

AD A 073398

LEVEL

12

NPS54-79-003

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Monterey, California



DDC
FORM 12
JUG 31 1979
RECEIVED

DDC FILE COPY

MARRIAGE/FAMILY ISSUES AND WIFE STYLES
ACROSS NAVAL OFFICER CAREER STAGES:
THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR CAREER SUCCESS

by

C. Brooklyn Derr
Department of Management
University of Utah

July 1979

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Monterey, California

Rear Admiral Tyler F. Dedman
Superintendent

Jack R. Borsting
Provost

This research was sponsored by the Organizational Effectiveness Research Program, Office of Naval Research (Code 452), under Contract No. N0028-79-C-J314; NR170-836.

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

This report was prepared by:

C. B. Derr
C. Brooklyn Derr
Department of Management
University of Utah

Reviewed by:

Carl R. Jones
Carl R. Jones, Chairman
Department of Administrative Sciences

Released by:

William M. Tolles
William M. Tolles
Dean of Research

18 NPS

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

9 Technical Rept.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS
BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER

Technical Report No. 2

2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.

3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER

54-79-001

4. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED

6 Marriage/Family Issues and Wife Styles Across
Naval Officer Career Stages: Their Implications
For Career Success

14 TR2

5. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER

7. AUTHOR(s)

10 C. Brooklyn/Derr

8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)

N0028-79-C-J314
N00228

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California 93940

10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
NR170-836, 61153N
RR042-08-01,
N0001479R90057

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS

Organizational Effectiveness Research Programs
Office of Naval Research (Code 452), Arlington,
VA 22217

12. REPORT DATE
May 79

13. NUMBER OF PAGES

14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)

12 74p.

15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)

Unclassified

15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING
SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

15 N00228-79-C-J314

16 RR042081

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

17 RR0420801

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Career stages, family stages, career development, early-career, mid-career,
late-career, marital coping, career patterns, careers.

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

After a general statistical overview of Naval officers marriage relationships
from the perspective of twenty-five husbands and wives and 135 other Naval
officers in five different Naval communities, special marriage/family pro-
blems during the early-mid-late-career stages of an officer's career are
discussed. A model of the various types of Navy wives, their coping styles,
and the implications for the officer's career, is presented.

411357

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Introduction	pp. 1-4
1. Rationale	
2. Nature of the Study	
B. Statistics About the Officer Couples	pp. 4-9
C. Career-Family Stages	pp. 9-33
1. The Early-Career Phase	
2. The Mid-Career Phase	
3. The Late-Career Phase	
D. Conclusion	pp. 33-35

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/ _____	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Availability
A	special

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

The Navy of the future is faced with difficult personnel problems which could impair manning levels and the effective deployment of human resources needed to use increasingly complex advanced technology. Among the officer cadre of the U.S. Navy and more acutely within some communities (e.g., Aviation), retaining top-quality people is of utmost importance.

Current officer shortages are most serious in the 5-12 year experience range, and it has been predicted that 40% of the officers leave the Navy before having completed twelve years of service (Robertson, 1975) which, obviously, is very costly in terms of training and applied future experience. Some predict that about 40% of all military personnel leave after their first tour of duty (Hand et al., 1977).

Moreover, it is not enough that the Navy retain total numbers of personnel or its manpower quota. It must seek to keep top-quality people and to have a surplus of personnel from which to be selective. The Surface Warfare Officer community (SWO), for example, is experiencing increasing difficulty meeting SWO retention objectives. In FY77, there was a shortfall of some 7 junior officers and in FY78, they may fall 170 officers short. This kind of trend seems to be continuing in FY79 (Holzbach, 1978).

In the Submarines, 2,200 nuclear-trained officers were required in FY79 for full manning of the nuclear submarine fleet (SSN attack and SSBN ballistic missile submarines). In spite of a continuation bonus of \$15,000 offered for an additional obligation of four years, the chronic shortage of nuclear-trained and qualified line officers persists. Many Weapons Officer and Navigator billets on nuclear submarines must now be filled by non-nuclear trained officers. The high officer retention rate considered necessary to adequately man the nuclear

submarine fleet, while improved by the bonuses, has never been realized (Powers, 1977).

A recent article in U.S. Navy Proceedings (Fisher, 1979) points to five major reasons why officers resign their commissions. While this phenomenon is multi-faceted and depends on each individual, this paper argues that one major issue in officer retention and productivity is how the Navy career impacts on and is reacted to by the spouse and the family. The impact of the spouse/family on the U.S. Naval officer's career is reported below.

Nature of the Study

The following report is based on research conducted in 1977-78 by the author and his colleagues on U.S. Naval officers and some Navy wives. A total of 154 interviews (see Appendix A), lasting between 45-90 minutes each, were conducted. Of those interviewed, 136 subjects also returned questionnaires (see Appendix B).

Naval officers from five different communities were queried: "line officers from the Aviation, Subsurface and Surface Warfare communities, and "staff" officers from the Civil Engineering Corps and Supply Corps communities. Because of its complexity, subgroups of aviators were researched: those flying in multi-engine aircraft, helicopters, attack jets and fighter jets. Five Navy wives from each of these communities, a total of 25, and their husbands were studied as couples.

The average age of the officers in the sample was 31.6 years. Although 10% of the population was single, the rest of the group had been married an average of 8.08 years and had 1.6 children. About 12% had been divorced. Only 19% of the population reported that their wives were looking for or had full-time outside-the-home employment.

The officers reported having been in the Navy, on the average, for about

9.93 years. There were among the subjects researched four Ensigns, sixteen Lieutenant Junior Grades, sixty-six Lieutenants, sixty Lieutenant Commanders and eight Commanders. About 41% of the group queried were coming from a rural setting, while 32% saw their backgrounds as urban/suburban and 16% said they were raised in many settings or came from families that were highly mobile (e.g., military families). About 4% received their college education at prestigious universities, whereas 49% got their degrees at well-reputed institutions (including the U.S. Naval Academy), 22% graduated from less-known colleges and 25% finished their Bachelors at little-known institutions of higher education.

The general purpose of the study, funded by the Office of Naval Research, was to investigate from the officer's point of view those career-related factors which might impact on human resource productivity and officer retention. New findings in social psychology, organizational behavior and management (Derr and Schein, 1979; Van Maanan, 1977; Gammon, 1979) give reason to believe that individual choices in the career have been neglected in research. They are, of course, critical factors to be understood since a productive career depends as much on individual motivation as it does on organizational/occupational opportunity.

Five general categories of "person-career concerns" were investigated: the match between the employee's career success map and the organization's career opportunities, the congruence between the person's "career anchor" and the on-going career paths, the importance of spouse/family concerns for a Naval officer's career, the extent to which the individual careerist's adult life stage development helped or hindered his progression through the various career stages, and whether/how organizational politics played a role in career satisfaction and productivity.

The purpose of this paper is to report on one aspect of the proposed research; namely, the impact of spouse/family on the U.S. Naval officer's career. Following

the reporting of several statistical trends below, a description of the various spouse/family issues across several career stages is presented.

STATISTICS ABOUT THE OFFICER COUPLES

While twenty-five officer couples were interviewed, only seventeen couples returned the questionnaire. Wives were asked to make judgments about what they believed would constitute a successful career for their husbands, what career values were preferable for him, the job and job-related wants they would choose for him to pursue and their perceptions of how he is currently feeling about his career.

On the "career concepts" question (see item A of the questionnaire, Appendix B), there was a range of twelve possible points of difference had one partner chosen a 1-2-3-4-5 ranking while the other selected a 5-4-3-2-1 ranking. A large difference score would have demonstrated considerable disparity between spouses on which concept represented career success for the husband. This, in turn, has implications because one concept may be more supportive or more antagonistic towards the wife's future plans. Thus, she could be expected to favor a career success map which complimented her own orientation (Driver, 1979).

The average difference scores between spouses was 5.375. It is interesting to note that six of the couples had difference scores of 8, however. This indicates key perceptual (perhaps career-goal) differences between those six couples. A more telling figure is that almost half of the women (7) chose in first place the same career success concept as their husband and that six other wives selected their husband's first choice in second place. The rest of the wives (4) put their mates first choice for a career success concept in third place. There was, therefore, surprising congruence between both spouses on this dimension.

Given that considerable agreement between spouses existed on husband's espoused career success, with an assumption that the wife understood the impli-

cations of her position, it is interesting to underscore the general trend of these career success concepts. One officer opted as a first choice for career loyalty and longevity (concept 3), nine for growth-orientation and change (concept 4) and three for a second-career emphasis (concept 5).

Three wives chose ascending the hierarchy or advancement (concept 2) as their first choice, three picked career loyalty and longevity, ten opted for growth-orientation and change, and one selected a second-career emphasis.

In the total sample of officers who completed the questionnaires (136 persons), the top five career success concepts were ranked as follows:

TABLE 1
Career Success Concept Ranking

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Average Score</u>
1. Growth-orientation and change	1.669
2. Ascending the hierarchy	2.346
3. Second-career emphasis	2.934
4. Career loyalty and longevity	3.677
5. Career mobility	4.338

* Where (1) represents the highest rankings and (5) the lowest.

The couple was also asked to respond to a questionnaire item called a Career Values Form (see Item B, Appendix B). The purpose of this instrument was to compare current career values in an attempt to better ascertain what "anchored" the officer to his career. Sixteen of the twenty-five couples completed and returned this questionnaire item. Its implications are similar to those discussed for career concepts. Table 2 below represents the frequency distribution of the career values selected as first choices among sixteen officers and their wives.

TABLE 2
Career Values Rankings: Sixteen Couples

<u>Career Values</u>	<u>First Choices</u>	
	<u>Number of Officers</u>	<u>Number of Wives</u>
Autonomy (#2)	3	3
Helping Others (#3)	1	2
Job Security (#4)	3	3
Management/Command (#5)	2	3
Creativity/Innovation (#6)	2	1
Starting The Second Career (#8)	2	0
Expertise/Technical Competence (#10)	3	4
High Income (#1)	0	0
Lots of Free Time (#7)	0	0
Status (#9)	0	0

Again, there are no surprising value differences between a majority of the couples. Table 3 illustrates the rank-ordering by average score for all the officers who returned questionnaires (N=136) on this item.

