



AIR WAR COLLEGE (12)

RESEARCH REPORT

No. AU-AWC-86-217

AD-A177 653

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, REDUCE
PCS COSTS AND FAMILY TURMOIL

By LT COL ROBERT H. UPCHRUCH, USA

DTIC
ELECTE
MAR 13 1987
S D

DTIC FILE COPY

AIR UNIVERSITY
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA

87 3 13 044

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC
RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION
UNLIMITED

**Best
Available
Copy**

**AIR WAR COLLEGE
AIR UNIVERSITY**

**PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT -- REDUCE
PCS COSTS AND FAMILY TURMOIL**

**by
Robert H. Upchurch
Lieutenant Colonel, USA**

**A RESEARCH REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
IN
FULFILLMENT OF THE RESEARCH
REQUIREMENT**

Research Advisor: Colonel Thomas F. Seebode

MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA

JANUARY 1986

DISCLAIMER-ABSTAINER

This research report represents the views of the author and does not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Air War College or the Department of the Air Force.

This document is the property of the United States government and is not to be reproduced in whole or in part without permission of the Commandant, Air War College, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama 36112.

A copy of this document with a different title page has also been submitted by the Author to the Faculty of the Graduate Division, Troy State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Science Degree in Personnel Management.



Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution /	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	23

AIR WAR COLLEGE RESEARCH REPORT ABSTRACT

TITLE: Personnel Management--Reduce PCS Costs and Family Turmoil

AUTHOR: Robert H. Upchurch, Lieutenant Colonel, US Army

→The Department of Defense (DOD) and the military services are continually seeking methods to reduce Permanent Change of Station (PCS) costs, which are escalating. The thesis of this research is: Designation of future assignment locations for married officers will reduce PCS costs and family turmoil. When an officer is reassigned on PCS orders for a short period (one year or less) with a known end date, assignment officers should be able to project the next assignment location for many of these officers. Current officer personnel assignment policies do not routinely allow for a home-basing or follow-on assignment for intra-Continental United States (CONUS) PCS moves. Some officers could be returned to their previous location (home-basing) while others could be given their future (follow-on assignment) base location. This would allow that officer to make the best decision concerning his family's move and save the government a significant amount of PCS funds at the same time. In addition to a literature review, a survey questionnaire was administered to 293 Air Force officers and 30 Army officers who were students in the United States Air Force (USAF), Air Command and Staff College (ACSC), Class of 1986. The results of this questionnaire indicated that many officers would have taken advantage of the proposed programs resulting in significant savings for the government (in one proposal, potential savings of nearly \$1.5 million for the sample surveyed). Most officers who indicated they would not use any of the proposed programs consider them to result in an unnecessary separation from their family. Other officers indicated that trauma, instability, psychological and emotional problems, disruption and general turmoil, all in varying degrees, are characteristics of each PCS move. Understanding this, Personnel Managers can save PCS funds by informing the officer of future assignments when possible. Moreover, a reduction of PCS moves by the proposed methods would have a corresponding reduction in family turmoil and stress. A major conclusion of the research is that the thesis is accurate and the need exists to implement home-basing and follow-on assignment programs for intra-CONUS moves of short duration. Also, it concluded that assignments as a result of these programs must be guaranteed to the officer so he will not have to suffer the consequences of changed or cancelled orders. The research supported the recommendation that these cost saving programs should be adopted and implemented by all services and all possible DOD organizations. Further, that each service apply the thesis to all intra-CONUS assignments of one year or less duration and determine the feasibility of applying the thesis to enlisted personnel assignments.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Lieutenant Colonel Robert H. Upchurch currently has 20 years active military service and was promoted to Lieutenant Colonel on 14 October 1980. In 1964 he graduated from North Carolina State University with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Mathematics. As a Distinguished Military Graduate in ROTC, he was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the Regular Army. His assignments include: Launcher Platoon Leader, NIKE HERCULES Air Defense Artillery (ADA) Battery; Commander, Basic Combat Training Company; Commander, HAWK ADA Battery; Commander, NIKE HERCULES ADA Battery; Operations Officer, HAWK ADA Battalion; Executive Officer, HAWK ADA Battalion; Area Commander, US Army Recruiting Command; Brigade Intelligence Officer, 101st Airborne Division in South Vietnam; ADA Instructor and Chief, Artillery Division, US Army Infantry School; Chief of Plans for the Rapid Deployment Force-Army (RDF-A) at XVIII Airborne Corps; Commander of a 900 soldier, 1st HAWK ADA Battalion in Germany; and Chief, Current Operations Division, Joint Operations Directorate, United States European Command. His military schooling includes Airborne School, Ranger School, Air Defense Artillery Officer Basic and Advanced Courses, and the US Army Command and General Staff College. LTC Upchurch also has a Master of Military Art and Science Degree from the Command and General Staff College, where his research thesis was titled "Some Causes of Conflicting Quality and Performance Standards of US Army Enlistees 1973-1975." His awards and decorations include the Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters, Air Medal, Army Commendation Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters, Army Achievement Medal, Combat Infantryman Badge, Airborne Wings, and Ranger Tab. LTC Upchurch is currently a student in the Air War College, Class of 1986.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
Title Page.....	i
Disclaimer-Abstainer.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Biographical Sketch	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vii
 I INTRODUCTION	
Background	1
Thesis Statement and the Problem	1
Purpose of the Research	2
Scope and Focus.....	2
Assumptions	2
Significance	3
Remaining Chapters	3
Summary	4
 II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	
Overview	5
Reduce PCS Moves and Costs	5
Reduce Family Turmoil	6
Summary.....	7
 III RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES	
Overview	8
The Population and Sample	8
Questionnaire	9
Subjects for the Pretest	9
Summary	10

CHAPTER		PAGE
IV	FINDINGS	
	Overview	11
	Findings - Literature	11
	Findings - USAF Respondents to Questionnaire	11
	Findings - US Army Respondents to Questionnaire	16
	Discussion	19
	Summary	20
V	SUMMARY	
	Overview	21
	Findings	21
	Conclusions	23
	Recommendations	23
APPENDIX		
A	Glossary	25
B	Questionnaire	26
C	PCS Costs and Reimbursements	34
D	Subjective Responses to Question 12	36
E	Subjective Responses to Question 13	38
F	Subjective Responses to Question 14	40
G	Subjective Responses to Question 15	46
H	Subjective Responses to Question 21	49
I	Subjective Responses to Question 22	52
J	Miscellaneous Subjective Comments	56
K	Data From Objective Questions	61
L	Cumulative Results of Objective Questions	68
M	Subjective Responses - US Army Respondents	75
N	Potential PCS Cost Savings by USAF and USA Students, ACSC	
	Class of 1986 by Question	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY		83

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
K-1	Data From Objective Questions For AF Pilots.....	60
K-2	Data From Objective Questions For AF Navigators.....	62
K-3	Data From Objective Questions For AF Missile Officers.....	63
K-4	Data From Objective Questions For AF Professional Officers.....	63
K-5	Data From Objective Questions For Non-rated AF Officers.....	64
K-6	Data From Objective Questions For US Army Officers.....	66
K-7	Cumulative Data From Objective Questions	67
N-1	Potential PCS Cost Savings by USAF and USA Students, ACSC Class of 1986 by Question.....	82

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

The Department of Defense (DOD) and the military services are continually seeking methods to reduce Permanent Change of Station (PCS) costs. This has been prompted by budget restraints and requirements to tighten the DOD financial responsibilities and fiscal policies. The Congressional mandate for overcoming the federal deficit by 1991, known as the Gramm-Rudman legislation, was passed by Congress and signed by the President in mid-December 1985. While the full ramifications of this legislation are not known, it is a fact that the next five years will be some "lean" years for all the services and DOD. This requires implementation of as many money-saving ideas as possible. Also, the need to reduce family turmoil has surfaced in the last few years as one way to retain good officers and reduce officer and family stress. Reducing PCS cost and family turmoil are positive results of good personnel management.

Thesis Statement and the Problem:

The thesis of this research is: Designation of future assignment locations for married officers will reduce Permanent Change of Station costs and family turmoil. This thesis will be of interest to those who manage officer assignments and those with high level fiscal responsibilities. This policy could possibly apply to assignments for enlisted personnel. While this potential application will not be developed in this paper, it may be determined later to be an area of potential savings of greater magnitude than the thesis of this research.

When an officer is reassigned on PCS orders for a short period (one year or less) with a known end date, assignment officers should be able to project the next assignment location for many of these officers. Current officer personnel assignment policies do not routinely allow for a home-basing or follow-on assignment for intra-Continental United States (CONUS) PCS moves. Some officers could be returned to their previous location (home-basing) while others could be given their future (follow-on assignment) base location. This would allow that officer to make the best decision concerning his family's move and save the government a significant amount of PCS funds at the same time.

Under the thesis proposal, the officer has three readily apparent options. One, he could possibly leave his family in their current location. This could potentially save two PCS moves, if the officer was returned to that same base--not necessarily to the same unit or job. Two, he could move his family directly to his follow-on assignment location if applicable. This would save one PCS move. And three, he could move his family with him to his PCS location--knowing he will have to move again in the near future. This is currently the most selected option and requires two PCS moves--except for the very small percentage of officers who remain assigned to Maxwell Air Force Base (AFB).

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research is to determine if changes in personnel management and assignment policies would reduce PCS costs and family turmoil associated with PCS moves. Financial constraints continue to be applied to all DOD organizations. Every avenue of possible cost reductions and savings must be explored. Management at all levels, in all programs must be scrutinized and this aptly applies to personnel management. Costs related to personnel are a significant part of the DOD budget. Any savings as a result of better management can be reallocated dollar-for-dollar to other critical defense programs.

Scope and Focus

From the literature search, it appears that this problem pervades all services and probably applies to some civilian moves within DOD. The scope of this research effort will be limited and will specifically focus on the thoughts, perceptions, and decisions of the married, American officers who are students in the United States Air Force (USAF) Air Command and Staff College (ACSC), class of 1986. ACSC is approximately ten months long with nearly every student moving (PCS) into and out of the Maxwell AFB, Alabama area at the beginning and end of the school year, respectively.

Assumptions

In the absence of any specific data or more accurate information, it costs the government \$5,660 for each PCS move of an Air Force Major and \$5,160 for an Army Major. [This figure was derived as the cost to move each respondent's family to the Maxwell AFB area and will be used later in the calculations of PCS costs or cost savings. This amount is considered to be a representative PCS cost for the government for the purposes of analysis in this research.]

Significance

The costs associated with PCS moves continue to increase both for the government and the service member. "The overall costs of the PCS programs quadrupled from 1971 to 1981 . . ." (9:8). "The services spent \$2.5 billion on PCS (permanent change of station) moves in fiscal year 1982" (6:45) and about \$3 billion in 1984 with the number of PCS moves declining (9:8). The median moving expense in 1983 for officers was \$3,222. While the government paid \$803 of this, the officer's out-of-pocket cost was \$2,419 or an increase of 35 percent from the median unreimbursed expense for officers in 1982 (8:26). As a result of the Air Force 1984 PCS Cost Survey, the median out-of-pocket costs for senior officers (O4-O6) was \$3,640 with the government reimbursing only \$910, leaving the officer with \$2,730 in expenses (14). Not only is it costing the government more for PCS moves, the cost to the officer continues to rise also.

In the past few years, the news media and DOD publications have reported that the highest levels of our government, DOD, and services have broken new ground for the support of the military family. The Army had the "Year of the Family" in 1984. Air Force Secretary Orr (recently retired) and Air Force Chief of Staff Gabriel made a joint statement when they appeared before the 98th Congress on Defense Manpower Issues that indicated "People are the Priority" (7:104). The Navy and Marines also have programs with emphasis on the military family. Lawrence J. Korb, Assistant Secretary of Defense stated, "People must remain our highest priority" (3:20). Mr Korb further stated, "To ensure that we maintain our momentum in this area, I have established an office of family policy reporting directly to me" (3:25). A thread of emphasis in all these programs dealt with reduction of family (and service member) stress and turmoil. Some of these programs continue today and are considered a significant part of the personnel management process.

Remaining Chapters

In the following chapter, a review of the literature relating to the thesis will be summarized. Chapter 3 will provide research design and procedures to include a general description of the population and the questionnaire used in the survey. The findings will be presented in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 will provide the summary to include conclusions and recommendations.

Summary

The importance of reducing PCS costs cannot be over-emphasized. It will be an integral part of DOD's efforts to limit future spending to share in the government's goal of a balanced budget by 1991. Another stated goal of all the services is to reduce family turmoil and stress. Both of these goals can become a reality through better personnel management relative to the assignment process. A review of the literature relating to these areas of concern will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Overview

Literature that covers the short-duration PCS part of this thesis is scarce. Most literature relates to routine PCS reassignment policies associated with tour lengths and replacements. The majority of literature in general addresses the problem as two separate areas of interest--one, reduce PCS moves to reduce costs and, two, family turmoil resulting from PCS moves. Reducing family turmoil, and the accompanying problems such as stress, teenage rebellion, emotional upheaval is a natural, positive result of reducing the frequency a family must move. This chapter will look at the literature that addresses the areas separately and where possible at the end, pull these two areas into closer perspective with each other.

Reduce PCS Moves and Costs

A DOD study group in late 1983, found that, "Sixty percent of 1.3 million moves this fiscal year are the result of accessions, separations or training and therefore are not influenced directly by tour lengths or assignment policies" (9:8). Moves associated with accessions and separations generally cannot be manipulated while PCS moves related to officer training can be adjusted. This is, an officer's current assignment could be curtailed or extended based on the needs of the service and the individual officer.

The PCS moves associated with this thesis are those PCS moves of one year or less duration. Most of these type PCS moves have a known end date prior to the officer's departure from his previous duty station. Many of these moves are for the purposes of training or attending a school, such as the Air Command and Staff College (ACSC), Command and General Staff College (CGSC), or Armed Forces Staff College (AFSC). There are numerous other military schools that fall within the scope of this thesis such as the Army's officer advanced courses. While "Personnel stability is a fundamental principle of all DOD personnel management policies" (12:7), the short duration PCS to attend school or a training course is an "exception" and does not necessarily fall

under the stipulations of a routine PCS reassignment. This is especially true when school attendance results from the selection board process and officers PCS with minimum time on station.

