

AD-A199 704 7



DEFENSE

MANPOWER DATA CENTER

DESCRIPTION OF SPOUSES OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL IN THE U.S. SELECTED RESERVE: 1986

A REPORT BASED ON THE 1986 RESERVE COMPONENTS SURVEYS

SELECTED
OCT 27 1988
S D

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

10 27 069

ADA199704

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

| | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified | | 1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS | |
| 2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY | | 3. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A Approved for public release; Distribution Unlimited | |
| 2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE | | 4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) | |
| 4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) | | 5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) | |
| 6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Research Triangle Institute Survey & Computing Sciences | 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable) | 7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION DoD/Defense Manpower Data Center | |
| 6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) P.O. Box 12194 Research Triangle Park, N. Carolina 27709 | | 7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 400 Arlington, Virginia 22209 | |
| 8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION OASD(PA) & OASD(PM&P) | 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable) | 9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER MDA-903-86-c-0289 | |
| 8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) DoD, Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301 | | 10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS | |
| | | PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. | PROJECT NO. |
| | | TASK NO. | WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. |
| 11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Description of Spouses of Officers and Enlisted Personnel in the U.S. Selected Reserves: 1986 | | | |
| 12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Griffith, Janet D.; Doering, Zehava D.; Mahoney, Bette S. | | | |
| 13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final | 13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____ | 14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) | 15. PAGE COUNT 200 |
| 16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION A Report Based on the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys | | | |
| 17. COSATI CODES | | 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) | |
| FIELD | GROUP | SUB-GROUP | |
| | | Manpower, military personnel, officer, enlisted, survey, reserve component, spouse, guard, reserve, couple, marital status, employment, personal characteristics, civilian wives | |
| 19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) SEE REVERSE PAGE FOR ABSTRACT. | | | |
| 20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/INLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS | | 21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified | |
| 22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Laverne C. Wright | | 22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (202) 696-5833 | 22c. OFFICE SYMBOL DMDC |

→ This volume presents an overview of the background, current activities, knowledge and views of the spouses of military personnel in the National Guard and Reserve components based on the 1986 Reserve Components Survey of Selected Reserve Spouses, one portion of the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys. An overview of the two military portions of the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys - the 1986 Reserve Components Survey: Selected Reserve Officer and Enlisted Personnel and the 1986 Reserve Components Survey: Full-Time Support Officer and Enlisted Personnel - is presented in a companion volume.

These surveys were conducted for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) [OASD(RA)] and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management and Personnel) [OASD(FM&P)] by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC). Over 12,000 officers and about 52,000 enlisted personnel in all seven reserve components, representing the approximately 1,012,000 trained personnel in the Selected Reserve, and over 33,000 spouses, representing the approximately 640,000 spouses married to reserve components military personnel, responded to detailed questionnaires sent to them in the spring of 1986. The questionnaire sent to spouses asked about their civilian status and economic status, perceptions of family and employer attitudes toward reserve participation, and their attitudes and orientations toward and satisfaction with reserve service of their spouses. (SIP)

The introductory chapters of this report provide a brief discussion of the perspective and audience for the report (Chapter 1) and the methodology and background for the study (Chapter 2). The first data chapter (Chapter 3) presents data for the spouses of all categories of members of the trained Selected Reserve, while the remaining data (Chapters 4-7) are restricted primarily to the wives of part-time unit members.

This report has been prepared for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management and Personnel), under Contract Number MDA-903-86-C-0289, expiring 30 November 1987. The Research Triangle Institute (Post Office Box 12194, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, 27709) has been the contractor for this study with the assistance of Decision Science Consortium, Inc. (1895 Preston White Drive, Suite 300, Reston, Virginia, 22091). The technical monitor for the study has been the Survey and Market Analysis Division, Defense Manpower Data Center.

The views, opinions, and findings contained in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed as an official Department of Defense position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from

Defense Manpower Data Center
Survey and Market Analysis Division
1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 400
Arlington, VA 22209

Reports produced as part of this project include:

Description of Officers and Enlisted Personnel
in the U.S. Selected Reserve: 1986
A Report Based on the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys

Description of Officers and Enlisted Personnel
in the U.S. Selected Reserve: 1986
Supplementary Tabulations from the
1986 Reserve Components Surveys

Description of Spouses of Officers and Enlisted Personnel
in the U.S. Selected Reserve: 1986
A Report Based on the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys

Description of Spouses of Officers and Enlisted Personnel
in the U.S. Selected Reserve: 1986
Supplementary Tabulations from the
1986 Reserve Components Surveys

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The ultimate purpose of all Department of Defense (DoD) manpower policies is to recruit, train, equip, and field a force capable of preserving the peace and protecting the vital interests of the United States and its allies. The men and women currently in the reserve forces are an integral part of that force. Since the proclamation of the Total Force policy in the All Volunteer Force era, and particularly since 1980, increased reliance has been placed on reserve members and units.

Increasingly, both active and reserve forces have been staffed by men and women who are married and have families. Consequently, the impact of military life on the family - spouses, children, and military members - has become an issue of concern to DoD and the active and reserve components. In the reserve forces, this concern has two aspects. First, as part of the partnership between the military and its members, the reserve components are committed to addressing family needs and assisting the family as much as possible. This is a commitment made with the recognition that the majority of the families are members of civilian communities and have a relationship to the armed forces different from that of families whose members are in the active forces. Second, family support and well-being is viewed as an essential factor in the retention of trained military personnel. This report, and other analyses which will be conducted using data from the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys, are a contribution to the on-going evaluation of the effectiveness of family programs and activities; they also provide tools for the identification of future areas for policy action.

This volume presents an overview of the background, current activities, knowledge and views of the spouses of military personnel in the National Guard and Reserve Components, based on the 1986 Reserve Components Survey of Selected Reserve Spouses, one portion of the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys. An overview of the two military portions of the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys - the 1986 Reserve Components Survey: Selected Reserve Officer and Enlisted Personnel and the 1986 Reserve Components Survey: Full-Time Support Officer and Enlisted Personnel - is presented in a companion volume.

These surveys were conducted for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) [OASD(RA)] and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management and Personnel) [OASD (FM&P)] by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC). Over 12,000 officers and about 52,000 enlisted members in all seven reserve components, representing the approximately 1,012,000 trained personnel in the Selected Reserve, and over 33,000 spouses, representing the approximately 640,000 spouses married to reserve components military personnel, responded to detailed questionnaires sent to them in the spring of 1985. The questionnaire sent to spouses asked about their civilian employment and economic status, perceptions of family and

employer attitudes toward reserve participation, and their attitudes and orientations toward and satisfaction with the reserve service of their spouse.

The introductory chapters of this report provide a brief discussion of the perspective and audience for the report (Chapter 1) and the methodology and background for the study (Chapter 2). The first data chapter (Chapter 3) presents data for the spouses of all categories of members of the trained Selected Reserve, while the remaining data (Chapters 4-7) are restricted primarily to the wives of part-time unit members.

Over 13 percent of the spouses of officers and 14 percent of enlisted reservists are married to members providing full-time support to the reserve components. About half of the full-time support group are spouses of Guard and Reserve members on full-time duty and half are spouses of military technicians. Military technicians are part-time unit members who also support the Guard and Reserve as full-time civilian employees. All full-time support spouses are excluded from the discussion in Chapters 4-7. Another 12 percent of officer spouses and one percent of enlisted spouses are married to members whose part-time reserve duties are as individual mobilization augmentees (IMAs) in support of active component units and headquarters.

