

AD-A165 591


THE DUAL-CAREER HOUSEHOLD AND ITS EFFECTS ON SURFACE
WARFARE OFFICER CARE. (U) NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY CA M D VALENTINE DEC 85


1/2

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 5/9

NL





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

AD-A165 591

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Monterey, California



DTIC
ELECTE
MAR 24 1986
S D

THESIS

THE DUAL-CAREER HOUSEHOLD AND ITS EFFECTS
ON SURFACE WARFARE OFFICER
CAREER INTENT AND CAREER SATISFACTION

by

William D. Valentine, Jr.

December 1985

Thesis Advisor:

William J. Haga

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

86 3 21 032

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Naval Postgraduate School		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) Code 54	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Naval Postgraduate School		
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Monterey, California 93943-5100			7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Monterey, California 93943-5100		
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 NUMBERS		
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO	PROJECT NO	TASK NO
			WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO		
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) THE DUAL-CAREER HOUSEHOLDS AND ITS EFFECTS ON SURFACE WARFARE OFFICER CAREER INTENT AND CAREER SATISFACTION					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Valentine, William D. Jr.					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Master's Thesis		13b. TIME COVERED FROM TO		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 December	
				15. PAGE COUNT 102	
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	Dual-careers status and family issues impact on SWO career intent and satisfaction		
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)					
This study analyzes data from a survey of the Surface Warfare Officer community. The questionnaire was initiated by Navy Personnel Research and Development Center (NPRDC) in the summer of 1981. This thesis enhances the understanding of the effects of dual-careers and related family issues on surface warfare officer retention. Six theoretical measures were identified (household career status, family responsibility, grade, type duty, family disruptions, and family decision process), which were expected to explain the variance across career intent and career satisfaction. The study defined a dual-career family as a family in which husband and wife pursue careers that (a) both have professional-administrative-Technical (PAT) jobs and (b) the relative proportion between the two incomes is between 60-40 and 50-50.					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT ☐ DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Thomas G. Swenson			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) 408-646-2686		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL Code 54

The findings show that both career intent and career satisfaction are influenced by the interaction of household career status, family decision process, grade and type duty. The study partly rejects the idea that the dual-career family trend in the Navy is a major problem. Additionally, the study raises questions for future research to address.

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

The Dual-Career Household and Its Effects
On Surface Warfare Officer
Career Intent and Career Satisfaction

by

William D. Valentine, Jr.
Lieutenant, United States Navy
B.S., United States Naval Academy, 1979

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of


MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the


NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

December 1985

Author:


William D. Valentine, Jr.

Approved by:


William J. Haga, Thesis Advisor


Thomas G. Swenson, Second Reader


Willis R. Greer, Jr., Chairman,
Department of Administrative Sciences


Kneale T. Marshall,
Dean of Information and Policy Sciences

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes data from a survey of the Surface Warfare Officer community. The questionnaire was initiated by Navy Personnel Research and Development Center (NPRDC) in the summer of 1981. This thesis enhances the understanding of the effects of dual-careers and related family issues on surface warfare officer retention. Six theoretical measures were identified (household career status, family responsibility, grade, type duty, family disruptions, and family decision process), which were expected to explain the variance across career intent and career satisfaction. The study defined a dual-career family as a family in which husband and wife pursue careers that (a) both have professional-administrative-technical (PAT) jobs and (b) the relative proportion between the two incomes is between 60-40 and 50-50.

The findings show that both career intent and career satisfaction are influenced by the interaction of household career status, family decision process, grade and type duty. The study partly rejects the idea that the dual-career family trend in the Navy is a major problem. Additionally, the study raises questions for future research to address.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION -----	9
A.	BACKGROUND -----	9
B.	THE DUAL-CAREER FAMILY DEFINED -----	13
C.	PROBLEM STATEMENT -----	16
D.	THESIS INTENTION -----	19
E.	RESEARCH QUESTION -----	19
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW -----	20
A.	THE DUAL-CAREER HOUSEHOLD: DESCRIPTION AND CHARACTERISTICS -----	20
B.	THE MILITARY, THE FAMILY, AND THE DUAL-CAREER TREND -----	23
C.	CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND CAREER PLANNING-----	25
III.	METHODOLOGY -----	29
A.	FUNDAMENTAL ASSUMPTIONS -----	29
B.	SAMPLE -----	29
C.	SCREENING MEMBERS OF SAMPLE -----	30
D.	LIST OF VARIABLES -----	32
	1. Household Career Status -----	34
	2. Family Responsibility -----	35
	3. Grade -----	36
	4. Type Duty -----	37
	5. Family Disruptions -----	38
	6. Career Intent -----	39
	7. Career Satisfaction -----	39
	8. Family Decision Process -----	40
E.	METHOD OF ANALYSIS -----	42



Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

IV.	FINDINGS -----	47
A.	SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS -----	47
B.	ANALYSIS RESULTS -----	47
	1. HYPOTHESIS 1 - Household Career Status--	47
	2. HYPOTHESIS 2 - Family Decision Process--	50
	3. HYPOTHESIS 3 - Grade and Household Career Status -----	51
	4. HYPOTHESIS TEST 4 - Type Duty -----	55
	5. HYPOTHESIS TEST 5 - Family Decision Process -----	58
	6. HYPOTHESIS 6 - Family Responsibility and Family Disruption -----	58
V.	ANALYSIS -----	64
A.	CAREER INTENT -----	64
B.	CAREER SATISFACTION -----	67
VI.	CONCLUSIONS -----	71
A.	OVERVIEW -----	71
B.	POLICY SUGGESTIONS -----	72
	1. Sea Tour Lengths and Split Tours -----	72
	2. Command Understanding and Involvement---	73
	3. Family Services -----	74
C.	SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH -----	74
D.	INTO THE FUTURE: THE NEXT GENERATION -----	75
E.	FINAL COMMENTS -----	76
	APPENDIX - NPRDC SURFACE WARFARE OFFICER QUESTIONNAIRE-	77
	LIST OF REFERENCES -----	99
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST -----	101

LIST OF TABLES

I	THE DUAL-CAREER PHENOMENON -----	10
II	PROJECTED TOTAL SHIPS UNDER THE NAVY'S PLANNED BUILDUP 1983-1990 (END OF FY) -----	11
III	ACTIVE-DUTY OFFICER REQUIREMENTS BY TYPE OF BILLET FISCAL YEARS 1983-1990 (IN THOUSANDS)-----	12
IV	THE SUCCESS-CYCLE -----	14
V	SURFACE WARFARE OFFICER CAREER PATH -----	15
VI	MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME BY TYPE OF FAMILY SELECTED YEARS 1968-1980 (CONSTANT 1980 DOLLARS, THOUSANDS) -----	18
VII	CAREER STAGE MODELS -----	26
VIII	NAVAL OFFICER CAREER STAGES -----	28
IX	NPRDC SURFACE WARFARE OFFICER SAMPLE POPULATION -----	31
X	MARRIED SURFACE WARFARE OFFICER POPULATION-----	31
XI	SAMPLE POPULATION BY GRADE AFTER SCREENS APPLIED -----	33
XII	DUAL-CAREER INDEX CORRELATION MATRIX -----	34
XIII	NAVAL OFFICER PROMOTION FLOW POINTS -----	37
XIV	FAMILY DISRUPTION INDEX CORRELATION MATRIX -----	38
XV	CAREER SATISFACTION INDEX CORRELATION MATRIX-----	40
XVI	FAMILY DECISION PROCESS CORRELATION MATRIX-----	41
XVII	THE SYSTEMS APPROACH -----	43
XVIII	HYPOTHESIS 1: ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY SUMMARY-----	43
XIX	HYPOTHESIS 2: ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY SUMMARY-----	44
XX	HYPOTHESIS 3: ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY SUMMARY-----	44
XXI	HYPOTHESIS 4: ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY SUMMARY-----	45
XXII	HYPOTHESIS 5: ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY SUMMARY -----	45

XXIII	HYPOTHESIS 6: ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY SUMMARY -----	46
XXIV	GENERAL SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS -----	48
XXV	RESULTS FOR HOUSEHOLD CAREER STATUS MEANS TEST---	49
XXVI	CAREER INTENT AND CAREER SATISFACTION MEAN SCORES -----	49
XXVII	RESULTS FOR FAMILY DECISION MEANS TEST -----	50
XXVIII	CAREER INTENT AND CAREER SATISFACTION MEAN SCORES BY FAMILY DECISION PROCESS -----	51
XXIX	ANOVA (GLM) BY HOUSEHOLD CAREER STATUS AND GRADE -----	53
XXX	DEVIATIONS FROM THE GRAND MEAN IN HYPOTHESIS TEST 3 -----	54
XXXI	ANOVA (GLM) BY HOUSEHOLD CAREER STATUS AND TYPE DUTY -----	56
XXXII	DEVIATIONS FROM THE GRAND MEAN IN HYPOTHESIS TEST 4 -----	57
XXXIII	ANOVA (GLM) BY HOUSEHOLD CAREER STATUS AND FAMILY DECISION PROCESS -----	60
XXXIV	DEVIATIONS FROM THE GRAND MEAN IN HYPOTHESIS TEST 5 -----	61
XXXV	ANOVA (GLM) BY HOUSEHOLD CAREER STATUS, FAMILY RESPONSIBILITY AND FAMILY DISRUPTIONS (F-STAT)---	62
XXXVI	DEVIATIONS FROM THE GRAND MEAN IN HYPOTHESIS TEST 6 -----	63
XXXVII	DIFFERENCES IN CAREER INTENT AND CAREER SATISFACTION WHEN FAMILY DECISION PROCESS ACCOUNTED FOR -----	72

I. INTRODUCTION


A. BACKGROUND

In 1984 and 1985, the press heralded the two-executive family and pondered its impact upon corporation, community and children. The traditional model of bread-winner husband and the homemaker wife was soon to be gone. Disappearing was the wife who ran the house, made social plans, and moved her household across the country as her husband pursued success. In the past twenty years the dual-career family has grown from a curiosity into a trend. As Table I depicts, in 1960 900-thousand American couples consisted of spouses who both held positions as executives, professionals or technicians. In 1983 there were 3.3 million.

The trend of two-career families in American society merits the attention and concern of Naval manpower planners and policy makers.

During this same 20-year period the United States Navy embarked on a major expansion to a 600-ship Navy. The Navy's shipbuilding plan for FY's 1984-1988 includes 124 new ships with a projected cost of \$93 billion (in 1985 dollars). The majority of these ships would be deployable combatants capable of wartime services at overseas locations. Table II illustrates the scope of the planned build-up through 1990 [Ref. 1: p. xiv].

TABLE I
THE DUAL-CAREER PHENOMENON



(Source: Elias, Marilyn, "Two-job couples: Let the Man Rule," USA Today 8 August, 1985.)

TABLE II

PROJECTED TOTAL SHIPS UNDER THE NAVY'S
PLANNED BUILDUP 1983-1990 (END OF FY)

Ship class	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Deployable forces								
Strategic Forces								
Submarines (SSBN)	34	35	37	39	39	39	41	42
Support	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Battle Forces								
Carriers	13	13	13	13	14	14	14	15
Submarines (SSN)	91	93	96	97	99	98	96	97
Cruisers	28	29	30	32	35	38	42	46
Destroyers	69	69	69	69	69	69	70	65
Frigates	93	102	107	111	113	113	113	113
Battleships	1	1	2	2	2	3	4	4
Amphibious	63	61	61	62	62	64	67	67
Mobile Logistics	52	53	53	53	53	55	58	60
Mine Warfare	3	3	4	5	10	14	22	25
Other	12	12	12	12	12	12	8	7
Support Forces	43	49	55	55	54	56	58	60
Total Forces	509	527	546	556	569	582	600	608

(CBO 1982)

A larger fleet will, obviously, require substantially more manpower. By the end of fiscal year 1990, some 9,000 more officers will be required. Table III depicts those officer requirements by type of billet [Ref. 1: p. 10].

From where will these new commissions come? How will the Navy compete for manpower in an expensive labor market?

Part of the answer rests with understanding the economic and demographic characteristics of dual-career families.

TABLE III

ACTIVE-DUTY OFFICER REQUIREMENTS BY TYPE OF BILLET
FISCAL YEARS 1983-1990 (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE BILLET	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Sea Duty	19	19	20	21	21	21	22	23
Shore Duty	38	39	39	40	40	40	40	41
Overhead*	15	16	17	17	17	17	17	17
Total Officer	72	74	76	79	79	78	79	81

*Indicates cadets, students, trainees, patients, prisoners and personnel in transit (permanent change of station).

The roles of work and family in the lifestyles of Americans for the rest of this decade and into the next will be profoundly reorganized. If the Navy is to succeed in getting and keeping top-grade officers in sufficient numbers to man the 600-ship Navy, it must take account of a new family arrangement in which both spouses pursue professional or executive careers. Not just officers in aggregate, but

it is safe to assume that, like attracting like, it is precisely the best and brightest of the officer corps whose mates will have careers of equal importance and income. Long hours, frequent separations and transfers may turn into critical manpower losses if these demands turn into critical conflict with a spouse's career and such conflicts are resolved by resignations of commissions.

B. THE DUAL-CAREER FAMILY DEFINED


What is a dual-career family? For the purposes of this study, a dual-career family is defined as a family in which husband and wife pursue careers in which (a) both have professional-administrative-technical (PAT) jobs and (b) the relative proportion between the two incomes is between 60-40 and 50-50. In this study, the relative proportion factor was assumed by virtue of the rigor imposed on the PAT factor. Income data was not available. A dual-career family is not merely a working wife. Rather, it is a wife with a successful career.