TABLE 3
Career Values Rankings: Total Population

<u>Career Value (By Rank)</u>	<u>Average Score</u>	
	<u>Officers</u>	<u>16 Wives</u>
Management/Command (#5)	3.92	4.00
Job Security (#4)	4.00	3.62
Expertise/Technical Competence (#10)	4.06	2.44
Autonomy (#2)	4.73	5.19
Creativity/Innovation (#6)	5.25	4.50
High Income (#1)	5.72	7.19
Starting The Second Career (#8)	6.10	6.38
Helping Others (#3)	6.21	5.62
Status (#9)	7.50	7.94
Lots of Free Time (#7)	8.10	8.44

* where (1) represents the highest ranking for the officers and (10) the lowest.

In general, the officers in the sixteen-pair sample follow the general population trend on preferred career values. The wives also seem to prefer for their husbands the top four values selected by the officers. The question of why more wives did not select for their husbands such values as status, making money, more free time and preparing for their next career venture (which

would, in turn, have been very supportive of the wives) is puzzling and remains to be answered.

The wives on a scale of Life Satisfaction (see Item D, Part B, Appendix B) reported a relative sense of well-being. Table 4 below reports the average scores for sixteen wives responding to the questionnaire.

TABLE 4
Life Satisfaction of Wives

<u>Words</u>	<u>Average Score</u>
Hopeful (v. Resigned)	1.31
Free (v. Trapped)	1.31
Secure (v. Threatened)	1.38
Interested (v. Bored)	1.50
Competent (v. Incompetent)	1.50
Pleased (v. Disappointed)	1.81
On The Way Up (v. Going Nowhere)	1.88
Successful (v. Unsuccessful)	1.94
Tense (v. Relaxed)	2.00
Challenged (v. Unfulfilled)	2.06
Self-Satisfied (v. Self-Critical)	2.13
Intensive (v. Nonchalant)	2.31
Competitive (v. Non-Competitive)	2.56

* On a scale of 1-5 where (1) represents feeling more like the first word and (5) represents feeling more like the parenthesized word.

For the man, there is a similar trend. Table 5 reports how the 136 officers felt.

TABLE 5
Life Satisfaction of Officers

<u>Words</u>	<u>Average Score</u>
Competent (v. Incompetent)	1.49
Hopeful (v. Resigned)	1.57
Interested (v. Bored)	1.61
On The Way Up (v. Going Nowhere)	1.65
Successful (v. Unsuccessful)	1.78
Competitive (v. Non-Competitive)	1.87
Secure (v. Threatened)	1.88
Free (v. Trapped)	1.90
Pleased (v. Disappointed)	1.95
Relaxed (v. Tense)	1.98

Challenged (v. Unfulfilled)	1.99
Intensive (v. Nonchalant)	2.16
Self-Satisfied (v. Self-Critical)	2.31

* On a scale of 1-5 where (1) represents feeling more like the first word and (5) represents feeling more like the parenthesized word.

The reader will note that, in general, the officers self-report feeling slightly better about their lives than their wives. However, both groups in the sample are quite positive about most dimensions of their life at this point in time.

An analysis was undertaken of marital happiness as correlated with numerous other variables (financial security, career objectives being met, good billets, aging, career concerns, increased economic burdens, changes in the spouse, changes in the children, etc.). There was little significant correlation. A stepwise regression of marital happiness with various items on the scales for Life Stage Concerns (Item E, Appendix B), Career Satisfaction (Item D, Part A, Appendix B), and Life Satisfaction (Item D, Part B, Appendix B) was completed. Again, there was little adjusted correlation between variables.

Finally, most couples seemed generally happy in their marriages. Of the sixteen paired responses for spouses on a seven-point Likert-scale of marital happiness, where 7 is "perfectly happy" (see Item F, Appendix B), the average score was 5.21. Of the 136 officer respondents, the average score for reported marital happiness was 4.923.

The respondents were also asked to judge the amount of marital unhappiness which would be attributed to the career. Only 14% of all officers report that this is 80% or more of the problem, whereas 22% say that the career is related to 60% or more of their marital problems, 14% of the sample say that it is attributable to 40% or more of their marital issues and 51% say it is 39% or less of their spousal difficulties.

From this statistical analysis, it would appear that on the average there

are few marital problems or stresses between most officer couples. While our interviews confirmed the fact that many officers and their wives had positive feelings about themselves, their spouses, their family situations and the Navy, there were also special issues to consider. These are important in spite of the general statistical trends.

The difficulties associated with conducting questionnaires research and making sense of broad statistical analyses have been underscored elsewhere (Argyris, 1979; Unger, 1975; Lundberg, 1976). Perhaps the questionnaires were not well-designed to yield the type of information needed for the study. Maybe the respondents reported invalid information. Or, it is possible that they didn't fully understand the questions being asked. What is important is that the interviews, which were a much more personal way to investigate these sensitive problems, did produce rich descriptive data which was notably absent in the questionnaire analysis.

The following sections of the paper, while not contradicting what is reported above, are descriptive of some of the special concerns faced by U.S. Naval officers and their wives across their various career stages. A descriptive model of wife-coping patterns and the place of these in career success is presented.

CAREER-FAMILY STAGES

The Early-Career Phase

During the early stages of a naval officer's career, typically from Ensign to Lieutenant Junior Grade, the young careerist must achieve his own sense of identity through work and adapt to the demands of the organization. This is the matching period when one takes his first job and given who he is becoming, attempts to ascertain if he wants to make it a career. The organization, on the other hand, attempts to determine whether the recruit has the

potential to meet its future needs and, if so, encourages him usually by advancement and attractive assignment, to stay. Many careerists and organizations determine after a trial period that they do not have a good career match.

Other than normal attrition as a result of this period, the Navy has some special problems. First, Naval officers and their wives must develop a model of work-family life often unlike that of their parents or other careers that they may have observed. Not only must the officer work very long hours, he frequently leaves the home for extended tours at sea. In the case of a fleet ballistic missile (FBM) submarine officer, for example, the family must adjust to "Daddy" being home for three months and then away for three months. In the case of many other officers, a sea tour may last for two weeks to eight months. Such a tour may be carefully planned or, as in the case of SSN attack submarine crews, it may come without warning. Much work on the family difficulties and problems associated with such separations has been done elsewhere, (Hunter and Nice, 1978).

There are other models in society of frequent travel and long hours (e.g., many young business executives), and of on-off work rotations (e.g., airline crews), what makes the Navy career model so unique is the frequency of travel, the extent of away-from-home time (up to a year away) and the fact that except for the FBM officers, one cannot count on extended at-home time in order to compensate for being away. Often, the officers just home from a cruise must work very hard while in port in order to prepare for going back to sea. Junior officers get more than their share of the "dirty work" and, thus, perceive of a career pattern which leaves them little time for anything except dedication to the Navy.

The service juniors, those whose fathers were military and especially Naval officers, are notably different in this regard. They seem to have already

formulated expectations about the military career model and to see it in a time perspective. They know, for example, that the early career period is the worst in terms of hardships because as they get more senior they are able to pass on onerous tasks to their juniors. They know how to adapt during this period. The wives, especially if they had grown up in military families, know how to be active outside-the-home when their husbands are away and be available when their husbands are at home. In short, they seem to have expectations congruent with the Navy way of life and are developing effective coping mechanisms.

A related point in adaptation of the marriage and family to the Naval career during this early phase, is the problem of converting the wife (especially when she is ignorant of such a lifestyle) to the Navy way. As mentioned above, most wives have no expectation of such a consuming model for their husband's career. Many report that despite some definite advantages, the demands put on them and the family seem excessive.

On the positive side, some couples come from small rural areas of the country and from lower-middle-class socio-economic backgrounds. The Naval officer career meets their needs for increased status, good pay, job security, and an opportunity to retire at half of base pay, at a relatively young age, and return "home" to live out their dreams. It is also perceived as an exciting opportunity, one which would not otherwise have developed, to travel and see the world. The career, providing the husband performs adequately, is quite secure and promises steady promotions and pay increases as well as enviable benefits.

On the other hand, report both wives and husbands, the family separations, the heavy work loads and long hours, the uncertain schedules, and the eroding benefits (e.g., the possibility that the twenty-year retirement option may be discontinued and the defacto policy of 5% cost-of-living increases in 10% inflationary periods) often seem to offset these advantages. Moreover, the policy of frequent moves is perceived as an advantage during the early years of marriage

while children are small and the family is open to new adventures. Once the children reach school age, it is perceived as a disadvantage disruptive to family life.

The marital role adjustments are also difficult during this formative period. The couple must work out when/if he is the patriarch, who will keep the finances, the parenting roles when he is at sea and when he is home, her time at home and away from home and how this corresponds with his schedule. These are complex and intensive role issues for young couples to resolve.

Another consideration associated with the adjustment phase has to do with the values and generational conflict being experienced between young officer couples and their more senior counterparts. Not only has the Women's Liberation Movement made the younger wives more independent, more assertive when their needs are not being met and less apt to adopt traditional helping roles subordinate to their husband's work, but the more senior officers and their wives are likely to view the career from a very different perspective than their more junior counterparts.

Research now shows that for many younger persons, work is no longer a primary value. The importance of self/family development and lifestyle are often more salient values (Emery, 1977; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1975, 1978; Kanter, 1977; Hall and Hall, 1979). Younger male careerists are likely to be sharing parenting roles and household tasks with their wives and wives are apt to be pursuing their own careers. Further, many junior navy couples do not view ascending the management hierarchy as necessarily correlated with having a successful career; rather, they are likely to define career-life success as doing work which corresponds with their personal and family growth cycles, having variety and not being bored, or being a craftsperson and doing something more and better until one has finally achieved intrinsic pleasure and feels he has left his contribution to society.

Senior Navy couples, on the other hand, often portray career-life values

which are counter to those just mentioned. Many seniors proclaim that the fun of being an officer is to be at sea (away from home), "driving" an airplane, ship, or submarine; that the essence of the career is subordination of all else to one's work. A good Navy wife is often viewed by senior officers as a type of superwoman who should be able to manage efficiently while the husband is away but eagerly becomes subordinate when he returns. She does not complain. She entertains well, stays physically attractive and mixes socially with other wives (especially those who are peers and superiors of the husband). If she chooses a career of her own, it is to keep herself busy while he is away and to add income to the family. Becoming a real estate salesperson, for example, is seen as an ideal career choice because she can carefully choose her own hours and quickly adjust her work to a new environment and the demands of his schedule.