The major findings are summarized below:

Characteristics of Spouses and Families of Guard/Reserve Members
(Chapter 3)

- o Overall, three-fifths (61%) of Guard/Reserve members are married.
- o Among part-time male unit members, 60 percent are married. Although the proportion is higher for officers (79%) than enlisted members (57%), the majority of both are married.
- o With few exceptions, wives of part-time unit members are civilians who have no experience of military service (93%). By contrast, three-fourths (74%) of women members are married to men who currently or formerly served in the active duty force or the reserve components.
- o Most wives of Guard/Reserve members are relatively well-educated women, born in the U.S., and married for some time to the member. The large majority of the families have children. Most appear to be established members of their civilian communities, with half having lived in their neighborhood for five years or more and three-fourths owning or buying their home.

- o Families of officers are somewhat older than families of enlisted members (as measured by wife's age, marriage duration, and family life course stage).

Employment of Spouses of Guard/Reserve Members (Chapter 4)

- o Overall, Guard/Reserve wives are very similar to the general civilian population in their employment: two-thirds are employed; only a small percentage (less than 5%) are unemployed; and almost a third are not in the labor force.
- o Among employed Guard/Reserve wives, two-thirds work full time, a percentage somewhat higher than for the general civilian population or for wives of members of the active duty force.
- o The occupational distributions of Guard/Reserve wives of enlisted and officer personnel are generally what would be expected on the basis of the women's education and family socioeconomic status: officers' wives are concentrated in professional (42%) and clerical (24%) positions, with a smaller number (13%) in managerial or administrative positions; the largest group of enlisted members' wives are in clerical positions (28%), with a smaller proportion in professional jobs (19%), and others in service (13%) or sales (12%) positions. Consistent with their relatively long-term residence in their local communities, many have held their current jobs for long periods; three-fifths have had their job for two years or more, and one-fourth have been in the job for seven or more years.
- o Data on wives' reasons for working show the importance of financial reasons, including: money for basic family expenses (cited by 64%); extra money to use now (49%); and saving for the future (35%). Career and intrinsic reasons were also cited, though by fewer women. These include independence/self esteem (43%); enjoyment of working (30%); and having always planned to work/have a career (33%) or experience for a future career (23%). Enlisted members' wives cited financial reasons somewhat more than officers' wives, whereas officers' wives were more likely to give intrinsic or career-related reasons.
- o Husbands of women part-time Guard/Reserve unit members have a different pattern of employment experience, since many are current or former members of the armed forces, in either the active duty force or reserve components. The large majority of civilian husbands (87%) are currently employed and, of those, most (84%) work full time. A relatively large proportion (15%) of employed husbands work as civilian employees of the federal government.

Spouse and Family Participation in Guard/Reserve Activities
(Chapter 5)

- o With the exception of social/recreational programs, the majority of spouses report either that, to their knowledge, their husband's unit does not have most family programs or activities, or that they do not know whether the activity is available at the unit. Half the spouses know about family-oriented social or recreational events and programs, although another one-fifth say they do not know even about these events. Less than one-fifth report that their husband's unit has other kinds of programs or events, such as meetings for new unit members, information programs, meetings about mobilization, or about medical benefits or retirement benefits. The large majority are divided between those who say the unit does not have such events/programs and those who do not know whether they are available.
- o A large proportion of spouses are interested in receiving materials or attending programs that provide information for family members. More than three-fourths are interested in information about benefits, including retirement benefits (87%), survivor benefits (87%), and medical benefits (85%). Large numbers also want other information: 85 percent want information on the family's role in the event of mobilization; 78 percent would like advance schedules for drills and Annual Training/ACDUTRA; 75 percent want information on the mission of the member's unit; and 74 percent want information on the unit's role in mobilization. The only difference in the interests of spouses of enlisted members and officers is that the former are also very interested in two types of near-term benefits: educational benefits and medical benefits.
- o Participation in programs and activities for family members is very low, with the exception of social/recreational programs. Overall, two-fifths have attended social/recreational events one or more times, but only about one-tenth or fewer have ever attended such events as meetings for new family members, information programs, and meetings about such issues as medical benefits, retirement benefits, or mobilization. Participation is considerably higher among those who report they know about the programs/activities at the unit, ranging from a high of 77 percent for social/recreational programs, down to about one-third for programs about medical or retirement benefits.
- o Very few (about 5%) wives of part-time unit members perform any Guard/Reserve volunteer work, although a much larger number (41%), especially of officers' wives (58%), do volunteer work in the civilian community. Both the distance to the Guard/Reserve unit location and, possibly, lower salience of Guard/Reserve volunteer work compared with work in the local community may be important factors in this pattern.

- o Participation in family or volunteer activities appears to be somewhat higher among families who live in smaller places or rural areas than among ones living in large cities.
- o The reason most frequently reported by spouses for non-participation in Guard/Reserve activities was that no family activities are available (41%). Only a few said they do not participate because they are not interested (12%). Other reasons given include location (17%), not knowing other people (16%), times activities are scheduled (15%), and lack of child care (12%).

The Effects of Guard/Reserve Participation on Families (Chapter 6)

- o Travel time to the place where the member's unit meets or drills can be substantial, especially for officers: one-fifth (20%) of enlisted members and two-fifths (38%) of officers travel an hour or more to get there. This can add substantially to the time that Guard/Reserve participation takes from leisure, family, or other activities.
- o At the same time, the data suggest that the member's participation is unlikely to disrupt regular child care arrangements as only a few members regularly provide child care while the mother is at work or school.
- o At least some features of Guard/Reserve participation cause significant problems for a substantial number of families. Most frequent cited as a problem (by 32% of spouses) is the member's participation in drills on special days, such as Mother's Day or Easter. About one-fifth to one-fourth cite unscheduled Guard/Reserve activities, family emergencies when the spouse is on Guard/Reserve duty, scheduling family vacations, absence for Annual Training/ACDUTRA, and time away from the spouse or children. Less frequently cited are two features: absence for weekend drills; and absence for extra time spent at the Guard/Reserve.
- o Officers' wives are more likely than enlisted members' wives to report that a number of aspects of the member's Guard/Reserve participation create problems for the family, especially time away from the children and spouse, weekend drills, and extra time spent at the Guard/Reserve.
- o Spouses' feelings about the amount of time members spend on Guard/Reserve activities, their civilian job, and family and leisure activities also indicate conflict between Guard/Reserve and family participation, especially for families of officers. Whereas most spouses say the member spends about the right amount of time or too much time on Guard/Reserve activities and on his civilian job, half say he spends too little on leisure activities (54%) or family activities

(50%). And officers' wives are more likely than wives of enlisted members to say the member spends too much time on Guard/Reserve activities (26% vs. 12%), and too little on leisure activities (66% vs. 52%) or family activities (54% vs. 49%).

- o Guard/Reserve participation makes a major contribution to the family financial situation, for both enlisted members' and officers' families. Half the spouses (54%) say the member's Guard/Reserve income makes a major contribution to one or more aspects of the family's financial situation. Nearly a third (31%) say it contributes to meeting basic family expenses or to having extra money to use now (32%), and about half that number (16%) say it contributes to savings for the future. Enlisted members' wives are slightly more likely than officers' wives to say that the Guard/Reserve income makes a major contribution to meeting basic expenses, and slightly less likely to say it provides savings or extra money to use now, but generally the differences are modest in size, and the overall picture is one of considerable similarity between the two spouse groups in their perception of the positive impact of the member's Guard/Reserve participation.
- o Twenty-two percent of the wives say that the member's Guard/Reserve participation is a problem because of its effect on his pay and promotion at his civilian job, with five percent considering it a serious problem. The majority say this is not a problem.

