AD785490

GROUP RESEARCH PROJECT

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

1 JUNE 1974

DDC
RECEIVED
SEP 25 1974
C

ARMY FAMILIES

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL WILLARD M. BENNETT, JR., FA
COLONEL HUBERT T. CHANDLER, DC
COLONEL JAMES P. DUFFY, JR., MPC
LIEUTENANT COLONEL JERE L. HICKMAN, FA
LIEUTENANT COLONEL CHARLES R. JOHNSON, INF
LIEUTENANT COLONEL MICHAEL J. LALLY, JR., INF
LIEUTENANT COLONEL ALLISON L. NICHOLSON, TC
LIEUTENANT COLONEL GARY J. NORBO, QMC
COLONEL AVON R. OMPS, ADA
LIEUTENANT COLONEL VLADIMIR A. POSPISIL, FA
LIEUTENANT COLONEL RICHARD S. SEEBERG, AGC
COLONEL WILLIAM L. WUBBENA, JR., FA

DAVID R. SEGAL, PH.D., RESEARCH LEADER
ROBERT HOLZ, PH.D., ASSISTANT RESEARCH LEADER
MADY W. SEGAL, PH.D., ASSISTANT RESEARCH LEADER
COLONEL ROBERT S. NICHOLS, MSC, RESEARCH COORDINATOR

US ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013

Approved for public release;
distribution unlimited.

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

USAWC MILITARY RESEARCH PROGRAM PAPER

ARMY FAMILIES

A GROUP RESEARCH PROJECT

by

Lieutenant Colonel Willard M. Bennett, Jr., FA
Colonel Hubert T. Chandler, DC
Colonel James P. Duffy, Jr., MPC
Lieutenant Colonel Jere L. Hickman, FA
Lieutenant Colonel Charles R. Johnson, Inf
Lieutenant Colonel Michael J. Lally, Jr., Inf
Lieutenant Colonel Allison L. Nicholson, TC
Lieutenant Colonel Gary J. Norbo, QMC
Colonel Avon R. Omps, ADA
Lieutenant Colonel Vladimir A. Pospisil, FA
Lieutenant Colonel Richard S. Seeberg, AGC
Colonel William L. Wubbena, Jr., FA

David R. Segal, Ph.D., Research Leader
Robert Holz, Ph.D., Assistant Research Leader
Mady W. Segal, Ph.D., Assistant Research Leader
Colonel Robert S. Nichols, MSC, Research Coordinator

Approved for public release;
distribution unlimited.

US Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania
1 June 1974

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER

2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.

3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER

AD-785 490

4. TITLE (and Subtitle)

ARMY FAMILIES

5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED

Group Research Project

6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER

7. AUTHOR(s) LTC W. M. Bennett, Jr; COL H. T. Chandler; COL J. P. Duffy, Jr; LTC J. L. Hickman; LTC C. R. Johnson; LTC M. J. Lally, Jr; LTC A. L. Nicholson; LTC G. J. Norbo; COL A. R. Omps; LTC V. A. Pospisil; LTC R. S. Seeberg; COL W. L. Wubbena; Dr. D. R. Segal

8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

US Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013

10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS

Same as Item 9.

12. REPORT DATE

1 June 1974

13. NUMBER OF PAGES

148

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

15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)

Unclassified

15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

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

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

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

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

This study examines Army families as related to the important areas of housing, health, income, education, and recreation. Additionally, social and psychological factors such as career advantages, privacy, sense of community, security, mobility, religion, and marital relations are investigated. Comparisons are drawn between Army families and civilian families in selected areas. The report attempts to identify the state of the art by listing all available data and research sources relating to Army families.

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

The preceived quality of the Army family life and its impact on retention is investigated. The family is examined so as to better understand the hopes, aspirations, disappointments, and attitudes of family members toward the Army.

AUTHOR(S): W. M. Bennett, Jr., LTC, FA; H. T. Chandler, COL, DC; J. P. Duffy, Jr., COL, MPC; J. L. Hickman, LTC, FA; C. R. Johnson, LTC, Inf; M. J. Lally, Jr., LTC, Inf; A. L. Nicholson, LTC, TC; G. J. Norbo, LTC, QM; A. R. Omps, COL, ADA; V. A. Pospisil, LTC, FA; R. S. Seeberg, LTC, AGC; W. L. Wubbena, Jr., COL, FA; D. R. Segal, Ph.D.; R. Holz, Ph.D.; M. W. Segal, Ph.D.; COL R. S. Nichols, MSC.

TITLE: Army Families

FORMAT: Group Research Project

DATE: 1 June 1974 **PAGES:** 148 **CLASSIFICATION:** Unclassified

This study examines Army families as related to the important areas of housing, health, income, education, and recreation. Additionally, social and psychological factors such as career advantages, privacy, sense of community, security, mobility, religion, and marital relations are investigated. Comparisons are drawn between Army families and civilian families in selected areas. The report attempts to identify the state of the art by listing all available data and research sources relating to Army families. The preceived quality of the Army family life and its impact on retention is investigated. The family is examined so as to better understand the hopes, aspirations, disappointments, and attitudes of family members toward the Army.

PREFACE

This group research project was carried out under the aegis of the US Army War College. This research paper is intended to serve as a basis for future studies of Army families.

The choice of study parameters was dictated in part by the paucity of available research concerning Army families coupled with the time restraints of the group research project. The bibliography, the list of agencies contacted, the identification of gaps in the literature and the discussion of family problem areas should greatly assist future Army family research groups in the selection of a specific research area and the data collection effort.

PREFACE

Page

ABSTRACT....ii
PREFACE....iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS....iv
LIST OF TABLES....v
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION....1
Families....1
Society....1
The Changing Army....2
Changing Attitudes....3
The Army and the Family....4
Purpose....6
Overview....7
II. DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS....9
Incidence of Marriage....9
Comparison With Civilians....17
Current Picture....19
Working Wives....29
Conclusion....37
III. BENEFITS AND FACILITIES....39
Housing....41
Economic Factors....53
Health Services....58
Education....66
Recreation....69
IV. PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL FACTORS....76
Privacy....77
Sense of Community....80
Security....84
Mobility....85
Separation....94
V. INFLUENCE ON RETENTION....106
Marital Status by Race Composition....106
The Wife's Role in Career Advancement....108
Effects of Reception on Retention....112
Retention as Affected by Psychological Factors....113
Housing....115
Mobility....117
Separation....119
VI. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS....124
Findings....124
Conclusions....124
Recommendations....125
BIBLIOGRAPHY....126
APPENDIX 1. INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED....140

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Percent of Army Males Who Are Married	10
2.	Percent Married Among Army Personnel For Selected Years By Grade	10
3.	Percent Married Among Males in Grade E-4 By Length of Active Federal Service	12
4.	Percent of Married E-5's For Selected Years	13
5.	Average Years of Active Service and Percent Married By Grade	15
6.	Comparative Trends in Percent Married For Army and Civilian Males	18
7.	Active Army Personnel and Their Dependents	20
8.	Male Enlisted Strength By Grade For Selected Years	21
9.	Average Size of Family Units and Average Number of Children By Rank and Year	23
10.	Dependent Children of Married Army Personnel	24
11.	Distribution of Married Personnel by Number of Dependent Children and Grade	24
12.	Average Number of Children Under 18 Years of Age Per Family by Occupational Group of Male Family Head-1973	25
13.	Fertility Rates for Civilian and Military Families FY 1966-1972	27
14.	Age Distribution of Dependent Children of Active Duty Military Personnel (as of 31 March 1973)	30
15.	Employment Among Wives of Married Army Personnel	32
16.	Reasons Given by Married Personnel for Employment of Their Wives	33
17.	Reasons Given by Married Personnel for Unemployment of Their Wives	35
18.	Low Income and Military Families	55

19. Working Wives of Married Army Personnel.....56

20. Male Officers With Eligible Dependents by Grade
Opinions Concerning Medical Care.....60

21. Male Officers With Eligible Dependents By Grade
Opinions Concerning Medical Care.....61

22. Male Officers With Eligible Dependents By Grade
Opinions Concerning Medical Care.....63

23. Length of Tours In Europe.....88

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

FAMILIES

Although the family is universally recognized as a fundamental unit of social organization, little systematic research has been produced on the Army family. This study will examine the relationship between the family and the military installation, and will focus on the degree to which the duty performance and retention of Army personnel, particularly enlisted men and women, is affected by their dependents.

Particular attention will be paid to the structural relationship between the family and the installation. Data on the utilization of post facilities by military families, as well as basic data on marriage, divorce, and fertility rates, will be considered.

SOCIETY

> American society is undergoing rapid social, economic and political change, the result of technological developments, demographic shifts, and social and political change at home and abroad. The nature and implications of these changes are difficult to discern, and considerable uncertainty is attached to any projections into the future.[1]

The Army is a social system that parallels civilian society in general. The Army has its blue collar workers, supervisors, white collar workers, and executives. Each person in the Army society has the same hopes, dreams, and aspirations as his or her civilian counterparts. He wants a meaningful job, a chance to advance, security, and

a good place to live and raise a family.

The degree to which the Army is able to fulfill the basic needs and desires of its members will determine its ability to attract and hold the new people which must be continually acquired. It is indeed difficult to quantify each of the needs and desires of members of the Army and to determine what effect, if any, they have on the acquisition, retention, and performance of duty. The Army, like other social systems is not static but changes constantly both in attitudes of personnel and composition as will be shown later in this report.

THE CHANGING ARMY

Little has been written about families in the Army. The index of Marriage and Family Living of the Journal of the National Council on Family Relations, lists only two articles concerning the Army between 1939 and 1962. Nancy Shea's book, The Army Wife, written in 1941, contained no reference to NCO and enlisted families. Historically, the Army, while showing concern for the officer families, has shown little regard for those of enlisted men. This lack of concern was understandable. Charles C. Moskos, Jr. points out that "at the risk of overstatement, the pre-World War II enlisted force might be viewed as an Army of Bachelors, while during the post-Vietnam era it has become an Army of family men."[2] The percentage of enlisted men who are married has increased from 39 to 52 since 1969 and indications are that the percentage will continue to increase.[3]

CHANGING ATTITUDES

Institutions have traditionally viewed improvements on the quality of life as an adjunct to larger goals and not as an end in itself. It is only recently that improvement of the quality of life as an end in and of itself has been viewed as a legitimate goal.

An indicator of the comtemporary concern with quality of life is a 1974 survey of US social attitudes conducted for the Institute of Life Insurance. The survey revealed that over 80 per cent of the sample viewed "a happy family life" as a more important goal than a fulfilling career, the opportunity to develop as an individual, or making a lot of money.[4]

Another rapidly changing social attitude is that concerning women. The literature is replete with articles discussing the rapidly changing position of women in the American society. Perhaps, the clearest evidence of these changing norms is the passage of legislation that will profoundly effect women's rights. Since 1923, a constitutional amendment proposing equal rights for women languished in Congress, and was rarely debated.[5] In 1972, whether this amendment will be ratified by the necessary three-quarters of the states is not certain but, if ratified, its impact on the military will be significant. It is not the purpose of this paper to evaluate the potential effect of this constitutional amendment on the military. It is merely cited as one indicator of the mood of society.

The Army wife plays an important role in her husband's career. She is expected to stand behind him and make his life easier, be the mainstay in raising children and provide support socially. In

this changing society, many women are no longer satisfied to be relegated to this passive support role. Some Army wives have their own careers. Some want to pick their own friends and choose their own type of leisure. An example of this mood is expressed in the 1 August 1973 issue of Family Magazine in an article by Mildred Kavanaugh. She quotes as an example an interview with an officer's wife who said, "I don't want to spend my life in a role which is like being a den mother to a grown man. I want my own identity and so do my friends. We want to be able to choose what we do, instead of having our lives programmed for us by the wives of our husbands' fellow-Army officers."[6] The prevalence of this attitude of independence is not known.

The conceptions women have of their role is changing very rapidly and the effects have been and are likely to continue to be felt strongly by many sectors of American society--including corporations and the military. Dr. Robert Seidenberg, in a recent book about corporation wives, has made the observation that, "By and large, corporate wives are still being considered only in regard to their help to the corporation. Personal aspirations and needs as well as any spirit of independence are not only ignored but in most instances looked upon as encumbrances."[7] Is this true of the Army?

THE ARMY AND THE FAMILY

The families of Army personnel are almost as varied and different as those families found in the civilian community. The Army family may be large or small, black or white, officer or enlisted; these families

cover the spectrum from the twenty-year-old PFC and his pregnant wife or the NCO with two grade-schoolers to a field grade officer's family of four teenagers. Army families are not homogeneous.

A development which is transpiring at this time and will develop further in the near future is the utilization of greater numbers of women in all branches of the Army with the present exception of the Infantry, Armor and Field Artillery. The subject of the families of these female Army personnel is not addressed as a separate entity in this paper because of the past small numbers involved and the paucity of information available. This area should be a fertile field for future investigation.

What's happening to Army families? Are they exhibiting any of the tensions and problems that appear to be increasing in the civilian family? How well is the Army meeting the changing needs of today's Army families?

Morris Janowitz says that services are sensitive to the needs of their families and are aware that unhappiness of wives constitutes a major cause of resignation.[8] Even though this may be true, Roger W. Little states:

> Few subjects in the sociology of military organization have received as little attention as the military family. In part, this neglect of a central institution may be attributed to a tendency of military sociologists to study issues which have been defined as critical by members of the military organization rather than selecting subjects of study from a sociological perspective. Consequently, the military family has been neglected because its significance within the military organization has been traditionally denied or relegated to a secondary level of importance.[9]

It is interesting to note that in the report "The Volunteer Army -- One year Later," dated February 1974, little attention is paid to reporting improvements in the quality of family life. The introduction and summary to this document state that the Army has dedicated some of its actions towards improving Army life and morale. Yet, in the body of the document little more than a paragraph is devoted to Army families.

Prior to World War II, there were few attempts to integrate the military family into the total military community. Recruiting was aimed primarily at young, unmarried men. The majority of Army families were those of officers.[10] What was fact in the past is no longer fact. The attitudes that prevailed in the past may be changing. It is one of the goals of this paper to point out trends in attitude changes in society and in particular in Army families.

PURPOSE

This study has three major purposes: Data Collection: The study attempts to identify available data and research sources relating to Army families. Information Gaps: The compilation of data concerning Army families has identified voids in the literature which need additional research. Retention: This paper examines the perceived quality of family life and its impact on retention.

This report is designed as an advanced point of departure for future studies of Army families.

OVERVIEW

This group research paper will address the subject of Army families in the following manner:

Chapter II builds a demographic picture of Army families and points out changes that have occurred over time. Wherever possible, these statistics are compared with civilian statistics as a societal standard.

Chapter III describes the benefits and facilities available in the institutional community, to Army families. These include housing, economic factors, health, education, and recreation. Insofar as possible, these items are discussed in relation to how they differ between living on-post and off-post, their effect on the quality of family life, and their effect on the attitude of the Army member and his family.

Chapter IV describes the social-psychological community of Army personnel and their families. These factors include career advancement, privacy, sense of community, security, mobility, separation, and marital status. As in Chapter III, consideration is given to these factors insofar as information is available with regard to on-post versus off-post differences, their effect on the quality of family life, and the attitude of the Army member and his family.

Chapter V discusses the influence of items outlined in Chapters III and IV on retention. Where information is available, these factors are placed in a perspecitve of relative importance.

Chapter VI presents the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Army Families Research Group.

CHAPTER I

FOOTNOTES

1. US Army War College. Army Tasks for the Seventies. Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, June 1972, p. 30.

2. Charles C. Moskos, Jr., "The Emergent Army," Parameters, Vol IV, No. 1, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, 1974, pp. 17-30.

3. Table 1, Chapter II, p. 10.

4. United Press International Dispatch, "Happy Family Life Said Top Ranking Goal," The Evening Sentinel, Carlisle, Pennsylvania, 7 May 1974, p. 26.

5. "One Giant Leap For Womankind," Army Times, Washington, DC, 3 April 1972, p. 16.

6. Mildred Kavanaugh, "Coffes, Teas, But Without Me!," Family, August 1, 1973, p. 5.

7. Robert Seidenberg, "Corporate Wives-Corporate Casualties?" AMACOM, American Management Association, N.Y., 1973, p. 72.

8. Morris Janowitz, The Professional Soldier. New York: The Free Press. 1971, p. xxxii.

9. Roger W. Little (ed.), Handbook of Military Institutions Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1971, pp. 247.

10. Elizabeth M. Finlayson, "A Study of the Army Officer. Her academic and career Preparation, Her Current employment and Volunteer services," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The George Washington University, 1969, pp. 18-19.

CHAPTER II

DEMOGRAPHICS AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

Any study of Army families, must of necessity begin with an examinination of the distribution of Army personnel with regard to marital status and dependents. This chapter describes the current picture and changes in the incidence of marriage among Army personnel, numbers of dependents, and some characteristics of Army wives.

INCIDENCE OF MARRIAGE

The trite old saying about "if the Army wanted you to have a wife, it would have issued you one," is an admonition widely ignored--or the Army has been issuing wives. Increasingly in the past twenty years, enlisted men have been choosing the institution of marriage from a low of 29.7 percent in 1952 to a rate of 52.6 percent in 1972, an increase of over 77 percent.[1] Between February 1969 and May 1973 (roughly the last four years for which comparable data are available) (Table 1), the number of enlisted men with wives has increased from 39.4 percent to 51.9 percent of all male enlisted men. This increase accounted for more than half of the total net increase registered in the last 20 years. A corresponding rise in the number of married commissioned officers in the 1969-1973 time frame from 73.6 percent to 84.7 percent, while almost equal in percentage points of gain, was nevertheless substantially lower in proportion of increase. From an Army-wide perspective, the combined factors mean a total male married population that increased from 43.4 percent to 56.5 percent in the last four years.

Table 1: PERCENT OF ARMY MALES WHO ARE MARRIED

Year	Army Wide	Commissioned Total	Commissioned Regular Army	Officer OTRA *	Warrant Officer	Enlisted Men Total	Enlisted Men Regular Army	OTRA *
Feb 66	40.2	80.4	90.4	73.2	92.9	35.7	47.0	13.8
Aug 67	40.8	75.7	90.9	68.3	91.6	36.7	44.4	26.2
Feb 68	42.5	74.1	90.7	66.6	91.4	38.4	44.7	28.9
Feb 69	43.4	73.6	84.6	68.5	84.9	39.4	45.3	29.0
Nov 72	57.0	85.1	88.2	80.8	89.2	52.6	53.8	41.6
May 73	56.5	84.7	87.7	80.5	88.4	51.9	53.4	36.2

(Note) The years 1966 through 1968 are provided to give a lead-in to the period just discussed as well as to provide data for subsequent analysis.

* OTRA is an acronym for Other Than Regular Army

Source: Sample Surveys of Military Personnel, Office of Personnel Operations, DA, reports numbers, 23-66E, 2-68E, 26-68E, 27-69E, 12-73E, and 49-73E.

The data in Table 2 indicates that the incidence of marriage among service members appears, in part, to be influenced by length of service and rank (i.e. officer, warrant officer, or enlisted). Categorizing individuals as noncareerists, career enlisted, and officers is quite useful when examining the significance of the data at varying points in a military career.

Table 2: PERCENT MARRIED AMONG ARMY PERSONNEL FOR SELECTED YEARS BY GRADE

Officers

	1966	1969	1973
COL	97.5	96.3	93.0
LTC	94.8	95.0	94.0
MAJ	96.8	90.7	93.6
CPT	86.7	79.6	87.9
1LT	67.4	61.4	72.9
2LT	51.1	56.0	58.1

Enlisted Men

	1966	1969	1973
E8 & E9	95.4	95.1	90.8
E7	93.3	91.2	90.1
E6	90.7	75.7	87.6
E5	71.8	47.7	75.3
E4	28.2	30.9	43.5
E3	14.1	26.0	31.9
E2	10.0	21.2	22.7
E1	15.0	18.6	18.2

Source: Sample Surveys of Military Personnel, Office of Personnel Operations, DA, reports numbers 23-66E, 27-69E, and 49-73E.

At the level, 2LT and E-1, over three times as many of the officers as the enlisted men entering the Army for the first time are married. As could be expected, since most enlisted men enter the Army at a young age, the majority of accessions (more than four out of five) are unmarried. The enlisted volunteer usually begins his service during his late teens, while officers are approximately four years older at the time of their entry on active duty.[2] Some of this difference can also be attributed to personnel procurement policies which often restricted the entrance of married enlisted men. Roger Little suggests that the customs of the service may also contribute to the differences in marital status in the lower grades, in that officers are encouraged to escort ladies to nearly all formal social functions, but no corresponding activities or rituals exist for junior enlisted men.[3] Thus, we see that while there is a wide disparity at the very lowest grade level, a fair degree of similarity exists in the progressive marriage rates that occur in advancing through the lower three officer grades and the lower four enlisted grades. Beyond this stage, the slope of the curve flattens out rapidly. However, over the years, the expansion factor within each of the lower four enlisted

grades has been considerably greater than within the lower three officer grades which have remained relatively stable.

In the pattern of career progression marriage becomes increasingly prevalent and more importantly, perhaps even a requisite.[4] This cross-over for enlisted men, wherein marriage becomes the modal pattern, has normally been associated with either promotion to grade E-5 or completion of four years of service as an E-4, both of which generally would occur during a second-term of service, implying career intentions. "With remarkable consistency, about four out of five second term servicemen remain in the military to complete at least 20 years of service."[5] The importance of the family is highlighted by the following statistics. The service member seems to make a career commitment at the same time that he considers marriage. This break point of four years' service is very pronounced with regard to E-4's, as is evidenced by the data in Table 3.

Table 3: PERCENT MARRIED AMONG MALES IN GRADE E-4 BY LENGTH OF ACTIVE FEDERAL SERVICE

Year	E-4 With Less than 4 Years Service	E-4 With 4 or More Years Service
Feb 1966	21.3%	62.0%
Aug 1967	27.2%	44.2%
Feb 1968	30.4%	54.4%
Feb 1969	29.5%	60.0%

Source: Sample Surveys of Military Personnel, reports numbers 23-66E, 2-68E, and 27-69E.

As expected, the rapid expansion of the Army, as well as the accelerated promotions experienced during the Vietnam War period, introduced a

sizeable deviation in the normal marriage pattern of soldiers advancing to grade E-5. The effect is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: PERCENT OF MARRIED E-5'S FOR SELECTED YEARS

Year	1966	1967	1968	1969	1972	1972
Percent	71.8	50.0	48.2	47.7	72.1	75.3
Strength	146,527	173,724	189,606	219,368	119,838	110,519

Source: Sample Surveys of Military Personnel, reports numbers 23-66E, 2-68E, 26-68E, 27-69E, 12-73E, and 49-73E.

