

AD-A212 035 DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY Unclassified		1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS TIC	
2a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE Aug 08 1989		3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Unlimited	
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) D 3 D		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Dept of Military Psychiatry	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) SGRD-UWI-A	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A Approved for public release	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (WRAIR) Washington, DC 20307		7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Unlimited	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Walter Reed Army Institute of Research	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Washington, DC 20307		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. PROJECT NO. TASK NO. WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.	
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Thematic Analysis of Spouse Comments: Annual Survey of Army Families, 1987			
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Florence R. Rosenberg, Ph.D. and Jocelyn S. Vuozzo			
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Scientific Report	13b. TIME COVERED FROM 1988 TO 1989	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1989 July	15. PAGE COUNT 85
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION			
17. COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP		18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Thematic Analysis, Survey, Military, Army, Spouse, Wife, medical care, CONUS, OCONUS rank, enlisted, commissioned	
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) This research consists of an analysis of comments made by Army spouses in the 1987 ASAF survey. About 40% of the 12,000 survey respondents volunteered opinions, criticisms, suggestions, etc. on a wide variety of Army related topics. Comments were coded under 25 major subject areas, many including sub-topics. Topics eliciting the greatest volume of comments were (in order of frequency): medical care; military or an organization; moving; military way of life; and spouse issues. Although the majority of comments were negative, several areas drew a high proportion of positive comments; military way of life; pride in the military; and the survey itself. The comment sheets included two items of information about the spouses: location (CONUS or OCONUS) and rank of active duty soldier. Analysis revealed only slight differences between CONUS and OCONUS residents. With regard to rank, there was a general tendency for the proportion of negative comments to decline as rank rises, both within the enlisted and commissioned corps. <i>Kennedys</i>			
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT ☐ DTIC USERS		21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Florence R. Rosenberg, Ph.D.		22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) 301-427-5210	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL SGRD-UWI-A

DD Form 1473, JUN 86

Previous editions are obsolete.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

UNCLASSIFIED

89 8 07 094

THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF SPOUSE COMMENTS:
ANNUAL SURVEY OF ARMY FAMILIES, 1987*

Florence R. Rosenberg, Ph.D.

Department of Military Psychiatry
Walter Reed Army Institute of Research
Washington, D.C. 20307-5100

Department of Psychiatry
Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences

Jocelyn S. Vuozzo

Department of Sociology
University of Maryland

Department of Military Psychiatry
Walter Reed Army Institute of Research

1 JULY 1989

Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution /	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A1	

*The authors wish to express their appreciation to SSG Genette Gerow, SGT Paul Gutierrez, SPC Bill Deerfield and SPC Roy Skinner without whom this analysis would not have begun.

The opinions or assertions contained herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the Department of the Army of the Department of Defense (para. 4-3 AR 360-5)

REVIEWED BY DEPT MILPSY
DEPUTY CHIEF FOR SCIENCE
FORWARD FOR CLEARANCE
RETURN TO ORIGINATOR

89 8 07 094

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents a thematic analysis of the comment sheets included with the 1987 ASAF Survey of Army spouses. These comment sheets were voluntarily returned by approximately two-fifths of the survey respondents. The spouses who volunteered comments are self-selected, and thus are not necessarily representative of the total population of Army spouses. However, their comments are an extremely valuable source of qualitative data, enriching both analysis and understanding of the ASAF survey results as well as introducing issues of military life not fully covered in the survey.

A total of 2205 comment sheets including 10,578 comments were analyzed (50% of the total). In terms of geographic location of spouse and rank of soldier (the only demographic data included on the comment sheet), this sample does not differ significantly from that of the ASAF survey. The comments were coded in terms of content area and valence (negative, positive or neutral evaluation of any aspect of Army life).

Results

1. The great majority of comments (81%) have a negative, valence, 18% are positive and 1% are neutral. Negative comments include two major types: those critical of a particular policy, program, etc. and those which favor a particular program but feel it is absent or inadequately developed. Neutral comments are rare but occur most frequently with regard to the survey itself.

2. Analysis of the comments identified 25 major content categories, most of which include a number of sub-categories. The single category which emerges as the most important issue is medical care which elicits 1349 comments, 86% of them negative. The next four categories in order of frequency are: military organization (805); moving (630); military way of life (569); spouse issues (565). With the exception of military way of life, most (89-96%) of the comments in the other three categories have a negative valence.

3. Several categories show predominantly positive comments. The survey itself elicits mostly favorable responses (60%) and many of its negative comments represent suggestions for improving it in the future. Pride in the military is mentioned favorably 75% of the time and the military way of life is viewed positively 57% of the time. These two positively viewed categories refer to general perceptions of Army life as contrasted with specific policies, programs and other aspects of Army life in which negative perceptions predominate.

4. Location (CONUS/OCONUS) affects responses in a limited way. In terms of both number and valence of comments, there is little difference between the two groups. Categories that show large or sizeable differences in valence by location include: schools; overseas; retention; pride in military; military community; and children. In all these areas, respondents living overseas tend to express more negative sentiments than their counterparts resident in the U.S.

5. Rank differences relate to comments in several ways:

- a) The average number of comments per respondent for each rank rises steadily from 3.9 for E1-3 to 5.2 for commissioned officers.
- b) Salience (i. e., prominence or importance) of issues shows great consistency across ranks with medical concerns emerging as the predominant issue for almost all ranks.
- c) Several issues, including family separation and the unit, are relatively more important (i.e., salient) for lower rank spouses (enlisted and junior NCO) than for the higher ranks.
- d) The proportion of negative comments tends to decline as rank rises. Only negative comments on the survey itself increase with rank and many of these comments are actually suggestions for improvement.
- e) Several areas - the military way of life, Army attitudes to families, and the military community - show particularly large declines in negative valence as rank rises. All three refer to general perceptions of Army life, the family and the spouse.

6. Generally, as rank rises within the enlisted corps, the proportion of negative comments decreases; junior officers show a slight increase in negative comments while there is a further decline among senior officers. Rank is thus a significant factor; however, the direction of causality cannot be established. It is possible that with continued experience in military life (and higher rank), attitudes and perceptions improve as do certain objective factors such as pay, benefits and autonomy. However, it is also possible that the most dissatisfied families do not remain in the Army and thus are not found among the higher ranking NCOs or commissioned officers.

7. Three themes which cut across response categories emerge in these findings:

- a) Ineffective communication/information dissemination by the Army is reflected in the general comments and, specifically, with respect to preparation for moving and overseas duty. Moreover, some respondents indicate that they had no knowledge of certain programs until they saw them listed in the ASAF survey.
- b) Attitudes of service agency personnel are criticized in a number of areas: medical; housing; commissary/PX; Civilian Personnel Office. Civilian personnel elicit negative comments, particularly in overseas locations.
- c) There is a tendency to be positive toward military life in general, despite complaints about many institutional specifics. This is reflected in favorable comments about the Army way of life, pride in the military and the Army as a career.

8. Although developed independently, the comment coding categories show great consistency with the ASAF structured questionnaire. A brief comparison of the results of the two sets of data shows the following:

- a) While not directly comparable, the survey and comment data generally are consistent and reinforce each other.
- b) The survey and comment results also tend to explain each other. The high volume of comments in certain comment categories such as medical care can be understood in terms of the high usage revealed in the survey. Similarly, the high level of Army spouse unemployment revealed by the survey is explained in the comments citing problems of child care, frequent moves and inadequate assistance in job hunting.
- c) The comments identify certain issues not fully covered in the survey: assignment and deployment policies; impact of Army life on the personality of the spouse; the perception of soldier job satisfaction and its effect on spouse attitudes. These topics might be included in future research.

INTRODUCTION

This report presents a thematic analysis of comments volunteered by respondents in the Annual Survey of Army Families, (ASAF) 1987. This is a survey of over 12,000 Army spouses and covers the following areas: housing and transportation; relocation; family programs and services; medical care; children; work experience; background of respondent; background of soldier spouse. The survey is completely structured allowing only a choice of pre-categorized responses. Substantively, the focus is on the respondent's experiences with and attitude toward various aspects of Army life and Army services. The final question in the survey asks the following:

We are interested in any comments you may have about Army families, whether or not the topic was covered in this survey. Do you have any comments?

Yes USE THE ENCLOSED COMMENT SHEET
No

The comment sheets were not attached to the survey and it was indicated that they would remain separate after receipt. The comment sheet requested information on military spouse's rank and respondent's current location (in the United States or outside the United States). A copy of the comment sheet is found in Appendix A.

The survey was originally sent to a stratified probability sample of 20,272 spouses of active duty soldiers (8,141 officers and 12,131 enlisted personnel), representing about 10% and 3% of the universe of spouses of officers and enlisted soldiers, respectively. The response rates were 70% for officers' spouses and 54% for spouses of enlisted personnel for a total of 12,525 returned surveys. After correction for missing data and ineligible respondents, the final total of usable surveys was 11,578.

A total of 4,632 respondents returned the comment sheets (approximately 40% of the survey total). Among these, 111 were unusable, usually because of ineligibility for the ASAF survey, i.e., the spouse was a member of the military, the couple was no longer married and, in a few cases, because the comments were illegible.

METHODOLOGY

It should be pointed out that although this report refers to "comment sheets," the term indicates the number of respondents. Actually, the length of the comments ranged from a few words or a single sentence to 4 or 5 single spaced typed pages. However, the average comment sheet consisted of a full single page; the majority were hand-written but a significant minority were typed or composed on a word processor.

1. CODE CONSTRUCTION

Initial review revealed that an extremely wide variety of topics was included in the comment sheets and that it would be necessary to examine individual comments systematically in order to design a valid and inclusive coding scheme. Two investigators each selected a sample of 154 comments sheets. Investigator A started with the first sheet and chose every 30th sheet while Investigator B used the same method but started with the fifteenth comment sheet. Thus a total of 308 sheets (every fifteenth sheet) were carefully examined before code categories were developed.

The two investigators independently constructed a series of major code categories covering basic substantive areas (e.g., medical, housing, etc.) Most were then expanded to include frequently-mentioned sub-categories. The investigators reviewed their separate codes and came to general agreement on a basic code.

As an initial check on both validity and reliability of the code, each investigator coded the same set of ten randomly selected comments sheets. They then reviewed, discussed and amended their codes until they felt confident that their perceptions and judgements were in general agreement. This procedure tested the validity and inclusiveness of the code categories as well as agreement between the coders. Additional sub-categories were developed as needed.

At the same time, code sheets were developed to facilitate computer data entry. Each sheet provided space for an I.D. number; rank of soldier spouse; current location of respondent; and a total of ten comments, using a four-digit code for each comment. A second code sheet using the same ID number provided space for an additional ten comments. Thus, we could code a total of twenty comments per respondent in the order in which they occur on the comment sheets. The code itself indicates the substantive area of the particular comment. A copy of the code sheets can be found in Appendix C.

The following is a list of the major code categories constructed for the analysis of the comment sheets. (For the full code, see Appendix B.) The two-digit number assigned to each category represents the code of the basic substantive area. (We will refer to this as the major code throughout this report.)

- 01 Medical
- 02 Dental
- 03 Housing/On Post
- 04 Housing/Off Post
- 05 Moving
- 06 Finances
- 07 Post Facilities
- 08 Soldier's Work Conditions
- 09 Unit Climate
- 10 Army Attitudes toward Families/Spouses
- 11. Support Programs for Families and Spouses
- 12. Family Separation
- 13. Spouse Issues
- 14. Children
- 15. Schools
- 16. Social and Post Problems
- 17. Military Way of Life
- 18. Military Community
- 19. Communication/Information Dissemination
- 20. Civilian Attitudes toward Military
- 21. Patriotism, Nationalism, Pride/Shame in
Military
- 22. Military as an Organization
- 23. Overseas Experience
- 24. Comments on the Survey Itself
- 25. Statements Related to Plans to Stay in Army
(Retention)

Most of these major codes include sub-categories; the exceptions are Numbers 10, 17, 19, 21, and 25, all of which refer to general perceptions, feelings, and evaluations. The sub-categories are coded by the third digit of the four digit code and range from 0 through 8. In all cases, 0 indicates no sub-category while 8 is a residual "other" category. An example of this code is the sub-category, "availability of appointments" under medical which is coded 014, 01 representing the major code, "medical" and 4 indicating the sub-category. Major areas which lack any sub-categories such as Military Way of Life are given the code 170, the 0 indicating no sub-classification. (It should be pointed out that in some cases, 8 developed into a fairly specific sub-category.)

The final digit on the four-digit code represents the valence of each comment, i.e., whether it is negative, positive or neutral/not discernible. The following code is used to show valence:

0	Negative
1	Positive
9	Neutral

In the example above, if the respondent complains about long waits for medical appointments, the complete code is 0140, indicating negative valence for availability of medical appointments.

To sum up, every comment is assigned a four-digit code to indicate general area, sub-category and positive/negative valence.

At this point, it is necessary to explain the coding method for valence of comments. Positive valence is generally simple to assess. This includes favorable comments about any aspect of Army life including programs or policies, either in general or in terms of their operation at a particular post. Positive statements about military life in general, the military community, the Army as an organization, etc., are also included here. However, negative valence is more complex as it comprises two distinct types of comments. The first includes unfavorable statements about any program, policy or general aspect of military life (i.e., the converse of positive valence as described above). The second class of comments refers to the absence or lack of certain desirable/desired programs, policies, etc. The respondent is favorable toward these programs but feels they are either absent or relatively undeveloped in the Army as a whole or at a particular installation. The neutral category indicates that the comment either has no valence or it is not possible to discern it. Examples of each type of comment category and its code are presented below: (These are paraphrased, not quoted, comments.)

Positive: "We have enjoyed military life" (1701)
"There are a lot of family activities in my husband's unit which I enjoy" (0941)
The sponsorship program was a great help in our move to this post" (0541)

Negative: The doctors at the clinic here act as if they don't care about you" (0130)
"Prices are too high at the commissary" (0710)
"We need more programs for teenagers at this post" (1420)
"The Army should provide courses so that wives can continue their education" (1340)

Neutral: "My husband is a recruiter and we are not near any post facilities" (0859)

The first two negative comments represent criticisms of existing conditions; the last two refer to programs that should be developed. In some cases, "negative" actually indicates constructive criticism; this is particularly relevant in comments on the survey itself where many respondents suggest changes and improvements for future surveys.

In addition to the basic 25-category code, there are two other categories designed to code particular types of comments; these special codes represent double coding as they are also coded in the standard categories above. The first applies to direct appeals for help; thus a spouse who asks for assistance because her husband is not receiving a certain allowance would be assigned a code of 3064 - 3 for help and 064 to indicate the substantive area in which help was requested (e.g., loss of financial benefits). This comment is also coded under the basic system as 0640, showing major area, sub-category and negative valence. Direct appeals for help occur in a small, but significant, minority of cases and usually represent a respondent who feels she has exhausted all avenues of appeal.

The second special code refers to "things that work" and is applied in the same way as help, using the code 4. Again, this type of comment is coded twice, under the basic code and the special code. This type of comment occurs extremely rarely and is difficult to distinguish from simple positive statements. An example of this type of comment is "The post schools work well here; please don't change them," coded 4152 as well as 1521.

2. RELIABILITY

The coding system was developed as described above: each investigator examined 154 comment sheets, developed a thematic scheme (i.e., major substantive areas) and the two schemes were compared and amended. Codes were then assigned to the amended scheme. Next, each investigator independently coded the same group of ten comment sheets and differences in coding were examined and discussed until general agreement was reached on both major codes and sub-categories.

At this point, the two investigators began the coding process. Each coded separate groups of comment sheets in no particular order. However, an additional check on reliability was conducted in the early stages of the coding process. Each investigator coded the same group of eleven comment sheets. The degree of agreement was extremely high; both coded the same number of comments (40) and agreed on 37 of the codes for a reliability rate of 92%. Furthermore, one of the disagreements referred to sub-categories within the same major code category;

thus the agreement rate between categories rises to 95% (38 out of a total of 40 codes).

On the basis of the total process of code development and checking procedure, we developed confidence in both the validity and reliability of the coding system. It should be pointed out that only the two investigators did all of the coding, thus minimizing variation among coders. In addition, throughout the coding procedure, difficult cases were discussed and sub-categories were clarified to maximize agreement between the coders.

3. THE SAMPLE

Because of the large number of comment sheets, the researchers decided to code 50% of the total. This was done by selecting and coding every second comment sheet. This method avoids any bias introduced by prior grouping of the comment sheets, either by location, rank, topic areas or length. Certain topic areas emerged only in the last few hundred cases, indicating some prior sorting before receipt by WRAIR.

The total number of comment sheets (i.e., respondents) is 2,205. As indicated earlier, 111 comment sheets were discarded as invalid usually due to ineligibility of the respondents. The N of 2,205 refers to cases or respondents. However, in terms of coding, the N = 10,578; this refers to the total number of comments or responses which are coded. The presentation and analysis of results is based on this total of responses, rather than respondents, except where indicated.

We can compare the distribution of respondents on the ASAF quantitative survey and the ASAF comment sheets in terms of only two identifiable factors: soldier's rank and spouse's current location. Since the comment sheet was a separate form designed to insure complete anonymity, this information (soldier's rank and spouse's location) represents the only data shared by both the survey and the comment sheets.

Table 1: Comparison of Comment Sheets and ASAF Survey
Samples: Rank and Location

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Comment Sheets</u>	<u>Survey</u>
Enlisted	51%	53%
Officers*	49	47
Total N**	2,166	11,578
<u>Location</u>		
CONUS	62%	64%
OCONUS	38	36
Total N**	2,181	11,161

* Officers include Warrant Officers.

**Variation in total N's is due to missing data.

We can see that the distribution on the comment sheets is very similar to that of the survey. The small differences in proportions of officers' and enlisted spouses may be due to relatively higher education and articulateness among the former which makes them more likely to volunteer written comments. Those living overseas may also be more apt to offer comments as they welcome the chance to discuss problems and issues that are especially salient during an overseas tour.

Below is a more detailed breakdown of responses by rank on the comment sheets compared with the survey. Certain pay grades have been combined here to achieve consistent rank categories.

Table 2: Comparison of Comment Sheet and ASAF Survey
Samples by Rank

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Comment Sheets</u>		<u>Survey</u>	
E1 - E3	7%	21%	17%	(E1-E4)
E4	14			
E5	9	16	25	(E5-E6)
E6	7			
E7	7	14	11	(E7-E9)
E8 - E9	7			
CW1 - CW2	6	13	9	(CW1-CW4)
CW3 - CW4	6			
O1 - O2 (2LT & 1LT)	9	18	19	(O1-O3)
O3 (CPT)	9			
O4 (MAJ)	8	17	20	(O4 and up)
O5 - O7 (LTC, COL, GEN)	9			

We can see in the table above that the our sample and the overall survey sample differ in the following respects: the comment sheets include a somewhat higher proportion of lower enlisted ranks (21% compared to 17%), a considerably smaller proportion of junior NCOs (16% compared to 25%), and slightly more senior rank NCOs and Warrant Officers (14% to 11% and 13% to 9%, respectively). Among the commissioned officers, the differences are small with slightly fewer respondents on the comment sheets among the senior ranks. Except for the disparity in response rates among E5 and E6 spouses, differences between the comment sheets and the survey in terms of rank distribution tend to be small.