Spouse and Family Support for Member's Guard/Reserve Participation (Chapter 7)

- o For the most part, spouses perceive community views of the member's Guard/Reserve participation as favorable or very favorable. Half the spouses say the member's relatives (49%) and the wife's relatives (50%) are very favorable to his participation; half (46%) say that neighbors' attitudes are at least somewhat favorable; and similar proportions think the member's civilian boss (45%) and civilian co-workers (43%) are at least somewhat favorable. For the most part, spouses do not believe others have unfavorable views of the member's participation; the highest percentage seen as unfavorable is civilian bosses (14%), followed by seven percent for co-workers.
- o The majority of spouses rate the couple's level of agreement on the member's career plans as very high (57% for military career plans, and 61% for civilian career plans). Additionally, agreement on one area of career plans is strongly associated with agreement on the other.

- o Spouses were asked what factors contributed to the member's most recent decision to stay in the Guard/Reserve. The most frequently cited categories of reasons were: military career (retirement benefits, promotion opportunities - 69%); intrinsic or personal benefits (pride in accomplishments, enjoyment of Guard/Reserve participation - 52%); service to country (48%); and financial benefits (money for basic expenses, to use now, or to save - 48%). Much less frequently cited were social/recreational reasons (serving with people in the unit, travel or "get away" opportunities - 30%); military skills training (opportunity to use military equipment, challenge of military training - 27%); and training related to civilian employment opportunities (using educational benefits, obtaining skills training that would get a civilian job - 16%).
- o Spouses expressed satisfaction with a number of aspects of the member's Guard/Reserve participation, including: the opportunity to serve the country (75%); military pay and allowances (67%); military retirement benefits (63%); acquaintanceships or friendships (56%); and the time required at Guard/Reserve activities (53%). Differences between officers' and enlisted members' wives are evident for only a few aspects. More officers' wives than enlisted members' wives are satisfied with military pay and allowances (82% vs. 64%) and with military retirement benefits (72% vs. 61%), while fewer officers' wives are satisfied with the time required at Guard/Reserve activities (47% vs. 55%).
- o Overall, the large majority of responding spouses are very favorable (54%) or somewhat favorable (31%) to the member's Guard/Reserve participation; officers' and enlisted members' wives are very similar; and only a few wives (7%) say they are somewhat or very unfavorable to his participation.
- o When the data on spouse attitudes are examined by other factors, the proportion favorable to the member's participation is positively related to: the spouse's sense that the member's income makes a major contribution to family finances; spouse participation in the Guard/Reserve activities or volunteer work; and perceived family/community support for the member's participation. It is negatively related to the perception that Guard/Reserve participation causes serious problems for the family.
- o Spouse favorableness to member participation is also positively associated with high importance of different reasons for his continuing participation, including: service to the country; personal/intrinsic reasons (pride, enjoyment); career reasons (retirement benefits; promotion); financial reasons; military skills/experience; and social/recreational reasons.

- o Data for couples show that favorable attitudes to the member's Guard/Reserve participation are positively associated with member satisfaction with his participation. Conversely, members whose spouses have neutral or unfavorable attitudes are much less likely to have highly favorable views of their own participation.

Taken together, these data underline the importance of member, family, and community factors for favorable spouse attitudes toward the member's Guard/Reserve participation, and of the spouse's attitude in relation to the member's satisfaction.

PREFACE

This report provides an overview of selected data from the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys prepared by the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) under Contract MDA-903-86-C-0289 sponsored by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) [OASD(RA)] and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management and Personnel) [OASD(FM&P)] with the collaboration of Decision Science Consortium, Inc. and the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC).

The 1986 Reserve Components Surveys (1986 RC Surveys) consist of three portions, two of reserve component members and the third of their spouses. The 1986 Reserve Components Survey: Selected Reserve Officer and Enlisted Personnel (1986 RC Member Survey) surveyed a sample of Selected Reserve unit members, Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMAs), and military technicians, i.e. Selected Reservists who are also employed full-time in reserve units in a civilian capacity. The 1986 Reserve Components Survey: Full-Time Support Officer and Enlisted Personnel (1986 RC AGR Survey) surveyed a sample of Active Guard/Reserve or Training and Administration of Reserve (AGR/TARs) members. The 1986 Reserve Components Survey of Spouses of Selected Reserve Personnel (1986 RC Spouse Survey) was a census of the spouses of all individuals sampled for participation in the 1986 RC Member Survey and the 1986 RC Spouse Survey.

Two overview reports are being published as initial presentations of the data collected in the 1986 RC Surveys. This volume, and a companion report, Description of Officers and Enlisted Personnel in the U.S. Selected Reserve: 1986. The overview presented here focuses primarily on the spouses and families of male part-time unit members. Spouses of other categories of reservists surveyed are discussed in a very limited fashion.

The activities connected with designing and conducting the 1986 RC Surveys, as well as the preparation of this report and the associated volumes of Supplementary Tabulations and User Manual and Codebook, required the effort of a number of people whose contributions the authors would like to acknowledge. First, Lieutenant General Emmett H. Walker, Jr., USA, Chief, National Guard Bureau; Major General (now Lieutenant General) Herbert R. Temple, Jr., USA, Director Army National Guard; Major General John B. Conaway, USAF, Director Air National Guard; Major General William R. Berkman, USA, Chief, Army Reserve; Vice Admiral Cecil J. Kempf, USN, Chief, Naval Reserve and Commander, Naval Reserve Force; Major General (now Lieutenant General) L. H. Buehl, USMC, Deputy Chief of Staff for Reserve Affairs, HQ USMC; Major General Sloan R. Gill, USAF, Chief of Air Force Reserve; and Rear Admiral A. D. Breed, Chief, Office of Readiness and Reserve, United States Coast Guard, provided the strong backing and support without which these surveys could never have been conducted. Their understanding of the immediate and lasting value of the project to evaluate the effectiveness of current policies and programs and to

plan new ones was evident in the thought and hard work contributed by their staffs and by National Guard and Reserve commanders and administrative personnel everywhere.

Within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, COL Francis Rush, Jr., USAF, deserves special recognition. Both in his former capacity as Principal Director, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Guard/Reserve Manpower and Personnel) [ODASD(G/R M&P)] and in his current capacity, Staff Director, Sixth Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation (QRMC), COL Rush provided guidance, direction and wise counsel during every phase of survey design, data collection, analyses and writing.

Major General Stuart H. Sherman, USAF, Retired, while serving as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (G/R M&P) initiated the 1986 RC Surveys, participated in the design, and facilitated the data collection. CDR Lena Hartshorn, ODASD(G/R M&P), was DMDC's principal point-of-contact throughout the data collection. COL David T. Fee, Principal Director, ODASD(G/R M&P) and Gary Carlson, Executive Director, National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (NCESGR), and Robert A. Nemetz, OASD(FM&P) have strongly supported the effort and provided assistance at critical junctures.

Special appreciation is due Dr. David W. Grissmer, the Rand Corporation, and Barbara Moser, the Research Triangle Institute. Dr. Grissmer shared his expertise and knowledge of the reserve forces with us during both design and analysis phases of the study. Major portions of the present effort build directly on his previous research. Barbara Moser served as Project Director and provided overall direction for this large, complex project.

Staff members at each of the participating organizations -- the Research Triangle Institute, Decision Science Consortium, Inc. and the Defense Manpower Data Center -- provided technical and substantive support throughout. While too numerous to mention here, they are individually acknowledged in several other publications based on these surveys. In addition to the staff at the participating organizations, personnel from the Rand Corporation and Computer Based Systems, Inc. also provided technical support. The authors recognize that without the dedication of these individuals, and the range of talents utilized in these studies, the data reported here could not have been collected, prepared for analysis and analyzed.

