

SOME ASPECTS OF NAVY MANPOWER MANAGEMENT:
CAREER MANNING RATIOS, VARIABLE
REENLISTMENT BONUSES AND PROFICIENCY PAY

120 30 1000
by

Sheldon E. Haber

TECHNICAL REPORT

Serial TR-1146

30 July 1973

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Econometric Research on Navy Manpower Problems

This report was prepared under the
Navy Manpower R&D Program of the
Office of Naval Research under Con-
tract Number N00014-67-A-0214-0016.

This document has been approved for public
sale and release; its distribution is unlimited.

AD768997

NONE

Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R & D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES ECONOMETRIC RESEARCH ON NAVY MANPOWER PROBLEMS		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION NONE	
		2b. GROUP	
3. REPORT TITLE SOME ASPECTS OF NAVY MANPOWER MANAGEMENT: CAREER MANNING RATIOS, VARIABLE REENLISTMENT BONUSES AND PROFICIENCY PAY			
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) SCIENTIFIC			
5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name) SHELDON E. HABER			
6. REPORT DATE 30 July 1973	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 21	7b. NO. OF REFS 2	
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. N00014-67-A-0214-0016	9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) TR-1146		
b. PROJECT NO. NR 347-024	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)		
c.			
d.			
10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT This document has been approved for public sale and release; its distribution is unlimited.			
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Office of Naval Research	
13. ABSTRACT The Variable Reenlistment Bonus and Proficiency Pay are monetary incentives designed to increase the supply of manpower in military specialties experiencing shortages of personnel. This paper examines current Navy practice in assigning these monetary benefits.			

14. KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Variable Reenlistment Bonuses Proficiency Pay Assignment of Monetary Incentives						

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Econometric Research on Navy Manpower Problems

Abstract
of
Serial TR-1146
30 July 1973

SOME ASPECTS OF NAVY MANPOWER MANAGEMENT:
CAREER MANNING RATIOS, VARIABLE
REENLISTMENT BONUSES AND PROFICIENCY PAY

by

Sheldon E. Haber

The Variable Reenlistment Bonus and Proficiency Pay are monetary incentives designed to increase the supply of manpower in military specialties experiencing shortages of personnel. This paper examines current Navy practice in assigning these monetary benefits.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page Number</u>
ABSTRACT	ii
0. INTRODUCTION	1
I. BACKGROUND	1
II. CAREER MANNING RATIOS, VARIABLE ENLISTMENT BONUSES AND PROFICIENCY PAY: EMPIRICAL FINDINGS	3
III. CONCLUDING REMARKS	13
REFERENCES	15
APPENDIX	16

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Econometric Research on Navy Manpower Problems

SOME ASPECTS OF NAVY MANPOWER MANAGEMENT:
CAREER MANNING RATIOS, VARIABLE
REENLISTMENT BONUSES AND PROFICIENCY PAY*

by

Sheldon E. Haber[†]

0. Introduction

This paper examines the allocation of Variable Reenlistment Bonuses (VRB's) and Proficiency Pay (Pro Pay) among Navy ratings, i.e., occupation specialties. In particular, the assignment of these monetary incentives to reenlistment in the recent past is evaluated in terms of efficiency and effectiveness criteria. Subsequent papers will explore improved procedures for identifying Navy occupations, i.e., ratings, with shortages of personnel, and for assigning incentive pays such as the VRB and Pro Pay. Additionally, attention will be given to economic factors influencing reenlistment rates to determine, for example, the extent to which current levels of VRB and Pro Pay are effective in raising reenlistment rates.

I. Background

As specified by the Department of Defense (DOD), personnel shortages in a military occupation specialty are determined by a measure known as the career manning ratio. The career manning ratio is a ratio of career inventory or strength to career requirements. Career inventory includes all

* This report was prepared under the Navy Manpower R&D Program of the Office of Naval Research under Contract Number N00014-67-A-0214-0016.

[†] Thanks are due to Kate Arbogast for her assistance in collecting the data employed in this study.

enlisted personnel on active duty with more than four years service. Career requirements are measured by extant enlisted billets in pay grade E-5 and above.

