

2

AD-A167 167

STUDENT ESSAY

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

DTIC
ELECTE
S APR 30 1986 D
K D

FAMILY POWER: ITS IMPACT ON UNIT READINESS

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL GENE K. BRYSON

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release;
distribution is unlimited.

7 APRIL 1986



US ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA

DTIC COPY

36 4 90 021

**Best
Available
Copy**

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. ADA 167167	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Family Power: Its Input on Unit Readiness		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED STUDENT ESSAY
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) LTC Gene K. Bryson		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS SAME		12. REPORT DATE 7 April 1986
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 35
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Historically, the Army has been a rather conservative institution, but it is changing, even if at times very painfully, along with a much larger society that has experienced dramatic changes during the past 10 years. The transition from a draft Army to an all-volunteer one has resulted in changes in the composition of the Army population and in the implicit philosophies and policies which have regulated the Army in past years. It no longer suffices to say "If the Army wanted you to have a family, it would		

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

BLOCK 20 (continued)

have issued you one" because a large number of volunteers have families before they enlist and they see the Army as a way to improve themselves. As a consequence, military leaders are facing new or greater problems. In addition to the increased number of junior enlisted personnel with families there are soldiers married to soldiers, single parent families headed both by males and females and a significantly higher percentage of working wives. All these changes have required modifications in the way the Army Family Support programs must be conducted if families and programs are to support the Army mission. What changes are required? What do today's commanders think about the Army effort to help families?

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

USAC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for public consumption until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

FAMILY POWER: ITS IMPACT ON UNIT READINESS
AN INDIVIDUAL ESSAY

by

Lieutenant Colonel Gene K. Bryson

Lieutenant Colonel James Schoonover
Project Adviser

U. S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013
7 April 1986

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release;
distribution is unlimited.

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Gene Bryson, LTC, IN.

TITLE: Family Power: Its Impact on Unit Readiness

FORMAT: Individual Essay

DATE: 7 April 1986 **PAGES:** 22 **CLASSIFICATION:** Unclassified

Historically the Army has been a rather conservative institution, but it is changing, even if at times very painfully, along with a much larger society that has experienced dramatic changes during the past 10 years. The transition from a draft Army to an all-volunteer one has resulted in changes in the composition of the Army population and in the implicit philosophies and policies which have regulated the Army in past years.

It no longer suffices to say "If the Army wanted you to have a family, it would have issued you one" because a large number of volunteers have families before they enlist and they see the Army as a way to improve themselves. As a consequence, military leaders are facing new or greater problems. In addition to the increased number of junior enlisted personnel with families there are soldiers married to soldiers, single parent families headed both by males and females and a significantly higher percentage of working wives. All these changes

have required modifications in the way the Army Family Support programs must be conducted if families and programs are to support the Army mission. What changes are required? What do today's commanders think about the Army effort to help families?

piecemeal programs have evolved.

An Army Chief of Staff White Paper in 1983, titled The Army Family, acknowledges the need for the Army to articulate a philosophy for its families. The paper contends that current Army leadership recognizes that families have an important impact on the Army's ability to accomplish its mission and that the family life of members of the Army, once a private matter, is now an organizational concern.¹

HISTORICAL VIEW OF ARMY and FAMILY RELATIONSHIP

Historically, families have always been a part of the Army. However, the Army's unwillingness to acknowledge the critical role families play in the performance of its mission has moved from studied neglect, through ambivalent and selective inclusion of families in the military community, to a sense that the development of a family philosophy is an institutional imperative.

In the earliest years of its existence, the Army avoided any reference to family issues in formal regulations. Families followed their sponsors as the Army moved across the United States. One regulation which could be interpreted as recognition of their presence concerned the status of "camp followers" and gave regimental or post commanders complete and arbitrary

authority over all civilians. The unwritten professional code at the time was that officers were to take care of their own while the assumption was that enlisted men never married. It was recognized that many senior non-commissioned service members did marry. In this recognition lies the beginning of the Army acknowledgement of an implied obligation to provide the basics of life, e. g., shelter, food and medical care. Eventually the conditions of early Army family life led to a recognition that the obligation should be extended to officers' families as well. Even then the expression of concern remained informal.

