AD-A166 732

20000801205

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

DTIC FILE COPY

AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE

STUDENT REPORT

WORK/FAMILY ATTITUDES OF
DUAL MILITARY MEMBER COUPLES

MAJOR MARGARET K. BALDWIN 86-0175

"insights into tomorrow"

DTIC
ELECTE
APR 30 1986
S E

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.

86 4 29 0

DISCLAIMER

The views and conclusions expressed in this document are those of the author. They are not intended and should not be thought to represent official ideas, attitudes, or policies of any agency of the United States Government. The author has not had special access to official information or ideas and has employed only open-source material available to any writer on this subject.

This document is the property of the United States Government. It is available for distribution to the general public. A loan copy of the document may be obtained from the Air University Interlibrary Loan Service (AUL/LDEX, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, 36112) or the Defense Technical Information Center. Request must include the author's name and complete title of the study.

This document may be reproduced for use in other research reports or educational pursuits contingent upon the following stipulations:

-- Reproduction rights do not extend to any copyrighted material that may be contained in the research report.

-- All reproduced copies must contain the following credit line: "Reprinted by permission of the Air Command and Staff College."

-- All reproduced copies must contain the name(s) of the report's author(s).

-- If format modification is necessary to better serve the user's needs, adjustments may be made to this report--this authorization does not extend to copyrighted information or material. The following statement must accompany the modified document: "Adapted from Air Command and Staff Research Report ___(number)___ entitled ___(title)___ by ___(author)___."

-- This notice must be included with any reproduced or adapted portions of this document.

2

REPORT NUMBER 86-0175

TITLE WORK/FAMILY ATTITUDES OF DUAL MILITARY MEMBER COUPLES

AUTHOR(S) MAJOR MARGARET K. BALDWIN, USAF

FACULTY ADVISOR MAJOR MICKEY R. DANSBY, LMDC/AN

SPONSOR MAJOR MICKEY R. DANSBY, LMDC/AN

Submitted to the faculty in partial fulfillment of requirements for graduation.

AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE
AIR UNIVERSITY
MAXWELL AFB, AL 36112

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.

UNCLASSIFIED
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

ADA166732

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED	1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY	3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT STATEMENT "A" Approved for public release; Distribution is unlimited.
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) 86-0175	5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION ACSC/EDCC — 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION
6c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Maxwell AFB AL 36112-5542	7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION — 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
8c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)	10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NOS. — PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. / PROJECT NO. / TASK NO. / WORK UNIT NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) WORK/FAMILY ATTITUDES OF DUAL	
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Baldwin, Margaret K., Major, USAF	
13a. TYPE OF REPORT — 13b. TIME COVERED FROM ____ TO ____	14. DATE OF REPORT (Yr., Mo., Day) 1986 April — 15. PAGE COUNT 141
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION ITEM 11: MILITARY MEMBER COUPLES	
17. COSATI CODES — FIELD / GROUP / SUB. GR	18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

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

This report provides a comparison of the work/family attitudes of dual military member Air Force couples with those of Air Force couples with a civilian spouse. Results of analyses of responses to the U.S. Air Force Spouse Survey and the Organizational Assessment Package show dual military member couples to be less satisfied with on-base services, more frustrated with their jobs and work environment, and less apt to be influenced in a career decision by job benefits or patriotism. When viewed in light of demographic differences between the comparison groups, dual military member couples were characterized as more motivated to achieve, more confident of their abilities, and more frustrated with not achieving their potential in their jobs. Includes a review of literature on the work/family interface, and recommendations for Air Force leaders.

20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT ☒ DTIC USERS ☐	21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL ACSC/EDCC Maxwell AFB AL 36112-5542	22b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code) (205) 293-2483 — 22c. OFFICE SYMBOL

DD FORM 1473, 83 APR — EDITION OF 1 JAN 73 IS OBSOLETE

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Major Margaret Baldwin received her commission in 1974 upon completion of the Air Force ROTC program at Rutgers University. She has taught electronics and radar systems at the Air Force Electronic Warfare Training Squadron and served as an electronic warfare engineer with the European Communications Division Headquarters. She has traveled worldwide in support of the President of the United States as a Presidential Communications Trip Officer and Unit Commander with the White House Communications Agency. She received a Master of Science Degree in Systems Management from the University of Southern California and is a resident graduate of the Squadron Officer School. Major Baldwin is married to an active duty Air Force officer.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

QUALITY INSPECTED 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

About the Author iii
List of Illustrations vi
Executive Summary vii

CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW 5

CHAPTER THREE - METHOD 11
Instrumentation 11
Data Collection 13
Subjects 14
Procedures 16
Comparison 1, Analysis of Demographic Information . . . 17
Comparison 2, Analysis of Attitudinal Information . . . 17

CHAPTER FOUR - RESULTS 21
AFSS Comparison 1, Analysis of Demographic Information . . 21
AFSS Comparison 2, Analysis of Attitudinal Responses . . . 22
Military Spouses of Officers vs Civilian Spouses of Officers 22
Military Spouses of Enlisted Members vs Civilian Spouses of Enlisted Members 23
OAP Comparison 1, Analysis of Demographic Information . . 25
OAP Comparison 2, Analysis of Attitudinal Responses . . . 26
Officers With Military Spouses vs Officers With Civilian Spouses 26
Enlisted Members With Military Spouses vs Enlisted Members with Civilian Spouses 28

CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION 31
Interpretation of AFSS Results 31
Demographic Differences 31
Attitudinal Differences 33
Interpretation of OAP Results 39
Demographic Differences 39
Attitudinal Differences 40
Relationship to Prior Research 42

CONTINUED

CHAPTER SIX - CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 45

References 51
Appendices
A. U.S. Air Force Spouse Survey: Variables and Factors 55
B. Organizational Assessment Package Survey: Factors and Variables 79
C. Analysis of Demographic Information, AFSS 95
D. Analysis of Demographic Information, OAP 107
E. AFSS Comparison of Military Spouses of AF Members to Civilian Spouses of AF Members 119
F. OAP Comparison of AF Members With Military Spouses to AF Members With Civilian Spouses 125

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Table 1 - Sample Size of Comparison Groups, AFSS 15

Table 2 - Sample Size of Comparison Groups, OAP 15

Table 3 - Significant Attitudinal Differences: Military Spouses of Officers vs. Civilian Spouses of Officers, AFSS 23

Table 4 - Significant Attitudinal Differences: Military Spouses of Enlisted Members vs. Civilian Spouses of Enlisted Members, AFSS 24

Table 5 - Significant Attitudinal Differences: Officers With Military Spouses vs. Officers With With Civilian Spouses, OAP 27

Table 6 - Significant Attitudinal Differences: Enlisted Members With Military Spouses vs. Enlisted Members With Civilian Spouses, OAP 29

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Part of our College mission is distribution of the students' problem solving products to DoD sponsors and other interested agencies to enhance insight into contemporary, defense related issues. While the College has accepted this product as meeting academic requirements for graduation, the views and opinions expressed or implied are solely those of the author and should not be construed as carrying official sanction.

"insights into tomorrow"

REPORT NUMBER 86-0175

AUTHOR(S) MAJOR MARGARET K. BALDWIN, USAF

TITLE WORK/FAMILY ATTITUDES OF DUAL MILITARY MEMBER COUPLES

I. Purpose: To investigate the work/family attitudes of dual military member Air Force couples, compare them to those of military/civilian couples, and propose recommendations for Air Force leaders and researchers based on project findings.

II. Background: Recently, family issues have become more important to the Air Force, as well as to the other services. The civilian economy increasingly competes with the military for the declining number of 18-year-olds. Recruiting and retention will require high-level attention if the Air Force is to maintain manning levels. Research shows retention requires family commitment; unless the needs of the family are heard and considered, commitment will be diminished. It is therefore imperative that Air Force leaders understand the forces at work within the family so they can design organizational structures, work requirements, and policy which help build commitment to the Air Force. In keeping with this need, the present research looks at the work/family attitudes of what has been a rapidly expanding Air Force family type--the dual military member couple.

III. Procedures & Results:

1. Current research and theory on the work/family interface of military families were reviewed, with particular attention to the scarce research targeting dual military member couples.

2. The work/family attitudes of dual military member couples were compared to those of military couples with one civilian spouse using responses to two surveys administered by the U.S. Air Force Leadership and Management Development Center: the U.S. Air Force Spouse Survey (AFSS) and the Organizational Assessment Package (OAP). Data included over 8,500 member and spouse responses to the AFSS from January 1982 to 1985, and over 53,000 member responses to the OAP from 1981 to 1985.

3. For each survey, responses of members of dual military member couples were compared to those of military/civilian couples, by personnel category of the member (i.e., officer or enlisted), to determine significant attitudinal differences.

(a) Results of AFSS analyses revealed military spouses of officers showed less identification with their spouses' jobs, perceived both job benefits and patriotism as less influential on their spouses' career intentions, and were more concerned about the pressure under which their spouses worked than was the case with civilian spouses of officers. Military spouses of enlisted members, compared to civilian spouses of enlisted members, showed less identification with their spouses' jobs and with Air Force life; reported less satisfaction with on-base services; perceived job benefits, patriotism, and the quality of medical care as less influential on their spouses' career intentions, and viewed status/prestige as having a more favorable effect on their spouses' career intentions.

(b) Results of the OAP analyses revealed both officer and enlisted members of dual military couples were less satisfied than their counterparts with civilian spouses in all four key areas measured: the work itself, job enrichment, work group process, and work group output.

IV. Conclusions:

1. The results of the survey analyses were considered in light of the demographic differences between the groups; i.e., the dual military respondents were more evenly divided between male and female, more highly educated, younger, had less time in service, and were less likely to have children. The author's interpretation characterizes dual military member couples, compared to military/civilian couples, as more motivated to achieve, more confident of their abilities, and more frustrated with not achieving their potential.

CONTINUED

2. Results of this study bear some relationship to previous research efforts. First, they tend to refute a hypothesis that married couples with both members in the military are more satisfied with Air Force life. Second, they support a study that predicted dual military member couples would be more likely to tolerate lengthy separations for career purposes. Finally, they support a proposed concept of "homogeneity," which states those families whose needs are not well met by the military lifestyle separate from the service early, leaving a relatively homogeneous group of families highly committed to the military lifestyle.

V. Recommendations:

1. Air Force agencies should continue to encourage research on the work/family interface, particularly with respect to nontraditional family types, with a view toward determining factors that influence career decisions.

2. Air Force researchers should follow up this effort with a study of work/family attitudes by gender. The effect of this characteristic on such attitudes might prove enlightening.

3. The Military Personnel Center should consider comparing the evaluations and training reports of members of dual military couples with those of members married to civilians. Such a comparison might shed more light on the author's conclusion the former are more motivated.

4. Air Force leaders should continue to seek ways to improve military family life. The special needs and constraints of dual military member couples, as well as those of single parent families, should be considered in designing such base services as child care and dependent medical care.

5. In working join spouse assignments, Air Force personnel specialists should be encouraged to be receptive to the specific desires of dual military member couples. They should not assume either spouse places his or her career second to the other's, or that family separations are unacceptable.

6. Air Force leaders should reevaluate the concept of the duties of the "commander's wife." Commanders may have active duty spouses, who may not be wives at all. Perhaps some outdated assignment barriers could be knocked down.

7. Finally, Air Force leaders should reevaluate the concept of the professional Air Force member. The prevailing definition of an Air Force professional as one whose family provides no competing career doesn't work for dual military member couples.

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

"We recruit soldiers, but we retain families!" (Meyer, as quoted in O'Keefe, Eyre, & Smith, 1984, p. 260). These words of then Army Chief of Staff General E.C. Meyer reflect the services' increasing interest in recent years in the role of military families. This interest has been spurred by such factors as the impact of the all volunteer force (Hunter, 1982), problems in recruiting and retaining personnel (Air Force Conference on Families, 1981), and the effect of demographic changes in military families (Beeson, 1985). Concern over family issues led to the first Military Family Research Conference in San Diego in 1977, attended by senior leaders from each of the services (Hunter & Nice, 1978). Independent service initiatives ensued.

Interest in Air Force family issues was institutionalized with the Chief of Staff's approval in July 1980 of the appointment of an Assistant for Air Force Family Matters (AFFAM) within the Directorate of Personnel Plans, Headquarters United States Air Force. The ultimate goal of AFFAM is enhanced Air Force mission readiness by attention to family issues which impact upon the retention and productivity of Air Force members. A notable conclusion in the report of AFFAM's September 1980 Air Force Conference on Families is "Air Force policies and programs

which ignore or work to undermine Air Force families are destined to fail because Air Force members value their families as an institution above all others, including the Air Force" (Air Force Conference on Families, 1981, p. 15). The Air Force Family Support Center program and the U.S. Air Force Spouse Survey (AFSS) are two significant results of recommendations from that conference. The fate of the AFSS is of particular interest.

Administration of the AFSS was discontinued in 1985 as a result of the phase-out of the Air Force Leadership and Management Development Center (LMDC) management consulting program due to manning constraints. Consequently, the Air Force lost a valuable research program in the investigation of the relationships between spouse and family attitudes, and job and retention variables (Ibsen & Austin, 1983). This is unfortunate, as both Dansby (1984) and Beeson (1985) have stressed the need to continue to emphasize family matters even in light of temporarily improved retention rates.

The improving civilian economy will compete with the military for the declining number of 18-year-old males in the population (Dansby, 1984). Recruiting and retention will require significant attention if the Air Force is to maintain effective manning levels. Research shows retention requires family commitment (Hunter, 1982). Unless the needs of the family are heard and considered, commitment will be diminished.

In addressing the needs of its personnel and their families, the Air Force should continue to study the characteristics of its

members and their environment. The push for equality for women in the workplace and the increasing perception of the necessity for two paychecks in a family have led to larger roles for women in the work world, and more active family roles for men (Hunter, 1982). The Air Force cannot accomplish its mission unless its members respond to military directives. Beeson (1985) points out military needs have often translated into activities which adversely affect family life. Therefore, he continues, it is important for Air Force leaders to understand the forces at work within the family so they can design organizational structures, work requirements, and policy which will build positive family attitudes towards the Air Force and minimize danger to morale and loyalty. This research project aims to assist that effort.

In keeping with this need of the Air Force to understand its people, the project looks at the work/family attitudes of what has been a rapidly expanding Air Force family type--the dual military member couple (Beeson, 1985). The purpose is to determine if there are significant differences in work/family attitudes between those couples and Air Force couples with only one military member. The research instruments employed are the AFSS and the Organizational Assessment Package (OAP), both developed by the LMDC at Maxwell AFB, Alabama. The objective of this research is to translate the survey data into useful information. To that end, this project has four goals:

1. To conduct a literature review of current research and theory on the work/family interface of Air Force families, with

particular attention to dual military member couples;

2. To compare and identify statistically significant differences for (a) AFSS-measured results for military spouses of Air Force members versus civilian spouses, and (b) OAP-measured results for Air Force members married to other members versus members married to civilians;

3. To analyze significant attitudinal differences between the groups in light of background research results and literature review findings; and

4. To develop recommendations for Air Force leaders, planners, and researchers based on the project findings.

The present report addresses these goals as follows. First, Chapter Two provides the findings of the literature review. Next, Chapter Three outlines the methodology of the data collection and analysis, and defines the work/family factors measured. Then, Chapter Four presents the results of the data analysis, along with demographic factors for the comparison groups. In Chapter Five, the results are discussed in light of what previous research and the literature review predicted, implied, or suggested. Finally, Chapter Six provides a summary, discussion, and recommendations.

Chapter Two

LITERATURE REVIEW

It has long been recognized that the military organization has a profound effect on the military family; only recently have military managers come to realize the impact of the family on military effectiveness (Hunter & Nice, 1978). Interest in military family and organizational linkages has been shown by a recent upsurge in military family research (Beeson, 1985). Several extensive literature reviews (Military Family Resource Center, 1984; Hunter, den Dulk, & Williams, 1980; McCubbin, Dahl, & Hunter, 1976) summarize this research. Policy makers are becoming increasingly aware of family issues. For example, national workshops on the military family have been convened by military groups and other professional organizations (Beeson, 1985). Additionally, Defense, a monthly publication of the American Forces Information Service, has begun including an update on military family statistics in its annual almanac.

The Air Force began its own research after the 1980 appointment of the Assistant for Air Force Family Matters. The Families in Blue studies, Quality of Life Surveys, and USAF Spouse Survey are among the research programs instituted to investigate family issues in the Air Force (Beeson, 1985). This

research comes in the midst of significant military family changes.

Marriage rates, family structure, and gender role orientation are changing within the military community. Marriage rates have increased dramatically, with more than half of all military personnel and almost two thirds of Air Force members now married (American Forces Information Service, 1985). The traditional nuclear family (worker husband, homemaker wife) now accounts for only 20% of households in the U.S., and this change is reflected in military families. There are increasing numbers of dual career, dual worker, and single parent military families (Beeson, 1985; Mazzaroppi, 1984; Air Force Conference on Families, 1981). Attitudes toward parental roles, family leadership, household responsibilities, and employment of wives are in a state of flux. Studies show military families are clearly being influenced by shifts in family values (Flannery & Dansby, 1985; Mazzaroppi, 1984; Grossman, 1981; Orthner, 1980). As Beeson (1985) points out, the issues of shifting gender role orientation and work/family balances are crucial to the armed forces.

