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ABSTRACT

Two-career couples are studied and compared with military families having either a one-career/one-job lifestyle or a single-income lifestyle. The purpose of the study is to determine differences in attitudes and behavior of families with the two-career lifestyle concerning their career intentions, career satisfaction and family services needs.

A random sample of 459 married Naval officers was studied in the initial survey. The follow-up study involved 55 military members and 47 civilian spouses.

It is found that two-career families were significantly different from one-career/one-job or single-income families in age, rank, designator, career intentions and family service needs. Transfers are the number one problem for two-career families. It is concluded that both the Navy and these families would benefit from adaptation of current transfer policies to the needs and desires of the more non-traditional career/family lifestyles.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The two-career family, one in which both spouses pursue careers as well as family roles, is emerging as a more prevalent lifestyle among Naval officers as it is in the larger American society. In the Naval officer population two-career families include officers married to other service members. Also, two-career families include a large portion of officers with career-oriented civilian spouses. This thesis examines this Naval officer population and explores the possible implications of the two-career family lifestyle upon both the families and the Navy organization.

Although 96 percent of all Naval officer's families consist of male officers with civilian wives, both joint-spouse\(^1\) couples and female officers with civilian husbands will be included in the research presented in this thesis.

A. BACKGROUND

Before World War II, the military services were

\(^{1}\) The term "joint-spouse" refers to military members married to other military members.
primarily made up of single personnel. Even officers\textsuperscript{2} were discouraged from marrying until they were 30 to 35 years old. As an officer became more senior, a wife became important to his social life, and he usually married. These military families were expected to withstand the inconveniences of inadequate living quarters and isolation, and were afforded few considerations in military policies or programs (Goldman, 1976).

Compared to the percentages of married people in the civilian population, there has always been a high percentage of married personnel in the Naval officer population. The percentages of Naval officers who were married increased from 78.3 percent in 1953 to 80.9 percent in 1972 while within the civilian population, the percentage of married males 18 years of age or older increased from 68 percent in 1950 to 74.8 percent in 1972 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1974; Department of Defense and Statistical Abstract, 1974 cited in Goldman, 1976).

The differences in percentages between married personnel in the military and those in the civilian population may be partially due to the fact that marriage has always been important to the male officer's career advancement, and divorce has always been detrimental (Goldman, 1976).

\textsuperscript{2}"Officers" refers to male officers before World War II. Women were allowed to marry, but were considered "auxiliaries" until 1942 when the WAVES, Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service, were established. It wasn't until 1947 that Navy nurses were designated as either enlisted or officer.
Also, the percentages stated for the civilian population were not controlled for ages congruent with the military population.

More recent figures show that the military still exceeds the civilian population in its proportion of married personnel. In 1978 the total married population of the United States was 57 percent (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978). Within the Navy the percentage of married officers was 70 percent (Hunter, 1978). The research which will be presented in this thesis indicates that as of July 1978, 73 percent of all Naval officers were married.\(^3\)

Growth in the number of women in the services has also introduced a new dimension in military families. Until 1973, when the Department of Defense started to expand women's programs in the services, women comprised less than 2 percent of the total military force (Binkin, 1977). Traditionally, these few women remained single and childless. Women were generally encouraged to leave the service and policies made it easy for them to do so if they married or became pregnant.\(^4\) Since 1973 the status of women in the services has changed dramatically, providing virtually equal status in all respects except combat

\(^3\)This percentage was provided by the Naval Personnel Research Development Center as a result of an analysis of the BUPERS Master file 1978.

\(^4\)Until 1975 Navy policy stated that women in dependency status (having a dependent under the age of 18 in the women's household more than 30 days a year) or pregnancy status would not generally be allowed to enter or remain in the Naval services (BUPERSMAN, 1974).
duty. Women who marry and have children now stay on active duty and are encouraged to leave only under extreme hardship conditions.

The number of women officers in the Navy is expected to increase. By January 1979, the number of female officers in the Navy was 4050, 6.5 percent of the total Naval officer population. The total projected strength for women officers in 1983 is 5000, approximately 7 percent of the total projected end strength for all Naval officers (Office for Women's Programs, NMPC, Washington D.C., 1979).

Marital status of women officers has not been of great interest in the literature published regarding military women. However, in a January 1979 analysis of all female Officer Data Cards by the Naval Manpower Personnel Center (NMPC), formerly BUPERS, it was found that 24 percent of women officers were married. These figures show that the proportion of female officers who are married is substantially lower than the proportion of married females in the total civilian population.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1977), the proportion of married women in the female population was 59 percent, while their

5 This figure is estimated to be very conservative. Officer Data Cards are required to be updated approximately six months after reporting to each successive duty station and therefore may not accurately reflect proportions of married women officers.
proportion in the female labor force was 57 percent. Although female officers are less likely to be married than male officers, they are more likely than male officers to have a spouse who has a career.

There is a trend toward non-traditional, two-career families (Department of Labor Statistics, 1977). With a large proportion of married personnel and a trend toward non-traditional two-career couples, the Navy must now direct its attention to the possible implications of the family lifestyles of its people upon the organization. Additionally, as a major social institution, the Navy has a moral obligation to also give consideration to the effects of its decisions and policies upon the family unit.

B. TRENDS IN AMERICAN FAMILIES IN THE LABOR FORCE

Trends in the U.S. labor force have moved toward increasing numbers of two-career families. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, in nearly half of all families in 1976, both the husband and the wife were wage-earners. In the labor force the total number of married women tripled between 1950 and 1976. Although the percentage of married women in the female population had dropped from 65 percent in 1950 to 59 percent in 1976, the proportion of married women in the female labor force rose from 49 to 57 percent. There are no comparable figures for the military services. However,

---

6 "Two-earner families" is a standard term used by the Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics which indicates two full-time employed members of a family.
it has been shown in other demographic studies that the military population often follows the same social trends as the larger civilian society. (Hunter and Nice, 1978).

C. TRENDS IN MILITARY FAMILIES

An Army study in 1971 found that 22.1 percent of the Army officers' wives and 39 percent of the Army enlisted men's wives worked (Bennett et al., 1974 cited in Goldman, 1976). In the civilian population, only 22.9 percent of all married women were in the labor force in 1950, and 45.7 percent in 1976.7

Traditionally, fewer military wives than married women in the civilian population have worked outside the home (Goldman, 1976; Stanton, 1976). Several factors may be considered which effect the percentage of Naval officer's wives who work. Some of the reasons which may contribute to a lower percentage of Naval officers' wives who work may be: (1) that at any given time a percentage of those wives are moving and probably changing jobs and (2) that a percentage of those wives are overseas and (3) that many military wives may become discouraged from working because of the frequent moves. On the other hand, two

characteristics common to Naval officers' wives are (1) a generally high level of education and (2) a generally middle income family. These are also characteristics most common to women who work outside the home.

Another trend which has recently concerned the services is the increasing number of marriages between service members. One Navy study indicates that 3000 Navy women are married to other active duty members (Hunter, 1978). The Air Force has had at least one study related to the two-career family which indicates 14,000 active-duty members married to other active duty members, and 2300 of those are officers (Williams, 1978). An Air Force study has compared the percentages of the total force who are married to civilians, broken down by male and female service members. While 61 percent of the total force consists of male servicemen with civilian wives only 1 percent of the total force consists of servicewomen with civilian husbands (Orthner in print, 1979). Among Air Force officers, 32 percent of all females are married to civilian men while 82 percent of all males are married to civilian women. Overall, Orthner concludes that Air Force women who marry are very likely to marry other active duty members. He found in his study of all Air Force women who marry, 77.5 percent of them marry military men.
These marriages, commonly referred to as "joint spouse" couples present a new dimension in the relationship between the family and the military organization. Although these couples express some of the same problems that military families have dealt with for years, there is a new twist: the military organization now has to consider the needs of a non-traditional family and if conflicts are not resolved satisfactorily, the organization may lose one and possibly two productive members.

D. TRENDS IN THE ROLE OF WOMEN

The changing roles of women have opened up an untapped source of military manpower. Because of society's changing norms, the Navy will gain a population of women officers willing to commit themselves to their work and less willing to allow the pressures of combined family responsibilities to overshadow their careers. The trend toward more female professionals is becoming more prevalent among Naval officers wives as well.

When the Navy wife is committed to her career, she may not be available, as the military organization has always assumed she would be, to assume total family and home management responsibilities when the military man is called away. The couple may not consider the female's career second in priority, and there may be times when the male member will need to make adjustments to his work
schedule to accommodate family needs or her career demands. Because of these changes in women's roles, two-career military families may be less flexible to variable and long working hours of the military member. More importantly, the family may be less able to withstand frequent family separations and transfers (Hunter, 1978).

As the Navy assigns more women to non-traditional jobs, i.e., billets aboard ships and air squadrons, serious concerns for the families of women arise. The Navy perceives family situations in a different light when the family is that of a female service member. In the past, some leaders have been very lenient in bending the rules for women. In some cases women have been offered jobs closer to home, more flexible working hours and often more understanding when they needed time off to attend to problems at home. Although men are occasionally afforded similar considerations, it has been generally acceptable for men to routinely ask for special treatment for the convenience of the family—thus, the old cliche, "If the Navy had wanted you to have a wife, they would have issued you one."

E. REASONS FOR THE CHANGE IN FAMILY LIFESTYLES

Society has actually paved the way for the increase in two-career families. Equal opportunity standards have opened up opportunities for women in non-traditional
fields and provided educational opportunities for women to develop careers according to their individual interests. Improved medical knowledge and changing social mores have allowed couples to plan their families, delay having children or to choose not to have children at all. Technological improvements have made homemaking and childcare less demanding. When other family members are willing to share household chores, many women find it comfortable and desirable to combine homemaking with a career outside the home.

From an economic point of view, two professionals can more easily afford the rising standard of living in the United States. The U.S. League of Savings Associations reports that 45 percent of all 1977 home buyers were two-earner families. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, the median income for two-earner families is $20,400, or $7,200 above that of one-earner families (Time Magazine, August 1978). The desire to purchase homes, now frequently priced over $100,000, provides an additional incentive for both members of a couple to pursue employment. Once a couple is accustomed to the double income, they may not be motivated or financially able to give up the second income, even if they decide to have children, or even if it means temporary separations and difficult relocations.

An additional motivating factor for maintaining a two-career family is the individual satisfaction gained by both members pursuing careers of their own.
F. THE TWO-CAREER FAMILY IN THE NAVAL OFFICER COMMUNITY: WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO THE ORGANIZATION?

Little attention has been given to the ability of Naval officers to integrate family life and career. However, it is well known that the quality of family life is often mentioned as a reason for leaving the service (Goodstadt 1974; Thomas, 1977). In a broad view, the Navy may need to evaluate its assumptions about military families and what kinds of demands it can continue to make upon its people.

The Navy may not be able to continue to make the same kinds of demands upon military officers whose families include a spouse with a career and priorities of his or her own. Continued demands for long hours, frequent family separations and transfers may be too expensive in manpower losses if officers view these realities as dilemmas and opt out.

Fair and equitable policies and regulations covering two-career situations have not been formally established. Policies appear to be made up as situations arise and often each couple must be treated on a case-by-case basis. As the rules are bent for each case, many single service members express resentment for this special treatment.

The Navy has not resolved some very hard questions. For example: to what degree should the Navy consider civilian spouses' careers? To what degree should the Navy
become concerned about children who may be left alone if the military member or members of a household are required to spend time away from the home? Are there alternatives to the present practice of transferring all Naval officers every two to three years? Can deployments be shortened?  

In the process of integrating large numbers of women into the service, the Navy is experiencing social conflicts which are not easily resolved. Some researchers now are evaluating the monetary costs of assigning women to ships and its effect on recruiting and retention. However, by the time these studies have reached policy makers, the Navy will have already assigned women to several ships and it will be too late to do anything about the recruiting problems if any arise.

Other questions in the minds of Navy leaders are: to what degree the American society will tolerate large numbers of women being required to perform duties which take them away from their families and, to what degree will women commit themselves to their careers if they are faced with conflicts between career and family.

A larger problem is: How many men will be willing to continue to commit themselves to their Naval careers if there are conflicts with the civilian spouse's career?

8(This latter question is tied to some very large budget considerations. Shorter deployments require a larger number of ships and personnel if the Navy is to maintain its commitments.)
This thesis will not attempt to answer all these questions, but it will provide descriptive data concerning the married Naval officer population and some insight into their attitudes toward the Navy, their family life and their continued service.

G. STRUCTURE OF THESIS

1. Chapter 1: Introduction

The introduction defined the two-career military family, provided some background on the social evolution of American families and military families, and described the impact of changing roles of civilian and military women upon military families. It also provided a broad view of the impact of non-traditional two-career families upon the military organization. It was stated that the purpose of this thesis is not to find solutions to all the possible problems associated with two-career military families, but is to provide descriptive data about the married Naval officer population and their attitudes toward the Navy, their families and their career intentions.

2. Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The review of the literature includes two background areas of social change: (1) American family lifestyles and (2) changing roles of women. The literature concerning military families, women in the military, military wives, and retention of officers is reviewed and
reported. An overview is also provided of two-career family studies associated with various civilian professions. Lastly, current written policies concerning military families and joint-spouse couples are reviewed.

3. Chapter 3: Current U.S. Navy Family Policies

The third chapter will provide a review of the most recent revisions to past policies and a summary of new policies and programs which have been established to improve family life. These changes reflect a favorable response from the Navy in regard to the increasing demands for family considerations. Several of the areas which the Navy has addressed include: family information needs, a family agency for monitoring the effects of Navy policies upon families, family health needs, officer assignment policies and considerations for working spouses.

4. Chapter 4: Method

The purpose, underlying assumptions and strategy of the thesis will be described in detail in Chapter 4. Procedures for selecting the samples for the initial survey and the follow-up survey will be outlined. To illustrate the representativeness of the samples they will be described in terms of return rates and rank distribution. The method of analysis to be utilized in the findings chapter provides an overview of the author's intent in the use of the survey questionnaires.
5. Chapter 5: Findings

The findings are presented in two sections. The first section of the findings presents the results of an analysis of the initial survey questionnaires. In this section two-career families are compared with families having a one-career/one-job lifestyle and families with the traditional single-income lifestyle. Differences or the absence of differences in responses between family lifestyles are highlighted. The intent is to show how families according to lifestyle differ in their attitudes and behavior toward the military services, family services needs and degree of satisfaction with the military careers and family life.

The follow-up study, focusing exclusively on two-career families, consists of two questionnaires. One is for the military member and one is for the civilian spouse. Each was analyzed to gather more specific data concerning two-career families. Additionally, excerpts from the comments offered by respondents are presented to allow the reader to draw some conclusions of his own.

6. Chapter 6: Recommendations

The recommendations and suggestions offered in the concluding chapter are based upon the data findings presented in this thesis. The recommendations which would require Navy-wide policy changes are offered for consideration by the Chief of Naval Personnel. Suggestions directed toward improving retention efforts at the local
command level are provided for review by Commanding Officers. Finally, thoughts concerning directions for future research are submitted.
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Selected background readings for the study of two-career families were chosen in two areas associated with social change: American family lifestyles and changing roles of American women. A number of written materials concerning military families, wives of servicemen and women in the military were reviewed. The subject of two-career families in the military included only three published articles which focused on: joint-spouse couples, career orientation and volunteer service of Army wives and the career versus job syndrome. The remaining articles included a diverse group of contemporary studies of two-career families associated with various civilian professions. To help relate the two-career family and its implications to manpower in the Navy, two primary areas of concern were researched, utilization of women and retention.