Several trends were evident by the late 1800's. The obligation to provide for basic family needs received formal recognition in Army regulations. At the same time, the Army displayed a tendency to specify services and benefits and restrict eligibility to the families of officers and senior non-commissioned officers. The early 20th century Army considered families of enlisted men below the non-commissioned rank an unwanted burden. In fact, Army regulations, with exceptions, forbid the peacetime enlistment or reenlistment of men with wives and minor children until 1942. Housing, medical care in Army facilities, rations-in-kind, and other associated benefits were not formally available to enlisted families, although the Army continued to recognize an implied responsibility to them and frequently

over-extended its limited resources to meet that requirement.

Prior to World War I the Army was small enough for most benefits to be in kind. After World War I, during the build-up for World War II, and continuing to the present, the practice of authorizing monetary entitlements in lieu of goods and services in-kind began to expand. For example, today more than 40 percent of active duty soldiers live in the civilian community and receive Basic Allowance for Quarters.

Enactment of the Selective Training and Service Act in 1940 began the creation of a new civilian Army. The dramatic Army expansion which followed the United States' entry into World War II found no agency dedicated or prepared to assist young soldiers and their families experiencing problems of adjustment, financial straits, wartime separation and emotional burdens. Previously, the Army dealt with families requiring emergency support informally utilizing post funds, cooperation with local charitable organizations, and referrals to the American Red Cross. The American Red Cross expanded its operations but resources were not enough to meet growing needs for assistance. This generated a need for Army families to have an agency of their own to which they could turn without resorting to public charity or welfare. The Secretary of War directed the organization of Army Emergency Relief(AER) on 5 February 1942 as a private, nonprofit organization, the express purpose

of which was to collect and administer funds to relieve distress among Army members and their families. "The Army Takes Care Of Its Own" was adopted as the AER slogan. AER and Red Cross activities were closely coordinated to prevent duplication of effort. AER also maintained close contact and cooperation with federal, state, county, municipal and private agencies to effectively utilize all resources to relieve distress among soldiers and their family members. After World War II, it was determined that AER should continue as a private, nonprofit organization.

The creation of AER is a typical example of the early Army's "ad hoc" approach to dealing with families. Services and benefits as we know them today came into existence piecemeal and evolved individually. Therefore, housing and rations-in-kind fell under the prerogative of the old Quartermaster Corps; health benefits were administered by the Surgeon General; and the management of AER programs grew into another bureaucracy. Post world war II and the Korean war period saw a continuation of this trend.

The maintenance of a large standing peacetime Army during the post Korean war period made it unacceptable for the Army to revert to the pre-World War II practice of discouraging enlistment of married personnel. As a result of this policy change, family members outnumbered active duty service members by 1960.

This large military family population led to the first official attempt to create an umbrella organization for family services. The organization was The Army Community Service. Creation of the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) in 1966 to ensure "adequate" medical care for military families stationed at locations away from military treatment facilities was a big step toward direct, planned, formalized action for family support.

The era of the all-volunteer force required Army leaders to look at military personnel policies from a different perspective, particularly with respect to the enlisted ranks. The growth of young enlisted families required the Army to be more attentive to support for all families.²

The active Army today consists of approximately 777,000 soldiers; more than 107,000 officers and 669,000 plus enlisted. The enlisted corps is young, more than 240,000 are between the ages of 21 and 25; only 17,000 of the officers are that young. More than 50% of the active duty soldiers are married. There are more than 1,136,000 family members: almost 652,000 are children; more than 409,000 are spouses; and the other 72,000 are dependent parents, etc.³ It is impossible to predict specific family needs from these aggregate numbers because each family will more than likely have needs unique to that family only. For example, almost 25% of active duty Army spouses

speaking English as a second language. The difficulties these families encounter dictate a special consideration Army leaders must make in determining what support to provide.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE MODERN DAY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM

A complimentary effort has and is still being made to build the Army Support Program around what selected family members say Army families need. The U. S. Army Community and Family Support Center (USAFSC) was established as a Department of the Army field agency to "help commanders make life better for the Army family". Probably the most difficult problem of all is to create a meaningful program and stay within current budgetary and personnel constraints.

