3 (N=20)	40.0	25.0	35.0	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=77)	51.9	16.9	31.2	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=105)	62.8	12.4	24.8	100.0
Total	%	56.4	15.3	28.3
	N	114	31	57
Officers:				
W-1--W-4 (N=40)	52.5	17.5	30.0	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=31)	58.1	16.1	25.8	100.0
O-3 (N=101)	56.4	18.8	24.8	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=215)	54.4	16.7	28.9	100.0
O-6+ (N=137)	44.5	16.1	100.0	
Total	%	52.3	17.0	30.7
	N	274	89	161
Overall Total	%	53.5	16.5	30.0
	N	388	120	218

Table 23 (Continued)

Item Group	Response			Total
	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	
Marine Corps				
Q53: Length of waiting lists for military family housing				
Enlisted:				100.0
E-1-E-3 (N=31)	54.8	22.6	22.6	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=147)	62.6	11.6	25.8	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=232)	58.2	8.6	33.2	100.0
Total	59.5	10.7	29.8	100.0
	%		122	410
	N	44		
Officers:				100.0
W-1-W-4 (N=62)	58.1	17.7	24.2	100.0
O-1-O-2 (N=116)	76.2	4.3	19.5	100.0
O-3 (N=122)	73.8	3.3	22.9	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=255)	54.9	12.9	32.2	100.0
O-6+ (N=119)	34.4 11.8	53.8	100.0	
Total	58.8	9.9	31.3	100.0
	%	67	211	674
	N	396		
Overall Total	59.1	10.2	30.7	100.0
	%	111	333	1084
	N	640		
Q54: Ease of locating temporary civilian housing				
Enlisted:				100.0
E-1-E-3 (N=50)	56.0	16.0	28.0	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=176)	52.2	13.1	34.7	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=248)	61.3	13.7	24.0	100.0
Total	57.4	13.7	28.9	100.0
	%	65	137	474
	N	272		
Officers:				100.0
W-1-W-4 (N=58)	41.4	19.0	39.6	100.0
O-1-O-2 (N=115)	53.9	13.0	33.1	100.0
O-3 (N=131)	60.3	17.6	22.1	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=303)	56.8	15.5	27.7	100.0
O-6+ (N=135)	43.7 18.5	37.8	100.0	
Total	53.4	16.3	30.3	100.0
	%	121	225	742
	N	396		
Overall Total	55.0	15.3	29.7	100.0
	%	186	362	1216
	N	668		
Q55: Availability of government-funded temporary housing				
Enlisted:				100.0
E-1-E-3 (N=39)	53.8	7.7	38.5	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=155)	52.9	11.0	36.1	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=240)	63.7	7.1	29.2	100.0
Total	59.0	8.5	32.5	100.0
	%	37	141	434
	N	256		
Officers:				100.0
W-1-W-4 (N=62)	50.0	9.7	40.3	100.0
O-1-O-2 (N=108)	50.0	13.9	36.1	100.0
O-3 (N=150)	64.7	11.3	24.0	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=361)	64.9	11.6	23.5	100.0
O-6+ (N=184)	59.2 9.8	31.0	100.0	
Total	60.7	11.3	28.0	100.0
	%	98	242	865
	N	525		
Overall Total	60.1	10.4	29.5	100.0
	%	135	383	1299
	N	781		
Q56: Condition of government-funded temporary housing				
Enlisted:				100.0
E-1-E-3 (N=31)	54.9	16.1	29.0	100.0
E-4-E-6 (N=99)	49.5	16.2	34.2	100.0
E-7-E-9 (N=139)	51.1	10.8	38.1	100.0
Total	50.9	13.4	35.7	100.0
	%	36	96	269
	N	137		
Officers:				100.0
W-1-W-4 (N=44)	56.8	9.1	34.1	100.0
O-1-O-2 (N=80)	51.3	17.5	31.2	100.0
O-3 (N=100)	67.0	13.0	20.0	100.0
O-4-O-5 (N=251)	63.3	11.2	25.5	100.0
O-6+ (N=120)	60.0 6.7	33.3	100.0	
Total	61.2	11.3	27.5	100.0
	%	67	164	595
	N	364		
Overall Total	58.0	11.9	30.1	100.0
	%	103	260	864
	N	501		

Table 23 (Continued)

Item Group	Response			Total
	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	
Navy				
Q53: Length of waiting lists for military family housing				
Enlisted:				
E-1--E-3 (N=37)	73.0	16.2	10.8	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=333)	68.1	7.5	24.4	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=395)	58.2	10.4	31.4	100.0
Total	% 63.3	9.4	27.3	100.0
	N 484	72	209	765
Officers:				
W-1--W-4 (N=60)	58.3	6.7	35.0	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=58)	74.2	12.1	13.7	100.0
O-3 (N=211)	55.9	19.9	24.2	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=254)	61.4	14.6	24.0	100.0
O-6+ (N=250)	34.4 11.8	53.8	100.0	
Total	% 59.1	15.2	25.7	100.0
	N 492	127	214	833
Overall Total	% 59.1	10.2	30.7	100.0
	N 976	199	423	1598
Q54: Ease of locating temporary civilian housing				
Enlisted:				
E-1--E-3 (N=66)	43.9	28.8	27.3	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=378)	51.3	12.7	36.0	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=437)	53.7	15.3	31.0	100.0
Total	% 52.0	15.2	32.8	100.0
	N 458	134	289	881
Officers:				
W-1--W-4 (N=64)	53.1	10.9	36.0	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=78)	57.7	10.3	32.0	100.0
O-3 (N=271)	50.6	18.1	31.3	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=435)	51.7	18.1	31.3	100.0
O-6+ (N=422)	47.1 17.3	35.6	100.0	
Total	% 50.4	17.1	32.5	100.0
	N 640	217	413	1270
Overall Total	% 51.0	16.3	32.7	100.0
	N 1098	351	702	2151
Q55: Availability of government-funded temporary housing				
Enlisted:				
E-1--E-3 (N=55)	49.1	16.4	34.5	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=324)	57.1	13.3	29.6	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=425)	46.3	12.7	41.0	100.0
Total	% 50.9	13.2	35.9	100.0
	N 409	106	289	804
Officers:				
W-1--W-4 (N=70)	52.8	7.1	41.1	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=68)	60.3	14.7	25.0	100.0
O-3 (N=297)	51.5	11.8	36.7	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=502)	52.8	12.5	34.7	100.0
O-6+ (N=526)	52.7 8.6	38.7	100.0	
Total	% 52.8	10.8	36.4	100.0
	N 773	158	532	1463
Overall Total	% 52.1	11.6	36.3	100.0
	N 1182	264	821	2267
Q56: Condition of government funded temporary housing				
Enlisted:				
E-1--E-3 (N=33)	42.4	18.2	39.4	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=181)	35.4	21.0	43.6	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=256)	39.0	18.4	42.6	100.0
Total	% 37.9	19.4	42.7	100.0
	N 178	91	201	470
Officers:				
W-1--W-4 (N=48)	37.5	18.8	43.7	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=40)	42.5	25.0	32.5	100.0
O-3 (N=188)	47.9	13.8	38.3	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=316)	44.9	16.5	38.6	100.0
O-6+ (N=324)	43.6 11.4	45.0	100.0	
Total	% 44.5	14.6	40.9	100.0
	N 408	134	374	916
Overall Total	% 42.3	16.2	41.5	100.0
	N 586	225	575	1386

Table 24

Responses of Career-motivated Personnel to Housing
Issue Items by Officer/Enlisted

Item	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied
Air Force			
Q53: Length of waiting lists for military family housing			
Enlisted (N=458)	48.2	11.1	40.6
Officers (N=462)	50.9	20.1	29.0
Q54: Ease of locating temporary civilian housing			
Enlisted (N=459)	51.2	16.8	32.0
Officers (N=634)	53.0	14.8	32.2
Q55: Availability of government-funded temporary housing			
Enlisted (N=466)	52.1	7.3	40.6
Officers (N=726)	55.8	10.5	33.7
Q56: Condition of government-funded temporary housing			
Enlisted (N=360)	35.6	13.0	51.4
Officers (N=524)	37.2	16.4	46.4
Army			
Q53: Length of waiting lists for military family housing			
Enlisted (N=170)	74.7	8.8	16.5
Officers (N=346)	68.8	19.6	11.6
Q54: Ease of locating temporary civilian housing			
Enlisted (N=279)	49.1	14.3	36.6
Officers (N=524)	49.4	16.6	34.0
Q55: Availability of government-funded temporary housing			
Enlisted (N=208)	64.9	9.1	26.0
Officers (N=459)	65.4	13.1	21.5
Q56: Condition of government-funded temporary housing			
Enlisted (N=141)	56.0	16.3	27.7
Officers (N=327)	54.4	18.3	27.3

Table 24 (Continued)

Item	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied
Marine Corps			
Q53: Length of waiting lists for military family housing			
Enlisted (N=292)	53.8	10.6	35.6
Officers (N=428)	63.1	9.1	27.8
Q54: Ease of locating temporary civilian housing			
Enlisted (N=324)	58.3	13.6	28.1
Officers (N=463)	55.9	16.0	28.1
Q55: Availability of government-funded temporary housing			
Enlisted (N=303)	59.4	9.2	31.4
Officers (N=522)	62.4	12.6	25.0
Q56: Condition of government-funded temporary housing			
Enlisted (N=193)	49.7	12.4	37.9
Officers (N=365)	62.7	12.0	25.3
Navy			
Q53: Length of waiting lists for military family housing			
Enlisted (N=529)	63.7	8.5	27.8
Officers (N=410)	62.2	13.9	23.9
Q54: Ease of locating temporary civilian housing			
Enlisted (N=594)	51.2	15.8	33.0
Officers (N=601)	51.6	18.0	30.4
Q55: Availability of government-funded temporary housing			
Enlisted (N=543)	48.2	14.9	36.9
Officers (N=696)	52.6	12.1	35.3
Q56: Condition of government-funded temporary housing			
Enlisted (N=324)	34.6	21.6	43.8
Officers (N=441)	47.2	13.6	39.2

Table 25

Response Percentages to Items on Relocation Experiences by Service Branch

Item	Air Force		Army		Marine Corps		Navy	
	Enlisted	Officers	Enlisted	Officers	Enlisted	Officers	Enlisted	Officers
General Experiences								
Q28: Number of PCS moves made in the past 10 years:	(N = 1530)	(N = 1796)	(N = 774)	(N = 1357)	(N = 797)	(N = 1346)	(N = 1616)	(N = 2343)
None	16.5	3.8	18.5	4.9	16.0	0.9	15.5	5.7
1-2	28.9	22.8	23.8	14.0	23.3	10.7	26.0	22.0
3-4	37.3	48.4	34.3	43.1	38.4	44.3	43.1	49.4
5-6	14.5	21.5	17.6	29.4	17.6	35.5	11.1	19.1
7	2.7	3.5	5.7	8.6	4.5	8.6	4.3	3.8
Q30: Should the number of PCS moves be limited to every 4 or 5 years?	(N = 1527)	(N = 1794)	(N = 774)	(N = 1363)	(N = 974)	(N = 1344)	(N = 1613)	(N = 2337)
Strongly agree or agree	80.7	77.1	79.3	74.0	81.3	70.3	77.4	73.4
Neutral	12.2	11.9	12.5	14.0	11.9	15.5	14.7	16.7
Disagree or strongly disagree	7.1	11.0	8.1	12.0	6.8	14.3	7.9	9.8
Specific Experiences								
Q31: Value of lost/damaged goods during the most recent relocation:	(N = 1254)	(N = 1718)	(N = 607)	(N = 1282)	(N = 751)	(N = 1324)	(N = 1271)	(N = 2182)
None	28.8	11.6	28.7	11.8	34.2	16.2	30.5	12.7
Up to \$400	45.2	48.8	43.6	42.2	47.5	47.4	43.6	46.3
\$401-\$800	12.8	19.2	14.0	20.0	10.2	18.0	14.9	18.9
\$801-\$1500	7.7	10.6	8.0	14.0	5.2	11.3	7.1	12.3
\$1501-\$2500	4.1	5.9	3.5	6.9	1.9	4.2	3.1	6.0
Over \$2500	1.4	3.8	2.2	5.2	0.9	2.8	0.8	3.7
Q32: Personal cost of the most recent move to the service member:	(N = 1259)	(N = 1718)	(N = 607)	(N = 1288)	(N = 760)	(N = 1320)	(N = 1289)	(N = 2181)
None	7.3	5.6	15.8	5.7	17.5	8.0	15.2	5.9
Up to \$400	28.4	18.6	32.1	21.4	35.1	24.1	29.9	22.6
\$401-\$800	23.9	17.0	22.9	21.8	20.4	23.4	24.2	19.8
\$801-\$1500	26.8	23.6	19.1	25.8	18.4	22.1	20.2	22.8
\$1500-\$2500	9.8	17.0	8.2	15.1	6.3	13.3	8.1	25.8
Over \$2500	3.8	18.1	1.8	10.2	2.2	8.5	2.4	13.7
Q35: Sale of a home prior to the most recent location:	(N = 145)	(N = 551)	(N = 86)	(N = 337)	(N = 103)	(N = 359)	(N = 185)	(N = 701)
Sold at a loss	19.3	5.1	30.2	6.2	21.4	3.9	15.1	6.4
Sold for the original price	32.4	12.5	46.5	16.9	36.9	12.3	24.3	16.0
Sold at a profit	48.3	82.4	23.3	76.9	41.7	83.8	60.5	77.6
Sponsor Program								
Q33: Were you contacted by a sponsor prior to your most recent relocation?	(N = 1497)	(N = 1791)	(N = 729)	(N = 1352)	(N = 928)	(N = 1339)	(N = 1564)	(N = 2315)
Yes	70.7	78.2	27.3	67.4	19.1	36.1	37.7	63.6
No	27.7	17.4	71.6	32.1	80.4	62.7	59.8	34.4
Sponsor declined	1.6	4.4	1.1	0.5	0.5	1.1	2.4	2.0
Q34: Helpfulness of the sponsor:	(N = 953)	(N = 1304)	(N = 170)	(N = 833)	(N = 158)	(N = 431)	(N = 483)	(N = 1268)
Not at all helpful	18.3	12.0	21.8	14.4	19.0	10.7	20.3	14.7
Somewhat helpful	42.1	47.7	42.4	47.3	43.7	48.7	43.9	48.7
Very helpful	39.7	40.3	35.9	38.3	37.3	40.6	35.8	36.6

Table 26

Response Percentages to Items on Unaccompanied/Overseas Tours by Service Branch

Item	Air Force		Army		Marines		Navy	
	Enlisted	Officers	Enlisted	Officers	Enlisted	Officers	Enlisted	Officers
Q25: Number of times apart from dependents for 6 months or more:	(N=1478)	(N=1737)	(N=759)	(N=1352)	(N=925)	(N=1333)	(N=1537)	(N=2235)
None	46.9%	41.7%	42.4%	31.3%	39.4%	22.2%	60.1%	65.5%
One	24.2	30.5	19.6	22.5	22.7	18.4	17.3	17.2
Two	13.3	16.5	12.9	21.5	15.0	17.9	9.9	8.6
Three	8.9	6.8	11.8	15.2	9.2	13.6	5.2	3.6
Four or more	6.7	4.6	13.2	9.5	13.6	21.8	7.5	4.9
Q26: Reason for being unaccompanied by dependents at current station:	(N=163)	(N=153)	(N=137)	(N=181)	(N=125)	(N=157)	(N=187)	(N=148)
High cost of relocating dependents	16.0	9.2	21.2	8.3	22.4	7.0	26.7	22.3
Long lists for military family housing	8.6	5.2	21.2	7.7	17.6	3.8	23.5	11.5
No military housing	3.7	1.3	4.4	1.6	0.8	1.9	2.7	2.0
Dependents couldn't/wouldn't move	18.4	17.6	18.2	19.9	21.6	15.3	20.3	33.8
Dependents don't usually go	0:0	2.6	4.4	4.4	4.8	3.2	4.3	2.7
Anticipate short-term duty	13.5	4.6	13.1	11.6	5.6	5.1	11.8	10.1
Dependents not allowed	39.9	59.5	17.9	46.4	27.2	63.7	10.7	17.6
Q27: Would you like your dependents to accompany you on overseas tours of duty?	(N=1478)	(N=1728)	(N=769)	(N=1350)	(N=923)	(N=1327)	(N=1550)	(N=2230)
Very much	83.6	87.6	78.2	87.6	69.0	67.3	81.5	88.6
Somewhat	6.8	5.7	5.9	5.6	9.8	13.8	6.5	4.3
No preference	3.7	2.4	5.9	2.5	6.8	6.1	5.9	2.6
Somewhat prefer they stay in CONUS	1.8	1.9	2.7	1.2	3.4	4.2	1.3	1.4
Very much prefer they stay in CONUS	4.1	2.4	7.4	3.0	11.1	8.6	4.8	3.1

Proposals Affecting Military Housing Assignment Policies

Respondents were presented with a list of nine proposals (Q100-Q108) that could affect military housing assignments and asked to indicate whether they favored or opposed each, using a 5-point scale where 1 = strongly oppose and 5 = strongly favor. It was felt that proposal No. 1, which concerned extending eligibility for military family housing to all service members with dependents, regardless of pay grade, would be of particular interest. Therefore, respondents were asked to indicate what effect passage of this proposal would have on their plans to stay in the Navy, using a 5-point scale where 1 = very positive and 5 = very negative (Q109).

Item 12 in the demographic section of the survey asked respondents to indicate whether the service member intended to make the service a career, using a 5-point scale where 1 = definitely will and 5 = definitely will not. Responses to this question were cross-tabulated with those to the proposal questions by pay grade. Also, responses to other survey items (i.e., those concerning spouse's active duty status, number of dependents, number of years in military housing, total income, spouse's employment, current and preferred housing type and style, length of wait for military family housing, number of waiting lists on which family is registered, service member's VHA status, and family's current military housing assignment) were cross-tabulated with responses to the proposal items. Results of cross-tabulations reported are limited to those items where (1) large differences were found, (2) differences, regardless of magnitude, were of practical value in profiling respondents's attitudes, and/or (3) responses were most likely to impact directly on the proposals.

Ranking of Housing Policy Proposals

Table 27 indicates the percentages of respondents who favored each of the proposals and shows how they ranked in popularity. Responses are discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

The two proposals most favored by Air Force enlisted were No. 1, extension of eligibility for military family housing to all service members with dependents, and No. 2, assignment of housing solely on the basis of bedroom requirements. The two most favored by Air Force officers were No. 7, continued separation of housing areas for officer and enlisted personnel, and No. 5, construction of new, possibly smaller, housing units specifically for pay grades E-1 to E-3. The greatest disparities in enlisted and officer rankings were found for proposals No. 2 (bedroom requirements assignment) and No. 5 (continued separation); and the greatest agreements, for No. 6, the dual-career BAQ forfeiture proposal, and No. 4, offering all families a choice of military housing units at quality and prices comparable to civilian housing.

Army

Results for Army respondents, both enlisted and officer, were generally the same as those for the Air Force, with enlisted most favoring proposals 1 and 2; and officers, 7 and 5.

Marine Corps

Marine enlisted agreed with Air Force and Army enlisted in that proposal No. 1, extension of eligibility, was one of the two most favored proposals. Their second most favored

proposal was No. 7, the continued designation of separate housing areas for enlisted and officer personnel. Officers concurred, ranking No. 7 as their most popular proposal, followed by No. 5, the construction of new, possibly smaller, units specifically for E-1 to E-3 personnel. The greatest disparities in enlisted and officer rankings were found for No. 2 (bedroom requirements assignment) and No. 3, maintaining existing assignment procedures for military family housing.

Navy

Navy respondents, enlisted and officer, agreed with Air Force and Army respondents, in that enlisted most favored proposals 1 and 2; and officers, 7 and 5. The greatest agreement in officer and enlisted rankings was found for proposal 4, offering all families military housing units at prices comparable to civilian community housing (ranked seventh by both groups); and the greatest disparity, for No. 2 (bedroom requirements assignment).

Proposal 1: Extend Eligibility for Military Family Housing to all Service Members With Dependents Regardless of Pay Grade.

Responses concerning proposal No. 1 are provided in Tables 28 through 30 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

This proposal was ranked first by enlisted and third among the officers. Table 28, which provides a response breakdown by pay grades, shows that support among all grades was high but decreased as a function of increasing pay grade for both enlisted and officers. E-1 to E-6 personnel who favored the proposal more often indicated they were "strongly" in favor.

Table 29, which indicates how passage of this proposal would affect respondents' career intention (Q109), shows that it would have the most positive impact on the E-1 to E-3 pay-grade group and that positive responses decreased as rank increased. Negative effects were minimal overall, and, except for E-1s through E-3s, the majority of responses were in the "no effect" category.

Results of cross-tabulating responses to Q109 with responses to the demographic career intention item (Q12) showed that the percentages of officers who favored the proposal did not differ by their career intention responses. However, 77.2 percent of the enlisted personnel with positive career intentions favored the proposal, compared with 90.7 percent of those who were undecided and 89.1 percent of those with negative intentions.

The E-4 to E-9 group showed the highest percentage expecting the eligibility extension to affect negatively plans to stay in the military. As shown in Table 30, of the 720 who responded to both items, 3.8 percent (N = 27) of those with neutral intentions and 2.4 percent (N = 17) of those with negative career intentions felt the proposal would positively impact their plans, while 6.1 percent (N = 44) with positive intentions felt it would have a negative impact.

Results of cross-tabulations with other items showed that, in general, enlisted with less experience living in military units favored the proposal more strongly than did those with more experience living in military housing (80.5 vs. 68.0%). A similar trend

was found among the officers, with those with less time in military housing favoring the proposal more than did those with more time (69.6 vs. 54.4%). Among the enlisted, those that experienced the longest wait for assignment to housing (19 months or more) favored the proposal more than did those in all other waiting time categories (84.0 vs. 74.2%); across all waiting time categories, those that favored the proposal did so "strongly." Enlisted currently residing in substandard military housing favored the proposal more strongly than did those residing in housing classified as adequate (86.0 vs. 71.4%). By housing style, more of the enlisted currently housed in apartments (military and civilian) favored the proposal (and tended to favor it "strongly") than did those in single-family, condominium-style, or duplex housing (87.8% vs. 73.6, 76.5, and 75.2%). By income level, enlisted with very low total incomes were more strongly supportive of the policy proposal than were those in the middle and very high income brackets (88.0% vs. 71.0 and 74.5%). Among officers, those in the middle income range were more in favor than those at either extreme (75.0% vs. 67.4% (low) and 62.7% (high)).

Army

Proposal No. 1 was ranked second by Army enlisted and third by the officers. Table 28 shows that, among the enlisted, support was greatest among the E-1 to E-3 group and decreased as pay grade increased. Also, pay grades E-1 to E-6 showed a greater percentage of "strongly favor" responses than did all other personnel (enlisted and officer). For officers, the O-1 to O-2 and O-4 to O-5 groups were most in favor, and the O-6 and above group, least in favor.

Table 29 shows that the career intentions of the E-1 to E-3 group, who were currently ineligible for housing, were most positively affected, with "very positive" responses being nearly twice as frequent as "positive" and "no effect" responses, with negativity minimal. Among the officers, the "no effect" responses increased as a function of increasing rank, except for the W-1 to W-4 group, who also showed the highest percentage of negative responses of any group.

Cross-tabulation of responses to the demographic career intention item (Q12) showed that enlisted with negative career intentions were more in favor of the proposal (95.9%) than were those who were undecided (72.7%) or those with positive intentions (68.5%). Approximately the same percentages of officer groups were in favor, regardless of career intention (58.1 to 61.9%). The E-4 to E-9 enlisted group and W-1 to W-4 and O-1 to O-2 officer groups had the highest percentage expecting the eligibility extension to impact negatively on their plans to stay in the military. As shown in Table 30, of the 511 E-4 to E-9 enlisted who responded to both career intention items, 4.5 percent (N = 23) of those with neutral intentions and 2.3 percent (N = 12) of those with negative intentions indicated the policy change would have a positive effect, while 6.1 percent (N = 31) of those with positive intentions felt it would have a negative impact. For the officers, 2.2 percent (N = 3) of those with uncertain intentions and 2.2 percent (N = 3) of those with negative intentions saw the policy change as having a positive effect and 8.6 percent (N = 12) of those with positive intentions viewed the proposal as negative to their plans.

Response differences were not found by type of current housing (military or civilian), possibly because the military housing sample was so small. However, differences by housing preferences emerged, with the enlisted who preferred military housing more in favor of the proposal than were those who preferred civilian housing (75 vs. 67%). Among officers, the trend reversed, with those who preferred civilian housing being more in favor than were those who preferred military housing (59.3 vs. 50.0%). Considering only current housing styles with sufficiently large Ns, the enlisted currently living in apartments were

more supportive of the proposal than were those in single-family or duplex housing (77.9% vs. 64.3 and 64.0%). On a lesser scale, officers in duplex and apartment housing were somewhat less in favor than were those currently in single-family residences (54.0 vs. 58.0%). By style preferences, enlisted preferring single-family residences were less in favor than were those preferring all other styles combined (67.5 vs. 81.0%). Among officers, the difference was between those preferring apartments (66.7% in favor) versus all other style preferences (57.9% in favor). For officers only, support for the proposal was greater among those not currently on a waiting list for military family housing than those who were currently on one or two lists (58.2 vs. 46.3%).

Marine Corps

This proposal, which was ranked first by Marine Corps enlisted and third by the officers, was well supported across all pay grades. As shown in Table 28, among the enlisted, support decreased as pay grade increased, with E-1 to E-3 personnel showing the largest percentages of "strongly in favor." A majority of E-4 to E-9 respondents used the "strongly favor" response option also, and this trend continued through the O-3 group. Among officers, the O-1 to O-2 pay grades were the most supportive; and the O-6 and above, the least supportive.

Reaction to this policy proposal in terms of its direct impact on career intention showed a preponderance of "no effect" responses across all pay grades, except for the E-1 to E-3 group. Although the group perceived the impact of this policy in their career intentions as most positive, the perception of positive effects was generally relatively high through the level of warrant officers (Table 29). Regarding career intention in general, more enlisted who were undecided or negative toward a military career favored the change than did those who were positive (86.8 and 82.9% vs. 73.4%). The trend was similar for officers but to a lesser degree. Those with positive career intentions were somewhat less in favor of the proposal than were those who were undecided or negative (65.5% vs. 70.8 and 66.7%).

Although the percentages who responded that the eligibility extension would have a negative impact on their plans to stay in the military were relatively low, a cross-tabulation was performed on those who answered both the direct and the indirect questions regarding career intention. Table 30 shows that, among the 623 E-4 to E-9 enlisted who responded to both items, 3.7 percent (N = 23) of those with neutral intentions and 2.9 percent (N = 18) of those with negative intentions responded that the eligibility extension would have a positive effect on their plans. On the other hand, 5.4 percent (N = 34) of those with positive career intentions felt the proposal would negatively affect their plans.

Of the 819 officers who responded to both items, 1.5 percent (N = 12) of those with neutral intentions and 0.8 percent (N = 7) of those with negative intentions felt the proposal would positively impact their plans. However, 4.5 percent (N = 37) of those with positive career intentions felt it would have a negative impact.

Relative to other items, enlisted with either no experience or 8 years or more of experience living in military family housing were less in favor of the proposal (62.5% and 61.4% respectively) than were those with more moderate amounts of time in military housing (1 to 7 years, 73.8% in favor). For officers, support was higher among those with little (up to 3 years) or no experience (64.5%) than among those with more time in military housing (4 years or more, 58.9% in favor). Somewhat more of the enlisted currently living in civilian housing favored the proposal than did those in military housing

(77.7 vs. 70.7%), but no difference was apparent among officers. However, neither pay-grade group (enlisted or officers) showed a meaningful percentage difference in favor as a function of their housing type or style preferences.

For the enlisted, support for the eligibility extension was higher among those not receiving VHA because they lived in an ineligible area (81.8%) and those receiving VHA currently (77.8%) than among those not drawing VHA because they lived in military housing (70.2%). Among the personnel currently in military housing, the enlisted in housing classified as substandard were more in favor of the proposal than were those in adequate housing (80.7 vs. 67.4%). For officers, the opposite was true (substandard, 54.4% in favor vs. adequate, 62.0% in favor). By income level, no definite trends were evident for enlisted or officers. However, the lowest income group of enlisted personnel was the most highly in favor of the eligibility extension (91.9%).

Navy

This proposal, which was ranked first by Navy enlisted and third by the officers, showed a strict linear decrease in popularity as pay grade increased across both enlisted and officers (Table 28). E-1s through E-3s showed the greatest support for this proposal, with 71 percent indicating they were "strongly in favor." This trend of strong support extended through the O-3 pay grade. Overall, high percentages of all groups were supportive, including over half of O-6 and above officers.

Table 29 shows that 68 percent of the E-1 to E-3 group felt the proposal would have a positive effect on career intentions, with the majority using the "very positive" response option. In general, positive responses decreased and "no effect" responses increased as a function of increased rank, except for O-1 to O-2 officers. This group showed a markedly low percentage of positive responses and, along with W-1 to W-4 officers, the greatest negativity. Over all pay grades, however, negativity toward the proposal was low.

Relative to career intention in general, the enlisted with neutral or negative career intentions favored the proposal more than did those with positive intentions (82.7 and 86.2% vs. 75.3%).

E-4 to E-9 enlisted and W-1 to W-4 and O-1 to O-2 officers indicated the greatest negative impact of this proposal on their plans to stay in the military. As shown in Table 30, of the 1965 E-4 to E-9 enlisted who responded to both career items, 3 percent (N = 32) of those with neutral intentions and 2.1 percent (N = 22) of those with negative intentions saw the proposal as having a positive impact on their plans, while 4.8 percent of those with positive intentions felt the impact would be negative. Among the officers, only one person with neutral intentions felt the effect would be positive, while five with positive intentions felt it would be negative.

Relative to housing factors, among enlisted with experience living in military family housing, support for the proposal decreased somewhat as years of experience increased (from 81.2% with less than 1 year to 70.9% with 8 years or more). For both enlisted and officers, the groups most in favor of the proposal were those who had waited the longest for assignment to military housing (82.8% enlisted and 71.4% officers). Among enlisted only, a difference was found according to classification of housing, with those in "substandard" housing being more in favor than were those in "adequate" housing (83.0 vs. 73.2%).

The only demographic item to show a response difference was among the officers by income levels. Those with low and middle incomes supported the proposal more than did those with high incomes (67.4 and 67.7% vs. 58.0%).

Proposal 2: Assign Military Housing Solely on the Basis of Bedroom Requirements, Regardless of Rank

This proposal was least favored by officers in all services. Responses by pay grade are presented in Table 31 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

This proposal was ranked second by Air Force enlisted, with 59.2 percent in favor, and ninth (lowest) by the officers, with only 25.5 percent in favor. Table 31 shows how the pay grades polarized on this issue. E-1 to E-6 enlisted were the most in favor, with the majority being "strongly" in favor; and O-4 and above officers, the most opposed, with the majority of the O-6 and above group being "strongly" opposed.

Regarding career intention (Q12), the enlisted with positive intentions were only slightly less in favor of the proposal than were those with neutral or negative intentions (65.6% vs. 68.0 and 64.0%). However, those with positive attitudes and who favored the proposal favored it "strongly." Similarly, officers with positive intentions opposed the proposal more than did those with neutral or negative intentions (55.0% vs. 41.3 and 43.9%).

The percentage of enlisted living in military housing who favored the proposal did not differ from that of enlisted in civilian housing (58.0 and 59.1%). Among officers, those in military housing were more opposed to the proposal than were those in civilian housing (69.8 vs. 58.8%). Of enlisted and officers who had had experience living in military family housing, support for the proposal decreased as length of the experience increased (from 68.2 to 41.9% for enlisted, and 35.4 to 15.0% for officers). Differences were also found by classification of military housing. The enlisted currently in substandard housing were more in favor of the proposal than were those in housing classified as adequate (69.4 vs. 54.0%); a similar trend was found for the officers (27.3 vs. 18.6%).