Finally, and most importantly, the survey data described here would not have been possible without the participation of men and women in the reserve components who took the time to collect the data and complete questionnaires. Over 12,000 officers and about 52,000 enlisted personnel in all seven reserve components, and over 33,000 spouses, responded to questionnaires and many more were involved in the administrative aspects of the surveys. Their contributions and cooperation are appreciated. Many hundreds of these members and spouses also took the time to provide additional comments which helped

to set the quantitative data within the life and perspective of the Guard and Reserve member and spouse. In addition, these comments served to identify concerns and issues that were not specifically addressed in the survey questionnaire. These reports tell their story. The authors hope they have told it fairly and accurately for the benefit of policymakers and the public at large.

DESCRIPTION OF SPOUSES OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL IN THE
U.S. SELECTED RESERVE: 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | iii |
| PREFACE | xi |
| 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND | 1-1 |
| A. Introduction | 1-1 |
| 1. Perspective | 1-1 |
| 2. Audience for the Report | 1-3 |
| B. Organization of the Report and Analytic Approach | 1-4 |
| 1. Organization and Chapter Contents | 1-4 |
| 2. Analytic Approach | 1-6 |
| ENDNOTES | 1-8 |
| 2. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE 1986 RESERVE COMPONENTS SURVEYS | 2-1 |
| A. Survey Research in the Department of Defense | 2-1 |
| B. Background of the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys | 2-2 |
| 1. Purpose | 2-2 |
| 2. Previous Reserve Studies | 2-4 |
| 3. Brief Description of the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys | 2-5 |
| C. Survey Populations and Samples | 2-6 |
| 1. Military Personnel | 2-6 |
| 2. Spouses | 2-10 |
| 3. Couples | 2-10 |
| D. Survey Administration and Response Rates | 2-10 |
| 1. Administration | 2-10 |
| 2. Response Rates | 2-13 |
| 3. Weighting the Data | 2-28 |

DESCRIPTION OF SPOUSES OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL IN THE
U.S. SELECTED RESERVE: 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| E. The Survey Questionnaires | 2-28 |
| 1. Questionnaire Development | 2-31 |
| 2. Questionnaire Contents | 2-33 |
| ENDNOTES | 2-37 |
| | |
| 3. CHARACTERISTICS OF SPOUSES AND FAMILIES OF GUARD/RESERVE MEMBERS | 3-1 |
| A. Introduction | 3-1 |
| B. Marital Status of Guard/Reserve Members | 3-1 |
| C. Military Experience of Spouses of Guard/Reserve Members | 3-14 |
| D. Personal Characteristics of Spouses | 3-27 |
| E. Summary and Conclusions | 3-38 |
| ENDNOTES | 3-40 |
| | |
| 4. EMPLOYMENT OF SPOUSES OF GUARD/RESERVE MEMBERS | 4-1 |
| A. Introduction | 4-1 |
| B. Employment of Civilian Wives | 4-1 |
| C. Employed Wives' Reasons for Working | 4-10 |
| D. Employment of Civilian Husbands of Women Members of the Guard/Reserve | 4-12 |
| E. Summary and Conclusions | 4-14 |
| ENDNOTES | 4-17 |

DESCRIPTION OF SPOUSES OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL IN THE
U.S. SELECTED RESERVE: 1986

TAB' E OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 5. SPOUSE AND FAMILY PARTICIPATION IN GUARD/RESERVE ACTIVITIES | 5-1 |
| A. Introduction | 5-1 |
| B. Knowledge of and Interest in Programs and Activities for Family Members | 5-1 |
| C. Spouse Participation in Guard/Reserve Activities | 5-5 |
| 1. Participation in Programs and Activities for Family Members | 5-5 |
| 2. Volunteer Participation | 5-7 |
| 3. Factors that Prevent Participation | 5-12 |
| D. Summary and Conclusions | 5-12 |
| 6. THE EFFECTS OF GUARD/RESERVE PARTICIPATION ON FAMILIES | 6-1 |
| A. Introduction | 6-1 |
| B. Member and Family Time, and Impacts of Time on Family | 6-1 |
| 1. Amount of Member and Family Time | 6-1 |
| 2. Impact of Guard/Reserve Time on the Family | 6-6 |
| C. Financial Aspects of Guard/Reserve Participation | 6-11 |
| D. Summary and Conclusions | 6-11 |
| ENDNOTES | 6-15 |

DESCRIPTION OF SPOUSES OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL IN THE
U.S. SELECTED RESERVE: 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| 7. SPOUSE AND FAMILY SUPPORT FOR MEMBER'S GUARD/RESERVE PARTICIPATION | 7-1 |
| A. Introduction | 7-1 |
| B. Community Support | 7-1 |
| C. Career Agreement | 7-3 |
| D. Spouse Satisfaction with Member's Guard/Reserve Participation | 7-3 |
| 1. Spouse Perception of Reasons for Member's Participation in Guard/Reserve | 7-3 |
| 2. Satisfaction with Features of Member's Participation in the Guard/Reserve | 7-9 |
| 3. Overall Attitude to Member's Participation | 7-13 |
| E. Member Satisfaction with Guard/Reserve Participation | 7-18 |
| F. Summary and Conclusions | 7-18 |

DESCRIPTION OF SPOUSES OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL IN THE
U.S. SELECTED RESERVE: 1986

LIST OF TABLES

| | | <u>Page</u> |
|-----------|---|-------------|
| Table 2.1 | 1986 Reserve Components Surveys Sampling Ratios for Military Members | 2-7 |
| Table 2.2 | Basic Sample of Military Members Selected for the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys | 2-8 |
| Table 2.3 | 1979 Reserve Forces Follow-Up Survey Sample | 2-9 |
| Table 2.4 | 1986 Reserve Components Surveys Response Rates for Military Members, by Stratum | 2-15 |
| Table 2.5 | 1986 Reserve Components Surveys Response Rates for Military Members, by Reserve Components | 2-19 |
| Table 2.6 | 1986 Reserve Components Spouse Survey Response Rates, by Stratum | 2-22 |
| Table 2.7 | 1986 Reserve Components Spouse Survey Response Rates, by Reserve Component | 2-26 |
| Table 2.8 | Relationship of Usable Questionnaires to Selected Reserve Population as of 30 June 1986 1986 Reserve Component Surveys | 2-29 |
| Table 3.1 | Members' Marital Status by Sex | 3-2 |
| Table 3.2 | Members' Marital Status by Sex and Reserve Category | 3-3 |
| Table 3.3 | Part-Time Unit Members' Marital Status by Sex and Reserve Component | 3-7 |
| Table 3.4 | Military Status of Spouses by Sex and Reserve Category | 3-15 |
| Table 3.5 | Military Status of Spouses by Sex and Reserve Component | 3-20 |
| Table 3.6 | Age of Civilian Wives of Members | 3-28 |
| Table 3.7 | Education of Civilian Wives of Members | 3-28 |
| Table 3.8 | Race/Ethnicity of Civilian Wives of Members | 3-29 |

DESCRIPTION OF SPOUSES OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL IN THE
U.S. SELECTED RESERVE: 1986

LIST OF TABLES

| | | <u>Page</u> |
|------------|---|-------------|
| Table 3.9 | Place of Birth and Citizenship of Civilian Wives of Members | 3-30 |
| Table 3.10 | Primary Language of Civilian Wives of Members . . . | 3-31 |
| Table 3.11 | Marriage Duration | 3-31 |
| Table 3.12 | Marriage and Member's Decision to Join Guard/Reserve | 3-33 |
| Table 3.13 | Number of Dependents | 3-33 |
| Table 3.14 | Handicapped Dependents in Family | 3-34 |
| Table 3.15 | Family Life Course | 3-34 |
| Table 3.16 | Type of Place and Housing Where Family Lives | 3-36 |
| Table 3.17 | Length of Time Family Has Lived in Present Neighborhood | 3-37 |
| Table 4.1 | Employment Status of Civilian Wives of Members . . . | 4-2 |
| Table 4.2 | Employment Status of Civilian Wives of Members by Wife's Educational Level | 4-3 |
| Table 4.3 | Employment Status of Civilian Wives of Members by Family Life Course Stage | 4-5 |
| Table 4.4 | Employment Level of Civilian Wives of Members . . . | 4-6 |
| Table 4.5 | Employment Level of Civilian Wives of Members by Family Life Course Stage | 4-6 |
| Table 4.6 | Type of Employment of Civilian Wives of Members | 4-8 |
| Table 4.7 | Length of Time Worked at Present Job for Civilian Wives of Members (Wives Employed in 1985) | 4-8 |
| Table 4.8 | Occupation of 1985 Job for Civilian Wives of Members (Wives Employed in 1985) | 4-9 |
| Table 4.9 | Employed Wives' Reasons for Working: Percentage Who Cite Each Reason as a "Major Contribution" . . . | 4-11 |