As a result of Army Family Symposia conducted in 1980, 1981 and 1982, Army family representatives said the most important family needs were:

- Employment assistance - a referral service which responds to the specific needs of the Army family.
- An educational model - establishment of minimum standards of acceptable education for children.
- Health care - better medical and dental care.
- Volunteer recognition - documentation of professional development acquired as a volunteer.
- Expanded transportation - inclusion of off-post families.

- Improved youth activities - stronger emphasis on youth orientation programs.
- Improved quarters termination procedures - a revision of cleaning/clearing policies and a more standardized system.
- Improved support of child care facilities and extended hours of operation.
- Recognition of and sensitivity to individuality of family members (particularly spouses' role).
- Centralization of activities which support family programs.

Publication of these needs in official Army publications, Army Family Action Plan I and II in January 1984 and May 1985 respectively, has had varying impact on service members and their families. Depending upon individual service member and family needs, opinions vary as to the amount, if any, progress has been made. Those who received and read updated publications or who have benefited directly from new program initiatives and policy changes, know that a great deal of work is being done to make the noted needs a reality. Others whose needs are different and for whatever reason have not been kept informed are disillusioned and even bitter over what they feel have been unfulfilled promises of support. Poor information flow can be attributed as the culprit in the latter situation.

Far too many families just do not know what progress is being made or what problems are being encountered.

Commanders welcome the USACFSC plan for assistance. They have known for some time that they had neither the resources nor the technical expertise to cope with the increasing need to provide the required and expected family support. The smart commander knows that soldiers who are preoccupied with family problems do not respond to training and therefore do not contribute to unit readiness as required.

For many commanders there remains the question - "what specific assistance can I realistically expect from USACFSC?" Thus far visible support has been slow in coming. At unit level, brigade and below, most family programs are almost totally dependent upon volunteers or "out of hide" assets. Resourcing a good, efficient and consistent family program is a major mission. The increasing number of working wives (Fig. 1) has had a dramatic negative impact on volunteer programs.⁴

FIGURE 1

PERCENTAGE OF SPOUSES CURRENTLY WORKING

	<u>OFFICER</u>	<u>ENLISTED</u>
Not Working	57%	53%
Working Full-time	30%	33%
Working Part-time	12%	12%

This increase in the number of military spouses who work outside the home directly affects the spouses' ability to become involved in social and volunteer activities. Commanders must be alert to the stress placed on the military family with a working spouse and consider this when planning social and volunteer programs. Many spouses simply do not want to be counted on as an "always available volunteer" resource.

Many commanders have chosen not to wait for help from USACFSC or anyone else and have decided to create excellent family support programs despite the time, money and volunteer constraints. These commanders recognize the importance of a good program and the contributions it can make to the readiness of their units.

A recent study of the "Excellence In The Combat Arms" by three Army officers at the Naval Post Graduate School revealed the following:

"The family support program in the excellent battalions impressed us. We found that this program receives top priority in these units. It's not a half-baked program with a small percentage of the wives in the battalion attending. Instead it's an important event in the course of the battalion's life. Most of the battalions conduct monthly meetings with a large percentage of the wives attending. They employ speakers from the various Army services available and even from the local community. The battalions provide baby sitting service and translators. The commanders show their interest by attending at least every other month. As we said earlier, actions express commanders' priorities and their attendance at the

meetings is no exception.

Make no mistake, these meetings are not social calls. Instead the wives conduct business with specific agendas.

But how did the battalions get their programs into such good shape? We found the aftermath of Grenada is partially responsible. Those units that deployed had problems. Many of the wives had no idea where their husbands were initially, had no money for weeks, and didn't know where to turn. As one XO told us, "We just weren't ready for Grenada from the family aspect." So for the Ft. Bragg battalions, turning this program around received top priority. And the Grenada stories have spread to other posts like wildfire. People on other posts told us about the problems the families had during Grenada. The Grenada experience certainly had something to do with the outstanding shape the family support programs are in.

