

LIBRARY, NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL MONTEREY, CA 93940





NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL Monterey, California



THESIS

THE EFFECTS OF PERSONNEL POLICIES ON THE RETENTION OF SERVICE COUPLES

by

Milady Blaha Hixenbaugh and Paul Noel Hixenbaugh

December 1982

Thesis Advisor:

R. S. Elster

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

T207954

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION F | PAGE | READ INSTRUCTIONS |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| T REPORT NUMBER | 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER |
| | | |
| 4. TITLE (and Subtitie) | | S. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED |
| The Effects of Personnel Policies | on the | Master's Thesis |
| Retention of Service Couples | December 1982 | |
| | | O. PERFORMING ONG. REPORT NUMBER |
| 7. AUTHOR(a) | | 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(0) |
| Milady Blaha Hixenbaugh | | |
| Paul Noel Hixenbaugh | | |
| PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS | | 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK |
| Naval Postgraduate School | | AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS |
| Monterey, CA 93940 | | |
| 1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS | | 12. REPORT DATE |
| Naval Postgraduate School | | December 1982 |
| Monterey, CA 93940 | | 13. NUNBER OF PAGES |
| | | 208 |
| A. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(I dillorant | iren Centrelling Office) | 18. SECURITY CLASS. (of this repart) |
| | | |
| | | IS. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE |
| . DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) | | |
| | | |
| Approved for public release: dist | ribution unlimi | ted |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract entered in | n Block 20, 11 different tra | a Roportj |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde il necessary and | I identify by block number; | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Service couples | | |
| Joint Service couples | | |
| Dual-career families | | |
| Dual-Career ramines | | |
| | Identify by block own | |
| ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side in necessary and | isontiny of stock with lot) | |
| The effects of personnel policies | on the retention | n of service couples, |
| servicemembers married to other me | embers, were stu | died to determine what factors |
| most cause one or both members to | leave the milit | ary service and to recommend |
| solutions to increase satisfaction | and retention. | A survey was mailed to |
| 2,000 service couples; 821 respons | ses were analyze | d using the computerized |
| Statistical Package for the Social | Sciences (SPSS |). The three major reasons |
| for leaving the military service w | vere inability t | o co-locate with the spouse. |

1

DD 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 15 DBSOLETE S/N 0102-014-6601 -



UNCLASSIFIED

separation from family, and better civilian job. An additional issue of major importance was the requirement for childcare. A number of inequities were found in the treatment of service couples as opposed to members married to civilians on the issues of BAQ, FSA, and dependency. It was concluded that better detailer support of service couples, the correction of some policy inequities and confusion, and improvement in childcare availability would make a dramatic impact on the retention of service couples.

UNCLASSIFIED

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

The Effects of Personnel Policies on the Retention of Service Couples

by

Milady Blaha Hixenbaugh Lieutenant, United States Navy B.A., Texas A&M Jniversity, 1972

anđ

Paul Noel Hixenbaugh Lieutenant, United States Navy B.A., Fort Lewis College, 1975

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the legree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSIGRADUATE SCHOOL December 1982



ABSTRACT

The effects of personnal policies on the ratantion of service couples, servicemenbers married to other members, were studied to determine what factors most cause one or both members to leave the military service and to recommend solutions to increase satisfaction and retention. A survey was mailed to 2,000 service couples; 821 responses were analyzed using the computerized Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The three major reasons for leaving the military service were inability to co-locate with the spouse, separation from family, and better civilian job. An additional issue of major importance was the requirement for childcare. A number of inequities were found in the treatment of service couples as opposed to members married to civilians on the issues of BAQ, FSA, and dependency. It was concluded that better detailer support of service couples, the correction of some policy inequities and confusion, and improvement in childcare availability would make a dramatic impact on the retention of service couples.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| I. | INTF | RODUC | TION | • | • | • • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | ٠ | • | 8 |
|------|------|-------|----------|------|------|------------|----|-----|-----|----|-------------|-----|----|------|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|----|---|----|
| | Α. | BRIE | EF DE | SCE | RIP | TID | N | OF | RI | ΞS | EAS | RCH | | IE] | снс | D | • | • | • | • | • | 9 |
| | в. | OUTI | INE | OF | TH | ESI | S | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 9 |
| | с. | SUMM | I A RY | OF | FI | NDI | NG | s | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 10 |
| | D. | LI TE | ER ATU | RE | RE | VIE | W | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 11 |
| II. | METH | IODOL | . 0 GY | | • | •• | • | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 17 |
| | Α. | RESE | A RCH | ı QI | JESI | гір | NS | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 17 |
| | | 1. | Pers | oni | nel | Рþ | 11 | .ci | es | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 17 |
| | | 2. | Pay | Pol | lic | ies | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 19 |
| | | 3. | Rete | enti | Lon | Is | ຣນ | les | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 20 |
| | | 4. | Chil | dca | are | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 20 |
| | в. | DATA | COI | LEC | | NC | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 21 |
| | | 1. | Data | Ba | ise | Al | te | rn | ati | v | 93 | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 21 |
| | | 2. | Samp | le | Sel | lec | ti | on | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 22 |
| | | 3. | Ques | tic | onna | aic | е | De | sig | Jn | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 22 |
| | | 4. | Ques | tic | onna | air | e | Тэ | sti | Ln | J | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 24 |
| | | 5. | Samp | le | Sia | Z Ə | De | te | rmi | n | ati | Lon | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 24 |
| | | 6. | Resp | ons | se i | Rat | e | of | St | 15 | vэy | [| • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | 27 |
| | | 7. | Stat | ist | ica | <u>a</u> 1 | Me | th | ods | 5 | ປຣສ | 9 J | in | t t | :h∋ | 2 | Ana | 1 y | rsi | .5 | • | 27 |
| III. | ANAL | YSIS | ANI |) F3 | IND | ING | S | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | | • | • | 31 |
| | Α. | DEMO |) G RA F | HIC | cs (| OF | RE | SP | ONI | DE | NIS | 5 | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | | 31 |
| | в. | PERS | O NN E | LI | 2013 | ICI | ES | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | | • | • | • | 37 |
| | | 1. | Deta | ile | er s | 51p | po | rt | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | | 37 |
| | | 2. | Assi | .gni | ien | ts | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | | | • | • | | • | 39 |
| | | 3. | Care | er | Col | nfl | ic | ts | • | • | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | | 41 |
| | | 4. | Sepa | rai | io | n. | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | | • | • | • | 42 |
| | | 5. | A ddi | .tic | onal | 1 2 | IC | bl | em | A | 2 93 | as | • | • | • | • | • | | • | • | • | 42 |
| | с. | PAY | POLI | CI | ES . | • • | • | | | • | • | • | • | • | • | | | • | • | | | 48 |
| | | 1. | Basi | .c ł | 110 | ow e | nc | :e | foi | - | Que | art | eI | s | | • | • | • | • | • | | 48 |



| | | | | | 2. | | F | ami | 1 | У | Sэ | p | a c | at | ti | . D | n | A | 11 | 5 | WB | n | ce | 3 | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 50 |
|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|-----|------|----|----|-----|------|-----|----|----|------------|-----|---|----|-----|----|------------|----|----|---|-----|-----|----|---|---|-----|-----|
| | | | | | 3. | | 0 | the | I | F |)IC | b | 19 | m | A | r | ea | s | | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 51 |
| | | Γ |). | | RE | TE | N | TIC | N | I | ss | U | ES | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 52 |
| | | | | | 1. | | M | ajo | r | Ē | lea | s | מכ | s | f | b. | I | L | ea | V | in | g | t | he | | Ser | :vi | Ce | • | • | • | 52 |
| | | | | | 2. | | A | dđi | t. | ic | na | 1 | 3 | ea | 15 | SO | ns | ; | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 56 |
| | | E | 8. | | СН | IL | D | CA F | E | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 56 |
| | | | | | 1. | | M | ajo | I | C | on | ı pi | 13 | iı | nt | s | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 57 |
| | | | | | 2. | | A | adi | t | ic | na | 1 | ₽ | I¢ | b | 1 | e m | | Αr | Э : | 13 | ; . | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 57 |
| IV. | | C | :0 | NC | LU | SI | 0 | NS | A | NE |) R | E | ວ | MI | ME | N | DA | r | ID | N S | S | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 59 |
| | | A | • | | co | NC | L | USI | 01 | NS | 5 | • | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 59 |
| | | | | | 1. | | P | ers | 01 | nn | e1 | . 1 | Рэ | 1 | Lc | i | es | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 59 |
| | | | | | 2. | | P | ay | Po | 01 | .ic | i | e 3 | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 59 |
| | | | | | 3. | | C | hil | đ¢ | ca | IIS | ! | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 60 |
| | | | | | 4. | | P | oli | c | ie | s | i | n | Ge | en | 3 | ra | 1 | | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 60 |
| | | | | | 5. | | L | ack | (| of | Ī | n | £э | I | na | t | io | n | | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 61 |
| | | | | | 6. | | C | ost | s | t | 0 | t | ьэ | 1 | Ма | V [| Y | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 62 |
| | | E | 3. | | RΕ | CO | M | MEN | D | ΑI | 'ID | N | 5 | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 66 |
| | | | | | 1. | | P | ers | 01 | nn | el | . 1 | 5 S | 1 | ic | i | es | | - | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 65 |
| | | | | | 2. | | P | ay | Po | 51 | .ic | i | 33 | • | • | • | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 68 |
| | | | | | 3. | | C | hil | đ | ca | re | : | • | • | • | • | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 71 |
| APP | EN | DIX | | A : | | co | V | ER | L | ET | ΤE | R | A | NI | D | S | UR | V | ΕY | | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 73 |
| APP | EN | DIX | | в: | | DA | T. | A E | NO | СС | DI | N | 3 | s | СН | E | ΜE | 1 | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 83 |
| APP | EN | DIX | . (| C: | | su | R | VEY |] | RE | SP | 0 | N 5 | E | D | A | ΓA | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 95 |
| APP | ΕN | DIX | | D: | | AN | A | LYS | I: | S | PR | .0 | G R | Al | ľ | • | • | | - | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 143 |
| APP | EN | DIX | | Ξ: | | TA | B | LES | | • | • | • | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 151 |
| LIS | T | OF | R | ΞF | ER | EN | С | ES | | • | • | • | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • 4 | 206 |
| INI | TI | AL | D | IS | TR | IB | U - | TIO | N | L | IS | r | | | | | | | • | | | | • | • | | • | • | • | • | | • 4 | 207 |

| I. | Survey | Resp | onse | Rat | te . | • | • • | • • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | ٠ | 28 |
|------|---------|-------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|-----|-------|-----|----------|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| II. | Target | Po pu | lati | lon | and | the | Mai | lled | Sa | r w E | ple | <u>}</u> | • | • | • | • | • | 32 |
| III. | Target | Po pu | lati | .on : | and | Resp | pond | lent | s | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 33 |
| IV. | Feeling | s Ab | out | Loca | atio | n ai | nd B | 3ill | ət | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 40 |
| v. | Reason | for | Leav | ving | Mil | itai | ry s | Serv | ice | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 53 |



I. INTRODUCTION

A relatively new phenomenon in the military services that is becoming more and more noticeable is the occurence of "service couples," military members married to other servicemembers. It is likely that the personal lifestyles, desires and career intentions of such couples present new problems for personnel management. The objective of this study is to explore the effects of various Navy policies on the retention of service couples. This small but growing population of active duty members married to other active duty members is confronted with a range of special problems in assignment, pay, and administrative processes. Not only are the relevant policies scattered through various Federal statues, and DoD and Navy manuals and instructions, but they are often interpreted differently at different commands. It is anticipated that the ensuing confision, along with a perceived bias against service couples, is often enough to cause dissatisfaction with the Naval Service, resulting ultimately in the separation of one or both members.

The primary concern of this research is to highlight those factors that directly affect the retention of the Navy's service couples. Without knowing these factors, suggested policy changes and program implementations would be just "shots in the dark" in an attempt to resolve the perceived problems. The recognition and analysis of the relevant problems is the first step towards the proper development of well thought-out and effective solutions. Policy may then be developed and implemented which can realistically be expected to improve the retention of these couples.

It is further expected that the final cost to the Navy in recruiting, training, and other replacement costs far overshadows what it would have cost to retain the dissatisfied member in the first place.

Two suppositions regarding service couples were explored in this study.

(1) Some personnel policies, such as the lack of a requirement/effort to co-locate spouses in detailing to assignments, result in marital and/or career conflicts for the couple, i.e., either they get divorced or one or both leave the service.

(2) Certain pay policies discriminate against or adversely affect service couples to the extent that one or both is/are unhappy enough to leave the service (causing replacement costs greater than the cost of inducing the member to stay).

A. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH METHOD

This study is limited to an examination of the problems and factors influencing retention of service couples in the Navy only. The research method included a survey of a random sample of the target population and analysis of their responses utilizing a computerized program, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The respondents' written comments were also examined for further amplification of their questionnaire responses.

B. OUTLINE OF THESIS

Chapter I of this thesis presents an introduction and description of the topic and purpose of the research, a brief description of the research method, an outline of the thesis, a summary of the findings and conclusions and a review of the relevant literature.

Chapter II explains the research methodology in detail, including questionnaire design and testing, sample selection, response rate, and analysis techniques.

Chapter III presents the results of the frequency tables, crosstabulations, and statistical tests used in the analysis of the questionnaire responses. The written comments of the respondents are included (in paraphrase) to explain the respondents feelings.

Chapter IV summarizes the authors' conclusions from the analysis and presents some recommendations for improving or correcting the problems found.

Appendix A is a copy of the survey cover letter and the survey itself.

Appendix B is the coding scheme used in processing of the survey results using the SPSS program.

Appendix C is the encoded data from the returned surveys that were used in the study. The written comments were not preserved.

Appendix D is a copy of the SPSS program that was utilized to process the data and to generate frequency tables and crosstabulation tables.

Appendix E contains all of the frequency and crosstabulation tables that were generated in the course of the study.

C. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The analysis of the questionnaire responses reveals that the major reasons why service couples choose to leave the service are:

- 1. Unable to get assigned to the same location as spouse.
- 2. Separation from family.
- 3. Better civilian job.



- 4. Raising a family.
- 5. Unable to get assigned to a desirable billet in the same location as spouse.

As a result of career conflicts experienced by service couples, e.g., difficulty in obtaining co-located careerenhancing assignments for both, over 70% stated that one or both would leave the service.

Pay policies were reportedly a major source of dissatisfaction, particularly the perceived inequity between the treatment of service couples vice members married to civilians.

Childcare was also found to be a major concern influencing service couples retention intentions. Nonavailability and inadequacy of childcare services make it difficult for servicemembers to cope with military duties.

D. LITERATURE REVIEW

A literature search revealed no research or reports dealing solely or specifically with "service couples." However, service couples were sometimes included as a subset in studies of different groups, e.g., dual-career families in the military in general. The literature which does mention service couples to some degree is reviewed here only insofar as it is relevant to the purpose and findings of this study.

1. In <u>The Two-Career Family in the Navy</u>, Della Suter surveyed married Naval officers [Ref. 1: pp. 10-135]. She noted the increasing trend in marriages between servicemembers, and the increasing number of women officers in the Navy. At the time of her study (1979) she found that "fair and equitable policies and regulations covering two-career situations (had) not been formally established;" polices were made up and problems handled on a case-by-case basis.

Suter reported that the most recently published guidance concerning assignment of "joint spouse couples" was an article in the Fall 1978 Officer Newsletter, which stated that detailers do "attempt to assign married members ... to the same geographic area, with conconitant effort directed at filling billets for which each service member is qualified." The article advised servicemembers to inform their detailers of their and their spouses' career desires by letter or preference card. It also stated that "officers are reminded that upon marriage to a servicemember they can request adjustment of their PRD to coincide with or more closely approximate the spouses' PRD. Such requests should be made to their detailers. " Suter cites Navy policy providing for no cost transfers "at other than normal projected rotation dates" for officers who desire to be co-located with their servicemember spouses (BUPERSMAN Article 1820340). She also mentions a recently established Navy policy prohibiting concurrent assignment of "jointspouse couples without dependents" to sea duty without their consent due to the "extraordinary financial hardships" such couples would face when their BAQ was forfeited (CNO msg 24 February 1979; Navy Times, 16 April 1979).

In her analysis, Suter found that transfers were the most often reported problem of both military members and civilian spouses. She reports that, "in the case of joint military careers, one female officer indicated that detailers insisted on placing priority on her spouse's career regardless of the couple's decision that he would not remain in the Navy but that she would continue to pursue her Naval career." Suter found that while 74.5% (n=41) of her respondents thought detailers should consider spouses' careers, only 36.4% (n=20) indicated that they had ever mentioned it to their detailer. She felt this discrepancy could be attributed to the recency of stated "policy" on the

subject. According to Suter's survey, childcare was the second most often reported problem for military members, and third most often mentioned by civilian spouses. "Time together and time for children" was the second biggest concern for civilan spouses. "Conflicts over careers and money" were also frequently mentioned problems of two-career families.

Suter reported that saveral of her respondents indicated that divorce or resignation from the Navy were "eminent" as a result of the incompatability of their two-career lifestyle with military family life. She concluded that two-career families had less desire for a full Navy career than did single income or one-career/one-job families, and that Navy policies would have to take the special problems of the former group into consideration in order to improve retention.

2. The Navy has recognized "that personnel satisfaction with military life is correlated with family satisfaction and family functioning" [Ref. 2: pp. 4-38]. The Navy Family Support Program was developed to respond to the needs and concerns of military families. In order to facilitate proper planning of programs and family services, a demographic study of Navy Personnel and families was conducted. This study utilized a one percent random sample of Emergency Data Forms, to detemine the composition of Navy families. In this study, A Demographic Profile of U.S. Navy Personnel and Families, Orthner and Nelson found that 54% of Navy Members are married. Of these, 2.5% (n=13,227) were married to other military members, mainly other Navy nembers (90%). The study also found that married Navy women were more likely to be married to another servicemember (47%) than were men (2%). A majority (79%) of dual-military families had no children. The report stated that Navy policies should attempt to "keep military couples together in assignments since separations \varkappa



can be causally linked to marital instability and subsequent job problems." It concluded that the Navy's ability to attract and retain qualified personnel would be influenced by the Navy's response to current trends in families and their lifestyles. The Orthner report stated that "conflicts between the family system and the military system are inevitable unless the needs of Navy persons and their families are met." They pointed out that more research in this area was needed and that information was not centralized nor easily accessible for analysis. The study group recommended that policies and programs affecting Navy families be evaluated for effectiveness in changes in morale, retention and personnel performance.

3. In <u>Dual Career Families Within the Coast Guard</u> <u>Officer Corps</u>, Harlan Henderson surveyed a random sample of married officers [Ref. 3: pp. 11-73]. He cited problems encountered by "joint spouses," including joint assignments, childcare and family separations. He noted that "offical, written policy of the Coast Guard concerning dual careers (aidressed) the assignment procedure of women and married (joint) spouses" (CG-207) (1967:4-A-3 and 4-A-3A). Specifically, Coast Guard policy states that "if authorized billets are available, every effort will be made to assign husband and wife to the same geographic area in order to permit them to maintain a joint residence." Additionally, a husband and wife would only be assigned to sea duty simultaneously at their request, and requirements for no-cost transfers in order to co-locate are specified.

In this study, 36% of dual career couples experienced serious career conflict; the reasons given, in decreasing order of frequency, were transfers/relocating, overload and childcare.

In his analysis, Henderson found that dual career families were least satisfied with childcare options available (22% were dissatisfied).

Henderson also found that 90% of dual career respondents felt their lifestyles should be considered by their detailers in making assignments, but only 54% had ever mentioned their spouse's career to their detailers.

Henderson concluded that, in general, Coast Guard officers are satisfied with their service and are very career oriented, but dual career families were a little less satisfied and experienced more conflict in their marriages than those with other lifestyles. Overall, "the Coast Guard (appeared) to be doing a good job of personnel management" [Ref. 3: p. 73].

4. In <u>A Comparison of Attitudes in Dual-Career Air</u> Force Families, Linda Houk reports that joint spouse marriages are becoming common; 76% of married Air Force women'are married to other servicemembers, as are 4.5% of married Air Force men [Ref. 4: pp. 1-70]. She explored the possibilty that service couples were more satisfied with Air Force life than couples with a civilian spouse due to policy changes recognizing the special problems of service couples but no special attention given to members with zivilian spouses. Houk utilized lata obtained from the 1980 USAF Quality of Life Survey III to analyze 1418 dual-career families. She noted that the Air Force had recently (1980) established policy for concurrent reassignment of joint spouses, temporary exemptions from recalls, alerts, exercises, shift work and deployments for military couples with newly acquired dependents, and requirements for joint spouses to have an emergency care plan for their dependents in case of moblization of both partners at the same time. Houk's analysis produced the following findings: Military couples selected Family separation as their main reason for
not making the Air Force a career; nembers with civilian spouses chose pay and allowances as the main influence and separations as their second reason. Each group was most dissatisfied with the area in which they felt their military lifestyles compared unfavorably with a civilian lifestyle. Houk recognized special problems experienced by service couples, e.g., separations due to separate remote assignments when they had dependents, or inavailability of career-enhancing assignments in the same location. Houk noted that the problems and dissatisfaction experienced by dual-career families lead to divorce or separation from the service. She concluded that as the Air Force has more control over assignment policies than pay, and has recognizied the importance of job and family satisfaction to retention, additional attention should be directed at dualcareer families, particularly those with civilian spouses.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The effects of personnel policies, pay policies and other factors on the retention of service couples was determined by administering a survey to a random sample of the target population. Their responses were analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The development of the survey, the sample and the analysis are described in this chapter.

Just what current policies create negative influences on the retention of service couples and what changes need to be made to counteract these effects are the central themes of this study. This section will discuss several potentially relevant factors which serve as the basis of our questionnaire design.

1. Personnel Policies

Perhaps the single most important personnel policy throughout the Navy, regariless of marital status, is the assignment/detailing process. It is likely that the service couple faces this with great apprehension, as two members must attempt to get stationed in the same location in meaningful billets, meet the necessary career gates, maintain a household and take care of their minor dependents if they have any. These couples must either decide: that one of their careers has priority and will be pursued while the other becomes secondary, that both will maintain viable careers at the cost of geographic separations as meeded, or that they will insist on co-location to the possible detriment of one or both careers. Or perhaps they will just do

the best they can on a case-by-case basis until they can get out. This process is especially difficult when the designators and subspecialties are different for officers and the ratings and NEC's are different for enlisted. It means that the detailers must be willing to work across community lines and at times overcome the parochial bias that exists between these communities.

Different people in the Navy have different opinions as to the amount of cooperation that their detailers provide. To what degree do detailers support a couple who both want to pursue Naval careers and yet remain co-located? Does the detailer of each spouse give much effort to locating a meaningful billet for that person; does he just pick the first available billet without regard to that individual's career qualifications, skills, and past performance; or does he insist that the person be separated from his/her spouse for the "needs of the Navy?" The efforts and attitudes of the Navy's letailers have a great effect on all military members, but decisions when dealing with service couples affect the very existence of their family life as well as their careers.

There are certain basic considerations that Navy Personnel Policies should take into account: (1) married couples want to stay together and (2) they frequently have young children to care for. Do Navy policies currently make provisions for a service couple to have opposite sea/shore rotations when they have minor dependents? This could in effect drive at least one person from the service in order to maintain the household and take care of the minor children.

2. Pay Policies

Twice a month, each Navy member receives a government pay check based on a myriad of factors such as pay grade, length of service, dependents, sea/shore duty status, etc. Most members are acutaly aware of their entitlaments and are continually comparing theirs with others. One issue facing the service couple is the matter of Basic Allowance for Quarters (BAQ). The issue is complex because service couples are treated much differently than service members married to civilians. In the first place, a spouse or child is not considered a "dependent" for pay purposes if he or she is a member of the military service [Ref. 5: p. 3-18.1]. A service couple without dependents, both assigned to sea duty, does not receive BAQ because the Navy provides them with quarters on board their ships. Yet, this couple is just as likely as any other couple to want to maintain a house-When they see their fellow shipmates married hold ashore. to civilians receiving BA2 at the with-dependents rate, do they feel slighted and begin to resent the Navy for making their marriage even more difficult?

Another unclear issue is the dependent status of children from prior marriages and current marriages. In some cases service couples with children from prior marriages as well as their current marriage may both claim dependents and draw BAQ at the with-dependents rate; in certain circumstances they may not. The Department of Defense Personnel Manual (DODPM) sets forth eligibility requirements in detail. Yet they are still confusing, unclear and apparently inconsistent. It often seems that the principles of fairness and justifiable entitlement, as well as the rules, change from one situation to another. For example, a service couple may both draw BAQ with dependents if some of the dependents are parents and some are children, but not if the dependents are



children from a previous marriage and the current one. In the latter case, they are entitled to one BAQ with dependents and one single BAQ, even if the dependents from the previous marriage are living in another household and receiving child support [Ref. 5: pp. 3-15 - 3-54].

3. <u>Retention Issues</u>

As the pcol of eligible recruits dwindles and replacement costs continue to grow, retention of current service members becomes a more serious consideration in policy making. If the major factors causing one or both members of a service couple to leave the service can be identified and remedied, the Navy may be able to retain a substantial number of its trained, experienced and qualified members. A married couple co-located in desirable billets is likely to have more job satisfaction, and be more productive, better able to reconcile their family life with the demands of military life, and more inclined to remain in the service until retirement.

Reduced cost is another benefit to the government. When there are two billets in one location to be filled, it costs less to move one service couple family than the separate families of two military members married to civilians.

This study will explore the possible factors that influence service couples to leave the service.