A career is defined here as a job sequence that requires a high degree of psychological commitment and that has a continuous developmental character. In order for a career to have that aspect of continuous developmental character, it must embody the process of generating action steps for individuals to progress along alternative pathways, in work systems, and it must unite organizational planning with individual needs, capabilities, and aspirations [Ref. 2: p. 23].

In short, it must provide a challenge and allow for growth. Table IV illustrates the "success cycle" as developed by Hall and Hall [Ref. 3: p. 33].


In the success cycle depicted, a person accepts a challenge or reaches for a goal, gets recognition and internal satisfaction, and enjoys a huge boost in ego. This increased sense of self-esteem and confidence generates increased job involvement. This in turn leads to setting more challenging future goals, representing higher levels of aspiration.

TABLE IV
THE SUCCESS-CYCLE



In the methodology chapter, I will explain how I identified and defined dual-career couples in terms of the variables found in the Navy data on surface warfare officers.

TABLE V
SURFACE WARFARE OFFICER CAREER PATH



C. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Command at sea marks the zenith of a surface warfare officer's career. The path up the ladder of success requires that an officer understand the assignment process and that he make a major career decision every two to three years. These decisions have a considerable effect on an officer's family. Table V depicts a typical Surface Warfare Officer career path.

Integrating professional needs and family responsibilities is strain enough in the conventional breadwinner husband/homemaker wife family. In the dual-career household the strain is amplified. Domestic chores, child care, job demands and social obligations compete for the limited hours in the day of a dual-career couple.

From the male officer's point of view, a career oriented wife's inability to be a traditional Navy-Wife is likely to undermine his career success. As a male officer progresses up the chain of command, the role of his wife as social hostess and symbol of command increases. She is both hostess and social director. Pye and Shea, in their book "Welcome Aboard. A Service Manual for the Naval Officers Wife", outline traditional responsibilities of the Navy-Wife:

You should do all you can to fulfill the wishes of the wife of your husband's commanding officer . . . as far as possible, you should comply with her requests . . . it is not only considered good manners to be as cooperative as possible, but it helps the morale of the ship if the wives all get along together. [Ref. 4: p. 22]

A wife with a career of her own may find it impossible to embrace the role of "Navy-Wife", either because:

- (1) She does not have the time.
- (2) She is geographically separated.
- (3) She is not interested in traditional subordination.

Further, the financial realities of the dual-career lifestyle cannot be overlooked. Two professionally salaried people can more easily afford a rising cost of living in the United States. The desire to purchase homes frequently priced over \$100,000, to drive new cars, and to generally improve their quality of life provides additional incentive for both members of the household to pursue careers.

Additionally, the motivations of women are changing. In 1964 the Census Bureau found that two-thirds of working women were employed out of economic need; only one-sixth gave "personal satisfaction" as their rationale for working. A decade later, in a National Opinion Research Center survey, 60 percent of married women gave "important and meaningful work" as their most preferred job characteristic. Today, in a national survey of women aged eighteen to thirty-five, over 80 percent of the working women polled said they would continue to work even if money were no problem.

This concern for autonomy and self-fulfillment indicates that society is beginning to endorse a new type of success for both men and women: a psychological success based on the individual's internal priorities, values, and standards of excellence [Ref. 3: p. 67].

Table VI relates the difference in median family income for dual-career and single-career families for selected years 1968-1980.

TABLE VI

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME BY TYPE OF FAMILY
SELECTED YEARS, 1968-1980 (CONSTANT 1980 DOLLARS,
THOUSANDS)

TYPE FAMILY	YEAR						
	1968	1970	1972	1974	1976	1968	1980
Dual-Career	10.63	12.15	13.88	16.58	19.08	22.73	27.74
Single-Career	8.7	10.01	11.49	13.48	15.48	18.99	22.40

(Source: Haygle, Howard. "Dual Earner Families", Two Paychecks (Sage publications, London, England: 1982), p. 36.

As Table VI indicates, the difference in median earnings between the two lifestyles is widening. In many cases, once a family is accustomed to a double income, they often are financially not able to give up one of the income sources, even if it means temporary separations and difficult relocations [Ref. 5: p. 27].

The income from two well-paid careers in one household becomes a vital factor in resistance to:

- (1) Frequent moves.
- (2) Moves to non-metro assignments.
- (3) Overseas moves.

An officer in San Diego or Washington, D.C. simply and truly may not be able to afford an assignment to Maine if it means losing 40 percent of the household income.

If the Navy is serious about attracting and keeping its best surface warfare officers, then the special needs of dual-career households must be understood. Programs dealing with career paths, the detailing process, PCS policies, job data banks for spouses, and family issues in general may ease the task of manning a larger surface force.

D. THESIS INTENTION

The purpose of this study is to understand the effects of dual careers and related family issues on surface warfare officer retention.

E. RESEARCH QUESTION

Do dual-career families exhibit different behaviors with regard to career intent and career satisfaction as a result of family oriented variables? If so, what roles do family responsibility, family decision process, grade, type duty, and family disruptions play in explaining any such differences?

Compared to single-career families, are dual-career families less career-oriented? Do they experience a lesser degree of career satisfaction?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. THE DUAL-CAREER HOUSEHOLD: DESCRIPTION AND CHARACTERISTICS

The literature addressing the dual-career phenomenon is as new and dynamic as the trend itself. The various writings run from family issues to the economic, social, and organizational impact of dual-career households.

Two social phenomena led to the increase in dual-career households:

- (1) The rapid rise in the number of women in the work force.
- (2) A success ethic that was previously valued by men only has spread to working women. They are equally concerned with the quality of life now that they can afford it.

A classic study of the dual-career households was done by Rapoport and Rapoport in 1971. They defined the two-career family as:

heads of household pursue careers and at the same time maintain a family life together [Ref. 6: p. 42].

The study classified couples according to four descriptions:

Careerist Couples: both emphasize career only.
Conventional Couples: the wife emphasizes family only and the husband emphasizes career.
Family Couples: both emphasize family as their major source of satisfaction.
Coordinate Couples: both value family and career.

In a related study, Hall and Hall (1978) discussed how dual-career couples and organizations cope. They grouped couples according to career stages:

Characteristics of Early Career Couples

1. Similar career demands. For both partners, the need to develop skills and contacts and gain broad work experience means traveling, relocations, long hours, and a high degree of job involvement. For each, the job is top priority. These responsibilities and demands often lead to conflict.
2. Conflicting career choices. The best opportunity for each, in terms of advancing their respective careers, may mean moving in different directions geographically.
3. Intense commitment to career. Both partners usually have a strong drive to succeed. Because of this, they understand and empathize with the other's commitment to career. This doesn't lessen the intensity of their own commitment, however.
4. Lack of preparedness. Most couples have little information about managing two careers or about what lies ahead if they plan to have a family.
5. No problem-solving skills. For many couples, the conflict over a first job or relocation is their first experience in working on problems together. Often they perceive the situation in terms of "my career versus yours".
6. Fear of the organization. Many couples are afraid to discuss their problems with a boss or superior in the firm for fear it will reflect negatively on their career commitment.
7. Personal flexibility. When pushed, most young couples seem willing to explore non-traditional alternatives for managing a family or a marriage.

Characteristics of Mid-Career Couples

1. Career versus family conflicts over children and relocation.
2. Alternative career paths which accommodate family needs are viewed as viable.
3. More clearly defined career and family priorities and goals.
4. Commitment to the family unit.

5. Improved ability to plan and cope as a function of experience in problem solving career/family issues.
6. Less fear of the organization, more sharing of career/family concerns, and willingness to test the organization's flexibility.
7. Acceptance of the career as flexible and the family as a given [Ref. 3: p. 38].

Dual-career families tend to be more inner-directed.

The source of direction for the individual is inner in the sense that it is implanted early in life by elders and directed toward generalized but nonetheless inescapably destined goals. These individuals possess a greater degree of flexibility in adapting themselves to changing requirements and in return require more from their environment [Ref. 7: p. 14].

They act upon, and are guided by individual principles and motives, rather than responding primarily to external pressures [Ref. 8: p. 45].

Furthermore, there is strong evidence which suggests that wives in dual-career families tend to come from a higher social and economic class than their husbands [Ref. 9: p. 63].

Burke and Weir (1976), found that two-career families relied less on the need to receive affection, inclusion and control. They concluded that dual-career families were more self-reliant and self-sufficient than single career families [Ref. 10: pp. 453-459].

Suter (1979), reported that there were significant differences in attitudes and behavior between dual-career and single-career families across age, rank, designator and career intent [Ref. 5: pp. 79-123].

Strifler (1982), found that family disruption was a significant factor in assessing the variance across career intent. His study employed the same data set used for this work. [Ref. 2: p. 87]

Both Suter (1979) and Strifler (1982) employed a broader definition of a dual-career family than is used in this study. In both cases, the criterion used to identify two-career couples was merely if the spouse was employed outside of the home. This study takes a closer look at the nature of the spouse's employment.

Yogev and Brett (1983), found that, in dual-career couples, family dynamics and interaction were important aspects in shaping family attitudes and behaviors [Ref. 11: p. 13].

B. THE MILITARY, THE FAMILY, AND THE DUAL-CAREER TREND

This section reviews the literature pertaining to the effects of the dual-career trend on the military family.

Grace, Steiner and Holcher (1976) found that Navy wives have a favorable attitude towards Navy life, but that recently those attitudes have become less favorable. They observed that:

- (1) More wives are working outside of the home;
- (2) Wives are growing dissatisfied with family separations;
- (3) Wives are having difficulty in obtaining assistance when the husband is away.
[Ref. 12: p. 19].

Along the same lines, Githens (1979) showed that deprivation of home life and family separation together was the number one reason for leaving the service as stated on Navy Officer Exit Statements [Ref. 13: p. 43].

In assessing Surface Warfare Junior Officer retention, Mohr, Holzbach and Morrison (1981) found that separation was considered to be the worst aspect of Navy life. Wives who worked outside of the home generally were less supportive of a Navy career than those who maintained the home [Ref. 14: p. 29].

In examining family roles in a changing military, Hunter and Pope (1981) found that the changing roles for both men and women in civilian society are belatedly being reflected within the military [Ref. 15: p. 16].

In a study of Air Force personnel, Carr and Orthner (1980) expressed the need for the military to understand family composition and characteristics. Because the family is a primary component of military policy [Ref. 16: p. 12].

The problem of recognition and action was summarized by Bailyn (182) who found that, despite widespread awareness patterns of work/family relations, organizations are not responding to this change [Ref. 17: p. 32].

A successful two-career family must share household responsibilities and family work. Yogev and Brett (1983) reported that the perception which distinguishes between dual-career spouses who are satisfied with marriage and general lifestyle and those who are not, is that the other partner is doing his/her share of family work. Family work includes not only housework, but child care as well [Ref. 11: p. 21].


The recurring themes are dissatisfaction with prolonged separation, the need to share family responsibilities and household work, the lack of flexibility in both military and corporate structure and the degree of independence and self reliance present in dual-career families.

C. CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND CAREER PLANNING

A number of career development and career stage theories have been put forth. Virtually all of these state, in one way or another, that an adult develops through specific stages or steps and that an age range bounds each stage. These stages must be "stepped-through" by an individual if he/she is to follow a normal career development path. Table VII summarizes the various career stage models.

Career development and career planning were defined by London and Stumpf (1982), as the activities individuals participate in to improve themselves relative to their current planned work-roles and the activities that organizations sponsor to help ensure that individuals will meet

TABLE XVII
CAREER STAGE MODELS



(Source: Morrison, R.F. and Cook, T.M. "Military Officer Career Development and Decision Making: A Multiple-Cohort Longitudinal Analysis of the First Twenty-Four Years," NPRDC, San Diego, [March, 1982]).

or exceed their future human resource requirements.

[Ref. 18: p. 11].

The necessary relationship between the individual and the organization was highlighted by Morrison and Cook (1982) who postulated that "variations in career development patterns, career intentions, performance and continuance with the organization will be a function of the interaction between individual, organization, social and environmental factors over time" [Ref. 19: p. 23].

In a study of marriage and family issues across Naval Officer careers, Derr (1979) defined three major stages in the career/family life of a Naval Officer. Table VIII displays those stages [Ref. 20: p. 18].

These career stages are important for both the organization and the individual to understand in undertaking career planning and development.

TABLE VIII
NAVAL OFFICER CAREER STAGES

STAGE	STAGE	ISSUES
ENSIGN, LTJG	Early-career	Determine if the Navy is to be a career. Adjusting to Navy way of life. Developing work and family model.
LT, LCDR	Mid-Career	Sure of career anchor. Period of "questioning". Family issues rise in importance. Wife has significant impact on career decisions.
CDR and above	Late-Career	Key family issue is geographic stability. Preparing for transition to retirement. Confronting issues of aging.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. FUNDAMENTAL ASSUMPTIONS

This study was designed to draw conclusions about the effect of dual-career situations on surface warfare officer career intent and career satisfaction.

The following assumptions are behind the design of this study and its statistical analysis:

- (1) All surface warfare officers responding to the survey were career oriented (in either military or civilian sectors).
- (2) The best assessment of the impact of family oriented issues is by officer respondents.
- (3) The respondent's answer to the career intent and the career satisfaction portions of the questionnaire accurately represent the officer's true inclinations and feelings.

B. SAMPLE

This study analyzes data from a survey of the surface warfare officer community. The questionnaire was initiated by Navy Personnel Research and Development Center (NPRDC) in the summer of 1981. Its purpose was to determine factor in the Navy's career management system that affect officer career decision-making and action (see the Appendix).