DESCRIPTION OF SPOUSES OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL IN THE
U.S. SELECTED RESERVE: 1986

LIST OF TABLES

| | | <u>Page</u> |
|------------|---|-------------|
| Table 4.10 | Employment Status of Civilian Husbands of Members | 4-13 |
| Table 4.11 | Employment Level of Civilian Husbands of Members | 4-13 |
| Table 4.12 | Type of Employment of Civilian Husbands of Members | 4-13 |
| Table 4.13 | Occupation of 1985 Job for Civilian Husbands of Enlisted Members | 4-15 |
| Table 5.1 | Knowledge of Availability of Unit Programs and Activities by Civilian Wives of Members: Percentage of Spouses Who Say They Know of Program or Activity | 5-2 |
| Table 5.2 | Interest in New Information Materials and Programs Among Civilian Wives of Members by Topic: Percentage Who Are "Very Interested" or "Interested" | 5-4 |
| Table 5.3 | Participation in Unit Programs and Activities by All Civilian Wives of Members: Percentage Who Have Participated At Least Once | 5-6 |
| Table 5.4 | Participation in Unit Programs and Activities by Civilian Wives of Members Who Say Program or Activity is Available: Percentage Who Have Participated At Least Once | 5-6 |
| Table 5.5 | Volunteer Work in Guard/Reserve and Civilian Activities by Civilian Wives of Members | 5-8 |
| Table 5.6 | Volunteer Work in Civilian Activities by Civilian Wives of Members | 5-8 |
| Table 5.7 | Volunteer Work in Guard/Reserve by Civilian Wives of Members | 5-8 |
| Table 5.8 | Participation in Guard/Reserve Activities and Volunteer Work by Civilian Wives of Members | 5-10 |
| Table 5.9 | Participation in Guard/Reserve Activities and Volunteer Work by Civilian Wives of Members by Family Life Course Stage | 5-10 |

DESCRIPTION OF SPOUSES OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL IN THE
U.S. SELECTED RESERVE: 1986

LIST OF TABLES

| | | <u>Page</u> |
|------------|---|-------------|
| Table 5.10 | Participation in Guard/Reserve Activities and Volunteer Work by Civilian Wives of Members by Employment Status | 5-11 |
| Table 5.11 | Participation in Guard/Reserve Activities and Volunteer Work by Civilian Wives of Members by Type of Place Where Family Lives | 5-13 |
| Table 5.12 | Factors that Prevent Wives' Taking Part (as Participant or Volunteer) in Guard/Reserve Family Activities | 5-15 |
| Table 6.1 | Length of Time it Takes Member to Get to Place Where Unit Meets/Drills | 6-2 |
| Table 6.2 | Length of Time it Takes Member to Get to Place Where Unit Meets/Drills by Who Drives | 6-4 |
| Table 6.3 | Who Usually Cares for Youngest Child While Wife Works, Looks for Work, or Attends School . . . | 6-5 |
| Table 6.4 | Weekly Hours of Child Care by Member While Wife Works, Looks for Work, or Attends School . . . | 6-5 |
| Table 6.5 | Extent of Problems Caused for Family by Guard/Reserve Participation | 6-7 |
| Table 6.6 | Spouse Perception of How Hard Member Works During Time at Guard/Reserve | 6-9 |
| Table 6.7 | Spouse Feelings About the Amount of Time Member Spends on Different Activities | 6-10 |
| Table 6.8 | Contribution of Member's Guard/Reserve Income: Percentage of Wives Who Say Income Makes a "Major Contribution" | 6-12 |
| Table 6.9 | Extent of Problems Caused for Family by Guard/Reserve Participation: Effects on Pay and Promotion at Civilian Job Due to Guard/Reserve Duty | 6-12 |
| Table 7.1 | Spouse's View of Support for Member's Guard/Reserve Participation: Percentage Who View Support as "Very Favorable" | 7-2 |

DESCRIPTION OF SPOUSES OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL IN THE
U.S. SELECTED RESERVE: 1986

LIST OF TABLES

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Table 7.2 Spouse's View of Community Support for Member's Guard/Reserve Participation | 7-2 |
| Table 7.3 How Well Member and Spouse Agree on Member's Military Career Plans | 7-4 |
| Table 7.4 How Well Member and Spouse Agree on Member's Civilian Career Plans | 7-4 |
| Table 7.5 How Well Member and Spouse Agree on Member's Civilian and Military Career Plans | 7-5 |
| Table 7.6 Contribution of Factors to Member's Most Recent Decision to Stay in Guard/Reserve: Percentage Who Say Factor Made a "Major Contribution" | 7-8 |
| Table 7.7 Types of Factors Spouse Says Made a "Major Contribution" to Member's Most Recent Decision to Stay in the Guard/Reserve | 7-8 |
| Table 7.8 Spouse's Level of Satisfaction with Features of Member's Participation in Guard/Reserve | 7-10 |
| Table 7.9 Spouse's Overall Attitude Toward Member's Participation in Guard/Reserve | 7-14 |
| Table 7.10 Spouse's Overall Attitude Toward Member's Participation in Guard/Reserve by Family Factors: Percentage Whose Attitude is "Very Favorable" | 7-15 |
| Table 7.11 Spouse's Overall Attitude Toward Member's Participation in Guard/Reserve by Reasons for Participation: Percentage Whose Attitude is "Very Favorable" | 7-17 |
| Table 7.12 Member Satisfaction with Guard/Reserve Participation by Spouse Satisfaction and Pay Grade for Enlisted Personnel | 7-19 |
| Table 7.13 Member Satisfaction with Guard/Reserve Participation by Spouse Satisfaction and Pay Grade for Officers | 7-21 |

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

A. Introduction

1. Perspective

The ultimate purpose of all Department of Defense (DoD) manpower policies is to recruit, train, equip, and field a force capable of preserving the peace and protecting the vital interests of the United States and its allies. The men and women currently in the reserve forces are an integral part of that force. Since the proclamation of the Total Force policy in the All Volunteer Force era, and particularly since 1980, increased reliance has been placed on reserve members and units.

Service in the U.S. Armed Forces, both in the active and reserve forces, entails participation in a way of life and a reciprocal commitment between the institution and its members - military personnel and their families. For the spouse and family, participation in the military life has both objective and psychological aspects. For the spouses of members of the reserve forces, the subjects of this report, objective factors include the regular absence of mates at least several days each month and temporary separation of families when reservists attend annual training or special schools. In addition to the objective aspects of military life, military members and their families participate in a way of life which carries with it psychological aspects as well. These include exposure to danger for the member and its associated stress for families; satisfactions and frustrations that come from being integral to the defense of the nation; as well as some tension with the civilian world in which they live and work.

