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MARITAL AND JOB SATISFACTION AND RETENTION IN THE ARMY

The Army family has been paid relatively scant attention in past military research, particularly in research concerning potential problems facing Army families. According to Farrish et al. (1976)

Only recently has the military family been perceived as an appropriate, meaningful, and fruitful area of research and investigation. Due to the relative novelty of the topic, research on the military family has suffered from non-proliferation of reports, difficulty in locating existing reports, and the subsequent isolation of existing reports.

Possibly one reason for the lack of research is the relatively small percentage of married personnel in the Army in the past. In 1952 only 36 percent of Army personnel were married. By 1963 only 43 percent of Army personnel were married. But by November 1975 more than 57 percent (57.2) of all Army personnel were married. The percentage married for each of the officer and enlisted paygrades for November 1975 is presented in Table 1.

The fact that many soldiers now have family responsibilities as well as Army responsibilities suggests that promotion and maintenance of family harmony among Army families should act to promote job satisfaction and high levels of job performance among the soldiers from these families. In addition, Bennett et al. (1974) have suggested that family harmony will be positively associated with a desire to remain in the Army. However, while these propositions seem intuitively obvious, they have not received sufficient empirical testing. There is some evidence that family problems are related to both AWOL and desertion from the Army (Bell and Houston, 1976; Hartnagel, 1974). In addition, several family-related variables have been shown to affect the intention of soldiers to remain in the Army. Among these variables are frequency of permanent change of station (PCS) moves, separation from family, medical benefits, and wife's opinion of the Army (U.S. Army, 1971).

---

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., September 1976.

1952 was the earliest period for which we were able to obtain figures on marital status despite a number of searches through various statistical sources.

The figures from 1952 and 1963 were obtained from Bennett et al. (1974).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioned officer(^a)</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant Officer(^b)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Data were obtained from MILPERCENT Master Tape File, November 1975.

\(^a\)Data are not available for General officers.

\(^b\)Data are not available for Warrant officers by paygrade.
While these studies suggest that family life is influential over certain aspects of Army attitudes and behavior (retention and delinquency), there is apparently no evidence relating measures of family harmony to job satisfaction and the performance of the routine duties required by the soldiers' MOS.

A second important question regarding the Army family is what aspects of Army life actually produce family disharmony or promote family harmony. This question has received some attention (US Army, 1969; Vineberg and Taylor, 1972) and several areas have been uncovered. These include medical and dental care, separation from family, frequent PCS moves, and housing, among others.

One possible limitation of these studies is that they have used fixed alternative items to determine family problems. That is, they present the respondents with a list of areas of Army life and ask them to rate these areas as satisfying or dissatisfying. This technique, therefore, restricts the areas of Army life which can be identified as satisfying or dissatisfying.

A third question concerning Army families is how the simultaneous experience of living within both the context of the Army and the context of the family affects a soldier's job performance and job satisfaction.

These three questions regarding the Army family can be represented pictorially as in Figure 1. Essentially, Question 1 addresses path c, the relationship between family life and satisfaction with and performance of Army duties.

![Figure 1: Pictoral Representation Of Questions Regarding Army Families](image-url)
Question 2 seeks to determine path a (1) identifying the particular aspects of Army experience which have perceptible impact on family life and (2) measuring the strength of this impact. Question 3 looks at the interaction effects of Army experience and family life on job satisfaction and performance (paths a x c), along with the direct effect of Army experience on satisfaction and performance (path b).

The purpose of this paper is to provide some preliminary data bearing on the Model in Figure 1. The data presented here derive from two studies. The first study was designed to identify those aspects of Army life which soldiers say are either satisfying or dissatisfying to them vis-a-vis their family life. The second study was geared to measure the relationships among Army experiences, marital satisfaction, satisfaction with military duties, and intention to remain in the Army.