The questionnaire was designed to survey approximately 8,000 surface warfare officers from Ensign to Commander (year groups 1961-1980). The questionnaire itself was divided under the following headings:

- (1) Background information
- (2) Professional Qualifications
- (3) Present Assignment Experience
- (4) Assignment Process
- (5) Decision Process
- (6) Career Management
- (7) Career Attitudes
- (8) Education, Training, and Professional Development
- (9) Supplemental Questions

In addition, a final section to allow the respondent the opportunity to make narrative comments was also provided. However, this narrative information was not stored in the data base and is therefore unavailable. The questionnaire is contained in the appendix.

Table IX shows the total sample population by rank. This distribution reflects a response rate of 36 percent.

C. SCREENING MEMBERS OF SAMPLE

In order to conform with the specific focus of the study, the total sample population of 2859 cases (see Table IX) was screened by first limiting the usable cases to those married respondents. Survey question 1.2 was used to make this initial cut (see the appendix). The results are shown in Table X.

The sample was further screened by determining the nature of the spouse's employment. Question item V.18 was structured as follows:

How is your spouse primarily employed (Choose best response)

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| () 1. Full-time homemaker | () 7. Consultant |
| () 2. Secretary/Clerical | () 8. Business/Finance |
| () 3. Teacher | () 9. Navy Officer |
| () 4. Nurse | () 10. Navy enlisted |
| () 5. Engineer | () 11. Other military |
| () 6. Other professional | () 12. Other ----- |

If a respondent indicated that the spouse was primarily employed in categories (1) through (8) then the case was

TABLE IX

NPRDC SURFACE WARFARE OFFICER SAMPLE POPULATION

RANK	N
Commander	850
Lieutenant Commander	792
Lieutenant	639
Lieutenant (j.g.)	440
Ensign	<u>138</u>
Total	2859

TABLE X

MARRIED SURFACE WARFARE OFFICER POPULATION

Number Married	Percent of Total Sample Population
2149	7516

included in the sample to be studied. Responses (9) through (12) were excluded. While two-officer families are interesting in their own right, their relationships are in a dimension apart from the dual-career family with only one member in the service.

Table XI displays the resultant sample frequency after both screens have been applied.

As presented, the sample to be studied comprises 1927 separate cases, representing 67 percent of the sample. Due to the size of this sample, the underlying distribution is assumed to be normal.

D. LIST OF VARIABLES

Each variable selected for the study was designed to measure one of the following general constructs:

CONSTRUCT	VARIABLE
(1) Household career status	Spouse employment Job importance
(2) Family responsibility	Number of children
(3) Grade	Rank
(4) Type duty	Assignment
(5) Family disruptions	Disruptions in spouse's schooling

TABLE XI
SAMPLE POPULATION BY GRADE AFTER SCREENS APPLIED

Grade	N	Percent of Total
		Sample Population
Ensign	29	21.0
Lieutenant (j.g.)	116	26.0
Lieutenant	478	75.0
Lieutenant Commander	710	89.0
Commander	594	70.0
Total	1927	67.0

(6) Career intent

Career intent

(7) Career satisfaction

Impact of career change

Career enjoyment

Career pride

Occupation satisfaction

(8) Family decision process

Discussion lead time

Spouse involvement in

career

An indexing scheme was devised and applied were feasible.
This indexing approach was directly relevant to the
constructs:

- (1) Household career status;
- (2) Family decision process;
- (3) Career satisfaction;
- (4) Family disruptions

The four indexes were formed by collapsing variables significantly correlated at the .05 level into single measures. Each construct, including indexing strategy where applicable will now be discussed in depth.

1. Household Career Status

In this study, household career status is defined as either single-career family or dual-career family. An indexing strategy was employed to formulate the dual-career portion of this construct. The index involved two questions on the survey questionnaire, item V.18 (Spouse employment) and item V.20 (Job importance) (See the appendix).

In order to be classified as a dual-career family the following criteria were applied.

- (1) The respondent indicated that the spouse was employed as an engineer, professional, consultant, or in business/finance. Responses 5 through 8 inclusive on Spouse employment.)
- (2) The respondent indicated that he did not consider his career significantly more important than that of his spouse. (Responses 1 through 4 inclusive on Job importance.)

Table XII gives the correlation matrix for the variables involved (Spouse employment and Job importance). As a result of this indexing strategy, 106 cases qualified for dual-career classification.

TABLE XII

DUAL-CAREER INDEX CORRELATION MATRIX

	Job Importance
Spouse Employment	.59474*

*Correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level.

It should be noted that attempts to apply more stringent requirements for dual-career classification resulted in sample sizes that were too small to allow for confident data analysis.

If a respondent indicated that his/her spouse was a full-time homemaker, secretary/clerical, a teacher or a nurse (items 1 through 4), then the family was considered single-career. No indexing scheme was applied to this variable. This grouping resulted in 1608 cases and represents 83 percent of the original sample size.

This approach captures the executive aspect of the true dual-career situation. It is not intended to slight or lessen the degree of commitment or dedication of any of the vocations grouped in the single-career status, but rather, makes the assumption that those jobs have a certain aspect of mobility not shared by the dual-career grouping.

Furthermore, because in dual-career families (a) both spouses earn nearly equal incomes and (b) the women may avoid traditional women's work, jobs that are portable (nurses, teachers) involve less pursuit of top organizational success.

2. Family Responsibility

The number of dependents in a household has a direct effect on the degree of family responsibility. Specifically, the more the dependents the greater the degree of responsibility [Ref. 3: p. 67].

Dependents were equated to the number of children living in the household. Item I.6 (number of children) from the questionnaire was utilized (see the appendix). The mean number of children for the entire sample population was 1.23, and 96.5 percent of the households had three or less children. As a result, families who indicated that there were anywhere from 1 to 3 children in their household were grouped as having significant family responsibilities. This resulted in 1589 cases.

Families with no children were considered to have no significant family responsibilities. Those cases numbered 1171.

3. Grade

Table XIII summarizes the promotion flow points that a typical surface warfare officer can anticipate.

Due to the fact that this study is interested in, among other things, ascertaining whether junior and senior officers react differently to the pressure of a dual-career lifestyle, the sample was broken down into the following two categories.

- (1) Junior officer (01-03).
- (2) Senior officer (04-05).

This grouping strategy resulted in cell sizes of 623 and 1304 respectively.

TABLE XIII
NAVAL OFFICER PROMOTION FLOW POINTS

To Grade	Years of Service
Ensign (01)	0-2 years
Lieutenant (j.g.) (02)	2 years
Lieutenant (03)	4 years
Lieutenant Commander (04)	9 years
Commander (05)	14-15 years
Captain (06)	21-22 years
Admiral (07+)	25 years

4. Type Duty

One of the keys in helping to make a dual-career arrangement successful is the sharing of family duties and responsibilities. The care of dependent children and the daily chores involved with maintaining a home are obvious manifestations of these responsibilities. More subtle in nature, but of equal importance, are the social facets, or the corporate spouse syndrome. Just as the Navy-Wife is expected to entertain and be involved in the service members career, both spouses in the dual-career household must share equal roles in this area.

The professional life of a Naval Officer, and more specifically, a surface warfare officer, does not always lend itself to the easy sharing of family responsibilities.

In order to capture any effects that type of duty may contribute, survey question III.1 (Type duty currently assigned) was employed (see the appendix). The general categories are sea-duty and shore-duty and the respective cell sizes are 977 and 943.

5. Family Disruptions

The survey did not address the question of family disruptions specifically. However, question V.22 concerning the impact of PCS (permanent change of station) moves was determined to be an adequate proxy (see the appendix). In this case, two aspects of the question were considered:

- (1) Disruptions in spouse's employment (PCSMOVE1).
- (2) Disruptions in family schooling (PCSMOVE2).

These two responses were combined to form an index on the basis of the correlation matrix given in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

FAMILY DISRUPTION INDEX CORRELATION MATRIX

	Disruptions in family schooling
Disruptions in	.509*
Spouse employment	

*Correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level.

If the officer respondent had a response of 2 or less on both PCSMOVE1 and PCSMOVE2 they were included in the category. This grouping strategy resulted in a cell size of 85 and represents about 4.5 percent of the total population of concern.

If the above criteria were not met, the family was considered not to have significant disruptions. There were 1589 such cases.

6. Career Intent

The relative strength of career intent of the sample population was taken directly from item VII.1 on the questionnaire (see the appendix). Unfortunately, the question provides no insights regarding the respondents intentions of remaining past the minimum length of service in order to be eligible for retirement. Furthermore, the item does not measure actual behavior, only intent. The ramifications of this fact will be probed in greater depth in the analysis section of this study.

7. Career Satisfaction

This study employs a number of variables from the NPRDC questionnaire in constructing a career satisfaction index. Sections VIII.2 and IX.36 of the questionnaire provide the relevant study measures (see the appendix). These measures are weighted on a seven point scale, from (1) strongly agree, to (7) strongly disagree. All of the variables are concerned with some measure of either career or occupational satisfaction. They are defined as follows:

- (A) CARSAT1 - I would be very dissatisfied if I had to change my career.
- (B) CARSAT3 - I thoroughly enjoy my career.
- (C) CARSAT4 - I take great pride in my career.
- (D) OCCSAT1 - I am very satisfied with my occupation.

Table XV is the correlation matrix for the variables involved in the index.

TABLE XV
CAREER SATISFACTION INDEX CORRELATION MATRIX

	CARSAT1	CARSAT3	CARSAT4	OCCSAT1
CARSAT1	1.00*	.539*	.444*	.529*
CARSAT3	.539*	1.00*	.648*	.709*
CARSAT4	.444	.648*	1.00*	.525*
OCCSAT1	.529*	.709*	.525*	1.00*

*Correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level.

8. Family Decision Process

Often conflicts arise when a crucial decision must be made. How partners approach a decision generally determines their success in finding a satisfactory resolution.

The process people use to arrive at decisions depends on:

- (1) Whether they agree about the goal they are trying to accomplish;
- (2) Whether they agree about how to achieve that goal;
- (3) Whether they assume a cooperative or a competitive attitude toward working on problems.

In order to identify couples who seemed to exhibit cooperative qualities, an indexing strategy was again employed. This index involved combining questions V.1.d and V.25 (see the appendix). The variables involved are defined as follows:

- (A) DPPLAN4 - Lead time involved in discussing career decisions with family.
- (B) SPINVCAR - Spouse involvement when making major career decisions.

In the first instance, if the officer indicated that he/she began discussing possible assignments at least 14 months prior to rotation (response 1 through 3 inclusive), the case was included.

In the second instance, if the respondent said that he/she involved the spouse when making major career decisions (responses 1 through 4 inclusive), the observation was included.

Table XVI depicts the family decision correlation matrix. This grouping strategy resulted in 999 usable cases.

TABLE XVI
FAMILY DECISION PROCESS CORRELATION MATRIX

	DPPLAN4	SPINVCAR
DIPPLAN4	1.00*	.335*
SPINVCAR	.335*	1.00*

*Correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level.

The formulation of an index to group families who do not make major decisions a family process employed the same variables as above. In this case, if the respondent indicated that his response to DPPLAN4 was 4 or greater and his response to SPINVCAR was 5 or more, then the case fell into

the individual decision grouping. This resulted in a cell size of 928.

E. METHOD OF ANALYSIS

All data analysis was accomplished using the Statistical Analysis System, (SAS). The particular procedures employed were as follows:

- (1) T-TEST.
- (2) Analysis of Variance using the General Linear Model (GLM)

The necessity to use the GLM procedure in the case of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is dictated by the fact that the various data sets were not of equal cell sizes. Through the concept of estimability, GLM can provide tests of hypotheses for the effects of a linear model regardless of the number of missing cells or the extent of confounding. Simple ANOVA utilized with unbalanced data may lead to erroneous results [Ref. 21: p. 144].

The framework on which the analytical techniques are based has as its foundation the systems approach. The input, output, and process variables form an intricate web of interaction and dependence. The application of statistical methods offers a means by which this complicated data can be understood.

Table XVII illustrates the basic systems model as it applies to this study.

TABLE XVII

THE SYSTEMS APPROACH

INPUT ----->	PROCESS ----->	OUTPUT
Dual-Career	Family Decision	Career Intent
Family	Family Responsibility	Career Satisfaction
	Type Duty	
Single-Career	Grade	
Family	Family Disruptions	
	Career needs	

Tables XVIII through XXIII summarize the statistical technique employed, the dependent variables, the independent variables, and the test statistic used for each hypothesis tested.

TABLE XVIII

HYPOTHESIS 1: ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY SUMMARY

Dual-career households will exhibit lower degrees of career intent and career satisfaction than single-career households.

TECHNIQUE	DEP VAR	INDEP VAR	TEST STAT
T-Test	Career intent	Household career	T
	Career satisfaction	status	

TABLE XIX

HYPOTHESIS 2: ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY SUMMARY

Households that employ the family decision process will exhibit a higher degree of career intent and career satisfaction than families who do not employ it.

TECHNIQUE	DEP VAR	INDEP VAR	TEST STAT
T-Test	Career intent Career Satisfaction	Family decision process	T

TABLE XX

HYPOTHESIS 3: ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY SUMMARY

Career intent and career satisfaction in dual-career households will vary by grade, with junior officers (01-03) displaying lower degrees of career satisfaction and being less career oriented than their senior officer (04-05) counterparts.

TECHNIQUE	DEP VAR	INDEP VAR	TEST STAT
ANOVA (GLM)	Career intent Career satisfaction	Grade Household Career status	F

TABLE XXI

HYPOTHESIS 4: ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY SUMMARY

Career intent and career satisfaction in two-career families will vary by type duty, with officers on sea-duty scoring less on both measures than officers on shore-duty.