The number of enlisted men serving in grade E-5 increased by almost 50 percent between 1966 and 1969, and this expansion in strength was accompanied by a parallel decline in the percentage of those married. However, further analysis shows that equilibrium had been restored by 1973 and that three out of every four male E-5's were married. The overall adjustments between 1969 and 1973 (and between 1966 and 1973) are in keeping with the less volatile Army-wide trend and support the proposition that E-5 is the most marked point of departure for the occurrence and sanctioning of marriage. Consistently, marriage among E-5's has been more than half again as great as it has been for the next lower grade (Table 2). This may very well not be the case in future years, however, since the Army has modified its policies to extend a number of dependent related benefits to E-4's who have served more than two years and are obligated to serve a total of not less than six years.

Another way of examining the existence and past significance of the threshold of reaching E-5 or E-4 with four or more years service is to review, in greater detail, the Other Than Regular Army (OTRA) data contained in Table 1. By definition, OTRA enlisted men are, for the most part, inductees with less than two years in service and are performing

in grade E-1, 2, 3, or E-4 and thus are not entitled to dependent travel, command sponsorship, relocation pay, movement of privately owned vehicles, or other benefits such as oversea station allowance. There is admittedly some weakness in the definition. While minimum time in service to E-5, without waiver is 31 months, it has not been possible to extend a tour of duty more than eleven months beyond a two year obligation without changing component. Thus, without changing componency, the OTRA enlisted man is virtually denied the opportunity to achieve E-5 or stay for four or more years of service. From Table 1 it is noted that the gap between the two groups has narrowed, but that the tendency toward marriage remains considerably greater with Regular Army enlisted men than it is for OTRA enlisted men.

While the marriage rate by OTRA enlisted men has increased decidedly over the years, particularly between 1966 and 1967 and again between 1969 and 1972, the OTRA strength of the Army has been continually declining since about 1968 and as a group they have been responsible for fewer and fewer enlisted wives each successive year. By way of comparison, in 1966 when only 13.8 percent of the OTRA personnel were married, they accounted for better than one out of every eight enlisted wives, but by 1973 when 36.2 percent of them were married, less than one in every eighteenth enlisted wife was married to an OTRA soldier. By way of contrast, it is interesting to note that marriage among OTRA officers dipped sharply during the years 1967 through 1969 and that the net affect of their added numbers and lower rates, induced a large drop in the total commissioned officer rate of those years.

Very possibly the importance of the OTRA data is declining in today's Army. As of 31 January 1974, only 6.2 percent or just under 41,000 of the total male enlisted population was OTRA. Furthermore, with the arrival of the zero draft in February 1973, the term of service of the last increment of OTRA inductees is due to expire in 1975. Nonetheless, the point to be made is that RA enlisted men have habitually exhibited a much greater propensity to marry, even in the lower grades, and that in the approaching environment of an all volunteer force we are likely to experience a renewed acceleration in the existing upward trend.

A large portion of the above discussion has related, at least indirectly, to the consideration of time in service. A more direct look at length of service in relation to grade and marital status is worthy of examination. The relevant data are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: AVERAGE YEARS OF ACTIVE SERVICE AND PERCENT MARRIED BY GRADE

Grade	Average Years of Active Service	Percent Married
	Officers	
0-3	6.2	87.9
0-2	3.6	72.9
0-1	1.3	58.1
	Enlisted Men	
E-9	25.3	92.9
E-8	20.7	92.9
E-7	17.0	93.7
E-6	11.7	88.3
E-5	4.6	72.1
(E-5 - E-9)		(82.4)

Enlisted Men

Grade	Average Years of Active Service	Percent Married
E-4	2.1	39.2
E-3	1.2	26.9
E-2	.82	24.4
E-1	.25	18.7
(E-1 - E-4)		(29.4)

Median Length of Service for Enlisted Men is 2.5 Years

Source: Adapted from DCSPER 46 Report, Strength of the Army, 30 November 1972, and Sample Surveys of Military Personnel, reports numbers 12-73E, and 49-73E.

Several interesting factors become readily apparent. Obvious is the breakpoint that has been cited repeatedly as occurring at grade E-5 and that on the average, this is not reached until sometime well into the second term of service. Another is that over 80 percent of the enlisted men in the senior ranks, signified by E-5 and above, are married. As an aside it is interesting to note that it takes longer to advance from E-5 to E-6 than it does between any other set of grades. In addition, the data implies that a large segment of the enlisted population is continually moving in and out of the system rather quickly and that the Army has not been very effective at inducing first termers to convert to career status even though 623,787 of 726,854 male enlisted that were the basis for the data in this table were members of the Regular Army.

In a survey recently conducted by N. W. Ayers, a number of young wives expressed their feelings that the Army creates severe hardships on young first-termers and particularly on their wives by not encouraging the husbands to bring their wives to oversea stations and by not encouraging social activities which would specifically include wives.[6] With 40 percent of the E-4 being married and averaging just over two years in the service, the

Army's liberalized dependent entitlement policy may well lower the traditional breakpoint to E-4 and reduce the type of dissatisfaction expressed by these young wives.

As previously suggested, the data reiterate that marriage and social imperatives are significant at a much earlier point in an officer's career and that similar protocols begin for enlisted men only after reaching E-5, the earliest point at which marriage has taken on major significance. Roger Little contends that beyond this stage, social affairs at noncommissioned officers' clubs increasingly involve wives and that "very senior enlisted men may be involved in formal social activities at which wives play as significant a role as among officers."[7] In short, marriage for both officers and enlisted men is of variable significance during the course of a military career, wherein it becomes progressively more prevalent to the point of perhaps even becoming a requisite.

COMPARISON WITH CIVILIANS

It is necessary that comparisons between military and civilian life be made to give us a perspective of the military characteristics. Of the US male population, 18 years of age and over, 74.8 percent were married as of 1972, as compared to 57.0 percent of Army male personnel in the same year. During the past 20 years the incidence of marriage has increased in both communities but at noticeably different rates and at different intervals (see Table 6).

As indicated, 1950 to 1960 and 1965 through 1972 were periods of relative stability for the civilian community, with most of the growth

in marriage rates being registered between 1960 and 1965. The pattern within the Army is in almost total contrast, with 1952 to 1960 and 1970 to 1972 being periods of acceleration, while 1960 to 1965 was part of a period of marked decline.

Table 6: COMPARATIVE TRENDS IN PERCENT MARRIED FOR ARMY AND CIVILIAN MALES

	1950/52	1960	1965	1970	1972
Civilian	68.0	69.1	76.2	75.0	74.8
Officer	74.8	87.2	81.6	75.2	84.5
Enlisted	29.7	44.9	38.3	40.9	52.6
Total Army	36.0	49.8	43.3	45.3	57.0

(Base year for civilian data is 1950 and 1952 for Army data. Also, the 1950 civilian data include persons 14 years old and over. When standardized for age, the 1950 figure becomes 67.4%.)

Source: These data were derived from those presented in: Statistical Abstract of the United States 1973, US Department of Commerce, Selected Demographic Trends 1952-1972; DAPC-PMP report number 50-73E; and Selected Manpower Statistics 1973, OASD (Comptroller).

(The cyclical movement within the Army broke a little differently than the intervals shown in Table 6, with 1953 to 1958 being the period of actual growth and 1965 through 1966 being the period of greatest decline. 1958-63 was an interval of considerable stability.)

It is apparent that the trend within the Army has been marked not only by greater variation but greater growth. Consistently, the data revealed higher incidence of marriage for officers than the corresponding civilian figures, whereas the data at each point for enlisted men showed a substantially lower rate. The essentially youthful nature of

our Army is the basic reason why the combined rate for the Army is so much lower than the civilian figures. The median age for males 17 years of age and older is 23.9 for the military, as opposed to 40.3 in the civilian community. More than 90 percent of the Army is below the 40.3 civilian median, with some 56 percent of the military being 24 years of age and under. The meaning of this becomes more significant when related to the distribution of marital rates by age. Less than 32 percent of all US males between the ages of 18 through 24 are married. Yet, 56 percent of the military is below that age. It is not until moving up to the 25 through 29 age bracket that a civilian group is encountered that has a higher incidence of marriage than the Army. Thus the Army, though markedly different than the general population, may not be all that different when compared to an equally youthful population.

CURRENT PICTURE

What emerges is a clear understanding that any notion of the professional soldier as a bachelor is grossly inaccurate. In terms of numbers, there are almost a million and a half dependent wives, children, and parents "in the Army." Though there have been wide fluctuations in the trend toward marriage since 1952, first due to Korea and then Vietnam, equilibrium has been restored, and the Army is again pursuing a path of sustained growth in its married population.

Table 7 provides a comparison of the data before and after Vietnam which supports the claim of return to "normalcy" and the continued gains registered in the rate of family status among Army members.

TABLE 7: ACTIVE ARMY PERSONNEL AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

		Military		Dependents of Military Personnel					
Year	Identity	Total Number	Number of Males	Total Dependents (All Types)	No. Per Military Person	No. Per Family Unit a/	Wives	Children	Other
30 Sep 1964	All Army	969,791	957,438	1,357,128	1.40	3.04	446,720	813,914	96,494
	Officer	111,373	107,586	275,051	2.47	3.07	89,507	178,582	6,962
	Enlisted	858,418	849,852	1,082,077	1.26	3.03	357,213	635,332	89,532
30 Sep 1972	All Army	845,820	827,595	1,368,361	1.65	3.04	450,037	768,692	149,632
	Officer	120,759	116,164	280,390	2.41	2.93	95,653	176,808	7,929
	Enlisted	725,061	711,431	1,087,971	1.53	3.07	354,384	591,884	141,703
31 Mar 1973	All Army	828,645	808,155	1,413,206	1.75	2.99	473,420	795,414	144,372
	Officer	118,197	113,897	276,217	2.43	2.89	95,750	173,351	7,116
	Enlisted	710,448	694,258	1,136,989	1.64	3.01	377,670	622,063	137,256

(a) Family Units are based on the number of Wives.

Source: 1965 Military Market Facts: Statistical Abstract, prepared by the Army Times Publishing Company; Selected Manpower Statistics, 1973, OASD (Comptroller), and 1974 Military Market Facts Book prepared by the Army Times Publishing Co.

Of particular interest is the high number of collateral dependents associated with Army families and their marked increase in the past ten years. In 1973, the Army accounted for 144,372 of the total 163,473 dependents of this category, Department of Defense wide. Also of note are the variations within grades shown in Table 8, for the lower three enlisted ranks as opposed to the general stability of the top three and the impact this has when talking about percentages of married by grade from year to year.

Table 8: MALE ENLISTED STRENGTH BY GRADE FOR SELECT YEARS

Grade	30 Sep 1964	30 Sep 1972	31 Mar 1973
E-9	4,016	4,070	4,081
E-8	12,129	13,562	12,685
E-7	36,789	50,573	48,820
E-6	82,265	82,800	78,920
E-5	142,191	121,066	108,399
E-4	165,547	192,014	140,800
E-3	252,509	80,731	88,292
E-2	81,751	65,237	149,445
E-1	72,655	101,378	62,816
Total	849,852	711,431	694,258

Source: 1965 Military Market Facts; A Statistical Abstract, prepared by the Army Times Publishing Company; Selected Manpower Statistics, 1973, OASD (Comptroller), and 1974 Military Market Facts Book prepared by the Army Times Publishing Co.

Approximately 75 percent of the net reduction in enlisted strength subsequent to the Vietnam peak of June 1968, occurred in grades E-1 through E-4 a grade bracket accounting for less than 40 percent of all married enlisted personnel. Thus, the major reduction in strength prompted only a moderate decline in the total number of families, thereby creat-

ing a continued raise in the percentage of married Army personnel to new levels.

Implications are that this outcome, along with the liberalized E-4 over 2 years entitlement policy and the ever increasing RA composition of the Army, will not only sustain the current growth, but induce a possible acceleration in the rate at which male enlisted men are choosing the institution of marriage.

After examining the marital status of the servicemen, it seems appropriate to discuss (1) the size of Army families, (2) number of dependents and, (3) the characteristics of the Army wives.

The Army is currently faced with satisfying the requirements of over 1.4 million dependents. This means that dependents outnumber military personnel by a ratio of 1.7 to 1. These dependents consist of about 33% wives, 56% children, and 11% other dependents. As shown in Table 9, the average size Army family unit among married personnel has decreased from 3.78 in 1966 to 3.60 in 1973. Also, the average number of children per married commissioned and warrant officer dropped from 2 to 1.81, and for married enlisted men the decrease was from 1.75 to 1.46. However, not all factors showed a decline over the entire period. The average number of direct dependents per enlisted man decreased from February 1966 to February 1969 and then increased drastically by November 1972. It should also be noted that during 1966-69, the Army expanded at a rapid rate as more single men were added to the enlisted ranks. Also, many enlisted men postponed marriage until after their tour in Vietnam. The trend of all these data indicates that there are more married personnel, but that families have fewer children.

According to 1969 census data, 62% of the US families had one child or less, as compared to 65% for Army families. Later data are unavailable because Army surveys conducted after 1969 considered only dependent children of Army males and did not differentiate between married and single personnel. However, these surveys do support the earlier data showing that a larger proportion of families are childless and families with four or more dependent children are less prevalent.

Table 9: AVERAGE SIZE OF FAMILY UNITS AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN BY RANK AND YEAR

	Average					
	Feb 66	Aug 67	Feb 68	Feb 69	Nov 72	May 73
Average family unit (married personnel only)	3.78	3.42	3.33	3.54	3.64	3.60
Children per married commissioned and warrant officer	2.00	1.86	1.72	1.60	1.77	1.81
Children per married enlisted man	1.75	1.31	1.24	1.18	1.55	1.46

Source: Data derived from Sample Surveys of Military Personnel conducted by USAMILPERCEN. Report numbers 23-66E, 2-68E, 26-68E, 27-69E, 12-73E, and 49-73E.

Specific data on dependent children of married officers and enlisted men during the 1966-69 period, presented in Table 10, show an increase of 47 percent among officers' families and 50 percent among enlisted men's families having one or no children. Also, a major change took place in the families of Army enlisted men wherein the numbers of families with two and three children decreased from 33% to 22% during the three year period.

Table 10: DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF MARRIED ARMY PERSONNEL

Dependent Children	Feb 66	Aug 67	Feb 68	Feb 69
		Officers		
0	20.5	27.0	27.6	30.1
1	20.7	19.3	21.3	21.8
2	26.3	24.3	23.5	22.4
3	17.9	15.7	15.3	15.2
4 or more	14.6	13.7	12.3	10.5
		Enlisted Men		
0	29.2	43.3	43.9	43.9
1	23.0	22.3	23.1	24.4
2	20.0	14.8	14.5	14.5
3	13.5	9.7	8.9	8.3
4 or more	14.3	9.9	9.6	8.9

Source: Sample Surveys of Military Personnel, Office of Personnel Operations, DA, reports numbers 23-66E, 2-68E, 26-68E, and 27-69E.

Like the incidence of marriage, the incidence of children increases with grade. Table 11 shows, in 1969, 69.8% of the second lieutenants' families but only 29.2% of the captains' families had no children.

Table 11: DISTRIBUTION OF MARRIED PERSONNEL BY NUMBER OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN AND GRADE

Officers

Dependent Children	WO	2LT	1LT	CPT	MAJ	LTC	COL
0	15.7	69.8	57.9	29.2	7.7	7.3	17.5
1	19.0	20.9	31.3	29.0	13.6	11.9	16.6
2	26.9	5.3	7.4	25.7	35.0	29.3	26.2
3	22.0	2.5	2.3	11.5	26.9	26.0	21.9
4	16.4	1.5	1.1	4.6	16.8	25.5	17.8

This situation is more marked in the families of enlisted men where 71.4% of the E-1s but only 48.5% of the E-5s had no children.

(Table 11 continued) Enlisted Men

Dependent Children	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E7	E8&9
0	71.4	64.6	65.8	62.4	48.5	18.9	10.9	12.9
1	20.2	22.9	24.7	28.2	30.3	22.6	14.9	15.2
2	6.9	8.5	7.3	6.4	12.2	24.5	27.5	25.2
3	1.1	3.2	1.5	2.1	5.0	16.3	20.5	20.6
4 or more	0.4	0.8	0.7	0.9	4.0	17.7	26.2	26.1

Source: Survey Estimate of Marital Status and Dependents of Army Male Personnel, OPOPM report number prepared by Personnel Management Development Office, Office of Personnel Operations, Department of the Army, 28 February 1969.

The 1974 Military Market Facts Book, prepared by the Army Times Publishing Company, showed, in an examination of 12 occupational groupings, that Armed Forces families in the United States had the highest average number of children under 18 years of age. (Table 12)

Table 12: AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE PER FAMILY BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP OF MALE FAMILY HEAD - 1973
(Ranked from highest number of children per family to lowest)

RANK	Occupational Group of Male Family Head	Average Number of Children Under 18	Index of Concentration (All families 100)
1	ARMED FORCES FAMILIES IN THE US	1.68	138
2	Farm laborers and foremen	1.62	133
3	Operatives, including transport workers	1.49	122
4	Craftsmen, foreman, and kindred workers	1.46	120
5	Laborers, except farm	1.44	118
6	Professional, technical and kindred workers	1.40	115
7	Managers and administrators, except farm	1.32	108
8	Sales workers	1.23	101
9	All US families	1.22	100

RANK	Occupational Group of Male Family Head	Average Number of Children Under 18	Index of Concentration (all families 100)
10	Farmers and Farm managers	1.21	99
11	Service workers, except private household	1.19	98
12	Clerical and kindred workers	1.14	93

Total Families, including those with no children, are used in computing the averages.

Source: Military Market Facts Book, Army Times Publishing Company, 1974.

It is also of interest that the population of service wives has babies at a rate nearly double that of the civilian population. The fertility rate per 1,000 US women aged 15-44 has decreased from 92 to 73 during the period 1966 to 1972 while the rate for wives of military men has increased from 169 to 175 (Table 13). A recent article by Harold Schmench, Jr. in the 16 April 1974 edition of the New York Times, listed the 1973 fertility rate for the US population as 69.3, which is a decrease of six percent over 1972.[8] The civilian-military fertility differential is in part an artifact of differing definitions of base figures. The military rate is based on wives while the civilian rate includes single and married women.

A superficial analysis of these data might indicate that they are inconsistent. For example, a large number of families have no children and yet wives of servicemen have a higher fertility rate and a higher average number of children under 18 years of age than other US women. It is also the case, however, that military wives are, as a group, considerably younger than other US wives. (See Figure 1)

TABLE 13: FERTILITY RATES FOR CIVILIAN AND MILITARY FAMILIES FY 1966-1972

	MILITARY POPULATION				TOTAL US POPULATION	
Fiscal (for Military) Calendar Year (For Total US)	Total Babies Born	Average Number Per Week	Babies per 1000 population Active Duty Military Community	Babies per 1000 wives Ages 15-44 Fertility Rate	Babies born per 1000	Babies per 1000 women Ages 15-44(1) Fertility Rate
1966	220,348	4,327	31.8	168.6	18.5	91.7
1967	239,189	4,600	30.9	168.5	17.9	88.0
1968	250,876	4,824	30.7	170.0	17.6	86.0
1969	263,757	5,072	29.3	169.7	17.8	86.2
1970	265,097	5,097	27.7	170.9	18.3	87.4
1971	244,398	4,700	27.9	167.7	17.2	81.9
1972	242,951	4,672	27.5	174.8	15.6	73.4

(1) For information only: babies per 1000 women in the US population include married and single women; figures for "Military Fertility Rate" include WIVES only.

Source: Military Market Facts Book, Army Times Publishing Company, 1974.

FIGURE 1: AGE DISTRIBUTION: WIVES OF ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY COMPARED WITH TOTAL US WIVES IN HUSBAND-WIFE FAMILIES

MILITARY WIVES (MARCH 1973)			TOTAL US WIVES IN HUSBAND-WIFE FAMILIES (MARCH 1973)	
NUMBER	PERCENT	AGE GROUP	PERCENT	NUMBER
14,174	1.1	Under 18 years	.4	212,000
194,578	15.1	18-19 years	1.7	848,000
545,076	42.3	20-24 years	11.5	5,646,000
226,793	17.6	25-29 years	12.3	6,059,000
141,746	11.0	30-34 years	10.8	5,347,000
94,068	7.3	35-39 years	10.1	4,955,000
45,101	3.5	40-44 years	10.4	5,114,000
24,483	1.9	45-54 years	20.2	9,926,000
2,577	.2	55-64 years	14.1	6,935,000
		65-74 years	6.9	3,395,000
		75-over	2.0	1,007,000
1,288,596	100.0	TOTAL	100.0	49,260,000

Median Age: Military Wives 23.0 years; Total US Wives: 40.7 years.

Source: Military Market Fact Book, Army Times Publishing Company, 1974.

The median age for wives of military men is 23 years and for US wives is 40.7. This difference in median ages is caused primarily by the fact that 97.9% of the wives of military men are under 45 years old. Therefore, in order to achieve some degree of similarity, it seems appropriate to compare this population to the same age group of US wives. As one might predict, such an analysis reveals that the median ages of both groups are lower. For wives of military men under 45, the median age figure drops from 23 to 21 and for the US wives under the same age limitation, the reduction is more pronounced decreasing from 40.7 to 29.

Relative youth permeates the entire family/dependent structure. Over 53% of the wives of service personnel are 24 years old or younger and 76% are under 30. Although these data are derived from all services, the percentage of married personnel is similar for all services. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that the data are an accurate representation of the ages of wives of Army personnel. In any event, the crucial point is not that the wives are younger but that the base of the data on fertility rates is misleading, since a greater proportion of wives of military men are in the prime child-bearing years. These wives are younger; their children are too. As Table 14 shows, slightly less than half of the dependent sons and 44% of the dependent daughters of military personnel are under five years of age. (See Table 14)

Working Wives

Although the wife has gained some added attention within the total Army system, her sponsor is still considered the spokesman, decisionmaker and breadwinner. This "position" is under increasing challenge, and many

TABLE 14: AGE DISTRIBUTION OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL (AS OF 31 MARCH 1973)

Age Group	Number of Sons	Percentage	No. of Daughters	Percent	Total No. of Children	Percent
Under 5 years	557,057	49.3	448,124	44.4	1,005,181	47.0
5 & 6 years	118,728	10.5	108,063	10.7	226,000	10.6
7-9 years	184,311	16.3	177,271	17.6	361,582	16.9
10-13 years	163,958	14.5	159,112	16.8	323,070	15.1
14 years	24,146	2.1	23,324	2.3	47,470	2.2
15 years	18,092	1.6	22,559	2.2	40,651	1.9
16-17 years	26,007	2.3	25,342	2.5	51,349	2.4
18 years	14,701	1.3	21,171	2.1	35,872	1.7
19 years & over	23,745	2.1	23,825	2.4	47,570	2.2
TOTALS	1,130,745	100.0	1,008,791	100.0	2,139,536	100.0

Median age of dependent children of military personnel: 5.3 years.