To sum up, we have compared the survey and comment sheets in terms of respondents in order to see if there are any dramatic differences between the two. We can conclude from the data above that, although differences exist, they tend to be relatively small. It is reasonable to conclude that the comment sheets are a fairly representative sample of the total group of survey respondents.

RESULTS

1. GENERAL FINDINGS

As indicated earlier, the 2,205 comment sheets generated a total of 10,578 codeable responses. These can be classified in terms of valence as follows:

Table 3: Distribution of Comments by Valence

<u>Valence</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Number of Comments</u>	<u>Percent of Comments</u>
Negative	0	8,578	81
Positive	1	1,911	18
Neutral	9	89	1
		<u>10,578</u>	<u>100%</u>

It is clear that negative comments far outweigh the positive (more than four to one) while there is only an insignificant proportion of neutral comments (those with no valence). The overwhelming preponderance of negative comments can be attributed to a number of factors. First, there is a well-documented tendency for individuals who are dissatisfied to air their complaints when given an opportunity, i.e., they "let off steam." Second, the survey instrument was introduced to spouses as a means to identify issues relevant to improving Army family life. Consequently, many of these substantive issues are unlikely to elicit comments unless there are complaints; for example, if post housing was obtained easily, it is not likely to

be commented on but a long wait for housing may draw a negative comment. Third, some critical remarks refer to particular posts and not to others, i.e., they are situation-specific rather than Army-wide. Finally, a significant number of negative comments refer not to the respondents' direct experiences but to their views of the military community in general. For example, many officers' spouses state that their own lives are satisfactory but they criticize the Army's concern for and treatment of the lower ranks.

It should be emphasized that, despite the high proportion of negative comments, most respondents manifest a balanced and reasoned attitude in their comments. Some indicate that they welcome the chance to let off steam but, on the whole, are generally satisfied with Army life. The complaints and dissatisfactions are presented in a thoughtful and reasonable manner. For example, it is not uncommon for a respondent to state after a series of specific complaints that, despite these, the Army is a great way of life. Furthermore, a number of individuals express both positive and negative valence within the same substantive area, e.g., medical care is poor for routine illnesses but very satisfactory in emergencies. (We should point out that in such cases, the comment is coded both positively and negatively.) Similarly, the spouse may complain about the commissary at her present location but indicate that it was very good at the previous duty station.

We feel that the respondents generally took the survey seriously and welcomed the opportunity to express their views, both positive and negative. The comment sheets gave them additional scope for opinions which could not be covered by the pre-categorized responses on the ASAF survey as well as allowing them opportunity to discuss issues omitted in the survey. It is noteworthy that the instrument itself, the ASAF survey, elicited generally favorable comments. The statements on the survey that are coded as "negative" mostly reflect constructive criticism such as suggestions for improving the survey the next time it is administered.

Above, we presented the total results of the comment sheet analysis in terms of number of comments and valence. The table below shows the results in terms of major categories. They are presented in order of frequency of occurrence.

Table 4: Major Categories by Frequency and Valence

<u>Code</u>	<u>Major Category</u>	<u>Total Number of Comments</u>	<u>Percent Total</u>	<u>Percent Negative</u>	<u>Percent Positive</u>
01	Medical	1349	13%	86%	14%
22	Mil Organization	805	8	96	4
05	Moving	630	6	90	10
17	Mil Way of Life	569	5	42	57
13	Spouse Issues	565	5	89	10
23	Overseas	560	5	86	14
03	Housing/on Post	549	5	93	7
24	Survey Itself	540	5	32	60
06	Finances	463	4	87	13
10	Army Attitude to Families	451	4	81	19
08	Soldier's Work	438	4	86	11
07	Post Facilities	433	4	87	12
11	Support Programs	416	4	69	31
09	Unit Climate	406	4	88	12
12	Family Separation	391	4	96	4
18	Mil Community	388	4	71	28
02	Dental	342	3	84	15
16	Social Problems	199	2	94	6
19	Information	199	2	95	5
15	Schools	175	2	82	18
04	Housing/off Post	172	2	94	5
20	Civilian Attitudes	169	2	97	2
14	Children	153	1	84	16
21	Pride/Shame in Military	136	1	25	75
25	Army Retention	80	1	81	18

Total Number of Comments 10578

Where the total responses (negative and positive) do not add up to 100%, the remainder are neutral, i.e., manifesting no valence. In almost all categories, the proportion of neutral comments does not exceed 1%. The major exception to this is the category referring to the survey itself in which 8% of the comments are neutral. Most of these comments take the form of amending certain responses on the survey or pointing out that they are inapplicable to the respondent's particular situation. Comments within the area of soldier's work include 3% with no valence; these tend to refer to off-post duty stations and are simply informative statements.

It is apparent from the Table 4 above that negative comments far outweigh the positive for reasons discussed in an earlier section. However, there are three categories notable for the fact that positive comments are in the majority: 1) pride/shame in the military, 2) military way of life and 3) the ASAF survey itself. The first two categories represent general attitudes and perceptions which are distinct from specific complaints and dissatisfactions. Thus, a number of respondents complete their description of specific problems, criticisms, etc. with a general statement that they enjoy Army life or that they are proud of being an Army spouse. In these cases, the overall attitude is not equal to the sum of the parts and, indeed, the respondents are careful to make this distinction. It is clear that most of the spouses who comment on the ASAF survey consider it a good idea and value it as an expression of Army interest in families and concern for them. Negative comments with regard to the survey typically involve doubts as to whether it will make a difference.

2. GENERAL CATEGORY ANALYSIS

Thus far, we have described the comment sheets in terms of overall results as well as frequency of major categories. To analyze the comments more fully, it is necessary to examine results within the major categories. Initially, we will look at those areas that do not include sub-categories. They are presented in order of frequency with the total number of comments in parentheses. Following the frequency is the percentage of negative/positive comments in that category as listed in Table 4. Wherever possible, we include examples of the actual comments made by spouses to illustrate the predominant trends and patterns. These examples are actual quotes, but may have been edited for grammatical accuracy or brevity. In all instances, the spouse's rank appears as actually written.

Military Way of Life (569) 42/57%

Comments included in this category tend to reflect a general impression, perception or evaluation of military life as a whole. They often take the form of a general statement such as "It's a great way of life" or "I don't recommend it to any family." In other cases, these comments focus on a particular attribute of military life such as frequent moves, distance from one's family, etc., basing the general statement on this attribute. This category is notable in eliciting a majority of positive comments (57%). As noted earlier, respondents frequently criticize many specifics of military life and then sum up the whole by stating that despite these dissatisfactions, they generally enjoy military life. The following are a sample of the responses in this category:

"Military life is one full of excitement and opportunities to enrich everyone's life, but at the same time is full of hard work, sacrifices, loneliness, frustrations and instability. In my personal case it has been most difficult to separate myself and my first child from my parents, especially since she is the first grandchild for them. Also very difficult is leaving what has been our home for 3 or 4 years to start all over again. (E5's spouse)

"I enjoy the Army way of life. The most important thing I could say to you is maintain the excellent benefits, support agencies, and morale building activities. Life can be very difficult as a soldier's wife, don't take away the things that help us make it enjoyable, not just bearable." (1LT/O2's spouse)

"My husband and I are currently separated...When you are an Army family, you are a member of a club, and this feeling is reinforced by the virtual sameness of every Army post in the world. When I rattle off all the places I've lived and visited, I get a knowing smile and they say "Oh, you must be in the military." I consider myself and our daughter to be as much in the military as my husband. And right now, I miss that way of life almost as much as I miss him. I miss troops in formation, loud cadence calls, helicopters landing and taking off, even the commissary on payday! I may have done a lot of grumbling about it, But I've never lived better than in the bosom of the Army." (SFC's spouse)

"I love having the hardest job in the Army, that of an Army wife. I'm married to a wonderful man and that makes it all worthwhile...the opportunity to travel and experience other cultures has been invaluable to me and my family members. The family separations have made us appreciate each other more, as

well as developed self reliance. The moves and relocation strengthened us as a family unit, although the bureaucratic red tape and preparations for the move are extremely stressful. The Army, like everything in life has its trade-offs but I'm continually impressed with how much the Army does for the Army family. Like my husband, I'm proud to serve." (Major's spouse)

Army Attitude to Families/Spouses (451) 81/19%

This area focuses on the respondent's perception of the Army's attitude toward families and spouses of soldiers. Over 80% express negative feelings. Some simply state that the Army does not care about families; others emphasize that the Army's concern for families is largely verbal and is not effectively translated into policy or programs. A number of comments include specific examples of the Army's lack of concern for families, e.g., failing to consider the unique needs of families at various life stages or to allow for certain emergencies such as death in the family. A minority states that although still not ideal, the Army has made great strides in its attitude toward families and spouses. Finally, it should be pointed out that 19% is a relatively high proportion of positive comments compared to most other categories.

"My husband is proud of his Army service, & is committed to serving his country." We are proud and happy to be a part of those who defend our nation and way of life. Make no mistake. However, our family is our way of life. And so to have our commitment to our family so cavalierly dismissed and even ridiculed by officers in authority over my husband seems inconsistent at the very least, and is very offensive to us. (E-6's spouse)

"The Army tries to support families by several programs, but I feel that personal support and understanding is missing in reality. The Army toasts to the wives at any occasion and stresses how important they are to the soldiers. But, if we are really so important why do we need our spouses' permissions (eg., power of attorney) all the time? Why can't we take care of business he cannot take care of?" (SSG's spouse)

"...Even though the Army offers programs and facilities to overcome some of the hardships of this life, when time comes to really prove their concern, it shows that after all, we are only "dependents". We are supposed to be grateful to the Army as if they give everything for free. The Army has to remember that we as dependents put our family on the line, our husbands and fathers and as women we give our children to the

defense of the country and deserve the best treatment we can get." (E5's spouse)

Communication/Information Dissemination (199) 71/28%

This category includes only general comments about communication of information in the Army; specific aspects of communication may be found under other categories such as preparation for moving and for deployment overseas. As might be expected, the comments are overwhelmingly negative (95%). Individuals are most apt to be aware of communication of information when it is not effective. Respondents cite lack of information about services and programs; in some cases, they describe unsuccessful efforts to obtain this information. And most notably, a small group indicates that they learned about certain services only from the survey itself. Some suggest remedies such as newsletters and others use the comment sheet to ask that information be sent to them. However expressed, information dissemination, as reflected here and in other categories, is an area that clearly could be improved.

"I think it would be a lot easier on a new military member such as myself, newly married to an active duty soldier, to have some kind of packet of information about Army life. Giving information on who to contact about certain problems. Or just about general information about Army education & opportunities. Mark has been in Germany a full year & I'm just now joining him. In this past year, I wish I'd had some information about several things. I didn't know who to contact. I tried a recruiting center, they couldn't help me either. I believe there must be some way to have 'information packets' sent out to new members of military life." (E3's spouse)

"As an Army Community Service Volunteer and the wife of a career soldier of 17 years, I've heard from a lot of soldiers about a lot of different problems and I've noticed a few areas where a lot of problems seem to arise...Recruiting is the first place that the new soldier comes away from with a lot of misinformation...My questions are, first of all, in recruiting, would some kind of quality control help clear up some of the misunderstandings, someone who is independent of recruitment to ask 'Do you understand all this and do you have any questions?'...Secondly, in Basic training, how much of the basics are taught and how much is left up to the soldiers to find out on their own? Where is the soldier told how to read the LES, where are they informed of entitlements, authorized housing, command sponsorship and the mysterious workings of Finance?...Have they received enough information upon leaving Basic training to

enable them to know enough to ask the right questions of the right people so that they can insure that they and their families are receiving all they are entitled to?...My last question is why has it been left to ACS staff and volunteers, along with other social service agencies, to try to answer these soldiers questions and straighten out their problems after the soldiers have reached a point of financial disaster?" (SSG(P)'s spouse).

"It would be nice if the Army could develop ONE STANDARD family services manual covering a detailed army listing of services available. It is not enough just to list the service, but to also give a short synopsis of what the service provides. The quality of print should be standard courier 10 pitch for easy reading and laid out in simple form. Subject headings could be used instead of Post Location headings. It would be nice to know how to use the service provided, what paperwork is necessary, or what information will be needed from me to use that service organization. At the end of each subject section you could list the posts that provide the service and the address/tel information. At the end of the manual give a x-ref: list a subject and other subjects that may pertain to that. If you already have such a manual, why don't I know about it?...It is not enough just to list the paperwork or form number. Show an example. Some Army spouses speak little or no English; develop the manual to take this into consideration. The more examples the better. (CW3's spouse)

Pride/Shame in Military (136) 25/75%

This category produced the highest proportion of favorable comments (75%). Once again, many of these positive statements follow a discussion of specific complaints and criticisms. The respondents state that they are proud of their spouses for serving their country or that they feel they are also serving as an "Army spouse." Negative comments tend to take either of two forms: first, that the sense of pride and patriotism, once widespread, is being eroded; and second, that some members and families in the military are interested only in personal advancement and/or their pay checks.

"...All comments I have about the Army are not negative. Having grown up in the military I traveled many places and had many experiences that normal people never have. I've thoroughly enjoyed all of the countries I've seen, people I've met, and things I've learned, and am very much looking forward to being an Army spouse. I've never met such a diverse and interesting group of people anywhere else! There is a

special bond that military families share that you don't find in the civilian community. I've always been proud that my father served in the military and also my husband. I endeavor to support him in everything he does. In my opinion there is nothing more honorable than being in the military, defending your country, and fighting for what you believe in." (1LT's spouse)

"This is a great nation and I am as proud of this land and our flag as the next person but I have to say I feel in the event of a military conflict we will be a great nation in a pack of trouble! Our armed forces have become lazy, self-indulgent, and so caught up in the budget that nobody knows (and precious few care) what is going on..." (CW2's spouse)

Retention/Plans to Stay in the Army (80) 81/18%

This category includes only explicit statements on plans to take voluntary retirement, to reenlist or not reenlist, forced retirement, etc., regardless of reasons. It does not include any comments about normal retirement. The majority of comments (81%) are coded as negative, reflecting either an intention to leave the Army or being forced out before normal retirement.

"I find the Army to be a stifling environment for family members. The Army exerts far too much control over the lives of family members. Because we have no control over where we will live, Army moves play havoc with plans for higher education and career advancement. Another reason that we are leaving the Army is the constant loss of dear friends. After a period of years this becomes emotionally draining. We have enjoyed the friends we have made and the places we have seen, but the disadvantages of Army life far outweigh the advantages at this stage of our lives." (E-5's spouse)

3. SUB-CATEGORY ANALYSIS

This section describes the results for each sub-category within the major code categories. These will be in order of frequency of the major category. The figures next to each sub-category represent the total number of responses in that sub-category and the percent of these that are negative/positive or neutral. Neutral comments are included only where they exceed 1%. (Appendix B presents the code in somewhat greater detail.) As in the previous section we include examples of the actual comments made by spouses to illustrate the predominant trends and patterns. Again, they are actual quotes, but may have been edited for grammatical accuracy or brevity.

We would like to add a special caution before presenting these results. Throughout this section, the reader should be particularly attentive to the relative numbers of comments in each sub-category when attempting to interpret or discuss negative/positive proportions. A sub-category with a very small total of comments cannot easily be compared with one which has a large total even where the percentages are similar. (Appendix E presents a table showing the relative proportion of comments represented by each sub-category within a single major category.)

Medical (1349) 86/14%

1. CHAMPUS/cost/coverage (192) 83/17%
2. Adequacy/competence of care (419) 77/22%
3. Attitudes of personnel (222) 90/10%
4. Availability of appointments/waiting time (233) 99/1%
5. Accessibility (hours; location) (75) 96/4%
6. Administration (25) 100/0%
7. Staffing/shortages of personnel (108) 98/2%
8. Other (Primus, Family Medical Practice) (22) 55/45%
0. NEC (Not elsewhere classified/general) (53) 72/28%

Army medical care emerges as the topic of greatest concern or salience to respondents. Not only does this major category lead others in terms of frequency, but it leads them by a considerable number (1349 comments to 805 for the next most frequent). Within this area, issues of competence and adequacy are mentioned most often; these include professional competence of doctors and other personnel; standards and conditions in hospitals; adequacy of treatment of certain illnesses such as those needing specialized care. Some respondents simply criticize medical care in general; others describe specific incidents of inadequate or unprofessional treatment. A major source of dissatisfaction is the waiting time for medical care. Spouses complain of difficulty in making appointments and then the excessive waiting time for a confirmed appointment. It is perhaps surprising that attitudes of personnel toward family members represent a major area of dissatisfaction; both doctors and other personnel in the clinics and hospitals are criticized for lack of caring, inconsiderateness, coldness and downright rudeness to patients. A number of respondents perceive that medical personnel act as if patients have no place in the clinic! The great majority of medical comments are negative; the one area in which favorable opinions occur is found in "other" and most of these comments refer to the Family Medical Practice Program.

It is clear that the Army's medical program is important to spouses and that they have a great deal to say about it. It should be pointed out that it is probably the most widely used Army service so that every family has had some experience with it. Furthermore, many respondents qualify their negative comments by pointing out that they have experienced good medical care at some locations and by some personnel. However, the

frequency, the specificity and the fact that respondents share common views as to what is wrong, indicate that there is great room for improvement in this area. The following are a sample of the range of responses in this category:

"Because of just having open heart surgery, I have experienced treatment in many Army medical facilities. While some were terrible - with 4 hour waits and shabby treatment from doctors, others were great, with good treatment and supportive staff. There shouldn't be such diversity, but one standard of care." (E4's spouse).