Current DOD policies concerning home-basing and follow-on assignments as pertains to unaccompanied hardship overseas tours are similar to the proposed thesis of this research. These terms are defined in the DOD directive on military personnel assignment and are as follows:

Home-basing Policy: All Military Services shall, whenever feasible, have a home-basing policy under which service members assigned to unaccompanied hardship overseas tours or Service designated sea duty shall be returned to the location of their previous CONUS assignment (10:4).

Follow-on assignment policy: For those service members assigned to unaccompanied hardship overseas tours and not participating in the home-basing program, the Military Services shall, whenever practicable, provide notification of follow-on assignments before the service members depart for a hardship tour (10:4).

Since implementation of these two policies in 1977, DOD has saved scarce PCS funds and has reduce some family moves previously required by a short tour assignment. While DOD looks for new ways to reduce PCS costs, inflation and moving expenses continue to increase. Again, DOD studies appear to have addressed the normal PCS problems and have not looked at the PCS of short duration.

Reduce Family Turmoil

Family turmoil within the military services is caused by many different reasons. However, the greatest reason is a PCS move with all its attendant spinoffs. "And there's definitely no way to eliminate the personal turmoil of a move" (6:57). Another article put it this way. "Uprooting a home is never easy, regardless of how many times a person has awakened to the cold gray dawn of 'P-Day'--Packing Day. The emotional toll of stepping off into the unknown is great. The hundreds of details that need attention are physically exhausting" (6:57).

The turmoil cause by PCS moves is cyclic for the military family. They make friends, the children adjust (hopefully) to new schools, become adapted to a community way of life, etc.--all which will change in a year or two and the cycle begins all over again. "Moving becomes rougher on children as they get older" (4:31). A quote heard from many teenagers is "I had an especially hard time in high school. I wanted to graduate with the same class I started with. I didn't want to pick up and move" (4:31). Following frequent moves, "Children can eventually choose to turn away from all close relationships and become emotionally numb" (13:20).

PCS moves cause reactions not typical of the people involved. Even the smallest problem becomes magnified by the stresses of a move. "Any behavior is possible, up to and including suicide" (1:5). Because of this possibility, any reduction in the frequency of family moves will certainly reduce turmoil and possibly a catastrophic situation for some families.

"A great deal of the stress of moving is related to money. Paying out-of-pocket expenses and travel costs not covered by moving allowances . . . all add up to financial frustration" (1:5-6). In an Air Force survey conducted in 1984, "Almost 60 percent of the respondents said they had to borrow money from lending institutions or tap their own savings to finance the government-ordered move" (8:1). "Service members are not only at a distinct financial disadvantage, but the financial penalties are repetitive due to the frequency of PCS moves over the course of a career" (8:25). Some PCS costs and reimbursements determined by a 1984 survey are provided in Appendix C.

Summary

While most of the literature addresses PCS costs and family turmoil as separate areas, the latter would certainly be reduced if the PCS frequency was reduced. It appears that the more PCS moves a family experiences, the harder it becomes to adjust, especially for the family with children. The considerations for children and their significance in PCS decisions is a specific question on the questionnaire developed for input to this research. This will be covered in the next chapters along with other concerns relating to PCS moves. The next chapter will incorporate these concerns into the research design and procedures.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Overview

In the previous chapter, the Department of Defense (DOD) problems with increasing Permanent Change of Station (PCS) costs and the impact of PCS moves on family stability were discussed. Following the literature review, a questionnaire was developed (see Appendix B) to gather data concerning the thesis of this research. Following the questionnaire development, a pretest was conducted using ten subjects similar to the population to be surveyed. Minor problems with the questionnaire were corrected prior to final administration.

The Population and Sample

The population for this survey was all the married, American officers who were students in the Air Command and Staff College (ACSC), Class of 1986. Reserve officers on active duty just to attend ACSC were exempted since they were not representative of the fulltime, active duty, married officers who must make a PCS move at periodic intervals. The survey was conducted during the period 12-22 November 1985. The survey was distributed through the student chain of command which reported that the population was 434. Of this, 349 returned the questionnaire which represents 80 percent of the population. Twenty-six of the 349 were not used for the following reasons:

Spouse also in the military (not representative of population).....	13
Legally separated from spouse (not representative of population)	1
Already stationed at Maxwell AFB (No PCS required).....	6
USN and USNR-one each. (Sample too small).....	2
USMC. (Sample too small).....	<u>4</u>
	26

Therefore, the sample total is 323 composed of 293 Air Force officers and 30 Army officers. These totals hereafter will be considered to be 100 percent of the sample. The results for the four

Marines and two Navy officers will not be included since the sample is so small and cannot be considered to be representative.

According to the Evaluation Department, ACSC, the sample represents a confidence level above 99.9 percent and a precision level of better than five percent. This large sample of the population minimizes the risk of inferences while the reliability is well within the parameters expected for surveys.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire administered (See Appendix B) was developed using a combination of multiple choice or closed end questions and some open end questions. Some of the closed end questions also had a space for open end responses which were solicited by the question. Many times it is important for the personnel manager to know "why" an officer selected a particular distractor. This gives the manager a little more insight into the impact of a movement order he prepares. Where possible, the "intensity" question was used to provide a degree of strength in the response. This also will provide the manager with additional information on which to base his decisions.

Since there are officers from other services attending ACSC, a question was included to distinguish those officers, so a separate finding may be made for each service. Questions pertaining to the weight of household goods (HHG) and distance from previous duty stations were included so an approximate cost of shipping HHG can be calculated.

Questions pertaining to the current location of the family and reasons for the decisions concerning their PCS to Maxwell AFB were included. This definitely will impact on the analysis and findings. Also, some "what if" questions were included pertaining to PCS decisions. A question concerning the impact of the considerations for their children was included. As children become older, especially when they get into high school, many family decisions are based on the needs or desires of the children. Since the current home-basing and follow-on assignment programs are important in reducing PCS costs and family turmoil, questions were included to determine the extent of familiarity with the existence of these two programs.

Subjects for the Pretest

Ten married, American students in the Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) were selected at random to participate in this pretest sampling of the total population. The questionnaires were returned on 8 October 1985. One of the subjects was a United States Air Force Reserve (USAFR) officer on active duty only to attend ACSC. Since the thesis was developed

with the career active duty officer in mind, the questionnaire responses by the USAFR officer were not considered appropriate to the context of this study. This is especially true when considering that USAFR officers are not subject to repetitive PCS moves or the family turmoil caused by these PCS moves. All subjects were USAF Majors with an average of 13.2 years of commissioned service. Specialties included three pilots, one navigator and five non-rated.

One pretest subject was married to another active duty officer. The answers on that subject's questionnaire seemed appropriate and "in line" with what was expected. At this point in the research, responses from subjects married to another active duty officer seemed acceptable. However, it was determined after reading the comments from these respondents that their responses were not representative of the population.

Based on the results of the pretest, some word changes and other minor problems were corrected in the questionnaire. Some changes in the cover letter were necessary to eliminate leading, conclusive statements that may have prejudiced some of the respondents. A situation paragraph was deleted as being superfluous once two questions were restructured.

Summary

Selection of the sample size is critical to insure the results of the survey will be accepted as being representative of the population. A significant part of the survey is the development of the questionnaire which is based on the purpose of the survey and the survey plan. The questionnaire must provide the desired information or data on which to base findings and conclusions which will be addressed in the next two chapters.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Overview

In the preceding chapters, the importance of reducing PCS moves and the resulting family turmoil was covered. This chapter will look at the findings and the data and results from the questionnaire discussed in chapter III. The basic data from the objective questions is at Appendix K while the cumulative results of the multiple choice and objective-type questions are at Appendix L in a format similar to that of the questionnaire. The findings for the Air Force will be discussed separately from the findings for the Army to allow easier analysis by the services and other interested personnel. The responses to the open end questions including a selection of the most representative comments are covered in more detail in Appendixes D - J.

Findings - Literature

The literature relative to permanent change of station (PCS) costs revealed a continuing rise in annual costs for the Department of Defense (DOD) and a continuing pressure to reduce these costs in the face of increasing budget constraints. Concurrent with this is an increase in the out-of-pocket expenses the officer must pay each time he makes a PCS move. Excessive moving cost was just one reason that increased the family turmoil with each PCS move. Numerous articles expound on the trauma, instability, psychological problems and general turmoil each PCS move causes.

Findings - USAF Respondents to Questionnaire

The results of the survey questionnaire administered to married, American students in the USAF Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) were certainly enlightening and of significant benefit in addressing the thesis. The cumulative data from the objective questions is contained in Table K-7 (See Appendix B or L for the questions). The basic data, by respondent, to the objective questions is at Appendix K, while the objective results with questions in a format similar to the questionnaire are at Appendix L. The subjective responses to questions 12-15 and 21-22 are in Appendixes D-I, respectively, with some miscellaneous comments in Appendix J. Again, the

sample consisted of 293 Air Force Officers and 30 Army Officers. The Army findings will be discussed separately. Table N-1 provides PCS cost savings by service by question.

Some of the basic information concerning the respondents can be taken from the table (Questions 1, 3, 4, 10). Question 5 provides the breakout by specialty status and question 6 provides the numbers of pilots and navigators who have been on flying status for varying lengths of time.

Question 8 requested the number of miles (to the nearest 100 miles) from the previous assignment location. For those officers coming from overseas, 500 miles were used for those returning from the East (Europe, etc.) and 2500 miles were used for those returning from the West (Japan, Korea, etc.). Table K-7 provides the average for each specialty group. The approximate cost to move the household goods (HHG) was computed for each respondent using the tables (references 2 and 5) provided by military transportation. The cost is listed for each respondent in Appendix K. The approximate cost to move the HHG for all the respondents averaged \$4,750. This added to \$910 per officer for out-of-pocket costs equals \$5,660 which was the approximate, average cost to the government for the PCS move made by each officer to the Maxwell AFB area. This PCS cost figure of \$5,660 will be used for all cost/cost savings figures derived from analysis of the other results.

From question 11, 34 (11.6 percent) families did not accompany their spouse to Maxwell. Question 12 was a follow-on question to 11 and revealed that 32 (10.9 percent) families remained in the area of the spouse's previous assignment. The reasons for this are listed in Appendix D along with some verbatim comments from respondents. For the most part, the reasons related to reducing or eliminating family turmoil and providing the family stability-- children in school, spouse's career, spouse going to school and those with multiple reasons. Some officers stated they would probably get reassigned to their previous base, many hoped to, but none had a guarantee or orders. By these 34 families making the decision not to move to Maxwell, the government had a unrealized PCS savings of approximately \$192,440 (34 times \$5,660). But in the cases of these families, stability was the reason they stayed-- not from anything the Air Force promised them or did for them. The real savings will be realized if they do send most of the 34 officers back to their previous location not requiring the family to move at all. In essence, the government potentially will have saved \$384,880-- on 34 officers that could have been "home-based" under the thesis of this research. This is the minimum saved because if an officer gets PCS orders, he will have to move to his new base and a second officer will have to move to fill

the first officer's position. The government is paying for two moves when there is a possibility that neither one was really necessary.

Question 13 asked, "If your family did not accompany you to the Maxwell/Montgomery area and they did not remain at your previous assignment location, please explain where they went and why." Four respondents answered (See Appendix E for verbatim comments). Only one of these four officers said they had a follow-on assignment to the area where their family moved. Some of these officers have already saved the government a lot of PCS funds with more savings to be realized if the Air Force assigns them to the base near where their family is currently located.

Question 14 asked, "If there had been a change in the personnel assignment system that would have allowed you and your assignment officer/functional manager to agree on a CONUS base/post of your assignment after ACSC (guaranteed), would you have moved your family to that location prior to reporting into ACSC?" Thirteen (4.4 percent) responded "Definitely Yes," 28 (9.6 percent) responded "Probably Yes" and 40 (13.7 percent) responded "Undecided." If the 41 who responded "yes" had been authorized to do that, they would have saved the government 41 PCS moves at the representative cost of \$5,660 each or \$232,060--nearly a quarter of a million dollars. There is a good probability that some of the 40 "Undecided" officers would have accepted this for even greater savings. Following the objective part of question 14, the question asked the respondent to, "Please state the reasons/rationale for your answer." The subjective responses to this are at Appendix F. The negative responses were in the majority with many officers viewing the situation posed by this question as being an unnecessary family separation. In fact, a few officers stated that if they could not have brought their family they would not have attended ACSC. Six said they could not afford the cost of maintaining two households and others said they would have come unaccompanied if they could have gotten a room in the Bachelor Officer Quarters (BOQ). That is a real problem and must be rectified if more officers elect to come to the Air University unaccompanied. Of those that responded "yes," most gave the reasons of reducing family turmoil and providing stability for their children's education.

Question 15, an extension of question 14, asked, "In order to confirm your assignment after ACSC so you could move your family there without a PCS to Maxwell, would you have accepted an assignment location that was not listed in your three choices?" Four (1.4 percent) responded "Definitely Yes," 30 (10.2 percent) responded "Probably Yes" and 58 (19.8 percent) responded "Undecided." It is interesting to note that of the 34 that responded "yes" to this question, 20 did not respond "yes" to question 14 which would result in an additional \$113,200 (20 times \$5,660) in potential savings. Subjective responses to this question are at Appendix G. Like the

responses to question 14, there were more negative than positive responses with the desire for maintaining the family togetherness being the leading reason. There were a large number of "undecided's" that would possibly have taken advantage of this if a policy had been in effect. Even still, with the 41 "yes" responses to question 14 added to the additional 20 "yes" responses for question 15, a potential savings of \$345,260 (61 times \$5,660) may have been realized if the follow-on assignment policy had been in effect.