In our research, many junior officers reported that they perceive their seniors as unsympathetic and even hostile to the new values they espouse. One Surface Warfare Lieutenant reported receiving perfect ratings from a former Commanding Officer (CO) but with a footnote that "he could become CNO if he and his wife just learned the Navy team concept." This, he said, meant that he was great but that they were somewhat deficient as a twosome. In this case, the wife was pursuing her own studies and couldn't cope with all that the CO's wife asked her to do.

A senior Captain in the submarines complained that an Executive Officer was resigning at fourteen years of service "just because his housewife keeps bitching." It was hard for him to understand. An aviator Commanding Officer said, "I don't understand the young wives. They are ruining these guys' careers. If they would fall into line, half of my problems would be resolved. They just need to mature beyond all this Women's Lib crap." A jet fighter pilot flight instructor exclaimed, "I'm getting out because as I get more senior,

they also want to include my wife in more activities and she doesn't want to be in the Navy. She has her own career."

Thus, the four critical problems during the adjustment or early phase of a Naval officer's career are: (1) whether he feels that there is a good match between his own career aspirations and the career requirements of the enterprise; (2) whether he and his wife have accepted and come to terms with a different kind of career-family model; (3) whether the wife has come to accept the Navy as a way of life where the advantages to the family outweigh the disadvantages and where she is prepared for a career which includes her; and (4) whether the young officer couple will come to accept or at least not be discouraged by the values of their mentors and seniors and whether they will feel that in spite of minimal compliance in order to be "political" they can still be who they are, can eventually change things to their liking, or will as they grow older want to emulate some of the values of successful superiors.

Those in the study who at this first stage of the career seem most content with family life in the Navy were of several types. Some were staff officers (CEC, Supply) where sea duty and family separations are limited. Some were bachelors and childless couples where flexibility posed less of a problem. Other contented careerists were those couples where the wife was pursuing the kind of career which allowed her to work intensely while her husband was away and be at home when he was there. Where the spouses had both accepted the Navy model as a way of life (or already knew it from their early family backgrounds), they also seemed more apt to be willing to make the Navy a long and productive career.

The Mid-Career Phase

For a Naval officer, one is at mid-career at about the Lieutenant-Lieutenant Commander ranks. This is normally between eight and fourteen years of service and at about ages 27-36.

Early mid-career is usually a time when one has made some tentative commitment to an occupation or an organization and has been accepted into full membership. Early in the mid-career, one may be preoccupied with independent performance and establishing technical competence. A typical progression would then advance the careerist to higher levels of responsibility and require him to succeed via managing other people or achieving excellence through and with others rather than alone. The organization eventually decides who among these mid-careerists it will prepare for future executive positions. It attempts to weed some persons out of its ranks rather than making a long-term commitment to them. Others are allowed to remain as craftsmen and future drones but, while meeting some baseline criteria for competence, are not valued as "front-runners" (Dalton, Thompson and Price, 1977; Schein, 1978).

By this time, many Naval officers and their spouses have already made some sort of a commitment to staying in the Navy. The officer has completed about ten years of service and can retire at twenty years, at a relatively young age, with half of his base pay. Thus, the couple commits to remaining for at least twenty years. Nevertheless, some do decide to leave at mid-career. Here are some of the reasons uncovered.

It is only at about this stage of the career that many experience the first questioning period of adult life development. During this questioning phase, the adult must often contend with feelings of unbalance or with a need to develop his non-work and non-achievement identity: being a better father, being a more considerate and loving husband, pursuing hobbies, engaging in personal growth activities. The wife, on the other hand, often confronts internal sentiments associated with moving away from nurturing tasks and towards fulfilling the achievement or work side of her personality in order to get a better balance. Thus, this is a period associated with some malaise stemming from a

need to get one's life into full perspective or balance and, quite often, to renegotiate the marriage contract as the spouse struggles with similar issues but, perhaps, from a somewhat different perspective. For the careerist who achieved so much of his early adult development through work, it is a pull towards non-work or a period of questioning what else is needed for more total identity (Gould, 1972; Levinson, 1978).

Our data indicate that many Naval officers cope with this period by simply postponing it. Their career stage frequently demands very hard work at mid-career because of the up-or-out policy of having to get selected for Lieutenant Commander or leave the Navy. Because the fitness reports during this time are critical to future advancements, not many are willing to risk distractions and non-work orientations. Those who do stop to honor these unsettling feelings and questions often do so because some external crisis forced the issue: their wife was so frustrated as to provoke a major marital confrontation, a death of a loved one occurred and made them stop to ponder, or they faced the possibility of not advancing to LDCR and had to ask the question "what should I become in my next career?" However, some who we encountered had either "found" their new internal equilibriums by being in an introspective setting during the questioning period (e.g., in a psychology course at the Naval Postgraduate School) or had experienced a personal crisis which demanded that they stop and take heed. Some were, in fact, considering leaving the Navy at the Senior Lieutenant rank because they found Navy life incompatible with these newly found lifestyle and family needs.

A second related reason given by some officers for resigning their commissions at such a late period in their careers was that they experienced a critical mismatch between the direction of their Naval career and their newly discovered "career anchor."

At mid-career, usually after 6-10 years of work experience, one is able to

ascertain basic work needs, values, motives, attitudes, and talents, the culmination of which tend to anchor him to a particular occupation or organization. For some, they possess an internal need to manage an operation with full authority and responsibility. Others may yearn for basic job security while a third group, for example, may strive for professional-technical proficiency or becoming a real craftsman at whatever line of work they are pursuing. These needs, values, motives, attitudes, and talents have been called "career anchors" because they are associated with one's career identity and when they are basically violated the careerist will usually tend to become very dissatisfied (Schein, 1978).

In this study, we discovered that numerous Naval officers had uncovered their career anchors at mid-career. Where a mismatch accrued between the direction the Naval career was taking and who the careerist had become, two responses seemed predominant. Most officers simply decided to defer personal gratification until their second (post-military) career. In other words, they planned to exercise minimally acceptable performance during the rest of their Navy career hoping to do well enough to retire at a respectable rank with a good retirement salary, but they also anticipated putting much time and energy into planning and preparing for their second career, which would lead to more fulfillment of their career anchor. However, some officers were sufficiently disturbed by the mismatch that they decided to leave the Navy.

Several of the most common examples of career anchor violations within the various Naval officer communities were the following. Aviators, basically oriented to technical proficiency through flying, feared leaving the cockpit. Surface Warfare officers, driven by the need to manage a ship at sea, feared being promoted to a bureaucratic staff position. Supply Corps officers, motivated by stimulating work and a good family life, feared their Washington, D.C. tours where it was perceived that they would interact with their families on a much more restricted basis. CEC officers also feared becoming managers and losing

their technical/professional expertise.

Thirdly, officers left at mid-career because the conditions of family life frequently changed at this stage. Many families were in the situation of having young children at home or in elementary school. These intensive years of child rearing are demanding. Coupled with the new societal values for sharing child-rearing tasks, the wife finds it particularly difficult to have her husband at sea at this time. The children also seem more parent-centered at this stage wanting time to interact with both parents and find long separations very difficult.

Fourth, at mid-career is when the Navy wife most typically becomes more active as a partner in her husband's career. During the early-career phase, she was asked mainly to give unquestioned support. That is, he was establishing his technical competence and was so involved at work, partly because it met his own identity needs, that his wife was asked mainly to pick up the loose ends at home, not complain and provide for her husband a peaceful refuge from the daily pressures. For example, when younger officers are asked how their wives can be helpful in their career, they usually say "by not complaining."

By late mid-career, however, Lieutenant Commanders are often in charge of major departments or are Executive Officers. They are expected to accomplish most of their tasks by working with people. To be promoted, they should entertain and be active in Navy social life. They realize that advancement beyond the rank of Commander will depend in large measure on many informal criteria ("politics") and that they are likely to be judged as a couple for higher position. The role of the wife changes at mid-career from that of unquestioning supporter to that of active manager of the family's social obligations. She is asked to help create the family image so that her husband appears as good potential for senior officer material. While on occasion she may not directly help

her husband in a given billet, her actions--or lack of them--can certainly hurt his career image. She should begin to involve herself with other senior officer wives and to entertain (Kanter, 1978).

In our research, we found some officers at this career stage who perceived that their wives were questioning this new social role. Some wives were pushing for severance from the Navy or at least a minimal commitment to it because of the pressures being placed on them. This was one reason given for leaving at a more senior level.

Having focused thus far on the reasons for resigning a commission at mid-career, the paper will now highlight a descriptive model of wife types which seemed to emerge during this period (partly in response to the new set of problems described above). Table 6 below describes the five wife types.

TABLE 6
Types of Navy Wives at Mid-Career

<u>TYPE</u>	<u>DEFINITION</u>	<u>ISSUES</u>	<u>ATTITUDE</u>
Blind Supporters	<p>1. Those who tie lives exclusively to husband's career or see it as a "our" two-person career.</p> <p>2. Those whose self-interests are not identical but beautifully complimentary and do not conflict with his career.</p>	How can I help to advance our career?	His happiness is my happiness.
Deferred Gratifiers	<p>1. Some are happy to enjoy the security of Navy life and will develop their own career interests, if any, when their husband retires.</p> <p>2. Others are somewhat angry at having to delay gratification in their life until they can pursue their own careers (probably when their husband retires) and they are impatient.</p>	How can I help him now so that he (and the benefits from his career) will help me in the future?	I'm willing to wait but at some point it is my turn.
Careerists	<p>1. Those who are willing to put up with the difficulties of the husband's career (probably by subordinating their career to his) but insist on finding their own "niche" within those constraints.</p> <p>2. Those whose career is as or more important than the marriage. Lots of hostility towards any infringement on her own career plans.</p>	How can I pursue my own career plans regardless of his?	I have as much right to a career as he does and mine is as important as his.