"...In closing, I think I speak for most of the spouses in my situation. We would just like to know that we can trust our doctors and that we could get better treatment from the hospital worker. We should be treated with kindness and understanding when we go to the hospital because this is the place we feel most insecure and lost. We should not have to wait three hours to see a Doctor, when we have an appointment and we at least deserve the courtesy and kindness of a smile...If you could improve anything this would be our largest wish and hope!" (E-4's spouse)

"As for the military medical care, I am appalled that you would allow such abuse on both the staff and patient. As a wife of a Medical Officer in Primary Care and as a dependent wife, I have seen both sides of the story. The staff is severely over-worked and understaffed, therefore, unable to render the proper care necessary for the soldier and their dependents. As an example, my husband has had to work 12 days straight only to break on the weekend. This is approximately every other weekend. How can you expect your medical officers to make rational decisions when they are under this type of stress?..." (CW2's spouse)

"Army medical care (mainly the MDs) is the PITS. In the short time we have been married, (7 years) we have racked up some absolutely horrible experiences with Army doctors. It scares us to think of what we will do if we ever really get seriously ill. For the above reason primarily, I will continue to encourage my husband to get out of the Army when his time is up...Even with all the above mentioned advantages to being a military family, the problem of medical incompetence and bureaucratic nightmares involved with getting sick are enough to cause us serious concern about remaining in the military beyond present commitment. After all, health concerns are of primary importance. What good is it to have all of these other benefits if we aren't in good health to enjoy them? I

might add that I have had 22+ years' experience working in hospitals myself and I know whereof I speak." (O4's spouse)

Military as an Organization (805) 96/4%

This category focuses on the Army itself and is sub-classified as follows:

1. Trust/distrust; faith/cynicism (99) 98/2%
2. Bureaucracy (59) 97/3%
3. Unfairness/favoritism; equity; rank structure (215) 99/1%
4. Effectiveness/efficiency (195) 98/2%
5. Concern for soldiers (112) 92/8%
6. Overall Army leadership (45) 87/13%
8. Other - policies as to duty assignments (64) 98/2%
0. NEC (16) 50/50%

These sub-categories refer to the Army as a whole, rather than to the soldier's unit which is coded in a separate major category. We can see that a perception of unfairness leads the list of comments, both in frequency and dissatisfaction. These comments refer to the inequities among ranks, such as greater benefits or advantages to higher ranks. In a few cases, respondents complain of inadequate distinctions among ranks, such as mixed housing areas. Army inefficiency is another salient issue; respondents criticize waste, e.g., not utilizing manpower and resources sensibly as well as inconsistencies among programs, policies and posts. Many make concrete suggestions as to how things could be done more efficiently or effectively. Overall Army leadership (e.g., the general staff) elicits the highest proportion of positive comments; many of these refer to family-oriented policies and programs adopted by the Army in recent years. The negative statements with regard to concern for soldiers reflect a perception that the Army "uses" people and then discards them without care or compassion. Finally, we should point out that the final category ("other") actually includes comments on Army policies about deployment and assignment, e.g., suggestions that only single soldiers be sent on unaccompanied tours, that special family needs be considered in making assignments, etc.

"...the housing here is so tight on and off post. Why, can't the Army here at Ft. [X] take some of these old rental trailers that have been vacant for awhile, and refurbish them for use? And the old visitors houses and officers quarters that sit vacant, why can't they be used? Most of the trailers off-post renting for \$300.00 & up a month are rat infested bug holes! And something like what I have described would be a welcome invitation to many families who can't find or afford a place to live here! There are

so many things that the Army wastes and abandons rather than fixes them up. Why? It is sometimes cheaper to re-do than rebuild!" (E4's spouse)

"...Have seen pay raises capped, overseas tours extended, would like to see assignment preferences considered to even the cons of military life. My husband requested to go to Texas and he is being sent to Maryland. I strongly feel that the Army does not take care of it's own." (SSG's spouse)

"...The U.S. Army should consider that if there isn't enough living space than they should deploy single soldiers first. The Army commercializes on public television how they try to keep families together and in reality they are separating them or tearing them apart..." (E-6's spouse)

Moving (630) 90/10%

1. Cost/compensation for damage (187) 99/1%
2. Frequency (43) 91/9%
3. Information/preparation (52) 100/0%
4. Sponsorship/support (102) 83/17%
5. Immediate duty after moving (15) 100/0%
6. Timing/disruption/stress (135) 99/1%
8. Other (longer tours; MAC shipment) (67) 70/27/3%
0. NEC (28) 36/64%

The most frequent complaint about moving involves the expense: the actual cost of shipping furniture and household goods which is rarely covered by the moving allowance; damages incurred by moving companies, also not fully compensated; and, finally, the "hidden" costs of moving, such as being forced to sell a house quickly, expenses of house hunting, etc. Disruption and stress are second in frequency. Here, timing is often a factor as many spouses believe the Army should consider the family's special situation (e.g., a child in high school) in scheduling a move. The sponsorship program elicits considerable favorable comment (17%); the negative statements do not criticize the existence of the sponsorship program but feel it is lacking or inadequately developed at some locations. Some respondents complain of inadequate preparation for moving and indicate it is difficult to obtain accurate information regarding procedure, dates, etc. (This group can be added to those describing communication problems in the section above.) The subject of longer tours elicits diverse comments: some respondents think the Army should schedule longer tours, others think they should be abolished while still others like or dislike the extension of their current assignments. Finally, the favorable comments about moving in general (64%) are usually from spouses who say they enjoy the change and adventure of moving.

It should be pointed out that moving is part of the Army way of life and thus comments relating to it are significant in developing policy and action that might improve the process.

"Every PCS move that we, or anyone else I've talked to, has made has set us back financially. It seems the military has an unrealistic view of the cost to move a family. Also, it seems to me a bit much for the military to expect families to happily accept 7 or more months of separation from their sponsor because housing isn't available." (E7's spouse)

"Regarding the military families and PCS moves, each PCS move is extremely costly, especially when the spouse is a career or professional person. The spouse sacrifices retirement benefits due to multiple moves in a limited time frame. The spouse also is unable to acquire additional benefits and security that come with longevity in employment, such as tenure. In dealing with longevity for spouse employment perhaps, 5 or 10 year stateside assignments would be feasible. Besides, providing post high school education for dependents necessitates a double income with the value of today's dollar. With stateside to overseas PCS moves and vice versa, cars, homes and personal possessions must be sold (usually at a loss since the length of tours is short) to meet the weight limitations and restrictions placed on its members by the army. Perhaps, weight limits should be established by size of families in addition to rank." (CW4's spouse)

"...I also feel more stress should be put upon implementing an effective sponsorship program. It should be important to find out - especially with overseas assignments - if the family has ever been so far from home. Culture shock can be brutal, especially for those very young new mothers. Without adequate education and help from sponsors it can often be overwhelming. Also, encouraging a stairwell reception program would be a great help. Many young "first timers" are reluctant to make the first move. It would be a great service to have a welcome wagon type of service - not just a welcome packet (which incidentally, I never received). Thank you." (1LT's spouse).

"...I'm an Army brat so I've seen two sides of Army life. As a child it was awful to constantly have to move and go to new schools and make new friends - friends that you know would only be there a couple of years. I did quite well in school grade-wise, so the quality of education was good. Now as an army wife I

hate moving and having to find a new job & start over. My husband has had good assignments and has (and does) enjoy his work and the bases have been good ones. However I hate being uprooted all the time and having to start over...Moving too frequently is the biggest problem. The Army should have people stay longer at one place or return to the same post." (O3's spouse)

Spouse Issues (565) 89/10%

In a sense, the entire survey relates to family issues, including of course, the spouse. However, this category focuses specifically on subjects relating to the soldier's spouse as an individual, independent of family concerns.

1. Establishment of a career (138) 92/7%
2. Employment/job availability (191) 87/13%
3. Civilian Personnel Office (93) 97/3%
4. Education (57) 95/4/2%
5. Participation (44) 89/9/2%
6. Volunteer work (40) 58/40/3%
8. Other (2) 100/0%

Among those issues which concern spouses as individuals, employment is clearly the most important. Here, it is necessary to distinguish job from career concerns. Many respondents complain simply about lack of jobs, both on post and in the surrounding civilian area. Favorable comments about jobs (13%) tend to refer to the Priority Placement Plan, giving preference to Army dependents. Career concerns focus on the effects of frequent moves and the consequent inability to establish seniority, pension rights, or to advance in one's field. A number of professionally-qualified wives state that they must constantly start all over, whenever they move to a new area. The Civilian Personnel Office arouses considerable criticism for inefficiency, lack of helpfulness and a general attitude of not caring about the job concerns of Army spouses, especially when competing with foreign nationals. A number of wives stress their desire to continue or enrich their education. With regard to participation, negative comments relate to forced participation, pressure on wives to join in social and other activities, whether or not they want to or can afford to; this complaint is particularly frequent among officers' wives. A smaller group enjoys participating in unit and other activities. With regard to volunteer work (an area related to participation and sometimes difficult to distinguish from it), negative comments often refer to the Army's over-reliance on volunteerism for family services while a sizeable proportion (40%) enjoys and favors volunteer activities.

"...I work in a Civilian Personnel Office in Germany as a rater of the applications (SF171s) of family members applying for positions with Federal Service...I also provide counseling service for family members to help them find employment through Federal Service. From my experiences, employment through Federal Service is the most critical concern for Family Members in the overseas area...The most frustrated family members seeking employment are those with education and/or work experience, who have earned large salaries, who leave these well-paying and satisfying jobs, only to be told they do not qualify for positions with Federal Service, whose only employment opportunities lie in low-grade clerical positions. Second are those with little or no work experience, who qualify at only GS-2 or 3 levels and who cannot work, provide child care and transportation costs and still have money left over to live on. I have encouraged these family members to seek more education in order to qualify at higher levels, but how can a Spec. 4's wife with 2 children afford to do that when one college course costs \$300.00?" (O-5's spouse)

"CPO - Current practices at local CPO offices are a 'closed door' policy, especially for those spouses that are trying for the first time to work for the federal government. CPO should allow people to walk in and assist them in filling out their SF171 or to give them advice on current openings, what qualifications they need to fill a specific job, etc." (CW3's spouse)

"When we came to Panama I soon found that in order to get a full time job here, even with AAFES, it was near impossible unless I was a local national. If you walk through the commissary, PX, shoppettes, etc....you'll find very few Americans working full-time, or even part-time for that matter. A lot of these employees don't even speak English even tolerably well. Treaty or no treaty, I find it sad that on an American Military Installation, it's hard to find a job if you are an American." (E7's spouse)

Overseas Experience (560) 86/14%

The comment sheets include data on location, whether in the United States or overseas (CONUS or OCONUS). Most comments by overseas respondents are coded exactly like any others, e.g., in categories such as medical, housing, spouse issues, etc. However, some comments refer specifically to aspects of the overseas experience and, therefore, it was considered necessary to develop a separate section for these types of comments. Two

methodological factors must be noted here: location is that of the spouse, so that a spouse who remains in the U.S. while the soldier is overseas is considered in a U.S. location; second, while Alaska and Hawaii were considered U.S. locations on the comment sheets, statements which describe them as overseas experiences are coded as such.

1. Experience as a whole (132) 60/39%
2. Language (38) 95/5%
3. Culture shock (54) 85/15%
4. Geographic isolation (29) 100/0%
5. Emotional stresses (121) 98/2%
6. Preparation (45) 93/7%
7. Cost of living (95) 98/2%
8. Other (desire to go overseas, to be reassigned) (40)
80/20%
0. NEC (6) 0/83/17%

Unlike other substantive areas, the single most frequent type of comment in this category refers to the experience as a whole. While the majority of comments are negative, a sizeable proportion (39%) state that they enjoy travelling, seeing new things, meeting different people, etc. (It should be noted that the majority of overseas respondents are in Germany.) However, many respondents report emotional stress related to being far from one's family, general loneliness, fear (e.g., of terrorism) and boredom. Expressions of fear and anxiety are particularly marked among respondents living in Panama. An additional source of stress in Germany is stairwell living which produces many complaints. The cost of living is cited as a problem in view of the declining dollar and is particularly salient for those living on the economy. Culture shock includes factors such as standard of living and life style, e.g., inability to do things one did in the U.S., unavailability of certain types of recreation and entertainment. A minority enjoys the differences characteristic of overseas living. Criticisms of preparation are similar to those described under "moving" but stress the importance of information about overseas life. Finally, under "other," in addition to complaints about specific things such as APO mail service, many respondents report a strong desire to go home because of certain family factors such as illness while others like an overseas assignment. These type of comments refer to personal factors and are distinguished from those relating to Army policy which are coded under "Military Organization."

It should be pointed out that a number of respondents who are now in the U.S. offer comments on previous overseas tours and these data are included in this category. Many respondents offer specific suggestions to improve overseas tours for families such as greater availability of government housing, language training for family members, job preference on post for spouses over foreign nationals, and regular subsidized trips to the U.S. for family members.

"My comment concerns dependents stationed overseas. Having been one of many bewildered family members arriving in Germany totally unprepared, I would strongly suggest that language courses be offered stateside for families on orders for foreign countries. I feel these courses would greatly impact on the family in a positive way. Walking into a foreign country with no prior preparation for communicating with the 'host nation' population makes the initial periods of adjustment very traumatic and unpleasant. To have a basic beginner course in the language before arriving would help tremendously."
(Major's spouse)

"Language Barrier - This is the most common complaint that I hear from both the soldiers and spouses. They wish they could speak the language better and be able to communicate with their landlord, the store owners, or neighbors. It is very frustrating when you don't know the language and wish very badly that you could talk to the local people. Currently a one week headstart or gateway class is offered that gives you the very basics in the language ie: how to order a meal, say hello, buy a dress, ask directions. But that is not enough if you are invited to your landlord's house for cake and coffee and that's as far as your conversation can go. I was fortunate to take German classes at the University of Maryland but the cost is \$265 per quarter. Not many people can afford to spend \$1000 to learn the language. There should be an opportunity to learn the basics of the language at a minimal cost to the service member or spouse." (CW3's spouse)

Housing/on Post (549) 93/7%

This category includes government leased housing OCONUS as well as on-post housing both in the U.S. and overseas.

1. Availability (200) 98/5%
2. Quality/maintenance (224) 89/11%
3. Post community (46) 87/11/2%
4. Attitudes of personnel (52) 96/4%
8. Other (rules & regulations; self-help) (14) 86/14%
0. NEC (13) 62/38%

The major sources of criticism in this area relate to quality and availability of on-post housing. Comments regarding quality focus on units that are too small for the family; inadequate storage space or other facilities; failure or delay in making necessary repairs or in general maintenance of the unit, such as painting. These concerns are particularly strong overseas where respondents complain of inadequate control of landlords in

government-leased housing. With reference to availability, there are two major types of comments: first, general lack of on-post housing, producing long waiting periods during which families are forced to rent expensive housing in the civilian community. This complaint is particularly salient overseas where government housing is relatively scarce. Second, many complain of unfairness in housing allocation, i.e., the unavailability of housing for the lower ranks (E1-E3) who can least afford off-post housing. It is noteworthy that this issue of unfairness in housing allocation is also raised by higher-rank spouses who do have on-post quarters. The question of unfairness or inequity arises in a number of contexts and is particularly evident with regard to housing. A much smaller group is critical of the maintenance of the post community in general, e.g., appearance, trash collection, etc. Negative comments about personnel center mostly on lack of helpfulness by the Housing Office in finding quarters and inefficiency of maintenance personnel. Other comments cover a miscellany of topics including behavior of neighbors who fail to observe rules or common courtesies.

"I keep hearing that the Army stands behind and supports their soldiers. It has always been a forethought of mine that the Army is concerned for their soldiers well-being and welfare, or so it is said. Especially of those soldiers that have a family and at the same time have chosen to serve their country by trying to make a career out of the Military Service. Personally I find that hard to believe and am not convinced that the Army is on the right track. It appears to me that the army is looking at the military housing situation through the eyes of a Senior NCO or even an officer, when in fact the 'real' picture is seen through the eyes of the E-1's, E-2's and E-3's that have families that have families. On what basis did the military decide that the lower enlisted with families could afford to take up housing on the economy? Whose brilliant idea was it that decided government family housing should be reserved for E-4's and above? The E-4 or E-5 that takes in a higher monthly salary is awarded with government family housing while the lower enlisted (E-1's, E-2's & E-3's) are thrown to the wolves and told that that is how it is supposed to be, Survive anyway that you can...How do I explain to my 5 year old daughter when she asks me, "Mommy, why don't the Army let us live as good as Daddy's Sergeant?" ...Does it really make much sense to force out the E-1 on the economy and therefore make it necessary to use 3/4 of his salary on economy housing? If so, then to whom? Surely not to the many other Army wives that are experiencing the financial strain of just getting by each day or even not getting by. And surely not to my 5 year old daughter who is forced to sacrifice all those things that 5 year olds

look forward to, just because the money isn't there. But then what do 5 year olds know anyway." (E-3's spouse)

"I am dissatisfied with the housing for two reasons: (1) My kitchen is falling apart. (2) The roaches are taking over the place even though I've had the exterminators come twice. I feel that knowing there is a problem from the survey that were done the people in them should not have a choice on the exterminator, cause of this choice the problem is getting worse by the day." (E-5's spouse)

"...When we lived in a 'stairwell' here in Germany, we felt as if we were in a slum. No matter what a few people try to do to improve living conditions, there are always those who succeed in returning the slum feeling to the area. Perhaps the quarters in the states are too good, but I doubt it. After living in quarters in various places during the 16 years of my marriage and my husband's Army career we found the conditions in Germany unacceptable..." (MAJ's spouse)

Housing/off Post (172) 94/5%

This category elicits far fewer comments than does on-post housing and is here listed out of order in terms of total frequency.

1. Availability (7) 71/14/14%
2. Quality (23) 83/17%
3. Community (10) 90/10%
4. Cost (81) 100/0%
5. Distance from post (44) 100/0%
8. Other (3) 100/0%
0. NEC (4) 25/75%

The content and nature of comments with regard to off-post housing are quite different from those about on-post housing. There are relatively few comments on availability and quality and a sizeable minority of these are either positive or neutral. Comments on the community often refer to the larger city or metropolitan area, occasionally citing issues such as corruption and crime. The major complaint focuses on the rental cost of off-post housing. Once again, these comments are more frequent among OCONUS residents, many of whom describe rent-gouging by foreign landlords. Spouses living off post also frequently complain about being far from post facilities (such as the medical clinic and commissary), especially where public transportation is either lacking or inadequate.

"My husband is a 1SG in an Infantry (COHORT) unit, and because of his position I have the opportunity to deal with the wives of the lower enlisted and Jr. NCOs. The biggest problem I see them dealing with is money - or lack of it. (Especially ranks E1-E4). Families are encouraged, but yet housing is unavailable. They are forced to live off post, usually paying high rent, and have transportation problems because of the distance. Can this problem be addressed, putting a little emphasis on our young troops?"
(1SG/E8's spouse)

"As a junior officer's wife living in a high cost of living area our family really has to pinch pennies. However, after talking with some enlisted families I realize just how much we do have. I really feel that enlisted soldier's pay should reflect a substantial monetary increase when he/she is assigned to an extremely high cost of living area. It's very difficult and sometimes almost impossible for these soldiers, especially young married couples with children to have any sort of a comfortable family life without feeling financially strained..." (O2 1LT (P)'s spouse)

The ASAF Survey Itself (540) 32/60%

Originally, we did not include a code for comments on the ASAF survey itself. It was with some surprise that we noted the relatively large number of references to the content, goals and value of the survey. This category differs from most others in the high proportion of positive comments and the constructive nature of the negative comments.