One means for increasing the supply of personnel to ratings experiencing shortages is to provide VRB's and Pro Pay. The VRB is payable, with some exceptions, in equal yearly installments during the reenlistment period on first reenlistment in specified occupations to individuals who are entitled to a regular first reenlistment bonus.¹ The VRB is based on multiples (one through four, the latter being the highest payment) of the regular first reenlistment bonus. Since the total of all regular reenlistment bonuses may not exceed \$2,000, the maximum VRB is \$8,000. Pro Pay is a monthly payment paid to careerists in highly technical specialties of special importance to military needs where the maximum VRB is an insufficient retention incentive. This monthly addition to pay and allowances may be received over successive reenlistments but terminates when the occupation specialty no longer qualifies for Pro Pay. Although Pro Pay is only awarded for superior performance, in practice most individuals in a Pro Pay rating receive it.

In determining whether a rating is eligible for a VRB and/or Pro Pay, three factors are generally mentioned; these are the career manning ratio, total training costs and training time.² Obviously, the formulation of explicit criteria for the assignment of VRB's and Pro Pay is not an easy task. As a first step it is useful to see how these monetary supplements to pay and allowances have been allocated in the recent past. This is the

¹Regular reenlistment bonuses are lump sum payments awarded to enlisted personnel to induce them to reenlist. Unlike reenlistment bonuses which may be offered at the completion of any contract term, the VRB, which is an extra bonus, can be offered only for the first reenlistment.

²Some ambiguity in criteria, however, may be noted. For example, as stated in [2, p. 7514], VRB is "used to assist in attaining and maintaining career manning ratios in critical military specialties with inadequate first term retention rates" [italics added].

subject matter for this paper. Empirical findings are presented in the next section which indicate that improvement in the efficiency and effectiveness of these incentives to reenlistment may be desirable. Concluding comments are contained in the last section.

II. Career Manning Ratios, Variable Enlistment Bonuses and Proficiency Pay: Empirical Findings

In this section empirical relationships between career manning ratios, VRB's and Pro Pay are discussed.³ In the discussion that follows, it is assumed that the career manning ratio is the best measure for identifying Navy ratings with shortages of personnel. The relationship between career manning ratios and other measures for identifying Navy occupations with personnel shortages, e.g., reenlistment rates, will be examined in a forthcoming paper.

The Department of Defense (DOD) categorizes career manning ratios into four groups as shown below.

<u>DOD Group</u>	<u>Career Manning Ratio</u>
A	Less than 0.75
B	Between 0.76 and 0.89
C	Between 0.89 and 1.10
D	Over 1.10

In practice career manning codes A and B are used to identify military occupation specialties experiencing a shortage of personnel, C and D to identify occupations where supply and demand are equal or where there is a surplus of personnel.

In Table 1, the Navy ratings are grouped according to the DOD classification of military occupations.⁴ As can be seen from this table,

³The data for the analysis were provided by the Office of the Special Assistant for Enlisted Force Analysis, Bureau of Personnel (Pers AX).

⁴The ratings in each DOD group are shown in the Appendix.

the DOD major occupation groups with the highest percentage of ratings in a shortage status are electronics equipment repairmen, communications and intelligence specialists, and other technical and allied specialties. The occupations with the lowest percentage of ratings in a shortage status are service and supply handlers, administrative specialists and clerks.

TABLE 1
PERCENT OF RATINGS WITH LOW CAREER MANNING RATIOS (CMR), WITH
A VARIABLE REENLISTMENT BONUS (VRB), AND WITH PROFICIENCY
PAY (PRO PAY) BY DOD OCCUPATION GROUP, 1971

<u>DOD Group</u> ^{a/}	<u>Percent of Ratings in DOD Group with</u>		
	<u>Low CMR</u> ^{b/}	<u>VRB</u> ^{c/}	<u>Pro Pay</u> ^{d/}
1. Electronics equipment repairmen (11)	82	100	55
2. Communication and intelligence specialists (6)	83	100	17
3. Medical and dental specialists (2)	50	50	0
4. Other technical and allied specialists (5)	100	40	0
5. Administrative specialists and clerks (9)	56	11	0
6. Electrical/mechanical equipment repairmen (17)	76	65	0
7. Craftsmen (12)	75	33	0
8. Service and supply handlers (4)	0	0	0

^{a/} Number of different ratings in each DOD group shown in parentheses.

^{b/} Percent of ratings with a career manning code of A or B.

^{c/} Percent of ratings providing a Variable Reenlistment Bonus.

^{d/} Percent of ratings providing Proficiency Pay.