The evolving military family types are not those around which the military built its expectations. Military planners assumed families would have traditional family role structures, with husbands (military members) giving priority to their work roles and wives giving priority to home and family management (Beeson, 1985). Egalitarian gender roles, though now more

accepted in business organizations, pose problems for the military (Hauser, 1985). Many researchers see the civilian wife of the military member as the key player in the contest between family and military organization (Bjeson, 1985), and the bulk of military family research to date has concentrated on her attitudes. Research on other family types, particularly the dual military member couple, is scarce. In light of the number of dual military member couples in the Air Force (23,199 as of December 1985), this scarcity reflects a definite shortcoming in the overall military family research effort.

The 1977 LADYCOM Survey is one example of research which concentrated on the attitudes of civilian wives of military members. The authors concluded these wives, as a group, were becoming more involved in their own lives and careers and were having less time to be part of the military community. They were weighing the advantages and disadvantages of the military lifestyle and taking a careful look at the impact of their husbands' careers upon their own educational and occupational goals (Hunter, 1979). Along similar lines are the Air Force Quality of Life Surveys. Results in 1976 showed wives to be dissatisfied with family separations and work schedules, but pleased with the security of the military lifestyle. They did not believe the Air Force was keeping them as informed about their husbands' work as they wanted to be (Hunter, 1979). Subsequent Quality of Life Survey information has been examined by additional researchers.

Houk (1980) used the data from the 1980 USAF Quality of Life Survey III to compare spousal attitudes in dual career Air Force families. Her hypothesis, based on Air Force policies that support military spouse careers but ignore civilian spouse careers, was that families with both members in the military are more satisfied with Air Force life than those with a civilian spouse. While her findings were inconclusive in some areas, she found dual military member couples were most dissatisfied with family separation, and military/civilian couples placed family separation second to pay and allowances as the factor with which they were most dissatisfied. Subsequent improvements in research tools led to more concrete findings.

In 1985, Beeson used the USAF Organizational Assessment Package and the USAF Spouse Survey in a military family research effort. A major conclusion of his study was the civilian wife's personal identity lacked any meaningful association with feelings about her husband's work. The explanation he found most likely for this conclusion (which deviated significantly from previous findings) is that when the wife's work commitment is high and the family cannot resolve the conflicts between the wife's employment aspirations and Air Force organizational requirements, the family probably separates from the Air Force. The net effect is a relatively homogeneous group of families, highly committed to the military lifestyle and having generally low work commitment on the part of the wives. Unfortunately

this study specifically excluded dual military member couples from consideration.

Some research efforts which included dual military member couples are the Families in Blue studies (Orthner, 1980). Findings in 1980 indicated couples in which both the husband and wife are Air Force members are more likely to be happily married than couples with a civilian wife. Factors contributing to this higher satisfaction were purported to be the mutual fulfillment from their jobs, the economic stability of the relationship, and the ability of the Air Force to maintain joint assignments (Air Force Conference on Families, 1981). The leveling off of the numbers of dual military member couples since 1983 (after 12 years of rapid increase) may have something to do with the increasing difficulty of providing joint assignments. Additional research is clearly needed.

The research literature specifically targeting dual military member couples is scant. However, one researcher (Williams, 1978) conducted a study to gain insight into specific problem areas for this military family type. He found that almost all of the couples participating in his study planned not to have children. They further reported they would tolerate lengthy separations if they meant significant career progression for one of them. Williams concluded his subjects sincerely believed they could blend relatively normal family lives with successful careers, but he thought dual careers were much easier for civilian couples. This study, like the others cited, represents

a step towards better understanding of Air Force families. But there is room for more work.

The literature shows family patterns in the Air Force are changing. Air Force leaders are increasingly aware of these changes and are concerned about the impact they will have on mission accomplishment. The Air Force must focus on the family and the forces at work within it to minimize dangers to morale and loyalty and maximize readiness. Current research on nontraditional military family types is conspicuous in its absence. This research project is an attempt to help Air Force leaders better understand one of these Air Force family types--the dual military member couple. The next chapter explains how the current research was conducted.

Chapter Three

METHOD

This chapter describes the collection and organization of data to compare the work/family attitudes of dual military member couples with those of couples in which only one member is military. The first section describes the two survey instruments employed. Next is an explanation of the data collection methodology. This is followed by a description of the subjects in the study. The final section outlines the procedures used to analyze the data.

Instrumentation

The two survey instruments employed in the study were the AFSS (see Appendix A) and the OAP (see Appendix B). The AFSS was developed by the LMDC to (a) provide a recurring measure of attitudes, opinions, and beliefs of Air Force spouses, (b) link attitudinal responses of Air Force members to those of their spouses, and (c) determine the effect of spousal attitudes on the job and retention (Ibsen & Austin, 1983). This 73-item survey (administered to spouses of Air Force members) consists of 15 demographic items and 58 attitudinal items. Responses to attitudinal items range across a 7-point Likert scale with a "1" usually indicating strong disagreement or dissatisfaction, and a

"7" usually indicating strong agreement or satisfaction. The short lifespan of the survey (January 1982 - April 1985) precluded conclusive documentation of temporal stability and internal consistency. However, after its first 2 years of use, Dansby (1984) examined the stability of factor construction through a series of factor analyses, and found the principal factors to be consistent over that 2-year period. An important feature of this survey is that it is linked to the OAP via a Survey Instrument Linking Code, allowing the matching of members' and spouses' responses.

The second instrument, the OAP, was developed jointly by the LMDC and the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory to support the LMDC mission to (a) conduct research on Air Force systemic issues, (b) provide leadership and management training, and (c) provide management consultation services to Air Force commanders upon request (Short, 1985). This 109-item survey (administered to Air Force members) consists of 16 demographic items and 93 attitudinal items. Responses to the attitudinal items, again, range across a 7-point Likert scale. Documentation of the factor analysis results during development of the survey is contained in Hendrix and Kaiverson (1979a; 1979b). Short and Hamilton (1981) conducted a factor by factor assessment of the reliability of the OAP and found it showed generally acceptable to excellent reliability for the primary factors, and was reliable enough for collection of Air Force systemic data. After 2 years of field use, the validity of the OAP was re-examined by

Hightower and Short (1982). Their findings also support the use of the OAP as a data gathering instrument.

Data Collection

All AFSS and OAP data for the present report were collected as part of the LMDC management consultation process. During management consulting visits (solicited by commanders of Air Force organizations) all military and civilian personnel present for duty were administered the OAP in group settings. Survey respondents were promised individual anonymity. No one from the host organization handled completed surveys at any time. Married personnel with spouses in the local area were given the AFSS to take home to their spouses. Approximately 35% of the spouses returned the completed surveys (in sealed envelopes) to a central collection point. After approximately 6 weeks for analysis, the LMDC consultants returned to the organization to provide feedback to the commander. Survey results were treated in a confidential manner between LMDC and the client commander, and management action plans were usually designed to resolve problems discoverad. About 6 months after results were fed back, LMDC consultants returned to administer the OAP again to assess attitudinal changes following the LMDC intervention.

The data from AFSS administrations are stored in two separate computer files, providing separate data bases. One is a linked file, as it also contains members' responses to the OAP. Each AFSS response sheet is linked to the OAP response sheet of the

corresponding service member. Only matched pairs of responses are entered into this linked data file. The other data file contains AFSS data alone, with an accumulation of 11,060 records. In addition to the 15 demographic questionnaire items, other demographics collected on the answer sheet and stored on each record include age and sex of the respondent, as well as the member's personnel category and grade.

The data from OAP administrations are stored in a cumulative data base containing over 200,000 records. In addition to the 16 demographic questionnaire items, other demographics collected on the answer sheet and stored on each record include work group code, personnel category and pay grade, age, sex, Air Force Specialty Code (AFSC), base, and major command. In the present study, only OAP data gathered in initial (i.e., pre-intervention) administrations for the period 1 October 1981 to 10 September 1985 were considered.

Subjects

To examine the attitudes of dual military member couples, responses to the AFSS were taken from the data base to form two independent groups: military spouses of Air Force members (MIL-MIL) and civilian spouses of Air Force members (CIV-MIL). Each group was further subdivided into spouses of both officers and enlisted personnel. Sample sizes for the groups are indicated in Table 1. Similarly, responses to the OAP were taken from that data base to form two independent groups: Air Force

members with military spouses (MIL-MIL) and Air Force members with civilian spouses (MIL-CIV). Each of these two groups contained subgroups of both officers and enlisted members. Sample sizes for these groups are indicated in Table 2.

Table 1

Sample Sizes of Comparison Groups, AFSS

	Officers	Enlisted
MIL-MIL	150	753
CIV-MIL	2,008	5,680

Table 2

Sample Sizes of Comparison Groups, OAP

	Officers	Enlisted
MIL-MIL	910	6,245
MIL-CIV	8,962	37,587

The data base for the AFSS includes data from 30 bases or organizations in 9 major commands. The data base for the OAP includes data from over 72 bases or organizations in every major command. It should be noted that in neither case were the installations selected to be representative of the Air Force. Rather, they represent opportunity samples. Therefore, the

reader is advised that generalizations to the Air Force must be approached with caution. However, the broad representation of different commands and bases leads to speculation the results may be generalizable to the total population of the Air Force, at least as far as general attitudes toward the Air Force and Air Force life are concerned. In any case, the data are representative of the bases at which they were collected, and the results reflect the attitudes of a significant portion of Air Force members and spouses.

Procedures

For each of the two survey instruments employed, the results of analyses of the independent groups are reported in separate comparisons. In each case, Comparison 1, "Analysis of Demographic Information," is provided to characterize the sample groups. Comparison 2 compares attitudinal data for the groups by personnel category. For the AFSS, Comparison 2 ("Comparison of Attitudes of Military Spouses to those of Civilian Spouses") compares (a) military spouses of officers to civilian spouses of officers, and (b) military spouses of enlisted members to civilian spouses of enlisted members. For the OAP, Comparison 2 ("Comparison of Members with Military Spouses to Members with Civilian Spouses") compares (a) officers with military spouses to officers with civilian spouses, and (b) enlisted members with military spouses to enlisted members with civilian spouses. The number n, shown throughout this study, is the total number of

valid responses in the data base for the variable or key factor being examined. Statistical analyses were performed using the appropriate procedures contained in the SPSS^{X} User's Guide (Nie, 1983).

Comparison 1. Analysis of Demographic Information

For each survey, two independent groups were extracted from the respective data bases to perform this analysis. For the AFSS, group one consisted of military respondents whose spouses were military members (MIL-MIL). It was further subdivided by personnel category (i.e., spouses of officers and spouses of enlisted personnel). The second group was composed of civilian respondents whose spouses were military members (CIV-MIL). The group was further subdivided by personnel category of the member. For the OAP, group one consisted of Air Force members whose spouses were military members (MIL-MIL). The second group was composed of Air Force members whose spouses were civilians (MIL-CIV). Each group was further subdivided by personnel category. The SPSS^{X} subprogram "Crosstabs" was used to analyze 21 demographic categories for the AFSS and 19 for the OAP.

Comparison 2. Analysis of Attitudinal Information

For this analysis, the attitudes of the members of the independent groups described above were compared for each of the surveys. Two-tailed t-tests were performed to discern any attitudinal differences between groups within each personnel category. The level of significance for all t-tests was alpha =.05. An F-test was performed to test the assumption

of equal variances in the comparison groups. Where appropriate, t-tests for unequal variance groups were used. These procedures were followed to identify variables in which data for MIL-MIL respondents varied significantly from data for CIV-MIL respondents (in the case of the AFSS) or from data for MIL-CIV respondents (in the case of the DAP).

For the AFSS, 58 separate comparisons were made. The results are grouped into the following 12 factors and two items which relate family and organizational attitudes.

1. Identification with the Air Force. Assesses the degree of commitment to the Air Force.

2. Job Benefits as a Retention Influence. Measures the degree to which items such as job security, retirement, and medical benefits are perceived to affect retention.

3. TDY Attitudes. Evaluates the perceived effects of TDY frequency and duration on family life.

4. Satisfaction/Prestige as a Retention Influence. Assesses the degree to which job satisfaction and prestige affect career intentions.

5. Recreational Facilities. Measures the overall level of satisfaction with such base recreational facilities as the recreation center, library, auto hobby shop, and bowling center.

6. Identification with Job. Evaluates the perception of the desirability and usefulness of the respondent's spouse's Air Force job.

7. Services--Basic Needs. Assesses the level of satisfaction with such base services as the exchange, commissary, open mess, child care, and medical care.

8. Time Pressure. Measures the perception of the respondent's spouses's job-related stress and the time devoted to the Air Force job, and their effects on family life.

9. Patriotism as a Career Influence. Evaluates the respondent's attitude toward patriotism as a career influence, as well as the respondent's perception of the spouse's attitude toward same.

10. Desire for Information About Job. Assesses the perceived importance placed on keeping informed about the Air Force in general and the respondent's spouse's job in particular.

11. Protocol/Prestige. Measures the perceived importance of status and prestige as a career influence, as well as the perception of importance of respondent's participation in the spouse's career.

12. Medical Care. Evaluates the perceived impact of medical and dental benefits on career intention.

13. AFSS Item #31--Effect of PCS Moves. Assesses the perceived effect of PCS moves on family life and retention.

14. AFSS Item #32--Sensitivity of AF Leaders. Measures the degree to which respondents perceive AF leaders to be sensitive to family needs.

See Appendix A for the items from the AFSS which comprise these factors.

For the OAP, 21 comparisons were made. The results are grouped into the following four areas of organizational functioning.

1. Work Itself. Deals with the task properties (technologies) and environmental conditions of the job; measures perceptions of task characteristics.

2. Job Enrichment. Measures the degree to which the job itself is interesting, meaningful, challenging, and responsible.

3. Work Group Process. Assesses the effectiveness of supervisors and the process of accomplishing the work.

4. Work Group Output. Measures task performance, group development, and effects of the work situation on group members. Assesses perceptions of quality and quantity of task performance, along with pride and satisfaction in the job.

See Appendix B for the factors and items from the OAP survey which comprise these areas.

The next chapter presents the results of these demographic and attitudinal analyses.

Chapter Four

RESULTS

This chapter provides the results of the data analyses as described in Chapter Three. The first section addresses the demographic information provided on the AFSS responses. The next section contains a comparative analysis of the results for the 12 attitudinal factors and two separate items measured by the survey. The third section addresses the demographic information provided on the OAP survey responses. The final section contains a comparative analysis of the results for the four areas of organizational functioning into which the OAP attitudinal factors were grouped.

AFSS Comparison 1. Analysis of Demographic Information

Tables C-1 through C-19, Appendix C, provide detailed descriptive information about members of dual military couples (MIL-MIL) who have responded to the AFSS. The typical responding military spouse of an officer is equally likely to be a male or female, and is white, between 26 and 35 years of age, married between 1 and 8 years. Over 52% have no children; 32% hold advanced degrees. Over half of the MIL-MIL respondents' officer spouses have fewer than 8 years in service. These couples

typically have 12 to 36 months on station, and have bought a residence off base.

The typical responding military spouse of an enlisted member is equally likely to be a male or female, and is white, between 21 and 30 years of age, married between 1 and 8 years. Fifty-nine percent have children; over 66% have at least some college education. Over 60% of the MIL-MIL respondents' enlisted spouses have fewer than 8 years in service. These couples typically have 12 to 36 months on station, and are either buying or renting a residence off base.

AFSS Comparison 2. Analysis of Attitudinal Responses

Tables E-1 and E-2, Appendix E, provide detailed information about the work/family attitudes of members of dual military couples (MIL-MIL) who have responded to the AFSS. Significant differences were found between these individuals and civilian spouses of military members (CIV-MIL). These differences are presented by personnel category.

Military Spouses of Officers vs. Civilian Spouses of Officers

Military spouses of officers (MIL-MIL) were found to be significantly different from civilian spouses of officers (CIV-MIL) on 4 of the 12 factors considered for this analysis (see Table 3). First, they showed less identification with their spouses' jobs. Next, they perceived both job benefits and patriotism as having less influence on their spouses' career intentions. Finally, they were more concerned about the pressure under which their spouses worked, and its effects on family life.

Table 3

Significant Attitudinal Differences

Military Spouses of Officers
vs.
Civilian Spouses of Officers, AFSS

	Mean	
	MIL-MIL	CIV-MIL
Identification With Job	5.26	5.57
Job Benefits as a Retention Influence	5.11	5.38
Patriotism as a Career Influence	4.79	5.12
Time Pressure	5.29	5.02

Military Spouses of Enlisted Members vs. Civilian Spouses of Enlisted Members

Military spouses of enlisted members (MIL-MIL) were found to be significantly different from civilian spouses of enlisted members (CIV-MIL) on 9 of the 12 factors considered for this analysis (see Table 4). The first three of these mirror three of the differences found in the officer comparison. The military spouses showed less identification with their spouses' jobs, and perceived both job benefits and patriotism as having less influence on their spouses' career intentions. Six additional differences were found in the enlisted comparison. First, the military spouses showed less Identification With the Air Force.

At the same time, they indicated more interest in being informed about the Air Force. They also reported less satisfaction with on-base services providing basic needs, to include medical care, but viewed medical care as having less effect on their spouses' career intentions. Additionally, they were less concerned about the effects of their spouses' TDYs on family life or career intentions. Finally, they viewed status and prestige as having a more favorable effect upon their spouses' career intentions.