Median age of all US children under 21 years of age: 10.5 years.

Source: Military Market Facts Book, Army Times Publication Company, 1974.

wives desire a career of their own; or, at least a voice in family matters if she is employed. Many of the societal changes that have taken place since the early 1950's have altered the role of the women in the US. It is now "acceptable" for married women to be part of the labor force. In the U.S. today, there are some 26 million in the active work force. Army wives are part of the trend.

While in the military, wives of officers are often dissuaded from outside employment, no such norm appears to affect the wife of an enlisted man.[9] For years enlisted men's salaries were low and it was recognized that, in many cases, the wife's paycheck was necessary to provide an adequate standard of living. Also, until recently, the Army displayed a relative lack of concern for the enlisted man's wife and family. It made little difference that the wife was employed as long as she was not a "problem" to the Army.

Wives who actively pursue personal needs and aspirations are often thought of as "negative assets" in terms of the husband's career advancement.[10] This attitude may be part of the explanation for the statistics revealing an inverse relationship between wives' employment and their husband's rank contained in the 1969 Study of the Wife of an Army Officer by Elizabeth M. Finlayson. She found 25% of the company grade officers' wives employed, 19% of the field grade officers' wives and only 5% of the generals' wives employed.[11] Survey data collected by the Army in 1971 and presented in Table 15 show that 21% of the officers' wives and 32% of the enlisted men's wives work.

TABLE 15: EMPLOYMENT AMONG WIVES OF MARRIED ARMY PERSONNEL

Officer's Wives		Enlisted Men's Wives	
Rank of Officer	% Working	Rank of EM	% Working
Colonel	11.6	E9 & E8	25.8
LTC	20.5	E7	27.1
MAJ	15.9	E6	26.9
CPT	19.0	E5	31.2
1LT	34.1	E4	33.5
2LT	25.3	E3	39.6
WO	22.1	E2 & E1	44.1
Total Officers	22.1	Total Enlisted	39.0

Source: Sample Survey of Military Personnel: Survey Estimate of Dependent and Off-Duty Employment of Army Personnel, DAPO-PMP, OPD, DA, 31 May 1971.

Results from a 1973 LADYCOM survey show that almost 27% of the wives of officers and 30% of the wives of enlisted work. Of those who do work, over 55% of both groups of wives work full-time.[12]

While enlisted men in the grade of E-1 through E-5 claim their wives work primarily to meet basic living expenses, company grade officers said their wives worked mainly "to improve their standard of living." (See Table 16)

As one might expect, while senior enlisted men reported that their wives were employed to improve their standard of living, field grade officers' wives were reported to have joined the labor force primarily for non-financial reasons.

The occupational fields most frequently represented by the officers' wives were education (23%), and clerical (15%). Wives who had job-oriented majors such as nursing, clerical, and education were least apt to change fields when selecting occupations.[13]

TABLE 16: REASONS GIVEN BY MARRIED ARMY PERSONNEL FOR EMPLOYMENT OF THEIR WIVES

OFFICERS

Primary Reason for Employment of Wife	Total	COM OFF	WO	2LT	1LT	CPT	MAJ	LTC	COL*
Need income to meet basic living expenses	13.5	12.4	20.5	27.5	16.5	7.9	9.7	7.7	--
To improve standard of living	32.2	31.5	37.7	28.7	35.9	33.7	26.6	27.9	--
Savings/investments	22.0	22.3	19.7	23.8	20.4	26.9	21.8	17.3	--
Personal reasons	32.2	33.8	22.1	20.0	27.2	31.5	41.9	47.1	--

ENLISTED MEN

Primary Reason for Employment of Wife	Total	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E7	E8	E9*
Need income to meet basic living expenses	48.4	77.5	66.2	63.9	58.2	45.0	33.4	23.9	23.0	--
To improve standard of living	24.6	7.5	9.4	10.0	18.5	25.9	37.9	43.5	36.4	--
Savings/investments	9.9	6.0	11.9	7.6	8.1	13.3	8.4	11.4	9.5	--
Personal reasons	16.7	9.0	12.5	13.5	15.2	15.8	20.3	21.2	31.3	--

*Sample size too small for reliability, no data shown for sample size less than 50.

Source: Sample Survey of Military Personnel: Survey Estimate of Dependent and Off-Duty Employment of Army Personnel, DAPO, PMP, OPO, 31 May 1971.

With regard to those officers' wives not employed, their husbands' listed "need does not exist" as the primary reason for not working." "Personal reasons" was also an important factor and had a direct relation to the rank of the husband. As the husband advances in rank and attains more responsible positions, financial rewards are greater as are the expected social responsibilities of the wife.

With regard to the junior officers' wives, lieutenants mentioned "no employment opportunities". However, this could be a function of frequent moves during the first two years as the officer attends schools of short duration to become branch qualified. The importance of this factor decreases when the officer attains the rank of captain. (See Table 17) At this point, the officer generally becomes a careerist and begins to experience some degree of stability and higher monetary rewards

Enlisted men were less specific in providing reasons for their wives' not working. Twenty-seven percent either gave "personal reasons" or "reason other than above" for their wives' not joining the work force. However, similar to the officers' wives, the number of enlisted men's wives choosing not to work because "the need did not exist" was directly proportional to their husband's rank. An additional factor that is of importance to non-working wives of both officers and enlisted men is child care. Nearly 11% of the enlisted men and 7.8% of the officers' listed "no child care facilities," "not confident in child care," or "child care too expensive" as reasons for their wives' not working. Of these three reasons, the lack of confidence in child care is the most prevalent.

Examination of these data indicate that further research on the characteristics of the wives and dependents of Army servicemen is needed.

TABLE 17: REASONS GIVEN BY MARRIED ARMY PERSONNEL FOR UNEMPLOYMENT OF THEIR WIVES

		OFFICERS						
Wife is Employed	Total	WO	2LT	1LT	CPT	MAJ	LTC	COL
Yes:	21.2	22.1	25.3	34.1	19.0	15.9	20.5	11.6
Full time	(13.8)	(15.9)	(16.5)	(24.7)	(12.7)	(9.1)	(11.2)	(5.8)
Part time	(7.3)	(6.2)	(8.8)	(9.4)	(6.3)	(6.8)	(9.3)	(5.8)
No:	78.9	77.9	74.7	65.9	81.0	84.1	79.5	88.4
Need does not exist	(39.2)	(34.4)	(26.5)	(19.3)	(41.1)	(48.1)	(46.4)	(58.4)
Personal reasons	(11.8)	(13.1)	(7.7)	(9.9)	(11.7)	(13.2)	(13.2)	(11.2)
No employment opportunities	(6.9)	(7.3)	(16.2)	(13.2)	(6.7)	(3.1)	(2.6)	(2.7)
No child care facilities	(.7)	(.7)	(--)	(1.5)	(.6)	(1.1)	(.2)	(--)
Not confident in child care	(5.5)	(5.6)	(9.5)	(5.3)	(5.8)	(5.1)	(4.7)	(2.7)
Wife lacks skill or training	(1.3)	(2.4)	(.4)	(1.0)	(1.3)	(1.3)	(.8)	(1.3)
Employers will not hire Army dependents	(1.0)	(.9)	(1.4)	(2.7)	(1.3)	(.1)	(--)	(--)
Reason other than above	(10.9)	(10.1)	(11.5)	(11.8)	(10.6)	(10.8)	(10.8)	(11.7)

(continued)

TABLE 17 (CONTINUED)

ENLISTED MEN

Wife is Employed	Total	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E7	E8	E9
Yes:	32.0	41.7	46.5	39.6	33.5	31.2	26.9	27.1	28.8	22.9
Full time	(23.0)	(29.9)	(33.5)	(29.8)	(25.2)	(22.6)	(18.3)	(18.5)	(18.2)	(17.7)
Part time	(9.0)	(12.7)	(13.0)	(9.8)	(8.3)	(8.6)	(8.6)	(8.6)	(10.6)	(5.2)
No:	68.0	58.3	53.5	60.4	66.5	68.8	73.1	72.9	71.2	77.1
Need does not exist	(16.8)	(6.3)	(4.6)	(9.1)	(11.7)	(16.2)	(20.5)	(26.8)	(32.2)	(44.7)
Personal reasons	(13.0)	(12.7)	(10.4)	(15.8)	(14.9)	(12.7)	(12.4)	(10.2)	(14.8)	(9.4)
No employment opportunities	(9.1)	(7.0)	(9.4)	(11.1)	(11.8)	(9.8)	(7.6)	(6.1)	(5.1)	(4.2)
No child care facilities	(1.5)	(.7)	(2.0)	(1.5)	(1.6)	(1.1)	(1.4)	(2.8)	(.4)	(--)
Not confident in child care	(6.1)	(6.3)	(3.3)	(3.8)	(5.3)	(7.6)	(7.4)	(6.3)	(3.0)	(2.1)
Child care too expansive	(3.3)	(2.8)	(2.3)	(1.8)	(2.4)	(3.1)	(4.9)	(4.7)	(3.0)	(2.1)
Wife lacks skill or training	(2.6)	(3.5)	(1.0)	(.9)	(2.1)	(2.5)	(4.0)	(3.5)	(1.7)	(2.1)
Employers will not hire Army dependents	(1.7)	(--)	(1.0)	(1.1)	(3.2)	(2.1)	(1.3)	(.7)	(.4)	(--)
Reason other than above	(13.9)	(19.0)	(19.5)	(15.3)	(13.5)	(13.7)	(13.6)	(11.8)	(10.6)	(12.5)

Source: Dependent and Off-Duty Employment of Army Personnel, OPOPM Report 53-71E, prepared by Personnel Management Development Office, Office of Personnel Operations, DA, 31 May 1971.

Such research must be more intensive and must focus on wives as well as husbands.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing demographic characteristics describe families in the Army. In particular, we noted increasing marriage rates, smaller families, and significant numbers of working wives. Since marriage and children tend to occur at the crucial time when a member opts for a career, family considerations are vital to insure compatibility among the Army system, the individual's aspirations, and his family's well-being.

More research is needed to provide empirical data on perceptions and attitudes along the entire spectrum of social psychological factors affecting the Army families. In an era where the Army must first induce a civilian to volunteer and then convince him to stay, there is no room for conflicting loyalties between Army and family.

CHAPTER II

FOOTNOTES

1. Department of the Army, Selected Demographic Trends 1952-1972, DAPC-PMP Report No. 50-73E.

2. US Department of Defense (1973), Selected Manpower Statistics, Washington, DC, p. 38.

3. Roger W. Little, "The Military Family", Handbook of Military Institutions, ed. R. W. Little, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1971, pp. 251-252.

4. Ibid., p. 252.

5. Charles C. Moskos, Jr., "The Emergent Army," Parameters Journal of the US Army War College, Vol. IV, 1 (1974).

6. Dale Wyatt and Samuel Zuckerkandel, "A Survey of Attitudes of First Term Soldiers Toward Reenlistment," N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., May 1973.

7. Little, p. 252.

8. Harol M. Schmench, Jr., "Birth Fertility Rates at a New Low in U.S.," New York Times, 16 April 1974, p. 1.

9. Elizabeth M. Finlayson, "A Study of the Wife of the Army Officer: Her Academic and Career Preparation, Her Current Employment and Volunteer Services," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The George Washington University, 1969, p. 11.

10. Robert Seidenberg, "Corporate Wives--Corporate Casualties?," AMACOM, American Management Association, New York, 1973, p. 72.

11. Finlayson, pp. 149-150.

12. Survey, "A Survey of Military Wives," conducted by LADYCOM Magazine, 1973, Table 73.

13. Finlayson, p. 142.

CHAPTER III

BENEFITS AND FACILITIES

Harry Marmion in "The Case Against a Volunteer Army" says,

> The recommendation for across-the-board salary increases for all military personnel put forth by advocates of a volunteer army assumes that all one must do to increase enlistments is to increase base pay. An increase in base pay, it is further assumed, will increase the service's rate of retention of personnel as well. (This is a key point, since savings can only occur with a low rate of personnel turnover, which would reduce training costs, etc.) Yet there is ample evidence that the quality of life in the military needs upgrading beyond salary increases. As anyone who has looked into the matter knows, the cost of living is very high in areas where military bases are located. Moreover, there is a serious shortage of adequate on-base military quarters. Service people, especially enlisted men of lower ranks, are in effect trapped in these areas.
>
> So extreme is the situation that it has forced thousands of servicemen to put their families on relief rolls. Disgraceful, though it is, there are actually public welfare agencies set up to aid service families to supplement their overseas allotment by helping to pay rent as well as buy food and other necessities. . . . Studies indicate that nearly 100,000 Army families can, by current standards, be considered poor or earning only marginal incomes. The advocates of the volunteer army have failed to recommend funding proposals for such fringe benefits as housing, dependent medical and dental care, educational opportunities, and the like. The Gates report says, ". . . we have decided against recommending general increases in such benefits . . . because we believe that general increases in noncash pay would be an inefficient means of compensating military personnel."[1]

The questions raised by such a damning statement are first, "To what extent is the situation true?" and secondly, "If true,

to what extent will these inadequacies infringe not only on the Army family, but the volunteer army itself?"

As indicated in Table 1, Chapter II, a sample survey of military personnel conducted by US Army Military Personnel Center, as of 31 May 1973, indicated that today's Army is a married army. Overall 56.5 percent of all Army male personnel are married. Overall 84 percent of male Army officers are married and almost 52 percent of the male enlisted personnel are married. Overall, there are 1,009,547 dependents in the Army, resulting in an average Army family unit of 3.061 persons.[2] The implication of this statistic was recognized by LTG Bernard W. Rogers, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Headquarters Department of the Army, in an interview by MSG Nat Dell of Soldier Magazine when General Rogers said, "More of our young soldiers do get married earlier. If that trend continues, we will have to think about building fewer barracks and more family housing. We must take a very hard look at this because here we are talking about projects involving millions of dollars."[3]

General Rogers' explanation of the problem is indeed candid and perceptive. According to the last article in a five-part series entitled "The Price of Today's Army," Duncan Spencer of the Washington Star-News points out that it now costs the Army $32,600 to build a family housing unit whereas last year, the unit cost was $27,500.[4] In an era of spiraling inflation, the proper utilization and mix of Army funds in benefits and facilities becomes increasingly important. The soldier and his family require

a decent living wage, adequate housing, and educational, recreational, and religious facilities and services that are seen by him at least comparable to his civilian counterpart. The question is, to what extent are these available to the contemporary Army family whether living on or off-post at a price the family can afford.

This chapter will examine critical benefits and facilities, either afforded or denied the Army family depending on rank and location. Considered will be housing, economic factors, health services, educational and recreational facilities and their overall impact on the Army family.

HOUSING

Quarters over the years have not been replaced as fast as they have become substandard. Numbers of quarters available have decreased because of base closings. Housing on post is becoming more difficult to get in a timely fashion because of larger troop concentrations at fewer posts. Even though quarters are less desirable because of age, condition, and size, they are highly sought after for convenience and financial reasons. Experience of the research group indicates that availability of quarters on-post vary worldwide from 80 percent at some posts to perhaps less than 10 percent at others. The most recent study of military family housing by Department of Defense indicated that overall, some 68.2 percent of military families (all services) are housed or live off-post.[5]

According to this same study conducted in April 1974, the Army as of June 30, 1973, had 138,600 family housing units worldwide. Slightly over 90,000 of these units were located in the United States and its possessions with the remainder in foreign countries. The study also revealed that of the 2,241,618 DOD (Department of Defense--All Services) personnel in uniform, 58.9 percent are married yet only 26.5 percent of these personnel are in adequate military quarters as defined by DOD. About 24 percent of all eligible enlisted personnel are in adequate military quarters while about 37 percent of all officers are in adequate on-post housing.[6]

At first blush, this might lead the reader to believe that the military housing situation is grossly inadequate and has adverse effects on morale and overall effectiveness. Such a conclusion is contradicted by a sample survey of about twelve thousand military personnel with dependents at 17 CONUS locations where military construction is planned. The survey found that most persons now waiting to get into on-post family quarters are not dissatisfied with their present off-post accommodations. Likewise, personnel living in civilian housing are slightly more satisfied with their housing than those living on-post. Of the enlisted personnel surveyed who were living in civilian housing, 62 percent were either satisfied or very satisfied while only 56 percent of the enlisted personnel in on-post housing express those same degrees of satisfaction. Officers showed an even greater satisfaction with civilian quarters.[7]

Survey results such as these tend to endorse the Department of Defense policy of reliance on the local housing markets in communities near military installations as the primary source of housing for military personnel and their dependents. Construction of family housing on-post is only programed if the local civilian housing market is limited or nonexistent or the available housing on the local market places undue hardships on the military family as a result of costs, distance, safety, etc.

Construction of new on-base housing is not always the most effective means of satisfying the military family housing requirement. Short-term requirements, small requirements which make construction uneconomical, or politically unpalatable areas overseas are examples of situations for which other housing program components are used to satisfy the need. These include both domestic and foreign leasing, rental guaranty projects, and utilization of country-to-country agreements such as the Okinawa Reversion Agreement, the Off-set Agreement with the Federal Republic of Germany, and quid-pro-quo arrangements.[8]

Housing regulations favor rank. To provide facilities where most needed the government should be furnishing quarters to people who can least afford to furnish their own. The families who need it most are the lowest ranking members.

In a recent survey of Army wives by the magazine LADYCOM, only 20.7 percent chose the response that quarters were "roomy, modern, and nice," while 47.6 percent listed "adequate" as their response

and 29.3 percent indicated that quarters were "too small and in need of repairs." 3.2 percent did not respond.[9]

Families living on-post tend to limit their interaction with the civilian community. Many families go for considerable periods of time without leaving the boundaries of the post. Generally, the opposite is true for off-post residents. They range far without regard to community boundaries. However, because facilities on-post are more economical, off-post families frequently visit the post.[10]

Housing surveys reviewed indicate that over half, approaching 60 percent, of families eligible are not able to live in government furnished quarters because of nonavailability. In years past, that difference was of little consequence since the housing in the civilian community was of equal quality and of equal cost. Frequently, the cost approximated the families quarters allowance. In recent years, however, and especially in metropolitan areas, the cost of housing off-post approaches double the amount received in quarters allowance. This results in a rather significant difference in living style between those who live on post and those living off-post even among those of the same rank.

Of families living off-post, the LADYCOM survey revealed that 57.8 percent owned their own house or condominium, 17.9 percent rented a home, 21 percent rented an apartment, while 3.2 percent did not respond.[11]

The availability of on-post quarters will most likely be aggravated on June 1, 1974, when some 51,000 E-4's with more than two years of service become eligible for post quarters under a change in Army housing policy. It is likely that Army installations with tight housing situations and long waiting periods for quarters will be able to do little more than maintain a housing list for the newly eligible E-4's.[12]

This policy change is significant when one considers that according to the Defense's chief family housing programmer and planner, the rate of new family housing construction will fall off significantly after FY 75. It is reported that in the US existing government quarters and those in the civilian community will shelter most military families. Overseas more emphasis will be placed on leased housing rather than new construction. For example, it is planned to lease more than 12,000 family housing units in Germany alone during FY 75.[13]

Current DOD policy for the programming of on-post housing construction classifies private off-post housing as being adequate if it meets the following criteria.

1. Not more than one hour driving time from the administrative area of the installation during rush hour traffic.

2. The average total cost (rent, utilities, operating, and allowance transportation costs) does not exceed an established schedule of Maximum Allowance Housing Costs (20 to 25 percent of pay and allowances).

3. Quarters must be a complete dwelling unit with private entrance, with bath and kitchen for sole use of the occupants and arranged in such a manner that both bath and kitchen can be accessed without passing through bedrooms.

4. Bedroom count must be adequate for military families in accordance with criteria listed below:

Number of dependents (excluding wife)	Number of bedrooms
None	1
One	2
Two, except as follows	2
--one 10 years or over	3
--one 6 years or over and other opposite sex	3
Three, except as follows	3
--two 10 years or over	4
--one 10 years or over and other two opposite sex with one 6 years or over	4
Four, except as follows	3
--one 10 years or over	4
--one 6 years or over and all of the other three opposite sex of the one	4
--two 6 years or over of opposite sex and other two same sex	4
--two 10 years or over and other two opposite sex with one 6 years or over	5
--three 10 years or over	5
Five, except as follows	4
--two or more 10 years or over	5
--one 10 years or over, with one 6 years or over and of the opposite sex of the other three	5[14]

5. Quarters must be well constructed and in good state of repair with adequate heating and kitchen equipment provided.

6. Must be located in a residential area with acceptable health and sanitation facilities and free from offensive fumes and industrial noises, etc.

7. One bedroom units should contain not less than 550 square feet of net floor area; 2 bedrooms, 750; 3 bedrooms, 960; and 4 bedrooms, 1,080 square feet.

Units in the civilian community that have been purchased by and are occupied by military families are considered adequate unless it can be shown that the purchase was the only alternative to family separation and that one of the criteria for adequacy has not been met.[15]

Where housing surveys indicate a need to construct on-post housing because of private housing inadequacies, all reasonable precautions are taken to avoid unfavorable economic impact on the local housing market.

Often the choice of off-post living by the military family may be driven by the profit motive. In this case, the military member and his family may purchase a home with the expectation of realizing a profit upon selling the dwelling on his next permanent change of station or retaining the home for long-term investment subsidized by rental contracts. This is particularly true in the Washington area where housing has one of the highest rates of appreciation in the country. According to the Army Times Family Magazine, the value of homes nationwide has been appreciating at an annual rate of eight percent. In the Washington metropolitan area, however, houses are appreciating 21 percent annually. People who bought three-bedroom homes in

Virginia for $35,000 a [illegible] years ago are selling them now for over $50,000.[16] Thus, buying a house in the Washington area can be a good investment; however, a similar purchase in a community that later is faced with a neighboring base closure can be a family financial disaster.