Question 16 asked, "If you came to ACSC from a CONUS assignment and could return to that same CONUS area after ACSC, would you have left your family there without a PCS for them?" Sixty-one (20.8 percent) officers responded "Definitely Yes," 66 (22.5 percent) responded "Probably Yes" and 47 (16.0 percent) responded "Undecided." This program was the most popular proposal and would have potentially saved the government \$1,437,640 (Two PCS moves for 127 families at \$5,660 per move). Eight officers picked a "yes" response for questions 14 or 15 who did not pick a "yes" response for question 16. So, if both the follow-on and home-basing programs had been effective, the government may have saved at least \$1,482,920 (262 times \$5,660) plus an additional \$820,700 (145 times \$5,660) possible for those that responded "Undecided" for questions 14-16. Some respondents provided unsolicited subjective comments relative to question 16. They are presented in Appendix J.

Question 17 asked, "If you came to ACSC from a CONUS assignment and were told that you would be going on an accompanied overseas long tour after ACSC, would you have left your family at your previous station without making a PCS move for them to Maxwell?" From the normal assignment distribution, some ACSC graduates will be assigned to a overseas long tour. If the assignments could be programmed, then some officers, prior to coming to ACSC, could volunteer for these overseas long tours and agree to leave their family at their previous station without a PCS to the Maxwell area. In the case of this class, 26 (8.9 percent) responded "Definitely Yes," 22 (7.5 percent) responded "Probably Yes" while 26 (8.9 percent) responded "Undecided." This potentially would have saved the government \$271,680 (48 times \$5,660). Two of the 48 had not answered questions 14-16 with a "yes" which would add a little more to the potential savings.

Question 18 asked the same as question 17 but in reference to a short tour. Thirty-six (12.3 percent) responded "Definitely Yes," 52 (17.7 percent) responded "Probably Yes" and 38 (13.0 percent) were "Undecided." This indicates a strong desire to stabilize their families at their previous location rather than PCS them to the Maxwell area for ACSC and then to "who-knows-where" while the sponsor goes on a overseas short tour. This is in accordance with many officers who want to provide stability and cause the least amount of turmoil for their

families. If the 88 respondents would leave their families at their previous location, that would save 88 PCS moves. Plus another possible 88 PCS moves might be saved from Maxwell to a CONUS location of choice prior to the sponsor departing for the short tour. This is a potential savings of \$996,160 (176 times \$5,660). Taking this one step further, the officer on a short tour can be home-based back to the base of his previous CONUS assignment, thusly saving another PCS move. So for a little prior planning for overseas short tour requirements, the Air Force could save three PCS moves for some families.

In managing personnel and making assignments, the responsible officer must be aware of the impact children have on the decisions officers make relative to moving their family. In some of the subjective responses to previous questions, providing stability for children's education or not wanting their children to attend the perceived "substandard" Montgomery area schools was the reason many gave for not bringing their families to the Maxwell AFB area. Question 21 was, "Considerations pertaining to my children impacted on my decisions and answers to the above questions." One hundred, sixty (54.6 percent) responded "Strongly Agree," while another 81 (27.6 percent) responded "Agree." Anytime an assignment officer or personnel manager can do anything for an officer that may go along with this reasoning will certainly improve that officer's and his family's morale and attitude toward the Air Force. Appendix H has some of the subjective comments for this question. Many feel that family separation is not good for the children while others feel that each PCS move is traumatic and a disruption for children, especially teenagers and those in high school.

Question 22 was an open response question that stated, "If there are any other circumstances (not covered in above answers) that would have caused you to not move your family when you came to ACSC, please list below and/or on the back of this page." The reason given by the greatest number of respondents was "not being able to sell their house and the fact that they could not afford two house payments." The next highest number of responses was "to make ACSC shorter." There are some fairly emotional comments relative to these reasons and others in Appendix I. Others dealt with preventing family turmoil and stability for family and children's education.

During discussions with Air Force Officers concerning the thesis of this research and the development of the questionnaire, a general lack of knowledge on the part of these officers relative to the current home-basing and follow-on assignment programs was discovered. Questions 23 and 24 were included in the questionnaire to determine the degree of familiarity with these programs since they impact significantly on PCS costs and cost savings. Question 23 asked, "Are you

familiar with the Air Force Home-Basing Program which states: 'A home-basing assignment provides for the return of the officers to the same CONUS base from which they departed for an overseas short tour?' (AFR 36-20). Only 36 (12.3 percent) responded "Definitely Familiar" while 115 (39.2 percent) responded "Somewhat Familiar." Thirty-four (11.6 percent) responded "Uncertain" and 70 (23.9 percent) responded "Never Heard of the Home-Basing Program."

Question 24 asked, "Are you familiar with the Air Force Follow-on Program which states: 'A follow-on assignment provides for advance determination of the CONUS or overseas long tour base to which an officer will be assigned after completing a short tour?'" (AFR 36-20). Only 44 (15.0 percent) responded "Definitely Familiar" while 137 (46.8 percent) responded "Somewhat Familiar." Forty-two (14.3 percent) responded "Uncertain" and 70 (23.9 percent) responded "Never Heard of the Home-Basing Program." Some subjective comments pertaining to these two programs are in Appendix J. From these negative comments, it appears that this is an area that the Air Force needs to improve.

Findings - US Army Respondents to Questionnaire

Each year, approximately 44 US Army officers are selected to attend the Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) at Maxwell AFB, Alabama located in Montgomery. The ACSC class of 1986 had 30 married USA officers that were respondents to the survey. In Table K-7, reference number "F" is the USA cumulative data from the objective questions (See Appendix B or L for the questions). The basic data, by respondent, to the objective questions is at Appendix K, while the objective results with questions in a format similar to the questionnaire are at Appendix L. The subjective responses to some of the open-end questions are at Appendix M. Table N-1 provides PCS cost savings by service by question.

The basic data for the Army respondents can be obtained from Table K-7 or Appendix L. Question 8 requested the number of miles (to the nearest 100 miles) from the previous assignment location. For those officers coming from overseas, 500 miles were used for those returning from the East (Europe, etc.) and 2500 miles were used for those returning from the West (Japan, Korea, etc.). Table K-7 provides the average for the group. The approximate cost to move the household goods (HHG) was computed for each respondent using the tables (references 2 and 5) provided by military transportation. The cost is listed for each respondent in Appendix K. The approximate cost to move the HHG for all the Army respondents averaged \$4,250. This added to \$910 per officer for out-of-pocket costs equals \$5,160 which was the approximate, average cost to the government for the PCS move made by each Army officer to the Maxwell AFB area.

This PCS cost figure of \$5,160 will be used for all cost/cost savings figures derived from analysis of the other results.

From question 11, three (10.0 percent) families did not accompany their spouse to Maxwell. Question 12 was a follow-on question to 11 and revealed that two of the three families remained in the area of the spouse's previous assignment. The third family remained at the same location they were while the officer was on a short tour and they did not PCS to Maxwell. The reasons for this are listed in Appendix M along with some verbatim comments from respondents. By these three families making the decision not to move to Maxwell, the Army had a unrealized PCS savings of approximately \$15,480 (3 times \$5,160). The real savings will be realized if they do send the two officers back to their previous location and the third to the post near his family's current location--not requiring any of the families to move. In essence, the Army potentially will have saved \$30,960--on three officers that could have been "home-based" under the thesis of this research.

Question 14 asked, "If there had been a change in the personnel assignment system that would have allowed you and your assignment officer/functional manager to agree on a CONUS base/post of your assignment after ACSC (guaranteed), would you have moved your family to that location prior to reporting into ACSC?" Two (6.7 percent) responded "Definitely Yes," five (16.7 percent) responded "Probably Yes" and four (13.3 percent) responded "Undecided." From question 15, an extension of question 14, one additional officer responded "yes" for a total of eight. If the eight who responded "yes" had been authorized to do that, they would have saved the government eight PCS moves at the representative cost of \$5,160 each or \$41,280. Following the objective part of question 14, the question asked the respondent to, "Please state the reasons/rationale for your answer." The subjective responses to this are at Appendix M. The negative responses were in the majority with many officers viewing the situation posed by this question as being an unnecessary family separation. Of those that responded "yes," most gave the reasons of reducing family turmoil and providing stability for their children's education.

Question 16 asked, "If you came to ACSC from a CONUS assignment and could return to that same CONUS area after ACSC, would you have left your family there without a PCS for them?" Twelve (40.0 percent) officers responded "Definitely Yes" and four (13.3 percent) responded "Probably Yes". This program was the most popular proposal with the Army respondents and would have potentially saved the Army \$82,560 (16 times \$5,160).

Question 17 asked, "If you came to ACSC from a CONUS assignment and were told that you would be going on an accompanied overseas long tour after ACSC, would you have left your family at your previous station without making a PCS move for them to Maxwell?" Some ACSC level

graduates will be assigned to a overseas long tour. If the assignments could be programmed, then some officers could volunteer for them and agree to leave their family at their previous station without a PCS to the Maxwell area. From the 30 Army respondents, four (13.3 percent) responded "Definitely Yes" and two (6.7 percent) responded "Probably Yes". This potentially would have saved the government \$30,960 (6 times \$5,160).

Question 18 asked the same as question 17 but in reference to a short tour. Three (10.0 percent) responded "Definitely Yes," eleven (36.7 percent) responded "Probably Yes" and five (16.7 percent) were "Uncecided." This indicates a strong desire by the Army officers to stabilize their families at their previous location rather than PCS them to the Maxwell area for ACSC and then move again prior to going on a short tour. If the 14 respondents would leave their families at their previous location, that would save 14 PCS moves. Plus another possible 14 PCS moves might be saved from Maxwell to a CONUS location of choice prior to the sponsor departing for the short tour. This is a potential savings of \$123,840 (28 times \$5,160). Taking this one step further, the officer on a short tour can be home-based back to the base of his previous CONUS assignment, thusly saving another PCS move. So for a little prior planning for overseas short tour requirements, the Army could save three PCS moves for some families.

The Army responses to questions 21 and 22 were similar in nature to those of the Air Force respondents. The Army subjective comments are at Appendix M. Questions 23 and 24 pertained specifically to the Air Force.

Question 25 was included in the questionnaire to determine the degree of familiarity by the Army respondents with the Army's home-basing and follow-on assignment programs. This is important since they impact significantly on PCS costs and cost savings. Question 25 asked, "For Officers from services other than USAF. Does your service have programs similar to the two outlined in items 23 and 24 above? If 'Yes', please outline details on the back of this page."

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Uncertain

Only nine (30.0 percent) indicated they knew the Army had such programs but most could not provide any details. Eight (26.7 percent) indicated the Army does not have these programs while 13 (43.3 percent) were uncertain. As a result of the high percentage (70 percent) that indicated the Army did not have these programs or they were uncertain, it appears that this is an area that the Army needs to improve.

Discussion

Air Force pilots and navigators who have not met the maximum gate normally will seek rated assignments at least until they achieve the highest gate possible. Therefore, personnel managers and assignment officers must be aware of the needs of these officers and assign them to a base where they can get rated assignments. Follow-on or home-basing assignments could be "routine" for these officers.

There apparently is a "perceived policy" that back-to-back or repeat assignments at the same base are not career enhancing or career progression and must be avoided. This author could not find any substantiation that this is an official policy of the Air Force. It may have started out with avoid returning to the same job/position at the same base which is different than returning to the same base and getting a different job of increasing responsibility or one commensurate with the officer's rank. This "perceived policy" is certainly counter-productive to the home-basing and follow-on assignment programs and is probably costing the Air Force and government a significant amount of PCS dollars. If no one wants to return to a base, then there is essentially no effective home-basing or follow-on assignment programs. There are normally multiple channels and units for progression through positions of increasing authority and responsibility, as one increases in rank, at the same base. There are some bases with elements of more than one MACOM at the same base and some officers can even change commands possibly without changing bases. So, returning to the same base certainly should not inhibit career progression.

From the questionnaire, some officers do not trust personnel managers or assignment officers--the system--and are not confident that if they get orders for a follow-on or home-based assignment, that the orders will not be changed and they will suffer the consequences caused by this change. Many officers would not take advantage of these programs because they could lose a lot of money if their orders were changed after they had made a commitment in the future assignment location. These assignments must be guaranteed to the officer so he can buy a house if he desires. Cost savings programs such as these must have the highest levels of support and the system must demonstrate that its guarantees are just that. The orders might contain a statement to the effect that they cannot be cancelled without written authorization by the officer.

The implementation of these programs will impact on base housing. New rules or policies may be required to allow these cost saving programs to function properly. Families, less sponsor, may need to stay in government quarters awaiting the return of the "home-based" sponsor. Also, if an officer moves his family to a designated follow-on base location, if quarters are available, housing personnel should allow that officer's family to move into government quarters even though the sponsor will not live there for a period of time. This may even improve quarters utilization rates.

If these programs are implemented, more BOQ's will be needed which will enhance the chances of the programs' success. Most military personnel cannot afford to maintain two households. If they must rent a house or apartment off base while maintaining quarters for their family elsewhere, it may become cost-prohibitive for the officer who will not be able to take advantage of the program. Some officers on the survey responded that they would have come to ACSC unaccompanied if they could have gotten a BOQ--they could not afford it otherwise. In these situations, the government ends up moving the officer's family as before and no PCS funds have been saved. The government might need to build some more BOQ's to realize cost savings later.

The home-basing concept of this research is for intra-CONUS PCS moves. A tangent is to "home-base" an officer in Europe--especially if the officer has a skill for which there is a greater requirement in Europe than in CONUS. That would be a considerable savings for PCS moves overseas. It would eventually save two PCS moves. There are probably not too many officers that would do this but personnel managers must be constantly seeking new ways to save critical defense funds.

As can be seen from the results of the questionnaire, only a small percentage (which is significant, monetarily) of officers will take advantage of these programs and save the government PCS funds. Another aspect is that prior notification of future assignments allows the officer to make more intelligent decisions and allows him time to weigh options. Some may not sell their home if they know they will be returning to the area in a year. This might not save the government money but it will save the officer some money and probably increase his and his family's morale. It just seems to be an example of good personnel management to plan ahead for officer assignments.