Increasingly, the manpower demands of the military have required recruiting and retaining men and women who are able, motivated, have or can be trained to have good technical and other skills, and are committed to the armed forces. At the same time, as more skilled personnel are needed, and as there is greater emphasis on retaining well-trained and capable people, both active and reserve forces have come to be staffed by men and women who are married (some when they enter, but most after they are in the military) and have families.

Consequently, the impact of the military life on the family - spouses, children, and military members - and the role of the family in continued and effective participation on the part of reservists, have become issues of concern to DoD and the active and reserve components. In the reserve forces, this concern has two aspects. First, as part of the partnership between the military and its members, the reserve components are committed to addressing family needs and assisting the family as much as possible. This is a commitment made with the recognition that the majority of the families are members of civilian communities and have a relationship to the armed forces different from that of families whose members are in the active forces.

Second, family support and well-being is viewed as an essential factor in the retention of trained military personnel.

Continued effective management of and policy formulation for all armed forces personnel requires that DoD and the active and reserve components have reliable, valid, and timely data bases to support policy analysis, evaluation, and research on defense manpower issues. In addition to data that are routinely collected for administrative purposes, demographic, economic, behavioral and attitudinal information is needed. Survey research can provide such information. If collected periodically, survey data can be used to assess the responses of military personnel to past and current policy changes and to identify future areas for policy action.

This volume presents an overview of the spouses of military personnel in the National Guard and Reserve Components, and their responsiveness to and attitudes toward programs and policies which affect their welfare. It is based on the 1986 Reserve Components Survey of Selected Reserve Spouses, one portion of the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys. The 1986 Reserve Components Surveys (1986 RC Surveys) consist of three portions, two of reserve component members and the third of their spouses.

The 1986 Reserve Components Survey of Selected Reserve Spouses (1986 RC Spouse Survey), surveyed the spouses of all married members selected for inclusion in the two members surveys. The spouses of married reservists in all seven reserve components (Army National Guard, Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air National Guard, Air Force Reserve and Coast Guard Reserve) were included.

From the point of view of policy makers and program staff in DoD and the reserve components, it is important to have the best understanding possible of the particular features of the interaction between reserve participation and family life that are sources of problems, as well as those that provide major benefits or life satisfaction and well-being. From the point of view of military personnel policy, family problems and satisfactions are important because of their expected effects on such crucial outcomes as the retention of highly qualified and committed military personnel. The results of the 1986 RC Spouse Survey provide an opportunity to contribute to an understanding of the central issues of family well-being.

In reading this report, it is important to remember that, in recent decades, American family life has undergone major change. One key change is the increase in labor force participation by married women, and especially by those with young children. Family roles, family economic situation, and needs for family programs and services are all affected by this change. Families with members in the reserve components live within an environment that is shaped both by the change in families in the larger society and by the unique structural and cultural features of military life. In addition, these families are affected by the increase in the number of women in the reserve components, and the concomitant increase in the number of civilian

husbands and dual military couples (i.e. where both spouses are military members). The results of the 1986 DoD Spouse Survey also provide an opportunity to explore how families with members in the reserve components have adapted in this period of rapid change.

The report presents the major findings from this survey and, where appropriate, compares the information with data collected in a companion survey conducted with the spouses of active duty military personnel, the 1985 DoD Survey of Military Spouses.*¹

These surveys were conducted for the Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) [OASD(RA)] and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management and Personnel) [OASD (FM&P)] by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC). Over 12,000 officers and about 52,000 enlisted personnel in all seven reserve components, representing the approximately 1,012,000 trained personnel in the Selected Reserve and over 33,000 spouses, representing the approximately 640,000 spouses married to reserve components military personnel responded to extensive questionnaires sent to them in the spring of 1986. The questionnaire sent to spouses asked about their civilian community, personal and family characteristics, civilian employment and economic status, perceptions of family and employer attitudes toward reserve participation, and their attitudes and orientations toward and satisfaction with the reserves.

In the chapters that follow, and in the associated Supplementary Tabulations, we present a description of the spouses of military personnel based on the surveys. In addition to extensive, heretofore unknown, family demographic and economic characteristics, behavioral and attitudinal data are presented. The reactions of these spouses to current policies, the ways in which their mates' reserve participation interacts with their civilian lives as family members and (for many) as participants in the labor force, and their assessments of the conflicts between their mates' reserve participation and other aspects of their lives are discussed.

Clearly, the satisfaction and performance of members of the reserve forces are partly a reflection of the effectiveness of personnel policies. This report, and other analyses which will be conducted using the survey data, are a contribution toward an assessment of current policies and the formulation of new ones.

2. Audience for the Report

Data collected in broad-based personnel surveys such as the 1986 RC Surveys cannot in a single report or volume meet the needs of all of its potential audiences entirely. Although the data were collected to satisfy a set of information requirements, many of these were intentionally general in scope so as to provide for future, as yet unanticipated, uses. In addition, the various actual and potential users of these data have differing needs as to the complexity and level of detail of specific analyses.²

*See endnotes to this chapter.

In the course of the initial survey planning, it became clear that a report which presented a broad overview of the data would serve as a useful document and reference tool for both current and potential users. Senior DoD managers in the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and in the regular and reserve components, and interested members of Congress and the public, would find a basic descriptive summary of the demographic and attitudinal data collected from spouses of personnel in the reserve forces useful. DoD analysts could use both the present report and its associated Supplementary Tabulations in the preparation of reports, issue papers, congressional testimony, briefings, and correspondence without additional analyses. Finally, DoD, the Coast Guard, and the regular and reserve components could use the information in these reports to place problems in perspective and identify issues which require policy attention. It is toward the audiences described above that this report is directed.

In the next section of this chapter, the organization of the report is discussed, including abbreviated summaries of the contents of subsequent chapters. Then, the analytic approach is summarized.

B. Organization of the Report and Analytic Approach

1. Organization and Chapter Contents

In addition to this Introduction and Background (Chapter 1), this report contains a methodological chapter (Chapter 2) and five substantive chapters. A supplementary volume contains copies of all the text tables, as well as additional tables, which present more detailed data than are included in the text tables. These detailed Supplementary Tabulations are organized in the same order and cover the same topics as the text tables. To facilitate use, the Supplementary tabulations use the same numbering system as the text tables, with the more detailed supplementary tables indicated by "a", "b", "c", following the table number. The reader can go from any table in the text to the corresponding supplementary tables.

The general contents of Chapters 2-7 are:

Chapter 2. "Introduction to the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys." After a brief discussion of survey research in the Department of Defense, this chapter describes the 1986 Reserve Components survey design and provides information about the sample, data collection, response rates, weighting procedures, and the questionnaires.

Chapter 3. "Characteristics of Spouses and Families of Guard/Reserve Members." This chapter first presents data on Guard/Reserve members' marital status and on the military status and experience of spouses of members. The remainder of the chapter describes the social and demographic characteristics of wives of part-time unit members, and characteristics of families in which the wife is a civilian. The wives included are those who are themselves in the Guard/Reserve. Wives who are currently serving on active duty in any of the services

are excluded. This population of families, in which the couple consists of a wife not on active duty and a part-time unit member husband, represents the large majority of Guard/Reserve families, and is the primary focus of the analyses in the present report. Unless otherwise indicated, all data in the report are for this population. The data presented in this chapter are important for describing Guard/Reserve families, and provide the background for understanding the relationship between families and the Guard/Reserve described in subsequent chapters.

Chapter 4. "Employment of Spouses of Guard/Reserve Members." This chapter describes the employment situation and occupations of wives of part-time Guard/Reserve members, including: employment status and level; occupation; and reasons for working. These results are compared with data for wives of members of the active duty force, and with the larger population of civilian women. In addition, the employment and occupations of civilian husbands of women part-time Guard/Reserve members are described.