STUDY 1:
Method for Determining Satisfying and Dissatisfying Aspects of Army Life

The sample for this study consisted of 116 Army personnel who were either currently or previously married while in the Army. The respondents were from Forts Lewis, Dix, and Polk. The respondents were selected so as to obtain equal numbers of males and females, officers and enlisted, and whites and non-whites. However, due to the limited number of married females at these installations, particularly non-white females, we were unable to obtain equal numbers of males and females or whites and non-whites. The sample consisted of 77 males and 39 females, 72 white and 42 non-white, 63 officers and 53 enlisted.3

The data were gathered by means of personal interviews conducted with the respondents during September 1975. The interviewers were Army personnel matched to the respondents on the basis of rank, sex, and race. The interviewers were trained in group sessions of approximately one hour.

The interview schedule consisted of three parts. The first part was open-ended and asked the respondents to name any problems or advantages they felt the Army held for them in terms of their relationship with their spouse and in terms of raising their children (if they had any). The second part of the schedule asked the respondents to comment on certain aspects of Army life which have been suggested in previous literature as possibly disruptive or beneficial to family life. The items included in this part were separation from family, PCS moves, recreational facilities, medical and dental care, and financial benefits.

3Due to missing data the number of males and females and of whites and non-whites do not total 116.
The third section virtually echoed the first section and asked the respondents to list the three most beneficial and the three most detrimental aspects of Army life in terms of their relationship with their spouses and their children.

Results of Study 1

Table 7 presents the 10 areas of Army life which the respondents most frequently listed as either beneficial or disruptive to family life. These findings are taken from the open-ended sections (sections 1 and 3) of the interview schedule.

MOS-related factors were the most frequently mentioned area of disruption. The majority of complaints about MOS centered around duty hours. Respondents felt that their hours were too long, too irregular, or too uncertain. They claimed that problems centering around duty hours either prevented them from making plans with their families or interrupted plans which already had been scheduled.

Separation from family and PCS moves were the next most frequently mentioned disruptive factors. Interestingly, one person saw benefits to separation. He felt that his separation from his wife afforded her the opportunity to be independent, a trait he valued in her.

PCS moves were listed as disruptive and beneficial by equal numbers of respondents. Some respondents listed PCS moves simultaneously as beneficial and disruptive. The main benefits attached to PCS moves were the ability to travel and see new geographical locations, and the opportunity to meet new people, particularly those of different social and ethnic backgrounds. The main liability accruing from PCS moves was the disruption caused to spouse and children by uprooting them and moving to a new location.

The single most satisfying aspect of the Army experience (in terms of frequency of endorsement) was financial. The majority of respondents who were satisfied with the financial aspect named things such as job security, number and size of fringe benefits, and/or base pay as among the satisfying portions of the financial conditions derived from the Army. A few respondents were dissatisfied with their financial condition in the Army. Their two main concerns were declining benefits and low base pay.

Housing was viewed as both good and bad by almost equal numbers of respondents. Among the main complaints lodged against housing were the lack of on-post facilities, the congestion and lack of privacy associated with on-post housing, and the high cost of off-post housing coupled with the inadequacy of the basic allowance for quarters (BAQ) to help defer this cost.
Table 2

Percent of Respondents Naming Selected Aspects of Army Life, as Disruptive or Beneficial to Family Harmony
(N=116)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disruptive</th>
<th>Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOS-related*</td>
<td>59.5 (n9)b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>50.9 (59)</td>
<td>0.9 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>25.9 (30)</td>
<td>24.1 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial c</td>
<td>11.2 (13)</td>
<td>62.9 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>11.2 (13)</td>
<td>10.3 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory social events</td>
<td>9.5 (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and Dental care</td>
<td>6.9 (8)</td>
<td>44.8 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>4.3 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational facilities</td>
<td>2.6 (3)</td>
<td>9.5 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the opposite sex</td>
<td>2.6 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This category includes comments by the respondents such as "extra duties," "needless or meaningless work," "uncertain work schedule," and "long duty hours."

bFigure in parentheses is the actual number of respondents naming that category.