Summary

The findings indicate that many would take advantage of these programs which would significantly reduce PCS costs. The literature and many respondents indicate that each PCS move causes family turmoil and that it gets worse as the children get into high school. Therefore, any reduction in PCS moves would cause less turmoil for the family. A greater percentage of the Army Officers than the Air Force Officers would take advantage of these programs. Some officers think that ACSC should be shortened which would enhance the implementation of these programs. Indications are that most officers prefer to keep their family together and would not use these programs. However, some officers also state that as their children get older, they might change their minds. A distrust (questioning guarantees) in the assignment system and a lack of adequate BOQ's will inhibit implementation of these programs. In the following chapter, the conclusions and recommendations will be covered.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Overview

The thesis of this research is: Designation of future assignment locations for married officers will reduce permanent change of station (PCS) costs and family turmoil. When an officer is reassigned on PCS orders for a short period (one year or less) with a known end date, assignment officers should be able to project the next assignment location for many of these officers. Current officer personnel assignment policies do not routinely allow for a home-basing or follow-on assignment for intra-Continental United States (CONUS) PCS moves. Some officers could be returned to their previous assignment location (home-basing) while others could be given their future (follow-on assignment) base location. This would allow that officer to make the best decision concerning his family's move and save the government a significant amount of PCS funds at the same time. With each PCS move, considerable family turmoil adds to the stresses placed on the officer. Reduction of family turmoil and stability for their children's education become dominant reasons for the decisions of some officers concerning PCS moves.

A review of pertinent literature and the administration of a survey questionnaire to all married, American officers in the Air Command and Staff College (ACSC), Class of 1986, was accomplished. The analysis and findings from these sources provide the basis for the findings, conclusions, and recommendations that follow.

Findings

1. The average cost to the government for a PCS move continues to increase. For the respondents surveyed, the PCS cost to Maxwell AFB was \$5,660 for Air Force officers and \$5,160 for Army officers. Additionally, each officer incurred unreimbursed expenses (exclusive of home ownership costs) of approximately \$2,730 for each PCS move.

2. Trauma, instability, psychological and emotional problems, disruption and general turmoil, all in varying degrees, are characteristics of each PCS move.

3. Of the Air Force families, 11.6 percent and 10.0 percent of the Army families did not accompany their spouses to ACSC for an unrealized savings of \$207,920 in PCS funds.

4. If the follow-on assignment program for intra-CONUS PCS moves had been in effect, 20.8 percent of the Air Force officers and 26.7 percent of the Army officers indicated they would have taken advantage of that option for a potential savings to the government of \$386,540.

5. The home-basing proposal was the most popular with 43.3 percent of the Air Force officers and 53.3 percent of the Army officers indicating they would have used this program. Considering that this saved "roundtrip" PCS moves (a PCS into Maxwell and a PCS out of Maxwell), this would have a potential savings for the government of \$1,437,640.

6. If they had been told they were going on an accompanied overseas long tour after ACSC, 16.4 percent of the Air Force officers and 20 percent of the Army officers would have left their families at their previous duty station without a PCS to the Maxwell AFB area. This would have potentially saved \$302,640.

7. If they had been told they were going on an unaccompanied overseas short tour after ACSC, 30 percent of the Air Force officers and 46.7 percent of the Army officers would have stabilized their family at their previous duty station. This would have saved at least \$570,320 for PCS moves to Maxwell, plus a possible \$570,320 for PCS moves away from Maxwell with additional savings possible for every officer that is returned to his home-base from his overseas short tour. Under this program, the government could save three PCS for some families.

8. Over 80 percent of Air Force and Army officers "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that considerations pertaining to their children impacted on their PCS decisions.

9. Over 35 percent of the Air Force officers indicated they were "uncertain" or had "never heard of the Air Force's current Home-Basing Program." Another 39.2 percent indicated they were "somewhat familiar" with the program.

10. Over 38 percent of the Air Force officers indicated they were "uncertain" or had "never heard of the Air Force's current Follow-on Assignment Program." Another 46.8 percent indicated they were "somewhat familiar" with the program.

11. Seventy percent of the Army officers responded that they were "uncertain" or that the Army did not have home-basing or follow-on assignment programs.

12. Some Air Force officers indicated that back-to-back or repeat assignments at the same base are not career enhancing or career progression and must be avoided.

13. Some Air Force officers do not trust the system and are not confident that if they get orders for a home-based or follow-on assignment, that the orders will not be changed and they will suffer the consequences caused by this change.

14. The availability of BOQ's for the officers who take advantage of these programs will enhance the program's implementation and success. Most officers cannot afford to maintain two households if they must rent off base/post.

15. Most officers who indicated they would not use any of the proposed programs consider them to result in an unnecessary separation from their family.

Conclusions

1. Designation of future assignment locations for married officers will significantly reduce permanent change of station costs and the resulting family turmoil caused by PCS moves.

2. A need exists for the implementation of intra-CONUS home-basing and follow-on assignment programs for officers who must go on a short duration (one year or less) PCS.

3. Assignments as a result of these programs must be guaranteed.

4. Officers base their decisions, to (or not to) PCS their family, on personal considerations such as to provide stability for their children's education and to reduce family turmoil. The services can capitalize on this and save PCS funds by informing an officer of future assignments when possible.

5. The services need to educate their leaders on currently effective cost savings programs such as the home-basing and follow-on assignment programs.

6. The services need to suppress and eliminate the "perceived policy" that back-to-back or repeat assignments at the same base/post are not career enhancing and must be avoided.

7. Most officers prefer to keep their family together.

8. Some officers think ACSC should be shortened which would enhance the implementation of these programs.

Recommendations

1. That these cost saving programs be adopted and implemented by the military services and all other possible organizations within DOD.

2. That the highest personnel organization or command of each service apply the thesis of this research to all intra-CONUS assignments of short duration (one year or less) to determine applicability and possible utilization in managing and assigning more officers.

3. That each service determine the feasibility of applying this thesis to managing and assigning enlisted personnel under the conditions described in this research.

4. That civilian personnel managers within other DOD organizations determine the applicability of this research to the management their organizations.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY

ACSC	Air Command and Staff College
AFB	Air Force Base
AFSC	Air Force Specialty Code
AFSC	Armed Forces Staff College
BOQ	Bachelor Officer Quarters
CGSC	Command and General Staff College
CONUS	Continental United States (The 48 contiguous states)
DAFSC	Duty Air Force Specialty Code
DOD	Department of Defense
HHG	Household Goods
JTR	Joint Travel Regulations
MACOM	Major Command (Most frequently used by the Army)
MAJCOM	Major Command (Most frequently used by the Air Force)
MILPERCEN	Military Personnel Center [For the Army], Washington DC
MPC	Manpower and Personnel Center [For the AF], Randolph AFB, TX
OCONUS	Outside the Continental United States
PCA	Permanent Change of Assignment
PCS	Permanent Change of Station
PME	Professional Military Education
TOS	Time-on-Station
USA	United States Army
USAF	United States Air Force
USAFR	United States Air Force Reserve
USMC	United States Marine Corps
USN	United States Navy
USNR	United States Navy Reserve

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
Air War College(AU)
Maxwell Air Force Base, AL 36112

30 October 1985

Subject: Questionnaire in Support of Air War College Research Project

To: ACSC Students, Class of 86 (Married, American Officers only)

1. I am Lieutenant Colonel Upchurch, currently a student in the Air War College. I am working on a Research Project relating to Personnel Management and PCS moves and I need your help.

2. To support my research, I need to determine your perceptions and thoughts on assignment policies for PCS moves of less than one year, more specifically concerning your PCS decisions relative to your assignment to ACSC. When an officer is selected to attend a school requiring a PCS (ACSC is a good example), assignment officers should be able to project the follow-on assignment location and allow that officer to make the best decision concerning his family's move (or no move). Many officers could be returned to the same location after attending school. My thesis is similar to the existing Air Force Home-Basing Program and Follow-on Program for Officers on orders for an overseas short tour (AFR 36-20), addressed in questions 23 and 24. A major purpose of this questionnaire is to determine how many of you would have taken advantage of this "assignment policy" had it been available before you departed your last duty station enroute to the Maxwell AFB area.

3. Since your comments are the best source of data, a significant amount of input to my research project will be the results from this questionnaire. Considering this, I ask that you take a little time and provide me some good comments.

4. If you have been an assignments officer or have any personal knowledge of the assignment process and would be willing to educate me on the system, I would certainly appreciate it if you would contact me. My AWC box is 217. My home phone is 271-3141. Duty phone for messages is 2119 or 2837.

5. I certainly appreciate your time and assistance in providing this information. Without it, I could not complete my research project.

/s/ Robert H. Upchurch

Robert H. Upchurch
LTC, US Army

PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT

In accordance with AFR 12-35, paragraph 8, the following information is provided as required by the Privacy Act of 1974.

- a. Authority: AFR 30-23, Air Force Personnel Survey Program.
- b. Principal Purpose: To survey Married, American, ACSC students in support of an Air War College Research project relating to Personnel Management and PCS moves.
- c. Routine Uses: To provide data for an AWC Research Project.
- d. Participation in this survey is required to obtain needed data. Respondents cannot and will not be identified by responses required by the survey.
- e. No adverse action may be taken against any individual for information contained in the responses to this survey.

AU SCN: 85-54. Expires: 30 October 1986

QUESTIONNAIRE

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT--REDUCE PCS COSTS AND FAMILY TURMOIL

To be completed only by married, American Officers who are students in ACSC, Class of 1986. (NOTE: Reserve officers on Active Duty just for ACSC need not complete this survey).

When you complete this questionnaire, please drop it into one of the evaluation boxes in the foyer of Wing B or D. Request this be completed within five working days of receipt. Thank-you for your help.

CIRCLE ANSWER OR FILL IN THE BLANK AS REQUIRED:

1. Grade: a. O3(P) b. O4 c. Other_____
2. Date of Rank_____
3. Years of Commissioned Service_____
4. Service
 - a. USAF d. USMC
 - b. USA e. Other_____
 - c. USN
5. Specialty Status (Officers other than USAF, please mark f.)
 - a. Pilot d. Professional (Med, JAG, etc.)
 - b. Navigator e. Non-rated
 - c. Missile f. Service other than USAF
6. How many months do you have accrued toward your gates? (Non-rated officers and officers from service other than USAF, please mark e.)
 - a. Less than 72 months.
 - b. 72-108 months.
 - c. 108-132 months.
 - d. More than 132 months.
 - e. Not applicable

7. Location of previous assignment. Base/Post_____

Town, State_____ Country_____

8. What is the approximate distance (nearest 100 miles) from your previous assignment location to Maxwell AFB area? (For those returning from outside the United States, write country in space)

Distance or Country_____

9. What is the approximate weight of your household goods?_____

10. Ages of Children (list ages)

11. Did your family accompany you to the Maxwell/Montgomery area?

a. Yes

b. No

12. Did your family remain at the location of your previous assignment? (If yes, please provide short reason below.)

a. Yes

b. No

13. If your family did not accompany you to the Maxwell/Montgomery area and they did not remain at your previous assignment location, please explain where they went and why.

14. If there had been a change in the personnel assignment system that would have allowed you and your assignment officer/functional manager to agree on a CONUS base/post of your assignment after ACSC(guaranteed), would you have moved your family to that location prior to reporting into ACSC?

- a. Definitely Yes
- b. Probably Yes
- c. Undecided
- d. Probably Not
- e. Definitely Not

Please state the reasons/rationale for your answer.

15. As an extension of the above question: In order to confirm your assignment after ACSC so you could move your family there without a PCS to Maxwell, would you have accepted an assignment location that was not listed in your three choices?

- a. Definitely Yes
- b. Probably Yes
- c. Undecided
- d. Probably Not
- e. Definitely Not

Please state the reasons/rationale for your answer.

16. If you came to ACSC from a CONUS assignment and could return to that same CONUS area after ACSC, would you have left your family there without a PCS for them?

- a. Definitely Yes
- b. Probably Yes
- c. Undecided
- d. Probably Not
- e. Definitely Not

17. If you came to ACSC from a CONUS assignment and were told that you would be going on an accompanied overseas long tour after ACSC, would you have left your family at your previous station without making a PCS move for them to Maxwell?

- a. Definitely Yes
- b. Probably Yes
- c. Undecided
- d. Probably Not
- e. Definitely Not

18. If you came to ACSC from a CONUS assignment and were told that you would be going on an unaccompanied overseas short tour after ACSC, would you have left your family at your previous station without making a PCS move for them to Maxwell?

- a. Definitely Yes
- b. Probably Yes
- c. Undecided
- d. Probably Not
- e. Definitely Not

19. Do you own a home?

- a. Yes
- b. No

20. If the answer to question 19 is yes, is the area where you own your home the location where you would want most of your CONUS assignments?

- a. Yes
- b. No. (If the answer is no, please explain.)
- c. Not applicable. I do not own a home.

21. Considerations pertaining to my children impacted on my decisions and answers to the above questions.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Agree
- c. Neutral
- d. Disagree
- e. Strongly disagree
- f. Not applicable. I do not have children.

If applicable, please provide these considerations in the space on the top of the next page unless answered in above questions.

22. If there are any other circumstances (not covered in above answers) that would have caused you to not move your family when you came to ACSC, please list below and/or on the back of this page.

23. Are you familiar with the Air Force Home-Basing Program which states: "A home-basing assignment provides for the return of the officers to the same CONUS base from which they departed for an overseas short tour?" (AFR 36-20). (Officers other than USAF, please mark e.)

- a. Definitely Familiar
- b. Somewhat Familiar
- c. Uncertain
- d. Never heard of the Home-Basing Program
- e. Service other than USAF

24. Are you familiar with the Air Force Follow-on Program which states: "A follow-on assignment provides for advance determination of the CONUS or overseas long tour base to which an officer will be assigned after completing a short tour?" (AFR 36-20). (Officers other than USAF, please mark e.)

- a. Definitely Familiar
- b. Somewhat Familiar
- c. Uncertain
- d. Never heard of the Follow-on Program
- e. Service other than USAF

25. For Officers from services other than USAF. Does your service have programs similar to the two outlined in items 23 and 24 above? If "Yes", please outline details on the back of this page.

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Uncertain

When you have completed this, please drop it into one of the evaluation boxes in the foyer of Wing B or D. Again, thank you very much for your time and help.