During the last several years the number of ratings with personnel shortages has increased. As indicated by Table 2, in 1965 less than one-third of the ratings had career manning codes of A or B. By 1971, this proportion had increased to more than two-thirds. Of particular importance, there were 18 different ratings which were in a shortage status in 1965 and were still in this status six years later; five of these ratings were in the electronics equipment repairmen occupations and a VRB was given in each in 1965 and in 1971. The length of time that these shortages have persisted suggests that the structure of VRB and Pro Pay and/or the structure of basic pay and allowances have not been sufficiently flexible to equate demand and supply.

TABLE 2
NUMBER OF RATINGS BY CAREER MANNING
CODE (CMC),^{a/} 1965 AND 1971 ^{b/}

1965 CMC	1971 CMC				Total
	D	C	B	A	
D	2	11	4	1	18
C		4	14	7	25
B			9	2	11
A		2	4	3	9
Total	2	17	31	13	63

^{a/}Career manning codes A and B indicate a shortage of personnel in a rating.

^{b/}Information missing for three ratings.

In allocating VRB's and Pro Pay, it is desirable that they be assigned to ratings in an effective and efficient manner. Focusing solely on the career manning ratio for the moment, effective allocation requires that these benefits be assigned to ratings with personnel shortages. By this definition, ineffective allocation occurs when incremental compensation in the form of a VRB or Pro Pay is not provided in a rating experiencing a career manning ratio of A or B. A second measure of performance in the

assignment of VRB's and Pro Pay relates to efficiency. Efficient allocation requires that these benefits not be assigned to ratings where the supply of personnel is adequate. The following cases illustrate these different measures.

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Career Manning Ratio</u>	<u>Career Manning Code</u>	<u>VRB Code</u>
1)	Hull Technician	.73	A	4
2)	Utilitiesman	.74	A	0 <u>a/</u>
3)	Storekeeper	.94	C	0 <u>a/</u>
4)	Signalman	.90	C	3

a/ Indicates no VRB offered.

All other things being equal, in case 1 the allocation of VRB is effective; in case 2, ineffective; in case 3, efficient; and in case 4, inefficient.

Although the data in Table 1 indicate that, on the whole, the distribution of VRB's and Pro Pay is efficient and effective in that it is concentrated in the occupation groups with the highest proportion of ratings in a shortage status, further examination of the detailed ratings suggests that if the career manning ratio, total training cost and training time are used as the criteria for assignment, effectiveness and efficiency can be improved. This is indicated first for the VRB and then for Pro Pay.

Some evidence that the effectiveness and efficiency in allocation of VRB's can be improved is presented in Table 3. As can be seen from this table, in 1971 almost one-third, 15 of the 47 ratings, with a career manning code (CMC) of A or B, were not covered by a VRB. On the other hand, a VRB was provided in more than one-fifth, 4 out of 19, of the ratings with a CMC of C or D.

TABLE 3
 CAREER MANNING CODE (CMC)^{a/} BY VARIABLE
 REENLISTMENT BONUS (VRB) CODE,^{b/} 1971

1971 VRB	1971 CMC				Total
	D	C	B	A	
<u>c/</u>	2	13	9	6	30
1					
2		1	2		3
3		1	9	2	12
4		2	13	6	21
Total	2	17	33	14	66

^{a/} Career manning codes A and B indicate a shortage of personnel in a rating.

^{b/} The VRB code indicates the relative ratio of the Variable Reenlistment Bonus to the regular first reenlistment bonus.

^{c/} No Variable Reenlistment Bonus.

As noted above, VRB's are based on the total cost of training⁵ and training time as well as on the career manning ratio. Examination of these latter costs indicates that training cost is highly correlated with training time; the coefficient of correlation for these variables is 0.84.⁶ For this

⁵Total training cost includes basic training and school training costs. In each case, the costs taken into account are pay and allowances of students, pay and allowances of instructional staff and overhead personnel, expenses of operating and maintaining facilities and other real property, travel, and accrued leave [1]. Hence, the cost figures represent average cost rather than marginal cost, i.e., the incremental cost of training an additional man.

⁶Total training costs ranged from \$3,312 for the quartermaster rating to \$13,557 for the electronic technicians rating. But the range in training cost per year was very small. Excluding the highest and lowest

reason, only total training cost is considered as a measure of the cost of filling vacancies. Total training cost data are juxtaposed against career manning levels and VRB's in Table 4 in order to further assess the consistency of current VRB allocations.