By current style of housing, respondents currently residing in apartments or mobile/manufactured homes supported the proposal more than did those living in other styles of housing (66.5 vs. 57.2% for enlisted; 45.3 vs. 25.6% for officers), with the enlisted making more use of the "strongly favor" response option. By preferred style of residence, among the enlisted, less support came from those preferring single-family units than from those preferring all other styles (58.3 vs. 63.4%). Among officers, those preferring duplex and apartment housing supported the proposal more than did those preferring other styles (38.9 vs. 25.1%).

Although support for the proposal was higher among the lower income groups and among enlisted, it decreased linearly as total income increased across both pay-grade groups. Additionally, among enlisted, more respondents with unemployed spouses favored the proposal than did those with employed spouses (61.2 vs. 55.6%). In both cases, the majority used the "strongly favor" option. Among officers, however, those with employed spouses were less opposed than were those with unemployed spouses (55.9 vs. 66.5%).

Army

This proposal was ranked first by Army enlisted and last by the officers. As shown in Table 31, this proposal, more than any other, tended to polarize the respondents by pay grade. The E-1 to E-6 group was most strongly in favor, with greater "strongly favor" response frequencies, followed by the O-1 to O-2s. Across all other pay grades, the percentage who opposed it were considerably higher than those who supported it; only the O-6 and above group used the "strongly oppose" option more than the "oppose" option.

Relative to career intention, enlisted with negative career intentions were more in favor of the proposal than were those with neutral or positive intentions (80.9% vs. 64.3 and 61.6%). Officers showed no differences.

Enlisted currently living in military family housing were more supportive of the proposal than were those in civilian housing (67.9 vs. 58.7%). However, these figures should be interpreted with caution because of the small number of respondents living in military housing. More important, perhaps, was the difference by housing type preference. Greater support for this proposal was found among the enlisted who preferred military housing than those who preferred civilian housing (69.9 vs. 55.5%). A similar trend was noted among the officers but to a lesser degree (22.5 vs. 17.4).

By housing styles, enlisted currently living in single-family or duplex units (civilian or military) supported the policy proposal less than did those currently residing in all other styles combined (55.9 vs. 67.6%). Among officers, those living in apartments were somewhat more favorable toward the proposal than were those living in single-family or duplex housing (28.8% vs. 21.1 and 22.7%). Enlisted who preferred single-family units were less in favor than were those who preferred all other styles combined (57.6 vs. 71.4%).

Although no response trend was evident among enlisted by number of dependents, officers with either no or five or more dependents were more in favor of the proposal than were those with from one to four dependents (33.3 vs. 19.7%). By income level, among the enlisted, support generally decreased as income increased (67.6% (low), 54.8% (mid), 39.5% (high)). Similarly, for officers, although to a much lesser degree, support decreased as income level increased (30.0% (low), 25.0% (mid), 18.8% (high)). Enlisted personnel with unemployed spouses were more in favor of the proposal than were those with employed spouses (64.2 vs. 55.5%).

Marine Corps

This proposal was ranked fourth by the Marine enlisted and ninth (last) by the officers. Table 31 shows that, across all pay grades, the percentages in favor decreased rapidly as rank increased, especially among officers. E-1 to E-6 respondents in favor frequently used the "strongly favor" option.

Regarding career intention, more enlisted respondents with neutral or negative career intentions favored the proposal than did those with positive intentions (65.7 vs. 52.5%). For officers, opposition was higher among those with positive career intentions than those who had neutral or negative intentions (71.0% vs. 49.2 and 55.0%).

Among enlisted, those with little or no experience in military family housing favored the proposal more than did those with a year or more of experience (64.1 vs. 46.8%).

Similarly, officers with experience in military housing were more opposed than were those without experience (74.3 vs. 33.3%). Somewhat more of enlisted personnel currently living in civilian housing favored the proposal than did those in military (56.9% vs. 50.8%). The same was true for officers, with opposition higher among military housing residents than civilian housing residents (77.9 vs. 68.9%). Enlisted living in single-family or duplex housing favored the policy proposal less than did those in other styles (51.5 vs. 63.3%), a tendency also reflected in their style preferences. Those preferring single-family, duplex, and mobile/manufactured home styles were less in favor than were those preferring apartments and/or condominium styles (54.0 vs. 68.8%). Similar to some extent, officers in single-family or condominium-style housing opposed the proposal more than did those in other styles (72.8 vs. 66.1%). In terms of preferences, officers in these same groups split even more dramatically (72.7% opposed who preferred single-family or condo styles versus 44.0% opposed who preferred other styles).

Officers currently on a waiting list for military housing were less opposed than were those not registered for housing (63.1 vs. 72.4%). Enlisted in substandard military housing favored the proposal more than did those in adequate housing (55.2% vs. 46.3%).

For enlisted, those not receiving VHA because of living in military housing were less in favor of the proposal than were those drawing VHA or living in an ineligible area (48.0 vs. 58.3 and 65.2%). Similarly, officers in military housing were more opposed than were those either drawing VHA or living in an ineligible area for VHA (77.5% vs. 69.3 and 64.9%).

Navy

This proposal was ranked second by Navy enlisted and ninth (last) by the officers. As shown in Table 31, pay grades E-1 to E-3 were the most in favor overall, but E-4 to E-9 respondents more often used the "strongly favor" option. For officers, over 50 percent in all groups opposed the proposal, with 78.6 percent of O-6s and above opposing it.

Relative to career intention, enlisted respondents with negative intentions were more in favor of the proposal than were those with neutral or positive intentions (76.8% vs. 68.4 and 63.2%). Also, officers with negative intentions were more in favor of the proposal than were those with neutral or positive intentions (37.5% vs. 21.8 and 22.8%).

For officers, but not enlisted, those currently living in military family housing were more opposed than were those in civilian housing (73.5 vs. 64.6%). Also, officers currently housed in single-family or duplex units (civilian or military) were more opposed than were those in all other housing styles combined (66.8 vs. 48.1%). Enlisted currently living in military housing classified as "substandard" were more in favor of the proposal than were those in "adequate" housing (71.2 vs. 59.8%).

Relative to VHA, officers not drawing VHA because of their current assignments in military housing were more opposed to the proposal than were those drawing VHA or not drawing VHA because they live in ineligible areas (74.3% vs. 64.3 and 61.5%).

Among the enlisted, there were no appreciable differences in the percentages favoring the policy proposal as a function of their number of dependents. For officers, opposition was greatest among those with only one or two dependents (70.1 and 50.8%). By income levels for the enlisted, support generally decreased as income level increased (69.6% (low), 58.9% (mid), 51.1% (high)). For officers, the greatest opposition was found among those with the highest total incomes (76.6%).

Proposal 3: Maintain Existing Housing Assignment Procedures for Military Family Housing

This proposal was least favored by enlisted in all service branches. Responses by pay grade are presented in Table 32 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

This proposal was ranked ninth (last) by Air Force enlisted and seventh by the officers. Table 32, which provides the pay grade distribution of responses to this proposal, shows that, although percentages of neutral responses were relatively large for all groups, opposition decreased as rank increased for both enlisted and officers. Polarization at rank extremes was evident, with over half of the E-1 to E-3 and E-4 to E-6 groups opposing the proposal and over half of the O-6 and above group supporting it.

Relative to career intentions, enlisted with neutral or negative intentions were more opposed than were those with positive intentions (58.1 and 64.6% vs. 49.9%). Although officers did not differ significantly, those with neutral intentions were somewhat more opposed than were those with either positive or negative intentions (39.8% vs. 32.2 and 30.5%).

By experience with living in military family housing, opposition among the enlisted generally decreased (from 58.7% to 35.7%) as a function of the amount of time spent in military family housing units. For officers, the trend was similar but, in their case, support increased as experience with military family housing increased (from 31.8% for those with 1 to 3 years experience to 54.9% for those with 12 years or more). Enlisted who had experienced a wait for assignment to military housing showed differences in responses as a function of the length of the wait. Those who had never waited or had waited 7 months or more for assignment were more opposed to the proposal than were those who had waited for shorter periods of time (56.2 vs. 42.7%). Officers showed no definitive trend in this item.

By type of housing, enlisted in civilian housing were more opposed than were those in military family housing (55.8 vs. 41.8%). For officers, those in civilian housing favored the proposal less than did those in military housing (31.0 vs. 47.4%). By preference for type of housing, enlisted who preferred civilian housing opposed the proposal somewhat more than did those who preferred military housing (51.9 vs. 46.9%). Similarly, officers preferring military housing favored the proposal more than did those preferring civilian housing (45.8 vs. 33.7%). Regarding housing styles, opposition among enlisted currently housed in duplex units was lower than for those in all other styles combined (42.4 vs. 53.3%). In terms of style preferences, enlisted currently in apartments were the most opposed to the current assignment policy being maintained (59.1%).

By income level, the enlisted at the two extremes were more opposed than were the middle income respondents (54.0% (low), 56.8% (high), and 44.0% (mid)). On the other hand, officers in the middle income group were more opposed than were those at either extreme (36.6% (mid), 28.8% (low), and 24.7% (high)).

Army

Opposition to this proposal, ranked ninth (last) by Army enlisted and fifth by the officers, was greatest among the E-1 to E-3 and E-4 to E-6 enlisted and least among O-6

and above officers. For other pay-grade groups, percentage split into thirds across the three response categories (Table 32).

By career intention, enlisted with negative intentions were more opposed to the proposal than were those with neutral or positive intentions (65.1% vs. 53.4 and 44.3%). Officers showed no differences by career intention, with responses split nearly equally among the three response categories.

Enlisted personnel with less experience living in military family housing units were more opposed to the existing assignment policy than were those with greater experience (43.8 vs. 38.0%). The trend was similar for officers, with the less experienced being more opposed than the more experienced (31.9 vs. 24.6%). By housing styles, enlisted currently living in single-family houses (civilian or military) were less opposed than were those in all other styles combined (39.8 vs. 50.0%). Among officers, those housed in single-family units or duplex housing were less opposed than were those in other styles (27.1 vs. 34.7%).

No difference was found among the enlisted by the number of live-in dependents, but officers without dependents were considerably more opposed to continuation of the existing assignment policy than were those with one or more dependents (41.0 vs. 26.7%). Enlisted personnel with unemployed spouses were more opposed than were those with employed spouses (48.4 vs. 29.9%).

Marine Corps

Table 32 shows that this proposal, rated as least popular by the enlisted and fourth by the officers, was opposed by 43.7 percent of all enlisted and 24.4 percent of all officers. However, almost 30 percent of all groups were neutral towards it.

Relative to career intentions, no meaningful response differences were evident among the enlisted. However, officers with positive intentions favored the proposal more than did those with neutral or negative intentions (40.4% vs. 25.4 and 28.6%).

Support for the policy increased linearly among the officers as a function of increased experience living in military family housing (from 33.3% with no experience to 63.8% with 12 or more years). Somewhat more enlisted living in civilian housing were opposed to maintenance of the existing assignment procedures than were those in military housing (48.2 vs. 40.8%). Regarding housing preferences, officers who preferred military housing favored the policy more than did those who preferred civilian housing (53.4 vs. 43.3%). By housing styles, officers in single-family, duplex, and mobile/manufactured home residences were more supportive than were those in apartment and condominium styles (47.4 vs. 34.7%). By preferences for styles, officers preferring single-family residences were more in favor than were those preferring all other styles combined (47.3 vs. 33.3%).

Among the enlisted, those not drawing VHA because they lived in military housing were less opposed to the policy than were those drawing VHA or those ineligible to do so (40.6% vs. 48.3 and 55.0%). Officers not drawing VHA because they lived in military housing were considerably more in favor of the policy than were those drawing VHA or living in an ineligible area (54.8 vs. 43.1%).

Navy

This proposal, ranked ninth (last) by Navy enlisted and sixth by the officers, drew relatively large numbers of neutral responses in all pay-grade groups, with the enlisted generally opposed (Table 32). Surprisingly, nearly one-fourth of the E-1 to E-3 group favored the proposal. Among officers, only two pay-grade categories--the W-1 to W-4 and O-6 and above groups--had higher percentages favoring the proposal than opposing it.

Relative to career intention, somewhat more of the enlisted with negative intentions opposed the proposal than did those with neutral or positive intentions (58.0% vs. 52.5 and 50.9%). Officers showed no appreciable response differences as a function of their career plans.

By housing variables, enlisted living in civilian housing opposed the proposal somewhat more than did those in military housing (54.3 vs. 46.3%). Among officers, those in military housing were much more in favor of maintaining the existing policy than were those in civilian housing (51.7 vs. 35.1%). Similarly, more officers preferring military housing supported the policy than those did preferring civilian housing (47.9 vs. 36.4%). By housing styles, enlisted opposition was highest among those currently housed in apartments and those preferring apartments (59.0 and 63.6%). Officer support was highest among those in single-family and duplex housing units (38.2%).

Relative to VHA, officers not drawing VHA because they live in military housing were much more in favor of the existing policy than were those who were drawing VHA (51.9 vs. 34.9%).

Proposal 4: Offer All Families a Choice of Military Family Housing Units at Prices Comparable to Civilian Housing, With Rent to be Paid Out of Housing Allowances

Responses to this proposal are presented in Table 33 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

This proposal was ranked eighth by both enlisted and officers, making it the most opposed proposal overall across pay grades. Among Air Force enlisted, opposition increased as pay grade increased. Among the officers, the O-1 to O-2 and O-6 and above pay-grade groups were the most opposed.

Relative to career intention, enlisted with positive career intentions were more opposed than those with neutral or negative intentions (58.4% vs. 52.6 and 45.3%). The trend was the same for officers, with those with positive career intentions most opposed, followed by those with neutral or negative intentions (56.1% vs. 55.7 and 37.5%).

Response differences as a function of the type of current housing were found for both enlisted and officers. Those in military housing were more opposed than were those in civilian housing (63.5 vs. 53.2% for enlisted; 59.3 vs. 54.8% for officers). Enlisted currently residing in military housing classified as adequate were somewhat more opposed than were those in housing classified as substandard (66.3 vs. 59.0%); the trend was the same for officers (59.3 vs. 47.4%).

Enlisted who preferred military housing were more opposed than were those who preferred civilian housing (63.7 vs. 55.9%). The same was true for officers (63.2 vs. 54.8%). By current housing style, enlisted currently housing in single-family or duplex units (military or civilian) were more opposed to the proposal than were those in other styles (59.4 vs. 49.3%). By preference for style, enlisted who preferred condominium style or mobile/manufactured home housing were less opposed than were those who preferred all other styles (38.2 vs. 59.2%).

Personnel not drawing VHA because they currently lived in military family housing were more opposed than were those not drawing VHA because they lived in an ineligible area (64.0 vs. 40.9% for enlisted; 59.8 vs. 35.6% for officers). Percentages of personnel drawing VHA and opposed to the proposal fell between the two other groups (53.0% for enlisted, 55.7% for officers).

With respect to other demographic items, opposition to the proposal generally increased among the enlisted as the number of dependents living with the service member increased (from 49.5% with none to 63.8% with four or more). The trend was similar for officers (from 42.9% opposed with no dependents to 61.2% opposed with four or more). The income level analysis showed no definitive trends for either pay-grade group.

Army

This proposal was ranked seventh by Army enlisted and eighth by the officers. As shown in Table 33, it was favored by over half of E-1 to E-3 respondents. Percentages in favor for all other groups ranged from 29.2 to 36.9 percent.

Relative to career intention, enlisted with neutral intentions were more opposed to this proposal than were those with positive or negative intentions (54.3% vs. 49.9 and 37.0%). Officers showed no response differences by career intention.

As a function of experience with military family housing, enlisted were generally more opposed as the number of years spent in military housing increased (from 45.5% with minimal experience to 68.8% with 12 or more years). Enlisted preferring military housing were more opposed than were those preferring civilian housing (53.6 vs. 48.5%). Officers showed greater opposition as a function of housing type preferences (58.4% opposed who preferred military housing versus 48.7% who preferred civilian housing). By length of wait for military family housing, enlisted who had waited shorter periods of time for assignment were more opposed to this proposal than were those who had waited longer (64.7 vs. 51.6%). Currently being on a waiting list also affected responses. Personnel on a waiting list were more opposed than were those who were not (57.7 vs. 48.7% for enlisted; 68.3 vs. 48.8% for officers). Enlisted personnel not drawing VHA because they live in military housing or because they live in an ineligible area were somewhat more opposed to the proposal than were those currently drawing VHA (56.8 vs. 48.8%). The trend was similar for officers (54.4% opposed and not drawing VHA versus 48.9% opposed and drawing VHA).

By current housing style (civilian or military), enlisted housed in duplex units were more opposed than were those in all other styles combined (58.5 vs. 47.3%). Officers housed in duplex and apartment style housing were more opposed than were those in single-family housing (56.3 vs. 49.2%). Housing style preference differences paralleled

the current style differences somewhat, with the enlisted who preferred single-family or duplex housing more opposed than were those preferring other styles (50.1 vs. 42.8%). No officer trend by style preference was evident.

Personnel with unemployed spouses were more opposed than were those with employed spouses (51.4 vs. 44.5% for enlisted; 51.0 vs. 48.7% for officers). By income level, officers with lower incomes were more opposed than were those with middle and high incomes (66.0 vs. 49.0%).

Marine Corps

For this proposal, which was ranked eighth by both enlisted and officers, opposition percentages were greater than support percentages at all pay-grade levels, with the officers generally more opposed than the enlisted. The E-7 to E-9 pay grades made greatest use of the "strongly oppose" response category.

Relative to career intention, enlisted with negative or neutral career intentions favored the proposal more than did those with positive intentions (41.9 and 35.1% vs. 24.0%).

Among the enlisted, support for the proposal diminished as length of experience in military family housing increased (from 42.9% with no experience to 13.6% with 8 to 11 years). However, 27.6 percent of those with 12 or more years in military housing supported this proposal. Similarly, the officer percentages in favor decreased with increased experience in military housing (from 33.3% with none to 15.5% with 8 to 11 years); 22.3 percent of those with 12 years or more of experience were in favor of the proposal.

No meaningful differences emerged among officers or enlisted as a function of housing type. Officers who preferred civilian housing favored the proposal more than did those who preferred military housing (25.1 vs. 18.8%). Differences by housing styles showed that enlisted currently in apartment or condominium styles were more supportive than were those in single-family, duplex, or mobile/manufactured home residences (36.8 vs. 27.8%). For both enlisted and officers, those not drawing VHA because they live in military housing were less in favor than were those drawing VHA or living in ineligible areas (22.9 vs. 32.0% for enlisted; 20.3 vs. 24.5% for officers).

Only one demographic difference emerged. For the enlisted, support for the proposal diminished as the number of live-in dependents increased (from 34.1% with no or only one dependent to 9.1% with five or more).

Navy

For this proposal, ranked seventh by both enlisted and officers, support decreased among the enlisted as rank increased. Among officers, support was consistently less than one-third across pay grades. Opposition expressed in the superlative (strongly opposed) was most evident in the E-4 to E-9 pay grades.

Relative to career intention, enlisted with positive intentions opposed the proposal more than did those with neutral or negative intentions (56.0% vs. 41.9 and 43.5%). The same was true of officers (52.0, 48.4, and 38.5%).

For both enlisted and officers, those currently housed in military family housing tended to be more opposed to the proposal (62.4 and 58.1%). Similarly, those who preferred military housing were more opposed than were those who preferred civilian housing (60.4 vs. 50.0% for enlisted; 57.1 vs. 51.4% for officers). By housing styles, enlisted living in duplex and condominium style units were more opposed than were those in all other styles (59.2 vs. 48.7%). By style preferences, however, enlisted preferring duplex and apartment styles were somewhat less opposed than were those preferring single-family, condominium, or mobile/manufactured home units (45.3 vs. 53.3%).

Officers who had waited only short periods of time (up to 3 months) for their military family housing assignments were more opposed than were those who had waited longer periods of time (64.1 vs. 53.5%). Additionally, officers not currently on a waiting list for military housing were less opposed than were those who were on one or more lists (51.5 vs. 65.4%). Enlisted currently in military housing classified as adequate were more opposed than were those living in housing classified as substandard (64.6 vs. 52.9%).

Relative to VHA, enlisted not drawing VHA because of their assignments to military housing were more opposed than were those drawing VHA (64.1 vs. 48.8%). The trend was similar for officers (57.8 vs. 51.2%).

Proposal 5: Construct New, Possibly Smaller, Military Family Housing Units Specifically for Pay Grades E-1 to E-3

This proposal was ranked second by officers in all services branches and either third or fourth by enlisted. Responses are provided in Table 34 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

This proposal was ranked third by Air Force enlisted and second by the officers. Among enlisted, it received the greatest support from the E-7 to E-9 pay-grade group, and the least support from the E-4 to E-6 group. Of the E-1 to E-3 personnel who opposed the proposal, just over half were "strongly" opposed. For officers, support for the proposal increased as rank increased.

Relative to career intention, those with neutral intentions were more opposed than were those with definite intentions (yes or no) (53.7 vs. 56.6% for enlisted; 59.9 vs. 67.9% for officers).

For officers, a difference emerged by current housing style. Those in single-family, duplex, or mobile/manufactured home housing (military or civilian) favored the proposal more than did those in apartment or condominium style housing (68.8 vs 48.3%). Enlisted currently living in military housing classified as adequate were more in favor than were those in housing classified as substandard (58.6 vs. 41.9%). The same was true for officers (70.9 vs. 40.9%).

The only other demographic item on which a trend emerged was among officers by number of dependents living with the service member. Those with larger families tended to be more in favor of the proposal than did those with no or only one dependent (70.6 vs. 61.4%).

Army

This proposal was ranked fourth by Army enlisted and second by the officers. It was favored by over half of the enlisted, with the E-1 to E-3 group showing the most support and the most usage of the response option "strongly favor." Among officers, support was consistently higher overall.

Relative to career intention, no response differences were found among the enlisted. Officers with positive career intentions were more supportive of the proposal than were those with neutral or negative intentions (68.1% vs. 58.3 and 62.5%).

By housing parameters, experience living in military family housing produced differing responses among enlisted. Those with more experience in military housing favored the proposal more than did those with little or no experience (58.3 vs. 39.5%). Although based on a small sample of respondents currently living in military housing, the trend among enlisted was for those in civilian housing to favor the proposal more than did those in military housing (58.1 vs. 46.6%); the opposite was true for officers (65.6 vs. 75.0%). Enlisted who preferred military housing favored the policy more than did those who preferred civilian housing (62.1 vs. 54.7%). Officers showed no differences by housing preferences. Enlisted drawing VHA showed more support for the proposal than did those who did not, either because they lived in military family housing or because they lived in an ineligible area (58.7 vs. 39.6%).

By demographics, officers with one or more dependents living with them favored the proposal more than did those with no live-in dependents (66.4 vs 53.5%).

Marine Corps

This proposal was ranked third by Marine Corps enlisted and second by the officers. As shown, it was opposed by nearly a third of the E-1 to E-6 pay grades. This result may have been a reaction to the term "smaller" in the questionnaire item.

Regarding career intention, enlisted with positive or neutral career intentions supported the proposal more than did those with negative intentions (57.0 vs. 46.4%). For officers, those with negative intentions favored it more than did those with neutral or positive intentions (80.0% vs. 72.3 and 70.5%).

A difference emerged for enlisted by the length of time spent in military housing, with support for the proposal generally increasing as experience increased (from 40.3% in favor with less than 1 year to 71.0% in favor with 8 years or more). By housing styles, enlisted in single-family and condominium style residences favored the proposal more than did those in other styles combined (67.3 vs. 50.2%). By style preferences, greater support was found among enlisted preferring single-family houses than among those preferring all other styles (60.4 vs. 44.4%). Enlisted currently in military housing classified as adequate were more in favor than were those in housing classified as substandard (62.0 vs 48.3%).

Responses as a function of whether or not personnel were drawing VHA showed opposing trends among enlisted and officers. Enlisted living in ineligible areas were more in favor than were those drawing VHA or living in military housing (68.3% vs. 57.3 and 57.5%). Officers in these latter two categories were more in favor than were those in areas ineligible to draw VHA (70.6 and 75.3% vs. 51.4%).

By income level, enlisted in the middle income bracket favored the proposal more than did those at the extremes (66.6% (mid), 51.4% (low), 53.6% (high)), while officers in the middle and high income brackets were more supportive than were those at the low end (72.8% (mid), 71.0% (high), 67.8% (low)). Officers with larger families tended to support the proposal more than did those with two or less live-in dependents (75.0 vs. 67.5%).

Navy

This proposal was ranked fourth among the enlisted, with just over half in favor, and second by the officers. Across all pay grades, the percentages in favor were consistently and appreciably greater than those opposed.

Relative to career intention, response differences as a function of career plans were minimal for both enlisted and officers. Enlisted with positive intentions favored the proposal slightly more than did those with neutral or negative intentions (52.9% vs. 47.1 and 49.3%). Officers with negative intentions supported the proposal more than did those with positive or neutral intentions (68.9% vs. 64.7 and 61.3%).

Only two other survey items showed different responses to this policy proposal. Among enlisted with experience living in military housing, a generally linear trend was noted, with support for the proposal increasing as length of time in military housing increased (from 48.0% to 60.0%). Officers currently living in military housing classified as adequate favored the proposal more than did those in substandard housing (67.1 vs. 58.3%). However, the number in the latter category was very small.

Proposal 6: Have Only One of Dual-career Couples Forfeit BAQ for Military Family Housing.

Responses to this item are provided in Table 35 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

This proposal was ranked fifth by both enlisted and officers. Overall, the E-1 to E-3 group was the most in favor, followed by the O-3 officers. Except for these groups, the percentages in favor decreased linearly as rank increased, among both enlisted and officers, with officers showing nearly even splits in favor or opposed.

Not surprisingly, service members with spouses in the military were much more in favor of this proposal than were the others (92.4 vs. 38.6% for enlisted; 78.3 and 39.9% for officers).

Relative to career intention, those with neutral or negative intentions favored the proposal more than did those with positive intentions (54.2 and 55.2% vs. 41.2% for enlisted; 51.1 and 55.6% vs. 42.4% for officers).

There were no response differences by the major housing variables. However, respondents with less time spent in military housing (0 to 3 years) favored the proposal more than did those who had spent longer periods of time (46.2 vs. 33.8% for enlisted, 47.5 vs. 37.0% for officers). Enlisted respondents currently living in military housing classified as substandard were more in favor than were those in housing classified as adequate (48.2 vs. 35.1%).

Enlisted with no dependents or with smaller families (one or two dependents) tended to favor the proposal more than did those with more live-in dependents (46.6 vs. 33.9%).

Enlisted respondents with low or high incomes favored it more (46.6% & 44.0% respectively) than did those in the middle income category (36.0%).

Army

This proposal was ranked fifth by Army enlisted and fourth by the officers. Among enlisted, the E-1 to E-3 group made more use of the "strongly favor" response option, with the greatest support from the E-4 to E-6 group. Among officers, those in the O-1 to O-2 pay grades were most supportive; and higher ranking officers, the least supportive.

Relative to career intention, no meaningful differences emerged among the enlisted. For officers, those with neutral intentions favored the proposal more than did those with positive or negative intentions (52.1% vs. 45.9 and 45.7%).

Not surprisingly, service members who had military spouses were much more in favor than were those who did not (75.0 vs. 52.8% for enlisted; 80.0 vs 42.4% for officers).

By housing parameters, support for the proposal was greater among those with little or no experience spent in military housing than among those with greater investitures of time (63.3 vs. 50.6% for enlisted; 50.8 vs. 41.7% for officers). Greater percentages of officer personnel currently living in military housing favored the proposal than those in civilian housing (57.1 vs. 43.3%). Officers currently on a waiting list for military housing were more in favor than were those who were not (51.6 vs. 43.0%).

Enlisted who were currently drawing VHA were less supportive than were those who were not either because they lived in military housing or because they lived in an ineligible area (54.4 vs. 65.2%). For officers, those not drawing VHA because of their current assignment to military housing supported it more than did those in ineligible areas or those who were drawing VHA (60.0% vs. 52.4 and 42.8%).

By demographics, respondents without dependents supported the proposed more than did those with one or more (65.3 vs. 52.9% for enlisted; 70.0 vs. 43.1% for officers).

Marine Corps

This proposal was ranked sixth by Marine Corps enlisted and seventh by the officers. Overall, younger and junior personnel favored the proposal more than did older and senior personnel. However, among officers, the difference between the percentages opposed and in favor were relatively small. The E-4 and E-9 pay grades used the "strongly favor" or "strongly oppose" responses options most frequently.

Relative to career intention, enlisted respondents with negative career intentions favored the proposal more than those with neutral or positive intentions (54.6% vs. 46.9 and 47.8%). Officers with neutral intentions supported the proposal more than did those with either positive or negative intentions (47.7% vs. 37.2 and 35.1%).

Not surprisingly, respondents with spouses in the military were much more in favor than were those whose spouses were not (74.0 vs. 43.9% for enlisted; 57.1 vs. 35.8% for officers).

Enlisted currently on a waiting list for military housing supported the proposal less than did those who were not (37.7 vs. 49.0%). The trend was the same for officers (26.5

vs. 37.3%). Enlisted drawing VHA favored the proposal more than did those in ineligible areas or those living in military housing (50.3% vs. 40.0 and 44.4%). Officers drawing VHA or living in military housing were less supportive than were those not eligible by area (36.2 and 37.4% vs. 47.4%). Those living in housing classified as substandard favored the proposal more than did those in housing classified as adequate (52.6 vs. 42.8% for enlisted; 54.4 vs. 36.4% for officers).

By demographics, only one difference emerged. Enlisted showed a generally linear trend of decreasing support as the number of dependents increased (from 51.7% with none to 43.7% with three or more).

Navy

This proposal was ranked sixth by Navy enlisted and fourth by the officers. Overall, just under half of both officers and enlisted were in favor. It was most favored among the lower ranking enlisted and officers, who also made greater use of the "strongly favor" response option.

Relative to career intention, respondents with neutral or negative intentions tended to favor the proposal more than did those with more positive intentions (58.1 vs. 42.9% for enlisted; 56.1 vs. 48.2% for officers).

Not surprisingly, those who had spouses in the military favored the proposal more than did those who did not (72.9 vs. 43.8% for enlisted; 73.8 vs. 46.0% for officers).

By housing items, enlisted with experience living in military family housing showed decreasing support as their experience increased (from 47.5% in favor with less than 1 month to 35.0% with 12 years or more). Enlisted who preferred apartment, condominium, or mobile/manufactured home styles were considerably more in favor than were those who preferred single-family or duplex housing (62.2 vs. 44.3%). Enlisted currently living in military housing classified as substandard were more supportive of the proposal than were those in housing classified as adequate (55.8 vs 40.6%). The opposite was true for officers (23.1 vs. 48.5%).

The only demographic item on which response differences emerged was by the number of live-in dependents. Enlisted respondents showed a linear decrease in support for the proposal as their numbers of dependents increased (from 50.0% with one dependent to 38.4% with five or more). Officers showed a similar but not strictly linear pattern. Those most in favor of the proposal had only one dependent (51.3%), while those with five or more dependents were considerably less supportive (35.5%).

Proposal 7: Continue Present Policy of Designating Separate Housing Areas for Officers and Enlisted

This proposal was rated first by officers in all service branches and from second to sixth by enlisted. Responses are provided in Table 36 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

Air Force enlisted ranked this proposal sixth, with the E-1 to E-3 group being the most neutral; a strong linear trend was indicated across all pay grades, with support

increasing as rank increased. For officers, O-3s and above increasingly expressed their support using the "strongly favor" option.

Relative to career intention, enlisted with positive intentions favored the proposal more than did those with negative or neutral intentions (37.8% vs. 33.3 and 29.5%). Officers with positive intentions were more in favor than were those with neutral or negative intentions (76.5% vs. 64.8 and 53.7%).

Housing style and experience living in military family housing showed response differences. Enlisted in apartments were least in favor of the proposal (31.6%); and those in single-family housing, most in favor (41.8%). Larger differences were evident in the officer group. Apartment dwellers were less in favor than were those in single-family or duplex housing (61.0% vs. 81.4 and 77.5%). Experience living in military housing differences showed that enlisted with no experience were the most in favor (55.6%). Among officers, increased time spent in military family housing paralleled increased support (from 66.7% with no experience to 89.3% with 12 or more years).