APPENDIX C

PCS COSTS AND REIMBURSEMENTS

The information contained in this Appendix was extracted from the results of the Air Force "1984 PCS Cost Survey" (14) conducted February - August 1984. The survey results contained much data, pertaining to officer and enlisted personnel, some of which is listed below for comparison. This data is provided to support the numerous comments that PCS moves cost service personnel a lot of money, which in turn may cause family turmoil and hardships. This is especially true when more than half of those surveyed had to borrow money or withdraw from their savings accounts to meet PCS expenses.

INADEQUATE PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION (PCS) REIMBURSEMENTS

--An Air Force Survey showed that, exclusive of home ownership costs, for every \$4 spent on a PCS move, only \$1 was reimbursed by the government (median dollar amounts):

	<u>Officers</u>		<u>Enlisted</u>		<u>All Respondents</u>	
	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>
Total Expenses	3222*	2735*	1651	2057	1978	2183
Reimbursements	803	871	376	581	459	635
Put-of-pocket	2419	1864	1275	1476	1519	1548
% Paid by Member	75	68	77	72	77	71

*No explanation for drop in expenses from 1983 to 1984

--Median unreimbursed expenses (exclusive of home ownership costs) were \$1,383 for junior officers (O1-O3), \$2,730 for senior officers (O4-O6), \$1,791 for mid-grade enlisted (E4-E6), and \$2,541 for senior enlisted (E7-E9).

-for an O-3, \$1,383 represents 20 months of the Jan 85 4% pay raise.

-for an E-5, \$1,791 represents 33 months of the Jan 85 4% pay raise.

--Over half (58%) stated they needed to borrow, including withdrawals from savings, in order to meet PCS expenses.

--Most significant median out-of-pocket costs incurred were:

-Temporary Lodging Expense (meals & lodging).....	\$559**
-Automobile Expenses (gas, oil, maintenance, etc.).....	339
-Moving in Expenses (making house ready for occupancy).....	294
-Household Goods (damaged/lost or not shipped).....	172

**Excludes junior enlisted members (E4 less than 2 years service and below) since government quarters are readily available to these grades.

--The following median expenses were not included in the above out-of-pocket expenses;

however, many members incurred one or more of these additional expenses:

-Cost of Moving dependents to designated location (9%).....	\$ 616
-House hunting trip (15% of respondents).....	459
-Loss on sale of automobile (32% of respondents moving overseas chose to sell car).....	513
-Depreciation on automobile while in storage (14% of respondents moving overseas stored car).....	750
-Cost of selling home (13% - home owners).....	3,950
-Cost of Buying home (13% - home owners).....	5,282
-Members gave up monthly net pay from second job (14% of respondents).....	388
-Civilian Spouses gave up monthly net pay from job (45% of respondents).....	555

APPENDIX D

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES TO QUESTION 12

General

The subjective responses provided below were selected as being representative comments from Question 12, a combination closed end and open end question on the survey questionnaire (see Appendix B). The responses are broken into two sections below. The first section is the author's compilation of reasons for all open end responses with comments for Question 12. The second section is for individual, verbatim comments. These responses are not in any particular order and are provided for informational purposes for the reader. These comments may also provide the basis for further research or additional study. They also can be used to improve the questionnaire used in this study or for use in subsequent research or surveys.

Question 12 in the survey was as follows:

12. Did your family remain at the location of your previous assignment? (If yes, please provide short reason below.)

All the responses below were as a result of a "yes" answer. The alpha-numeric characters at the beginning of the response are references used by the author for administrative accountability and can be disregarded by the reader.

Compilation of Reasons

The number preceding the reason is the number of times that reason or a similar reason was listed in the written comments. The "multiple reasons" category was essentially a mixture of the other reasons listed, examples of which can be seen in the individual comments below.

8 - Educational needs of children

-Children in excellent schools where they are presently living.

-Schools in Montgomery are not good.

9 - Spouse's job/career

11 - Multiple reasons

2 - Wife in school

1 - Unable to sell house

1 - Wife's parents ill

Individual Verbatim Comments

- A21--Due to my wife's job and the fact that our two oldest children are graduating from high school, we, as a family, decided it was in our best interests not to disrupt our life for 10 months.
- A33--1. Senior in high school that I didn't want to move. 2. Couldn't sell house, housing very depressed in Ft. Worth area. 3. Local high schools/schools in Montgomery are below standards for education.
- B11--Wife is a GM-13 and couldn't get a similiar job here since we would only be here 10 months.
- B17--Schools! Probable return to same base [Offutt AFB]. Couldn't sell house. Wife works.
- B32--Twins in senior year at high school. Cost of selling house/poor market. Cost and short time of move.
- B44--Illness in wife's family (DC is home). Good chance of reassignment to area (Pentagon tour was 2 yrs). PCS'd in '83, cost \$1000 in overweight charge, didn't want moves in '85 & '86. School situation-Fairfax Co, Va vs Alabama.
- B46--Stability for children-school, etc. Wife working-enjoys job/environment.
- C9--Wife has good job. Child in good schools. Assignment less than one yr. Too many moves for too little travel pay equals big financial loss.
- C19--(1) Spouse career-civilian. (2) Children's education disruption (Quality of Public Schools) (3) Spouse education (disruption of degree program).
- E10--Owned a house, wasn't sure where next assignment was going to be, wife had job, kids liked school & neighborhood, school system one of the best in nation, felt 10 months move would be unfair to family.
- E20--Wife employed in her career speciality. School system for child's education. Good chance of assignment back to the area, not firm. Purchased home recently.
- E27--Inability to sell home was primary reason. I did not want to "pull up roots", suffer a significant loss on sale of home, and go through another PCS move within a year.
- E89--Husband (Civ) is employed in DC area. It was not appropriate that he pick up roots/transfer job location for this 10 month period.
- E109--Both children are in advanced program courses. For the 16-yr old, it would have meant 3 high schools in 3 years. My wife is a civil service employee at Randolph AFB and her income would be lost. We decided it was less traumatic to readjust one life, than all four of us for only 10 months.

APPENDIX E

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES TO QUESTION 13

General

The subjective responses provided below are from Question 13, a open end question on the survey questionnaire (see Appendix B). The responses are individual, verbatim comments. These responses are provided for informational purposes for the reader. These comments may also provide the basis for further research or additional study. They also can be used to improve the questionnaire used in this study or for use in subsequent research or surveys.

Question 13 in the survey was as follows:

13. If your family did not accompany you to the Maxwell/Montgomery area and they did not remain at your previous assignment location, please explain where they went and why.

The alpha-numeric characters at the beginning of the response are references used by the author for administrative accountability and can be disregarded by the reader.

Individual Verbatim Comments

B28--Moved to N. Virginia [Author's note: Moved from Offutt AFB]--invested in a home for follow-on assignment to Pentagon. Schools in Montgomery discouraged family from accompanying me to Maxwell. [Author's note: This officer saved the government the PCS costs for a second PCS move for his family following ACSC. It is apparent that the thesis of this research was applied to the future assignment of this officer.]

E1--To a rental house we own in Niceville, Fl. (Eglin AFB) [Author's note: Moved from Kelly AFB, Tx]. Although I did not have an assignment, I volunteered for a remote (overseas short tour) with hopes of getting a follow-on assignment to the Eglin Area. The whole idea was to keep the kids in one school as long as possible. (Not Montgomery schools). [Author's note: This officer, if he gets his short tour with Home-Basing to Eglin AFB, will have potentially saved the government the cost of two PCS moves--one after ACSC (if he had brought his family with him) and one to a new base after his short tour.]

E4--Fla, where my family and house are located. [Author's note: Officer moved from Germany]. The twins go to Jr college and live at home. 99% chance of getting Tyndall AFB (where I live) after ACSC. [Author's note: If this officer gets his assignment to Tyndall AFB, he will have saved the government the cost of two PCS move. Officer's family lived in FI while he was assigned to Germany. He elected to leave them in FI (saving one move to ACSC) in hopes that he could get assigned to Tyndall (saving another PCS move to some other base). In retrospect, this officer has already saved the government PCS moves to and from Germany for his family. All this, to provide stability, and reduce the turmoil, for his family.]

E66--Residence previously owned in Ft Walton Beach, FL. [Author's note: Officer moved from Greece]. Also, wife is employed as school teacher there. Oldest son wanted to attend school in Florida. [Author's note: Officer did not mention possibility of a follow-on assignment; however, if he is assigned to the AFB near his Ft. Walton Beach home, he will have saved the government the cost of one PCS move.]

APPENDIX F

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES TO QUESTION 14

General

— The subjective responses provided below were selected as being representative comments from Question 14, a combination closed end and open end question on the survey questionnaire (see Appendix B). This question received more subjective responses than any of the others. The responses are broken into three sections below. The first two sections are the author's compilation of reasons for all open end responses with comments for Question 14. The third section is for individual, verbatim comments. These responses are arranged in the same order as the objective distractions listed below and are provided for informational purposes for the reader. These comments may also provide the basis for further research or additional study. They also can be used to improve the questionnaire used in this study or for use in subsequent research or surveys.

Question 14 in the survey was as follows:

14. If there had been a change in the personnel assignment system that would have allowed you and your assignment officer/functional manager to agree on a CONUS base/post of your assignment after ACSC (guaranteed), would you have moved your family to that location prior to reporting into ACSC?

- a. Definitely Yes
- b. Probably Yes
- c. Undecided
- d. Probably Not
- e. Definitely Not

Compilation of Positive Reasons

The number preceding the reason is the number of times that reason or a similar reason was listed in the written comments. Some of the responses had multiple reasons, but only one was listed here. Examples of this can be seen in the individual comments below.

15 – Less Family turmoil. Eliminate moves. Less damage to Household Goods.

- 1 - So Wife can get a job.
- 10 - To provide stability for children's education.
- 5 - Want/need to purchase a home.
- 7 - Moving is too expensive. Reduce cost of two moves. Better off financially .
- 3 - Multiple reasons.

Compilation of Negative Reasons

- 95 - Unnecessary family separation. Will not be separated by choice. Family always accompanies me when possible. Too much TDY as it is.
- 16 - Quality time for family togetherness.
- 5 - Harder for family to adjust or settle in new area without sponsor.
- 6 - Family did not want to move from previous location. Provide stability.
- 5 - Orders can be changed--would not take the chance. Don't trust the system. There are no guarantees.
- 6 - Cannot afford the cost of maintaining two households.
- 8 - Would depend on the location.
- 2 - Medical problems in family.
- 6 - Would say yes if school shortened to six months or less.
- 4 - If chose not to bring family to Maxwell, would have left them at previous location.
- 3 - Family also gets a lot out of ACSC experience.

Individual Verbatim Comments

The alpha-numeric characters at the beginning of the response are references used by the author for administrative accountability and can be disregarded by the reader. The next item is the objective response selected, which is followed by the individual's comments.

C18--Definitely Yes--The school system in Montgomery, Alabama is terrible!! I would rather have my family settled at my next assignment rather than being stuck here.

E4--Definitely Yes--Only if the agreed upon location was the same as my house location.

- E52--Definitely Yes--**Needed to purchase house to avoid capital gains tax from sale of house at previous stateside assignment. Family did not want to come to Alabama.
- E60--Definitely Yes--**The reasons are obvious. Stability (family) in terms of the children's education. Financial costs (out-of-pocket). Only one PCS move (family/household goods, etc.)
- E62--Definitely Yes--**The option you described above would promote family stability, enhance spousal employment posture, and improve the productivity of the service member. High school/college age dependents and spouses would have one less educational and occupational adjustment to make.
- A31--Probably Yes--**In order to provide more stability for my children's education.
- A32--Probably Yes--**I want to build a house. Moving is a royal pain in the ass, and the dollars I must pay in three moves is like having your house burn down once.
- A74--Probably Yes--**1. Allows purchase of home one year earlier and subsequent lower price.
2. Better continuity for children's schooling. 3. One less move, hassles of packing, damage, etc.
- A78--Probably Yes--**It would have been better financially. My HHG would not have to be moved twice. My children would not have to change schools. My wife could have found employment.
- A96--Probably Yes--**Bucks! School for kids. With present system my oldest daughter will have three different schools during her high school.
- B25--Probably Yes--**Two moves in one year is too much. Damage to goods, furniture, etc. Stability for kids in school etc. make this (frequent moves) undesirable.
- B28--Probably Yes--**One year too short, abrupt for children in school--want to give my children stability to meet/make friends and do well in school.
- B36--Probably Yes--**This really depends on the location of my next assignment. However, in most cases I would move them to the follow-on [location] because of the costs of moving and school for the kids. Constant moving disrupts my children's education process.
- B40--Probably Yes--**Less turbulence with kids and school. One move vs two. Lose less money.
- C4--Probably Yes--**I am not favorably disposed to two PCS moves in a 10 month period. One would be much better. Furniture damage, change of addresses, insurance requirements, etc. make multiple moves a definite pain!
- C10--Probably Yes--**1. I desire air staff. I would have purchased a new home in Washington, D.C.
2. Montgomery is a southern slum. 3. Inadequate housing on and off base.
- C17--Probably Yes--**Cost of housing and needs to settle my son into Jr. High. Additionally, would allow my wife to continue her profession with less disruption.

- E50--Probably Yes-- Save two HHGs overweight charges. Save pulling my kids out of school twice. Reduce moving expenses. Reduce damage to HHG.
- A16--Undecided--That would depend on base location (proximity to either Maxwell or family). If close, possibly yes--If not, definitely not. Also a change in length of ACSC would effect decision.
- A23--Undecided--I do not think I would want to leave my family in a new location and expect them to settle in without me.
- A65--Undecided--It would depend a lot on the particular assignment location. Things such as job market for my spouse, school quality, climate and housing would be key factors.
- C14--Undecided--I came from overseas and setting up household at another CONUS Base would have been just as tough as it was for Maxwell--would probably not. CONUS to CONUS, I see advantages--move HHG only once, kids can get settled in a school system. However, financially I need to use base housing. Can this be accommodated in your scenario?
- E31--Undecided--May have left them in Europe.
- A19--Probably Not--Assuming the next location is not my previous location, it makes no sense to locate my family in an unknown situation with me not there. If I knew I was returning to my previous location, I may have left them there and not sold my home (but a return to some area is not necessarily a good career move).
- A27--Probably Not--Strong desire to have family with me at ACSC. Much depends on follow-on location. If within "commuting" distance (Holidays), would consider moving family there vice here.
- A33--Probably Not--When I move five children, three cats and a dog plus 10,500 lbs of household goods, I need to be around for a few months to get things settled in. That's too much work for my wife alone to handle.
- A49--Probably Not--We would only have moved if the firm my wife works for has a branch at or near the "guaranteed" assignment. Also there are no guarantees in the AF and one would be foolish to move based on a "guarantee". ACSC would have a tough time recruiting faculty if everyone arrived with a follow-on assignment.
- A66--Probably Not--If assigned back to same base--Yes. If assigned to new base--No. Family must stay together. If ACSC is shortened then possibly Yes.
- A71--Probably Not--I like my family with me and am willing to "eat" the PCS costs to be with them. If, however, my next assignment was a return to where I was, I probably would have left them.