But we found that Grenada is not the whole story. The battalions work at making this program what it is. They mail information about the meetings to the wives. They don't give fliers to the soldiers for them to place in file 13. The units mail information packets to the wives before a major off post deployment. Consequently the wives know when the battalion is going to the field, who to call if a problem arises, and when the soldiers will return. As one A4 said, "I've always felt this battalion cared about my family. I can soldier better knowing they are taken care of when I'm in the field." Soldiers are given incentives to attend with their wives; for example, a half day off. Another battalion CSM does it a different way: "I make it mandatory for the wives to attend the first meeting when they arrive in the battalion. They like it so much they keep coming back."

And it doesn't stop with just meetings. The excellent battalions go out of their way to involve the families, from organization day to Halloween parties for

the children. In another case we witnessed an armor battalion which brought the wives out to see tank gunnery. This battalion tries to show the wives as much training as possible. The chain of command doesn't think up all of the reasons why they can't bring the families out to the range (for example it's unsafe or we can't get transportation), but instead they make it happen. The result? As one CSM put it, "If the wives know what you're doing, or trying to do, they'll support you." We heard stories of the wives coming in and decorating the barracks and providing all sorts of goodies, from fried chicken to cakes and cookies, whenever the men come back from the field. The family program plays a big part in the battalion's story of success. For the excellent battalions, the family is a combat multiplier, not a nuisance."5

With no intent to belittle the sincere efforts of those who made the above programs work, some would disagree with the methods and long term benefits. Can commanders or Command Sergeants Major make it mandatory for wives to attend meetings? Obviously the programs described require extensive volunteer effort, time and soldiers to help coordinate the program. How many commanders have the luxury of those resources? In fact one commander said "the majority of success stories from one installation were driven by battalion commanders' and company commanders' wives who were under intense pressure to make it work. Pressure to make it happen came from higher headquarters." He suggested a need for a "team effort".

Without question the major concern among soldiers and their families today is the impact budget constraints will

have on all Army programs, especially family support programs.

The snap of the Gramm-Rudman whip was heard in December 1985 and with each passing week an increasing number of soldiers and family members feel the sting.

Cost of living adjustments have been delayed and apparently will be eliminated for this year and probably next.

Veterans Administration loans began to dry up, making it difficult for active duty members to get out from under high interest mortgages or to reuse loan benefits when they move to new assignments. Only with emergency legislation have provisions been made for funds to last through the remainder of this fiscal year.

GI Bill education benefits are being cut by 8.7 percent and veterans death benefits will drop by 10 percent.

The Army is promoting only about half as many people as it had planned to, and it has authorized up to 30,000 soldiers to leave service early - all because of the intense pressure on the budget.

Consideration has been given to reducing new assignments this year because the Army may not have travel money.

Many family members likely will be affected by civilian hiring freezes imposed. This, in turn, will put a greater workload on service members and civilian workers who still must carry out the missions of their commands but with fewer personnel.

Impact aid money for school districts that educate children of Army families who live off post is on the chopping block, and school administrators are warning of closures if the ax falls. While such cuts have been proposed and defeated before, future budget pressures make passage more likely.

Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger indicated in a recent interview that fiscal pressure also was behind the decision not to recommend any significant military benefit improvements in the fiscal 1987 budget presented to Congress. He also indicated that those same pressures make for an uphill battle to get a 4 percent military pay raise in October 1986.

Some in Washington who understand Gramm-Rudman remind us that this year, and this year only, military personnel accounts are afforded special protection. Starting fiscal year 1987, the drive to whittle down the budget deficit from \$200 billion to zero by 1991 gets rougher.

That should give many Army families reason to pause. If recent developments are the consequences of Gramm-Rudman when special protection is afforded them, what will four more unprotected years do to the ranks of active duty, retirees and other veterans?

The most troublesome aspect of Gramm-Rudman, presently under attack in the courts, is that nobody really knows what the future holds.

President Reagan was asked during a nationally televised press conference February 11, 1986 if he knew VA was running out of money to provide home loans for 250,000 eligible veterans. He responded that the administration does not want to take away any veterans' benefits. But he then conceded, "I just have to tell you that with everything that's going on right now, I couldn't answer you about the situation of the housing loans for veterans." Many Army families sat in front of their televisions and cringed wondering if anyone really cared about their welfare.