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

Accommodators	1. Some view working here as a job which must accommodate to the family demands (the first priority) and plan accordingly.	How can I have meaningful work and still be a good marriage partner and mother?	I need something more than being active in his career and the family (partly because he is away so much and for so long) but my main priority is my marriage and family.
	2. Others see the career over the long-term and are essentially opportunistic and flexible. They can de-emphasize their careers, change directions, subordinate or do whatever seems necessary to reach a meaningful balance between work-family.		
Insiders	1. Navy/military juniors who are accustomed to the lifestyle and have seen military marriages modeled.	How can I use what I already know to make this system work for me (us)?	I can see the long-term aspects of this career and have seen it work for others. By doing my part, I can reap numerous benefits in the present and the future.
	2. Those who are themselves in the Navy and are pursuing a dual career with their husbands.		

Many women fell into the category of Deferred Gratifiers. One potential conflict that we uncovered in the interviews was that while wives were patiently waiting their turn and expecting much support from their husbands after retirement, the husbands were often preparing to pursue an active second career and did not see themselves as primarily supporting their wife's efforts or expectations. Another problem was that many of these women seemed to harbor anger and impatient feelings at having to wait in order to achieve their goals.

The Careerist wives seemed most at odds with the Navy career pattern and with their husband's career aspirations. In fact, the women in this category, a rather small percentage of the sample, were judged to be experiencing great dissatisfaction with the status quo. They were most likely to present their mates with ultimatums: "It's the Navy or me!" They seemed prepared to risk their marriages for more independence. Most could not see how they could pursue a viable career of their choice and be part of the Navy system which includes frequent moves, little husband help and demands extensive support from them for the husband's career.

As expected, the Blind Supporters, Accommodators, and Insiders seemed to

be the most ideal companions for Naval officers.

An analysis of the twenty-five wife interviews (five from each of the Navy sub-communities which were studied) and the perceptions of the officers about their wives attitudes, also reveals that while all five categories of spouses mentioned above seems to exist in every Navy community, dominant styles seem to vary somewhat by community. Table 7 below illustrates the dominant type in which a majority of the wives per each sub-community were judged to belong.

TABLE 7
Types of Navy Wives By Sub-Community

<u>Model Type</u>	<u>COMMUNITY</u>				
	<u>AVIATION</u>	<u>SURFACE</u>	<u>SUBMARINE</u>	<u>SUPPLY</u>	<u>CEC</u>
Blind Supporter	X	X	X		
Deferred Gratifier	X			X	
Careerist					
Accommodator				X	X
Insider					

It is not surprising that the stringent work requirements for line officers in the surface, subsurface and air communities demand a supportive spouse. Indeed, these are the major communities areas of critical officer shortages in the Navy and, concomitantly, where the demands on the family for support are the greatest.

The Supply Corps seems the most "political" of the communities we studied and we suspect that the informal requisites for promotion are in part linked to the role of the wife as a supportive part of the officer couple team. On the other hand, as a staff officer who is seldom at sea or separated from his family, the Supply Corps officers interviewed reported to be returning support to wives

who were Accommodators. In the Civil Engineering Corps, more spouses appeared to be involved in balancing their own careers with those of their husbands than in any other sub-community.

In general, however, some other factors affected individual wives across all communities and need to be highlighted because of their impact on officer retention and productivity in the Navy at mid-career. These points are: (1) younger women seem better educated, more motivated and attach greater value to pursuing a career at some point in their lives than do older spouses (over thirty-five), (2) the erosion of military pay and benefits as part of the general economic condition of inflation along with the post-Vietnam War cutbacks, encourage many officer couples to consider her career as an important source of additional family income, (3) the Women's Movement has changed the attitudes of many Navy wives towards seeking their own self-identities via some sort of outside-the-home occupation and (4) the officers themselves show an increasing willingness to change their preconceived ideas about their wife's role in the Navy career, to allow her to be less supportive and even assume that her lack of support should not matter in his career, and to be more actively supportive of her own outside-the-home pursuits (e.g., in sharing with the child care so that she can be more active).

The idea of deferring gratification in the present (when the current career is dissatisfying) and until the post-Navy career, introduces the next major issue for officers at mid-career: whether to invest in the Naval or the second career. Derr has written elsewhere about this career transition phenomenon (Derr, in press); but, in general, some officers at late mid-career simply decide to "do my twenty years" at a level of minimal commitment and begin to invest their time and energy in their next career ventures.

Many of these persons become disenched with the Navy. They might dislike

the nature of the work. Their wives and families may be dissatisfied. Perhaps their career anchors have been violated (e.g., the pilot who is technically oriented but must switch from cockpit to administration). Or a combination of all these factors may enter into their career malaise and cause them to withdraw their energy and become second-career oriented.

Others simply perceive that there are greater benefits attached to preparing for their second careers (which may be years away) than for actively pursuing their Navy careers. Another segment of this group, unlike those who have become "turned off" to the Navy, believe that their opportunities for a successful military career are limited. They perceive that it would be wiser to change their career direction. Some of the interviewees in this category had already been passed over once by the Selection Board and were expecting to be involuntarily retired in the near future. For most, however, there is a commitment to retiring honorably and at a high enough rank so as to enjoy the benefits of retirement (half of highest base pay).

It is important to understand the distinction between those who are second-career oriented by choice and those who are not. The voluntary second-careerists and those who are attempting to pursue both their military and second careers with equal vigor, are likely to strive for both some level of second-career competence and advancement in their military careers. They seem equally concerned about both careers (the Navy and the next venture) whereas the involuntary second-careerists clearly put their second career in first priority. This is manifest in how they use their time, energy, and planning moments and how they articulate their priorities.

For example, one officer at the Naval Postgraduate School was busy searching a new career because he had been denied promotion on the first round of the Selection Board. He was a Civil Engineering Corps officer and had not succeeded at demonstrating proficiency as an architect. Moreover, this involuntary second-

careerist had decided that he did not like and was not, in fact, particularly talented at architecture and he was busy using all of his time exploring other career options.

Another voluntary second-careerist was a Surface Warfare officer whose goal was a Ph.D. in Management. He worked hard to influence his detailer to give him billets which allowed him to be near University centers. He was preparing to teach at the junior college level. He also read extensively in his field and wrote about relevant aspects of his naval experience to demonstrate before retirement his academic competence by publishing several articles. He was to retire after twenty years as a Lieutenant Commander, having chosen jobs during the last seven years of his military service which were not career-enhancing for his Navy occupation.

A third example of a voluntary second-careerist was that of an aviator Lieutenant Commander who had accumulated fourteen years of service. He was preparing earnestly for a career in real estate in San Diego. His plan was to find some way to remain in that geographical area in order to work part-time, get his Broker's license and manage his investments. At the same time, he wanted to retire as a Commander with twenty years of service. He also had as his goal to do well enough on the job and appear career-motivated enough so as to attain the rank of Commander while, simultaneously, pursuing his second career. Thus, he saw himself as equally dividing his energy between the two career objectives.

On retaining commissioned officers in the service at mid-career, two points are worth mentioning. First, this is the period when a Lieutenant must either qualify for advancement to LCDR or leave the Navy. At mid-career is the last practical point when the organization can choose to retain or let go an officer. While those who are involuntarily retired at this point experience, with their families, numerous career adjustment problems, it is in part up to the organization to exercise its best options. Should it, for example, expunge those whose

wives are Careerists or Deferred Gratifiers? Does it appear as if an officer is more second-than-Navy career oriented?

Second, in those communities where the employment market in the corresponding civilian world allows for switching jobs from the military to a civilian employer, the above mentioned family and self-development issues weigh heavily as major reasons for officers leaving the Navy. Our research underscores that such is certainly the case in two of the critical officer shortage areas: for pilots and nuclear-trained submariners. Nuclear-trained submarine officers can, if they choose, transition to jobs of equal pay and status in the nuclear power industry. Pilots are now being hired by the civilian airlines to replace World War II airline pilots facing the mandatory retirement age.

Should the officer switch his attention and energy from the Navy career to a preparation for the second career, this could be a problem. The dissipation of energy from the Navy to elsewhere could be a major problem in maintaining productive officer executives. This is the danger when deferred gratification occurs. Although the officer couple may be "psychologically present" at some level of commitment and not "rocking the boat," their career energy is elsewhere. They become "warm bodies" but not vital human resources.

In summary, the major reasons why Naval officers retire at mid-career appear to be (1) the impact of changing spousal and family demands on the officer himself, (2) this along with his own internal self-development transitions (maybe prodded by a response to these pressures) as he questions his life to date and tries to get better balanced, (3) the mismatch between his newly confirmed career anchor and the Navy's future career opportunities and (4) the requirements for a changing role for the wife and her acceptance or rejection of those new demands. Much of the success of this transition period will depend on the orientation of the wife. Five types of wives are listed above and it has been

pointed out that given the current demands on most Naval officers for career success, Blind Supporter, Insider, and Accommodator wives seem preferable if such success is the goal.

On the other hand, for numerous reasons mentioned above, the social forces are pushing Navy wives towards more of a career orientation. Deferred Gratifiers and Accommodators could become a problem for the Navy in that husbands will be forced to become more accommodative themselves in order to give their wives ample opportunities to prepare for and engage in work and, consequently, the officers will normally be less willing at some point to be totally devoted to their own careers. Careerists wives could be a serious problem for the Navy because it would be very difficult to envisage the full pursuit of the officer's career when he must share responsibilities and support for his spouse's career.

Late-Career Phase

Most of those queried in the study are at the rank Ensign-Lieutenant Commander; thus, there are fewer persons in the sample considered to be in the senior officer or late-career phase (Commander, Captain, Admiral). However, we have studied a number of senior LCDR's (26) and some Commanders (8) and of those sampled, twenty-three have sixteen or more years of service. Given that a typical career lasts twenty years (certainly no more than twenty-six years), there is some basis to comment on this phase of the Naval officer career pattern. Also, numerous implications can be drawn from other research and theory.

The critical issues at late-career seem to be, first, how to adjust as an executive couple wherein there are increased expectations and responsibilities; second, how to actually transist from the initial career and Navy life to a second career as a civilian; third, how to cope with a possible mid-life adult crisis.