- E46--Probably Not--Would have either kept them at old location or moved to ACSC. Not enough time to find a new house, settle family into house, school, etc. before attending ACSC. Would be no familiar support network for family at new location.
- E64--Probably Not--ACSC is advertised for bringing your wife if at all possible--especially for the social life. However, having her at a follow-on would have been better for her chances of getting a good job.
- A4--Definitely Not--I have spent much time away from my family for the last 10 years. ACSC offers tremendous free time that can be spent on family activities. Therefore, I definitely would have brought them, even if I knew my follow-on base.
- A8--Definitely Not--Unless going remote, our family will not be separated by choice. We'd rather make the two moves.
- A9--Definitely Not--10 months is just too long a time to be separated from my family. I just can't imagine being here without my family for any reason.
- A11--Definitely Not--Why would I want a remote tour at ACSC. I was unable to sell my house at my last base--I sure wasn't going to have them sit there. I wanted them with me.
- A24--Definitely Not--I consider marriage and family a biblical responsibility and privilege. I am convinced that when possible, we will maintain family integrity. We will not separate for "expediency" sake (i.e. financial reasons, etc.).
- A90--Definitely Not--I have previously been separated for periods of 3-6 months due to TDY's. Those separations were hard on the family and 12 months separated unnecessarily just was not appropriate.
- B31--Definitely Not--I like my family. A year is too long. If the school were four months or less, or a move would be necessary in the school year then my answer might have been (b) [Probably Yes].
- B46--Definitely Not--My family remained at my prior base in an attempt to provide some stability for my children. They were established in that community and I would not take them out unless absolutely necessary.
- C3--Definitely Not--10 months is too long to be without family given prospects of other, remote assignments during career. It would be more expensive (trips, phone calls, two lodging/food expense accounts) and more worries to interfere or impinge upon effective studying.
- E34--Definitely Not--Had they decided not to come with me, they would have stayed at my previous location where they knew the area, friends, schools, etc.

E68--Definitely Not--I firmly believe in the importance of the husband-wife team. ACSC is an educational experience for the wife as well as the husband. Therefore, it is important both come to the Maxwell area for the ACSC experience.

E113--Definitely Not--Because the Air Force personnel system is not stable enough for one to trust an assignment that sits in waiting for a year.

APPENDIX G

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES TO QUESTION 15

General

The subjective responses provided below were selected as being representative comments from Question 15, a combination closed end and open end question on the survey questionnaire (see Appendix B). The responses are broken into two sections below. The first section is the author's compilation of reasons for all open end responses with comments for Question 15. The second section is for individual, verbatim comments. These responses are arranged in the same order as the objective distractors listed below and are provided for informational purposes for the reader. These comments may also provide the basis for further research or additional study. They also can be used to improve the questionnaire used in this study or for use in subsequent research or surveys.

Question 15 in the survey was as follows:

15. As an extension of the above question: In order to confirm your assignment after ACSC so you could move your family there without a PCS to Maxwell, would you have accepted an assignment location that was not listed in your three choices?

- a. Definitely Yes
- b. Probably Yes
- c. Undecided
- d. Probably Not
- e. Definitely Not

Compilation of Reasons

The number preceding the reason is the number of times that reason or a similar reason was listed in the written comments. Some of the responses had multiple reasons, but only one was listed here. Examples of this can be seen in the individual comments below.

- 33 - Like having family with me. Quality time with family.
- 21 - Job is more important than location.
- 16 - Depends on location and job.
- 1 - Idea stinks. Future assignments not guaranteed.

- 2 - Don't trust the system. Orders can be changed.
- 4 - What choice? Do we really have a choice?
- 1 - Would like to take a look at the assignment and situation.
- 3 - Will accept assignment to where ever assigned.
- 3 - Some assignments worse than extra PCS move. Not concerned with PCS move.
- 1 - Rather leave family at previous location.
- 1 - Depends on availability of job for my wife.
- 3 - Provides stability. Saves dollars. One PCS is better than two in 10 months.
- 1 - If compatible to both careers.

Individual Verbatim Comments

The alpha-numeric characters at the beginning of the response are references used by the author for administrative accountability and can be disregarded by the reader. The next item is the objective response selected, which is followed by the individual's comments.

E60--Definitely Yes--To me, my family's well being and financial situation are not worth sacrificing for my favorable assignment preference.

E108--Probably Yes-- I7XX don't have much say on assignments for O4 and below. You usually don't get one of your three choices anyway.

A31--Probably Yes--It would appear to me to be a reasonable trade that would benefit both myself and the service.

A71--Probably Yes--Job location preferences are a minor point at this stage of my career. Important aspect is type of job.

C4--Probably Yes--One PCS move is much better than two in a 10 month period.

C18--Probably Yes--My family's needs rate higher to me than getting any of my top three assignment.

E51--Undecided--It will cost the government \$10,000 to move me each time. I will not be held hostage to an assignment.

A65--Probably Not--In reality I'd probably have to because of what MPC is offering me which is not on my Form 90. MPC often pressures people to change Form 90's to show that they gave you one of your three choices, i.e. I pick the best of what they offer me; to get it I must change my Form 90 to reflect the choice.

- B16--Probably Not--Can't imagine under current assignment process they can effectively work one year out--too many variables.
- B39--Probably Not--Still desire to keep family together. Knowing location would be useful in other ways though.
- E46--Probably Not--You assume we "really" have a choice of assignments. We have an input but really don't have the option (other than retire if eligible) to not accept an assignment.
- A11--Definitely Not--I think your idea stinks. I'm going back to flying, but I don't know in what capacity. A lot depends on upcoming Promotion Board. Even today, I don't know which location offers the best opportunity to become an Ops Officer. Also, it sure would be ridiculous to send my family to Washington state and subsequently find out I was selected as a non-volunteer to remain as an ACSC faculty instructor.
- A24--Definitely Not--This ought to be one of the best years we can have with our family--less pressure, more time to spend with them. It would be a shame to put them somewhere else.
- A26--Definitely Not--There are some assignments that are far worse than an extra PCS move.
- A88--Definitely Not--I'm sick and tired of living in places I can't stand.
- B31--Definitely Not--Family place of living has very little to do with accepting a dogshit assignment.

APPENDIX H

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES TO QUESTION 21

General

The subjective responses provided below were selected as being representative comments from Question 21, a combination closed end and open end question on the survey questionnaire (see Appendix B). The responses are broken into two sections below. The first section is the author's compilation of reasons for all open end responses with comments for Question 21. The second section is for individual, verbatim comments. These responses are arranged in the same order as the objective distractors listed below and are provided for informational purposes for the reader. These comments may also provide the basis for further research or additional study. They also can be used to improve the questionnaire used in this study or for use in subsequent research or surveys.

Question 21 in the survey was as follows:

21. Considerations pertaining to my children impacted on my decisions and answers to the above questions.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Agree
- c. Neutral
- d. Disagree
- e. Strongly disagree
- f. Not applicable. I do not have children.

If applicable, please provide these considerations in the space on the top of the next page unless answered in the above questions.

Considerations for children, their stability, education, and lessening the family turmoil have been common threads throughout the answers to the questionnaire. In answering the objective part of this question, 82 percent selected "Strongly agree" or "Agree". Not very many entered subjective comments here, probably because considerations for their children had already been mentioned in the preceding responses. In fact, many had written in "See previous comments" or words to that effect.

Compilation of Reasons

The number preceding the reason is the number of times that reason or a similar reason was listed in the written comments. Some of the responses had multiple reasons, but only one was listed here. Examples of this can be seen in the individual comments below.

- 20 - Family separation is not good for children. Important to keep the family together for psychological and emotional growth.
- 12 - PCS is too much trauma and disruption to lives of kids/teenage children.
- 8 - Don't want children changing schools every year, especially in high school.
- 8 - Schools in Montgomery not good.
- 7 - If children were older, would be interested in promoting stability.
- 6 - Children too young to influence decision.
- 4 - Will not be separated from children because of inconvenience of a PCS move.
- 2 - Don't want my children exposed to schools in Montgomery.

Individual Verbatim Comments

The alpha-numeric characters at the beginning of the response are references used by the author for administrative accountability and can be disregarded by the reader. The next item is the objective response selected, which is followed by the individual's comments.

A19--Strongly agree--Family unity predominated in this instance. I think its critical that infants be kept with their family. If he were of school age, I don't think, however, that exposing him to schools in Montgomery is worth it!

A26--Agree--It is important that wherever my children are, they have the opportunity to attend very good schools.

A65--Strongly agree--School systems; housing; mental side effects of move; side effects of one parent absent for year; climate.

B21--Strongly agree--I have two sons in high school. It is very important that I be available during this critical point in their lives.

B32--Strongly agree--I moved seven times in my first 11 years in service. My kids needed to stay put [previous location]--especially considering ACSC is 10 months.

B40--Strongly agree--Kids seem to have it the hardest in a move. I would do almost anything to ease the adverse impact on them.

- B44--Strongly agree--My youngest daughter is in 4th grade and has been in three elementary schools, adapted to latest slowly. I would not put her through that again with two more moves in two years.
- B49--Strongly agree--Schools, two moves in a year (resulting social changes) and a desire to provide a solid base for my kids entered into my decisions.
- C10--Strongly agree--I want my kids to attend school in Fairfax County, Virginia. I intend to retire at the 20 year point partially for that reason.
- E49--Strongly agree--The lack of a strong academic environment for the children has significantly influenced my decision not to have my family accompany me to MAFB, AL.
- E56--Strongly agree--My children are foremost in my career decisions. The unity of the family is the driving factor in my career decisions.
- E103--Strongly agree--Having my family with me is of utmost importance to me so I can participate in the rearing of my child. The temporary inconvenience of a move is of little consideration in my family.

APPENDIX I

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES TO QUESTION 22

General

The subjective responses provided below were selected as being representative comments from Question 22, a open end question on the survey questionnaire (see Appendix B). The responses are broken into two sections below. The first section is the author's compilation of reasons for all open end responses with comments for Question 22. The second section is for individual, verbatim comments. These responses are not in any particular order and are provided for informational purposes for the reader. These comments may also provide the basis for further research or additional study. They also can be used to improve the questionnaire used in this study or for use in subsequent research or surveys.

Question 22 in the survey was as follows:

22. If there are any other circumstances (not covered in above answers) that would have caused you to not move your family when you came to ACSC, please list below and/or on the back of this page.

Compilation of Reasons

The number preceding the reason is the number of times that reason or a similar reason was listed in the written comments. Some of the responses had multiple reasons, but only one was listed here. Examples of this can be seen in the individual comments below.

- 19 - Not being able to sell house at last assignment. Could not afford two house payments.
- 12 - Make ACSC shorter. [Author's note: Responses recommended reducing it to a range of three to six months for the most part.]
- 9 - Spouse's job more important than PCS to ACSC. Spouses could not get as good a job here. Career opportunities for spouse.
- 6 - Stability for high school age children. Child in high school, didn't want to move.
- 4 - Financial problems or strain.

- C4--I have several antiques. In every move, some get damaged. This is a financial hardship and one reason I am considering buying a home and locating my family there until I retire.
- C10--Had my home not sold I would have left them in it. Had we known what a shitty place Montgomery is, we would not have moved here. Had I seen the impact on my four year old, I would have not moved them here.
- E10--Every time I move it costs me between \$4,000 to \$10,000 out of my pocket. Not worth it for this 10 month assignment.
- E12--If we had known how poor the public schools are in Montgomery, we probably would not have moved family here.
- E20--Regardless of the above comments. Family turmoil for 10 months is the main reason for unaccompanied status. This short tour should count as such.
- E31--Better understanding of school requirements limiting available time for family.
- E34--If ACSC were six months or shorter, I would have made the trip alone! Their schooling would have taken precedence over our collection in that case!
- E65--Inability to sell my house without losing any money on the transaction. Since the AF is moving me they should pay "all" moving costs. I should not be required to subsidize the USAF!!!
- E66--Did not want to go through the hassles of moving, changing schools, finding wife a job for such a short period.
- E92--I'm not sure of policy. If I could have received an assignment (follow-on) in the area of my wife's family I may have moved my family there instead of here for school or for an unaccompanied short tour.

APPENDIX J

MISCELLANEOUS SUBJECTIVE COMMENTS

General

The miscellaneous comments in this appendix were taken from different places on the responses to the survey questionnaire (Appendix B). Some comments are relative to questions that did not solicit a subjective response, yet they are pertinent to the issues of this research. Some of the comments are general in nature yet provide additional information as to how officers think relative to the thesis of this research. Where possible, the comments will refer to the specific question they address.

Comments

The next few comments refer to Question 16 which is, "If you came to ACSC from a CONUS assignment and could return to that same CONUS area after ACSC, would you have left your family there without a PCS for them?"

--Yes, just to preclude the hassles of moving twice in one year , especially to and from the same place.

--Definitely not but I would have kept my house and rented it for a year.

--Probably Yes. Wife had a good job (which she subsequently couldn't recover in Montgomery) and we sold a home we were happy with. That's not to say I would return to previous assignment solely on economic grounds. I think it's a career mistake to do so.

--Probably not unless the school was significantly shorter.

--Probably not, but I would not have sold my house.

The following comments refer to Questions 23 and 24, which asked if the respondent was familiar with the Air Force's Home-Basing program and Follow-on assignment program .