TECHNIQUE	DEP VAR	INDEP VAR	TEST STAT
ANOVA (GLM)	Career intent	Type duty	F
	Career satisfaction	Household	
		Career status	

TABLE XXII

HYPOTHESIS 5: ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY SUMMARY

Career intent and career satisfaction will vary in dual-career households dependent on the type of decision process employed by the family. Specifically, families who use a family decision process will be more satisfied with their careers and will display greater career intent than those families who do not.

TECHNIQUE	DEP VAR	INDEP VAR	TEST STAT
ANOVA (GLM)	Career intent	Family decision	F
	Career satisfaction	process	
		Household career status	

TABLE XXIII

HYPOTHESIS 6: ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY SUMMARY

Career intent and career satisfaction for dual-career households will vary across (a) FAMILY RESPONSIBILITY, with no children families scoring higher on both measures than families with children; (b) FAMILY DISRUPTIONS, with families experiencing significant levels of disruption exhibiting lower degrees of career satisfaction and less career intent than families who do not experience disruptions.

TECHNIQUE	DEP VAR	INDEP VAR	TEST STAT
ANOVA (GLM)	Career intent	Family	F
	Career satisfaction	responsibility	
		Family disruptions	

The next section of this study will present the findings obtained from the hypothesis tests described.

IV. FINDINGS

In addition to presenting the results of the hypothesis tests, this chapter highlights some general characteristics of the sample.

A. SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Table XXIV displays sample characteristics by marital status and dependent status by rank, commissioning source, and present tour.

B. ANALYSIS RESULTS

1. HYPOTHESIS 1 - Household Career Status

In this case officer scores on career intent and career satisfaction constructs were measured against household career status. The T-Test procedure was employed under the assumption that the variables are normally and independently distributed within each group. This assumption is justified by the size of the sample. The procedure computes a T-statistic for testing the null hypothesis that the means of the dual-career and single-career groups are equal. Table XXV displays the results for this hypothesis test.

As shown by Table XXV, while respondents in dual-career environments scored lower with regard to career intent, the difference in the mean scores between the two groups is not statistically significant at the .05 level. As a result,

TABLE XXIV
GENERAL SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

RANK	<u>Single</u>		<u>Married No Children</u>		<u>Married w/Children</u>		<u>Other¹</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
ENS	92	(66.6)	28	(20.0)	11	(8.0)	7	(5.0)	138	(4.8)
LTJG	224	(50.9)	131	(29.8)	73	(2.7)	12	(2.7)	440	(15.4)
LT	174	(27.2)	198	(31.0)	248	(38.8)	19	(3.0)	639	(22.4)
LCDR	75	(9.5)	157	(19.8)	531	(67.0)	29	(3.7)	792	(27.7)
CDR	<u>37</u>	<u>(4.4)</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>(7.8)</u>	<u>724</u>	<u>(85.2)</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>(2.7)</u>	<u>850</u>	<u>(29.7)</u>
TOTAL	602	(21)	580	(20)	1587	(55.5)	90	(3)	2859	(100)

COMMISSION SOURCE

USMA	162	(19.4)	202	(24.2)	452	(54.2)	18	(2.2)	804	(29.2)
NROTC	193	(26.4)	187	(25.4)	338	(46.2)	14	(1.9)	731	(25.6)
OCS	222	(24.0)	148	(16.0)	517	(55.3)	39	(4.2)	926	(32.4)
NESEP	13	(5.2)	31	(12.4)	191	(76.4)	15	(6.0)	250	(8.7)
OTHER	<u>12</u>	<u>(10.1)</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>(11.0)</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>(75.4)</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>(4.0)</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>(4.1)</u>
TOTAL	602	(21)	580	(20)	1587	(55.5)	00	(3)	2859	(100)

PRESENT TOUR

Sea	439	(27.6)	345	(21.7)	753	(47.3)	55	(3.5)	1592	(55.7)
Shore	<u>163</u>	<u>(12.9)</u>	<u>235</u>	<u>(13.5)</u>	<u>334</u>	<u>(65.3)</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>(2.7)</u>	<u>1267</u>	<u>(44.3)</u>
TOTAL	602	(21)	580	(20)	1587	(55.5)	90	(3)	2859	(100)

the alternative hypothesis of unequal means cannot be supported.

However, in the case of career satisfaction, the dual-career group does score significantly lower at the .05 level than the single-career group, and therefore the null hypothesis of equal means is rejected.

Table XXVI displays the mean response on the career intent and career satisfaction portions of the survey for the entire sample, and the independent variables dual-career and single career.

TABLE XXV

RESULTS FOR HOUSEHOLD CAREER STATUS MEANS TEST

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	N	Mean	STD	Test Stat (T)
Career Intent	Dual-career	106	3.132	2.461	1.799
	Single-career	1608	2.704	2.226	
Career Satisfaction	Dual-career	106	4.199	1.311	2.570*
	Single-career	1608	5.161	1.335	

*Significant difference at .05 level.

TABLE XXVI

CAREER INTENT AND CAREER SATISFACTION MEAN SCORES

Dependent Variable	Entire Sample	Dual-Career	Single Career
Career Intent*	2.918	3.132	2.704
Career Satisfaction	5.182	4.199	5.111

*Scale is from 1 to 8 with 1 indicating virtual certainty of remaining on active duty.

As the table indicates, dual-career couples score lower than the general population mean on both career intent and career satisfaction, while single-career couples approach the population mean on both measures.

2. HYPOTHESIS 2 - Family Decision Process

For the test on hypothesis 2, the dependent variables of interest are once again career intent and career satisfaction. The null hypothesis to be tested is that the means of the two groups (Family decision group and Individual decision group) will not vary with respect to the dependent variables. The alternative hypothesis is that the respective means will be statistically different. The test was conducted at the .05 level of significance. Table XXVII summarizes the test results.

TABLE XVII
RESULTS FOR FAMILY DECISION MEANS TEST

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	N	Mean	STD DEV	Test Stat (T)
Career Intent	Family Decision	999	2.314	1.959	4.408*
	Individual Decision	850	2.787	2.326	
Career Satisfaction	Family Decision	999	5.380	1.252	.139
	Individual Decision				

*Significant difference at .05 level.

In this instance, the difference in means with regard to career intent is statistically significant. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected and the alternative hypothesis of different means is supported by the evidence. Respondents

using the family decision process indicate stronger career intent than respondents who do not.

The difference in means across the dependent variable career satisfaction was not statistically significant at the .05 level. Consequently, the null hypothesis of equal means cannot be rejected.

Table XXVIII shows the mean response for the entire sample and each independent variable.

As the table indicates, dual-careerists who use a family decision model score the higher than the sample population with regard to career intent, but lower with regard to career satisfaction.

TABLE XXVIII

CAREER INTENT AND CAREER SATISFACTION MEAN SCORES
BY FAMILY DECISION PROCESS

Dependent Variable	Entire Sample	Dual-Career	Single-Career
Career Intent*	2.918	2.314	2.787
Career Satisfaction	5.182	4.199	5.111

*Scale is from 1 to 8, with 1 indicating virtual certainty of remaining on active duty.

3. HYPOTHESIS 3 - Grade and Household Career Status

The intent of this hypothesis is to determine if career intent and career satisfaction in dual-career households are effected by officer grade. The underlying belief is that senior officers (0-4 and above) are less likely to be adversely effected by dual career status for two primary reasons:

- (1) Experience. Senior officers are better able to adapt and adjust their lifestyles to any household career situation.
- (2) The nearness of retirement. The years invested in a naval career represent an expensive opportunity cost, especially with regard to career intent.

The null hypothesis is that the mean scores across career intent and career satisfaction will not vary as a result of grade and household career status.

The methodology employed here is analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the General Linear Model (GLM).

The results of this analysis are summarized in Table XXIX. The table relates the interactions and effects for each dependent variable. The presence of statistically significant interaction means that the effects of one factor depend substantially on the level of the other factor. In this case, the factors involved are household career status and grade. The procedure was performed at the .05 level of significance.

Table XXX displays the deviation from the grand mean for each combination of independent variables.

As Table XXIX shows, statistically significant effects were found for junior officer dual-careerists, junior officer single-careerists and senior officer single-careerists for the dependent variable career intent. The only statistically significant effect for the career satisfaction portion of the test was found for senior officer dual-careerists. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected and the alternative hypothesis of significant interaction effects is accepted.

TABLE XXIX

ANOVA (GLM) BY HOUSEHOLD CAREER STATUS AND GRADE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: CAREER INTENT(F-STATISTIC)

N = 1608

R-SQUARE = .8700

	Dual-career	Single-career
Junior Officer	2.05*	3.38*
Senior Officer	1.17	2.38*

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: CAREER SATISFACTION(F-STATISTIC)

N = 1608

R-SQUARE = .8700

	Dual-career	Single-career
Junior Officer	1.66	1.22
Senior	2.80	1.62

*Significant at the .05 level

TABLE XXX

DEVIATIONS FROM THE GRAND MEAN IN HYPOTHESIS TEST 3

N = 1608 GRAND MEAN = 2.41 R-SQUARE = .8700

Dep Var	Indep Var	Mean	Deviations
Career Intent	Dual-career	2.278	(.132)
	Junior Officer		
	Dual-career	2.207	(.203)
	Senior Officer		
	Single-career	2.015	(.395)
	Junior Officer		
	Single-career	3.140	-(.730)
	Senior Officer		

N = 1608 GRAND MEAN = 5.390 R-SQUARE = .8700

Dep Var	Indep Var	Mean	Deviations
Career Satisfaction	Dual-career	5.479	-(.089)
	Junior Officer		
	Dual-career	5.529	-(.139)
	Senior Officer		
	Single-career	5.095	(.295)
	Junior Officer		
	Single-career	5.495	-(.069)
	Senior Officer		

The R-Square in both cases was .8700, indicating that this combination of independent variables account for 87 percent of the variance in the dependent variable.

4. HYPOTHESIS TEST 4 - Type Duty

The degree to which the sharing of family responsibilities takes place in dual-career families has a great bearing on the success that relationship will enjoy. Obviously, the presence of both partners is necessary for that sharing to occur. An obstacle confronted by the surface warfare dual-career family is frequent and prolonged absences of the service member. As a result, the basis for testing hypothesis 4 rests with the type of duty to which the service member is assigned (i.e. shore-duty or sea-duty).

The null hypothesis is that there are no interaction effects for any of the independent variables.

The ANOVA (GLM) procedure was used to derive an F-statistic for each effect.

Table XXXI displays the results for this test.

Table XXXII illustrates the differences from the grand mean for each interaction effect.

As the table illustrates, the null hypothesis of no interaction effect cannot be rejected in all but two cases:

- (1) Shore duty single-careerists for the dependent variable career intent.
- (2) Sea duty dual-careerists for the dependent variable career satisfaction.

TABLE XXXI

ANOVA (GLM) BY HOUSEHOLD CAREER STATUS AND TYPE DUTY

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: CAREER INTENT

N = 1608 (F-STATISTIC) R-SQUARE = .7416

	Dual-career	Single-career
Sea-duty	.690	1.02
Shore-duty	.730	3.30*

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: CAREER SATISFACTION

N = 1608 (F-STATISTIC) R-SQUARE = .7545

	Dual-career	Single-career
Sea-duty	2.55*	.980
Shore-duty	1.53	1.17

*Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXXII

DEVIATIONS FROM THE GRAND MEAN IN HYPOTHESIS TEST 4

N = 1608

GRAND MEAN = 2.370

R-SQUARE = .7416

Dep Var	Indep Var	Mean	Deviations
Career Intent	Dual-career	2.849	-(.47)
	Sea-Duty		
	Dual-career	2.137	(.23)
	Shore-Duty		
	Single-career	2.240	(.13)
	Sea-Duty		
	Single-career	2.255	(.12)
	Shore-Duty		

N = 1608

GRAND MEAN = 5.54

R-SQUARE = .7545

Dep Var	Indep Var	Mean	Deviations
Career Satisfaction	Dual-career	4.959	(.58)
	Sea-Duty		
	Dual-career	5.75	-(.21)
	Shore-Duty		
	Single-career	5.749	-(.20)
	Sea-Duty		
	Single-Career	5.715	-(.18)
	Shore-Duty		

5. HYPOTHESIS TEST 5 - Family Decision Process

This hypothesis addresses the method by which families make decisions, but from the perspective that interaction and the sharing of responsibilities not only applies to domestic tasks, but also to career planning and execution. The null hypothesis states that family decision making will have no effect on career intent and career satisfaction in dual-career households.

The ANOVA (GLM) procedure was used and the test was performed with an $\alpha = .05$.

Table XXXIII relates the findings associated with this test.

Table XXXIV shows the deviations from the grand mean for the independent variables involved.

The only statistically significant effects found occurred for the dependent variable career intent. As is shown, dual-career individual decision families and single-career individual decision families displayed statistically significant effects. In both cases, the mean score for career intent was lower than the grand mean. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no interaction effect as a result of family decision process is rejected in both of these cases.

6. HYPOTHESIS 6 - Family Responsibility and Family Disruption

The raising of children, and frequent household moves pressure any family regardless of household career status.

The test, in terms of the null hypothesis, is no interaction

effects as a result of family responsibility and family disruption.

The presence of children in a household, are assumed to place a burden on the life-style of a dual-career household. The two-career couple must not only adjust their individual schedules to allow for the sharing of responsibilities, but they are also not able to spend as much time together as a family. If an officer husband is deployed or absent from the home the problem is worse.

The Navy requires that officers rotate every 18-36 months. Often this involves geographic relocations. The dual-career family is affected on at least two fronts:

- (1) Complications in spouse employment.
- (2) Disruptions in schooling in cases if they have school-age children.