Table 4

Significant Attitudinal Differences

Military Spouses of Enlisted Members
vs.
Civilian Spouses of Enlisted Members, AFSS

	Mean	
	MIL-MIL	CIV-MIL
Identification With Job	4.90	5.27
Job Benefits as a Retention Influence	5.31	5.67
Patriotism as a Career Influence	4.77	5.07
Identification With the Air Force	4.31	4.48
Desire for Info about Job	5.97	5.86
Services--Basic Needs	4.00	4.19
Medical Care	4.76	4.98
TDY Attitudes	3.04	3.52
Protocol/Prestige	4.17	4.00

OAP Comparison 1. Analysis of Demographic Information

Tables D-1 through D-19, Appendix D, provide detailed descriptive information about members of dual military couples (MIL-MIL) who have responded to the OAP survey. The typical responding MIL-MIL officer is equally likely to be a male or female, and is white, between 26 and 35 years of age. Over 65% have fewer than 8 years in service. Ten percent are geographically separated from their member spouses. The typical responding MIL-MIL officer is nonrated, has 6 to 24 months on station, 12 to 24 months in present career field, and 1 to 12 months in present position. More than 33% hold advanced degrees, and the same percentage have completed Intermediate Service School. More than 58% are supervisors, and 41% supervise three or more people. Over 50% do not write performance reports. Over 67% indicate they either will, or likely will, make the Air Force a career.

The typical responding MIL-MIL enlisted member is equally likely to be a male or female, and is white, between 21 and 30 years of age. Over 70% have fewer than 8 years in service. Approximately 8% are geographically separated from their member spouses. The typical responding MIL-MIL enlisted member is nonrated, has 6 to 24 months on station, 12 to 24 months in present career field, and 1 to 12 months in present position. More than 57% have at least some college education. Forty-two percent have completed as far as NCO Phase 1 or Phase 2 in their Professional Military Education. More than 39% are supervisors,

and over 20% supervise three or more people. Over 65% do not write performance reports. Fifty-two percent indicate they either will, or likely will, make the Air Force a career.

OAP Comparison 2. Analysis of Attitudinal Responses

Tables F-1 and F-2, Appendix F, provide detailed information about the attitudes of members of dual military couples (MIL-MIL) who have responded to the OAP survey. Significant differences were found between these individuals and members with civilian spouses (MIL-CIV). The differences are discussed by personnel category.

Officers With Military Spouses vs. Officers With Civilian Spouses

Officers with military spouses (MIL-MIL) were found to be significantly different from officers with civilian spouses (MIL-CIV) on 16 of the 21 OAP factors considered for this analysis (see Table 5). Of the 16, the MIL-MIL group was less positive on every factor. A summary by main area follows.

In the key area of the work itself, officers with military spouses were less positive regarding Job Performance Goals, Task Characteristics, Task Autonomy, and Job Training. They also reported their jobs required more Work Repetition, which they did not view favorably.

In the job enrichment area, officers with military spouses were less positive regarding the Skill Variety required by their jobs. They also reported less positive attitudes toward the extent of Job Feedback. Finally, they found the motivating potential of their jobs to be lower than did their counterparts.

Table 5

Significant Attitudinal Differences

Officers With Military Spouses
vs.
Officers With Civilian Spouses, OAP

		Mean	
		MIL-MIL	MIL-CIV
The Work Itself	Job Performance Goals	4.61	4.76
	Task Characteristics	5.28	5.38
	Task Autonomy	4.46	4.62
	Job Related Training	4.43	4.71
	Work Repetition	4.52	4.24
Job Enrichment	Skill Variety	5.26	5.52
	Job Feedback	4.83	4.93
	Job Motivation Index	119.83	129.81
Work Group Process	Work Support	4.47	4.58
	Management Supervision	5.06	5.36
	Supervisory Communications	4.61	4.90
	Organizational Communications	4.68	4.94
Work Group Output	Pride	5.33	5.54
	Advancement/Recognition	4.46	4.62
	General Organizational Climate	4.94	5.27
	Perceived Productivity	5.71	5.81

The work group process area elicited less positive responses from the MIL-MIL group on all four supporting factors. Hence, they were less satisfied than their counterparts with Work Support, Management and Supervision, the Supervisory Communications Climate, and the Organizational Communications Climate.

The final area, work group output, found the MIL-MIL group less favorable on four of the five contributing factors. These

included pride in their work, awareness of advancement and recognition, and overall perception of their organizational environment. They were also less positive about the quantity, quality, and efficiency of the work generated by their work groups.

Enlisted Members With Military Spouses vs. Enlisted Members With Civilian Spouses

Enlisted members with military spouses (MIL-MIL) were found to be significantly different from enlisted members with civilian spouses (MIL-CIV) on 20 of the 21 OAP factors considered for this analysis (see Table 6). Of the 20, the MIL-MIL group was less positive on 19 factors. The twentieth factor showed the MIL-MIL group having a greater desire for job enrichment, but was not a measure of job perceptions. A summary by main area follows.

In the area of the work itself, enlisted members with military spouses were less positive regarding Job Performance Goals, Task Characteristics, Task Autonomy, and Job Training. They also showed less desire for easy or repetitive tasks, but reported their jobs required more of those tasks.

In the job enrichment area, the enlisted members were less positive about the Skill Variety and Task Identity required by their jobs. They also showed less positive attitudes toward the extent of Job Feedback, and the motivating potential of their jobs. However, they reported a greater need than did their counterparts for such job enrichment characteristics as autonomy, personal growth, and use of skills.

Table 6

Significant Attitudinal Differences

Enlisted Members With Military Spouses
vs.
Enlisted Members With Civilian Spouses, OAF

	Mean	
	MIL-MIL	MIL-CIV
The Work Itself		
Job Performance Goals	4.71	4.80
Task Characteristics	5.04	5.15
Task Autonomy	3.88	4.02
Desired Repetitive/Easy Tasks	3.09	3.17
Job Related Training	4.29	4.52
Work Repetition	5.31	5.09
Job Enrichment		
Skill Variety	4.48	4.79
Task Identity	5.09	5.14
Job Feedback	4.79	4.84
Job Motivation Index	100 64	108.67
Need for Enrichment	5.61	5.58
Work Group Process		
Work Support	4.49	4.53
Management Supervision	4.68	4.94
Supervisory Communications	4.33	4.55
Organizationel Communications	4.22	4.42
Work Group Output		
Pride	4.86	5.08
Advancement/Recognition	4.22	4.40
Job Related Satisfaction	4.89	5.03
General Organizational Climate	4.21	4.52
Perceived Productivity	5.39	5.54

The enlisted members with military spouses showed less favorable attitudes toward all four factors constituting the work group process area. That is, they were less satisfied than their counterparts with Work Support, Management and Supervision,

Supervisory Communications Climate, and Organizational Communications Climate.

The final area, work group output, found the enlisted MIL-MIL group less favorable on all five of the factors. These included pride in their work, awareness of advancement and recognition, job satisfaction, and overall perceptions of their organizational environment. They were also less positive about the quantity, quality, and efficiency of the work generated by their work groups.

The foregoing sections show the members of dual military couples had significantly different work/family attitudes from those of the larger group of members married to civilians. In most cases, these differences reflect less favorable attitudes. The next chapter discusses these differences.

Chapter Five

DISCUSSION

This chapter provides an interpretation of the results presented in Chapter Four. The first section addresses the AFSS results. In the author's opinion, these results tend to show the dual military respondents to be somewhat more motivated to achieve, confident of their ability, and frustrated in the achievement of their potential. The second section addresses the OAP results. These are interpreted to show the MIL-MIL respondents to be a more motivated group who don't feel as sufficiently challenged in their work. The third section addresses the relationship of these results to three prior research efforts.

Interpretation of AFSS Results

Demographic Differences

There are five demographic differences between the dual military member couples and the couples with a civilian spouse that are helpful to keep in mind in interpreting the AFSS results.

The first of these differences is gender of the respondent. In the MIL-MIL group, a respondent is nearly equally likely to be male or female (54% male, 46% female). This contrasts significantly with the CIV-MIL group in which 3% of the

respondents are male and 97% are female. Hence, a strong female influence on the responses of the CIV-MIL group as a whole can be expected.

The second distinguishing factor is time in service. In the MIL-MIL group, over 76% in the officer category and over 80% in the enlisted category have fewer than 12 years in the Air Force. This represents a distinct difference from the CIV-MIL group, in which approximately half of the respondents in each personnel category have fewer than 12 years in the Air Force. (This should not be viewed as a shortcoming of the opportunity sample, but rather as a representation of the fact that most of the married women in the service are in the lower officer and enlisted grades.) It is fair to assume, then, members of the MIL-MIL group are less likely to have made career decisions.

The third factor is spouse employment status. By definition, all AFSS MIL-MIL respondents have full-time employment (i.e., they are active duty military). This contrasts significantly with the CIV-MIL group, in which fewer than 20% of the officers' spouses and fewer than 26% of the enlisted members' spouses work full time. It is fair to assume, then, MIL-MIL couples are likely to have more discretionary income.

Fourth, the educational level of the respondents varies between the groups. In the officer category, 32% of the MIL-MIL respondents have advanced degrees, as compared to 9% in the CIV-MIL group. In the enlisted category, over 66% of the

MIL-MIL respondents have some college, as compared to fewer than 45% in the CIV-MIL group.

Finally, the number of couples with no children varies between the groups. Over half of the officer dual military member couples have no children, while that proportion is less than one quarter in the couples with a civilian spouse. In the enlisted category, 41% of the dual military member couples are childless as compared to 22% of the couples with a civilian spouse.

These five demographic differences may have significant bearing upon the variations in attitudinal responses between the comparison groups, which are discussed in the next section.

Attitudinal Differences

Identification with Spouse's Job. In both officer and enlisted categories, MIL-MIL respondents showed significantly less identification with their spouses' jobs than did CIV-MIL respondents. Particularly, they didn't believe their spouses' abilities were as fully used in their jobs or that their spouses felt as positive about their contributions to their jobs. They expressed more desire for their spouses to change jobs within the Air Force. The author interprets these sentiments as reflecting the frustrations of well-educated, motivated people whose jobs don't allow achievement of potential. They further indicate a belief, however, that the Air Force does have fulfilling jobs to offer; it's just a matter of getting one. Contributing to their frustrations could be the join spouse

assignment procedures. Although these procedures are not designed to be limiting in nature (other than that MIL-MIL couples cannot serve remote tours together, nor can either member supervise the other), either one or both members may have to take a less than desirable job in order that they be assigned together.

Job Benefits as a Retention Influence. In both officer and enlisted categories, this factor was rated lower by the MIL-MIL respondents. Particularly, they saw medical/dental benefits, job security, and retirement as having less impact on a career decision. The author interprets these results as reflecting the sentiments of intelligent, motivated individuals who are driven more by the need to achieve and be productive in a worthwhile job. These individuals are confident of their ability to find employment elsewhere when and if they become sufficiently dissatisfied. Their relatively higher levels of discretionary income may be a factor here, in that lower order needs may be less of an issue than with CIV-MIL couples with less spending power. While it is likely career decisions have not yet been made, those eventual decisions are more likely to be influenced by higher needs than job benefits than is the case with CIV-MIL couples.

Patriotism as a Career Influence. This factor elicited lower ratings by the MIL-MIL respondents than by their civilian counterparts in both officer and enlisted categories. The author proposes these respondents, by virtue of their education

and self-confidence, are more driven by needs and desires to achieve and are not as locked into Air Force careers for their fulfillment. As in the case with job benefits, patriotism probably won't be as great an influence when the MIL-MIL couples make their career decisions.

Time Pressure. An attitudinal difference toward time pressure surfaced between the groups in the officer category. Particularly, the MIL-MIL officer respondents reported their spouses to be under more pressure as a result of the job, and to have duty hours more disruptive to family life. The author interprets these sentiments as reflecting the frustrations of individuals working long, hard hours, particularly when their jobs are seen as not allowing full achievement of potential. These frustrations are, perhaps, compounded by the higher likelihood of schedule conflicts in two-career families, leaving the MIL-MIL respondents with less opportunity for family togetherness than their civilian counterparts.

Identification With the Air Force. An attitudinal difference toward identification with the Air Force was evident between the comparison groups' enlisted categories. Although the MIL-MIL enlisted respondents reported they would recommend the Air Force as a career, they gave the Air Force less credit for trying to make service life attractive. They were also less sure they wanted their spouses to choose Air Force careers, and indicated more potential to be happier if their spouses performed the same jobs as civilians. The author interprets

these results as reflecting a stronger belief on the part of these couples that the Air Force is not doing all it could to make military service a good career. The greater possibility of family separation and schedule conflicts faced by dual military member couples may contribute to this belief.

Services--Basic Needs. The difference between the enlisted categories' responses on level of satisfaction with base services tracks with the preceding factor. The enlisted MIL-MIL respondents showed significantly less satisfaction with these services than did their civilian counterparts. This parallels the author's belief these couples are more likely to see the Air Force as not doing all it could to make the service a good place to work. It could also reflect the likelihood the MIL-MIL couples have more knowledge of, access to, and financial ability to use off-base services. Additionally, since MIL-MIL respondents are less likely to have children, their lower frequency of use of dependent services (e.g., child care, medical, and dental) might affect their responses.

Medical Care. Lower satisfaction with medical care on the part of the enlisted MIL-MIL respondents tracks with the results for the two preceding factors. Additionally, these respondents viewed the quality of medical care as having less effect on a career decision. The author views this along the same lines as the officer MIL-MIL response to job benefits as a career influence. Again, these MIL-MIL respondents are intelligent and highly motivated, and perhaps more driven by the need to achieve

and be productive. They are confident of their ability to find employment elsewhere when and if they become sufficiently dissatisfied. Additionally, their higher discretionary incomes, which allow other avenues for fulfilling medical needs, may tend to lessen their perceptions of the importance of this factor. While it is likely in these cases that career decisions have not yet been made, higher needs, rather than the quality of Air Force medical care, will probably have more influence on those eventual decisions.

TDY Attitudes. The less negative responses toward family inconvenience as a result of spouses' TDYs by enlisted MIL-MIL respondents are seen by the author as reflecting three facts. First, these spouses are military members themselves and, as such, are more aware of the legitimate need for TDY; they may be more willing to accept TDY as a fact of military life. Second, these spouses, in addition to having responsible jobs of their own, are somewhat better educated than their civilian counterparts. Hence, they are more likely to be independent and better able to cope in their spouses' absences. Third, since the MIL-MIL respondents are less likely to have children, TDY schedules could be expected to have less negative impact on family plans. Overall, the MIL-MIL group showed what could be considered a more objective response to a potentially negative factor.

Desire for Information About Job. The lower ratings of the enlisted MIL-MIL respondents toward desire for information about

their spouses' jobs must be viewed in light of two component responses. First, the lower importance they placed on knowing about their spouses' jobs should be seen in proper perspective. These respondents have full-time military jobs of their own with which to be concerned and to which they must devote their time and effort; the majority of their civilian counterparts are members of one-career families. Also, they may believe they are already considerably well-informed about their spouses' jobs by virtue of their own military status. Second, they placed higher importance on being informed about the more general Air Force role and mission. In the author's opinion, this reflects the importance these respondents place on being informed about their organization--possibly for reasons of their own satisfaction and career progression.

Protocol/Prestige. The final significant difference between MIL-MIL and CIV-MIL couples on the AFSS surfaced in the enlisted category. The MIL-MIL respondents were more favorably disposed towards the status and prestige of an Air Force job than were the CIV-MIL respondents. In the author's opinion, this sentiment may reflect the somewhat higher standard of living presumably attained by the two-paycheck MIL-MIL group. Additionally, the MIL-MIL respondents saw their participation as being more important to their spouses' promotion potential than did their civilian counterparts. The author sees this as stemming from a clearer understanding on the part of military members of the importance of commitment and the "total person"

concept to achieving promotion potential in the Air Force.

In sum, the author interprets the AFSS results as showing the MIL-MIL respondents to be more driven by the need to achieve and be productive, less motivated by tangible benefits, more frustrated in achievement of their potential, and more confident of their ability to find employment elsewhere when and if sufficiently dissatisfied, as compared with the CIV-MIL group. Additionally, the enlisted MIL-MIL respondents are more affected by the pressures of military jobs and less satisfied that the Air Force is doing all it could to make the service a worthwhile career, as compared with the CIV-MIL group. The OAP results are consistent with these interpretations.

Interpretation of OAP Results

Demographic Differences

As with the AFSS, there are demographic differences between the comparison groups that bear note. For the OAP, there are four such differences.

Gender of the respondent represents the first major distinction. In the MIL-MIL group, a respondent is nearly equally likely to be male or female (49% male, 51% female). This contrasts significantly with the MIL-CIV group in which 97% of the respondents are male and 3% are female. Hence, there may be a very strong male influence on the responses of the MIL-CIV group.

The next important difference is age of the respondent. Over half of the officers in the MIL-MIL group are age 30 or

under, while fewer than one third of the MIL-CIV officers are age 30 or under. Similarly, over half of the enlisted members in the MIL-MIL group are age 25 or under, while only about one third of the MIL-CIV enlisted members are age 25 or under.

As might be expected, the difference in age yields a corresponding difference in another demographic--time in service. In the MIL-MIL group, over 82% of the officers and over 88% of the enlisted respondents have fewer than 12 years in service. This represents a distinct difference from the MIL-CIV group, in which approximately half of the officers and 63% of the enlisted respondents have fewer than 12 years in the Air Force. Again, it seems fair to assume the MIL-MIL respondents are less likely to have made career decisions.

Finally, there is a difference between the comparison groups in educational level, with the MIL-CIV group somewhat more highly educated overall. However, this is most likely a function of the age difference between the groups, and adds little to the interpretation of the results.

Attitudinal Differences

Since the attitudinal differences between the comparison groups all point in the same direction, there is little to be gained by going through them factor by factor. It is certainly instructive to point out, however, the MIL-MIL respondents' views were always less positive where there was a significant difference (and 20 of the 21 factors evaluated showed significant differences between the groups).