Based upon this capsule illustration of the current budget situation, indications are that the budget will get balanced, soldiers and their families will get hurt and nobody will be blamed.

Responsible political leaders cannot dodge their responsibility for producing a rational budget piece-by-piece for too long, without affecting more important goals.

Helicopters, tanks and rifles do not work without people. Top notch people are necessary for them to work well. Current budget balancing policies will make the acquisition of top notch soldiers increasingly difficult.

It seems that there are more responsible ways to balance the budget without turning the screws on soldiers and their families who have made such tremendous sacrifices to serve the nation.⁶

While this approach will make it even more difficult for commanders to "make life better for his Army families", there are other important considerations.

Gramm-Rudman portends to tear away at the very heart of the Army Family Support Program and will make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to provide for those family needs expressed in the 1980, 1981 and 1982 Family Symposia. Recruiting, retention and readiness could then become virtual impossible missions.

Morale of the force is another important concern. Many soldiers and family members have placed a great deal of faith in their leadership to follow through on promises to meet agreed upon needs. Others have seen and benefited from this progress resulting in improved family programs and anxiously await even more improvements. It may be devastating for many of them to learn that not only may improvements be slower, but some planned programs may have to be cancelled.

VIEWS FROM COMMANDERS

In December 1985 a survey (Appendix 1) was administered to 166 former commanders in the U. S. Army War College Class of 1986. The very basic survey format was intended to determine how this group of senior officers felt about the Army Family Support Program and, more precisely, the impact, in their

opinion, of the family on the readiness of their past commands.

Of the 135(80%) respondents, 133(98%) had just completed battalion command and 2(1.5%) had been brigade commanders. Most of the group(47.4%) had commanded Combat Arms units and the majority of the command assignments had been in CONUS(55.6%) with Europe(35.6%) a distant second.

A large majority of the group(61.5%) had served more than 24 months in their last command assignment and most(55.6%) had completed their last command assignment in 1985. Most (90.4%) of the officers were married and accompanied by their family during their command tour. Most of the officers(84.4%) and enlisted soldiers(50%) they commanded were married and accompanied by their families.

In response to questions on methods to improve information flow to families the group was almost evenly split between the spouse chain of concern(33.1%) and family briefings(30.1%) as the ways they found most effective. Direct mailing of information to the home was a not too distant third choice at 21.8%. An overwhelming majority of the respondents(47.8%) agreed that soldier sponsors, officer and enlisted, are the least effective means of passing information to families.

Even though the command team training program began in 1983 the survey revealed that 51.9% of the officers and 57.8% of their spouses received no Army sponsored training on the family support program prior to the assumption of command.

Most (45.7%) of the group chose to conduct unit family activities once per quarter to enhance cohesion. They believed adequate installation support was available and believed they worked for superiors who actively supported family programs.

While more than 50% of the group believed they were provided adequate resources to conduct an adequate unit level family program, more than 30% indicated a lack of resource support. Almost 18% had no opinion. One respondent said that he "had the resources but only through volunteers and a conscious decision to take them out of hide. No dedicated Army support was authorized in the battalion. In fact, additional duty type soldier diversion for NEO, family care packets and other similar regulatory requirements was considerable."

While it was a minority view, more than 40% of those responding thought spouse abuse was a problem during their command assignment and almost 30% thought child abuse was also a problem.

Junior officers and their spouses were seen as active supporters of unit family programs by 69.7% of the respondents. Only 44% felt they had active support from their non-commissioned officers and their spouses. One respondent commented "involvement and interest in unit activities and volunteer services is mostly limited to the spouses of senior(field grade) officers and NCOs. The wives of E-4s and below are very interested in

unit activities generally, but there is an interest gap at the middle NCO(E5-E7) levels. Because the senior spouses are spread too thin, many of the junior enlisted wives do not receive the attention they deserve. Unless the situation changes somehow, volunteerism will be a thing of the past when our wives leave the service."

More than 46% of the group believed that available family support programs met the expectations of the families in their command and a strong majority(66.9%) indicated available programs enhanced the readiness of their command.