As an executive couple, the status of most senior Naval officers and their

wives, there are increased demands for entertaining and representing the organization at ceremonial and social occasions (Konter, 1978). Many Navy executive wives have functions of their own related to their husband's career, such as, organizing and helping to care for other wives when the men are at sea, helping to create a tightly-knit group between wardroom families, overseeing some Navy Wives Club activities, making ceremonial and social appearances and helping to care generally for the welfare of the families under her husband's command. An Admiral's wife, for example, can be quite influential on matters associated with housing, medical care, the Officer's Club and recreational activities. Growing into this new role is one issue for the wife in the late-career phase.

It may be useful to project the various late-career issues for the five types of Navy wives identified earlier. These could signal potential family problems which will help us to better understand some of the major career-family dilemmas impacting on Naval officer productivity at late-career. First, the Blind Supporter often discovers at late-career that her support has returned dividends for her husband's career in the form of higher rank. Consequently, she must assume an executive wife role and will probably become more visible as an individual in this role, rather than continue as a purely supportive extension of her husband. This is a period when she may need to learn new skills and behaviors in order to continue as an effective mate (executive spouse) and it could either be challenging or traumatic for her.

We have mentioned above the major problems for the Deferred Gratifier at late-career. In brief, she must now cope with the realities of transiting to civilian life and these may not match her original expectations. She must also take concrete measures to meet the expectations which can be salvaged and to prepare for the next phase of life. Thus, she is likely to be busy, challenged but, also, frustrated by the mismatch between old expectations and new realities.

The Careerist may become less anxious as she now sees near-term possibilities

for enhancing her own career. This assumes, of course, that the marriage is still in tact since we are assuming that the officer remained in the Navy until late-career. The Careerist is not likely to have played the executive wife role very well in the earlier career phases and it is, therefore, doubtful that her husband could have gotten very high rank since the top executive roles are often designed for a careerist and his support person. However, if by chance he has progressed up the hierarchy, she may be forced to become a "Navy wife" and have to experience the inner-stress which may come from such external pressure.

The Accommodator, on the other hand, should make a smooth transition to late-career. She may now make the choice between her family or her career role and neither choice should result in a crisis. She is likely to transist back and forth between family, her husband's career roles and her own career with apparent ease--emphasizing one or the other as the situation demands.

Insiders will also do well at late-career. If they too are wives and also Naval officers, they will be looking forward to retirement and may experience the same career transition and mid-life crisis as their husbands. Most of them will be seasoned Navy spouse veterans, however, who saw their parental families cope during this period and who have by now years of their own experiences. They would be able to adjust quite easily to the role of "first lady" or "CO's wife." On the other hand, they might experience the problem of having known military life for so long that they feel anxious about civilian status. Thus, the actual second career transition period and the mental and physical preparations for it could be traumatic.

A somewhat more controversial problem for officers will be trying to cope with the upcoming career transition. Must must finally decide their next career venture based on some intuitive sense of what they do well, what kind of work they enjoy, in what geographical setting they wish to settle, what monetary needs they have, what job flexibility they desire in order to accommodate to their

spouse's and children's needs and what lifestyle concept they hold for the 45-60 year age period in their lives. This choice normally results in some form of compromise. Making the decision often provokes long discussions, even arguments, with one's spouse, children, relatives, and friends. Planning is critical. For some, they will naturally transist to similar jobs in civilian life (e.g., nuclear submarine officers to nuclear industry, CEC architect to an architectural firm, computer analyst to another computer job).

For many, especially for line officers, it will be a career switch since their primary activity as an officer is that of a general "commander" who rotates every two to three years between his military specialty (e.g., on a ship, in a squadron) and a more general management support position (e.g., project management, personnel, financial management). The military jobs which have the most second-career potential are frequently short-lived opportunities of, perhaps, two divided tours of duty in a whole military career. For example, an Organization Development Specialist might spend three years as an internal consultant at a Human Resource Management Center, go back to sea duty, go to another shore billet, back to sea and, finally, go into a policy position in administering OD programs. Moreover, one's specialty training (e.g., Naval Postgraduate School) normally takes place at mid-career and may be somewhat obsolete by the time the officer retires.

A related issue is how to continue to perform credibly as a senior Naval officer while simultaneously conducting an active search and then preparing to transist into the next career. Balance is critical for the late-careerist. While a number of billets are second-career enhancing (e.g., graduate education, training as a technician), they may not be career enhancing in the military. For line officers, the military tends to reward one for having served in combat, on ships, with the troops, or in some directly defense-related activity. The support activities are seen as necessary but not as critically important, as

many of these activities could be accomplished by civil service. Becoming highly specialized, by becoming very knowledgeable in one's field, is somewhat suspect. It is, therefore, often difficult to pursue the current and secondary career simultaneously and sometimes, to the extent one can influence the situation, one must seize on a second career opportunity at the expense of his military career. The closer one is to retirement, the truer this is.

The third important issue for officers and their families during the late-career stage is how to cope with normal personal problems associated with aging. Many persons during the ages 40-50 experience a change in their subjective state (feelings) and are unable to cope with life's problems in the same way as before. They are searching a new sense of direction as well as new coping mechanisms. Much of this mid-life crisis can be attributed to coming to terms with one's career and life, the realization that life is not endless and more than half over and the corresponding need to accept the past and plan out the future (Derr and Schein, 1978; Gould, 1972; Levinson, 1978; Vaillant, 1977).

Some reasons which tend to "trigger" this type of menopause are (1) coming to terms with signs of physical deterioration or ill-health, (2) experiencing a career plateau (when one's work is boring or regarded as unchallenging) or coming face-to-face with the fact that they will not likely achieve all that they had hoped, and (3) being confronted with significant changes in the society or in the family situations.

On this latter point, marriages which have endured some twenty years may undergo increasing strain as both partners experience physical and psychological changes. A wife who is a Deferred Gratifier may, for example, be starting a new life in earnest and relatively unsympathetic or unurturing regarding her husband's personal trauma. She is up while he is down. Or, a spouse of any type may be working on her own "turning points" having to do with her new role in life as children leave the nest and her problems may compound those of her

husband. Another too common scenario is that one or the other partner becomes at this age involved in a brief sexual affair with someone who is younger in an attempt to recapture his/her own youth.

The changing social trends (e.g., Women's Liberation or an economic recession) and coming to terms with maturing children are also potential triggers which set off the mid-life crisis. Evans and Bartolome (1978) discovered among European business executives that these were typically the years most preoccupied with questions related to one's concern, guilt and stance vis a vis the teenage kids. Watching a child become rebellious and, perhaps, alter his values from your own can be a painful experience.

It is hypothesized in the research done to date on this phenomenon that those who postpone the regular adjustments of life such as the first questioning and balancing period mentioned above during mid-career (ages 28-34), will encounter a more severe adaptive period later on. This inquiry was not part of the study, but it was uncovered among junior Naval officers (while many of their wives tend to defer gratification) a tendency to defer the balancing period because of the intensive career demands of the organization at that particular time. To raise such questions would be futile, even painful, because the organizational demands would not permit one to do much about the problem. Thus, it could be hypothesized that senior Naval officers near retirement (where their lives are in flux anyway and where these changes could well trigger a personal crisis) will experience a relatively difficult mid-life transition period.

There is some anecdotal evidence that this may be the case. Medical facilities, alcohol rehabilitation centers and military social workers are said to treat an abnormally high percentage of Captains and Admirals undergoing severe emotional stress shortly after retirement. It stands to reason that those who made it to the top and whose internal competitive reward system and career orientation ("hard-charging" worker) demanded that they postpone many personal and

family matters until retirement, would experience some sort of trauma once confronted by the personal issues they had been postponing. The military is also unique as an organization in that it forces its people to retire at the period of their lives in which many of these crisis-provoking questions are being asked.

A related issue particularly relevant to the military is the notion of adjusting to the realities of postponing gratification. If, as our research indicates, many officers and their spouses are not satisfied during much of their career but are, instead, waiting for the retirement period to live out their dreams, then what sorts of problems does this attitude pose as retirement draws near?

This is the period during which the wives, identified in our study as Deferred Gratifiers during the mid-career phase, may begin to call in the "old debts." In order to meet her own deferred needs, the wife may be relying on her husband's future support and accommodation to her new career or career plans. Our research also indicates, however, that the officers are planning at retirement to work long and hard at their new career ventures--ones often based on career anchors discovered at mid-career--towards which they are looking forward with great anticipation. He is, in turn, going to need his wife's support in order to start his second career. While deferred gratification may make for one of the more successful marital adjustments in the early- and mid-career phase, it is suggested that this coping style may be a definite liability to marital adjustment in the late-career phase.

In summary, the late-career phase presents its own special problems--again closely intertwined with outside-the-job concerns (self-wife-family). First, there is the issue of how to adapt to a new executive couple role--which greatly involves the wife and the success of which will greatly affect future promotions. Second, the officer and his wife are usually quite involved in

searching, deciding, and preparing for the post-Navy career. Third, the officer himself must cope with the possibility of a mid-life crisis. This will greatly impact on his family if it materializes, and it will impact on the Navy if it happens before actual retirement.

Of the five wife types mentioned at mid-career, the Accommodators and Insiders seem the most apt to cope effectively at late-career. Blind Supporters will be forced into new and perhaps unsettling roles as their husbands become top executives. Careerists will be asked to play executive wife roles which they never intended and which impinge on their own aspirations. Deferred Grati-fiers will be busy preparing for the future, rather than acting in the present role, and are likely to experience some frustrations at the gap between past expectations and current realities.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the preliminary results of our research indicate that there are three major phases in the Naval Officer's career, these being the Early-Career Phase, the Mid-Career Phase, and the Late-Career Phase. Marital and family adjustment figures prominently in all three phases with these concerns accelerating in the mid- and late-career stages. Making plans for transition to a second career or viewing the Navy career as a temporary step in a life-long work history emerges in mid-career and peaks in the late-career phase. The mid-life crisis, with the personal issues inherent in the crisis and its resolution, appears in the late-career phase and may be compounded by the voluntary or involuntary termination of the Naval career and the marital and family adjustments of this period.