In Table 4, the ratings are classified into four groups depending on career manning code (CMC) and whether a VRB was offered in the rating. Within each group ratings are distributed according to total training cost. From this table it is seen that total training costs tended to be higher for ratings with a shortage of personnel, i.e., for ratings with a CMC of A or B for which a VRB was given (Group 2), than for ratings with a shortage for which no VRB was assigned (Group 1). Yet there were a number of ratings with shortages of personnel and low training costs that were assigned a VRB and some ratings with a shortage and high training costs that were not assigned a VRB. Additionally, there were ratings where no shortage of personnel was indicated and where a VRB was given (Group 4); for these ratings the spread of training costs was very large.

Similar findings, but primarily relating to effectiveness rather than efficiency, are found with respect to Pro Pay. Unlike the VRB, the amount of Pro Pay is independent of other monetary payments. Three levels of Pro Pay are offered; however, four categories are distinguished since in practice Pro Pay of 50, 75, 100 and 150 dollars per month is paid depending on the particular rating.

From Table 5 it is seen that Pro Pay was offered in seven ratings in 1971. In all but one of these there was a shortage of personnel⁷ and in all ratings a VRB was paid. Of 29 other ratings in which a VRB was quintiles (i.e., excluding ten percent of the ratings that have either very high or very low training costs per year), the range in annual training costs varied between \$9,971 and \$13,487. Of particular interest, the training cost per annum of stewards, \$10,588, was only slightly less than that for aviation fire control technicians, \$10,936.

⁷However, of the six ratings with personnel shortages, only two had a career manning code A indicating a severe shortage of personnel.

TABLE 4
 TOTAL TRAINING COST BY CAREER MANNING CODE (CMC)
 AND VARIABLE REENLISTMENT BONUS (VRB) CODE, 1971

Total Training Cost	Number of Ratings			
	Group 1 <u>a/</u>	Group 2 <u>b/</u>	Group 3 <u>c/</u>	Group 4 <u>d/</u>
<u>e/</u>	1	2	2	1
3,001 - 4,000	3	2	4	1
4,001 - 5,000	2	5	2	
5,001 - 6,000	6	7	5	
6,001 - 7,000	1	8	1	1
7,001 - 8,000		4		
8,001 - 9,000		1		
9,001 and over	2	3	1	1
Total	15	32	15	4

a/ CMC codes A and B; no VRB.

b/ CMC codes A and B; VRB codes 1 through 4.

c/ CMC codes C and D; no VRB.

d/ CMC codes C and D; codes 1 through 4.

e/ Information missing.

TABLE 5
 PROFICIENCY PAY (PRO PAY) CODE BY VARIABLE
 REENLISTMENT BONUS (VRB) CODE, 1971

1971 VRB <u>b/</u>	1971 Pro Pay <u>a/</u>					Total
	<u>c/</u>	1	2	3	4	
<u>d/</u>	30					30
1						
2	3					3
3	12					12
4	14	1	4	1	1	21
Total	59	1	4	1	1	66

a/ Monthly Pro Pay of \$50, \$75, \$100 and \$150 is designated by codes 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively.

b/ The VRB code indicates the relative ratio of the Variable Reenlistment Bonus to the regular first reenlistment bonus.

c/ No Pro Pay.

d/ No Variable Reenlistment Bonus.

paid but no Pro Pay offered, five had the additional properties of being short of personnel, requiring technical expertise, and having a training cost in excess of the minimum training cost of \$5,062 for ratings receiving Pro Pay.⁸

The preceding discussion assumes that, given the career manning ratio, training time and total training cost, all shortages are of equal importance. In the long run this is true but in the short run it may be argued that some shortages are more important than others. Thus, for

⁸The ratings for which these conditions prevailed were as follows: Fire Control Technician, Missile Technician, Air Controlman, Photographic Intelligenceman, and Instrumentman.

example, it may be that in the short run the readiness of the total Navy may be reduced more by an unfilled position aboard a destroyer or oil tanker than an unfilled position in a land-based communications center or storage facility, whereas in the long run, all things being equal such as training cost and time, the incremental gain in output resulting from the employment of an additional person in a specialty with a shortage is likely to be independent of the geographical location of the position being filled.