--These programs are 90 percent irrelevant to fighter pilots.

--Definitely familiar with Home-Basing Program but nobody at MPC pays any attention.

"Needs" of the AF!!

--Definitely familiar with Follow-on Program. In my opinion, this is a poor, unworkable program.

--In reference to the Follow-on Program. I am in MAC. Never been satisfied with their assignment process.

--Reference the Follow-on Program: This sounds like a good deal but it really isn't all that helpful. In my case, even though I volunteered for a remote after ACSC and let my career advisor know that, they (he) still has not told me even if I'll be going remote, much less where I'll be going after the remote. My career advisor informed me that my remote tour won't be finalized until December 85 and then the "follow-on program" will only identify a follow on base--not necessarily my base of preference. So far I've moved my family to Eglin AFB on blind faith in the system with no guarantee of my being assigned there after the remote. Still, one PCS in two years is better than two. Even though I'm separated from my family, the kids are guaranteed two years in the same school instead of two schools in two years.

The following comments are general in nature but contain some very interesting insights and thoughts relative to this research.

--The DOD PCS program is a shame. I have had six PCS in 12 years. The last three in four years. I've lost money on homes and moves and I'm sick of it!!

--I would very much like to see many more programs such as ACSC a TDY. The hassle and expense of the PCS move, the uncertainty of not knowing a follow-on assignment. However, I spent far too much time TDY with my first daughter not getting to know me as well as I would have liked. The best of both worlds would be: 1. make it TDY with family, with goods in storage and 2. a known follow-on so that housing, etc. can be acquired early. Naturally the cost of building sufficient TDY facilities would be huge. If problem exists with more-than-179-day program, make it 179 days. Armed Forces Staff College is less than one-half year--why not condense programs to TDY duration? Perhaps a shorter program (and it can be done--all A.U. programs have much room for condensing and elimination of material) would change my opinion on leaving family at follow-on location, etc. I would give much more favorable thought to having my family at my follow-on location if six months than for the current duration of ten plus.

--I feel the graduates of ACSC represent a special Corps of Officers who are being groomed for bigger and better responsibilities. A return to or continued assignment at one's CONUS Base

may not be in the best interest for utilizing this quality asset. I believe Base of Preference action works best within junior grades; not necessarily applicable to senior ranks (Lieutenant Colonel and up). Analysis toward reduction of unnecessary PCS moves is worthy work and needs to be done. I'm not sure the "system" can commit to post-ACSC assignment selection too early. But certainly, if an officer elects not to bring his family to ACSC, he should not be penalized and forced to PCS. If changes are recommended, what about officers coming to ACSC from Overseas long tours (let's say Germany) who would have a better than average chance to return to Europe and maybe the same base. I've come from Germany and setting up a household in any CONUS location is an insignificant event compared to overseas.

APPENDIX K

DATA FROM OBJECTIVE QUESTIONS

This appendix contains the spreadsheets used by the author to record the data from the objective questions of the survey questionnaire. This basic data is provided in the event readers would like to derive any additional facts not presented in this report.

The reference numbers (left column of each spreadsheet) were used for administrative accountability. The reference numbers preceded by an "A" are for AF Pilots (Table K-1), by a "B" are for AF Navigators (Table K-2), by a "C" are for AF Missile Officers (Table K-3), by a "D" are for Professional (Med, JAG, etc.) Officers (Table K-4), by an "E" are for AF Non-rated Officers (Table K-5), and by an "F" are for US Army Officers (Table K-6).

Additionally, Table K-7 is the cumulative data from the objective questions.

**Table K-1: Data From Objective Questions
For AF Pilots**

[illegible]

Table K-1: Data From Objective Questions
For AF Pilots

Item #	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24
A61	X	1	2	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A62	X	1	4	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A63	X	1	2	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A64	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A65	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A66	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A67	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A68	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A69	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A70	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A71	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A72	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A73	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A74	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A75	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A76	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A77	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A78	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A79	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A80	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A81	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A82	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A83	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A84	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A85	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A86	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A87	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A88	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A89	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A90	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A91	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A92	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A93	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A94	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A95	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A96	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	2	2	2	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Table K-2: Data From Objective Questions
For AF Navigators

Map #	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24
B11	X	15	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B12	X	10	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B13	X	12	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B14	X	11	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B15	X	13	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B16	X	12	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B17	X	13	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B18	X	14	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B19	X	15	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B20	X	14	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B21	X	13	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B22	X	12	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B23	X	13	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B24	X	14	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B25	X	15	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B26	X	14	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B27	X	11	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B28	X	12	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B29	X	13	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B30	X	15	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B31	X	14	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B32	X	11	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B33	X	12	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B34	X	13	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B35	X	12	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B36	X	11	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B37	X	13	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B38	X	12	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B39	X	15	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B40	X	14	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B41	X	14	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B42	X	12	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B43	X	13	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B44	X	14	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B45	X	14	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B46	X	14	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B47	X	14	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B48	X	13	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B49	X	11	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B50	X	14	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B51	X	13	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

**Table K-3: Data From Objective Questions
For AF Missile Officers**

[illegible]

**Table K-4: Data From Objective Questions
For AF Professional Officers**

[illegible]

**Table K-5: Data From Objective Questions
For Non-rated AF Officers**

[illegible]

Table K-6: Data From Objective Questions
For US Army Officers

Item #	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24	Q25
F-1	X	1.7	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-2	X	1.6	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-3	X	1.2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-4	X	1.3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-5	X	1.0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-6	X	1.3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-7	X	1.3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-8	X	1.5	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-9	X	1.5	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-10	X	1.4	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-11	X	1.5	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-12	X	1.1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-13	X	1.4	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-14	X	1.3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-15	X	1.3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-16	X	1.4	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-17	X	1.6	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-18	X	1.4	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-19	X	1.3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-20	X	1.1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-21	X	1.4	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-22	X	1.2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-23	X	1.3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-24	X	1.3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-25	X	1.3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-26	X	1.6	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-27	X	1.2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-28	X	1.4	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-29	X	1.3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-30	X	1.4	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Table K-7
Cumulative Data From Objective Questions

REP #	Q1	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Cost/100lb	Move Cost	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14
	a b c		a b c d e	a b c d e f	a b c d e		a b c d e f	a b c d e f			a b c d e	a b c d e	a b c d e	a b c d e	a b c d e
A PILOT	4 92 -	12 5	96 - - - -	- - - -	1 28 38 29 -	10 5 10 9					22 83 7	7 89	2 13 12 33 36		
B NAVIGATOR	2 44 -	12 9	51 - - - -	- - - -	- 17 26 7 1	10 1 11 5					21 44 7	6 45	1 5 4 24 17		
C MISSILE	- 19 -	12 4	19 - - - -	- - - -	- - - -	12 3 10 9					17 17 2	2 17	1 3 2 9 4		
D PROFESSIONAL	1 11 -	12 5	12 - - - -	- - - -	- - - -	10 6					17 12 -	- 12	- - 3 2 7		
E NON-ATTEND	3 112 -	12 7	115 - - - -	- - - -	- - - -	10 2 11 3					19 97 18	17 48	9 7 19 45 35		
AF TOTALS	10 25 -	12 6	285 - - - -	96 51 19 12 115 -	1 45 64 36 147	10 15 11 0					19 3 21 32 1	32 1	13 28 40 15 99		
F US ARMY	1 29 -	13 3	- 30 - - -	- - - -	- - - -	9 3 10 5					19 27 3	2 28	2 5 4 8 11		

REP #	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24
	a b c d e	a b c d e	a b c d e	a b c d e	a b c d e	a b c d e	a b c d e	a b c d e	a b c d e	a b c d e
A PILOT	1 10 20 24 41	17 21 20 19 19	3 3 13 37 40	11 16 12 16 41	40 56	15 25 26	61 17 4 4 3	7	4 29 14 49	- 8 42 16 30 -
B NAVIGATOR	- 3 11 20 17	10 11 6 17 7	4 4 5 23 15	5 10 7 11 18	28 27	10 14 29	30 17 1 - - 3	2 16 6 27 -	3 21 6 21 -	
C MISSILE	- 3 2 7 7	4 5 1 5 4	4 3 1 5 6	3 3 3 1 19	6 13	2 4 13	7 7 1 1 1 2	5 6 1 7 -	5 7 3 4 -	
D PROFESSIONAL	- 1 3 3 5	- 1 3 4 4	- 1 - 4 7	- 2 1 4 5	4 8	2 2 8	5 3 2 - - 2	1 4 2 5 -	2 6 2 2 -	
E NON-ATTEND	3 13 22 32 45	30 28 17 26 14	15 11 7 46 36	17 21 15 23 39	55 60	32 23 40	57 37 6 1 3 11	24 140 11 20 -	26 61 15 13 -	
AF TOTALS	41 30 58 86 115	61 66 49 71 48	26 22 26 115 104	36 52 38 155 112	129 164	61 68 4	16 81 14 6 7 25	36 15 34 108 -	144 17 42 70 -	
F US ARMY	1 3 8 9 9	12 4 2 9 3	4 2 1 14 9	3 11 5 6	10 20	5 5 20	16 8 2 0 2 2	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -

APPENDIX L **CUMULATIVE RESULTS OF OBJECTIVE QUESTIONS**

The information contained in the following pages of this Appendix is the compilation of the objective responses to the questionnaire used in this research. The subjective results will be covered elsewhere in this report. The "letter" headings for the columns of data represent the specialty status of the Air Force officers A-E, TOT will be the totals for the Air Force Officers (Columns A-E) and F will be for the Army Officers. Reference is as follows:

- A - Pilot
- B - Navigator
- C - Missile
- D - Professional (Med, JAG, etc.)
- E - Non-Rated
- TOT - Total of Columns A-E
- F - US Army Officers

Some questions only have subjective responses which will be noted at each applicable question. Some have only averages based on the original input. Question 10 originally asked for the ages of children. From this, the average number of children was derived and listed as such. The data listed below is only for the sample. The inputs for those respondents not used, including the two Navy and four Marines, have been deleted to avoid confusion.

	A	B	C	D	E	TOT	F
1. Grade:							
a. 03(P)	4	2	--	1	3	10	1
b. 04	92	49	19	11	112	283	29
2. Date of Rank (not included here)							
3. Years of Commissioned	12.5	12.9	12.4	12.5	12.7	12.6	13.3
Service (average)							

	A	B	C	D	E	IOI	E
4. Service							
a. USAF	96	51	19	12	115	293	--
b. USA	--	--	--	--	--	--	30
5. Specialty Status (Officers other than USAF, please mark f.)							
a. Pilot	96	--	--	--	--	--	--
b. Navigator	--	51	--	--	--	--	--
c. Missile	--	--	19	--	--	--	--
d. Professional (Med, JAG, etc.)	--	--	--	12	--	--	--
e. Non-rated	--	--	--	--	115	293	--
f. US Army	--	--	--	--	--	--	30
6. How many months do you have accrued toward your gates? (Non-rated officers and officers from service other than USAF, please mark e.)							
a. Less than 72 months.	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
b. 72-108 months.	28	17	--	--	--	--	--
c. 108-132 months.	38	26	--	--	--	--	--
d. More than 132 months.	29	7	--	--	--	--	--
e. Not applicable	--	1	19	12	115	--	30
7. Location of previous assignment. (Not addressed here)							
8. What is the approximate distance (nearest 100 miles) from your previous assignment location to Maxwell AFB area? (For those returning from outside the United States, write country in space) [Author's Note: When the officer was returning from overseas, 500 miles were used for those returning from the East (Europe, etc.) and 2500 miles were used for those returning from the West (Japan, Korea, etc).]							
Distance or Country (Average to the nearest 100 miles)	10.5	10.1	12.3	10.8	10.2	10.8	9.3

	A	B	C	D	E	IQI	E
9. What is the approximate weight of your household goods? (Numbers indicate 1000's of pounds)							
	10.9	10.5	10.9	10.6	11.3	11.0	10.5
10. Number of Children (average)	2.2	2.1	1.7	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.9
11. Did your family accompany you to the Maxwell/Montgomery area?							
a. Yes	89	44	17	12	97	259	27
b. No	7	7	2	--	18	34	3
12. Did your family remain at the location of your previous assignment?							
a. Yes	7	6	2	--	17	32	2
b. No	89	45	17	12	98	261	28
13. If your family did not accompany you to the Maxwell/Montgomery area and they did not remain at your previous assignment location, please explain where they went and why.							
[Subjective answer only--not addressed here]							
14. If there had been a change in the personnel assignment system that would have allowed you and your assignment officer/functional manager to agree on a CONUS base/post of your assignment after ACSC(guaranteed), would you have moved your family to that location prior to reporting into ACSC?							
a. Definitely Yes	2	1	1	--	9	13	2
b. Probably Yes	13	5	3	--	7	28	5
c. Undecided	12	4	2	3	19	40	4
d. Probably Not	33	24	9	2	45	113	8
e. Definitely Not	36	17	4	7	35	99	11

A B C D E IOI E

15. As an extension of the above question: In order to confirm your assignment after ACSC so you could move your family there without a PCS to Maxwell, would you have accepted an assignment location that was not listed in your three choices?

a. Definitely Yes	1	--	--	--	3	4	1
b. Probably Yes	10	3	3	1	13	30	3
c. Undecided	20	11	2	3	22	58	8
d. Probably Not	24	20	7	3	32	86	9
e. Definitely Not	41	17	7	5	45	115	9

16. If you came to ACSC from a CONUS assignment and could return to that same CONUS area after ACSC, would you have left your family there without a PCS for them?

a. Definitely Yes	17	10	4	--	30	61	12
b. Probably Yes	21	11	5	1	28	66	4
c. Undecided	26	6	1	3	17	47	2
d. Probably Not	19	17	5	4	26	71	9
e. Definitely Not	19	7	4	4	14	48	3

17. If you came to ACSC from a CONUS assignment and were told that you would be going on an accompanying seas long tour after ACSC, would you have left your family at your previous station without making a PCS move for them to Maxwell?

a. Definitely Yes	3	4	4	--	15	26	4
b. Probably Yes	3	4	3	1	11	22	2
c. Undecided	13	5	1	--	7	26	1
d. Probably Not	37	23	5	4	46	115	14
e. Definitely Not	40	15	6	7	36	104	9

18. If you came to ACSC from a CONUS assignment and were told that you would be going on an unaccompanied overseas short tour after ACSC, would you have left your family at your previous station without making a PCS move for them to Maxwell?

a. Definitely Yes	11	5	3	--	17	36	3
b. Probably Yes	16	10	3	2	21	52	11
c. Undecided	12	7	3	1	15	38	5
d. Probably Not	16	11	1	4	23	55	5
e. Definitely Not	41	18	9	5	39	112	6

19. Do you own a home?

a. Yes	40	24	6	4	55	129	10
b. No	56	27	13	8	60	164	20

20. If the answer to question 19 is yes, is the area where you own your home the location where you would want most of your CONUS assignments ?

a. Yes	15	10	2	2	32	61	5
b. No.	25	14	4	2	23	68	5
c. Not applicable. I do not own a home.	56	27	13	8	60	164	20

21. Considerations pertaining to my children impacted on my decisions and answers to the above questions.

a. Strongly agree	61	30	7	5	57	160	16
b. Agree	17	17	7	3	37	81	8
c. Neutral	4	1	1	2	6	14	2
d. Disagree	4	--	1	--	1	6	--
e. Strongly disagree	3	--	1	--	3	7	2
f. Not applicable. I do not have children.	7	3	2	2	11	25	2

A B C D E TOT E

22. If there are any other circumstances (not covered in above answers) that would have caused you to not move your family when you came to ACSC, please list below and/or on the back of this page.