A. THE FAMILY IN A CHANGING SOCIETY

1. Changing Family Mission and Structure

In the United States families have evolved from large agrarian economic units with traditional roles for each member to urban households where members are generally
fewer in numbers, less dependent upon one another, and more likely to have different priorities and values.

Never before has a society consisted of so many types of family lifestyles. Burgess (1973) writes that families in the American society are showing some distinctive characteristics and trends. He says the families are more mobile and adaptable to rapid social change, are adopting the urban lifestyle, are placing less emphasis on the role of religion, more emphasis on material comforts and are more likely to be separated by divorce. Today, the family centers on intrinsic functions of family life and relies on the society to provide the extrinsic functions such as education, religious training, protection and economic production, once performed by the family unit.

A special report by Newsweek (May 15, 1978) entitled "Saving the Family", addressed current trends in American family living. Different types of families are examined--traditional nuclear families, farm families, combined families of previously divorced parents, black families and clan and commune families. The article maintains that although new family lifestyles may not closely resemble the traditional family in appearance, they are equally as strong. The assertion is made that government and civilian employers are now looking for ways to support rather than supplant the family.
2. Changing Roles of Women in the Labor Force

The changing roles of women have had a considerable impact upon both families and the workplace. The U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1977) reports several interesting statistics which reflect the current trends in the female labor force.

66 percent of married women in the work force with children under the age of 3 worked full time in 1976.

Nearly half (46 percent) of the children under age 18 had mothers in the labor force in 1976, up from 39 percent in 1970.

Of the children 3 to 13 whose mothers were in the labor force, more than 3 out of 5 were cared for by a parent when they were not in school.

In 1976 both the birth rate and the fertility rate was the lowest ever recorded in the United States.

Women are attaining higher levels of education and pursuing more professional, managerial and administrative careers. Also, the more education women have, the more likely they are to be in the labor force. (Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1977).

The Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that 6 percent of the nation's working women are managers and administrators and 10 percent are professionals. Another 6 percent are school teachers. It is predicted that 13 percent of all professionals will be women by 1985.
3. **Changing Roles of Men**

Men's roles are also changing. Men whose spouses work are more able to make mid-career changes, say "No" when promotions depend on relocations which interrupt the family or the spouse's career and are less willing to give single-minded devotion to their career (series of articles on changing roles of men and women in The Wall Street Journal, September 1978). Men are also more likely to participate in homemaking and childcare tasks (Newsweek, January 16, 1978).

These changes in men's and women's roles in society are having an impact upon organizations. Organizations are responding with more flexible working hours, relaxed policies concerning required relocations and some are even subsidizing childcare facilities. However, the majority of organizations lag behind. (Annual Report of Carnegie Corporation, 1976). Companies have found that by helping couples resolve family conflicts they have generally benefited by gaining people who are highly committed to staying with the organization and also, in the process, have generated positive attitudes toward the company (Hall and Hall, 1976).
B. MILITARY FAMILIES

1. Past Military Family Research

In the book, *Families in the Military System*, edited by McCubbin, Dahl and Hunter (1976), a comprehensive review of military family research from 1940 to 1975 is provided. Most of the topics covered during that time included mobility, child adjustment and development, adjustment of separation, family reunion and re-integration, adjustment to loss, families in transition, and services to families under stress. Prior to this book, most family research studies assumed traditional family patterns and were directed toward coping styles of families in a rigid unchanging military. Also contained within this book is an annotated bibliography of research on the military family which was extremely helpful.

In an historical review of military families, Goldman (1976) found that the military services are highly familistic institutions, in contrast to a century ago when the services were almost entirely made up of single personnel, and were very little concerned about the welfare of military families. With the institution of the all-volunteer force, the services have come to offer benefits which make the military particularly attractive to men with families. In the future, the services will be dealing with increasingly younger families who have fewer children. Goldman (1976) indicates that the changing characteristics of the military families
are an added dimension of the context of the new trends in the military profession.

In a review of military families, past and future trends in relation to family trends in the civilian society were reviewed by Stanton (1976). He indicated that the family had not gained much attention in the policy-making levels. He predicts that it is likely that more families will have either both spouses on active duty or the husband will qualify as a dependent. Although increasing numbers of military wives were taking jobs to supplement their income (Steiger, 1971 cited in Stanton, 1976), Stanton predicted that those numbers might level off with the increases in military pay which were granted shortly after instituting the all-volunteer force. Stanton made several recommendations intended to help resolve some of the conflicts between families and the military organization. First, he suggested that families serve as primary units for management decisions. He proposed an agency at the Department of Defense level which could exert influence in the areas of family health, adaptation and welfare. He felt that adolescent dependents were affected most severely by relocation and recommended that Defense policy should minimize reassignments for families with adolescents. He also recommended several counseling and health programs for military families.
2. Military Wives and the Feminist Movement

Dobrofsky (1977) addresses the status of military wives, traditionally referred to as "dependents," and their trend toward becoming more individualistic with values and priorities of their own. In evaluating the roles of military couples in the past, she says that there were only two roles, "...warrior and warrior's wife." She points up the large degree of dependence of the military organization upon the military wife who has always been available to head the household when the husband had to be away.

Researchers (McCubbin, Dahl and Hunter, 1976; Finlayson, 1976; Dobrofsky, 1977; Thomas, 1977) have all referred to the changing roles of women relative to the feminist movement and its possible impact upon the military wife and her willingness to continue to fill the traditional wife role. Although research (Dobrofsky & Batterson, 1976 cited in Dobrofsky, 1977) indicates little effect of the feminist movement on military wives overall, she predicts that officers' wives, being most closely identifiable with civilian women who are pro-feminist, are most likely to become significantly effected. Because of officers' wives' generally high level of education, they are most likely to pursue equal treatment in the communities in which they live.
3. **How Military Wives Cope**

The coping styles of military wives associated with the problems of extended separations and reunions may be expected to change with the effects of the women's awareness movement. The result may be negative in its effect upon the stability of military marriages (Worthington, 1977).

Studies of POW families (McCubbin, Dahl, Metres, Hunter and Plag, 1974; Webster, Hunter and Palermo, 1977) found that after long separations, some up to nine years, POW families experienced difficulties in adjusting to changed roles of the wife. During the long separation wives became extremely independent, providing for and managing households in their husbands' absences, and as a result found relinquishing this status somewhat difficult. Although normal separations are rarely more than one year in length, some of the same effects are seen in today's military couples. Although little empirical data has specifically validated or invalidated the effects of wives' attitudes and coping abilities upon performance and retention of servicemen, researchers have suggested that investigation from this perspective might be significant. (McCubbin, 1977; Thomas, 1977).

In an anthropological field research project conducted with career-oriented submariners' wives, Snyder (1977) found that the wives coping behavior was quite
successful. She found that these submariners' wives actually went through two non-coping periods, one at the first separation and one associated with what she identified as a mid-life transition. She found that these wives experienced a mid-life transition between the ages of 30 and 35. The transition was characterized by having completed their family size, increased responsibilities of the traditional role the woman was expected to play, increased leisure time, and ambivalence toward the husband's time-consuming position. She found that as the wives began to solve their mid-life crises they began to separate themselves from the Navy. When it came time for their husbands to retire, many times the wife had already partially completed her transition into the civilian society.

4. Military Wives: Career Orientation Versus Navy Wife Role

Officers' wives often have high levels of education. They also have a good deal of time when husbands are absent in which to pursue further education or careers. A study of Army officers' wives found that 80 percent had some education beyond high school and approximately 40 percent had earned bachelor's degrees. The study also found that although few officers' wives were employed, many indicated that they were interested in employment in the future. Also, those wives with higher degrees of
education were most likely to have careers outside the home (Finlayson, 1976).

The trend today is toward increasing numbers of these career seeking wives. Society has provided avenues for careers, and the educational opportunities to support them. Navy wives, as civilian women, are also looking for their own personal identity and fulfillment through careers of their own. Often now, these wives may earn more and prove to have more lucrative careers than their husbands.

Both advantages and disadvantages exist for the military wife pursuing a career. Finlayson (1976) found that problems of career-oriented women centered around the loss of benefits—salary, fringe, seniority—caused by transfers; the differences in establishing any sort of a career; the lack of uniformity in state licensing and certification requirements which necessitated requalifying for employment, and discrimination by potential employers because of the transient existence of the military family. Snyder (1977) suggested that career interest of wives facilitated smoother transitions from the military to the civilian life upon retirement by drawing the wife away from the encompassing military community and allowing her to associate herself with the civilian way of life.

In her personal account, Scott (1978), an Army wife, describes the dilemmas she faced trying to maintain
a satisfying career while she moved about with her husband to each new duty station. In her article she says that although she has given up her career aspirations for the time, she has managed to continue to grow professionally and personally. She points out many of the problems of career-oriented wives, which for many spell divorce or at least serious marital problems. Although it is popular belief that nursing or teaching are ideal careers for a military wife, the fact is that while she frequently finds work, she rarely achieves promotions or the desirable positions she might if she did not have to move every two or three years. These wives often accept jobs below their capabilities and lose pay and retirement benefits each time they move. The women's awareness movement has fostered women's beliefs that they too have an independent competitive and contributing place in society, and for these women the military way of life can be very frustrating.

Scott additionally gives some advice to husbands and wives. To the wives she says: get involved, strive for your own identity, and make the best of the opportunities at each duty station. She tells husbands to recognize their wives' need for self esteem and outside recognition, show an interest in what she does and, above all, be honest and treat her like an intelligent woman.
5. Families of Military Women

Since the end of the draft in 1973, considerable interest and concern has been expressed about the utilization of women as a possible solution to the increased manpower needs of the all-volunteer force (Hoiberg, 1978). Integrating large numbers of women into the military introduces further ramifications of military families upon the service. Problems of significant numbers of joint-spouse families and increased mid-career attrition problems may become paramount (Landrum, 1978). Additionally, increasing numbers of married military women leads to increases in pregnancies in the service. Although policies now authorize continued service, pregnant women cannot be assigned to do certain jobs; i.e., pilots cannot fly when they are pregnant. Families of military women will be less flexible to regular transfers because of their working spouses. These families are also likely to require more family services such as day care for children (Thomas, 1977).

The military must consider what kinds of demands American social norms will allow the services to make upon women. In particular, the military must assess the effects of increased family services needs and the cost of considering families when making management policies and decisions. The degree to which the military is able to provide a satisfactory level of family living for women
may have a large impact upon the women's choice to enter and remain in the service. Binkin (1977) postulates that the future of the all-volunteer force may depend on how effectively the female labor resources are employed.

6. **Joint Spouse Couples**

The integration of large numbers of women officers into the Navy has brought about a relatively new phenomenon in Naval officer manpower planning, the joint-spouse couple. Reasons for the increase in military members who marry each other and choose the two-career family lifestyle are the same as many of the reasons civilian couples choose this lifestyle. Williams (1978) lists career opportunities for women, a society more accepting of women in the working environment and more social acceptance of day-care centers for children as major factors in the trend toward two-career lifestyles. He also mentions inflation and the need for two incomes for many families.

One aspect which makes the military career particularly attractive to women is that sex discrimination is not as much a factor in military pay as it is in civilian pay (Binkin, 1977). The Bureau of Census in *The Income Disparities Between Men and Women in the United States* (1978 Almanac) indicates that the mean annual income for white females with eighteen or more years of education is $11,384, and only 12.5 percent of these females make over
$15,000 a year. It is significant to note that by the fifth year of active military service women officers' base pay exceeds the great majority of their counterparts' salaries in civilian business, i.e., a Navy Lieutenant with 5 years of active duty earns $15,364.80 plus living allowances, a total of $18,717.96. Retention of women officers in the Navy is higher than that for men, 47 percent compared with 44 percent respectively. 9

In his research, Williams (1978) concluded that there were several common difficulties that the joint-spouse couples faced which placed them at a particular disadvantage regarding family life. Specific problems of dual-military career couples which Williams discussed were: the necessity to move geographically for career advancement, the expectation by the organization that certain jobs held by men demand that wives devote time and energy to entertaining and supporting volunteer services, the demand for single-minded devotion to work on the part of the service member and the difficulties in raising children.

Dual-military career couples also introduce problems for the organization. Some of those are: the need for joint assignments, career progression at the more senior levels, absence of the "corporate wife" to fill the

9 Figures received from Head, Women Officers Programs, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.
institutionalized role of the senior Naval officer's wife (Williams, 1978).

Other problems the Navy may need to consider are how to compensate for time loss of women officers who are pregnant. Simpson (1979) states that plans now indicate an increase in female contingents onboard selected Naval vessels to 25 percent. He says that 8 percent of all service women are pregnant at one time. On a small Naval ship, one or two pregnant officers could create a major manpower shortage among the officers. Current policies, programs and regulations addressing these subjects will be covered in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

7. Recognition of the Family

Publications resulting from the Military Family Research Conference on current trends and directions held in San Diego in 1977, demonstrate that military leaders recognize the importance of seriously considering the family as an integral factor in military decision making. The conference, hosted by the Family Studies Branch of the Naval Health Research Center, San Diego and the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, was the first time that researchers and top level military leaders had come together to discuss what had been done and what needed to be done in the future. This conference was attended by VADM Watkins, USN, Chief of Naval Personnel at that time; ADM Elmo Zumwalt, former Chief of Naval Operations;
RADM D. Earl Brown, MC, USN, then Commanding Officer of the Naval Regional Medical Center, San Diego; and RADM John J. O' Connor, CHC, USN, Chief of Navy Chaplains. A summary of the accomplishments of the conference reflected that it had provided an opportunity to examine the entire spectrum of military family research—what had been done, what was being done then and the directions such research should pursue in the future (Hunter, 1978). It was found that many of the factors often thought of as unique to the military, such as separations and frequent relocations, are also common to many civilian families. Consequently, studies of military families and studies of civilian families have a large degree of mutual applicability (Hunter, 1978).

Recommendations resulting from the conference addressed development of better means of keeping track of, assessing, and disseminating research results to the right people.

In November 1978, The Family Awareness Conference, sponsored by the Bureau of Naval Personnel and the Navy League was held in Norfolk. This time the emphasis was placed on bringing large numbers of Navy personnel, Navy wives, family services volunteer and support personnel, Navy Chaplains and Commanding Officers together with military family researchers and top decision makers to address the status of families in the Navy. Again, high level interest was indicated with participation.
by the Honorable Graham Claytor, Secretary of the Navy, ADM Thomas B. Hayward, Chief of Naval Operations, and VADM Robert B. Baldwin, Chief of Naval Personnel. Other high level policy-makers included the Surgeon General, Chief of Chaplains, and the Commander-in-Chief Atlantic Fleet. Essentially, each of these speakers requested that the participants of the conference come together to formulate recommendations for actions which might improve family life. ADM Hayward discussed retention and readiness as they relate not only to the satisfaction of the individual in uniform but also to the civilian spouse's attitude. What motivates men to stay in the Navy has a lot to do with the attitude of the wife, and we have not given enough attention to the satisfaction of the wives in the Navy. He ended by urging the participants of the conference to work on all those things that are critical to family life.10

Awareness presentations, workshops and reporting sessions were held. Recommendations for improving family life and ultimately providing personnel who are better prepared to meet the Navy's manpower demands were compiled and submitted to the Chief of Naval Personnel (series of articles in Navy Times Magazine, November through March).

10Taken from ADM Hayward's address at the Family Awareness Conference, November 9, 1978, from author's notes.
C. TWO-CAREER FAMILIES

Since 1970 the two-career family\textsuperscript{11} literature has evolved from descriptive studies primarily focussed upon the families (Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport, 1970; Bailyn, 1970; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971) to studies addressing the organizational, social and economic impact of two-career families upon the society (Hayghe, 1976; Hall and Hall, 1978).