The inability of one spouse to transfer a career, coupled with avoidance of interrupted schooling can result in an officer becoming a "geographic bachelor". This voluntary separation places strains on the dual-career family, especially in sharing family responsibilities.

The test was conducted at a .05 level of significance. Table XXXV displays the resulting F-statistics for the process variables.

The deviations from the grand mean for each interaction effect are summarized in Table XXXVI.

TABLE XXXIII

ANOVA (GLM) BY HOUSEHOLD CAREER STATUS AND FAMILY DECISION
PROCESSDEPENDENT VARIABLE: CAREER INTENT(F-STATISTIC)

N = 1608

R-SQUARE = .887

	Dual career	Single-career
Family Decision	1.23	.900
Individual Decision	2.46*	3.19*

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: CAREER SATISFACTION(F-STATISTIC)

N = 1608

R-SQUARE = .6919

	Dual career	Single-career
Family Decision	.320	1.74
Individual Decision	.710	.860

*Significant at .05 level.

TABLE XXXIV

DEVIATIONS FROM THE GRAND MEAN IN HYPOTHESIS TEST 5

N = 1608 GRAND MEAN = 3.342 R-SQUARE = .8870

Dep Var	Indep Var	Mean	Deviations
Career Intent	Dual-career	3.472	-(.13)
	Family Decision		
	Dual-Career	3.509	-(.17)
	Individual Decision		
	Single-career	2.877	(.47)
	Family Decision		
	Single-career	3.509	-(.04)

N = 1608 GRAND MEAN = 5.035 R-SQUARE = .6919

Dep Var	Indep Var	Mean	Deviations
Career Satisfaction	Dual-career	5.042	-(.007)
	Family Decision		
	Dual-career	5.033	(.002)
	Individual Decision		
	Single-career	5.032	(.003)
	Individual Decision		

TABLE XXXV

ANOVA (GLM) BY HOUSEHOLD CAREER STATUS,
FAMILY RESPONSIBILITY AND FAMILY DISRUPTIONS (F-STAT)

Dependent Variable: Career Intent

N = 1923

R-SQUARE = .7369

	Dual-career	Single-career
Family Responsibility	.61	1.62
No Family Responsibility	.21	1.22
Family Disruptions	1.32	1.62
No Family Disruptions	1.71	2.38

Dependent Variable: Career Satisfaction

N = 1923

R-SQUARE = .7252

	Dual-career	Single-career
Family Responsibility	1.14	1.57
No Family Responsibility	1.21	.67
Family Disruptions	.72	3.33
No Family Disruptions	1.25	1.10

*Significant at .05 level.

TABLE XXXVI

DEVIATIONS FROM THE GRAND MEAN IN HYPOTHESIS TEST 6

N = 1589

GRAND MEAN = 2.295

R-SQUARE = .7369

Dep Var	Indep Var	Mean	Deviations
Career Intent	Dual-career Family Resp	2.176	(.12)
	Dual-career No Family Resp	2.223	(.07)
	Dual-career Family Disrup	2.234	(.06)
	Dual-career No Family Disrup	2.458	-(.16)
	Single-career Family Resp	2.674	-(.38)
	Single-career No Family Resp	2.235	(.06)
	Single-career Family Disrup	2.235	(.06)
	Single-career No Family Disrup	2.131	(.16)

N = 1589

GRAND MEAN = 5.162

R-SQUARE = .5715

Dep Var	Indep Var	Mean	Deviations
Career Satisfaction	Dual-career Family Resp	4.792	(.37)
	Dual-career No Family Resp	4.985	(.18)
	Dual-career Family Disrup	4.783	(.38)
	Dual-career No Family Disrup	4.986	(.18)
	Single-career Family Resp	5.411	-(.25)
	Single-career No Family Resp	5.421	-(.26)
	Single-career Family Disrup	5.573	-(.41)
	Single-career No Family Disrup	5.394	-(.23)

V. ANALYSIS

The results for career intent and career satisfaction follow an interesting pattern. The findings show both measures are influenced by the interaction of household career status, family decision process, grade and type duty.

A. CAREER INTENT

It is interesting to note that household career status, in and of itself, does not emerge as a significant variable in the study. However, this conclusion is tempered by the nature of the question involved. It requires that the respondent make some definite judgement about future events. The tendency when answering this type of question is to hedge or, at least psychologically, not burn any bridges.

When combined with grade and family decision process, household career status contributes substantially in explaining variations in career intent.

With respect to grade, a statistically significant effect was found for junior officer (0-1 to 0-3) dual-career households. Junior officers in two-career situations have not had the experience in dealing with many of the problems confronted when both husband and wife work. Consequently, they score lower with regard to career intent. This lack of experience can lead to frustration. Early career couples are noted for not possessing problem solving skills and being ill-prepared to cope with the dual-career lifestyle.

A surprise in the data involves the statistically significant effect found for single-career senior officers. Logic dictates that their scores on career intent should be the highest. However, a mean of 3.140 is well below the means of the other groups. The reason for this apparent anomaly is unclear. Further research to pinpoint the causes would prove interesting.

The greatest influence on surface warfare officer career intent occurred with the introduction of the family decision process. A statistically significant difference in mean career intent was found between family decision process groups and individual decision process groups, with the families employing a joint decision process scoring higher.

The reasons for this difference can be explained on a number of different levels.

The setting of compatible goals, and the decisions implemented in pursuit of those goals have as underpinnings frequent and sustained interaction on the part of the individuals involved. This interaction encompasses career planning, family planning and assignment selection.

In a household where an effective family decision process is used both parties concerned have a clearer picture of how individual goals and aspirations relate to the family.

Furthermore, family interaction and joint career planning allow for long-term career decisions, such as remaining on active duty until retirement, to be made earlier.

In addition, employing a family decision process results in a better understanding of the hardships and prolonged separations inherent in a career in the surface navy. Once illuminated, these adversities can be better dealt with.

The importance of a joint decision process was further underscored when applied across household career status. In this case, statistically significant effects were found for dual-career individual decision families. In this instance, deviations from the grand mean indicate that the absence of a joint decision process negatively influences career intent.

A family decision process helps dual-career couples to balance their respective careers, allocate household duties and solve problems in a systematic and effective manner. When it is not used, problems can quickly turn into dilemmas that may be solved by resigning commissions.

From the Navy's point of view, educating spouses about the requirements of a naval career could enhance the family decision process. Advertising and promoting spouse attendance at detailer briefs and career oriented newsletters sent to the home are two means by which this effort could be implemented.

In any case, the active participation of the spouse in career and assignment decisions, not to mention the interaction that is necessary to coordinate the maintenance of a household, undoubtedly influences the career decisions of officers in dual-career situations.

B. CAREER SATISFACTION

When career satisfaction was tested across household career status the result was a difference in means that was statistically significant. Specifically, dual-career households display a lower degree of career satisfaction than their single-career counterparts. The dual-careerists tend to indicate that they are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their careers, while single-careerists display moderate levels of career satisfaction.

Dual-careerists tend to be highly motivated, self-sufficient and inner directed and this may help to explain why officers in dual-career environments are not as satisfied with their careers.

The perceived and the real differences in earning power between the surface warfare officer and his civilian spouse is an issue. As was highlighted in the literature review section, the wife in dual-career households tends to come from a higher social and economic class than her husband. Regardless of the level of maturity of both parties, competition surrounding career success and pay may be present. Because a military officer cannot influence his earnings as quickly by performing well (i.e. no bonuses or accelerated promotions) as can his private sector wife, he may be frustrated with his career pace.

Finally, the prolonged absences and long deployments that must be endured by the surface warfare officer take

away from the time he has to spend with his family. In any family situation this is important, but it is more so in the dual-career household.

The results further indicate that grade, when coupled with household career status, plays a role in explaining differences in career satisfaction. A statistically significant interaction effect was found for senior officer dual-careerists. The finding supports the hypothesis that senior officers in dual-career situations display higher levels of career satisfaction than junior officers.

As was the case with career intent, familiarity with the dual-career lifestyle contributes to this finding. Hall and Hall (1978), in describing the characteristics of mid-career couples, cited defined career and family priorities and improved ability to plan and cope as important characteristics. [Ref. 3: p. 39].

Furthermore, both an officer and a civilian spouse have begun to undertake more challenging and rewarding positions within the organization. For the male officer, this stage in his career more than likely finds him as either a commanding officer or an executive officer, both highly influential and rewarding positions. His wife can also expect to be approaching the pinnacle of her career at this point. This heightened realization of success, along with the economic security it brings, contribute to increased feelings of career and occupational satisfaction.

The alternative hypothesis of statistically significant interaction effects was supported in the case of the dual-career sea duty group.

Because of the long separations inherent with sea duty, officers assigned to such billets are not able to share responsibilities in a dual-career household. The significant stresses and strains already experienced in a dual-career household may be magnified when the officer is assigned to sea duty. Duty aboard ship requires very long hours, frequent separations and extended overseas deployments.

This result may be viewed with a certain amount of caution. Frustration with being separated from family coupled with the often mundane routine of life at sea, can result in downwardly biased responses to the career satisfaction portion of the questionnaire.

Of particular interest is the absence of statistically significant effects for family decision process. This finding is surprising, especially in light of the importance of joint decision making with regard to career intent. The same concerns that influence career intent, things such as joint career and family planning and assignment selection, should also impact career satisfaction. As a result, family decision process should emerge as important.

One explanation for the lack of statistically significant effects is that career satisfaction may be based on more recent experiences that are more closely related to the

workplace. The responses obtained for career satisfaction may represent crystallizations of events and experiences that occurred 6 to 12 months prior to the survey. More research is needed to clarify the underlying relationship.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

A. OVERVIEW

Of the six hypothesis that were tested, five produced results that are of some value in assessing and explaining behavior in dual-career households.

The study showed that officer career intent and career satisfaction are not dependent on household career status alone, but rather, are influenced by a number of factors working in concert, including grade, type duty, and family decision process.

Dual-career couples scored higher than expected on career intent (see hypothesis 1 results). Two-career families have been able to adjust to the demands of their lifestyle. This is not to suggest that the growing trend towards dual-career lifestyles in the military does not merit further study.

Another finding of interest is that career intent and career satisfaction rise 26 percent and 22 percent respectively when family decision process is considered. Table XXXVII illustrate the point.

This finding is consistent with previous research where a recurring theme is cooperation, understanding and joint decision making in a successful dual-career family.

Finally, type duty and grade followed the pattern hypothesized. It seems as though a settling process occurs as an officer transitions into the senior officer category. Senior officers scored higher on both career intent and career satisfaction than their junior officer counterparts. Their added experience in dealing with the problems of a dual-career lifestyle is a factor contributing to this finding.

TABLE XXXVII

DIFFERENCES IN CAREER INTENT AND CAREER SATISFACTION
WHEN FAMILY DECISION PROCESS ACCOUNTED FOR

Dep Var	Indep Var	Mean	% Change
Career Intent	Dual-career	3.132	+(26)
	Dual-career Family Decision	2.134	
Career Satisfaction	Dual-career	4.199	+(22)
	Dual-career Family Decision	5.380	

B. POLICY SUGGESTIONS

1. Sea Tour Lengths and Split Tours

This study links career intent and career satisfaction in dual-career households to type duty. Sea-duty exerted negative influences in each case.

Currently, initial sea assignments are about 36 months in length. This period is designed to provide the prospective SWO with the time to complete his Personal

Qualification Standards (PQS) and earn 111X designation. Furthermore, it enables him to hone his talents as both a mariner and a Naval Officer.

Where a dual-career situation is identified, a guaranteed shore assignment at the same homeport (or area of spouse location) could be offered if the officer completes his qualification requirements in no more than 30 months. In return, the officer would agree to attend the Department Head Course and serve as a Department Head afloat.

Upon graduation from Department Head School, officers are required to serve two 18-month split tours (except in the case of new construction assignments where one 30 month tour is required). Officers in dual-career situations could be offered assignments in the same homeport whenever possible.

While the need for officers at sea is indeed a critical one, these measures would serve to alleviate at least some of the burdens associated with transfers and sea-duty.

2. Command Understanding and Involvement

Perhaps the key element in a working dual-career retention program rests, as most things in the Navy do, at the Commanding Officer level. His ability to change perceptions is profound. The availability of command resources and Commanding Officer awareness about dual-career households can contribute to easing the burdens of the dual-career family.

A dual-career awareness workshop could be initiated as part of the CO/XO pipeline. Furthermore, this issue could be touched at levels as low as Department Head School.

While difficult to measure, this enhanced understanding may well contribute favorably to SWO retention in dual-career environments. In addition, this grass-roots appreciation of the issues would help to overcome the persistent traditionalist viewpoints.

3. Family Services

Child care facilities could include 24-hour service. These centers should be located at all major fleet installations. The cost of running the centers would be borne partly by the users with the balance budgeted by the Navy.

Dual-career information centers could also be established. These centers would provide job information at key locations, referral services, and relocation assistance. A counseling service and a babysitter/housekeeper hot-line could also be offered.

C. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Navy Personnel Research and Development Center will initiate a follow-up Surface Warfare Officer career questionnaire in the fall of 1985. The same issues addressed in this and earlier studies [Refs. 2, 5] (Suter, 1979, and Strifler, 1982) will again be relevant. Furthermore, an assessment of the scope of the problem in terms of a trend should also be investigated.

Investigation as to why family responsibility and family disruptions do not exert more of a negative influence on

dual-career Surface Warfare Officer career intent and career satisfaction may prove helpful.

Studies are needed on the impact of current economic changes on family work-roles and their implications for the military. Increased participation by women in defense related activities is one issue that falls within this category.