Granting the desirability of differentiating between shortages in the short run, the problem arises as to how to measure the importance of a shortage. For the Navy, the importance of a shortage depends, in part, on how the shortage affects Navy output. Given the current state of the art for measuring this magnitude, Navy output is often stated in terms of ship readiness. This suggests that the percentage of billets in an occupation which are sea jobs might serve as a rough approximation of the impact of a shortage of personnel in that occupation on overall ship readiness. This measure is used in Table 6 to determine the extent to which the assignment of VRB's has been influenced by the consideration of maximizing short run Navy output.⁹

The format of Table 6 is similar to that of Table 4 except that the row stubs show the ratio of sea/total billets for a rating. Ratings for which the sea/total billet ratio is greater (less) than 0.7 are considered to have a relatively large (small) impact on ship readiness. As can be seen from Table 6, for the most part the ratio of sea/total billets is higher for ratings which have been assigned a VRB, for ratings with and without a personnel shortage. Thus, Navy practice in assigning VRB's (and Pro Pay) appears to be weighted toward increasing current ship readiness.¹⁰

⁹ Among other factors, one rationale for assigning greater importance to sea billets is the relative ease of substitutability for filling short positions through the Civil Service or contractor personnel. A more refined measure would take account of differences among ratings in the distribution of sea jobs by type of ship.

¹⁰ It is of some interest to note that the average ratio of ship/total billets is .61 for the 47 ratings with a CMC of A or B and .62 for the 19

TABLE 6
 RATIO OF SEA / TOTAL BILLETS BY CAREER MANNING CODE (CMC)
 AND VARIABLE REENLISTMENT BONUS (VRB) CODE, 1971

Ratio of Sea / Total Billets	Number of Ratings			
	Group 1 <u>a/</u>	Group 2 <u>b/</u>	Group 3 <u>c/</u>	Group 4 <u>d/</u>
Less than 0.7	12	15	10	2
0.7 or larger	3	17	5	2
Total	15	32	15	4

a/ CMC codes A and B; no VRB.

b/ CMC codes A and B; VRB codes 1 through 4.

c/ CMC codes C and D; no VRB.

d/ CMC codes C and D; VRB codes 1 through 4.

III. Concluding Remarks

The allocation of Variable Reenlistment Bonuses (VRB) and Proficiency Pay (Pro Pay) is of special importance for at least three reasons. First, with the exception of the enlistment bonus introduced in June 1972, they are the only forms of compensation which permit direct occupational wage differentials within the military.¹¹ Second, because they constitute a very small percentage, approximately 2.7 percent, of total pay and allowances,¹² proper allocation of occupational incentive pay is especially important. Third, although occupational incentive pay is a small percentage of total pay and allowances, this percentage is likely to increase in the future as the military adapts to the all-volunteer environment. For example, it appears that the regular reenlistment bonus, which is given for reenlistment in any rating whether it be a shortage or surplus rating, is to be phased out and the monies formerly used for this purpose are to be allocated to VRB's. As the VRB increases in importance, the problem of VRB allocation will become even more acute.

This paper has attempted to assess some of the influences underlying current Navy practice in assigning VRB's and Pro Pay. As indicated above, it appears that shortages of career personnel have increased in the Navy over the last several years and that in 1971 shortages of career personnel were experienced in over two-thirds of all ratings. The duration and range of shortages suggest that factors other than assignment of VRB's and Pro Pay account for these shortfalls. Nonetheless, assignment of these monetary

ratings with a CMC of C or D, suggesting that the probability of a rating being short in career personnel may be independent of the proportion of all billets (in the rating) requiring sea duty. The influence of this and other factors on retention will be examined in another paper.

¹¹Indirect ways of maintaining differentials in pay exist, however; for example, differential promotion rates within occupation.

¹²From the FY 1973 President's Budget for Military Personnel on Active Duty (see [2, p. 7507]).

benefits in an effective and efficient manner is desirable. Current Navy practice appears to emphasize short run ship readiness in assigning VRB's (and Pro Pay). Although this may not be unreasonable, there were a number of ratings with a shortage for which the cost of filling vacancies was relatively high but where VRB's or Pro Pay were not offered. On the other hand, there were ratings for which supply exceeded or approximately matched demand and yet a VRB was offered. Although the problem of quality of inputs to the VRB and Pro Pay decision process was only briefly examined, the data also suggest that improvement in this area is necessary, particularly in the estimation of annual training costs.