On the whole, the results show the MIL-MIL respondents found their jobs less demanding, less productive, and less rewarding than did their MIL-CIV counterparts. It is no surprise, then, they reported having less pride in their jobs. In the enlisted category, a greater need for job enrichment also surfaced in the MIL-MIL group. There are several possible interpretations of the trend that emerged in the results. One is the military members married to other military members represent a group of uncommitted malcontents without whom the Air Force would probably be better off. A second interpretation, espoused by the author, is perhaps more in line with the AFSS results. According to that interpretation, the responding dual military members are com,etent, motivated individuals who don't feel sufficiently challenged in their jobs. Problems associated with join spouse assignments, as discussed in the previous section, may have a considerable impact. In either case, it appears the group as a whole is not as well-adjusted to its Air Force environment as is the group of military members with civilian spouses. If the author's interpretation is closer to the truth, then the Air Force may be about to lose some valuable members.

The author's interpretation of the results of the two surveys tends to support the following observation of William Hauser (1985): ". . . there appears a correlation between executives' ability and their propensity to be half of a 'two paycheck marriage.' If this is so in the military as well, then a disproportionate exodus of the more 'modern' officers and

their wives may be happening right now" (p. 180). It is useful to keep in mind, as pointed out earlier, that the MIL-MIL respondents are generally younger and have less time in service than is the case with their civilian counterparts. This could make them less committed to begin with, and may color their responses. Still, in the author's opinion, the survey responses indicate attitudinal differences between the groups that cannot be explained away quite that simply.

Relationship to Prior Research

Results of this study bear some relationship to three previous research efforts. Houk (1980) hypothesized that families with both members in the military are more satisfied with Air Force life than those with a civilian spouse. While her findings were inconclusive, the results of this study tend to refute the hypothesis--particularly in the case of the OAP results. Also, Williams' (1978) research in the 1970s predicted dual military member couples were less likely to have children, and more likely to tolerate lengthy separations for career purposes. The demographic and attitudinal results of this study support his predictions. Finally, the Beeson (1985) study purported a concept of "homogeneity," whereby those families whose needs are best met by the military lifestyle remain in, and the others separate from the service at an early opportunity. The net result is a relatively homogeneous group of families, highly committed to the military lifestyle and having generally low work commitment on the part of the wives.

Although Beeson's research specifically excluded dual military member couples from consideration, the results of the current study tend to support his conclusion. Although it cannot necessarily be inferred from the current study that the competent, motivated, insufficiently challenged dual military group will suffer a higher attrition rate beyond the 12-year period, it is certainly a distinct possibility. In fact, in this author's opinion, that is exactly what will happen.

It seems reasonable to assume any individual who is dissatisfied with his or her job, given a good chance of finding another one, will eventually quit. In this study, dual military member couples have expressed more frustration with their inability to achieve their potential. When you add to that their relatively higher levels of education and confidence in their abilities, their probability of separation from the Air Force appears higher. The next chapter will provide some recommendations for dealing with this potential problem.

Chapter Six

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter concludes this research effort with a brief summary of the study and some recommendations by the author dealing with dual military member couples.

Although family issues have been at the forefront of military interest for most of this decade, little attention has been devoted to nontraditional family types. The intent of this study has been to help fill the gap by looking at the work/family attitudes of one of these nontraditional family types--the dual military member couple.

Several steps were taken to fulfill the purpose of the study. First, current research and theory on the work/family interface were reviewed, with particular attention to the scarce research on dual military member couples. Next, the work/family attitudes of dual military member couples were compared to those of couples with civilian spouses using responses to two survey instruments: the U.S. Air Force Spouse Survey and the Organizational Assessment Package. Third, significant attitudinal differences between the groups were determined using standard inferential statistics at the 95% confidence level. Results of the analyses showed members of dual military couples to have, in general, less positive attitudes toward the Air

Force than was the case with the comparison group. They showed less satisfaction with on-base services, more frustration with their jobs and work environment, and less tendency to be influenced in career decisions by job benefits or patriotism.

These attitudinal differences were discussed in light of the demographic differences between the groups (i.e., the dual military couple respondents were more evenly divided between male and female, more highly educated, younger, had less time in service, and were less likely to have children). The author's resulting interpretation characterizes members of dual military couples as more motivated to achieve, more confident of their abilities, and more frustrated at not achieving their potential in their jobs than is the case with the comparison group. The author further projects these characteristics increase the probability of a high attrition rate among dual military member couples. Since it is reasonable to assume the Air Force would prefer not to lose these members, the question becomes, what can or should be done?

Although there is no simple answer, the author offers a few recommendations:

1. As was suggested by both Dansby (1984) and Beeson (1985), Air Force agencies should continue to encourage research on the work/family interface, particularly with respect to the nontraditional family types such as dual military member couples. Current research is scant, and many questions remain

unanswered. Of particular interest should be determining the factors that influence their career decisions.

2. Air Force researchers should follow up this effort with a study of work/family attitudes by gender--using the AFSS and OAP data bases. In this study, the dual military respondents were compared with a predominantly female group on the AFSS, and with a predominantly male group on the OAP. It might be enlightening to concentrate on the effect of gender on such attitudes.

3. The Military Personnel Center should consider comparing the evaluations and training reports of members of dual military couples with those of members married to civilians. Based partly on their expressed desire for more challenging jobs, the author characterizes the former as being more motivated. Such a comparison could shed more light on this distinction.

4. As suggested by Dansby (1984), Air Force leaders should be encouraged to continue to seek ways to improve military family life. The special needs and constraints of dual military member couples, as well as those of single parent families, should be taken into consideration in designing such base services as dependent medical care and child care.

5. In working join spouse assignments, Air Force personnel specialists should be encouraged to be receptive to the specific desires of dual military member couples. Granted, the needs of the Air Force must come first. However, assignment personnel should not assume either spouse places his or her career second

to the other's, or that family separations are unacceptable.

6. Air Force leaders should reevaluate the concept of the duties of the "commander's wife." Commanders may have active duty spouses, who may not be wives at all. Some thought in this direction might help eliminate confusion and knock down some outdated assignment barriers.

7. Finally, Air Force leaders should reevaluate the concept of the professional Air Force member. The prevailing definition of an Air Force professional as one whose family provides no competing career doesn't work for dual military member couples. Either the concept needs revision, or the fate of these couples should be seriously addressed.

Perhaps the first two recommendations will help find what it really takes to make members of dual military couples feel more productive and more able to achieve their potential in Air Force jobs. The third recommendation may help determine how concerned the Air Force should be about losing these members, and may properly set the emphasis. The fourth recommendation addresses some practical considerations that should be taken into account towards the aim of keeping these Air Force members. More importantly in this author's view, however, is the need to make Air Force leaders aware these couples do exist in great numbers, and to remove any psychological biases against them that may negatively affect their career decisions. These are the aims of the final three recommendations.

Much work remains to be done in this area. If this research

effort accomplishes nothing but to generate more interest and concern for the retention of members of dual military couples, then it will have served a useful purpose.

REFERENCES

Air Force Conference on Families. (1981). U.S. Department of the Air Force. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

American Forces Information Service. (1985, September). Almanac Defense/85. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Beeson, G. W. (1985). Influences on the identification of wives with the Air Force organization. Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dansby, M. R. (1984). A proposal for the revision of the U.S. Air Force Spouse Survey (Report No. 84-0645). Maxwell AFB, AL: Air Command and Staff College.

Flannery, P. A. & Dansby, M. R. (1985). USAF Family Survey: A revision of the USAF Spouse Survey (Report No. LMDC-TR-85-3). Maxwell AFB, AL: Leadership and Management Development Center.

Grossman, A. S. (1981). The employment situation for military wives. Monthly Labor Review, 104(2), 60-64.

Hauser, W. L. (1985). Careerism vs. professionalism in the military. In Dimensions of leadership (pp. 175-191). Maxwell AFB, AL: Air Command and Staff College.

Hendrix, W. H. & Halverson, V. B. (1979a). Organizational Survey Assessment Package for Air Force organizations (Report No. AFHRL-TR-78-93). Brooks AFB, TX: Air Force Human Resources Laboratory.

Hendrix, W. H. & Halverson, V. B. (1979b). Situational factor identification in Air Force organizations (Report No. AFHRL-TR-79-10). Brooks AFB, TX: Air Force Human Resources Laboratory.

Hightower, J. M. & Short, L. O. (1982). Factor stability of the Organizational Assessment Package (Report No. LMDC-TR-82-1). Maxwell AFB, AL: Leadership and Management Development Center.

CONTINUED

Houk, L. D. (1980). A comparison of attitudes in dual-career Air Force families (Report No. AD-A093243, LSSR 78-80). Wright Patterson AFB, OH: Air Force Institute of Technology.

Hunter, E. J. (1979, June). Familypower: An issue in military manpower management. Paper presented at the joint Interuniversity Seminar-Air University Symposium on Changing Military Manpower Realities: Strategic and Organizational Implications in the 1980s. Maxwell AFB, AL.

Hunter, E. J. (1982). Families under the flag. New York: Praeger.

Hunter, E. J. & Nice, D. S. (Eds.). (1978). Military families: Adaptation to change. New York: Praeger.

Hunter, E. J., den Dulk, D., & Williams, J. W. (1980). The literature on military families, 1980: An annotated bibliography (Report No. USAFA-TR-80-11). U.S. Air Force Academy, CO.

Ibsen, K. A., & Austin, J. S. (1983). Initial development of the USAF Spouse Survey. Proceedings of the 25th Annual Conference of the Military Testing Association, 633-638.

Mazzaroppi, L. L. (1984). The changing roles of military wives: An analysis of work-related values and lifestyle variables. Proceedings, Psychology in the Department of Defense, Ninth Symposium, 460-464.

McCubbin, H. I., Dahl, B. B., & Hunter, E. J. (1976). Families in the military system. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Military Family Resource Center. (1984). Review of military family research and literature. Springfield, VA: Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower Planning and Analysis.

Nie, N. H. (1983). SPSS^{x} user's guide. New York: McGraw-Hill.

CONTINUED

O'Keefe, R. A., Eyre, M. C., & Smith, D. L. (1984). Military family service centers. In F. W. Kaslow & R. I. Ridenour (Eds.), The military family: Dynamics and treatment (pp 254-267). New York: The Guilford Press.

Orthner, D. K. (1980). Families in blue: A study of married and single parent families in the U.S. Air Force. Greensboro, NC: Family Research and Analysis, Inc.

Short, L. O. (1985). The United States Air Force Organizational Assessment Package (Report No. LMDC-TR85-2). Maxwell AFB, AL: Leadership and Management Development Center.

Short, L. O., & Hamilton, K. L. (1981). An examination of the reliability of the Organizational Assessment Package (OAP) (Report No. LMDC-TR-81-2). Maxwell AFB, AL: Leadership and Management Development Center.

Williams, J. W. (1978). Dual-career military families. In E. J. Hunter & D. S. Nice (Eds.), Military families: Adaptation to change (pp. 103-112). New York: Praeger.

APPENDIX

Appendix A

U.S. Air Force Spouse Survey: Variables and Factors

U. S. AIR FORCE SPOUSE SURVEY

VARIABLES AND FACTORS

JANUARY 1986

LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT CENTER
AIR UNIVERSITY
Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama 36112-5712

The U.S. Air Force Spouse Survey is a 77-item attitudinal survey developed by the Leadership and Management Development Center (LMDC) to examine the relationship between spouse and family attitudes, and the member's job satisfaction and career intentions. It serves three main purposes (a) to provide a recurring measure of attitudes, opinions, and beliefs of Air Force spouses, (b) to link responses of Air Force members with those of their spouses, and (c) to determine the effect of spouses' attitudes on the members' job and retention.

Items of the survey are divided into two sections, demographic and attitudinal. The first section contains 15 items that are essentially demographic in nature; the second section consists of 58 items grouped into 14 statistical factors which measure such areas as the spouse's identification with the Air Force lifestyle, and perceptions of how various sources (such as base services and TDY) influence the member's career intentions, and spouse's desire for career intention. Four additional items are not included in the statistical factors because of problems interpreting their responses or because they did not load to a factor during analysis; however, data from these items are included in the data base.

The Spouse Survey may be administered either by itself or in conjunction with another LMDC attitudinal survey, the Organizational Assessment Package (OAP). The OAP focuses on members' jobs, leadership effectiveness and organizational issues and is administered to a census of the organization to which LMDC has been invited as a part of the LMDC consultation process. The OAP is administered to military and civilian members of the organization in group sessions. They are assured of the confidentiality of the individual survey response sheets (which are processed at Maxwell AFB where the consultants analyze the data for feedback to the organization in approximately five to six weeks).

When the Spouse Survey is administered in conjunction with the OAP survey, members are first instructed to complete a special section of the Spouse Survey response sheet with codes that permit members' responses to the OAP to be matched with those of their spouses, and then the members are told to ask their spouses to complete the Spouse Survey and return it in a sealed envelope to a local, central collection point. When the Spouse Survey is administered by itself, packages containing instructions, a survey booklet, and a self-addressed return envelope are mailed to the participants. In both cases, the Spouse Survey response sheets are returned in sealed envelopes so only LMDC personnel see completed response sheets. This collection process allows

confidentiality similar to that given to members completing the OAP.

Both the Spouse and OAP surveys use a seven-point Likert response scale. This facilitates administration and aids comparability of the data bases. The data for the Spouse Survey and the OAP survey are stored in separate, cumulative data bases and may be retrieved by demographics such as personnel category, age, sex, spouse employment status, and educational level. The data for members and spouses may be analyzed jointly by using the survey matching codes, thus allowing examination of the correlations between the attitudes of military members and their spouses.

The Spouse Survey data base is kept in two files: a matched Spouse-OAP data file containing approximately 8,500 cases and a "Spouse only" data file, which includes additional spouse data that did not match (for various reasons) with OAP data. This second file allows retention of data which could not be stored on the matched data file. Thus, this data file is larger, containing over 11,000 cases.

Since January 1982, the Spouse Survey has been administered to personnel from 34 bases, 22 in the CONUS, and 12 overseas. Responses from officers' spouses make up 23% of the data base, with spouses of enlisted members accounting for 68%, the remaining 9% being spouses of Air Force civilian employees. Thirteen percent of the respondents are male and 87% are female. (These demographics are from the "spouse only" data file).

U.S. AIR FORCE SPOUSE SURVEY

VARIABLES AND FACTORS

Variables

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement Response Options
AGE *	__	Age of survey respondent
SEX *	__	Sex of survey respondent
PERCAT *	__	Personnel category (officer, enlisted, or civilian) of Air Force member
GRADE *	__	Pay Grade (e.g., 01, 06, 14) of Air Force member

* When Spouse Survey data are matched with OAP data, the above variables are recoded (as indicated below) to differentiate them from OAP variables with the same names.

SAGE	__	Age of survey respondent
SSEX	__	Sex of survey respondent
SPERCAT	__	Personnel category (officer, enlisted, or civilian) of Air Force member
SGRADE	__	Pay Grade (e.g., 01, 06, 14) of Air Force member
S1	1.	How many years does your spouse have in in the Air Force? 1. Less than 1 year. 2. More than 1 year, less than 2 years. 3. More than 2 years, less than 3 years. 4. More than 3 years, less than 4 years. 5. More than 4 years, less than 8 years. 6. More than 8 years, less than 12 years. 7. More than 12 years.

S2 2. How many months have you been at this station (base) during this assignment?

1. Less than 1 month.
2. More than 1 month, less than 6 months.
3. More than 6 months, less than 12 months.
4. More than 12 months, less than 18 months.
5. More than 18 months, less than 24 months.
6. More than 24 months, less than 36 months.
7. More than 36 months.

S3 3. How many years have you been married to your spouse?

1. Less than 1 year.
2. More than 1 year, less than 4 yrs.
3. More than 4 years, less than 8 yrs.
4. More than 8 years, less than 12 yrs.
5. More than 12 years, less than 16 yrs.
6. More than 16 years, less than 20 yrs.
7. More than 20 years.

S4 4. Where do you live?

1. On the base to which my spouse is assigned
2. On another military installation
3. Off base, renting
4. Off base, buying

S5 5. If you live on base, why?

1. I live off base.
2. Quality and availability of schools.
3. Off base housing is too expensive.
4. Off base housing is not available.
5. Requirements of spouse's job.
6. Base housing occupancy requirements.
7. Other

S6 6. If you live off base, why?

1. I live on base.
2. Quality and availability of schools.
3. Base housing not available.
4. Investment in housing is part of our financial plan.
5. Requirements of spouse's job.
6. Base housing does not meet our requirements. (Space, design, etc.)
7. Other

S7 7. What is your Ethnic Group?

1. American Indian or Alaskan Native
2. Asian or Pacific Islander
3. Black, not of Hispanic Origin
4. Hispanic
5. White, not of Hispanic Origin
6. Other

S8 8. What is the highest educational level you have obtained?

1. Non-high school graduate
2. High school graduate or GED
3. Less than 2 years college
4. Two years or more college
5. Bachelors degree
6. Masters degree
7. Doctoral degree

S9 9. How many children do you have?

1.	None	5.	4 or 5
2.	1	6.	6, 7, or 8
3.	2	7.	9 or more
4.	3		

S10 10. How many children presently live at home?

1.	None	5.	4 or 5
2.	1	6.	6, 7, or 8
3.	2	7.	9 or more
4.	3		

S11 11. Are you employed in an income producing job?

1. No, and do not want to be employed.
2. No, would like to work but cannot find employment.
3. Yes, part time.
4. Yes, active duty military.
5. Yes, federal civil service.
6. Yes, other full time employment.

S12 12. If you are employed, what is your usual work schedule?