An interesting and relatively untouched field of study is a review of the impact of microcomputer technology on family-work patterns. Preliminary studies have suggested that this new technology may expand the possibilities for women to join the workforce, while at the same time, participate in the more traditional roles of homemaker and mother. The growing industry of "home-work" is one example of this new technology changing the work patterns of American society. It has the possibility that some professional/technical occupations will become location-independent.

D. INTO THE FUTURE: THE NEXT GENERATION

Families continuously change, but they change in the manner of the moral rather than the technical order [Ref. 22: p. 229].

What implications do changes in gender-role conception, in the role of children, in the linkages between families and their social environments, and in the conception of the family itself have for the Navy in the coming century?

Perhaps the key to answering the question lies in understanding the perception that different family structures are

personal/social options rather than products of fate, inheritance or divine decree [Ref. 23: p. 241].

If the perceptions, values and gender-role definitions of the children in dual-career families are being influenced by their upbringing and environment, this new outlook could have a major impact on manning the All-Volunteer Force.

E. FINAL COMMENTS

This study partly rejects the idea that the dual-career family trend in the Navy is a major problem. However, it did uncover some relationships that may prove beneficial in the formulation of future policy.

The scope of the problem, and the extent of the effect of dual-career situations, is largely dependent on how a dual-career family is defined. This work employed a more stringent definition than most of the studies cited. Consequently, it understates the phenomenon.

The business of taking ships to sea is no longer solely a matter of good seamanship and judgement. Understanding the social phenomenon of the dual-career trend and its effect on sea-going officers will be a prerequisite to readiness. If not in the 1980's, then in the early 1990's.

APPENDIX

NPRDC SURFACE WARFARE OFFICER QUESTIONNAIRE



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

NAVY PERSONNEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92152

003:PMS:bas
5250
Ser 594
27 August 1981

From: Commanding Officer

Subj: Officer Career Research


Ref: (a) "Perspective," July/August 1981

Incl: (1) Officer Career Questionnaire

1. Reference (a) discussed research which has been initiated to determine factors in the Navy's career management system that affect officer career decision-making and action. This Center is conducting the research which has at its core, a questionnaire intended to survey approximately 8,000 Surface Warfare Officers over a period of time. You have been selected at random to receive enclosure (1) and your participation in this survey is completely voluntary. Your input may eventually have an important effect upon issues related to officer career development. This research has been authorized by higher authority and results will be provided to the Surface Officer Distribution Division in NMPC-4 and to OP-13. Individuals, units or specific organizations will not be identifiable in reports, briefings or discussions since results of the survey will be in a statistical or combined form. However, we need your name and SSN initially because we intend to contact you sometime in the future to find out what has happened to your career in the interim.

2. Please review the enclosed questionnaire. It is rather lengthy, but officers who assisted us in revising an earlier version felt that it contained essential areas of concern to surface warfare officers. A high degree of thoroughness was felt to be necessary in order to pursue each topic completely. You are invited to add any comments which serve to amplify your feelings and opinions.

3. Thank you in advance for your participation. Please mark your answers on the questionnaire itself and return it to the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center by using the return envelope provided. Results of this questionnaire will be published periodically in the officer newsletter, "Perspective." If you should have any questions regarding the questionnaire, please call Dr. Robert Morrison at (714) 225-2191 or AUTOVON 933-2191. Report symbol OPNAV 3330-1 has been assigned to this survey.


J. P. KELLY, JR.

1. NAME: _____ 2. SSN: _____ - _____ - _____
 First M.I. Last

SURFACE WARFARE OFFICER CAREER QUESTIONNAIRE

Privacy Act Notice

Under the authority of 5 USC 301, information regarding your background, attitudes, experiences, and future intentions in the Navy is requested to provide input to a series of studies on officer career processes and retention. The information provided by you will not become part of your official record, nor will it be used to make decisions about you which will affect your career in any way. It will be used by the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center for statistical purposes only. You are not required to provide this information. There will be no adverse consequences should you elect not to provide the requested information or any part of it. Return of the questionnaire constitutes acknowledgment of these Privacy Act provisions.

I. Background Information

3. Grade: O- _____ 4. Designator: _____
5. Marital Status: () 1. Never Married () 2. Married - Year _____
 () 3. Widow(er) - Year _____; and () 4. Remarried - Year _____
 () 5. Divorced - Year _____; and () 6. Remarried - Year _____
6. Children living with you: Number _____ Age(s) _____
7. Precommissioning Class Ranks:
- | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-------------------------------|-------|--------|------|-----|------|-----|
| | Don't | Bottom | Next | Mid | Next | Top |
| | Know | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% |
| a. Academic (Undergraduate) | () | () | () | () | () | () |
| b. Military (OCS, USNA, etc.) | () | () | () | () | () | () |
8. Were you a SWOS Basic Distinguished Graduate?
 () 0. Did not attend SWOS () 1. Yes () 2. No

II. PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

1. When were you awarded the IIII designator? _____ / _____ () N/A
 Month Year
2. What additional qualifications have you obtained (check all that apply)?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| () a. Division Officer | () f. Evaluator/TAO |
| () b. Department Head | () g. XO Afloat (LCDR & above) |
| () c. OOD | () h. Qual.-Surface Ship Command |
| () d. EOCW | () i. Surface Nuclear Power |
| () e. Weapons Control | () j. Other _____ |

3. Please complete the following table by providing the indicated information from all of the fitness reports you received during your present tour and the tour preceding it. If you are enroute to a new assignment, use your last two tours, starting with your most recent FITREP. Include dates of fitness reports that are not available and write in the word "missing." Please circle your position on the Evaluation and Summary rankings. The first three lines are filled in as examples. Omit information which is not relevant or available.

Date Block (13)	Sea/Shore [*]	Evaluation and Summary (blocks 51 & 52)								EARLY PROMOTION		
						TYPICALLY EFFECTIVE		BOTH		(block 62) RECD	(block 66) RANKING	(block 65) NUM RECD
		1%	5%	10%	30%	50%	50%	30%	MARG UNSAT			
05/81	1	②	1	1		1				YES	2 of 2	
11/80	1	1	③		1			1		NO	of	
11/79	2	MISSING									of	
											of	
											of	
											of	
											of	
											of	
											of	
											of	

*1=Sea; 2=Shore

III. PRESENT ASSIGNMENT EXPERIENCE

In this section (pages 2 and 3) information is sought about your present tour of duty. If you are enroute to a new duty station, refer to your last tour to answer the items. The last 3 months should be your frame of reference when a specific time period is required

1. My present tour is: () 1. Sea () 2. Shore

2. PRD /
Month Year

3. Ship Type/Activity (e.g., AOE, DD, NTC, NAVSTA):

4. Home Port/Location:

5. If your duty is a sea tour, how many months have been spent in shipyard overhaul, including non-home port upkeep? _____ month(s)
6. Have you been (or will you be) extended in this tour beyond your initial PRD? () 1. No () 2. Yes — how long? _____ (months)
() 3. Don't know
7. If you answered YES to question 6, what was/is the reason (choose best response)?
() 1. Complete PQS/attain SWO designator
() 2. Awaiting relief
() 3. Awaiting opportunity to enter school
() 4. Short time remaining in Navy
() 5. No reason given
() 6. Other _____
8. What is your evaluation of the following aspects of your present job and related duties (Respond using the following scale. Omit if not applicable)?
- | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---------|---|---|----------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Very | | | Neutral | | | Very |
| Negative | | | | | | Positive |
- _____ a. Challenge _____ i. Adventure
_____ b. Separation from family/friends _____ j. Opportunity to complete PQS
_____ c. Use of skills & abilities _____ k. Sense of accomplishment
_____ d. Working environment _____ l. Opportunity to grow professionally
_____ e. Hours of work required _____ m. Doing something important
_____ f. Work pressure _____ n. Relationships in wardroom
_____ g. Interesting duties _____ o. Relationship with CO or reporting senior
_____ h. Ability to plan & schedule activities
9. Approximately how long (in months) did it take you to "fit in" with your—
_____ a. Command/activity () still don't
_____ b. Local community () still don't
10. Overall, how do you evaluate this tour in terms of (omit if not applicable)—
- | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| | Highly | | | | Highly |
| | Unfavorable | Unfavorable | Neutral | Favorable | Favorable |
- a. Ship/Command () () () () ()
b. Type duties () () () () ()
c. Wardroom/peers () () () () ()
d. Superiors () () () () ()
e. Immediate Subordinates () () () () ()

IV. ASSIGNMENT PROCESS

1. For your most recent experience with a completed PCS change, how many days relative to your PRD did you receive (not applicable = 0)?
 - a. Informal notification _____ days prior to PRD, or _____ days after PRD
 - b. Formal notification (orders): _____ days prior to PRD, or _____ days after PRD
2. When did you detach from your last assignment (use numbers such as 10-79; 0-0 equals no reassignment)? _____ / _____
Month Year
3. Was the new assignment sea or shore duty?
() 0. Never reassigned () 1. SEA () 2. SHORE
4. Did the reassignment involve a change in geographic location?
() 0. Never reassigned () 1. YES () 2. NO
5. How satisfactory was the amount of notification time you received for—

	More than	Just about	Cut it	Totally	
	<u>N/A</u>	<u>enough</u>	<u>right</u>	<u>too close</u>	<u>unsat</u>

 - a. Informal notification () () () () ()
 - b. Formal notification () () () () ()
5. If you answered question 5. with "cut it too close" or "totally unsatisfactory," were there special circumstances that may have affected the timing of your notification (choose best response)?
() 1. No
() 2. Yes—and it was justifiable.
() 3. Yes—and it wasn't justifiable.
7. Prior to your most recent transfer, how many days of lead time did you have to make travel arrangements and household effects shipment?
_____ Days () Never transferred or not applicable.
8. How many months prior to your PRD to your current assignment did you submit a new preference card (none submitted = 0)? _____ Months
() Don't remember.
9. If you did not submit one, why not (check best choice)?
() 1. It doesn't do any good.
() 2. I talked to my detainer by phone to discuss my desires and the available options.
() 3. I didn't need to submit a new one, the old one was O.K.
() 4. I got my new assignment before I could submit one.
() 5. Other

10. When I completed my most recent preference card, I (check the best choice):
- ☐ 0. Did not complete one.
 - ☐ 1. Put down choices I personally wanted regardless of how they might affect my Navy career.
 - ☐ 2. Put down primarily what I wanted but tempered them a little with what I thought would help my Navy career.
 - ☐ 3. Put down choices which I wanted, and I felt the Navy would want me to have, because Navy requirements and my interests are alike.
 - ☐ 4. Put down choices which I thought would help my Navy career but tempered with my personal desires.
 - ☐ 5. Put down choices which I thought would help my Navy career even though they weren't personally desirable.
11. How did you rank the following in importance on your last preference card (rank the highest as a 1. List zeroes if none submitted or out of date or not transferred):
- _____ a. Location _____ b. Type Billet _____ c. Type Activity
12. Assess the acceptability of your current assignment in comparison with what was expressed on your preference card using the scale below:
- 0 - Preference card not sent/out of date or never transferred.
- | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---------|---|---|-----------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Very Poor | | | Neutral | | | Very Good |
- _____ a. Location _____ b. Type Billet _____ c. Type Activity
13. Which one of the following statements best describes your experience in obtaining your current assignment?
- ☐ 0. Haven't been through reassignment.
 - ☐ 1. Tended to run smoothly—my detailee located an acceptable billet relatively quickly.
 - ☐ 2. Tended to run smoothly but there was a certain amount of uncertainty and discussion with my detailee along the way.
 - ☐ 3. Tended to be a very difficult, unhappy experience. However, I eventually received a satisfactory or acceptable assignment.
 - ☐ 4. Tended to be a frustrating, anxiety-producing experience. Only through the intervention of senior officers or extreme efforts on my part did I ultimately receive a satisfactory or acceptable assignment.
 - ☐ 5. Tended to be a completely hopeless situation. No amount of effort on my part or by others was successful in influencing the system.
14. About how often did you interact with your detailee during your most recent assignment? Provide your best estimate.
- a. About _____ times within a year of PRD.
 - b. About _____ times a year otherwise.
 - ☐ c. Haven't been through reassignment.

15. What was the purpose of these interactions (check one or more)?

- () a. Not applicable () f. To determine status of requests, letters, etc.
 () b. To keep in touch () g. To obtain an answer to a specific question
 () c. To determine potential openings () h. Other _____
 () d. To learn more about recent trends and policies _____
 () e. To seek career advice _____

16. How many times did you use the following ways of interacting with your detailer during your most recent complete tour, including the reassignment process (leave blank if not reassigned)? How effective do you feel each is as a method (answer all even if not reassigned)?

	Number of Times Used	Effectiveness				
		(1) Very Ineffective	(2) Ineffective	(3) So-So	(4) Effective	(5) Very Effective
a. Preference Card		()	()	()	()	()
b. Letter		()	()	()	()	()
c. Telephone		()	()	()	()	()

17. My detailer's designator is _____. () Don't know.

18. What is your evaluation of your current detailer in the following areas (Respond using the following scale.)?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Don't Know	Very Negative			Neutral			Very Positive
_____ a. Knowledgeable of current policy trends				_____ h. Knowledgeable of previous communications			
_____ b. Knowledgeable of which billets are available				_____ i. What (s)he says can be trusted			
_____ c. Knowledgeable of requirements and duties of available billets				_____ j. Looks out for my best interests			
_____ d. Knowledgeable of my career development needs				_____ k. Listens to my problems, desires, needs, etc.			
_____ e. Knowledgeable of my personal desires				_____ l. Provides useful career counseling			
_____ f. Returns telephone calls				_____ m. Responds to correspondence			
_____ g. Shares information				_____ n. Availability			

19. When was the last time you communicated with your current detailer (give month and year in digits such as 10-79; 0-0 equals none)?