cThis category includes such responses as "base pay," "retirement benefits," "PX and commissary privileges," and other general responses like "benefits," "job security," and "economic considerations."
The last five items in Table 2 received some mention as dissatisfying or disruptive to family life, although only a small portion of the sample (less than 10 percent) felt adversely affected by these problems. One of these five items, medical and dental care, was listed by nearly half the respondents (44.8 percent) as a satisfying aspect of Army life. Only the financial aspect was perceived by more respondents as a satisfying aspect of Army life than medical and dental care. The complaints which a few respondents leveled at Army health care were (1) long waits (up to four hours) for emergency and regular care, (2) insensitivity of the medical staff to patient problems, and (3) the elimination of dental benefits to dependents.

Many of the satisfying and dissatisfying aspects of Army life uncovered here are similar to those obtained in previous research offering a measure of reliability for these findings. For example, a 1969 MILPERCEN study found both officers and enlisted personnel naming separations from family as the most dissatisfying aspect of Army life. With regard to PCS moves, a Ladycom (1973) study of military wives found, as evidenced here, a split in opinion. Of the wives 62 percent said that the best thing about Army life was the mobility, while 38 percent said that moving was a primary reason why the military puts extra pressures on marriages.

Concerning medical and dental care, a 1972 study 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 action in the Health Care category is considerably greater for married personnel than for single personnel" (Systems Development Corporation).

A 1971 MILPERCEN study identified inadequate or non-existent child care facilities as a deterrent to wives of military personnel seeking employment to relieve financial pressures on the family.

STUDY 2:
Army Experiences, Marital Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction, and Retention

While the preceding data illuminate the problems and benefits Army personnel see accruing to them and their families from their Army experience, the data cannot tell to what extent these Army experiences actually promote or disrupt family harmony. To accomplish this, a questionnaire was designed to assess soldiers' experiences in these 10 areas of Army life in addition to their job satisfaction, marital satisfaction and intention to remain in the Army. The questionnaire was administered to 215 soldiers at Forts Hood and Riley in February and March 1976.

The sample consisted of 112 males and 100 females, 83 commissioned officers, 14 warrant officers, and 117 enlisted personnel. With regard
to race, 158 were white, 35 black, and 15 were from other racial/ethnic origins. All the respondents were either currently married or had been previously in their Army career.

The data gathered by this effort allow an opportunity to provide some specification of the model presented in Figure 1. The model to be tested here is presented in Figure 2. The model portrays selected background and family characteristics of the respondents affecting both how they experience the Army and their marital and job satisfaction and intention to remain in the Army.

Army experiences are also depicted as influencing job satisfaction, marital satisfaction, and retention. Job and marital satisfaction are depicted as related to one another but no causal ordering is predicted. Both of these variables are posited to affect intention to remain in the Army.

Variable Operationalizations

Background and family characteristics

SEX $x_1$—Coded 0 if male, 1 if female

RANK $x_2$—Coded 0 if commissioned officer, 1 if warrant officer, 2 if enlisted.

Length of Marriage (YRSMARR) $x_3$—Coded 1=1 year, 2=2 years, 3=3 to 6 years, 4=7 to 10 years, 5=11 to 14 years, 6=15 to 18 years, 7=19 to 22 years, and 8=23 years or more.

Number of children (#CHIL) $x_4$—Coded as number of children.

Army experience variables

MOS-related factors—This variable was measured by three items.

Primary MOS (PMOS) $x_5$—Coded 0 if respondent is not working in his/her primary MOS, 1 if respondent is working in his/her primary MOS.

Hours worked per week (#HOURS) $x_6$—Coded 0=20 hours, 1=21 to 30 hours, 2=31 to 40 hours, 3=41 to 45 hours, 4=46 to 50 hours, 5=51 to 55 hours, 6=55 to 60 hours, 7=60 to 65 hours, 8=65 or more hours.