In early-career, one of the most difficult challenges for the officer couple is that of accepting the Navy way of life, with its separations, its long hours devoted to work and its assumptions that the Navy career should be pervasive and all else subordinate to it. This issue is especially important for

the wife. Whether or not she can make such an adjustment seems highly correlated with whether the officer will remain in the service (at least while he remains married to her). The problem is compounded by the changing social trends and values tending away from work as the dominant concern and towards role-sharing and career-sharing as women experience the impact of Feminism on society.

At mid-career the officer is more sure of his career anchor and has somehow come to terms with the first important adult life passage (the questioning period). He might conclude that he will stay in the Navy (1) because the Navy is the best setting in which he can be fulfilled or (2) because he wants the retirement benefits which come with serving twenty years and views the Navy partly as a vehicle for transiting to his chosen (second) career.

However, family issues become more acute at this career stage. The wife is, herself, often experiencing a life change and may choose to be less supportive and more career or outside-the-home involved as she seeks to balance her nurturing side with her achievement needs. The children are aging and requiring more intensive parenting.

At the late-career phase, the key issues for officer families are those of becoming less mobile in order to provide more stability for the older children, planning in earnest the realities of career transition at retirement, growing into the executive role (including Executive Wife), and confronting the issues of aging (perhaps of a mid-life crisis).

In general, the most salient conclusion is that there is a strong link at all three stages between the dynamics of family life and officer productivity. The impact of the pressures and influences of the spouse on her officer husband cannot be overemphasized. Some key problems felt by most of the wives interviewed were those of family separations when the men go off to sea, too frequent moves which disrupt children's schooling, and how to best cope given her the

career aspirations.

Needed Research

More information is needed about the problems of late-career and how couples and families transist from their military to their civilian careers.

Whether the wife models discovered in this study are, indeed, generalizable to the entire Navy wife population and to other settings should be investigated. Some underlying questions are (1) what are various spousal styles which impact on the aspirations and performance of the careerist and (2) how do these styles help or hinder the careerist at the various career stages?

Finally, the whole issue of adult life development which comes into play at mid-career needs further study. What is of importance to those interested in career development issues is what are the implications for the careerist and what impact are the life transitions of the spouse likely to have on him/her? In the U.S. Navy, these issues seem especially relevant for the study of officers who are in the 12-20 year experience range.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argyris, C., Intervention Theory and Method (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970), Chapters 4-5.
- Dalton, G.W., P.H. Thompson, and R.L. Price, "The Four Stages of Professional Careers: A New Look at Performance by Professionals," Organizational Dynamics, Summer, 1977.
- Derr, C.B., "Career Switching and Career Politics," in R. Katz, ed., Career Issues for Human Resource Management (Prentice-Hall, in press).
- Derr, C.B. and E.H. Schein, "Proceedings of the Career Research Conference," Sloan School of Management Working Paper #1004-78, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, June, 1978.
- Driver, M.J., "Career Concepts and Career Management in Organizations," in C. Cooper, ed., Behavioral Problems in Organizations (London: Prentice-Hall International, 1979).
- Emery, F., Futures We Are In (Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishing Co., 1977).
- Evans, P.A.L. and F. Bartolome, "The Relationship Between Professional Life and Private Life," unpublished working paper, The European Institute of Business, Fontainebleau, France, February, 1979.
- Figler, H.R., Overcoming Executive Mid-Life Crisis (New York: John Wiley, 1978).
- Fisher, R.H., "Nobody Asked Me But...Junior Officer Retention, Why Is It A Problem?", U.S. Naval Proceedings, February, 1979.
- Gammon, M.J., Organizational Behavior: A Managerial and Organizational Perspective (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1979), Chapter 17.
- Gould, R.L., "The Phases of Adult Life," American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 129, No. 5, November, 1972.
- Hall, D.T. and F.S. Hall, The Two-Career Family (Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1979).
- Hand, H.H., R.W. Griffeth and W.H. Mobley, "Military Enlistment, Reenlistment and Withdrawal Research: A Critical Review of the Literature," Technical Report 3, Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina, College of Business Administration, December, 1977.
- Holzbach, R.L., "Research Plan: Quality Retention of Surface Warfare Junior Officers," Naval Personnel Research and Development Center Document, #307-225-67211-2283.
- Hunter, E.J. and D.S. Nice, Children of Military Families: A Part and Yet Apart (U.S. Government Printing Office, 008-040-00181-4).
- Hunter, E.J. and D.S. Nice, eds., Military Families: Adaptation to Change (New York: Praeger, 1978).

Kanter, R.M., Work and Family in the United States (Russell Sage Foundation, 1977).

Kanter, R.M., "Corporate Wives," MBA Magazine, February, 1978.

Levinson, D.J., The Seasons of a Man's Life (New York: Ballantine Books, 1978).

Lundberg, C.L., Hypothesis Creation in Organizational Behavior Research," Academy of Management Review, Vol. 1, No. 2, April, 1976, pp. 5-12.

Powers, F.W., "A Study of Nuclear Submarine Retention Factors," Masters Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, September, 1977.

Rapoport, R. and R. Rapoport, Leisure and the Family Life Cycle (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975).

Rapoport, R., R. Rapoport and J. Bumstead, eds., Working Couples (New York: Harper and Row, 1978).

Robertson, D.W., "R&D Program in Support of Career Stability of Navy Officer and Enlisted Personnel," Naval Personnel Research and Development Proposal, September, 1975.

Schein, E.H., Career Dynamics: Matching Individual and Organizational Needs (Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1978).

Unger, B., Program Evaluation From the Viewpoint of Organizational Intervention: A Critique of the Literature, unpublished doctoral Qualifying Paper, Harvard Graduate School of Education, November, 1975.

Van Maanan, J., ed., Organizational Careers: Some New Perspectives (New York: John Wiley, 1977).

APPENDIX A

Code _____

CAREER CONCEPTS

1. What is your definition of a successful career? That is, what will determine for you at the end of your career whether or not it has been successful?

2. As you are aware, you will retire one day. How do you see your second or non-Navy career? Do you know yet what you will do? Have you done much planning for it? Do you see retirement as a necessary evil or an exciting opportunity?

CAREER ANCHORS

1.a. What were your ambitions or long range goals when you started your career?
Have they changed? When? Why?

b. What kinds of billets do you prefer most (e.g., sea, shore and specific types
of work situations)?

c. What are things you look for in a good billet, things that are important to you?

d. As you look back over your career thus far, identify some times you have especially enjoyed. What about those times did you enjoy?

e. Identify some times you did not especially enjoy. What about them did you not enjoy?

f. Have you ever pushed hard to resist or change a particular assignment? Why?

CAREER SUPPORT

1. Do you have a strategy for advancing your career? Could you please share some of it so I can better understand how people in your community influence the career?

2. Is it important or helpful to have "sponsors" (more senior officers who try to exert influence in your behalf) and what role do they play?

3. In this regard do you think that getting on the good side of your current CO is most important, or is it critical to get as your sponsor a long term mentor who will look out for you no matter what? Or, is it important to have both kinds of sponsors?

4. What is a good strategy for relating to peers and what role do they play in a person's career?

5. Can your spouse play a critical role? If so, how?

6. What will be the most important combination of factors in advancing your military career (e.g., billets, fitness reports, politics)?

LIFE-STAGE INTERFACES

1. Please talk about your childhood as it relates to you having chosen this career. What were your early interests in high school? What was your major or concentration in college? Why did you choose that area? How did you feel about it?

2. Which people, if any, played key roles in influencing you to choose a military career?

3. Why did you choose a military career? Initially? At the various re-enlistment stages?

4. How long do you plan to remain? What rank would you like to attain?

5. Do you like the life of being a career military officer? Why? Why not?

6. Are you experiencing any changes in your own life style or values which might conflict with your career (e.g., questioning working such long hours, being away at sea, feeling unfulfilled)? Explain.

7. Do you think much about not making your career goals? If you do not reach them, how are you likely to handle this? Will you feel unfulfilled?

FAMILY CONCERNS

1. Is your spouse experiencing any changes which could affect your career?

2. In what ways might the organization fail to meet your changing personal/family needs? How will this impact on your desire to actively pursue your career?
How will this impact on your satisfaction with your career?

3. Do you think it is possible for both husband and wife to pursue careers outside the home if one of them is in the military?

4. How are career goal conflicts resolved in your family?

APPENDIX B

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Monterey, California

NC4(54Dr)/sm
12 August 1977

Department of Administrative Sciences


Dear Participant:

Thank you for your cooperation in this research project. Attached is a questionnaire which attempts to ask some of the questions from the interview in a more systematic and private way. Ultimately this research could help to influence Navy policy on career development issues.

I can assure you that absolute confidentiality will be maintained in this research project. These results will be reported in terms of the responses as a whole for the group of Naval officers and their spouses participating in the study.

It is important that you answer each question as honestly as possible. The answers should reflect your own true feelings and not what you think others expect of you. Please give your own opinions and do not consult with your husband or wife.

Thank you again for your important contribution to the understanding of the more "personal" aspects of a Navy officer's career.


C. Brooklyn Derr
Study Director

Enclosures

A. Career Concepts

*Wives should give their own answer about their husband's career.
That is, what are your concepts for what would constitute a
successful career for your husband?

INSTRUCTIONS: Described below are several different concepts of a successful career. Please rank order them according to what you consider important in your own idea of a successful career (generally, whether or not this matches your own career pattern). Mark them (1) to (5) with (1) representing the concept that is most important to you for career success, and (5) the one which least corresponds to your ideal version of career success.

A career change here refers to switching professions or the nature of the work itself (e.g. becoming a salesman when you were an architect) as opposed to changing jobs (e.g. driving a truck for a different project or doing the same thing for a new company).

- | | <u>Rank Order</u> |
|---|-------------------|
| 1. a person who makes frequent career changes in order to remain mobile, independent, free and uncommitted | _____ |
| 2. a person who aggressively seeks to ascend up the hierarchy and increase his rank and pay | _____ |
| 3. a person who loyally, faithfully and tenaciously pursues a life-long career (whether or not he advances up the hierarchy) | _____ |
| 4. a person who is growth-oriented and periodically seeks new adventures and career changes corresponding to his new life stage | _____ |
| 5. a person who retires from his first career early, with some financial security, and then pursues a second career corresponding to his new life stage | _____ |

B. Career Values Form

*Wives should answer this question for their husband's career. What do you prefer for his career?