[Subjective answer only--not addressed here]

23. Are you familiar with the Air Force Home-Basing Program which states: "A home-basing assignment provides for the return of the officers to the same CONUS base from which they departed for an overseas short tour?" (AFR 36-20). (Officers other than USAF, please mark e.)

a. Definitely Familiar	4	2	5	1	24	36	--
b. Somewhat Familiar	29	16	6	4	60	115	--
c. Uncertain	14	6	1	2	11	34	--
d. Never heard of the Home-Basing Program	30	21	4	2	13	70	--
e. Service other than USAF	--	--	--	--	--	--	30

24. Are you familiar with the Air Force Follow-on Program which states: "A follow-on assignment provides for advance determination of the CONUS or overseas long tour base to which an officer will be assigned after completing a short tour?" (AFR 36-20). (Officers other than USAF, please mark e.)

a. Definitely Familiar	8	3	5	2	26	44	--
b. Somewhat Familiar	42	21	7	6	61	137	--
c. Uncertain	16	6	3	2	15	42	--
d. Never heard of the Follow-on Program	30	21	4	2	13	70	--
e. Service other than USAF	--	--	--	--	--	--	30

25. For Officers from services other than USAF. Does your service have programs similar to the two outlined in items 23 and 24 above? If "Yes", please outline details on the back of this page.

[Army Answer Only]

a. Yes	9
b. No	8
c. Uncertain	13

APPENDIX M

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES--US ARMY RESPONDENTS

General

The subjective responses provided in this Appendix were selected as being representative comments from the US Army respondents to the survey questionnaire. For each question noted, the question will be stated first, followed by a compilation of the reasons provided in the written comments. The number preceding the reason is the number of times that reason or a similar reason occurred in the written comments. Some of the responses had multiple reasons, but only one was listed in the compilation. Examples of this can be seen in the individual verbatim comments which follows the list of reasons. The alpha-numeric characters at the beginning of the individual response are references used by the author for administrative accountability and can be disregarded by the reader. The next item is the objective response selected by that individual, which is followed by the individual's comments. These responses are provided for informational purposes for the reader. These comments may also provide the basis for further research or additional study. They can also be used to improve the questionnaire (Appendix B) used in this study for use in subsequent research or surveys.

QUESTION 12

Question: Did your family remain at the location of your previous assignment? (If yes, please provide short reason below.)

Compilation of Reasons: See individual comments.

Individual, Verbatim Comments:

F12--Late notification (one month). PCS after only two years. Wife is a full time high school teacher. Unsure about next assignment.

F24--To continue dental work on daughter that could not be provided at Maxwell.

QUESTION 13

Question: If your family did not accompany you to the Maxwell/Montgomery area and they did not remain at your previous assignment location, please explain where they went and why.

Compilation of Reasons: See individual comments.

Individual, Verbatim Comments:

F8--Remained in Enterprise, AL for the duration of my unaccompanied overseas and school assignments.

QUESTION 14

Question: If there had been a change in the personnel assignment system that would have allowed you and your assignment officer/functional manager to agree on a CONUS base/post of your assignment after ACSC (guaranteed), would you have moved your family to that location prior to reporting into ACSC?

- a. Definitely Yes
- b. Probably Yes
- c. Undecided
- d. Probably Not
- e. Definitely Not

Please state the reasons/rationale for your answer.

Compilation of Reasons:

- 11 - Keep family together
- 3 - Depends on location
- 1 - Family would enjoy service at an AFB
- 1 - Personnel system too unsettled to guarantee new position
- 1 - Would rather stabilize family at previous location
- 3 - Yes, Family stability
- 2 - Yes, Stabilize children in school

Individual, Verbatim Comments:

F14--Probably Yes--To avoid having to move twice in one year.

F16--Probably Yes--Schooling for Children. Build equity on home.

F26--Probably Yes--Eliminate unnecessary move for family. Quarters here are substandard. Schools are substandard. Too busy to have a good family life.

F10--Undecided--Other family/personal reasons influenced decision to move family to MAFB.

Location of a follow-on assignment after ACSC would have influenced a decision on where to locate family during ACSC.

F4--Probably Not--Family would enjoy service at an Air Force Base. Quarters were also offered.

F12--Probably Not--Spent the last two years excessive TDY. Family is at least stabilized for three years. I commute back (Ft Rucker) during the week to complete my master's program at night.

F25--Probably Not--This school is nearly one year long--if it had been six months or less I may have moved them to the follow-on assignment. My wife was seven months pregnant when we moved plus we wanted to be together for the birth.

F28--Probably Not--Owned a home at Ft. Campbell. Would maybe have waited until after ACSC to move them.

F5--Definitely Not--A year is too long to be away from my family when the situation does not require it.

F6--Definitely Not--I do not want to be separated from my family for 10 months for a school assignment. If the school were shorter, 3-4 months, I might have considered such a move.

F20--Definitely Not--If I were going back to the same post I had left and owned a home there, my answer might be different.

F21--Definitely Not--I left Germany in June 85. Had I sent my family to a follow-on post we would have been separated for almost an entire year. Although we have just finished three moves in eleven months a separation for this long is not acceptable.

QUESTION 15

Question: As an extension of the above question: In order to confirm your assignment after ACSC so you could move your family there without a PCS to Maxwell, would you have accepted an assignment location that was not listed in your three choices?

- a. Definitely Yes
- b. Probably Yes
- c. Undecided
- d. Probably Not
- e. Definitely Not

Please state the reasons/rationale for your answer.

Compilation of Reasons:

- 4 - Keep family together
- 2 - Depends on the location
- 1 - Job more important than location

- 1 - Make ACSC shorter
- 1 - No guarantees
- 2- Yes, Family stability

Individual, Verbatim Comments:

F10--Probably Yes--Benefits to family stability would outweigh location.

F26--Probably Yes--Better for future planning to know in advance where you're going--choice is normally optional.

F8--Undecided--It would depend on the situation. If I were returning from an unaccompanied overseas tour, yes.

F22--Undecided--If move would put family close to friends or relatives, I would be receptive.

F25--Probably Not--this is an unfair advantage for the assignment personnel. Every effort should be made to assign officers to one of their three choices.

F5--Definitely Not--Since I will keep my family with me if the separation will be longer than six months, I will not accept a poor assignment just to eliminate a PCS move.

QUESTION 21

Question: Considerations pertaining to my children impacted on my decisions and answers to the above questions.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Agree
- c. Neutral
- d. Disagree
- e. Strongly disagree
- f. Not applicable. I do not have children.

If applicable, please provide these considerations in the space on the top of the next page unless answered in above questions.

Compilation of Reasons:

- 7 - Keep family together. Went to stay with kids.
- 4 - Quality of schools and stability
- 1 - Quality of schools much better at previous location

Individual Verbatim Comments:

- F6--Strongly agree--I feel that I should be available to my children, especially as they are still in the formative years of their personality.
- F21--Strongly agree--Having lost much time with my second child, we would normally not decide on a course of action that would involve separation.
- F12--Agree--Stabilization of the family first, school stability second.
- F30--Agree--Although moves are hard on the children, I feel they benefit socially. I am also committed to putting them in best available schools regardless of where we live.

QUESTION 22

Question: If there are any other circumstances (not covered in above answers) that would have caused you to not move your family when you came to ACSC, please list below and/or on the back of this page.

Compilation of Reasons:

- 3 - ACSC should be shortened
- 2 - Lack of post quarters/housing
- 1 - Finances
- 1 - If spouse had a great job
- 1 - Schools in Montgomery
- 1 - Unable to sell house
- 1 - Costs of selling and buying another home

Individual Verbatim Comments:

- F2--ACSC should be reduced to a six month course which would help the situation.
- F6--If ACSC was 90-120 days TDY enroute to a new assignment then I may have considered leaving them at my previous duty station until I moved to my new duty station.
- F10--Shorten the ACSC curriculum to reduce family separation time.
- F19--Schools in AL are the pits. Lack of adequate number of Post quarters available.
- F22--If family was settled in an area where we had friends, I would not hesitate to leave them there while attending ACSC. I would, however be hesitant to return from Outside CONUS to a new location, drop them off, and leave them while attending ACSC. I question MILPERCEN's [Military Personnel Center] ability to forecast 12-18 months in advance--they don't even know where most of us will go six months from now.

F25--If we were unable to sell our house at my last station. I would have kept my family at that residence until we did sell and commute/stay in BOQ.

Miscellaneous Comments

F28--ACSC guidance strongly discouraged "geographic bachelor" living in BOQ. Otherwise may have made a different decision. In response to question 18: I would definitely have kept my house though--maybe rented while I was at ACSC, so the family could live in it while I was OCONUS. I sold our home prior to PCS to Maxwell. It'll really piss me off (and my wife) if I go to Korea Solo now.

F30--Reference question 25: "Yes" to follow-on, "No" to Home-basing.

APPENDIX N

**Potential PCS Cost Savings by USAF and USA
Students, ACSC Class of 1986
By Question**

Table N-1
Potential PCS Cost Savings by USAF and USA
Students, ACSC Class of 1986
By Question

<u>Response</u>	<u>US Air Force</u>			<u>US Army</u>		
	<u>% (1)</u>	<u>Nr</u>	<u>Savings (2)</u>	<u>% (1)</u>	<u>Nr</u>	<u>Savings (4)</u>
<u>Question 14</u>						
DY	4.4	13	73,580	6.7	2	10,320
PY	9.6	28	158,480	16.7	5	25,800
<u>Question 15</u>						
DY	1.4	4	22,640	3.3	1	5,160
PY	10.2	30	169,800	10.0	3	15,480
<u>Question 16</u>						
DY	20.8	61(3)	690,520	40.0	12(3)	123,840
PY	22.5	66(3)	747,120	13.3	4(3)	41,280
<u>Question 17</u>						
DY	8.9	26	147,160	13.3	4	20,640
PY	7.5	22	124,520	6.7	2	10,320
<u>Question 18</u>						
DY	12.3	36	203,760	10.0	3	15,480
PY	17.7	52	294,320	36.7	11	56,760

DY = Definitely Yes

PY = Probably Yes

(1) 293 Air Force students, 30 Army Students

(2) Number times \$5,660 (AF PCS Cost) = Savings

(3) Double Number to get PCS moves saved (roundtrip from previous duty station)

(4) Number times \$5,160 (Army PCS Cost) = Savings

BIBLIOGRAPHY

References Cited

1. Akerlund, Kathy. Saying Goodbye. The Times Magazine, 6 February 1984, pp 5-14.
2. Household Goods Domestic Rate Solicitation 4-2. HMMC, Washington, D.C., 1 Nov 1984.
3. Korb, Lawrence J. Keeping the Quality in a Quality Force. Defense '85, June 85, pp 19-27.
4. Mouze, Victoria. Family Ties. Soldiers, July 1984, 32 (7), 28-31.
5. Mover's and Warehousemen's Association of America, Inc. Agent Mileage Guide 101-A. Washington, D.C., 28 February 1983.
6. Moving. The Times Magazine, 4 April 1983, pp 45-46 +.
7. People are the Priority. Air Force Magazine, Nov 1984, pp 104 +.
8. Philpott, Tom. Out-of-Pocket Outlays For PCS Increase 40%. Air Force Times, 16 April 1984, pp 1 +.
9. Philpot, Tom. Panel Eyes Changes to Curb PCS Costs. The Times Magazine, 30 January 1984, p 8.
10. U.S. Department of Defense. Military Personnel Assignments. DOD Directive 1315.7. Washington, D.C.: 19 March 1985.
11. U.S. Department of the Air Force. Officer Personnel, Officer Assignments. Air Force Regulation 36-20 (with changes). Washington D.C.: Headquarters, US Air Force, 5 August 1981.
12. U.S. Department of the Army. Officer Assignment Policies, Details, and Transfers. Army Regulation 600-100. Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Dept of the Army, 15 July 1984.
13. Zobel, David. Losing Friends: How to Help Your Child Cope. The Times Magazine, 6 February 1984, p 20.
14. U.S. Air Force Survey titled: 1984 PCS Cost Survey, USAF SCN 84-62 conducted Feb-Aug 84 by HQ AFMPC/MPCYPs, Randolph AFB, TX 78150-6001.

Related Sources

- Home-Base and Follow-on Assignment Program Expanded. Officer's Career Newsletter, USAF MPCAFRP 36-1, Vol XIII, No. 1, Jan-Mar 1980.
- Maze, Rick. Proposed Move Pay Still Lower Than Civilian. Air Force Times, 25 Mar 1985, 45:3.
- Moving. The Times Magazine--Handbook For Military Families, 1 April 1985, pp 57-60.