Whatever the motivation of the prospective military home purchaser, the Federal Government has provided substantial benefits in the form of home loan programs. The Veterans Administration's GI Bill Program of Home and Farm Loans is available to all servicemen on active duty with 181 days service. Effective February 18, 1971, the interest rate on all GI loans was set at 7 percent per year. This rate is now up to 8 3/4 percent. VA does not require a down payment in the purchase of a GI home, but lenders frequently require down payments as a condition to obtaining the VA guaranteed home loan. Servicemen who sell their GI homes may get back the amount of guarantee entitlement previously used if the house is sold as a result of military transfer orders and the loan is repaid in full.[17]

A serviceman on active duty for two or more years is also eligible for Federal Housing Administration In-Service Mortgages if he has a good credit rating and is able to make the required down payment. His monthly mortgage payments also must be properly related to his present and anticipated income and expenses. Maximum annual interest for the FHA In-Service Loan is now over 8 percent. An additional benefit is that upon the death of an

active duty member, the particular service will continue the premium payments for the widow for two years after her spouse's death or until she sells the home, whichever occurs first. Service personnel who are or will be eligible under the GI Bill and who use the In-Service Loan while on active duty do not forfeit future entitlement to the GI Bill guarantee. Conversely, veterans who have returned to active duty and previously bought homes with GI Bill loans may obtain FHA-insured mortgage loans if otherwise eligible.[18]

Nancy Shea says that wives of military personnel who are assigned quarters on post, no matter what the vintage of the quarters are, feel lucky that their husbands will be spared the necessity of fighting heavy traffic to get back and forth work each day and that the men find it a definite hardship when they are forced to live at considerable distances from the post.[19] In the current era of the energy crisis, the transportation requirement necessitated by off-post living becomes an even greater irritant or inconvenience.

It is also not uncommon that many potential landlords are reluctant to rent their housing to military families because of previous experiences, neighborhood pressures, or economic fears. Irresponsible conduct, bad debts, sloppy housekeeping, and other prejudicial actions by previous military tenants have probably caused many a young soldier and his wife to be refused a house rental.[20]

In summary, "although they were frequently less satisfied with their quarters, on-base families all preferred on-base living for at least one of these reasons: safety, convenience, comfort, and economy. This motivation for creature needs contrasted to the varied reasons given by the off-base families. For the latter, there was often simply an aversion to the negative side of the military coin which contains restrictions, lack of choice in housing, invasion of privacy, and a constricted milieu."[21]

Oversea assignments, especially Europe, present a more complex problem. The Army Times of March 13, 1974, quotes the CG of US Army Europe as saying, "Soldiers are expressing a desire for a short tour and early return to the United States rather than bring their families with them because of the shortage of housing." There are 60,000 soldier families living in Europe with only enough quarters to house 41,000 families. The remaining 18,000 to 20,000 must live on the economy.[22]

The situation in Alaska is no better. The June 1974, issue of Soldiers has the following advisory:

> All married Corporals/Specialists 4's on orders to Fort Wainwright, Alaska, having under 2 years service and all other personnel not authorized on-post housing are advised to arrive without dependents. Little or no housing is available in Fairbanks and personnel arriving with families may experience undue hardships. Off-post housing is of a general lower quality than in the CONUS and more expensive. Average rates of apartments in the Fairbanks area are: * 1 bedroom apartment, $250-$280; * 2 bedroom, $280-$325; * 3 bedroom, $350-$400 up.[23]

Attitudes and opinions of Army personnel concerning housing vary greatly and lead one to believe that the generalizations from the survey results are based more on individual opinions than on thoughtful and subjective consideration. Two schools of thought exist regarding family housing. There are those who feel the military should merge in the community with the civilian population for purposes of image and understanding. Others advocate that on-post living provides economic advantages, security, companionship and contributes to the development of Army loyalties, careers and professionalism.

A study for the Secretary of the Army, conducted in 1967, indicated that preference among officers to live on-post increases in rank as it does with EM. Economic factors were cited as the predominant reason by both groups.[24] Addressing this fact in a 1972 USAWC Individual Research Report, LTC Harold R. Golden, submitted that "growth of professional interest and association plays a role in this preference (as does the fact that the more junior personnel would likely have to accept lower quality and more undesirable quarters, have somewhat lesser housing needs, and are more likely to be unacquainted with the professional and fraternal benefits of on-post housing)."[25]

An Office of Personnel Operations survey in May 1969 solicited officers' views of their wives' satisfaction with Army life. Housing was included in the seven areas of military life listed in the questionnaire for comment. It ranked third in degree

of dissatisfaction, following family separation and frequency of moves. This was fairly general throughout the officer grades with greatest dissatisfaction occurring in the grades O-3 and up and concentration in grades O-4 and O-5.[26]

A sample survey conducted by Office of Personnel Operations in August 1969 sheds some light on the importance of housing. The survey asked the respondents to identify the most satisfying and the most dissatisfying aspects of military life. The factors from which they were asked to choose as the most satisfying and most dissatisfying aspects included housing, duties, pay, social life, medical care, retirement benefits, PX and commissary. Officers as a whole listed housing last as a satisfying aspect. The Warrant Officers and Lieutenants listed housing second to last with social life being the least satisfying. Overall, enlisted personnel also listed housing as the least satisfying aspect. The question was then rephrased to ask identification of the most dissatisfying aspect of military life and two additional factors were added to the previous seven aspects. The added factors were "frequent permanent changes of station" and "separations" from the family. The officers listed "housing" as the second most dissatisfying with "separations from the family" getting the honor spot. Among grades of officers, the Lieutenants and Warrant Officers listed "separations from the family" and "pay" as more dissatisfying followed closely by "housing." The enlisted respondents, as a whole, had "housing" listed as the fourth most dissatisfying

aspect. "Separations from the family," "pay" and "duties" were more dissatisfying in that order.[27]

A sample survey conducted by US Army Military Personnel Center, in November 1972, provides some insights concerning the attitudes of Army male personnel toward certain housing options.[28] Of the male officers surveyed concerning which option they preferred for their family after receiving PCS orders for unaccompanied (short) tours, the most favored option was to "relocate the family to a home or mobile home that he owned or was purchasing." This option was followed closely by that of "relocating to private rental quarters" and next by "remaining in their present government quarters." The same order of preference was also true for the enlisted men surveyed.

ECONOMIC FACTORS

The family living on-post has a definite financial advantage, since government quarters are furnished in toto in return for relinquishing quarters allowance. This means all the utilities, i.e., water, heat, electricity, are provided. On some posts even firewood for fireplaces is furnished. Usually the only additional item of cost for the occupant is a telephone. Other economic benefits accrued are fewer required driving miles, resulting in significant savings in gas and automobile maintenance costs, less out-of-pocket expense for community dependent organizations, i.e., scouts, stables, youth activities, etc. Equipment for maintenance

of grounds, paint for self-help programs, seed and fertilizer are frequently provided. So, by living on-post savings are compounded. When moving from one post to another no deposits, advances, or leases are required. A stringent checkout procedure is required, but this has a positive aspect in that the occupant expects military quarters to be clean upon arrival and no detrimental effect is generated when the same family is required to clean upon departure.

Myriad problems confront the family not provided quarters on-post and who must find accomodations in the nearby civilian community. Very frequently, upon arrival at a post, a family will find a waiting period for quarters if any are in fact available. The family must then make temporary housing arrangements. Guest house facilities are limited, accommodations in the surrounding community are costly. The family must decide if it is more advantageous to wait or get settled elsewhere.

If the family decides to forego waiting for quarters, they must then decide if they are going to rent or purchase a home. Because they continually move, the family is forced to purchase homes at peak prices. Because they have little time in which to decide, they usually pay a premium price for housing which does not meet personal desires. Add to this the distance from the sponsor's work, deposits for utilities, cost of purchasing the house, and payments for utility and upkeep costs, and the economic difference between living on and off-post is indeed significant.

While the economic problems cited above are in some cases significantly burdensome on the military family, Marmion's contention that studies indicate nearly 100,000 Army families can, by current standards, be considered poor or earning only marginal incomes is questionable. Facts developed by DCSPER on 28 February 1973, pointed out that based on level of income alone there should be no Army families receiving welfare but that unusual family circumstances and temporary financial hardship will no doubt result in some families requiring Public Assistance. These conclusions were based on a comparison of regular military compensation for E-1's with existing low income standards considering family sizes of two to six or more (Table 1).[29]

TABLE 18

LOW INCOME AND MILITARY FAMILIES

Pay Grade	Family Size	Regular Military Compensation[1]	Low Income Standard[2]
E-1	2	5,889.82	$3,540
E-1	3	5,870.90	4,140
E-1	4	5,757.23	4,740
E-1	5	5,629.83	5,190
E-1	6 or more	5,548.65	5,190

[1]Regular Military Compensation (RMC) is defined as basic pay plus the allowances for quarters and subsistence and the tax advantage which accrues because these allowances are not subject to Federal Income Tax.

[2]The low income standard is defined as the earned income level at which families will no longer be eligible for benefits under the President's Proposed Family Assistance Plan. This definition is similar to the poverty guidelines developed by the various Federal agencies.

To counter the argument that few military families do not make a living wage is a DOD statistic showing that in 1972, 36,342 military members and families received $5,102,657 in emergency assistance from the Army Emergency Relief alone.[30]

Roger Little in examining status groups within the military family cites a 1965 sample survey which indicated that almost one-third (31.6%) of the enlisted men's wives were engaged in outside employment to supplement the family income (see Table 2). In this particular sample, only 16.2 percent of the Army officers' wives were engaged in outside employment.[31]

TABLE 19

WORKING WIVES OF MARRIED ARMY PERSONNEL

Officers' Wives		Enlisted Men's Wives	
Rank	Percent Working	Rank	Percent Working
Warrant Officer	18.5	E1 - E2	31.0
2d LT	32.0	E3	39.2
1st LT	23.4	E4	34.9
CPT	11.5	E5	29.4
MAJ	11.9	E6	29.5
LTC	13.1	E7	30.8
COL	8.2	E8 - E9	23.7
Total Officer	16.2	Total Enlisted	31.6

Source: Sample Survey of Military Personnel, "Survey Estimate of Attitudes and Opinions Related to Development of Family Service Centers," Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1965. Sample size 6,588 officers, 13,000 enlisted.

It is interesting to note that when compared to the 1971 Army Survey of Working Wives of Married Army Personnel cited in Chapter II (Table 17) percentages of total enlisted working wives remained almost constant during the six year period. Working wives of officers in all grades showed a net increase of almost five percent. Unexplained is an increase of over 13 percent in the number of working wives of E-1's and E-2 while the number of working wives of 2LT's decreased by almost 7 percent despite percentage rises in all other officer grades.

A great number of the wives that are employed have jobs on the post itself. Clerical and secretarial positions are often filled by military wives as well as positions in the commissary, post exchange, post library, officers club, etc. If the Army is truly concerned about the welfare of its financially destitute families, it would appear necessary that it adopt employment programs and practices favoring such groups.

Such a program was put into effect in Europe as reported in the October 31, 1973 issue of Army Times. Soldier dependents are getting their first crack at Army civilian jobs. In addition, the Army is urging German firms to hire more American dependents. More than 11,000 dependents were already working for Army agencies in Germany as of October 1973.[32]

An interesting insight into the relative economic position of the soldier is provided by the Army Times in an article titled "Living Costs Rise Faster Than Usual."

Bureau of Labor Statistics for a specific family of a 38 year old husband employed full time; a non-working wife; a boy of 13 and a girl of 8 are as follows: Here are comparisons for three families of typical budgets, and how inflation affected them in 1973 (comparable military wage-earners shown in parenthesis):

* Low budget, $8,116 civilian income. (The regular military compensation for an E4 with four years' service, a wife and two children is $8,132.) This family had to pay an extra $730 in 1973 to maintain 1972 living standards, the study found. This is compared to a budget cost increase of only $172 in the previous year. The impact was nearly three times greater than for a middle or high budget family.

* Middle budget, $12,614 civilian income. (This corresponds closely to an E7 with 20 years' service, a wife and three children, earning $12,542.) This family had to pay an extra $1,168 to maintain 1972 living standards in 1973, compared to a $475 increase the previous year.

* Higher budget, $18,130 civilian income. (This corresponds to an 03 with 10 years' service, a wife and two children, earning $18,206.) This family paid $1,572 more in 1973 to maintain its 1972 living standard, compared to an increase of $653 the previous year.[33]

HEALTH SERVICES

Medical support is provided to all military families whether they live on or off-post. For those on-post, there is the convenience of being near the medical facility. Frequently, on-post transportation facilities are available for dependent use as are ambulance facilities. On-post medical care is frequently limited and where they qualify, families may use CHAMPUS.

Being part of the civilian community rather than the military community has many peripheral disadvantages. One such disadvantage

is distance. This requires time and transportation to and from the medical facility. This inconvenience is detrimental to a full health care program. Additionally, experience indicates that most military medical facilities are overcrowded, understaffed, and overworked.

The FY 72 final report, "Analysis of MVA/VOLAR Actions Impact on Soldiers' Attitudes toward the Army and on Retention," concludes that "actions in the Health Care category rank among the top MVA/VOLAR actions in terms of impact on overall attitudes and on retention. The retention impact of actions in the Health Care category is considerably greater for married personnel than for single personnel."[34]

A survey was conducted by the Military Personnel Center on "The Attitude Toward the Army Out-Patient Care Facilities as Expressed by Army Military Personnel for Themselves and Their Dependents."[35]

Although the specific question, "Are you and your dependents satisfied with Army Out-Patient care?" was not asked, all the attitudes questioned concerning outpatient care, indicated a high percentage of personnel were satisfied overall with medical care received. Regarding their opinion of courtesy and concern shown, eligible dependents at Army Out-Patient Care facilities responded as indicated in Table 20.[36] Table 21 indicates responses to a question on the waiting period for dependents with an appointment.

TABLE 20

MALE OFFICERS WITH ELIGIBLE DEPENDENTS BY GRADE

Officers' Opinion of Courtesy And Concern Shown Eligible Dependents At Army Out-Patient Care Facility	Total	Grade							
		COM-OFF	COL	LTC	MAJ	CPT	1LT	2LT	WO
Always courteous and concerned	13.0	12.7	12.1	11.1	15.4	11.7	12.4	14.5	14.7
Usually courteous and concerned	62.3	62.5	69.2	64.8	61.7	62.4	61.7	54.4	61.3
Seldom courteous and concerned	23.2	23.3	18.7	23.0	21.7	24.2	23.4	28.6	22.5
Never courteous and concerned	1.5	1.5	-	1.1	1.2	1.7	2.5	2.5	1.5
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ENLISTED MEN WITH ELIGIBLE DEPENDENTS BY GRADE

Enlisted Men's Opinion Of Courtesy and Concern Shown Eligible Dependents At Army Out-Patient Care Facility	Total	Grade								
		PV1	PV2	PFC	CPL SP4	SGT SP5	SSG SP6	SFC SP7	MSG 1SG	SGM
Always courteous and concerned	21.4	27.5	28.2	24.8	20.5	19.0	21.5	21.6	21.6	16.3
Usually courteous and concerned	52.5	55.2	45.9	49.3	48.6	51.2	53.8	57.5	58.4	67.4
Seldom courteous and concerned	22.5	13.0	18.6	22.3	25.2	26.6	22.2	19.1	15.5	14.4
Never courteous and concerned	3.6	4.3	7.3	3.6	5.7	3.2	2.5	1.8	4.5	1.9
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 21

MALE OFFICERS WITH ELIGIBLE DEPENDENTS BY GRADE

Officers' Opinion of Waiting Period Eligible Dependents Had For Out-Patient Care With An Appointment	Total	Grade							
		COM OFF	COL	LTC	MAJ	CPT	1LT	2LT	WO
The wait was always reasonable	20.6	20.2	19.1	16.8	21.2	20.3	21.6	22.3	22.8
The wait was usually reasonable	40.2	40.9	45.0	40.6	41.7	39.4	42.9	40.6	36.1
The wait was sometimes reasonable	18.5	18.2	15.9	20.9	16.9	19.4	16.2	15.6	20.2
The wait was usually unreasonable	16.0	16.0	16.7	17.5	15.5	16.3	12.8	16.7	16.6
The wait was always unreasonable	4.7	4.7	3.3	4.1	4.7	4.6	6.5	4.8	4.3
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ENLISTED MEN WITH ELIGIBLE DEPENDENTS BY GRADE

Enlisted Men's Opinion Of Waiting Period Eligible Dependents Had For Out-Patient Care With An Appointment	Total	Grade								
		PV1	PV2	PFC	CPL SP4	SGT SP5	SSG SP6	SFC SP7	MSG 1SG	SGM
The wait was always reasonable	26.2	62.4	24.9	31.5	24.9	24.0	24.1	27.2	28.5	24.2
The wait was usually reasonable	31.4	14.5	33.8	29.7	30.2	30.9	32.5	32.6	33.5	38.4
The wait was sometimes reasonable	20.5	13.0	24.6	18.1	21.5	21.0	21.5	18.3	18.8	15.2
The wait was usually unreasonable	15.6	5.8	10.[illegible]	14.9	16.5	16.6	15.8	16.6	14.2	20.2
The wait was always unreasonable	6.3	4.3	6.6	5.8	6.9	7.5	6.1	5.3	5.0	2.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Sample size too small for reliability.

Personnel surveyed were also asked about their preferences for civilian over Army outpatient care for dependents. Table 22 indicates responses to this question.[38]

Of primary concern to military dependent care and the overall quality of the DOD Health Services program is the acquisition and retention of military physicians. The single greatest deterrent to the assurance of adequate health services in the military appears to be the strong magnetic effect of high earning potential for the physician in the civilian community. Currently an Army physician who has been practicing for five years draws a salary of $20,000 per year including tax advantage. His counterpart practicing off in the civilian community draws a median salary of $43,000. Legislation (S.2770) currently awaiting presidential approval was proposed to narrow this and other gaps between the military and civilian physician.

Dr. Richard S. Wilbur, former Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Environment) and currently a consultant for DOD, in supporting S.2770 says "adequate medical care for the active duty member and his family is a valuable incentive for the married volunteer. Army degradation in the amount or quality of medical care provided to military personnel and their families will be counterproductive to the All-Volunteer Force concept. With reduced staffing, we will be required to curtail health care to many beneficiaries, first, for retired members and their families and secondly, for active duty dependents."[39]

TABLE 22

MALE OFFICERS WITH ELIGIBLE DEPENDENTS BY GRADE

Officers' Preference For Civilian Over Army Out-Patient Care For Eligible Dependents If Cost Were Not A Factor	Total	Grade							
		COM OFF	COL	LTC	MAJ	CPT	1LT	2LT	WO
Strong preference for civilian care	23.0	23.1	11.7	18.6	21.6	24.3	32.3	24.7	22.0
Preference for civilian care	25.3	25.2	20.4	20.1	21.3	26.9	28.6	36.8	25.8
No preference	20.6	20.6	10.6	18.1	20.3	21.7	22.8	25.0	21.2
Preference for Army care	22.1	22.1	35.4	31.7	23.9	20.2	13.6	10.6	22.0
Strong preference for Army care	9.0	9.0	21.9	11.5	12.9	6.9	2.7	2.9	9.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ENLISTED MEN WITH ELIGIBLE DEPENDENTS BY GRADE

Enlisted Mens' Preference For Civilian Over Army Out-Patient Care For Eligible Dependents If The Cost Were Not A Factor	Total	Grade								
		PV1	PV2	PFC	CPL SP4	SGT SP5	SSG SP6	SFC SP7	MSG 1SG	SGM
Strong preference for civilian care	36.8	54.8	40.7	42.2	44.8	37.8	32.1	27.1	28.6	21.1
Preference for civilian care	26.7	22.6	27.0	28.2	29.1	30.2	25.2	22.1	20.7	20.2
No preference	18.3	9.6	17.8	17.5	16.0	17.8	21.6	19.9	18.4	14.7
Preference for Army care	13.0	7.8	11.3	8.7	7.3	10.9	14.9	20.9	24.8	24.7
Strong preference for Army care	5.2	5.2	3.2	3.4	2.8	3.3	6.2	10.0	7.5	19.3
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In a sample survey of military personnel conducted by the Office of Personnel Operations as of August 1969, almost 17 percent of Army officers and 25 percent of enlisted men cited medical care as the single most satisfying aspect of military life.[40] As a result a degradation of Army health services would most likely have a deleterious affect on not only Army family life, but retention as well. To what extent CHAMPUS could relieve the pressures and anxieties of Army dependents if on-post health services were diminished or eliminated is not known at this time. To explore this problem, a study project that will shape the future of military health care was recently initiated by the Office of Management and Budget. The study will concentrate on two sample areas: The first in Northern California because of its variety of military groups, active, retired, and reserve; several different health-care plans in operation and hospitals of three military services, and the second at Fort Hood, Texas primarily because of its role as a major training center. The data collection effort now in progress involves:

1. Face to face interviews of active-duty persons on a sample basis.

2. Telephone interviews of retired personnel on a sample basis.

3. Collection of outpatient workload data.

4. Data gathered from observation of various health care services including health maintenance organizations.

According to Army Times, specific goals of the study as described by officials of Management and Budget are "Potential alternatives to current health-care programs so that the military can continue to ensure the continued availability of comprehensive, high quality health care for all its beneficiaries, both in peacetime and under contingency conditions."[41] The results of this study should prove extremely valuable to future researchers and decisionmakers in evaluating the relative merits of on-post health services versus alternative off-post health care programs. Additionally, researchers would find a Department of the Army Special Inspection of Army medical outpatient services of considerable value in evaluating the relative merits of on-post/off-post health services.

In reporting a rise in per-diem hospitalization rate from $1.75 per day to $3.50 per day, Mary Russell of the Washington Post cites a cost of $1.5 billion a year to DOD for medical care for active duty personnel and their dependents. While no figures are available to measure the costs of medical care for dependents on-post, the cost of care for active duty dependents using the CHAMPUS program is about $530 million a year.[42] At a time when hospital rates and physicians' fees are spiraling upward in the off-post civilian community while at the same time, on-post medical services will probably be required to absorb costs associated with military physicians' bonuses of up to $15,000 per year per military doctor it would appear that future research regarding military vs community-supported health programs urgently requires a detailed cost/benefit

analysis in terms of contemporary economics and resources. Such a study, in addition to considering the intangible benefits and values to military quality of life must also utilize demographic data regarding the family to consider the proper mix of medical assets.