1. Not employed
2. Day shift, normally stable hours
3. Swing shift (about 4 P.M. to 8 P.M.)
4. Mid shift (about midnight to 8 A.M.)
5. Rotating shift schedule
6. Day or shift work with irregular or unstable hours
7. Frequent travel or frequently on-call to report to work

S13 13. If you are employed, why do you work?

1. Not employed
2. Financial necessity
3. To earn "extra" money
4. Personal growth and development
5. Professional growth and development
6. Other

S14 14. Are you a student?

1. No
2. Yes, full time undergraduate
3. Yes, part time undergraduate
4. Yes, full time graduate
5. Yes, part time graduate
6. Other

S15 15. Do you do volunteer work?

1. No
2. Yes, on base
3. Yes, off base
4. Yes, on and off base

Factors

FACTOR 1. IDENTIFICATION WITH THE AIR FORCE. Measures spouse's identification with the Air Force, to include commitment to the Air Force, endorsement of Air Force values, and value of the Air Force career.

Response Options for variables S16, S17, S19, S22, and S27:

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Moderately disagree
3 = Slightly disagree
4 = Neither agree nor disagree
5 = Slightly agree
6 = Moderately agree
7 = Strongly agree

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement Response Options
S16	16.	I feel involved with the Air Force life-style.
S17	17.	I would recommend an Air Force career for any young man or woman, including a son or daughter of mine.
S19	19.	An Air Force career has as much prestige and status as a civilian career.
S22	22.	The Air Force has made considerable efforts to make service life more attractive for members and their families.
S27	27.	I am glad my spouse chose the Air Force as a career.
S44	44.	Which of the following best describes your desires for your spouse's career or employment intentions?

1. I would like my spouse to separate terminate from the Air Force as soon as possible.

2. For the most part, I would like my spouse to not make the Air Force a career.

3. I am undecided as to my desires concerning my spouse making the Air Force a career.

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement Response Options
		4. For the most part, I would like my spouse to make the Air Force a career.
		5. I would like my spouse to make the Air Force a career.
		* 6. I would like my spouse to retire in the next 12 months.
S45	45.	Your spouse may have different career intentions than you would hope. Which of the following best describes your spouse's career or employment intentions?
		1. Will separate/terminate from the Air Force as soon as possible.
		2. Will most likely not make the Air Force a career.
		3. May continue in/with the Air Force.
		4. Will most likely continue in/with the Air Force as a career.
		5. Will continue in/with the Air Force as a career.
		* 6. Planning to retire in the next 12 months.

* If a respondent answers with option "6," that case is not considered for factor score analysis.

Response Options for variable S71:

1 = Not at all
2 = To a very little extent
3 = To a little extent
4 = To a moderate extent
5 = To a fairly large extent
6 = To a great extent
7 = To a very great extent

S71	71.	To what extent would you be happier if your spouse was doing a similar job only as a civilian?

Formula: F1 = (S16+S17+S19+S22+S27+S44+S45+(8-S71))/8.

FACTOR 2. JOB BENEFITS AS A RETENTION INFLUENCE. Measures spouse's perception of how selected job benefits influence career intention and spouse's desire for career intention.

Response Options for all variables in Factor 2:

1 = Not at all
2 = To a very little extent
3 = To a little extent
4 = To a moderate extent
5 = To a fairly large extent
6 = To a great extent
7 = To a very great extent

To what extent do you believe each of the following is important in determining your spouse's career intention?

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S49	49.	Medical/dental benefits
S50	50.	Job security
S51	51.	Retirement

To what extent do you believe each of the following is important in how you feel about your spouse's career intention.

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S57	57.	Medical/dental benefits
S58	58.	Job security
S59	59.	Retirement

Formula: F2 = (S49+S50+S51+S57+S58+S59)/6.

FACTOR 3. TDY ATTITUDES. Measures spouse's perceptions of how the member's TDY affects the family's lifestyle, member's career intentions and desirability of the Air Force life.

Response Options for all variables in Factor 3:

1 = Not at all
2 = To a very little extent
3 = To a little extent
4 = To a moderate extent
5 = To a fairly large extent
6 = To a great extent
7 = To a very great extent

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S64	64.	To what extent does the frequency of your spouse's TDY affect your family's life?
S65	65.	To what extent do the length of your spouse's TDYs affect your family's life?
S66	66.	To what extent do you believe TDY requirements influence your spouse's career intentions?
S67	67.	To what extent do the TDY requirements of your spouse's job influence your opinion of the desirability of the Air Force lifestyle?

Formula: F3 = (S64+S65+S66+S67)/4.

FACTOR 4. SATISFACTION/PRESTIGE AS RETENTION INFLUENCE. Measures spouse's feelings about the importance of the member's job satisfaction, status, and rate of pay as influences on retention and spouse's desire for career intention.

Response Options for all variables in Factor 4:

1 = Not at all
2 = To a very little extent
3 = To a little extent
4 = To a moderate extent
5 = To a fairly large extent
6 = To a great extent
7 = To a very great extent

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement

To what extent do you believe each of the following is important in determining your spouse's career intention?

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S46	46.	Job satisfaction
S47	47.	Status and prestige
S48	48.	Rate of pay

To what extent do you believe each of the following is important in how you feel about your spouse's career intention.

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S54	54.	Job satisfaction
S55	55.	Status and prestige
S56	56.	Rate of pay

Formula: F4 = (S46+S47+S48+S54+S55+S56)/6.

FACTOR 5. RECREATION FACILITIES. Measures spouse's satisfaction with various recreational services provided by the installation (base).

Response Options for all variables in Factor 5:

1 = Extremely dissatisfied
2 = Moderately dissatisfied
3 = Slightly dissatisfied
4 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
5 = Slightly satisfied
6 = Moderately satisfied
7 = Extremely satisfied

For the various services indicated below, please indicate your level of satisfaction.

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S37	37.	Recreation center
S38	38.	Base library
S39	39.	Auto hobby shop
S40	40.	Bowling Center
S41	41.	Golf
S42	42.	Arts and Crafts

Formula: F5 = (S37+S38+S39+S40+S41+S42)/6.

FACTOR 6. IDENTIFICATION WITH JOB. Measures spouse's identification with member's job, to include pride and importance of member's job.

Response Options for variables S25, S26, and S28.

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Moderately disagree
3 = Slightly disagree
4 = Neither agree nor disagree
5 = Slightly agree
6 = Moderately agree
7 = Strongly agree

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S25	25.	My spouse's abilities are fully used in his/her current job.
S26	26.	My spouse has an important job.
S28	28.	My spouse feels positive about his/her contribution to the Air Force.

Response Options for variables S70 and S72:

1 = Not at all
2 = To a very little extent
3 = To a little extent
4 = To a moderate extent
5 = To a fairly large extent
6 = To a great extent
7 = To a very great extent

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S70	70.	To what extent are you proud of your spouse's job?
S72	72.	To what extent would you like your spouse to change the job he/she is now doing, but remain in the Air Force?

Formula: F6 = (S25+S26+S28+S70+(8-S72))/5.

FACTOR 7. SERVICES--BASIC NEEDS. Measures spouse's satisfaction with various basic services provided by the installation (base).

Response Options for all variables in Factor 7:

1 = Extremely dissatisfied
2 = Moderately dissatisfied
3 = Slightly dissatisfied
4 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
5 = Slightly satisfied
6 = Moderately satisfied
7 = Extremely satisfied

For the various services listed below, please indicate your level of satisfaction.

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S33	33.	Base Exchange
S34	34.	Commissary
S35	35.	Military Medical Care
S36	36.	Open Mess
S43	43.	Child Care

Formula: F7 = (S33+S34+S35+S36+S43)/5.

FACTOR 8, TIME PRESSURE. Measures spouse's perceptions of the degree to which the Air Force job requires extra time on the member's part, thereby creating stress on the family.

Response Options for variables S23, S24, and S29.

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Moderately disagree
3 = Slightly disagree
4 = Neither agree nor disagree
5 = Slightly agree
6 = Moderately agree
7 = Strongly agree

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S23	23.	My spouse has to devote more time to "staying competitive" for promotion by means of service schools, college degrees, etc., than does his/her civilian counterpart.
S24	24.	My spouse has been under a lot of pressure as a result of his/her Air Force job.
S29	29.	My spouse has to devote more time to his/her job than his/her civilian counterpart.

Response Options for variable S68:

1 = Not at all
2 = To a very little extent
3 = To a little extent
4 = To a moderate extent
5 = To a fairly large extent
6 = To a great extent
7 = To a very great extent

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S68	68.	To what extent do your spouse's duty hours disrupt your family life?

Formula: F8 = (S23+S24+S29+S68)/4.

FACTOR 9, "OTHER" INFLUENCES ON CAREER DECISION. Measures spouse's perception of the degree, to which other, unspecified factors influence member's career intentions and spouse's desire for career intention.

Response Options for all variables in Factor 9:

1 = Not at all
2 = To a very little extent
3 = To a little extent
4 = To a moderate extent
5 = To a fairly large extent
6 = To a great extent
7 = To a very great extent

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S53	53.	To what extent do you believe "Other" factors are important in determining your spouse's career intentions?
S61	61.	To what extent do you believe "Other" factors are important in how you feel about your spouse's career intention?

Formula: F9 = (S53+S61)/2.

FACTOR 10, PATRIOTISM AS CAREER INFLUENCE. Measures spouse's perceptions of how feelings of patriotism affect member's career intention and spouse's desire for career intention.

Response Options for all variables in Factor 10:

1 = Not at all
2 = To a very little extent
3 = To a little extent
4 = To a moderate extent
5 = To a fairly large extent
6 = To a great extent
7 = To a very great extent

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S52	52.	To what extent do you believe patriotism is important in determining your spouse's career intention?
S60	60.	To what extent do you believe patriotism is important in how you feel about your spouse's career intention?

Formula: F10 = (S52+S60)/2.

FACTOR 11, DESIRE FOR INFORMATION ABOUT JOB. Measures spouse's desire for information about the Air Force and the member's job.

Response Options for all variables in Factor 11:

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Moderately disagree
3 = Slightly disagree
4 = Neither agree nor disagree
5 = Slightly agree
6 = Moderately agree
7 = Strongly agree

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S20	20.	I am interested in being informed and kept up-to-date on subjects related to the Air Force role and mission.
S21	21.	It is important for me to know about the kind of work my spouse is doing.

Formula: F11 = (S20+S21/2)

FACTOR 12. PROTOCOL/PRESTIGE. Measures spouse's perceptions of the importance of status-related activities in the member's job satisfaction, career intention and progression, and in the spouse's desire for career intention.

Response Options for variable S18:

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Moderately disagree
3 = Slightly disagree
4 = Neither agree nor disagree
5 = Slightly agree
6 = Moderately agree
7 = Strongly agree

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S18	18.	My participation in base or organizational activities is essential for my spouse to achieve his/her full promotion potential in the Air Force.

Response Options for variables S47 and S55:

1 = Not at all
2 = To a very little extent
3 = To a little extent
4 = To a moderate extent
5 = To a fairly large extent
6 = To a great extent
7 = To a very great extent

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S47	47.	To what extent do you believe job satisfaction is important in determining your spouse's career intention?
S55	55.	To what extent do you believe status and prestige are important in how you feel about your spouse's career intention?

Formula: F12 = (S18+S47+S55)/3.

FACTOR 13. MEDICAL CARE. Measures spouse's perceptions of the effect of satisfaction with medical and dental care on member's career intention and spouse's desire for career intention.

Response Options for variables S35:

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Moderately disagree
3 = Slightly disagree
4 = Neither agree nor disagree
5 = Slightly agree
6 = Moderately agree
7 = Strongly agree

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S35	35.	Indicate your level of satisfaction with Military Medical Care.

Response Options for variables S49 and S57:

1 = Not at all
2 = To a very little extent
3 = To a little extent
4 = To a moderate extent
5 = To a fairly large extent
6 = To a great extent
7 = To a very great extent

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S49	49.	To what extent do you believe medical/dental benefits are important in determining your spouse's intentions?
S57	57.	To what extent do you believe medical/dental benefits are important in how you feel about your spouse's career intention?

Formula: F13 = (S35+S49+S57/3)

FACTOR 14. EQUITY BETWEEN JOB AND FAMILY. Measures the degree to which the spouse perceives the member's compensation to be proportionate to the efforts the member puts forth.

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement Reponse Options
S63	63.	How long does each TDY normally last?

1. Less than 3 days
2. More than 3 but less than 7 days
3. More than 7 but less than 14 days
4. More than 14 but less than 21 days
5. More than 21 but less than 30 days
6. More than 30 days
7. Duration varies widely

Response Options for variables S69 and S73:

1 = Not at all
2 = To a very little extent
3 = To a little extent
4 = To a moderate extent
5 = To a fairly large extent
6 = To a great extent
7 = To a very great extent

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S69	69.	To what extent is your attitude about your spouse's job an important consideration to him/her?
S73	73.	To what extent do you believe that the pay and allowances earned by your spouse are in proportion to the job he/she performs?

Formula: F14 = ((8-S63)+S69+S73)/3.

Non-factored Variables

The following four variables did not load to the preceding factors. However, the responses to them are in the data base.

Response Options for non-factored variables S30, S31, and S32:

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Moderately disagree
3 = Slightly disagree
4 = Neither agree nor disagree
5 = Slightly agree
6 = Moderately agree
7 = Strongly agree

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement
S30	30.	I would encourage my spouse to extend his/her military career if there were fewer moves.
S31	31.	The effect of PCS moves on family life is an important factor in my spouse's career decision.
S32	32.	Air Force leaders are sensitive to the needs of Air Force families.

TDY is defined as temporary military duty, and the maximum length of a TDY is 179 days.

Variable	Item Number	Survey Statement Reponse Options
S62	62.	My spouse's job requires him/her to be TDY:

1. Less than once a year
2. Once or twice a year
3. 3 to 5 times a year
4. 6 to 9 times a year
5. 9 to 11 times a year
6. Once or twice a month
7. More than twice a month

APPENDIX

Appendix B

Organizational Assessment Package Survey: Factors and Variables

ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT PACKAGE SURVEY

FACTORS

AND

VARIABLES

JANUARY 1986

LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT CENTER
AIR UNIVERSITY

FACTORS AND VARIABLES OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT PACKAGE

The OAP is a 109-item survey questionnaire designed jointly by the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory and the Leadership and Management Development Center (LMDC) and is used to aid LMDC in its missions to: (a) conduct research on Air Force systemic issues using information in the OAP database, (b) provide leadership and management training, and (c) provide management consultation service to Air Force commanders upon request.

Allowable responses to the attitudinal items on the survey range from 1 (low) to 7 (high). The attitudinal items are grouped into 25 factors that address such areas as the job itself, management and supervision, communications, and performance in the organization. Each data record consists of 7 externally coded descriptors and 24 demographic items as well as the responses to the 93 attitudinal items.

The factors measured by the OAP are grouped into a systems model to assess three aspects of a work group: input, process, and output (adapted from McGrath's model).

Input. In LMDC's adaptation of the model, input is comprised of demographics, work itself, and job enrichment.

A. Demographics. Descriptive or background information about the respondents to the OAP survey.

B. Work Itself. The work itself has to do with the task properties (technologies) and environmental conditions of the job. It assesses the patterns of characteristics members bring to the group or organization, and patterns of differentiation and integration among position and roles. The following OAP factors measure the work itself:

806 - Job Desires (Need For Enrichment)
810 - Job Performance Goals
812 - Task Characteristics
813 - Task Autonomy
814 - Work Repetition
816 - Desired Repetitive Easy Tasks
823 - Job Related Training
Job Influences (not a statistical factor)

C. Job Enrichment. Measures the degree to which the job itself is interesting, meaningful, challenging, and responsible. The following OAP factors measure job enrichment:

800 - Skill Variety
801 - Task Identity
802 - Task Significance
804 - Job Feedback
806 - Need for Enrichment Index (Job Desires)
807 - Job Motivation Index
808 - OJI Total Score
809 - Job Motivation Index - Additive
825 - Motivation Potential Score

Work Group Process. The work group assesses the pattern of activity and interaction among the group members. The following OAP factors measures leadership and the work group process:

805 - Performance Barriers/Blockages (Work Support)
818 - Management and Supervision
819 - Supervisory Communications Climate
820 - Organizational Communications Climate
Work Interferences (not a statistical factor)
Supervisory Assistance (not a statistical factor)

Work Group Output. Measures task performance, group development, and effects on group members. Assesses the quantity and quality of task performance and alteration of the group's relation to the environment. Assesses changes in positions and role patterns, and in the development of norms. Assesses changes on skills and attitudes, and effects on adjustment. The following OAP factors measure the work group output:

811 - Pride
817 - Advancement/Recognition
821 - Work Group Effectiveness (Perceived Productivity)
822 - Job Related Satisfaction
824 - General Organizational Climate

EXTERNALLY CODED DESCRIPTORS

Batch Number

Julian Date of Survey

Major Command

Base Code

Consultation Method

Consultant Code

Survey Version

(Note: These items are concatenated to each data record during EDP processing.)

DEMOGRAPHIC ITEMS (NOT A STATISTICAL FACTOR)

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
-	-	Supervisor's Code
-	-	Work Group Code
-	-	Sex
-	-	Your age is
-	-	You are (officer, enlisted, GS, etc.)
-	-	Your pay grade is
-	-	Primary AFSC
-	-	Duty AFSC

(Note: The above items are on the response sheet.)