_____/_____
 Month Year

20. How did you prepare for your initial contact with your detailer during your last reassignment (check all that apply)?
- ☐ a. No reassignment.
 - ☐ b. Did not prepare.
 - ☐ c. Reanalyzed my preference card.
 - ☐ d. Submitted an updated preference card.
 - ☐ e. Reviewed my whole career plan.
 - ☐ f. Contacted others at my present duty station for advice.
 - ☐ g. Discussed it with my spouse.
 - ☐ h. Checked instructions, personnel manual and other policy(ies).
 - ☐ i. Checked the URL Career Planning Guide or "Perspective."
 - ☐ j. Other _____
21. I, not my detailer, initiated the first contact regarding my most recent reassignment.
- ☐ 0. Never reassigned. ☐ 1. YES ☐ 2. NO
22. Have you attended a detailer field trip meeting in the last two years?
- ☐ 1. No - Meeting has never been scheduled in my command(s).
 - ☐ 2. No - I was not available when trip was scheduled.
 - ☐ 3. No - I chose not to attend a scheduled meeting.
 - ☐ 4. Yes - _____ months prior to my PRD.
23. During my most recent transfer, I was promised one type of duty or duty station location, and it was changed in the orders I received just before I transferred.
- ☐ 1. Yes ☐ 3. Have never discussed orders with my detailer.
 - ☐ 2. No ☐ 4. Have never been transferred.
24. If you have attended a detailer field trip meeting, to what extent—(Respond using the following scale. Omit if one not attended)
- | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|---|---|------|---|---|---------------|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Not App-
licable | Very
Little | | | Some | | | Very
Great |
- ____ a. Did it provide clarification of assignment policies and practices?
 - ____ b. Did it give you an appreciation of officer career paths and alternatives?
 - ____ c. Did it resolve some assignment problems you had?
 - ____ d. Was it conducted in an open and honest manner?
 - ____ e. Was it a useful and beneficial meeting?

25. What individuals did you use to intervene on your behalf to obtain the assignment you wanted during your last reassignment (check all that apply)?
- ☐ a. No previous reassignment.
 - ☐ b. No one.
 - ☐ c. My CO.
 - ☐ d. The CO of the billet I wanted.
 - ☐ e. A senior officer from my direct chain of command from my previous assignment.
 - ☐ f. A senior officer in the direct chain of command of my desired assignment.
 - ☐ g. A senior officer from my community but not in the chain of command of either assignment.
 - ☐ h. A senior officer from outside of my community.
 - ☐ i. Other _____
26. When you received your Last Officer Data Card (ODC), did you verify each block?
- ☐ 1. Yes, I'm sure no corrections were required.
 - ☐ 2. Yes, it seemed to me that no corrections were required, but I'm not positive.
 - ☐ 3. Yes, corrections were required, but I didn't follow-up.
 - ☐ 4. Yes, corrections were required, and I sent them to Washington.
 - ☐ 5. No, but I checked a few blocks.
 - ☐ 6. No, I gave it hardly a glance.
 - ☐ 7. Have never received an ODC.
 - ☐ 8. I don't know what an ODC is.
27. Has your Administrative Office offered to help you to verify your latest ODC?
- ☐ 1. Yes
 - ☐ 2. No
 - ☐ 3. Have never received one.
 - ☐ 4. Still don't know what an ODC is.
28. On the average with respect to your last reassignment, how many times did you have to dial your detailer's number before you were able to talk to him (her) or another detailer? _____ ☐ Did not try to call him. ☐ Never reassigned.
29. With respect to your most recent transfer, did your detailer inform you by message that orders were being forwarded and they were not received in a timely fashion?
- ☐ 0. Not applicable
 - ☐ 1. Yes
 - ☐ 2. No
30. Did you have a copy of your preference card or official correspondence (i.e., fitness report, OOD (U) qualification, etc.) mailed or telecopied for your detailer's use?
- ☐ 1. Yes, and it was received.
 - ☐ 2. Yes, and it was lost somewhere in the system.
 - ☐ 3. Yes, but I don't know what happened to it.
 - ☐ 4. No.

11. Are you presently on an overseas tour of duty?

() 1. Yes—accompanied () 2. Yes—unaccompanied () 3. No

If yes, please answer question 11.a. Otherwise go directly to Section V.

a. Did your transferring command provide timely and accurate support for your overseas transfer?

() 0. Not applicable () 1. Yes () 2. No

() 3. Did not inform me of the requirements.

V. DECISION PROCESS

1. When did you begin the following activities in regard to your last reassignment? (Use the following scale to respond to items a through g:)

0. Not applicable 4. 7 to 10 months before my PRD.
1. Systematically throughout my tour. 5. 3 to 6 months before my PRD.
2. More than 14 months before my PRD. 6. Within 3 months before my PRD.
3. 11 to 14 months before my PRD. 7. I didn't do this.

___ a. Contacting your detailer.
___ b. Specifically seeking the advice of a senior officer.
___ c. Specifically seeking the advice of peers.
___ d. Discussing possible assignments with my spouse/family.
___ e. Considering choices of location.
___ f. Considering choices of types of billets.
___ g. Considering choices of types of duty.

2. How important was your desire for a post-Navy career in your preference for your most recent reassignment? (Circle most appropriate response)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not Some A Primary
Considered Consideration Factor

3. How important was your desire for a change in your Navy career (change in designator outside present community) in your preference for your most recent assignment? (Circle appropriate response)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not Some A Primary
Considered Consideration Factor

4. Looking at a SWO career, for approximately how many years from now do you have a relatively clear idea of what your career path (billets, promotions, etc.) will be? (years)

5. How many more years do you plan to remain on active duty? _____ years; () Don't have any idea.

6. How attractive does the SWO career path appear to you (circle the appropriate number)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Neutral Very
Unattractive Attractive

7. How attractive would it be to change your designator and pursue a different career path (circle the appropriate number)?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Very Neutral Very
 Unattractive Attractive

8. When did you or will you make the following decisions? Consider when you were (will be) deciding to do something, not when you will be implementing the decision. If enroute to a new assignment, respond by referring to your last assignment. Each question requires two responses.

QUESTION	YOUR DECISION			DECISION POINT			
	Yes	No	Undecided	Decided in Previous Tour	Present Tour		Decision Deferred Till Later
					Decided on MO/YR	Will decide on MO/YR	
I have decided to:							
a. Complete SWO PQS.							
b. Request Dept. Head School.							
c. Request PG School.							
d. Make the Navy a career							
e. Seek a designator change from SWO							
f. Complete EOW Qual.							
g. Complete Qualification for Command							
h. Obtain a proven Subspecialty							
i. Request Staff or War College							
j. Remain geographically stable							
k. Accept a Washington headqtrs staff assign.							
l. Prepare for a career outside the Navy							
m. Remain in the Navy beyond eligible retirement date.							
n. Strive for Command at sea.							
p. Strive for CAPT.							
q. Strive for flag rank							

9. Do you feel that the Navy wants you to continue your career as an active duty Naval officer? Circle best response.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Definitely Don't Definitely
 Does Not Know Does

10. If you were to seek civilian employment, how prepared are you to do so?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Essentially Neither Essentially
 Unprepared Prepared Prepared
 nor
 Unprepared

11. In reference to your present assignment, evaluate the following sources of information concerning how much you use them and how accurate, honest, and available they are in providing you with career planning information and guidance. Also evaluate the amount of influence each source exerts on your career decisions and whether the influence is positive or negative. Respond using the following scale:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 Very Moderate Very Not
 Low High Applicable

	USE	ACCURACY	HONESTY	AVAILABILITY	INFLUENCE	DIRECTION OF INFLUENCE (CHECK ONE)	
						Positive	Negative
CO						()	()
XO						()	()
Department Head						()	()
Other Senior Officers in my Community						()	()
Senior Officers outside my Community						()	()
Peers						()	()
Detailers						()	()
"Perspective"						()	()
"VNL Officer Career Planning Guidebook"						()	()
"Commanding Officer's Addendum"						()	()
"Officer Billet Summary"						()	()
Navy Times						()	()
Public Media						()	()

12. What is your evaluation of the following aspects with regard to a Navy career?
Respond using the following scale:

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Very			Neutral			Very
Negative						Positive

- | | |
|---|--|
| <u> </u> a. Continuity of detailers | <u> </u> e. Sea duty |
| <u> </u> b. Assignments received | <u> </u> f. Shore duty |
| <u> </u> c. Change of billets at 2-3 year intervals | <u> </u> g. Overseas assignments, accompanied |
| <u> </u> d. Possibility of change of geographic location with billet changes | <u> </u> h. Overseas assignments, unaccompanied |
| | <u> </u> i. Commissary and exchange benefits |

Respond to items 13 and 14 using the following scale:

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Definitely			Somewhat			Definitely
Do Not						Do

13. When you are (or "should be") completing your Officer Preference Card, do you have a good idea of available billets for which you would be fully competitive?
14. Do you feel the billets you have received reflected your experience and past performance?
15. Rate the following assignments. First evaluate them according to their contribution to your Navy career. Then assess the desirability of each assignment. Respond using the following scale:

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Strongly	Substan-	Moderately	Neutral	Moderately	Substan-	Strongly
Negative	tially				tially	Positive

	Navy Career Contributions	Desirability
<u>Sea</u>		
a. Department Head (DH) - Weapons	☐	☐
b. DH-Engineering	☐	☐
c. XO-IST	☐	☐
d. XO-FFG	☐	☐
e. Afloat Staff Duty	☐	☐
f. DH-Amphib/Service	☐	☐
g. CO-AE	☐	☐
h. CO-DB	☐	☐
i. Flag Aide	☐	☐
<u>Shore</u>		
j. Shore Support Unit (OIC)	☐	☐
k. Flag Aide	☐	☐
l. SWOS-Basic Instructor	☐	☐
m. Naval Academy Instructor	☐	☐
n. NROTC Instructor	☐	☐
o. OCS Instructor	☐	☐

(Shore continued from previous page)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Substan-	Moderately	Neutral	Moderately	Substan-	Strongly
Negative	tially				tially	Positive

Navy Career
Contributions

Desirability

Shore

- p. Detailer
- q. Washington Tour
- r. Major Shore Staff
- s. Recruiting
- t. Training Command (Enlisted)
- u. Navy PG School Student

16. Please indicate the relative opportunity of obtaining each of the following characteristics in the Navy versus your expectations of obtaining them in a civilian career if you left the Navy:

	CIVILIAN			4.	NAVY		
	1. Substantially Better	2. Much Better	3. Better		5. Better	6. Much Better	7. Substantially Better
a. Interesting and challenging work	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
b. Ability to plan work	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
c. Work hours	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
d. Minimal work stress	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
e. Freedom from hassle	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
f. Own initiative	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
g. Pay and allowances	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
h. Health benefits/care	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
i. Job security	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
j. Family stability (omit if NA)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
k. Desirable place to live	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
l. Desirable co-workers	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
m. Recognition	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
n. Responsibility	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
o. Chance for spouse to develop own interests (omit, if NA)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()

	CIVILIAN			Comparable	NAVY		
	Substantiall. Better	High Better	Better		Better	High Better	Substantiall. Better
p. Quality of superiors	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
q. Retirement program	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
r. Variety of assignments	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
s. Educational opportunities	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
t. Promotional opportunities	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
u. Social Relationships	()	()	()	()	()	()	()

17. PLEASE GO BACK TO QUESTION 16 AND CIRCLE THOSE 5 CHARACTERISTICS THAT ARE MOST MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU AND CROSS OUT THOSE 5 CHARACTERISTICS THAT ARE LEAST IMPORTANT TO YOU.

The following eight items (18-25) cover the family's impact on your career. Skip to the next section if you are not currently married.

18. How is your spouse primarily employed? (Choose best response)

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| () 1. Full-time homemaker | () 7. Consultant |
| () 2. Secretary/clerical | () 8. Business/Finance |
| () 3. Teacher | () 9. Navy officer |
| () 4. Nurse | () 10. Navy enlisted |
| () 5. Engineer | () 11. Other military |
| () 6. Other professional | () 12. Other _____ |

Respond to items 19-21 using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Uncertain			Strongly agree

19. My spouse's career limits considerably the options available in my career decisions.
20. At the present time, my career is more important to me than my spouse's career.
21. I am actively involved in my spouse's career.
22. Rank order the following items according to the severity of their impact on your most recent PCS move (the most severe = 1).
- | | |
|--|---|
| ___ a. My spouse's employment | ___ d. Disruptions in social relations |
| ___ b. Disruptions in family schooling | ___ e. The moving process itself |
| ___ c. My out-of-pocket expenses | ___ f. My unavailability to help the family (deployed, for example) |
23. How do you think your spouse feels towards your Navy career?
- | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| () 1. Completely Opposed | () 4. Moderately supportive |
| () 2. Moderately Opposed | () 5. Completely supportive |
| () 3. Neutral | |

Respond to items 24 and 25 using the following scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not Applicable	I defer to spouse's wishes			Equal Partici- pation			I decide alone

24. How involved was your spouse when you made decisions during your last reassignment (completing the Preference Card, for example).
25. How involved is your spouse when you are making major career decisions such as staying in the Navy, choosing a second career, retiring, etc.