EDUCATION

Educational systems vary throughout the world. For the most part, stateside on-post educational systems are part of the state, city, or county school system and the quality of education corresponds to that locality. The study group is of the opinion that on-post education overseas tends to be of lower quality. There are several reasons for this condition. Bower in his study of "American Children and Families in Overseas Communities," says the following:

> Pupil personnel workers such as psychologists, social workers, speech therapists, nurses, and counselors are in short supply, especially in the elementary schools. In general, teachers are a significant cut above their back-home colleagues, most seem more imaginative, adventurous and resourceful, perhaps as a consequence of having to make do with less. Teachers in the Dependent Schools maintain an infections JOIE DE VIVRE even when billeted in less than joyful housing. Some teach with out-of-date books with illustrations of bottles of milk with the cream floating on top, discarded first aid procedures, and a lack of the fancy hardware available to many of their stateside colleagues. Their biggest handicap, they felt, is the loss of contact with the professional mainstream and frontiers. . . . Of major concern to the teachers and principals are children with learning and behavior problems. The prevalence of such problems did not appear to be significantly different from that

> in continental U.S. schools, but school and community resources to help teachers cope with such children are limited, especially in the elementary schools.[43]

Because of limited facilities and size of school systems, courses available are limited as well as schedules. Frequently, long distances and time-consuming bus rides to and from classes are required. Family participation in school activities are likewise limited for the same above reasons. Other problems are encountered in that student testing, college selection, and entrance interviews are made more difficult. To be considered not as an advantage or a disadvantage is the fact that on-post school systems consist of "Army brats" and little assimilation with children of the civilian community occurs.

There are certain problems associated with the military family's assimilation into the civilian community. Because of the transient nature of military family life superficial relationships normally develop with civilian neighbors and institutions. At times even the most superficial relationships are difficult to establish. In a sense the transient military family is comparable to the highly mobile corporate executive family. As Robert Seidenberg points out in Corporate Wives--Corporate Survival:

> It takes time to make new friends and break into established circles. Adults moving into a new area maintain a reserve about themselves, an aloofness that belies the anxiety of wondering whether one will ever fit in. One doesn't want to impose or intrude, and here there emerges the issue of pride: "We are no social beggars" . . . It takes time for the trust to develop between people that permits the intimacies and confidence that make friendships so valuable--so human.[44]

To a lesser degree the difficulties adults experience in establishing new relationships also apply to the military child who finds himself the "new kid on the block." School organizations, after-school activities, sports teams are already established. A new child frequently has to fight to get in. Teachers do not know him, consequently scholarship applications requiring references are difficult to obtain. Curriculum differences because of individual state graduation requirements place extra requirements on the student. As stated above the calibre of education available to the military family depends on the quality of education in the local community. Very frequently an evaluation is difficult to make and only standardized national achievement tests can definitely indicate how a student stands. When asked to rate the education that their children were receiving 49.3 percent of the wives responding did not answer. 2.3 percent rated education poor, 4.8 percent fair, 18.6 percent average, 17.1 percent better than average and 7.8 percent excellent.[45]

Information on the precise educational level of Army wives is not available; however, an inspection of the responses of wives responding to the earlier noted LADYCOM survey showed 2.2 percent had completed grade school, 57.9 percent high school, 31.4 percent college, 6.8 percent graduate studies and 1.7 percent no answer.[46]

Finlayson in a random sample of 1000 officers' wives found that 40 percent had attained a bachelor's degree and 80 percent had education beyond high school. It is reasonable to surmise then

that the Army wife is well educated and that most state a desire or need for further education. They cite personal growth, completion of degree programs, an increase in employment potential, better citizenship, and security as the reasons for wanting more education.[47]

RECREATION

A post is really a city in itself. It has all the components of a complete community, i.e. social, economic, political, religious, and ideological systems. The maximum benefit is derived by those families who live in that community. Army money allocated to these programs is allotted on the basis of total military population while the actual total benefits are normally enjoyed by less the total population.

Off-post personnel are contributing to two economies, the military and civilian communities. Such personnel and their family because of time, distance, and location, cannot benefit fully from the facilities provided them by a post. In effect, the off-post family is charged twice for benefits received. On-post children are frequently provided playground maintenance and outfitting, uniforms, umpire, and coaching fees, swimming pools, etc. The civilian community member is entitled to that same benefit, but instead finds himself participating in money-raising campaigns or assessments to provide that same facility in the civilian community in which he lives.

Although many surveys have been conducted on the popularity and use of the various recreational facilities available to soldiers, there is a paucity of literature on use of on-post recreational facilities by families. One way of securing information on this issue is to observe people at bowling alleys, swimming pools, golf courses, driving ranges, craft shops, auto hobby shops, gymnasiums and other recreational facilities. Such observations might well indicate that such facilities are vastly oversubscribed. Most of the surveys reviewed for this report did not include questions on dependent utilization or popularity.

Facilities and activities that have been examined are Service Club activities, Craft programs, Libraries, Movies, and Sports.

Volume I, Analysis of MVA/VOLAR Actions Impact on Soldiers' Attitudes Toward The Army and On Retention, dated 15 September 1972 (SDC TM 4886/003/00), states that, in the area of entertainment and recreation:

> Actions in this area have been generally well-received and have a relatively greater impact for the lower enlisted grades; however, following an initial enthusiastic reception, such actions have tended to show a decline in the degree of positive response accorded them. The impact on retention is quite low and in keeping with the relatively low importance rating attached to such actions by soldiers at a number of installations.[48]

The intuitive feeling of this committee is that as the facilities and activities become known to the families their utilization will increase and their importance will have a greater impact on retention.

A sample survey was conducted on the "Estimate of Participation in the Army Crafts Program" as of 31 August 1970.[49] For the purpose of this paper, only the data from those respondents 25 years old or less (for both officers and enlisted men's wives) will be shown.

The survey indicated that approximately 49 percent of the enlisted men's wives and 69 percent of the officers' wives were interested in the Crafts program at Army installations.[50] Although the survey results indicate an interest of wives and families, only 8.5 percent of the wives and 1.6 percent of the children of enlisted men and 25 percent of the wives and 3.8 percent of the children of officers participate in the programs.[51] The most popular programs for wives are fashion design, dress making and sewing; art appreciation; ceramics and mosaics; the fourth most popular program for enlisted men's wives was grooming, hair styling, and make-up while the officer's wives preferred interior decoration.[52] It should be remembered that the respondents to these surveys were men. These programs may or may not accurately reflect the attitudes and interest of the wives.

CHAPTER III

FOOTNOTES

1. Harry A. Marmion, The Case Against a Volunteer Army (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971), pp. 57-58.

2. US Department of the Army, US Army Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, Survey Estimate of Marital Status and Dependents of Army Male Personnel, DAPC-PMP Report No. 49-73-E, 31 May 1973, pp. 2, 11, and 13.

3. MSG Nat Dell, "Toward a Professional Army" Soldiers, Vol. 28, No. 8, August 1973, pp. 9-10.

4. Duncan Spencer, "The Price of Today's Army," Washington Star News, 3 May 1973, p. 1, Col. 2.

5. Department of Defense, Joint OSD/Service Task Force, A Study of the Military Family Housing Program, April 1974, p. 18.

6. Ibid., pp. 13-14.

7. Ibid., p. 29.

8. Ibid., p. 19.

9. See Table 28, "Military Wives Survey," LADYCOM Magazine Computer Printout.

10. Charles William Blochberger, Jr., "Military Families: Differential Life Styles" (Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1970), pp. 157-158.

11. LADYCOM, op. cit., Table 29.

12. "Housing: 51,000 E-4's Eligible to Get Post Quarters," Army Times, 29 May 1974, pp. 1 and 18.

13. "Family Housing Construction to Drop Sharply," Army Times, 22 May 1974, p. 8.

14. Department of the Army, Family Housing Management AR 210-50, January 1971, pp. 5-8.

15. Department of Defense, A Study of the Military Family Housing Program, op. cit., pp. B2-3.

16. "Assignment Washington: To Buy or Not to Buy," Family, Army Times Publishing Co., 8 May 1974, p. 6.

17. "GI Bill Loans," Army, Navy, Air Force Times Reports. Report No. 60, Army Times Publishing Co., April 1971, p. 4.

18. "FHA In-Service Home Loans," Army, Navy, Air Force Times Reports, Report No. 86, Army Times Publishing Co., March 1972, pp. 3-4.

19. Nancy Shea, The Army Wife, (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p. 99.

20. Ibid., p. 73.

21. Blochberger, op. cit., p. 157.

22. "Davison Hits Housing Lack," Army Times, 13 March 1974, p. 27.

23. "Alaska Housing," Soldiers, June 1974, p. 2.

24. US Department of the Army, "Housing for the Military Family," A Study for the Secretary of the Army, April 1967, pp. 7-8.

25. Harold R. Golden, "Housing and the Military Family," Individual Research Report for the US Army War College, 3 March 1972, pp. 62-63.

26. US Department of the Army, Office of Personnel Operations, Sample Survey of Military Personnel as of 31 May 1966, Survey Estimate of Officers' Wives' Satisfaction with Army Life as Expressed by Officers, OPOPM Report No. 44-69-E, Tables A and F.

27. US Department of the Army, Office of Personnel Operations, Sample Survey of Military Personnel as of 31 August 1969, Survey Estimate of Satisfying and Dissatisfying Aspects of Military Life as Indicated by Army Officers and Enlisted Men, OPOPM Report No. 52-69-E, Tables A and D.

28. US Department of the Army, US Army Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, Sample Survey of Military Personnel as of 30 November 1972, Survey Estimate of Kinds of Quarters Family Occupied and Attitudes of Army Male Personnel Toward Housing Options, DAPC-PMP Report No. 41-73-E, Tables A and B.

29. US Department of the Army, Office Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Low Income and Military Families, Backup Sheet (1/93)-PER-36, 28 February 1973 (mimeographed).

30. US Department of Defense, Relief Agencies for Service Families, Information Guidance Series, No. 8A-55 (Washington: Defense Printing Plant, 1974), p. 3.

31. Roger W. Little (ed.), Handbook of Military Institutions. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1971, pp. 253-254.

32. Larry Carney, "Kin Win Job Priority in USAREUR," Army Times, 31 October 1973, p. 34.

33. "Living Costs Rise Faster Than Usual," Army Times, 6 February 1974, p. 29.

34. Modern Volunteer Army MVA/VOLAR Evaluation Project, Analysis of MVA/VOLAR Action Impact on Soldiers' Attitudes Toward the Army and on Retention, System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California, September 1972, pp. 4-38.

35. US Department of the Army, Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, Sample Survey of Military Personnel MILPC-3 00 of 28 February 1973, Survey Estimates of Attitudes Found Toward the Army Out-Patient Care Facilities as Expressed by Army Male Personnel for Themselves and their Dependents. DAPC-PMP Report No. 48-73-E.

36. Ibid., pp. 40-45.

37. Ibid., pp. 33-38.

38. Ibid., pp. 64-69.

39. Dr. Richard S. Wilbur, "Military Departments Must Provide Top Health Services," Commanders Digest, Vol. 15, No. 2, 10 January 1974, p. 5.

40. US Department of the Army, US Army Office of Personnel Operations, Personnel Management Development Office, OPOPMC, Survey Estimate of Satisfying and Dissatisfying Aspects of Military Life as Indicated by Army Officers and Enlisted Men, OPOPM Report No. 52-69-E, 31 August 1969, Tables A and D, pp. 4, 7.

41. "Med Care Project Beginning," Army Times, 20 February 1974, p. 3.

42. Mary Russell, "GI Family Hospital Costs Rise," Washington Post, 1 January 1974, p. 5.

43. Eli M. Bower, "American Children and Families in Overseas Communities," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 39, No. 4, 1967, p. 792.

44. Robert Seidenberg, M.D., Corporate Wives - Corporate [illegible]al, New York, AMACOM, 1973, p. 34.

45. Military Wives Survey, LADYCOM, Table 62.

46. Ibid., Table 80.

47. Elizabeth Mason Finlayson, "A Study of the Wife of an Army Officer: Her Academic and Career Preparation, Her Current Employment and Volunteer Services" (Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, George Washington University, Washington, 1969), pp. 141-143.

48. Modern Volunteer Army MVA/VOLAR Evaluation Project, op. cit., pp. 4-46.

49. US Department of the Army, Office of Personnel Operations, Sample Survey of Military Personnel as of 31 August 1970, Survey Estimates of Participation in Army Crafts Program by Army Male Personnel, OPOPM Report No. 18-71-E, pp. 1-60.

50. Ibid., pp. 47-51.

51. Ibid., pp. 35-41.

52. Ibid., pp. 42-46.

CHAPTER IV

PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL FACTORS

In describing the dilemma of mobility for the corporate wife and family, Robert Seidenberg says:

> The human spirit thus needs a community in which character may grow, not wither--one that reinforces a person's grip on reality, not loosens it. The verity that humans are social animals implies scope and freedom of association . . . a family lives where the man can make a living, they say. True, first things first. But just as an infant can actually die if only its physical requirements are attended to, with its need for contact left unfilled, so an adult can disintegrate when deprived of community ties.[1]

The primary community ties for an Army member and his family have been traditionally linked to the post to which he is assigned. The transient nature of Army life has mitigated against establishment of the normal civilian ties. The Army post qualifies as a psycho-social community in that the personnel ordinarily share a common culture and practice a common way of life. The traditional Army post is certainly thought of as embodying the qualities of social solidarity and loyalty to the group which Coates and Pellegrin describe as being characteristic of the psycho-social community.[2]

It is the purpose of this chapter to examine those social and psychological factors that influence and affect the Army family. In this regard, the extent to which the traditional Army post community actually exists in today's highly mobile and interacting social environment will be addressed. Is the typical Army post

still a distinct social psychological entity that can be distinguished from its neighboring civilian community?

In discussing the psycho-social military community, Coates and Pellegrin suggest that the military base in today's society is more similar to the impersonal urban metropolis in its social characteristics than to the small village that the Army outpost once resembled. They suggest that one of the principal reasons for the weakening of the social cohesion of the post military community is the growing heterogeneity of the post population. Included in this heterogeneity are such factors as more varied racial and sexual composition, varied social backgrounds of military personnel and their dependents, and the influx of the large number of non-careerists with no previous acquaintance with the military culture. Additionally, the large number of civilian employees who are now members of the working post community have tended to dilute its exclusiveness.[3] With this increased civilian-military interaction and apparent loosening of the ties of the modern Army family to the post community, the key question appears to be, "What has or will be the impact on the family's way of life and psychological and social needs?"

PRIVACY

The above discussion notwithstanding, relative to its civilian counterpart, the family living on post is living in a "fish bowl." Every facet of activity is in view and subject to regulation. Rules range from dress code to curfew and affect each member of the family. Family matters become mixed with official matters, each having an

effect on the other. Freedom of action, individual pursuits, and any activity out of the ordinary is curtailed, prohibited, or restricted. The extent to which the regimented life of on-post living actually affects the Army family is open to debate. In an article entitled, "Runaways: Why do Your Children Leave Home," that appeared in Family magazine, Bill Treanor, the founder of the runaway house in Washington, DC, discusses the effects of on-post living on children.

> Look at the military base as a company town. It's one of the few remaining places in the country where the class system is worn on the sleeve. The kids all know their fathers' status. All the NCO's live together, all the officers live together. The kids all go to the same school, same church, shop in the same PX and Commissary. The parents all know each other, so there's intensive pressure to conform.
>
> What happens when a teenager refuses to conform? Say some Sergeant's kid lets his hair grow or smokes dope, or his daughter is caught sleeping with the Major's son. When the child deviates from the norm, it's not just a family problem like in a civilian family. It can be an employment problem. The Sergeant thinks: What will the Major think of ME? He cracks down on the kid, maybe harder than he would if it were just a family conflict and this accelerates the process of the kid's alienation from his family.[4]

Janowitz would not agree with this analysis because he contends that the stratification that once existed in the military community as a result of rank restrictions is now ambiguous, especially during off-duty relationships and attitudes.[5] Who is correct can only be determined by additional research regarding social interactions and attitudes.

However, it was the consensus of the research group that behavior may be governed by the whims of the military commander rather than the prevailing or preferred social norms. The role of the commander is very important. The consideration or lack of consideration he feels for family matters affects all phases of family life. This phenomenon requires more study to determine if command prerogatives should be changed, centralized or influenced to insure greater consideration of the family.

The family with the orientation that only the military member should be subject to regimen may be expected to thrive best in the civilian community. In the on-post family, disciplinary and domestic problems come to the attention of the military hierarchy and thus can have a potentially detrimental effect on the career of the military member. When the family is less integrated into the military community, such socially disapproved behaviors are less likely to come to the attention of military authorities. A social balance is thus sought by association with a civilian community rather than the more controlled on-post environment.

The speculations regarding privacy considered above tend to be supported by the results of a DA survey of married male military personnel conducted in 1966. The surveyed groups included both officers and enlisted men. Thirty-two percent of the officers and sixty-eight percent of the enlisted men surveyed expressed a preference for off-post housing. The most frequently cited reason for preferring off-post housing in all groups was privacy. This

feeling was especially strong among E-4's to E-6's and company grade officer (Lieutenants and Captains).[6]

SENSE OF COMMUNITY

The nostalgic view of yesterday's Army life for the family portrays a closely-knit community, a sharing of a common life-style, a comfortable feeling of belonging. This was perhaps true in the post-World War II Army and most certainly true in the pre-World War II establishment. As described by Coates and Pellegrin[7] and Morris Janowitz:[8]

> The realities of the profession pervaded family and social life, and, in turn the military community was comprehensively organized to assist family relations . . . Military wives spent their time with other military wives. Social life took place almost exclusively in the military community.

This type of institutionalized family living filled a need for the young couple which was in most cases away from home for the first time. The couple's expectations were that the closeness of the Army community would compensate for their departure from friends and relatives. The social changes which began with World War II did not end with the hostilities. A temporary retrenchment followed the war, but the Army did not return to its small pre-war size. Likewise, after the Korean War, a large force remained on active duty. Army post facilities and services simply could not support the lifestyle of the era of the 1930's. Housing was not sufficient to accommodate entire post populations, and large organizations with diverse missions rather than smaller, single

mission units became the norm. Relatively speaking the community fragmented; Army families did not have the sense of belonging; the sharing of a common lifestyle was lost to a degree. (It is interesting to note the reaction of an experienced service member from a large installation or the Pentagon while visiting a small post, where semblances of the former era remain even today. He can feel the decreased tension; he enjoys the calm orderliness; and yearns for halcyon days.) Perhaps some research is required regarding the size and characteristics of Army posts and the effect of these factors on the lifestyle of the military community.

In attempts to accommodate the larger force of the post-World War II era, many quarters were built, commissaries were expanded, new facilities were constructed. But the posts simply became bigger and "communities" did not jell in the traditional sense. And the Army, which expected the family to be a tension-reducing morale-building element, tended to undercut its own expectations by constant policy changes, unaccompanied tours, and a seeming indifference to family problems.

As bigness was compounded by the devastating turbulence of the Vietnam era, the Army reacted by instituting the Army Community Service Program in 1964. This program, whose prime objective is to establish a centrally located, responsive and recognizable service to provide information, assistance and guidance to members of the Army community in meeting personal and family problems, has not been effective but not pervasive. The full sense of community had not been recaptured.

One reason for this less than complete success has been the transference of large numbers of families to the civilian communities nearby the post complexes, where they have become partially assimilated in a different world. The paradox is that the family, which was tending to lose its identity on-post, became submerged off-post. This diluted an already strained sense of belonging. Loyalties were divided between neighborhood and installation. Frictions occurred because the family units were not fully socialized by either community and the post hierarchy could not control two communities--the installation and the civilian. In many areas a sense of truce, rather than cooperation, prevailed.

For a rift to develop between a community and a military installation nearby is not a new occurrence. If such a gap exists it has developed from centuries of preparation. A recent translation of a French article, presented in synopsis form in the Military Review, traces the rift in France back to the time of the Roman occupation. Communities today have evolved through tradition and stability. People whose families have lived in a community for generations tend to be a little wary of transients who have the potential of upsetting or ignoring custom. Thus, many military people feel rejected.

The French suggest there are many ways to improve the situation, with the burden falling on the military personnel and installation itself. Cited as helpful are: taking part in community relations, individual contact by military personnel interested in a particular sport or hobby, and more comprehensive

collaboration in church-related matters initiated by the installation chaplains.[9]

The community life program was conceived at Ft. Lewis, WA, with the idea of reducing, if not eliminating, anxieties, frustrations, and family problems. It was instituted in recognition of the fact that military life is transitory, challenging, controlled, and rewarding and that with each new assignment new knowledge is gained, old friends meet again, new and lasting friendships develop, and that the new experiences are of general benefit. However, some families may also feel anxiety, experience frustrations, or even have serious problems as a result of the change of stations.[10] It is significant to note that the Community Life Handbook, while describing services to all, is specifically keyed to the Ft. Lewis resident. Those who live in the surrounding communities appear to be virtually disregarded, even though they are the ones who probably most need the support.

For the American military family overseas a rather grim picture is painted by Eli M. Bower in his study entitled, American Children and Families in Overseas Communities.[11] According to Bower, the military community no longer provides a place to live and to work in which there is stability about rules, roles, and responsibilities. The phenomenon of "culture shock" is real and significant to families living overseas. American families have a difficult time making contact with persons in the host countries.

The host culture, if different to that to which the family is accustomed, when added to normal problems of living, threatens family

control of teenagers, especially if the adolescents are unhappy and dissatisfied. An adolescent in trouble often brings a whole family to a jarring economic and career crisis.[12] The result is often transfer of the sponsor and his family from the command.