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
001	-	(Not used)
002	-	(Not used)
003	1	Total years in the Air Force: 1. Less than 1 year 2. More than 1 year, less than 2 years 3. More than 2 years, less than 3 years 4. More than 3 years, less than 4 years 5. More than 4 years, less than 8 years 6. More than 8 years

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
004	2	Total months in present career field: 1. Less than 1 month 2. More than 1 month, less than 6 months 3. More than 6 months, less than 12 months 4. More than 12 months, less than 18 months 5. More than 18 months, less than 24 months 6. More than 24 months, less than 36 months 7. More than 36 months
005	3	Total months at this station: 1. Less than 1 month 2. More than 1 month, less than 6 months 3. More than 6 months, less than 12 months 4. More than 12 months, less than 18 months 5. More than 18 months, less than 24 months 6. More than 24 months, less than 36 months 7. More than 36 months
006	4	Total months in present position: 1. Less than 1 month 2. More than 1 month, less than 6 months 3. More than 6 months, less than 12 months 4. More than 12 months, less than 18 months 5. More than 18 months, less than 24 months 6. More than 24 months, less than 36 months 7. More than 36 months
007	5	Your Ethnic Group is: 1. American Indian or Alaskan Native 2. Asian or Pacific Islander 3. Black, not of Hispanic Origin 4. Hispanic 5. White, not of Hispanic Origin 6. Other
008	11	Which of the following "best" describes your marital status? 0. Not married. 1. Married: Spouse is a civilian employed outside home. 2. Married: Spouse is a civilian employed outside home - geographically separated. 3. Married: Spouse not employed outside home. 4. Married: Spouse not employed outside home - geographically separated. 5. Married: Spouse is a military member. 6. Married: Spouse is a military member - geographically separated. 7. Single parent.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
009	6	Your highest education level obtained is: 1. Non-high school graduate 2. High school graduate or GED 3. Less than two years college 4. Two years or more college 5. Bachelors Degree 6. Masters Degree 7. Doctoral Degree
010	7	Highest level of professional military education (residence or correspondence): 0. None or not applicable 1. NCO Orientation Course or USAF Supervisor Course (NCO Phase 1 or 2) 2. NCO Leadership School (NCO Phase 3) 3. NCO Academy (NCO Phase 4) 4. Senior NCO Academy (NCO Phase 5) 5. Squadron Officer School 6. Intermediate Service School (i.e., ACSC, AFSC) 7. Senior Service School (i.e., AWC, ICAF, NWC)
011	8	How many people do you directly supervise? 1. None 5. 4 to 5 2. 1 6. 6 to 8 3. 2 7. 9 or more 4. 3
012	9	For how many people do you write performance reports? 1. None 5. 4 to 5 2. 1 6. 6 to 8 3. 2 7. 9 or more 4. 3
013	10	Does your supervisor actually write your performance report? 1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
014	11	Your work requires you to work primarily: 1. Alone 2. With one or two people 3. As a small work group (3-5 people) 4. As a large work group (6 or more people) 5. Other
015	12	What is your usual work schedule? 1. Day shift, normally stable hours 2. Swing shift (about 1600-2400) 3. Mid shift (about 2400-0800) 4. Rotating shift schedule 5. Day or shift work with irregular/unstable hours 6. Frequent TDY/travel or frequently on-call to report to work 7. Crew schedule
016	13	How often does your supervisor hold group meetings? 1. Never 4. Weekly 2. Occasionally 5. Daily 3. Monthly 6. Continuously
017	14	How often are group meetings used to solve problems and establish goals? 1. Never 3. About half the time 2. Occasionally 4. All of the time
018	15	What is your aeronautical rating and current status? 1. Nonrated, not on aircrew 2. Nonrated, now on aircrew 3. Rated, in crew/operations job 4. Rated, in support job

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
019	16	Which of the following best describes your career or employment intentions? 1. Planning to retire in the next 12 months 2. Will continue in/with the Air Force as a career 3. Will most likely continue in/with the Air Force 4. May continue in/with the Air Force 5. Will most likely not make the Air Force a Career 6. Will separate/terminate from the Air Force as soon as possible

NOTE: Variable 006, Statement 11 was added to the OAP on 19 Jan 80 and replaced variable 014 which appears on page 6. Although no longer used, Variable 014 is still shown because data collected from about 25,000 samples for this variable are still in the data base.

FACTORS

Each 800 series factor consists of two or more variables which correspond to statements in the OAP. A mean score can be derived for each factor except 835, 807, 808, 809 and 825 by using a "straight average." The formula for computing the exceptions is indicated.

FACTOR 800 - SKILL VARIETY: Measures the degree to which a job requires a variety of different tasks or activities in carrying out the work; involves the use of a number of different skills and talents of the worker; skills required are valued by the worker.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
201	17	To what extent does your job require you to do many different things, using a variety of your talents and skills?
212	29	To what extent does your job require you to use a number of complex skills?

FACTOR 801 - TASK IDENTITY: Measures the degree to which the job requires completion of a "whole" and identifiable piece of work from beginning to end.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
202	18	To what extent does your job involve doing a whole task or unit of work?
211	28	To what extent does your job provide you with a chance to finish completely the piece of work you have begun?

FACTOR 802 - TASK SIGNIFICANCE: Measures the degree to which the job has a substantial impact on the lives or work of others; the importance of the job.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
203	19	To what extent is your job significant in that it affects others in some important way?
210	27	To what extent does doing your job well affect a lot of people?

FACTOR 803 (NOT USED)

FACTOR 804 - JOB FEEDBACK: Measures the degree to which carrying out the work activities required by the job results in the worker obtaining clear and direct information about job outcomes or information on good and poor performance.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
272	22	To what extent are you able to determine how well you are doing your job without feedback from anyone else?
209	26	To what extent does your job provide the chance to know for yourself when you do a good job, and to be responsible for your own work?

FACTOR 805 - WORK SUPPORT: Measures the degree to which work performance is hindered by additional duties, details, inadequate tools, equipment, or work space.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
206	23	To what extent do additional duties interfere with the performance of your primary job?
207	24	To what extent do you have adequate tools and equipment to accomplish your job?
8	25	To what extent is the amount of work space provided adequate?

ula (8-206+207+208)/3

FACTOR 806 - NEED FOR ENRICHMENT INDEX (JOB DESIRES): Has to do with job related characteristics (autonomy, personal growth, use of skills, etc.) that the individual would like in a job.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
(In my job, I would like to have the characteristics described--from "not at all" to "an extremely large amount")		
249	51	Opportunities to have independence in my work.
250	52	A job that is meaningful.
251	53	The opportunity for personal growth in my job.
252	54	Opportunities in my work to use my skills.
253	55	Opportunities to perform a variety of tasks.

FACTOR 807 - JOB MOTIVATION INDEX: A composite index derived from the six job characteristics that reflects the overall "motivating potential" of a job; the degree to which a job will prompt high internal work motivation on the part of job encumbents.

Index is computed using the following factors:

800	Skill variety
801	Task identity
802	Task significance
805	Performance barriers/blockages
813	Task autonomy
804	Job feedback

Formula ((800+801+802+805)/4)*813*804

FACTOR 808 - OJI TOTAL SCORE: Assesses one's perception of motivation provided by his or her job. This factor is a variation of a scale employed by other job motivation theorists.

Score is computed using the variables in the following formula:

Formula (V201+V202+V203+V270+V271+V272
+8-V206+V207+V208+V209+V210
+V211+V212+V213)

FACTOR 809 - JOB MOTIVATION INDEX ---- ADDITIVE: This factor is a variation of a [illegible] employed by other job motivation theorists.

Index is computed using the following factors:

800	Skill variety
801	Task identity
802	Task significance
805	Performance barriers/blockages
813	Task autonomy
804	Work repetition

Formula ((800+801+802+805)/4)+813+804

FACTOR 8.0 - JOB PERFORMANCE GOALS: Measures the extent to which job performance goals are clear, specific, realistic, understandable, and challenging.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
217	34	To what extent do you know exactly what is expected of you in performing your job?
218	35	To what extent are your job performance goals difficult to accomplish?
273	36	To what extent are your job performance goals clear?
274	37	To what extent are your job performance goals specific?
221	38	To what extent are your job performance goals realistic?

FACTOR 8.: - PRIDE: Measures the pride in one's work.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
215	32	To what extent are you proud of your job?
275	46	To what extent does your work give you a feeling of pride?

FACTOR 812 - TASK CHARACTERISTICS: A combination of skill variety, task identity, task significance, and job feedback designed to measure several aspects of one's job.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
201	17	To what extent does your job require you to do many different things, using a variety of your talents and skills?
202	18	To what extent does your job involve doing a whole task or unit of work?
203	19	To what extent is your job significant, in that it affects others in some important way?
272	22	To what extent are you able to determine how well you are doing your job without feedback from anyone else?
209	26	To what extent does your job provide the chance to know for yourself when you do a good job, and to be responsible for your own work?
210	27	To what extent does doing your job well affect a lot of people?
211	28	To what extent does your job provide you with a chance to finish completely the piece of work you have begun?
212	29	To what extent does your job require you to use a number of complex skills?

FACTOR 813 - TASK AUTONOMY: Measures the degree to which the job provides freedom to do the work as one sees fit; discretion in scheduling, decision making, and means for accomplishing a job.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
270	20	To what extent does your job provide a great deal of freedom and independence in scheduling your work?
271	21	To what extent does your job provide a great deal of freedom and independence in selecting your own procedures to accomplish it?
213	30	To what extent does your job give you freedom to do your work as you see fit?
214	31	To what extent are you allowed to make the major decisions required to perform your job well?

FACTOR 814 - WORK REPETITION: Measures the extent to which one performs the same tasks or faces the same type of problems in his or her job on a regular basis.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
226	39	To what extent do you perform the same tasks repeatedly within a short period of time?
227	40	To what extent are you faced with the same type of problem on a weekly basis?

FACTOR 815 (NOT USED)

FACTOR 816 - DESIRED REPETITIVE EASY TASKS: Measures the extent to which one desires his or her job involve repetitive tasks or tasks that are easy to accomplish.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
255	56	A job in which tasks are repetitive.
258	57	A job in which tasks are relatively easy to accomplish.

FACTOR - JOB INFLUENCES (NOT A STATISTICAL FACTOR):

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
216	33	To what extent do you feel accountable to your supervisor in accomplishing your job?
238	42	To what extent do co-workers in your work group maintain high standards of performance?

FACTOR 817 - ADVANCEMENT/RECOGNITION: Measures one's awareness of advancement and recognition, and feelings of being prepared (i.e., learning new skills for promotion).

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
234	41	To what extent are you aware of promotion/advancement opportunities that affect you?
239	43	To what extent do you have the opportunity to progress up your career ladder?

240	44	To what extent are you being prepared to accept increased responsibility?
241	45	To what extent do people who perform well receive recognition?
276	47	To what extent do you have the opportunity to learn skills which will improve your promotion potential?

FACTOR 818 - MANAGEMENT and SUPERVISION (A): Measures the degree to which the worker has high performance standards and good work procedures. Measures support and guidance received, and the overall quality of supervision.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
404	58	My supervisor is a good planner.
405	59	My supervisor sets high performance standards.
410	60	My supervisor encourages teamwork.
411	61	My supervisor represents the group at all times.
412	62	My supervisor establishes good work procedures.
413	63	My supervisor has made his responsibilities clear to the group.
445	64	My supervisor fully explains procedures to each group member.
416	65	My supervisor performs well under pressure.

FACTOR - MANAGEMENT and SUPERVISION (B): (NOT A STATISTICAL FACTOR)

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
424	66	My supervisor takes time to help me when needed.
434	71	My supervisor lets me know when I am doing a poor job.
439	75	When I need technical advice, I usually go to my supervisor.

FACTOR 819 - SUPERVISORY COMMUNICATIONS CLIMATE: Measures the degree to which the worker perceives that there is good rapport with supervisors, that there is a good working environment, that innovation for task improvement is encouraged, and that rewards are based upon performance.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
426	67	My supervisor asks members for their ideas on task improvements.
428	68	My supervisor explains how my job contributes to the overall mission.
431	69	My supervisor helps me set specific goals.
433	70	My supervisor lets me know when I am doing a good job.
435	72	My supervisor always helps me improve my performance.
436	73	My supervisor insures that I get job related training when needed.
437	74	My job performance has improved due to feedback received from my supervisor.
442	76	My supervisor frequently gives me feedback on how well I am doing my job.

FACTOR 820 - ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS CLIMATE: Measures the degree to which the worker perceives that there is an open communications environment in the organization, and that adequate information is provided to accomplish the job.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
300	82	Ideas developed by my work group are readily accepted by management personnel above my supervisor.
301	83	My organization provides all the necessary information for me to do my job effectively.
302	84	My organization provides adequate information to my work group.
303	85	My work group is usually aware of important events and situations.
304	86	My complaints are aired satisfactorily.
309	91	The information in my organization is widely shared so that those needing it have it available.

314	96	My organization has clear-cut goals.
317	99	The goals of my organization are reasonable.
318	100	My organization provides accurate information to my work group.

FACTOR 821 - WORK GROUP EFFECTIVENESS: Measures one's view of the quantity, quality, and efficiency of work generated by his or her work group.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
259	77	The quantity of output of your work group is very high.
260	78	The quality of output of your work group is very high.
261	79	When high priority work arises, such as short suspenses, crash programs, and schedule changes, the people in my work group do an outstanding job in handling these situations.
264	80	Your work group always gets maximum output from available resources (e.g., personnel and material).
265	81	Your work group's performance in comparison to similar work groups is very high.

FACTOR - WORK INTERFERENCES (NOT A STATISTICAL FACTOR): Identifies things that impede an individual's job performance.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
277	48	To what extent do you have the necessary supplies to accomplish your job?
278	49	To what extent do details (task not covered by primary or additional duty descriptions) interfere with the performance of your primary job?
279	50	To what extent does a bottleneck in your organization seriously affect the flow of work either to or from your group?

FACTOR 822 - JOB RELATED SATISFACTION: Measures the degree to which the worker is generally satisfied with factors surrounding the job.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
705	101	Feeling of Helpfulness The chance to help people and improve their welfare through the performance of my job. The importance of my job performance to the welfare of others.
709	102	Co-worker Relationships My amount of effort compared to the effort of my co-workers, the extent to which my co-workers share the load, and the spirit of teamwork which exists among my co-workers.
710	103	Family Attitude Toward Job The recognition and the pride my family has in the work I do.
717	106	Work Schedule My work schedule; flexibility and regularity of my work schedule; the number of hours I work per week.
718	107	Job Security
719	108	Acquired Valuable Skills The chance to acquire valuable skills in my job which prepare me for future opportunities
723	109	My Job as a Whole

FACTOR 823 - JOB RELATED TRAINING: Measures the extent to which one is satisfied with on-the-job and technical training received.

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
711	104	On-the-Job Training (OJT) The OJT instructional methods and instructors' competence.
712	105	Technical Training (Other than OJT) The technical training I have received to perform my current job.

FACTOR 824 - GENERAL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE: Measures the individual's perception of his or her organizational environment as a whole (i.e. spirit of teamwork, communications, organizational pride, etc.).

Variable Number	Statement Number	Statement
305	87	My organization is very interested in the attitudes of the group members toward their jobs.
306	88	My organization has a very strong interest in the welfare of its people.
307	89	I am very proud to work for this organization.
308	90	I feel responsible to my organization in accomplishing its mission.
310	92	Personnel in my unit are recognized for outstanding performance.
311	93	I am usually given the opportunity to show or demonstrate my work to others.
312	94	There is a high spirit of teamwork among my co-workers.
313	95	There is outstanding cooperation between work groups of my organization.
315	97	I feel motivated to contribute my best efforts to the mission of my organization.
316	98	My organization rewards individuals based on performance.

FACTOR 825 - MOTIVATION POTENTIAL SCORE: This factor is another variation of a scale employed by other job motivation theorists. The score ranges between 1 and 343 with 109 being the Air Force average. Low scores indicate a poorly motivating job. Score is computed using the following factors:

800	Skill variety
801	Task identity
802	Task significance
804	Job feedback
813	Task autonomy

Formula ((800+801+802)/3)*813*804

VARIABLES

Variable Number	Factor	Statement Number	Statement
201	800/812	17	To what extent does your job require you to do many different things, using a variety of your talents and skills?
202	801/812	18	To what extent does your job involve doing a whole task or unit of work?
203	802/812	19	To what extent is your job significant, in that it affects others in some important way?
204 & 205	--	--	(Not used)
206	805	23	To what extent do additional duties interfere with the performance of your primary job?
207	805	24	To what extent do you have adequate tools and equipment to accomplish your job?
208	805	25	To what extent is the amount of work space provided adequate?
209	804/812	26	To what extent does your job provide the chance to know for yourself when you do a good job, and to be responsible for your own work?
210	802/812	27	To what extent does doing your job well affect a lot of people?
211	801/812	28	To what extent does your job provide you with a chance to finish completely the piece of work you have begun?
212	800/812	29	To what extent does your job require you to use a number of complex skills?

Variable Number	Factor	Statement Number	Statement
213	813	30	To what extent does your job give you freedom to do your work as you see fit?
214	813	31	To what extent are you allowed to make the major decisions required to perform your job well?
215	811	32	To what extent are you proud of your job?
216*	--	33	To what extent do you feel accountable to your supervisor in accomplishing your job?
217	810	34	To what extent do you know exactly what is expected of you in performing your job?
218	810	35	To what extent are your job performance goals difficult to accomplish?
219 & 220	--	--	(Not used)
221	810	38	To what extent are your job performance goals realistic?
222-225	--	--	(Not used)
226	814	39	To what extent do you perform the same tasks repeatedly within a short period of time?
227	814	40	To what extent are you faced with the same type of problem on a weekly basis?

* This variable is an element of "Job influences" (not a statistical factor).