Knowledge of duty hours (KNOWHRS) $x_7$—Coded 0 if respondent knows weekly work schedule no more than one or two days in advance, 1 if respondent knows schedule about one week in advance, coded 2 if respondent knows schedule at least one month in advance.
FIGURE 2. Basic Model
Separation from family (SEP) $x_8$—Coded as the number of separations from family during Army career which were thirty days in duration or greater. Since this variable is so highly related to time spent in the Army, the number of separations were divided by length of Army service (in months) in order to afford some control for the effects of time spent in the Army.

PCS moves (PCS) $x_9$—coded as the number of PCS moves with family during Army career. This variable was also divided by time spent in the Army.

ECONOMIC $x_{10}$—This is the average score on a six-item scale measuring the respondents' satisfaction with base pay, housing allowance, PX and commissary privileges, along with the respondents' perceived ability of their income to meet family expenses and the respondents' estimate of whether their economic situation would be better or worse as a civilian. Low scores on this scale indicate low satisfaction with one's economic condition. Scale reliability as measured by alpha is .69.

HOUSING $x_{11}$—This is the average score on a six-item scale measuring the respondents' general satisfaction with housing, satisfaction with the size of the rooms in their quarters, satisfaction toward quality of construction, toward heating and cooling, and the size of the house in terms of number of rooms. Low scores on this scale indicate low satisfaction with housing. Alpha for this scale is .68.

Mandatory social events (SOCIAL) $x_{12}$—This variable measures the frequency with which the respondents feel they are required to attend social functions in order to advance their military careers. Coded 0=once a week, 1=once every two weeks, 2=once every three weeks, 3=once a month, 4=once every three months, 5=once every six months, 6=once a year, 7=less than once a year, 8=never.

Medical and dental care (HEALTH) $x_{13}$—This is the average score on a six-item scale measuring the respondents' satisfaction with the dental care they receive, satisfaction with the medical care they and their families receive at both the Army clinic and the hospital, satisfaction with the quality of the medical staff and medical facilities, and the estimated amount of time they are required to wait for medical attention if they have no appointment. Alpha for this scale is .69.
Child care (CC) \(x_{14}\)--Coded on a scale from low to high satisfaction with the most frequently used type of child care.

Recreational facilities (REC) \(x_{15}\)--This is the average score on a six-item scale measuring the respondents' frequency of using recreational facilities, and satisfaction with Army recreational facilities for men, women, and dependents. Alpha for this scale is .52.

Treatment of females (TREATOPPSEX) \(x_{16}\)--This was operationalized by the question "I am called offensive or obscene names by members of the opposite sex." It was coded on a 5-point scale from almost always to never.

Primary endogenous variables

Marital satisfaction (MARSAT) \(y_1\)--This is the sum of a 7-item scale obtained from Campbell et al. (1975). Low scores reflect low marital satisfaction. Alpha for this scale is .84.

Job satisfaction (JOBSAT) \(y_2\)--This is the sum of 11 items comprising the Military Work Role Scale (Bauer et al., 1977). Low scores on this scale reflect low job satisfaction. Alpha for this scale is .89.

Intention to remain in the Army (RETENTION) \(y_3\)--Coded 0 if respondent plans to leave Army after current tour, 1 if respondent plans to stay at least one more tour, 2 if respondent plans to stay in the Army until retirement. Respondents who were undecided about their future career plans were excluded from the analysis.

Solutions to the Model

Theoretically all the potentially satisfying and dissatisfying aspects of Army life can be seen as related to marital and job satisfaction and retention. Arguments also can be made linking the four demographic and background characteristics to each of the Army experience variables and the primary endogenous variables. In order to uncover the more important variables, a stepwise multiple regression was performed estimating each of the experience variables (excluding child care and recreation)\(^4\) regressed on the four background variables and each of the primary endogenous variables regressed on all of the background and experience variables\(^5\).

\(^4\) Child care was excluded from the analysis since fewer than 100 persons expressed an opinion about the quality of child care facilities. The recreation scale was excluded due to its low reliability.

\(^5\) The specific equations solved were:

(continued)
Table 3 presents the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the variables subjected to the stepwise regression.