More than 30% of the group thought that their spouses spent an inordinate amount of time coordinating family program activities and 30% said they felt obligated to use their personal funds to support unit family programs.

Training on family programs was another area on which the group strongly agreed. Most (80%) thought that junior officer training was inadequate and 85% indicated training for junior officer spouses was substandard. Virtually the same opinions held true for NCO training. Almost 80% considered NCO training to be below par and 82% considered training for NCO spouses as less than adequate.

CONCLUSION

The important role the Army family plays in enhancing the readiness of Army units is recognized and understood by virtually

all those in leadership positions today. As a result, a great deal of work has and still is being done to ensure family needs are known and programs initiated to resolve problems related to providing for those needs. The work to date has been very encouraging. Those commanders responsible for taking care of families are appreciative of the support because it not only improves family quality of life, it also improves the readiness of their units.

Unfortunately a storm appears to be gathering over the horizon. The storm is called Gramm-Rudman and no one has been able to predict how severe its impact will be once it arrives in full force. Actions are currently underway to prepare everyone for the worst of all possibilities. At best it seems that budget constraints caused by Gramm-Rudman will cause current progress to be slowed and may even cause cancellation of some programs. The end result may very well be an increased dependence on volunteerism and "out of hide resources" to keep family support programs moving in a positive direction. Neither of these is a popular choice.

The bottom line is that there is a need for progress to continue. Responsible leaders must fight for money and other resources to keep family programs afloat. While it may be difficult when confronted with the choice of new equipment or happy families, the key is to accept the fact that neither can

be totally neglected. Soldiers free of unnecessary concern for the health, security and safety of their families are the most efficient operators of Army equipment and, therefore, contribute as required to the readiness of the organization.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A great deal of work remains to be done in order to really determine the degree to which soldiers' family environments impact upon their ability to do their job. The fact that there is an impact is no longer questionable. Studies such as this one only scratch the surface in determining the degree of impact on total Army readiness.

In an effort to focus the direction of future policy and study the following recommendations are made:

- Conduct Army sponsored study of the problem which makes the time and resource available to do a thorough job.
- Make Army Family Support Programs a priority consideration in future budget considerations.
- Include Army spouses in the future study of family support programs with particular emphasis on commanders' wives.
- Provide necessary money and personnel support for commanders at battalion level to conduct programs.

- Increase junior officer and NCO education on family support programs in basic courses.
- Make it mandatory for commanders to participate in command team training prior to the assumption of command.
- Make travel funds available for commanders' spouses to participate in command team training. For those who cannot participate, mail training materials to them.
- Improve the information flow regarding the status of family programs by mailing or having information hand carried to family homes on and off post.
- Make funds available to pay for selected heretofore volunteer services.
- Initiate a command team training program for battalion sergeants major and their spouses.

Recommendations for a commitment of additional money and personnel to the family support program may appear to be a dichotomy in light of the anticipated budget constraints the Gramm-Rudman legislation may impose on the total Army budget. If budget considerations do require cutbacks in family support programs, careful management of available resources must preclude terminal decay of the program and concurrent depreciation of Army readiness.

END NOTES

1. Chief of Staff, U. S. Army, white Paper 1983, The Army Family. p. 1.
2. Ibid. pp. 1-3.
3. Department of Defense. Defense 85 Almanac. Sep 1985. p. 31.
4. Chief of Staff, U. S. Army, white Paper 1983, The Army Family. p. 9.
5. Excellence in the Army Study. Naval Post Graduate School. 1984. pp. 65-66.
6. Army Times. 24 February 1986. p. 21.

APPENDIX 1
Family Power - Its Impact on Unit Readiness

1. What level was your most recent command?

	frequency	percent
Battalion.....	133	98.5
Brigade.....	2	1.5

	135	

2. What type of command did you have during your most recent command tour?

	frequency	percent
Combat Arms.....	64	47.4
Combat Sup.....	32	23.7
Combat Serv Sup.....	27	20.0
Training.....	11	8.1
Recruiting.....	1	0.7
Other.....	0	0.0

	135	

3. Where did you last command?

	frequency	percent
CONUS.....	75	55.6
Korea.....	4	3.0
Europe.....	48	35.6
Other.....	8	5.9