4. <u>Childcare</u>

The availability of childcare is a necessity for any working couple, But for the service couple this is an extremely important issue due to their military obligations. Service members work rotating shifts, stand watches, are sent TAD, deploy and are subject to 24 hour recall as a normal function of military life. The military couple must have reliable, high guality, inexpensive child care



facilities available around the clock, every day of the week, in order to accommodate their required working schedules. Having to hire a private babysitter may be beyond the couples' financial means and difficult to arrange to fit military duty requirements, especially on short notice.

B. DATA COLLECTION

In order to analyze the effects of personnel policies and other factors on service couples' retention intentions, careers, lifestyles, etc., a data base revealing their opinions, perceptions, intentions, demographic data, etc. was needed. Such a data base, pertaining specifically to service couples, apparently did not exist and had to be created for the purposes of this thesis.

1. Data Base Alternatives

The 1978 Department of Defense Survey of Enlisted Personnel, Forms 1 and 2, and of Officers, Forms 3 and 4, were first evaluated to determine if they were applicable to the objective of this study. This Rand Corporation project was determined to be too dated and did not contain information in all areas of concern. It was therefore rejected as a data source for this study.

The next data base considered was developed during a Naval Postgraduate School thesis project on <u>The IworCareer</u> <u>Family in the Navy</u>" by LT Della J. Suter in 1979. Once again, the information was dated and did not cover all aspects of interest to the current study. It was also rejected.

After inquiries to the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) in Monterey, Naval Personnel Research and Development Center (NPRDC) in San Diego, and the Center for Naval Analyses (CNA) in Alexandria, Virginia, in search of a

current and usable data base were unfruitful, it was apparent that a questionnaire-type survey would have to be conducted to gather the required information.

2. <u>Sample Selection</u>

The next problem was to locate a source of names of personnel in the target population to receive the survey. DMDC, NPRDC, AND CNA did not have this sort of data either, and requested that they be advised of such a source should one be discovered. After nearly three months of searching, a final effort phone call was made to the Navy Finance Center (NFC) in Cleveland to determine if they could create a data file with the required ranks, names, and addresses. Fortunately, the Center replied that they could produce a tape containing such information from records that they currently maintained. The tape produced contained information on 14,722 service members who, according to NFC files, were married to cther service members. Enlisted members made up the bulk with 12,937 listings while officers completed the total with 1,785 members. Subsequently, The Family Support Program (NMPC-66) offered to sponsor a thesis in this area. The staff members at NMPC-56 were, however, unsure of the reliability of the data available from NFC. Therefore, a check on the accuracy of the file from Cleveland was added as the first question of the survey.

3. <u>Questionnaire Dasiin</u>

The basic rules for using the questionnaire method were that it be short, easily understood by all educational levels, easy to fill out, and that it would lend itself to coding to take advantage of computer analysis. By combining the formats used by the 1978 DoD Survey and that of Suter, a useful survey format for the purpose of this thesis was achieved. A copy of the survey and its cover letter are contained in Appendix A.



Question number one was designed to ensure that only the desired sample completed the questionnaire and served to validate the accuracy of NFC's records. The five options provided cover all conceivable circumstances of marital status and spouse military status. Questions two through 16 were intended to provide a description of the characteristics of the respondents and a determination as to whether or not the respondents were representative of the target population. They would also be used in the analysis of the questions of interest.

Questions 17 through 21 were designed to investigate the perceived degree of detailer support of the service couple's career decisions and their subsequent satisfaction with the assignment process.

Questions 22 and 23 were added to determine specifically what personnel policies created problems for service couples and what changes they would recommend. Comments were solicited rather than providing response choices so as not to influence the responses of the service members.

Questions 24 and 25 were included to determine the extent of conflict between the careers of the military partners and the probable result of such a conflict.

Question 26 was affed to determine the length of permanent separation that a service couple would accept. Question 27 was included to see where the service couples put their priorities when they were facing a Permanent Change of Station (PCS) transfer.

Questions 28 and 29 were included to determine which, if any, pay policies were perceived to discriminate against service couples and what changes should be made. These questions are also purposely vague so as not to influence the responses.



In response to a request from DMDC to explore the problems with childcare, question 30 was included. The five response categories provided were intended to cover the general situations encountered by members with childcare requirements. As with several other questions, space for comments was added to provide for specific details if the respondent desired.

Specific reasons for leaving the service are covered in question 31 for the respondent and in question 32 for the spouse. This design actually allowed information to be solicited from twice as many members as the sample size. Having the members rank the top three reasons that would influence them to leave the service before retirement was intended to reveal the major factors leading to separation from military service. However in analysis their unranked responses proved confusing and useless. The marked responses were therefore combined, regardless of ranking, to facilitate a more meaningful analysis.

4. <u>Questionnaire Testing</u>

The initial rough draft of the questionnaire was tested on ten service couples, both officer and enlisted, assigned to the Naval Postgraduate School. They were instructed to evalute the format and wording of the questions as well as the areas of concern covered. Based on their comments and recommendations, the format and content were altered to arrive at the final form of the questionnaire (see Appendix A).

5. <u>Sample Size Determination</u>

The sample was drawn on a random basis utilizing the last digit of the service members' Social Security Number (SSN). The tape from the Navy Finance Center was organized by SSN, which led to this decision.

The size (n) of the random sample to receive questionnaires was calculated based on the expected rate of return and the sample size (number of respondents) that would provide a 95% confidence level. That is, a proportion in the population would lie within a given interval around the variable sample proportion estimate 95% of the time. According to informed sources in the Naval Postgraduate School Operations Research Department, on the average, mail surveys were currently obtaining about a 25% response rate. Therefore the number of required completed surveys desired must be multiplied by a factor of four to arrive at the number which must be mailed out.

In the "worst case", variance about a proportion is greatest when the proportion is 0.5. Utilization of the worst case in selecting a confidence interval is considered a "reasonable and conservative rule-of-thumb approach" [Ref. 6: p. 285]. Where

- P = proportion in the population, also, the probability of occurrence of the trait in question,
- p = proportion in the sample which is an estimate
 of P,
- p = "worst case" probability of P,
- 1-P = the probability of the trait not occurring in the worst case,
 - n = sample size, and

<u>p(1-p)</u>

N n = sample estimate of Standard deviation of p, the calculation of the number of completed surveys required to obtain a 95% confidence interval is as follows.

A confidence interval of \pm .)5 centered around P=.50 was selected, e.g., .45 $\leq \hat{2} \leq .55$. Therefore, as the limits selected for this proportion P are p \pm .05 and as the 95% confidence interval for this proportion in a large sample (n > 30) has the limits



$$\hat{p} + 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}$$

1.96 being the "z value" or number of standard deviation units required above and below the mean to give a confidence interval of 95% [Ref. 7: pp. 200-223], then

$$.05 = 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}$$
$$.05 = 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{.5(.5)}{n}}$$

Solving for n,

n = 384.16.

This n was rounded to 400 for simplicity.

The number of surveys calculated was multipled by four to produce the number of surveys that must be mailed out, or 1600. To this, 400 additional surveys were added for a total of 2,000 to allow for surveys returned as undeliverable, incomplete surveys, and others that could not be used for some other reason.

The 2,000 surveys were divided between the officer and enlisted populations. As the number of officers in the target population was relatively small, the officer population was over sampled in order to obtain enough responses to permit a thorough analysis. Therefore, 750 officers and



1,250 enlisted members were sent questionnaires in the hope of receiving at least 400 complete and useable returns. This meant sampling about 9.6% of the enlisted portion of the population, and about 42% of the officer segment of the population.

The names, ranks, and addresses of those selected for survey were then processed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) program to produce the mailing labels for the survey envelopes.

6. <u>Response Rate of Survey</u>

As noted on the survey cover letter, 7 October 1982 was established as the deadline for returning surveys in order to ensure adequate time for encoding, processing and analyzing the data. In actuality, all survey responses, totalling 821, that were received up through the 22nd of October were used in the analysis. Many respondents stated that they had not received their survey until after the due date but wanted to participate. All returned surveys are being forwarded to the Joint Service Committee on Compensation Issues relating to service couples, at its request. Table I presents the survey response rate statistics.

7. Statistical Methods Used in the Analysis

The data contained in the completed questionnaires were coded into computer entry format using the coding scheme shown in Appendix B. The entire data file containing the coded responses for all 821 surveys used in the analysis is in Appendix C. Written comments of the respondents and their spouses will be brought out in the analysis section as appropriate.

LABLE I

Survey Response Rate

| Surveys mailed out | 2,000 | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| LESS: deserters and deceased undeliverable unusable never married | 231 6 4 245 | |
| possible responses responses received through 10/22 response rate in analysis | 1,755 821 46.8% | |
| responses received after 10/22 total number of responses overall response rate | 172 993 56.6% | |

The computer file of data was analyzed utilizing SPSS. Originally, selected frequencies and numerous crosstabulation tables were programmed to break out information expected to be interesting. This was later modified to include frequencies to all questions. Frequency distributions were run on all questions to determine the demographic characteristics of the respondents and whether these contributed to any difference in responses on various questions.

Crosstabulation is a joint frequency distribution of cases according to two or more classification variables. This is the most commonly used analytic method in the social sciences. A crosstabulation can be analyzed statistically by tests of significance to determine whether or not the variables are statistically independent [Ref. 8: pp. 218-222].

During the analysis process, crosstabulations were deleted which proved to have no statistical significance as determined by chi-square tests. Chi-square is a comparison of expected cell frequencies, when no relationship exists, to actual values found. Small values of chi-square are interpreted to mean no relationship exists between the variables in question. The chi-square tests were used to



determine if observed relationships between responses were statistically significant. That is, they occurred more often than could be expected on a chance basis. A high significance or probability (p) level for the calculated chi-square indicates independence between the variables. Thus, the larger the chi-square significance probability, the less statistically significant or dependent the relationship. Correlation between variables with significance (p) levels higher that .05 were not considered in this study. The focus was on significance levels around .01 or smaller in order to narrow the amount of data analyzed; this level of significance was considered sufficient because of the large sample size [Ref. 8: p. 223-224].

However, the chi-square test alone does not reveal how strongly the variables are related; other statistics are necessary to adjust for sample size and table size and measure the degree of association. Those used include the phi statistic for 2x2 tables and Cramer's V for larger tables. Both range from 0, when no relationship exists, to +1 when the variables are highly or perfectly related. A strength value of 0.3 or greater was used to select tables of interest [Ref. 8: p. 224]. For the interested reader who might want to pursue comparisons of some variables (responses) against others, it is pointed out that the following crosstabulations were run and analyzed (Q refers to question):

> Q8A, Q3, Q6 by Q15 Q8A, Q14 by Q26 Q31A to Q31N by Q8A, Q3, Q6 Q32A to Q32N by Q9A, Q3, Q7 Q8A, Q14 by Q28 Q10 by Q26 by Q8A (Q8A=1) (enlisted) Q10 by Q26 by Q8A (Q8A=2) (officer) Q3, Q17 by Q18 Q24 by Q25

Q21 by Q19a, Q19B, Q20A, Q203 Q15, Q16 by Q22 Q15, Q16 by Q28 Q3, Q7 by Q16 Q22, Q27, Q28 by Q8A (28A=1) (enlisted) Q22, Q27, Q28 by Q8A (28A=2) (officer) Q17 by Q18 by Q3 (23=0) (male) Q17 by Q18 by Q3 (23=1) (female) Q3 by Q15, Q16 The results of these crosstabulations are discussed in the following chapter on "Analysis and Findings."



III. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The purpose of the analysis was twofold. First, the characteristics of the service couple population were estimated by studying the demographics of the survey respondents. Second, the factors which significantly affect the lifestyles, career intentions and retention of the surveyed service couples were determined by analyzing their questionnaire responses and written comments.

A. DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS

Frequency tables were constructed for all questions and are provided in Appendix E for detailed examination. A general discussion of the important characteristics of the population follows.

The results of the crosstabulations were generally insignificant statistically or, where some relationship appeared to exist, it was so weak as to be virtually meaningless. This means, essentially, that the responses showed no patterns or relationships which differentiated among races, sexes, paygrades, etc. In other words, any response could be attributed to any member of the population.

In the end, only a handful of crosstabulations proved to be both statistically significant (Chi-Square significance of 0.10 or less) and to have a "strong" relationship (0.3 or greater) as measured by the Phi statistic or Cramer's V. These and several "weaker" crosstabulations are discussed in this chapter where appropriate.

Before entering into an analysis of the actual response data, the characteristics of the target population, the surveyed sample, and the respondents were studied to

determine if the sample and the respondents were in fact representative of the service couple target population.

In Table II, a comparison is made between the paygrades of the target population and the paygrades of those who

FABLE II

Target Population and the Mailed Sample

| pay- grade | Target 1 Frequency | Population Percentage | Sa Frequency | mple Percentage | Difference in Percent |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1233456789 | 280 792 3,272 3,920 3,438 1,059 1,059 154 16 6 | 2.16 6.12 25.29 30.37 26.58 8.19 1.19 .12 .05 | 25 90 314 373 330 103 13 13 0 | 2.00 7.21 25.14 29.86 26.42 8.25 1.04 .09 .00 | .16 1.09 .15 .44 .16 .06 .15 .04 .05 |
| TOTALS | 12,937 | 100.0% | 1,249 | 100.0% | |
| W12 W33 W02 003 003 005 006 | 0 5 7 184 401 892 247 44 3 | 00 23 39 11 10.31 22.47 49.96 13.84 2.47 .17 |))))) 1 2 1 7 3 6 4 1 0 5 2 1 2 5 | 00 00 13 10.92 23.70 48.47 13.98 2.80 00 | .00 .28 .39 .61 1.23 1.49 .14 .33 .17 |
| TOTALS | 1,785 | 100.0% | 751 | 100.0% | |
| | | | | | |

received surveys. A test utilizing the Chi-square Goodness-of-Fit Statistic [Ref. 7: p. 503] resulted in a Chi-square of 3.18 with six degrees of freedom for the enlisted and a Chi-square of 0.92 with four degrees of freedom for the officer segment. This indicates that the sample for both enlisted and officer segments were representative of the target population with regard to paygrade.



PABLE III

| Target Por | ulation | and Res | pondents |
|------------|---------|---------|----------|
|------------|---------|---------|----------|

| Pay- | Target P | opulation | Responde | ents | Differences |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| gride | Frequency | Percentage 1 | Frequency Per | rcentage | in Percent |
| E23 E23 E25 E25 E25 E25 E25 E25 E25 E25 E25 E25 | 280 792 3,272 3,920 3,438 1,059 154 16 6 | 2. 15 6. 12 25. 29 30. 30 26. 58 8. 19 1. 19 . 12 . 05 | 1 73 107 143 61 17 0 | .00 1.47 17.85 26.16 34.96 14.92 4.16 .24 .00 | 00 4.65 7.44 4.14 8.38 6.73 2.97 .12 .05 |
| TOTAL | S 12.937 | 100.0% | 409 | 100.0% | |
| W1 W2 W3 W4 01 02 03 04 05 06 | 0 5 7 2 184 401 982 247 44 3 | 00 23 39 11 10.31 22.47 49.96 13.84 2.47 .17 |)) 35 217 79 15 1 | .00 000 000 8.574 15.372 15.372 19.275 24 | .00 .28 .39 .11 1.77 7.10 2.96 5.43 1.19 .07 |
| TOTAL (Two | S 1,785 respondents | 100.0% did not ind | 41) dicate their | 100.0% Tanks.) | |

Table III is a comparison of the target and response populations to determine if the respondents were representative of the target group. The same Chi-square Goodness-of-Fit Statistic test resulted in a Chi-square of 93.89 with six degrees of freedom for the enlisted segment and a Chi-square of 23.55 with four degrees of freedom for the officers. This indicates that neither enlisted nor officer segments of the response were representative of the target population with regard to paygrades.

At this point, two items need to be brought out. During the development of the above data, it was discovered that the W1 through W4 paygrades were actually included in with the enlisted paygrades during the random selection process. Of the 14 warrant officers in the target population, one was


drawn for the survey. The actual figures for the surveys sent out are 1,249 enlisted and 751 officers.

The second item is the accuracy and completeness of the listing of names of personnel married to other service members. A review of the entire listing of names revealed that of six service couples known to the authors at the Naval Postgraduate School, including the authors, only three members, all of them women, were on the listing. There were also four people who returned their survey stating they had never been married, one whose spouse was deceased, 44 who were no longer married, and 44 whose spouse was no longer on active duty. This all indicates a relatively incomplete and inaccurate listing. However, the majority of the returned surveys were from respondents whose spouse was also currently serving. Those who were no longer married but whose former spouse was on active duty, and those with spouses who had previously served but were separated from active duty, were all asked to complete the survey as though they were still married or as though their spouse was still on active duty. Of those who responded to the survey, 91.4% of their spouses were also on active duty in the Navy. Therefore, the majority of couples fell within the scope of this research which was only intended to exam the policies that affect the retention of Navy service couples. All 821 responses used in the analysis are therefore expected to reflect the feelings and problems of the service couple community in the Navy.

Both the respondents and spouses were predominantly white (91%). This reflects the fact that the majority of the Navy is also white. Although the various minorities had a response rate to the survey in a smaller proportion than their respective levels in the Navy population, there should be no effect on the representativeness of this study as explained above in the discussion on crosstabulations. All

questions dealt with overall Navy policies which do not differentiate among races. Nor did any of the minority respondents mention anything in the area of racial discrimination in the written comments sections.

The officer/enlisted proportions were different than had been expected. Officers made up 49.9% of the respondents and 45.4% of the spouses. These proportions are not reflective of the population in general and are due to the fact that officers were oversampled because of their small numbers (as explained in Chapter II under "Sample Size Determination"), and that their response rate was higher than expected.

A significant difference in numbers existed between the sexes of the respondents. Two-thirds were women, which is different from the expected proportion in the target group, i.e., one-half. Possibly, the NFC files indicate more women married to other service nembers than men because most women change their names after they marry, which means pay records and emergency data forms are more likely to be updated to reflect their marital status and their husbands' military status. Alternatively, perhaps many males did not receive their surveys due to being deployed.

Most respondents (40.4%) were in the 26 to 30 year old category, followed by the 21 to 25 year old group at 31.2%, and the 31 to 35 bracket with 17.9% The spouses closely followed the ages of the respondent with 35.6% in the 26 to 30 group, 29.8% in the 21 to 25 age group, and 19.4% between 31 to 35.

A majority (59.7%) of the respondents had been in the service less than five years, while a total of 37.8% had less than 10 years of active duty behind them. The spouses on the other hand appeared to have been generally in longer, with 47.6% in for less than 5 years, 78.4% less than 10 and 91.6% in for less than 15 years.

Most service couples (37.3%) in the sample have been married less than 5 years. Almost all (89.8%) were married while both were on active luty, while only 4.4% had been married before entering the Navy.

Service couples are predominantly (61.3%) without children, while an additional 29.6% had only one child. Since 87.3% of the couples had been married for less than five years and all service couples are trying to maintain two careers, this is not an uncealistic finding.

Most respondents and spouses were in one of two categories with regard to their active duty intentions. The largest group of respondents (43.8%) was undecided, while 37.0% of the spouses were also undecided about making the Navy a career. Retiring from the Navy was selected by 32.5% of the respondents and 37.3% of the spouses. A small percentage (13.1%) of the respondents, and 9.3% of the spouses had already decided to get out with less than six years of service. During the encoding phase of this project, it was noted that although the question asked for intended total service intentions, many people indicated the remaining time to 20 years, or the time they had left on their current obligation. Some indicated a combination less than the minimum allowable obligation. Needless to say, some amount of error exists as the data had to be interpreted before it could be encoded.

Comparisons of active duty intentions of respondents and spouses (questions 15 and 16 respectively) by sex (question three) indicated a statistically significant tendency for a larger percentage of males to remain in for 20 years than females, and for more females to get out with less than six year of service. However, the Cramer's V Statistic indicated that these relationships were so weak (e.g., 0.143 for respondents and 0.265 for spouses) as to be virtually meaningless.

B. PERSONNEL POLICIES

Several of the survey questions were directed at determining what problems, if any, the service couples had with personnel policies, procedures, and other aspects of Navy life, e.g., detailing, transfers, separations, and incompatible careers and personal desires. Comments were solicited to provide amplifying information. As stated before, the complete frequency tables are provided in Appendix E.

1. <u>Detailer Support</u>

Question 17 asked whether either career had been chosen as the dominant one by the couple to facilitate the detailing process. About half (51.5%) of the respondents indicated that either their career or their spouse's career had, in fact, been decided upon. However, when asked if their detailers accommodated their decision (question 18) 40.9% replied that they had not even advised their detailers of the matter. Less than half (40%) of the respondents said that both detailers were cooperative when asked. Therefore, it appears, that detailers do a fair job of assigning personnel who make it easier for them by deciding on a dominant career and notifying them of that fact.

However, some respondents complained that their detailers forced them to choose one career over the other or told them to choose between their career and their marriage or family, rather than attempt to locate career-enhancing billets at the same duty station for both of them. In some cases the detailer(s) decided which career came first, generally the husband's. In one instance, the female's detailer would not start working on her orders until her husband had his, although her PRD was months sconer. The detailer explained "You do want to live together." The authors know of servicewomen who avoid informing their

detailers of dependent children or pregnancy for fear of prejudicing the detailer and jeopardizing their careers. Many respondents stated that they felt their detailers were not only uncooperative, but sarcastic and even spiteful.

A statistically significant, though not very strong, relationship exists between question 17, selection of the dominant career, and question 18, detailer support of that decision, when sex is the controlled variable. For male respondents: when the male's career is chosen by the couple as the dominant one, both detailers are seen as supporting that decision slightly more often than when the female's is chosen; when the wife's career is chosen as dominant the male's detailer is seen as not supporting that decision more often than when the male's career is decided upon. The trend here is not strong; Cramer's V Statistic is 0.205.

For the female respondents, when the couple decides the female's career is more important, both detailers support that decision less than when her spouse's career is chosen by the couple; though weak, this pattern is slightly stronger with a Cramer's V Statistic of 0.221. In general, it appears that detailers are a little more supportive of the service couple's decision when the husband's career is chosen as dominant than when the wife's is chosen. (See Appendix E.)

Some couples reported that they had had to locate billets for themselves and become personally cognizant of Navy assignment policies, in order to ensure co-location in meaningful billets, because their detailers were unwilling to make these efforts. On some occasions detailers are reported to make blanket statements, to the effect that there are no billets available for both spouses in the desired location, up to a year in advance without taking the time to check. Some officer-enlisted couples felt that their detailers purposely assigned them to separate locations to thwart them.

Several respondents felt that detailers from different communities did not communicate or cooperate with each other in co-locating billets. One respondent was told by her detailer that he would see what he could do for her <u>after</u> her husband got his orders. Another was told she should have married a surface type, not a submariner. Some respondents felt their communties took a back-seat to others in the detailing process, e.g., the detailers would co-locate a staff corps officer with a line officer, but not vice versa. On the positive side, many couples stated that they hadn't had any trouble with their detailers so far, especially when they had the same detailer.

2. Assignments

Question 27 asked what was the most important aspect when confronted with a new assignment. A majority (74.5%) chose co-location with spoke over a career-enhancing billet or other factors. Further analysis under "Retention Issues" will reveal that co-location is reported to be of extreme importance in decisions to remain in the service until retirement.

According to the responses to question 21, 85% of the service couples are stationed together, 5.1% are not but agreed to be separated (probably in order to receive favorable billets), and 9.5% are separated against their wills. Questions 19 and 20 asked how the respondents and their spouses felt about their assigned duty stations (location) and billets. Overall, both respondents and spouses were predominantly satisfied with their assignments. In general they were more satisfied with their locations than their billets, and more dissatisfied with their billets than their locations, as summarized in Table IV.

FABLE IV

Feelings About Location and Billet

| (Questions 1 | 9 and 20) | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Respondent | Location | Billet |
| Satisfied/very satisfied No strong feelings Dissatisfied/very dissatisfied | 72.1 11.7 14.7 | 67.2 11.6 19.3 |
| Spouse | Location | Billet |
| Satisfied/very satisfied No strong feelings Dissatisfied/very dissatisfied | 69.6 9.7 17.9 | 64.1 11.4 21.2 |
| (Columns do not add up to 100% | due to missing | responses. |
| | | |

This probably indicates that they were happy to be stationed together but less pleased with the type of billet they had to accept in order to be co-located. Their written comments do, in fact, support this explanation. Many respondents stated that they or their spouse had to take undesirable or non-career enhancing billets in order to be stationed near the other. They often wondered if any better billets had been available or if the detailer was just being lazy or spiteful. One officer felt that she was being detailed to non-career enhancing billets because her detailer expected her to give up on her career in favor of her family; as a result, eventually she would have no career left and might as well get out.

When respondents and spouses feelings about location (questions 19 and 20) are compared with service couples status as stationed together or apart, with or without their agreement (question 21), it appears to be statistically significant that they become more dissatisfied as they are stationed apart and stationed apart without their agreement. This is particularly true for the spouses, as indicated by a Cramer's V Statistic of 0.337, compared to a 0.238 for respondents. (See Appendix E.)



3. Career Conflicts

To guestion 24, over one-third (36.1%) of the couples reported that they had experienced conflict between their two careers and, of those, 22% stated that as a result both would leave the service before retirement, and 53% said that one or the other would get out (question 25). As brought out previously, most of the conflict is due to not being able to get desirable billets in the same location with their spouse. In some cases, the respondents recognized that there are no co-located billets for their particular ratings/NEC's or designators/specialties. In other cases, respondents with the same rating or lesignator were faced with limited numbers of co-located billets, for which they had to compete with each other, e.g., Limited Duty Officers (LDO) or Judge Advocate Corps (JAG) officer billets. In many cases, a career enhancing billet for one spouse means sea duty and if they have children it means the other must forego sea duty, schools, or billets with extensive Tenporary Assigned Duty (TAD) requirements, which may have been desirable.