Listed below are 10 values related to life/career planning. We would like you to compare each value with the others using the comparison table below.

For example, look at value #1 (High income--making lots of money) and compare it with #2 (Independence--being your own boss). If #1 is more important to you than #2, then circle the $\frac{1}{2}$. However, if being your own boss is more important to you than making lots of money, then circle the 2 like this: $\frac{1}{2}$. Move on to the next two numbers $\frac{1}{3}$. Compare value #1 with value #3. If value #1 (High income) is more important to you than value #3 (Helping others), then circle #1 like this: $\frac{1}{3}$. Or, if value #3 is more important to you than #1, circle value #3 like this: $\frac{1}{3}$. Continue through the rows of numbers, comparing each pair of numbers, circling the number of the more important value each time.

VALUES

COMPARISON TABLE

1. High Income-- Making lots of money	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{5}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{1}{7}$	$\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{9}$	$\frac{1}{10}$
2. Independence-- Being your own boss	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{4}$	$\frac{2}{5}$	$\frac{2}{6}$	$\frac{2}{7}$	$\frac{2}{8}$	$\frac{2}{9}$	$\frac{2}{10}$	
3. Helping others		$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{3}{5}$	$\frac{3}{6}$	$\frac{3}{7}$	$\frac{3}{8}$	$\frac{3}{9}$	$\frac{3}{10}$	
4. Career and job security			$\frac{4}{5}$	$\frac{4}{6}$	$\frac{4}{7}$	$\frac{4}{8}$	$\frac{4}{9}$	$\frac{4}{10}$	
5. Managing others and administering activities, command				$\frac{5}{6}$	$\frac{5}{7}$	$\frac{5}{8}$	$\frac{5}{9}$	$\frac{5}{10}$	
6. Creating or inventing new things or ideas, innovation					$\frac{6}{7}$	$\frac{6}{8}$	$\frac{6}{9}$	$\frac{6}{10}$	
7. Having a job with lots of time off						$\frac{7}{8}$	$\frac{7}{9}$	$\frac{7}{10}$	
8. Retiring early and starting a second career							$\frac{8}{9}$	$\frac{8}{10}$	
9. Having a job that has high social importance								$\frac{9}{10}$	
10. Becoming technically outstanding and expert in your field									

C. Values Clarification

*Wives should give their own opinions about the values they prefer for their husband's career. That is, what do you think should be the five most important job wants in his career.

Please circle from the following list the five job wants most important to you. Then rank order them from most (1) to least important (5).

challenge	_____	leadership	_____
variety	_____	education/training	_____
responsibility	_____	advancement	_____
power	_____	fun work	_____
expertise	_____	independence	_____
autonomy	_____	travel	_____
status	_____	early retirement	_____
security	_____	esthetics	_____
innovation	_____	low pressure	_____
		other (list)	_____

Now please circle from the following list the five job-related wants most important to you. Then rank-order them from most (1) to least (5) important.

*Wife, reinterpret the question as follows: What are the five job-related wants most important to you about your husband's career?

type of business/activity	_____	friends at work	_____
size of organization	_____	rural community	_____
hours worked	_____	suburban community	_____
free time	_____	metropolitan	_____
benefits	_____	cost of living	_____
geographic location	_____	commuting distance	_____
physical facilities	_____	attitudes of management	_____
proximity to extended family	_____		

D. Career - Life Satisfaction

Part A. How You Feel About Your Career (or, if you are the wife, how do you think your husband feels about his career)

INSTRUCTIONS: Below is a list of pairs of words which can be used to describe how people feel about their career as it has thus far unfolded. Please mark the space between the two words which comes closest to your feelings. The further you mark a space in either direction means that your feelings about your career are more like that word. Remember only one mark per line.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Secure	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Threatened
Bored	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Interested
Tense	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Relaxed
Challenged	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Unfulfilled
Intensive	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Nonchalant
Going Nowhere	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	On The Way Up
Trapped	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Free
Pleased	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Disappointed
Incompetent	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Competent
Competitive	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Non-Competitive
Self-Satisfied	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Self-Critical
Successful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Unsuccessful
Hopeful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Resigned

	<u>Extremely Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Somewhat of An Issue</u>	<u>So-So</u>	<u>Not At All Important</u>
10. feeling that I may not achieve my military career goals	1	2	3	4	5
11. being worried about my sexual performance	1	2	3	4	5
12. feeling more burdened economically by increased financial responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
13. desiring more socio-emotional closeness with family & friends	1	2	3	4	5
14. feeling that the demands of my current career prevent me from fulfilling my emotional needs	1	2	3	4	5
15. being concerned generally about the current direction of change in my spouse (e.g. she now wants to pursue a career, she is pushing her independence, she is more promiscuous)	1	2	3	4	5
16. being concerned about the direction of change in one or more of my children (e.g. they are pursuing courses of action I don't like, don't agree with, or think will bring them harm).	1	2	3	4	5
17. being concerned about the direction of change in society	1	2	3	4	5

•

***Wives should answer for themselves. How happy are you?**

• • • • •

Happy

Perfectly Happy

Please check one of the following:

80% or more

60% or more

40% or more

20% or more

Less than 20%

.....

Not at all
Influential

Distribution List

LIST 1

MANDATORY

Office of Naval Research (3 copies)
(Code 452)
800 N. Quincy St.
Arlington, VA 22217

Director
U.S. Naval Research Laboratory (6 copies)
Washington, DC 20390
ATTN: Technical Information Division

Defense Documentation Center (12 copies)
Building 5
Cameron Station
Alexandria, VA 22314

Deputy and Chief Scientist (Code 102)
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217

Assistant Chief for Technology (Code 200)
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217

Director of Technology (Code 201)
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217

Assistant Chief for Research (Code 400)
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217

Director of Research (Code 401)
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217

Manager, Program in Manpower R&D (Code 450) - 12 copies
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217

Research Psychologist
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
536 South Clark Street
Chicago, IL 60605

Psychologist
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
495 Summer Street
Boston, MA 02210

Psychologist
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
1030 East Green Street
Pasadena, CA 91106

Library, Code 2029 (6 copies)
U. S. Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, DC 20390

Science & Technology Division
Library of Congress
Washington, DC 20540

Head, Manpower Training and Reserve Group (Op-964D)
Room 4A538, The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20350

Manpower Analysis and Systems Development Branch (Op-121)
Room 1606, Arlington Annex
Washington, DC 20370

Human Resources Program Manager
Naval Material Command (0344)
Room 1044, Crystal Plaza #5
2221 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 20360

Technical Director - 5 copies
Navy Personnel Research and Development Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Scientific Advisor to the Chief of Naval Personnel (Pers Or)
Naval Bureau of Personnel
Room 1416, Arlington Annex
Washington, DC 20370

Special Assistant for Enlisted Force Analysis
Naval Bureau of Personnel (Pers-2x)
Room 2628, Arlington Annex
Washington, DC 20370

Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Personnel for
Retention Analysis and Coordination (Pers-12)
Room 2403, Arlington Annex
Washington, DC 20370

Military Assistant for Human Resources
Office of the Director of Defense Research & Engineering
Room 3D129, The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301

Personnel Analysis Division
AF/DPXA, Headquarters USAF
Room 5C360, The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20330

Technical Director
U. S. Army Research Institute for the
Behavioral and Social Sciences
1300 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209

Director, Management Information Systems Office
OSD (M&RA)
3B917, The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301

Program Director
Manpower Research and Advisory Services
Smithsonian Institution
801 North Pitt Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Bernard Rostker
Department of the Navy
Principle Deputy Assistant Secretary (M&RA)
Washington, D. C. 20350

CAPT W. A. Lamm
Department of the Navy
Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-01Bc)
Special Assistant for Attrition
Washington, D. C. 20350

Code 307
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, California 92152

Dr. Norman J. Kerr
Chief of Naval Technical Training (Code 0161)
NAS, Memphis (75)
Millington, Tennessee 38054

LIST 2

ONR FIELD

Director ONR Branch Office
495 Summer St.
Boston, MA 02210

Director
ONR Branch Office
536 S. Clark St.
Chicago, IL 60605

Director
ONR Branch Office
1030 E. Green St.
Pasadena, CA 91106

Sam L. Renneker
ONR Resident Representative
Georgia Institute of Technology
325 Hinman Research Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30332

Navy Cont'd

Training Officer
Human Resource Management Center
San Diego, CA 92133 NTC

Scientific Director
Naval Health Research Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Navy Personnel R&D Center (5 cys)
Code 01
San Diego, CA 92152

Commanding Officer
Naval Submarine Medical Research Lab.
Naval Submarine Base New London, Box 900
Groton, CT 06340

Commanding Officer
Naval Training Equipment Center
Technical Library
Orlando, FL 32813

Naval Aerospace Medical Research Lab.
(Code L5)
Naval Aerospace Medical Center
Pensacola, FL 32512

Lt. Rebecca G. Vinson, U.S.N.
Navy Recruiting District, Boston
575 Technology Square
Cambridge, MA 02139

Chief, Naval Technical Training
NAS Memphis (75)
Millington, TN 38054
ATTN: Mr. Tom Warrick, N622

Dr. C. Brooklyn Derr
Associate Professor, Code 55
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Human Resource Management Center
Box 23,
FPO New York 09510

Human Resource Management Center, Norfolk
5621-23 Tidewater Drive
Norfolk, VA 23511

Human Resource Management Center
Bldg., 304
Naval Training Center
San Diego, CA 92133

Office of Naval Research (Code 200)
Arlington, VA 22217

ACOS Research & Program Development
Chief of Naval Education & Training (N-5)
Naval Air Station
Pensacola, FL 32508

Human Resource Management Center
Pearl Harbor
FPO San Francisco, CA 96601

Human Resource Management School
Naval Air Station Memphis (96)
Millington, TN 38054

Capt. Charles Baldwin
Bureau of Naval Personnel
Pers 65
Washington, DC 20370

Director, Human Resource Training Department
Naval Amphibious School
Little Creek
Naval Amphibious Base
Norfolk, VA 23521

Navy Materiel Command
Employee Development Office (Code SA-65)
Room 150 Jefferson Plaza, Bldg., #2
L429 Jeff Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 20360