Income level was the only demographic item that showed response differences. Among enlisted, as income level increased, support for the separation generally increased (from 32.6% to 60.9%). This trend was apparent among officers but at a much higher level of support (from 55.8 to 89.4%).

Army

Support for this proposal, which was ranked first by the officers and third by enlisted, was high overall and increased as rank increased, for both enlisted and officers.

Relative to career intention, both enlisted and officers with positive intentions were more in favor of this proposal (61.6 and 91.2%) than were those with neutral or negative intentions (48.3 and 76.6%).

In terms of housing parameters, favorability increased among the enlisted as a function of greater time spent in military family housing (from 40.0% with no experience to 83.8% with 12 years or more). Officers, however, split sharply between those with no prior experience and those with from minimal to much experience (33.3% in favor vs. 93.4%). No differences were found among enlisted or officers in terms of their current or preferred housing types (military or civilian). Enlisted currently housed in single-family or duplex units (military or civilian) favored the proposal more than did those in all other housing styles combined (63.8 vs. 57.1%).

Demographically, enlisted with one or more dependents favored the proposal more than did those with no live-in dependents (63.0 vs. 51.4%). By income level, a trend among the enlisted was for support to increase as income increased (55.6% (low), 66.6% (mid), and 73.0% (high)).

Marine Corps

This policy was very popular among Marine Corps respondents, with officers ranking it first and enlisted, second. While one-fifth of the E-1 to E-3 personnel opposed the continued separation of enlisted and officers, opposition overall was very low. All pay grades, except the E-1 to E-3 group, used the "strongly in favor" option to express their attitudes.

Relative to career intention, enlisted with positive intentions showed considerably more support for the proposal than did those with neutral or negative intentions (70.9% vs. 57.7 and 55.9%). Officers with positive or uncertain intentions were more in favor than were those with neutral intentions (96.6 and 96.9% vs. 82.5%).

Enlisted with minimal or no experience in military housing were less supportive than were those with more time spent in military housing (53.9 vs. 65.4%). Enlisted in the lower income bracket were not as supportive as were those in the middle or high levels (62.2% vs. 77.4 and 73.2%).

Relative to housing types, enlisted in military housing were somewhat more in favor of the proposal than were those in civilian housing (73.1 vs. 67.2%). For officers in military and civilian housing, the percentage differences were minimal and support consistently high (96.3 and 96.9%). By housing styles, enlisted currently residing in single-family and duplex housing were considerably more in favor of maintaining the status quo than were those in other styles (72.9 and 73.7% vs. 56.6%). Similarly, enlisted preferring single-family, duplex, and mobile/manufactured home residences were more in favor than were those preferring apartments and condominiums (70.1 vs. 48.0%). Of enlisted currently living in military housing, those in units classified as adequate were much more in favor of the policy than were those in housing classified as substandard (77.3 vs. 51.7%).

Response differences were also found among enlisted as a function of their VHA status. Those not receiving VHA because they lived in military housing were more in favor of the policy than were those drawing VHA and those in VHA ineligible areas (75.2% vs. 67.9 and 52.4%).

By demographics, enlisted with larger families tended to support the policy more than did those with no or up to two dependents (76.1 vs. 65.4%). Also, enlisted in the lower income bracket were not as supportive of the proposal as were those in the middle and high levels (62.2% vs. 77.4 and 73.2%).

Navy

This proposal was ranked fifth by Navy enlisted and first by the officers. As shown in Table 36, while enlisted support for the proposal outweighed opposition, there was also considerable ambivalence. Officers, on the other hand, were consistent in their very strong support for this proposal, with the O-3 and above pay grades expressing their support more often than all others by the "strongly favor" response option.

Relative to career intention, respondents with positive intentions favored the policy more than did those with neutral or negative intentions (52.1 vs. 39.9% for enlisted; 91.3 vs. 86.6% for officers).

By the amount of experience living in military housing, enlisted with considerable time (8 years or more) supported the policy more than did those with less experience (65.4 vs. 55.0%). Support was somewhat less among personnel living in civilian housing than among those living in military housing (49.4 vs. 50.0% for enlisted; 90.8 vs. 92.6% for officers). Enlisted living in adequate military housing were more supportive of the proposal than were those in substandard housing (59.7 vs. 50.0%).

Comparisons of demographic items revealed that, for the enlisted, support for the policy increased linearly as the number of dependents increased (from 44.1% with none to 58.4% with five or more). However, for officers, support showed a slight decline as the

number of dependents increased (from 92.8% with one to 87.9% with five or more). As total income increased among the enlisted, support for the proposal also increased (44.9% (low), 57.2% (mid), 59.6% (high)).

Proposal 8: Extend Housing Eligibility to Pay Grades E-1 to E-3, Even if Time on Waiting Lists is Increased for Everyone.

This proposal is a conditional version of proposal 1, which concerned extending military housing to all service members with dependents, regardless of pay grade, and which was ranked first by enlisted in all service branches. Responses to proposal 8 are provided in Table 37 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

This proposal was ranked fourth by both Air Force enlisted and officers, compared to first and third for proposal 1. Over all pay grades, this conditional version of the eligibility extension policy proposal received considerably less support than did the unconditional extension. Across pay grades, for both enlisted and officers, support decreased as rank increased.

Relative to career intention, enlisted personnel with neutral or negative intentions favored the proposal more than did those with positive intentions (69.0 and 72.7% vs. 58.0%). Among officers, those with neutral intentions were less favorable than were those with positive or negative intentions (47.2% vs. 53.4 and 55.4%).

Among enlisted with experience living in military family housing, support for the proposal decreased as experience increased (from 63.3% to 38.8%); officers showed no definitive trend. Those living in civilian housing supported the proposal more than did those who lived in military housing (61.2 vs. 48.3% for enlisted; 52.7 vs. 40.2% for officers). Additionally, officers who expressed a preference for civilian housing were much more in favor than were those who preferred military housing (51.3 vs. 39.2%). Those currently housed in military units classified as substandard were more in favor of the proposal than were those in housing classified as adequate (56.6 vs. 45.1% for enlisted; 50.0 vs. 37.4% for officers)

By housing style (civilian and military combined), enlisted living in apartments supported the policy proposal more than did those in single-family or duplex units (69.8% vs. 53.7 and 52.0%). By style preferences, enlisted who preferred duplex and apartment styles favored the proposal more than did those who preferred single-family housing (63.2 vs. 55.4%). Similarly, officers who preferred duplexes and apartments were more supportive than were those who preferred single-family units (62.2 vs. 48.5%).

In terms of other demographics, enlisted with fewer dependents living with them (none to two) favored the proposal more than did those with larger live-in families (59.2 vs. 50.8%). By income level, enlisted with low incomes were more supportive than were those with middle or high income levels (63.2% vs. 48.1 and 56.4%). Officers showed no definitive trend with regard to income level. By spouse employment, enlisted showed no "in favor" response differences, but officers with employed spouses were more in favor than were those whose spouses were unemployed (55.4 vs. 44.8%).

Army

This conditional version of the eligibility extension proposal was ranked sixth by both enlisted and officers, compared with second and third for proposal 1. Over 90 percent of the E-1 to E-3 group favored proposal 1, compared to only 70 percent for proposal 8. The percentages for the E-4 to E-6 and E-7 to E-9 groups dropped from 71 and 62 percent to 45 and 46 percent. Among officers, both neutral and opposed responses increased, with no pay-grade group showing over 42 percent in favor. Warrant officers and O-4 and above officers showed more opposition than support.

Relative to career intention, enlisted with negative intentions were much more in favor than were those with positive or neutral intentions (72.3% vs. 47.5 and 51.0%). For officers, those with positive intentions were more in favor than were those with neutral or negative intentions (43.9% vs. 36.1 and 31.3%).

By housing parameters, enlisted living in the civilian community favored the proposal more than did those in military housing (50.2 vs. 42.9%). The reverse was true for officers (37.2 vs. 47.2%). Enlisted showed only slight differences in responses according to their housing preferences, with those preferring military housing being more supportive than were those preferring civilian housing (51.4 vs. 47.7%). Again, the officers showed a relatively strong difference in the opposite direction, with 39.8% of those preferring civilian housing in favor, versus 28.7% of those preferring military housing. Enlisted who had not waited for military housing favored the proposal more than did those who had waited (52.0 vs. 42.7%).

Marine Corps

This proposal was ranked fifth by both enlisted and officers, compared with first and third for proposal 1. Support was moderately high for all pay grades, with the E-1 to E-3 group being most in favor and the O-6 and above group, the least.

Relative to career intention, enlisted respondents with neutral or negative intentions favored the proposal more than did those with more positive intentions (58.7 vs. 48.8%). Officers showed no differentiation in responses by career intent.

By experience in military housing, enlisted with little or no experience favored the proposal more than did those with more years spent in military housing (56.8 vs. 44.7%). Similarly, officers without experience favored the proposal more than did the more experienced personnel (66.7 vs. 39.3%). Respondents not on a housing list supported the proposal more than did those currently registered and waiting for a housing assignment (51.5 vs. 44.0% for enlisted; 41.7 vs. 30.6% for officers). Also, for both officers and enlisted, support tended to decrease as a function of increased waiting time for military housing, except for those who had waited the longest, who were more in favor of the proposal (64.3% enlisted, 53.3% officers).

No differences were found for either enlisted or officers as a function of their current or preferred housing types. Officers currently housed in apartments were more in favor than were those in all other housing styles combined (55.4 vs. 40.7%). Personnel not drawing VHA because they live in military housing were less in favor than were those drawing VHA (45.4 vs. 53.2% for enlisted; 39.3 vs. 42.0% for officers); this group, in turn, was less supportive than were those living in VHA ineligible areas (60.9% enlisted and 47.2% officers). Among enlisted living in military housing, those in substandard units

favored the proposal more than did those in adequate housing units (52.6 vs. 42.0%). Officers showed the opposite trend, with an even larger difference (18.2 vs. 39.6%).

By demographics, respondents without dependents were much more in favor of the proposal than were those with one or more live-in dependents (57.0 vs. 49.4% for enlisted; 60.4 vs. 40.4% for officers). Among officers only, support decreased as income level increased (54.4% (low), 43.6% (mid), 38.8% (high)).

Navy

This conditional version of the eligibility extension was ranked third by enlisted and fifth by the officers, compared with first and third for proposal 1. Compared to the unconditional extension, support for this proposal fell off by almost 20 percent in all pay grades, including the currently ineligible E-1 to E-3 group, who would benefit the most from its adoption. However, this group tended to express their support through use of the "strongly favor" response option.

Relative to career intention, enlisted with neutral or negative intentions were more in favor than were those with positive intentions (64.2 and 66.0% vs. 52.3%). Officers showed no appreciable response differences as a function of their career plans.

Enlisted and officers living in civilian housing favored the proposal more than did those living in military housing (56.9 vs. 50.2% for enlisted; 40.5 vs. 30.2% for officers). A similar relationship was found regarding housing preferences for officers: Those preferring civilian housing were 40.5 percent in favor and 40.7 percent opposed, whereas those preferring military housing were 31.1 percent in favor and 53.3 percent opposed. Those living in military housing classified as substandard supported the proposal more than did those living in adequate housing (66.0 vs. 47.5% for enlisted; 41.7 vs. 30.6% for officers).

Enlisted respondents drawing VHA were only somewhat more in favor of the proposal than were those not drawing VHA because they live in military housing (57.3 vs. 49.2%). The officer response difference was greater (41.0 vs. 29.9%).

Proposal 9: Construct Additional Housing for Pay Grades E-1 to E-3 on a Priority Basis

This proposal was the conditional version of proposal 5, which concerned constructing new, possibly smaller, units for pay grades E-1 to E-3. Responses to this proposal are presented in Table 38 and discussed below by service branch.

Air Force

The conditional version of proposal 5 was ranked seventh by Air Force enlisted and sixth by the officers, compared to third and second for proposal 5. Overall, it drew fewer responses than did proposal 5 but had a greater increase in "neutral" than "opposed" responses, especially among the officers.

Relative to career intention, enlisted personnel with neutral or negative intentions favored the proposal more than did those with positive intentions (45.2 and 41.1% vs. 35.1%). Among officers, those with positive intentions supported it more than did those with neutral or negative intentions (43.7% vs. 36.4 and 39.1%).

By housing style (civilian and military combined), enlisted in apartments favored the proposal more than did those in single-family or duplex housing (48.6% vs. 30.8 and 33.8%). Among officers, support decreased over the three style options (single-family, 41.7%; duplex, 36.4%; and apartments, 26.7%). Similarly, enlisted who preferred housing styles with less physical separation (duplexes, apartments, and condominiums) were more in favor than were those who preferred detached housing styles (single-family and mobile homes) (49.6 vs. 33.7%).

Demographically, enlisted with smaller live-in families favored the proposal more than did those with larger numbers of dependents (39.8 vs. 30.1%).

Army

The conditional version of proposal 5 was ranked eighth by Army enlisted and seventh by the officers, compared to fourth and second for proposal 5. By pay grade, over half of the E-1 to E-3 group remained in favor but support dropped considerably (from 64.8 to 54.4%), as it did among the E-4 to E-9 pay grades (from 55.5 to 28.8%). Overall, only one third of officers were still in favor, compared to two thirds for proposal 5 (32.9 vs. 65.7%).

Relative to career intentions, enlisted with negative intentions favored the proposal more than did those with positive or neutral intentions (56.5% vs. 28.7 and 21.7%). The reverse was found for officers, with those with positive intentions supporting the proposal more than did those with neutral or negative intentions (38.2% vs. 24.3 and 29.8%).

Regarding housing, enlisted currently in civilian housing favored the policy more than did those in military housing (31.9 vs. 21.8%). However, officers who preferred civilian housing favored the proposal more than did those who preferred military housing (35.2 vs. 22.1%). Also, officers who preferred single-family units (civilian or military) favored it more than did those who preferred all other styles combined (33.6 vs. 19.6%). Regarding wait for military housing, officers who had experienced a shorter wait for their current assignment supported the proposal more than did those who had waited 7 months or more (36.4 vs. 18.7%). Also, officers currently on a waiting list were much less supportive than were those who were not (15.9 vs. 33.7%).

Marine Corps

The conditional version of proposal 5 was ranked seventh by Marine Corps enlisted and sixth by the officers, compared to third and second for proposal 5. Not surprisingly, the E-1 to E-3 group was the most in favor (53%, compared to 47% for proposal 5). Over all other pay grades, the percentages in favor and against were fairly even, with the neutral responses being relatively high. The O-6 and above pay-grade group was the most opposed (54%).

Relative to career intention, enlisted with negative or neutral intentions favored the proposal more than did those with positive intentions (50.5 and 45.9% vs. 37.4%). Officers showed the opposite trend: Those with positive intentions were more in favor than were those with neutral or negative intentions (43.6% vs. 33.3 and 38.9%).

For officers, support for the proposal decreased as experience living in military housing increased (from 48.9% with minimal experience to 26.3% with 12 or more years). For enlisted, those preferring duplex or condominium style housing supported the proposal more than did those preferring other styles (60.8 vs. 37.9%). Enlisted personnel in VHA

ineligible areas were more in favor than were those drawing VHA or not drawing VHA because they currently lived in military family housing (50.0% vs. 39.7 and 38.0%).

Navy

The conditional version of proposal 5 was ranked eighth by both enlisted and officers, compared to fourth and second for proposal 5. It lost support in all pay grades, when compared to the unconditional proposal. Except for the E-1 to E-3 group, the percentages who were opposed and neutral both increased.

Relative to career intention, enlisted with positive intentions were more opposed than were those with neutral or negative intentions (45.2% vs. 37.6 and 29.0%). The same was true for officers (44.8, 36.1, and 36.5%).

By housing parameters, enlisted living in military housing were more opposed than were those in the civilian community (51.7 vs. 40.5%). Relative to housing styles, personnel living in single-family or duplex housing were more opposed than were those living in all other styles (46.3 vs. 34.8% for enlisted; 48.9 vs. 36.6% for officers). Enlisted respondents preferring single-family housing were more opposed to the proposal than were those preferring all other housing styles (45.8 vs. 31.2%).

Regarding VHA, enlisted respondents not drawing VHA because they currently live in military housing were more opposed than were those drawing VHA (52.8 vs 40.5%).

By demographic items, opposition among enlisted increased as a function of increasing family size (from 33.0% opposed with one dependent to 58.8% opposed with five or more). Enlisted personnel in the middle income brackets were more opposed than were those at either end (47.9% (mid), 39.8% (low), 32.2% (high)). Officer opposition increased as income increased (39.5% (low), 43.8% (mid), 50.2% (high)).

Summary

Air Force

Air Force respondents were most in favor of the proposals that would incorporate the E-1 to E-3 personnel into the mainstream of housing eligibility. Enlisted and officers alike had higher percentages in favor of than opposed to the unconditional and conditional extension of eligibility (proposals 1 and 8) and of the unconditional building of new units specifically for the E-1 to E-3 pay-grade group (proposal 5). However, the conditional version of the proposals to construct new units for E-1 to E-3 personnel on a priority basis (proposal 9) received nearly equal, and only moderate, support from both groups. All the pay-grade groups, except the O-6 and above group, were opposed to (or were neutral toward) maintaining the existing housing assignment procedures (proposal 3).

Proposals peripheral to the central theme of extended eligibility showed either agreement among the pay-grade groups or relatively wide disparity, depending on their content. Both enlisted and officers had higher percentages opposed to than in favor of the proposal to offer all families a choice of military housing units at quality and costs comparable to civilian housing (proposal 4). However, the proposal to assign military family housing solely on the basis of bedroom requirements (proposal 2) was highly favored by enlisted and very opposed by the officers.

There was moderate agreement across pay grades for the proposal to have only one of dual-career couples forfeit BAQ for military housing (proposal 6) and wide disparity on continuation of the policy designating separate housing areas for officers and enlisted (proposal 7), with enlisted opposed and officers very much in favor.

For all proposals, change was generally supported more by younger and/or lower ranking personnel and those who had less experience with or were less committed to the traditional military way of life. Among enlisted in general, support for or opposition to a proposal tended to be expressed in superlative terms (i.e., "strongly" in favor/opposed or "very" positive/negative), a trend that was not found consistently among the officers. Personnel whose time and experience in the military reflected their acceptance of the current housing assignment and other policies being challenged were generally more resistant to change and tended to see the proposals as more detrimental to their own interests.

Not surprisingly, respondents currently benefitting from military housing assignments where one important criterion had been rank were most opposed to changes in the policies. By contrast, personnel in military housing classified as substandard showed greater enthusiasm toward proposed policy changes, as did those in civilian housing who were either in their preferred style (most often single-family detached units) or in styles that were less preferred (most often apartments). In general, then, personnel who would not be directly affected by a change in policy were less threatened by challenges to it than were those currently benefitting from the policy in terms of their assignments to single-family residences. The underlying interaction appeared to be between the perceived loss or gain involved in the policy change and the strength of the commitment to the military in terms of time and experience under the current policy. Personnel who perceived a gain from a policy change were generally in favor of it. Those who would not be affected by a change were either in favor or opposed, depending on their commitment to the military establishment as they had matured under it. Those who perceived a threat to their best interests by the changes were more opposed to change in general.

Relative to career intention, the direct effect of eligibility extension was seen as positive for the E-1 to E-3 pay-grade group and generally as having no effect for the others. Negative responses were minimal, the highest among those most likely to be impacted, the E-4 to E-9 pay grades. Within this group, however, relatively small numbers of personnel with positive attitudes toward a military career felt that the extension of eligibility to the E-1 to E-3 pay grades would negatively impact their plans. An equal number of E-4 to E-9 personnel who were uncertain or negative toward a military career felt the proposal would positively impact their plans. Examination of policy proposal responses in relationship to career intention in a general sense revealed that, across pay grades, the trend was for those who were undecided or negative toward a military career to hold more positive attitudes toward policy changes.

Army

An overall response profile showed that respondents (across pay grades) were generally in favor of the unconditional extension of eligibility (proposal 1) and construction of new housing units for E-1 to E-3 personnel (proposal 5). The conditional versions of these proposals (proposals 8 and 9), which suggested impact on personnel living in and or waiting for assignment to military housing, were less popular across all pay grades. Respondents also favored the continued designation of separate housing areas for enlisted and officers (proposals 7). In support of this trend, enlisted were generally opposed to

maintaining the existing housing assignment policy (proposal 3) while officers were ambivalent, except for the O-6 and above group who were generally opposed.

The proposal to offer all families a choice of military housing units at quality and rents comparable to the civilian community (proposal 4) was not well received by either enlisted or officers, and the question of having only one of dual-career couples forfeit BAQ for military housing (proposal 6) met with only moderate approval across pay grades. Proposal 2, which concerned assigning housing solely on the basis of bedroom requirements, caused the greatest disparity between the two groups: It was ranked first by enlisted and last by officers.

In general, desire for change was most evident among the E-1 to E-3 pay grades. Although officers as a whole were more resistant to change than were enlisted respondents, the E-4 to E-9 pay grade tended to respond more like the officers than like their most junior associates. Unlike the officers, the enlisted respondents made greater use of the superlative response options (strongly favor and strongly oppose) to express their opinions about the proposals.

Since almost all of the Army respondents were currently housed in the civilian community, a more meaningful trend emerged from their preferences for housing than from their current assignments. Among enlisted, preferences for military housing were generally associated with desire for assignment policy changes that were central to the eligibility extension and accommodation of the E-1 to E-3 pay grades, as well as to assignment on bases other than rank. As mentioned earlier, however, support for change decreased as time and experience in military family housing increased. Officers who preferred civilian housing and/or had less experience in military housing were generally more supportive of policy change than were those who preferred military housing and/or had more experience with it.

Regarding career intention, the direct impact of eligibility extension on a service member's career intentions was more positive for the currently ineligible group, with "no effect" responses increasing in frequency as pay grade increased. Although negativity was minimal over all pay grades, cross-tabulation of the responses made by those showing the highest percentages of negative responses was made against the earlier career intention item. Among the E-4 to E-9 enlisted, approximately the same percentages showed shifts in their career plans as a result of the extension, in both directions, positive and negative. While the officer (W-1 to W-4 & O-1 to O-2) shift was more negative percentage-wise, the actual numbers were very small. Cross-tabulations of the career intention item with all of the policy proposals revealed that enlisted with negative or neutral career intentions generally supported policy changes; and those with positive intentions, maintenance of the status quo. Officers with positive intentions generally supported the extension of eligibility and construction of new units for E-1 to E-3 along with maintenance of the status quo, indicating a trend toward incorporation of the E-1 to E-3 pay grades into the present system.

Marine Corps

Overall, both enlisted and officers favored proposals that would unconditionally incorporate the E-1 to E-3 personnel into the established system of military family housing by extending eligibility and building new units specifically for them (proposals 1 and 5). However, conditional versions of these proposals (Nos. 8 and 9), which might be disruptive to the system, were less favored. Enlisted and officers alike also supported the proposal to continue designating separate housing areas for enlisted and officers (No. 7).

Proposals that offered sweeping changes that would benefit select groups or affect everyone were either not well favored by all or showed a wide disparity between enlisted and officers. Assignment by bedroom requirement only (proposal 2) was favored by the enlisted but opposed by the officers. Similarly, officers had a greater vested interest in the existing assignment procedure (proposal 3) than did the enlisted. Both pay-grades groups, however, were unenthusiastic toward the major changes incurred by offering all families military housing units at prices and quality comparable to the civilian sector (proposal 4) and making military housing more attractive to dual-career couples (proposal 6).

The enlisted and lower ranking officers were more supportive of policy proposals that implied change. Also, enlisted respondents tended to use superlatives ("strongly" in favor/opposed) in their expression of attitudes more than did the officers. Personnel benefitting from the existing assignment procedures, as well as those with greater commitments to the traditional military, were more opposed to change, as illustrated by greater opposition as a function of time spent in military family housing. Among those currently living in military housing and those whose military housing was classified as "adequate," it appears that perceived threats or benefits to their own best interests were the moderating variables in respondents' expressions of desirability for change.

Relative to career intention, enlisted respondents with undecided or negative intentions generally favored policy changes of all kinds. Officers with positive intentions, while in favor of the basic changes in assignment procedures, were conservative with respect to the more dramatic policy changes offered.

Navy

Overall, support for the unconditional proposals to extend housing eligibility to the E-1 to E-3 families and to construct new housing for them (proposals 1 and 5) was high among both enlisted and officers. However, when these same proposals were offered in conditional form (Nos. 8 and 9), they both dropped in popularity. Enlisted respondents still showed relatively high support for extending eligibility to E-1 to E-3 families when the waiting lists for all might be affected (No. 8), but officer support fell off to below half in favor. Both pay-groups groups were unenthusiastic toward constructing units for E-1 to E-3 families on a priority basis (proposal 9). Relative to maintenance of the status quo, the enlisted generally took a very different stance than did the officers. Enlisted respondents were considerably less in favor of maintaining existing assignment procedures (proposal 3) and continued designation of separate housing areas by rank (proposal 7) than were the officers as a group. When the proposals suggested sweeping change or benefit for particular groups, the pay grades either concurred or became widely disparate in their responses. Offering all families military units at rentals and qualities comparable to the civilian sector (proposal 4) and making military housing more attractive to dual-career couples (proposal 6) found only moderate support among the respondents. The proposal to assign housing solely on the basis of bedroom requirements (proposal 2) polarized the ranks dramatically: It was strongly supported by enlisted and strongly opposed by officers.

Desire for change, while generally most apparent among the enlisted and lower-ranking officers, was not necessarily limited to these groups. Relatively high percentages of officers at all levels supported conservative changes in policy. In support of the pay-grade differences in conservatism, the enlisted respondents generally made greater use of the "strongly" in favor/opposed response options to express their opinions. The perception of threat or benefit of each proposal undoubtedly moderated responses, to some extent

regardless of rank (e.g. the differences as a function of current and preferred housing type (military/civilian), number of years living in military housing, and actual lengths of wait for assignment to military housing).

Relative to career intention, desire for change among the enlisted was most often associated with undecided or negative intentions. For officers, the trend was reversed, with the more conservative approaches to change associated with positive intentions.

Table 27
 Percentage of Respondents in Favor of Housing Policy Proposals by Service Branch

Policy Proposal	Air Force			Army			Marine Corps			Navy		
	Favor and Strongly Favor		Ranking									
	ENL	OFF	ENL OFF									
1. Extend eligibility for military family housing to all service members with dependents, regardless of pay grade.	76.6	68.2	1 3	69.8	57.7	2 3	75.6	61.6	1 3	77.4	60.7	1 3
2. Assign military housing solely on the basis of bedroom requirements, regardless of rank.	59.2	25.5	2 9	69.9	21.4	1 9	55.2	19.0	4 9	63.4	21.1	2 9
3. Maintain existing housing assignment procedures for military family housing.	23.5	36.2	9 7	29.2	39.3	9 5	27.1	46.6	9 4	18.1	37.9	9 6
4. Offer all families a choice of military family housing units at prices comparable to civilian housing, with rent to be paid out of housing allowances.	28.9	29.5	8 8	36.0	32.1	7 8	29.4	23.2	8 8	32.8	29.8	7 7
5. Construct new, possibly smaller, military family housing units specifically for pay grades E-1 to E-3.	57.3	68.2	3 2	57.1	65.7	4 2	57.7	70.9	3 2	52.2	62.4	4 2
6. Have only one of dual-career couples forfeit BAQ for military family housing.	42.1	42.4	5 5	54.8	44.0	5 4	48.0	36.8	6 7	46.0	47.8	6 4
7. Continue present policy of designating separate housing areas for officers and enlisted.	39.5	80.2	6 1	61.4	91.4	3 1	69.0	96.8	2 1	51.6	91.0	5 1
8. Extend housing eligibility to pay grades E-1 to E-3, even if time on waiting lists is increased for everyone.	56.1	48.8	4 4	49.4	37.8	6 6	50.9	41.2	5 5	55.2	38.9	3 5
9. Construct additional housing for pay grades E-1 to E-3 on a priority basis.	35.5	40.6	7 6	32.5	32.9	8 7	40.0	39.6	7 6	28.3	29.0	8 8

Table 28

Responses to Policy Proposal 1 by Service Branch

Group	Response				Total (%)
	Favor and Strongly Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Strongly Oppose and Opposed (%)		
Air Force ^a					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=325)	92.3	4.0	3.7		100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=545)	76.9	10.3	12.8		100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=619)	68.0	8.9	23.1		100.0
Total	%	76.6	8.3	15.1	100.0
	N	1140	124	225	1489
Officer:					
O-1--O-2 (N=348)	77.3	11.3	11.5		100.0
O-3 (N=196)	74.5	13.8	11.7		100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=594)	69.0	15.8	15.2		100.0
O-6+ (N=606)	60.1	12.2	27.7		100.0
Total	%	68.2	13.4	18.4	100.0
	N	1189	234	321	1744
Total	%	72.0	11.1	16.9	100.0
	N	2329	358	546	3233
Army					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=110)	91.0	4.5	4.5		100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=273)	71.4	11.4	17.2		100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=367)	62.4	11.4	26.2		100.0
Total	%	69.9	10.4	19.7	100.0
	N	524	78	148	750
Officer:					
W-1--W-4 (N=94)	56.4	20.2	23.4		100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=77)	62.3	13.0	24.7		100.0
O-3 (N=233)	54.9	13.3	31.8		100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=533)	63.8	12.9	23.3		100.0
O-6+ (N=397)	50.6	15.6	33.8		100.0
Total	%	57.7	14.3	28.0	100.0
	N	770	191	373	1334
Total	%	62.1	12.9	25.0	100.0
	N	1294	269	521	298

^aWarrant officers not included due to the very small N (10).

Table 28 (Continued)

Group	Response			Total (%)	
	Favor and Strongly Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Strongly Oppose and Opposed (%)		
Marine Corps					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=179)	92.2	6.7	1.1	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=343)	75.0	12.2	12.8	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=423)	69.1	12.2	18.7	100.0	
Total	%	75.6	11.2	13.2	100.0
	N	714	106	125	945
Officer:					
W-1--W-4 (N=83)	69.9	7.2	22.9	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=149)	71.8	16.8	11.4	100.0	
O-3 (N=199)	65.3	16.1	18.6	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=564)	62.8	11.5	25.7	100.0	
O-6+ (N=321)	50.1	12.8	37.1	100.0	
Total	%	61.6	12.8	25.6	100.0
	N	810	169	337	1316
Total	%	67.4	12.2	20.4	100.0
	N	1524	275	462	2261
Navy					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=202)	91.1	5.4	3.5	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=647)	77.9	11.4	10.7	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=718)	73.1	12.4	14.5	100.0	
Total	%	77.4	11.1	11.5	100.0
	N	1213	174	180	1567
Officer:					
W-1--W-4 (N=103)	69.0	11.6	19.4	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=113)	68.2	16.8	15.0	100.0	
O-3 (N=452)	66.1	18.4	15.5	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=763)	62.6	18.5	18.9	100.0	
O-6+ (N=835)	54.0	17.4	28.6	100.0	
Total	%	60.7	17.7	21.6	100.0
	N	1376	400	490	2266
Total	%	67.5	15.0	17.5	100.0
	N	2589	574	670	383

Table 29

Effect of Extending Eligibility for Military Family Housing to Pay Grades E-1 to E-3 on Career Intention by Service Branch

Pay Grade	Response			Total (%)	
	Very Positive and Positive Effect (%)	No Effect (%)	Negative and Very Negative Effect (%)		
Air Force ^a					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=310)	68.4	30.3	1.3	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=515)	34.8	57.7	7.5	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=577)	26.9	65.0	8.1	100.0	
Total	%	38.9	54.6	6.5	100.0
	N	546	766	90	1402
Officer:					
O-1--O-2 (N=327)	19.9	77.1	3.1	100.0	
O-3 (N=190)	18.5	78.9	2.6	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=558)	20.5	76.9	2.7	100.0	
O-6+ (N=568)	21.0	75.0	4.1	100.0	
Total	%	20.3	76.5	3.2	100.0
	N	333	1257	53	1643
Total	%	28.9	66.4	4.7	100.0
	N	879	2023	143	3045
Army					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=107)	69.1	29.0	2.8	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=257)	45.9	47.1	7.0	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=342)	43.9	48.0	8.1	100.0	
Total	%	48.4	44.6	6.9	100.0
	N	342	315	49	706
Officer:					
W-1--W-4 (N=87)	32.0	57.5	10.3	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=71)	38.1	52.1	9.8	100.0	
O-3 (N=222)	16.3	77.5	6.3	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=511)	21.8	73.8	4.5	100.0	
O-6+ (N=366)	24.3	70.5	5.2	100.0	
Total	%	23.2	71.1	5.7	100.0
	N	291	894	72	1257
Total	%	32.2	61.6	6.2	100.0
	N	633	1209	121	1963

^aWarrant officers not included due to the very small N (10).