The strongest relationship between any two variables compared by crosstabulation analysis was that between question 24, existence of a conflict between careers, and question 25, result of that conflict. There is an extremely strong tendency, in cases where a conflict is experienced, for one or both members of the couple to leave the service (70.8%) as indicated by a Tramer's V Statistic of 0.889. A small percentage (11.1%) put up with separations to pursue their careers, but another 11.1% said they will get divorced. (See Appendix E.)



4. <u>Separation</u>

Separations due to PCS assignments, deployments, etc., were overwhelmingly reported to contribute to personal grief, financial burdens, narital/familial problems and disenchantment with the Navy. In response to question 26, as to how long a couple would accept geographic separations before one or both decided to leave the service, 16.2% stated that they would not tolerate any separation, and another 68.2% said they would accept a year or less. These figures may not be completely accurate because in some cases the couples were talking about the total amount of separation during their career (s) and in some cases they were stating the length of separation they would accept in addition to that which they had already suffered-sometimes up to three years. Many couples who had been married a year or two reported that they had been separated most of their married lives. Several of them were contemplating divorce or in the process of obtaining one.

A comparison of question 25, maximum acceptable length of geographic separation, by 28A, paygrade of respondent, shows a slight but statistically significant tendency for officers to accept separations more often than enlisted and to accept longer separations. This tendency is not very strong according to the Cramer's V Statistic, 0.203. (See Appendix E.)

5. Additional Problem Areas

Most of the comments on personnel policies and matters have been negative, but that is not unexpected. It could be expected that the people most likely to return the survey would be those who had complaints, and that those who returned the survey although they were not particularily dissatisfied would not have much to say. In fact, in



response to question 22, almost two-thirds (64.1%) of the respondents stated that they had not personally encountered difficulties with personnel policies. However, many of them qualified this by comments such as "so far" or "not yet", and went on to say that they foresaw or anticipated problems in the future. A majority (57.1%) affirmed this by responding to question 23 that they felt changes should be made to personnel policies. Part of this concern was over pay policies, judging from their written comments, which will be covered later in this Chapter. The space provided in question 23 to "please explain" invited a wide range of comments, which will be related next in no particular order.

A common problem for service couples is planned rotation dates (PRD) that do not coincide. This means they may be separated for as long as a year when one rotates before the other, and even then the second one to transfer may not be able to get an assignment near the first. If one spouse wants to transfer at other that his/her PRD in order to join the other, he or she may have to make a no-cost transfer. The Enlisted Transfer Manual, Chapter 3, states policy and requirements concerning transfers at government expense including that the member be "otherwise eligible for reassignment under current distribution directives (i.e., near PRD)." However, Enlisted Distribution Branch staff (NMPC-40BB) is unaware of any such written policy or definition of "near PRD." In fact, it was explained that the various detailing sections handle individual requests for early rotation "differently," on a "case by case" basis. They do have an "unwritten policy" to attempt not to separate service couples for more that one year due to PCS assignments. Obviously more clearly stated, written policy is needed regarding no-cost transfers.

The cost to the government is apparently the same, however, whether the service couple transfers at the same time or not. Joint Travel Regulations (JTR) state that they may combine the prescribed weight allowance of each when transfering to a permanent duty station where they will maintain a joint residence [Ref. 9: p. 8-2-1]. It is unclear whether or not the policy is to grant each their full weight allowance if they transfer separately to or from the same location. One couple reported that they were limited to one member's household goods weight allowance when transferring within CONUS. The JPR states that a service couple is limited to the weight allowance of the senior member only for a transfer overseas [Ref. 9: p. 8-2].

A related problem reported by a respondent is the different lengths of sea luty for women and men and the fact that frequently women are assigned to overseas duty as sea duty. Actually, the <u>Enlisted Fransfer Manual</u>, Chapter 3, states that women are detailed based on OUTUS/CONUS rotation whereas men face sea/shore rotations. Sea duty and overseas assignment count as OUTUS for women. This makes it difficult to syncronize rotations or co-locate assignments.

Sea duty itself is a complex and controversial issue. Apparently existing regulations (ENLTRANSMAN ART. 3.195) are interpreted to mean that officer and enlisted couples without children cannot be sent to sea duty at the same time without their consent. This says nothing about service couples with children. Therefore, some respondents reported, as soon as they had children their detailer(s) said they were available for sea duty concurrently. Some respondents complained that they were required to sign custody of their children over to a third party because they were both assigned to sea duty. Of course, this is an absurd predicament and surely not the intent of the Navy.

The policy in question is apparently intended to prevent the couple from losing both basic allowances for quarters (BAQ) when assigned to sea duty because without dependents they would not be entitled. However, a more reasonable, comprehensive, and clearly stated policy regarding concurrent assignemnt to sea duty is obviously needed. Many respondents felt they should not be subjected to concurrent sea duty without their consent as they have children to care for and households to maintain. Many couples wanted to be assigned to the same ships, if detailed to sea duty at the same time, to reduce the amount of separation. They were willing to be berthed separately.

Enlisted personnel assigned to the same command complained that they were prohibited from working on the same shift. For couples who can only afford one car, this creates problems getting to and from work, not to mention the amount of separation it causes. Many wondered why they couldn't be assigned to the same shop as they didn't expect to cause any more problems than couples who were dating or living together and working in the same shop.

An enlisted couple in the same squadron felt that enlisted personnel were discriminated against because, while on deployment to Japan, they were not allowed to live with their spouses while the officers were allowed to have their civilian wives stay with them in government quarters. One respondent complained that while his ship was in overhaul, the crewmembers with civilian spouses received air fare to visit their spouses; those with military spouses did not.

Many comments were related to government housing policies. Some respondents reported that at their duty station they were not allowed to move into government housing until they were <u>both</u> on board, while members married to civilians could move right in before the spouse/family arrived. One respondent said he was evicted from housing

when his spouse returned to CONUS and their child stayed with him, because the child was listed as her dependent. He was not allowed to list the child as his dependent before being evicted. One female officer stated that she had been denied a room at the BOQ because the heads were shared by men. She was also not allowed to share her husband's BOQ room while they awaited housing, so they had to move into a motel. Another couple sharing a BOQ room while awaiting housing complained that they had to forfeit two BAQ's for one room. One officer complained that she was not allowed to move into the BOQ while her spouse was deployed. An officer-enlisted couple stated that they were not permitted to live in officer or enlisted housing. Furthermore, their commands would not allow them to attend each others' promotion ceremonies in uniform.

Another command would not allow one member to go on a no-cost house hunting trip prior to transfer because the spouse had gone on one (without success). According to one respondent, regulations require one spouse to return to CONUS if two enlisted personnel marry overseas. Others were concerned that overseas ration cards were halved for each member of a service couple, as they felt they were each entitled to a whole one.

A respondent pointed out that currently only one member is listed as the sponsor on a child's medical records: therefore in the "sponsor's" absence, she incurred problems in obtaining medical care for the child in an emergency. According to the Bireau of Medicine and Surgery, Health Benefits Division (NM&S 313), there is no written BUMED policy specifying that either active duty parent or both should be listed as a child's sponsor. The practice in the field seems to vary from listing whichever sponsor is indicated on the child's military ID (if he/she is old enough to have one), to listing whichever parents claims

sponsorship, to routinely listing the father. The Health Benefits Division suggested that any problems could be resolved by the sponsor giving indefinite power of attorney to his/her spouse versus BUMED providing any written guidance for such a small and insignificant segment of the Navy community. The Army does have written policy on the subject of service couples in this area [Ref. 10: P. 4-1].

Some respondents resented that members married to civilians could get "homesteaded" in one location to accomodate the civilian's career or the family's stability, but service couples were not so accomodated due to "needs of the Navy" although they too would like to establish a stable household.

One respondent wondered why there were no HRM (Human Resouce Management) information/support programs for service couples like those for civilian dependents, minorities, etc.

Another respondent suggested that many separations could be avoided by moving the schools located in Newport, Rhode Island (Department Head, PCO/PKO, etc.) to the large Navy population centers like Norfolk and San Diego.

Many of the comments received were confusing, contradictory and surprising. A lot of the problems and worry experienced by service couples are caused by unclear policies, lack of stated policies and scattered regulations. Disburing clerks and personnelmen at the local level are unaware of the special status, problems and policies pertaining to service members married to other members, and therefore frequently interpret and apply policies inconsistently and incorrectly.

C. PAY POLICIES

Some survey questions were directed specifically towards perceived problems with pay policies. Over one-half of the respondents (58.7%) replied that they felt pay policies discriminated against them due to their status as a service couple (question 28). Consequently, 54.6% of them responded to question 29 that changes in pay policies were needed. Most of their written comments were very specific and pertained to BAQ (Basic Allowance for Quarters). It was noted that, in general, the respondents apparently regard BAD as a basic entitlement which they earn for their service to the Navy much like basic pay, and not as a compensation which is only provided to make up for lack of government quarters. The same complaints appeared over and over again in the respondents' comments. A representative sample is provided here.

1. Basic Allowance for Quarters

Many respondents strongly resented the forfeiture of BAQ on sea duty if married to another service member, while members married to civilians retained their BAQ, at the with-dependents rate, no less. The member of a service couple on shore duty with no "dependents" only draws single BAQ [Ref. 5: pp. 3-17 and 3-32]. Why, they ask, should a member with a civilian spouse be entitled to more BAQ than a service couple? Both couples only require a one bedroom household ashore. Furthermore, the civilian spouse doesn't contribute anything to the Navy in return for the extra (with dependents rate) BAQ, but both members of a service couple serve the Navy. In fact, civilian spouses are regarded as an extra burden on the Navy, in the way of medical care, housing, commisary and exchange privileges, increased BAQ rates, etc., But quite often the civilian



"dependent" earns more salary than his or her spouse. How, then, is BAQ at the "with dependents" rate justified for someone who is not actually dependent? Obviously the term "dependent" is inappropriate, inconsistently applied and in need of reevaluation.

Many respondents felt that they, and single personnel as well, should both continue to draw BAQ while on sea duty as they were just as likely as members with civilian spouses to want to maintain a household ashore, and rent and mortgage payments don't stop when one is on sea duty. The loss of BAQ therefore causes them a severe financial hardship and makes budgeting for housing difficult. In fact, the policy of requiring military personnel to occupy quarters where quarters are available, vice paying a housing allowance to anyone who prefers it, denies military personnel of the opportunity to invest in housing, build up equity, and assure themselves of a home when they separate from the service [Ref. 11: p. 569], and [Ref. 5: p. 3-16]. As an alternative, many felt that a service couple should at least be entitled to BA2 with dependents like the other couples, while one is on sea duty. Some resented being reduced to single status for BAQ purposes, while having to file income tax returns as married.

There appear to be many strange twists in the application of policy on BAQ. According to some respondents, the service couple can retain both BAQ's while one is on sea duty if that one claims any children they have as dependents. The spouse on sea duty then draws BAQ "with-dependents." However, if the shore based spouse claims the dependent, and draws BAQ at the with-dependents rate, the one on sea duty forefeits. It seems they must transfer the claim of dependents back and forth with each new assignment in order to maintain their financial status. It appears that this is permissable according to the DODPM,

but apparently most personnel are unaware of this [Ref. 5: p. 3-32 and 3-32.2].

It was also perceived as unfair that single CPO's and single officers should be paid BAQ and COMRATS/BAS while in homeport, while married enlisted were not. The latter understandably prefer to reside ashore with their spouses rather than aboard ship.

The status of children of a previous marriage in regard to BAQ at the with-dependent rate is another confusing issue. Many respondents complained that they were not permitted to both draw BAQ "with dependents" if they had children from their own marriage and one was paying child support for children of a previous marriage [Ref. 5: p. 3-19]. They feel that both should receive the increased BAQ as the children were not all being supported under the same roof. However, other respondents, and the authors as well, know that in many cases such BAQ payment is in fact permitted. Other variations of this situation are possible: both spouses could be supporting children from previous marriages who may or may not reside with them. Once again the definition of "dependent" and policy in this area are unclear and appear unreasonable to most personnel.

2. Family Separation Allowance

Family Separation Allowance (FSA) is another source of dissatisfaction to service couples because they are currently not entitled to it [Ref. 5: p. 3-18 - 3-39]. They stated that separations due to deployments were just as much of an emotional and financial hardship on them as it is on members with civilian spouses. Furthermore, many respondents felt they deserved FSA when separated by PCS assignments as well, which is certainly a greater hardship. It appears that service couples with recognized "dependents" (children) may be authorized FSA under the DODPM policy, but this is not clear and probably less well known or applied.

3. Other Problem Areas

One respondent said that one spouse should be allowed to live in housing when the couple was not co-located, presumably in order to maintain a household with their possessions, vice being required to live in the barracks or BOQ. Another felt the option of giving up quarters in favor of receiving BAQ should be made easier. Many couples complained that assignment to housing did not justify forfeiture of two BAQ's, especially when members married to civilians were only giving up one BAQ for the same quarters. Many complained that the quarters were not worth the BAQ.

Many service couples resent the accusations that they are receiving "windfalls" in the form of double BAQ for one household. They point out that not only are they both serving the Navy, standing watches, going to sea, etc., they frequently need two cars to get to their respective jobs, they must often pay for childcare because duty requirements and deployments keep them both away from home simultaneously, and when they aren't co-located they may be maintaining two households and have higher telephone bills and transportation expenses.

Obviously there exists a lot of misunderstanding and a lack of information on pay policies as they pertain to service couples. This is true for the personnel responsible for administering pay as well as for the recipients. Consequently, policies and procedures are often applied inconsistently and erroneously throughout the Navy. The ultimate result is a detrimental morale problem among service couples, in addition to financial hardships.

In conclusion, most of the respondents were confused and unhappy about the complexities and perceived injustices of the pay system; therefore, they suggested that the
intricacies of "with dependent" rates should be dispensed with and all allowances, like basic pay, should be based on military status/rank/services rendered and not on marital or dependent status. In short, married service members should be entitled to BAQ, regardless of their spouse's military or civilian status.

D. RETENTION ISSUES

1. Major Reasons for Leaving the Service

Questions 31 and 32 were designed to determine the greatest influences on service couples' decisions to leave the service prior to retirement. The respondents were instructed to rank their top three reasons and those of their spouse. However, many respondents had marked reasons without indicating any priority, which necessitated the creation of a fourth category of response, "marked but not ranked," which did not really contribute to an analysis of priorities.

Therefore, all the rankings (and unranked marks) for each reason were combined to produce the total number of marks for each reason. These were then compared to determine the relative importance of each issue. Table V shows the number of marks (frequencies) each question received from respondents, spouses, and both combined. The adjusted percentages indicate the proportion of persons marking each question out of the total who marked anything. Note that two respondents did not answer question 31 at all, nor did they (or their spouse) answer question 32 in 35 cases. Bear in mind that, as each person was asked to mark three responses to each question, the frequencies and percentages will not sum to 100%.



TABLE V

Reason for Leaving Military Service

| | Respondents | | Spouses | | Combined | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------|---------|-------|------------|-------|
| Question 31/32 Reason | Freq | Adj % | Freq | Adj % | Freq | Aaj % |
| Raising a family | 267 | 32.6 | 186 | 23.7 | 453 | 28.2 |
| Pay policies | 143 | 17.5 | 126 | 16.0 | 269 | 16.8 |
| Better civilian job | 261 | 31.9 | 289 | 36.8 | 550 | 34.3 |
| Personal preference | 1 2 2 | 14.9 | 177 | 22.5 | 299 | 18.6 |
| Location of assignments | 74 | 9.0 | 86 | 10.9 | 160 | 10.0 |
| Separation from family | 364 | 44.4 | 352 | 44.8 | 716 | 44.6 |
| Pressure from family | 40 | 4.9 | 24 | 3.1 | 64 | 4.0 |
| Disagree with personnel policies | 71 | 8.7 | 95 | 12.1 | 166 | 10.3 |
| Reduction in military benefits | 193 | 23.6 | 127 | 16.2 | 320 | 19.9 |
| unable to locate With spouse | 4 30 | 52.5 | 367 | 46.7 | 797 | 49.7 |
| qood billet | 2 14 | 26.1 | 191 | 24.3 | 405 | 25.3 |
| advance | 125 | 15.3 | 106 | 13.5 | 231 | 14.4 |
| Retired | 19 | 2.3 | 32 | 4.1 | 51 | 3.2 |
| Other | 46 | 5.5 | 60 | 7.6 | 106 | 6.6 |
| Number of respondents Missing | 8 19 2 | | 786 | | 1605 37 | |

Analysis of Table V reveals the following. The reason for getting out of the service that was chosen most often by the respondents is "unable to get assigned to the same location as spouse." It was marked by 52.5% of those who answered the question. The second most often selected reason is "separation from family." There is essentially a tie for third most important reason between "raising a family" and "better civilian job"; the adjusted percentages for these responses differ by only 0.7%. The next most often chosen reason is then "unable to get assigned to desirable billet in the same location as spouse."



The spouses' most often indicated reason for getting out is essentially tied between "unable to get assigned to the same location as spouse," selected by 46.7%, and "separation from family" (44.8%); the adjusted percentage difference is only 1.9%. The spouses' second most important reason is "better civilian job." Again the third most often selected reason is tied between "unable to get assigned to desirable billet in same location as spouse" and " raising a family," the difference being only .5%. These five issues cover exactly the top five reasons indicated by respondents.

The frequencies of the respondents and the spouses were added and the adjusted percentages recomputed based on the combined total to determine the overall priorities of 1605 service members. The factors having the most influence over their decision to get out of the service before retirement are listed in order.

- Unable to get assigned to the same location as spouse.
- 2. Separation from family.
- 3. Better civilian job.
- 4. Raising a family.
- Unable to get assigned to a desirable billet in the same location as spouse.

(Responses four and five differed by only 2.9%.)

It is worth noting that, for the service couple segment of the Navy community, the major factors influencing their career decisions are related to spouse/family togetherness versus any other aspects of military life. It is not known what the respondents consider to be a "better civilian job", but the probability that it wouldn't keep them separated could reasonably be an attractive consideration, as well as the fact that civilian jobs io not generally treat or pay employees differently according to what their spouses do for a living.



As discussed previously in this chapter under "Demographics", a large proportion of respondents (43.8%) and their spouses (37.0%) are undecided about whether or not to make the service a career. A small percentage (22.7%) of the respondents and 17.7% of their spouses have decided not to stay in for 20 years. (It is noted that some of those getting out after 19 years are eligible for retirement.) The five areas of concern which were pinpointed above can reasonably be assumed to be the major causes of their indecision or decision to get out, and therefore deserve attention by policy makers and others concerned with improving retention.

Career conflicts were also a source of dissatisfaction for a large proportion (36.1%) of service couples, as discussed under "Personnel Policies". This is reflected here in the findings that two of the major concerns of service couples are "unable to get assigned to the same location as spouse" and "unable to get assigned to a desirable billet in the same location as spouse." These concerns should also be of interest to those responsible for retention and assignment policies.

A comparison of sexes on selection of raising a family as a reason for leaving military service (question 31 and 32) revealed a statistically significant relationship. Females were more likely to mark "raising a family" as an important influence on their career decision than were males, especially among the spouses as indicated by a Cramer's V Statistic of 0.346 but not as much among respondents, 0.216. (See Appendix E.) It should be noted that in many cases the respondents marked responses on behalf of their spouses, and therefore statistics regarding spouse's feelings may be inaccurate.

2. Additional Reasons

The written explanations provided for selecting "other" usually cited job dissatisfaction and pursuing education/using G.I. Bill benefits.

The fact that "passed over/cannot advance" was marked by only 14.4% of the couples indicates that many of them would stay in even if their advancement opportunites were not good, but would get out because of other problems, e.g., family separations, even though they had viable careers and good advancement possibilities.

It is worth noting that the least often indicated reason for leaving the service prior to retirement is "pressure from family to get out." It seems reasonable to conclude that service couples are highly dedicated to the Navy and supportive of each other's lesire to pursue a military career. However, the hardships or dissatisfaction caused by military policies (or lack thereof) may drive them out of the military service.

E. CHILDCARE

Although only 38.7% of the respondents have children, 58.5% of those replied to question 30 that child care caused them problems, either because it was not available, or it was available but unsatisfactory. This number should be higher. Many of those who marked "childcare not required" did have children and indicated in their written comments that because available government childcare was unsatisfactory, they had made private arrangements, including having relatives move in with them.



1. Major Complaints

Two areas of complaints were cited repeatedly. In many cases, child care facilities are available but their hours of business do not coincide with the work schedules of military personnel. Service members often work unusually long days, being required at work before the child care facilities open, and getting off duty long after the facilities are closed. Quite often the child care facilities available are not open nights or weekends, while military members frequently work during these times due to shifts, watches and duty days. Many child care facilities do not accept unscheduled "drop-ins," but military members who are subject to recall at any time need this service.

The second most often cited problem is the fact that most child care facilities do not accept infants under six months of age; in the Navy, maternity (convalescent) leave is usually only authorized up to 30 lays [Ref. 12: pp. 30-7 - 30-8 and pp. 38-1 - 38-3]. Therefore, the mother who must return to work has to utilize a private baby sitter or other more expensive civilian child care facilities for infants, which she can ill afford. The problem is more severe for service couples of which one member is on sea duty because they are forfeiting one BAQ, one spouse in not available to assist with caring for the children, and extra expense is incurred.

2. Additional Problem Areas

Additional complaints were: facilities are understaffed, children are frequently unsupervised, babies are ignored until their crying becomes acute, and guided activities or instruction are not provided (children watch TV all day). Facilities are inadequate and even unsafe; in one case, they had been condemned by the fire department and



parents had to sign a waiver releasing the facility from responsibility. Special child care is needed for children who have temperatures or other minor illness as their parents usually cannot get time off from work to stay home with them.

On some bases, the child care facility is available to civil servants and other civilian employees, but many military members are placed on a waiting list for child care. It seems that children of service couples and single parents should have priority for child care facilities, followed by children of other military couples, and lastly by children of civilians (if such accomodation is justifiable at all in a facility intended to serve the military).

Many of the respondents noted that while the Navy only grants about 4 weeks for maternity leave, the Army authorizes 6 weeks. Surely Navy mothers need as much time to recuperate and adjust their lifestyles as Army nothers do.

As a result of the significant problems caused by the inadequacy or inavailability of thild care, many service couples stated that one member would have to leave the service in order for the family to tope. Some suggested that perhaps a member could be granted a temporary leave of absence in order to make family adjustments and arrangements; this time off could be repaid at the end of the member's service obligation.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the preceding analysis of the responses to the service couples survey, the following conclusions were drawn.

1. Personnel Policies

The statistics and respondents' written comments presented in the analysis in Chapter III provide ample evidence that service couples do experience problems with personnel policies peculiar to them which cause them to have career conflicts, get divorced and, in a significant number of cases, to leave the service. Major difficulties encountered are: getting co-located, getting assigned to desirable billets and co-located, separations, maintaining a household and raising a family.

2. Pay Policies

Perceived inequities in the administration of BAQ, FSA, etc., were reported to be the source of a great deal of concern, confusion and dissatisfaction among service couples. Over one-half of the respondents felt pay policies were in need of revision. However, their dissatisfaction with this issue is not as great a contributor to their decision to leave the service, as compared with dissatisfaction over separate assignments and temporary separations.

3. <u>Childcare</u>

An additional finding is the significant effect of childcare problems on career decisions of service couples. Not only are the respondents dissatisfied with facilities, staffing, activities, services (hours of operation), and policies (minimum age requirements), many reported that the inavailability and/or inadequacy of childcare was a factor in their decisions to leave the service. They are not able to reconcile the demands of a military career with the demands of a family without childcare support.

4. Policies in General

It is also concluded that much of the dissatisfaction and problems experienced by service couples stem from policies which are inadequate, inconsistent, unclear, misinterpreted, and not well known. The areas and issues brought out by the respondents are summarized here.

a. Policy regarding concurrent assignment to sea duty of service couples, both with and without children, is not fully and clearly stated.

b. Policy is needed stating the Navy's intent to co-locate service couples in career-enhancing billets for both whenever possible, including the degree of priority attributed to this effort, and the amount of cooperation expected between detailers and their constituents and between detailers of different communities.

c. Policy regarding tour lengths for men and women and PRD adjustments should be reviewed and revised to make tour lengths more compatible and rotations easier to syncronize.

d. BAQ entitlement policy is not clearly stated or consistently applied to service couples in relation to sea duty, assignment to quarters/housing, and dependents, and is regarded as discriminating unfairly against service couples.



e. Policy regarding authorization of FSA (type I and II) also appears to discriminate unfairly against service members married to other members when they are in the same circumstances, e.g., PCS overseas assignment or sea duty, as members married to civilians.

f. Policy is neeled permitting both service member parents to be listed as sponsors for their children on the children's medical records, to ensure timely medical attention can be obtained in the absence of either of the parents.

g. Policy regarding service couples' household goods weight allowances is not clearly stated for all situations, e.g., when the members transfer at different times and/or to separate locations.

h. Guidance is needed at the local command level to standardize policy regarding: assignment of service couples to same shifts, shops, crews; granting of no-cost TAD house hunting trips; provision of transportation to crews in overhaul to visit spouses, etc.

i. Housing policy guidance is also needed at the local level to standardize the housing assignment to officer-enlisted couples, waiting periods for housing when one member of the service couple is onboard, etc.

5. Lack of Information

Much of the confusion and frustration experienced by service couples is caused by a lack of information or understanding on their part. Many problems could be better accepted, resolved or avoided altogether if service couples, and members contemplating marriage to other members, were better informed on policies and aware of the special circumstances they face. For example, many couples are unhappy with their duty assignments because they think they could have had better billets or been co-located if their

detailers would only make the effort. However, in many cases the service couple's specialties are not compatible to co-location or openings do not exist in the required timeframe.