Bower sums it up this way. What is most visible in military families can be summed up by the old adage about the rich getting richer and the poor, poorer. Those who come prepared to profit by the "wealth of the Indies," carry the wealth of the Indies home with them; those who are shocked by the culture, overwhelmed by the parade of small persistent irritations, and frightened by its opportunity for adventure, begin counting their days like a convict serving a jail sentence. In some cases, the additional strain weakens already enfeebled family bonds, and the proverbial straw effective against the backs of camels become equally potent in such families. Where there is a child of school age, the full impact of the family problem often becomes visible in the student's behavior and learning problem.[13]

Security

The front page of the March 16, 1974 edition of the Washington Post carries the tragic story of the slaying of Chief Master Sergeant Warren Quimby, United States Air Force. Sergeant Quimby was slain by a single shot during a $132 robbery at a 7-Eleven store just outside Andrews Air Force Base, Prince Georges County, Maryland, where he held a part-time civilian job. Mrs. Quimby's remarks following the tragedy best express the actual or perceived security

the average military installation offers. Mrs. Quimby said, "I know it sounds strange, but I don't understand the civilian world anymore. It's so violent." As Mrs. Quimby sat with five neighbors, all of whom had been neighbors and friends on various military posts across the country, one of the women said, "It's a different kind of life. You don't have to lock your door and worry all the time. It's like a small town wherever you go."[14]

There is by and large a sense of safety or security associated with on-post residence. To what degree this sense of security is real or imagined is difficult to measure. Just as all civilian communities are subject to a certain amount of disorder, crime, and delinquency, so also is every military installation. Local, comparisons of military installations with their surrounding communities can be made to measure the relative degree of security the post affords, but such comparisons are relatively meaningless because of major differences in geography, populations, controls, and the life. Whether an Army installation actually offers more security than its civilian community counterpart is not as important as the fact that it is generally perceived to offer better security. As Nancy Shea says, "While putting down roots comes under the heading of wishful thinking in the nomadic way of Army people, the regimental life at your first post will give you a feeling of security."[15]

Mobility

Every year 20 percent of the population of the United States moves to a different residence.[16] Relocation of the family has

become an American way-of-life. The US Bureau of the Census statistics regarding the approximately 40 million people who move each year provide some pertinent insights into overall mobility patterns which are useful in comparing the military situation to that of the civilian populace. For example, the great preponderance of moves by civilians are local in nature with 60 percent of the relocations occurring in the same county. Another 15 percent of the moves occur within the same state. In other words, only one-fourth of the moves are across state lines. The mobility of the civilian populace is actually local in character, as contrasted to the interstate and/or intercontinental nature of the mobility of Army members and their dependents. Mobility rates of the civilian population are generally linked to other factors, such as age (peak rates for these in their early twenties), class of work (wage and salary workers move more often than self-employed), education (college graduates move more often than non-graduates), and children (families with school-age children move more often than those without).[17] The rate of mobility for Army families is generally independent of these factors in that they move at generally the same rate throughout their period of service.

Service in the Army usually entails a minimum of two moves: one for accession and one for separation. The number of additional relocations made depends on many factors, a key variable being the presence or absence of a combat situation in which there is a specified tour length. Mobility varies widely between service members and according to grade, occupational specialty, length of

service, schools attended, and other factors. Moves, in addition to those accompanying accession and separation, fall generally into the categories of reassignments between units and posts (both overseas and in CONUS), operational moves as a part of unit reassignments, and moves for long-term schooling.

The total number of Permanent Change-of-Station (PCS) moves by Army personnel in fiscal year 1973 was approximately one million. The estimate for fiscal year 1974 is 851,000.[18] This is roughly an average of one move for each member of the Army each year. Although information is not available on the total number of family moves, if PCS moves are made generally without regard to family status, each family could be expected to move an average of once per year, based on current data. It must be recognized that this generalization is based on the inclusion of the accession and separation moves of all personnel entering or leaving the Army. Since accession and separation moves account for approximately one-half of the total, elimination of these moves from consideration would lead to the conclusion that approximately one-half of the Army members with family would move for other reasons during the two given years, or using another approach, that each Army family could be expected to move once during the two-year period 1973-1974.

This calculation is similar to the method normally used by Department of Army to measure personnel stabilization--the average tour length. The average tour length varies over time as a result of many factors; some are controllable by the Army, others are not. For example, the average tour length (in months) in Europe, the

major overseas non-combat assignment area, has varied during the last decade as shown in the following table.[19]

TABLE NO. 23--LENGTH OF TOURS IN EUROPE

	1965	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
Officer	32	24	23	22	24	28
Enlisted	27	19	18	16	17	21

The fact that Army families move frequently probably requires no further substantiation. However, the survey by LADYCOM magazine is of interest because it presents data from the wife's point of view. Fifty percent of the wives responding indicated they had moved more than seven times; 65 percent had moved six times or more. Gross averaging of the data contained in the answers to the questions related to moving reveals that the respondent group, representing approximately 17 thousand years of marriage, had moved a total of approximately 9,800 times or an average of once every 22 months.[20]

Do most Army families look forward to moving as an exciting new experience or do they dreasd it as an ordeal fraught with inconvenience and uncertainty? Just as there is no one Army family, there is no one consensus attitude regarding moves in the Army. For example, LADYCOM Survey showed differences of opinion about moves. Sixty-two percent said that the best thing about military life was that it provided a chance to travel and live in many places. On the other hand, thirty-eight percent said that frequent moving was a primary reason why military life puts extra pressures on marriage. Frequent moves were also cited by fifty-one

percent as the primary reason why military life puts extra pressures on a child growing up.[21]

The social and psychological effect of frequent moves on Army families is not clearly positive or negative. A review of the literature on the subject of the effects of moving on the military family reveals mixed conclusions. Some of the more pertinent studies and opinions on the positive side of the ledger are as follows. (Emphasis added by the Research Group.)

The Military Family — The Editors of Army, Navy, and Air Force Times

> No matter what the grade or rank of the military man there's a move in store every few years. And while there are some inconveniences in this nomadic way of life, the advantages, as many career service wives will quickly point out, soon outweigh them. Few careers offer the challenges--both in work and pleasure--of adjusting to new living quarters, new climates, new friends, and new social activities every few years.[22]

The Army Wife — Nancy Shea

> Orders always cause excitement even though they may have been anticipated and the move will be of a local nature. . . . It usually takes a few hours, sometimes a few days, to adjust one's self to orders that involve a change of station, but adjust you must. After the first shock you will learn to welcome orders and love a change of station which will involve meeting old friends and making new ones. You will enjoy learning the customs of different people, and in a short time you will be enough of a world traveler and cosmopolite to look at people not only with your eyes, but with your mind and heart as well.[23]

Honest Ma, Moving is Broadening — Dr. James Max Snyder
(A study comparing achievements of mobile and static high school seniors)

> The mobile group was found to be equal to the static group in achievement and perhaps slightly superior. In addition, there was evidence that the overall education of these mobile students had benefited as a result of travel and other factors associated with family moves . . . frequent changes of schools did not have an adverse influence on achievement of the children of mobile families.[24]

The Family Move--Its Psychological Effects on Children (Symposium)
Dr. Ralph Ojemann

> Cited his study of sixth graders which related academic experience to the number of moves the family had made. He found that "the results showed no significant difference among groups in academic achievement. The children of parents who have a positive attitude toward changing schools tend to adjust more readily."

Dr. F. Kuno Beller

> Conducted a study which indicated no significant differences in school performance and achievement among children in families who moved often and families who stayed in one place.[25]

Some examples of the negative school of thought regarding the effects of moving are:

Corporate Wives--Corporate Casualties — Dr. Robert Seidenberg

> Although there can be a great pride in dealing with and overcoming hardships, enthusiasm is not endless. A toll is eventually exacted. Evidence is mounting to substantiate the observation that moving in America has a deleterious effect, particularly on women.

Until recently we have accepted facile explanations and rationalizations of disintegrative behavior of spouses and children on the basis of inherent weakness or inferiority. Psychology most conveniently supplied the rhetoric--words like neurosis or psychosis--to hide inordinate stresses or injustices as a result of repeated uprooting in the name of progress and opportunity.

Children helpless to ruminate their feelings and frustrations were looked upon as behavior problems, prone to delinquency and drugs. Only the end results were perceived but none of the oppressions visited upon them by the life of nomadism imposed by otherwise well meaning corporations and fathers.[26]

Military Sociology — Coates and Pellegrin

The authors conclude that a number of family life problems are associated with the high rate of movement in the military. They point specifically to the monetary and social-psychological costs of military moves, emphasizing the requirement for children to become accustomed to giving up old friends and establishing new ones when each move occurs. Their contention is that even though the child of a military family gains in experience and associations from travel, the emotional problems associated with frequent movement are not compensated for.[27]

Psychiatry and the Army Brat — Victor R. Gonzales

The author agrees that, while in some instances family ties may be strengthened by repeated moves, there is little doubt that negative feelings within the family are reactivated in these moments of stress, in that each member of the family must adapt to his new niche in the community.[28]

Relocation in the Military: Alienation and Family Problems — Jerry Lavin McKain

One of the more pronounced environmental situational stresses encountered by modern

> families is geographic mobility. The military family, while no longer unique in this regard, is particularly susceptible to the potential stress of moving because of the frequency of their geographical changes.[29]

There appears to be general agreement that frequent moves have not been shown as having a degrading effect on the academic achievement of children. Conversely, there appears to be evidence that the likelihood of emotional problems does increase with frequent moving, for both wives and children. Unquestionably, more study is required in these areas, in that most work thus far has been limited in scope and in many cases, such as that of Nancy Shea and Allied Van Lines, has been developed from somewhat of an advocacy standpoint.

It is also possible to advance the hypothesis that the positive or negative effect on moving is largely determined by the stability and family life pattern existing in a static situation. While it can hardly be argued that moving does not place many unique stresses on the family, the ability to cope with the situation apparently depends on many factors. Raymond Marsh found a direct relation between a family's attitude toward moving and the amount of disruption suffered as a result of relocation--the better the attitude, the less disruption.[30] This theme pervades most dissertations on the subject. Patricia M. Barger, Chairman of the Allied Van Lines Symposium on The Family Move--Its Psychological Effects on Children sums it up as follows:

> One general theme ran through much of the discussion and presentation: It's not important when a family moves, but rather how it moves

> . . . The keys to successful relocation are the relationships within the family, the preparation in terms of making the child a part of the move rather than just an object to be moved, and the importance of a positive frame of mind for the individuals concerned.[31]

The consensus of the Research Group is that a significant reduction in the number of moves would have a postive psycho-social effect on Army families. Longer tours would enable the family to attain a greater sense of community and security and would subject it to the stress of dislocation less often. Even with a significant reduction, the opportunity for travel for those whose desire it would undoubtedly be available.

The Army has a constant and on-going effort to increase personnel stabilization and thus reduce PCS moves. Although the primary thrust of the effort is cost reduction, an associated decrease in the number of family disruptions as the result of moves would also accrue. Planned actions to decrease the number of moves, many of which are currently in effect, include establishment of:

1. Minimum tours of 24 months at CONUS posts, military needs permitting.

2. Minimum tours of twelve months for company commanders, twenty-four months for first sergeants and sergeants major.

3. Sixteen month tours at first station for unit-of-choice enlistees.

4. Restrictions on more than one PCS move per fiscal year.

5. Tour length goals in Europe of 32 months for officers and 27 months for enlisted personnel.

The number of PCS's has been on the decrease in the Army due in great part to the elimination of the Vietnam short tour. During the period 1970-1974 the number of PCS moves dropped by sixty-five percent compared to a drop of forty-three percent in Army man-years.[32]

Separation

An aspect of military life which has wide-ranging effects on the life of the Army family is that of separations of the father/husband from his wife and children. Of the many problems affecting the family of an Army member, perhaps the first mentioned and most discussed is separation. Surveys indicate that this is a key element of dissatisfaction to both husbands and wives in their attitudes toward Army life. A 1969 OPO Survey indicated that both 28 percent of the officers and 31 percent of the enlisted men state family separation is the most dissatisfying aspect of military life.[33] In more recent surveys (1972) of attitudes toward the volunteer Army officers and enlisted men rank family separation seventh out of a total of fifteen areas that need most improvement if the Army is to operate without a draft.[34]

The nature of mandatory family separation situations fall within the categories of unaccompanied overeseas tours (both combat and noncombat), temporary absences, and those associated with a waiting period (overseas or within the CONUS) for housing accomodations upon a change of duty station. For a period of

time, the Army referred to those assignments to which families were not authorized to accompany the sponsor as hardship tours and undesirable tours. Although these labels were officially removed, probably for cosmetic reasons, the fact remains that the "unaccompanied" tour places the Army family in its greatest situation of stress.

Voluntary separations occur when housing is not adequate at a new assignment location or when families are reluctant to remove children from school or even when wives return home (usually from overseas) because living costs are too high. Also, many separations occur when wives do not accompany their husbands to initial locations and even subsequent CONUS assignments because of financial or housing difficulties. Thus, while decisions for voluntary separation are not forced in these circumstances, they nonetheless result from conditions that are less than optimum.

Temporary absence of the Army member from his family is considered a routine phase of military service. The various types of temporary absence include field trips, other travel, maneuvers, and exercises. The term "temporary" generally indicates an absence of days or a few weeks; any absence beyond two months is considered prolonged and falls into the category of "separation." Conversations with many officers, their wives, and several sociologists indicate that temporary absences are not considered detrimental to most families unless they become too frequent or tend to extend over longer and longer periods

of time. In the main, temporary absences are not harmful and quite often can have a salutary effect on family harmony and relationships. The question of a dividing line between temporary absence and separation is open to debate and needs clarification by further research. Opinions vary, but the consensus thus far is that it is about two months. Interviews of POW and MIA wives support the contention that the first two months are the most difficult during a prolonged absence.[35] Temporary absences will not be discussed further, inasmuch as they represent only a peripheral aspect of the overall question of separation.

The number, nature, and duration of the periods of mandatory family separation varies widely in accordance with many factors, such as (1) the worldwide disposition of Army units, (2) the worldwide requirements for an individual's occupational specialty, (3) the amount of short-term schooling an individual receives, (4) and the type of units to which he is assigned. These are in addition to the obvious variable, the amount of time the individual is required to perform duty in the combat zone. The soldier who goes to war illustrates the most dramatic case, but except for the inherent physical dangers of war, the father's (or husband's) going to war is not necessarily the greatest problem from a family life standpoint.

The above variables notwithstanding, the fact remains that, since World War II, family separation has become a way of life to the Army family. Because of the many variables involved, statistics in regard to the number of separations could be

misleading. However, it is of interest to note that in the LAYDCOM Survey, 83 percent of the Army wives responding indicated that their husbands had been away from home for at least one period of three months or more. It should be noted that 21 percent of the wives indicated they had been married four years or less; this group undoubtedly contained many of those who had not been separated. Of those who had been separated, 43 percent had been separated two or three times, with an additional 25 percent indicating more than three extended periods of separation.[36]

The primary feature of separation is the universality of its impact; all family members are affected; all are active participants in the stressful situation. The children suffer from the lack of a father figure and everything that the lack entails. This deprivation goes beyond the obvious void of companionship and the curtailment of certain family activities. Indeed, many children develop serious psychological strains, especially in the early years. These difficulties often are not manifested until much later, when seemingly inexplicable behavior abnormalities crop up to the bewilderment of the parents. Some of these problems can be frightening when character disorders occur.[37]

The wife perhaps suffers most. She must shoulder many family responsibilities that previously were shared by her husband or fully accepted by the husband. She must bear these sometimes overwhelming burdens along, and in addition, substitute

for the father/husband in countless ways. She must assume all managerial functions, often made more difficult by policy or bureaucratic lapses on the part of the Army or by shortsightedness on the part of the father/husband in his preparations for the separation. For example, the lack of a power-of-attorney can be crucial, and the delay (or absence) of an allotment check devastating. In many areas, her role changes from that of an interested observer to complete operator. Some of these areas might be totally unfamiliar to her: financial management of household expenses, automotive and household repairs, medical and dental requirements, insurance, legal matters, and school or neighborhood athletics are but a sample. And, she might have to pursue these matters in a psychological void in that her companionship is limited to juveniles.

In addition to all these difficulties, the family's disruption is usually accompanied by a requirement to move because Army policy requires that families separated by orders for an unaccompanied tour vacate government quarters. Although many families elect to remain in the same general community as the post to which the member was assigned, disengagement from the supportive social network of the post is required to a great degree. For those families who elect to relocate to another area, the disengagement is virtually total. Thus, at a time of potentially greatest stress, the family is forced to sever itself from the military community which they have come to rely upon for help and assistance in time of stress. This is probably the most unique

aspect of Army family separation when compared to those of civilian occupations. Although the implications of a policy which would permit families of personnel serving unaccompanied tours to remain in government quarters, given the overall shortage of quarters, is obvious, mitigation of the problem of separation hinges on addressing this point.

A severe condition can develop when the waiting wife is cut off from the community. As the separation begins, she very well might seek anonymity in an attempt to increase her security, so that she would not become a "target" for opportunistic businesses, gossips and busybodies, and men seeking a love affair. Her "security" soon can turn into almost total isolation. Suspicious neighbors, especially wives, shun her as a "threat" to their own marriage relationships. Because she has selected a remote location for her "security," she is far removed from the Army community and cannot readily take advantage of those services. Younger wives suffer more than those with more experience in the Army; the latter are more likely to have friends and knowledge of available assistance and the ways of the world to offset the effects of isolation. The overall result of this social isolation can be devastating. The wife is completely alone, and feelings of helplessness can cause severe psychological difficulties.

Coupled with all these pressures, uncertainties and problems is the wife's own personal lack of a husband and companion. The sum total of her difficulties can produce fear, anxiety, worry,

uncertainty, loneliness apprehension, and even hopelessness. The member himself, although busily engaged in professional duties in the company of adults, is affected by the separation. Not only does he feel the deprivation, he is often concerned about his wife's ability to cope, whether his children can progress normally, and if all will be well upon his return.

One sociological premise is that the carrying out of the normal family functions is predicated on the existance of a well functioning family unit with a normal complement of parents. Although she is speaking specifically of Air Force families, Dr. Lindquist states the case well for all military families:

> In an era when partnership marriages are regarded by many in the United States as the type which can contribute most to individual development and satisfaction, the husband's proper role is seen as one of sharing with his wife the responsibility for determining family goals, for making major and long-time plans, and for the care and guidance of children. This role is often an impossible one even for those who desire to fulfill it. In some families the monthly allotment check has become the one important contribution by the husband on which the wife can count. The husband may want to assume other responsibilities, but they are often left to the wife on short notice as a result of transfers, TDY's, and special assignments.[38]

The ability of the family to cope with extended separation varies almost as widely as the composition and social and psychological make-up of each family. Two crucial variables appear to be the health of the family unit and the strength of the wife. Since it appears logical to assume that the Army will place no restrictions on family composition, e.g., number of children,

etc., the key question appears to be what can and should the Army do to mitigate against problems that result during the stressful separation periods.

CHAPTER IV

FOOTNOTES

1. Robert Seidenberg, M. D. Corporate Wives--Corporate Casualties, New York, AMACOM, 1973, p. 32.

2. Charles H. Coates and Roland J. Pellegrin. Military Sociology. New York, Random House, 1965, pp. 373-374.

3. Coates and Pellegrin, op. cit., p. 380.

4. Marianne Lester, "Why Do Your Children Leave Home?" Family Magazine, Washington, D. C., Army Times Publishing Company, 2 May 1973.

5. Morris Janowitz, The Professional Soldier, New York, The Free Press, 1966, pp. 178-179.

6. DA Survey of Married Male Military Personnel, OPOSS Report Number 52-66-E.

7. Coates and Pellegrin, op. cit., pp. 378 and 379.

8. Morris Janowitz, The Professional Solier, New York, The Free Press, 1971, Chapter 9.

9. CPT A. Huyon, "The Military in the Community, or, Relations Between a Town and Its Garrison." Forces Armees Francaises. November, 1973, Synopsis in May 1974 issue of Military Review, USACGSC, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

10. Jerry L. McKain, Feelings of Alienation, Geographical Mobility and Army Family Problems: An Extension of Theory. Doctoral Dissertation. The Catholic University of America, 1969. See also Community Life Handbook, 9th Infantry Division and Fort Lewis, Washington, 25 July 1973.

11. Eli M. Bower, Ed.D. American Children and Families in Overseas Communities." American Journal of Ortho Psychiatry, Vol. 37, No. 4, 1967, pp. 787-796.

12. Ibid., p. 791.

13. Ibid., p. 792.

14. The Washington Post (Washington, D.C.) Page 1 and Page 4, 16 March 1974, by Bill Richards, Staff Reporter.

15. Nancy Shea, The Army Wife, New York, Harper and Row, 1966, p. 72.

16. US Congress, Senate, Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Children and Youth of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, American Families, Trends and Pressures, 1973, pp. 58-65.

17. Ibid.

18. US Congress, House of Representatives, Hearing Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Department of Defense Appropriations for 1974, 6 June 1973, pp. 110-111.

19. Ibid.

20. "Tell Us About You," LADYCOM, October 1973.

21. Ibid.

22. The Editors of Army Times, Navy Times, and Air Force Times, The Military Family, Washington: Army Times Publishing Co., 1968.

23. Nancy Shea, op. cit., pp. 209-210.

24. James Max Snyder, "Honest, Ma, Moving is Broadening," The Army Digest August 1968.

25. Dr. Ralph Ojemann and Dr. E. Kuno Beller, Reports at a Symposium on the Effects Change of Environment on a Child, Chicago, IL, 13-14 February 1970.

26. Robert Seidenberg, op. cit.

27. Charles H. Coates and Roland J. Pellegrin, Military Sociology, University Park, MD, The Social Science Press, 1965.

28. Victor R. Gonzalez, Psychiatry and the Army Brat, Springfield, IL, Charles C. Thomas, 1970, pp. 38-40.

29. Jerry Lavin McKain, "Relocation in the Military: Alienation and Family Problems, Journal of Marriage and Family, May 1974.

30. Raymond N. Marsh, Family Disruption During the Moving Process, Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Brandeis University, 1970.

31. Patricia M. Barger, Remarks made at Symposium on the Effects of Change of Environment on a Child, Chicago, IL, 13-14 February 1970.

32. US Congress, House of Representatives, Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Department of Defense Appropriations for 1974, pp. 394-395.

33. Department of the Army, OPOPM Report Number 52-69-E. Survey Estimate of Satisfying and Dissatisfying Aspects of Military Life as Indicated by Army Officers and Enlisted Men, 1969.

34. Department of the Army, DAPO-PMP Report Number 18-72-E. Survey Estimates of Opinions and Attitudes Towards Volunteer Army, 1972. Also, DAPC-PMP Report Number 28-72-E. Survey Estimate of Career Plans of Male Officers and Factors Affecting Retention, 1973.

35. Conversation with Edna J. Hunter, Ph.D. US Navy Neuro-psychiatric Research Unit, San Diego, California. Dr. Hunter conducted many interviews of POW and MIA wives in her work at the Center for POW Studies.

36. LADYCOM Survey, op. cit.

37. Thomas L. Trunnell, M.D. A Review of Studies of the Psycho-social Significance of the Absent Father, August 1968. See also: Montalvo, Frank Flares. Family Separation in the Army: A Study of the Problems Encountered and the Caretaking Resources Used by Career Army Families Undergoing Military Separation. Doctoral Dissertation for the University of Southern California, 1968. Darnauer, Paul Frederick. The Adolescent Experience in Career Army Families. Doctoral Dissertation for the University of Southern California, 1970.