Table 29 (Continued)

Pay Grade	Response			Total (%)	
	Very Positive and Positive Effect (%)	No Effect (%)	Negative and Very Negative Effect (%)		
Marine Corps					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=158)		52.5	46.8	0.6	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=327)		30.9	63.6	5.6	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=397)		28.7	63.7	7.6	100.0
Total	%	33.8	60.7	5.6	100.0
	N	298	535	49	882
Officer:					
W-1--W-4 (N=80)		33.8	61.3	5.0	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=146)		22.6	72.6	4.8	100.0
O-3 (N=187)		25.1	70.1	4.8	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=539)		18.0	76.6	5.4	100.0
O-6+ (N=307)		17.9	75.6	6.5	100.0
Total	%	20.6	73.9	5.5	100.0
	N	259	931	69	1259
Total	%	26.0	68.5	5.5	100.0
	N	557	1466	118	2141
Navy					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=189)		67.7	31.2	1.0	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=611)		28.7	66.4	4.9	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=684)		27.2	67.5	5.2	100.0
Total	%	32.9	62.5	4.6	100.0
	N	489	927	68	1484
Officer:					
W-1--W-4 (N=96)		25.0	68.8	6.3	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=110)		5.4	88.2	6.3	100.0
O-3 (N=437)		14.4	83.1	2.6	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=734)		17.5	78.6	3.8	100.0
O-6+ (N=788)		13.8	81.2	4.9	100.0
Total	%	15.3	80.5	4.2	100.0
	N	331	1743	91	2165
Total	%	22.5	73.2	4.4	100.0
	N	820	2670	159	3649

Table 30

Effect of Eligibility Extension (Q109) on Career Intentions (Q12)

Group/Effect	Definitely/ Probably Will		Neutral		Probably/Defi- nitely Will Not		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Air Force								
<u>E-4 to E-9</u>								
Very positive and positive	187	26.0	27	3.8	17	2.4	231	32.2
None	361	50.1	46	6.4	28	3.9	435	60.4
Negative and very negative	44	6.1	8	1.1	2	0.3	54	7.5
	<u>592</u>	<u>82.2</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>11.3</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>720</u>	<u>100.1</u>
Army								
<u>E-4 to E-9</u>								
Very positive and positive	189	37.0	23	4.5	12	2.3	224	43.8
None	210	41.1	25	4.9	11	2.2	246	48.2
Negative and very negative	31	6.1	10	2.0	0	0.0	41	8.1
	<u>430</u>	<u>84.2</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>11.4</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>511</u>	<u>100.1</u>
<u>W-1 to W-4, O-1 to O-2</u>								
Very positive and positive	40	28.8	3	2.2	3	2.2	46	33.2
None	57	41.0	14	10.1	6	4.3	77	55.4
Negative and very negative	12	8.6	4	2.9	0	0.0	16	11.5
	<u>109</u>	<u>78.4</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>15.2</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>6.5</u>	<u>139</u>	<u>100.1</u>
Marine Corps								
<u>E-4 to E-9</u>								
Very positive and positive	141	22.6	23	3.7	18	2.9	182	29.2
None	315	50.6	52	8.3	38	6.1	405	65.0
Negative and very negative	34	5.4	1	0.2	1	0.2	36	5.8
	<u>490</u>	<u>78.6</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>12.2</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>9.2</u>	<u>623</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Officers</u>								
Very positive and positive	154	18.8	12	1.5	7	0.8	173	21.1
None	531	64.8	46	5.6	28	3.4	605	73.8
Negative and very negative	37	4.5	2	0.2	2	0.2	41	4.9
	<u>722</u>	<u>88.1</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>7.3</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>4.4</u>	<u>819</u>	<u>99.8</u>
Navy								
<u>E-4 to E-9</u>								
Very positive and positive	244	22.9	32	3.0	22	2.1	298	28.0
None	555	52.1	84	7.9	71	6.7	710	66.7
Negative and very negative	51	4.8	5	0.5	1	0.1	57	5.4
	<u>850</u>	<u>79.8</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>11.4</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>8.9</u>	<u>1065</u>	<u>100.1</u>
<u>W-1 to W-4, O-1 to O-2</u>								
Very positive and positive	17	12.1	1	0.7	0	0.0	18	12.8
None	81	57.4	24	17.0	9	6.4	114	80.8
Negative and very negative	5	3.5	2	1.4	2	1.4	9	6.3
	<u>103</u>	<u>73.0</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>19.1</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>99.9</u>

Table 31
Responses to Policy Proposal 2 by Service Branch

Pay Grade		Favor and Strongly Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Strongly Opposed and Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Air Force ^a					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=315)	68.6	18.1	13.3	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=544)	72.1	13.0	14.9	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=626)	43.3	9.3	47.4	100.0
Total	%	59.2	12.5	28.3	100.0
	N	879	186	420	1485
Officer:					
O-1--O-2	(N=350)	40.8	16.6	42.6	100.0
O-3	(N=197)	36.1	16.2	47.8	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=592)	26.0	16.2	57.8	100.0
O-6+	(N=609)	12.2	5.2	82.6	100.0
Total	%	25.3	12.5	62.2	100.0
	N	442	218	1088	1748
Overall Total	%	40.9	12.5	46.6	100.0
	N	1321	404	1508	3233
Army					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=107)	73.8	11.2	15.0	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=270)	70.8	11.8	17.4	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=364)	29.5	16.43	54.2	100.0
Total	%	60.5	11.7	27.8	100.0
	N	408	87	206	741
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=94)	31.9	12.8	55.3	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=78)	34.6	16.7	48.7	100.0
O-3	(N=232)	19.8	16.4	63.8	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=534)	21.4	10.1	68.5	100.0
O-6+	(N=400)	17.4	8.0	74.5	100.0
Total	%	21.4	11.1	67.4	100.0
	N	287	149	902	1338
Overall Total	%	35.3	11.4	53.3	100.0
	N	735	236	1108	2079

^aWarrant officers not included due to the very small N (10).

Table 31 (Continued)

Pay Grade		Favor and Strongly Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Strongly Opposed and Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Marine Corps					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=177)	74.0	16.4	9.6	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=351)	59.9	12.2	27.9	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=425)	43.5	11.3	45.2	100.0
Total					
	%	55.2	12.6	32.2	100.0
	N	526	120	307	953
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=86)	30.2	7.0	62.8	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=152)	32.9	13.8	53.3	100.0
O-3	(N=196)	23.5	14.3	62.2	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=561)	16.0	9.3	74.7	100.0
O-6+	(N=321)	11.8	4.7	83.5	100.0
Total					
	%	19.0	9.3	71.7	100.0
	N	250	122	944	1316
Total	%	34.2	10.7	55.1	100.0
	N	776	242	1251	2269
Navy					
Enlisted					
E-1--E-3	(N=198)	70.7	16.7	12.6	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=649)	71.7	12.6	15.7	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=726)	54.1	12.4	33.5	100.0
Total					
	%	63.4	13.0	23.5	100.0
	N	998	205	370	1573
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=102)	37.2	10.8	52.0	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=113)	33.7	15.0	51.3	100.0
O-3	(N=456)	31.6	15.6	52.8	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=778)	21.9	14.5	63.6	100.0
O-6+	(N=851)	11.3	10.1	78.6	100.0
Total					
	%	21.1	13.0	65.9	100.0
	N	486	298	1516	2300
Overall Total	%	38.3	13.0	48.7	100.0
	N	1484	503	1886	3873

Table 32
Responses to Policy Proposal 3 by Service Branch

Pay Grade		Favor and Strongly Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Strongly Opposed and Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Air Force ^a					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=288)	14.2	28.5	57.3	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=494)	19.3	27.5	53.2	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=587)	31.7	24.7	43.6	100.0
Total	%	23.5	26.5	50.0	100.0
	N	322	363	684	1369
Officer:					
O-1--O-2	(N=325)	24.9	39.1	36.0	100.0
O-3	(N=184)	20.1	42.9	37.0	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=549)	29.2	39.3	31.5	100.0
O-6+	(N=570)	55.1	17.9	27.0	100.0
Total	%	36.4	35.4	28.3	100.0
	N	592	576	460	1628
Overall Total	%	30.5	31.3	38.2	100.0
	N	914	939	1144	2997
Army					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=99)	20.2	19.2	60.6	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=247)	26.3	23.9	49.8	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=336)	33.9	29.5	36.6	100.0
Total	%	29.1	26.0	44.9	100.0
	N	199	177	306	682
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=86)	31.4	30.2	38.4	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=73)	31.5	37.0	31.5	100.0
O-3	(N=218)	31.2	40.4	28.4	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=490)	36.9	33.5	29.6	100.0
O-6+	(N=381)	50.1	28.1	21.8	100.0
Total	%	39.3	33.0	27.7	100.0
	N	490	412	346	1248
Overall Total	%	35.7	30.5	33.8	100.0
	N	689	589	652	1930

^aWarrant officers not included due to the very small N (10).

Table 32 (Continued)

Pay Grade		Favor and Strongly Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Strongly Opposed and Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Marine Corps					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=155)	20.0	30.3	49.7	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=313)	23.3	27.2	49.5	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=394)	32.7	25.9	41.4	100.0
Total	%	27.1	27.1	45.7	100.0
	N	234	234	394	862
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=78)	44.8	24.4	30.8	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=147)	33.3	34.7	32.0	100.0
O-3	(N=182)	36.3	30.2	33.5	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=514)	44.1	29.6	26.3	100.0
O-6+	(N=308)	63.7	25.6	10.7	100.0
Total	%	46.6	29.0	24.4	100.0
	N	573	356	300	1229

Total	%	38.6	28.2	33.2	100.0
	N	807	590	694	2091
Navy					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=172)	24.5	23.2	52.3	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=578)	14.5	32.0	53.5	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=648)	19.6	30.9	49.5	100.0
Total	%	18.1	30.4	51.5	100.0
	N	253	425	720	1398
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=94)	41.5	20.2	38.3	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=91)	31.8	26.4	41.8	100.0
O-3	(N=397)	22.9	45.1	32.0	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=676)	33.0	43.3	23.7	100.0
O-6+	(N=716)	51.2	31.6	17.2	100.0
Total	%	37.9	37.5	24.5	100.0
	N	749	741	484	1974

Overall Total	%	29.7	34.6	35.7	100.0
	N	1002	1166	1204	3372

Table 33

Responses to Policy Proposal 4 by Service Branch

Pay Grade		In Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Air Force ^a					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=308)	32.1	19.2	48.7	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=521)	29.4	14.8	55.8	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=605)	26.7	9.8	63.5	100.0
Total	%	28.9	13.6	57.5	100.0
	N	414	195	825	1434
Officer:					
O-1--O-2	(N=339)	27.1	13.6	59.3	100.0
O-3	(N=190)	30.0	19.4	50.6	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=562)	31.0	15.8	53.2	100.0
O-6+	(N=580)	26.4	14.0	59.6	100.0
Total	%	28.5	15.1	56.4	100.0
	N	476	253	942	1671
Overall Total	%	28.7	14.4	56.9	100.0
	N	890	448	1767	3105
Army					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=103)	51.4	14.6	34.0	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=263)	30.0	19.0	51.0	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=348)	35.9	11.8	52.3	100.0
Total	%	36.0	14.8	49.2	100.0
	N	257	106	351	714
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=89)	29.2	12.4	58.4	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=78)	33.3	16.7	50.0	100.0
O-3	(N=223)	29.6	20.6	49.8	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=513)	36.9	18.3	44.8	100.0
O-6+	(N=384)	27.6	18.2	54.2	100.0
Total	%	32.1	18.2	49.7	100.0
	N	413	234	640	1287
Overall Total	%	33.5	17.0	49.5	100.0
	N	670	340	991	2001

^aWarrant officers not included due to the very small N (10).

Table 33 (Continued)

Pay Grade		In Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Marine Corps					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=171)		39.8	15.8	44.4	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=346)		33.2	15.6	51.2	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=411)		21.9	12.2	65.9	100.0
Total	%	29.4	14.1	56.5	100.0
	N	273	131	524	928
Officer:					
W-1--W-4 (N=81)		14.9	4.9	80.2	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=148)		27.0	14.9	58.1	100.0
O-3 (N=188)		29.8	16.0	54.2	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=535)		23.5	16.3	60.2	100.0
O-6+ (N=308)		19.2	15.9	64.9	100.0
Total	%	23.3	15.2	61.5	100.0
	N	293	192	775	1260
Overall Total	%	25.8	14.8	59.4	100.0
	N	566	323	1299	2188
Navy					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=193)		48.7	13.5	37.8	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=633)		32.7	14.7	52.6	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=691)		28.4	15.3	56.3	100.0
Total	%	32.8	14.8	52.4	100.0
	N	497	225	795	1517
Officer:					
W-1--W-4 (N=95)		32.7	12.6	54.7	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=106)		27.3	18.9	53.8	100.0
O-3 (N=446)		32.1	15.0	52.9	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=737)		32.2	19.1	48.7	100.0
O-6+ (N=791)		26.3	19.3	54.4	100.0
Total	%	29.8	18.1	52.1	100.0
	N	649	393	1134	2176
Overall Total	%	31.0	16.7	52.3	100.0
	N	1146	618	1929	3693

Table 34
Responses to Policy Proposal 5 by Service Branch

Pay Grade		In Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Air Force ^a					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=328)	58.0	14.6	27.4	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=542)	52.3	16.2	31.5	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=617)	61.4	14.3	24.3	100.0
Total	%	57.3	15.1	27.6	100.0
	N	852	224	411	1487
Officer:					
O-1--O-2	(N=343)	62.4	20.1	17.5	100.0
O-3	(N=195)	66.7	15.9	17.4	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=586)	69.8	13.8	16.4	100.0
O-6+	(N=598)	71.2	13.2	15.6	100.0
Total	%	68.5	15.1	16.4	100.0
	N	1179	260	283	1722
Overall Total	%	63.3	15.1	21.6	100.0
	N	2031	484	694	3209
Army					
Enlisted					
E-1--E-3	(N=108)	64.8	11.1	24.1	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=276)	53.3	16.3	30.4	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=360)	57.8	15.3	26.9	100.0
Total	%	57.1	15.1	27.8	100.0
	N	425	112	207	744
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=92)	60.9	16.3	22.8	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=76)	67.2	11.8	21.0	100.0
O-3	(N=233)	66.2	15.4	18.4	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=530)	65.2	15.5	19.4	100.0
O-6+	(N=397)	67.1	13.8	19.1	100.0
Total	%	65.7	14.8	19.5	100.0
	N	872	197	259	1328
Overall Total	%	62.6	14.9	22.5	100.0
	N	1297	309	466	2072

^aWarrant officers not included due to the very small N (10).

Table 34 (Continued)

Pay Grade		In Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Marine Corps					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=172)		47.1	20.9	32.0	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=353)		51.0	18.7	30.3	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=423)		67.6	15.6	16.8	100.0
Total	%	57.7	17.7	24.6	100.0
	N	547	168	233	948
Officer:					
W-1--W-4 (N=85)		65.9	15.3	18.8	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=151)		64.9	17.9	17.2	100.0
O-3 (N=196)		76.5	12.2	11.3	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=556)		73.1	11.5	15.4	100.0
O-6+ (N=316)		70.8	10.8	18.4	100.0
Total	%	71.5	12.5	16.0	100.0
	N	932	163	209	1304
Overall Total	%	65.7	14.7	19.6	100.0
	N	1479	331	442	2252
Navy					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=198)		57.1	17.7	25.2	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=641)		47.3	22.0	30.7	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=713)		55.4	16.3	28.3	100.0
Total	%	52.3	18.8	28.9	100.0
	N	811	292	449	1552
Officer:					
W-1--W-4 (N=102)		66.7	10.8	22.5	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=113)		67.3	15.0	17.7	100.0
O-3 (N=453)		67.2	17.4	15.4	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=758)		61.2	18.1	20.7	100.0
O-6+ (N=827)		59.9	16.4	23.7	100.0
Total	%	62.5	16.8	20.7	100.0
	N	1407	380	466	2253
Overall Total	%	58.3	17.7	24.0	100.0
	N	2218	672	915	3805

Table 35
Responses to Policy Proposal 6 by Service Branch

Pay Grade		In Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Air Force ^a					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=304)	55.6	17.4	27.0	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=530)	46.6	15.3	31.8	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=604)	31.4	14.9	53.7	100.0
Total	%	42.1	15.6	42.3	100.0
	N	606	224	608	1438
Officer:					
O-1--O-2	(N=336)	42.6	16.7	40.7	100.0
O-3	(N=200)	49.0	11.5	39.5	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=574)	41.0	13.2	45.5	100.0
O-6+	(N=595)	40.8	14.3	44.9	100.0
Total	%	42.3	14.1	43.6	100.0
	N	721	240	744	1705
Overall Total	%	42.2	14.8	43.0	100.0
	N	1327	464	1352	3143
Army					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=93)	52.7	20.4	26.9	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=267)	57.3	14.6	28.1	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=350)	53.4	10.0	36.6	100.0
Total	Total	%	54.8	13.1	32.1
		N	389	93	228
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=92)	46.7	18.5	34.8	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=76)	63.1	13.2	23.7	100.0
O-3	(N=230)	42.2	12.6	45.2	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=513)	44.0	15.6	40.2	100.0
O-6+	(N=387)	40.5	12.7	46.8	100.0
Total	%	44.0	14.3	41.8	100.0
	N	571	185	542	1298
Overall Total	%	47.8	13.8	38.3	100.0
	N	960	278	770	2008

^aWarrant officers not included due to the very small N (10).

Table 35 (Continued)

Pay Grade		In Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Marine Corps					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=169)	51.5	28.4	20.1	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=346)	51.5	17.3	31.2	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=408)	43.6	14.7	41.7	100.0
Total	%	48.0	18.2	33.8	100.0
	N	443	168	312	923
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=81)	39.5	13.6	46.9	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=150)	41.3	14.7	44.0	100.0
O-3	(N=188)	37.8	13.3	48.9	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=539)	35.8	14.5	49.7	100.0
O-6+	(N=307)	35.2	15.3	49.5	100.0
Total	%	38.8	14.5	48.7	100.0
	N	466	183	616	1265
Overall Total	%	41.5	16.0	42.4	100.0
	N	909	351	928	2188
Navy					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=192)	57.3	18.2	24.5	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=620)	49.0	15.2	35.8	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=699)	40.2	11.9	47.9	100.0
Total	%	46.0	14.0	40.0	100.0
	N	695	212	604	1511
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=96)	43.7	9.4	46.9	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=105)	53.3	16.2	30.5	100.0
O-3	(N=444)	52.5	13.7	33.8	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=753)	47.9	15.1	37.0	100.0
O-6+	(N=811)	45.2	16.5	38.3	100.0
Total	%	47.8	15.2	37.0	100.0
	N	1057	335	817	2209
Overall Total	%	47.1	14.7	38.2	100.0
	N	1752	547	1421	3720

Table 36

Responses to Policy Proposal 7 by Service Branch

Pay Grade		In Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Air Force ^a					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=319)	33.0	28.8	38.2	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=543)	33.3	21.0	45.7	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=619)	48.3	19.4	32.3	100.0
Total	%	39.5	22.0	38.5	100.0
	N	585	326	570	1481
Officer:					
O-1--O-2	(N=347)	63.7	20.2	16.1	100.0
O-3	(N=200)	68.0	17.0	15.0	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=596)	81.0	12.8	6.2	100.0
O-6+	(N=614)	93.2	5.0	1.8	100.0
Total	%	80.4	12.0	7.6	100.0
	N	1412	211	134	1757
Overall Total	%	61.7	16.6	21.7	100.0
	N	1997	537	704	3238
Army					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=104)	48.1	23.1	28.8	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=273)	57.2	20.1	22.7	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=356)	68.5	13.5	18.0	100.0
Total	%	61.4	17.3	21.3	100.0
	N	450	127	156	733
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=94)	89.4	7.4	3.2	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=77)	84.4	9.1	6.5	100.0
O-3	(N=235)	86.9	12.3	0.8	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=539)	91.0	6.1	2.8	100.0
O-6+	(N=405)	96.3	2.0	1.7	100.0
Total	%	91.4	6.2	2.4	100.0
	N	1234	84	32	1350
Overall Total	%	80.8	10.1	9.0	100.0
	N	1684	211	188	2083

^aWarrant officers not included due to the very small N (10).

Table 36 (Continued)

Pay Grade		In Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Marine Corps					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=168)	56.0	23.8	20.2	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=350)	64.4	18.8	16.8	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=426)	78.0	9.6	12.4	100.0
Total	%	68.9	15.6	15.5	100.0
	N	651	147	146	944
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=86)	94.2	2.3	3.5	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=154)	95.5	3.2	1.3	100.0
O-3	(N=199)	95.5	3.2	1.3	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=570)	97.2	1.9	0.9	100.0
O-6+	(N=324)	98.2	0.9	0.9	100.0
Total	%	96.8	2.1	1.1	100.0
	N	1290	28	15	1333
Overall Total	%	85.2	7.7	7.1	100.0
	N	1941	175	161	2277
Navy					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=197)	41.2	28.9	29.9	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=641)	45.7	22.2	32.1	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=722)	59.7	18.7	21.6	100.0
Total	%	51.6	21.4	27.0	100.0
	N	805	334	421	1560
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=103)	84.5	9.7	5.8	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=117)	89.7	6.0	4.3	100.0
O-3	(N=460)	87.6	7.8	4.6	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=779)	90.4	6.9	2.7	100.0
O-6+	(N=857)	94.6	3.3	2.1	100.0
Total	%	91.1	5.8	3.1	100.0
	N	2110	135	71	2316
Overall Total	%	75.2	12.1	12.7	100.0
	N	2915	469	492	3876

Table 37

Responses to Policy Proposal 8 by Service Branch

Pay Grade		In Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Air Force ^a					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=316)	74.1	16.4	9.5	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=537)	58.5	14.5	27.0	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=616)	44.8	11.4	43.8	100.0
Total	%	56.1	13.6	30.3	100.0
	N	824	200	445	1469
Officer:					
O-1--O-2	(N=345)	51.3	19.1	29.6	100.0
O-3	(N=193)	53.4	20.7	25.9	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=579)	55.6	16.1	28.3	100.0
O-6+	(N=598)	39.3	12.5	48.2	100.0
Total	%	48.8	16.0	35.2	100.0
	N	837	274	604	1715
Overall Total	%	52.2	14.9	32.9	100.0
	N	1661	474	1049	3184
Army					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=106)	69.8	15.1	15.1	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=269)	45.4	22.3	32.3	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=359)	46.5	14.5	39.0	100.0
Total	%	49.5	17.4	33.1	100.0
	N	363	128	243	734
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=91)	37.3	20.9	41.8	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=73)	42.5	24.6	32.9	100.0
O-3	(N=231)	42.4	15.6	42.0	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=522)	41.8	15.3	42.9	100.0
O-6+	(N=394)	29.2	14.2	56.6	100.0
Total	%	37.8	15.9	46.2	100.0
	N	496	209	606	1311
Overall Total	%	42.0	16.5	41.5	100.0
	N	859	337	849	2045

^aWarrant officers not included due to the very small N (10).

Table 37 (Continued)

Pay Grade		In Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Marine Corps					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=170)		69.4	20.6	10.0	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=330)		47.9	23.3	28.8	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=406)		45.6	17.2	37.2	100.0
Total	%	50.9	20.1	29.0	100.0
	N	461	182	263	906
Officer:					
W-1--W-4 (N=80)		52.5	12.5	35.0	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=150)		44.6	20.7	34.7	100.0
O-3 (N=195)		47.2	15.9	36.9	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=553)		43.4	13.6	43.0	100.0
O-6+ (N=318)		29.2	8.5	62.3	100.0
Total	%	41.2	13.4	45.4	100.0
	N	534	174	588	1296
Overall Total	%	45.2	16.2	38.6	100.0
	N	995	356	851	2202
Navy					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=198)		72.3	14.6	13.1	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=642)		54.4	19.0	26.6	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=715)		51.3	17.8	30.9	100.0
Total	%	55.2	17.9	26.9	100.0
	N	859	278	418	1555
Officer:					
W-1--W-4 (N=103)		50.5	6.8	42.7	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=105)		43.8	18.1	38.1	100.0
O-3 (N=454)		43.0	20.9	36.1	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=762)		41.1	19.3	39.6	100.0
O-6+ (N=817)		32.5	17.9	49.6	100.0
Total	%	38.9	18.5	42.6	100.0
	N	872	414	955	2241
Overall Total	%	45.6	18.2	36.2	100.0
	N	1731	692	1373	3796

Table 38

Responses to Policy Proposal 9 by Service Branch

Pay Grade		In Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Air Force ^a					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=312)	51.0	30.4	18.6	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=520)	32.1	29.4	38.5	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=604)	30.4	20.9	48.7	100.0
Total	%	35.6	26.0	38.4	100.0
	N	510	374	552	1436
Officer:					
O-1--O-2	(N=343)	37.9%	32.4%	29.7%	100.0
O-3	(N=191)	39.3	29.8	30.9	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=578)	46.9	23.7	29.4	100.0
O-6+	(N=590)	36.6	17.8	45.6	100.0
Total	%	40.7	24.1	35.3	100.0
	N	692	410	600	1702
Overall Total	%	38.3	25	36.7	100.0
	N	1202	784	1152	3138
Army					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=103)	54.4	26.2	19.4	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=259)	28.2	28.2	43.6	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=355)	29.3	23.7	47.0	100.0
Total	%	32.5	25.7	41.8	100.0
	N	233	184	300	717
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=86)	32.6	23.2	44.2	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=76)	25.0	26.3	48.7	100.0
O-3	(N=220)	33.2	22.3	44.5	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=523)	38.0	21.8	40.2	100.0
O-6+	(N=391)	27.3	20.5	52.2	100.0
Total	%	32.9	21.8	45.3	100.0
	N	426	283	587	1296
Overall Total	%	32.7	23.2	44.1	100.0
	N	659	467	887	2013

^aWarrant officers not included due to the very small N (10).

Table 38 (Continued)

Pay Grade		In Favor (%)	Neutral (%)	Opposed (%)	Total (%)
Marine Corps					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=166)	53.0	31.3	15.7	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=343)	34.1	27.4	38.5	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=402)	39.6	23.1	37.3	100.0
Total	%	40.0	26.2	33.8	100.0
	N	364	239	308	911
Officer:					
W-1--W-2	(N=82)	47.6	14.6	37.8	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=152)	36.8	23.7	39.5	100.0
O-3	(N=191)	42.9	24.1	33.0	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=552)	43.3	16.1	40.6	100.0
O-6+	(N=315)	30.1	15.6	54.3	100.0
Total	%	39.5	18.0	42.5	100.0
	N	511	232	549	1292
Overall Total	%	39.7	21.4	38.9	100.0
	N	875	471	857	2203
Navy					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=188)	39.9	37.2	22.9	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=635)	26.6	29.6	43.8	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=692)	26.7	24.7	48.6	100.0
Total	%	28.3	28.3	43.4	100.0
	N	429	429	657	1515
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=101)	40.6	16.8	42.6	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=108)	26.0	25.9	48.1	100.0
O-3	(N=445)	31.2	28.1	40.7	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=747)	31.8	23.8	44.4	100.0
O-6+	(N=826)	24.5	19.1	56.4	100.0
Total	%	29.1	22.7	48.2	100.0
	N	647	506	1074	2227
Overall Total	%	28.8	25.0	46.3	100.0
	N	1076	935	1731	3742

Variable Housing Allowance (VHA)

Seventy-three percent of the sample were receiving VHA at the time of the survey (Q110). Table 39, which presents the breakdown by service branch, shows that 78 percent of Navy respondents indicated they were receiving VHA, compared to 66 and 62 percent of Marine Corps and Army respondents. The Army percentage of 90 percent is spuriously high, since the Army sample was made up almost entirely of service members living in the civilian sector.

VHA Impact on Housing Situations

Ten survey items (Q111-120) attempted to determine how receiving VHA impacted on respondent's housing and related situations. They consisted of a list of statements concerning housing; respondents were to indicate whether or not VHA had affected the situation described in each statement.

Table 40, which presents the numbers and percentages of respondents who indicated that VHA had affected various housing situations, shows that, overall, VHA had the greatest influence on "have more places the family can afford to live," followed by "have been able to have dependents accompany the service member at current duty station." However, the positive effect of VHA on this situation was much greater for the enlisted than for the officers--64 versus 37 percent.

Although the statement "would like to live in the local civilian community if released from mandatory military family housing" was ranked third overall, most of the respondents receiving VHA indicated "does not apply" to this question. Of the relatively small number (N = 816) who live in mandatory military housing, almost half (47.2%) indicated that "they would prefer to live in civilian housing." Also, 41.4 percent of the total group indicated that they "plan to live in a local civilian community instead of military family housing at the next duty station" and "have more money available for nonhousing items." More enlisted than officers indicated they would like to live in the civilian community; and more officers than enlisted, that they now have more money for nonhousing items. Overall, 42.9 percent indicated that they plan to buy a house at a future duty location (34% enlisted and 49% officers).

Both officers and enlisted indicated that VHA had the least impact on moving closer to the service member's place of work and having moved to increase the size of the family's living space.

Table 41, which provides pay-grade analyses of responses, reveals definite relationships between respondents' pay grade and VHA impact on particular housing situations. These relationships are discussed below.

1. Moving (Q111 and 112). As shown, for both officers and enlisted, as pay grade increased, the percentage who moved to increase their family living space or relocate closer to work generally decreased. E-1 through E-6 enlisted and O-1 to O-2 officers had the greatest percentages of "yes" responses.

2. Nonhousing Items (Q113). Use of VHA for nonhousing items was somewhat higher among officers than enlisted (45 vs. 34%), with the "yes" responses increasing as pay grade increased among the officers.

3. More Places of Live (Q114). Almost 60 percent of both officer and enlisted respondents indicated VHA had given them more places in which their families could afford to live. Among enlisted, this positive impact increased with increasing pay grade.

4. Plans to Live in Civilian Community (Q115). More enlisted than officers (47 vs. 38%) indicated they planned to live in the local civilian community, instead of in family housing, at the next duty station due to VHA. Also, this impact increased as pay grade increased among the enlisted. No trend was evident among officers by pay grade.

5. Accompanied by Dependents (Q116). More enlisted than officers (64 vs. 37%) indicated VHA enabled them to have dependents accompany them at their current duty station. This impact was highest among E-1 to E-6 enlisted and W-1 to W-4 and O-1 to O-2 officers.

6. Plans to Purchase Homes (Q117-118). Plans to purchase homes as an impact of VHA were generally greater among officers than enlisted, with higher percentages of all respondents indicating home ownership plans for a future duty station location as opposed to at their current location. The pay-grade analysis showed plans to buy a home increased with increasing pay grade among the enlisted, but no definitive trends were found for officers.

7. Family Housing Waiting List (Q119). Thirty-seven percent of the enlisted respondents indicated they had removed their name from the military family housing waiting lists because of VHA, compared to 24 percent for the officers. Among enlisted, this impact increased with increasing pay grade.

8. Desire for Civilian Housing. Similarly, among respondents in mandatory military housing, desire to live in the civilian community if released increased as pay grade increased for all enlisted pay grades and for officers (except O-6s and above).

Impact on Service Member

Three survey items (Q121-123) were included to determine how VHA impacted the service member's career motivation, ability to afford better housing, and willingness to relocate to high cost areas. Table 42, which provides responses by service branch and pay grade, shows that about 55 percent of Navy and Air Force respondents agreed that VHA made military service more attractive, compared to 48 percent for the Army and 47 percent for the Marine Corps. Relatively high percentages in all pay grades agree that VHA had a positive impact on career motivation, with agreement increasing with increasing pay grade across both enlisted and officer ranks.