Many service members do not inderstand the purpose of BAQ and therefore do not accept the application of policy on entitlement. Many are not aware that favorable provisions do exist in current policies because they are unfamiliar with the policies or the policies are difficult to interpret.

It seems that much of the dissatisfaction of service couples could be alleviated if they were provided with such information as which specialties can be co-located and what the likelihood is, what special provisions in pay policies pertain to them, and what their rights and obligations are as military members with military spouses.

6. Costs to the Navy

As the number of service couples continues to grow, the Department of the Navy has an opportunity to improve retention of these members through carefully thought out policy. As pointed out earlier, service couples indicated a high degree of support of each others careers and desire to remain in the service if certain hardships can be alleviated. Their increased retention will reduce personnel shortages, loss of skills and experience, and ultimately replacement costs, i.e., the cost of recruiting, training and sustaining new personnel to replace those who leave the service. The costs to the Navy caused by loss of qualified, experienced personnel should be weighed against the costs incurred in inducing those personnel to remain in the service.



What are the costs which result from personnel losses? First of all, obviously, there are the unfilled billets and the billets filled with indergualified personnel. This results in a reduction in operational readiness, a serious consequence. The necessity to replace personnel who leave leads to replacement costs which ultimately exceed the cost of retaining those personnel. This is because the new personnel require additional recruiting and training costs. The average cost of recruiting one person is \$1,671 according to the offices of Commander Navy Recruiting Command (CNRC): the average cost to train an enlisted member in the Avionics Technican (AT) rating ("boot camp", Aviation Fundamentals, Basic Electricity and Electronics, and "A" school) is \$22,688; the average cost of training an officer (Officer Candidate School and Surface Warfare Officer School) is \$20,789, or, for a pilot, \$159,794 (Aviation Officer Candidate School and helicopter pipeline flight training). Even after the new member is recruited, trained, qualified and ready to fill the vacant billet, it is years too late. The Navy will never achieve or maintain the desired and necessary level of expertise and readiness if it is continually losing experienced middle managers and replacing them with raw recruits or fresh "A" school graduates.

In addition to the personnel and dollar costs of policies which fail to enhance retention, there is the morale cost to be considered. Many of those who remain are also likely to be unhappy with the policies which contributed to the separation of their shipmates, to be dissatisfied with the military service and consequently less productive than they could be. They are also likely to resent the extra requirements laid on them, e.g., extended/ frequent deployments, frequent watches, long shift hours, to compensate for the shortage of personnel.

ł

On the other hand, what are the costs of improving retention? We explore here the possible costs of improving the factors found to contribute to service couples' decisions to leave the service.

Co-location, and co-location in desirable billets, is a major issue with service couples. What extra cost would be incurred if detailers were to spend more time and effort in attempting to locate career-enhancing billets for their constituents in the same location as their spouse? What extra cost would be incurred if detailers from different communities would communicate and work together to co-locate constituents with different specialties? The information on available billets in various locations is already available. The cost of studing it more thoroughly should be nil.

Another major factor in service couple retention is availability of childcare. The major problems are operating hours which do not accommodate the working hours of military members, and restrictions on the acceptance of infants (under 6 months old). As the members who need the childcare services are paying customers, increased operating hours (nights and weekends) and staff would be paid for by those generating the increased requirements. Some revision in the policy and purpose of childcare facilites could even eliminate the need for additional staff; for instance, childcare services could be limited to military personnel vice civilian employees.

A retention issue that would be expected to generate dollar costs to the Navy is the policy on payment of FSA and BAQ to members married to other members. Additional costs would result from authorizing FSA for service couple members on PCS overseas duty or sea duty, but the total amount which might be paid during an average enlisted members' career does not exceed the extensive cost of recruiting and training a replacement for him. For example, assuming the



average enlisted person is assigned overseas, unaccompanied, for a two year tour once during his career, he would draw an average FSA Type I of \$3,344 per year, or \$6,688 total for the tour. Also assuming that during his 20 years he makes five deployments of eight months each, he would draw a total FSA Type II of \$1,280 at \$32 per month. In the case of the average AT, this \$7,968 total compares favorably with the \$24,359 cost to replace him. The same cost savings applies to the payment of the same BAQ rates (with dependents) to members married to members as to members married to civilians when on sea duty, or the authorization of with dependents rates to both members of a service couple who are supporting children from marriages prior to their current one. The extra amount of BAQ at the with dependents rate averages only about \$90.21 per month. This would amount to roughly \$17,220 additional BAQ over 16 years (as permitted under current policy) in a 20 year career.

The retertion of service couples generates savings in other areas. PCS moves are an example. A service member typically is re-located regularly about every two or three years. Normally when there are two billets in an area which must be filled, two service members and both of their families and households are moved to fill them. However, if a service couple can fill the two billets, only one family and one household need to be moved. Although both members may be entitled to their full individual weight allowances, it is not likely that their household goods would weigh more than those of a member married to a civilian. Therefore, the Navy can save the cost of one PCS move, on the average \$5,639 for officers and \$2,762 for enlisted according to the current data base at OP 13, in relocating a service couple vice a service member-civilian family.



Another "savings" to the government inherent in service couples is more difficult to estimate. Both members of a service couple serve the Navy in return for the pay, allowances and benefits which they receive. A civilian spouse, on the other hand, does not contribute materially to the Navy's mission in return for with dependents BAQ rates, medical benefits, exchange and commissary privileges, military family housing, etc. In effect, it costs the Navy more to support civilian "dependents."

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

As retention rates have such serious implications for military readiness and national defense, the factors affecting retention demand careful consideration and action. the purpose of this study was to single out areas which could be affected in order to improve the retention of one segment of the Navy community: service couples. Based on the preceeding analysis and conclusions, the following recommendations are offered.

1. Personnel Policies

a. Policies affecting service couples, as well as all other military members, should be reveiwed and revised on a regular basis to ensure that they are: comprehensive, consistent, clearly stated and easily interpreted. all situations possible should be considered and covered in writing. Wording should be examined and field tested to ensure standardized interpretation and application of policy. Policy applicable in various circumstances should be compared to ensure consistency and fairness in application.

b. Personnel responsible for interpreting and administering policies should be equally familiar with the special provisions and location of policies pertaining to

service couples. Surveys should be conducted at the local level to ensure standardization and consistency of policy interpretation and application.

c. Service members married to or contemplating marriage to other service members should be provided information and guidance relative to their special circumstances, possible problems, entitlements, policies affecting them differently than other members, etc. This could be done via HRMC/D (Human Resouce Management Centers/Detachments) briefings or handouts provided by personnel and disbursing offices. Articles should also appear on a regular basis in military publications such as <u>Perspective</u> and <u>Link</u>.

d. "Hot lines" could be established for the use of all service members to answer questions and explain personnel policies (e.g., detailing) and pay policies (e.g., BAQ) when efforts to obtain satisfactory explanations or treatment at the local level are unsuccessful. The "hot line" offices should have no authority over local commands, but should only serve to refer concerned members to appropriate regulations or offices for assistance. The personnel manning the "hot line" should maintain a log on the nature of the questions and the command concerned. The log then could be reviewed to determine problem areas and/or commands which require guidance.

e. Policy regarding the detailing of service couples should be clearly and comprehensively stated and include the following:

1. Concurrent assignment to sea duty should not be permitted without the consent of both members of the service couple (regardless of whether or not they have children). This would allow them to maintain a household and meet family demands.



2. Efforts should be made to co-locate service couples in career-enhancing billets in order to meet both the professional and personal needs of these service members. Detailer department head review should be required in all cases where a service couple can not be co-located within 50 miles of each other.

3. Detailers should be required to cooperate with each other and constituents as much as possible, and to present a professional attitude toward the couples' requests for co-location.

4. Members whose specialties are not compatible for co-location should be encouraged to change their specialties in accordance with the needs of the Navy to improve career compatibility.

5. PRD's should be adjusted as much as possible within Navy requirements to reduce separations due to PCS assignments.

2. Fay Policies

The military pay system, in reality is not a "system" at all but a collection of regulations and measures designed to resolve separate problems as they arose. Seemingly little thought or study has been given to the interrelations, ramifications or contradictions posed by those measures as they fit into the overall system.

a. The following recommendations attempt to alleviate some of the inconsistencies in the pay system regarding BAQ.

1. the concept of BAQ should be revised. BAQ should be paid to all service members as an allowance with which to secure housing and should be regarded as an entitlement based solely on paygrade. The "with-dependents" rate should be dispensed with along with the concept that BAQ is only paid as a compensation when housing is not



provided. This revised concept is more in line with civilian pay practices.

Under this concept, BAQ would not be forfeited by servicemembers on sea inty regardless of dependent status or utilization of housing. However, a fair market rental value should be charged for housing when utilized, either by service members or their civilian spouses (in their absence). For example, a member on sea duty married to a civilian who occupies housing would continue to draw BAQ, but would pay rent for the housing. A member of a service couple on sea duty would also continue to draw BAQ as would the member-spouse even if he/she occupied housing; that couple would also be charged only the fair market rental value for the housing, even when the member on sea duty returns to shore duty. In short, the amount assessed for housing should be based on the worth of the housing and not on the military/civilian status of the occupants.

The money saved by not paying "with dependents," rates should be used to increase the basic BAQ for everyone and to provide BAQ to enlisted personnel in paygrade E-4 with over two years of service, vice four years.

2. Should the recommendation to revise the concept of BAQ as explained above be rejected, the following alternative actions are recommended.

Regarding sea iuty, service couples should be entitled to the same total amount of BAQ between the two of them as a military member with a civilian spouse, when either or both members of the service couple is (are) on sea duty. That is, both couples should receive one BAQ with dependent(s). This is because either couple is likely to be maintaining the same quality houshold ashore for similar sized families.


Regarding dependent chiliren of different marriages, when service couples are supporting children from more than one marriage in the same household, all of the children should be claimed by one parent; thus the couple would receive one single BAQ and one BAQ with dependents (provided they do not occupy government housing). When one member is providing child support to children of a previous marriage who reside with the ex-spouse, that member should draw BAQ with dependents and his current spouse should also draw BAQ with dependents on behalf of the children who reside with them (unless they reside in government quarters). This is necessary because the service couple is responsible for providing housing in two separate locations.

Members married to civilians, who reside in government housing, should also receive BAQ with dependents for any children from a previous marriage for whom they provide child support but with whom they do not reside.

To be completely fair, these members deserve to receive two BAQ's at the "with dependents" rate if they do not reside in housing and support children from a previous marriage in another household as well as children who reside in their own household. However, it is <u>not</u> recommended that two BAQ's be paid to one service member.

3. The foregoing recommendations are offered to rectify the inequities revealed in this study. It is recognized that they do not cover all possible situations or discrepancies. A thorough and extensive analysis of pay policies is required but is beyond the scope of this study. Such an analysis is recommended for further in-depth research.

b. FSA-Type I should be authorized for service members separated from their spouses who are also service members when they are separated due to PCS assignments "outside the U.S. or in Alaska." This requires a change in

7)



the wording of the regulation so that "dependent(s)" includes active duty spouses in DODPM, article 30302 and 30303.

FSA-Type II should be authorized for service members separated from their spouses who are also service members when separated "due to PCS, duty aboard a ship or TDY." Change the wording so that "dependent(s)" includes active duty spouses in DODPM article 30304.

3. <u>Childcare</u>

a. Military childcare facilites should offer services 24 hours a day, every day of the week. This includes "drop-in" service for short notice military requirements.

b. Childcare facilities should accept infants at the age at which the mother is required to return to work after maternity leave expires (currently four weeks).

c. Military members, particularly service couples, should be given priority for childcare services over civil servants and civilan employees. When military members/ service couples require childcare, civilians currently accommodated should be "binped" and placed on a waiting list.

d. Childcare facilities/services should be enhanced to include as many military bases as possible, more and better trained staff, safer and more comfortable facilities and guided activities for the children.

E. Navy maternity leave should be extended to six weeks, comparable to Army maternity leave policy, to ensure adequate recuperation and adjustment time for mothers before returning to full military duties [Ref. 10: p. 8-3].

As the number of service couples grows and they comprise a larger segment of the Navy population, factors influencing their retention become increaseingly important. This study has highlighted issues reported by service couples to affect their lifestyles and career decisions. These should prove useful to makers of policy in focusing their efforts on areas needing attention.

APPENDIX A COVER LETTER AND SURVEY

Dear Servicemember:

You have been randomly selected to participate in the attached survey from an estimated 14,722 Navy personnel who are married to other active duty members. This survey will form the basis for a Naval Postgraduate School thesis on the Effects of Personnel Policies on the Retention of Service Couples. It is sponsored by the Navy Family Support Program (NMPC-66). The results of the survey response analysis will be provided to the appropriate offices and policy makers in the Departement of the Navy.

To date, little to no research has been conducted in this area; therefore your completed survey will make a significant contribution to the data base on service members married to other members. More importantly, your combined inputs could possibly change the policies which affect you directly.

Timely return of the survey is important to meet the scheduled completion date for this research project. Please return the completed survey in the enclosed envelope by 7 October 1982. Your answers will remain confidential as we do not ask for any identifying information.

Thank you for your cooperation.

| Milad | iy Bla | aha | Hixe | nba | ug. | h |
|-------|--------|-----|-------|------|-----|---|
| LT | | | | | US | N |
| Paul | Npel | His | (enba | ugh | | |
| LΤ | | | | IISN | | |



REPORT CONTROL SYMBOL: OPNAV-7041-1(OT)

SERVICE COUPLES SURVEY

 Has your spouse ever served on active duty? (MARK ONLY ONE)

NO. STOP AND RETURN SURVEY

- ___ Never married. STOP AND RETURN SURVEY
- -- No longer married but my previous spouse served/is serving on active duty. Answer the remainder of the survey as though you were still married.
- --- Yes, my spouse previously served on active duty. ANSWER THE REMAINDER OF THE SJRVEY AS THOUGH YOUR SPOUSE WERE STILL ON ACTIVE DUTY.
- ___ Yes, my spouse is currently on active duty.
- In what service does (or did) your spouse last serve? (MARK ONLY ONE)
 - __ Army
 - ___ Navy
 - __ Air Force

__ Marine Corps

3. What is your sex? ____Male

4. What is your age?

-- --

5. What is the current age of your spouse?

-- --

__ Female

- What do you consider to be your main racial or ethnic group? (MARK ONLY ONE)
 - ____Afro-American/Black/Negro
 - Hispanic/Puerto Rican/Mexican/Cuban/Latin/Chicano/ Other Spanish
 - __ Caucasian/White
 - __ other
- 7. What does your spouse consider his/her main racial or ethnic Group? (MARK ONLY ONE)
 - Afro-American/Black/Negro
 Hispanic/Puerto Rican/Mexican/Cuban/Latin/Chicano/
 Other Spanish
 Caucasian/White
 - __ other
- What is your present pay grade? (Eq. E5, 01, W3, etc.)

If an officer, what is your designator? (Eg. 1110, 1310, etc.)

If enlisted, what is your rating? (Eg. AD, SM, FTM, etc.)

-- -- -- --

9. What is the present (or last) pay grade of your spouse?

If your spouse is (was) an officer, what is (was) his/her designator?

If your spouse is (was) enlisted, what is (was) his/her rating/mos?

-- -- -- --

- How many years, to the nearest whole year, of active duty do you have to date? (Eg. 03, 16, etc.)
- 11. How many years, to the nearest whole year, of active duty does (or did) your spouse have?
- 12. How many years, to the nearest whole year, have you been married to your current spouse?
- 13. When did your marriage to your current spouse occur? (MARK ONLY ONE) ____ While both were on active duty ____ I was on active duty but my spouse was not ____ My spouse was on active duty but I was not ____ Neither of us was on active duty
- 14. How many children do you and your current spouse have in your household? (INCLIDE PREGNANCY) Do not count children under someone else's custody.
- 15. How many total years to you intend to remain on active duty? (Eg. 06, 12, etc.)

____ Undecided

-- --

-- --

- 16. How many total years loes your spouse intend to remain on active duty?
 - ____ Undecided
 - _____ Not applicable. Spouse no longer on active duty or no longer married.



| 17. | Has either | career be | en chosen by you and your spouse as |
|-----|-------------|------------|-------------------------------------|
| | the consis | tently dom | inant one when it comes to |
| | detailing? | (MARK ONL | Y JNE) |
| | Yes, my | career | |
| | Yes, my | spouse's | CILGEL |
| | No | | |
| 18. | If your de | tailers ha | ve been askel to accommodate your |
| | decision r | egarding t | he dominant career, do they do so? |
| | (MARK ONLY | ONE) | |
| | Yes. bo | th detaile | rs do |
| | No. my | detailer d | oas not |
| | No. my | spouse's d | etailer does not |
| | No, nei | ther detai | ler does |
| | Not app | licable. D | etailers not asked to cooperate |
| | | | |
| 19. | How do you | feel abou | t your current assignment? |
| | (MARK ONE | IN EACH CO | LUMN) |
| | Location | Billet | |
| | | | Very satisfied |
| | | | Satisfied |
| | | | No strong feelings |
| | | | Dissatisfiel |
| | | | Very dissatisfied |
| 20. | How does yo | our spouse | feel about his/her current (or |
| | last) assi | gnment? | |
| | Location | Billet | |
| | | | Very satisfied |
| | | | satisfied |
| | | | No strong faalings |
| | | | Dissatisfiel |
| | | | Very Dissatisfied |

| 21. | <pre>Are (were) you and your spouse stationed within 50 miles of each other?YesNo, but with our agreementNo, without our agreement</pre> |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 22. | <pre>Have you and your spouse had difficulties with personnel policies regarding service members married to other members?NoYes. PLEASE EXPLAIN</pre> |
| 23. | Do you feel that any changes should be made to personnel policies pertaining to service nembers married to members? NO Yes. PLEASE EXPLAIN |
| 24. | Have you and your spouse experienced a conflict between your careers? No Yes. PLEASE EXPLAIN |



- 25. If you answered "yes" to question 24, what is the probable result of your conflict of careers? (MARK ONLY ONE)
 - ... We will both get out before ratirement
 - __ I will get out before retirement
 - ___ My spouse will get out before retirement
 - __ We will get divorced
 - We will put up with physical separation in order to pursue our careers
 - ___ Not applicable. No conflict
- 26. What is the maximum length in months of separate geographic assignments which you and your spouse would accept before one of both of you decide to leave active duty? Do not include temporary deployments. (Eq. 09, 24, etc.)

-- --

- 27. Which of the following is of the greatest importance when you are considering transfer to a new assignment? (MARK ONLY ONE)
 - __ Career en hancing tour/billet
 - __ Co-location with your spouse
 - ___ Geographic location

_____Other. PLEASE EXPLAIN______



| 28. | Do you feel that current pay policies (Forfeiture or BAQ due to sea duty or housing, etc.) discriminate against you and your spouse as a service couple? |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | NO Yes. PLEASE EXPLAIN |
| | |
| 29. | Do you feel that any changes should be made to pay |
| | policies pertaining to service nembers married to other |
| | members? |
| | NO |
| | Yes. PLEASE EXPLAIN |
| | |
| | |
| 30. | If you require childcare, which of the following applies |
| | to your situation? (MARK ONLY ONE) |
| | Childcare facilities are available and satisfactory |
| | Childcare is available but inadequate or inconvenient |
| | Childcare is not available, and this causes problems |
| | Childcare is not available, but this does not cause |
| | me any problems |
| | Not applicable. Do not require childcare |
| | COMMENTS |
| | |
| | |
| | |



| 31. | What would have the greatest influence in making you |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------|
| | leave the service prior to retirement? |
| | (RANK YOUR TOP THREE REASONS: 1, 2, 3) |
| | Raising a family |
| | Pay policies |
| | Better civilian job |
| | Personal preference |
| | Location of assignments |
| | Separation from family |
| | Pressure from family to get out |
| | Disagree with personnel policies |
| | Reduction in military banefits |
| | Unable to get assigned to the same location as spouse |
| | Unable to get assigned to desirable billet in the |
| | same location as spouse |
| | Passed over/cannot advance |
| | Petired |
| | Other. PLEASE EXPLAIN |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| 32. | What would have (or did have) the greatest influence in |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------|
| | making your spouse leave the service prior to |
| | retirement? |
| | (RANK HIS/HER TOP THREE REASONS: 1, 2, 3) |
| | Raising a family |
| | Pay policies |
| | Better civilian job |
| | Personal preference |
| | Location of assignments |
| | Separation from family |
| | Pressure from family to get out |
| | Disagree with personnel policies |
| | Reduction in military banefits |
| | Unable to get assigned to the same location as spouse |
| | Unable to get assigned to a desirable billet in the |
| | same location as spouse |
| | Passed over/cannot advance |
| | Retired |
| | Other. PLEASE EXPLAIN |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | END OF SURVEY. THANK YOU |
| | |



APPENDIX B DATA ENCODING SCHEME

The following is the encoding scheme used to transform the data from the returned surveys to enable processing using the SPSS PROGRAM.

Each case uses two lines.

THE FOLLOWING DATA IS ENCODED ON THE FIRST LINE: Columns 1-4:

indicates the number of the survey: 0001-0821.

Column 6:

Has your spouse ever served on active duty? (MARK ONLY ONE)

- (1) NO. STOP AND RETURN SURVEY
- (2) Never married. STOP AND RETURN SURVEY
- (3) No longer married but my previous spouse served/is serving on active iuty. Answer the remainder of the survey as though you were still married.
- (4) Yes, my spouse previously served on active duty. ANSWER THE REMAINDER OF THE SURVEY AS THOUGH YOUR SPOUSE WERE STILL ON ACTIVE DUTY.
- (5) Yes, my spouse is currently on active duty.
- (9) Missing

Column 8:

- 2. In what service does (or did) your spouse last serve? (MARK ONLY ONE)
 - (1) Army
 - (2) Navy
 - (3) Air Force
 - (4) Marine Corps
 - (5) Coast Guard
 - (9) Missing



Column 10 3. What is your sex? (0) Male (1) Female (9) Missing Column 12-13: 4. What is your age? -- --(77) Missing Column 15-16: 5. What is the current age of your spouse? (77) Missing Column 18: 6. What do you consider to be your main racial or ethnic group? (MARK ONLY ONE) (1) Afro-American/Black/Negro (2) Hispanic/Puerto Rican/Mexican/Cuban/Latin/Chicano/ Other Spanish (3) Caucasian /White (4) other (9) Missing Column 20: 7. What does your spouse consider his/her main racial or ethnic Group? (MARK ONLY ONE) (1) Afro-American/Black/Negro (2) Hispanic/Puerto Rican/Mexican/Cuban/Latin/Chicano/ Other Spanish (3) Caucasian/White (4) other (9) Missing



Columns 22-23: 8. What is your present pay grade? (Eg. E5, 01, W3, etc.) ----E1=01 $E_{2}=0_{2}$ E3=03 E4=04 E5=05 E6=06 E7=07 E8=08 E9=09 W1 = 10₩2=11 W3=12 W4=13 01=14 02=15 03=16 04 = 1705=18 06=19 07=20 77=Missing Columns 24-27: If an officer, what is your designator? (Eg. 1110, 1310, etc.) -- -- -- --(77) Missing Columns 29-32: If enlisted, what is your rating? (Eg. AD, SM, FIM, etc.) -- -- -- ---(77) Missing



Columns 34-35: 9. What is the present (or last) pay grade of your spouse? ----(Same coding as for question 8) Columns 36-39: If your spouse is (was) an officer, what is (was) his/her designator? ___ __ __ __ (77) Missing Columns 41-44: If your spouse is (was) enlisted, what is (was) his/her rating/mos? __ __ ~_ ~_ (77) Missing Columns 45-46: 10. How many years, to the nearest whole year, of active duty do you have to date? (Eq. 08, 16, etc.) -(77) missing Columns 47-48: 11. How many years, to the nearest whole year, of active duty does (or did) your spouse have? ----(77) Missing Columns 49-50: 12. How many years, to the nearest whole year, have you been married to your current spouse? ---(77) Missing