Chapter 5. "Spouse and Family Participation in Guard/Reserve Activities." This chapter describes spouse knowledge of and participation, and interest in Guard/Reserve-related activities, programs, and information. Specific topics include: spouse knowledge of and interest in family-oriented programs and activities; participation in programs and activities for family members, and in civilian and Guard/Reserve volunteer work; and factors that prevent participation in Guard/Reserve activities.

Chapter 6. "The Effects of Guard/Reserve Participation on Families." This chapter first presents data on spouse feelings about the amount of time the member spends on family, Guard/Reserve, and other activities, and problems caused for families by members' Guard/Reserve participation. Next, it shows the contribution the member's Guard/Reserve income makes to different aspects of the family's financial situation.

Chapter 7. "Spouse and Family Support for Member's Guard/Reserve Participation." This chapter presents data on: the spouse's sense of community support for the member's Guard/Reserve participation; couple agreement on the member's civilian and military career plans; the spouse's perception of the member's reasons for continuing participation in the Guard/Reserve; the spouse's satisfaction with different features of the Guard/Reserve; overall spouse attitude toward the member's participation; and the relationship between member and spouse satisfaction with member participation. The last analysis uses data for both members of the couple in order to present each one's self-report of his or her attitudes. This kind of analysis is made possible by the survey sample design, which provided for the collection of data from spouses of members selected for the member sample.

2. Analytic Approach

Tables are used in Chapters 3-7 to describe the family situation of Guard/Reserve members and the experience of spouses and families with their own and the member's participation. All the tables present data separately for spouses of enlisted member and officers, and the total for all Guard/Reserve spouses. As discussed earlier, the primary focus is on families in which the spouse is a woman who is not a member of the active duty force and the member is a part-time unit member. In a number of cases, comparisons are explicitly drawn between spouses of officers and enlisted men, in order to examine similarities and differences in their experience, participation, and attitudes. In other cases, where differences are small, the main focus is on the total population of Guard/Reserve wives married to part-time unit members. In several analyses, data for the comparable U.S. civilian population (using data from the Current Population Survey (CPS) for women aged 16-45, married to men who are employed full-time in the civilian labor force) and for the active duty force (from the 1985 DoD Spouse Survey) are used to compare Guard/Reserve family experience with that of the larger civilian population and families of active duty members.

Several composite or summary variables were created for use in the analyses reported in this volume. These include a composite measure of the member's reasons for the most recent decision to stay in the Guard/Reserve, which groups the specific reasons into larger categories; a single measure of the contribution of the member's Guard/Reserve income to the family's financial situation, which is based on the specific financial contribution items; and a single item measure of whether member Guard/Reserve participation causes one or more kinds of serious problems for the spouse and family. These are used in different analyses presented here, and are described in more detail in the discussion of the analysis results.

Statistical tests of significance were not used in the analyses. In a survey with as large a sample size as this one has, most estimates can be made so precisely that even small differences in percentages between major groups (e.g., wives of officers vs. enlisted men) are statistically significant. In some cases, where the percentage differences are small (e.g., less than five percentage points), even statistically significant differences are unlikely to be important for policy purposes. In general, the approach used has been to provide the overall picture and to focus on differences in family experience only when they are relatively large in magnitude or are part of a systematic pattern of differences evident in a number of different analyses. Because estimates for some subgroups detailed in these tables are based on smaller numbers of observations, generalized tables of standard errors have been estimated for this study. A brief description of standard errors and generalized tables appears in Appendix B of the Supplementary Tabulations. Unclassifiable or missing data have been excluded from the tabulations, rather than being treated as a separate response category. In effect, this approach assumes they are distributed in the same way as the data from spouses who did

respond to the survey items. Readers can determine the level of missing data for different analyses by examining the information on the number of cases, which is presented in each table.

This report does not separately analyze data for families of members of the various reserve components. The decision not to analyze data by reserve component was made for several reasons, including: the variability in response rates for spouses of members of the different components would limit the generalizability and value of some results; in some cases, sample sizes, especially for smaller subgroups of the officer's spouse category, were too small to allow reliable estimates or comparisons; and, from a policy perspective, the differences between components in family experience was deemed to be less important than the overall picture and the similarities and differences between spouses of officers and enlisted men.

The reader interested in more detailed information is directed to the Supplementary Tabulations mentioned earlier. Comparisons with the experience of families of the active duty can be made by consulting the report on the 1985 DoD Spouse Survey and its accompanying set of Supplementary Tabulations.³

ENDNOTES

¹A Description of Military Dependents Issues Based on the 1985 DoD Survey of Officer and Enlisted Personnel. By A.J. Bonito, Research Triangle Institute, 1986.

Description of Officers and Enlisted Personnel in the U.S. Armed Forces: 1985 A Report Based on the 1985 DoD Survey of Officer and Enlisted Personnel. By M.E. McCalla, S.H. Rakoff, Z.D. Doering, and B.S. Mahoney. Research Triangle Institute, 1986.

Description of Officers and Enlisted Personnel in the U.S. Armed Forces: 1985 Supplementary Tabulations from the 1985 DoD Surveys of Officer and Enlisted Personnel. By L.M. LaVange, M.E. McCalla, T.J. Gabel, S.H. Rakoff, Z.D. Doering, and B.S. Mahoney. Research Triangle Institute, 1986 (3 Volumes).

Descriptions of Spouses of Officers and Enlisted Personnel in the U.S. Armed Forces: 1985 A Report Based on the 1985 DoD Surveys of Officer and Enlisted Personnel Military Spouses. By J.D. Griffith, Z.D. Doering, and B.S. Mahoney. Research Triangle Institute, 1986 (3 Volumes).

Description of Spouses of Officers and Enlisted Personnel in the U.S. Armed Forces: 1985 Supplementary Tabulations from the 1985 DoD Surveys of Officer and Enlisted Personnel Military Spouses. By L.M. LaVange, T.J. Gabel, J.D. Griffith, Z.D. Doering, and B.S. Mahoney. Research Triangle Institute, 1986 (3 Volumes).

²For example, staff members of the Sixth Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation (QRMC) are already using these data in a comprehensive evaluation of the benefits and costs of all reserve compensation programs.

³Description of Spouses of Officers and Enlisted Personnel: 1985. A Report Based on the 1985 DoD Surveys of Officer and Enlisted Personnel and Military Spouses; and Description of Spouses of Officers and Enlisted Personnel: 1985. Supplementary Tabulations from the 1985 DoD Surveys of Officer and Enlisted Personnel and Military Spouses, by J.D. Griffith et al., Research Triangle Institute, 1986.

2. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE 1986 RESERVE COMPONENTS SURVEYS

This chapter provides an overview of the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys. It includes a discussion of survey research in the Department of Defense and the design used in conducting the present surveys. Information about the sample, data collection, response rates and the questionnaires is also provided.

A. Survey Research in the Department of Defense

In formulating manpower and personnel policy, the Department of Defense (DoD) relies on both administrative data and on survey data. Administrative data are personnel-related information collected from individuals, or maintained about them, primarily for record-keeping purposes. Such information is used in determining the types and amounts of military compensation, eligibility for various forms of health and program benefits, and performance assessments. These data are largely automated and readily available for policy research and formulation purposes.

Survey data collected in DoD include social characteristics, descriptive, economic, demographic, and behavioral information, as well as data about tastes, preferences, experiences, and projected behaviors. Survey data are currently collected from samples of individuals, using a range of methodologies. Data are most frequently collected using self-administered questionnaires distributed and collected individually or in group settings. They are also collected through personal and telephone interviews and as an adjunct to field experiments. Survey data can be used to supplement administrative data as well as to address issues which cannot be studied from the administrative data. Particularly if collected periodically and systematically, these data serve as a basis for assessing the response of military personnel to policy changes and for identifying areas for future policy action.