	135	

4. How many complete months of duty did you have in your last command?

	frequency	percent
1-6 Mo.....	0	0.0
7-12 Mo.....	1	0.7
13-18 Mo.....	4	3.0
19-24 Mo.....	47	34.8
over 24 Mo.....	83	61.5

	135	

Family Power - Its Impact on Unit Readiness

5. In what calendar year did you complete your last command?

	frequency	percent
1981 or earlier.....	2	1.5
1982.....	3	2.3
1983.....	6	4.5
1984.....	47	35.3
1985.....	74	55.6

	132	

6. In your opinion, which of the phrases below best describes the family situation of a majority of the officers in your last command?

	frequency	percent
Married & Accom.....	114	84.4
Married & Not Accom.....	2	1.5
Not Married.....	17	12.6

	133	

7. In your opinion, which of the phrases below best describes the family situation of a majority of the enlisted members in your last command?

	frequency	percent
Married & Accom.....	67	50.0
Married & Not Accom.....	7	5.2
Not Married.....	60	44.8

	134	

8. Which of the phrases below best describes your family situation during the majority of your last command?

	frequency	percent
Married & Accom.....	122	90.4
Married & Not Accom.....	2	1.5
Not Married.....	10	7.4

	134	

Family Power - Its Impact on Unit Readiness

9. On an average, how often during your command did your unit conduct over night deployments away from garrison?

	frequency	percent
At least once a week.....	10	7.4
Less than once a wk, at least once a mo.....	55	40.7
Less than once a mo, at least once a qrtr.....	42	31.1
Less once a qrtr, at least once every 6 Mo....	9	6.7
Less once every six Mo, at least once a Yr....	5	3.7
No deployments away from Garrison.....	14	10.4

	135	

10. How long on an average were overnight deployments?

	frequency	percent
One night.....	2	1.5
Two to three nights.....	40	29.6
Four to five nights.....	39	28.9
Six or more nights.....	40	29.6
No deployments away from Garrison.....	13	9.6

	134	

11. Which method have you found to be the most effective in getting information to family members?

	frequency	percent
Soldier Sponsors.....	17	12.8
Unit Newsletters mailed home.....	29	21.8
Spouse chain of concern.....	44	33.1
family Briefings.....	40	30.1
Other.....	3	2.3

	133	

12. Which method have you found to be the second most effective in getting information to family members?

	frequency	percent
Soldier Sponsors.....	13	9.7
Unit Newsletters mailed home.....	29	21.6
Spouse chain of concern.....	40	29.9
family Briefings.....	50	37.3
Other.....	2	1.5

	134	

Family Power - Its Impact on Unit Readiness

13. Which method have you found to be the least effective in getting information to family members?

	frequency	percent
Soldier Sponsors.....	64	47.8
Unit Newsletters mailed home.....	36	26.9
Spouse chain of concern.....	12	9.0
family Briefings.....	18	13.4
Other.....	4	3.0

	134	

14. When did you receive Army sponsored training on the Army Family Support Program?

	frequency	percent
Prior to last command.....	32	23.7
During last command.....	21	15.6
Both before and during.....	12	8.9
Received no training.....	70	51.9

	135	

15. When did your Spouse receive Army sponsored training on the Army Family Program?

	frequency	percent
Prior to last command.....	20	14.8
During last command.....	19	14.1
Both before and during.....	10	7.4
Received no training.....	78	57.8
Does not apply.....	8	5.9

	135	

16. How often were organized family activities conducted within your unit?

	frequency	percent
At least once a week.....	0	0.0
Less than once a wk, at least once a mo.....	31	23.0
Less than once a mo, at least once a qrtr.....	59	43.7
Less once a qrtr, at least once every 6 Mo....	38	28.1
Less once every six Mo, at least once a Yr....	7	5.2

	135	

Family Power - Its Impact on Unit Readiness

17. On average, what percentage of your unit was unable to participate in extended training exercises due to family problems?

	frequency	percent
Less than 1%.....	62	45.9
1% - 5%.....	55	40.7
6% - 10%.....	5	3.7
More than 10%.....	0	0.0
Does not apply.....	13	9.6