Interest in the two-career family has grown with the increased incidence of women in the workforce. Popular literature has publicized the growing numbers of two-career families and the subsequent problems of both families and organizations as a result of the new lifestyle (Newsweek, May 15, 1978; Time Magazine, August 21, 1978; the Wall Street Journal, September 13, 1978; Washington Post, April 8-9, 1979).

Reasons for the increased numbers of two-career families vary. Hayghe (1976), in a study of working wives, found in a review of labor statistics reports that the majority of married women worked because of financial necessity. Reasons which followed in importance were personal satisfaction and extra money. However, for married women who have careers, as opposed to temporary gainful employment, financial gain may not be a motivating

\textsuperscript{11}For the purpose of this paper, the terms "two-career families" and "dual-career families" are synonymous.
factor. In a study of continuous dual-career families, St. John-Parsons (1978) found that financial gain was not of motivational significance and that the dual-career pattern was not always financially rewarding. Additional forces mentioned in the literature which contribute to the emerging two-career lifestyle are: women's search for personal fulfillment outside the home and technological improvements which have made homemaking less demanding (Hall and Hall, 1970).

1. Descriptions and Categories of Two-career Families

Two early studies which described and categorized two-career families laid the foundation for many studies to follow (Bailyn, 1970; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971).

The Rapoports defined the two-career family as:

...one in which both heads of household pursue careers and at the same time maintain a family life together.

They defined work/family patterns according to the female's orientation toward her career.

**Conventional:** The woman drops her career when she marries or has children and concentrates on being a housewife with no intention to return to work.

**Interrupted:** The woman may drop work for a period when her children are small but intends to resume it eventually.

**Continuous:** The woman interrupts her work only minimally or not at all if she has children.
Family types were described according to the two-career couples' career/family commitment (Bailyn, 1970; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971).

**Careerist couples:** both emphasize career only

**Conventional couples:** the wife emphasizes family only and the husband emphasizes career

**Familistic couples:** both emphasize family as their major source of satisfaction

**Coordinate couples:** both value family and career

In a study by Hall and Hall (1978) which discussed how two-career couples and organizations coped, it was found that couples could be divided according to career stages. They categorized the couples into: early career stages, mid-career stages, two established careers, and multiple careers (additional family members).

2. **Characteristics of Two-career Families**

In a study of 16 British "coordinate couples", Rapoport and Rapoport (1971) found that the two-career couples they studied faced some unique dilemmas. They named five dilemmas which they found most common among the couples: overload dilemmas, dilemmas of environmental sanction, dilemmas of personal identity and self esteem, social network dilemmas, and dilemmas of multiple role-cycling.

a. **Overload Dilemmas**

St. John-Parsons (1978) in a study of 10 continuous dual-career couples (i.e., those where the
wives interrupted their careers only minimally to have children), found that every family interviewed experienced work overload problems. The overload condition was a result of both partners attempting to maintain careers, domestic roles, parenting roles, and social activities. He found that although couples reported periods of physical exhaustion it appeared that both the parents and the children had developed inner strength and resilience to the problem.

Heckman, Bryson and Bryson (1977) in their study of 200 psychologist couples, addressed the reasons for differences in productivity of male and female members of two-career couples. They found that females were more likely to place their careers second when conflicts with the family appeared. They reported that their subjects complained that they did not have enough time or energy to do everything that needed to be done. For many the greatest overload period was when children were small.

Additional studies found that couples dealt with the problem of overloading in different ways. Hall and Hall (1978), in their study based upon their consulting experience in group interviews and workshops during two years prior to their article with 300 people from Chicago, New York, and Washington D.C., discussed how couples cope with the two-career lifestyle. They found that successfully coping couples learned to say "no"
to community demands and simply ignored the less impor-
tant demands of their domestic roles. Domestic help
with housekeeping and childcare was also a common solu-
tion (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; St John-Parsons, 1978).
Some females simply find the demands overwhelming and
give up or delay their careers until children are older
(Heckman, Bryson and Bryson, 1977).

b. Environmental Sanction

In the Rapoports' sample, some couples who
chose not to have children felt that they might be con-
sidered odd. They found that most of the females wanted
to have children but were faced with the dilemma of how
to be both a good mother and a successful career woman.
The Halls describe one solution to coping with conflicts
of community expectations is to simply tell the role
senders that you will not be able to engage in certain
activities.

c. Personal Identity and Self-esteem

Couples described in several studies com-
monly faced conflicts between their personal desires
and the conventional role expectations they had acquired
in growing up. Huser and Grant (1978) in a study which
compared 43 traditional families with 40 dual-career
couples on specific variables of inner-directedness, self-
actualizing values, existentiality, self-regard, and self-
acceptance, reported that husbands and wives of dual-career
families are more inner-directed and flexible in applying personal values than husbands and wives of traditional families. The Brysons also found that women most often accepted the major portion of the domestic responsibilities, feeling that they had to be good at homemaking to be a "good" woman. Although housework was often mentioned as detracting from the females' commitment to their careers, it was never mentioned as detracting from the husbands' careers. They concluded that both women's self-image and society's expectations will have to change for women to commit themselves equally as much as men do to their careers.

d. Social Network Dilemmas

Most two-career couples found their social life was the first area to be neglected when career and family commitments began to pile up. In St. John-Parsons' study, the dual-career families rarely complained and expressed that it was an inevitable characteristic of their lifestyle. The Rapoports describe the social networks of two-career couples as usually maintained on a couple basis rather than an individual basis, and that couples tended to have small select groups of friends.

e. Role Cycling Dilemmas

Role cycling, maintaining multiple roles of parent, spouse, and career-person and rotating them throughout the day and week, has been a dilemma faced by two-career couples in most of the studies. The Brysons
again found that role cycling to be of much greater concern for females than for males. Families who established themselves professionally before having children were better prepared to devote time to the home and children as well as financially able to utilize domestic help (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1970; St. John-Parsons, 1978).

3. **Success of the Two-career Couples**

Regardless of the problems that two-career families faced, all of the studies mentioned that the couples actually had very fulfilling and happy lives. Rapoport and Rapoport concluded that the positive attributes of having a two-career family far outweighed the negative.

4. **Marital Happiness and Adjustment**

In a study of 200 British women university graduates and their husbands, Bailyn (1970) investigated career and family orientations of husbands and wives in relation to marital happiness. She made several interesting findings. Her study showed hardly any relation between husbands' and wives' orientations: men who were career-oriented were no more likely to marry traditional oriented (housewife) women than they were likely to marry women who had integrated career and family. Women who wanted to integrate career and family were no more likely to have married men who were either career or family oriented.
Bailyn did find that the more children conventional couples (career-oriented husband with family-oriented wife) had, the less likely they were to be happy. Also, marital happiness declined when the husband was more satisfied with his work situation. He found that among co-ordinate couples, (both members family and career-oriented) those with happier marriages were more likely to share in housework and childcare. Bailyn concluded that the husbands' ability to integrate family and career was important, in terms of marital satisfaction, to the wives' ability to integrate family and career.

Weingarten (1978) studied 32 two-professional couples with children to determine if there was a relationship between their employment pattern and their distribution of family involvement in the home. She indicates that regardless of the female's employment patterns (full-time/continuous or part-time/intermittent) the females still did more than 50 percent of the household and child rearing tasks. Women tended to choose childcare to compensate for the time they spent away from the children and men chose household tasks which were least threatening to their masculinity.

Burke and Weir (1976) utilized the Schulz's FIRO-B\textsuperscript{12} (which consists of six scales: expressed and desired behavior regarding inclusion, control, and affection)

in their attempt to determine personality differences between one-career and two-career couples. They defined two-career couples as couples where both partners were employed outside the home. Although all of the husbands belonged to a professional organization, there was no determination of the degree to which the female was committed to her work.

They found that two-career families had lower scores in need to receive affection, inclusion and control. Housewives were more passive than employed wives. They concluded that dual-career families were more self-reliant and self-sufficient individuals than one-career families.

Booth (1976) interviewed 356 persons in Toronto contacted by utilizing 13 census tracts. They found that husbands and wives are readily adapting to female participation in the labor force and that the benefits accruing to couples as a result of pursuing dual-careers far outweigh the disadvantages. In their study they found that women in a transition either into the labor force or leaving it showed more signs of stress than housewives. Another interesting fact was that while working wives worried about the amount of time they spent with their families, housewives worried more often about family sickness.
5. Effects of the Two-career Family Upon the Organization

Most of the past studies have addressed only the effect of the two-career lifestyle upon the individuals or the family. Few have considered the impact of this lifestyle upon the organization. Those studies which have discussed organizational impact (Heckman, Bryson and Bryson, 1977; Huser and Grant, 1978; Wallston, Foster, and Berger, 1978; Hall and Hall, 1978) have found organizations less prepared for the two-career family situation than the families themselves.

Traditionally, organizations have assumed that the male's career would take priority (Heckman, Bryson and Bryson, 1977; Hall and Hall, 1978; Wallston, Foster and Berger, 1978).

Heckman, Bryson and Bryson (1973) found that often professional couples were taken advantage of by institutions offering the wife a lesser position. Women in professional pairs tended to have lower salaries, even though they tended to be more productive than other women. Several couples in their sample reported problems in maintaining similar careers because of nepotism regulations.

Concerning productivity, they found that women psychologists who were married to another psychologist had a high level of achievement relative to men and women in general, but not in relation to their husbands. They concluded that although sex discrimination accounted for
part of the difference in productivity between the men and the women, most of the difference was due to the fact that the women in their sample were willing to place their careers secondary to their families and the needs of their husbands' careers.

Wallston, Foster and Berger (1978) described a significant degree of egalitarian decisions concerning job seeking of PhD's who had professional wives. They advised that corporations should reconsider their past assumptions about both men's and women's willingness to sacrifice personal and family needs for career requirements.

In an analysis of how companies and couples cope with two-career phenomenon, Hall and Hall (1978) concluded that companies have not yet felt the full impact of this emerging lifestyle. They predict that when the couples who are in the initial stages of their careers in 1973 take more responsible positions, that the companies will then be faced with much more critical issues concerning relocation, promotion and work/family conflicts. Additionally, these couples will be less willing to make family and personal sacrifices to fulfill the needs of the organization.

Common to each of the studies addressing the effects of two-career families upon the organization, is the evaluation that companies are just now recognizing that unique problems for two-career couples exist, but that most companies believe that the problems belong to the couples.
6. **Environmental Impact of Two-career Family Lifestyles**

The Department of Labor reports, and popular literature reflects, the most acute awareness of the effects of two-career families upon the environment (Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin, 1977; Time Magazine, August 21, 1978; the Washington Post, April 8 and 9, 1979). Time Magazine calls two-career couples "America's new elite" and claims that the double incomes of these families are partially responsible for the rising prices of homes. The Washington Post claims that many of the double income families over-estimate their spending power and find themselves trapped into continuing their two-career lifestyles.

Families are having fewer children (Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin, 1977). Many of them plan to have children after they are established in their careers, but more frequently are not having children at all. The Washington Post termed this situation, "backing into childlessness."

7. **Summary of the Literature**

A review of the military family literature and the literature concerning two-career families establishes the fact that the two-career family is an emerging lifestyle in the American society and it is very likely to become more prevalent in the Naval officer population as well. Navy decision-makers who are formulating family
policies are confronted with finding new solutions to new problems associated with the changing lifestyles of military families.

McCubbin, Marsden, Durning and Hunter (1973) assess the military community of the future as one of all-volunteer personnel, more jobs for female members, less traditional roles accepted by military wives, changing family lifestyles, less commitment to the traditional military way of life and increased assertiveness of families regarding their needs and concerns. They state further that it is important that military organizations recognize the influence of the family on the recruitment, performance, and retention of personnel in an all-volunteer force. They argue that assumptions about families underlying past family-related policies are no longer valid.

The remainder of this thesis will examine current changes to family related policies and present a study which attempts to better describe the married Naval officer population which is affected by those policies. The primary objective is to gain a better picture of military families and how the career-orientation of the husband and wife is related to their satisfaction and commitment to the military way of life.
III. CURRENT U.S. NAVY FAMILY POLICIES

A new awareness of the military family has brought about several recent revisions to past policies and the establishment of new policies and programs to improve family life. Some areas of concern for families still remain officially unaddressed, but are being investigated by staff members such as those in the Family Program.

A. THE FAMILY PROGRAM

As a result of the Family Awareness Conference in Norfolk, 7-9 November, 1978, the family program was established 30 January, 1979. The family program is part of OP-15 under the Director, Human Resources Management Division, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. The program has a staff of 8 members involved in several efforts which include: program planning, fiscal and budget planning, liaison with Navy and non-Navy departments and agencies, policy analysis, development of a research/studies plan to accompany the Family Program, "awareness raising" efforts, and involvement with the San Diego and Norfolk family services programs.

The Family Program's primary concern is fostering and enhancing family life in the Navy. Their intent is to establish 50 to 60 centers throughout the Navy which
will provide linkages between the military family and available military and civilian family services.

B. THE FAMILY OMBUDSMAN

The Navy Wives Ombudsman Program was established by Z-gram 24 on 14 September 1970. In March of 1978 operations target (OpTar) funding for legitimate expenses and responsible use of franking privileges were granted and a new title, Family Ombudsman, was given to the program.

The Family Ombudsman is appointed by the Commanding Officer from the Navy officer's and enlisted's spouses who volunteer their services for one year. The ombudsman's main duties are to present the families' views to the Commanding Officer and help settle grievances. Additionally, the ombudsman is asked to help disseminate information to the families while the command is away from its homeport.

The Family Ombudsman has the opportunity to attend several types of information schools which keep her informed of military and civilian services available to families. For a more complete explanation of the Family Ombudsman Program see U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, February, 1979, pages 104-107.

C. FAMILY CONTACTS AND ASSISTANCE DURING DEPLOYMENT

A new policy providing that type commands will designate a contact officer for each home port of deployed
units was established in BUPERS Manual in April of 1979. The contact officer is to be an information source for families regarding unit accomplishments, schedules and welcoming plans.

D. MEDICAL BENEFITS

In the past few years, the Navy has instituted a Family Practitioner program to provide continuity of treatment and support for all members of the family as far as Navy assignments permit. There are presently 140 specially trained Family Physicians in the Navy, with an eventual goal of 280.

E. ASSIGNMENT POLICY

General policy for officer assignments was revised in April, 1979, in BUPERS Manual Article 1820100. Specifically, the article states:

The assignment is based on service requirements, the professional needs of the individual, the officer's record of performance, and, to the maximum extent practicable, on the preference of the officer.

Women officers shall be assigned to duty in the same manner as other officers except that they shall not be assigned to duty in aircraft engaged in combat missions or in vessels of the Navy, except hospital ships and naval transports.

F. WORKING SPOUSES

Working spouses, civilian and military, present unique problems for the military organization regarding detailing
and transfers. Joint-spouse couples require special consideration for basic allowance for quarters (BAQ) and sea duty assignments. Additionally, new policies have been formulated for those female officers who choose to remain on active duty while having and raising children.

The only published policy regarding civilian working spouses was published in the Fall 1978 Officer Newsletter.

Growing numbers of Navy members are married to spouses who are employed outside the home. This fact often bears on the individual officer's desires for his or her next tour. Officers are encouraged to cite this factor under the remarks section of the preference card, together with any specific consideration which they wish to have the factor given. Detailers will attempt to consider this element along with those which relate to the career needs of the individual and the needs of the service in making future assignments.