VI. Career Management

1. On the scale below, check the statement which most accurately reflects your idea of the community which you represent.
- () 1. I am a surface warfare specialist.
 - () 2. I am primarily a surface warfare specialist and secondarily a Navy officer.
 - () 3. I am an equal balance of both.
 - () 4. I am primarily a Navy officer and secondarily a surface warfare specialist.
 - () 5. I am a Navy officer.
 - () 6. Other _____

Using Surface Warfare as your "community", respond to items 2-10 using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Uncertain			Strongly Agree

- 2. My community has some programs to help me with my career which are different from other Navy communities such as aviation.
- 3. My community has a higher rate of promotion for senior officers than the other Navy communities.
- 4. My community tries to take care of its own in regards to promotions.
- 5. It is almost essential for me to be sponsored by someone senior if I want to advance in the Navy.
- 6. Officers in communities other than mine get the billets which contribute most to their Navy careers.
- 7. My community uses an "old boy" (informal) network to keep tabs on officers for the best assignments.
- 8. It is important to have someone available with whom I am comfortable and trust to discuss my career.
- 9. My senior officers interact with me frequently.
- 10. I use senior officers as role models when I make career decisions.
- 11. I have been counseled on how the Navy's career system works for members of my community.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Uncertain			Strongly Agree

- ___ 12. I have been counseled about the "right" contacts to make to help further my Navy career.
- ___ 13. I have been counseled on the Navy's career opportunities outside of my community.
- ___ 14. I have been counseled on the "blind alleys" which might kill my Navy career.
- ___ 15. I have been counseled on the "tickets" which have to be punched so that I can reach my career goals in the Navy.
- ___ 16. I have had good counsel on the Navy's norms and values for officers.
- ___ 17. I have a close, personal relationship with a considerably more senior officer who serves as a mentor for my career.
- ___ 18. I have counseled a more junior officer in career-related matters.
- ___ 19. Officers need a special career counseling system for them.
- ___ 20. Visibility is very important at this stage in my Navy career.
- ___ 21. Officers in my community make flag rank because they (Rank order the following five statements with 5 being the most important):
- | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| ___ a. are highly specialized | ___ d. have the right contacts. |
| ___ b. are not overspecialized | ___ e. punched the right tickets. |
| ___ c. are superb performers. | |
- ___ 22. In comparison with other communities, officers in my community make flag rank. (circle best choice):

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very frequently			At the same rate			Very Infrequently

VII. CAREER ATTITUDES

1. Career Intentions: The following item concerns the intensity of your desire to continue your career as a Navy officer at least until you are eligible for retirement. Areas on the scale are described, both verbally and in terms of probability, to provide meaningful reference points. Check the response which most closely represents your current level of commitment.

How certain are you that you will continue an active Navy career at least until you are eligible for retirement?

- () 1. 99.9-100% I am virtually certain that I will not leave the Navy voluntarily prior to becoming eligible for retirement.
- () 2. 90.0-99.8% I am almost certain I will continue my military career if possible.
- () 3. 75.0-89.9% I am confident that I will continue my Navy career until I can retire.
- () 4. 50.0-74.9% I probably will remain in Navy until I am eligible for retirement.
- () 5. 25.0-49.9% I probably will not continue in the Navy until I am eligible for retirement.
- () 6. 10.0-24.9% I am confident that I will not continue my Navy career until I can retire.
- () 7. 0.2-9.9% I am almost certain that I will leave the Navy as soon as possible.
- () 8. 0.0-1% I am virtually certain that I will not voluntarily continue in the Navy until I am eligible for retirement.

2. Career Satisfaction: The following items deal with your attitudes toward your career and location. Please respond as honestly and accurately as you can. It is important that you complete each item even though it appears to be the same statement. Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement by using the scale below and responding to each item.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Strongly Disagree			Neither Agree nor Disagree			Strongly Agree

- ☐ a. I would be very dissatisfied if I had to change my career.
- ☐ b. I would definitely not recommend my location to friends.
- ☐ c. The I think about it, the more I feel I made a bad move in entering my career.
- ☐ d. I am fortunate to be located where I am.
- ☐ e. I thoroughly enjoy my career.
- ☐ f. I thoroughly enjoy my location.
- ☐ g. I take great pride in my career.
- ☐ h. I would live anywhere in order to stay in my career.
- ☐ i. I often think about being in a different location.
- ☐ j. I would definitely like to change my career.
- ☐ k. I would be more satisfied in a different location.
- ☐ l. I feel I could be much more satisfied in a different career.
- ☐ m. I am very satisfied with my present location.
- ☐ n. Where I live is much more important to my satisfaction than my career.

VIII. EDUCATION, TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Indicate your level of agreement to the next 17 items. Respond using the following scale:

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree

In evaluating the first four items, consider ASW, CIC, etc. as technical schools and LNET, PAO, etc. as non-technical ones. Omit consideration of major professional schools such as SWOS, NPGS or war college.

- ☐ 1. Navy school(s) that I completed during my most recent transfer or present assignment were valuable to me in performing my job. (score "0" if none completed).
- ☐ 2. The Navy has provided me with adequate training in the general (managerial) aspects of how to perform as a Naval officer.
- ☐ 3. I believe that non-technical schools improve my ability to do my job.
- ☐ 4. Technical schools will increase my promotion opportunities much more than non-technical service schools.
- ☐ 5. Except for technical/key billets, the assignment of primary duties to an officer by the commanding officer is guided by the officer's service record and the officer's need to obtain well rounded professional experience.
- ☐ 6. The assignment of an officer on sea duty as a division officer, may be a collateral duty.
- ☐ 7. An officer must serve as the head of a major department before selection for assignment as an executive officer afloat.
- ☐ 8. The EOW qualification must be obtained before an L11X can be designated as "Qualified for Command".
- ☐ 9. A written examination is required to obtain the designation, "Qualified for Command".
- ☐ 10. If an URL officer (L16X) does not qualify within 24 months of shipboard duty, this may result in reassignment to shore duty and a designator change to L10X.
- ☐ 11. My ship has a planned program for rotating junior officers through several departments during their first sea tour. (Omit if on shore duty).
- ☐ 12. I have been encouraged by many of my seniors (CO, XO, department head, etc.) to pursue a graduate education.
- ☐ 13. Obtaining a postgraduate degree will strengthen my chances for promotion.
- ☐ 14. I would rather receive a postgraduate degree from a civilian institution than NPGS.
- ☐ 15. If I leave my warfare specialty area for any reason, including attendance at NPGS, my Navy career will suffer.
- ☐ 16. The development of a subspecialty is important for my Navy career.
- ☐ 17. The development of a subspecialty is important for my career beyond the Navy.

AD-A165 391

THE DUAL-CAREER HOUSEHOLD AND ITS EFFECTS ON SURFACE
WARFARE OFFICER CARE. (U) NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY CA W D VALENTINE DEC 85


2/2

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 5/9

NL

							END
							FILED
							DATE



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

IX. SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS

Indicate your level of agreement with items 1 through 35. Respond using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree

- ___ 1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help the Navy be successful.
- ___ 2. I talk up the Navy to my friends as a great organization to work for.
- ___ 3. I feel very little loyalty to the Navy.
- ___ 4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to remain in the Navy.
- ___ 5. I find that my values and the Navy's values are very similar.
- ___ 6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of the Navy.
- ___ 7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work were similar.
- ___ 8. The Navy really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
- ___ 9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave.
- ___ 10. I am extremely glad that I chose the Navy to work for, over other organizations I was considering at the time I joined.
- ___ 11. There's not too much to be gained by staying with the Navy indefinitely.
- ___ 12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with the Navy's policies on important matters relating to its personnel.
- ___ 13. I really care about the fate of the Navy.
- ___ 14. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.
- ___ 15. Deciding to join the Navy was a definite mistake on my part.
- ___ 16. The Navy should provide clear, specific career paths with associated plans.
- ___ 17. I don't really think about the career decision; it's in the back of my mind for a while, then it will suddenly hit me, and I know what I will do.
- ___ 18. Career opportunities are unpredictable so you must be ready to make a decision when one arises.
- ___ 19. I am willing to invest considerable time in exploring career opportunities.
- ___ 20. I like to imagine what it would be like to be the very top person in my field.
- ___ 21. I research, plan, and find my own billets.
- ___ 22. It helps to know exactly what you want in your next assignment.
- ___ 23. I can not depend upon the detailing system to find a job that I want.
- ___ 24. I know the steps that I need to take to achieve my Navy career goals.
- ___ 25. I know the steps that I need to take to achieve my post-Navy career goals.
- ___ 26. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
- ___ 27. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
- ___ 28. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
- ___ 29. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
- ___ 30. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
- ___ 31. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree

- ___ 32. At times I think I am no good at all.
- ___ 33. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
- ___ 34. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
- ___ 35. I certainly feel useless at times.
- ___ 36. Career Satisfaction II: The following items are similar to those you covered earlier. However, we would like your assistance to see how Navy officers look at their career in relation to their occupation and organization. Multiple items help us obtain stable estimates of attitudes. Respond using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Neither Agree nor Disagree			Strongly Agree

- ___ a. I am very satisfied with my occupation.
- ___ b. Being in the Navy is more important than my location.
- ___ c. I thoroughly enjoy my field of work.
- ___ d. My career is significantly more important to me than the Navy.
- ___ e. I would definitely like to change my field of work.
- ___ f. The occupation in which I work is more important to me than my location.
- ___ g. I would feel happier with a different occupation.
- ___ h. The occupation in which I work is more important than my career.
- ___ i. I definitely feel I am in the right field of work.
- ___ j. I am very sorry I chose my occupation.
- ___ k. The Navy is more essential to me than my field of work.
- ___ l. I feel very good about my career.
- ___ m. I take great pride in my field of work.
- ___ n. Location is not nearly as important to me as being in the Navy.
- ___ o. If I could do it over again, I would not choose my occupation.
- ___ p. I definitely feel that I am in the wrong career.
- ___ q. The Navy is materially more essential to me than my career.
- ___ r. I think I made a serious mistake in choosing my field of work.
- ___ s. I often think about changing my career.
- ___ t. My career takes precedence over my field of work.
- ___ u. Location is more important to me than the field in which I work.
- ___ v. My occupation is more vital to me than the Navy.

If you would like to comment on any aspect of your Navy career as it affects your desire to continue as a Surface Warfare Officer, please use this space.

Thank you for your assistance with this questionnaire.

NOTE: If you would like to receive an information letter on the general findings from the questionnaire, please print your name and address in the space provided:

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Congressional Budget Office, Manpower for a 600-Ship Navy: Costs and Policy Alternatives, CBO, August 1983.
2. Strifler, Christen S., The Effects of Dual-Career Households and Family Responsibilities on Surface Warfare Officers Career Intent, M.S. Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, 1981.
3. Hall, Francine S. and Douglas, T., The Two-Career Couple, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1978.
4. Pye, Anne B. and Shea, Nancy K., The Navy Wife, Harper and Rowe Publishers, New York, 1965.
5. Suter, D.J., The Two-Career Family in the Navy, M.S. Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, 1979.
6. Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R.N., Dual-Career Families Re-examined, Harper and Rowe Publishers, New York, 1971.
7. Riesman, David, The Lonely Crowd, Yale University Press, 1966.
8. Huser, W.R. and Grant, C.W., "A Study of Husbands and Wives from Dual-Career and Traditional Career Families", Psychology of Women Quarterly, Vol 3. No. 1, Fall 1978.
9. St. John Parson, D., "Continuous Dual-Career Families: A Case Study", Psychology of Women Quarterly, Vol 3. No. 1, Fall 1978.
10. Burke, Ronald J. and Weir, Tamara, Some Personality Differences Between Members of One-Career and Two-Career Families, Department of the Navy, 1976.
11. Yogev, S. and Brett, J., Patterns of Work and Family Involvement Among Single and Dual-Earner Couples: Two Competing Analytical Approaches, Northwestern University, 1983.
12. Grace, G.I., Steiner, M.B. and Holcher, H.A., Navy Career Counseling Research: Navy Wives Study, Systems Development Corporation, 1976.
13. Githens, W.H., Navy Officer Exit Statement Analysis, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, 1979.

14. Mohr, D.A., Holzbach, D.I. and Morrison, R.F., Surface Warfare Junior Officer Retention: Spouse's Influence on Career Decisions, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, 1981.
15. Hunter, Edna J. and Pope, Melissa A., Family Roles in Transition. In a Changing Military, United States International University, 1981.
16. Carr, R., Orthner, D.K., and Brown, R.J. III, "Living and Family Patterns in the Air Force", Air University Review, Vol 3, No. 2 (January-February 1980).
17. Bailyn, Loe, Work and Family: Testing the Assumptions, Alfred P. Sloan School of Management, 1982.
18. London, M. and Stumpf, J.A., Managing Careers, Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1982.
19. Morrison, R.F. and Cook, T.M., "Military Officer Career Development and Decision Making: A Multiple-Cohort Longitudinal Analysis of the First Twenty-Four Years, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, 1981.
20. Derr, C. B., Junior Officer Retention: Another Perspective, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, 1980.
21. SAS Institute, SAS Users Guide: Statistics 1982 Edition, SAS Institute Inc., Cary, North Carolina, 1982.
22. Redfield, R., The Primitive World and Its Transformation, Cornell University Press, 1953.
23. Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R., The Next Generation in Dual-Earner Family Research, Sage Publications, 1983.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	No. Copies
1. Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22304-6145	2
2. Library, Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943-5002	2
3. Chief of Naval Operations (OP-114D) Navy Department Washington, D.C. 20350-2000	2
4. William Haga Box 3036 Monterey, California 93942	1
5. LCDR Mark H. Lepick Department of Administrative Sciences (Code 5421) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943-5004	2
6. Lt. William D. Valentine, Jr. 1423 Deauville Place Costa Mesa, California 92626	2

END

FILMED

4-86

DTIC