This study indicates the need for a procedure which results in the formulation of explicit assignment criteria that can be employed in a timely manner. One procedure to be explored in a follow-up paper is discriminant analysis. This approach is particularly appropriate in that it can provide a preference ranking of ratings for a VRB and Pro Pay in terms of such input variables as the career manning ratio, the reenlistment rate, total training cost, total training time, and the ratio of sea/total billets. In so doing, the weight of each input variable is given explicitly. The problem of assigning VRB's and Pro Pay is complicated by the fact that career manning ratios may not be the preferred measure for assessing whether a shortage of personnel exists in a rating. Alternative measures need to be examined and likewise will be discussed in the follow-up paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY. Annual Training Time and Cost for Navy Ratings and NEC's. NAVPERS 18660, PY 73 edition.
- [2] U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES. Pay and Allowances of the Uniformed Services Pursuant to Title 37, United States Code (Public Law 87-649 (76 Stat. 451)) As Amended Through January 18, 1972 and Supplementary Material (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972).

APPENDIX

NAVY RATINGS BY DOD OCCUPATION GROUP

I. ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT REPAIRMEN

AQ Aviation Fire Control Technician
 AT Aviation Electronics Technician
 AX Aviation Anti-Sub Warfare Technician
 DS Data Systems Technician
 ET Electronics Technician
 EW Electronics Warfare Technician ^{a/}
 FT Fire Control Technician
 MT Missile Technician
 OT Ocean Systems Technician
 ST Sonar Technician
 TD Tradesman
 TM Torpedomans Mate

II. COMMUNICATIONS & INTELLIGENCE SPECIALISTS

AC Air Controlman
 AW Aviation Anti-Sub Warfare Operator
 CT Communications Technician ^{b/}
 PT Photographic Intelligenceman
 RD Radarman
 RM Radioman
 SM Signalman

III. MEDICAL & DENTAL SPECIALISTS

DT Dental Technician
 HM Hospital Corpsman

IV. OTHER TECHNICAL & ALLIED SPECIALISTS

AG Aerographers Mate
 DM Illustrator Draftsman
 EA Engineering Aid
 MU Musician
 PH Photographers Mate

^{a/}New rating excluded from the analysis.

^{b/}Old rating excluded from the analysis. Now disaggregated as follows: CTA Communications Technician (Administrative); CTI Communications Technician (Interpretive); CTM Communications Technician (Maintenance); CTO Communications Technician (Communications); CTR Communications Technician (Collection); CTT Communications Technician (Technical).

V. ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALISTS & CLERKS

AK Aviation Storekeepers
 AZ Aviation Maintenance Administrationman
 DK Disbursing Clerk
 DP Data Processing Technician c/
 JO Journalist
 PC Postal Clerk
 PN Personnelman
 SK Storekeeper
 YN Yeoman

VI. ELECTRICAL/MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT REPAIRMEN

AB Aviation Boatswains Mate
 AD Aviation Machinists Mate
 AE Aviation Electricians Mate
 AM Aviation Structural Mechanic
 AO Aviation Ordnanceman
 AS Aviation Support Equipment Technician
 BR Boilermaker
 BT Boilerman
 CM Construction Mechanic
 EM Electricians Mate
 EN Engineman
 GM Gunners Mate
 IC Interior Communications Electrician
 IM Instrumentman
 MM Machinists Mate
 MN Mineman
 OM Opticalman

VII. CRAFTSMEN

BM Boatswains Mate
 BU Builder
 CE Construction Electrician
 EO Equipment Operator
 HT Hull Technician d/
 LI Lithographer
 ML Molder
 MR Machinery Repairman
 PM Patternmaker
 QM Quartermaster
 SW Steelworker
 UT Utilitiesman

c/ Changed from MA Machine Accountant.

d/ Combines SF Shipfilter and DC Damage Controlman.

VIII. SERVICE & SUPPLY HANDLERS

CS Commissaryman
PR Aircrew Survival Equipmentman
SD Steward
SH Ships Serviceman

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Econometric Research on Navy Manpower Problems

Distribution List for Technical Reports

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Office of Sponsored Research
Library
Vice President H. F. Bright
Dean Arthur E. Burns
Prof. James T. Bennett
Prof. Joseph L. Gastwirth
Prof. Sheldon E. Haber
Prof. C. T. Ireland
Prof. Solomon Kullback
Prof. Sar A. Levitan
Prof. Henry Solomon
Prof. Herbert Solomon
Prof. Charles T. Stewart