1. Appreciation of opportunity (204) 2/98%
2. Feeling someone cares about spouse/family (38) 5/95%
3. Omissions, changes, suggestions (182) 70/6/24%
4. Will it make a difference (98) 35/63/2%
8. Other (desire to see results; publish results) (12)
17/75/8%
0. NEC (6) 0/83/17%

The most frequent comment is a favorable one about the survey and the opportunity to express one's feelings and opinions. A number of respondents indicate that it is the first time anyone has shown this interest in them and that they appreciate it. An additional smaller group emphasizes that the survey indicates that the Army (finally) is showing real concern for Army spouses and families. The second major area of comment refers to the content of the survey; many respondents suggest certain changes, correcting omissions, allowing responses for particular situations, etc. Although these suggestions are usually coded under negative valence, in most cases they represent constructive

criticism designed to improve the survey in future replications. Relatively few think the survey is poorly constructed in general. Neutral comments tend to explain something in the survey that did not apply to the respondent, e.g., assignment to an off-post duty station so that post and other Army facilities are not available to the family. The only truly negative comments in this section reflect a cynicism that the survey will make any difference; these respondents say the survey is a good idea but the results will never be translated into action. Others suggest that this is another example of the Army going through the motions of showing concern for family and spouses. However, these negative remarks represent a minority of comments on the survey. It is clear that most spouses like the idea of a survey and believe it will help Army families.

"I would first like to thank you for taking the time to find out how Army families feel about the Army in general. Many times my husband and I have felt that the Army does not care, but receiving your survey made us realize maybe there is someone out there that cares after all..." (E4's spouse)

"Thank you, first of all, for this survey. It's nice to know that someone out there cares about what the spouse's opinions might be." (E7's spouse)

"Reading through your survey makes me wonder if you meant to send it to someone at such a remote site. Most of your questions do not even apply to us simply because we do not have most of what you are asking us about..." (E4's spouse)

"I do not mind participating in this survey, however, I do resent the fact that a letter was sent to my husband requesting his permission for me to participate. So many times spouses are treated as if they have no mind or will of their own." (MAJOR's spouse)

Finances (463) 87/13%

1. Pay issues (158) 95/5%
2. Security/stability (38) 53/47%
3. Pensions; retirement benefits (31) 87/13%
4. Benefits- current (209) 87/13%
8. Other (pay deductions) (24) 100/0%
0. NEC (3) 33/67%

The most salient financial issue is not pay, but benefits. Spouses are concerned with perceived erosion of benefits, e.g., medical. Other benefits cited negatively are inadequate housing allowances, TDY pay and Family Support Allowances. Some respondents living overseas suggest that there be greater

provision for MAC flights for families so that they could visit the U.S. regularly. Positive comments tend to express appreciation for Army benefits. Most of the comments about pay complain about inadequate pay, often comparing it to civilian standards. The concern is that Army pay is not increasing proportionate to the decrease in benefits. On the other hand, nearly half of the respondents who comment on security feel that the Army provides financial security and stability. Some of the negative remarks in this area refer to obtaining support for spouses and children when the couple is separated. Finally, the group of "other" comments tend to be critical of administrative procedures, e.g., delays in obtaining certain benefits, inequitable distribution of salary deductions causing financial hardship, etc.

"There are basically 2 real incentives the Army has to attract and keep qualified personnel. The retirement system that has been under attack the last few years and the service that most families depend upon is the medical facilities that has slid from quality care to who cares...You can hit hard on the commanders of medical services but it will not do any good if they do not have the personnel to work with...These people are demonstrating to Army families that the leaders of the country and those in the services allocating funds would rather build expensive, massive computerized & mechanized systems that are antiquated before they are even finished rather than supply good medical personnel - not only for the families but for the backbone of the Army conventional forces - Your Soldiers!!!" (Lt. Col.'s spouse)

"I think medical care/dental care has a lot to be desired. I have had serious allergy problems & back problems and because of the shortage or lack of doctors I had to suffer for 8-9 mths. to get appointments for these clinics (there is no possible way to go to a civilian doctor because of money). The dental care at our post is almost nonexistent for dependents. SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE. Either give us more benefits medical/dental etc - or raise base pay - it's too hard to make it as enlisted otherwise. (E-5 SGT's spouse)

"Army should quit trying to solve family problems - pay us enough for the many inconveniences - reimburse our moves like Federal Civilian Employees are reimbursed. Talking about an Army Family being special and all that just doesn't mean much." (LTC's spouse).

"I have been a lucky family member. I have held good jobs which has brought our standard of living equal with the community. The unlucky family members have problems. So many do not have the training, education or the chance to hold other than minimum wage positions. The junior enlisted spouse cannot afford to work and also pay for baby-sitters. So they are caught in Catch 22..." (E-9 (SGM)'s spouse)

Soldier's Work (438) 86/11%

1. Hours (99) 99/1%
2. TDY (23) 96/4%
3. Promotions (87) 97/3%
4. Stress/GWB (64) 94/6%
5. Off-post duty stations (e.g., ROTC) (64) 75/8/17%
6. Access to education, self improvement (41) 73/27%
7. MOS/relation of job to training (25) 80/20%
8. Other (3) 100/0%
0. NEC (General career comments) (32) 34/66%

This category includes issues directly related to the soldier spouse's work in the Army. The major concern is hours of work with many complaints about long hours, work on weekends and, to a lesser extent, unpredictability of hours. Promotions are a second important issue; respondents criticize delay in promotions, evaluation ratings, etc. A considerable number of spouses report that a soldier's promotion chances can be ruined by a single negative evaluation, even if his total record is good. Stress due to long hours, poor work conditions, etc. is cited frequently as a source of family discord as the soldier brings his problems home. A sizeable group of comments focuses on opportunities for education, training and self-improvement available to the soldier. Some of these comments refer to the development of skills useful in the civilian world, i.e., second career concerns after retirement. It is noteworthy that over one-quarter of the remarks about educational opportunities are favorable. Off-post duty stations refer to assignment to recruiting, ROTC or other services. Negative comments tend to concern lack of access to Army facilities; the large proportion of neutral comments are simply informative or indicate that some survey questions are inapplicable to the respondent's situation. Finally, most of the comments in the unclassified sub-category relate to the Army as a career in general and two-thirds of these are favorable. Here, as elsewhere, we observe the phenomenon of many specific complaints but an overall positive attitude.

"...One more situation that adds stress to our home is the length of time my husband works. He leaves in the morning about 6:00 AM and returns home in the evening about 6:30-7:00. The long duty days normally

would not bother me, however, when he is required to be in the field and TDY at least 3 months of the year along with the lengthy duty days; I feel the Army is asking too much of the soldiers and their families. Requiring this much time away from the family, shows the lack of concern the Army displays toward the dependents." (CPT's spouse)

"...I would like my spouse to continue in the ARMED FORCES BUT the lack of opportunity to develop job skills and acquire the education needed for those job skills will most likely have a negative impact on his decision. So as a military family member I really feel that all those leaders and Army achievers take a good look at todays Army and together try to re-compose what this Army once was. 'It's not too amusing when you can't be all you can be'. Think about it!" (E-5's spouse)

Post Facilities (433) 87/12%

1. Commissary; PX (272) 90/10%
2. Transportation (34) 94/3/3%
3. Religious (11) 73/27%
4. Recreational (57) 81/19%
5. MP's (11) 82/18%
8. Other (library; bank; Post Office) (15) 80/20%
0. NEC (33) 82/18%

It is clear that among post facilities, the commissary and post exchange are the most significant as 63% of the comments in this category refer to them. (This includes a small number of comments on other AAFES facilities.) The commissary and PX are often mentioned together and most comments are critical. Complaints focus on three areas: prices, availability of products and attitudes of personnel. Commissary prices are frequently described as higher than those in area stores. The PX is criticized for lack of merchandise, particularly basic items such as children's clothes and baby needs; this seems to be especially important in overseas locations where respondents are more dependent on the post facilities. Finally, commissary and PX employees are described as rude, inefficient and generally not helpful. Among other post facilities, only recreation elicits much comment. Some respondents feel not enough recreational activity is provided for spouses while others desire a particular type of program. Most comments about transportation on post describe it as inadequate, particularly for spouses who do not have a car. It should be noted that except for the commissary/PX and transportation, other post facilities are mentioned infrequently but draw favorable comments from a sizeable minority (18-27%) of spouses.

"...PX and Commissary facilities need to be upgraded. Availability and quality of food and merchandise is very limited." (1LT's spouse)

"...Now for the PX. It is too expensive. I price shop there and then buy at Wall Marts or K Marts. If you want to list it as a service, then make it a service. The Commissary is all right but there are competitive stores off post that offer the same savings." (E5 Sgt's spouse)

"...The last of the complaints that I am going to voice to you is the so called benefits which the Army so highly praises. The commissary is satisfactory in that the prices are comparable to the 'outside' and it is always well stocked, however, the personnel leaves a lot to be desired. For the most part, they are rude and inconsiderate. They have the attitude that they are doing us a favor by being there, when it is the business that we are giving them that is paying their wages. The PX Exchange in my eyes is over-priced and overstaffed. The few times that I have gone in there, I have walked out empty-handed due to the fact that the items could all be purchased elsewhere for a lesser amount. Secondly, the salespersons were nowhere to be found when it came to finding assistance..." (CW2's spouse)

Support Programs (416) 69/31%

This area refers to support programs for families and spouses and is classified as follows:

1. ACS (38) 68/29/3%
2. Family support groups (41) 73/27%
3. Spouse centers; wives clubs (28) 64/36%
4. Child care (134) 84/15%
5. Chaplain; counseling (21) 67/33%
6. Umbrella services (community life; financial programs)
(10) 60/40%
7. Red Cross; AER (8) 63/38%
8. Other (legal service) (17) 76/24%
9. NEC (comments about support programs in general) (119)
51/48%

This category differs from most others in including a large number of unspecified comments. Many respondents refer to support programs in general and nearly half of the comments are favorable. Interestingly, a small number of negative comments state that there are too many support programs, producing a population that is overly-dependent on outside help. The most

salient specific in this category is child care. Respondents complain about lack of child care facilities, cost of child care, insufficient hours of operation for day care centers, etc. Some spouses indicate that they cannot seek employment or have been forced to leave jobs because of inadequate child care facilities. Family support groups refers to spouse organizations, usually unit-based, whose purpose is family and spouse support while wives clubs in general tend to be recreational or social groups. It is noteworthy that most support programs elicit favorable comments from sizeable proportions of respondents.

"...One area that I find to be sadly deficient is child care. My son is six months old and finding him a sitter has been very difficult. I am not working outside the home at the moment, but I would like to participate in some volunteer organizations. The Army does not sponsor many child care centers in this area, those that they do sponsor do not accept children under 18 months of age. Since those centers are few in number and they service a large area, the waiting lists are lengthy. Now, I am discovering that most of the certified sitters do not want to care for infants. This is not a problem in the states because I turned to the private sector for child care services. In my opinion, the Army needs to channel more funds into child care centers, allowing parents the opportunity to get involved in service organizations and the community..." (CPT's spouse).

Unit Climate (406) 88/12%

This section refers to the unit as distinct from the larger Army as an organization. Although many of the same issues arise, the unit is a distinct entity because, for many soldiers and spouses, unit issues dominate their everyday lives.

1. Leadership (122) 89/11%
2. Rank differences; favoritism; unfairness (24) 100/0%
3. Unit attitudes toward families/spouses (95) 88/11%
4. Unit family support (142) 85/15%
5. Unit morale (20) 95/5%
0. NEC (3) 3/67%

Unit/family interaction is the major topic of concern here. Most respondents comment that the unit does not really care about families, e.g., spouses are treated poorly if they telephone or try to get any information. Unit family support refers to activities (other than Family Support Groups) such as parties for families, time off for family activities, organized functions for unit wives while husbands are in the field. Comments about the unit seem to be internally consistent, i.e., many respondents criticize unit attitudes, support and leadership, while others praise all three. Apparently, spouses attribute unit/family

relations to the officers and NCO's. The other major type of criticism of unit leadership involves unfairness, e.g., favoritism toward some, unfair evaluations, etc. And, finally, some leaders are simply described as incompetent and inefficient.

"Question 75 asks about support and concern from the officers and NCO's of my husband's unit toward my family...To help my husband keep things smooth with his troops I keep in close touch with the wives of his men. We have become friends. The NCO's in his unit are very concerned and helpful at every turn. I can not say the same for the officers. The senior officers in this BN care only about getting ahead and themselves. I was insignificant to them until it was realized I do volunteer work with the Community Commander's wife. I do not feel they support my family at all, and I am an officer's wife, imagine how the soldier's wives feel. They say 'Soldiers first' but their actions say 'what can that soldier do for me?' I realize in an Army as big as this one there will be men such as these. I hope they are few and far between." (1LT/O2's spouse)

"...I would also like to comment about the amount of time spent with my spouse. It would be wonderful to get to spend the free time my husband has in from the field with my husband, but this is usually not the case. It seems that when the wives finally do get a chance to be with their husbands the battalion always comes up with some kind of function or another to boost soldier morale. Boosting soldier morale is very important but so is the opportunity to have some quality time alone with your spouse." (1LT's spouse)

"...Then there was the time my husband had to attend a mandatory party at the company so that the Col. could give a speech about the importance of military families and miss his son's birthday party which was scheduled during this time..." (E5 Sgt.'s spouse)

"During my experience I found that when a problem of the above nature occurred, it could have been alleviated if someone with the authority to plan or act considered the effect of his action on the family. I realize that in many instances such as training, nothing can be done. But I have also seen many other instances, where such planning was made by someone who was extremely concerned about how he looked to a superior, and not the least bit considerate of the effects of his actions on others - whether subordinates

or peers. Passing the IG and getting good OER's seem to motivate many people in charge at the Post or Community level. Most families, Army or otherwise, and especially young ones, want a decent place to live, enough money to survive, and time to spend as a family. Not really outrageous requests." (O6's spouse)

Family Separation (391) 96/4%

This area covers any type of extended family separation due to field duty, unaccompanied tours or other factors.

1. Duration (136) 98/2%
2. Frequency (29) 93/7%
3. Need for counseling (10) 100/0%
4. Effect on marriage (63) 94/6%
5. Effect on soldier (21) 95/5%
6. Effect on children/family (115) 96/3%
8. Other (3) 100/0%
0. NEC (14) 86/7/7%

It is clear that most respondents who comment do not like any extended separation from their active duty spouses. The most frequent single complaint relates to duration of separation. Extended field duty and unaccompanied tours are criticized most frequently. Some respondents suggest that the Army assign only single men to locations where families cannot be accommodated. (Note: This is coded under the section on policy under Military Organization.) Others indicate that they are enduring a difficult separation because accompanying the soldier is even more disruptive for the family. Respondents are most concerned about the effect of separation on the family, especially the children, and on the marriage. They describe children who forget their fathers, wives who are overburdened and lonely and couples who have difficulty readjusting after reunion. A smaller number comment that the absent soldier misses part of his children's lives and development. As mentioned above, the major remedy suggested is adjusting assignments to family needs, e.g., sending married soldiers only to places where families can accompany them. Others suggest simply shortening overseas tours and limiting length of field duty.

"The Army is not a family oriented service. Families are the last thing of importance. There is a high divorce rate because husbands are sent on year tours without families but they have plenty of time to meet foreign women when they are already lonesome & used to having a family around, so they get attached have kids & start a new family life..." (Sgt E-5's spouse)

"The long-term TDY (4 months or more) creates problems on the family, not in the sense that the family has a difficult time 'getting along' without their spouse, but the differences it makes in the roles of each party. The wife becomes more independent and the household authority while the husband is gone. When the husband returns after that long a time, habits are difficult to break and changing roles of each party to accommodate both party's presence becomes difficult. Children receive the brunt of this problem." (E5's spouse)

"My greatest concern is for the children & spouses of the military who are on unaccompanied tours. This is a tremendous hardship on all family members...Having a teaching degree I have always been able to work part time substituting for extra money. It was not a financial drain on us to have my husband come home for 30 days during his tour or to visit him in Korea. This is not the case for many military families and their marriages & relationships often reflect the hardships they have had during an unaccompanied tour...I wish there was some way the Army could make it easier on the military & their spouses & dependents during these tours. Paying for the trip home during the tour - or not charging them with leave time while they are waiting to fly - at military expense would help many families..." (CW4's spouse)

Military Community (388) 71/28%

1. Morale; cohesion; spirit (128) 61/39%
2. Loneliness; isolation (47) 81/19%
3. Role/behavior of Army spouse (107) 79/20%
4. Psychological effects (89) 73/25/2%
8. Other (8) 75/25%
0. NEC (8) 25/75%

The first sub-category refers to the perception of the military community in general; this may be post-specific or reflect experience at a number of posts. Although the majority is critical, a sizeable minority describes a feeling of community, of common interests and, in some cases, a perception that the Army community is like a family. Criticisms focus particularly on failure to welcome and assist newcomers as well as general lack of friendliness. Some respondents complain of the loneliness and isolation of military life while a small group deliberately isolates itself from the military community and finds this a better way of life. Role refers to expectations for Army spouses, how the respondent believes the spouse is supposed to act and think. Some criticize any such expectations, stating that the spouse is not a member of the Army and should not

conform to any expectations. Others criticize failure to carry out the role, e.g., officers' wives who do not participate in certain activities or inappropriate behavior such as the officer's wife who overemphasizes rank. It should be noted that a few male spouses indicate that their role is unclear and that they seem to have no place in the military community. Positive comments include the perception that development of the role of Army spouse is useful and beneficial both to the military organization and to the community. Psychological effects focus on the individual; the major source of discontent is a feeling of loss of identity or autonomy, the perception that the spouse's identity is based solely on the soldier's identity. Many respondents cite examples of this; the most dramatic is the complaint of one wife that her husband's ID number is on her dentures! The requirement that the soldier must sign certain documents, arrange for car registration overseas, etc., produces a sense of loss of self within the "dependent" spouse. It is not surprising that many object both to the term and sense that they are "dependents." However, not all psychological effects are negative; about one-quarter of those commenting in this area cite development of understanding, tolerance and, particularly, independence as positive consequences of being an Army spouse. Finally, "other" comments include specific community action programs that are either needed or have been achieved.

"Overall, I have found Army families to be among the most well-adjusted and most well-rounded families I have ever met. I've enjoyed each and every move, each and every assignment because of the wonderful people we've met and the friends we've made. The Army truly seems to be an extended family. I always feel very much welcome and very much at home wherever we happen to be." (O-5's spouse)

"...You have a wealth of experience and knowledge in senior officer wives. Very rarely are they asked opinions by those who can take action. And many people don't like to hear negative comments. But we do know what Army life is like - and would love to help make it better..." (O6's spouse)

"Being DW of (last four) certainly does nothing for one's self-esteem. Not to mention the fact that I have little or no power over any circumstances or situations which pertain to my family & myself. For example, I was not allowed to enroll my child in the military day care center until my husband filled out & signed the admission form. I had no control over the fate of the child whom I love & raised pretty much single-handedly since my husband's military obligations had kept him away for most of my son's two years. I believe that the Army needs to acknowledge the importance of the spouse & family of the military member not as an extension of the member, but as

individuals with needs of their own. While I appreciate the advances of the military programs thus far, I think they should consider more the individual & not be implemented merely to placate a non-issued piece of equipment in the military members life..." (1LT's spouse)

I don't believe I'm in the Army because I'm married to a soldier. But I do support him (financially and emotionally) so he can do his job. He married me because I'm independent - I enjoy his TDY trips, and can understand tools and computers so we have been surprised over the years to find very few military families who share our views. In this job a military wife better know how to take care of herself. She never knows when she will have to do it alone. Just ask the wives of the Ft. Campbell, the U.S.S Stark, the Marines in Beirut..." (LTC's spouse)

Dental (342) 84/15%

The Army's dental program is clearly less fully-developed and utilized than is the medical program as it is normally found only in certain sites. Consequently, it elicits far fewer comments as we can observe below.