38. Ruth Lindquist, Marriage and Family Life of Officers and Airmen in a Strategic Air Command Wing. Technical Report No. 5, Air Force Base Project, Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, October 1972, p. 17.

CHAPTER V

INFLUENCE ON RETENTION

INFLUENCE OF MARITAL STATUS ON RETENTION

Faced with increased manpower replacement costs and enlistment assession problems, the retention of trained individuals becomes paramount in today's peacetime Army. In view of the substantial rise in the percent of enlisted men who are married (29.7% in 1952 vs. 52.6% in 1972), marriage and family relationships are likely to have increasingly important impacts on retention. The Army of the 70's must recognize that over half of the enlisted male population and nearly two-thirds (72.9%) of the first three grades of commissioned officers are married.[1] Genuine concern at all levels as to the well being of the family will have far reaching implications on the success or failure of the all volunteer force.

This chapter will discuss the impact of certain aspects of Army family life on retention and, where appropriate offer recommendations for consideration.

MARITAL STATUS BY RACE COMPOSITION

Recent surveys indicate that the percentage of black enlisted men who are married is almost identical to the corresponding percentage of white enlisted men. The same similarity is not true in the officer corps: black officers are somewhat less likely to be married (78.2%) than white officers (85.6%).[2]

Preceding page blank

Overall retention rates of black enlisted men has consistently run higher than rates for whites. It is very possible that the black married enlisted man feels more satisfied with his "quality of life" in the Army relative to his perceptions of civilian life and therefore opts for a Service career. For enlisted men in mixed marriages, Charles Moskos suggests in his book, The American Enlisted Man, that it is probable that avoidance of the problems associated with mixed marriages in civilian life is an important reason behind many decisions to remain in the armed forces. Moskos further suggests that the tensions that racially mixed marriages provoke in the American community at large are much less evident in the more racially equalitarian setting of military life.[3] Specific data as to how prevalent interracial marriages exist among Army personnel is not available; therefore, retention rates among this group cannot be determined. Further surveys in this area are required before the hypothesis of Moskos can be judged.

The lower rate of marriage among black officers in the Army compared to white officers can possibly be explained by differences in the economic situation between the two races, prior to entry on active duty. A majority of officers enter the Army through the ROTC program. The black student enrolled in ROTC may be more limited in monetary resources than his white counterpart, thereby precluding any opportunity to undertake the extra financial burden of marriage. The college educated black officer has become increasingly difficult to retain on active duty due to the tremendous

demand for his talents in the civilian labor market. Thus the majority of black officers are precluded from marriage during the period of ROTC training and once a member of the Army, even if married, only serve on active duty the minimum time required before joining the civilian labor force. Perhaps another contributing cause for the high loss rate stems from a hostile attitude toward military life by the wife of the junior black officer. She may feel a lack of personnel acceptance for herself and her children among the social establishment of the officers corps. On the other hand, there appears to be general acceptance of the wife and children of the black enlisted man among the enlisted ranks.

It appears that present policies directed toward equal rights are effective as evidenced by the retention rates of married black enlisted men. The high loss rate of the junior black officer continues to be a serious problem. The primary cause may be pressure on the civilian industry to hire blacks in greater numbers, and until their goal is reached, the demand for the black officer will continue. Additional research is needed to prove or disprove these hypotheses to determine (1) Why is civilian life more attractive to such a large number of black officers and perhaps their families,and (2) What can be done by the Army to retain these individuals ?

THE WIFE'S ROLE IN CAREER ADVANCEMENT

Traditionally, the military officer's wife has been conspicuously involved in the career of her husband. The Army social community

has been organized so that family relations supported the husband in performance of his duty and his aspirations for advancement. Conflicts between family and career obligations were held to an absolute minimum. Although not an official publication of the Department of Army, Nancy Shea's The Army Wife was accepted as a basic textbook for the Army wife. The introduction in her book is an indication of the career-supporting role of the Army wife and has been regarded as normative for many years:

> As a wife you have a most important role in your husband's Army career. It does not matter whether he is an enlisted man, noncommissioned officer, warrant officer, or commissioned officer. . . . Although no serviceman's career was ever made by his wife, many have been hindered or helped by the social skills of their wives, their flexibility, and their loyalty toward the Army and its customs. . . . In your new role as an Army wife you must understand that your husband's duty will come first--before you, before your children, before his parents, and before his personal desires and ambitions.[4]

Thus, the traditional military community molded family life to the requirements of the profession. The military family has been deeply involved in military tradition As Maurine Clark, the wife of General Mark Clark, wrote in her autobiography:

> Life on an Army post in peacetime gives the Army wife far more opportunity and probably more obligation to help her husband in his career than most wives find in civilian life. The reasons are fairly obvious. The Army post is something like a company town. Everybody is working for the same outfit. The people the wife sees at night are the people her husband works with or for. It is quite common for the wife to call the ranking officer by his first name, while her husband must address him by his rank or title.[5]

Jobs that are likely to lead to career advancement act as a magnet for military members seeking upward mobility, resulting in frequent moves to places where such jobs are available and considerations for the well-being of the family are secondary. As a result, families are dragged along as an appendage for one of those "it's just a year, honey" jobs. As a general rule the above is more applicable to officers than enlisted men although the enlisted ranks do share in this experience.

A wife well versed in social amenities and active in community functions can make a positive contribution to a member's career by projecting a strong "team" image. This is particularly true in the senior officer and enlisted grades. Similarly, a member's career can be damaged when family interests and family problems conflict with expected conduct. Additional research is needed to verify this assertion, but the general belief among careerists is that the family plays an important role in the career advancement of the servicemember. Although not typical of all promotion boards, an example which tends to support this belief is the instructions given to the BG Selection Board, which announced its findings in May 1974. The Board's guidance was as follows:

> . . . wives should be considered in the promotion selection. A wife is not a prime consideration, but give some weight to the wife's ability to help her husband. Lack of a wife should not be a hindrance. Likewise, if a wife is a burden solely because of infirmities, that should not be a consideration. If a wife is a probable embarrassment, that should be a consideration.[6]

Family relations and the role of the family in contemporary military life may not adhere so closely to these rigid requirements as they did in the traditional Army. The emergence of Women's Liberation and the emphasis on equal rights and freedoms is undoubtedly affecting military tradition with regard to the role of the wife and family. Contrary to a popular belief, the Army is not totally isolated from the changes occurring in contemporary society. The real question regards the degree to which the traditional role has changed and the degree of change that is compatible with the Army's operational requirements. Do today's commanders recognize the changing attitudes in contemporary society, and are their expectations concerning the role of the military family compatible with the "real world"?

While no military study specifically answers the above question, there is a substantial amount of research which demonstrates the changes which are likely to have an impact on Army family life. For example, a recent survey of 660 women conducted by Social Research Incorporated concluded that after decades of being one of the most stable, unchanging groups in American society, wives of working class men are emerging as a new social, political, and economic force in today's world. Among the more dramatic manifestations of their changing attitudes are:

a. A new desire for independence coupled with a new interest in community and jobs.

b. A desire for fewer children.

c. A new interest in herself as a person rather than as an instrument for the care of family and home.[7]

Results such as these cause one to wonder how the 1974 Army wife would react to Nancy Shea's advice and counsel, and what effect opposition to the traditional role of the wife has on retention. Does the "mandatory" tea or luncheon turn off today's wife and serve to drive the family from the service? Is it practical to tell today's Army wife that her husband's "duty" comes first before herself and her children? Are new values required both in the form of advice and practice? Deep-rooted traditions, some of which stem from directives, must be examined in light of today's changing social norms. Research is needed on the influence of these role conceptions on retention and on ways in which the family and career demands of military personnel can be satisfied.

EFFECTS OF RECEPTION ON RETENTION

Data previously outlined in Chapter II reveals the number of married enlisted men in the lower three grades has steadily increased over the past eight years. Moreover the volunteer enlisted man has consistently married in greater numbers, even in the lower grades, in comparison to his draftee counterpart. Therefore, if this trend continues, the percentage of married enlisted men as of May 1973 (51.9%)[8] will increase. If unmarried personnel cannot be attracted in sufficient numbers, the Army must be ready to acknowledge this new makeup of its population and be prepared to change or initiate policies affecting the retention of the young family. It is important to remember that this is probably the first time this young wife has

been away from the security of her extended family and lifelong friends. It is also probably her first attempt to set up and run a home. The reception and assistance she receives is critical at this point. The young military wife will remember whether this transition was smooth or traumatic and how she was received into Army life. The sincerity and quality of this reception will play a major role at the time a career decision is made. The Army must remember that retention begins with reception.

Research is needed to determine what types of policies and programs affect the adjustment of young wives to Army life and their attitudes toward the Army and how these factors affect the retention of their husbands.

RETENTION AS AFFECTED BY PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS

There are three bases of influences that cause a man to stay with an organization or produce with an organization. These are:

1. Normative influence--that it would be moral and right. The activity agrees with your values.

2. Calculative influence--has remunerative effects--he works because he gets paid. He will get certain benefits if he reenlists.

3. Coercive influence--if he doesn't do the job he will be court martialed and put in jail.

Normative influence results in the highest commitment and is first learned in the family environment. Calculative influence is effective as long as the service person is paid and benefits are obvious. Coercive influence results in resentment and is least desirable.

These types of influence follow the hypothesis of Dr. Max Wever the noted sociologist, who wrote the protestant ethic, (a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, or hard work is its own reward) has high normative aspects. Military life is considered arduous without high financial renumeration. Based on the fact that 63.7[9] percent of all military personnel are Protestant one can hypothesize that perhaps a greater number of military people remain in the service or join in the first place because they believe "it's the right thing to do," or put another way, "because of duty, honor, and country," than one is led to believe by current surveys.

A survey was conducted for the Navy by the Institute of Social Research of the University of Michigan between November 1972 and February 1973. In the portion of the questionnaire dealing with values, preferences and perceptions concerning military service, the results show that enlistment and reenlistment are heavily influenced by deep-rooted perceptions and ideology related to the military. It further found that ". . . it does not require years and years of service experience for later-term enlisted men to develop the strongly pro-military attitudes noted earlier."[10]

In another survey conducted by the Navy, recruits were asked their reasons for joining. Thirty-two percent choose the most positive end of the answer scale "yes a lot" when asked "Did wanting to serve your country have anything to do with making up your mind to join the Navy?"[11]

In a recent Department of the Army quarterly survey, using intent to reenlist as the dependent variable, the opinion most highly correlated was that a "strong Army was necessary" which indicates normative aspects are important to the individual soldier. This is substantiated by the relationship between belief that a strong Army is necessary and a man's willingness to commit himself to a military career.[12] The important discovery in their three surveys is that deeply rooted perceptions favorable to the military were found.

If "Duty, Honor and Country" emerges as a prominent factor affecting enlistment and retention as it appears to be doing, greater emphasis on the subject throughout the recruiting and reenlistment programs should be undertaken.

Further research is required to determine to what extent the family influences the Service member by placing them in a setting conducive to normative behavior patterns.

HOUSING

The statement made by Mr. Melvin Laird, then Secretary of Defense in his FY 72 posture statement succinctly states the opinions held by this research group at this time. He said:

> We should be reducing the inherent personal and family hardship of military service life by providing among other things . . . adequate housing for all personnel without discrimination . . . I feel strongly that we must increase our efforts to upgrade housing conditions for military personnel. The provision of satisfactory housing for our servicemen and their families is a key factor in career motivation and retention and contributes substantially to improving morale within our armed forces.[13]

Providing adequate housing raises many corollary questions. Just how important is adequate and economical housing to the morale and retention of the Service person? Is more post housing the answer or should the housing allowance be increased to allow the Service person the flexibility to rent or buy the type of home he wants where he wants it? Or should our housing policies be reversed to allow the younger officer and enlisted person a better chance at quarters? Should we depend on government-leased housing? How about the E-5, E-6 or O-3 who is ordered to a high cost area such as Washington, D.C.? Maybe we should provide these Service people with an extra allowance to make their service in that area less burdensome financially. Could a system of military co-ops, organized and operated by military members, achieve the desired result of providing adequate economical housing?

Perhaps new and innovative approaches to the problem of housing need to be explored. For example, we believe that most military members can afford to make a house payment; however, many are forced to rent quarters in high-cost living areas or areas where no government quarters are available simply because they cannot produce the funds required for a down payment. If it is possible at all, raising a down payment depletes the serviceman's entire savings, and often drives him to accept housing he does not want or to accept a second mortgage at exorbitant interest rates simply to meet his families' housing needs. Perhaps a revolving fund could be established which would be available to active duty

prospective homeowners at a small interest or service charge. The fund would provide the down payment and closing costs required with the maximum amount established perhaps by grade and time in service. The loan would be due and payable to the fund when the sponsor no longer uses the home as his primary residence or when separated from active duty.

This is simply one of many possible solutions to the problem that, in our judgment, will play a far greater role in career attractiveness and retention as family separations decline with the reduction of our overseas commitments particularly in Southeast Asia. Housing should be given its proper place on the scale of priorities. More positive action, including further study and surveys, are required which explicitly determine the views of Army personnel and their families toward housing if we are to entice and keep the quality of personnel we must have to make the Volunteer Army a success.

MOBILITY

In every article, study or survey done on the Army family, geographic mobility is identified as being one of the most disruptive aspects to the Army family system. A recent survey of officer and enlisted wives shows that over 50 percent of the nearly 1800 Army wives surveyed have moved more than seven times since they were married.[14] These figures are particularly significant when one considers that over 1200 of the women surveyed were under 35 years of age.

When asked, "Do you think military life puts extra pressures on a marriage?" more than 90 percent of the Army wives surveyed responded in the

affirmative. Of these, over 37 percent listed frequent moves as the primary reason.[15]

Although other surveys have shown frequent moves (mobility) further down on the scale of dislikes of Army personnel and/or families, moving impacts on other areas of the social and psychological well-being of the Army family. These may include: family separation associated with the move, changing jobs, living in different climates, moving household goods, disruption of wives' careers, disrupting children's education, making new friends (which implies separation from those friends made at the old duty station), and disruption of the serviceman's education.

There are many alternative solutions to the problems created by frequent geographical mobility. Perhaps the social and psychological well-being of the family could be improved by reducing moves through the adoption of a system similar to the regimental system used successfully for many years by the British Army. A system of home-basing which is similar to the British system would allow the young officer or enlisted man up to two or three years after entering active duty to designate his home unit or base from a Department of the Army list of available assignments. Once assigned to such a unit the individual would be reasonably assured of remaining in that unit or on that post throughout his career. If it became necessary to assign him to an overseas tour area, he would again be reasonably assured of returning to his home base.

There are of course disadvantages to a system of homebasing. Perhaps the foremost is that not all personnel will want to be home-based. Those servicemen not desiring such assignment could be

assigned in the usual rotational manner. From this group it might be possible to meet our overseas requirements particularly if significant overseas troop reductions occur. If this is not possible, individual or unit assignments from homebased units could be made. Other objections to homebasing could include an increased bookkeeping system in the Officer and Enlisted Personnel Directorates (OPD and EPD), a possible increase in job stagnation and a possible tendency for Army personnel to make their military careers subordinate to outside interests. Additionally, it must be recognized that should the homebased family be required to move after a lengthy period of stability the traumatic affect could be magnified.

Regardless of the disadvantages inherent in homebasing, we believe it might offer a workable alternative for the Service person who places a great deal of emphasis on those social and psychological factors of family life associated with stability. Further research is required to determine if homebasing is a viable solution to the problem of mobility and to what extent stability of the family affects retention.

SEPARATION

The Army as an institution has shown genuine interest in the problems of the Service member during reassignment, but little attention is given to family considerations. Policy, born of operational necessity, concentrates on the movement and assignment of the member. There is little, if any, focus on the impact of the separation upon the family. The Schilling Manor program at Fort Riley during the

Vietnam War was a notable exception in providing housing and community services to waiting families. To what degree this program resulted from compassionate concern is unknown. However, regardless of the motivations, the experiment was very well received by the families it helped. Planners need to investigate the possibility of similar, permanent programs. As a minimum, complete legal and financial briefings and assistance should be provided the wife (or primary next of kin) before the member departs. Other information is vital also, and the full range of community services available should be explained. Housing may never be available, but assistance and advice should be provided to the maximum extent possible. It may be that housing policies could be liberalized to allow the waiting families to remain in quarters for an extended period, if not for the full tour, in order, for example, to allow the children to finish the school year.

The salient point is that during separation the focus of attention should, in large measure, shift to the family. If this requires additional staffing of community services activities and more funds to provide better service, the cost would be well worth it. Under the present system, there are important social costs. In addition, there are financial losses (including training costs) associated with personnel leaving the Army because of family considerations.

A secondary point is that the Army system and the family system are not incompatible. The all-volunteer concept requires that the compatibility be strengthened so that conflicting loyalties can be eliminated. If

the member and his family are convinced that the Army truly cares about the separation problem and is doing as much as it can to assist, the resultant feeling, and the decreased problems associated with separation, would work wonders for recruiting and retention.

An often overlooked phenomenon is that separation problems do not end when the member returns. The readjustment of the whole family can be quite a difficult and lengthy process. The member must reenter the family and resume his role. The wife may be asked to relinquish certain of her roles, and she might be reluctant to do so. The children must evaluate and accept the changes and the new patterns. Reunion can be as difficult as separation. Army planners should consider this aspect of the problem also and develop assignment and leave policies so that the member is not thrust into a professional stress situation or forced to move to an undesired station unnecessarily. Perhaps leave should be required for returnees. Perhaps returnees should be granted a form of assignment preference priority.

The entire range of community services should be examined to determine what additional assistance is needed by Army families both before and during separations. A number of policy or even statutory changes could be made to ease the burden of separation. Future research should address how various policies alter the abilities of Army families to cope with separations and the extent to which retention of Army personnel is affected.

CHAPTER V

FOOTNOTES

1. Department of the Army, Selected Demographic Trends 1952-1972, DAPC-PMP Report No. 50-73E.

2. Department of the Army, DAPC-PMP, Survey No. 4-74.

3. Charles C. Moskos, Jr., The American Enlisted Man, (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970), p. 97.

4. Nancy Shea, The Army Wife, New York: Harper & Row, 1966, p. 1.

5. Maurine Clark, Captain's Bride, General's Lady, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956, p. 265.

6. Army Times, 15 May 1974, p. 2.

7. "Study Finds Wives Become New Force," New York Times, 5 November 1973, p. 27.

8. Department of the Army, DAPC-PMP, Survey No. 49-73E.

9. Army Personnel Composite, Office of Personnel Operations, Personnel Management Development Office, Department of the Army, Washington, DC, Report No. 29-73E, p. 29.

10. Values, Preferences and Perceptions Concerning Military Service, Michigan University Ann Arbor Institute for Social Research, June 1973, Executive Summary, p. 5.

11. Personnel Reactions to Incentives, Naval Conditions, and Experiences (PRINCE), Demographic and Background Information, Expectations, Attitudes, Values, and Motivations of New Recruits, September 1971, Naval Personnel Research and Development Laboratory, p. 11.

12. Department of the Army Human Readiness Report for the Last Half of Fiscal Year 1974 indicated that in a survey of over 13,000 enlisted men that investigated the relationship among several attitudinal variables, the belief that a strong Army was necessary correlated most highly with the dependent variable of intent to reenlist. Other variables include such things as job satisfaction and presumed quality of life.

13. Study of the Military Family Housing Program. Assistant Secretary of Defense, Program Analysis and Evaluation, Department of Defense, Washington, DC, 17 April 1974, p. 10.

14. "A Survey of Military Wives," conducted by LADYCOM magazine, 1973, Table 5.

15. Ibid., Table 12.

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS

This study has identified the following areas as needing additional research and/or study.

1. Social Characteristics of Army Families.

2. Benefits and facilities provided to Army families.

3. Social and psychological factors that affect Army families.

4. Influences of the family on retention.

5. There is no single agency to coordinate services provided and research efforts concerned with Army families.

6. Families of female personnel in the Army.

Conclusions

The Army is a society that parallels civilian society in general. Neither the Army nor civilian society is static; both change constantly in their attitudes and compositions. Institutions are increasingly confronted by the individual and collective demands of society for improvements in the quality of life as an end in itself and not merely as an adjunct to larger goals. The impatience of society with the institutional rate of change has led to dissatisfaction, discontent, and the desire for more personalized attention by institutions to restore a feeling of humaness to the individual. The Army as an institution must be aware of the changing social attitudes of its members and must increase its efforts to improve the quality of life of its members.

It is our hypothesis that happier families would materially improve the retention of first term enlisted and officer personnel. Concomitantly, the improved image of the Army as a good community for family life should improve future acquisitions.

Recommendations

1. That follow-on studies be conducted in the areas identified as needing additional research.

2. That a single agency should be established to coordinate all efforts in the area of family life so that redundant efforts can be eliminated and more meaningful results obtained.

3. That more publicity be given to the advantages of family life in the Army and that the Army seek to improve its image, especially with the lower ranking enlisted personnel, as an institution concerned with Army families.

Bibliography

1. Department of Defense. Report Bibliography. "Family Life in the Army." Defense Documentation Center, Defense Supply Agency, Alexandria, November 1973.

2. Pitzer, Ronald L. (ed). Family Life Literature and Films: An Annotated Bibliography. University of Minnesoat, 1951.

3. Straus, Murray A. and Susanne C. Graham. Marriage and Family Living. The National Council on Family Relations, Menasha, Wisconsin, 1963.

4. US Army. Bibliography of Reports Military Personnel Surveys, US Army, 1965-1973. 2d ed. Office of Personnel Operations, Personnel Management Development Office, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1973.

Books

5. Army Times Publishing (eds.) 1974 Military Facts Book, Washington: Army Times Publishing Co., 1974.

6. Clark, Macine. Captains Bride, Generals Lady. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

7. Coates, Charles H., and Roland J. Pellegrin. Military Sociology. University Park: The Social Science Press, 1965.

8. Gonzales, Victor R. Psychiatry and the Army Brat. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1970.

9. Goode, William V., Elizabeth Hopkins, and Helen M. McClure. Social Systems and Family Patterns. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1971.

10. Editors of Army Times, Navy Times, and Air Force Times. The Military Family. Washington: Army Times Publishing Co., 1968.

11. Hanis, Thomas A. Counseling the Serviceman and His Family. Philadelphia, Fortess Press, 1966.

12. Hill, Reuben. Families Under Stress. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

13. Janowitz, Morris. The Professional Soldier. New York: The Free Press, 1960.

14. Lang, Kurt. Military Institutions and the Sociology of War. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1972.

15. Little, Roger W. (ed.) A Survey of Military Institutions. The Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society, Inc., 1969.