Column 51: 13. When did your marriage to your current spouse occur? (MARK ONLY ONE) (1) While both were on active duty (2) I was on active duty but my spouse was not (3) My spouse was on active duty but I was not (4) Neither of us was on active duty (9) Missing Column 52: 14. How many children do you and your current spouse have in your household? (INCLUDE PREGNANCY) Do not count children under someone else's custody. (9) Missing Columns 53-54: 15. How many total years do you intend to remain on active duty? (Eg. 06, 12, etc.) -----(77) Missing (88) Undecided Columns 55-56: 16. How many total years does your spouse intend to remain on active duty? -- --(77) Missing (88) Undecided (99) Not applicable. Spouse no longer on active duty or no longer married.


```
Column 57:
17. Has either career been chosen by you and your spouse as
    the consistently dominant one when it comes to
    detailing? (MARK ONLY ONE)
    (1) Yes, my career
    (2) Yes, my spouse's career
    (3) NO
    (9) Missing
Column 58:
18. If your detailers have been asked to accommodate your
    decision regarding the dominant career, do they do so?
    (MARK ONLY ONE)
    (1) Yes, both detailers do
    (2) No, my detailer does not
    (3) No, my spouse's detailer does not
    (4) No, neither detailer does
    (5) Not applicable. Detailers not asked to cooperate
    (9) Missing
Columns 59-60:
19. How do you feel about your current assignment?
    (MARK ONE IN EACH COLUMN)
    Location Billet
    (1)
               (1)
                         Verv satisfied
    (2)
                         Satisfied
               (2)
                         No strong feelings
    (3)
               (3)
                        Dissatisfiei
    (4)
               (4)
    (5)
               (5)
                         Very dissatisfied
    (9)
               (9)
                        Missing
```



```
THE FOLLOWING DATA IS ENCODED IN ROW TWO:
Columns 1-2:
20. How does your spouse feel about his/her current (or
   last) assignment?
   Location Billet
                  Very satisfied
           (1)
   (1)
                  satisfied
   (2)
          (2)
                   No strong feelings
   (3)
           (3)
                  Dissatisfiel
           (4)
   (4)
                   Very Dissatisfied
   (5)
           (5)
   (9)
           (9)
                   Missing
Column 4:
21. Are (were) you and your spouse stationed within 50 miles
   of each other?
   (1) Yes
   (2) No, but with our agreement
   (3) No, without our agreement
   (9) Missing
Column 6:
22. Have you and your spouse had difficulties with personnel
   policies regarding service members married to other
   members?
   (1) NO
   (2) Yes. PLEASE EXPLAIN
         (9) Missing
```



| Colu | 1mn 8: |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 23. | Do you feel that any changes should be made to personnel |
| | policies pertaining to service members married to |
| | members? |
| | (1) NO |
| | (2) Yes. PLEASE EXPLAIN |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | (9) Missing |
| Colu | 1mn 10: |
| 24. | Have you and your spouse experienced a conflict between |
| | your careers? |
| | (1) NC |
| | (2) Yes. PLEASE EXPLAIN |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | (9) Missing |
| Colu | (9) Missing |
| Colu 25. | (9) Missing umn 12: If you answered "yes" to question 24, what is the |
| Colu 25. | (9) Missing umn 12: If you answered "yes" to question 24, what is the probable result of your conflict of careers? |
| Colu 25. | (9) Missing umn 12: If you answered "yes" to question 24, what is the probable result of your conflict of careers? (MARK ONLY ONE) |
| Colu 25. | <pre>(9) Missing mn 12: If you answered "yes" to question 24, what is the probable result of your conflict of careers? (MARK ONLY ONE) (1) We will both get out before ratirement</pre> |
| Colu 25. | <pre>(9) Missing mmn 12: If you answered "yes" to question 24, what is the probable result of your conflict of careers? (MARK ONLY ONE) (1) We will both get out before retirement (2) I will get out before retirement</pre> |
| Colu 25. | <pre>(9) Missing imn 12: If you answered "yes" to question 24, what is the probable result of your conflict of careers? (MARK ONLY ONE) (1) We will both get out before retirement (2) I will get out before retirement (3) My spouse will get out before retirement</pre> |
| Colu 25. | <pre>(9) Missing umn 12: If you answered "yes" to question 24, what is the probable result of your conflict of careers? (MARK ONLY ONE) (1) We will both get out before retirement (2) I will get out before retirement (3) My spouse will get out before retirement (4) We will get divorced</pre> |
| Colu 25. | <pre>(9) Missing umn 12: If you answered "yes" to question 24, what is the probable result of your conflict of careers? (MARK ONLY ONE) (1) We will both get out before retirement (2) I will get out before retirement (3) My spouse will get out before retirement (4) We will get divorced (5) We will put up with physical separation in order to</pre> |
| Colu 25. | <pre>(9) Missing mn 12: If you answered "yes" to question 24, what is the probable result of your conflict of careers? (MARK ONLY ONE) (1) We will both get out before ratirement (2) I will get out before retirement (3) My spouse will get out before retirement (4) We will get divorced (5) We will put up with physical separation in order to pursue our careers</pre> |
| Colu 25. | <pre>(9) Missing mn 12: If you answered "yes" to question 24, what is the probable result of your conflict of careers? (MARK ONLY ONE) (1) We will both get out before retirement (2) I will get out before retirement (3) My spouse will get out before retirement (4) We will get divorced (5) We will put up with physical separation in order to pursue our careers (6) Not applicable. No conflict</pre> |
| Colu 25. | <pre>(9) Missing mm 12: If you answered "yes" to question 24, what is the probable result of your conflict of careers? (MARK ONLY ONE) (1) We will both get out before retirement (2) I will get out before retirement (3) My spouse will get out before retirement (4) We will get divorced (5) We will put up with physical separation in order to pursue our careers (6) Not applicable. No conflict (7) Other</pre> |
| Colu 25. | <pre>(9) Missing mm 12: If you answered "yes" to question 24, what is the probable result of your conflict of careers? (MARK ONLY ONE) (1) We will both get out before retirement (2) I will get out before retirement (3) My spouse will get out before retirement (4) We will get divorced (5) We will put up with physical separation in order to pursue our careers (6) Not applicable. No conflict (7) Other (9) Missing</pre> |



| Col | umns 14-15: |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 26. | What is the maximum length in months of separate |
| | geographic assignments which you and your spouse would |
| | accept before one of both of you decide to leave active |
| | duty? Do not include temporary deployments. |
| | (Eg. 09, 24, etc.) |
| | |
| | (77) Missing |
| Col | umn 17: |
| 27. | Which of the following is of the greatest importance |
| | when you are considering transfer to a new assignment? |
| | (MARK ONLY ONE) |
| | (1) Career en hancing tour/billet |
| | (2) Co-location with your spouse |
| | (3) Geographic location |
| | (4) other. PLEASE EXPLAIN |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | (9) Missing |
| Col | umn 19: |
| 28. | Do you feel that current pay policies (Forfeiture or BAQ |
| | due to sea duty or housing, etc.) discriminate against |
| | you and your spouse as a service couple? |
| | (1) NO |
| | (2) Yes. PLEASE EXPLAIN |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | (9) Missing |

| Col | umn 21: |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| 29. | Do you feel that any changes should be made to pay |
| | policies pertaining to service members married to other |
| | members? |
| | (1) NO |
| | (2) Yes. PLEASE EXPLAIN |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | (9) Missing |
| Col | ump 23: |
| 30 | If you require childcare, which of the following applies |
| 500 | to your situation? (MARK ONLY ONE) |
| | (1) Childrare facilitias are available and satisfactory |
| | (7) Childcare is available but inadequate or inconvenient |
| | (2) Children is available but indequate of inconvenient |
| | (3) Childcare is not available, and this causes problems |
| | (4) ChildCale is not available, bit this does not cause |
| | me any problems |
| | (5) Not applicable. Do not require childcare |
| | (9) Missing |
| | COMMENTS |
| | |
| THE | FOLLOWING REMARKS APPLY TO BOTH QUESTION 31 and 32: |
| | The following are ranked 1, 2, 3, or coded 0 |
| | unmarked. Four if marked but not ranked, and 9 if |

none marked for the entire question.

31. What would have the greatest influence in making you leave the service prior to retirement? (RANK YOUR TOP THREE REASONS: 1, 2, 3) Column 25: __ Raising a family Column 26: __ Pay policies Column 27: __ Better civilian job Column 28: Personal preference Column 29: Location of assignments Column 30: ___ Separation from family Column 31: Pressure from family to get bit Column 32: __ Disagree with personnel policies Column 33: Reduction in military benefits Column 34: ___ Unable to get assigned to the same location as spouse Column 35: Unable to get assigned to desirable billet in the same location as spouse Column 36: __ Passed over/cannot advance Column 37: __ Retired Column 38: ___Other. PLEASE EXPLAIN_____

32. What would have (or did have) the greatest influence in making your spouse leave the service prior to retirement? (RANK HIS/HER TOP THREE REASONS: 1, 2, 3) Column 40: __ Raising a family Column 41: __ Pay policies Column 42: Better civilian job Column 43: ___ Personal preference Column 44: ___ Location of assignments Column 45: ____ Separation from family Column 46: ___ Pressure from family to get out Column 47: __ Disagree with personnel policies Column 48: Reduction in military benefits Column 49: ___ Unable to get assigned to the same location as spouse Column 50: ____ Unable to get assigned to a desirable billet in the same location as spouse Column 51: __ Passed over/cannot advance Column 52: __ Retired Column 53: Other. PLEASE EXPLAIN



APPENDIX C SURVEY RESPONSE DATA




















109















117





120


124




























APPENDIX D

ANALYSIS PROGRAM

//HIX14 JOB (2409,0143), 'HIXENBAUGH THESIS ', CLASS=A

//*MAIN LINES=(15)
// EXEC SPSS
//FT04F001 DD UNIT=3330V,MSVGP=PUB4A,DISP=(OLD,KEEP),
// DCB=BLKSIZE=6400,DSN=MSS.S2409.QJERY
//FT08F001 DD DISP=SHR,DSN=MSS.S2409.RESPONSE
//SYSIN DD *
RUN NAME SERVICE COUPLES SURVEY
FILE NAME QUERY5 RUN
DATA LIST FIXED (2)/1 ID 1-4

.

Q1 6 Q2 8 Q3 10 04 12-13 05 15-15 Q6 18 Q7 20 Q8A 22-23 Q8B 24-27 Q8C 29-32 (A) Q9A 34-35 Q9B 36-39 41-44 (A) 09C Q10 45-45 011 47-43 49-50 Q12 Q13 51 014 52 015 53-54 Q16 55-55



| | Q17 | 57 |
|---|-------|-------|
| | Q18 | 58 |
| | Q194 | 59 |
| | Q19B | 60 |
| 2 | Q20A | 1 |
| | Q20B | 2 |
| | Q21 | 4 |
| | Q22 | 6 |
| | Q23 | 8 |
| | Q24 | 10 |
| | Q25 | 12 |
| | Q26 | 14-15 |
| | Q27 | 17 |
| | Q28 | 19 |
| | Q29 | 21 |
| | Q30 | 23 |
| | Q31A | 25 |
| | Q31B | 26 |
| | Q310 | 27 |
| | Q3 1D | 28 |
| | Q31E | 29 |
| | Q31F | 30 |
| | Q313 | 31 |
| | Q3 1H | 32 |
| | Q31I | 33 |
| | Q31J | 34 |
| | Q31K | 35 |
| | Q31L | 36 |
| | Q31M | 37 |
| | Q31N | 38 |
| | Q32A | 40 |
| | Q32B | 41 |
| | Q320 | 42 |
| | Q32D | 43 |
| | Q325 | 44 |
| | | |

/

| | Q32F 45 |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| | Q323 46 |
| | Q32H 47 |
| | Q32I 48 |
| | Q32J 49 |
| | Q32K 50 |
| | Q32L 51 |
| • | Q321 52 |
| | Q32N 53 |
| INPUT MEDIUM | DISK |
| N OF CASES | UNKNOWN |
| RECODE | Q4 (LO THRU 20=1) (21 THRU 25=2) (25 THRU 30=3) |
| | (31 THRU 35=4) (36 THRJ HI=5) |
| RECODE | Q5 (LO THRJ 20=1) (21 FHRU 25=2) (26 THRU 30=3) |
| | (31 THRU 35=4) (36 THRU HI=5) |
| RECODE | Q10(1 THRU 5=1)(6 THRJ 10=2)(11 FHRU 15=3) |
| | (16 THRU 19=4) (20 THRU HI=5) |
| RECODE | Q11(1 THRU 5=1)(6 THRU 10=2)(11 THRU 15=3) |
| | (16 THRU 19=4) (20 THRU HI=5) |
| RECODE | Q 12 (1 THRU 5=1) (6 THRU 10=2) (11 THRU 15=3) |
| | (16 THRU 2)=4) (21 THRJ 76=5) |
| RECODE | Q 14 (4 THRU 3 = 4) |
| RECODE | Q 15 (1 THRU 5=1) (2 THRU 10=2) (11 THRU 15=3) |
| | (16 THRU 19=4) (20 THRJ 76=5) |
| RECODE | Q 16 (1 THRU 5=1) (2 THRU 10=2) (11 THRU 15=3) |
| | (16 THRU 19=4) (20 THRJ 76=5) |
| RECODE | Q 26 (1 THRU 5=1) (7 THRJ 12=2) (13 THRU 18=3) |
| | (19 THRU 24=4) (25 THRU 30=5) (31 THRU 36=6) |
| | (37 THRU 75=7) |
| RECODE | Q31A TO 231N (1 THRU +=1)/ |
| RECODE | Q32A TO $Q32N$ (1 THRU 4=1)/ |
| VAR LABELS | ID, RESPONSE NUMBER/ |
| | Q 1, SPOUSE EVER SERVED ON ACTIVE DUTY/ |
| | Q2, SERVICE OF SPOUSE/ |
| | 03. SEX OF RESONDENT/ |



Q4. AGE OF RESPONDENT/ Q5, AGE OF SPOUSE/ Q6, RACE OF RESPONDENT/ Q7, RACE OF SPOJSE/ Q8A, PAY GRADE OF RESPONDENT/ Q8B, DESIGNATOR OF RESPONDENT/ O 8C, RATE OF RESPONDENT/ Q9A, PAY GRADE OF SPOJSE/ Q9B, DESIGNATOR OF SPOUSE/ Q9C, RATE OF SPOUSE/ Q 10, RESPONDENTS YEARS ON ACTIVE DUTY/ Q11, SPOUSES YEARS ON ACTIVE DUTY/ Q 12, NUMBER OF YEARS MARRIED/ Q13, STATUS AT MARRIAGE/ Q14, NUMBER OF CHILDREN/ 015. ACTIVE DUTY INFENTIONS OF RESPONDENT/ Q 16, ACTIVE DUTY INTENTIONS OF SPOUSE/ 017, SELECTION OF DOMINANT CAREER/ Q 18, DETAILER SUPPORT OF DOMINANT CAREER/ Q19A, RESPONDENTS FEELINGS ABOUT LOCATION/ Q 19B, RESPONDENTS FEELINGS ABOUT BILLET/ Q20A, SPOUSES FEELINGS ABOUT LOCATION/ Q20B, SPOUSES FEELINGS ABOUT BILLET/ Q21, STATIONED FOGETHER/ Q 22, DIFFICULTIES WITH PERSONNEL POLICIES/ Q23, CHANGES IN PERSONNEL POLICIES/ Q24, EXPERIENCED A CONFLICT BETWEEN CAREERS/ Q25, RESULT OF CONFLICT OF CAREERS/ Q26, LENGTH OF GEOGRAPHIC SEPARATION/ 027, IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION UPON TRANSFER/ Q28, FEELINGS ABOUT PAY POLICIES/ Q29, CHANGES TO PAY POLICIES/ Q30, CHILD CARE/ Q31A, R-LV RAISING A FAMILY/ Q31B, R-LV PAY POLICIES/



| | | Q31C, R. | -LV | BETTER CIVILIAN JOB/ |
|-------|--------|-----------|-------|---------------------------------------|
| | | Q31D, R. | - T.A | PERSONAL PREFERENCE/ |
| | | Q31E, R. | -LV | LOCATION OF ASSIGNMENTS/ |
| | | Q31F, R. | -LV | SEPARATION FROM FAMILY/ |
| | | Q31G, R. | -LV | PRESSURE FROM FAMILY/ |
| | | Q31H, R. | -LV | PERSONNEL POLICIES/ |
| | | Q31I, R- | -LV | REDUCTION IN MILITARY BENEFITS/ |
| | | Q31J, R. | -LV | UNABLE TO CO-LOCATE WIFH SPOUSE/ |
| | | Q31K, R- | -LV | UNDESIRABLE BILLET AF CO-LOCATION/ |
| | | Q31L, R. | -LV | PASSED OVER/ |
| | | Q31M, R- | -LV | RETIRED/ |
| | | Q31N, R. | -LV |) TH ER / |
| | | Q32A, 5. | -LV | RAISING A FAMILY/ |
| | | Q328, S | - L V | PAY POLICIES/ |
| | | Q32C, S- | - L V | BETTER CIVILIAN JOB/ |
| | | Q32D, S | -LV | PERSONAL PREFERENCE/ |
| | | Q32E, S- | - L V | LOCATION OF ASSIGNMENTS/ |
| | | Q32F, S- | -LV | SEPARATION FROM FAMILY/ |
| | | Q32G, S- | - L V | PRESSURE FROM FAMILY/ |
| | | Q32H, S | -LV | PERSONNEL POLICIES/ |
| | | Q32I, S- | -LV | REDUCTION IN MILITARY BENEFITS/ |
| | | Q32J, S | -LV | UNABLE TO CO-LOCATE WITH SPOUSE/ |
| | | Q32K, S | -TA | UNDESIRABLE BILLET AT CO-LOCATION/ |
| | | Q 32L, S | - L V | PASSED OVER/ |
| | | Q32M, S | - L V | R ETIR ED/ |
| | | Q32N, S | - L V | > THER / |
| VALUE | LABELS | Q1 (3) NO | O LO | ONGER MARRIED (4) SPOUSE PREV SERVED |
| | | (5) SPOU | SE C | URR SERVING/ |
| | | Q2 (1) | ARMY | (2) NAVY (3) AIR FORCE |
| | | (4) MAR | INE | CORPS (5) COAST GUARD/ |
| | | Q3 (0) | MALE | C (1) FEMALE/ |
| | | Q4 (1) L | ĒSS | THAN 21 (2) 21-25 (3) 25-30 (4) 31-35 |
| | | (5)36 0 | R OL | DER/ |
| | | Q5 (1) L | ESS | THAN 21 (2) 21-25 (3) 25-30 (4) 31-35 |
| | | (5) 36 0 | R OL | DER/ |

```
Q6 (1) BLACK (2) HISPANIC (3) WHITE
(4) OTHER/
Q7 (1) BLACK (2) HISPANIC (3) WHITE (4) OTHER/
Q 10 (1) 1-5 YRS (2) 5-10 YRS (3) 11-15 YRS
(4) 16-19 YRS (5) 20 PLUS YRS/
Q 11 (1) 1-5 YRS (2) 6-10 YRS (3) 11-15 YRS
(4) 16-19 YRS (5) 20 PLUS YRS/
Q 12 (1) 1-5 YRS (2) 6-10 YRS (3) 11-15 YRS
(4) 16-20 YRS (5) 21 PLUS YRS/
Q 13 (1) BOTH ACT DUTY (2) RESP AD, NOT SPOUSE
(3) SPOUSE AD, NOT RESP (4) NEITHER AD/
Q14 (4) 4 OR MORE/
Q 15 (1) 1-5 YRS (2) 6-10 YRS (3) 11-15 YRS
(4) 16-19 YRS (5) 20 PLUS YRS (88) UNDECIDED/
Q16 (1) 1-5 YRS (2) 6-10 YRS (3) 11-15 YRS
(4) 16-19 YRS (5) 20 PLUS YRS (88) UNDECIDED/
Q 17 (1) YES, MY CAREER
(2) YES, SPOUSE'S CAREER (3) NO/
Q 18 (1) YES, BOTH DETAILERS
(2) NO, MINE DOES NOT
(3) NO, SPOUSE'S DOES NOT
(4) NO NEITHER DOES (5) NA/
Q 19A (1) VERY SAT (2) SAT (3) OK (4) DISSAT
(5) VERY DISSAT/
Q 19B (1) VERY SAT (2) SAT (3) OK (4) DISSAT
(5) VERY DISSAT/
Q 20A (1) VERY SAT (2) SAT (3) OK (4) DISSAT
(5) VERY DISSAT/
Q20B (1) VERY SAT (2) SAT (3) OK (4) DISSAT
(5) VERY DISSAT/
Q 21 (1) YES (2) NO, OK (3) NO, NOT OK/
Q22 (1) NO (2) YES/
Q 23 (1) NO (2) YES/
Q24 (1) NO (2) YES/
Q25 (1) BOTH GET OUT (2) I'LL GET OUT
```



(3) SPOUSE GET OUT (4) GET DIVORCE (5) PHYSICAL SEPARATION (6) NA, NO CONFLICT (7) OTHER/ Q26 (0) NO SEPARATION (1) 1-6 MOS (2) 7-12 MOS (3) 13-18 MOS (4) 19-24 105 (5) 25-30 MOS (6) 31-36 MOS (7) 37 PLUS MOS/ Q27 (1) CAREER ENHANCING (2) CO-LOCATION (3) GEOG LOCATION (4) OTHER/ 028 (1) NO (2) YES/ Q 29 (1) NO (2) YES/ Q30 (1) AVAIL AND SAF (2) AVAIL BUF UNSAT (3) NOT AVAIL, PROB (4) NOT AVAIL, NO PROB (5) NA/ Q31A TO Q31N (O) UNMARKED (1) MARKED/ Q32A TO Q32N (0) UNMARKED (1) MARKED/ MISSING VALUES Q1, Q2, Q3, Q6, Q7, Q13, Q14, Q17 TO Q25, Q27 TO Q32N (9),Q4, Q5, Q8A TO Q12, Q15, Q16, 0 26 (77) ASSIGN MISSING Q1, Q2, Q3, Q6, Q7, Q13, Q14, Q17 TO Q25, Q27 tc Q32N (9), Q4, 25, Q8A TO 212, Q15, 0.16, 0.026 (77) GENERAL=28A, Q9A FREQUENCIES STATISTICS 1,3,4 *RECODE 08A (1 THRU 9 =1) (10 THRU 23 = 2)/ *RECODE Q9A (1 THRU 9 =1) (10 THRU 23 = 2)/ VALUE LABEL Q8A (1) ENLISTED (2) DFFICER/ 09A (1)ENLISTED (2) OFFICER/ FREOUENCIES GENERAL=21,22,03,24,25,26,07,08A,09A,010,011, Q 12, Q13, Q14, Q15, Q16, Q17, Q18, Q19A, Q19B, Q20A, Q20B,Q21,Q22,Q23,Q24,225, Q 26, Q 27, Q 28, Q 29, Q 30, Q 31 A TO Q 31 N, Q 32 A TO Q 32 N STATISTICS 1,3,4 READ INPUT DATA END INPUT DATA



| *RECODE | Q8A (1 THRJ 9 =1) (13 THRU 23 = 2) / |
|------------|--------------------------------------|
| *RECODE | Q9A (1 THRJ 9 =1) (10 THRU 23 = 2) / |
| CROSSTABS | TABLES=Q3 BY Q15,Q16,218/ |
| | Q8A BY Q15,226/ |
| | Q 21 BY Q19A, Q19B, Q20A, Q20B/ |
| | Q27 BY QSA/ |
| | Q 24 BY Q25/ |
| | Q31A,Q316,Q31I,Q31K,Q31L BY Q8A/ |
| | Q31A TO 2310, 231K BY 23/ |
| | Q 31 B BY 26/ |
| | Q 32B, Q32K, 23 2L, BY 29A/ |
| | Q32A, Q32C, Q32L, Q32M BY Q3/ |
| STATISTICS | A LL |
| *RECODE | Q8A (1 THRU 9 =1) (10 THRU 23 = 2) / |
| *SELECT IF | (Q8A EQ 2) |
| CROSSTABS | TABLES=Q10 BY Q26 BY Q8A/ |
| STATISTICS | A LL |
| *SELECT IF | (Q3=0) |
| CROSSTABS | TABLES=Q17 BY Q18 BY 23/ |
| STATISTICS | A LL |
| *SELECT IF | (Q3=1) |
| CROSSTABS | TABLES=Q17 BY Q18 BY 23/ |
| STATISTICS | A LL |
| FINISH | |
| 4.1- | |

•

/*

//



APPENDIX E

TABLES

Q8A PAY GRADE OF RESPONDENT

| | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|-------|--------|----------|-------------|----------|-------|
| | | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EGOR Y | LABEL | C CD E | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| | | 1. | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| | | 2. | 5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.9 |
| | | 3. | 73 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 9.8 |
| | | 4. | 107 | 13.) | 13.1 | 22.8 |
| | | 5. | 143 | 17.4 | 17.5 | 40.3 |
| | | 6. | 51 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 47.7 |
| | | 7. | 17 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 49.8 |
| | | 8. | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 49.9 |
| 0 | | 14. | 35 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 54.2 |
| | | 15. | 5 3 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 61.9 |
| | | 16. | 217 | 26.4 | 26.5 | 88.4 |
| | | 17. | 79 | 9.5 | 9.6 | 98.0 |
| | | 18. | 15 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 99.9 |
| | | 19. | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 100.0 |
| | | 77. | 2 | J .2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | I | TAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q9A PAY GRADE OF SPOUSE

| | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----------|-------|---------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAF EGORY | LABEL | CODE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| | | 1. | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| | | 2. | 2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| | | 3. | 53 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.8 |
| | | 4. | 107 | 13.) | 13.0 | 19.9 |
| | | 5. | 155 | 18.9 | 18.9 | 38.7 |
| | | 6. | 94 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 50.2 |
| | | 7. | 23 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 53.6 |
| | | 8. | 8 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 54.6 |
| | | 11. | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 54.7 |
| | | 12. | 5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 55.4 |
| | | 13. | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 55.5 |
| | | 14. | 22 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 58.2 |
| | | 15. | 54 | 5.5 | 6.6 | 64.8 |
| | | 16. | 157 | 20.3 | 20.3 | 85.1 |
| | | 17. | 95 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 96.8 |
| | | 18. | 21 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 99.4 |
| | | 19. | 5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| |] | CO TA L | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q1 SPOUSE EVER SERVED ON ACTIVE DUTY

| | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAFEGORY LABEL CODE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| NO LONGER MARRIED 3. | 44 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.4 |
| SPOUSE PREV SERVED 4. | 44 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 10.7 |
| SPOUSE CURR SERVING 5. | 733 | 39.3 | 89.3 | 100.0 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q2 SERVICE OF SPOUSE

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAFEGORY LABEL | C CD E | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| ARMY | 1. | 5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| NAVY | 2. | 750 | 91.4 | 91.4 | 92.1 |
| AIR FORCE | З. | 17 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 94.2 |
| MARINE CORPS | 4. | 42 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 99.3 |
| COAST GUARD | 5. | 5 | Э.7 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| : | T OT A L | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Q3 SEX OF RESPO | NDENT | | | | |
| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCDE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| MALE | 0. | 253 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 |
| FEMALE | 1. | 558 | 68.0 | 68.0 | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| r |) TAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Q4 AGE OF RESPO | NDENT | | | | |
| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAFEGORY LABEL | CODE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| LESS THAN 21 | 1. | 47 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.7 |
| 21-25 | 2. | 256 | 31.2 | 31.2 | 36.9 |
| 26-30 | 3. | 332 | 40.4 | 40.4 | 77.3 |
| 31-35 | 4. | 147 | 17.9 | 17.9 | 95.2 |
| 36 OR OLDER | 5. | 3 9 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 100.0 |
| F | OTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q5 AGE OF SPOUSE