1. Cost/coverage (115) 87/10/3%
2. Adequacy/competence of care (74) 69/31%
3. Attitudes of personnel (21) 90/10%
4. Availability of appointments/waiting time (69) 97/3%
5. Accessibility (hours, location) (10) 100/0%
6. Administration (2) 100/0%
7. Staffing/shortages of personnel (4) 100/0%
0. NEC (37) 68/29/2%

The most frequent negative comment concerns inadequate coverage for dental care. Respondents particularly complain that the program does not cover orthodontia, a very common and costly dental need for children and teenagers. However, a minority praises the dental program, both in terms of coverage and in general (see NEC). Although many complain about the adequacy of dental care, nearly one-third of the comments are positive, a higher proportion than in the case of medical care. Availability of appointments and waiting time are a major source of complaint; respondents report difficulty getting through on the telephone and long waits at the dental clinic, similar to those reported under medical care. Finally, a small group criticizes dental personnel for lack of courtesy and inefficiency. It should be noted that many negative comments refer to the absence of a family dental program at a particular site, rather than criticizing the operation of an existing program.

"I would like to address in more detail the dental care - it is an important issue to most to the family members. The new dental care program is inadequate, it doesn't even begin to help with the cost of dental care. It covers the things you could get provided on post at the dental clinics. I had to have 2 root canals done, of course these are not provided for under the program or by the clinic. Luckily we had some money saved. The 2 root canals wiped out the majority of our savings. They costed \$720 for the 2. As of yet I have not been able to afford a crown for the back tooth because it is \$320. Do you believe most Army personnel can afford such high cost care? It is not just Enlisted and Warrant Officers - at BN coffee I have sat & listened to Majors' and Colonels' wives complain that dental and medical care was due them...Most of us can easily afford the \$25 - \$32 for a cleaning compared to 100's of dollars of high cost care. There are a lot of people out here that are doing without decent dental care because of cost or because they don't have family or friends that work the dental clinic..." (CW3's spouse)

"...the dentist wants all money up front first. We do not live in a 'military town' and the cost of living here is very high. We can't afford these extra expenses on E-5 pay. Any young man with a family that is planning to join the military all I can say is God help them and make sure you have plenty of money for you will need it." (Sgt. E-5's spouse)

Social and Post Problems (199) 94/6%

1. Drugs (11) 100/0%
2. Child abuse (19) 100/0%
3. Spouse abuse (9) 100/0%
4. Race (21) 95/5%
5. Crime/safety on post (40) 80/20%
6. Parking (6) 100/0%
7. Alcohol abuse (33) 94/6%
8. Other (morality; profanity; divorce; suicide; lack of supervision of children; pet abuse) (59) 98/2%
0. NEC (1) 100/0%

This category refers to general problems in the post community, as perceived by respondents and covers a miscellany of topics, e.g., see "other." Since the category is defined in terms of problems, it is not surprising that there are few positive comments; only the area of crime/safety elicits a sizeable minority of favorable remarks. Alcohol abuse is probably the most frequently cited problem; respondents complain that post social activities encourage the use of alcohol and that little is

done for alcoholics. The catch-all "other" category reflects a concern with "immorality" within marriage and the family. However, poor supervision of children (as distinct from child abuse) is probably the most prevalent complaint. Racism does not emerge as a major problem on post, according to these data, nor is it cited frequently either in the unit or in the Army as a whole. (See "unfairness" under Unit and Military Organization.)

"Does anyone, anywhere in the system ever think about how important it is for an army 'dependent' to maintain some level of independence? Army spouses can get so caught up in the 'Sponsor's last four syndrome' that they begin to feel smothered, or they feel they are losing their own identity. That leads to problems with alcohol abuse, child abuse, spouse abuse, or divorce. (All of which have serious effects on the service members' job performance.) I for one have separated myself from your system. I have civilian friends, a civilian house, a civilian job..." (CW2's spouse)

Schools (175) 82/18%

1. OCONUS (DODD) (105) 90/10%
2. CONUS (local/post schools) (30) 80/20%
3. CONUS (section 6 schools) (13) 38/62%
8. Other (1) 100/0%
0. NEC (23) 65/35%

It is necessary to distinguish three types of school systems: 1) local schools in the U.S.; 2) DODD's schools operated by the Department of Defense overseas; 3) section 6 schools on post operated by the DOD in the U.S. Most comments about overseas schools are sharply negative, criticizing lack of particular programs, poor teaching and unqualified teachers as well as standards inferior to those of American schools. However, in the U.S., the DODD's schools are viewed favorably by most although the total number of comments is small. The general category (NEC) mostly includes comments in which it was not possible to identify the type of school. Over one-third of these comments are positive. Schools are an important area of concern to parents. In other categories of comments, we have seen criticism of relocation schedules that disrupt the school year as well as some families that choose separation in order to continue their children's education in the United States.

"Returning from using DOD schools in Europe. They have much to be desired. They need to get the teachers who want to teach in the schools, not the ones who have signed contracts to supposedly teach (but really want a paid trip to Europe.) I believe the DOD schools would really save if they utilized more military spouses

overseas who are teachers. There would be big dollars saved. Military spouses would teach and be dedicated 'cause they know the problems the military child faces." (E-9 (SGM)'spouse)

"Education - [X] county school system which serves Ft. [X] is poor to say the least. They hire the least qualified personnel that they can find while refusing qualified spouses of military. One position remained open for 4 weeks after school began while myself and another military spouse holding master's degrees were not even called for an interview. My children's basic skills have gone back instead of forward. They have no sports programs or other extra-curricular activities including art classes but we pay tuition for each child to attend. No school in the surrounding area requires these fees." (E5 Sgt's spouse)

Civilian Attitudes to the Military (169) 97/2%

This section includes both attitudes of civilian employees on post (unless classified more specifically elsewhere) as well as attitudes of the community around the post.

1. OCONUS (40) 98/3%
2. CONUS (61) 98/2%
3. Congress/government agencies (37) 95/3/3%
8. Other (1) 100/0%
0. NEC (30) 97/3%

Attitudes of Army service agency personnel are a salient issue for Army spouses. In other sections, we observed criticisms of medical and dental staff (these are both military and civilian) as well as employees of the commissary, post exchange and the Civilian Personnel Office. Here, there is criticism of civilian employees in general; they are described as rude, inefficient and often obstructive. Comments about foreign nationals working overseas for the military are particularly bitter; they are often perceived as taking advantage of the U.S. by doing as little work as possible. Some respondents feel that only Americans should be employed at overseas sites. The NEC category consists mostly of negative comments about civilian employees in general without specifying whether they are in the U.S. or overseas. An additional source of complaint is the local community, whether CONUS or OCONUS which is perceived as hostile to the military or interested only in exploiting them for profit. Finally, a number of spouses criticize Congress for failing the military, chiefly by reducing benefits and pay raises.

"...My wife and I are amongst many many other persons who find housing on the economy. We are constantly paying two to three times as much for rent as the German neighbors. Out of 12 people who have

moved from our apartment complex, only one person got any of his deposit back. By the way deposit is 2,500 DM. Currently the DM rate is 1.80 DM per \$1.00 dollar. This has happened to almost anyone who lives on the economy because there aren't enough housing units for the community. The housing referral offices don't help the soldiers at all. Their attitudes are they can't do anything at all. It's the German's country so you should expect it. My wife and I have paid a \$900.00 end of the year electric bill plus \$120.00 monthly, although we were gone for over two months on emergency leaves. It is becoming more obvious that Europeans (many) don't want Americans in their country. And as long as we're here they take the opportunity to drain every cent they can get. And by being black it is even worse. They say no G.I.'s if you try to enter their clubs, even though I'm not a G.I. The attitude of the leadership is to go out of your way to be accepted. We've tried and it only works if you agree to black market. And I'm not breaking the law to be friends of anyone. Although these comments may seem to be of a personal nature, I can guarantee it is the opinion of far too many Americans that are subjected to living abroad..." (SSG's spouse)

"...I'm not alone in feeling that the immediate chain of command is generally sympathetic and supportive. Those higher in command in government law-making positions tend to forget the individual soldiers and the sacrifices made daily for all Americans and many others. It's appalling how many Americans have no respect and total empathy for their own soldiers and their needs. Many aren't aware that many G.I.'s could qualify for Welfare, (a national disgrace!) they don't understand what an increase in the Defense Budget could mean." (CW3's spouse)

Children (153) 84/16%

1. Facilities for young children (40) 83/18%
2. Facilities & opportunities for youth (82) 88/12%
3. Exceptional/handicapped children or other family members (22) 82/18%
8. Other (6) 50/50%
0. NEC (3) 67/33%

Facilities for children refer to playgrounds, recreational activities, etc. but not to child care programs which are coded elsewhere (see Support Programs). The chief complaint is lack of playgrounds for children and inadequate athletic and social activities for teenagers. The latter is perceived as an especially serious problem for overseas families; parents complain that there is little for teenagers to do and that this

causes family problems. A few respondents speak favorably about the advantages of military life for children, e.g., opportunity to travel, to have varied experiences and to learn about other cultures and people.

"In my community there is no activities for young children ages 2-5 years old such as play groups, gym classes etc. Also it seems as if the family's are forgotten. There is very little for us to do as a family. If it wasn't for the officers in my husband's unit the family would never be involved in any activities. The community offers very little for families of young enlisted children..." (E3's spouse)

"...The outside-of-school teen programs are absent. The high school offers programs for high schoolers, Grades 9-12, but neither promotes, encourages, nor organizes programs, especially sports for junior high age kids. They have no place of their own to go, for instance on Fri. and/or Sat. evenings or during the summer..." (MAJOR's spouse)

"The cost of your youth activities and morale support are too high for families with two or three children..." (E5's spouse)

SUMMARY

This report has described in some detail the results of the analysis of the comment sheets in terms of both major categories and sub-categories. We can briefly summarize some of the more significant findings as follows:

1. As might be expected, the valence of the majority of comments is negative. However, there is a sizeable minority of favorable comments (about 20% overall) and some substantive areas show even higher rates of approval. Not all negative comments express objections to Army programs, policies, etc.; rather, they indicate a desire for greater development and extension of existing programs.

2. Certain areas reflect particularly high levels of dissatisfaction, both in terms of total volume of comments and the proportion that are critical. These are medical services; inefficiency in the Army as an organization; spouse employment; housing; frequency and disruption of moving; and the commissary and post exchange. Communication/dissemination of information and civilian attitudes to the military elicit fewer, though highly negative, comments.

3. Despite much dissatisfaction with specific programs and policies, many respondents express favorable perceptions about military life in general, patriotism of military service, the Army as a career and the military community.

4. The unit is generally perceived as the core of family/Army interaction with many comments regarding unit attitudes toward family, unit activities for the family and unit leaders' concern for the family. Dissatisfactions relating to hours, time off and promotion are often attributed to the unit.

5. Spouses living overseas describe special problems involving both the objective difficulties and the emotional stress of living far from home in an unfamiliar culture. Many respondents believe the Army should consider family situations in making duty assignments, particularly those involving living overseas.

6. Finally, there is widespread appreciation for and interest in the ASAF survey itself, including constructive criticism for improving and expanding the survey in the future.

EFFECT OF LOCATION AND RANK

The comment sheets included two independent variables for each respondent: location of the respondent (CONUS/OCONUS) and rank of the soldier spouse. Most respondents provided these data. Thus it is possible to examine and compare the results both in terms of location and rank.

Location: CONUS/OCONUS

We can compare CONUS and OCONUS in terms of overall response rates. Of the total number of respondents who provided data on location, 62% are in the U.S. and 38% overseas. The distribution of comments is similar: 60% of the comments (for all categories) are made by U.S. respondents while 40% derive from overseas. Finally, the total proportion of negative comments is very similar for both location groups: 81% in U.S. and 82% overseas.

We can also compare CONUS/OCONUS responses in terms of major categories. Here we find substantial differences only in certain substantive areas. For most categories, the difference in the proportion of negative/positive comments varies from none to a few percentage points. The table below compares the two location groups, presenting only those categories in which the difference is 5% or greater. They are presented in descending order and only the negative percentage is shown. The figures in parentheses indicate the total number of comments in each category. (Appendix D compares CONUS and OCONUS comments for all categories.)

Table 5: Negative Comments in Major Categories by Location

<u>Category</u>	<u>CONUS</u>	<u>OCONUS</u>	<u>Difference in %*</u>
Schools	71% (82)	91% (92)	+20
Overseas	76 (94)	88 (464)	+12
Retention	77 (53)	89 (27)	+12
Pride in Mil.	21 (89)	32 (47)	+11
Mil Community	68 (243)	75 (138)	+ 7
Children	80 (69)	87 (83)	+ 7
Off post housing	96 (108)	91 (64)	- 5
Unit	86 (232)	91 (171)	+ 5
Support Programs	67 (243)	72 (169)	+ 5
Respondents: N =	1362	819	
Comments (all categories) N =	6302	4207	

*The last column in Tables 5 and 6 shows the difference between OCONUS and CONUS in percentage of negative comments (OCONUS minus CONUS).

Several results emerge in the above table. First, there is a greater volume of negative comments overseas than we might expect from the distribution of respondents. This is to be expected in the "overseas" category but we observe it in several others as well, most notably schools and children. We also see that with one exception, off-post housing, the differences in percentage of negative comments are all in the same direction. Respondents who are OCONUS are more likely to make negative comments about these aspects of military life than are their counterparts in the U.S. Even a subject such as patriotism which elicits mostly positive remarks shows substantially more negative feeling among overseas respondents.

The table above presents only the major categories. It is possible that certain sub-categories within the major areas account for most of the CONUS/OCONUS differences. Table 6 examines the sub-categories for each of the major categories where substantial differences occur. The table omits the two areas, retention and pride in military, which are not sub-classified. Figures in parentheses show the total number of responses for each sub-category in each location.

Table 6: Negative Comments in Sub-Categories by Location

<u>Category</u>	<u>CONUS</u>	<u>OCONUS</u>	<u>Dif. in %</u>
Schools			
OCONUS/DODD	77% (22)	94% (83)	+17%
CONUS/local	80 (30)	--	-80
CONUS/DODD	40 (10)	33 (3)	- 7
Other	100 (1)	100 (2)	0
NEC	63 (19)	75 (4)	+12
Overseas			
General exper.	40 (25)	64 (106)	+24
Language	67 (3)	97 (35)	+30
Culture shock	89 (9)	84 (45)	- 5
Geog. isolation	100 (3)	100 (26)	0
Emotional stress	95 (21)	99 (100)	+ 4
Preparation	80 (5)	95 (40)	+15
Cost of living	92 (13)	99 (81)	+ 7
Other	79 (14)	81 (26)	+ 2
NEC	100 (1)	80 (5)	-20
Military Community			
Morale; cohesion	53 (68)	71 (59)	+18
Loneliness	82 (39)	75 (8)	- 7
Role	79 (63)	81 (42)	+ 2
Psych. effects	69 (62)	80 (25)	+11
Other	75 (4)	67 (3)	- 8
NEC	29 (7)	-- (1)	-29

<u>Category</u>	<u>CONUS</u>	<u>OCONUS</u>	<u>Dif. in %</u>
Children			
Young children	80% (15)	83% (24)	+ 3%
Youth/teens	81 (37)	93 (45)	+12
Excep. Fam. Mem.	82 (11)	82 (11)	0
Other	50 (4)	50 (2)	0
NEC	100 (2)	-- (1)	-100
Unit			
Leadership	86 (70)	92 (51)	+ 6
Rank diff.	100 (10)	100 (14)	0
Fam. Attitude	86 (57)	92 (38)	+ 6
Fam. Support	86 (83)	84 (57)	- 2
Morale	89 (9)	100 (11)	+11
Other	--	--	
NEC	33 (3)	--	-33
Support Programs			
ACS	58 (19)	82 (17)	+24
Fam. Sup. Gps.	71 (31)	78 (9)	+ 7
Wives clubs	60 (15)	69 (13)	+ 9
Child care	82 (83)	88 (51)	+ 6
Chaplain/counsel	67 (12)	75 (8)	+ 8
Umbrella serv.	50 (6)	75 (4)	+25
Red Cross/AER	63 (8)	--	-63
Other	89 (9)	63 (8)	-25
NEC	48 (60)	54 (59)	+ 6
Off-Post Housing			
Availability	75 (4)	67 (3)	- 8
Quality	86 (14)	78 (9)	- 8
Community	100 (5)	80 (5)	-20
Cost	100 (55)	100 (26)	0
Distance	100 (28)	100 (16)	0
Other	100 (1)	100 (2)	0
NEC	-- (1)	33 (3)	+33

The data in the table above should be read as follows: under the category, Unit, 70 CONUS respondents offer comments about leadership and of these, 86% are negative (column 1). A total of 51 spouses OCONUS comment on unit leadership and 92% of these are negative (column 2). Thus, a higher proportion of overseas respondents make negative comments about unit leadership than do those in the U.S. (i.e., +6, column 3).

An examination of these data indicate which sub-categories account for most of the observed differences in the major categories. Under schools, as we might expect, OCONUS respondents make more comments about OCONUS schools and are considerably more likely to be negative than spouses in the U.S. Similarly, OCONUS respondents are much more likely to comment on the overseas experience, although some respondents in the U.S. describe earlier overseas tours. Comparisons here are

not very meaningful because of the small number of comments from U.S. respondents; however, the tendency is for people who are currently overseas to be more negative.

Two sub-categories within the Military Community account for most of the OCONUS/CONUS difference. Overseas spouses are more likely to make negative comments about morale and cohesion as well as the psychological effects of being an Army spouse (e.g., loss of identity). It is possible that the overseas spouse feels a greater need for community support than does her U.S. counterpart and thus is more critical of available support. With regard to psychological effects, a number of OCONUS respondents describe feelings of loss of identity when they are unable to register a car or carry out any legal business overseas.

Programs and facilities for teenagers represent the area of greatest concern overseas, accounting for most of the difference with regard to children. Respondents cite lack of job opportunities, poor recreational facilities and a general lack of things to do for the Army teenager.

Within the unit, most sub-categories show relatively more negative comments from overseas spouses, although most of the differences are not large. It is possible that the explanation lies in the overall negative attitude toward the overseas experience, an attitude that colors the unit/family interaction. This may also account for some of the differences within Support Programs. However, in the case of the unit, we may again be observing a greater need for unit level support among overseas respondents and their feeling that it is inadequate (similar to the differences seen with regard to the military community).

The only area in which CONUS respondents are more negative than overseas spouses is that of off-post housing with availability, quality and community showing more negative responses proportionately. It is difficult to explain these results except possibly in terms of expectations, i.e., U.S. respondents may express more negative sentiments because they expect high quality post housing. However, these sub-categories show only small numbers of comments both in the U.S. and overseas. The areas which elicit many comments are cost of off-post housing and distance from post and, in these cases, there is no difference between OCONUS/CONUS; all comments are negative.