Since in order to estimate the equations completed data were required on all variables in the equations, 80 cases were eliminated, reducing the sample size to 135. The sample for this model consisted of 78 males and 57 females, 59 commissioned officers, 10 warrant officers, and 66 enlisted personnel. With regard to racial/ethnic composition, 106 were white, 17 black, and 12 were from other racial/ethnic backgrounds. The median number of years married for the respondents was 3 to 6 years.

The variables which were significant in each equation at or below the .10 level were retained, and the resulting equations were estimated using

\[ y_1 = b_0 + b_1 x_1 + b_2 x_2 + b_3 x_3 + b_4 x_4 + b_5 x_5 + b_6 x_6 + b_7 x_7 + b_8 x_8 + b_9 x_9 + b_{10} x_{10} + b_{11} x_{11} + b_{12} x_{12} \]

\[ y_2 = b_{13} x_1 + b_{14} x_2 + b_{15} x_3 + b_{16} x_4 + b_{17} x_5 + b_{18} x_6 + b_{19} x_7 + b_{20} x_8 + b_{21} x_9 + b_{22} x_{10} + b_{23} x_{11} + b_{24} x_{12} \]

\[ y_3 = b_{25} x_1 + b_{26} x_2 + b_{27} x_3 + b_{28} x_4 + b_{29} x_5 + b_{30} x_6 + b_{31} x_7 + b_{32} x_8 + b_{33} x_9 + b_{34} x_{10} + b_{35} x_{11} + b_{36} x_{12} \]

\[ x_5 = b_{37} x_1 + b_{38} x_2 + b_{39} x_3 + b_{40} x_4 \]

\[ x_6 = b_{41} x_1 + b_{42} x_2 + b_{43} x_3 + b_{44} x_4 \]

\[ x_7 = b_{45} x_1 + b_{46} x_2 + b_{47} x_3 + b_{48} x_4 \]

\[ x_8 = b_{49} x_1 + b_{50} x_2 + b_{51} x_3 + b_{52} x_4 \]

\[ x_9 = b_{53} x_1 + b_{54} x_2 + b_{55} x_3 + b_{56} x_4 \]

\[ x_{10} = b_{57} x_1 + b_{58} x_2 + b_{59} x_3 + b_{60} x_4 \]

\[ x_{11} = b_{61} x_1 + b_{62} x_2 + b_{63} x_3 + b_{64} x_4 \]

\[ x_{12} = b_{65} x_1 + b_{66} x_2 + b_{67} x_3 + b_{68} x_4 \]

\[ x_{13} = b_{69} x_1 + b_{70} x_2 + b_{71} x_3 + b_{72} x_4 \]

\[ x_{14} = b_{73} x_1 + b_{74} x_2 + b_{75} x_3 + b_{76} x_4 \]

\[ x_{15} = b_{77} x_1 + b_{78} x_2 + b_{79} x_3 + b_{80} x_4 \]

\[ x_{16} = b_{81} x_1 + b_{82} x_2 + b_{83} x_3 + b_{84} x_4 \]
Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, And Intercorrelations Of The Variables In The Stepwise Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>y1</th>
<th>y2</th>
<th>y3</th>
<th>x1</th>
<th>x2</th>
<th>x3</th>
<th>x4</th>
<th>x5</th>
<th>x6</th>
<th>x7</th>
<th>x8</th>
<th>x9</th>
<th>x10</th>
<th>x11</th>
<th>x12</th>
<th>x13</th>
<th>x16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y1</td>
<td>MARSAT</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y2</td>
<td>JOBSAT</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y3</td>
<td>RETENTION</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x1</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x2</td>
<td>RANK</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x3</td>
<td>YRSMARR</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x4</td>
<td>#CHIL</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x5</td>
<td>PMOS</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x6</td>
<td>#HOURS</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x7</td>
<td>KNOWHRS</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x8</td>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x9</td>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x10</td>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x11</td>
<td>HOUSING</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x12</td>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x13</td>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x16</td>
<td>TREATOPSEX</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 19.30 25.01 .86 .42 1.05 2.67 1.18 .61 4.21 .90 .53 .31 1.88 2.61 5.45 2.05 .66
sd  4.46 9.48 .86 .50 .96 1.40 1.19 .49 1.69 .72 .57 .34 .77 .98 2.36 .72 1.06

Note: Correlations of .18 or larger are significant at .05, one-tail.
standard path analytic techniques. The nonsignificant variables in these equations were deleted and the equations reestimated. Figure 3 shows the significant paths among the variables.