The most recent guidance published concerning assignments of joint-spouse couples was also published in the Fall 1978 Officer Newsletter.

Manpower distribution policies established by the Bureau of Naval Personnel revolve around the needs of the service, career needs of the individual, and desires of the individual. While billet assignments cannot be dictated by marital status, assignment officers attempt to assign married members of the service to the same geographical area, with concomitant effort directed at filling billets for which each service member is qualified.

It is the service member's responsibility to submit information to his or her assignment officer by letter or updated preference card in order to allow maximum flexibility of assignment. In the remarks section of the preference card each married member should indicate the relative duty priorities (his first, hers first, or both in desired order). Remarks should also reflect data on the military spouse: specifically, name/rank/branch of service/SSN/present duty station/PRD.
Officers are reminded that upon marriage to a service member they can request adjustment of their PRD to coincide with or more closely approximate the spouse's PRD. Such requests should be made to their detailers.

Consult The Annual Officer Billet Summary Manual (junior and senior editions) which provides current information on available billets in various geographic areas. Finally, keep your assignment officers informed of changes in your status, interests, and aspirations.

Concerning changes to projected rotation dates (PRD's) the BUPERS Manual Article 1820340 states:

1. At other than normal projected rotation dates an officer married to another active duty member of the Armed Forces may request transfer to the permanent home port or duty station of the spouse provided the officer has been at his or her present duty station for at least one year, and that an authorized billet for which he or she is qualified is available, as determined by the Chief of Naval Personnel, in the area requested. Transfer will be further contingent on the availability of a relief if required. Such transfers will be at no cost to the Government.

Government transportation for the officer, dependents, or household effects and payment of dislocation allowance are not authorized. The transfer shall be effected during a leave period with no proceed or travel time authorized. A request for transfer shall be forwarded via the chain of command with the commanding officer's comments concerning the requirement for a relief. The request shall include the name, grade, designator, and duty station and projected rotation date of the spouse.

With the assignment of women to sea, the issue of joint-spouses both losing their Basic Allowance for Quarters (BAQ) has been addressed (Naval message from the CNO 24 February, 1979; Navy Times, April 16, 1979).

The new policy states that joint-spouse couples without dependents will not be given sea duty at the same time unless they volunteer for such assignment and acknowledge
in writing their awareness of the loss of BAQ. This policy was established because joint-spouse couples could experience extraordinary financial hardship if both members were no longer qualified for BAQ.

Although females may remain on active duty during and subsequent to pregnancy, policies make it fairly simple for them to leave the service if they desire to do so. Current policy for those who wish to remain on active duty indicates (BUPERS Manual Article 3810170):

A member serving in the naval service with dependency or pregnancy status is expected to retain a high degree of commitment or concurrently fulfill professional responsibilities. No exemption from other personnel policies or preferential treatment by virtue of such status is anticipated. Commanding officers shall ensure that this paragraph is brought to the attention of any member desiring to serve in the naval service in a pregnancy/dependency status in order that possible conflicts between the role of maintaining the Navy's posture of readiness and mobility and the role of motherhood are fully understood.

Members on active or inactive duty who acquire pregnancy status shall be retained unless the member submits a request to resign. Requirements for a request to resign are: that the request be submitted at least four months prior to the desired release date and that the request include certification of pregnancy status.

For those who choose to remain on active duty the BUPERS Manual states further:

The attending medical officer will prescribe, on a medical basis, the prenatal and postnatal period. Members may be placed in light duty status with subsequent assignment to sick in quarters status.
prior to hospitalization for delivery. Light duty, sick in quarters, and period of hospitalization are not chargeable as annual leave. Convalescent leave may be utilized during the postnatal period if authorized by the hospital commanding officer on the advice of the attending physician. Return to duty following delivery will be as soon as possible based upon medical determination of the member’s condition by the physician on a case by case basis. Any leave taken in addition to that prescribed by the physician will be charged to the member’s leave record. Annual leave shall be requested under the leave program of the command, but the member shall not receive preferential consideration over other members.

G. CONCLUSION

The most recent awareness of family needs is reflected in the rapid flow of revisions to current policies and programs reviewed in this chapter. The concept of a central agency at a high level office in the Navy recommended by several researchers (Stanton, 1976; McCubbin, Marsden, During and Hunter, 1978) has finally been established in the Family Program. The need for better channels for getting information to families and family health needs are being addressed as well. Assignment policies are becoming more responsive to the desires and needs of the military member and his or her family. Policies concerning childcare, medical and dental care still present dilemmas for both families and the organization. The establishment of the contact officers reflects a realization by the military that the organization cannot continue to rely entirely upon volunteer services of Navy wives in such positions as the Family Ombudsman to perform information and liaison services to families while units are deployed.
Along with the expansion of women's roles (both military women and military wives), policies are attempting to provide for a lifestyle where both men and women can pursue fulfilling careers as well as family roles.

However, the appropriateness of current policies and the future directions of family policies are uncertain because adequate data concerning the magnitude and the specific needs of new family lifestyles are not available.

The study to be presented in the following chapters of this thesis is an attempt to provide more inclusive data about military families upon which family policies can be based.
IV. METHOD

A. BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

The study was designed to draw inferences about married Naval officers by surveying a representative sample of the total married Naval officer population.

Two assumptions were made concerning the definition of the two-career military family: (1) that all Naval officers have careers, and (2) that determination as to whether the spouse has a career is best made by asking the respondent if he or she considers themselves and their spouse to be a two-career family. Additional information about the spouses' education, occupation and commitment further define the two-career family in the research presented.

B. AREAS OF CONCERN

First, demographic data is necessary to determine an estimate of relevant aspects of the total married Naval officer population. Demographic data presented concerns, rank, designator, marital status and number of children. Second, five specific areas of concern are examined:

(1) Career intentions
(2) Child care
(3) Satisfaction with military family life
(4) Spouse's career commitment
(5) Career satisfaction

Finally, the thesis compiles a list of common problems and methods for coping with the two-career family life-style which was gathered from the two-career couples participating in the follow-up survey.

C. STRATEGY

The study consisted of three questionnaires (Appendices 1, 7 and 8). The first questionnaire, designed to be filled out by the military member, was mailed to a sample of married Naval officers. The remaining two questionnaires were designed for couples who offered to participate in the follow-up study -- one for the military member and one for the civilian member (If the couple were both active duty military members they both received a military member questionnaire).

The first questionnaire was designed for two primary purposes. The first purpose was to gather descriptive data concerning the married Naval officer population. The second purpose was to obtain addresses of two-career families who would be willing to participate in a more in-depth study specifically concerning two-career families in the military. The initial questionnaire provided a starting point identifying some of the issues among
two-career families. It also collected data on one-career families (single-income and double-income) to be used as a basis for comparison.

The follow-up study again gathered demographic data because, to ensure anonymity of respondents, the follow-up questionnaires could not be linked to the initial questionnaires. Areas of concern which became apparent in the initial questionnaire were explored further in this study. These areas included: the nature of the spouses' occupation, attitudes toward both careers, childcare needs, descriptions of most pressing problems of the two-career lifestyle in the military and advice to other couples maintaining the two-career lifestyle.

D. INITIAL SAMPLE

The initial questionnaire was mailed to a representative sample of 800 married Naval officers. To select the sample, all married Naval officers were selected from the July 1973 Officer Master File.\footnote{The Officer Master File is updated and distributed by the Chief of Naval Personnel each quarter of every year.} Of the 62,314 Naval officers on the Master File, 45,664 (73 percent) were married. From the total, 45,664 married Naval officers, a systematic sample with a random start\footnote{A systematic sample with a random start is a sample taken by selecting every kth element. It has been found to be as good if not superior to the true random sample (Babbie, 1973).} was taken. The
sample size of 800 (1.75 percent of the total 45,664 married Naval officers) was selected for two reasons: (1) to ensure a large enough sample for reliability and (2) to maintain a manageable amount of data.

Figure 4.1 shows the total Naval officer population with percentages of married officers broken down by rank. This histogram indicates a sharp increase in percentages of married officers as rank increases. The sharpest increase is between 01 and 02 -- a 54 percent increase. Percentages of married Naval officers continue to increase with rank until the 09 level where 100 percent are married.
Figure 4.1 TOTAL NAVY PROFILE BY RANK.
The married Naval officers described by rank in Figure 4.1 represents the population from which the sample of 800 was taken for the initial survey. The sample of 800 married Naval officers who were mailed the initial questionnaire is broken down by rank in Figure 4.2. Subtracted from the top of each rank are the 67 surveys returned to the sender for incorrect addresses (missing data). The bottom portion of each rank indicated the percentage which were completed and returned.

This histogram indicates greater return rate percentages for the more senior officers with the exception of 07's who did not participate in the survey at all.
Figure 4.2 SAMPLE RETURN RATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE = 800</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RETURNED TO SENDER = 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETURNED = 459 (62.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>W3</th>
<th>W4</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL

800

733

459 (62.6%)
Before the follow-up study was done, the initial survey was partially analyzed to determine the distribution of career/family lifestyles in the survey sample. Figure 4.3 describes the percentages of each career/family lifestyle in each rank. The three career/family lifestyles are: (1) two-career families, (2) one-career/one-job families and (3) single-income families.

The histogram shows that junior officers have the highest incidence of two-career and one-career/one-job families, and these percentages decrease as rank increases. Consequently, junior officers tend to have spouses with careers of their own while senior officers tend to have spouses who have jobs versus careers or nonworking spouses.
Figure 4.3
INITIAL SURVEY BREAKDOWN OF CAREER/FAMILY LIFE STYLES BY RANK.

- SINGLE-INCOME FAMILIES (54.8%)
- ONE CAREER/ONE JOB FAMILIES (19.3%)
- TWO-CAREER FAMILIES (25.9%)

\( \Delta \) \( w_x \) COMBINED w1, w2, w3 & w4
E. FOLLOW-UP SAMPLE

Respondents to the initial survey were asked to provide their names and addresses if they had a two-career family and would be willing to participate with their spouse in a more in-depth study of two-career families. As a result, 86 questionnaires designed for military members and 78 questionnaires designed for civilian spouses were mailed. The return rate for the military members was 63.95 percent (N=55) and the return rate for the civilian spouses was 60.25 percent (N=47).

Figure 4.4 shows the percentages of initial survey two-career families who also participated in the follow-up survey. The participation of junior officers and 06's was much greater than that of the 04's and 05's participating in the follow-up study. The average overall participation rate for the follow-up study was 47 percent.

There is no explanation as to why senior officers showed a greater return rate on the initial survey (Figure 4.2) and junior officers show a greater participation rate on the follow-up study.
Figure 4.4 TWO-CAREER FAMILIES OF INITIAL SURVEY COMPARED WITH TWO-CAREER FAMILIES PARTICIPATING IN THE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY.
Figures 4.1 and 4.2 described earlier show the representativeness of the initial survey compared with the distribution of all married Naval officers. To describe the representativeness of the follow-up sample, it is compared with the two-career family portion of the initial survey. Figure 4.5 describes the percentages of total initial survey two-career respondents represented by each rank. For example, officers in the rank of 01 made up 9.4 percent of the initial survey two-career respondents and 16.4 percent of the total follow-up survey respondents.

This comparison shows that both 01's and 06's were over represented in the follow-up survey, but that the officers 02 through 05 were similarly represented in both survey samples.
Figure 4.5 TWO-CAREER RESPONDENTS TO INITIAL SURVEY COMPARED WITH RESPONDENTS TO FOLLOW-UP SURVEY BY RANK.
F. ANALYSIS

It has often been found in retention studies that compatibility of family life with military career life has affected military members' decisions regarding retention (Goodstadt, 1974; Cooper, 1977; McCubbin, Hunter, Dahl, 1978). The analysis in this study is directed toward finding out if there is a relationship between five specific areas of concern, which often affect career intentions and family/career lifestyle.

The initial survey questionnaire was analyzed by breaking down the respondents into those with single-income families and those with double-income families. Double-income families were further divided into two-career families and one-career/one-job families. Three family/career lifestyle groups were compared: (1) two-career (2) one-career/one-job and (3) single-income, to determine if there was a statistically significant difference\(^{15}\) between the three groups in 5 specific areas of concern. The areas of concern included:

(1) childcare
(2) satisfaction with military family life
(3) career/job commitment

\(^{15}\)For purposes of this paper, statistical significance will be defined as p<.05. For difference test p>.05 will be denoted by NS (not significant).
(4) career/job satisfaction
(5) career/job intentions

The follow-up study, which consisted of two questionnaires, one for the military member and one for the civilian spouse, was utilized to gather more specific data concerning just two-career families, their specific problems and what advice they would offer to other couples attempting to maintain a two-career family. This data is presented highlighting those areas of greatest concern for military members and their spouses.
V. FINDINGS

A. FAMILY ISSUES

Family issues become concerns for the Navy when the serviceman's ability or willingness to continue to be a productive member is affected. The Navy has known for several years that the quality of family life was having an increasingly significant impact upon retention. In response, the Navy has directed considerable resources toward improving family life. However, Navy program and policy directors have not always known what the needs and desires of service members and their families have been.

The findings presented in this chapter identify characteristics of families with different career/family lifestyles. Five areas of interest were compared by career/family lifestyle. First, because of its direct applicability to the Navy, families were compared in terms of the military member's career intentions. Then subjects more related to the family, e.g. childcare and degree of satisfaction with military family life were investigated. Finally career/family lifestyles are examined relative to career/family commitment and career satisfaction.
Together, the data presented provides some insight into family needs and concerns which are thought to affect career intentions. Additionally, the data contributes to a better knowledge of those areas of family life which are affected by other budgetary and operational policies and decisions. These areas may even have greater impact than the internal Family Program concerns. These operational policies and procedures require early Navy review if negative results are to be limited.

B. GENERAL DIFFERENCES (RANK AND DESIGNATOR)

Respondents were broken down into three career/family lifestyles: two-career (N=117) 25.9 percent, one-career/one-job (N=87) 19.3 percent and single-income (N=247) 54.8 percent. The rank distribution was significantly different for each career/family lifestyle ($X^2=30.89$, df=12, p<.002; Appendix 2). Of officers of the ranks 03 and below (N=200) 37.3 percent had two-career families while only 16.6 percent of officers of the ranks WX\(^{16}\), 04 and above (N=251) had two-career families. One-career/one-job families were more evenly spread among all ranks of officers. Single-income families were inversely spread, ranks 03 and below having 43.6 percent single-income families and ranks WX, 04 and above, 65.9 percent.

\(^{16}\)WX throughout this paper refers to warrant officers in the ranks of W2, W3 and W4.
Concerning designators again, a significant relationship was indicated when compared with the three career/family lifestyles ($X^2=45.9$, df=26, $p<.009$; Appendix 3). Nurses (N=4), 75 percent, and medical officers (N=20), 40 percent, were the only designators with a relatively higher incidence of two-career families.  

When double-income families were combined and compared with single-income families a significant relationship still remained ($X^2=27.6$, df=13, $p<.01$). Along with Nurses (same as above) restricted line officers (N=36) emerged with the highest incidence of double-income families, 61 percent. Of surface and aviation officers, (N=240) 47.2 percent had double-income families while only 28.3 percent of other staff officers had double-income families.

When double-income families were broken down into two-career families (N=117) 57.4 percent and one-career/one-job families (N=87) 42.6 percent, there were no longer significant relationships with either rank or designator.

C. CAREER INTENTIONS (MILITARY MEMBER)

Retention of Naval officers has become one of the most challenging problems of Navy managers. At the Navy

17 Designator refers to a four digit code utilized by the Navy to identify regular and reserve officers by warfare specialties and other special qualifications the officer might have.