Rank

The second independent variable included on the comment sheet is rank of soldier spouse. A few respondents (under 2%) failed to provide this information so that the total number of respondents is 2166. The table below summarizes the data on rank, presenting 1) combined rank categories; 2) proportion of total number of respondents represented by each category; and 3) proportion of total number of comments offered by each category. (Figures in parentheses show absolute numbers of respondents and comments.)

Table 7: Distribution of Respondents and Comments by Rank

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>		<u>Percent of Comments</u>	
E1 - E3	7%	(162)	6%	(643)
E4	14	(304)	12	(1282)
E5 - E6	16	(351)	16	(1647)
E7 - E9	14	(304)	14	(1496)
CW1 - CW4	14	(295)	14	(1469)
O1 - O3	18	(384)	19	(2003)
O4 - GEN	17	(366)	18	(1901)

We can see that in general there is a correspondence between proportion of respondents and comments within each rank. The only qualification is a slightly higher proportion of comments among commissioned officers but the difference is very small (1%).

The focus of interest with regard to ranks is a comparison of the content of the comments: is there any difference among ranks in terms of volume of comments in a particular code category (see Table 8); are there rank differences in proportion of negative/positive responses in certain areas (see Table 9). Table 8 indicates the relative salience of each major category by determining what proportion of the total number of comments it represents. Table 9 shows the percentage of those comments that are negative. In both tables, categories are presented in order of frequency and the rank categories listed above are used. A complete presentation of all sub-categories by rank can be found in Appendix E and Appendix F.

Table 8: Percent Total Comments in Major Categories by Rank

Category	E1-E3	E4	E5-6	E7-9	WO	LTS, CPT	MAJ, LTC, COL, GEN.
Medical	09%	12%	12%	15%	13%	14%	13%
Mil Org.	11	10	09	07	08	06	06
Moving	02	03	07	06	07	05	08
Mil Way Life	05	05	05	06	06	05	06
Spouse Iss.	03	03	04	05	06	08	06
Overseas	04	05	05	04	05	06	06
Post Housing	05	05	05	06	05	06	05
Survey	04	04	04	04	05	05	07
Finances	06	05	04	04	05	04	04
Att. Fam.	04	05	04	04	04	04	05
Sold. Work	06	06	05	04	03	03	04
Post Facil.	03	04	04	04	04	05	03
Supp. Prog.	04	03	03	04	04	04	05
Unit	08	07	05	02	03	04	01
Separation	08	07	04	03	03	03	01
Mil. Comm.	03	03	03	04	03	05	04
Dental	01	02	03	05	04	03	03
Soc. Prob.	02	02	03	02	02	01	01
Information	04	03	02	01	03	02	01
Schools	--	01	01	02	03	01	03
Off Post	03	02	02	02	01	01	01
Civ. Attit.	01	01	02	01	03	02	01
Children	--	01	02	02	01	01	02
Pride in Mil	01	01	01	02	01	01	01
Retention	01	01	01	--	--	01	01
Number of Respondents	162	304	351	304	295	384	366
Number of Comments	643	1282	1647	1496	1469	2003	1901

Note: The above categories are listed in order of overall frequency.

Table 9: Percent Negative Comments in Major Categories by Rank

Category	<u>E1-E3</u>	<u>E4</u>	<u>E5-6</u>	<u>E7-9</u>	<u>WO</u>	<u>LTS, CPT.</u>	<u>MAJ, LTC, COL, GEN.</u>
Medical	91%	89%	87%	87%	89%	85%	84%
Mil. Org.	96	94	99	97	93	98	93
Moving	100	100	96	89	90	84	88
Mil. Way Life	65	63	43	41	32	39	36
Spouse Iss.	100	93	95	86	88	89	86
Overseas	96	91	79	83	87	86	86
Post Housing	100	97	90	95	92	87	93
Survey	15	14	31	32	30	28	46
Finances	81	83	92	93	90	83	85
Att. Fam.	92	91	87	84	74	81	70
Sold. Work	90	89	90	89	82	85	77
Post Facil.	100	83	95	88	85	87	81
Supp. Prog.	76	64	73	77	67	67	63
Unit	98	91	82	94	85	89	71
Separation	100	96	96	90	96	98	89
Mil. Comm.	96	89	78	64	66	71	58
Dental	89	85	90	88	85	81	78
Soc. Prob.	100	96	96	97	90	92	90
Information	100	97	94	95	100	90	91
Schools	--	88	84	78	77	76	87
Off Housing	89	100	94	100	100	96	84
Civ. Attit.	100	100	100	96	98	97	91
Children	100	88	92	94	83	80	67
Pride in Mil	40	80	21	19	47	12	13
Retention	75	75	82	83	71	95	73
Number of Respondents	162	304	351	304	295	384	366
Number of Comments	643	1282	1647	1496	1469	2003	1901

Note: The above categories are listed in order of overall frequency.

The tables above include considerable data which can be analyzed in a number of ways. At this point, we will describe some of the major results that can be observed from these data.

1. The average number of comments per respondent tends to rise with rank , i.e., the total number of comments per rank divided by the number of respondents in that rank.

Table 10: Average Number of Comments by Rank

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Average number of comments</u>
E1-3	3.9
E4	4.2
E5-6	4.7
E7-9	4.9
CW1-CW4	4.9
01-03	5.2
04-GEN	5.2

These results can be explained by several factors: age, education and experience. As rank rises within the enlisted corps, average age also rises; the same occurs within the officer ranks. Older spouses may feel more secure and confident about expressing their opinions about the military. On the whole, education level is probably higher among officers' spouses, producing greater articulateness and ease in putting thoughts into writing. Finally, those in the higher ranks have usually been in the military for a longer period; with longer military experience, they may simply have more to say. It should be noted that lower rank officers' spouses are probably younger and less experienced than senior NCO spouses; however, their higher level of education may account for their somewhat greater volume of comments. A final qualification must be noted: these figures measure only the average, not the dispersion within each rank category (i.e., whether the number of comments cluster about the average or represent a wide range in terms of volume).

2. With regard to the salience of major categories, there is surprising overall consistency among ranks, despite some inter-rank variation (Table 8). This suggests that concerns of military spouses are not necessarily rank-specific. Salience is defined as the prominence or importance of an issue and is measured by the proportion of the number of comments made within a major category by a rank group to the total number of comments by that rank. Differences in salience of categories across ranks range from 1 to 7 percent. Medical concerns clearly emerge as the dominant category for all ranks accounting for the highest proportion of comments in each rank group.

Exceptions to the pattern of small inter-rank differences are family separation and the soldier's unit which show larger variations across ranks. Each of these categories accounts for 8% of all comments made by E1-E3 spouses, 7% by E4 spouses but only 1% by senior officers' spouses. These differences may reflect actual experience over the course of a military career. For the new soldier's spouse, issues related to separation and the unit are second in importance only to concerns about the larger Army's impact on quality of life (11%) and medical care (9%). On the other hand, for senior officers' spouses, concerns about separation and the unit are of less importance and are superseded by most other categories with medical (13%) and moving (8%) predominant. It is possible that, with experience, issues involving separation or the unit have been resolved for senior officers' spouses. Among other ranks, spouse issues relating to career and employment are most salient for junior officers' spouses (8%) while issues of fairness and efficiency within the Army, and the cost, disruption, and sponsorship of moving are most important for NCO and warrant officers' spouses.

3. In almost every category, the proportion of negative comments declines as we move from the lower enlisted ranks to the senior officer ranks (Table 9). In some cases, the trend is completely linear, while in others, negative comments decline within enlisted ranks, rise somewhat for lieutenants and captains and then decline again among senior officers' spouses.

4. Two areas deviate from the general pattern described above. Views of the survey itself show an increase in the proportion of negative comments as the ranks rise, from 15% for E1-3s to 46% for majors and up. As we pointed out earlier, negative comments on the survey consist mostly of suggestions for improvement in future surveys. It is likely that older, more experienced spouses are more aware of omissions, inadequacies, etc. in the survey.

The second category showing an increase with rank is finances and here the pattern is somewhat different. Negative comments increase from 81% among E1-3 spouses to 93% for E7-9s and to 90% among warrant officers; they then decrease to 83% and 85% for lower and higher rank officers' spouses, respectively. These changes may reflect a combination of factors: stage of the life cycle and military pay. While enlisted soldiers' earnings increase as rank rises, so do family responsibilities. For senior NCOs, there may be financial strain due to a growing family, children in college, and limited job opportunities for spouses. At the same time, their earnings are usually less than those of officers. It is this group, the senior NCO spouses, who are most likely to describe financial problems in their comments.

5. Several areas are notable for particularly large differences between lower and upper ranks. Two of these involve general attitudes and perceptions about the military: the military way of life and attitude of the Army toward families and spouses. In both cases, the percentage of negative comments decreases as rank rises to warrant officer, increases somewhat for lieutenants and declines again for senior officers. It is likely that the more positive (or less negative) attitudes are related to experience; both NCOs' and senior officers' spouses are more likely than spouses of enlisted soldiers and junior officers to describe Army life in a favorable way, i. e., to say it is a good way of life and that they would not have wanted any other. The NCOs' and senior officers' spouses are also more likely to perceive improvement in the Army's attitude toward families, indicating that there is considerably more concern and interest than there was in the past.

A third area, military community, is marked by the single sharpest overall decline in negative percentage as rank rises (minus 38%). Here again, we see a decline in negative comments as enlisted rank rises, contrasted with a slight increase among warrant officers' and lieutenants' spouses and a considerable decrease in negative comments among senior officers' spouses. Although there are some variations within the sub-categories of military community, the general pattern holds. It should be noted that in all three of these areas - military life, Army attitudes and military community - the lowest rank spouses (i.e., junior enlisted) are the most negative.

6. Comments about the unit show a sharp overall decline in percentage negative from 98% among E1-3 spouses to 71% for majors and up. However, in this case, the trend is not linear; there are ups and downs but the sharpest decline is between junior and senior officers' spouses: from 89% to 71% negative. This trend is observable in every sub-category relating to units but it is particularly dramatic for the sub-category "unit morale" in which there are no negative comments among higher rank officers' spouses.

7. There are two additional categories that show large overall rank differences in the proportion of negative comments but both are areas with a relatively small number of responses. Negative comments relating to children decline sharply for warrant officers' spouses and then again among spouses of senior commissioned officers. This pattern may reflect better family adjustment with longer military life experience. With regard to pride or shame in military, it is difficult to discern any pattern; the only clear result is a very sharp decline in negative comments among all commissioned officers spouses.

8. The remainder of the categories manifest the general pattern of relative decline of negative comments as rank rises but in varying degrees. Areas showing sizeable declines are (in descending order): post facilities (-19%); spouse issues (-14%); support programs and soldier's work (-13%); moving (-12%); and dental (-11%). It is interesting that the single most frequent category, medical, shows only a 7% decline in negative comments from the lowest to the highest rank category, suggesting widespread dissatisfaction across the Army.

In summary, the data indicate decreased dissatisfaction (measured by proportion of negative comments) the longer one's spouse is in the Army. This suggests that higher pay, greater authority and longer experience with military life result in more positive attitudes among Army spouses. However, the direction of causality is not clear; it is possible that only the more satisfied (or less dissatisfied) stay in the Army, resulting in the same kind of association between rank and attitudes. Possibly, both factors are involved: the most dissatisfied are not retained but, at the same time, those who remain in the Army adjust to the way of life and develop greater satisfaction with it.

At this point, we must add a final note on the special categories of Help and Success. The "Help" category was created to document the degree to which spouses use the comment sheet as a means to request help with a particular problem. Where this occurs, respondents generally indicate they have either exhausted all available avenues and/or simply did not know where to turn for assistance. In the final analysis, only 2% of the respondents request direct help with a problem. The majority of these are lower enlisted or junior NCO spouses who account for 76% of the 46 requests. While most of the requests are for information, a variety of individual needs is revealed by the range of categories within which help is asked. These include, among others, finances, soldier's work conditions, family separation and emotional stress associated with living overseas. The counter-balancing category of Success, in which respondents express glowing praise of aspects of military life that "work well," elicited only seven comments, a number too small and idiosyncratic to be scientifically meaningful.

A COMPARISON OF SURVEY RESULTS AND COMMENT SHEETS: CATEGORIES AND CONTENT AND CONSISTENCIES

The thematic categories and code for the comment sheets were developed independently of both the ASAF survey instrument and its quantitative results. This was a deliberate attempt to avoid any prior bias in constructing the coding system for the comments; our coding system was empirically-based, i.e., derived from an examination of a random sample of all the comment sheets.

However, a post factum comparison of the structured survey and the comment sheet coding categories indicates substantial agreement and consistency between the two. In the case of many major categories such as medical, housing, support programs, the code categories are very similar to the substantive areas and/or response categories of the survey instrument. In these cases, the comments serve to elaborate and enrich the structured responses of the survey. In some instances, the comments identify both general issues and individual situations that are not adequately covered in the survey.

The quantitative results of the survey and the comment sheets are not directly comparable. As pointed out earlier, the respondents who volunteer comments are a self-selected group, not necessarily representative of either the survey respondents or the Army spouse population as a whole. Furthermore, the survey offers a range of pre-categorized responses in terms of satisfaction-dissatisfaction while the comments sheets are completely open-ended. For a variety of reasons discussed earlier, freely-offered comments tend to concentrate on complaints and dissatisfactions. Despite these qualifications, we can use the comment sheets to elucidate some of the major survey results. In a sense, the comments and the quantitative results serve to "explain" each other. We will not attempt to cover every content area but, instead, will concentrate on some of the more important findings of both the survey and the comments, particularly those issues that elicit a high volume of comments.

It is clear that medical concerns lead all other topics in terms of number of comments. Respondents volunteer over 1300 comments involving medical issues, far exceeding the next most frequent topic, military organization, which draws about 800 comments. Moreover, the great majority of opinions about medical care are negative (86%), criticizing many aspects of medical care such as adequacy, waiting periods, accessibility and attitude of personnel toward patients. If we examine the survey, we can see that the comments are consistent with the survey results. First and foremost, the high volume of comments on medical issues can be understood within the context of use: 90% of the spouses indicate on the survey that either they or their families have used Army medical care at their current location. If we assume

that some have used it at previous locations, it is clear that the overwhelming majority of spouses are familiar with the Army's medical program. Thus, it is not surprising that spouses have so much to say about it. Furthermore, even on the survey which offers a range of options, user satisfaction is not high. Only 47% of Army spouses are satisfied with the overall quality of family medical care and 36% are dissatisfied. Consistent with this, competence or adequacy of care emerges as the most important sub-category on the comment sheets. Only 35% of the survey respondents are satisfied with waiting time and this is reflected in the high frequency of comments about waiting time (233 comments, nearly all negative). Within most aspects of medical care, the survey shows sizeable groups who are dissatisfied and these dissatisfactions explain the high volume of negative comments in this area. It is likely that spouses use the comment sheets as a means to explain and elaborate on their dissatisfactions in a way that the pre-categorized survey responses do not allow. While most of the comment categories are found in the survey, the importance of medical issues suggest that future replications of the survey include a larger section on this topic, allowing the Army spouse greater scope and specificity in her responses.

Comments on the military as an organization are second in frequency among spouses (805). This category includes feelings of trust in the Army, perceptions of concern for soldiers, Army efficiency, leadership, issues of equity/fairness and policies relating to assignment and deployment. Many of these issues involve the soldier, rather than the family. An examination of the survey indicates that this topic has been relatively neglected in the survey questions. The few survey items involving leadership and concern for soldiers relate to the unit, rather than to the Army as a whole. The other issues in this category appear to be omitted. The high volume of comments on inequities and inefficiencies in the Army indicate that these topics should be included in future surveys. While they do not directly relate to families, spouses' perceptions and opinions on these issues clearly influence their attitude toward the soldier's service and toward military life in general.

Finally, there is one family-related issue that emerges both in comments on the Army as an organization as well as in other areas. This involves Army policies and administration relating to assignment and deployment. The comments take various forms: some focus on the failure of the Army to consider certain family and spouse needs with regard to such policies, while others cite instances of unfairness, failure to consider special individual circumstances in assignments, etc. Whatever the focus, comments in this area are numerous and reflect a substantial area of concern. These results suggest that a substantive section dealing with this topic in all its aspects be included in future surveys.

Moving or relocation is clearly a phenomenon associated with Army life. The great majority (81%) of survey respondents report at least one move in the past three years and nearly one-quarter have moved three times or more in that period. As might be expected, this issue arises frequently in the comments, ranking third in order of frequency (630 comments, 90% negative). The aspect of moving that elicits the most comments is the cost, i.e., unreimbursed expenses. This result is consistent with the survey showing that half of the spouses report substantial unreimbursed expenses on PCS moves. Army relocation services and programs vary both with regard to usage and satisfaction. The survey shows that the majority are not satisfied with orientation programs on the unit, installation or overseas level. Sponsorship programs vary in terms of usage with only a minority of enlisted soldiers' spouses indicating that they had a sponsor. Other data on the survey suggest that many relocation services are not widely known or used by Army families. These data again are supported by comments criticizing either lack of information or unclear information about moving (e.g., dates, orders, etc.); inadequate preparation for overseas assignments; lack of sponsorship programs at particular posts. The sponsorship program elicits varying types of comments. A sizeable minority have a very favorable opinion of the sponsorship program, describing how helpful it has been during a particular reassignment. Another group of respondents indicate that they had no sponsors and feel that such a program would be of great benefit. These comments represent the single most frequent group. And, finally, some spouses describe experiencing an inadequate sponsorship program, i.e., they had a sponsor who was either unavailable, uninterested or generally unhelpful. There is apparently general consensus that a sponsorship program is desirable; however, the comments indicate widespread variation in terms of its existence and effectiveness.

The survey includes a final question asking "Overall, how satisfied are you with the Army way of life?" The majority (60%) are satisfied while only 15% are dissatisfied. This general perception of Army life emerges as an important category of comments (569), ranking fifth in order of frequency. Unlike other comment categories, this is a summing up, an overall view, and is not classified into sub-categories. It also differs from most other categories in its valence as more than half (57%) of the comments reflect a positive view of Army life as a whole. As indicated earlier, many respondents state that, despite numerous specific complaints and dissatisfactions, they like and enjoy the Army way of life. Others describe the positive qualities of Army life, e.g., the sense of a community, the varied experiences, the friends they have made, etc. The survey results show relatively higher satisfaction among officers' spouses as compared to enlisted; once again, the comments are consistent with these quantitative data as satisfaction with Army life increases as rank rises.