ONR, PLANNING CMTEE, MANPOWER R&D

Dr. Robert J. Lundegard
LCDR Robert D. Matulka
Dr. Thomas C. Varley
Mr. Marvin Denicoff
Dr. Glenn L. Bryan
Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko
Dr. John A. Nagay
Dr. Bert T. King
Dr. Martin A. Tolcott
Dr. Marshall J. Farr
Mr. Robert J. Miller
Mr. J. Randolph Simpson

ONR CONTRACTORS, MANPOWER R&D PROGRAM

American Institutes for Research
B-K Dynamics, Inc
Bureau of Social Science Res, Inc
Data Solutions Corporation
Decision Systems Associates, Inc
Denver Research Institute
Hudson Institute
Management Analysis Center, Inc
MATHEMATICA, Inc
Operations Research, Inc
Personnel Decisions, Inc
Princeton University
Prof. G. S. Watson
The RAND Corporation
Rockefeller University
Dr. Carl Pfaffman

Smithsonian Institution

Dr. Leonard Carmichael
Stanford Research Institute
Naval Warfare Research Center
Systems Development Corporation
Univ of California, Berkeley
Prof. Robert M. Oliver
Univ of Michigan
Dr. David G. Bowers
Univ of Pennsylvania
Dr. Herbert R. Northrup
Prof. Ezra S. Krendel
USN Pers & Train Res Lab, San Diego
Dr. Norman M. Abrahams
USN Postgrad School, Monterey
Dr. Jack R. Borsting

NAVY

Asst Secretary of the Navy (M&RA)
ACNP, Enlisted Force Analysis
ADCNO (Manpower)
Defense Documentation Center
Manpower Train & Res Group (Op-964D)
Chief of NavAir Train, Pensacola
Chief of Nav Train, Pensacola
CAPT Allen E. McMichael
Chief of Nav Tech Train, Millington
Naval Appl & Analysis Div (460)
Naval Development
Naval Education and Training
Naval Material Command (03PB)
Naval Medical Neuropsychiatric Res
Naval Medical Res Institute
Behavioral Sci Dept
Tech Ref Library
BUMED
Chief, Res Div
Code 513
Naval Operations (Manpower)
Op-01BZ2
DCNO (M&RA)
BUPERS
PERS 222e
Dir, Career Info & Publ Div
Dir, Career Motivation
Plans & Prog Div

Pers & Train Res Lab, San Diego
Dir, Pers & Train Res Prog
Pers & Train Support
Asst for Pers Logistics
Sp Asst to Chief NavPers (Oe)
Asst Chief of NavPers
Plans & Prog
Dir, Pers Res Div
Tech Dir, Pers Res Div
Asst Chief of NavPers
Personal Affairs
Proj Vol Coord Branch (A25)
USN Postgrad Sch, Monterey
Library, Code 2124
Prof. D. P. Gaver
Naval Prog Plan Office
Naval Recruiting Command
Commander
Dir, Advertising Dept
Dir, Plans Dept
Dir, Recruiting Dept
Naval Research
Chief of Naval Res
Dir of Res
Asst Chief for Res
Sp Asst for Res, OASN (M&RA)
Naval Res Branch Offices
Boston
Chicago
New York
Pasadena
Naval Research Lab, Code 2627
Naval Ship Sys Cmd (SHIPS 03H)
Naval Training Device Center
Support Forces Manpower & Logist Br
Systems Analysis Div
HQ, USMC
Commandant (AOIM-2)
DCS (Manpower)
Manpower Mgmt Info Sys Br
Manpower Plan/Prog & Budget Br
Personnel Res Br
Scientific Advisor
Dir, Navy Labs
US Naval Academy
Behavioral Sci Dept

ARMY

OAS (M&RA), Manpower
AFHRL
Pers Res Div, Lackland AFB
Wright-Patterson AFB
Dr. G. A. Eckstrand
Dr. Ross L. Morgan
AFHRL/MD, Alexandria, Virginia
Army Behavior & Sys Res Lab
Army Motivation & Train Lab
Chief of Res and Dev
Behavioral Sci Div
Sp Asst, Modern Volunteer Army

AIR FORCE

Aeromedical Library (SCL-4)
Brooks AFB
Aerospace Med Res Lab
Wright-Patterson AFB
Chief, Pers Res & Anal Div

OSD

Environmental & Life Sciences
Human Resources Research (ARPA)
Manpower Research
Manpower Res & Utilization

OTHER

Columbia University
Bur Applied Social Research
Prof. Paul F. Lazarsfeld