Overall, 76 percent agreed or strongly agreed they are able to afford housing that is appropriate for their family's needs primarily because of VHA. Over 80 percent of Navy respondents expressed this opinion, compared to less than 70 percent of Army respondents. Air Force and Marine Corps respondents were about equal to the average (75%). A pay-grade analysis of responses revealed that officers agreed with the statement more than did enlisted, but agreement in both groups increased as pay grade increased.

Finally, half of the service members agreed that VHA had a positive impact on their willingness to relocate to a high-cost-of-living area. There were no differences by service branch. However, the pay-grade analyses indicated that 55 percent of the officers were more willing to relocate, compared to 44 percent of the enlisted. O-6 and above respondents (59%) were more willing than others to move to such an area.

Other Opinions Concerning VHA

Question 124 asked respondents whether or not VHA should include service members' commuting costs. In response, 62 percent, including those who were not receiving VHA, indicated "yes"; 28 percent, "no"; and 10 percent, "didn't know."

When all the respondents were asked to indicate, to the best of their knowledge, the reason for VHA payments (Q124), results were as follows:

- 19.9%--Help pay for rental costs only.
- 1.2%--Help pay for buying a home only.
- 75.9%--Help pay for either rental or buying costs.
- 3.0%--Don't know.

Results of cross-tabulating responses to the items on career intentions in general (Q12) and on effect of VHA on career intentions (Q121) are presented in Table 43. Among individuals with negative intentions (N = 639), 31.1 percent agreed that VHA had made the military more attractive, 41.5 percent did not agree, and 27.4 percent were neutral. Among those with neutral intentions (N = 1013), 26.8 percent disagreed with this positive impact of VHA, 32.8 percent were neutral, and 40.4 percent agreed. Among those with positive career plans, 53.4 percent agreed that VHA had made the service more attractive, 25.6 were unsure, and 20.9 percent disagreed.

Table 39

Service Members Presently Drawing VHA by Service Branch

Service Branch		Yes (%)	No, in Military Family Housing (%)	No, Not in Eligible Geographic Area (%)	Don't Know (%)	Total (%)
Air Force	(N=3316)	62.2	34.8	2.2	0.8	100.0
Army	(N=2129)	90.3	2.7	5.2	1.8	100.0
Marine Corps	(N=2317)	65.8	30.1	2.6	1.5	100.0
Navy	(N=3946)	77.9	20.2	1.0	0.9	100.0
Total		% 73.3	23.1	2.4	1.2	100.0
		N 8582	2706	284	136	11708
Total % Minus Army		69.5	27.5	2.0	1.0	100.0

Table 40

Respondents Indicating that VHA had Affected Housing Situations

Housing Situation	Enlisted		Officer		Total		Ranking of Yes Responses		
	%	N	%	N	%	N	ENL	OFF	Total
Q111. Moved to increase size of family living space ^a	24	498	10	324	15.1	822	9	9	9
Q112. Relocated closer to service member's place of work ^a	18	375	6	208	10.4	583	10	10	10
Q113. Have more money for non-housing items	34	993	45	2196	41.1	3190	7	3	6
Q114. Have more places family can afford to live	58	1692	60	2832	59.6	4524	2	1	1
Q115. Plan to live in local civilian community instead of military family housing at next duty station	47	1158	38	1580	41.4	2538	4	5	5
Q116. Have been able to have dependents accompany service member at current duty station	64	1218	37	791	49.6	2009	1	7	2
Q117. Plan to buy housing at present duty location	26	551	38	892	29.1	1443	8	6	8
Q118. Plan to buy housing at future duty location	34	820	49	1879	42.9	2699	6	2	4
Q119. Removed name from military family housing waiting list ^a	37	368	25	326	29.6	694	5	8	7
Q120. Would like to live in local civilian community if released from mandatory military family housing ^a	50	413	45	403	47.2	816	3	4	3

^aSmall N due to many respondents who indicated this item was not applicable to them.

Table 41

Impact VHA has had on Service Members' Housing Solutions

Pay Grade	Response ^a			Total (%)	
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know (%)		
Moved to Increase Size of Family Living Space (Q111)					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=369)	29.3	66.9	3.8	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=769)	27.4	70.0	2.6	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=910)	19.7	79.2	1.1	100.0	
Total	%	24.3	73.5	2.2	100.0
	N	498	1506	44	2048
Officers:					
W-1--W-4 (N=136)	14.7	84.6	0.7	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=264)	17.0	82.2	0.8	100.0	
O-3 (N=551)	10.9	87.7	1.5	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=1386)	9.3	90.3	0.4	100.0	
O-6+ (N=1047)	6.7	92.9	0.4	100.0	
Total	%	9.6	89.8	0.6	100.0
	N	324	3039	21	3384
Overall Total	%	15.1	83.7	1.2	100.0
	N	822	4545	65	5432
Relocated Closer to Service Member's Place of Work (Q112)					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=414)	29.0	69.3	1.7	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=797)	19.1	79.3	1.6	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=935)	11.0	88.2	0.7	100.0	
Total	%	17.5	81.3	1.2	100.0
	N	375	1744	27	2146
Officers:					
W-1--W-4 (N=138)	6.5	92.8	0.7	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=271)	12.2	87.1	0.7	100.0	
O-3 (N=571)	7.0	91.8	1.2	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=1419)	4.8	95.1	0.1	100.0	
O-6+ (N=1065)	5.4	94.1	0.5	100.0	
Total	%	6.0	93.5	0.5	100.0
	N	208	3240	16	3464
Overall Total	%	10.4	88.8	0.8	100.0
	N	583	4984	43	5610

^a Respondents who indicated that question did not apply to them were excluded from the analyses.

Table 41 (Continued)

Pay Grade	Response ^a			Total (%)	
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know (%)		
Have More Money Available for Nonhousing Items (Q113)					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=550)	36.4	57.6	6.0	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=1050)	33.7	62.5	3.8	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=1322)	33.3	63.8	3.0	100.0	
Total	%	34.0	62.1	3.9	100.0
	N	994	1816	112	2922
Officers:					
W-1--W-4 (N=196)	30.6	68.4	1.0	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=365)	33.4	65.8	0.8	100.0	
O-3 (N=796)	38.3	59.2	2.5	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=1962)	47.5	51.1	1.4	100.0	
O-6+ (N=1530)	50.8	47.5	1.7	100.0	
Total	%	45.3	53.1	1.6	100.0
	N	2196	2574	79	4849
Overall Total	%	41.0	56.5	2.5	100.0
	N	3190	4390	191	7771
Have More Places Family Can Afford to Live (Q114)					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=550)	52.5	40.9	6.6	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=1070)	56.8	36.9	6.3	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=1288)	61.7	32.4	5.9	100.0	
Total	%	58.2	35.7	6.1	100.0
	N	1692	1037	179	2908
Officers:					
W1--W4 (N=188)	47.9	49.5	2.7	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=352)	58.0	40.3	1.7	100.0	
O-3 (N=778)	55.5	41.6	2.8	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=1935)	64.2	32.4	3.4	100.0	
O-6+ (N=1428)	60.5	34.9	4.6	100.0	
Total	%	60.5	36.0	3.5	100.0
	N	2832	1684	165	4681
Overall Total	%	59.6	35.9	4.5	100.0
	N	4524	2721	344	7589

^a Respondents who indicated that question did not apply to them were excluded from the analyses.

Table 41 (Continued)

Pay Grade	Response ^a			Total (%)	
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know (%)		
Plan to Live in Local Civilian Community Instead of Military Family Housing at Next Duty Station (Q115)					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=505)	37.0	26.9	36.6	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=959)	47.0	26.6	26.4	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=1004)	51.8	24.1	24.1	100.0	
Total	%	46.9	25.6	27.5	100.0
	N	1158	633	677	2468
Officers:					
W-1--W-4 (N=139)	41.7	31.7	26.6	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=311)	37.3	33.4	29.3	100.0	
O-3 (N=636)	40.9	32.2	26.9	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=1510)	39.5	33.3	27.2	100.0	
O-6+ (N=1066)	32.7	35.2	32.1	100.0	
Total	%	37.7	33.6	28.7	100.0
	N	1380	1231	1051	3662
Overall Total	%	41.4	30.4	28.2	100.0
	N	2538	1864	1728	6130
Have Been Able to Have Dependents Accompany Service Member at Current Duty Station (Q116)					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=465)	71.6	23.9	4.5	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=749)	64.9	32.3	2.8	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=676)	59.0	38.2	2.8	100.0	
Total	%	64.4	32.3	3.3	100.0
	N	1218	611	61	1890
Officers:					
W1--W4 (N=102)	42.2	56.9	1.0	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=208)	45.2	49.0	5.8	100.0	
O-3 (N=375)	37.1	60.8	2.1	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=850)	36.8	61.2	2.0	100.0	
O-6+ (N=623)	32.4	66.1	1.4	100.0	
Total	%	36.6	61.2	2.2	100.0
	N	791	1320	47	2158
Overall Total %	49.6	47.7	2.7	100.	
	N	2009	1931	108	4048

^a Respondents who indicated that question did not apply to them were excluded from the analyses.

Table 41 (Continued)

Pay Grade	Response ^a			Total (%)	
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know (%)		
Plan to Buy Housing at Present Duty Location (Q117)					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=499)	9.8	77.6	12.6	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=894)	22.6	68.1	9.3	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=752)	39.9	54.3	5.9	100.0	
Total	%	25.7	65.4	8.9	100.0
	N	551	1404	190	2145
Officers:					
W-1--W-4 (N=116)	31.0	61.2	7.8	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=260)	23.1	71.2	5.8	100.0	
O-3 (N=434)	30.9	64.3	4.8	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=840)	38.0	59.2	2.9	100.0	
O-6+ (N=517)	29.6	67.5	2.9	100.0	
Total	%	32.4	63.7	3.9	100.0
	N	702	1381	84	2167
Overall Total	%	29.0	64.6	6.4	100.0
	N	1253	2785	274	4312
Plan to Buy Housing at Future Duty Location (Q118)					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=514)	18.3	46.5	35.2	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=958)	32.4	41.9	25.8	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=978)	42.5	30.4	27.1	100.0	
Total	%	33.5	38.2	28.3	100.0
	N	820	937	693	2450
Officers:					
W-1--W-4 (N=137)	40.1	34.3	25.5	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=334)	52.7	26.9	20.4	100.0	
O-3 (N=694)	53.2	26.5	20.3	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=1605)	51.7	22.9	25.4	100.0	
O-6+ (N=1071)	41.9	27.7	30.3	100.0	
Total	%	48.9	25.7	26.5	100.0
	N	1879	986	976	3841
Overall Total	%	42.9	30.6	26.5	100.0
	N	2699	1923	1669	6291

^a Respondents who indicated that question did not apply to them were excluded from the analyses.

Table 41 (Continued)

Pay Grade	Response ^a			Total (%)	
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know (%)		
Removed Name from Military Family Housing Waiting List (Q119)					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=152)	25.0	73.0	2.0	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=457)	35.7	61.9	2.4	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=391)	42.7	55.5	1.8	100.0	
Total	%	36.8	61.1	2.1	100.0
	N	368	611	21	1000
Officers:					
W-1--W-4 (N=65)	27.7	72.3	0.0	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=150)	24.7	74.7	0.6	100.0	
O-3 (N=264)	25.4	72.3	2.3	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=506)	26.3	73.1	0.6	100.0	
O-6+ (N=359)	19.8	79.1	1.1	100.0	
Total	%	24.3	74.7	1.0	100.0
	N	326	1004	14	1344
Overall Total	%	29.6	68.9	1.5	100.0
	N	694	1615	71	2344
If Released from Mandatory Military Housing, Would Like to Live in Local Civilian Community (Q120)					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3 (N=176)	44.3	40.9	14.8	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=338)	43.5	42.9	13.6	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=321)	58.6	32.4	9.0	100.0	
Total	%	49.5	38.4	12.1	100.0
	N	413	321	101	835
Officers:					
W-1--W-4 (N=50)	50.0	40.0	10.0	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=90)	40.0	48.9	11.1	100.0	
O-3 (N=170)	45.3	46.5	8.2	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=347)	48.1	42.4	9.5	100.0	
O-6+ (N=238)	41.2	50.0	8.8	100.0	
Total	%	45.0	45.7	9.3	100.0
	N	403	409	83	895
Overall Total	%	47.2	42.2	10.6	100.0
	N	816	730	184	1730

^aRespondents who indicated that question did not apply to them were excluded from the analyses.

Table 42

Percentages Agreeing on VHA Impact on Service Member

Item		Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neither Agree or Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't Know (%)	Total (%)
The Military has Become More Attractive as a Career For Service Member (Q121)								
By Service Branch:								
Air Force	(N=2078)	5.5	14.9	22.7	38.3	16.0	2.6	100.0
Army	(N=1927)	7.6	16.5	24.0	33.6	14.4	3.9	100.0
Marine Corps	(N=1535)	7.7	17.7	25.0	30.0	16.8	2.8	100.0
Navy	(N=3087)	5.0	11.7	21.8	37.5	17.9	2.1	100.0
Total	(N=8627)	6.2	14.6	23.1	35.5	17.9	2.7	100.0
By Pay Grade:								
Enlisted:								
E-1--E-3	(N=566)	9.0	16.1	33.9	30.8	10.2	0.0	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=1128)	9.3	18.9	30.0	29.6	12.2	0.0	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=1461)	6.1	15.9	21.3	22.8	22.9	0.0	100.0
Total		% 7.8	17.0	26.7	31.8	16.8	0.0	100.0
		N 246	536	841	1002	530	--	3155
Officers:								
W-1--W-4	(N=203)	7.4	17.2	29.1	30.0	16.3	0.0	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=371)	6.2	19.4	27.0	33.2	14.2	0.0	100.0
O-3	(N=833)	7.3	17.0	23.6	35.1	16.9	0.0	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=2079)	5.6	13.9	21.5	39.9	19.1	0.0	100.0
O-6+	(N=1625)	3.8	10.5	19.3	43.5	22.9	0.0	100.0
Total		% 5.4	13.9	21.8	39.4	19.5	0.0	100.0
		N 276	708	1116	2012	999	--	5111
Overall Total		% 6.3	15.0	23.7	36.5	18.5	0.0	100.0
		N 522	1244	1957	3014	1529	--	8266
Service Member Better Able to Afford Appropriate Family Housing (Q122)								
By Service Branch:								
Air Force	(N=2077)	4.2	11.25	8.2	47.7	28.2	0.5	100.0
Army	(N=1930)	6.6	13.2	9.7	43.3	26.0	1.2	100.0
Marine Corps	(N=1535)	5.4	11.9	7.8	43.6	30.6	0.7	100.0
Navy	(N=3092)	4.0	7.5	6.6	46.5	34.4	1.0	100.0
Total	(N=8634)	4.9	10.4	7.9	45.6	30.4	0.8	100.0
By Pay Grade:								
Enlisted:								
E-1--E-3	(N=599)	8.2	17.4	13.2	41.5	17.4	2.3	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=1160)	6.1	16.3	12.6	41.0	22.8	1.2	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=1511)	4.9	10.5	7.9	40.6	35.3	0.8	100.0
Total		% 5.9	13.8	10.6	40.9	27.6	1.2	100.0
		N 194	451	345	1337	903	40	3270

Table 42 (Continued)

Item		Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neither Agree or Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't Know (%)	Total (%)
Service Member Better Able to Afford Appropriate Family Housing (Q122) (Con't)								
Officers:								
W-1--W-4	(N=211)	7.1	17.1	5.2	47.4	22.7	0.5	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=383)	5.7	14.4	7.8	41.9	29.2	1.0	100.0
O-3	(N=846)	5.6	12.1	8.0	4.4	29.4	0.5	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=2128)	4.0	6.7	5.7	49.6	33.5	0.5	100.0
O-6+	(N=1664)	2.8	5.7	5.4	51.3	34.0	0.8	100.0
Total		% 4.1	8.2	6.1	48.7	32.3	0.6	100.0
		N 216	431	320	2545	1686	34	5232
<hr/>								
Overall Total		% 4.8	10.4	7.8	45.6	30.6	0.9	100.0
		N 410	882	665	3882	2589	74	8502
<hr/>								
Service Member is More Willing to Relocate to High Cost Areas (Q123)								
By Service Branch:								
Air Force	(N=2075)	11.8	20.9	10.9	35.6	14.3	6.5	100.0
Army	(N=1922)	12.3	21.8	9.6	32.7	15.8	7.8	100.0
Marine Corps	(N=1535)	10.8	20.0	11.5	34.4	18.4	4.8	100.0
Navy	(N=3081)	11.3	19.7	11.9	34.1	17.4	5.6	100.0
Total	(N=8613)	11.5	20.5	11.1	34.2	16.5	6.2	100.0
By Pay Grade:								
Enlisted:								
E-1--E-3	(N=598)	10.4	20.6	16.2	29.4	9.7	13.7	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=1154)	11.0	21.1	16.0	32.0	11.8	8.1	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=1506)	11.9	23.0	12.0	28.2	17.1	7.8	100.0
Total		% 11.3	21.9	14.2	29.8	13.8	9.0	100.0
		N 368	713	463	970	451	293	3258
Officers:								
W-1--W-4	(N=211)	14.2	22.3	9.5	32.7	11.8	9.5	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=382)	12.8	18.1	8.6	40.9	17.5	2.1	100.0
O-3	(N=845)	12.4	20.5	9.1	35.9	17.8	4.3	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=2126)	13.2	21.0	9.4	34.4	18.2	3.8	100.0
O-6+	(N=1660)	8.6	17.8	8.2	41.0	19.1	5.3	100.0
Total		% 11.6	19.8	8.9	37.1	18.1	4.5	100.0
		N 606	1032	465	1940	948	233	5224
<hr/>								
Overall Total		% 11.5	20.6	10.9	34.3	16.5	6.2	100.0
		N 974	1745	928	2910	1399	526	8482

Table 43

Effect of Perceived Impact of VHA (Q121) on Career Intentions (Q12)

VHA has made the service more attractive as a career	Positive		Neutral		Negative		Total
	%	N	%	N	%	N	N
No	20.9	1307	26.8	272	41.5	65	1844 (23.3%)
Neither	25.6	1601	32.8	332	27.4	175	2108 (26.7%)
Yes	53.4	3336	40.4	409	31.1	199	3944 (50.0%)
Total	99.9 (79.1%)	6244	100.0 (12.8%)	1013	100.0 (8.1%)	639	7896 (100.0%)

Attitudes Toward Living in On-base Mobile/Manufactured Homes

Question 126 asked respondents whether they and/or their dependents had lived in a mobile/manufactured home for at least 6 months. Responses, when analyzed by service branch, showed that only 16.9 percent of Navy respondents had prior experience with mobile/manufactured home living, compared to 26.3, 26.7, and 23.3 percent respectively for the Air Force, Army, and Marine Corps. When analyzed by pay grade, results showed that greater percentages of enlisted (all groups) and W-1 to W-4s had lived in mobile/manufactured homes than had other officer groups (see Table 44).

To determine how respondents felt about mobile/manufactured home living, they were presented with a list of 12 styles of housing--six military, on- or off-base, and six civilian, rented or owned (Q127-138). For each, they were asked to indicate whether they preferred living in that style of housing or, if given a choice, in a government-owned, on-base, double-wide mobile/manufactured home. Preferences indicated by respondents with and without experience living in mobile/manufactured homes (Q126) are presented in Table 45 and discussed below by housing types.

1. Military. Respondents, both with or without experience living in mobile/manufactured homes, reported that they preferred to live in single-family housing, especially when located on base, or in duplex housing rather than mobile/manufactured homes. Respondents with no mobile/manufactured home experience indicated they would prefer to live in apartment-type housing rather than mobile/manufactured homes; however, those with experience living in a mobile/manufactured home actually preferred this style to apartment-type styles, whether located on or off base.

2. Civilian--Rented. Overall, the style preferences retained the same ranking: single-family, duplex, apartment, mobile/manufactured home. However, 55.6 percent of those with prior experience in mobile/manufactured home living preferred a rented duplex, compared to 76.3 percent of those with no experience. Again, those with mobile/manufactured home experience preferred that style of housing to a rented civilian apartment.

3. Civilian-owned. Ownership of housing was preferred to living in the on-base mobile/manufactured home, with the preference for single-family residences very high regardless of prior experience level.

Overall, these results showed that: (1) prior experience with mobile/manufactured home living increased the percentages of those preferring it over other styles of housing, (2) preferences for on-base mobile/manufactured homes over other styles in housing increased as the relative distance to or physical separation from neighboring housing decreased, and (3) ownership in the civilian community was generally preferred over rental.

Even though a smaller percentage of Navy respondents indicated having prior experience with mobile/manufactured home living than did the other service respondents, preferences for single-family units, whether military-owned or in the civilian community, over on-base mobile/manufactured homes were consistently high across the service branches. However, preferences for apartment-type housing differed by approximately 10 percent across the service branches. As shown in Table 46, Army respondents, with less than 5 percent currently residing in military family housing but with 22 percent indicating a preference for such housing, showed the highest percentages of preferences for apartment-style housing, both military and civilian rented.

As shown in Table 47, the percentages of respondents preferring all other housing styles to the on-base mobile/manufactured home tended to increase linearly as pay grade increased. This trend was consistent across all items for commissioned officers, but enlisted personnel and warrant officers showed some deviation from the linear trend when the referent was apartments. The E-1 to E-9 group was somewhat more in favor of on-base mobile/manufactured homes than on-base military apartments, and the WOs showed a nearly even split between the two options. Similarly, the WOs and the E-4 to E-6 group split evenly when the referent was off-base military apartments. The E-1 to E-3 group showed more preference for the off-base military apartment; and the E-7 to E-9 pay grades, for the on-base mobile/manufactured home. Preferences for apartment-style rentals in the civilian community over on-base mobile homes decreased as rank increased among the enlisted.

Table 44

Percentage of Respondents With Experience in Mobile/Manufactured
Homes by Pay Grade

Group	Respondents		
	Experienced (%)	No Experience (%)	Total (%)
Enlisted:			
E-1--E-3 (N=825)	34.5	65.5	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=1845)	36.7	63.3	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=2165)	33.2	66.8	100.0
Total	34.9 (N=1688)	65.1 (N=3147)	100.0 (N=4835)
Officers:			
W-1--W-4 (N=293)	35.2	64.8	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=701)	21.2	78.2	100.0
O-3 (N=1096)	15.1	84.9	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=2503)	14.4	85.6	100.0
O-6+ (N=2204)	7.8	92.2	100.0
Total	14.0 (N=952)	86.0 (N=5845)	100.0 (N=6797)
Overall Total	22.7 (N=2640)	77.3 (N=8992)	100.0 (N=11632)

Table 45

Housing Preferences (Other Styles vs. On-base Mobile/Manufactured Home)
by Respondents With or Without Experience Living in Mobile Manufactured Homes

Housing Style	Respondents					
	Experienced with Mobile/Mfd. Homes		No Experience with Mobile/Mfd. Homes		Total ^a	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Military Housing (Q127-132)						
On-base single-family	89.6	2346	96.8	8662	95.1	11008
On-base mobile/mfd. home	10.4	272	3.2	290	4.9	562
Off-base single-family	85.8	2245	95.2	8523	93.1	10768
On-base mobile/mfd. home	14.2	371	4.8	431	6.9	802
On-base duplex	61.2	1598	82.1	7329	77.3	8927
On-base mobile/mfd. home	38.8	1015	17.9	1602	22.7	2617
Off-base duplex	61.2	1600	81.2	7255	76.7	8855
On-base mobile/mfd. home	38.8	1014	18.8	1683	23.3	2697
Off-base apartment-type	43.4	1135	63.6	5681	59.1	6816
On-base mobile/mfd. home	56.6	1479	36.4	3245	40.9	4724
On-base apartment-type	39.5	1032	61.0	5439	56.1	6471
On-base mobile/mfd. home	60.5	1578	39.0	3481	43.9	5059
Civilian Housing (Q133-138)						
<u>Rental:</u>						
Single-family	78.8	2063	90.7	8115	88.0	10178
On-base mobile/mfd. home	21.2	554	9.3	832	12.0	1386
Duplex	55.6	1454	76.3	6816	71.7	8270
On-base mobile/mfd. home	44.4	1160	23.7	2112	28.3	3272
Apartment type	46.1	1205	66.1	5900	61.6	7105
On-base mobile/mfd. home	53.9	1409	33.9	3029	38.4	4438
<u>Owned:</u>						
Single-family	90.2	2362	95.3	8542	94.2	10904
On-base mobile/mfd. home	9.8	258	4.7	419	5.8	677
Duplex	63.9	1671	81.3	7262	77.3	8933
On-base mobile/mfd. home	36.1	944	18.7	1672	22.7	2616
Apartment-type	52.8	1369	71.6	6365	67.4	7734
On-base mobile/mfd. home	47.2	1224	28.4	2523	32.6	3747

^aListed in descending order of preferences for other housing styles.

Table 46

Housing Preference (Apartment-type vs. Mobile/Manufactured Home)
by Service Branch

Housing Style	Air Force (%)	Army (%)	Marine Corps (%)	Navy (%)
On-base military apartment-type	52.6	62.2	60.5	53.3
On-base mobile/mfd. home	47.4 (N=3290)	37.8 (N=2120)	39.5 (N=2291)	46.7 (N=3898)
Off-base military apartment-type	55.1	65.0	62.1	57.4
On-base mobile/mfd. home	44.9 (N=3294)	35.0 (N=2121)	37.9 (N=2293)	42.6 (N=3900)
Apartment-type civilian rental	56.9	66.9	64.0	61.3
On-base mobile/mfd. home	43.1 (N=3295)	33.1 (N=2120)	36.0 (N=2295)	38.7 (N=3902)

Table 47

Housing Preferences (Other Styles vs. On-base Mobile/Manufactured Home)
by Pay Grade

Housing Style	E-1--E-3	E-4--E-6	E-7--E-9	W-1--W-4	O-1--O-2	O-3	O-4--O-5	O-6
Military Housing (Q127-132)								
On-base single-family	(N=823) 79.3	(N=1830) 86.9	(N=2142) 95.9	(N=292) 97.9	(N=704) 97.4	(N=1101) 98.9	(N=2496) 99.4	(N=2200) 99.6
On-base mobile/mfd. home	20.7	13.1	4.5	2.1	2.6	1.1	0.6	0.4
Off-base single-family	(N=822) 76.8	(N=1831) 84.0	(N=2143) 92.0	(N=292) 94.2	(N=703) 95.0	(N=1102) 97.3	(N=2496) 98.6	(N=2199) 98.6
On-base mobile/mfd. home	23.2	16.0	8.0	5.8	5.0	2.7	1.4	1.4
On-base duplex	(N=821) 56.5	(N=1824) 59.4	(N=2140) 69.2	(N=292) 71.2	(N=703) 81.8	(N=1101) 84.5	(N=2490) 88.2	(N=2191) 91.6
On-base mobile/mfd. home	43.5	40.6	30.8	28.8	18.2	15.5	11.8	8.4
Off-base duplex	(N=821) 60.4	(N=1829) 62.6	(N=2141) 68.5	(N=292) 68.2	(N=702) 81.2	(N=1102) 83.1	(N=2492) 86.4	(N=2192) 87.5
On-base mobile/mfd. home	39.6	37.4	31.5	31.8	18.8	16.9	13.6	12.5
On-base apartment-type	(N=820) 46.0	(N=1823) 43.3	(N=2138) 44.5	(N=292) 49.0	(N=703) 53.9	(N=1099) 61.4	(N=2485) 65.4	(N=2188) 70.4
On-base mobile/mfd. home	54.0	56.7	55.5	51.0	46.1	38.6	34.6	29.6
Off-base apartment-type	(N=821) 54.6	(N=1828) 50.2	(N=2139) 46.0	(N=292) 50.0	(N=702) 57.5	(N=1099) 65.5	(N=2486) 67.3	(N=2190) 70.4
On-base mobile/mfd. home	45.5	49.8	54.0	50.0	42.5	34.5	32.7	29.6
Civilian Housing (Q133-135)								
<u>Rental:</u>								
Single-family	(N=821) 70.2	(N=1836) 77.5	(N=2140) 85.4	(N=292) 86.3	(N=702) 87.3	(N=1101) 93.3	(N=2496) 95.5	(N=2194) 95.2
On-base mobile/mfd. home	29.8	22.5	14.6	13.7	12.7	6.7	4.5	4.8
Apartment-type	(N=821) 54.2	(N=1833) 52.8	(N=2140) 49.2	(N=292) 51.4	(N=702) 60.0	(N=1098) 68.6	(N=2486) 69.9	(N=2189) 72.6
On-base mobile/mfd. home	45.8	47.2	50.8	48.6	40.0	31.4	30.1	27.4
Duplex	(N=820) 56.2	(N=1831) 59.6	(N=2140) 61.9	(N=292) 63.0	(N=699) 73.5	(N=1098) 80.3	(N=2490) 81.0	(N=2190) 82.7
On-base mobile/mfd. home	43.8	40.4	38.1	37.0	26.5	19.7	18.0	17.3
<u>Owned:</u>								
Duplex	(N=820) 50.5	(N=1832) 61.7	(N=2138) 68.9	(N=292) 74.3	(N=702) 76.6	(N=1100) 86.5	(N=2492) 89.6	(N=2191) 90.5
On-base mobile/mfd. home	49.5	38.3	31.1	25.7	23.4	13.5	10.4	9.5
Single-family	(N=8020) 71.2	(N=1840) 86.5	(N=2145) 95.7	(N=292) 95.5	(N=703) 94.6	(N=1101) 98.1	(N=2498) 99.4	(N=2201) 99.4
On-base mobile/mfd. home	28.8	13.5	4.3	4.5	5.4	1.9	0.6	0.6
Apartment-type	(N=815) 45.3	(N=1819) 52.1	(N=2126) 56.6	(N=291) 60.5	(N=696) 62.5	(N=1091) 74.7	(N=2480) 80.0	(N=2182) 83.0
On-base mobile/mfd. home	54.7	47.9	43.4	39.5	37.2	25.3	20.0	17.0

Opinions of Military Family Housing Regulations and Housing Office Services

Items in the section concerning military family housing regulations and housing office services (Q139-160) were answered only by respondents who were residents of military family housing (N = 3995). Since Army personnel were underrepresented in the sample (maximum N=133) due to accidental exclusion (see p. 7), they were not included in service comparisons.

Housing Aspects

Mandatory Assignment

The first item of this section (Q139) asked respondents whether they were assigned to military housing on a mandatory basis. Results, which are presented in Table 48, show that, overall, less than 20 percent reported that their assignment had been on a mandatory basis. Enlisted service members and O-1s and O-2s were less frequently mandatorily assigned. However, among warrant officers and O-3s and above, the higher the grade, the more likely they were to be mandatorily assigned.

Housing Classification

Respondents were asked to indicate whether their family housing was officially classified as adequate or substandard (Q140). As shown in Table 49, E-1 through E-6 enlisted claimed the highest percentage of substandard housing, with more E-1 through E-3s claiming to be living in substandard housing than in adequate housing. The two possible reasons for living in substandard housing are that (1) adequate housing is not available, or (2) the service member is attempting to economize on housing costs.

BAQ Forfeiture for Housing

Respondents who reported they were occupying substandard housing were asked to indicate the percentage of their BAQ that was being forfeited for housing (Q141). A total of 407 persons responded to this item, possibly including some who said they did not know the classification of their housing on the previous item. As shown in Table 50, overall, 64.4 percent of the respondents claimed that they forfeited all of their BAQ. This overall percentage included 40 percent of E-1 to E-3s and 92 percent of O-4/5s. Only 7 percent (N = 29) claimed that less than half of their BAQ for housing was forfeited.