Employment is an important issue for Army spouses, most of whom are women, as it is for many women today. The survey shows that while 63% of Army spouses are in the labor force, only 44% are currently employed, an unemployment rate of 19% which is considerably higher than the civilian rate. Furthermore, the majority of the unemployed state that they would like to work. The analysis of the comments reinforces the importance of spouse employment as well as identifying some of the specific problems. Spouse issues (i.e., aspects of Army life relating to the spouse as an individual, rather than to the family) emerge as a major comment category with a total of 565 comments, 89% negative. This area also includes topics such as educational opportunities, spouse participation and volunteer work but employment issues are clearly the most salient spouse issue. The comments serve to explain and give substance to the survey figures on employment and labor force participation. Spouses complain about problems in finding work of any kind, low pay in available jobs and the difficulty in establishing any kind of career (i.e., seniority, benefits, opportunities for promotion, etc.) because of frequent moves. Highly qualified spouses such as nurses and teachers complain that even if they can find a job, they must start at the bottom everytime they relocate. With regard to the Civilian Personnel Office, the survey shows that 40% of the spouses have used its services but slightly less than half of these respondents have found CPO services helpful. Consistent with these data, the Civilian Personnel Office elicits many critical comments (97% negative). Spouses claim that the CPO is generally uninterested, unhelpful and inefficient in job assistance. These complaints are particularly bitter among OCONUS residents who object perceived favoritism toward foreign nationals.

On the survey, wives who are not in the labor force cite child care responsibilities as the major reason; this is particularly true of those with pre-school children. However, the comments reveal that many wives would be working if child care facilities were improved. The category of support programs includes a number of programs such as Army Community Services, Family Support Groups, wives clubs, the Chaplaincy as well as child care. However, it is child care that draws the single largest number of comments, indicating its importance to the Army spouse. Wives complain about availability of child care facilities (e.g., waiting lists for day care centers on post), high cost of day care, especially when compared to potential earnings, inadequate hours of operation or other inconveniences in using child care facilities on post. Many respondents indicate that these problems have caused them to leave jobs or to drop out of the labor market entirely. At the same time, many of these spouses would like to work both for financial and other reasons. These data, based on both the survey and the comment sheets, suggest a need for policies and programs in several areas (e.g., child care and employment assistance) that will facilitate employment for Army spouses.

With regard to post facilities, the survey data show that nearly all families use the commissary and the Post Exchange (97%) but that many are not satisfied with these services (about one-quarter are dissatisfied). As is the case with medical care described above, heavy usage produces a high volume of comments. A total of 272 respondents offer opinions on either or both of these services, representing nearly two-thirds of all the comments regarding post facilities. As might be expected, the majority of the comments (90%) are unfavorable reflecting criticism of prices, availability of merchandise and inefficiency and discourtesy among personnel. OCONUS respondents are particularly critical as they are more dependent on the commissary and PX for ordinary family needs.

A basic outcome variable in any research on Army spouses and families is attitude toward retention - does the spouse want her husband to remain in the Army and what are the reasons for her attitude. The survey results reveal that the major reasons cited by spouses are: soldier's satisfaction with his job; security and stability of his job; and retirement pay and benefits. Analysis of the comments indicates both the importance of and dissatisfaction with some of these factors. Benefits, rather than pay, represent the single most salient financial issue. Respondents are concerned with a perceived erosion of benefits such as medical, retirement, etc. Many indicate that these benefits have been a major factor in retention; the predominantly negative comments with regard to current and retirement benefits reflect fears that they will be substantially weakened in the future. On the other hand, over half of the comments relating to security are favorable; the financial stability of Army life represents a definite plus for many respondents. Comments on the third factor cited in the survey, soldier's job satisfaction, reveal concern with on-the-job stress, unfair promotion policies and overlong duty hours. Spouses show concern both for the soldier personally and for the impact on the family of certain job-related problems.

This discussion is not intended to cover the entire content of either the survey or the comments. Rather, we have attempted to focus on the the areas that are highly salient in terms of eliciting voluntary comments and to show the interrelationship between these comments and the survey results. It is apparent that, while direct comparisons are not feasible, there are virtually no inconsistencies between the two sets of data. Some of the survey results explain the high volume of comments (e.g., medical care usage) and some of the comments shed light on relationships within the survey data (e.g., the impact of child care on employment and labor market participation by Army wives).

In this section, we will discuss several important topic areas, identified in the comments, which do not appear to be adequately covered in the survey. Earlier, we referred to assignment and deployment policies which are found among comments on the Army as an organization. This topic is also identified within other comment categories depending on its focus. Respondents complain about specific assignments, particularly to overseas locations, which fail to consider special family circumstances, such as illness, children's educational needs, etc. Comments relating to family separation and to PCS moves in general also criticize the Army's lack of concern for special circumstances, reflected, for example, in uprooting children in the middle of high school. Some respondents describe the need to choose between two undesirable alternatives: either relocating the family at a difficult time or deciding on an unaccompanied tour of duty for the soldier resulting in loneliness and other problems for the family, the spouse and the soldier. The number of comments relating to both general and specific assignment policies suggests a need in future surveys for a section on this general topic.

A second major area emerging in the comments that might be included in future surveys focuses on the personal impact of the Army and military life on the spouse. Respondents offer comments both positive and negative as to how the Army has influenced them in terms of self concept and personal development. A common criticism is the feeling of loss of identity, a sense that they are recognized only as "dependents" rather than as distinct individuals. Others emphasize the development of independence and coping skills as an Army spouse. Some respondents describe the Army community as warm and supportive while others feel it is lonely and isolating. Finally, a small group focus on the role of the Army spouse, the appropriate behavior and attitudes that the spouse needs to develop to function effectively. These type of comments are difficult to describe simply; however, they all focus on the Army's impact on the individual in terms of interaction with others and personal development. A group of items relating to these topics would be a desirable addition to the survey.

Finally, the reasons for staying in the Army suggest the importance of soldier's job satisfaction, an issue only indirectly related to the family and/or spouse. The present survey includes very little on this topic; it would be useful in future research to identify those factors that produce job satisfaction/dissatisfaction, as perceived by the spouse.

In summarizing the results of the survey and comments, we can conclude that they tend to reinforce each other. Furthermore, most of the comment topics do appear in the survey questions and response categories. In this last section we have identified several areas that are prominent in the comments but relatively absent in the survey. It would be most desirable to include them in future research.

ANNUAL SURVEY OF ARMY FAMILIES COMMENT SHEET

If you would like to make any comments concerning Army families, please write them in the space below and on the back of this page.

Because your comments will be kept separate from your questionnaire, the following information will be helpful.

1. Your spouse's rank. _____
2. Your current location. CHECK ONE.
____ In the United States (includes Hawaii and Alaska)
____ Outside the United States

Please use the enclosed postage-paid envelope to return your completed questionnaire and comments. If the envelope has been misplaced, mail your comments to:

Department of the Army,
Annual Survey of Army Families
Processing Center
Post Office Box 4199
Iowa City, IA 52244

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

APPENDIX B

CATEGORIES FOR THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF SPOUSE COMMENTS

Comments are coded as follows:

First two digits indicate major substantive category of comment, e.g., 01 = Medical

Third digit indicates sub-category, e.g.,

013 = attitudes of medical personnel

In all cases, a third digit of 8 = other

0 = no sub-category

Fourth digit indicates valence of comment:

0 = Negative

1 = Positive

9 = No valence (neutral or non-ascertainable)

Material in parentheses indicates certain subjects or areas included within the category or sub-category.

Military life categories

01. Medical

1. CHAMPUS/cost/coverage
2. Adequacy/competence of care (cleanliness; language difficulties with Drs.)
3. Attitudes of personnel
4. Availability of appointments/waiting time
5. Accessability (hours, location)
6. Administration (medical records)
7. Staffing/shortage of physicians or other personnel
8. Other (Primus, Family Med. Practice Program, liaison)
0. Not elsewhere classified (NEC)

02. Dental

1. Cost/coverage
2. Adequacy/competence of care
3. Attitudes of personnel
4. Availability of appointments
5. Accessability (hours, location, etc.)
6. Administration (medical records)
7. Staffing
8. Other
0. NEC

03. Housing/On Post (include govt leased housing OCONUS)

1. Availability (E1-E4 unavailability)
2. Quality/maintenance
3. Post community (area maintenance; quality)
4. Attitudes of personnel (insufficient or inefficient personnel)
8. Other (self help; rules and regulations)
0. NEC

04. Housing/Off Post
 1. Availability
 2. Quality
 3. Community (maintenance; quality; general criticism)
 4. Cost (rental cost)
 5. Distance from post (e.g., transportation)
 8. Other
 0. NEC
05. Moving
 1. Cost/compensation for damage (concurrent travel cost)
 2. Frequency
 3. Information, preparation
 4. Sponsorship (support)
 5. Immediate duty (after moving)
 6. Timing/disruption (stress; concurrent travel stress)
 8. Other (longer tours; MAC flights for shipment)
 0. NEC
06. Finances
 1. Inadequate pay
 2. Security/stability (support when separated)
 3. Pensions, benefits upon retirement
 4. Benefits -current (BAQ; VHA; MAC flights: student travel; TDY pay; FSA)
 8. Other (pay deductions; MRE)
 0. NEC
07. Post Facilities
 1. Commissary; PX; all AAFES facilities
 2. Transportation
 3. Religious
 4. Recreational
 5. MP's
 8. Other (library; bank, : Post Office; guest housing)
 0. NEC
08. Soldier's Work Conditions (General career comments)
 1. Hours (amount; unpredictability)
 2. TDY
 3. Promotions (performance ratings, OOR, EER)
 4. General & emotional stress/ combat threat, GWB
(include problems in family due to work stress)
 5. Off-post duty stations (ROTC, other services)
 6. Access to education, training, self improvement, skills
(second career concerns)
 7. MOS/job unrelated to training
 8. Other
 0. NEC

09. Unit climate (include local commander here)
1. Leadership
 2. Rank differences/favoritism within unit
 3. Unit attitudes toward families/spouses
 4. Unit family support (activities, when TDY; time off for family, except after move)
 5. Unit morale
 8. Other
 0. NEC

Family-related categories

10. Army attitudes toward families/spouses
e.g., perceptions as to Army's concern for families
11. Support Programs for Families and Spouses (General services)
1. ACS (lending closet)
 2. Wives/family support groups
 3. Spouse centers; wives clubs; other spouse activities
 4. Child care
 5. Chaplain; counseling
 6. Umbrella services (community life, financial programs)
 7. Red Cross; AER
 8. Other (mayor; legal service)
 0. NEC
12. Family Separation (include field duty unless specifically TDY)
1. Duration (unaccompanied tours)
 2. Frequency
 3. Need for counseling, advice
 4. Effect on marriage
 5. Effect on soldier
 6. Effect on children/family
 8. Other
 0. NEC
13. Spouse Issues
1. Establishment of a career (Federal jobs; losing benefits; advancement)
 2. Employment/availability of jobs (Prior. Place. Plan)
 3. CPO (Civilian Personnel Office); administrative hassles; policies)
 4. Education (availability, enrichment courses)
 5. Participation (pressures, forced participation)
 6. Volunteer work
 8. Other
 0. NEC

14. Children
 1. Facilities for young children (playgrounds; other than daycare)
 2. Facilities and opportunities for youth/teenagers (jobs)
 3. Exceptional/handicapped children or other family members
 8. Other
 0. NEC
15. Schools
 1. OCONUS (DODD)
 2. CONUS (local/post schools)
 3. CONUS (DODD)
 8. Other
 0. NEC
16. Social and Post Problems
 1. Drugs
 2. Child abuse
 3. Spouse abuse
 4. Race
 5. Crime/safety on post
 6. Parking
 7. Alcohol abuse
 8. Other (morality; profanity; pet abuse; divorce; lack of supervision of children; suicide)
 0. NEC

General themes

17. Military Way of Life

e.g., comments referring to military life as a whole such as distance from family
18. Military Community
 1. Morale, cohesion, welcome, spirit
 2. Loneliness; isolation
 3. Role/behavior expected of Army spouse; inappropriate behavior
 4. Psychological effects (loss or development of self, identity, independence)
 8. Other (e.g., specific community action)
 0. NEC
19. Communication/Information Dissemination

Include learning about services from Survey

20. Civilian Attitudes to Military (include civilian employees on post; code here unless specifically CONUS/OCONUS)
 1. OCONUS
 2. CONUS
 3. Congress, gov't agencies
 8. Other
 0. NEC
21. Patriotism, Nationalism, Pride/Shame in military
(pride in family being part of military; people using military for personal gain)
22. Military as an Organization
 1. Trust/distrust; faith/cynicism
 2. Bureaucracy
 3. Unfairness/favoritism; equity; rank structure; racism
 4. Effectiveness, efficiency (inconsistencies, waste; could be done better)
 5. Concern for soldiers (Army uses soldiers, then discards them)
 6. Overall Army leadership
 8. Other (policies as to duty assignment; deployment, etc.)
 0. NEC
23. Overseas (OCONUS) Experience
(Alaska, Hawaii Puerto Rico included if comment refers to them as overseas experience)
 1. General comments relating to experience as a whole
 2. Language
 3. Culture shock/loss (standard of living; life style)
 4. Geographic isolation
 5. Emotional Stresses (e.g., loneliness, fear, boredom; stairwell living)
 6. Preparation
 7. Cost of living
 8. Other (desire to go or to be reassigned - not policy; APO)
 0. NEC
24. Comments on Survey Itself
 1. Appreciation of opportunity
 2. Feeling someone cares about spouse/family
 3. Omissions, changes, suggestions (use 9 where no valence)
 4. Will it make a difference
 8. Other (desire to see results; have them published)
 0. NEC
25. Statements relating to plans to stay in Army
e.g., explicit statements on plans to leave Army, take voluntary retirement, stay in Army, irrespective of reasons for these plans; include forced retirement but exclude normal retirement.

Special codes

3. Request for help (where respondent uses survey to ask for direct help.
Area in which help is requested will be coded according to categories above:
 second and third digits = general category
 fourth digit = sub-category
 e.g., 3031 indicates request for help with regard to housing availability.
4. Things that work - Success
 Four-digit code as above
 e.g., 4031 indicates that system of housing availability works.

Note: a. Valence will not be coded for these two special codes

 b. The substantive areas in the special codes will be double coded as they will appear in the general coding system above as well.

Quotes

Particularly relevant or dramatic quotes will be recorded.

APPENDIX C

CODING SHEET FOR ANNUAL SURVEY OF ARMY FAMILIES THEMATIC ANALYSIS

Respondent's id IDNUM: | | | | (1-4)

Spouse's rank SRANK: | | (5-6)

Location LOC: | | (7)

Comment 1 CMNT1: | | | | (8-11)

Comment 2 CMNT2: | | | | (12-15)

Comment 3 CMNT3: | | | | (16-19)

Comment 4 CMNT4: | | | | (20-23)

Comment 5 CMNT5: | | | | (24-27)

Comment 6 CMNT6: | | | | (28-31)

Comment 7 CMNT7: | | | | (32-35)

Comment 8 CMNT8: | | | | (36-39)

Comment 9 CMNT9: | | | | (40-43)

Comment 10 CMNT10: | | | | (44-47)

Help HELP: | | | | (88-91)

Success SUCCESS: | | | | (92-95)

CODING SHEET FOR ANNUAL SURVEY OF ARMY FAMILIES

PAGE 2

(to be used only if respondent has written more than 10 comments)

RESPONDENT'S ID

(not coded for key-punching)

Comment 11 CMNT11: |___|___|___|___| (48-51)

Comment 12 CMNT12: |___|___|___|___| (52-55)

Comment 13 CMNT13: |___|___|___|___| (56-59)

Comment 14 CMNT14: |___|___|___|___| (60-63)

Comment 15 CMNT15: |___|___|___|___| (64-67)

Comment 16 CMNT16: |___|___|___|___| (68-71)

Comment 17 CMNT17: |___|___|___|___| (72-75)

Comment 18 CMNT18: |___|___|___|___| (76-79)

Comment 19 CMNT19: |___|___|___|___| (80-83)

Comment 20 CMNT20: |___|___|___|___| (84-87)

APPENDIX D

COMMENTS BY LOCATION

<u>Category</u>	<u>CONUS</u>			<u>OCONUS</u>		
	<u>Neg.</u>	<u>Pos.</u>	<u>Total*</u>	<u>Neg.</u>	<u>Pos.</u>	<u>Total*</u>
Medical	87%	13%	(906)	85%	14%	(432)
Dental	85	14	(256)	82	17	(85)
Post Housing	92	8	(324)	93	7	(223)
Off Housing	96	3	(108)	91	9	(64)
Moving	90	10	(387)	90	10	(240)
Finances	88	12	(338)	84	16	(123)
Post Facil.	86	14	(227)	88	118	(204)
Work	87	11	(265)	84	13	(171)
Unit	86	14	(232)	91	9	(171)
Att. Fam.	82	18	(257)	79	20	(192)
Support Prog.	67	32	(243)	72	28	(169)
Separation	96	4	(303)	95	5	(85)
Spouse Issues	87	12	(303)	91	9	(260)
Children	80	20	(69)	87	13	(83)
Schools	71	29	(82)	91	9	(92)
Soc. Prob.	92	8	(124)	97	3	(75)
Mil Way Life	42	58	(375)	43	57	(192)
Mil Community	68	31	(243)	75	25	(138)
Information	96	4	(128)	93	7	(71)
Civ. Attitudes	96	3	(108)	98	2	(60)
Pride/shame	21	79	(89)	32	68	(47)
Mil Org.	95	5	(487)	97	3	(314)
Overseas	76	25	(94)	88	12	(464)
Survey	31	60	(301)	33	61	(226)
Retention	77	21	(53)	89	11	(27)
Number of respondents		1362				819
Number of comments		6302				4207

*Where percents total less than 100%, remainder are neutral.
 Figures in parentheses indicate total number of comments in each major category for each location.