Human Resource Management Center, Washington
Washington, DC 20370

LIST 3

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS

Dr. Earl A. Alluisi
Old Dominion University Res. Foundation
Norfolk, Virginia 23508

Dr. Judith Daly
Decisions & Designs, Inc.
Suite 100
8400 Westpark Dr.
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dr. James A. Bayton
Department of Psychology
Howard University
Washington, D. C. 20001

Dr. H. Russell Bernard
Department of Sociology & Anthropology
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Dr. Arthur Blaiwes
Naval Training Equipment Center
Orlando, Florida 32813

Dr. Milton R. Blood
School of Business
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia 30332

Dr. Davis B. Bobrow
University of Maryland
Department of Government & Politics
College Park, Maryland 20742

Dr. David G. Bowers
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Dr. John J. Collins
Vice President
Essex Corporation
6305 Caminito Estrellado
San Diego, California 92120

Dr. Harry R. Day
University City Science Center
Center for Social Development
3624 Science Center
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Dr. C. Brooklyn Derr
Associate Professor, Code 55
Naval Post Graduate School
Monterey, California 93940

Dr. George T. Duncan
Carnegie-Mellon University
5000 Forbes Ave.
Pittsburg, Pennsylvania 15213

Dr. Samuel L. Gaertner
Department of Psychology
University of Delaware
220 Wolf Hall
Newark, Delaware 19711

Dr. William E. Gaymon
Suite 200
1055 Thomas Jefferson St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20007

Dr. Paul S. Goodman
Graduate School of Industrial Admin.
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Dr. J. Richard Hackman
Administrative Sciences
Yale University
56 Hillhouse Ave.
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

Dr. Leo A. Hazlewood
CACI, Inc.
1815 Fort Myer Dr.
Arlington, VA 22209

Dr. Edwin Hollander
Department of Psychology
State University of New York
at Buffalo
4230 Ridge Lea Rd.
Buffalo, New York 14226

Mr. Daniel F. Huck
General Research Corp.
Westgate Research Park
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dr. Charles L. Hulin
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Dr. Rudi Klauss
Syracuse University
Public Administration Dept.
Maxwell School
Syracuse, New York 13210

Dr. Edward E. Lawler
Battelle Human Affairs Research Centers
4000 N.E. 41st St.
P.O. Box 5395
Seattle, Washington 98105

Dr. Arie Y. Lewin
Duke University
Duke Station
Durham, North Carolina 27706

Dr. Morgan W. McCall, Jr.
Center for Creative Leadership
5000 Laurinda Dr.
P.O. Box P-1
Greensboro, North Carolina 27402

Dr. Terence R. Mitchell
School of Business Administration
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

Dr. William H. Mobley
College of Business Administration
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

Dr. Thomas D. Morris
The Brookings Institution
1775 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. James P. Murphy
National Analysts
A Division of Booz-Allen & Hamilton, INC.
400 Market St.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

Dr. Peter G. Nordlie
Human Sciences Research, Inc.
7710 Old Springhouse Rd.
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dr. Herbert R. Northrup
Industrial Research Unit
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19174

Dr. A.F.K. Organski
3068 Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Dr. Paul Pedersen
Society for Intercultural Education
Training and Research
107 MIB, University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260

Dr. Manuel Ramirez
Systems and Evaluations
232 Swanton Blvd.
Santa Cruz, California 95060

Dr. Irwin Sarason
Department of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

Dr. S.B. Sells
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas 76129

Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko
Program Director
Manpower Research & Advisory Services
Smithsonia Institution
801 N. Pitt St. - Suite 120
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Mrs. Alice I. Snyder
Mental Helath Clinic
Naval Regional Medical Center
Pearl Harbor
FPO San Francisco 96610

Dr. Richard Steers
Graduate School of Management & Business
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Dr. Victor H. Vroom
School of Organizational Management
Yale Univeristy
56 Hillhouse Aven.
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

Dr. Abraham R. Wagner
Analytical Assessments Corp.
357 South Robertson Blvd.
Beverly Hills, California 90211

Dr. J. Wilkenfeld
Department of Government & Politics
College Park, Maryland 20742

LIST 4

MISCELLANEOUS

Air Force

AFOSR/NL
Bldg., 410
Bolling AFB
Washington, DC 20332

Military Assistant for Human Resources
OAD (E&LS) ODDR&E
Pentagon 3D129
Washington, DC 20301

HQ, USAF
AFMPC/DPMYP
Randolph AFB, TX 78148

Air University Library/LSE-8110
Maxwell AFB, AL 36112

Army

Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff
for Personnel, Research Office
ATTN: DAPE-PBR
Washington, DC 20310

Chief, Plans & Operations Office
USA Research Institute for the
Behavioral & Social Sciences
Room 278
1300 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22209

Army Research Institute (2 cys)
Commonwealth Bldg.
1300 Wilson Blvd.
Rosslyn, VA 22209

ARI Field Unit - Leavenworth
P.O. Box 3122
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027

Headquarters, Forces Command
AFPE-HR
Ft. McPherson
Atlanta, GA 30330

Marine Corps

Dr. A. L. Slafkosky
Code RD-1
HQ US Marine Corps
Washington, DC 20380

Marine Corps Cont'd

Commandant of the Marine Corps
(Code MPI - 20)
Washington, DC 20380

Coast Guard

Chief, Psychological Research Branch
US Coast Guard (G-P-1/62)
400 7th St. SW
Washington, DC 20590

Navy

Chief of Naval Personnel
Assistant for Research Liaison (Pers-Or)
Washington, DC 20370

Bureau of Naval Personnel (Pers 6)
Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel for
Human Resource Management
Washington, DC 20370

Bureau of Naval Personnel (Pers-6a3)
Human Resource Management Financial Office
Washington, DC 20370

CDR P 1 D. Nelson, MSC, USN
Head, Human Performance Division (Code 44)
Navy Medical R & D Command
Bethesda, MD 20014

Assistant Officer in Charge
Naval Internal Relations Activity
Pentagon, Room 2E329
Washington, DC 20350

Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940
ATTN: Library (Code 2124)

Professor John Senger
Operations Research & Administration
Sciences
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Personnel Research and Development Center
United States Civil Service Commission
Bureau of Policies and Standards
Washington, D. C. 20415

Department of the Air Force
Air Force Institute of Technology (AU)
AFIT/SLGR (LT Col Umstot)
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433

Captain Joseph Weker
Department of the Army
Headquarters, 32D Army Air Defense Command
APO New York 09175

Code 310
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, California 92152

Dr. Barry Goodstadt
ARRO
8555 16th St.
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

C. Cortland Hooper
Hooper, Goode, Inc.
1200 Prospect St., Suite 500
LaJolla, California 92037

Miscellaneous

Library, Code 0212
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Dean of Research, Code 012
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Library, Code 54
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Department Chairman, Code 54
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Professor Carson Eoyand, Code 54
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Professor Richard Elster, Code 54
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Professor Meryl Louis, Code 54
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Professor Reuben Harris, Code 54
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Professor John Senger, Code 54
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Professor David Whipple, Code 54
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Professor Chester Wright, Code 54
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Dr. Robert Morrison, Director
Management of People and Organizations
Code 9301
NPRDC
San Diego, CA 92152

Deputy Chief of Naval Personnel
Bureau of Naval Personnel
Arlington Annex
Washington, D.C. 20370

Pers 62
Bureau of Naval Personnel
Arlington Annex
Washington, D.C. 20370

Management Department
Navy War College
Providence, RI 02840

Behavioral Science Department
U.S. Naval Academy
Luce Hall
Annapolis, MD 21402

C. Brooklyn Derr
Department of Management
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Edna J. Hunter
Director, Family Research Center
U.S. International University
P.O. Box X26110
San Diego, CA 92126

Professor Richard Williams
Graduate School of Education
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Professor Marshal Chatwin
Monterey Community College
Monterey, CA 93940

R. Mark Hinckley, Director
Center for Family Enrichment
220 Country Club Gate Center, #8
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Kathryn Decker
U.S. Defense Liaison Office
Box 10
FPO San Francisco, CA 96659

Professor William C. Glaugue
Graduate School of Management
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 84602

Professor Lotte Bailyn
Sloan School of Management
M.I.T.
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

(25)

Professor Gene Dalton
Dept. of Organizational Behavior
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 84601

William Dowling
Graduate School of Business
Center for Research in Career
Development
Uris Hall
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

Professor Michael Driver
Department of Management
Graduate School of Business
USC
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Professors Paul Evans and
Fernando Bartolome
Dept. of Organizational Behavior
INSEAD
Boulevard de Constance
F-77305 Fontainebleau, FRANCE

Professor Tom Ference
Graduate School of Business
Uris Hall
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

Professor J. Peter Graves
School of Administration
California State College
5500 State College Parkway
San Bernardino, CA 92407

Professor Douglas T. Hall
Department of Organizational Behavior
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Professor David Kolb
Dept. of Organizational Behavior
Sears Library Building
Case Western University
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Dr. Anne Harlan
Center for Research on Women in
Higher Education and the
Professions
Wellesley College
828 Washington Street
Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181

Drs. Robert and Rhona Rapoport
Inst. of Family and Environmental Research
7a Kidderpore Avenue
London NW3 7SX, ENGLAND

Professor Edgar Schein
Sloan School of Management
M.I.T.
50 Memorial Drive
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Dr. Dianne Sundby
416 North Bedford Drive, Suite 301
Beverly Hills, California 90210

Professor Paul Thompson
Dept. of Organizational Behavior
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 84601

Professor John Van Maanan
Sloan School of Management
M.I.T.
50 Memorial Drive
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Professor Andre Laurent
Dept. of Organizational Behavior
INSEAD
Boulevard de Constance
F-77305 Fontainebleau, FRANCE

Professor James Clawson
Dept. of Organizational Behavior
Graduate School of Business
Harvard University
Boston, Massachusetts 02163

Professor Stephen A. Stumpf
Dept. of Organizational Behavior and Mgt.
Graduate School of Business
New York University
New York, New York 10006

Professor Alain Rondeau
HEC
5255 Ave. Decelles
Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3T 1V6

Professor John Seybolt
College of Business
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Professor Roger Nelson, Chairman
College of Business
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112