Variable Number	Factor	Statement Number	Statement
228-233	--	--	(Not used)
234	817	41	To what extent are you aware of promotion/advancement opportunities that affect you?
235-237	--	--	(Not used)
238*	--	42	To what extent do co-workers in your work group maintain high standards of performance?
239	817	43	To what extent do you have the opportunity to progress up your career ladder?
240	817	44	To what extent are you being prepared to accept increased responsibility?
241	817	45	To what extent do people who perform well receive recognition?
242-248	--	--	(Not used)
249	806	51	Opportunities to have independence in my work?
250	806	52	A job that is meaningful.
251	806	53	The opportunity for personal growth in my job.
252	806	54	Opportunities in my work to use my skills.
253	806	55	Opportunities to perform a variety of tasks.
254	--	--	(Not used)
255	816	56	A job in which tasks are repetitive.

* This variable is an element of "job influences" (not a statistical factor).

Variable Number	Factor	Statement Number	Statement
256 & 257	--	--	(Not used)
258	816	57	A job in which tasks are relatively easy to accomplish.
259	821	77	The quantity of output of your work group is very high.
260	821	78	The quality of output of your work group is very high.
261	821	79	When high priority work arises, such as short suspenses, crash programs, and schedule changes, the people in my work group do an outstanding job in handling these situations.
262 & 263	--	--	(Not used)
264	821	80	Your work group always gets maximum output from available resources (e.g., personnel and material).
265	821	81	Your work group's performance in comparison to similar work groups is very high.
266-269	--	--	(Not used)
270	813	20	To what extent does your job provide a great deal of freedom and independence in scheduling your work?
271	813	21	To what extent does your job provide a great deal of freedom and independence in selecting your own procedures to accomplish it?
272	804/812	22	To what extent are you able to determine how well you are doing your job without feedback from anyone else?

Variable Number	Factor	Statement Number	Statement
273	810	36	To what extent are your job performance goals clear?
274	810	37	To what extent are your job performance goals specific?
275	811	46	To what extent does your work give you a feeling of pride?
276	817	47	To what extent do you have the opportunity to learn skills which will improve your promotion potential?
277**	--	48	To what extent do you have the necessary supplies to accomplish your job?
278**	--	49	To what extent do details (task not covered by primary or additional duty descriptions) interfere with the performance of your primary job?
279**	--	50	To what extent does a bottleneck in your organization seriously affect the flow of work either to or from your group?
280-299	--	--	(Not used)
300	820	82	Ideas developed by my work group are readily accepted by management personnel above my supervisor.
301	820	83	My organization provides all the necessary information for me to do my job effectively.
302	820	84	My organization provides adequate information to my work group.

** These variables are elements of "work interferences" (not a statistical factor).

Variable Number	Factor	Statement Number	Statement
303	820	85	My work group is usually aware of important events and situations.
304	820	86	My complaints are aired satisfactorily.
305	824	87	My organization is very interested in the attitudes of the group members toward their jobs.
306	824	88	My organization has a very strong interest in the welfare of its people.
307	824	89	I am very proud to work for this organization.
308	824	90	I feel responsible to my organization in accomplishing its mission.
309	820	91	The information in my organization is widely shared so that those needing it have it available.
310	824	92	Personnel in my unit are recognized for outstanding performance.
311	824	93	I am usually given the opportunity to show or demonstrate my work to others.
312	824	94	There is a high spirit of teamwork among my co-workers.
313	824	95	There is outstanding cooperation between work groups of my organization.

Variable Number	Factor	Statement Number	Statement
314	820	96	My organization has clear-cut goals.
315	824	97	I feel motivated to contribute my best efforts to the mission of my organization.
316	824	98	My organization rewards individuals based on performance.
317	820	99	The goals of my organization are reasonable.
318	820	100	My organization provides accurate information to my work group.
319-403	--	--	(Not used)
404	818	58	My supervisor is a good planner.
405	818	59	My supervisor sets high performance standards.
406-409	--	--	(Not used)
410	818	60	My supervisor encourages teamwork.
411	818	61	My supervisor represents the group at all times.
412	818	62	My supervisor establishes good work procedures.
413	818	63	My supervisor has made his responsibilities clear to the group.
414 & 415	--	--	(Not used)
416	818	65	My supervisor performs well under pressure.
417-423	--	--	(Not used)
424***	--	66	My supervisor takes time to help me when needed.
425	--	--	(Not used)

*** This variable is an element of "supervisory assistance" (not a statistical factor).

Variable Number	Factor	Statement Number	Statement
426	819	67	My supervisor asks members for their ideas on task improvements.
427	--	--	(Not used)
428	819	68	My supervisor explains how my job contributes to the overall mission.
429 & 430	--	--	(Not used)
431	819	69	My supervisor helps me set specific goals.
432	--	--	(Not used)
433	819	70	My supervisor lets me know when I am doing a good job.
434***	--	71	My supervisor lets me know when I am doing a poor job.
435	819	72	My supervisor always helps me improve my performance.
436	819	73	My supervisor insures that I get job related training when needed.
437	819	74	My job performance has improved due to feedback received from my supervisor.
438	--	--	(Not used)
439***	--	75	When I need technical advice, I usually go to my supervisor.
440 & 441	--	--	(Not used)
442	819	76	My supervisor frequently gives me feedback on how well I am doing my job.
443 & 444	--	--	(Not used)
445	818	64	My supervisor fully explains procedures to each group member.
446-704	--	--	(Not used)

*** These variables are elements of "supervisory assistance" (not a statistical factor).

Variable Number	Factor	Statement Number	Statement
705	822	101	Feeling of Helpfulness The chance to help people and improve their welfare through the performance of my job. The importance of my job performance to the welfare of others.
706-708	--	--	(Not used)
709	822	102	Co-worker Relationships My amount of effort compared to the effort of my co-workers, the extent to which my co-workers share the load, and the spirit of teamwork which exists among my co-workers.
710	822	103	Family Attitude Toward Job The recognition and the pride my family has in the work I do.
711	823	104	On-the-Job Training (OJT) The OJT instructional methods and instructors' competence.
712	823	105	Technical Training (Other than OJT) The technical training I have received to perform my current job.
713-716	--	--	(Not used)
717	822	106	Work Schedule My work schedule; flexibility and regularity of my work schedule; the number of hours I work per week.
718	822	107	Job Security
719	822	108	Acquired Valuable Skills The chance to acquire valuable skills in my job which prepare me for future opportunities.
720-722	--	--	(Not used)
723	822	109	My Job as a Whole
724-999	--	--	(Not used)

APPENDIX

Appendix C

Analysis of Demographic Information, AFSS

Appendix C

Table C-1

Number of Respondents by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL (903)	CIV-MIL (7688)
Officer	150	2008
Enlisted	753	5680

Table C-2

Sex of Respondent by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Male (53.8%)	Female (46.2%)	Male (2.8%)	Female (97.2%)
n =	484	416	211	7449
Officer	16.5	16.6	27.0	26.2
Enlisted	83.5	83.4	73.0	73.8

Table C-3

Age of Respondent by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (16.6%)	Enl (83.4%)	Off (26.1%)	Enl (73.9%)
n =	150	753	2008	5680
17 to 20 Yrs	2.0	4.8	0.6	6.6
21 to 25 Yrs	15.3	33.3	12.0	25.1
26 to 30 Yrs	30.0	32.8	24.3	25.0
31 to 35 Yrs	20.7	18.9	25.9	21.5
36 to 40 Yrs	22.0	7.6	23.0	13.2
42 to 45 Yrs	8.7	2.0	9.2	5.6
46 to 50 Yrs	0.7	0.4	3.4	1.5
Over 50 Yrs	0.7	0.3	1.7	1.5

Table C-4

Civilian Spouse Employment Status,
by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	CIV-MIL	
	Off (26%)	Enl (74%)
n =	1951	5546
Employed Outside Home	17.8	17.9
Not Employed Outside Home	82.2	82.1

Table C-5

Member's Time in AF, by Personnel Category, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (17%)	Enl (83%)	Off (26.2%)	Enl (73.8%)
n =	148	722	2003	5654
Less Than 1 Yr	1.4	1.8	3.1	2.0
1 to 2 Yrs	5.4	4.8	2.8	4.4
2 to 3 Yrs	11.5	8.4	4.5	5.3
3 to 4 Yrs	8.1	10.7	5.0	6.2
4 to 8 Yrs	30.4	35.6	17.8	20.2
8 to 12 Yrs	19.6	18.8	20.0	17.5
More Than 12 Yrs	23.6	19.8	46.6	44.4

Table C-6

Time on Station, by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (16.4%)	Enl (83.6%)	Off (26.1%)	Enl (73.9%)
n =	147	748	2001	5665
Less Than 1 Mo	0.7	0.5	1.3	1.6
1 to 6 Mos	12.9	9.8	11.7	11.5
6 to 12 Mos	21.8	11.4	18.1	15.9
12 to 18 Mos	10.9	14.6	15.7	15.2
18 to 24 Mos	19.7	16.2	14.0	12.7
24 to 36 Mos	22.4	25.8	23.6	20.8
More Than 36 Mos	11.6	21.8	15.6	22.0

Table C-7

Time Married, by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (16.7%)	Enl (83.3%)	Off (26.2%)	Enl (73.8%)
n =	150	750	2005	5662
Less Than 1 Yr	8.0	14.5	4.9	8.1
1 to 4 Yrs	38.7	41.6	16.8	25.2
4 to 8 Yrs	29.3	25.2	19.6	21.3
8 to 12 Yrs	12.0	11.1	18.3	17.8
12 to 16 Yrs	7.3	4.9	18.3	15.2
16 to 20 Yrs	4.0	1.5	13.5	8.2
More Than 20 Yrs	0.7	1.2	8.8	4.1

Table C-8

Where Live, by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (16.6%)	Enl (83.4%)	Off (26.2%)	Enl (73.8%)
n =	149	746	1982	5572
On Base With Member	16.1	23.7	38.2	49.0
On Another Base	0.7	1.6	2.8	4.6
Off Base Renting	28.9	49.3	18.7	31.4
Off Base Buying	54.4	25.3	40.4	15.0

Table C-9

Why Live On Base, by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (16.9%)	Enl (83.1%)	Off (25.7%)	Enl (74.3%)
n =	137	675	1863	5386
Live Off Base	81.8	71.6	55.3	43.4
Schools	0.0	1.6	2.2	3.7
Too Expensive	2.9	9.2	15.3	33.5
Not Available	2.2	0.6	2.1	1.6
Job Required	1.5	0.6	8.1	1.4
Occupancy Rqmts	0.0	1.3	1.3	2.1
Other	11.7	15.1	15.7	14.4

Table C-10

Why Live Off Base, by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (16.9%)	Enl (83.1%)	Off (26.6%)	Enl (73.4%)
n =	148	728	1895	5224
Live On Base	14.9	22.3	37.2	48.9
Schools	0.0	0.4	1.4	0.6
No Base Housing	1.4	6.5	6.4	11.9
Investment	41.2	17.9	24.6	10.4
Not Eligible	1.4	5.1	0.4	6.7
Bad Base Housing	29.1	26.0	22.6	10.3
Other	12.2	22.0	7.3	11.2

Table C-11

Ethnic Group by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (16.5%)	Enl (83.5%)	Off (26.2%)	Enl (73.8%)
n	148	749	2000	5629
American Indian	0.7	2.8	0.7	1.0
Asian	0.7	0.7	2.0	6.3
Black	2.0	12.4	1.9	6.3
Hispanic	2.0	3.6	2.5	5.4
White	89.9	77.7	91.6	79.6
Other	4.7	2.8	1.1	2.3

Table C-12

Highest Educational Level Obtained,
by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (16.6%)	Enl (83.4%)	Off (26.2%)	Enl (73.8%)
n =	150	752	2006	5649
Non-HS Grad	0.0	0.3	0.6	8.8
High School Grad	2.0	33.2	11.7	46.3
Less Than 2 Yrs Col	6.0	39.2	18.0	24.9
More Than 2 Yrs Col	7.3	19.7	24.7	13.3
Bachelor's Degree	52.7	6.8	35.6	5.9
Master's Degree	28.7	0.5	8.8	0.7
Doctoral Degree	3.3	0.3	0.6	0.1

Table C-13

Number of Children, by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (16.8%)	Enl (83.2%)	Off (26.1%)	Enl (73.9%)
n =	149	739	1994	5638
None	52.3	41.0	23.3	21.8
1	19.5	25.7	17.9	23.2
2	17.4	23.0	37.7	35.3
3	8.7	7.7	14.9	13.8
4 or 5	1.3	2.3	5.6	5.2
6, 7, or 8	0.7	0.3	0.6	0.6
9 or more	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1

Table C-14

Number of Children At Home, by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (16.8%)	Enl (83.2%)	Off (26%)	Enl (74%)
n =	145	719	1938	5524
None	56.6	43.4	24.8	23.3
1	22.8	28.0	22.1	25.5
2	16.6	22.4	36.9	35.3
3	3.4	5.3	12.4	12.3
4 or 5	0.7	1.0	3.5	3.3
6, 7, or 8	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3

Table C-15

Civilian Spouse Employed in Income Producing Job,
by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	CIV-MIL	
	Off (26%)	Enl (74%)
n =	1951	5546
Do Not Want to Work	46.8	28.7
No Work Available	15.7	27.7
Part Time	17.8	17.9
Civil Service	4.2	6.4
Other	15.4	19.4

Table C-16

Usual Work Schedule if Employed,
by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (16.6%)	Enl (83.4%)	Off (26%)	Enl (74%)
n =	150	751	1943	5540
Not Employed	0.7	0.4	62.7	56.1
Day Shift	64.7	66.3	28.4	30.8
Swing Shift	0.0	4.4	1.7	2.9
Mid Shift	0.7	2.3	0.6	0.7
Rotating Shift	10.0	12.3	1.6	3.4
Unstable Hours	12.0	10.8	3.9	5.5
Freq Travel-On Call	12.0	3.6	1.2	0.6

Table C-17

Reason for Working if Employed,
by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (16.5%)	Enl (83.5%)	Off (26.1%)	Enl (73.9%)
n =	147	743	1949	5530
Not Employed	0.0	0.7	62.2	55.9
Financial Necessity	19.7	33.5	6.0	20.7
Earn "Extra" Money	1.4	1.1	10.2	12.1
Personal Growth	12.9	14.0	7.8	5.2
Professional Growth	58.5	37.1	12.1	4.9
Other	7.5	13.6	1.6	1.2

Table C-18

Student Status, by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (16.9%)	Enl (83.1%)	Off (26%)	Enl (74%)
n =	150	739	1967	5610
Not a Student	72.0	67.3	83.8	88.8
Full Time Undergrad	0.7	1.5	3.7	2.4
Part Time Undergrad	8.0	25.6	6.4	6.0
Full Time Grad	1.3	0.4	1.2	0.3
Part Time Grad	15.3	3.1	3.2	0.9
Other	2.7	2.2	1.8	1.7

Table C-19

Volunteer Work, by Personnel Category of Member, AFSS

	MIL-MIL		CIV-MIL	
	Off (16.8%)	Enl (83.2%)	Off (26.1%)	Enl (73.9%)
n =	149	739	1985	5608
Non Volunteer	79.2	77.9	51.1	76.4
On Base	8.7	6.8	24.2	12.1
Off Base	5.4	6.2	12.6	7.5
Both	6.7	9.1	12.1	3.9

APPENDIX

Appendix D

Analysis of Demographic Information, DAP

Appendix D

Table D-1

Number of Respondents by Personnel Category, OAP

	MIL-MIL (7155)	MIL-CIV (46549)
Officer	910	8962
Enlisted	6245	37587

Table D-2

Sex by Personnel Category, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Male (49.1%)	Female (50.9%)	Male (97.1%)	Female (2.9%)
n =	3510	3636	45083	1357
Officer	11.5	13.8	19.3	18.5
Enlisted	88.5	86.2	80.7	81.5

Table D-3

Age by Personnel Category, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (12.7%)	Enl (87.3%)	Off (19.3%)	Enl (80.7%)
n =	910	6243	8962	37587
17 to 20 Yrs	0.0	7.8	0.0	4.8
21 to 25 Yrs	16.4	45.3	6.5	29.2
26 to 30 Yrs	40.4	28.6	24.1	22.7
31 to 35 Yrs	24.8	13.3	25.6	20.9
36 to 40 Yrs	12.7	4.1	23.6	15.6
41 to 45 Yrs	4.2	0.6	13.5	4.8
46 to 50 Yrs	0.9	0.1	4.3	1.2
Over 50 Yrs	0.5	0.3	2.4	0.8

Table D-4

Time in Air Force, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (12.7%)	Enl (87.3%)	Off (19.3%)	Enl (80.7%)
n =	909	6229	8951	37514
Less Than 1 Yr	3.2	2.1	1.7	2.9
1 to 2 Yrs	7.5	7.2	2.8	6.0
2 to 3 Yrs	11.0	12.6	5.0	7.7
3 to 4 Yrs	10.5	14.8	5.6	8.3
4 to 8 Yrs	33.1	34.2	19.1	20.9
8 to 12 Yrs	17.4	17.8	17.9	16.9
More Than 12 Yrs	17.4	11.3	47.8	37.3

Table D-5

Months in Present Career Field, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (16%)	Enl (84%)	Off (25.6%)	Enl (74.4%)
n =	239	1254	2292	6665
Less Than 1 Mo	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.0
1 to 6 Mos	15.1	10.6	15.8	14.0
6 to 12 Mos	20.5	25.0	27.4	26.3
12 to 18 Mos	28.9	29.0	26.7	29.5
18 to 24 Mos	33.9	33.7	28.2	28.2