The first thing to note about the model is which variables were totally eliminated. These were PCS moves and mandatory social events. A glance at the correlation matrix in Table 3 shows that mandatory social events are strongly related to rank (r=-.63), indicating that officers more than enlisted feel pressure to attend these social events. However, required attendance at these functions does not perceptibly alter marital satisfaction, job satisfaction, or intention to remain in the Army.

It may seem surprising that PCS moves were eliminated. However, it should be recalled that PCS moves were listed as both satisfying and dissatisfying by equal numbers of respondents in Study 1. Consequently, it is possible that if we divided our sample into those who enjoy PCS moves and those who dislike PCS moves, PCS moves might have a positive impact on the primary endogenous variables for the former group and a negative impact for the latter group. However, our limited sample size precluded such an analysis.

Of more importance than the excluded variables is the fact that none of the Army experience variables or background variables have a positive or negative effect on marital satisfaction, or at least on respondents' perception of their own marital satisfaction. Marital satisfaction, in turn, has no significant impact on job satisfaction or retention. This finding is in contrast to our expectation that family harmony would be related to these two variables.

As for job satisfaction, seven of the experience variables were related to job satisfaction as well as one background variable, sex. Women said they were more satisfied with their jobs than men. This is somewhat curious since women say they are less likely to remain in the Army than men (P<.05). However, P<.05 indicates that women perceive that men direct a great deal of verbal abuse at them. Abusive treatment of women by men is the strongest single factor influencing job satisfaction, and its influence is negative. Thus, while some women are more satisfied with their jobs than men, it appears that for a number of women perceived verbal abuse from men acts to reduce their job satisfaction, which in turn acts to reduce their desire to remain in the Army. Other factors which cause women to want to leave the Army disproportionately more than men will be discussed later.

Among the Army experience variables, two MOS-related factors affect job satisfaction. Respondents who work in their primary MOS are more satisfied with their jobs than those who do not work in their primary MOS. Also, the number of hours a soldier works is positively related to job satisfaction. The fact that soldiers who work in their primary MOS are more satisfied with their jobs is not surprising, since in most cases this is the job they hoped to perform in the Army and were specially trained for. However, it is curious that those who work longer hours are more satisfied with their jobs. The findings from Study 1 indicated
FIGURE 1. Solution To Path Model
that long work hours were a cause of dissatisfaction among the soldiers. However, it is conceivable that those who work long hours are more committed to the Army. We had intended to operationalize #HOURS as the number of hours the respondent was required to be on duty. Our speculation was that the longer a person is required to work, the more dissatisfaction toward the job will be engendered. However, in measuring #HOURS, we may have really tapped the number of hours the respondents were on duty both involuntarily and voluntarily. If this is the case, it could mean that those working the most hours per week, by and large, are doing so by choice, perhaps because they desire to improve their standing in the Army. It is also possible that job satisfaction is a casual factor, with people who enjoy their jobs putting in more hours. In any case, since we cannot be sure that #HOURS has the meaning we intended, we cannot accurately interpret path Py2x6.

Two of the experience variables influencing job satisfaction have a financial flavor, the economic index and housing quality. This finding is consistent with common sense as well as with evidence from national surveys of job satisfaction (Weaver, 1974). This evidence shows job satisfaction positively related to satisfaction with income and housing.