18 There is no evidence that these officers are married to each other.
Retention Conference, August 22-25, 1978, figures from the Bureau of Naval Personnel indicated that retention rates for officers were not satisfactory. It was announced that 80 percent of all junior officers leave the Navy during the period defined as their "minimum service requirements plus two-years." The Chief of Naval Operations placed a very high priority on improving retention in the Navy and he identified family issues as one of the areas most critical to the effort.

When career intentions were compared by career/family lifestyles, a statistically significant relationship was found (TABLE 5.1). It is interesting to note that as families progressed from one-career to one-career/one-job and finally two-career lifestyles that percentages of those desiring a full career decreased from 88.8 percent to 87.0 percent and 76.5 percent respectively.

TABLE 5.1: Career Intentions by Career/Family Lifestyle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>double-income</th>
<th>single-income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full career,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with retirement from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Navy</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a 20 year</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(102)</td>
<td>(77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(233)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( X^2 = 8.91, \text{ df}=2, p < .01 \)
\( (1+2), (3) \)
\( X^2 = 4.39, \text{ df}=1, p < .04 \)
\( (1) \& (2) \)
\( X^2 = 2.52, \text{ df}=1 \text{ NS} \)

* Appendix 1; Questions 12 and 19
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When double-income families were combined and compared with single-income families a significant relationship still existed, but when just two-career and one-career/one job families were compared the relationship was not significant.

D. FAMILIES WITH CHILDCARE NEEDS

Families with children living at home made up 78.4 percent of the total sample of married Naval officers. Of those families with children (N=360), the mean number of children living at home was 2.1. Comparing each of the three career/family lifestyles revealed that all three groups had approximately the same distribution in numbers of children per family ($X^2=12.44$, $df=10$, $p<.26$; Appendix 4).

Of families with children, (N=152) 42.2 percent had at least one child under the age of 5, (N=200) 55.6 percent had at least one child between 6 and 12 years old and (N=137) 38 percent had teenagers between 13 and 13 years old (Appendix 5). Of families without children (N=99) 63 percent indicated that they wanted to have at least one child in the future.

Of families who utilized childcare facilities (N=220) 65 percent indicated that a babysitter was one of the most frequently used alternatives for childcare. Analysis indicated that there was a different pattern of childcare usage across the career/family lifestyles (TABLE 5.2) A higher proportion of single-income families, 77.9 percent,
used babysitters or close relatives than did either one-career/one-job families, 71.4 percent and two-career families, 64.1 percent. More two-career families used civilian childcare facilities and live-in babysitters/housekeepers, 29.3 percent, than one-career/one-job families, 13.8 percent and single-income families, 7.9 percent.

TABLE 5.2: Childcare Most Frequently Used by Career/Family Lifestyle*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>double-income</th>
<th>single-income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two-career (1)</td>
<td>one-career/one-job (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military day care</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian day care</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babysitter</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in babysitter/housekeeper</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(65)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix 1: Questions 31A through 31E and Question 19.

(1), (2), (3) $X^2 = 20.2$, df = 8, p < .05
A considerable proportion, 42 percent, of families who utilized childcare facilities (N=142) were dissatisfied with the options available to them. Of those who were dissatisfied, 33 percent indicated that professionally run civilian or military day care would best meet their needs, 24 percent preferred a 24 hour childcare center, 23.9 percent preferred a babysitter and 18.4 percent preferred a babysitter/housekeeper.

When dissatisfied families were broken down into the three career/family lifestyles and compared by preferred childcare there was not a significant relationship, but when the double-income families were compared with single-income families a significant relationship emerged (TABLE 5.3). Of double-income families (N=49) 43 percent preferred day care, and 26 percent preferred live-in babysitter/housekeepers. Single-income families' preferences were more evenly spread among three of the alternatives and the fourth, live-in babysitters/housekeepers, was least preferred.

There were different patterns of childcare needs and preferences for families depending upon their family/career lifestyles. These findings have important implications for the directions of future childcare programs which will be addressed in the recommendations section of this thesis.

Childcare needs were studied further to determine how the occurrence of children might affect family/career lifestyles.
TABLE 5.3: Child Care Which Would Better Satisfy Needs By Dissatisfied Families Broken Down by Career/Family Lifestyle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>double-income</th>
<th>single-income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two-career</td>
<td>one-career/one-job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 hour care</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babysitter</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in babysitter/housekeeper</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix I; Question 32A through 32D and Question 19.

(1), (2), (3) $X^2 = 12.04$, df=6, NS
(1+2), (3) $X^2 = 11.36$, df=3, p<.05

Focusing on how females' career plans change when children are born. Of those families who did not have children but stated that they wanted to have children in the future (N=49) there was a significant relationship between career/family lifestyle and the female's career-orientation (TABLE 5.4). Of the two-career families (N=27) 44.4 percent indicated that the female would continue her career with only minimal interruptions when children were born, 51.9 percent indicated that she would interrupt her career until children were of an appropriate age and then return to her career. Of two-career families, in only 3.7 percent would the mother discontinue her career with no intentions.
of returning to it. No females in one-career/one-job or single-income families would elect a continuous career while 81.3 percent and 66.7 percent respectively would interrupt their careers until children were of an appropriate age and then return to their jobs/prospective careers.\textsuperscript{19}

The remainder indicated that the female would discontinue her career with no intentions of returning to it. This is referred to as the conventional family pattern. There was also a significant relationship between the two-career and the one-career families and family pattern (TABLE 5.4).

However, when they were combined and double-income and single-income families were compared, there was no significant relationship.

TABLE 5.4: Families Without Children But Planning To Have Children--Females' Career Orientation by Career/Family Lifestyle\textsuperscript{19}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Pattern</th>
<th>double-income</th>
<th>single-income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two-career (1)</td>
<td>one-career/one-job (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>00.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupted</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>(27)</th>
<th>(16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\textsuperscript{19}Appendix 1; Question 29 and Question 19.

(1), (2), (3) $X^2=15.5$, df=4, p .004

(1), (2) $X^2=19.9$, df=2, p .004

(1+2) & (3) $X^2=4.17$, df=2, NS

\textsuperscript{19}Since females in single-income families obviously do not have careers at the time of the survey, it is assumed that those answering the question (Q29, Appendix 1) were anticipating careers or were in between jobs.
These findings point out a dramatically high incidence of two-career families who plan to have children, in which females intend to continue their careers when children are born. If this finding is indicative of a trend toward more women choosing to maintain their careers after the birth of their children, it appears that there will also be an increased demand for the types of childcare that two-career families prefer, i.e. day care and live-in babysitters/housekeepers.

E. SATISFACTION WITH FAMILY LIFE (DOUBLE-INCOME FAMILIES)

In a study of the double-income families, it was found that two-career families and one-career/one-job families were about equally satisfied with military family life (TABLE 5.5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-career</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-career/One-job</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix 1, Question 13 by Question 19
However, when asked if the military member and his/her spouse were experiencing any serious conflicts as a result of their combined careers/jobs, there was a significant difference between the two-career and one-career/one-job families (TABLE 5.6).

TABLE 5.6: "Would you say that you and your spouse are experiencing serious conflict as a result of your combined careers/jobs?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two-career</th>
<th>One-career/One-job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing serious conflict</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not experiencing serious conflict</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>(112)</td>
<td>(82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percentage</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix 1: Question 26 and Question 19.

\[X^2 = 5.3, \text{ df} = 1, p < .02\]

When the respondents indicated that there was a serious conflict as a result of combined careers/jobs, they were asked to read a list of problems and check as many as applied. Table 5.7 shows the list of problems and the frequency of which each problem was checked.
TABLE 5.7: Serious Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency checked</th>
<th>Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1. relocating, transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2. separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3. overload (too much work, lack of leisure time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4. child care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5. no time for intimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6. commuting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7. social acceptability (meeting expectations of society concerning roles within the family and/or roles as a professional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8. jealousy of career successes, i.e., pay, promotions, status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9. jealousy of people with whom each works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix I, Question 27

Not surprisingly, for the two-career families, the incidence of serious conflict as a result of both members combining work and family was almost double that of one-career/one-job families. This finding substantiates that two-career families either experience more conflict or are more willing to express their problems. In either case, the Navy may expect increasing demands for family considerations if the proportions of two-career families increase.
F. CAREER COMMITMENT (SPOUSE'S)

It has long been assumed by the Navy organization that the military wife would remain supportive but subordinate to the military member. Servicemen and their families were expected to willingly accept inherent stresses resulting from extended family separations and frequent relocations (McCubbin, Marsden, Durning and Hunter, 1978).

For families in which the spouse of the military member works outside the home, it is questionable whether the past assumptions are valid. McCubbin, Marsden, Durning and Hunter (1978) propose that the Navy re-evaluate some of those assumptions. In particular, they suggest that family considerations should be incorporated into personnel policies regarding duty assignment, relocation, separation and career planning.

In this section, it is desired to measure the career/job commitment level of military spouses. It is assumed that those spouses with long-range career intentions, a high degree of career satisfaction and a lesser willingness to give their career a second place in priorities are the most committed. The more committed the spouse is to his/her work, the more it is anticipated that the military member will require family considerations from the military.

When rank was compared to career/family lifestyle, it appeared that after the first promotion, from 01 to 02, there was a decrease in the proportion of two-career families.
Possible explanations for this phenomenon could be that spouses tend to drop their careers when children are born, but it has already been shown earlier in this chapter that although this might have been the case in the past, significant proportions of future families with two-careers are not planning to follow this traditional pattern.

Another explanation for a decrease in commitment may be the possibility that the spouses drop their careers as a result of the frequent transfers experienced by junior officers. Possibly the military spouse becomes frustrated and gives up, after the second or third move, the struggle to find a new challenging and rewarding position in the same career.

To measure the spouse's career/job commitment respondents were asked to indicate their spouse's career intentions, career satisfaction, educational level, and career/job/family commitment relative to their own.

There was a significant relationship between spouse's career/job intentions and whether she considered herself to have a career or a job (TABLE 5.3).

Those members with two-career lifestyles had a higher incidence of spouses who desired to continue a full career. Since a full career for the spouse inherently implies that the spouse will be earning benefits which accrue with longevity, it is not surprising that they become disenchanted when frequent military moves force them to start all over.
TABLE 5.8: Civilian Spouses' Career Intentions for Double-Income Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>two-career</th>
<th>one-career/one-job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full career with retirement</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20-year career</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix 1; Question 15 and Question 19

X²=23.5, df=1, p < .0001

The next step was to see how satisfied the spouses were with their careers/jobs. Surprisingly, spouses in two-career families were more satisfied with their careers than those spouses with jobs in one-career/one-job families (TABLE 5.9). Despite the hardships and the serious conflicts experienced as a result of combined careers/jobs with family life, two-career spouses were relatively satisfied.

As previously discussed in this chapter, the military member's satisfaction with career was not different between two-career and one-career/one-job families, but now it is apparent that for spouses, there is a significant difference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>two-career</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-3.09</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-career/one-job</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix 1; Question 18 and Question 19*

One reason for the difference may be that although spouses are a highly educated group, those who choose to work at jobs versus careers often do not get to utilize their educational background. While the majority of spouses in both two-career and one-career/one-job families had four-year college degrees, the majority of spouses in one-career/one-job families often held jobs which required only a high school level of education (TABLE 5.10).
TABLE 5.10: Educational Level/Education Required in Work by Double-Income Family Lifestyles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Level of education required in work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two-career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some college or technical training</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than high school</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix 1: Questions 16 & 17 and Question 19

(1) & (2) $X^2 = 14.66$, df=4, p<.005
(3) & (4) $X^2 = 29.56$, df=4, p<.0001

Frequent transfers present a frustrating dilemma for spouses pursuing careers. It was anticipated that those with careers versus jobs would express more serious conflicts as a result of relocation. Officers were asked what would happen to the spouse's career if they had to transfer. The question was open-ended, so answers were coded into four general categories: (1) the spouse would move and find another job without any major concerns mentioned, (2) the spouse's career would end, (3) separation would occur, or (4) a major conflict was mentioned. Over

20 Several respondents in this category mentioned probable divorce.
80 percent indicated that the spouse would move and find another job without any major concerns mentioned, and there was no significant difference between two-career and one-career/one-job families (TABLE 5.11).

Even though a relatively small percentage, 13.9 percent, indicated that they would separate (live apart temporarily) or have a serious conflict, this percentage represents a sufficiently large number of officers who anticipate that they would have some very disruptive family experiences if they had to transfer. In view of these findings, family considerations, when planning transfers, are important to a large number of double-income families regardless of their career/family lifestyle.

TABLE 5.11: "If you were required to transfer now, what would happen to your spouse's career?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>two-career</th>
<th>one-career/one-job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(111)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix 1; Question 24 and Question 19.

$X^2 = 6.34, df = 3, NS$
When respondents were asked which member would most likely put their career second (a) to the spouse's career and (b) to the family needs, females were overwhelmingly chosen in both cases. When asked who would be most likely to be absent from work to take care of an emergency that either could handle, the percentage of males chosen increased. Further, a difference was noted between two-career and one-career/one-job families (TABLE 5.12).

**TABLE 5.12: Career Priorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two-career</th>
<th>One-career/One-job</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Who puts career/job needs second</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.75 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(112)</td>
<td>(86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Who puts career/job second to family needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.59 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(102)</td>
<td>(77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In case of a home emergency which is more likely to be absent from work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>6.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>p .008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(102)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix 1; Question 21, 22, 23 and Question 19

*df=1
Again, the implications of the findings indicate that two-career families are not only different but have different behavior patterns in regard to integrating work and family life. Men of two-career families may see their roles as more equally divided between work and family, while men of one-career/one-job families may hold more traditional attitudes. Although the non-traditional families make up a relatively small percentage of all families, the proportions are large enough that the numbers are significant to the Navy.

G. CAREER SATISFACTION

Of officers responding to the initial survey questionnaire (N=459), 79.1 percent responded either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied when asked to what degree they were satisfied with their military careers. On the five-point satisfaction scale there was a mean answer of 2.02 (slightly below somewhat satisfied).

Rank was only slightly negatively correlated with degree of satisfaction (R=-.20, p<.0001) suggesting that the more senior officers were less likely to be dissatisfied than more junior officers.\textsuperscript{21} There were no significant relationships between satisfaction and designator groups.

\textsuperscript{21}Because of the professional nature of Naval officers' careers, it is assumed that officers would always be highly satisfied with their careers. Those not so satisfied would most likely be selected out because of the highly competitive promotions rates for the more senior officers.
When degree of satisfaction was compared for each career/family lifestyle, it was found that double-income families were less satisfied than single-income families, but that there was no distinction between two-career and one-career/one-job families, (TABLE 5.13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Double-income</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-income</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-career</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-career/one-job</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix 1; Question 13 and Question 19

These findings are consistent with earlier findings in that less than 2 percent of senior officers were dissatisfied with their careers and also that they had a higher incidence of single-income families. The somewhat lower degree of satisfaction indicated by double-income families may be indicative of the hardships they endure. Both the inherent difficulties of co-ordinating their work/family lives and the fact that the military organization assumes families to have a more traditional single-income lifestyle may explain a large part of this difference.
H. SUMMARY OF INITIAL SURVEY FINDINGS

This study has provided both general data about the total married Naval officer population and specific data about families with particular career/family lifestyles. Analysis of the July 1978 Officer Master List from which the initial survey sample was selected indicated that 73 percent of all officers were married. Over 50 percent of officers were married by the time they had reached the rank of 02.