	135	

18. Adequate Installation Family Support Programs were available during my last command tour.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	21	15.7
Agree.....	73	54.5
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	11	8.2
Disagree.....	25	18.7
Strongly Disagree.....	4	3.0

	134	

19. My superiors during my last command assignment ACTIVELY supported family programs.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	49	36.3
Agree.....	57	42.2
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	18	13.3
Disagree.....	10	7.4
Strongly Disagree.....	1	0.7

	135	

20. I was provided adequate resources to conduct a productive unit level family program.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	15	11.1
Agree.....	55	40.7
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	24	17.8
Disagree.....	37	27.4
Strongly Disagree.....	4	3.0

	135	

Family Power - Its Impact on Unit Readiness

21. Spouse abuse was a problem during my most recent command assignment.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	6	4.5
Agree.....	50	37.3
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	25	18.7
Disagree.....	44	32.8
Strongly Disagree.....	9	6.7

	134	

22. Child abuse was a problem during my most recent command assignment.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	2	1.5
Agree.....	38	28.4
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	33	24.6
Disagree.....	52	38.8
Strongly Disagree.....	9	6.7

	134	

23. Junior officers and their spouses actively supported unit family programs.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	9	6.7
Agree.....	85	63.0
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	27	20.0
Disagree.....	12	8.9
Strongly Disagree.....	2	1.5

	135	

24. NCO leaders and their spouses actively supported unit family programs.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	5	3.7
Agree.....	55	40.7
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	35	25.9
Disagree.....	35	25.9
Strongly Disagree.....	5	3.7

	135	

Family Power - Its Impact on Unit Readiness

25. Family Support Programs met the expectations of the majority of the families in my last command.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	4	3.0
Agree.....	58	43.3
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	44	32.8
Disagree.....	25	18.7
Strongly Disagree.....	3	2.2

	134	

26. Available Family Support Programs enhanced the readiness of my command.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	19	14.3
Agree.....	70	52.6
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	30	22.6
Disagree.....	12	9.0
Strongly Disagree.....	2	1.5

	133	

27. My spouse spent an inordinant amount of time coordinating family program activities.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	13	9.7
Agree.....	28	20.9
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	33	24.6
Disagree.....	56	41.8
Strongly Disagree.....	4	3.0

	134	

28. I felt obligated to use my personal funds to support unit family programs.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	6	4.4
Agree.....	28	20.7
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	26	19.3
Disagree.....	61	45.2
Strongly Disagree.....	14	10.4

	135	

Family Power - Its Impact on Unit Readiness

29. Spouses of officers were organized to support unit family programs.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	9	6.8
Agree.....	83	62.4
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	22	16.5
Disagree.....	16	12.0
Strongly Disagree.....	3	2.3

	133	

30. Spouses of NCOs were organized to support unit family programs.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	5	3.7
Agree.....	49	36.6
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	33	24.6
Disagree.....	41	30.6
Strongly Disagree.....	6	4.5

	134	

31. In my opinion, the Junior officers in my command had received adequate training on the Army Family Support Program prior to their arrival in my unit.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	0	0.0
Agree.....	9	6.7
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	17	12.7
Disagree.....	79	59.0
Strongly Disagree.....	29	21.6

	134	

32. In my opinion, the spouses of junior officers in my command had received adequate training on the Army Family Support Program prior to their arrival in the unit.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	1	0.7
Agree.....	3	2.2
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	16	11.9
Disagree.....	66	49.3
Strongly Disagree.....	48	35.8

	134	

Family Power - Its Impact on Unit Readiness

33. In my opinion, the NCOs in my command had received adequate training on the Army Family support program prior to their arrival in the unit.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	1	0.7
Agree.....	5	3.7
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	21	15.7
Disagree.....	75	56.0
Strongly Disagree.....	32	23.9

	134	

34. In my opinion, the spouses of NCOs in my command had received adequate training on the Army Family Support program prior to their arrival in the unit.

	frequency	percent
Strongly agree.....	1	0.7
Agree.....	7	5.2
Neither agree nor Disagree.....	19	14.2
Disagree.....	67	50.0
Strongly Disagree.....	40	30.0

	134	