16. Little, Roger W. (ed.). Handbook of Military Institution. Beverly Hills: Saga Publications, 1971.

17. Marmion, Harry A. The Case Against a Volunteer Army. Chicago: Quadrangle Books,Inc., 1971.

18. Moskos, Charles C. Jr., The American Enlisted Man. Beverly Hills: Russel Sage Foundation, 1970.

19. Packard, Vance, A Nation of Strangers. New York: David McKay Company, 1972.

20. _____, The Sexual Wilderness. New York: David McKay Company, 1968.

21. Redfield, Robert. The Folk Culture of Yucatan. Chicago: The University Press, 1941.

22. Ryan, John J. Selling Armed Forces Exchanges and Commissaries. New York: Enterprise Books, 1968.

23. Shea, Nancy. The Army Wife. 4th ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

24. Seidenberg, Robert. Corporate Wives--Corporate Casualties. New York: American Management Association, 1973.

25. Weber, Max. The Sociology of Religion. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

26. Wolf, Charlotte. Garrison Community. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Corporation, 1969.

Periodicals

27. "Alaska Housing." Soldiers, June 1974.

28. Anderson, Leland V., "The Family Growth Group: Guidelines for an Emerging Means of Strengthening Families." The Family Coordinator, Vol. 23, No. 1, (January 1974), pp. 7-12.

29. "Assignment Washington: To Buy or Not to Buy." Family, Army Times Publishing Co., Washington, D.C., May 8, 1974.

30. Bower, Eli M., "American Children and Families in Overseas Communities," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 37, No. 4, (1967), pp. 787-796.

31. Buckley, James, "The Equal Rights Amendment," Vital Speeches, Vol. XXXVII, No. 16, (June 1972), pp. 493-496.

32. "Callaway Proposes Boost in Kin Housing," Army Times, February 27, 1974.

33. Carney, Larry, "Kin Win Job Priority in USAREUR," Army Times, October 31, 1973.

34. Dell, Nat, "Toward a Professional Army," Soldier, Vol. 28, No. 8, (August 1973), pp. 9-10.

35. "Davison Hits Housing Lack," Army Times, March 13, 1974.

36. Druss, Richard G., "Foreign Marriages in the Military," Psychiatrics Quarterly, Vol. 39, No. 2, (1965), pp. 220-226.

37. Dullea, Georgia, "Help for Nuclear Families: It's Called a Cocoon or a Cluster," The New York Times, May 1, 1974, p. 64M.

38. Duvall, Evelyn M., "Loneliness and the Serviceman's Wife. Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 7, (1945), pp. 77-81.

39. Editorial, The Journal of Pastoral Care, Vol XXVII, 1, (March 1974), p. 1.

40. "Family Housing Construction to Drop Sharply," Army Times, May 22, 1974, p. 8.

41. "For Military Wives Only," LADYCOM, October 1973, pp. 25-31.

42. Francis, Allan, and Leonard Gale, "Family Structure and Treatment in the Military," Journal of Family Study Research and Treatment, Vol. 12, No. 2, (1973), pp. 171-178.

43. Glick, Paul C., "Family Status of Men of Military Age," American Sociological Review, Vol. 8, (1943), pp. 157-163.

44. Halloran, Barney, "Changing Life Styles," Soldiers, February 1974, pp. 12-18.

45. Hartog, Joseph, "Group Therapy with Psychotic and Borderline Military Wives," American Journal of Psychiatry, 122, (April 1966), pp. 1125-1131.

46. Housing: 51,000 E-4's Eligible to Get Post Quarters, Army Times, May 29, 1974, pp. 1 and 18.

47. Huyon A., "The Military in the Community, or, Relations Between a Town and its Garrison," Forces Armies Francaise, November 1973, Synopsis, Military Review, Fort Leavenworth, May 1974.

48. Jones, Ray, "'Ignored' Army Wife Takes on Military Establishment," The Evening Sentinel, Carlisle, PA.

49. Kavanaugh, Mildred, "Coffees, Teas, But Without Me!" Family, Supplement of Army Times, August 1, 1973, pp. 5-7.

50. Kenny, James A., "The Child in the Military Community," Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, Vol. 16, No. 1, (1967), pp. 51-63.

51. LeBlanc, Rena D., "Mayor Alioto's Wife: Why I Really Ran Away," Ladies Home journal, May 1974, p. 62.

52. Lester, Marianne, "Runaways: Why Do Your Children Leave Home?" Family, Army Times, May 2, 1973.

53. Litwak, Eugene, "Occupational Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion," American Sociological Review, Vol. 25, (1960), pp. 9-21.

54. "Living Cost Rise Faster Than Usual," Army Times, February 6, 1974.

55. MacIntosh, Houston, "Separation Problems in Military Wives," American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 125, No. 2, (August 1968), pp. 260-265.

56. "Med Care Project Beginning," Army Times, February 20, 1974.

57. "Modernization Hits High Gear, Europe Life Brightens," Army Times, May 22, 1974.

58. Moskos, Charles C. Jr., "The Emergent Army," Parameters, US Army War College, Vol IV, No. 1, (1974), pp. 17-30.

59. "One Giant Leap for Womankind," Time, April 3, 1972, pp. 16-17.

60. Pope, Leroy, "Executive Wife is 'Headache' to Business," The Evening News, Harrisburg, PA, April 29, 1974, p. 21.

61. "Problems of Executive Wives," US News and World Report, February 18, 1974, pp. 80-83.

62. Religious News Service Dispatch, The Week in Religion, May 10, 1974.

63. Richards, Bill, "Shot Shatters Peaceful Military Life," Washington Post, March 16, 1974, p. 1.

64. Russell, Mary, "GI Family Hospital Cost Rise," Washington Post, 1 January 1974.

65. Saltin, Dana B., and John K. Biller, "The Ecology of Child Abuse Within a Military Community," American Journal Orthopsychiatry, July 1971, pp. 675-678.

66. Schmench, Harol M., Jr., "Birth Fertility Rates at a New Low in US," New York Times, April 16, 1974, p. 1.

67. Seplin, Celia Derene, "Abstracts of Theses," Smith College Studies in Social Work, Vol. 22, No. 2, (February 1952), pp. 123-124.

68. Snyder, James M., "Honest Ma, Moving is Broadening," The Army Digest, August, 1968.

69. "Social Organization in the Army," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 51, (1946), pp. 365-370.

70. Spencer, Duncan, "The Price of Today's Army," Washington Star-News, May 3, 1974, p. 1.

71. "Study Finds Wives Become New Force," New York Times, November 5, 1973, p. 27.

72. United Press International Dispatch, "Happy Family Life Said Top Ranking Goal," The Evening Sentinel, Carlisle, PA, May 7, 1974, p. 26.

73. Wilbur, Richard S., "Military Departments Must Provide Top Health Services," Commander's Digest, Vol. 15, No. 2, (January 1972), p. 5.

74. "Wives Work to Stay in Germany," Army Times, October 10, 1973.

Government Publications

75. US Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Department of Defense. Department of Defense Appropriations for 1974. Hearing. 93d Cong., 1st Sess., June 6, 1973. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973.

76. US Congress - Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Children and Youth. American Families, Trends and Pressures. Hearing, 93d Congress, 1st Session, June 6, 1973. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1973.

77. US Department of Commerce. US Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States--1973. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1974.

78. US Department of the Army - "Annual Historical Summary," Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1973.

79. US Department of the Army - Army Personnel Composite, US Army Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1973. Report number 29-73E.

80. US Department of the Army - Army Personnel Composite, US Army Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1973. report number 4-74E, 30 November 1973.

81. US Department of the Army - "Army Tasks for the Seventies," A Study done for the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 1972.

82. US Department of the Army - "Community Life Handbook." Headquarters 9th Infantry Division and Fort Lewis, Fort Lewis, 1973.

83. US Department of the Army - "Department of the Army Human Readiness Report for the Last Half of Fiscal Year, 1974." Office of the Deputy Chief of Personnel, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1974.

84. US Department of the Army - "Housing for the Military." A Study for the Secretary of the Army, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C. , April 1967.

85. US Department of the Army - "Low Income and Military Families." Back-up Support Paper 1/93, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel -36. Office of the Deputy Chief of Operations, Personnel Service Support Division, Department of the Army, Washington, D.D., 1973.

86. US Department of the Army - "Army Social Work Current Trends." Fitzsimmons General Hospital, Colorado, 1970.

87. US Department of the Army - Pamphlet No. 165-7. Our Moral Heritage. Washington, D.C., Department of the Army, 30 October 1970.

88. US Department of the Army - Pamphlet No. 165-11. Human Self-Development. Washington, D.C., Department of the Army, 30 June 1972.

89. US Department of the Army - "Post Information." Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1974.

90. US Department of the Army - Regulation No. 210-50. Installations Family Housing Management. Washington, D.C., Department of the Army, January 1971.

91. US Department of the Army - Regulation No. 608-1. Army Community Services. Washington, D.C., Department of Army, 15 November 1973.

92. US Department of the Army. "A Survey of Attitudes of First Term Soldiers Toward Reenlistment," conducted by Wyatt, Dale, and Samual Zuckerkandel of Ayer and Son, Inc., 1973.

93. US Department of the Army, Selected Demographic Trends 1952-1972, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1973. Report Number 50-73-E.

94. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimates of Marital Status and Dependents of Army Male Personnel. US Army Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1972. Report number 12-72-E.

95. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimates of Marital Status and Dependents of Army Male Personnel, US Army Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1973. Report number 49-73-E.

96. US Department of the Army - Survey of Married Male Military Personnel Concerning Family Housing. Office of Personnel Operations, Standards and Systems Office, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1966. Report number 52-66-E.

97. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimates of Officers' Wives' Satisfaction with Army Life as Expressed by Officers. Office of Personnel Operations, Personnel Management Development Office, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1969. Report number 44-69-E.

98. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimates of Opinions on the Army Special Services Program. US Army Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1972. Report number 1-73-E.

99. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimates of Opinions and Attitudes Towards Volunteer Army. Office of Personnel Operations, Personnel Management Development Office, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1971. Report number 18-72-E.

100. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimate of Opinion on Enlisted Men's Service Clubs in the Army. Office of Personnel Operations, Personnel Management Development Office, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1970. Report number 7-71-E.

101. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimate of Opinions on the Image of the Army, as Expressed by Army Male Personnel. Office of Personnel Operations, Personnel Management Development Office, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1972, Report number 7-72-E.

102. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimate of Participation in Army Crafts Program, by Army Male Personnel. Office of Personnel Operatons, Personnel Management Development Office, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1971. Report number 18-71-E.

103. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimate of Attendance at Military Theaters and Opinions on Least Desirable Features. US Army Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, DA, Washington, D.C., 1972, Report number 7-73-E.

104. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimate of Attitudes Toward the Army Out-Patient Care Facilities as Expressed by Army Male Personnel for Themselves and Their Dependents. US Army Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1973. Report number 48-73-E.

105. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimate of Attitudes Toward Serving All Tours in Continental United States (CONUS) at One Location. US Army Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1973. Report number 36-73-E.

106. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimate of Career Plans of Male Officers and Factors Affecting Retention. US Army Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1972. Report number 28-73-E.

107. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimate of Dependent and Off-Duty Employment of Army Personnel. Office of Personnel Operations, Personnel Management Development Office, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1971. Report number 53-71-E.

108. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimate of Influence of Unaccompanied Tours (Hardship Areas) Frequency of Moves and Tour Length. US Army Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., Report number 40-73-E., 1973.

109. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimate of Kinds of Quarters Family Occupies and Attitude of Army Male Personnel Toward Housing Options. US Army Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1973. Report number 41-73-E.

110. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimates of Marital Status and Dependents of Army Male Personnel. Office of Personnel Operations, Personnel Management Development Office, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1967. Report number 2-68-E.

111. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimates of Marital Status and Dependents of Army Male Personnel. Office of Personnel Operations, Personnel Management Development Office, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1968. Report number 26-68-E.

112. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimates of Marital Status and Dependents of Army Male Personnel. Office of Personnel Operations, Department of the Army, Personnel Management Development Office, Washington, D.C., 1969. Report number 27-69-E.

113. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimate of Satisfying and Dissatisfying Aspects of Military Life as Indicated by Army Officers and Enlisted Men. Office of Personnel Operations, Personnel Management Development Office, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1969. Report Number 52-69-E.

114. US Department of the Army - Survey Estimate of Retention of Army Personnel. Office of Personnel Operations, Personnel Management Development Office, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1969. Report number 45-69-E.

115. US Department of the Army - Survey of Factors Relating to the Retention of Junior Officers. US Army Military Personnel Center, Personnel Management Development Directorate, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1973. Report number 4-73-E.

116. US Department of the Army - Survey of Installation Commanders Concerning Family Housing. Office of Personnel Operations, Standards and Systems Office, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1966.

_____. "Survey of Married Male Short-Tour Returnees." Office of Personnel Operations, Standards and Systems Office, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., 1966.

117. Department of Defense - "Attitudes of Youth toward Military Service: Results of National Surveys Conducted in May 1971, November 1971, and June 1972," by Allan H. Fisher, Jr., for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Officers), Alexandria; Human Resources Organization, 1972.

118. Department of Defense - "Relief Agencies for Service Families." Information Guidance Series, No. 84-55, Washington, D.C., Defense Printing Plant, 1974.

119. Department of Defense - Selected Manpower Statistics, Washington, D.C., Defense Printing Plant, 1973.

120. Department of Defense - "A Study of Military Family Housing." Joint Office Secretary of Defense/Service Task Force, Washington, D.C., Defense Printing Plant, 1974.

121. US Department of the Navy - "Navy Wives' Perception of Conditions of Navy Life." Naval Personnel Research and Development Laboratory, Washington, D.C., March 1971.

122. US Department of the Navy - "Personnel Reactions to Incentives, Naval Conditions and Experiences (Prince) Demographic and Background Information, Expectations, Attitudes, Values and New Recruits." Naval Personnel Research and Development Laboratory, Development of the Navy, Washington, D.C., 1971.

123. US Department of the Navy. "Values, Preferences, and Perceptions Concerning Military Service." Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1973.

124. US President (Nixon). Report to the President White House Conference on Children. Superintendent of Documents. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

Unpublished Works

125. Barger, Patricia M. Remarks made at Symposium on the Effects of Change of Environment on a Child, Chicago, IL, February 13-14, 1970.

126. Belt, John A., and Arthur B. Sweeney. "The Air Force Wife: Her Knowledge of and Attitudes Toward the Air Force." Paper prepared for presentation at The Military Testing Association Conference on "Human Resources--Growing Demands," San Antonio, Texas, 1973.

127. Becke, Merrell S., "A Comparative Study of the Level of Social Maturity of Military Dependent and Nonmilitary Dependent Adolescents." Unpublished Masters thesis, Stetson University, 1973.

128. Blockberger, Charles W. "Military Families: Differential Life Styles." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of California, 1970.

129. Boggan, Edgar E. "Army-Civilian Community Relations: A Guide for Civic Leaders." Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Florida, 1956.

130. Brown, Frederick J. "Social Responsibilities of the Army." Unpublished Research paper, the National War College, Washington, D.C., 1971.

131. Cantrell, George K. "Trends in Aircrew Attitudes and Job Satisfaction: Wives' Report." Unpublished Report, US Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine, Aerospace Medical Division, Brooks Air Force Base, 1968.

132. Darnauer, Paul F. "The Adolescent Experience in Career Army Families." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Southern California, 1970.

133. Finlayson, Elizabeth M. "A Study of the Wife of an Army Officer: Her Academic and Career Preparation, Her Current Employment and Volunteer Services." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, George Washington University, Washington, D.C., 1969.

134. Goldern, Harold R. "Housing and the Military Family." Unpublished Research paper, US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 1972.

135. Habeck, Edgar V. "Anomie and Resocialization of the Military Offender." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1969.

136. Holz, Robert F., Carol Keegan, and David R. Segal. "The Quality of Life in the Volunteer Army." Paper prepared for presentation at the American Association of Public Opinion Research, 1974.

137. Kelly, Orris E. "Changing Values." Unpublished Research Paper. US Army War College, 1973.

138. Lindquist, Ruth. "Marriage and Family Life of Officers and Airmen in a Strategic Air Command Wing." Technical Report No. 5, Air Force Base Project, Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, October, 1972, p. 17.

139. Marsh, Raymond M. "Family Disruptions During the Moving Process." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Brandeis University, 1970.

140. McCubbin, Hamilton I., Edna J. Hunter, and Philip J. Metres. "Family Adaptation to the Prisoner of War and Missing in Action Experience: An Overview." Unpublished Study, Center for Prisoner of War Studies, Navy Medical Neuropsychiatric Research Unit. San Diego, 1973.

141. McKain, Jerry L. "Feelings of Alienation, Geographical Mobility, and Army Family Problems: On Extention of Theory." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, National Catholic School of Social Services, Washington, D.C., 1969.

142. Military Wives Survey - LADYCOM to be published in future issues.

143. Montalvo, Frank F. "Family Separation in the Army: A Study of the Problems Encountered and the Caretaking Resources Used by Career Army Families Undergoing Military Separation." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Southern California, 1968.

144. Myles, Donald A. "A Survey of Community Services Centers: Welfare Problems, Services, Personnel and Resources." Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, National Catholic School of Social Services, Washington, D.C., 1970.

145. Ojemann, Ralph and Beller, E. Kuno. Reports at a Symposium on the Effects of Environment on a Child, Chicago, IL, February 13-14, 1970.

146. Segal, David R., John Blair, Frank Newport, and Susan Stephens. "Convergence and Interdependence at the Civil-Military Interface." Paper presented at the International Studies Association, March, 1973, New York.

147. Spellman, Beth W., Jr. "Orientations Toward Problem Solving Among Career Military Families: A Study of the Knowledge of Available Resources in a Military Community and Perception of the Social Cost of Using them for the Resolution of Family Conflict." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Columbia University, 1965.

148. Sullivan, William K. "The Attitudes of a Group of Military Dependent High School Students Toward Frequent Moves as Determined in the Carlisle Area." Unpublished Research Paper, Shippensburg State College, 1973.

149. "Suburban Teens: Their Problems and Needs." A report prepared by Social Research, Inc. for Palatine Township Youth Committee, Palatine, Illinois, 1971.

150. Sweney, Arthur B., Gray Z. Hughes, and Leslie A. Fietchner. "Projective Measures of Interpersonal Relationships and Attitudes Toward the Air Force." Proposed paper for A.P.A. Convention, Center for Human Appraisal, Wichita State University, 1974.

151. System Development Corporation. Analysis of MVA/VOLAR Actions Impact on Soldiers' Attitudes Toward the Army and on Retention. Santa Monica, Vol 1 and Vol 2, 1972.

152. Trunnell, Thomas L. "A Review of Studies of the Psychosocial Significance of the Absent Father." Paper presented to Psychiatrist Association Meeting, August 1968; obtained through the US Navy Neuropsychiatric Research Unit, San Diego, California.

153. "Working-Class Women in a Changing World," - a Report by Social Research, Inc. for MacFadden-Bartell Corporation, NY, 1973.

Other Sources

154. Reports - FHA-In-Service Home Loans. Washington, D.C., Army Times Publishing Company, 1966.

A P P E N D I X I

INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED

INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED

The following is a listing of individuals consulted in the preparation of this research paper. Institutional affiliations are shown for individuals from the academic community; military grades are given for officers, active and retired; departmental affiliations are given for civilian governmental officials.

Adams, Bodie
Colonel
Office of the Surgeon General
Department of the Army

Bainbridge, Hazel
Sergeants Major Academy
Ft. Bliss, Texas

Bauman, Roger C.
Captain
William Beaumont Army Hospital
El Paso, Texas

Carrol, Bart
Major
Office of Judge Advocate General
Department of the Army

Dahl, Barbara
US Navy Neuropsychiatric Research Unit
San Diego, California

Darnauer, Paul F.
Lieutenant Colonel
Office of Surgeon General
Department of the Army

Drach, William
Army Times Publishing Co.

Eckelbarger, Donald E.
Lieutenant Colonel
Ft. Sill, Oklahoma

Hardin, Frank
Human Research Laboratory
Department of the Air Force

Hersh, C. M.
Office of Deputy Chief of Staff (Personnel)
Department of the Army

Hoy, Pat III
Major
Assistant DPCA Personnel and Community Activities
Ft. Sill, Oklahoma

Hunter, Edna J.
US Navy Neuropsychiatric Research Unit
San Diego, California

Johnson, Kermit D.
Chaplain (COL)
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania

Ketchersid, Corbin W.
Chaplain (COL)
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania

Kriete, Charles
Chaplain (COL)
Office of the Chief of Chaplains

Libby, Billy W.
Chaplain (MAJ)
US Army Chaplain Board
Department of the Army

Marsh, Roy M.
Lieutenant Colonel
Office of Deputy Chief of Staff (Personnel)
Department of the Army

McCubbin, Hamilton
Captain, MSC, USA
US Navy Neuropsychiatric Research Unit
San Diego, California

Merrill, William
Colonel
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)
Department of the Army

Messing, J. B.
Chaplain (COL)
Ft. Bliss, Texas

Morgan, Patricia
Service Wife
Carlisle, Pennsylvania

Morrison, James L.
University of North Carolina

Mowery, Elaine
US Navy Neuropsychiatric Research Unit
San Diego, California

Needle, Steve
Captain
Office of the Judge Advocate
Department of the Army

Olsmith, Edward
Lieutenant Cclonel
Office of the Inspector General
Department of the Army

Phillips, Robert L.
Major
Office of Deputy Chief of Staff (Personnel)
Department of the Army

Perkins, Andy
Lieutenant Colonel
Office of Deputy Chief of Staff (Personnel)
Department of the Army

Plag, John
US Navy Neuropsychiatric Research Unit
San Diego, California

Rooth, Richard
Colonel
Army Research Institute
Department of the Army

Rupp, James
Captain
Office of the Judge Advocate General
Department of the Army

Schillo, Edward C.
Captain
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania

Shapiro, Roger
National Institute of Mental Health
Bethesda, Maryland

Smalley,
Major
Military Personnel Center
Department of the Army

Stanward,
Lieutenant Colonel
Office, Deputy Chief of Staff (Personnel)
Department of the Army

Stumpf, Susan
US Navy Personnel Research and Development Center
San Diego, California

Sweney, Arthur B.
Wichita State University

Trone, Fred
Major
Military Personnel Center
Department of the Army

Williams, John
Lieutenant Colonel
US Air Force Academy

Williams, M. W.
Colonel
Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff (Personnel)
Department of the Army

Young, Robert
Colonel
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)
Department of the Army