The findings from the initial survey indicate that the married Naval officer population is a highly familistic group. Families with children have a mean of 2.1 children per family. Of those, 85.3 percent had at least one child under the age of 5, 71.9 percent had at least one child between 5 and 12 years old and 38 percent had teenagers between 13 and 18 years old.

Figure 5.14 provides a summary of the important findings which characterize families with different career/family lifestyles. More two-career families were junior officers, 03 and below, while more one-career/one-job families and more single-income families were senior officers, WX, 04 and above.

Of all designator groups, Nurses and medical officers had the highest proportions of two-career families, restricted line officers had the highest proportion of one-career/one-job families and other staff officers had the highest proportions of single-income families.
Fewer military members with two-career families had intentions of a full military career than did either one-career/one-job families or single-income families.

Concerning childcare issues, it was found that whether the spouse worked, considered her work a career or a job made no difference in numbers of children the families had. All families utilized babysitters more frequently than other types of childcare, but while the civilian day care facility was two-career families' second choice, the military childcare facility was the second choice for all other families. Of families dissatisfied with the childcare facilities available to them, double-income families indicated that day care (first) or a live-in babysitter/housekeeper (second) would better meet their needs while single-income families indicated babysitters (first) and day care (second).

Only two-career families had the higher proportion of females who would continue their careers with only minimum interruptions when children were born. The greater proportions of other families indicated the female would interrupt her career until children were of an appropriate age and then return to her career.

Military members indicated that, on the average, they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the quality of military family life. Although there were no significant differences in degree of satisfaction among career/family lifestyles, a significantly larger proportion of two-career
families indicated that they were having a serious conflict as a result of their combined work/family lifestyle.

Civilian spouses of two-career families were more highly committed to full careers of their own than one-career/one-job spouses were with their jobs. They were slightly more highly educated, but the largest distinction was that their careers required a much higher level of education (college degree) than did the jobs of spouses in one-career/one-job families (high school).

The male member’s career took priority over the female’s career/job in almost all double-income families. When asked which member would place their career needs second to their spouse's career needs or which member would place their career needs second to the family needs, over 90 percent of all families chose the female. However, when asked who would most likely be absent from work to handle an emergency at home which either member could handle, more two-career families answered that the male member would be absent than did one-career/one-job families. Overall, double-income families were also less satisfied with their military careers than were single-income families.

The above findings show several areas of concern to families which the Navy organization should consider when formulating new directions for the future of family programs. It is apparent that large proportions of military members have families, many of which have small children.
and spouses who work outside the home. As females become more highly educated they tend to establish careers of their own and often do not interrupt their careers when children are born. There is also evidence that males in these families accept greater proportions of family responsibilities than males in more traditional families.

It was also found that military members of two-career families were less satisfied with their careers and less interested in full careers. These findings suggest that two-career families may be less satisfied and, thus, less willing to remain in the Navy than families with other lifestyles. If the numbers of two-career families increase, as they have increased in the civilian population, retention rates which are already low could decrease further. Officers who share family responsibilities more equally with their spouses may demand more consideration from the Navy for their families.
TABLE 5.14: Summary of Findings From the Initial Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two-career families</th>
<th>One-Career/ one-job families</th>
<th>Single-income families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>59% 03 and below</td>
<td>41% 03 and below</td>
<td>48% 03 and below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41% WX, 04 and above</td>
<td>59% WX, 04 and above</td>
<td>61% WX, 04 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designator</td>
<td>Nurses and medical officers had the highest proportion of two-career families, 75% and 40% respectively.</td>
<td>Restricted line officers had the highest percentage of one-career/one-job families, 30%.</td>
<td>Other staff officers had the highest percentage of single-income families, 71.7%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career intentions</td>
<td>76% desire full career.</td>
<td>87.0% desire full career.</td>
<td>88.8% desire full career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family concerns:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of children</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>childcare most frequently used</td>
<td>Babysitters/civilian day care</td>
<td>Babysitters/civilian day care</td>
<td>Babysitters/military day care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>childcare alternative which would better meet their needs</td>
<td>day care/live-in babysitter, or housekeeper</td>
<td>day care/live-in babysitter, or housekeeper</td>
<td>babysitter/day care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5.14: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two-career families</th>
<th>One-career/one-job families</th>
<th>Single-income families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female-career plans when children are born (future families)</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>interrupted</td>
<td>interrupted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with military family life</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiencing serious conflicts as a result of two-career/job lifestyle</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career commitment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civilian spouse's career commitment</td>
<td>69.0% full career</td>
<td>14.3% full career</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spouse's career satisfaction</td>
<td>slightly below very satisfied (mean=1.85)</td>
<td>slightly below somewhat satisfied (mean=2.30)</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational level</td>
<td>45% college 19.7% postgraduate</td>
<td>32% college 9.2% postgraduate</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational level required by type of work done</td>
<td>50% college 12.1% postgraduate</td>
<td>22.2% college, 4.9% postgraduate</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-career families</td>
<td>One-career/one-job families</td>
<td>Single-income families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who puts career or job needs second to spouse's career or job needs?</td>
<td>almost always male</td>
<td>almost always male</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who puts career or job needs second to family needs?</td>
<td>almost always male</td>
<td>almost always male</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who is more likely to be absent from work to handle a home emergency?</td>
<td>31.4% male</td>
<td>13.6% male</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military career satisfaction</td>
<td>slightly below somewhat satisfied (mean=2.12)</td>
<td>slightly below somewhat satisfied (combined with two-career)</td>
<td>slightly above somewhat satisfied (mean=1.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. ANALYSIS OF FOLLOW-UP SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

For the follow-up study, both the military member and the civilian spouse filled out a survey questionnaire (Appendices 6 and 7). A general profile of the participants in the follow-up study is contained in Appendix 8. Both the respondents were asked to describe, in detail, the most pressing problems in pursuing a two-career lifestyle. Then they were asked what advice they would give to other couples maintaining a two-career lifestyle. The analysis of the respondents' comments resulted in nine categories of problems and seven categories of advice (TABLE 5.15). In the table, each problem category and each advice category is followed by the percentage and number of respondents who mentioned that problem or offered that advice. Then representative statements are listed for the purpose of providing the reader with the flavor of the respondents' comments.

Transfers were the most often stated problem by both military members and civilian spouses. Comments from both spouses included mention of such problems for the civilian spouse's career as: limited career progression and continuity (continually starting all over again and making new professional contacts); locations of duty stations not conducive to a career for the spouse; and employer prejudices against hiring military spouses. There was no mention of the civilian spouse's career causing problems for the military member's career. However, 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.

Many of the comments from both the military members
and their spouses showed a high level of frustration.
In some cases respondents actually mentioned drastic mea-
sures such as leaving the Navy or divorcing their spouse.
The following direct comments illustrate this sense of
frustration:

(Military member) "...In our situation the prospect
of periodic changes of duty station is highly dis-
ruptive of my spouse's career plans. Her highly spe-
cialized career requires the opportunity for
prolonged, if not permanent, residence in an area
to develop the patient case load, professional rela-
tionships, hospital privileges, continuing education
opportunities, membership in professional organizations,
involvement in community health planning, organization,
and service, and advancement of her career. PCS orders,
even if at fairly infrequent intervals of four or five
years, would be markedly disruptive and essentially
require her to rebegin her career on several occasions.
THIS IS THE PRIMARY REASON FOR OUR DECISION THAT I
NOT CONTINUE MY OTHERWISE QUITE SATISFYING, REWARDING,
AND PRODUCTIVE MILITARY CAREER."

(Military member) "...Although success in the business
world often requires managers to change firms, when
outside factors such as a Navy move cause an untimely
transfer, a decrease in salary or position for the
spouse is likely."

(Civilian spouse) "...Moving around is okay for awhile
because it broadens my job experience, but it is
depressing now to realize that employers are reluctant
to hire me because they know my spouse will be trans-
ferred in 2 or 3 years and they don't want to invest
time in me. If I want to advance, my spouse and I
will either have to separate for the duration of active duty or divorce."

(Civilian spouse) "...It is difficult finding jobs every time we move. Sometimes it's hard to get too involved if it's a short tour. Many times I've accepted jobs which fall beneath my job qualifications and pay is much less."

It would be interesting to know at what point these frustrations result in the military member resigning his/her commission to pursue a career more compatible with the spouse's career goals.

Advice offered for better dealing with transfers tended to center on the subordination and flexibility of the spouse's career or simply to leave the Navy. No respondent suggested that the military career should be more flexible. However, several did mention that detailers should consider the spouse's career when possible, in planning transfers.

When asked specifically if they had ever mentioned their spouse's career to their detailer (Appendix 6, Question 0), only 36.4 percent (N=20) indicated that they had. However, when asked if they thought detailers should consider spouse's careers (Appendix 6, Question P), 74.5 percent (N=41) said that they should. One possible explanation for the discrepancy between action and opinion may be that until the Fall Officer Newsletter was published by the Bureau of Naval Personnel, there was no written policy regarding consideration of spouses' careers. However, it has always been detailing policy to take officers' preferences
for duty assignments into consideration to the maximum extent possible after first considering the needs of the service and the needs of the officer's career. There is no provision for considering the officer's preference before his or her career needs, even for families who have decided that the civilian spouse's career has priority.

Childcare was the second most frequently mentioned problem for military members, and third most frequently mentioned by civilian spouses. Of the total civilian spouse respondents, 61.7 percent (N=29) had at least one child living at home, and 34.0 percent (N=16) had at least one child under the age of 12. Of those families with children under 12 years of age, 81.3 percent (N=13) indicated that they would use a 24-hour childcare center if it were available (Appendix 7; Question V), and 75.0 percent (N=12) indicated that they would use it to at least some extent (Appendix 7; Question W).

Prices families with children were willing to pay for childcare ranged from $.85 to $1.80 per hour, but several qualified their response in that it would depend on the type of care provided. They would be willing to pay much more if the care included some educational programs for the children or if the center provided for irregular working hours.

Advice concerning resolution of childcare problems included taking advantage of facilities available, using
domestic help and simply deferring having children until both careers are established.

**Time together and time for children** was the second most frequently mentioned problem by the civilian spouses, but was not one of the most frequently mentioned by the military members. However, when added together with scheduling and overload, the category was mentioned quite frequently by both members of the couples (TABLE 5.15).

When asked how many hours were spent on the job per week, 38.2 percent (N=18) civilian spouses indicated that the military member worked over 50 hours per week. Only 11.3 percent of civilian spouses indicated that they spent over 50 hours per week on the job. For at least some families, it appears that the inordinant amount of time they spend on the job may be contributing to their problems in integrating careers and family. It is interesting that not one respondent offering advice indicated that either member of the couple should control the hours they spend on the job. However, several individuals mentioned the importance of placing the family or the marriage relationship first.

**Long hours and family separations** were not mentioned frequently as major problems, but for those who did mention them, there was a considerable emotional content in their comments.

(Military member) "...In this case, the most pressing problem is separation. While on deployment, my spouse started school with the intention of coming back to
Hawaii after the deployment. She needs to accomplish her goals and thus decided to stay in school (on the mainland because the school here was inadequate). As a result of trying to be a two-career family, her decision, and my restrictions of being in the military, the family has broken and a probable divorce will happen. The total separation would have been 28 months if I stayed in the military."

Several respondents indicated that flexibility was the key to a successful two-career family. Understanding, willingness to make sacrifices and independence were emphasized.

Conflicts over careers and money were often mentioned among the problems of two-career families. Some comments indicated that there was not a consensus of opinion between the husband and wife concerning the compatibility of careers. When asked specifically to what extent they felt their spouse's career was compatible with their military career (Appendix 7; Question N), 76.4 percent of the military members indicated somewhat or very compatible. When asked what their feeling was toward their spouse's having a career (Appendix 6; Question M) 52.7 percent (N=29) answered "very positive," 45.5 percent (N=25) answered "all right as long as my spouse prefers to work and there are no seriously negative effects," and only 1.8 percent (N=1) answered that they would "prefer their spouse not work outside the home."

From the data it appears that part of the conflict over whose career takes priority may be a result of military
members who believe that their spouses should only work if there are no seriously negative effects. In other words, military members may be less adaptable to the hardships of having their spouse pursue a career than are spouses adaptable to their mates pursuing military careers.

The civilian spouses were not asked the same questions, but were asked if the couple had agreed upon their individual career plans. Only 61.7 percent had agreed on the military member's career plans and 66.0 percent had agreed on the civilian spouse's career plans. Given the importance of this subject and the relative maturity of the respondents, it was anticipated that these percentages would be much higher. Again, the failure of a relatively large percentage of couples who had not agreed upon career plans is probably the reason for the incidence of career conflicts.

Co-operation, mutual decision making and understanding were offered by the respondents as advice for coping with career and money conflicts.

Recommendations for sharing of housework was often mentioned in advice for other couples, and getting housework done was not often mentioned by the two-career couples as a problem. Since these couples seem to have a working method of dividing household chores, the data were examined to determine how the couples coordinated this effort. The civilian spouse survey questionnaire included an open-ended question which asked how the respondent and his/her spouse divided housework, child care, errands,
house and car maintenance and other routine chores (Appendix 7; Question P). The highest percentage of couples (38.3%) assigned specific tasks to each person in the family (N=18). Similarly, 34.0 percent (N=16) divided their household chores equally. In only 4.3 percent (N=2) of families did the male do the majority of the chores while in only 2.1 percent (N=1) of families did the female do the majority of the chores. Finally, in only 2.1 percent (N=1) was domestic help used. The remaining 19.1 percent had no specific plan.

From this analysis, it appears that couples successful in dividing household chores do so either by assigning specific tasks to specific individuals or by splitting the work equally. There appeared to be a general consensus among respondents that regardless of how the housework was divided that it was most important that both partners shared some part of the responsibilities.
TABLE 5.15: Comments from follow-up survey questionnaires: Most pressing problems in pursuing a two-career lifestyle and advice offered to other couples maintaining a two-career lifestyle (Appendix 7 & 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Civilian spouse's career must be subordinate to the military member's.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency stated by:</td>
<td>frequency stated by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civilian spouse:</td>
<td>civilian spouse:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military spouse:</td>
<td>military spouse:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The spouse has difficulty progressing in career because of frequent moves, accepting positions below capability, and poor continuity of work experience.

Frustration is experienced in finding a job and starting all over again.

The spouse experiences periods of unemployment and competition with established permanent members of the professional community.

Accept the fact that the civilian spouse is forced to subordinate his/her career to the whim of the Navy.

Recognize that spouse's career will be subordinate before marrying.