Housing Value

Respondents were asked to indicate, giving consideration to the amount of money they would receive as a housing allowance, whether they felt their military family housing was better than, equal to, or worse than housing they could afford in the nearby civilian community (Q150). Results, which are provided in Table 51, show that, overall, 40 percent of the respondents rated their military family housing as better than what they could afford in the civilian community, 19 percent claimed there was no difference between their military housing and affordable civilian housing, and 36 percent rated the civilian housing as better than the military. There was essentially no difference between officers and enlisted except that a higher percentage of officers than enlisted rated the civilian housing as better than the military (40 vs. 32%). Among officers, warrants and junior officers more frequently rated military housing as better than civilian, whereas senior officers more frequently rated civilian housing as better than military. Among

enlisted, higher percentages of senior enlisted tended to rate civilian housing as better than military.

Results by service branch showed that there were no differences among services for enlisted personnel. However, Air Force officers predominately rated civilian housing as better than military (44 vs. 36%); and Navy officers, military housing as better than civilian (46 vs. 33%). Marine officers provided in-between ratings, except that a somewhat higher percentage rated military and civilian housing as equal.

Maintenance

Responsibility for Major Maintenance/Repairs

Respondents were asked to indicate whom they thought performed major housing maintenance and repairs at their present housing site (Q142). As shown in Table 52, 53 percent attributed responsibility for major maintenance and repairs to station labor, 39 percent attributed it to private contractors, and less than 8 percent were unsure. Since true figures for housing sites are not available, it is only possible to observe that from 44 to 70 percent of respondents perceive that station labor performs maintenance and repairs, with the lower estimates coming from the pay grades with the highest percentage of uncertain responses. Thus, there appears to be a fairly high degree of consistency among respondents (and among sites).

Self-help Program

Respondents were asked to give their opinion regarding the self-help maintenance program at their present site (Q143) and to indicate what improvement they would most like to see in that program (Q144). Table 53, which provides responses to the first question, shows that nearly one half were satisfied with the existing self-help maintenance program, less than one fifth were dissatisfied, and the remaining one third were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. This latter category decreased in endorsement with increasing pay grade; while the satisfied and dissatisfied categories increased. Examination of the results by service showed that the Air Force had the highest percentage of "satisfied" responses; and the Marine Corps, the lowest.

Responses to the second item, provided in Table 54, showed that, overall, 13 percent of the respondents (10% of enlisted and 16% of officers) judged the self-help maintenance program as "OK as is." The most preferred improvement in the program is to have more kinds of supplies on hand (28%), followed by easier access to supplies (22%) (e.g., by expanding dispensary hours). These preferences did not vary by pay grade or service branch, except that Navy enlisted service members expressed stronger preference for accessibility than for range of supplies.

Allocation of Maintenance Responsibilities

The last set of survey items (Q155-160) asked respondents to indicate who should be responsible for six maintenance categories--housing management, the occupant, or both. Responses are provided in Table 55 and discussed below.

Minor Repairs and Maintenance. Overall, 44 percent of the respondents attributed responsibility for minor repairs and maintenance to housing management; and 39 percent,

equally to housing management and the occupant. The percentage of enlisted who felt that management and occupants had equal responsibility was higher than the percentage who felt housing management had sole responsibility (42 vs. 40%). The opposite was true for officers (36 vs. 49%).

The results by service varied considerably. Marine Corps respondents were more likely to attribute responsibility for minor repairs and maintenance to the housing management than were Air Force or Navy respondents (50% vs. 43 and 44%). Air Force respondents were most likely to assign responsibility equally to housing management and the occupant (Air Force, 41%; Marines, 36%; Navy, 38%). Navy respondents were most likely to attribute responsibility to the occupant (Navy, 17%; Air Force, 15%; Marines, 14%).

Landscaping Around the Residence. Overall, 53 percent of respondents felt that landscaping around the residential housing units was the responsibility of the occupant; 32 percent, equally to housing management and the occupant; and 14 percent, to housing management. Enlisted respondents were much more likely than officers to attribute responsibility to the occupants (59 vs. 46%), and less likely to attribute responsibility to housing management (11 vs. 18%) or to both occupant and management (28 vs. 36%).

Results for each service show that response patterns for Air Force and Marine Corps respondents were highly similar. Fifty-six percent of both Marine Corps and Air Force respondents attributed landscaping responsibilities to the occupant, compared to 47 percent for Navy respondents. Thirty-five percent of Navy respondents attributed responsibility equally to management and the occupant, compared to 32 and 29 percent for Air Force and Marine respondents. Finally, 17 percent of Navy respondents attributed responsibility to management, compared to 12 and 14 percent for Air Force and Marine respondents.

Mowing the Lawn. Overall, 89 percent of respondents attributed responsibility for mowing the lawn to the occupant. The percentages of officer and enlisted respondents making this judgment were similar (90 vs. 87%); however, among officers, attribution of responsibility to the occupant decreased with pay grade (93% for O-1--O-2 to 81% for O-6+).

Considerable variation occurred among services. The Air Force respondents had the largest percentage attributing responsibility to the occupant (95%), followed by the Marine Corps (91%) and the Navy (79%). Air Force and Marine Corps respondents showed fairly high consensus, regardless of pay grade. Somewhat more variation existed between Navy enlisted and officer respondents (83 vs. 75%).

Thorough Cleaning of Residence Before New Occupant Moves In. Overall, 54 percent of respondents felt this task was the responsibility of the occupant; 25 percent, occupant and housing management equally; and 20 percent, housing management. The percentages of warrant officers and enlisted personnel attributing responsibility to the occupant increased as pay grade increased. On the other hand, the percentages of officers and enlisted attributing responsibility to both occupant and management decreased with increasing pay grade.

The Marines Corps had the highest percentage attributing responsibility to the occupants (60%), followed by the Air Force (52%) and the Navy (51%). Marine respondents were least likely to attribute responsibility to housing management (16%); and Navy respondents, most likely (23%).

Painting the Inside of the Residence. The task of painting was seen in a different light from the previously discussed tasks by both enlisted and officer personnel. Sixty-seven percent of enlisted respondents and 85 percent of officers attributed responsibility for interior painting to the housing management (overall, 76%). These percentages rose with pay grade. Overall, 23 percent of enlisted and 18 percent of officers attributed responsibility to management and the occupant, but, for both groups, the percentages decreased with increasing pay grade. A similar pattern occurred in assigning responsibility to the occupant (changing from 13% to 6% for enlisted as pay grade rises; from 5% to 1% for officers). No differences in response patterns were found among the services.

Painting the Outside of the Residence. Painting the outside of the residence was an even more extreme case of assignment of responsibility to the housing management. Overall, 95 percent of respondents assigned responsibility for exterior painting to housing management (98% of officers; 92% of enlisted). Again, no differences occurred among services.

Rules and Regulations

Five items dealt with rules and regulations in the respondents' family housing sites (Q145-149). These items were designed to obtain respondents' opinion as to the degree of enforcement, the number of rules and regulations, the least enforced and most frequently broken rule or regulation, and the agency primarily responsible for enforcement and police protection. Results are provided in Tables 56 through 59 and discussed below.

Degree of Enforcement

Analysis of responses by pay grade showed that, overall, 56 percent of respondents judged the strictness of enforcement of rules and regulations to be correct (enlisted, 45% and officers, 67%) (Table 56). Among enlisted, a relatively high proportion of respondents held no opinion, although this proportion declined as pay grade increased. A similar pattern occurred with respect to enlisted judgments of too-strict enforcement. As a consequence, relatively few E-1s to E-3s judged enforcement as not being strict enough (15%). On the other hand, officers showed fairly constant judgments of enforcement regardless of pay grade, with two exceptions. O-1s to O-2s judged enforcement as being too strict more frequently than did officers overall (12 vs. 7%). O-6s and above judged enforcement as being correct more often (78 vs. 68%) and as being too lenient less often (13 vs. 19%) than did officers overall.

Analysis by service branch revealed that, among enlisted respondents, the Marine Corps had the highest percentage judging the rule enforcement as being correct (52%) and the Navy, the lowest (41%). Marine Corps enlisted were least likely to judge rule enforcement as being too lenient (23%), and Navy respondents, the most likely (38%). Among officers, overall, 68 percent respondents judged rule enforcement as being correct. The Air Force had the highest percentage judging rule enforcement as being too strict (10%); and the Navy, the lowest (4%). The Navy officers had the highest percentage judging enforcement as being too lenient (22%), followed by the Marine Corps (19%) and the Air Force (16%).

Number of Rules and Regulations

Analysis by pay grade shows that a strong majority of all respondents--67.5 percent--felt that the number of housing rules and regulations was "about right" (enlisted, 62% and officers, 73%) (Table 57); and only 18.5 percent, that there were too many

(enlisted, 19% and officers, 18%). Among enlisted, satisfaction with the number of rules appears to be related to pay grade, with the higher rated personnel more strongly endorsing the "about right" category. Among officers, the highest endorsement of "about right" was by warrant officers and O-6s and above.

Analysis by service branch shows that more than two thirds of respondents in each service felt that the number of rules was about right. Air Force and Marine Corps enlisted were more likely to feel there were too many housing rules and regulations than were Navy enlisted (22 and 21% vs. 15%). A similar pattern was found for officers.

Least Enforced/Most Frequently Broken Regulations

Least Enforced Regulation. Officers and enlisted in all services consistently reported that the housing rule or regulation least enforced by the housing administration office was pet control (Table 58). However, pet control was seen as least enforced more frequently by Air Force personnel (38%) than by Marine Corps (27%) or Navy personnel (26%). Child supervision was seen as the next least enforced rule or regulation. The frequency of nomination varied most for officer versus enlisted (15 vs. 24%) but, within officer and enlisted groups, there was an opposite pattern. Among enlisted, child supervision was named as least enforced more frequently as pay grade increases; among officers, it was named less frequently as pay grade increases.

Most Frequently Broken Regulation. The pattern of responses to the item on the most frequently broken housing rule or regulation was essentially similar to that of the item on the least enforced rule or regulation (Table 58). Officer and enlisted respondents nominated pet control as the most frequently broken rule (enlisted, 32%; officers, 38%) followed by child supervision (enlisted, 25%; officers, 17%).

Enforcement Responsibility

As shown in Table 59, overall, 73 percent of the respondents reported the military police or shore patrol as the primary law enforcement agency. City police were attributed responsibility by 8 percent overall; and military agencies and police, by 9 percent. Officers tended to attribute responsibility to military agencies more frequently than did enlisted (80 vs. 68%) and to attribute responsibility to the city police or a combination of the city police and military agencies less frequently than did enlisted (4 and 6% vs. 11 and 11%).

Examination of the results by service (untabled) show that Air Force respondents were more likely to attribute responsibility to military agencies than were Marine Corps or Navy respondents (90% vs. 80 and 43%). Eighteen percent of Navy respondents attributed responsibility to the city; 16 percent, to military and city agencies; and 21 percent, to contractors.

Some insight into the nature of the results is available by examining differences between respondents who live in military housing on-base and those who live off-base. As shown in Table 59, 85 percent of on-base residents attributed primary law enforcement responsibility to military agencies; 8 percent, to contractors; and less than 5 percent, to joint military and city agencies. On the other hand, 38 percent of off-base respondents cited military agencies; 27 percent, military and city agencies; 22 percent, city police; and less than 10 percent, contractors.

Housing Office Services

Four survey items (Q151-154) assessed military family housing residents' satisfaction with housing office services. Responses to these items are provided in Table 60 and discussed below.

Assistance in Obtaining Government Housing

Overall, 65 percent of the respondents were satisfied with family housing office assistance in obtaining government housing, 19 percent were dissatisfied, and 17 percent were neither satisfied or dissatisfied. Satisfaction appeared to be slightly more frequent among officers than enlisted personnel (69 vs. 62%).

There was also some variation in satisfaction among services. Air Force enlisted were the most satisfied and the least dissatisfied (67 vs. 16%); and Navy enlisted, the least satisfied and most dissatisfied (59 vs. 21%). Marine Corps personnel fell in between (60% satisfied and 19% dissatisfied). Although more officers than enlisted expressed satisfaction, Marine Corps officers tended to be less satisfied and more dissatisfied (63 vs. 20%) than were Air Force (73 vs. 14%) or Navy officers (70 vs. 14%).

Orientation to Government Quarters

Overall, 55 percent of the respondents were satisfied with their orientation to government quarters by the family housing office, 18 percent were dissatisfied, and 24 percent were neutral. Levels of dissatisfaction varied with the service. Among enlisted, Air Force were the most dissatisfied (24%), while, among officers, Air Force respondents were the least dissatisfied (16%). Marine Corps personnel represented the opposite extremes: They included the least dissatisfied enlisted (17%) and the most dissatisfied officers (20%). Navy personnel fell between the other services in both the enlisted and officer categories.

General Helpfulness on Problems

Overall, 54 percent of the respondents were satisfied with the general help they received from the family housing office on "problems." Officers were more frequently satisfied with the helpfulness of the housing office than were enlisted personnel (60 vs. 48%). Differences among the services within enlisted or officer categories were relatively small (a maximum of 4-6%).

Help in Demonstrating and/or Suggesting Energy Conservation Procedures

Overall, 41 percent of the respondents were satisfied with the housing office demonstrations of and suggestions for energy conservation, 20 percent were dissatisfied, and 36 percent were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Among services, the Navy respondents were the least satisfied (38%) and the most dissatisfied (23%). Air Force and Marine respondents have almost identical percentages of satisfaction (42 vs. 43%) and dissatisfaction (19 vs. 18%).

Table 48

Nature of Assignment to Military Family Housing by Pay Grade

Group	Response			Total (%)	
	Mandatory (%)	Voluntary (%)	Don't Know (%)		
Enlisted (N=1558):					
E-1--E-3 (N=184)	13.6	82.1	4.3	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=693)	9.5	86.7	3.8	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=681)	11.5	87.4	1.1	100.0	
Total	%	10.8	86.5	2.7	100.0
	N	169	1347	42	1558
Officer (N=1437):					
W-1--W-4 (N=81)	17.3	77.8	4.9	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=265)	7.2	90.6	2.2	100.0	
O-3 (N=213)	19.3	79.3	1.4	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=368)	27.4	72.0	0.6	100.0	
O-6+ (N=510)	47.3	52.2	0.5	100.0	
Total	%	28.9	69.8	1.3	100.0
	N	416	1003	18	1437
Overall Total	%	19.5	78.5	2.0	100.0
	N	585	2350	60	2995

Table 49

Official Classification of Respondents' Housing by Pay Grade

Group	Response			Total (%)	
	Adequate (%)	Substandard (%)	Don't Know (%)		
<u>Enlisted (N=1529):</u>					
E-1--E-3 (N=174)	31.0	40.2	28.8	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=686)	65.2	16.3	18.5	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=669)	85.2	5.7	9.1	100.0	
Total	%	70.0	14.4	15.6	100.0
	N	1071	220	238	1529
<u>Officer (N=1391):</u>					
W-1--W-4 (N=78)	92.3	2.6	5.1	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=261)	81.2	4.2	14.6	100.0	
O-3 (N=204)	84.3	6.4	9.3	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=353)	89.5	3.4	7.1	100.0	
O-6+ (N=495)	95.2	3.4	1.4	100.0	
Total	%	89.3	4.0	6.7	100.0
	N	1243	275	331	1391
Overall Total	%	79.2	9.4	11.3	100.0
	N	2314	275	331	2920

Table 50

Percentage of BAQ Forfeited for Family Housing by Pay Grade

Group		0-50%	51-75%	76-99%	100%	Total
<u>Enlisted (N=318):</u>						
E-1--E-3 (N=87)		5.7	21.8	32.2	40.3	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=161)		6.8	14.9	13.0	65.3	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=70)		5.7	5.7	12.9	75.5	100.0
Total	%	6.3	14.8	18.2	60.7	100.0
	N	20	47	58	193	318
<u>Officer (N=89):</u>						
W-1--W-4 (N=4)		25.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=22)		4.5	22.7	0.0	72.8	100.0
O-3 (N=18)		11.2	11.1	11.1	66.6	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=25)		0.0	0.0	8.0	92.0	100.0
O-6+ (N=20)		25.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	100.0
Total	%	10.1	7.9	4.5	77.5	100.0
	N	9	7	4	69	89
Overall Total	%	7.1	13.3	15.2	64.4	100.0
	N	29	54	62	262	407

Table 51

Opinion of Respondents' Military Housing as Compared to Affordable Housing in the Nearby Civilian Community

Group	Response					Total (%)
	Military Better than Civilian (%)	No Real Difference (%)	Civilian Better than Military (%)	Don't Know (%)		
By Pay Grade						
Enlisted (N=1520):						
E-1--E-3 (N=172)	41.9	16.3	24.4	17.4		100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=678)	41.4	18.3	30.4	9.9		100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=670)	39.3	19.0	34.6	7.1		100.0
Total	%	40.5	18.4	31.6	9.5	100.0
	N	616	279	480	145	1520
Officer (N=1390):						
W-1--W-4 (N=78)	51.3	19.2	26.9	2.6		100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=262)	53.4	24.0	19.5	3.1		100.0
O-3 (N=201)	41.3	16.4	38.8	3.5		100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=352)	27.6	18.8	51.4	2.2		100.0
O-6+ (N=497)	35.4	17.1	44.5	3.0		100.0
Total	%	38.6	18.8	39.7	2.9	100.0
	N	496	262	552	40	1390
Overall Total	%	39.6	18.6	35.5	6.3	100.0
	N	1152	541	1032	185	2910
By Service Branch						
Enlisted (N=1434):						
Air Force (N=639)	41.0	19.6	31.6	7.8		100.0
Marine Corps (N=330)	41.2	19.1	32.1	7.6		100.0
Navy (N=465)	40.6	17.0	31.2	11.2		100.0
Total	%	40.9	18.6	31.6	8.9	100.0
	N	587	267	453	127	1434
Officer (N=1350):						
Air Force (N=543)	35.9	17.3	44.2	2.6		100.0
Marine Corps (N=414)	35.3	21.7	39.6	3.4		100.0
Navy (N=393)	46.3	18.3	32.8	2.5		100.0
Total	%	38.7	19.0	39.5	2.8	100.0
	N	523	256	533	38	1350
Overall Total	%	39.9	18.8	35.4	5.9	100.0
	N	1110	523	986	165	2784

Table 52

Attributed Responsibility for Major Maintenance and Repair by Pay Grade

Group	Response			Total (%)
	Station Labor (%)	Private Contractors (%)	Don't Know (%)	
Enlisted (N=1524):				
E-1--E-3 (N=174)	46.6	31.6	21.8	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=682)	45.3	44.0	10.7	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=668)	50.0	44.2	5.8	100.0
Total	% 47.5 N 724	42.7 650	9.8 150	100.0 1524
Officer (N=1386):				
W-1--W-4 (N=78)	70.5	24.4	5.1	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=262)	43.5	49.6	6.9	100.0
O-3 (N=199)	56.3	34.2	9.5	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=351)	63.5	30.5	6.0	100.0
O-6+ (N=496)	62.3	34.3	3.4	100.0
Total	% 58.7 N 813	35.6 494	5.7 79	100.0 1386
Overall Total	% 52.8 N 1537	39.3 1144	7.9 229	100.0 2910

Table 53

Opinion of the Self-help Maintenance Program

Group		Satisfied (%)	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied (%)	Dissatisfied (%)	Total (%)
By Pay Grade					
Enlisted:					
E-1--E-3	(N=128)	43.0	43.7	13.3	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=534)	45.1	32.8	22.1	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=528)	51.1	26.9	22.0	100.0
Total	%	48.0	31.7	21.3	100.0
	N	566	373	251	1190
Officer:					
W-1--W-4	(N=57)	45.6	40.4	14.0	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=219)	46.6	38.8	14.6	100.0
O-3	(N=148)	39.9	36.5	23.6	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=273)	42.1	35.5	22.4	100.0
O-6+	(N=357)	55.5	35.0	9.5	100.0
Total	%	47.4	36.4	16.2	100.0
	N	500	384	170	1054
Overall Total	%	47.5	33.7	18.8	100.0
	N	1066	757	421	2244
By Service Branch					
Enlisted (N=1124):					
Air Force	(N=559)	52.6	27.2	20.2	100.0
Marine Corps	(N=227)	40.5	22.5	100.0	100.0
Navy	(N=338)	42.0	34.9	23.1	100.0
Total	%	47.0	31.5	21.5	100.0
	N	528	354	242	1124
Officer (N=1023):					
Air Force	(N=469)	52.9	32.2	14.9	100.0
Marine Corps	(N=305)	40.0	19.0	100.0	100.0
Navy	(N=249)	46.6	37.8	15.7	100.0
Total	%	47.5	36.2	16.3	100.0
	N	486	370	167	1023
Overall Total	%	47.2	33.7	19.1	100.0
	N	1014	724	409	2147

Table 54

Most Preferred Improvement in Self-help Maintenance Program by Pay Grade

Group	Response							Total (%)	
	OK as is (%)	More Kinds of Supplies On Hand (%)	Increase Number of Repairs Can Do (%)	Ease of Access to Supplies (%)	Training Sessions on Self-help Tasks (%)	Other (%)	No Opinion (%)		
Enlisted:									
E-1--E-3 (N=127)	5.5	26.8	14.2	23.6	5.5	2.4	22.0	100.0	
E-4--E-6 (N=531)	11.3	27.1	13.6	21.7	7.9	6.2	12.2	100.0	
E-7--E-9 (N=537)	9.1	28.5	15.6	23.3	8.2	5.1	10.2	100.0	
Total	% N	9.7 116	27.7 331	14.6 174	22.6 270	7.6 93	5.3 63	12.3 148	1195
Officer:									
W-1--W-4 (N=56)	10.7	28.6	10.7	21.4	7.2	0.0	21.4	100.0	
O-1--O-2 (N=220)	10.0	29.1	6.8	22.3	9.5	7.3	15.0	100.0	
O-3 (N=146)	13.7	27.4	7.5	23.3	9.6	3.4	15.1	100.0	
O-4--O-5 (N=268)	11.6	28.4	10.8	23.0	4.5	4.9	16.8	100.0	
O-6+ (N=354)	24.6	27.4	5.9	15.8	5.1	1.1	20.1	100.0	
Total	% N	15.9 166	28.1 293	7.0 82	20.4 213	6.6 69	3.6 38	17.5 183	1044
Overall Total	% N	12.6 282	27.9 624	11.4 256	21.6 483	7.2 162	4.5 101	14.8 331	2239

Table 55

Ideal Attribution of Responsibility for Maintenance Categories by Pay Grade

Group		Responsi- bility of Housing Management (%)	Equal Responsi- bility (%)	Responsi- bility of Occupant (%)	No Opinion (%)	Total (%)
Minor Repairs and Maintenance						
Enlisted (N=1521):						
E-1--E-3 (N=174)		38.5	44.9	12.6	4.0	100.0
E-1--E-6 (N=676)		39.5	43.2	15.4	1.9	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=671)		39.9	40.4	18.2	1.5	100.0
Total	%	39.6	42.1	16.3	2.0	100.0
	N	602	641	248	30	1521
Officer (N=1394):						
W-1--W-4 (N=78)		43.6	43.6	12.8	0.0	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=263)		48.3	35.4	15.6	0.7	100.0
O-3 (N=204)		48.5	40.7	10.8	0.0	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=351)		49.0	33.9	16.5	0.6	100.0
O-6+ (N=498)		51.6	33.7	14.3	0.4	100.0
Total	%	49.4	35.7	14.5	0.4	100.0
	N	689	497	202	6	1394
Overall Total	%	44.3	39.1	15.4	1.2	100.0
	N	1291	1138	450	36	2915
Landscaping Around the Residence						
Enlisted (N=1524):						
E-1--E-3 (N=174)		13.8	29.9	52.9	3.4	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=677)		12.6	27.5	57.8	2.1	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=673)		9.1	28.7	61.0	1.2	100.0
Total	%	11.1	28.3	58.7	1.9	100.0
	N	170	431	894	29	1524
Officer (N=1396):						
W-1--W-4 (N=78)		6.4	29.5	64.1	0.0	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=263)		14.8	31.6	53.6	0.0	100.0
O-3 (N=204)		15.7	38.7	45.1	0.5	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=352)		16.8	34.9	47.2	1.1	100.0
O-6+ (N=499)		21.8	39.3	38.5	0.4	100.0
Total	%	17.5	36.1	45.9	0.5	100.0
	N	244	504	641	7	1396
Overall Total	%	14.2	32.0	52.6	1.2	100.0
	N	414	935	1535	36	2920

Table 55 (Continued)

Group		Respon- sibility of Housing Management (%)	Equal Respon- sibility (%)	Respon- sibility of Occupant (%)	No Opinion (%)	Total (%)
Mowing the Lawn						
Enlisted (N=1524):						
E-1--E-3 (N=174)		11.5	9.8	77.0	1.7	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=677)		3.8	6.4	88.3	1.5	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=673)		2.1	2.8	94.1	1.0	100.0
Total	%	3.9	5.2	89.6	1.3	100.0
	N	60	79	1365	20	1524
Officer (N=1369):						
W-1--W-4 (N=78)		1.3	3.8	94.9	0.0	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=263)		4.6	1.9	93.2	0.3	100.0
O-3 (N=204)		4.9	7.4	87.7	0.0	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=352)		4.3	5.4	89.8	0.5	100.0
O-6+ (N=499)		13.4	4.6	81.2	0.8	100.0
Total	%	7.5	4.7	87.3	0.5	100.0
	N	105	65	1219	7	1396
Overall Total	%	5.7	4.9	88.5	0.9	100.0
	N	165	144	2584	27	2920
Thoroughly Cleaning Residence Before New Occupant Moves In						
Enlisted (N=1521):						
E-1--E-3 (N=174)		20.1	34.5	43.1	2.3	100.0
E-1--E-6 (N=675)		20.1	27.9	50.7	1.3	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=672)		15.8	22.8	60.7	0.7	100.0
Total	%	18.2	26.4	54.2	1.2	100.0
	N	277	401	825	18	1521
Officer (N=1396):						
W-1--W-4 (N=78)		9.0	20.5	70.5	0.0	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=263)		22.8	28.5	48.7	0.0	100.0
O-3 (N=204)		20.1	28.4	51.0	0.5	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=352)		25.9	22.7	50.6	0.8	100.0
O-6+ (N=499)		21.6	22.1	56.1	0.2	100.0
Total	%	22.0	24.3	53.4	0.5	100.0
	N	307	339	745	5	1396
Total	%	20.0	25.4	53.8	0.8	100.0
	N	584	740	1570	23	2917

Table 55 (Continued)

Group		Responsi- bility of Housing Management (%)	Equal Responsi- bility (%)	Responsi- bility of Occupant (%)	No Opinion (%)	Total (%)
Painting the Inside of the Residence						
Enlisted (N=1524):						
E-1--E-3 (N=174)		54.0	31.0	12.6	2.4	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=677)		65.3	23.9	9.0	1.8	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=673)		72.7	21.0	5.5	0.8	100.0
Total	%	67.3	23.4	7.9	1.4	100.0
	N	1025	308	120	22	1524
Officer (N=1396):						
W-1--W-4 (N=78)		67.9	26.9	5.2	0.0	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=263)		78.3	16.0	5.7	0.0	100.0
O-3 (N=204)		84.4	12.7	2.9	0.0	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=352)		85.2	12.8	1.1	0.9	100.0
O-6+ (N=499)		91.4	7.2	1.2	0.2	100.0
Total	%	85.0	12.2	2.5	0.3	100.0
	N	1187	170	35	4	1396
Overall Total	%	75.8	18.0	5.3	0.9	100.0
	N	2212	527	155	26	2920
Painting the Outside of the Residence						
Enlisted (N=1522):						
E-1--E-3 (N=174)		85.7	9.2	1.7	3.4	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=677)		91.9	5.0	1.5	1.6	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=671)		94.3	4.0	0.7	1.0	100.0
Total	%	92.2	5.1	1.2	1.5	100.0
	N	1404	77	17	24	1522
Officer (N=1395):						
W-1--W-4 (N=78)		93.6	5.1	1.3	0.0	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=263)		97.7	1.5	0.8	0.0	100.0
O-3 (N=203)		99.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=352)		96.3	2.8	0.0	0.9	100.0
O-6+ (N=499)		99.2	0.2	0.4	0.2	100.0
Total	%	97.9	1.4	0.4	0.3	100.0
	N	1366	19	6	4	1395
Overall Total	%	95.0	3.3	0.7	1.0	100.0
	N	2770	96	23	28	2917

Table 56

Judged Enforcement of Rules and Regulations in
Respondents' Military Family Housing Site by Pay Grade

Group		Not Strict Enough (%)	Correct (%)	Too Strict (%)	No Opinion (%)	Total (%)
By Pay Grade						
Enlisted (N=1525):						
E-1--E-3	(N=174)	14.9	45.4	16.7	23.0	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=682)	32.8	38.6	12.5	16.1	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=699)	31.5	51.3	8.1	9.1	100.0
Total	% N	30.2 461	44.9 685	11.1 168	13.8 211	100.0 1525
Officer (N=1338):						
W-1--W-4	(N=78)	21.8	65.4	3.8	9.0	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=262)	22.1	57.6	12.2	8.0	100.0
O-3	(N=201)	23.4	59.7	7.0	10.0	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=351)	21.7	63.5	6.8	8.0	100.0
O-6+	(N=496)	12.7	78.4	4.2	4.6	100.0
Total	% N	18.8 261	67.3 934	6.8 94	7.1 99	100.0 1388
Overall Total	% N	24.8 722	55.6 1619	9.0 262	10.6 310	100.0 2913
By Service Branch						
Enlisted (N=1440):						
Air Force	(N=642)	28.3	47.0	13.6	11.1	100.0
Marine Corps	(N=330)	23.0	51.5	13.0	12.4	100.0
Navy	(N=468)	37.6	40.6	6.8	15.0	100.0
Total	% N	30.1 434	46.0 662	11.3 162	12.6 182	100.0 1440
Officer (N=1349):						
Air Force	(N=542)	16.1	68.6	9.6	5.7	100.0
Marine Corps	(N=413)	19.4	69.2	5.8	5.6	100.0
Navy	(N=394)	22.1	65.5	3.6	8.9	100.0
Total	% N	18.8 254	67.9 916	6.7 90	6.6 89	100.0 1349
Overall Total	% N	24.7 688	56.6 1578	9.0 252	9.7 271	100.0 2789

Table 57

Number of Rules and Regulations in Respondents'
Military Family Housing Community by Pay Grade

Group		Not Enough (%)	About Right (%)	Too Many (%)	No Opinion (%)	Total (%)
By Pay Grade						
Enlisted (N=1531):						
E-1--E-3	(N=174)	4.6	52.9	22.4	20.1	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=685)	6.4	58.3	21.9	13.4	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=672)	6.7	68.7	15.5	9.1	100.0
Total	%	6.3	62.2	19.1	12.3	100.0
	N	97	953	293	188	1531
Officer (N=1391):						
W-1--W-4	(N=78)	3.8	75.7	11.5	9.0	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=262)	1.9	66.8	24.8	6.5	100.0
O-3	(N=201)	4.5	69.6	17.4	8.5	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=352)	4.5	67.4	21.6	6.5	100.0
O-6+	(N=498)	2.0	81.7	12.7	3.6	100.0
Total	%	3.1	73.2	17.8	5.9	100.0
	N	43	1018	248	82	1391
Overall Total	%	4.8	67.5	18.5	9.2	100.0
	N	140	1971	541	270	2922
By Service Branch						
Enlisted (N=1445):						
Air Force	(N=644)	4.0	66.8	21.6	7.6	100.0
Marine Corps	(N=331)	8.2	58.9	21.1	11.8	100.0
Navy	(N=470)	7.9	62.3	15.1	14.7	100.0
Total	%	6.2	63.5	19.4	10.9	100.0
	N	90	918	280	157	1445
Officer (N=1352):						
Air Force	(N=543)	2.6	69.2	24.1	4.1	100.0
Marine Corps	(N=415)	2.9	76.1	15.7	5.3	100.0
Navy	(N=394)	3.8	77.9	10.9	7.4	100.0
Total	%	3.0	73.9	17.7	5.4	100.0
	N	41	999	239	73	1352
Overall Total	%	4.7	68.5	18.6	8.2	100.0
	N	131	1917	519	230	2797