Medical care is also related to job satisfaction and could itself be considered an economic benefit of Army life; medical care is free to Army personnel and their dependents. Separations from family, too, are related to job satisfaction. The combined effect of the eight variables on job satisfaction is able to account for 21 percent of the variance in job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction shows a strong effect on retention as predicted. Nichols (1971), Schreiber and Holz (1973), and Waters and Roach (1973) have all found job satisfaction related to positive intention to remain at a particular job. In addition to job satisfaction, two of the background variables and two experience variables are related to retention. The background variables are sex and years married. As noted before, men exhibit higher levels of intention to remain in the Army than women. It is not surprising to find women expressing more reluctance to remain in the Army since the Army is still an organization dominated by males, in which women still do not receive equal treatment. For example, women are still prohibited from taking part in combat-related duties. In addition women perceive that their chances for promotion in the Army are significantly slimmer than the promotion for men (MILPERCEN, 1974). Also, as mentioned previously, the fact that women feel verbally abused by men contributes to their lesser intentions to remain in the Army.

While years married is positively related to retention, the correlation is probably spurious. The coefficient appearing here is probably due to the joint relationship of years married and retention to the number of years the soldier has been in the Army.

The experience variables related to retention are knowledge of duty hours and number of hours worked per week. While the former variable might be expected to be related to retention indirectly through job
satisfaction, it appears to exert all of its influence directly on retention. Hours worked is also related to retention, although in a direction opposite from expectation. However, the relationship appearing here may be confounded by the relationship of hours worked to commitment to the Army.

We were able to account for 41 percent of the variance in retention, with the single most important factor being job satisfaction.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

This paper has presented the results from two studies designed to illuminate the relationships among the Army experience, family life, job satisfaction, and intention to remain in the Army. The results from the first study indicated several areas of Army life which soldiers say impact positively or negatively on their family life. Among these variables are separation from family, frequent PCS moves, financial rewards, health care, and housing. However, when we measured the soldiers' experiences with these areas of Army life, we found the experiences to be unrelated to the soldiers' perceptions of their marital satisfaction.

However, this does not conclusively rule out the possibility that the Army experience affects family life. For one thing, we have looked at only one indicator of family harmony, marital satisfaction. In addition, we have not looked at the impact of the Army experience on children of Army personnel. Third, we have measured only the soldiers' perception of their own marital satisfaction. Our findings might have been somewhat different had we measured their spouses' marital satisfaction and related spouses' marital satisfaction to Army experience variables. Certainly soldiers and their spouses are differentially affected by Army life. The soldiers have military duties which may, in some measure, take their minds off problems in the home. They also spend time with people like themselves (other soldiers) with whom they can relax and discuss problems. These discussions may act to alleviate, at least in their own minds, some of the tension which the Army experience produces in the family.

Many spouses of Army personnel, on the other hand, do not have jobs and may not have friends with whom they can spend time. If the spouses are not able to occupy their time with some other activities, they may spend some or most of this time reflecting on their family situation and the effect the Army has had upon it. This could lead, at least in their own minds, to a strong relationship between the Army experience and marital satisfaction.

A final point to be made here is that our data were collected in peacetime. Many past studies on the Army family have been conducted during war. Given the added threat of death surrounding soldiers during wartime, it is easy to speculate that during war many of the Army experience variables examined here would have a more disruptive effect on the family.
Not only was marital satisfaction unrelated to any of the Army experience variables, it was also unrelated to job satisfaction and retention. This finding refutes our initial speculation that marital satisfaction would be related to job satisfaction and retention. This finding is also apparently in contrast to the proposition that family harmony would be related to job performance. However, we have not measured job performance here. We have only measured job satisfaction and retention. While job satisfaction and job performance have been shown to be related in some studies (Greenwood and Soar, 1973; Katzell et al., 1961), there have been studies indicating that the two are not related (Kahn, 1960; Martin, 1969; Rosen and McCallum, 1962). In addition, we have used only one type of indicator of family harmony, marital satisfaction. Hence, future research is still required to deal with the relationship between family harmony and job performance.

While marital satisfaction is unrelated to job satisfaction and retention, selected Army experience variables do demonstrate an effect on job satisfaction and retention. In addition, job satisfaction emerges as the single most important factor influencing the respondents' intentions to remain in the Army.
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