The spouse should seek a flexible career.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailers insist on placing female officer's career subordinate to the male officer's career.</td>
<td>A compromise may be worked out by switching priority from one career to the other every few years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of duty stations are not always conducive to civilian spouse's career.</td>
<td>Both spouses must be prepared for career disappointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The female's career must be placed second.</td>
<td>Plan your military career so that you can stay in one large area a major portion of the time, i.e., Norfolk or San Diego.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The spouse is forced to accept a &quot;second citizen&quot; role.</td>
<td>Place the civilian spouse's career second until the military member retires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers are reluctant to hire military spouses because of frequent transfers.</td>
<td>Prepare a complete resume before each move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wife often receives adverse reactions from relatives and friends.</td>
<td>Diversify, have more than one skill within your career field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-certification for teachers, nurses and other certificate-holding spouses is costly and time consuming.</td>
<td>Make the best of each duty station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The spouse loses retirement benefits because she cannot stay with one job long enough.</td>
<td>The civilian spouse should work with a company which will transfer him/her easily or the couple must be willing to live apart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because the spouse changes jobs so frequently, she loses vacation benefits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5.15: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untimely moves cause the spouse to miss pay raises and promotions which she has earned.</td>
<td>Find out about available childcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving frequently results in the spouse being one or two promotions behind others in the same career field.</td>
<td>frequency stated by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving just when the spouse has established credibility and worth to the employer is frustrating.</td>
<td>civilian military spouse: spouse:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.8% 14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>(6) (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty finding adequate childcare facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The major problem is not two-careers but three--the Navy, her career and childrearing.</td>
<td>Don't be reluctant to use childcare facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young children often require the presence of an adult during short term sickness.</td>
<td>Get a housekeeper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defer children until both careers are established--then get some help.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5.15: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is an absence of adequate, low cost childcare of high quality with hours suitable for military schedules.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time off to care for sick children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking time to listen to problems of teenagers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for children when their father is deployed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping track of children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictions on the military member preclude sharing of family responsibilities such as taking children to medical appointments and teacher conferences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need reliable professional childcare facilities if we both have to travel at the same time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time together/time for children</th>
<th>Relationship, marriage and children must come first</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>frequency stated by:</td>
<td>frequency stated by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civilian spouse:</td>
<td>civilian spouse:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military spouse:</td>
<td>military spouse:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5.15: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling working hours and vacations in order to have time off together.</td>
<td>Educate children about matters concerning the family to promote better understanding and a more harmonious family unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency stated by:</td>
<td>Set aside time to be a family. One night a week should be &quot;family night&quot; and one day of each weekend should be set aside for the family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civilian spouse</td>
<td>If you have children, make sure the time you spend with them is not all taken up with telling them all the things they are not doing right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military spouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3% 12.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overload, too much work and not enough free time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency stated by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civilian spouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military spouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5% 1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting job schedules and often days off do not coincide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having leave cancelled which was timed in such a way as to run concurrent with wife's vacation has been a major problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both of us are too tired at night to properly discharge our duty as parents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time at home together with children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5.15: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Advice</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long hours (demanding military requirements).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency stated by:</td>
<td>frequency stated by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civilian spouse:</td>
<td>civilian spouse:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military spouse:</td>
<td>military spouse:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.9% (7)</td>
<td>9.1% (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1% (1)</td>
<td>9.1% (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When I'm deployed she has to take on all the extra duties of managing the home and children plus her career.

When the husband is gone there is too much day-to-day burden on the wife—particularly with small children and house maintenance.

Conflicts arising while separated which cannot be resolved upon reunion.

Because my spouse chose to remain at our past duty station to pursue educational and career goals, separation was inevitable and now, probable divorce.

Regardless of whether I work or not, the Navy takes 70% of David's time and that's the biggest drawback—we can live with it but it is not our ideal.

Both partners must be flexible and be willing to make sacrifices.

Be flexible and understanding.

Look for as much flexibility as possible in careers, positions, family—everything.

Become an independent person in all aspects, especially financial and home maintenance areas early on to prevent mental anguish during separation.

Be flexible and don't cause negative effects on young children.

Be willing to be unsettled and uncertain of future.
TABLE 5.15: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts over careers and money</td>
<td>Cooperation, decision-making and understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency <strong>stated by:</strong></td>
<td>frequency <strong>stated by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civilian spouse: 4.3% (8)</td>
<td>civilian spouse: 14.9% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military spouse: 9.1% (5)</td>
<td>military spouse: 20.4% (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We both tend to think our individual careers are most important.

My wife considers the Navy to be an easy job. She expects me to take all the time off to take children to medical appointments, recreational facilities, etc.

The initial response to her earning money was that the money she earned was hers not ours.

Mutual decision-making is of paramount importance.

Keep lines of communication open in order to prevent possible problems, resentment, etc.

Stay open-minded and put yourself in spouse's place.

Keep a good sense of humor.

It is important to have total agreement on what monies are spent and discuss purchases prior to obligation.

Use the extra money as a buffer to military pay, not absolute necessity to survive.

Set priorities together and realize that you can't have everything all the time.

Give each other all the encouragement you can.
TABLE 5.15: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting housework done</td>
<td>Share household chores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency stated by:</td>
<td>frequency stated by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civilian</td>
<td>military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spouse:</td>
<td>spouse:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trying to keep a clean house.

If the husband refuses to help the wife, her work load doubles, fatigue sets in and the relationship may suffer.

When housework is done, there is little free time left.

Both have to help in the house and with the children.

Resign yourself to the fact that you can't have two jobs (in the home and out) and still be a spotless housekeeper and super wife and mother.

Don't be a perfectionist about keeping house.

Make agreements about household responsibilities.

Get everyone involved in housework (children included).
J. CONCLUSIONS

The problems and advice offered by the respondents was overlapping in several cases. It is clear, though, that some problems are causing serious conflicts for families by the high number of emotionally-laden responses received. Although families seem to be coping with separations, transfers are the number one major problem. The high level of transfer-related frustration experienced by spouses of Naval officers is primarily a result of their being forced to leave behind their hard-earned benefits (often pay raises, pensions and promotions) and career successes to start all over again in a new location.

Time together and time for children is also a driving problem for many families. Reasons for the lack of time at least in some cases is a result of inordinately long hours of work.

Childcare was also high among the priorities of family problems. While two-career families frequently have young children, few childcare centers are available which provide for sick children or overnight care for children of parents who may have to travel at the same time.

This analysis does not attempt to say that the frustrations of combining family and careers are the reasons for discontented officers or poor retention. It is clear from several respondents comments, however, that there are
probably relatively large numbers of Naval officers who are experiencing career/family conflicts which are probably contributing to their decisions to leave the Navy.
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COMMAND ACTION
AND FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

It was anticipated that along with a trend toward non-traditional family lifestyles, the Navy will experience a significant decrease in officer career commitment and satisfaction. Although family lifestyles have changed rapidly over the past decades, until recently Navy policies have been slow to change. The underlying assumption on the part of Navy policy-makers appears to have been that Navy families are traditional in nature with a male head of household and female homemaker. As a result, many Navy policies are no longer adequately supportive for an increasing number of non-traditional families.

This thesis has provided evidence of a trend among Naval officers' families toward greater proportions of families with civilian spouses who work outside the home. Responses to the survey questionnaires indicated that families with two-career lifestyles, and sometimes families with one-career/one-job lifestyles, are significantly different from past Navy families in many respects. Differences in attitudes and behaviors of these families have implications for the Navy in areas such as officer retention, detailing and transfers, utilization of women officers and family services programs.
It is important for the Navy to know what kinds of policy changes would best meet the needs of both the Navy organization and families. It is also important that policies not be paternalistic, but provide meaningful compensation for financial hardships and allow military families, who take it upon their own initiative, to overcome the hardships of military life.

Drawing upon the data analysis provided in Chapter 5, the following recommendations are offered for consideration by the Chief of Naval Personnel. Additionally, suggestions for improving retention efforts, which are related to family life in the Navy, are offered for consideration by Commanding Officers.

A. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

The data presented in this thesis indicates that two-career families have less desire for a full career in the Navy than do families with either single-income lifestyles or one-career/one-job lifestyles. It was found that the most pressing problem for these families was required Navy transfers. Statements of two-career family respondents reflected a high degree of concern by both officers and their spouses. Several indicated that drastic measures such as divorce or resignation from the Navy were eminent as a result of the incompatibility of their two-career lifestyle with military family life.
The following recommendations offered for consideration are based on the assumption that officers and their families who are most satisfied with their transfers will consequently be more productive and more likely to continue to pursue their Naval careers.

1. **Detailing Joint-Spouse Couples**

   1. Establish a program for detailing joint-spouse couples in which the couple could elect to be detailed as a team. The couple would be counselled early in their careers concerning options most favorable for their careers and their chosen lifestyle. A detailing team for the purpose of coordinating joint-assignments would be responsible for locating billet possibilities for joint-spouse couples and coordinating information from other services for colocating inter-service, joint-spouse couples. This program would provide an added resource for detailers by lessening their burden of searching for joint-assignments. Additionally, with this extra coordinating assistance, detailers would less often be faced with the dilemma of either separating the couple or having to resort to less than optimal utilization of one officer. Both the Navy and the couple would benefit from this effort. The cost of the extra detailing team should prove cost-effective by increasing retention of joint-spouse couples and decreasing the often suboptimal utilization of one or both members of the joint-spouse couples.
2. Publish suggestions for joint-spouse couples concerning subspecialties and warfare specialties which are most compatible in making joint assignments.

3. Provide an additional pay allowance for joint-spouse couples who must maintain separate living quarters as a result of the location of their assignments.

2. Detailing Two-Career Couples With One Military and One Civilian Member

1. Establish a detailing program for officers electing to be detailed with additional consideration for their civilian spouse's career. Allow these officers to elect to place their career needs second to their personal desires. This policy would allow a viable option for couples who had decided that the civilian spouse's career would take priority over the military member's career. Officers electing to be detailed with these considerations would be required to submit an addendum to their duty preference card with relevant career information regarding their spouse.

2. Establish a detailing team to coordinate assignments for military members with two-career families. The team would be responsible for identifying jobs and career possibilities at less desirable or remote duty stations such as Adak, Guam or other overseas areas. This program would aid detailers in placing officers at the less
desirable duty stations as well as provide civilian resources which could improve the quality of life in some of these areas.

3. Provide a tuition aid program for spouses who are forced to attain additional education as a result of a Navy transfer. For example, spouses who are required to take additional college courses to become certified to practice nursing or teaching in a new location would have tuition for those courses paid for by the government. For families assigned overseas, foreign language courses could also be included in the tuition aid program. This program would lessen the financial burden of relocating for two-career couples. The Navy would also gain by fostering better family attitudes toward transfers.

3. Childcare Facilities

1. Establish a pilot program coordinated from a central point for Navy childcare facilities. The pilot program would consist of establishing 24-hour childcare facilities, professionally run with Navy specified standards and requirements, at several locations where there are large numbers of military families, a high degree of varying working hours and the absence of adequate civilian childcare facilities. Families using the childcare facilities could pay a reasonable charge and the remaining costs would be budgeted for by the central program coordinator.
While the Navy would initially have to budget for the childcare centers, it is anticipated that when families learned of the flexible hours and professional care that the facilities would be self-sufficient. The Navy would improve family life for the many two-career couples who find childcare facilities now inadequate. Additionally, the Navy would reduce the time lost when servicewomen and single parents with children are absent from work for reasons related to childcare. Childcare facilities in some areas could aid detailers in placing better qualified officers at less desirable duty stations.

4. Family Program

The Family Program could provide centralized coordination for gathering family-related information from local commands through the Family Program Center or Personnel Services Centers throughout the Navy. Information gathered would include: availability of civilian jobs near Naval stations, local or state certification requirements for particular career fields, professional contacts for civilian spouses in particular career fields, availability of civilian childcare facilities and local contacts for live-in babysitters/housekeepers.

Family Program Centers at local commands could provide assistance for spouses preparing to transfer. Besides providing information, a WATS line could be
provided for spouses making career/job contacts prior to transferring.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE SURGEON GENERAL

Nurses and Medical officers were the two designator groups with the highest incidence of two-career family lifestyles. It is anticipated that these two-career couples in particular, because of their other than normal working hours, are among the two-career families in most critical need of 24-hour childcare facilities, consideration for spouse's career and more flexible detailing policies. It is recommended that the detailing procedures for Nurses and Medical officers in particular be reviewed for the feasibility of providing additional considerations for families.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION BY COMMANDING OFFICERS

It is clear that many of the measures which can be taken to improve military family life must be taken at the local command level. The following suggestions offered for consideration by Commanding Officers are directed toward improving officer retention.

(1) Assess the impact of local command policies and directives and eliminate when possible the aspects which have negative effects upon families. For example, many
commands require extra working hours on weekends for reasons attributable to poor management.

(2) Provide as much early information as possible to families being transferred to the command. This information should include information about local employment opportunities and civilian as well as military childcare facilities in addition to the standard welcome aboard packages.

(3) Re-evaluate past assumptions about assignments of spouses to the same commands or working areas. It is probable that the negative impacts of spousal relationships in the working environment have been overstated. The positive aspects of keeping couples together might possibly far outweigh the negative aspects.

(4) Identify billets at the command which would or would not be appropriate for a joint-spouse team.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

There have been few research studies which have addressed the quality of military family life and how it affects service manpower problems. Although retention studies have found that family problems are often mentioned by service members leaving the Navy, no study has attempted to measure the relative impact of those family-related problems. Well-documented research would help gain recognition for family programs which could both improve the
quality of life for military members and lessen manpower-related problems for the military organization.

The viability of changing current transfer policies should be given top priority in research. As previously stated in Chapter 5 of this thesis, transfers were the number one most frequently described problem for two-career couples. It is recognized that any adjustment to tour lengths would have a substantial effect upon Navy manpower planning. Therefore, it is most important that research be conducted for the purpose of assessing subsequent effects of adjusting current tour lengths upon the manpower budget, manpower shortfalls at certain commands and in the rotation system.

Concerning childcare facilities, research is needed to substantiate the extent to which the facilities would be utilized. Research showing cost-effectiveness and verifying the need for these types of services would help in gaining an adequate allocation of resources for establishing a childcare program for the Navy.

Further research is necessary to examine the feasibility of negotiating employment opportunities for civilian spouses overseas. Professional requirements and qualifications for employment in countries other than the United States need to be investigated. Between country agreements must be interpreted and renegotiated where possible.
E. CONCLUSIONS

The study found that 25.9 percent of the married Naval officer sample had two-career family lifestyles. An inference drawn from these sample findings\textsuperscript{22} would indicate that approximately 11,827 Navy officer families have a two-career lifestyle, and another 8,813 (19.2 percent) have a one-career/one-job lifestyle. Therefore, there are substantial numbers of non-traditional families in the Navy. It was found that these families have significantly different attitudes toward their careers, their families and family service needs.

It is not to be misconstrued that this thesis is directed toward a female manpower problem. Of the families in the study, 91 percent were families of male Naval officers with civilian spouses. It is anticipated that in the future a very high percentage of women officers will have two-career families and probably of the joint-spouse nature. However, women officers make up only 6.5 percent of the Naval officer population and are projected for not more than 7 percent until 1983.

The recommendations provided for consideration of top Naval policy-makers are based upon the research presented

\textsuperscript{22}Chapter 4 of this thesis provides an illustration of the representativeness of the initial sample to the total married Naval officer population.
in this thesis. It appears that family related research has been an area given little consideration in the past, but which will be an area of increasing interest in the future. It is not only in the interest of families but more in the interest of the military organization to learn what desires and needs of families will motivate their positive attitudes toward military life and consequently the desire of the military member to remain a productive member of the service.
APPENDIX 1: INITIAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Military Family Research Survey

This survey is part of a study being done at the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California. This research has been coordinated with the Department of the Navy, and the results will be provided to the Chief of Naval Personnel. It is designed to gather some specific information concerning compatibility of marital needs with a military career. It is to be filled out by active duty Naval and Marine Corps Officers with marriage relationships, whether married or living with a partner of the opposite sex. Your candid responses are essential in reflecting the true family service needs of men and women officers in the military today. Information from all participants and individual commands will be controlled carefully to ensure confidentiality. Your time in filling out this survey will be greatly appreciated. If you are particularly interested, or have any questions please give me a call or write to me at the address on the back of this survey. Thank you!

LT. Della J. Suter, USN
Autovon # 878-2666

For the convenience of the respondents, this survey is divided into four sections. If a particular section is not applicable to your situation please go to the next section. SECTION 1 and SECTION 4 are for all respondents to answer.