Table D-6

Months at Present Duty Station, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (14.1%)	Enl (85.9%)	Off (20.2%)	Enl (79.8%)
n =	590	3591	5267	20771
Less Than 1 Mo	3.4	1.9	2.7	1.9
1 to 6 Mos	18.0	19.7	18.9	20.0
6 to 12 Mos	26.8	26.9	26.5	28.4
12 to 18 Mos	25.6	25.9	27.2	26.4
18 to 24 Mos	26.3	25.7	24.7	23.2

Table D-7

Months in Present Position, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (13.1%)	Enl (86.9%)	Off (20.2%)	Enl (79.8%)
n =	741	4934	7065	27942
Less Than 1 Mo	4.9	5.3	4.3	5.0
1 to 6 Mos	27.8	29.3	28.0	28.7
6 to 12 Mos	31.0	30.2	30.4	30.3
12 to 18 Mos	20.1	21.0	21.9	21.2
18 to 24 mos	16.2	14.2	15.4	14.8

Table D-8

Ethnic Group, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (12.7%)	Enl (87.3%)	Off (19.3%)	Enl (80.7%)
n =	905	6206	8924	37337
Indian-Alaskan	0.6	1.3	0.7	1.5
Asian-Pacific	1.9	1.7	1.3	2.1
Black	8.6	18.6	4.7	15.3
Hispanic	2.4	4.8	2.3	5.5
White	84.8	69.8	89.1	72.0
Other	1.8	3.8	1.9	3.5

Table D-9

Civilian Spouse Status, by Personnel Category of Member, OAP

	Geographically Separated		Not Geographically Separated	
	Off (10.2%)	Enl (89.8%)	Off (19.9%)	Enl (80.1%)
n =	338	2977	8624	34610
Employed Outside Home	74.6	68.9	37.6	44.2
Not Employed Outside Home	25.4	31.1	62.4	55.8

Table D-10

Highest Educational Level Obtained, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (12.7%)	Enl (87.3%)	Off (19.3%)	Enl (80.7%)
n =	907	6223	8943	37478
Non HS Grad	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.8
HS Grad or GED	0.1	41.6	0.2	40.1
Less Than 2 Yrs Col	0.6	38.8	0.2	35.8
More Than 2 Yrs Col	3.2	15.5	0.9	18.7
Bachelor's Degree	62.7	2.9	46.5	3.9
Master's Degree	27.7	0.5	43.0	0.6
PHD	5.7	0.1	9.0	0.0

Table D-11

Highest Level of Professional Military Education, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (12.6%)	Enl (87.4%)	Off (19.1%)	Enl (80.9%)
n =	899	6233	8847	37469
None	44.4	21.9	26.2	18.1
NCO Phase 1 or 2	0.8	42.2	1.0	29.0
NCO Phase 3	1.3	24.0	1.4	25.1
NCO Phase 4	0 8	8.1	1.1	17.7
NCO Phase 5	0.1	1.8	0.2	8.1
SOS	33.9	0.1	26.5	0.3
Int. Svc School	15.9	1.9	27.8	1.7
Sr. Svc School	2.8	0.0	15.8	0.1

Table D-12

Number of People Supervised, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (12.8%)	Enl (87.2%)	Off (19.6%)	Enl (80.4%)
n =	847	5747	8519	35053
None	41.9	60.4	38.7	48.8
1	9.0	10.2	6.9	8.6
2	7.2	8.4	6.1	8.5
3	9.6	5.7	7.7	6.9
4 or 5	11.2	7.5	15.0	10.4
6 to 8	8.6	3.4	11.3	6.9
9 or more	12.5	4.2	14.4	9.8

Table D-13

Number of People for Whom Respondent Writes APR/OER, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (12.7%)	Enl (87.3%)	Off (19.3%)	Enl (80.7%)
n =	906	6226	8941	37463
None	54.4	65.7	47.6	54.8
1	11.7	11.5	8.9	10.7
2	7.7	8.4	7.2	10.2
3	7.3	5.3	7.3	7.8
4 to 5	9.7	6.0	12.6	10.2
6 to 8	6.3	1.5	10.1	3.8
9+	2.9	1.6	6.3	2.5

Table D-14

Supervisor Writes Respondent's APR/OER, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (12.7%)	Enl (87.3%)	Off (19.3%)	Enl (80.7%)
n =	891	6147	8849	37061
Yes	78.3	72.2	77.4	74.5
No	15.5	18.0	14.1	16.8
Not Sure	6.2	9.8	8.5	8.7

Table D-15

Work Schedule, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (12.7%)	Enl (87.3%)	Off (19.2%)	Enl (80.8%)
n =	905	6196	8882	37299
Day	63.3	68.7	59.7	62.6
Swing	0.2	4.5	0.2	6.2
Mid	0.0	1.6	0.0	2.3
Rotating	9.4	10.7	3.4	11.4
Ireg	12.3	11.4	12.3	13.2
Freq TDY	6.1	2.1	8.6	2.9
Crew	8.7	1.0	15.8	1.3

Table D-16

Supervisor Holds Group Meetings, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (12.8%)	Enl (87.2%)	Off (19.3%)	Enl (80.7%)
n =	902	6146	8853	37122
Never	8.1	18.4	6.0	14.8
Occasionally	24.5	33.6	22.3	33.0
Monthly	16.7	8.6	12.8	9.4
Weekly	38.1	28.3	44.0	29.4
Daily	11.2	8.7	12.8	11.2
Continuously	1.3	2.5	2.1	2.2

Table D-17

Supervisor Holds Group Meetings to Solve Problems, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (12.8%)	Enl (87.2%)	Off (19.3%)	Enl (80.7%)
n =	893	6073	8813	36954
Never	18.5	28.5	14.7	23.7
Occasionally	41.9	37.9	42.6	40.4
Half the Time	21.8	16.6	22.4	16.9
Always	17.8	17.0	20.2	19.0

Table D-18

Aeronautical Rating and Current Status OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (12.9%)	Enl (87.1%)	Off (19.3%)	Enl (80.7%)
n =	907	6142	8830	36831
Nonrated	80.3	92.3	57.5	91.4
Nonrated, Crew	2.0	1.4	2.2	2.3
Rated, Operations	15.1	1.0	28.5	1.4
Rated, Support	2.6	5.2	11.8	4.9

Table D-19

Career Intent, OAP

	MIL-MIL		MIL-CIV	
	Off (12.7%)	Enl (87.3%)	Off (19.3%)	Enl (80.7%)
n =	909	6221	8918	37392
Retire in 12 Mos	0.8	1.1	4.1	4.6
Career	40.6	30.6	57.7	47.3
Likely Career	26.6	21.4	20.6	19.0
Maybe Career	18.6	21.6	11.7	15.5
Probably Not Career	8.1	14.4	3.4	7.7
Separate	5.3	10.9	2.5	5.9

APPENDIX

Appendix E

AFSS Comparison of Military Spouses of AF Members

to

Civilian Spouses of AF Members

Appendix E

Table E-1

Military Spouses of Officers vs. Civilian Spouses of Officers

	Mean	SD	df[a]	t
Identification With AF				
MIL-MIL	4.65	1.11	1906	-1.15
CIV-MIL	4.77	1.12		
Job Benefits as a Retention Influence				
MIL-MIL	5.11	1.37	160	-2.30 *
CIV-MIL	5.38	1.18		
TDY Attitudes				
MIL-MIL	3.40	1.89	161	-1.47
CIV-MIL	3.64	1.67		
Satisfaction/Prestige as a Retention Influence				
MIL-MIL	5.52	0.88	2108	1.63
CIV-MIL	5.39	0.99		
Recreation Facilities				
MIL-MIL	4.49	0.87	138	-0.87
CIV-MIL	4.56	0.73		
Identification With Job				
MIL-MIL	5.26	1.24	2081	-3.06 **
CIV-MIL	5.57	1.15		
Services--Basic Needs				
MIL-MIL	4.23	1.13	1730	-0.63
CIV-MIL	4.29	1.12		
Time Pressure				
MIL-MIL	5.29	1.08	172	2.87 **
CIV-MIL	5.02	1.25		
Patriotism as a Career Influence				
MIL-MIL	4.79	1.56	2130	-2.56 **
CIV-MIL	5.12	1.51		

Table E-1 (Continued)

	Mean	SD	df[a]	t
Desire for Information About Job				
MIL-MIL	6.26	1.07	2149	1.12
CIV-MIL	6.17	1.00		
Protocol/Prestige				
MIL-MIL	4.55	1.16	2119	1.81
CIV-MIL	4.35	1.31		
Medical Care				
MIL-MIL	4.71	1.25	2123	-0.31
CIV-MIL	4.75	1.33		
AFSS Item #31-- Effect of PCS Moves				
MIL-MIL	5.04	1.83	2133	0.79
CIV-MIL	4.91	1.92		
AFSS Item # 32-- Sensitivity of AF Leaders				
MIL-MIL	3.45	1.83	2143	-1.74
CIV-MIL	3.72	1.86		

[a] Approximate degrees of freedom are given when *t*-test for groups with unequal variances is used.

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$.

Table E-2

Military Spouses of Enlisted Members
vs. Civilian Spouses of Enlisted Members

	Mean	SD	df[a]	t
Identification With AF				
MIL-MIL	4.31	1.18	5696	-3.63 ***
CIV-MIL	4.48	1.16		
Job Benefits as a Retention Influence				
MIL-MIL	5.31	1.35	867	-7.05 ***
CIV-MIL	5.67	1.13		
TDY Attitudes				
MIL-MIL	3.04	1.82	5520	-6.40 ***
CIV-MIL	3.52	1.76		
Satisfaction/Prestige as a Retention Influence				
MIL-MIL	5.22	1.28	6318	0.68
CIV-MIL	5.19	1.23		
Recreation Facilities				
MIL-MIL	4.54	0.87	762	-1.03
CIV-MIL	4.58	0.77		
Identification With Job				
MIL-MIL	4.90	1.25	6234	-7.40 ***
CIV-MIL	5.27	1.23		
Services--Basic Needs				
MIL-MIL	4.00	1.21	782	-3.77 ***
CIV-MIL	4.19	1.14		
Time Pressure				
MIL-MIL	4.77	1.14	6272	-0.13
CIV-MIL	4.77	1.18		
Patriotism as a Career Influence				
MIL-MIL	4.77	1.67	6322	-4.75 ***
CIV-MIL	5.07	1.63		

Table E-2 (Continued)

	Mean	SD	df[a]	t
Desire for Information About Job				
MIL-MIL	5.97	1.18	6395	2.38 *
CIV-MIL	5.86	1.20		
Protocol/Prestige				
MIL-MIL	4.17	1.34	6262	3.16 **
CIV-MIL	4.00	1.36		
Medical Care				
MIL-MIL	4.76	1.34	6346	-4.12 ***
CIV-MIL	4.98	1.32		
AFSS Item #31-- Effect of PCS Moves				
MIL-MIL	5.13	1.90	6351	0.50
CIV-MIL	5.10	1.88		
AFSS Item #32-- Sensitivity of AF Leaders				
MIL-MIL	3.36	1.84	6407	-0.51
CIV-MIL	3.40	1.94		

[a] Approximate degrees of freedom are given when *t*-test for groups with unequal variances is used.

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$.

APPENDIX

Appendix F

OAP Comparison of AF Members With Military Spouses

to

AF Members With Civilian Spouses

Appendix F

Table F-1

Officers With Military Spouses vs. Officers With Civilian Spouses

	Mean	SD	df[a]	t
The Work Itself				
Job Performance Goals				
MIL-MIL	4.61	1.00	9500	-4.23 ***
MIL-CIV	4.76	0.99		
Task Characteristics				
MIL-MIL	5.28	0.93	9556	-2.93 **
MIL-CIV	5.38	0.95		
Task Autonomy				
MIL-MIL	4.46	1.33	9584	-3.22 ***
MIL-CIV	4.62	1.36		
Work Repetition				
MIL-MIL	4.52	1.37	9718	5.78 ***
MIL-CIV	4.24	1.36		
Desired Repetitive/ Easy Tasks				
MIL-MIL	2.50	1.08	9454	1.58
MIL-CIV	2.45	1.03		
Job Related Training				
MIL-MIL	4.43	1.55	876	-4.67 ***
MIL-CIV	4.71	1.46		
Job Enrichment				
Skill Variety				
MIL-MIL	5.26	1.33	1061	-5.55 ***
MIL-CIV	5.52	1.25		
Task Identity				
MIL-MIL	5.22	1.19	9758	-0.61
MIL-CIV	5.24	1.21		

Table F-1 (Continued)

	Mean	SD	df[a]	t
Task Significance				
MIL-MIL	5.81	1.24	9798	-0.30
MIL-CIV	5.83	1.24		
Job Feedback				
MIL-MIL	4.83	1.20	9772	-2.31 *
MIL-CIV	4.93	1.18		
Need For Enrichment				
MIL-MIL	6.07	0.88	9559	-1.39
MIL-CIV	6.11	0.85		
Job Motivation Index				
MIL-MIL	119.83	62.83	1020	-4.29 ***
MIL-CIV	129.81	68.41		
Work Group Process				
Work Support				
MIL-MIL	4.47	1.10	9425	-2.82 **
MIL-CIV	4.58	1.10		
Management Supervision				
MIL-MIL	5.06	1.52	986	-5.61 ***
MIL-CIV	5.36	1.31		
Supvry Communications				
MIL-MIL	4.61	1.60	973	-5.02 ***
MIL-CIV	4.90	1.40		
Orgnl Communications				
MIL-MIL	4.68	1.30	9141	-5.70 ***
MIL-CIV	4.94	1.26		

[a] Approximate degrees of freedom are given when *t*-test for groups with unequal variances is used.

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$.

Table F-1 (Continued)

	Mean	SD	df[a]	t
Work Group Output				
Pride				
MIL-MIL	5.33	1.45	1068	-4.30 ***
MIL-CIV	5.54	1.37		
Advancement/Recognition				
MIL-MIL	4.46	1.21	9347	-3.86 ***
MIL-CIV	4.62	1.20		
Perceived Productivity				
MIL-MIL	5.71	1.12	1027	-2.61 **
MIL-CIV	5.81	1.06		
Job Related Satisfaction				
MIL-MIL	5.33	1.12	9205	-1.33
MIL-CIV	5.38	1.10		
General Orgn Climate				
MIL-MIL	4.94	1.32	994	-7.07 ***
MIL-CIV	5.27	1.24		

[a] Approximate degrees of freedom are given when *t*-test for groups with unequal variances is used.

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$.

Table F-2

Enlisted Members With Military Spouses vs. Enlisted Members With Civilian Spouses

	Mean	SD	df [a]	t
The Work Itself				
Job Performance Goals				
MIL-MIL	4.71	0.98	42300	-6.83 ***
MIL-CIV	4.80	0.99		
Task Characteristics				
MIL-MIL	5.04	0.97	8186	-7.79 ***
MIL-CIV	5.15	1.00		
Task Autonomy				
MIL-MIL	3.88	1.41	8252	-7.20 ***
MIL-CIV	4.02	1.45		
Work Repetition				
MIL-MIL	5.31	1.34	8423	12.13 ***
MIL-CIV	5.09	1.37		
Desired Repetitive/ Easy Tasks				
MIL-MIL	3.09	1.38	8290	-4.18 ***
MIL-CIV	3.17	1.41		
Job Related Training				
MIL-MIL	4.29	1.65	7789	-10.16 ***
MIL-CIV	4.52	1.57		
Job Enrichment				
Skill Variety				
MIL-MIL	4.48	1.45	43142	-15.45 ***
MIL-CIV	4.79	1.45		
Task Identity				
MIL-MIL	5.09	1.24	43221	-3.14 **
MIL-CIV	5.14	1.25		

Table F-2 (Continued)

	Mean	SD	df[a]	t
Task Significance				
MIL-MIL	5.78	1.27	43431	-0.45
MIL-CIV	5.79	1.27		
Job Feedback				
MIL-MIL	4.79	1.29	43312	-2.67 **
MIL-CIV	4.84	1.29		
Need For Enrichment				
MIL-MIL	5.61	1.[illegible]3	42113	2.05 *
MIL-CIV	5.58	1.21		
Job Motivation Index				
MIL-MIL	100.64	61.56	7895	-8.94 ***
MIL-CIV	108.67	66.24		
Work Group Process				
Work Support				
MIL-MIL	4.49	1.13	42224	-2.78 **
MIL-CIV	4.53	1.13		
Management Supervision				
MIL-MIL	4.68	1.69	7623	-10.87 ***
MIL-CIV	4.94	1.58		
Supvry Communications				
MIL-MIL	4.33	1.72	7735	-9.17 ***
MIL-CIV	4.55	1.64		
Orgnl Communications				
MIL-MIL	4.22	1.32	40464	-10.66 ***
MIL-CIV	4.42	1.34		

Table F-2 (Continued)

	Mean	SD	df[a]	t
Work Group Output				
Pride				
MIL-MIL	4.86	1.65	8165	-9.99 ***
MIL-CIV	5.08	1.60		
Advancement/Recognition				
MIL-MIL	4.22	1.21	41681	-10.55 ***
MIL-CIV	4.40	1.21		
Perceived Productivity				
MIL-MIL	5.39	1.30	7774	-8.35 ***
MIL-CIV	5.54	1.24		
Job Related Satisfaction				
MIL-MIL	4.89	1.21	40240	-8.04 ***
MIL-CIV	5.03	1.23		
General Orgn Climate				
MIL-MIL	4.21	1.30	40330	-15.59 ***
MIL-CIV	4.52	1.40		

[a] Approximate degrees of freedom are given when *t*-test for groups with unequal variances is used.

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$.