APPENDIX E

PERCENT GENERAL COMMENTS BY RANK*

Category	E1-3	E4	E5-6	E7-9	WO	LTS, CPT	MAJ, LTC COL, GEN	Total % Major Cat.
<u>Medical</u>	(57)	(148)	(200)	(217)	(187)	(282)	(242)	(1349)
CHAMPUS/cost	14	13	16	12	12	16	16	14%
Adequacy	35	29	35	32	27	29	32	31
Attitudes	19	25	15	14	21	15	13	16
Avail/wait	23	17	16	18	18	19	15	17
Acessib.	05	09	06	07	04	04	05	06
Admin.	--	01	01	--	03	02	04	02
Staffing	02	03	07	10	09	11	08	08
Other	--	01	01	01	01	01	03	02
NEC	02	02	04	05	06	03	04	04
<u>Dental</u>	(9)	(20)	(49)	(69)	(61)	(64)	(64)	(342)
Cost/cov.	56	30	33	38	30	28	34	34
Adequacy	22	30	27	20	20	18	22	22
Attitudes	--	10	08	06	11	--	06	06
Avail/wait	--	25	16	12	28	31	16	20
Accessib.	--	05	04	03	--	03	05	03
Admin.	--	--	--	--	02	--	02	01
Staffing	--	--	--	06	05	06	05	04
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
NEC	22	--	12	16	05	13	11	11
<u>Post Housing</u>	(36)	(61)	(80)	(91)	(74)	(111)	(89)	(549)
Avail.	72	62	40	34	24	23	33	36
Quality	14	20	35	46	54	52	38	41
Community	06	03	09	08	07	10	12	08
Attitudes	06	13	08	07	08	13	11	09
Other	03	02	01	04	03	01	04	03
NEC	--	--	08	01	04	02	01	02
<u>Off Housing</u>	(18)	(32)	(36)	(24)	(13)	(22)	(25)	(172)
Avail.	11	--	03	--	08	05	04	04
Quality	06	19	14	04	23	14	16	13
Community	06	--	06	13	--	09	04	06
Cost	56	53	50	38	31	45	52	47
Distance	22	25	17	46	31	23	24	26
Other	--	03	03	--	08	--	--	02
NEC	--	--	08	--	--	05	--	02
<u>Moving</u>	(15)	(40)	(110)	(88)	(103)	(107)	(160)	(630)
Cost	13	23	21	39	34	26	33	30
Frequency	--	08	08	09	07	05	06	07
Info/prep.	13	15	13	01	06	10	08	08
Sponsorship	20	25	23	10	15	21	10	16
Immed duty	13	10	04	01	02	02	--	02
Disrupt.	27	13	20	25	21	17	26	21
Other	13	05	09	09	10	14	12	11
NEC	--	03	03	06	05	05	06	04

*Figures in parentheses indicate total number of responses for each rank in each major category. Percentages represent the proportion of each sub-category within the major category for each rank (first seven columns) and for all ranks (last column).

Category	E1-3	E4	E5-6	E7-9	WO	LTS,CPT	MAJ,LTC COL,GEN	Total % Major Cat.
<u>Finances</u>	(37)	(63)	(72)	(67)	(67)	(72)	(82)	(463)
Pay	46	33	42	28	39	29	29	34
Security	16	06	08	06	04	10	09	08
Retir. Ben.	--	--	01	16	09	01	15	07
Benefits	32	44	44	46	45	53	44	45
Other	05	14	04	03	03	06	02	05
NEC	--	02	--	--	--	01	01	01
<u>Post Facil.</u>	(22)	(54)	(64)	(60)	(66)	(93)	(64)	(433)
Comm./PX	55	70	59	67	62	61	66	63
Transpt.	14	06	09	12	08	08	03	08
Religious	--	02	02	--	06	01	03	03
Recreat.	09	17	17	05	15	16	09	13
MP's	05	--	03	05	02	01	03	03
Other	05	--	02	03	03	06	03	03
NEC	14	06	08	08	05	06	13	08
<u>Work</u>	(38)	(82)	(80)	(56)	(49)	(58)	(73)	(438)
Hours	32	23	23	16	27	33	12	23
TDY	--	02	--	09	08	05	12	05
Promot.	26	24	21	13	16	19	19	20
Stress	29	15	18	16	10	07	12	15
Off-post	--	04	14	30	14	14	23	15
Educate.	05	13	13	05	06	09	10	09
MOS	05	10	05	04	06	05	04	06
Other	--	--	--	02	02	02	--	01
NEC	03	09	08	05	10	07	07	07
<u>Unit</u>	(50)	(96)	(82)	(33)	(40)	(74)	(28)	(406)
Leader	40	22	23	21	28	38	43	30
Rank dif.	06	11	--	06	08	07	--	06
Fam. Attit.	18	24	24	24	20	24	29	23
Fam Supp.	32	35	46	42	30	26	29	35
Morale	04	06	04	06	08	05	--	05
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
NEC	--	01	02	--	--	--	--	01
<u>Att. Fam.</u>	(24)	(58)	(70)	(57)	(57)	(83)	(98)	(451)
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
<u>Support</u>	(25)	(36)	(55)	(65)	(54)	(86)	(86)	(416)
ACS	08	17	05	05	11	13	06	09
Fam. Supp.	16	03	11	11	06	07	15	10
Wives clubs	08	06	04	06	09	06	08	07
Child care	16	25	25	45	33	42	28	32
Chap/couns.	16	03	07	02	07	05	01	05
Umbrella	08	03	04	02	04	01	01	02
RC/AER	08	14	--	02	--	--	--	02
Other	--	06	11	02	02	03	05	04
NEC	20	25	33	28	28	23	36	27

Category	E1-3	E4	E5-6	E7-9	WO	LTS,CPT	MAJ,LTC COL,GEN	Total % Major Cat.
<u>Separation</u>	(52)	(88)	(74)	(41)	(45)	(61)	(28)	(391)
Duration	40	35	34	23	31	44	29	35
Frequency	10	05	09	05	04	11	07	07
Counsel.	--	02	01	05	02	05	04	03
Marriage	12	22	18	17	22	10	07	16
Soldier	06	05	08	07	07	02	--	05
Fam/child.	29	27	27	37	27	26	46	29
Other	--	02	--	--	02	--	--	01
NEC	04	02	03	07	04	02	07	04
<u>Spouse Iss.</u>	(18)	(42)	(65)	(73)	(81)	(158)	(122)	(565)
Career	17	07	22	26	22	30	27	24
Employment	33	43	49	40	35	27	26	34
CPO	22	10	14	26	17	17	12	16
Education	22	24	11	03	07	10	10	10
Particip.	06	05	--	01	10	10	13	08
Volunteer	--	12	05	04	07	05	11	07
Other	--	--	--	--	01	01	--	--
NEC	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<u>Children</u>	(3)	(8)	(26)	(35)	(18)	(25)	(35)	(153)
Young child.	67	75	35	17	22	32	11	26
Youth	33	--	58	69	50	40	63	54
EFM	--	13	08	14	22	20	14	14
Other	--	--	--	--	--	08	11	04
NEC	--	13	--	--	06	--	--	02
<u>Schools</u>	(0)	(8)	(19)	(32)	(39)	(21)	(54)	(175)
OCONUS/DODD	--	50	63	53	59	62	67	60
CON/local	--	25	16	16	23	19	13	17
CON/DODD	--	--	05	13	10	05	06	07
Other	--	--	05	--	--	05	02	02
NEC	--	25	11	19	08	10	13	13
<u>Soc. Prob.</u>	(15)	(22)	(50)	(36)	(31)	(25)	(19)	(199)
Drugs	07	05	10	08	03	--	--	06
Child abuse	--	05	08	06	13	16	21	10
Spouse "	--	05	06	06	06	04	--	05
Race	27	09	08	08	13	08	11	11
Crime	13	14	14	25	19	24	26	20
Parking	--	--	02	06	06	--	05	03
Alcohol.	13	14	20	17	19	20	11	17
Other	40	50	32	22	19	28	26	30
NEC	--	--	--	03	--	--	--	01
<u>Mil Way Life</u>	(31)	(62)	(75)	(88)	(87)	(104)	(119)	(569)
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Category	E1-3	E4	E5-6	E7-9	WO	LTS,CPT	MAJ,LTC COL,GEN	Total % Major Cat.
<u>Mil Community</u>	(22)	(37)	(45)	(56)	(44)	(91)	(84)	(388)
Morale	23	35	36	39	34	33	31	33
Isolation	32	14	11	13	11	10	11	12
Role	14	32	22	27	32	25	33	28
Psych.eff.	32	16	27	21	18	26	20	23
Other	--	03	04	--	--	01	02	02
NEC	--	--	--	--	05	04	02	02
<u>Information</u>	(28)	(36)	(35)	(19)	(20)	(39)	(22)	(199)
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
<u>Civ. Attit.</u>	(6)	(17)	(25)	(22)	(42)	(31)	(23)	(169)
OCONUS	33	35	28	18	24	29	04	24
CONUS	50	41	32	41	40	32	30	36
Congress	17	18	20	23	21	13	43	22
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
NEC	--	06	20	18	14	26	22	18
<u>Pride/shame</u>	(5)	(10)	(24)	(32)	(15)	(26)	(23)	(136)
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
<u>Mil Org</u>	(70)	(122)	(151)	(101)	(119)	(124)	(110)	(805)
Trust	16	17	15	08	10	10	11	12
Bureauc.	07	07	09	02	05	10	12	07
Fairness	36	22	25	33	32	24	21	27
Efficiency	10	20	24	25	24	31	28	24
Concern	17	16	12	18	15	12	10	14
Leadership	03	02	03	07	04	08	13	06
Other	10	11	12	06	08	04	05	08
NEC	01	06	01	02	02	--	01	02
<u>Overseas</u>	(27)	(68)	(84)	(66)	(70)	(118)	(116)	(560)
General	22	21	29	24	26	23	22	24
Language	04	07	04	08	06	09	07	07
Cult.shock	--	07	10	08	17	07	12	10
Geog.isol.	--	10	02	03	03	08	05	05
Stress	11	29	24	24	23	19	18	22
Preparation	11	01	05	06	07	14	08	08
Cost living	41	21	20	21	09	11	16	17
Other	11	03	05	06	10	06	10	07
NEC	--	--	02	--	--	02	02	01
<u>Survey</u>	(27)	(56)	(65)	(62)	(80)	(108)	(124)	(540)
Appreciat.	30	48	46	42	40	39	26	38
Care	11	07	12	03	04	08	07	07
Changes	19	21	25	35	38	27	48	34
Make dif.	33	20	15	13	16	21	17	18
Other	07	02	02	05	--	04	02	02
NEC	--	02	--	02	03	01	--	01
<u>Retention</u>	(8)	(16)	(11)	(6)	(7)	(20)	(11)	(80)
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

APPENDIX F

PERCENT NEGATIVE COMMENTS BY RANK*

Category	E1-3	E4	E5-6	E7-9	WO	LTS, CPT	MAJ, LTC, COL, GEN
<u>Medical</u>	(57)	(148)	(200)	(217)	(187)	(282)	(242)*
CHAMPUS	100	84	81	92	77	80	80
Adequacy	80	84	77	74	82	76	73
Attitudes	100	87	97	81	90	83	100
Avail/wait	100	100	100	97	100	98	97
Accessib.	100	92	100	100	100	83	100
Admin.	--	100	100	--	100	100	100
Staffing	100	100	100	96	100	97	100
Other	--	100	--	100	100	33	38
NEC	--	100	75	82	73	88	44
<u>Dental</u>	(9)	(20)	(49)	(69)	(61)	(64)	(64)
Cost/cov.	100	83	94	92	94	78	82
Adequacy	50	67	77	71	50	67	79
Attitudes	--	100	100	100	86	--	75
Avail/wait	--	100	100	100	100	95	90
Accessib.	--	100	100	100	--	100	100
Admin.	--	--	--	--	100	--	100
Staffing	--	--	--	100	100	100	100
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
NEC	100	--	83	82	67	63	29
<u>Post Housing</u>	(36)	(61)	(80)	(91)	(74)	(111)	(89)
Avail.	100	97	100	100	100	100	100
Quality	100	92	79	93	90	88	88
Community	100	100	86	86	80	82	91
Attitudes	100	100	100	100	100	86	100
Other	100	100	100	100	100	--	75
NEC	--	--	83	--	67	--	100
<u>Off Housing</u>	(18)	(32)	(36)	(24)	(13)	(22)	(25)
Avail.	50	--	100	--	100	100	100
Quality	--	100	100	100	100	100	25
Community	100	--	100	100	--	100	--
Cost	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Distance	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Other	--	100	100	--	100	--	--
NEC	--	--	100	--	--	--	--
<u>Moving</u>	(15)	(40)	(110)	(88)	(103)	(107)	(160)
Cost	100	100	100	100	100	100	98
Frequency	--	100	100	75	100	80	100
Info/prep.	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Sponsorship	100	100	96	89	73	74	69
Immed duty	100	100	100	100	100	100	--
Disrupt.	100	100	100	100	96	94	100
Other	100	100	90	63	70	67	58
NEC	--	100	--	20	60	20	44

*Figures in parentheses indicate total number of responses (negative, positive & neutral) for each rank in each major category. Percentages show the proportion of negative responses in each sub-category for each rank.

<u>Category</u>	<u>E1-3</u>	<u>E4</u>	<u>E5-6</u>	<u>E7-9</u>	<u>WO</u>	<u>LTS, CPT</u>	<u>MAJ, LTC, COL, GEN</u>
<u>Finances</u>	(37)	(63)	(72)	(67)	(67)	(72)	(82)
Pay	94	95	100	100	92	91	92
Security	33	25	67	--	67	86	57
Retir. Ben.	--	--	100	100	100	--	75
Benefits	83	79	88	97	87	79	92
Other	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
NEC	--	--	--	--	--	100	--
<u>Post Facil.</u>	(22)	(54)	(64)	(60)	(66)	(93)	(64)
Comm./PX	100	87	95	88	93	88	86
Transpt.	100	100	100	100	80	100	100
Religious	--	100	100	--	75	100	50
Recreat.	100	67	91	100	70	80	83
MP's	100	--	100	100	50	83	50
Other	100	--	100	100	50	83	50
NEC	100	67	100	60	67	83	88
<u>Work</u>	(38)	(82)	(80)	(56)	(49)	(58)	(73)
Hours	100	100	94	100	100	100	100
TDY	--	100	--	100	100	100	89
Promot.	100	95	100	86	100	91	100
Stress	82	100	100	100	100	100	78
Off-post	--	100	100	82	43	63	65
Educat.	100	82	80	67	33	80	57
MOS	--	100	75	100	67	100	67
Other	--	--	--	100	100	100	--
NEC	100	100	33	67	60	--	20
<u>Unit</u>	(50)	(96)	(82)	(33)	(40)	(74)	(28)
Leader	100	95	100	79	79	89	75
Rank dif.	100	100	--	100	100	100	--
Fam. Attit.	100	87	85	88	88	100	75
Fam Supp.	94	88	82	93	83	79	63
Morale	100	100	1090	100	100	75	--
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
NEC	--	--	50	--	--	--	--
<u>Att. Fam.</u>	(24)	(58)	(70)	(57)	(57)	(83)	(98)
	92	91	87	84	74	81	70
<u>Support</u>	(25)	(36)	(55)	(65)	(54)	(86)	(86)
ACS	100	67	67	100	67	64	60
Fam. Supp.	50	100	100	86	67	83	54
Wives clubs	100	50	50	50	60	60	71
Child care	100	89	79	83	78	89	83
Chap/couns.	50	100	100	--	75	50	100
Umbrella	50	--	100	100	50	--	100
RC/AER	100	40	--	100	--	--	--
Other	--	50	100	100	100	67	50
NEC	80	56	44	67	53	35	48

Category	E1-3	E4	E5-6	E7-9	WO	LTS, CPT	MAJ, LTC COL, GEN
<u>Separation</u>							
Duration	100	97	100	89	100	100	88
Frequency	100	75	100	50	100	100	100
Counsel.	--	100	100	100	100	100	100
Marriage	100	100	92	100	80	100	50
Soldier	100	75	100	100	100	100	--
Fam/child.	100	96	95	93	100	94	92
Other	--	100	--	--	--	--	--
NEC	100	100	50	67	100	100	100
<u>Spouse Iss.</u>	(18)	(42)	(65)	(73)	(81)	(158)	(122)
Career	100	67	93	90	94	92	94
Employment	100	100	97	86	82	81	81
CPO	100	100	100	95	100	93	100
Education	100	90	100	100	100	88	100
Particip.	100	100	--	--	88	100	81
Volunteer	--	80	67	33	50	50	57
Other	--	--	--	--	100	100	--
NEC	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<u>Children</u>	(3)	(8)	(26)	(35)	(18)	(25)	(35)
Young child.	100	83	89	100	75	75	50
Youth	100	--	93	92	89	100	77
EFM	--	100	100	100	100	40	80
Other	--	--	--	--	--	100	25
NEC	--	100	--	--	--	--	--
<u>Schools</u>	(0)	(8)	(19)	(32)	(39)	21)	(54)
OCONUS/DODD	--	75	92	88	87	92	94
CON/local	--	100	100	100	67	50	86
CON/DODD	--	--	--	50	25	--	67
Other	--	--	100	--	--	100	100
NEC	--	100	50	50	100	50	57
<u>Soc. Prob.</u>	(15)	(22)	(50)	(36)	(31)	(25)	(19)
Drugs	100	100	100	100	100	--	--
Child abuse	--	100	100	100	100	100	100
Spouse "	--	100	100	100	100	100	--
Race	100	50	100	100	100	100	100
Crime	100	100	71	89	83	67	80
Parking	--	--	100	100	100	--	100
Alcohol	100	100	100	100	67	100	100
Other	100	100	100	100	100	100	80
NEC	--	--	--	100	--	--	--
<u>Mil Way Life</u>	(31)	(62)	(75)	(88)	(87)	(104)	(119)
	65	63	43	41	32	39	36

Category	E1-3	E4	E5-6	E7-9	WO	LTS, CPT	MAJ, LTC COL, GEN
<u>Mil Community</u>	(22)	(37)	(45)	(56)	(44)	(91)	(84)
Morale	100	100	69	55	60	50	46
Isolation	100	100	80	71	60	78	78
Role	100	75	80	73	79	83	82
Psych.eff.	86	83	83	67	63	96	35
Other	--	100	100	--	--	--	50
NEC	--	--	--	--	50	25	--
<u>Information</u>	(28)	(36)	(35)	(19)	(20)	(39)	(22)
	100	97	94	95	100	90	91
<u>Civ. Attit.</u>	(6)	(17)	(25)	(22)	(42)	(31)	(23)
OCONUS	100	100	100	100	90	100	100
CONUS	100	100	100	100	100	100	86
Congress	100	100	100	80	100	100	90
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
NEC	--	100	100	100	100	88	100
<u>Pride/shame</u>	(5)	(10)	(24)	(32)	(15)	(26)	(23)
	40	80	21	19	47	12	13
<u>Mil Org</u>	(70)	(122)	(151)	(101)	(119)	(124)	(110)
Trust	91	95	100	100	100	100	100
Bureauc.	80	100	100	100	100	100	92
Fairness	100	100	100	100	97	100	96
Efficiency	86	96	100	100	96	100	100
Concern	100	95	94	89	83	93	91
Leadership	100	100	100	100	80	90	71
Other	100	100	100	100	100	80	100
NEC	100	43	100	50	--	--	--
<u>Overseas</u>	(27)	(68)	(84)	(66)	(70)	(118)	(116)
General	100	71	46	31	78	59	60
Language	--	100	100	100	75	100	100
Cult.shock	--	100	75	100	83	88	86
Geog.isol.	--	100	100	100	100	100	100
Stress	100	100	95	100	100	100	95
Preparation	100	--	100	100	100	94	89
Cost living	100	100	94	100	100	100	95
Other	100	50	75	100	71	43	100
NEC	--	--	100	--	--	100	50
<u>Survey</u>	(27)	(56)	(65)	(62)	(80)	(108)	(124)
Appreciat.	--	--	3	--	3	--	6
Care	--	--	--	--	33	11	--
Changes	20	50	86	77	60	69	80
Make dif.	33	18	60	38	31	35	29
Other	--	--	--	--	--	25	50
NEC	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<u>Retention</u>	(8)	(16)	(11)	(6)	(7)	(20)	(11)
	75	75	82	83	71	95	73