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|---------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY LABE | L C CD E | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| LESS THAN 21 | 1. | 32 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| 21-25 | 2. | 245 | 29.3 | 29.8 | 33.7 |
| 26-30 | 3. | 292 | 35.5 | 35.6 | 69.3 |
| 31-35 | 4. | 159 | 19.4 | 19.4 | 88.7 |
| 36 OR OLDER | 5. | 93 | 11.3 | 11.3 | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Q6 RACE OF RE | SPONDEN | Т | | | |
| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY LABE | L CODE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| BLACK | 1. | 39 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.б |
| HISPANIC | 2. | 14 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 5.4 |
| WHI TE | 3. | 743 | 91.1 | 91.4 | 97.8 |
| OTHER | 4. | 18 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 3 | 0.4 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | | | |

Q7 RACE OF SPOUSE

| | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|-------|-------|-------------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | ABSOLU TE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEG OR Y | LABEL | CCDE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| BLACK | | 1. | 43 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 5.2 |
| HISPANIC | - | 2. | 13 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 6.8 |
| WHITE | | 3. | 7 52 | 91.5 | 91.7 | 98.5 |
| OTHER | | 4. | 12 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| | | 9. | 1 | 0.1 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | - | FOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q8A PAY GRADE OF RESPONDENT

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY | LABEL CCDE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| ENLISTED | 1. | 409 | 49.3 | 49.9 | 49.9 |
| OFFICER | 2. | 410 | 49.9 | 50.1 | 100.0 |
| | 77. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q9A PAY GRADE OF SPOUSE

| | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EGORY | LABEL | CODE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| ENLISTED | | 1. | 448 | 54.5 | 54.6 | 54.6 |
| OFF IC ER | | 2. | 373 | 45.4 | 45.4 | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | 3 | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q10 RESPONDENTS YEARS ON ACTIVE DUTY

| | | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----|--------|-------|-------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAI | EGORY | LABEL | CODE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| 1-5 | YRS | | 1. | 490 | 59.7 | 59.7 | 59.7 |
| 6-1 | 0 YRS | | 2. | 231 | 28.1 | 28.1 | 87.8 |
| 11- | 15 YRS | 5 | 3. | 79 | 9.5 | 9.6 | 97.4 |
| 16- | 19 YRS | 3 | 4. | 15 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 99.3 |
| 20 | PLUS I | YRS | 5. | 5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | FOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q11 SPOUSES YEARS ON ACTIVE DUFY

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|---------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|--------|
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAFEGORY LABE | L C CDE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| | 0. | 2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| 1-5 YRS | 1. | 389 | 47.4 | 47.4 | 47.6 |
| 6-10 YRS | 2. | 253 | 30.3 | 30.8 | 78.4 |
| 11-15 YRS | 3. | 103 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 91.6 |
| 16-19 YRS | 4. | 35 | 4.4 | 4_4 | 96.0 |
| 20 PLUS YRS | 5. | 33 | 4.) | 4.0 | 100.0 |
| | | | **** | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Q12 NUMBER OF | YEARS | MARRIED | | | |
| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
| | | ABSOLJ TE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY LABE | L C OD E | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| | 0. | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 1-5 YRS | 1. | 717 | 87.3 | 87.4 | 87.6 |
| 6-10 YRS | 2. | 83 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 97.7 |
| 11-15 YRS | 3. | 14 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 99.4 |
| 16-20 YRS | 4. | ō | 0.5 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| | 77. | 1 | 0.1 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | | | |
| Q13 STATUS AT | MARRIA | AGE | | | |
| | | | RELATI | VE ADJUST | ED CUM |

| | | ABS OLUF E | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
|-------------|--------------|------------|-------|-------|-------|
| CATEGORY LA | ABEL CODE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| BOTH ACT DU | JTY 1. | 737 | 39.8 | 89.8 | 89.8 |
| RESP AD, NO | OT SPOUSE 2. | 12 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 91.2 |
| SPOUSE AD, | NOT RESP 3. | 36 | 4_4 | 4.4 | 95.6 |
| NEITHER AD | 4. | 36 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



| | | | RELAFIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAFEGORY L | ABEL CCDE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| | 0. | 503 | 61.3 | 61.3 | 61.3 |
| | 1. | 243 | 29.5 | 29.6 | 91.0 |
| | 2. | 52 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 98.5 |
| | 3. | 7 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 99.4 |
| 4 OR MORE | 4. | 5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 1 | 0.1 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | FOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q15 ACTIVE DUTY INTENTIONS OF RESPONDENT

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|---------|-------------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAPEGORY LABEI | L C CDE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| 1-5 YRS | 1. | 107 | 13.) | 13.1 | 13.1 |
| 6-10 YRS | 2. | 53 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 20.9 |
| 11-15 YRS | 3. | 9 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 22.0 |
| 16-19 YRS | 4. | 7 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 22.9 |
| 20 PLUS YRS | 5. | 257 | 32.5 | 32.8 | 55.7 |
| UNDECIDED | 88. | 350 | 43.3 | 44.2 | 99.9 |
| | 99. | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 100.0 |
| | 77. | 7 | 0.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | FOTAL | 82 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q16 ACTIVE DUTY INTENTIONS OF SPOUSE

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|-------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAFEGORY LABEL | CCDE | FREQ | (PCF) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| 1-5 YRS | 1. | 76 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 9.3 |
| 6-10 YRS | 2. | 53 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 16.4 |
| 11-15 YRS | з. | 7 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 17.2 |
| 16-19 YRS | 4. | 3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 17.6 |
| 20 PLUS YRS | 5. | 310 | 37.3 | 37.9 | 55.5 |
| UNDECIDED | 88. | 304 | 37.3 | 37.2 | 92.7 |
| | 99. | 50 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 100.0 |
| | 77. | 3 | 0.4 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | FOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q17 SELECTION OF DOMINANT CAREER

| | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----|-------------|------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT | EGORY LABEL | CCDE | FREQ | (PCF) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| YES | , MY CAREER | 1. | 174 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 21.2 |
| YES | , SPOUSE'S | 2. | 249 | 30.3 | 30.4 | 51.6 |
| NO | | 3. | 395 | 43.2 | 48.4 | 100.0 |
| | | 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | 1 | OTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q18 DETAILER SUPPORT OF DOMINANT CAREER

| | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----|-------------|--------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT | EGORY LABEI | CCDE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| YES | , BOTH | 1. | 328 | 40.0 | 40.4 | 40.4 |
| NO, | MINE NOT | 2. | 53 | 7.7 | 7.8 | 48.2 |
| NO, | SPOUSE'S N | IDT 3. | 43 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 53.4 |
| NO | NEITHER DOP | ES 4. | 42 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 58.6 |
| N A | | 5. | 335 | 40.9 | 41.4 | 100.0 |
| | | 9. | 9 | 1.1 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | ***** | | |
| | | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q19A RESPONDENTS FEELINGS ABOUT LOCATION

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAFEGORY LAB | BEL CODE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| VERY SAT | 1. | 375 | 45.3 | 46.4 | 46.4 |
| SAT | 2. | 215 | 25.3 | 26.6 | 73.0 |
| OK | 3. | 95 | 11.7 | 11.8 | 84.8 |
| DISSAT | 4. | 70 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 93.5 |
| VERY DISSAT | 5. | 53 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 10 | 1.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | IO TAL | 821 | 100.) | 100.0 | |


Q19B RESPONDENTS FEELINGS ABOUT BILLET

| | X | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|-------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCDE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| VERY SAT | 1. | 300 | 36.5 | 37.3 | 37.3 |
| SAT | 2. | 252 | 30.7 | 31.3 | 68.6 |
| ОК | 3. | 95 | 11.5 | 11.8 | 80.4 |
| DISSAT | 4. | 99 | 12.1 | 12.3 | 92.7 |
| VERY DISSAT | 5. | 59 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 15 | 1.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q20A SPOUSES FEELINGS ABOUT LOCATION

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|---------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAFEGORY LABE | L C CD E | FREQ | (PCP) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| VERY SAT | 1. | 329 | 40.1 | 41.2 | 41.2 |
| SAT | 2. | 242 | 29.5 | 30.3 | 71.6 |
| OK | 3. | 3 O | 9.7 | 10.0 | 81.6 |
| DISSAT | 4. | 7 0 | 8.5 | 8.8 | 90.4 |
| VERY DISSAT | 5. | 77 | 9.4 | 9.5 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 23 | 2.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



| Q2) B SPOUSES | FEELINGS | ABOUT BII | LET | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY LABE. | L C CD E | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| VERY SAT | 1. | 250 | 30.5 | 31.5 | 31.5 |
| SAT | 2. | 275 | 33.5 | 34.8 | 66.2 |
| ОК | 3. | 94 | 11.4 | 11.8 | 78.1 |
| DISSAT | 4. | 3.3 | 12.1 | 12.5 | 90.6 |
| VERY DISSAT | 5. | 75 | 9.1 | 9.4 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 27 | 3.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | FOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Q21 STATIONED | TOGETHE | R | | | |
| | | | RELAFIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAFEGORY LABE: | L C CDE | FREQ | (PCF) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| YES | 1. | 693 | 85.) | 85.3 | 85.3 |
| NO, OK | 2. | 42 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 90.5 |
| NO, NOT OK | 3. | 73 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 3 | 0.4 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Q22 DIFFICULT | IES WITH | PERSONNEL | POLICIES | | |
| | | | RELAFIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAFEGORY LABE: | L C CDE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| ИО | 1. | 525 | 64.1 | 64.5 | 64.6 |
| YES | 2. | 233 | 35.1 | 35.4 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 7 | 0.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |

TOTAL 821 100.0 100.0



Q23 CHANGES IN PERSONNEL POLICIES

| | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------|-------|-------|-----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | ABSOLJ TE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY | LABEL | CCDE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| NO | | 1. | 307 | 37.4 | 39.5 | 39.6 |
| YES | | 2. | 459 | 57.1 | 60.4 | 100.0 |
| | | 9. | 45 | 5.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | Ţ | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q24 EXPERIENCED A CONFLICT BETWEEN CAREERS

| | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAFEGORY | LABEL | CODE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| NO | | 1. | 518 | 63.1 | 63.6 | 63.6 |
| YES . | | 2. | 296 | 36.1 | 36.4 | 100.0 |
| | | 9. | 7 | 0.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | 1 | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

162



Q25 RESULT OF CONFLICT OF CAREERS

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----------------|--------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY LABEL | C OD E | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| BOTH GET OUT | 1. | 55 | 7.9 | 8.1 | 8.1 |
| I'LL GET OUT | 2. | 107 | 13.0 | 13.4 | 21.5 |
| SPOUSE GET OUT | 3. | 51 | 5.2 | 6.4 | 27.9 |
| GET DIVORCE | 4. | 37 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 32.5 |
| PHYSICAL SEP | 5. | 37 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 37.2 |
| NA, NO CONFLICT | 6. | 494 | 60.2 | 61.8 | 99.0 |
| OTH ER | 7. | з | 1.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 22 | 2.7 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | OTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q26 LENGTH OF GEOGRAPHIC SEPARATION

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|-------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY LABEI | C CDE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| NO SEPARATION | 0. | 133 | 15.2 | 17.1 | 17.1 |
| 1-5 MOS | 1. | 314 | 38.2 | 40.5 | 57.6 |
| 7-12 MOS | 2. | 245 | 30.0 | 31.7 | 89.3 |
| 13-18 MOS | 3. | 3 1 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 93.3 |
| 19-24 MOS | 4. | 3 4 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 97.7 |
| 25-30 MOS | 5. | 2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 97.9 |
| 31-36 MOS | 6. | 9 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 99.1 |
| 37 PLUS MOS | 7. | 3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 99.5 |
| | 99. | 4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| | 77. | 45 | 5.5 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q27 IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION UPON TRANSFER

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|-------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAFEGORY LABEL | CODE | FREQ | (PCF) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| CAREER ENHANCI | NG 1. | 117 | 14.3 | 14.5 | 14.5 |
| CO-LOCATION | 2. | 612 | 74.5 | 76.0 | 90.6 |
| GEOG LOCATION | 3. | 35 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 94.9 |
| OTHER | 4. | 41 | 5.) | 5.1 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 15 | 1.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q28 FEELINGS ABOUT PAY POLICIES

| | | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|--------|--------|-------|-------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAFEGO | RY | LABEL | CCDE | FREQ | (PCF) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| NO | | | 1. | 311 | 37.9 | 39.2 | 39.2 |
| YES | | | 2. | 482 | 58.7 | 60.8 | 100.0 |
| | | | 9. | 29 | 3.4 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | I | OTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Q29 СН | I A NG | ES TO | PAY E | POLICIES | | | |
| | | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
|-----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|---------|-------|
| CAF EGORY | LABEL | C CD E | FREQ | (PCF) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| NO | | 1. | 335 | 40.3 | 42.8 | 42.8 |
| YES | | 2. | 443 | 54.5 | 57.2 | 100.0 |
| | | 9. | 33 | 4.5 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | I | OTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q30 CHILD CARE

.

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|--------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY | LABEL CCDE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| AVAIL AND | SAT 1. | 92 | 11.2 | 11.4 | 11.4 |
| AVAIL BUT | UNSAT 2. | 121 | 14.7 | 15.0 | 26.4 |
| NOT AVAII | ., PROB 3. | 30 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 30.1 |
| NOF AVAII | L,NOT 4. | 15 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 31.9 |
| NA | 5. | 550 | 67.0 | 68.1 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 13 | 1.5 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | ***** | | ***** | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.) | 100.0 | |
| Q31A R-LV | RAISING A | FAMILY | | | |
| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAF EGORY | LABEL CCDE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KED | 0. | 552 | 67.2 | 67.4 | 67.4 |
| MARKED | 1. | 25 7 | 32.5 | 32.5 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Q318 R-LV | V PAY POLICI | IES | | | |
| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY | LABEL CCDE | FREQ | (201) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM ARKED | 0. | 675 | 82.3 | 82.5 | 82.5 |
| MARKED | 1. | 143 | 17.4 | 17.5 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q31C R-LV BETTER CIVILIAN JOB

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EGORY | LABEL CCDE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KED | 0. | 553 | 68.0 | 68.1 | 68.1 |
| MARKED | 1. | 261 | 31.3 | 31.9 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q31D R-LV PERSONAL PREFERENCE

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY | LABEL CCDE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| UNM ARKED | 0. | 697 | 84.9 | 85.1 | 85.1 |
| MAR KE D | 1. | 122 | 14.9 | 14.9 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | ***** | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q31E R-LV LOCATION OF ASSIGNMENTS

| | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSIED | CUM |
|------------|-------|--------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EGORY | LABEL | C CD E | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KED | | 0. | 745 | 90.7 | 91.0 | 91.0 |
| MARKED | | 1. | 74 | 9.) | 9.0 | 100.0 |
| | | 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | r | OTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q31F R-LV SEPARATION FROM FAMILY

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-------------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLJ TE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EGORY | LABEL CODE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KE D | 0. | 455 | 55.4 | 55.6 | 55.6 |
| MARKED | 1. | 354 | 44.3 | 44.4 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q31G R-LV PRESSURE FROM FAMILY

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY | LABEL CCDE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KED | 0. | 779 | 94.9 | 95.1 | 95.1 |
| MAR KED | 1. | 4.0 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q31H R-LV PERSONNEL POLICIES

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAF EGORY | LABEL CODE | FREQ | (201) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KED | 0. | 743 | 91.1 | 91.3 | 91.3 |
| MARKED | 1. | 71 | 8.5 | 8.7 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q311 R-LV REDUCTION IN MILITARY BENEFITS

| | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM · |
|------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| LABEL CCDE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| 0. | 625 | 75.2 | 76.4 | 76.4 |
| 1. | 193 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 100.0 |
| 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | LABEL CCDE 0. 1. 9. TOTAL | ABSOLJTE LABEL C CDE FREQ 0. 625 1. 193 9. 2 TOTAL 821 | RELATIVE ABSOLJTE FREQ LABEL CCDE FREQ (PCF) 0. 625 75.2 1. 193 23.5 9. 2 0.2 TOTAL 821 | RELATIVE ADJUSTED ABSOLJTE FREQ FREQ LABEL CCDE FREQ (PCT) (PCT) 0. 625 75.2 76.4 1. 193 23.5 23.6 9. 2 0.2 MISSING TOTAL 821 100.0 |

Q31J R-LV UNABLE TO CO-LOCATE WITH SPOUSE

| | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----------|-------|--------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY | LABEL | C CD E | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| UNM ARKED | | 0. | 389 | 47.4 | 47.5 | 47.5 |
| MAR KE D | | 1. | 430 | 52.4 | 52.5 | 100.0 |
| | | 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | Γ | OTAL | 821 | .100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q31K R-LV UNDESIRABLE BILLET AF CO-LOCATION

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EG OR Y | LABEL CCDE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM ARKED | 0. | 605 | 73.7 | 73.9 | 73.9 |
| MARKED | 1. | 214 | 25.1 | 26.1 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.) | 100.0 | |



Q31L R-LV PASSED OVER

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY | LABEL CCDE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KED | 0. | 694 | 84.5 | 84.7 | 84.7 |
| MAR KE D | 1. | 125 | 15.2 | 15.3 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q31M R-LV RETIRED

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EGORY | LABEL CODE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KED | 0. | 800 | 97.4 | 97.7 | 97 .7 |
| MARKED | 1. | 19 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | FOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q31N R-LV OTHER

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY | LABEL CCDE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM ARKED | 0. | 773 | 94.2 | 94.4 | 94.4 |
| MARKED | 1. | 4.5 | 5.5 | 5.6 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 2 | 0.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | ~ | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q32A S-LV RAISING A FAMILY

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY | LABEL CCDE | FREQ | (PCF) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KED | 0. | 600 | 73.1 | 76.3 | 76.3 |
| MAR KE D | 1. | 185 | 22.7 | 23.7 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 35 | 4.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | FOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q32B S-LV PAY POLICIES

| | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----------|-------|------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY | LABEL | CCDE | FREQ | (PCF) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| UNM ARKED | | 0. | 650 | 80.4 | 84.0 | 84.0 |
| MARKED | | 1. | 125 | 15.3 | 16.0 | 100.0 |
| | | 9. | 35 | 4.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | Т | OTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q32C S-LV BETTER CIVILIAN JOB

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EGORY | LABEL CODE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KED | 0. | 497 | 60.5 | 63.2 | 63.2 |
| MARKED | 1. | 289 | 35.2 | 36.8 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 3 5 | 4.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

- -



Q32D S-LV PERSONAL PREFERENCE

| | | ~ | RELAFIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLJ TE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EGORY | LABEL CODE | FREQ | (PCF) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KED | 0. | 609 | 74.2 | 77.5 | 77.5 |
| MARKED | 1. | 177 | 21.5 | 22.5 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 35 | 4.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | FOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q32E S-LV LOCATION OF ASSIGNMENTS

| | | | | RELAFIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|-------|-------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EGORY | LABEL | CCDE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KED | | 0. | 700 | 85.3 | 89.1 | 89.1 |
| MARKED | | 1. | 85 | 10.5 | 10.9 | 100.0 |
| | | 9. | 35 | 4.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | 7 | FOTAL | 321 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q32F S-LV SEPARATION FROM FAMILY

| | | | RELAFIVE | ADJUSIED | CUM |
|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EGORY | LABEL CODE | FREQ | (PCF) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KED | 0. | 434 | 52.9 | 55.2 | 55.2 |
| MARKED | 1. | 352 | 42.9 | 44.8 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 3 5 | 4.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q32G S-LV PRESSURE FROM FAMILY

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EGORY | LABEL CODE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KED | 0. | 752 | 92.3 | 96.9 | 96.9 |
| MARKED | 1. | 24 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 35 | 4.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | FOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q32H S-LV PERSONNEL POLICIES

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CATEGORY | LABEL C CDE | FREQ | (PCF) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM ARKED | 0. | 691 | 84.2 | 87.9 | 87.9 |
| MARKED | 1. | 95 | 11.5 | 12.1 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 3 5 | 4.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q321 S-LV REDUCTION IN MILITARY BENEFITS

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EGORY | LABEL CODE | FREQ | (PCP) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| UNMARKED | 0. | 659 | 80.3 | 83.8 | 83.8 |
| MARKED | 1. | 127 | 15.5 | 16.2 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 35 | 4.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | FOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q32J S-LV UNABLE TO CO-LOCATE WITH SPOUSE RELATIVE ADJUSIED CUM ABSOLJTE FREQ FREQ FREQ

| CAT EGORY | LABEL | CODE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
|------------|-------|------|------|-------|---------|-------|
| UNM AR KED | | 0. | 419 | 51.0 | 53.3 | 53.3 |
| MARKED | | 1. | 357 | 44.7 | 46.7 | 100.0 |
| | | 9. | 35 | 4.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | Г | OTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q32K S-LV UNDESIRABLE BILLET AT CO-LOCATION

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EGORY | LABEL CCDE | FREQ | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| UNM ARKED | 0. | 595 | 72.5 | 75.7 | 75.7 |
| MARKED | 1. | 191 | 23.3 | 24.3 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 3 5 | 4.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Q32L S-LV PASSED OVER

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAT EGORY | LABEL CCDE | FREQ | (PCI) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KED | 0. | 630 | 82.3 | 86.5 | 86.5 |
| MAR KE D | 1. | 106 | 12.9 | 13.5 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 35 | 4.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q32M S-LV RETIRED

| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| CAFEGORY LABED | L C CD E | FREQ | (PCF) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNMARKED | 0. | 754 | 91.3 | 95.9 | 95.9 |
| MAR KE D | 1. | 32 | 3.9 | 4-1 | 100.0 |
| | 9. | 35 | 4.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| _ | TOTAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Q32N S-LV OTHE | ER | | | | |
| | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |

ø

| | | | ABSOLJTE | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
|-------------|-------|------|----------|-------|---------|-------|
| CAT EGORY | LABEL | CODE | FREQ | (PCF) | (PCI) | (PCT) |
| UNM AR KE D | | 0. | 725 | 88.4 | 92.4 | 92.4 |
| MARKED | | 1. | 50 | 7.3 | 7.5 | 100.0 |
| | | 9. | 35 | 4.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | 1 | TAL | 821 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |



Q8A

| | | COU | I | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|---------|------|--------|--------|-----|-------|-----|----------|--|
| | | ROW | ΙH | ENLISP | ROW | | | | | |
| | | COL | PCT | I | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | | TOT | PCT | I | | 1.I | | 2.I | | |
| Q2 | 7 | | | -I- | | I- | | I | | |
| | | | 1. | I | 50 | I | 67 | I | 117 | |
| | CAREER | ENHANC | ING | I | 42.7 | I | 57.3 | I | 14.6 | |
| | | | | I | 12.5 | I | 16.5 | I | | |
| | | | | I | 6.2 | I | 8.3 | I | | |
| | | | | -I- | | I- | | I | | |
| | | | 2. | I | 304 | I | 307 | I | 611 | |
| | CO-LOC | ATION | | I | 49.3 | I | 50.2 | I | 76.1 | |
| | | | | I | 76.4 | I | 75.8 | I | | |
| | | | | I | 37.9 | I | 38.2 | I | | |
| | | | | -I- | | I- | | I | | |
| | | | 3. | I | 25 | I | 10 | I | 35 | |
| | GEOG L | OCATION | T | I | 71.4 | I | 28.6 | I | 4.4 | |
| | | | | I | 6.3 | I | 2.5 | I | | |
| | | | | I | 3.1 | I | 1.2 | I | | |
| | | | | -I- | | I- | | I | | |
| | | | ц. | I | 19 | I | 21 | I | 40 | |
| | OTHER | | | I | 47.5 | I | 52.5 | I | 5.0 | |
| | | | | I | 4.3 | I | 5.2 | I | | |
| | | | | I | 2.4 | I | 2.5 | I | | |
| | | | | -I- | | I- | | I | | |
| | | COLU | MN | | 398 | | 405 | | 803 | |
| | | TOT | AL | | 49.5 | | 50.4 | | 100.0 | |
| CHI | SQUAR | E = 8.9 | 5304 | 4 6 | VITH 3 | DES | GREES | ΟF | FREEDOM. | |

SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0299

Q8 A

| | | COUNT | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-------|----------|------|-------|------|--------|------|-----------|---------|-----|
| | | ROW | PCT | IE | NLIST | ED O | FFICER | ROW | | | |
| | | COL | PCT | I | | | | | TOTAL | | |
| | | TOT | PCT | I | | 1.I | 2 | 2.I | | | |
| QЭ | 1A | | | -I | | I- | | - I | | | |
| | | | 0. | I | 251 | I | 291 | I | 552 | | |
| | UNMARKED | | | I | 47.3 | I | 52.7 | I | 67.6 | | |
| | | | | I | 64.1 | I | 71.0 | I | | | |
| | | | | I | 31.9 | I | 35.5 | I | | | |
| | | | | -I | | I- | | - I | | | |
| | | | 1. | I | 145 | I | 119 | I | 265 | | |
| | MARKED | | | I | 55.1 | I | 44.9 | I | 32.4 | | |
| | | | | I | 35.9 | I | 29.) | I | | | |
| | | | | I | 17.9 | I | 14.6 | I | | | |
| | | | | -I | | I- | | - I | | | |
| | | COLU | MN | | 407 | | 410 | | 817 | | |
| | | TOI | AL | | 49.3 | | 50.2 | | 100.0 | | |
| COR | RECTED CI | HI SÇ | UAR | E = | 4.053 | 353 | WITH 1 | DI | EGREE OF | FREEDOM | 1 . |
| SIG | NIFICANCE | E = | 0.0 | 438 | | | | | | | |
| RAW | CHI SQUA | ARE = | <u> </u> | 3704 | D WIT | TH 1 | DEGRE | EE C | OF FREEDO | ЭМ. | |
| SIG | NIFICANCE | E = | 0.0 | 366 | | | | | | | |
| PHI | = 0.0 | 07314 | | | | | | | | | |