Table 58

Rules or Regulations Least Enforced/Most Frequently Broken

Group		Pet Control (%)	Lawn & Ground Maint. (%)	Excess. Noise (%)	UA Guests (%)	UA Changes (%)	Vehicle/Parking Violations (%)	Child Supervision (%)	Other (%)	Don't Know (%)	Total (%)
Least Enforced By Housing Administration Offices											
Enlisted (N=1510):											
E-1--E-3 (N=174)		27.0	5.2	10.9	4.1	1.2	8.0	19.5	6.9	17.2	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=671)		30.3	5.8	6.3	4.0	1.0	8.8	22.7	6.6	14.5	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=665)		30.1	7.4	4.1	5.0	0.8	8.1	25.7	3.6	15.2	100.0
Total	%	29.9	6.4	5.8	4.4	1.0	8.4	23.6	5.4	15.1	100.0
	N	450	97	88	67	15	127	357	81	228	1510
Officer (N=1376):											
W-1--W-4 (N=78)		30.8	9.0	3.9	3.8	0.0	12.8	12.8	5.1	21.8	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=259)		37.1	8.5	3.1	1.9	1.1	8.5	20.1	5.8	13.9	100.0
O-3 (N=199)		26.6	6.0	5.1	7.0	1.5	5.0	17.1	6.1	25.6	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=350)		36.0	8.3	4.0	1.7	0.9	5.4	15.1	4.3	24.3	100.0
O-6+ (N=490)		30.8	8.6	4.7	4.5	1.2	7.1	11.2	3.9	28.0	100.0
Total	%	32.7	8.1	4.2	3.6	1.2	7.0	14.8	4.7	23.7	100.0
	N	450	112	58	50	15	96	204	65	326	1376
Overall Total	%	31.2	7.2	5.1	4.1	1.0	7.7	19.4	5.1	19.2	100.0
	N	900	209	146	117	30	223	561	146	554	2886
	Rank	1	4	5	6	7	3	2	--	--	--
Most Frequently Broken by Occupants											
Enlisted (N=1511):											
E-1--E-3 (N=174)		30.5	7.5	13.2	4.0	0.6	6.9	16.7	4.0	16.6	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=672)		29.5	9.2	8.0	2.7	0.4	10.4	24.4	4.6	10.8	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=665)		35.3	7.2	5.3	3.5	0.3	8.1	27.4	3.0	9.9	100.0
Total	%	32.2	8.1	7.4	3.2	0.4	9.0	24.8	3.8	11.1	100.0
	N	486	123	112	48	6	136	375	58	167	1511
Officer (N=1378):											
W-1--W-4 (N=77)		40.3	11.7	3.9	2.6	1.3	11.7	10.4	1.3	16.8	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=262)		39.3	13.0	2.3	1.1	1.5	8.8	19.8	1.1	13.1	100.0
O-3 (N=200)		29.0	8.5	3.5	4.5	4.5	9.0	19.5	1.0	20.5	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=350)		40.0	8.6	2.0	1.7	1.4	6.9	17.7	1.1	20.6	100.0
O-6+ (N=489)		40.5	7.8	3.5	2.5	2.2	7.4	14.1	2.7	19.3	100.0
Total	%	38.5	9.3	2.9	2.3	2.2	8.0	16.7	1.7	18.4	100.0
	N	530	128	40	32	30	110	230	23	255	1378
Overall Total	%	35.2	8.7	5.3	2.8	1.2	8.5	20.9	2.8	14.6	100.0
	N	1016	251	152	80	36	246	605	81	422	2889
	Rank	1	3	5	6	7	4	2	--	--	--

Table 59

Agency Primarily Responsible for Law Enforcement
and Police Protection

Item		Military Police/Shore Patrol (%)	City Police Dept. (%)	MP/SP and City Police (%)	Contract Security (%)	Don't Know (%)	Total (%)
By Pay Grade							
Enlisted (N=1524):							
E-1--E-3	(N=174)	67.8	10.9	13.8	2.9	4.6	100.0
E-4--E-6	(N=684)	66.5	11.8	12.1	6.9	2.7	100.0
E-7--E-9	(N=667)	68.8	10.8	10.2	8.1	2.1	100.0
Total	% N	67.7 1032	11.3 172	11.5 175	7.0 106	2.5 40	100.0 1525
Officer (N=1382):							
W-1--W-4	(N=76)	81.6	6.6	3.9	6.6	1.3	100.0
O-1--O-2	(N=261)	85.4	2.3	7.3	3.1	1.9	100.0
O-3	(N=201)	67.2	8.0	6.5	15.9	2.4	100.0
O-4--O-5	(N=352)	77.8	6.3	6.0	8.5	1.4	100.0
O-6+	(N=492)	82.5	1.6	5.1	10.2	0.6	100.0
Total	% N	79.6 1100	4.1 57	5.9 81	9.0 125	1.4 19	100.0 1382
Overall Total	% N	73.3 2132	7.9 229	8.8 256	7.9 231	21.0 59	100.0 2907
By Residential Setting							
On-base	(N=2178)	85.2	1.5	4.5	7.9	0.9	100.0
Off-base	(N=518)	38.4	21.8	26.8	9.5	3.5	100.0
Total	% N	76.2 2054	5.4 145	8.8 237	8.2 222	1.4 38	100.0 2696

Table 60

Rated Satisfaction with Family Housing Office Services

Group		Very Dissatisfied or Dissatisfied (%)	Neither Dissatisfied Nor Satisfied (%)	Satisfied or Very Satisfied (%)	Don't Know (%)	Total (%)
Assistance in Obtaining Government Housing						
Enlisted (N=1458):						
E-1--E-3 (N=160)		17.5	21.3	57.5	3.7	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=649)		22.4	17.4	57.9	2.3	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=649)		15.7	16.3	66.5	1.5	100.0
Total	%	18.9	17.4	61.7	2.0	100.0
	N	275	253	900	30	1458
Officer (N=1326):						
W-1--W-4 (N=77)		16.9	10.4	72.7	0.0	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=259)		14.7	17.0	68.3	0.0	100.0
O-3 (N=199)		24.7	18.6	56.2	0.5	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=337)		17.8	15.7	65.9	0.6	100.0
O-6+ (N=454)		11.0	11.7	75.8	1.5	100.0
Total	%	15.8	14.7	68.7	0.8	100.0
	N	210	195	911	10	1326
Overall Total	%	17.4	16.1	65.1	1.4	100.0
	N	485	448	1811	40	2784
Orientation to Government Quarters						
Enlisted (N=1452):						
E-1--E-3 (N=157)		22.3	21.0	52.8	3.9	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=641)		22.6	25.6	49.2	2.6	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=654)		19.2	21.3	58.3	1.2	100.0
Total	%	21.1	23.1	53.7	2.1	100.0
	N	306	336	780	30	1452
Officer (N=1344):						
W-1--W-4 (N=75)		13.3	22.7	61.3	2.7	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=258)		16.7	26.7	55.8	0.8	100.0
O-3 (N=195)		28.2	22.1	48.2	1.5	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=340)		21.2	27.4	50.8	0.6	100.0
O-6+ (N=476)		11.3	22.9	65.4	0.4	100.0
Total	%	17.4	24.6	57.1	0.9	100.0
	N	234	331	768	11	1344
Overall Total	%	18.3	23.9	55.3	1.5	100.0
	N	540	667	1548	41	2796

Table 60 (Continued)

Group		Very Dissatisfied or Dissatisfied (%)	Neither Dissatisfied Nor Satisfied (%)	Satisfied or Very Satisfied (%)	Don't Know (%)	Total (%)
General Helpfulness						
Enlisted (N=1459):						
E-1--E-3 (N=164)		21.9	29.9	45.2	3.0	100.0
E-1--E-6 (N=643)		28.3	23.8	44.5	3.4	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=652)		27.2	19.2	52.0	1.6	100.0
Total	%	27.1	22.4	47.9	2.6	100.0
	N	395	327	699	38	1459
Officer (N=1344):						
W-1--W-4 (N=77)		18.2	16.9	64.9	0.0	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=257)		19.5	27.2	53.3	0.0	100.0
O-3 (N=199)		27.2	23.6	48.2	1.0	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=343)		23.9	20.7	54.8	0.6	100.0
O-6+ (N=485)		12.0	16.5	71.1	0.4	100.0
Total	%	19.4	20.7	60.0	0.4	100.0
	N	271	281	816	6	1361
Overall Total	%	23.1	21.6	53.7	1.6	100.0
	N	653	608	1515	44	2820
Help in Demonstrating and/or Suggesting Energy Conservation Procedures						
Enlisted (N=1343):						
E-1--E-3 (N=153)		21.6	34.0	35.9	8.5	100.0
E-4--E-6 (N=598)		24.2	36.8	33.9	5.0	100.0
E-7--E-9 (N=592)		20.7	31.3	46.0	2.0	100.0
Total	%	22.3	34.0	39.6	4.1	100.0
	N	300	457	531	55	1343
Officer (N=1195):						
W-1--W-4 (N=66)		13.6	37.9	45.4	3.1	100.0
O-1--O-2 (N=226)		15.1	46.0	37.2	1.7	100.0
O-3 (N=199)		27.2	23.6	48.2	1.0	100.0
O-4--O-5 (N=300)		25.3	40.7	32.3	1.7	100.0
O-6+ (N=433)		11.5	30.9	56.4	1.2	100.0
Total	%	17.7	37.8	42.6	1.9	100.0
	N	212	452	509	22	1195
Overall Total	%	20.2	35.8	41.0	3.0	100.0
	N	512	909	1040	77	2538

Write-in Comments

The last page of the survey provided space for respondents to provide comments/suggestions concerning three areas: the service provided by the local military housing office, the military family housing policy, and housing itself. Approximately ten percent of the respondents provided written comments.

A sample of 400 surveys with comments (100 for each service) was selected at random and content analyzed (see Table 61). For each area, comments were divided into response categories, combined by service branch, and analyzed by officer-enlisted differences. Results are provided in Table 62 and described below.

1. Service Provided by Local Military Housing Office. Comments on this area were separated into six response categories. Overall, there were twice as many comments indicating dissatisfaction with the service provided than satisfaction (77 vs. 38). However, the enlisted expressed dissatisfaction in 31 instances and satisfaction in 22 instances, compared to 46 and 16 instances for officers. Twice as many officers as enlisted (20 vs. 10) commented that military family housing personnel were inflexible when handling housing requirements. Finally, the enlisted complained more often than did officers (20 vs. 13) that the waiting lists for housing were too long.

2. Military Family Housing Policy. Comments on this area were divided into 17 response categories. The most frequently cited categories--by both officers and enlisted--were those concerning VHA/BAQ increases and eligibility of lower enlisted personnel for military family housing. Both of these categories were mentioned twice as frequently as any other. Officers and enlisted agreed that more military housing was needed; however, officers seemed to feel that civilian housing was a better alternative: 21 officers commented that they should have the option of living in civilian housing; and 14, that the military should encourage living in the civilian community. Approximately equal numbers of officers and enlisted (14 and 11) felt that an overall housing policy was needed to ensure standardization between bases.

3. Military Family Housing Itself. Officers and enlisted seemed equally dissatisfied with military family housing: 11 of the 13 response categories revealed negative attitudes towards the condition of the housing. Thirty-two officers and 22 enlisted said that housing was totally inadequate and that they would refuse to live in military family housing. Only half as many (N=28) commented that they were generally satisfied with family housing. The three most frequently cited specific complaints concerned the need for better and faster maintenance and repairs, "too-small" housing, and storage space.

Table 61

Number of Write-in Comments by Service Branch

Service Branch	Officers	Enlisted	Total
Air Force	48	52	100
Army	62	38	100
Marine Corps	52	48	100
Navy	55	45	100
Total	217	183	400

Table 62
Comments Provided by Survey Respondents

Response Category	Frequency		Total
	Officer	Enlisted	
On Service Provided by Local Military Family Housing Office			
1. Dissatisfied	46	31	77
2. Satisfied	16	22	38
3. Waiting lists too long	13	20	33
4. Inflexible	20	10	30
5. Need to spend more time locating housing in the civilian community	12	14	26
6. Should be manned with military personnel	6	5	11
On Military Family Housing Policies and Regulations			
1. VHA/BAQ should be increased	62	40	102
2. Lower enlisted should get housing	44	50	94
3. Need to build more military housing	18	19	37
4. Should have option of military vs. civilian	21	5	26
5. Need standardization between bases	14	11	25
6. Rank shouldn't determine number of bedrooms	7	12	18
7. Too many regulations	8	10	18
8. Should encourage civilian housing	14	4	18
9. Fair and equitable	8	6	14
10. Children should have own bedroom	5	9	14
11. Lower enlisted shouldn't get military housing	10	4	14
12. Need better enforcement of rules	7	4	11
13. Unfair heater/air conditioner regulations	4	3	7
14. Need more off-base military housing	2	5	7
15. Do away with military housing	6	1	7
16. Rank should determine number of bedrooms	4	1	5
17. Housing damage claims insufficient	3	0	3
On Military Family Housing Itself			
1. Military family housing inadequate	32	22	54
2. Need better/faster maintenance and repairs	23	20	43
3. Housing too small	29	14	43
4. Insufficient storage space	21	15	36
5. Can't afford civilian housing	19	10	29
6. Satisfied	16	12	28
7. Poor construction-thin walls, etc.	17	9	26
8. Need more personal touches-carpeting, painting, fences, antennas, etc.	11	11	22
9. Not enough privacy	7	10	17
10. Need more pest control	4	12	16
11. Prefer civilian housing	8	7	15
12. Too noisy	3	8	11
13. Unfair housing inspections	6	1	7

DISCUSSION

In 1974, a DoD-wide family housing preference survey was administered to a sample of DoD military personnel and their spouses (Stumpf & Kieckhaefer, 1975) to obtain information on housing style and type preferences, the potential impact of fair market rental (FMR), housing satisfaction, attitudes toward proposed housing policy changes, the relationship of housing to career motivation, and perceived quality of life. The 1982 survey was administered to assess the opinions and reactions of the military members concerning military housing assignment policy changes, their experiences and reactions to PCS moves, their housing preferences, the impact of VHA on housing experiences and choices, and military housing services and regulations (military residents only).

In looking at the results of the two surveys, certain observations and relationships are of interest and may indicate trends. However, there is an important difference between respondents to the two surveys: Those who answered the 1974 survey were largely draftees, while those who answered the 1982 survey were generally recruited under an all-volunteer system. There is evidence that individual characteristics (e.g., demographics and background) differ and may have influenced some of the areas assessed by the two surveys. When comparing similar items, this difference in samples should be kept in mind.

Relative to housing style preference, the results of both surveys showed that single-family housing was the most popular choice. Additionally, higher pay grades were most likely to express preference for, as well as to occupy, single-family residences. In the 1974 study, a substantial gap existed between current and preferred housing styles for all pay grades; in the present study, this gap diminished as pay grade increased. The 1974 study also found that pay grade was not related to preference for civilian or government housing but, rather, that interest in government quarters was the same at all pay grades. It further found that service members housing preferences could be predicted by their current housing style, especially among those living in government quarters and those owning their own homes.

In the present study, preference for military or civilian housing could also be predicted by where the service members currently lived, but satisfaction with current housing varied by pay grade. Preference for civilian housing was expressed at all pay grades; however, for people who currently live in the civilian community, satisfaction with where they lived increased as their pay grade increased (i.e., their preference for civilian housing increased). For service members who lived in military family housing, there was an inverse relationship between pay grade and satisfaction. Generally, among military family housing residents, satisfaction with living in military housing decreased as pay grade increased.

Other than environmental aspects for military housing, this decreasing preference may be related to perceptions of less community and spousal support and less marital satisfaction among military housing residents than among those living in the civilian community (reported in a recent study of Navy family needs (Farkas and Durning, 1982)). In the present study, having other military members in the neighborhood was rated among the least important of the housing environment aspects by all personnel, with those currently in government housing attaching only slightly more importance to the items than others. However, in the 1974 and earlier studies (Blockenberger, 1970; Family Housing, 1966; Knight, Neathammer, Pfiester, & Dinnat, 1963), this factor, along with the need for being in a military environment (e.g., the opportunity to live in a neighborhood with rules, regulations, and other military families), was one of the reasons people

expressed satisfaction with and preference for military housing. In both studies, preference for ownership of housing over civilian rental increased as pay grade increased.

Considering the alternative of mobile/manufactured homes, the 1974 study found that they were the least preferred style, with preference decreasing as pay grade increased. In 1982, the order of style preferences was (1) single-family residences, (2) duplexes, (3) apartments, and (4) mobile/manufactured homes, with the preference order increasing as pay grade increased. However, preference for the on-base mobile/manufactured home increased as the density of the referent style of housing increased. Security was the most important aspect of housing for all respondents, and housing density is known to be associated with higher crime rates. Privacy was the second most important aspect of housing. Since respondents with experience living in mobile/manufactured homes actually preferred the on-base mobile/manufactured home to on-or off-base apartments, the implication is that there is a bias against mobile/manufactured homes as a function of lack of experience living in them. However, they may be a viable alternative to government apartment-style housing.

At present, preference for military housing seems to be driven by economic factors. Service members in the lower pay grades, those with unemployed spouses, and those in low income categories all showed greater preferences for military housing than did their counterparts with more affluent economic situations. Supporting this further was the finding that a chance to save money was the most frequently given reason for being on a waiting list to live in military family housing. These findings are similar to those reported in the 1974 study. When respondents were queried in the 1974 study about FMR, there seemed to be a shift toward civilian housing, especially among those in government quarters.

The 1974 study inquired about the level of satisfaction with 19 aspects of housing environment. Results showed that pay grade was related to only three of these aspects: (1) satisfaction with getting away from the military atmosphere at their residences (satisfaction was higher among those in civilian housing, especially among those owning their own homes, than in military housing, (2) satisfaction in the civilian sector with the amount of privacy, and (3) the appearance of civilian residences. The present study examined 40 housing environment aspects, including the three items from the 1974 study, in terms of both their importance to the service members and their level of satisfaction with them. For the three items from the 1974 study, the results were essentially the same among officers and enlisted. Officers and enlisted respondents in civilian housing were more satisfied with these three aspects of their current housing than were residents of military housing. Of interest is that, while all personnel rated privacy and residence appearance as very high in importance, getting away from the military atmosphere at the residence was rated relatively low in importance, except for the enlisted living in civilian housing.

The aforementioned suggestion of bias against mobile/manufactured homes may also relate to the high level of importance placed on the appearance of the residence. In general, officers in civilian housing showed the highest satisfaction levels with the six aspects of their current housing rated as most important, while enlisted personnel in military housing were the least satisfied of the respondent groups.

Costs of housing and utilities were of importance only to the civilian-housed military members, and satisfaction with these items was low. Availability of good schools was

perceived differently by respondents, although all rated it as important. Government-housed officers were the least satisfied with availability of good schools, while enlisted in military housing were the most satisfied with them.

Among the items rated as moderately important, officers in the civilian sector showed higher satisfaction with housing amenity and freedom aspects of their environments, as opposed to the simple convenience items rated as yielding most satisfaction among the officers in military housing. Lack of adequate storage and/or cupboard space was more of an issue among military housing residents than among those in the civilian community.

The relative value of military and civilian housing is apparently related to housing allowances. Although a sizable group (about 40% of respondents) of military housing residents judged military housing as better than housing they could afford in the civilian community, the change in judgments of relative value with pay grade suggests that military housing is only better or comparable at lower levels of housing assistance (BAQ and VHA). As pay grade rises (along with associated BAQ and VHA), respondents tend to judge civilian housing as being more attractive. This outcome is clearest among officers.

There is a clear split among residents of military housing over its relative value, and the comparison is least favorable at higher pay-grade levels. This suggests that it would be more cost effective to upgrade and improve housing for lower- and intermediate-level personnel than housing for higher-graded personnel, who prefer to live in civilian housing.

An additional facet of the results is that enlisted respondents' judged values of their housing do not differ across services, but officers' judged values do. Air Force or Marine officers in military housing feel civilian housing is better than military housing, while Navy officers favor military housing over affordable civilian housing. This result may be due to economic differences among typical areas where each service locates its bases.

As mentioned previously, both the 1974 and the present survey addressed issues of policy change. In the 1974 study, the second most favored policy change was to vary the amount of BAQ based on local housing costs, which, in the present study, is called variable housing allowance (VHA). If this policy was intended to make civilian housing more attainable for service members and their families, the data in the present study indicate this is being realized. A sizable majority of personnel now receiving VHA claim that they now have more places in which their families can afford to live (the most frequent mentioned response to the impact of VHA). Being able to have dependents accompany them at their current duty station was the second most frequent response to the item concerning the impact of VHA. This impact was almost twice as high for enlisted than for officers. It appears that officers are utilizing VHA more for home ownership and having more money for nonhousing items, whereas enlisted are using it to upgrade the quality of their accommodations.

An important issue was the impact of VHA on service members' career intentions. The majority of people receiving VHA indicated that it had a positive effect on their career plans. Officers felt more strongly that it was a career enhancer than did enlisted. However, for both groups, this attitude increased as pay grade increased. Of interest is that VHA seems to have made a difference to the less career-motivated respondents in the sample. While behavior changes and long-term effects of VHA cannot be predicted, the early indication is that it is enhancing career motivation.

Regarding PCS moves, generally speaking, reimbursement seemed to be related to housing aspects of PCS moves. When individuals had bad experiences with any one aspect of their most recent PCS move, dissatisfaction tended to generalize to other related aspects of the move. The data also indicated service branches may differ in satisfaction on those items that relate to reimbursement and housing-related issues. The interrelationship differences (e.g., the amount of association as well as the number of associations) may be indicative of inconsistencies among services caused by differential interpretation or administration of housing policies.

Across services, military members were generally most dissatisfied with reimbursement to move dependents, reimbursement for lost or damaged goods, the ease of locating temporary civilian housing, the availability of temporary government housing, and the length of military family housing waiting lists. Service members who were on waiting lists expressed less dissatisfaction with lengths of lists as pay grade increased, which seems to imply there are either fewer people on the list or more available military housing for senior people.

More officers than enlisted indicated they had made a profit when they sold a house prior to their most recent PCS move. While the reason for this is not readily apparent in this study, it may be worthy of further investigation. Since satisfaction with advance notice of moves was relatively high for both enlisted and officers, it can be speculated that the enlisted might buy into housing areas that do not appreciate in value as quickly as those in which officers can afford to buy.

More officers than enlisted indicated that they had been contacted by a sponsor prior to reporting to their new command; also, more officers than enlisted were satisfied with the sponsor program. These findings seem to indicate that the program is less effective for enlisted personnel than for officers. This could be due to lack of support by the organization, lack of knowledge or individual motivation, etc., but the present study does not examine these issues or permit speculation regarding causation.

All personnel across services strongly agreed that the number of PCS moves should be limited to 1 every 4 or 5 years. Moving is both disruptive and costly. As mentioned earlier, dissatisfaction with reimbursement to move dependents was quite high. One of the primary reasons given by the enlisted for being unaccompanied was the high cost of relocating their dependents. Officers indicated having greater "out-of-pocket" expenses to move than did enlisted.

Generally, the inferred greater impact of economic considerations on the enlisted than the officers may have more far-reaching effects. While both groups were dissatisfied with dependent relocation reimbursements, only the enlisted give this cost as a principal reason for being unaccompanied at their current duty station. VHA seems to have made it more economically feasible for service members to have their dependents with them. The link may be missing for the enlisted; that is, relocation expenses may prohibit them from actually moving their dependents. If this is the case, a dilemma has been created that would account for the high enlisted dissatisfaction with reimbursements for relocation. Another important reason given for service members being unaccompanied at their current duty station, especially for officers, was that dependents were not allowed. Since VHA is making more housing affordable for service members and their dependents, this expectation of housing affordability, along with a policy that prohibits taking their dependents with them, may be leading to frustration and a general dissatisfaction with being in the service.

In the 1974 study, attitudes toward the nine housing proposals generally were not affected by where respondents lived (e.g., government or civilian housing). In the present study, attitudinal differences concerning policy proposals were often related to current (military or civilian) housing.

A policy proposal in both 1974 and 1982 that dealt with fair market rental (FMR) offered all families a choice of military family housing at prices comparable to civilian housing. FMR showed no officer/enlisted differences in either study. In the present data, this proposal was not a popular one, with only one-quarter to one-third in favor. Relatively speaking, in 1974, it was rated higher in popularity.

In the present study, when the nine policy proposals were ranked by enlisted/officers, some distinct differences were found in ranked favorability. In order to effect housing policy changes that would most ensure a smooth transition and/or meet with the most endorsement, the rank-ordering differences suggest that housing assignment policy might best be geared to officers and enlisted differentially.

Overall, personnel felt that a change in present assignment policy was needed to extend eligibility for military family housing to all service members with dependents regardless of pay grade. However, when proposals addressed actual implementation of policy changes, attitudinal differences emerged between officer and enlisted personnel. These differences were most likely due to differential perceptions of how the policy change might affect their personal situations.

The policy alternative of building smaller units for pay grades E-1 to E-3 was generally endorsed by both officer and enlisted groups. However, the policy alternative of assignment by bedroom requirements only, regardless of rank, was rated highly by the enlisted but was the least favorable among officers. It is possible that the officers may see this policy as displacing construction of officer housing or diverting their existing housing inventory, because they perceive the enlisted as having larger families.

Among officers, it was found that favorability toward maintaining existing assignment policies was related to time spent in military housing and current residence in military housing. These findings may indicate both a traditional bias against change and a perception of possible threat to officers' individual housing situations. In contrast, maintaining existing housing assignment procedures was least popular among the enlisted personnel. This obviously indicates a high degree of dissatisfaction with present policy. The trend by pay grade among enlisted showed that the junior and intermediate enlisted, the group most likely to have been recruited under the all-volunteer system, were most opposed to retaining the existing housing assignment policy. The senior enlisted were somewhat more supportive of the current assignment policy, perhaps for the same reasons as discussed for the officer population.

With regard to eligibility policies and assignment procedures, constructing additional housing for E-1 to E-3 families on a priority basis and offering all personnel FMR-type alternatives were the two least favored proposals. It is obvious that assigning priority to housing for the E-1 to E-3 pay grades with the consequence of delaying other housing construction was less well accepted because of its impact on all other pay grades. The FMR-type proposal may have been rated low, not so much as a reflection of the eligibility extension issue but because of a general distaste for the concept. It may also be conjectured that the low support for this proposal was a reaction to the "out-of-pocket" phrase in the wording of the proposal.

Lengthened waiting times for housing due to extension of eligibility to the E-1 to E-3 families is an alternative the enlisted personnel may be more willing to accept to be eligible for military family housing. Among officers, this proposal was equal in popularity with maintenance of existing procedures, probably because officers may not be as impacted by time on waiting lists, while they also have a relatively higher desire to live in the civilian community anyway.

Present policy for dual-career couples is that both forfeit BAQ for military family housing. Changing this policy to have only one of the dual-career service members forfeit BAQ was more frequently supported by those with military spouses than by others.

The questionnaire covered several aspects of housing rules and regulations, including strictness of enforcement, their number, the least enforced, and the most frequently broken. A majority of respondents judged housing rules and regulations to be correctly enforced, with officers more frequently endorsing this alternative than enlisted personnel. This alternative was more highly endorsed by Marine Corps and Air Force respondents than by Navy respondents. Among those who did not feel enforcement was correct, a three to one majority felt enforcement was too lenient (led by the Navy). It appears that, if enforcement were to be changed, enlisted personnel (especially Navy) would be most receptive to more strict enforcement.

The number of rules and questions was felt to be about right by a strong majority of respondents, with only slight differences between officers and enlisted personnel, and no differences among services. The minority opinion was predominately that too many rules and regulations exist. Since acceptance of the present number as right tends to increase with pay grade, it appears that selective retention is taking place. Those with objections go elsewhere for housing.

The least enforced and most frequently broken rules and regulations reported were pet control and child supervision. The fact that both questions elicited a similar response suggests that lack of enforcement and frequency of violation may be related. However, a more positive method of control than strict enforcement might be providing support to families in these areas by such means as yard fencing and day care or recreational activities for children.

Satisfaction with housing office services was highest for assistance in obtaining government housing, followed by orientation to government quarters and general helpfulness on problems. Slightly lower satisfaction was reported for help in demonstrating or suggesting energy conservation procedures. Depending on the service, from one out of six to one out of four respondents claimed dissatisfaction with the service.

Since the items obtained only a general rating of each housing office service, it is not possible to specify what improvements or changes might be made to raise residents' satisfaction with these services. Further exploration by the housing offices might obtain useful elaboration of these satisfaction ratings.

The allocation of responsibility for various types of maintenance around the residence can be expected to reflect current and past experience. This appears to be the case for the six maintenance areas assessed in the questionnaire.

Exterior painting, closely followed by interior painting, were felt to be the responsibility of housing management. Lawn mowing was clearly felt to be an occupant

responsibility. Cleaning and landscaping were usually also assigned to the occupant. Minor repairs and maintenance were less clear: Respondents split over assigning responsibility entirely to housing management or to both the occupant and the managers.

In most cases, residents' assignment of responsibility for upkeep was clear and, to the extent it aligns with present policy, there is no need for change; however, where discrepancies exist, residents' allocations of responsibility may be considered to reflect some disagreement with present policy and should be reexamined and compared to civilian practice.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Extending eligibility of military family housing to all service members with dependents, regardless of pay grade, seems to be an acceptable proposal to service members at all grade levels, especially in light of VHA.

2. Constructing smaller family housing units and the possible alternative of mobile/manufactured homes may be less expensive but acceptable approaches for increasing the inventory for pay grades E-1 to E-3.

3. VHA is having the impact of increasing the affordability of civilian housing for service members, giving them more options for locations where their families can live, and making it possible for more families to accompany the service member to his/her current duty station.

4. The implementation of VHA and the possibility of extending eligibility of family housing seem to have an overall positive effect on career motivation.

5. Reimbursement for the expenses incurred by the service member associated with relocating their dependents may be inadequate for some service members to bring their families to the new duty station.

6. Military family housing residents are generally satisfied with the services provided by the housing office and with the number of housing rules and regulations and their enforcement.

REFERENCES

- Blockenberger, C. W. Military families: Differential life styles. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1970.
- Chipman, M., & Rowe, M. Variable housing allowance (VHA) proposals and issues: review and analysis. (NPRDC Tech. Note 80-19) San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, June 1980.
- Family housing: Department of the Army survey of married male military personnel (OPOSS Report 52-66E) Washington, DC: Department of the Army, Office of Personnel Operations, December 1966.
- Farkas, A. J., & Durning, K. P. Characteristics and needs of Navy families: Policy implications. (NPRDC Spec. Rep. 83-1) San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, October 1982. (AD-A120 807)
- General Accounting Office. Lower-graded military personnel with families are not suitably housed but should be (CED-79-92). Washington, DC: Author, September 1979.
- Hutchins, R., & Rowe, M. Assessing alternative military housing assignment policies (NPRDC TN 82-24). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, August 1982. (AD-A118 742)
- Knight, R. C., Neathammer, R. D., Pfiester, J. L., & Dinnat, R. M. Attitudes and preferences of military family housing communities: Vol. 1. Executive Digest. Champaign, IL: Department of the Army, Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, October 1963.
- Lawson, J. K., Somer, E. P., Feher, B., & Perel, D. 1982 Department of Defense Family Housing Preference Survey: I. Management Report (NPRDC SR 83-47). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, August 1983.
- Lemon, H. B. The development and implementation of a fair market rental system for military family housing. Naval Postgraduate School Thesis, Alexandria, VA: March 1977.
- Othner, D. K., & Nelson, R. S. A demographic profile of U.S. Navy personnel and families. Greensboro, NC: Family Research and Analysis, Inc., August 1980.
- Stumpf, S. S., & Kieckhafer, W. F. Department of Defense family housing preference survey. (NPRDC Tech. Rep. 76-20) San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, November 1975. (AD-A018 146)
- Trejo, P. E. CNA retention study 1979--U.S. Pacific Fleet units (Air Systems Command Project No. P-0388-79-2) Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, CA, 1979.

APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

HOUSING INTERVIEWS

I. Demographics

- A. Service person's rank _____
- B. Average length of time in service _____
- C. Average length of time in government housing _____

II. Housing Preferences

- A. Main reason(s) for residing in military housing _____
- _____
- _____

- B. Prefer military or civilian community? _____
 - Why? _____
- _____

- C. Expectations vs. reality of government housing _____
- _____
- _____

III. Import and Various Aspects of Housing/Neighborhood/General Environment

- A. Use of city police vs. shore patrol or military police _____
- _____

- B. Personnel/social/physical supports _____
- Satisfaction with _____
- Importance of _____

- 1. Community councils _____
- 2. Chaplain program _____

- C. Needs assessment related to housing _____

- 1. Furnishings/drapes _____
 - 2. Expanding referral service (e.g., assistance in selling home) _____
- _____

IV. Impact of Frequency of Relocation

- A. Uncertainty about what next house is like _____
 - B. Feasibility of transferring people systematically in consideration of the match between their housing needs and housing availability _____
-

V. Perceptions of Civilian Community

- A. Member's perception of civilian attitudes regarding military housing (both government quarters and civilian housing) _____
 - 1. Perceive discrimination _____
 - 2. Perceive alienation _____
 - B. Perceived ability to purchase home in civilian community _____
-

VI. Perception of Military Housing

- A. Feel pride of ownership or perceive as rental unit _____
-

VII. Housing Administration

- A. Referral services _____
 - 1. Obtaining civilian housing _____
 - 2. Obtaining government quarters _____

VIII. Housing Management

- A. Orientation to government quarters _____
 - B. Maintenance service _____
 - 1. Station labor vs. PWC _____
 - 2. Self-help programs _____
 - C. Impact of individual manager on satisfaction _____
-

D. Enforcement of rules and regulations _____

IX. Housing Policy

A. Attitudes toward extending eligibility to junior enlisted _____

1. Designating part of housing for junior enlisted and establishing separate waiting list _____

B. Inequity of identical BAQ forfeiture for less desirable housing _____

C. Impact of VHA _____

1. More willing to relocate in certain high cost geographical locales due to higher VHA allotment _____

2. Affect where you live in civilian community _____

3. Voluntarily move into government quarters if able to live in civilian community _____

D. Damages policy (allows housing to check pay for damages to housing-DoD housing) _____

X. Importance of Various Military Benefits

- A. Compared to housing _____
 - B. Erosion of _____
-

XI. Quality of Life

A. Satisfaction level with the following:

- 1. House/apartment _____
- 2. Nonwork activities _____
- 3. Amount of spare time _____
- 4. Family's total income _____
- 5. Military pay and allowances _____
- 6. Independence/freedom _____
- 7. Military aspects of life _____
- 8. Life as a whole _____

B. What other factors figure strongly into your perceived quality of life?

(Geographical location?)


XII. Miscellaneous Comments and Questions

XIII. Military Housing: Best and Worst Aspects

BEST

WORST

APPENDIX B
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE





MANPOWER
RESERVE AFFAIRS
AND LOGISTICS

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20301

MEMORANDUM FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

SUBJECT: Department of Defense Family Housing Preference Survey--1982

Family housing is considered to be one of the more important aspects of being in the military. Satisfaction with housing is often mentioned by military personnel as a significant reason for staying in or leaving the service. For this reason, DoD is concerned with your opinions and attitudes about your housing needs and satisfaction. You have been randomly selected to take part in a survey of military families in the four services concerning housing and housing policies. Your participation in this survey will assist us in developing programs that will make better use of our funds in meeting the needs of military families.

Please take the time to give thoughtful, honest answers since your opinions will be viewed as representative of those held by other military personnel in the United States. Please read the directions carefully as you complete the questionnaire and return it within five days of receipt.

If you have any questions about the content of the questionnaire, please call Ms. P. Mitchell at Autovon 933-2191 or (714) 225-2191.

Reports Control Symbol DD-M (OT)8205 applies to this reporting requirement. Thank you for your cooperation.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Robert A. Stone".

Robert A. Stone
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense
(Facilities, Environment, and Economic Adjustment)

Attachment

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
FAMILY HOUSING PREFERENCE SURVEY
1982**



Developed by
The Navy Personnel Research and Development Center
San Diego, California 92152

IMPORTANT DIRECTIONS

- The addressee is referred to as the *service member* throughout the survey.
- If the addressee's permanent duty location is outside CONUS, place a check mark here . STOP. Please DO NOT complete this questionnaire. Mail the questionnaire back to the Navy Personnel Research & Development Center in the postage-paid envelope that came with the questionnaire.

HOW TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

- There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. We are interested in your feelings, attitudes and opinions about your housing.
- Carefully read each question and all possible answers before choosing your response. Mark your answer by either filling in the information asked for or by **printing** the letter or number of your response in the space provided next to each question.
- Use any pencil or pen that makes clear, dark marks. Erase cleanly or put an "X" over any answer that you wish to change.
- Finally, if you don't understand a question, please leave that answer space blank. However, it is important that you try to answer each question as best you can.

QUESTIONNAIRE RETURN INSTRUCTIONS

- When you have finished the questionnaire, mail it back to the Navy Personnel Research & Development Center in the postage-paid envelope that came with the questionnaire. You may fold the questionnaire if necessary.
- If you cannot complete the survey for any reason, place the survey in the return envelope and drop it in a mailbox.
- Please complete and mail the questionnaire within five (5) days after you receive it.

PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUAL PRIVACY

The Department of Defense (DoD) is conducting a survey concerning your attitudes and opinions about housing. The information you provide will assist DoD and the individual services with future housing decisions. Under the authority of 5USC301 as reflected in OPNAV 5450 of 17 April 1975, information is requested regarding your personal opinions and attitudes. The information will be used by the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, for statistical purposes only. In no case will your response be used in making decisions affecting you personally. Your participation is voluntary; there will be no penalty for deciding not to complete the survey.

Carefully read each question and all possible answers before choosing your answer. Mark your answer by either filling in the information asked for or by printing the letter or number of your response in the space provided next to each question.

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Month Day

1. In the spaces to the left, please fill-in the month and day that the questionnaire is being completed.

- _____ 2. What is your marital status?
- a. married → *Continue with Question 3*
 - b. separated
 - c. divorced
 - d. widowed
 - e. single, never married
- } *Go to Question 5*

- _____ 3. Are you presently living with your spouse?
- a. yes
 - b. no

- _____ 4. Is your spouse on active military duty?
- a. yes
 - b. no

- _____ 5. What is the sex of the service member (addressee)?
- a. male
 - b. female

- _____ 6. What branch of the military is the service member in?
- a. Air Force
 - b. Army
 - c. Marine Corps
 - d. Navy

<input type="text"/>					
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Zipcode

7. In the spaces to the left, please print the zipcode of the Continental U.S. (CONUS) post, base or homeport of the service member's permanent duty location. **HOWEVER**, if the service member's permanent duty location is **OUTSIDE** of CONUS, place a check mark here . **STOP. Do not complete this questionnaire. Place survey in envelope and return as directed in the instructions.**

19

--	--	--	--

Year Month

8. What year and month did the service member arrive at his/her current geographical location?

--	--	--	--	--	--

Zipcode

9. Please fill in the zipcode of the residence where the service member's dependents currently live.

_____ 10a. What is the service member's paygrade?

- | | | |
|--------|--------|-----------------|
| a. E-1 | j. W-1 | n. O-1 |
| b. E-2 | k. W-2 | o. O-1E |
| c. E-3 | l. W-3 | p. O-2 |
| d. E-4 | m. W-4 | q. O-2E |
| e. E-5 | | r. O-3 |
| f. E-6 | | s. O-3E |
| g. E-7 | | t. O-4 |
| h. E-8 | | u. O-5 |
| i. E-9 | | v. O-6 |
| | | w. O-7 or above |

_____ 10b. If the service member's spouse is on active military duty, what is his/her paygrade? If you are unmarried or your spouse is not on active duty, place a checkmark here and go to Question 11.

- | | | |
|--------|--------|-----------------|
| a. E-1 | j. W-1 | n. O-1 |
| b. E-2 | k. W-2 | o. O-1E |
| c. E-3 | l. W-3 | p. O-2 |
| d. E-4 | m. W-4 | q. O-2E |
| e. E-5 | | r. O-3 |
| f. E-6 | | s. O-3E |
| g. E-7 | | t. O-4 |
| h. E-8 | | u. O-5 |
| i. E-9 | | v. O-6 |
| | | w. O-7 or above |

_____ 11. About what is the total amount of time the service member has been on active military duty?

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| a. less than 1 year | f. 17-20 |
| b. 1-4 years | g. more than 20 years → Go to question 13 |
| c. 5-8 years | |
| d. 9-12 years | |
| e. 13-16 years | |

_____ 12. Does the service member intend to remain in the service for a career (at least 20 years)?

- a. definitely will make service a career
- b. probably will make service a career
- c. uncertain
- d. probably will not make service a career
- e. definitely will not make service a career

--	--

13. How old was the service member on his/her last birthday?

Years

_____ 14. How many dependents does the service member have?

- a. none (spouse is also on active military duty)
- b. 1
- c. 2
- d. 3
- e. 4
- f. 5 or more

_____ 15. How many dependents indicated in Question 14 live with the service member? (Dependents away at college are NOT to be considered as living with the service member.)

- a. none
- b. 1
- c. 2
- d. 3
- e. 4
- f. 5 or more

_____ 16. At how many duty stations have the service member's dependents lived in military family housing?

- a. none → *Go to Question 19*
- b. 1-2
- c. 3-4
- d. 5-6
- e. 7 or more

_____ 17. About how many years total has the service member had dependents living in military family housing?

- a. none
- b. less than 1 year
- c. 1-3 years
- d. 4-7 years
- e. 8-11 years
- f. 12 years or more

- _____ 18. Of the total time your dependents have lived in military family housing (indicated in Question 17), how much time was spent in military family housing that has been designated "substandard"?
- does not apply, never lived in military family housing
 - none of the time
 - less than half of the time
 - about half of the time
 - more than half of the time
 - all of the time
 - I don't know
- _____ 19. What type of basic allowance for quarters (BAQ) does the service member draw or could he/she draw if not living in government housing?
- BAQ at the without dependents rate
 - BAQ at the with dependents rate
 - I don't know
- _____ 20. What percentage of the service member's housing costs (e.g., rent, utilities, and condo fees) are covered by his/her BAQ (and VHA where applicable)?
- not applicable – live in military family housing
 - 1% – 25%
 - 26% – 50%
 - 51% – 75%
 - 76% – 100%
- _____ 21. About how much was your family's total income before taxes in calendar year 1981? (Include any spouse earnings, allowances, off-duty employment and other outside sources of income.)
- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| a. \$8500 or less | f. \$24501 – \$28500 |
| b. \$8501 – \$12500 | g. \$28501 – \$32500 |
| c. \$12501 – \$16500 | h. \$32501 – \$36500 |
| d. \$16501 – \$20500 | i. \$36501 – \$40500 |
| e. \$20501 – \$24500 | j. \$40501 or more |
- _____ 22. Is the service member's spouse employed?
- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| a. yes | → Continue with Question 23 | } Go to Question 24 |
| b. no | | |
| c. does not apply – service member is unmarried | | |
- _____ 23. What percentage of your family's 1981 total income indicated above was contributed by the spouse's earnings?
- | | |
|--------------|--------------|
| a. 0% | d. 51% – 75% |
| b. 1% – 25% | e. over 75% |
| c. 26% – 50% | |

- _____ 24. Has the service member or his/her dependents ever used a "self-help" maintenance store located at a military family housing site?
- does not apply — none available
 - yes
 - no
 - I don't know
- _____ 25. How many times has the service member lived apart from his/her dependents for at least six months since he/she joined the service? (Do not include tours of sea duty.)
- none —→ Go to Question 27
 - 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4 or more
 - I don't know
- _____ 26. Which of the following best describes the service member's reason for being unaccompanied by dependents at his/her present duty location? (Choose only one answer.)
- does not apply — the service member and dependents are together at present duty location
 - high cost of relocating dependents
 - waiting list for military family housing too long
 - no military family housing built at current location
 - dependents couldn't/wouldn't move to service member's present location
 - dependents don't usually relocate with service member
 - anticipate short-term tour of duty
 - dependents not allowed
 - other (please specify) _____
- _____ 27. Would the service member like his/her dependents to accompany him/her on an overseas tour of duty?
- would very much like to have dependents overseas
 - would somewhat like to have dependents overseas
 - no preference
 - would somewhat like dependents to stay in CONUS
 - would very much like dependents to stay in CONUS
- _____ 28. How many times has the service member changed his/her geographical location due to PCS (permanent change of station) orders in the past 10 years?
- none
 - 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9 or more
 - I don't know
- _____ 29. How many times has the service member asked for and been given a permanent geographical move since he/she has been on active military duty?
- none
 - 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9 or more
 - I don't know

_____ 30. In your opinion, should the number of involuntary PCS geographical moves be limited to no more than one every 4 to 5 years?

- a. strongly agree
- b. agree
- c. neither agree nor disagree
- d. disagree
- e. strongly disagree

_____ 31. During the service member's most recent PCS move, what was the value of the goods damaged or lost in transportation by the moving company?

- a. does not apply — never made a PCS move
- b. there were no damages or losses
- c. less than \$200
- d. \$200 — \$400
- e. \$401 — \$600
- f. \$601 — \$800
- g. \$801 — \$1000
- h. \$1001 — \$1500
- i. \$1501 — \$2000
- j. \$2001 — \$2500
- k. \$2501 — \$3000
- l. \$3001 — or more

_____ 32. Above the amount of any allowances given the service member for his/her most recent PCS move, about how much did the move personally cost the service member?

- a. does not apply — never made a PCS move
- b. nothing, allowances covered all expenses
- c. less than \$200
- d. \$200 — \$400
- e. \$401 — \$600
- f. \$601 — \$800
- g. \$801 — \$1000
- h. \$1001 — \$1500
- i. \$1501 — \$2000
- j. \$2001 — \$2500
- k. \$2501 — \$3000
- l. \$3001 — or more

_____ 33. Was the service member contacted by a sponsor from his/her new command prior to his/her most recent PCS geographical move?

- a. yes —————> *Continue with Question 34*
 - b. no
 - c. sponsor declined
 - d. I don't know
- } *Go to Question 35*

_____ 34. In your opinion, how helpful was the sponsor in assisting the family's adjustment to the new duty station?

- a. not applicable
- b. not at all helpful
- c. somewhat helpful
- d. very helpful
- e. no opinion

- _____ 35. If you sold your home before your most recent PCS geographical move, which of the following applies to you?
- a. does not apply — did not sell a home
 - b. sold home for less than I originally paid for it
 - c. sold it for about what I originally paid
 - d. sold home for more than I originally paid for it

—IMPORTANT—

For the rest of the survey, the term "residence" refers to the place where the service member's dependents live (zipcoded in Question 9).

- _____ 36. How many bedrooms are there in the residence?
- a. 0 (studio)
 - b. 1
 - c. 2
 - d. 3
 - e. 4
 - f. 5
 - g. 6 or more
- _____ 37. Which of the following describes the residence location and/or type of housing?
- a. government-leased housing in the civilian community
 - b. on-base military family housing
 - c. off-base military family housing
 - d. personally rented space to park mobile home which service member owns
 - e. personally rented housing in the civilian community
 - f. personally owned housing in the civilian community
 - g. other (please describe) _____
- _____ 38. Considering your total income, the local community, and the housing in which the dependents presently live, which of the types and/or locations of housing listed in Question 37 would you and your family MOST PREFER?
- _____ 39. What style of housing is the residence?
- a. single family, detached home
 - b. semi-detached (row/townhouse/duplex)
 - c. apartment (walk-up)
 - d. apartment (elevator)
 - e. condominium/cooperative
 - f. mobile home
 - g. other (please describe) _____
- _____ 40. Considering your total income, the local community, and the housing in which the dependents presently live, which of the styles of housing listed in Question 39 would you and your family MOST PREFER?

If the service member is RENTING housing in the civilian community, continue with Question 41. If not, check here and go to Question 43.

- _____ 41. Are you receiving any government rental assistance other than BAQ and VHA (for example, HUD Section 8 assistance)?
- a. yes
 - b. no
 - c. I don't know
- _____ 42. Are you required to give at least a 30-day notice before moving?
- a. yes
 - b. no
 - c. I don't know
- _____ 43. How long does it or would it usually take the service member to travel one-way from his/her local residence to his/her place of duty in a privately owned vehicle during "rush-hour" traffic?
- a. 15 minutes or less
 - b. 16-30 minutes
 - c. 31-45 minutes
 - d. 46-60 minutes
 - e. more than 60 minutes
- _____ 44. What kind of transportation does the service member most frequently use to travel from his/her local residence to his/her place of duty?
- a. private vehicle by him/herself
 - b. private vehicle with at least one other person
 - c. public transportation (bus, subway, train)
 - d. other (bicycle, walk, run)
- _____ 45. About how long have you waited or did you wait for military family housing at your present location?
- a. not applicable, never on waiting list
 - b. less than one month
 - c. 1-3 months
 - d. 4-6 months
 - e. 7-12 months
 - f. 13-18 months
 - g. 19 months or more

- _____ 46. Is the service member presently on a waiting list to move in or out of military family housing?
- no
 - yes, to move OUT of military family housing
 - yes, to move from one type of military family housing to another type of military family housing at family's current duty location
 - yes, to move from civilian housing to military family housing at family's current duty location
 - yes, to move dependents from another location to military family housing at service member's present duty location
 - yes, to move to military family housing at next duty location
- _____ 47. Which of the following best describes the service member's reason for not currently being on a waiting list to move in or out of military family housing? (Choose only one answer.)
- currently on waiting list to move in military housing
 - do not want to live in military housing
 - already live in military housing
 - not eligible for military housing
 - would like to live in military housing but don't want to move now that I'm settled
 - the wait for military housing is too long
 - other (please specify) _____
- _____ 48. On how many waiting lists for military family housing is the family presently listed?
- | | |
|---------|--------------|
| a. none | d. 3 |
| b. 1 | e. 4 or more |
| c. 2 | |
- _____ 49. Which of the following statements best describes the service member's reason for currently being on a waiting list for military family housing? (Choose only one answer.)
- not on waiting list now
 - to move from housing classified as substandard to adequate housing
 - to move into larger housing to have more bedrooms because the family size has increased
 - to move into housing that the service member prefers
 - to save money by moving into military housing
 - other (please specify) _____
- _____ 50. In your opinion, how helpful was the local military housing office in assisting the service member and/or dependents find housing in the civilian community?
- does not apply, didn't ask for help
 - not at all helpful
 - somewhat helpful
 - very helpful
 - no opinion

IMPORTANCE ...	SATISFACTION ...
0 = of no importance	0 = does not apply
1 = somewhat important	1 = very dissatisfied
2 = moderately important	2 = dissatisfied
3 = very important	3 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
4 = one of the most important	4 = satisfied
	5 = very satisfied

65. Adequacy of trash and garbage collection	_____	_____
66. Getting away from military atmosphere while at your residence	_____	_____
67. Having other military members in your neighborhood	_____	_____
68. General security of your possessions and personal safety in your neighborhood	_____	_____
69. Having playgrounds near your residence	_____	_____
70. Availability of good schools	_____	_____
71. Availability of day-care facilities	_____	_____
72. Adequacy of community facilities like laundries, recreation facilities, stores	_____	_____
73. Adequacy of community groups like clubs and church groups	_____	_____
74. Convenience to your place of work	_____	_____
75. Convenience to civilian stores and shopping centers	_____	_____
76. Appearance of your residence	_____	_____
77. Arrangement of rooms inside your residence	_____	_____
78. Cost of utilities used	_____	_____
79. Adequacy of heating system	_____	_____
80. Adequacy of the cooling system	_____	_____
81. Availability of washer/dryer hook-ups	_____	_____
82. Dishwasher provided in your residence	_____	_____

IMPORTANCE ...	SATISFACTION ...
0 = of no importance	0 = does not apply
1 = somewhat important	1 = very dissatisfied
2 = moderately important	2 = dissatisfied
3 = very important	3 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
4 = one of the most important	4 = satisfied
	5 = very satisfied

83. Garbage disposal provided in residence	_____	_____
84. Adequacy of storage space	_____	_____
85. Structural condition of the residence	_____	_____
86. Having separate bedrooms for each child, regardless of their sex or age	_____	_____
87. Amount of indoor living space	_____	_____
88. Amount of outdoor living space for your family activities	_____	_____
89. The amount of privacy you have	_____	_____
90. Having a fenced-in yard	_____	_____
91. Having a garage or carport	_____	_____
92. General appearance of your neighborhood	_____	_____
93. Availability of mass transportation	_____	_____
94. Being able to keep a pet	_____	_____
95. Having the freedom to paint, wallpaper, or make other similar minor changes to your residence	_____	_____
96. Limits on the number of dogs/cats that any one family may keep	_____ (II: 53-79)	_____ (III: 6)
97. Adequacy of pest control (termites, cockroaches, rats)	_____	_____
98. Running a business out of the home (day care, Amway)	_____	_____
99. Adequacy of kitchen cupboard space	_____	_____

Below are several proposals which could affect military housing assignments. Indicate whether you FAVOR or OPPOSE each proposal using the following answers.

1 = strongly oppose
2 = oppose
3 = neither oppose nor favor
4 = favor
5 = strongly favor
6 = I don't know

- _____ 100. Extend eligibility for military family housing to all service members with dependents, regardless of paygrade.
- _____ 101. Assign military housing solely on the basis of bedroom requirements, regardless of rank
- _____ 102. Maintain existing assignment procedures for military family housing.
- _____ 103. Offer all families (E-1 and up) a choice of military housing units at the same prices as similar quality civilian housing with rent to be paid from part or all of their housing allowance (and out-of-pocket, if necessary).
- _____ 104. Construct new, possibly smaller, military family housing units specifically for personnel in paygrades E-1 to E-3.
- _____ 105. When both husband and wife are active duty military members, have only one forfeit BAQ for military family housing.
- _____ 106. Continue present policy of designating separate housing areas for officer and enlisted personnel.
- _____ 107. Extend eligibility for military family housing to paygrades E-1 to E-3, even if time on the waiting list for housing increases for everyone.
- _____ 108. Construct additional housing for personnel in paygrades E-1 to E-3 on a priority basis (delaying construction of all other military family housing).

*

*

*

- _____ 109. If housing eligibility were extended to paygrades E-1 to E-3, what kind of effect would this have on the service member's plans to stay in the military?

- a. very positive effect
- b. positive effect
- c. no effect one way or the other
- d. negative effect
- e. very negative effect
- f. I don't know

- _____ 110. Is the service member presently drawing VHA (Variable Housing Allowance)?

- a. yes
- b. no, service member lives in military family housing
- c. no, service member lives in a geographical location that doesn't receive VHA
- d. I don't know

VHA has been paid to military personnel residing in high cost geographical areas in CONUS for over one year. Read the following statements and indicate whether or not receiving VHA has affected your present housing situation. Use the following answers for items 111 through 120.

0 = does not apply
1 = yes
2 = no
3 = I don't know

PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF VHA, THE SERVICE MEMBER AND/OR DEPENDENTS ...

- _____ 111. Moved to increase the size of the family's living space.
- _____ 112. Relocated closer to the service member's place of work.
- _____ 113. Have more money available for non-housing items.
- _____ 114. Have more places the family can afford to live.
- _____ 115. Plan to live in local civilian community, instead of military family housing, at the service member's next duty station.
- _____ 116. Have been able to have dependents accompany service member at his/her current duty station.
- _____ 117. Plan to buy housing at present duty location.
- _____ 118. Plan to buy housing at future duty location.
- _____ 119. Have removed the family's name from the military family housing waiting list.
- _____ 120. Would like to live in the local civilian community if released from mandatory military family housing.

Choose from the following answers to describe your opinion on items 121 through 123.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = neither disagree nor agree
4 = agree
5 = strongly agree
6 = I don't know

PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF VHA ...

- _____ 121. The military has become more attractive as a career for the service member.
- _____ 122. The service member is better able to afford housing that is appropriate for his/her family's needs.
- _____ 123. The service member is more willing to relocate to high cost areas (like San Diego, CA or Washington, D.C.) because the VHA allotment probably offsets the higher housing costs.

*

*

*

- _____ 124. In your opinion, should VHA include the service member's commuting costs?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
 - c. I don't know

- _____ 125. To the best of your knowledge, which of the following is the reason for VHA payments?
- a. help pay for housing rental costs only
 - b. help pay for buying a home only
 - c. help pay for either rental or buying costs
 - d. I don't know
- _____ 126. Has the service member and/or the dependents ever lived in a mobile home for at least 6 months?
- a. yes
 - b. no
 - c. I don't know

Given the choice of living on-base in a government-owned, double-wide mobile home or other types of housing listed below, which would you prefer? Look at each type of housing paired with a mobile home and choose the one you would prefer if given that particular choice. Select which you would prefer the most, even if you dislike both choices.

FROM THIS PAIR I MOST PREFER . . .

- _____ 127. a. on-base military single family housing
b. on-base mobile home
- _____ 128. a. off-base military single family housing
b. on-base mobile home
- _____ 129. a. on-base military duplex housing
b. on-base mobile home
- _____ 130. a. off-base military duplex housing
b. on-base mobile home
- _____ 131. a. on-base military apartment-type housing
b. on-base mobile home
- _____ 132. a. off-base military apartment-type housing
b. on-base mobile home
- _____ 133. a. single family civilian rental housing
b. on-base mobile home
- _____ 134. a. apartment-type civilian rental housing
b. on-base mobile home
- _____ 135. a. duplex civilian rental housing
b. on-base mobile home
- _____ 136. a. buying my own duplex housing
b. on-base mobile home
- _____ 137. a. buying my own single family housing
b. on-base mobile home
- _____ 138. a. buying my own apartment-type housing
b. on-base mobile home

—IMPORTANT—

If the residence where the service member's dependents live is MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING, please complete the rest of the questionnaire.

If not, check here . You are now finished with the survey. If you would like to make any comments, please turn to the last page of the questionnaire. Thank you for your participation.

- _____ 139. Was the service member assigned to military family housing on a mandatory basis?
- a. yes
 - b. no
 - c. I don't know
- _____ 140. How is your military family housing officially classified?
- a. substandard → Continue with Question 141.
 - b. adequate } Go to Question 142.
 - c. I don't know }
- _____ 141. What percentage of the service member's BAQ is being forfeited for his/her family housing?
- a. 25% or less
 - b. 26% - 50%
 - c. 51% - 75%
 - d. 76% - 99%
 - e. 100%
- _____ 142. Who usually does the major housing maintenance and repairs at your present housing site?
- a. station labor (for example, Public Works, Facilities Engineer, Civil Engineer)
 - b. private contractors
 - c. I don't know
- _____ 143. What is your opinion of the "self help" maintenance program at your present housing site?
- a. not applicable — there is no such program
 - b. very satisfied
 - c. satisfied
 - d. neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
 - e. dissatisfied
 - f. very dissatisfied
- _____ 144. What improvement would you most like to see in your "self-help" maintenance program? (Choose only one answer.)
- a. not applicable — there is no such program
 - b. none, the self-help program is okay as it is
 - c. have more kinds of supplies on hand
 - d. increase the number of repairs we can do ourselves
 - e. make it easier for us to get supplies (for example, expand hours)
 - f. training sessions each season covering important self-help tasks
 - g. other (please specify) _____
 - h. no opinion
- _____ 145. What is your opinion of the enforcement of rules and regulations in your military family housing community?
- a. rules and regulations are not enforced strictly enough
 - b. rules and regulations are correctly enforced
 - c. rules and regulations are too strictly enforced
 - d. no opinion

- _____ 146. What is your opinion of the number of rules and regulations in your military family housing community?
- a. there are not enough rules and regulations
 - b. the number of rules and regulations is about right
 - c. there are too many rules and regulations
 - d. no opinion
- _____ 147. In your opinion, which one of the following rules or regulations is the least enforced by your housing administration office?
- a. pet control (supervision and care)
 - b. lawn and grounds maintenance
 - c. excessive noise
 - d. unauthorized guests
 - e. unauthorized changes made to residence by occupant
 - f. vehicle and/or parking violations
 - g. child supervision
 - h. other (please specify) _____
 - i. I don't know
- _____ 148. In your opinion, which one of the following rules and regulations is most frequently broken by occupants of military family housing?
- a. pet control (supervision and care)
 - b. lawn and grounds maintenance
 - c. excessive noise
 - d. unauthorized guests
 - e. unauthorized changes made to residence by occupant
 - f. vehicle and/or parking violations
 - g. child supervision
 - h. other (please specify) _____
 - i. I don't know
- _____ 149. What agency is primarily responsible for law enforcement and police protection at your housing site?
- a. military police or shore patrol
 - b. local city police department
 - c. military police or shore patrol and city police department
 - d. contract security
 - e. I don't know
- _____ 150. Considering the amount of money you would receive as a housing allowance (BAQ & VHA) what is your opinion of your military family housing in comparison to the kind of housing you think you could afford in the nearby civilian community?
- a. My military family housing is better than housing I could afford in the civilian community.
 - b. There is no real difference between my military family housing and what I could afford in the civilian community.
 - c. Civilian housing that I could afford would be better than my military family housing.
 - d. I don't know

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF THE FOLLOWING MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING OFFICE SERVICES?

- 0 = no experience
- 1 = very dissatisfied
- 2 = dissatisfied
- 3 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
- 4 = satisfied
- 5 = very satisfied
- 6 = I don't know

- _____ 151. Assistance in obtaining government housing.
- _____ 152. Orientation to your government quarters (for example, explaining the operation of major appliances and your responsibilities as an occupant).
- _____ 153. General helpfulness on problems.
- _____ 154. Help in demonstrating and/or suggesting energy conservation procedures.

Like all housing, military family housing needs periodic repairs and upkeep. Listed below are several examples of typical upkeep. Indicate who you feel should be responsible for each item using the answers provided.

THIS UPKEEP SHOULD BE . . .

- 1 = the responsibility of Housing Management
- 2 = equal responsibility of Housing Management & Occupant
- 3 = responsibility of the Occupant
- 4 = no opinion

- _____ 155. Doing minor repairs and maintenance (fixing leaky faucets, unclogging drain pipes).
- _____ 156. Landscaping around the residence (planting flowers and bushes).
- _____ 157. Mowing the lawn.
- _____ 158. Thoroughly cleaning the residence before a new occupant moves in.
- _____ 159. Painting the inside of the residence.
- _____ 160. Painting the outside of the residence.

You are now finished with the survey. If you would like to make any comments, please turn to the last page of the questionnaire.
Thank you for your participation.

If you would like to make any additional comments or suggestions, please feel free to do so on this page of the survey.

COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING SERVICE PROVIDED BY LOCAL MILITARY HOUSING OFFICE.

COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING POLICY

COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING YOUR HOUSING ITSELF

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS

Thank you for your participation.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering (Research and Advanced Technology)
Military Assistant for Training and Personnel Technology (ODUSD(R&AT))
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)
Director of Manpower Analysis (ODASN(M))
Chief of Naval Operations (OP-01), (OP-115) (2), (OP-987H)
Chief of Naval Material (NMAT 05)
Chief of Naval Research (Code 270)
Commandant of the Marine Corps (016)
Commandant of the Marine Corps, Headquarters Marine Corps (Code LFF-3)
Commander in Chief U.S. Atlantic Fleet
Commander in Chief U.S. Pacific Fleet
Commander Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Commander Naval Military Personnel Command (NMPC-013C)
Superintendent, Naval Postgraduate School
Commander, U.S. Army Soldier Support Center, Fort Benjamin Harrison (Human Dimensions Division)
Commander, Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Alexandria (PERI-ASL)
Director, Systems Research Laboratory, Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Alexandria (PERI-SZ)
Commander, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Brooks Air Force Base (Scientific and Technical Information Office)
Commander, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Williams Air Force Base (AFHRL/OT)
Commander, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (AFHRL/LR)
Commandant Coast Guard Headquarters
Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Research and Development Center, Avery Point
Army Housing Management Office, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Headquarters U.S. Army, Washington, DC
Headquarters, USAF/LEE, Washington, DC
National Security Agency/CSS (ATTN: L092)
Defense Logistics Agency (DLA-W1)
Defense Mapping Agency (DMA-FL), Naval Observatory
Defense Intelligence Agency, Logistics Support Division (DIA AT-7)
Defense Technical Information Center (DDA) (12)

U209741