SECTION 1

(for all respondents)

Please fill in the following blanks.
5. Designator/MOS _______ 6. Married yes/no
7. Divorced yes/no ___ 8. Number of children living with you ___
9. Ages of children ________ 10. If you have no children, do you plan to have children yes/no ___ 11. How many children do you plan to have? ___.
12. What are your career intentions? (check more than one response if applicable)
   _a) continuing a full career until retirement from the Navy or Marine Corps
   _b) less than a twenty year career
   _c) less than a ten year career
   _d) until the end of my current obligation
   _e) other

13. To what degree are you satisfied with your military career?
   () very satisfied () somewhat satisfied () neutral () somewhat dissatisfied () very dissatisfied

14. If your spouse is active duty military, what are his/her career intentions? (check more than one response if applicable)
   _a) N/A
   _b) continuing a full career until retirement from the Navy or Marine Corps
   _c) less than a twenty year career
   _d) less than a ten year career
   _e) until the end of current obligation
   _f) other

15. If your spouse is a civilian what are his/her career intentions? (check more than one response if applicable)
   _a) N/A
   _b) continuing a full career until retirement
   _c) less than a twenty year career
   _d) less than a ten year career
   _e) until the end of any present commitment or contract
   _f) other

16. What level of education/training has your spouse completed?
   _a) less than High School
   _b) High School
   _c) Technical School and/or any special school
   _d) College Degree
   _e) Postgraduate Degree
   _f) other
SECTION 2

(for officers whose spouse is employed outside the home)
If this section is not applicable to you please go on to
SECTION 3, page 6.

17. What level of education is required for your spouse's current
career/job?
  _a) less than High School
  _b) High School
  _c) Technical School and/or any special school
  _d) College Degree
  _e) Postgraduate Degree

18. To what degree would you say your spouse is satisfied with
his/her career?

    very satisfied () somewhat satisfied () neutral () somewhat
                             dissatisfied () very
                             dissatisfied

19. Would you describe yourself and your spouse as a two-career
family?
  _a) yes
  _b) no
  _c) not sure (please explain)

20. Which family type best describes you and your spouse?
  _a) both are highly committed to our respective careers
  _b) the male is highly committed to his career and the female
      commits more of her effort toward the family or, is willing
      to place her career secondary to the male's career
  _c) both emphasize family
  _d) both emphasize career and family
  _e) ____________________________
21. When absolutely necessary, which member is most likely to place the needs of their career second to their spouse's career?  
_a) male  
_b) female  

22. Which member is most likely to place the needs of their career second to the needs of the family?  
_a) male  
_b) female  

23. If an emergency arises at home, which either member can handle, which is most likely to be absent from work to take care of it?  
_a) male  
_b) female  

24. If you absolutely had to transfer to a new duty station which required you to relocate, what would happen to your spouse's career?  

25. If both you and your spouse are involved in careers/jobs now, which of the following if any are advantages?  
_a) having more money  
_b) sharing broadening experiences in spouse's profession  
_c) each of you having a resident colleague you can depend on for support, consultation, and understanding  
_d) increased pride and admiration for each other's accomplishments  
_e) increased understanding of commitment to your respective careers  
_f) other  

_g)
26. Would you say that you and your spouse are experiencing serious conflict as a result of your combined careers?
   _a) N/A
   _b) yes (if yes, please answer next question)
   _c) no (if no, please skip next question)

27. If you answered the above question yes, which if any of the following are serious problems? (check as many responses as are applicable to your situation)
   _a) relocating, transfers
   _b) commuting
   _c) childcare
   _d) overload (too much work, lack of leisure time)
   _e) separation
   _f) jealousy of career successes i.e. pay, promotions, status
   _g) jealousy of people with whom each works
   _h) social acceptability (meeting expectations of society concerning roles within the family and/or roles as a professional)
   _i) no opportunity for intimacy
   _j) other ________________________________

28. To what degree are you personally satisfied with the quality of your family life in the military as it is today?
   () very satisfied () somewhat satisfied () neutral () somewhat dissatisfied () very dissatisfied
SECTION 3
(for officers planning to have children or already with children)
If this section is not applicable to your situation please go to SECTION 4, page 7.

29. Which of the following best fits your family pattern?
   _a) The female did/will discontinue her career when/if children are born, with no intentions of returning to her career.
   _b) The female did/will interrupt her career beyond what can be allowed for by leave of absence or vacation until children are of an appropriate age, and then resume her career.
   _c) The female did/will interrupt her career only minimally or not at all when/if she has children.

30. If the female would interrupt her career until the children are of appropriate age, what do you consider the appropriate age to be? What period of time would you anticipate that to be?

31. If you have children, what types of childcare facilities do you use most frequently?
   _a) military childcare center
   _b) local civilian childcare center
   _c) baby sitter
   _d) live-in baby sitter/housekeeper
   _e) close relative
   _f) other ______________________________________________________

32. If you are dissatisfied with the childcare services available to you now, which of the following types of services would best meet your needs?
   _a) 24 hour professional childcare center
   _b) day care only (professionally run by civilian or military)
   _c) baby sitter
   _d) live-in baby sitter/housekeeper
   _e) other ______________________
SECTION 4

(for all respondents)

33. To what extent does the quality of family life and the family services provided by the military have an impact on your career intentions?

() very negative () somewhat negative () no impact () somewhat positive () very positive

please answer next question please skip next question

34. If you answered with a negative or no impact response to the above question, please explain what, if anything, the military organization could do in regard to improving family life for you which would cause a positive change in your career intentions.

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

35. If you are a two-career family and are willing to participate in a more in depth study on the Military Family, please provide your name and address below. The follow up study will consist of another survey to be filled out by both you and your spouse. It will focus more specifically on Family Service needs of two-career military families. I will continue to ensure confidentiality of any information you provide, and I will be sending you the follow up survey in January 1979. I will also be happy to share a copy of the final report if you are interested. Thank you!

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
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APPENDIX 2: CAREER FAMILY LIFESTYLE BY RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career/Family Lifestyle</th>
<th>Two-career</th>
<th>One-career/one-job</th>
<th>Single-income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank:</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WX</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X²=30.89   df=12   p < .002

Appendix 1; Rank and Question 19
APPENDIX 3: CAREER/FAMILY LIFESTYLE BY DESIGNATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designator</th>
<th>Career/Family Lifestyle</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two-career</td>
<td>one-career/one-job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviator</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Line</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Service Corps</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag Corps</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Corps</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer Corps</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDO</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2=45.92, \ df=26, \ p<.009\)

Appendix 1, Designator, and Question 19.
APPENDIX 4:  CAREER/FAMILY LIFESTYLE BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>two-career</th>
<th>one-career/</th>
<th>single-income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td>(220)</td>
<td>(/355)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total row %</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 12.44$, df = 10, NS
### APPENDIX 5: NUMBER AND AGES OF CHILDREN LIVING AT HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>Cumulative % of Families with Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no children</td>
<td>(99)</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 1</td>
<td>(360)</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 2</td>
<td>(266)</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 3</td>
<td>(94)</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 4</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 5</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 6</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (459)

Families with Children (N=360)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages of Children</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 years</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>55.6% *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 years</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the largest percentage, 55.6%, of families with children had at least one child between the ages of 6 and 12 years.
APPENDIX 6: FOLLOW-UP SURVEY; MILITARY MEMBER QUESTIONNAIRE

MILITARY FAMILY RESEARCH SURVEY
TO BE COMPLETED BY THE MILITARY MEMBER

SOME OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE DUPLICATED FROM THE FIRST SURVEY. THIS WAS NECESSARY IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN CONFIDENTIALITY OF YOUR ANSWERS.

A. AGE ___  B. RANK ___  C. SEX ___  D. RACE ___  E. DESIGN ___
F. MARRIED YES/NO  G. DIVORCED YES/NO  H. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN MARRIED? _____  I. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN IN THE SERVICE? ____________________________________________
J. SPOUSE’S OCCUPATION ____________________________________________

K. WHAT ARE YOUR PLANS FOR THE NAVY?
   __1. TO REMAIN ON ACTIVE DUTY UNTIL RETIREMENT
   __2. TO LEAVE THE NAVY PRIOR TO RETIREMENT
   __3. UNDECIDED
L. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOUR SPOUSE HAS A CAREER OR IS PURSUING A CAREER IN THE SENSE THAT HE/SHE HAS PREPARED HIMSELF/HERSELF WITH SPECIAL SKILLS, HAS A COMMITMENT TO THAT LINE OF WORK AND HAS SOME FUTURE PLANS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THAT CAREER?
   __1. YES
   __2. NO
   __3. COMMENT ____________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
M. What is your feeling toward your spouse’s having a job/career?

1. Very positive, prefer my spouse to work outside the home.
2. All right as long as my spouse prefers to work and there are no seriously negative effects.
3. No opinion
4. Would prefer he/she not work outside the home.
5. Very negative, prefer my spouse not pursue a career.

N. Would you say that your spouse’s career is compatible with your military career?

1. Very compatible
2. Somewhat compatible
3. Minimally compatible
4. Not really compatible
5. Definitely not compatible

O. Have you ever mentioned your spouse’s career to your detailer either in discussion or on your duty preference card?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Comment ______________________________________________________________

P. Do you think detailers should consider civilian spouse’s careers when detailing the military member?

1. Yes, whenever possible
2. No
3. Comment ______________________________________________________________
Q. How many times have you been separated for more than a month from your family as a result of your military duty?

_________________________________________________________________________________

R. In your career approximately how many months separation total would that be?  ____________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

S. If you have had prolonged periods of duty which involved frequent short separations please describe the extent of those separations. (Approximately how many days per week or month for approximately how long)

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

T. How would you describe your present promotion possibilities in the Navy?

_1. ELIGIBLE FOR RETIREMENT

_2. VERY GOOD

_3. GOOD

_4. 50/50

_5. SLIM

_6. NEGATIVE

_7. LEAVING THE NAVY BEFORE NEXT POSSIBLE PROMOTION
U. Would you please describe in greater detail the most pressing problems in pursuing a two-career lifestyle while at least one of you is on active duty?
V. What advice would you give to other couples maintaining a two-career family lifestyle?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you again for your time and willingness to participate in this survey. If you are interested and have not previously indicated that you would like a copy of my final report, please provide an address below.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX 7: FOLLOW-UP SURVEY; CIVILIAN SPOUSE QUESTIONNAIRE

MILITARY FAMILY RESEARCH SURVEY
To Be Completed By The CIVILIAN SPOUSE

Thank you so much for your willingness to participate in my study of two-career military families. Please feel free to make additional comments about any question. If you have a question please indicate it on the last page of the survey with an address and I would be glad to write back to you. Thank you so much for your time.

A. AGE ___ B. RANK ___ C. SEX ___ D. RACE ________
E. MARRIED YES/NO  F. DIVORCED YES/NO  G. Are you presently a student? YES/NO  H. Your yearly income __________
I. What is your current work status?
   ___1. FULL TIME
   ___2. PART TIME
   ___3. VOLUNTEER WORK
   ___4. TEMPORARILY UNEMPLOYED
   ___5. DO NOT WORK OUTSIDE THE HOME
   ___6. OTHER __________________________________________

J. What type of position do you hold?
   ___1. TEMPORARY
   ___2. PERMANENT
   ___3. OTHER ________________________________________
K. What is the primary reason you work outside the home?
   _0. N/A
   _1. Head of household
   _2. Required income
   _3. Nice to have extra income
   _4. Independence
   _5. Self-esteem
   _6. Enjoy the work itself
   _7. Personal desire to work
   _8. Other ____________________________________________

L. Would you say that you have a career in the sense that you have prepared yourself with special skills, have a commitment to your line of work and have some future plans for development of that career?
   _1. Yes
   _2. No
   _3. Comment________________________________________

M. If you are a two-career family, how many years have you maintained the two-career family lifestyle? ___________________________

N. How many hours per week do you spend on the job?
   _1. Less than 40 hours
   _2. 40 to 50 hours
   _3. 50 to 60 hours
   _4. Over 60 hours
0. How many hours per week does your spouse spend on the job?

__1. Less than 40 hours
__2. 40 to 50 hours
__3. 50 to 60 hours
__4. Over 60 hours

P. How do you and your spouse divide housework, childcare, errands, house and car maintenance and other routine chores?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Q. If it were agreeable to your spouse what would you prefer?

__1. To stay in the Navy until retirement
__2. To leave the Navy before retirement
__3. Undecided

R. Have you and your spouse agreed upon his/her career plans?

__1. Yes
__2. No
__3. Comment ____________________________
________________________________________________________________________

S. Have you and your spouse agreed upon your career plans?

__1. Yes
__2. No
__3. Comment ____________________________
________________________________________________________________________
This section is to be completed only by those spouses having children. If you do not please go on to the next page.

T. How many children do you have living at home? __________

U. What are the ages of your children?

___1. Preschool 0-5 years
___2. Young school age 6-12 years
___3. Teenager 13-18
___4. Over 18

V. Would you use a professionally run childcare facility which was available for use 24 hours a day whenever you needed it?

___1. Yes
___2. No
___3. Comment __________________________________________

W. To what degree would you say you need such a facility?

___1. To a great extent
___2. To some extent
___3. Maybe
___4. To a little extent
___5. Not at all

X. What is a reasonable price for childcare centers to charge?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Y. If your spouse absolutely had to transfer to a new duty station which required him/her to relocate, what would happen to your career?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Z. Would you please describe in greater detail the most pressing problems in pursuing a two-career lifestyle while at least one of you is on active duty?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
What advice would you give to other couples maintaining a two-career family lifestyle?

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

Thank you again for your time and willingness to participate in this survey. If you are interested and have not previously indicated that you would like a copy of my final report, please provide an address below.

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________
Appendix 8. General profile of follow-up survey respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military member</th>
<th>Civilian spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution by age group:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>%  (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>10.9% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>32.7 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>20.0 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>21.8 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>9.1 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>5.5 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100% (55)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100% (47)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Distribution by sex:** |
| male | female |
| 90.9% (50) | 9.1% (5) |
| male | female |
| 6.4% (3)  | 93.6% (44) |

| **Distribution by race:** |
| caucasian (54) |
| no answer (1) |
| caucasian (44) |
| no answer (3) |
Appendix 8. (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Military member</th>
<th>Civilian spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>married: 100% (55)</td>
<td></td>
<td>married: 100% (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ever divorced: 1.8% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ever divorced: 00% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of marriage:</td>
<td>mean = 8.44</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service</td>
<td>mean = 10.96</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military career plans:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stay: 58.2% (32)</td>
<td></td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leave: 14.5% (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecided: 27.3% (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% (55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeling toward spouse's career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very positive: 52.7% (29)</td>
<td></td>
<td>not analyzed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all right: 45.5% (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefer he/she not work: 1.8% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% (55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility of spouse's career with military life:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very compatible: 20.0% (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>not analyzed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat compatible: 56.4% (31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimally compatible: 9.1% (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not really compatible: 10.9% (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitely not compatible: 3.6% (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% (55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 8. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouse's occupation:</th>
<th>Military member</th>
<th>Civilian spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>Houseswife 9.1% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 20.0 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurse 3.6 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business/management 18.2 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled 3.6 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naval officer 7.3 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other professions 7.3 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretarial/Clerical 18.2 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other 12.7 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100% 55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Full time or part time students: | not analyzed | 14.9% (7) |

| Types of positions: | not applicable | Temporary 27.9% (12) |
|                     |                 | Permanent 62.8 (27) |
|                     |                 | other 9.3 (4) |
|                     |                 | no answer (4) |
|                     |                 | **100% 47** |
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