175



Q8A

| COUNT | | | I | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------|-------|------|------------|------|--------|----|---------|--------|----|
| | ROW | PCT | IEI | NLIST | ED C | FFICER | | ROW | | |
| | COL | FCT | I | | | | | TOTAL | | |
| | TOT | PCT | I | | 1.I | 2. | I | | | |
| Q3 1B | | | -I | | I- | | I | | | |
| | | 0. | I | 320 | I | 354 | I | 674 | | |
| UNMARKED | | | I | 47.5 | I | 52.5 | I | 82.5 | | |
| | | | I | 78.5 | I | 86.3 | I | | | |
| | | | I | 39.2 | I | 43.3 | I | | | |
| | | | -I | | I- | | I | | | |
| | | 1. | I | 8 7 | I | 56 | I | 143 | | |
| MARKED | | | I | 50.3 | I | 39.2 | I | 17.5 | | |
| | | | I | 21.4 | I | 13.7 | I | | | |
| | | | I | 10.5 | I | 6.9 | I | | | |
| | | | -I | | I- | | I | | | |
| | COLU | MN | | 407 | | 410 | | 817 | | |
| | TOT | AL | | 49.3 | | 50.2 | | 100.0 | | |
| CORRECTED CI | HI SÇ | UAR | E = | 7.39 | 852 | WITH 1 | DE | GREE OF | FREEDO | Μ. |
| SIGNIFICANC: | E = 0 | .004 | ŧ9 | | | | | | | |
| RAW CHI SQUI | ARE = | : 8.0 | 1245 | 52 WI | TH 1 | DEGREE | 0 | F FREED | DM. | |
| SIGNIFICANC | E = 0 | .00 | 37 | | | | | | | |
| PHI = 0.101 | 55 | | | | | | | | | |


* * CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * Q31I R-LV REDUCTION IN BENEFITS BY Q3A PAY GRADE OF RESP. 08A COUNT I ROW PCT IENLISFED OFFICER ROW COL PCT I TOTAL 1.I 2.I TOT PCT I ----I----I Q31I 0. I 295 I 328 I 624 I 47.4 I 52.6 I 76.4 UNMARKED I 72.7 I 80.9 I I 36.2 I 40.1 I -I----I 1. I 111 I 82 I 193 I 57.5 I 42.5 I 23.6 MARKED I 27.3 I 20.0 I I 13.5 I 10.0 I -I----I 437 410 817 COLUMN TOTAL 49.3 50.2 100.0 CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 5.39130 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0180RAW CHI SQUARE = 5.98761 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0144PHI = 0.08561



1 1 1 1 1

| * | * | | С | R | 0 | S | S | Τ | A | В | U | L | A | Т | I | 0 | N | | О | F | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
|----|------|-----|-------------|-----|---|------|------|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|----|----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|
| QE | 31 E | K E | ≀− I | . V | U | ND I | ES I | RA | BI | ΞE | BI | LL | E : | r e | ΒY | QB | B A | 5 A | ΥY | GB | AI | ΡE | OE | ? I | RES | SPO | DNE |)EN | T |
| * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |

| 0 | 8 | Ά |
|-----|---|---|
| ~~~ | ~ | |

| | | COU | J NT | I | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------|------|-----|-------|------|--------|-----|-------|--|
| | | ROW | PCT | IE | NLIST | ED O | FFICER | | ROW | |
| | | COL | PCT | I | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | | TOT | PCT | I | | 1.I | 2 | .I | | |
| Q3 | 1 1 K | | | -I | | I- | | - I | | |
| | | | 0. | I | 320 | I | 233 | I | 603 | |
| | UNMARKED | | | I | 53.1 | I | 46.9 | I | 73.8 | |
| | | | | I | 78.5 | I | 69.0 | I | | |
| | | | | I | 39.2 | I | 34.5 | I | | |
| | | | - | -I- | | I- | | - I | | |
| | | | 1. | I | 87 | I | 127 | I | 214 | |
| | MARKED | | | I | 40.7 | I | 59.3 | I | 26.2 | |
| | | | | I | 21.4 | I | 31.0 | I | | |
| | | | | I | 10.5 | I | 15.5 | I | | |
| | | | - | -I- | | I- | | - I | | |
| | | COLU | I MN | | 437 | | 410 | | 817 | |
| | | TOT | AL | | 49.3 | | 50.2 | | 100.0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 9.24583 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0024 RAW CHI SQUARE = 9.73605 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0018 PHI = 0.10916



* * CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * Q31L R-LV PASSED OVER BY Q8A PAY GRADE OF RESPONDENT Q8A COUNT I ROW PCT IENLISTED OFFICER ROW COL PCT I TOTAL 2.I TOT PCT I 1.I ----I---I Q31L 0. I 352 I 330 I 692 I 52.3 I 47.7 I 84.7 UNMARKED I 88.9 I 80.5 I I 44.3 I 40.4 I -I----I 1. I 45 I 125 30 I I 36.0 I 64.0 I 15.3 MARKED I 11.1 I 19.5 I I 5.5 I 9.8 I -I----I COLUMN 437 410 817 50.2 100.0 49.3 TOTAL CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 10.62584 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0011RAW CHI SQUARE = 11.26887 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0008PHI = 0.11744

* * CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * 031A R-LV RAISING A FAMILY BY Q3 SEX OF RESPONDENT 03 COUNT I ROW PCT IMALE FEMALE ROW COL PCT I TOTAL TOT PCT I 0.I 1.I ----I----I 031A 0. I 215 I 336 I 552 UNMARKED I 39.1 I 60.9 I 67.4 I 82.1 I 60.4 I I 26.4 I 41.0 I -I----I 1. I 47 I 220 I 267 MARKED I 17.5 I 82.4 I 32.6 I 17.9 I 39.6 I I 5.7 I 26.9 I -I----I COLUMN 253 555 819 TOT AL 32.1 67.9 100.0 CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 37.27388 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000RAW CHI SQUARE = 38.25494 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000PHI = 0.21612

181



* * CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * 031B R-LV PAY POLICIES BY 23 SEX OF RESPONDENT Q3 Ι COUNT ROW PCT IMALE FEMALE ROW TOTAL COL PCT I TOT PCT I 0.I 1.I ----I----I 03 1B 0. I 199 I 477 I 676 I 29.4 I 70.5 I 82.5 UNMARKED I 75.7 I 85.8 I I 24.3 I 58.2 I -I----I 1. I 54 I 79 I 143 I 44.3 I 55.2 I 17.5 MARKED I 24.3 I 14.2 I I 7.3 I 9.6 I -I----I COLUMN 253 556 819 TOTAL 32.1 67.9 100.0 CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 12.01004 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0005RAW CHI SQUARE = 12.70298 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0004PHI = 0.12454

** CROSSTABULATION OF ******* 031C R-LV BETTER CIVILIAN JOB BY Q3 SEX OF RESPONDENT 03 COUNT I ROW PCT IMALE FEMALE ROW TOTAL COL FCT I TOT PCT I 0.I 1.I ----I----I-----I 031C 0. I 154 I 404 I 558 I 27.6 I 72.4 I 68.1 UNMARKED 58.5 I 72.7 I T I 18.8 I 49.3 I -I----I----I 1. I 109 I 152 I 261 I 41.3 I 58.2 I 31.9 MARKED I 41.4 I 27.3 I I 13.3 I 18.6 I -I----I COLUMN 253 556 819 TOTAL 32.1 67.9 100.0 CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 15.72085 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001RAW CHI SQUARE = 16.36414 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001PHI = 0.14135



* * CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * 031 K R-LV UNDESIRABLE BILLET BY 03 SEX OF RESPONDENT 03 COUNT I ROW PCT IMALE FEMALE ROW COL PCT I TOTAL TOT PCT I 0.I 1.I ----I----I 031K 0. I 207 I 398 I 605 UNMARKED I 34.2 I 65.8 I 73.9 I 78.7 I 71.5 I I 25.3 I 48.6 I -I----I 1. I 55 I 158 I 214 I 26.2 I 73.8 I 26.1 MARKED I 21.3 I 28.4 I I 6.8 I 19.3 I -I----I----I COLUMN 253 555 819 TOTAL 32.1 67.9 100.0 CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 4.33333 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0374

RAW CHI SQUARE = 4.69517 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM.

SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0302

PHI = 0.07572

* * CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * 031B R-LV PAY POLICIES BY 06 RACE OF RESPONDENT 06 COUNT I ROW PCT IBLACK HISPANIC WHITE OTHER ROW COL PCT I TOTAL TOT PCT I 1.I 2.I 3.I 4.I -----I-----I-----I 031B 0. I 26 I 10 I 624 I 13 I 673 3.9 I 1.5 I 92.7 I 1.9 I 82.5 I UNMARKED I 68.4 I 71.4 I 83.6 I 72.2 I I 3.2 I 1.2 I 76.5 I 1.6 I - I----- I------ I------ I------ I 1. I 12 I 4 I 122 I 5 I 143 I 8.4 I 2.8 I 85.3 I 3.5 I 17.5 MARKED I 31.6 I 28.6 I 15.4 I 27.8 I I 1.5 I 0.5 I 15.0 I 0.6 I 816 38 14 746 18 COLUMN TOTAL 4.7 1.7 91.4 2.2 100.0 CHI SQUARE = 8.39187 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0386CRAMER'S V = 0.10141

* * CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * 032B S-LV PAY POLICIES BY 29A PAY GRADE OF SPOUSE Q9A COUNT I ROW PCT IENLISTED OFFICER ROW COL PCT I · TOTAL TOT PCT I 1.I 2.I ----I---I 032B 0. I 335 I 325 I 660 50.8 I 49.2 I 84.0 UNMARKED I I 79.2 I 89.5 I I 42.5 I 41.3 I -I----I----I 1. I 38 I 38 I 126 I 59.3 I 30.2 I 16.0 MARKED I 20.8 I 10.5 I I 11.2 I 4.8 I - I ----- I - ----- I COLUMN 423 363 786 TOTAL 53.8 46.2 100.0 CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 14.74464 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001RAW CHI SQUARE = 15.50295 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001

PHI = 0.14044

| Ŧ | * | | C | R | 0 | 5 | 5 | T | A | В | U | مة | А | T | 1 | 0 | N | | 0 | r | | * | * | * | * | * | * | Ť | * |
|----|---|-----|-----|------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|------|------|-----|--------|-----|-----|-----------|-----|------------|-----|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|
| Q3 | 2 | K | s-: | LV | U | ND | ESI | RA | BI | LΕ | BI | LL | ΕT | Ĩ | BY | Q9 | A | 9 i | ΑY | GE | R A I | DE | OF | | SPO |)បន | Ε | | |
| * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| | | | | | | | | | | | 10 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | ç | 29 H | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | (| COU | INI | | I | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | R | WC | PC | T | II | ENI | .IS | STE | D | ЭI | FFI | CE | R | | E | RO | Ň | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | C | OL | FC | T | I | | | | | | | | | | T | T | AL | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | T | OT | PC | T | I | | | 1 | .] | | | | 2. | I | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q | 3 | 2 K | | | | - | | | | -I- | | | | - 1 | | | | - | -I | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 0. | | I | | 34 | 3 | 1 | | 2 | 47 | 1 | I | | 59 | 95 | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | JN | MAI | RKE | ED | | | | | I | 5 | 8. | 5 | I | | 41 | • 5 | • | I | - | 75 | .7 | • | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | I | 3 | 2. | 3 |] | - | 68 | . 0 | • | I | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | I | 4 | 4. | 3 | I | | 31 | .4 | | I | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | - | -I- | | | | -1 | | | | | - I | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 1. | | I | | 7 | 5 | I | | 1 | 16 | | I | | 19 | 91 | | | | | | | |
| | | MA | RKI | ED | | | | | | T | 3 | 9. | 3 | | - | 60 | . 7 | , | Т | - | 24 | . 3 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | - τ | 1 | 7. | 7 | Т | | 32 | 0 | | T | - | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | Ŧ | | 9 | 5 | - T | - | 14 | | 1 | T | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | MN | 7 | 1 | | 11.2 | 2 | - | • | 3 | 63 | | + | | 7 | 36 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | • | | _ | 72 | | | | 5 | - C C - C | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | TOT | AI | • | | 5 | 3. | 8 | | | 40 | • 2 | | | EC. | . 01 | • 0 | | | | | | | |
| CO | R | RE | CT | ED | C | ΗI | SQ | UA | RI | 3 = | = 2 | 0. | 72 | 42 | 25 | WI | ΤH | [] | 1 I | DEC | GR | ΞE | OF | ' 1 | FRE | EED | 0 1 | | |
| SI | G | IN | FI | CAN | IC: | E : | = 0 | | 00 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RA | W | C | HI | SQ | <u>)</u> U | ARI | E = | 2 | 21. | 49 | 906 | 8 | NI | TH | E 1 | D | EG | R 1 | ΞΞ | OI | 7 | FRI | EED | 001 | M . | | | | |
| SI | G | IN | FI | CAN | IC | E : | = 0 | .0 | 000 | 00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| рн | т | = | 0 | . 16 | 5 | 35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

> Q9A COUNT I

| | ROW | PCT | ΙE | NLISI | ED O | | ROW | | |
|----------|------|------|-----|-------|------|------|-----|-------|--|
| | COL | PCT | I | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | TOT | PCT | I | | 1.I | 2 | .I | | |
| Q32L | | | -I- | | I- | | - I | | |
| | | 0. | I | 384 | I | 296 | I | 680 | |
| UNMARKED | | | I | 56.5 | I | 43.5 | I | 86.5 | |
| | | | I | 90.3 | I | 81.5 | I | | |
| | | | I | 48.9 | I | 37.7 | I | | |
| | | | -I- | | I- | | - I | | |
| | | 1. | I | 39 | I | 57 | I | 106 | |
| MARKED | | | I | 36.3 | I | 63.2 | I | 13.5 | |
| | | | I | 9.2 | I | 18.5 | I | | |
| | | | I | 5.0 | I | 8.5 | I | | |
| | | | -I- | | I- | | - I | | |
| | COLU | I MN | | 423 | | 353 | | 786 | |
| | TOT | AL | | 53.3 | | 46.2 | | 100.0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 13.50678 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002 RAW CHI SQUARE = 14.28755 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002 PHI = 0.13482

** CROSSTABULATION OF ******* Q32A S-LV RAISING A FAMILY BY Q3 SEX OF RESPONDENT Q3 COUNT I ROW PCT IMALE FEMALE ROW COL PCT I TOTAL TOT PCT I 0.I 1.I -----I Q32A 0. I 137 I 463 I 600 UNMARKED I 22.8 I 77.2 I 76.3 I 54.3 I 86.4 I I 17.4 I 58.9 I -I----I 1. I 113 I 73 I 186 MARKED I 60.3 I 39.2 I 23.7 I 45.2 I 13.6 I I 14.4 I 9.3 I -I----I COLUMN 250 536 786 TOTAL 31.3 68.2 100.0 CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 92.38452 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000RAW CHI SQUARE = 94.12479 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000PHI = 0.34605

* * CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * O32C S-LV BETTER CIVILIAN JOB BY O3 SEX OF RESPONDENT Q3 COUNT I ROW PCT IMALE FEMALE ROW COL PCT I TOTAL 1.I TOT PCT I 0.I ----I----I Q32C 0. I 135 I 311 I 497 UNMARKED I 37.4 I 62.6 I 63.2 I 74.4 I 58.0 I I 23.7 I 39.6 I -I----I----I 1. I 54 I 225 I 289 I 22.1 I 77.9 I 36.8 MARKED T 25.5 I 42.0 I I 8.1 I 28.6 I -I----I COLUMN 250 536 786 TOTAL 31.3 68.2 100.0 CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 18.97049 WIFH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000RAW CHI SQUARE = 19.66859 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000PHI = 0.15819



| * | * | | С | F | 2 -1 | 0 | S | S | | T A | B | U | L | A | T | I | 0 | N | ł | 1 | 0 | F | | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
|----|-----|-----|----|-----|------|-----|-----|-------|----|------|-------|------|-------|-----|----|----|-----|----|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|
| QЗ | 2 | L | s- | LV | 1 | PA | S | SE | D | 07 | ER | B | Y ; | 23 | S | ΕX | 0 | F | RE | ES | 50 | DNI | DE | ΠU | | | | | | | |
| * | * | * | * | * | k : | * | * | * | | * * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | : * | × | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 603 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | ~~` | m | 1177 | - | 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | 2 | | U | NT | 1 | 16 2 | | | | - | TIM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | R | J W L | | PCT | 1 | IA. | ئت با | | | Ľ | En | AL | ت ، | | | - | RU' | N - | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | C | JC | | FCT | I | | | | | | | | | | | TO | JT. | AL | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | T(| TC | | PCT | I | | | | 0. | I | | | ٦ | • | Ι | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q | 3 : | 2 L | | | | | | | - | | -I | | | | | I- | | | | | Ι | • | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | 0. | I | | 23 | 3 0 | | Ι | | 45 | С | | Ι | | 6 | 80 | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | UN | MA | RK | E | D | • | | | | I | | 33. | . 3 | | I | 6 | 6. | 2 | | Ι | 8 | 36 | . 5 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | I | \$ | 92. | . c | | I | 8 | 4. | 0 | | Ι | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | I | | 29. | . 3 | | I | 5 | 7. | 3 | • | Ī | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | -I | | | | | I- | | | | - | Ι | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | 1. | I | | | 20 | | I | | 3 | 5 | | Ι | | 1 | 06 | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | ΜA | RK | ΕĒ |) | | | | | | I | | 18. | . 9 | | I | 8 | 1. | 1 | | Ι | | 13 | • 5 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | I | | 8. | . 0 | , | I | 1 | 6. | С | • | I | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | I | | 2. | . 5 | | I | 1 | 0. | 9 | | I | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | - I | | | | | I- | | | | 1 | I | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | С | DL | IJ | MN | | | 25 | 50 | | | | 53 | 6 | | | | 7 | 86 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | , | ror | Г | AL | | | 31. | . 3 | | | 6 | 8. | 2 | | | 1(| 00 | . 0 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | - | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| co | R I | RΕ | CT | ΕI |) (| CH | II | S | Q | UAR | Ξ | = | 8. | 77 | 97 | 6 | ΨI | ΤH | 1 | 1 | DI | EGI | RE | E | OF | FI | REE | EDC | DM. | | |
| SI | G | NI | FI | CA | N (| CE | 2 : | = (| 0 | .00 | 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RA | W | С | ΗI | 0 | SQ | U A | R | E : | = | 9. | 45 | 67 | 1 1 | IN | TH | 1 | D | ΞG | RE | ΞE | C | ΟF | F | RE | EDC | DM. | • | | | | |
| SI | G | ΝI | FI | CA | N | Cī | : : | = | 0 | .00 | 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PH | I | = | 0 | . 1 | 10 | 96 | 59 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

* * CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * 032M S-LV RETIRED BY 03 SEX OF RESPONDENT 03 COUNT I ROW PCT IMALE FEMALE ROW COL PCT I TOTAL TOT PCT I 0.I 1.I ----I----I 032M 0. I 249 I 505 I 754 I 33.0 I 67.0 I 95.9 UNMARKED I 99.5 I 94.2 I I 31.7 I 64.2 I -I----I 1. I 1 I 31 I 32 I 3.1 I 96.9 I 4.1 MARKED I 0.4 I 5.8 I 0.1 I 3.9 I I -I----I----I COLUMN 250 536 786 TOTAL 31.3 68.2 100.0 CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 11.31077 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0008RAW CHI SQUARE = 12.65170 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0004PHI = 0.12687

* * CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * Q17 SELECTION OF DOMINANT CAREER BY 218 DETAILER SUPPORT CONTROLLING FOR. . O3 SEX OF RESPONDENT VALUE = 0. MALE 018 COUNT I ROW PCT IYES, NOT NOT NOT NA ROW COL PCT IBCTH MINE SPOU. BOTH TOTAL TOT PCT I 1.I 2.I 3.I 4.I 5.I Q17 -----I----I-----I 1. I 47 I 10 I 18 I 9 I 33 I 117 I 40.2 I 8.5 I 15.4 I 7.7 I 28.2 I 45.2 YES, MY CAREER I 45.6 I 55.6 I 78.3 I 50.0 I 34.0 T I 18.1 I 3.9 I 6.9 I 3.5 I 12.7 I -I - ---- I ----- I ----- I ----- I ----- I 2. I 6 I 3 I 0 I 0 I 7 I 16 I 37.5 I 18.3 I 0.0 I 0.0 I 43.8 I YES, 6.2 SPOUSE'S I 5.8 I 16.7 I 0.0 I 0.0 I 7.2 Ι

I 2.3 I 1.2 I 0.0 I 0.0 I 2.7 Ι -I----I----I-----I-----I 3. I 50 I 5 I 5 I 9 I 57 I 126 CZ I 39.7 I 4.0 I 4.0 I 7.1 I 45.2 I 48.6 I 48.5 I 27.8 I 21.7 I 50.0 I 58.8 I I 19.3 I 1.9 I 1.9 I 3.5 I 22.0 I -I - ---- I----- -I----- I----- I----- I 103 18 23 COLUMN 18 97 259 39.8 6.9 8.9 5.9 37.5 TOTAL 100.0 CHI SQUARE = 21.78253 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0053CRAMER'S V = 0.20506

A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR OF

| * * | CR | 0 | S | S | T A | В | IJ | L | A I | C I | 0 | N | | 0 | F | * | * | * | * | * | * | * * | * |
|-------|------|-----|------|----------|----------|-----|------------|---------|-----------|------------|------------|-----|----------|------------|-----|-------------|--------|-----|---------------|--------|---|-------|----------------------------------------------|
| Q17 S | ELEC | CAF | REE | R | вұ | 21 | 8 | DE | FAI | LΕ | R S | SUP | PC | RT | | | | | | | | | |
| CONTR | OLLI | NG | FC | DR. | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q3 SE | X OF | RE | ESE | 20 N | DEN | T | /AL | UE | Ξ | 1. | 1 | FEM | A L | Ξ | | | | | | | | | |
| * * * | * * | * | * | * | * * | * | * | * | * * | * * | * | * | * | * | * : | * * | * | * | * | * | * | * * | ¥ |
| | | | | | | Ç | 218 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | C | COE | JN T | I | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RC | W | PC | ΤI | YES | 5, | | ro n | 2 | 1 | TCN | | | NO | r | | N A | | | | RO | W C |
| | | CC | L | PC | ΤI | BO | CH | | MIN | ΙE | : | SPO | U. | | BO | ΓH | | | | | T | OTI | AL |
| | | ΤC | TC | PC | TI | | 1 | • I | | 2 | .I | | 3 | . I | | 4 | .I | | 5 | . I | | | |
| Q17 | | | | | I | | | -I | | | -I· | | | - I | | | -I | | • | - I | | | |
| | | | _ | 1. | I | | 21 | I | | 9 | I | | 5 | I | | 2 | I | • | 18 | I | | | 56 |
| YES, | ΜΥ | CAR | ΕE | EP. | I | 3. | 7.5 | I | 16 | 5.1 | I | 10 | • 7 | I | | 3.6 | I | 32 | 2.1 | I | | 10. | . 2 |
| | | | | | I | | 9.4 | I | 20 |).0 | I | 30 | • 0 | I | | 8.3 | I | | /.6 | I | | | |
| | | | | | 1 | - | 3.8 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | • 1 | 1 | (| J.4 | 1 | | 5.3 | 1 | | | |
| | | | | 2 | -1 | | 146 | -L - | | | - ± · | | | - 1 - | | 1 2 | - T. | | | -1 | | 2 | <u>, </u> |
| VEC | SDO | uct | | ۷۰ ۲۰ | т 1 | 4.0 | 115 | 1 + | 11 | 20 | 1 | 2 |) (1 | . <u>т</u> | 1 | 13 | 1 - | 20 |) ()))) | 1 7 | | 23 | 1 |
| IL S, | 520 | 050 | 513 | | H L T | 4: | 7.0 1.2 | T T | 57 | 1•2 7 2 | T T | 10 | • 4 | | 5 | 0.0 11 0 | T | 30 |)•2 | T T | | + 2 . | . 1 |
| | | | | | т | 20 | 1 0 | т т | י כ וו | . 7 | ⊥ τ | +0 | • • 5 | т т | ر | ••2 2 11 | 1 T | 10 | , 4 7 | T T | | | |
| | | | | | т - т | | | т -Т | | | т. – т. | ' | • J | т - т | | | | | | - T | | | |
| | | | | 3. | T | | 88 | Ť | | 10 | т | | 5 | T | | 9 | Ť | | 150 | Т | • | 26 | 53 |
| ND | | | | | ī | 33 | 3.5 | T | 3 | 3.8 | T | 2 | .3 | T | | 3.4 | T | 51 | 7.0 | T | | 47. | .7 |
| | | | | | I | 39 | 9.3 | I | 22 | 2.2 | I | 30 | .) | I | 3. | 7.5 | I | 53 | 3.0 | I | | | |
| | | | | | I | 16 | 5.0 | I | 1 | 1.8 | I | 1 | . 1 | I | | 1.6 | I | 27 | 7.2 | I | | | |
| | | | | | -I | | | - I | | | -I· | | | - I | | | -I | | • | - I | | | |
| | | COI | របស | IN | | | 224 | | | 45 | | | 20 | | | 24 | | á | 238 | | | 55 | 51 |
| | | ΤC | DT A | L | | 4(|).7 | | | 8 | . 2 | | 3. | б | | 4. | 4 | Ĺ | 13. | 2 | 1 | 00. | .0 |
| CHI S | QUAR | E = | = 5 | 53. | 935 | 01 | WI | ΤЯ | 8 | DE | GRI | EES | 0 | F | FRI | EED | OM | • | | | | | |
| SIGNI | FICA | NCE | E = | : 0 | .00 | 00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CRAME | R'S | V = | = 0 | . 2 | 212 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

* * CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * 03 SEX OF RESP. BY 018 DEFAILER SUPPORT OF DOMINANT CAREER 018 COUNT I ROW PCT IYES NOT NOT NA ROW COL PCT IBOTH MINE SPOU. BOTH TOTAL TOT PCT I 1.I 2.I 3.I 4.I 5.I -----I----I-----I-----I-----I-----I 0.3 0. I 103 I 18 I 23 I 18 I 97 I 259 I 39.8 I 6.9 I 8.9 I 6.9 I 37.5 I 31.9 MALE I 31.4 I 28.5 I 53.5 I 42.9 I 28.9 I I 12.7 I 2.2 I 2.8 I 2.2 I 11.9 I -I-----I-----I-----I-----I 1. I 225 I 45 I 20 I 24 P 239 I 553 FEMALE I 40.7 I 8.1 I 3.6 I 4.3 I 43.2 I 68.1 I 68.6 I 71.4 I 46.5 I 57.1 I 71.1 I I 27.7 / 5.5 I 2.5 I 3.0 I 29.4 I -I-----I-----I-----I COLUMN 323 63 43 42 336 812 40.4 7.8 5.3 5.2 41.4 100.0 TOTAL CHI SOUARE = 13.32657 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0098

CRAMER'S V = 0.12811
| * * | С | R(| o s | S T | A | BUI | A | TI | 0 | N | С | F | * | * | * * * | * | * * |
|------|------|------|------|----------|--------|--------|------------|-----------|-------|---------------|-------|----------|-------|-----------|-------|------------|-------|
| Q21 | STAT | IOI | NED | TO GE | TH | ER BY | <u>z</u> | 19A | RE: | 5 2- 1 | FEE | LI | NGS A | BO | UT LO | CA | TION |
| * * | * * | * | * * | * * | * | * * * | * * | * * * | * | * * | * * | * | * * | * | * * * | * | * * |
| | | | | | | 0.10.3 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Q 19A | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | CC | DUNT | I | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | ROW | PCI | I | VERY | | SAT | | 08 | ζ | Ì | DIS- | 1 | VERY | | ROW |
| | | | COI | , PCI | I | SAT | | | | | | | SAT | | DISSA | T | TOTAL |
| | | | TOI | PCI | I | 1 | .I | | 2.3 | Γ | 3 | .I | 4 | .I | 5 | .I | |
| Q21 | | | | | -I | | I | | : | [| | -I | | -I | | -I | |
| | | | | 1. | I | 339 | I | 19 | 6 | Ι | 82 | I | 55 | I | 28 | I | 690 |
| Y ES | | | | | I | 49.1 | II | 27. | 0 3 | E 1' | 1.9 | I | 8.0 | Ι | 4.1 | I | 85.3 |
| | | | | | I | 90.2 | 2 I | 86. | 5 : | I 85 | 5.4 | I | 78.6 | I | 53.8 | I | |
| | | | | | I | 41.9 | I | 23. | 0 3 | E 13 |).1 | I | 6.8 | I | 3.5 | I | |
| | | | | | -I | | I | | | [| | -I | | -I | | -I | |
| | | | | 2. | I | 22 | ? I | : 1 | 2 3 | E | 3 | I | 4 | I | 1 | ī | 42 |
| NO, | O K | | | | I | 52.4 | ιI | 28. | 6 | I I | 7.1 | I | 9.5 | I | 2.4 | I | 5.2 |
| | | | | | I | 5.9 |) I | 5. | 6 3 | c 3 | 3.1 | I | 5.7 | I | 1.9 | I | |
| | | | | | I | 2.7 | 7 I | 1. | 5 : | E () |).4 | I | 0.5 | I | 0.1 | I | |
| | | | | | -I | | I | | | [| | - T | | - I · | | - I | |
| | | | | 3. | T | 1 - | - 5 т | 1 | 7 | T | 11 | Т | 11 | T | 23 | | 77 |
| NO | NOT | Оĸ | | | - - | 19 5 | с – С Т | · · · · | 1 | - T 11 | 1 7 | Ŧ | 14 3 | т | 29 9 | Ť | 95 |
| NOF | | U K | | | Ť | 11 (|) T | . 22. | а - | τ 1' | 1 5 | Ť | 15 7 | Ť | hh 2 | т т | 5.5 |
| | | | | | + + | 1 0 | , т 1 т | . '• | 1 | L 1 | 1 1 | | 1 / | - - | 2 2 | т т | |
| | | | | | | 1 | ' L | . 2.• | 1. | <u>r</u> | 1 + 4 | ⊥ _ + | 1 + 4 | يد ج _ | 2.0 | | |
| | | | 0.01 | FT 54 37 | | 2770 | 1 | | - | 1 | · | - ± ' | 70 | - ± . | | -1 | 0.00 |
| | | | COT | | | 3/6 | | 21 | 5 | | 96 | | /0 | | 52 | | 809 |
| | | | TC | DTAL | | 46.5 |) | 26. | 6 | 1. | 1.9 | | 8.7 | | 6.4 | | С.СОГ |
| CHI | SQUZ | RE | = 9 | 1.45 | 30 | 2 WII | H | 8 DE | GR | EES | ЭF | F | REEDO | Μ. | | | |
| SIG | TETO | TANG | | = 0_0 | 0.0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | |

CRAMER'S V = 0.23774

195

.

* * C R O S S T A B U L A F I O N O F * * * * * * * * * * 021 STATIONED TOGETHER BY 219B RESP-FEELINGS ABOUT BILLET Q 19B COUNT Ι ROW PCT IVERY SAF OK DIS- VERY ROW COL PCT ISAT SAT DSAT TOTAL TOT PCT I 1.I 2.I 3.I 4.I 5.I 0.21 1. I 269 I 216 I 75 I 80 I 46 I 687 YES I 39.2 I 31.4 I 11.1 I 11.6 I 5.7 I 85.6 I 90.0 I 35.1 I 80.0 I 80.8 I 78.0 Τ I 33.5 I 25.9 I 9.5 I 10.0 I 5.7 I <u>- I----I----I-----I</u> 2. I 13 I 14 I 7 I 7 I 1 I 42 I 31.0 I 33.3 I 16.7 I 16.7 I NO, OK 2.4 I 5.2 I 4.3 I 5.6 I 7.4 I 7.1 I 1.7 Ι I 1.6 I 1.7 I 0.9 I 0.9 I 0.1 Τ - I----I----I-----I-----I I 17 I 21 I 12 I 12 I 12 I 3. 74 NO, NOT OK I 23.0 I 23.4 I 16.2 I 16.2 I 15.2 I 9.2 I 5.7 I 3.4 I 12.6 I 12.1 I 20.3 I I 2.1 I 2.6 I 1.5 I 1.5 I 1.5 I - I-----I----I-----I-----I 95 99 COLUMN 299 251 59 803 37.2 31.3 11.3 12.3 7.3 100.0 TOTAL CHI SQUARE = 19.34326 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0131CRAMER'S V = 0.10975

| * * | | С | RC |) S | S | Т | AI | 3 (| J | LA | Ť | Ι | O N | | 0 | F | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
|-----|----|------|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|----------|-------|-----|------------|-------|----|----|----|-----|-----|
| Q21 | S | TAI | TOI | IED | TO | GE | THI | ER | B | Y Q | 20 | A : | SPOUS | S E S | 5 | ABOU | r 1 | LDD | : A I | IC | N | | | |
| * * | * | * | * * | * * | * | * | * * | * * | k > | * * | * | * | * * | * | * | * * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Ç | 2201 | A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | C | DUN | r | I | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | ROV | I PO | CT | IV | ERI | ľ | | SAF | | (| ΟK | | D | ISSA | r 1 | VER | Y | DI | S | | RC |)W |
| | | | COI | L PO | СТ | IS | SAT | | | | | | | | | | 5 | SAI | | | | Τ | L O | 'AL |
| | | | TOI | C 20 | CT | I | | 1. | I | | 2 | •I | | 3.1 | Ε | 4. | .I | | | 5. | Ι | | | |
| Q21 | | | | | | I- | | | -1- | | | -I· | | : | <u> </u> | | -I· | | | | ·I | | | |
| | | | | 1. | • | I | 3(|)4 | I | 2 | 16 | Ι | 74 | 1 3 | C | 53 | I | | 38 | 3 | Ι | | 68 | 35 |
| Y | ES | | | | | I | 44. | .4 | Ι | 31 | • 5 | I | 10.8 | 3 1 | 2 | 7.7 | I | 5 | 5.5 | 5 | I | 8 | 5. | , 9 |
| | | | | | | I | 92. | .7 | I | 89 | • 3 | Ι | 92.5 | 5 1 | <u>ב</u> | 75.7 | I | 49 | - 4 | Ļ | I | | | |
| | | | | | | I | 38. | . 1 | Ι | 27 | • 1 | Ι | 9.3 | 3 1 | C | 6.6 | I | 4 | • 6 | 3 | I | | | |
| | | | | | - | I- | | | ·I· | | | -I | |] | c – 1 | | -I- | | | | I | | | |
| | | | | 2. | • | I | | 14 | I | | 15 | I | 2 | 2 1 | E | 7 | I | | 1 | | I | | (7) | 19 |
| NO | Ο, | OK | 5 | | | I | 35. | 9 | Ι | 38 | •5 | Γ | 5. | 1 1 | Ε | 17.9 | I | 2 | . 6 | 5 | I | | 4. | 9 |
| | | | | | | I | 4. | . 3 | Ι | 5 | • 2 | Ι | 2.5 | 5 1 | 2 | 10.0 | Ι | 1 | .3 | 3 | I | | | |
| | | | | | | I | 1. | 8 | Ι | 1 | . 9 | I | 0.3 | 3 | Ε | 0.9 | I | С | • 1 | | I | | | |
| | | | | | - | I- | | | -1- | | | -I· | | : | [-] | | -I- | | | | ·I | | | |
| | | | | 3. | • | I | | 10 | I | | 11 | I | 1 | 1 3 | Ε | 10 | I | | 38 | 3 | I | | 7 | 13 |
| N | 0, | NC | T | | | I | 13. | . 7 | I | 15 | . 1 | I | 5.3 | 5 1 | 2 | 13.7 | I | 52 | . 1 | | I | | 9. | 2 |
| С | K | | | | | I | 3. | . 0 | Ξ | 4 | • 5 | I | 5.0 |)] | [| 14.3 | I | 49 | . 4 | ŀ | I | | | |
| | | | | | | I | 1. | . 3 | I | 1 | .4 | I | 0.5 | 5 3 | [| 1.3 | I | 4 | . 8 | 3 | I | | | |
| | | | | | - | I- | | | ·I· | | | -I· | | 3 | E | | -I- | | | | ·I | | | |
| | | | COI | | N | | 32 | 28 | | 2 | 42 | | 80 |) | | 70 | | | 77 | 7 | | | 79 | 7 |
| | | | TC | TAI | L | | 41. | . 2 | | 30 | .4 | | 10.0 |) | | 8.8 | | 9 | . 7 | 7 | | 10 | 0. | 0 |
| | - | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CHI | S | 2U A | RE | = | 181 | • 4 | 0/ | 99 | W | ETH | 8 | D : | EGREI | 5 | 0 | F FRI | EEI | NCC NCC | • | | | | | |

SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0

CRAMER'S V = 0.33735

* * CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * 021 STATIONED TOGETHER BY 200B SPOUSES FEELINGS ABOUT BILLET Q20B COUNT I ROW PCT IVERY SAF OK DISSAT VERY DIS ROW SAT TOTAL COL PCT ISAT TOT PCT I 1.I 2.I 3.I 4.I 5.I ----- I-----I-----I-----I-----I Q21 1. I 223 I 239 I 87 I 86 I 49 I 684 YES I 32.6 I 34.9 I 12.7 I 12.6 I 7.2 I 86.4 I 89.2 I 35.6 I 92.6 I 87.8 I 66.2 I I 28.2 I 30.2 I 11.0 I 10.9 I 5.2 Т - I-----I ---- I ----- I ----- I ----- I 2. I 15 I 14 I 2 I 5 I 3 I 39 NO, OK I 38.5 I 35.9 I 5.1 I 12.8 I 7.7 I 4.9 I 6.0 I 5.1 I 2.1 I 5.1 I 4.1 Ι 1.9 I 1.8 I 0.3 I 0.6 I I 0.4 Ι - I----- I ---- I ----- I ----- I ----- I 3. I 12 I 23 I 5 I 7 I 22 Ι 69 NO, NOT OK I 17.4 I 33.3 I 7.2 I 10.1 I 31.9 I 8.7 I 4.8 I 3.3 I 5.3 I 7.1 I 29.7 Ι I 1.5 I 2.9 I 0.6 I 0.9 I 2.8 Ι - I----I----I-----I-----I COLUMN 250 276 94 98 74 792 TOTAL 31.6 34.8 11.9 12.4 9.3 100.0 CHI SQUARE = 49.84183 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000CRAMER'S V = 0.17739CRAMER'S V = 0.10559

Q25

COUNT I

ROW PCT IBOTH I GET SPOUSE GET PHIS NA, NO OFHER ROW COL PCT IOUT OUT OUT DIV SEP CFLICT TOTAL TOT PCT I 1.I 2.I 3.I 4.I 5.I 6.I 7.I 024 ----I----I-----I-----I-----I-----I **1.** I 6 I 10 I 4 I 5 I 5 I 482 I 0 I 512 I 1.2 I 2.0 I 0.8 I 1.0 I 1.0 I94.1 I 0.00 I 64.1 NO I 9.2 I 9.3 I 7.8 I 13.5 I 13.5 I 97.6 I 0.00 I I 0.8 I 1.3 I 0.5 I 0.6 I 0.5 I60.3 I 0.00 I -I----I----I-----I-----I-----I 2. I 59 I 97 I 47 I 32 I 32 I 12 I 8 I 287 YES I20.6 I33.8 I16.4 I11.1 I11.1 I 4.2 I 2.88 I 35.9 I90.8 I90.7 I92.2 I86.5 I86.5 I 2.4 I100.00 I I 7.4 I12.1 I 5.9 I 4.0 I 4.0 I 1.5 I 1.00 I -I----I----I-----I-----I-----I 51 37 37 494 799 COLUMN 65 107 8 TOTAL 8.1 13.4 6.4 4.6 4.5 61.8 1.00 100.0 CHI SQUARE = 631.49634 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0CRAMER'S V = 0.88902

The second s

* * C R O S S T A B U L A F I O N O F * * * * * * * * * * O3 SEX OF RESP. BY 015 ACTIVE DUTY INTENTIONS OF RESP. 015 COUNT I ROW PCTI1-5 6-10 11-15 16-19 209LUS UNDEC ROW COL PCTIYRS YRS YRS YRS YRS . TOTAL TOT PCTI 1.I 2.I 3.I 4.I 5.I 88.I 99.I Q3 ----I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I 22 I 5 I 1I 98 I 118 I 0 I 263 0. I 19I I 7.2I 8.4 I 1.9I 0.4I 37.3 I 44.9 I 0.0 I 32.3 MALE I 17.8I 34.9 I 55.5I 14.3I 35.7 I 32.8 I 0.0 I I 2.3 I 2.7 I 0.5 I 0.1 I 12.0 I 14.5 I 0.0 I I----I----I-----I-----I-----I-----I **1.** I 88 I 41 I 4I 6I 169 I 242 I 1 I 551 FEMALE I 16.01 7.4 I 0.71 1.11 3).7 I 43.9 I 0.2 I 67.7 I 82.2I 65.1I 44.4I 85.7I 63.3 I 67.2 I100.0 I I 10.8I 5.0 I 0.5I 0.7I 20.8 I 29.7 I 0.1 I I-----I-----I-----I-----I-----I COLUMN 107 63 9 7 257 360 1 814 TOTAL 13.1 7.7 1.1 0.9 32.8 44.2 0.1 100.0 CHI SQUARE = 16.69196 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0105CRAMER'S V = 0.14320

201

* * CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * 03 SEX OF RESP. BY Q16 ACTIVE DUTY INTENTIONS OF SPOUSE 016 COUNT I ROW PCTI1-5 6-10 11-15 16-19 20PLUS UNDEC ROW COL PCTIYRS YRS YRS YRS YRS TOTAL TOT PCTI 1.I 2.I 3.I 4.I 5.I 88.I 99.I 03----I----I----I-----I-----I-----I-----I 0. I 53I 118 I 27 I 38I 24I 1I 1 I 262 MALE I 14.5I 9.2I 0.4I 0.4I 20.2I 45.0 I10.3 I 32.0 I 50.0I 41.4I 14.3I 33.3I 17.1I 38.8 I45.0 I I 4.6I 2.9I 0.1I 0.1I 6.5I 14.4 I 3.3 I I----I----I----I-----I-----I-----I 1. I **38I 34I 6I 2I 257I 186 I 33 I 5**56 FEMALE I 6.8I 6.1I 1.1I 0.4I 46.2I 33.5 I 5.9 I 68.0 I 50.0I 58.6I 85.7I 66.7I 82.9I 61.2 I55.0 I I 4.6I 4.2I 0.7I 0.2I 31.4I 22.7 I 4.0 I I----I----I-----I-----I-----I-----I 7 3 313 304 50 818 COLUMN 76 58 FOTAL 9.3 7.1 0.9 0.4 37.9 37.2 7.3 100.0 CHI SOUARE = 57.43658 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000CRAMER'S V = 0.26498

* * CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * 08A PAY GRADE-RESP. BY 015 ACTIVE DUTY INTENTIONS-RESP. 015 COUNT I ROW PCT I1-5 16-10 11-15 16-19 2)PLUS UNDEC ROW COL PCT IYRS YRS YRS YRS YRS TOTAL TOT PCT I 1.I 2.I 3.I 4.I 5.I 88.I 99.I 65 I 40 I 7 I 4 I 105 I 183 I 1 I 1. I 405 ENLISTEDI 16.0 I 9.9 I 1.7 I 1.0 I 25.9 I 45.2 I 0.2 I 49.8 I 60.7 I 63.5 I77.3 I57.1 I 39.3 I 50.8 I 100.0 I I 8.0 I 4.9 I 0.9 I 0.5 I 12.9 I 22.5 I 0.1 I -I----I----I----I----I----I----I 2. I 42 I 23 I 2 I 3 I 152 I 177 I 0 I 409 OFFICER I 10.3 I 5.6 I 0.5 I 0.7 I 39.6 I 43.3 I 0.0 I 50.2 I 39.3 I 36.5 I 22.2 I 42.9 I 6).7 I 49.2 I 0.0 I I 5.2 I 2.8 I 3.2 I 0.4 I 19.9 I 21.7 I 0.0 I 107 63 9 7 257 COLUMN 360 1 814 TOTAL 13.1 7.7 1.1 0.9 32.8 44.2 0.1 100.0 CHI SOUARE = 25.70134 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0003CRAMER'S V = 0.17769

** CROSSTABULATION OF ******* OSA PAY GRADE-RESP. BY 225 LENGTH OF GEOGRAPHIC SEPARATION 026 COUNTI ROW PCT INO 1-6 7-12 13-1819-2425-3031-3637 ROW COL PCT ISEP MOS MOS MOS MOS MOS PLUS TOTAL TOT PCT I 0.I 1.I 2.I 3.I 4.I 5.I 6.I 7.I99. I 08A----I---I----I----I----I----I----I 1. I 92I 146I 112I 11I 18I 0I 4I 1I 0 I 384 ENLISTEDI24.0138.0129.21 2.91 4.71 0.01 1.01 0.310.0 1 49.5 . 169.2146.6145.5135.5152.91 0.0144.4133.310.0 I I11.9I18.8I14.5I 1.4I 2.3I 0.0I 0.5I0.1 IO.0 I 2.I 41I 167I 134I 20I 16I 2I 5I 2I 4 I 391 OFFICER I10.5142.7134.31 5.11 4.11 0.51 1.31 0.511.0 I 50.5 I30.8153.4154.5164.5147.11100.155.6166.71100.1 I 5.3I21.5I17.3I 2.6I 2.1I 0.3I 0.6I 0.3I 0.5I I----I----I----I----I----I----I COLUMN 133 313 246 31 34 2 9 3 4 775 FOTAL 17.2 40.4 31.7 4.0 4.4 0.3 1.2 0.4 0.5 100.0 CHI SQUARE = 32.04709 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM. SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001CRAMER'S V = 0.20335

* * C R O S S O10 RESP. YEARS CONTROLLING FOR. 08A PAY GRADE OF * * * * * * * A T D UTY о вч T A B U L ON ACTIVE N 225 O F * * LENGTH OF ネ * * I * * * * SEPARATION RESPONDENT FICER 2* VALUE Ξ OF ٠ * ¥ * * * * * * * * Q26 COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT Q10-----INO 1-6 ISEP MOS I 0.1 ROW MOS 7. TOTAL 7. I 99. 0 I 2 0 J 1.0 0 J 50.0 0 J 10.5 - I - - -0 I 1 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 J 2 0 I 208 53.2 124 31.7 0.310.010.31 2.11111 4.012.012.01 40.0150.0125.01 0.510.310.31 0.0112.510.01 0.0150.010.01 0.0150.010.01 0.0150.010.01 0.010.010.01 0.010.010.01 0.010.010.01 0.010.010.01 0.010.010.01 0.010.010.01 0.010.010.01 50 12.8 2.0 0.3 - I --I----4 391 1.0 100.0

LIST OF REFERENCES

Suter, Della J. The Two-Career Family in the Navy, Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraluate School, Monterey, 1979. S2. Family Research and Analysis, Inc. Report, A Demographic Profile of U.S. Personnel and Families, by D.K. Orthner and R.S. Nelson, August 1980. Henderson, Harlan, <u>Dual Career Families Within the</u> <u>Coast Guard Officer Corps</u>, Masters' Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, 1981. Houk, Linda D., <u>A Comparison of Attitudes in</u> <u>Dual-Career Air Force Families</u>, Masters' Thesis, Force Institute of Fechnology, WPAFB Ohio, 1980. Air Department of Defense, <u>Department of Defense Personnel</u> <u>Manual</u>, 9 August 1982. 5. Blalock, H.M. Jr., <u>Methodology</u> in <u>Social Research</u>, McGraw-Hill, 1968. 6. Wonnacott, T.H. and Wonnacott, R.J., Introductory Statistics, 3d ed., John Wiley and Sons, 1977. 7. Nie, N.H. and others, <u>SPSS</u>, 2ri ed., McGraw-Hill, 1975. 8. Department of Defense, Joint Travel Regulations, 1 June 1982. 9. Department of the Army, Army Regulations, 15 December 1981. 10. 11. United States Code, Fitle 37. 12. Department of the Navy, <u>Navy Military Personnel</u> <u>Manual</u>, 23 June 1981.

205



INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

| | | No. | Copies |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--------|
| 1. | Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314 | | 2 |
| 2. | Library Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940 | | 2 |
| 3. | Department Chairman, Code 54 Department of Administrative Sciences Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940 | | 1 |
| 4. | Professor Richard S. Elster, Cole 54Ae Department of Administrative Sciences Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940 | | 1 |
| 5. | LT Paul N. Hixenbaugh 4661 Revere Drive Virginia Beach, Virginia 23455 | | 4 |
| б. | ENS. James P. Kout Office of the Chief of Information Navy Department Washington, DC 20350 | | 1 |
| 7. | Robert F. Lockman Center for Naval Analyses Post Office Box 11280 Alexandria, Virginia 22311 | | 1 |
| 8. | Samuel B. Landau, Phd Naval Personnel Research and Development Center Code 15 San Diego, California 92152 | | 1 |
| 9. | LT J.L. Brittain Post Office Box 49 Navy Drug Rehabilitation Senter Naval Air Station Misamar San Diego, California 92145 | | 1 |
| 10. | LT C.L. Jones Human Resouce Management Jenter Norfolk, Virginia 23539 | | 1 |
| 11. | LT L.A. Blair Air Operations Naval Air Station Oceana Virginia Beach, Virginia 23460 | | 1 |
| 12. | LCDR Kitty Chamberlain Commander Mine Warefare Command N21 Charleston, South Carolina 29403 | | 1 |



| 13. | Lt M.S. Brittain 10822 Cariuto Court San Diego, California 92124 | 1 |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 14. | LCDR M.P. Batchellor Commander in Chief Pacific Box 29 Camp Smith, Hawaii 95361 | 1 |
| 15. | YN1 JoAnn Jones Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, California 90740 | 1 |
| 16. | CDR William J. Lash Department of the Navy Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-132H4) Washington, DC 20350 | 1 |
| 17. | LCDR J. Baldwin Department of the Navy Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-134D3) Washington, DC 20350 | 2 |
| 18. | Military Family Resource Center 6501 Loisdale Court Suite 900 Springfield, Virginia 22150 | 1 |
| 19. | CDR William D. McClellan Code 1210 Naval Research Laboratory 4555 Overlook Avenue, S.W. Washington, DC 20375 | 1 |
| 20. | LCDR R.F. Munsey Naval Safety Center Naval Air Station Norfolk Norfolk, Virginia 23511 | 1 |
| 21. | LTJG M. Eyre Family Support Program Naval Military Personnel Commani (NMPC-66) Washington, D.C. 2037) | 2 |
| 22. | Professor R.A. Weitznan, Code 54Wz Department of Administrative Sciences Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940 | 2 |







200032

Thesis

3

.H5826 Hixenbaugh c.l The effects of personnel policies on the retention of service couples.