Each of the Services and the reserve components undertakes policy analyses using its own administrative data and data from surveys conducted among its own personnel. In general, such studies address Service- or component-specific issues. Issues which are cross-Service or cross-component in nature are addressed within the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD). Either such studies are conducted by OSD or a single service is designated to conduct a study on OSD's behalf.

The administrative data used to support OSD studies are less detailed than those available at the Service or component level, since the former are primarily used for policy formulation and assessment, while the latter are used for detailed personnel management as well as for policy purposes. Surveys conducted at the OSD level strive for a balance between data which will allow for cross-Service or cross-component policy analysis and data detailed enough so that they can also be used by the separate military services.

The 1986 Reserve Components Surveys (1986 RC Surveys) described below are the most recent examples of OSD surveys, developed and conducted with the cooperation of the reserve components and intended to provide data for both OSD and component-specific studies. In the case of the 1986 RC Surveys, the Coast Guard Reserve was included to ensure comprehensive coverage of all seven reserve components of the armed forces.

B. Background of the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys

1. Purpose

In January, 1983, the Deputy Secretary of Defense mandated a survey of military families, who were increasingly recognized as important to the retention and preparedness of the armed forces. While each of the military services had previously conducted small-scale studies of Service-specific military families, a single consistent cross-service data set which could be used to study emerging family issues was not available. Concurrent with the requirement to create a data base for studying military families, DoD also had a need to assess the impact of a range of personnel policies implemented in the past few years. Because there was a great deal of overlap in the information needed for both purposes, i.e., studying family issues and studying a broad range of personnel issues, the two requirements were merged.

In preparation for that task, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics) [currently the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management and Personnel)] established the Family Survey Coordinating Committee, a DoD-wide committee which assessed both information requirements and data sources within the DoD. Early in the deliberations of the Committee, it was recognized that major surveys of both the active and the reserve components were required. Recognizing the complexity of the undertaking, the Committee initiated active force surveys but temporarily postponed the reserve components surveys. The 1985 DoD Survey of Officer and Enlisted Personnel (1985 DoD Member Survey) and the 1985 DoD Survey of Military Spouses (1985 DoD Spouse Survey), collectively the 1985 DoD Surveys of Officer and Enlisted Personnel and Military Spouses (1985 DoD Surveys), were thus conducted to meet the requirements for data from active-duty military personnel and their spouses.

In February, 1985, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Guard/Reserve Manpower and Personnel) [DASD(G/R M&P)] asked the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) to act as his agent in the conduct of the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys. DMDC had acted in a similar capacity in the conduct of the 1985 active duty surveys. In addition, the DASD (G/R M&P) convened a special committee of reserve component representatives to focus on establishing the requirements for the surveys. The 1986 Reserve Components Surveys, described in detail in the remainder of this chapter, were conducted to meet the requirements for data from members of the reserve components and their spouses.

Together, the 1985 DoD Surveys and the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys provide data sets on the total population actively involved in the military way of life. The survey data collected from both of these major surveys can be used to study:

- o The response of military personnel to changes in military compensation and benefits enacted in recent years;
- o Factors affecting individual preparedness and retention of active-duty and reserve personnel;
- o Projected behavior of military personnel in response to possible changes in personnel management;
- o Differences in career orientations, attitudes, and experiences between members of different subgroups, e.g., occupational specialties, officers and enlisted members, minorities, men and women;
- o The demographic, household, familial and other characteristics of military personnel, couples, and families, including special groups such as dual-career couples and single-parent families;
- o The impact of military policies on aspects of military and family life such as residential arrangements, continuing education, and spouse employment;
- o Family well-being, including economic issues facing military families; and
- o Demand for, use and adequacy of programs providing family services.

In addition, data available from the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys can be used to address a variety of questions about National Guard and Reserve components members and families which heretofore have been the subject of limited or outdated research, broad stereotyping, and speculation. These include:

- o Patterns of previous active and reserve component service;
- o Financial issues that would face Guard and Reserve families in the event of mobilization;
- o The interaction between the amount and forms of reserve compensation and career intentions;
- o The relationship between civilian occupations and military occupations for members;
- o Availability of medical and health coverage to reserve families from non-reserve sources;

- o The impact of employer policies, practices and attitudes on member reserve participation; and
- o The role of the family in reserve participation.

2. Previous Reserve Studies

The 1985 DoD Surveys and the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys (1986 RC Surveys) build directly on OSD-sponsored survey research conducted in recent years. The objectives of these surveys include a systematic examination of, and provision of policy-sensitive information about the military life cycle. The military life cycle includes both reserve and active force enlistment and reenlistment decisions, career orientations, responses to policies that affect military members and their households, and decisions to leave the military.

Beginning in FY 1979, several major life cycle surveys have been conducted. The 1979 DoD Survey of Personnel Entering Military Service and the 1981 and 1983 DoD Surveys of Applicants for Military Service focused on enlistment decisions. The 1978/79 DoD Survey of Officer and Enlisted Personnel (1978/79 DoD Surveys) focused on the in-service population; i.e., the men and women on active-duty in the four Services. The 1985 DoD Surveys are closely related to the 1978/79 DoD Surveys both in subject areas and survey design.

Former studies of the reserve components include the 1979 Reserve Force Studies Surveys (1979 RF Surveys) and the 1984 Survey of National Guard and Reserve Members. The 1979 RF Surveys were administered to a cross-section of enlisted members and unit commanders in both the Army National Guard and Army Reserve. The purpose of the surveys was to collect data for the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) and the Army Guard and Reserve components to support policy research analysis on reserve force and manning problems. The study was limited to a sample of 441 Army National Guard and Army Reserve units, 219 for specialized case studies and 222 randomly selected. In each unit, questionnaires were administered to all junior and senior enlisted members and to the unit commanders. In addition, one questionnaire was filled out either by the unit commander or another unit member (generally the unit military technician) to report basic factual information about each sampled unit.

The 1984 Survey of National Guard and Reserve Members was conducted at the request of the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) and the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Military Personnel and Force Management). The purpose of the survey was to provide information on the attitudes and experiences of Selected Reserve members with regard to the military identification card system and other aspects of reserve service. The sample included 201 units. Within sampled units, all Selected Reserve members (including drilling members, Active Guard/Reserve or Training

and Administration of Reserve members (AGR/TARs), and military technicians) were asked to complete questionnaires.

3. Brief Description of the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys

The 1986 Reserve Components Surveys (1986 RC Surveys) consist of three portions, two of reserve component members and the third of their spouses. The 1986 Reserve Components Survey: Selected Reserve Officer and Enlisted Personnel (1986 RC Member Survey) surveyed a sample of Selected Reserve unit members. Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMAs), i.e., Selected Reservists who train with the active components, and military technicians, i.e., Selected Reservists who are also employed full-time in reserve units in a civilian capacity, were also included in the 1986 RC Member Survey. The 1986 Reserve Components Survey: Full-Time Support Officer and Enlisted Personnel (1986 RC AGR Survey) surveyed a sample of Active Guard/Reserve or Training and Administration of Reserve (AGR/TARs) members. Individuals in all seven reserve components (Army National Guard, Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air National Guard, Air Force Reserve and Coast Guard Reserve) were included in both the 1986 RC Member Survey and, where appropriate, in the 1986 RC AGR Survey.

As an additional part of these surveys, a follow-up of selected Army National Guard and Army Reserve units included in the 1979 RF Surveys was conducted. Of the 222 units randomly selected in 1979, 145 were still in existence in 1986. A census of approximately 13,000 enlisted members in these units constituted the 1979 RF Follow-Up portion of the 1986 RC Surveys. These units were included so that changes in personnel attitudes and attributes could be compared between 1979 and 1986. Members selected for the 1979 RF Follow-Up are included in the 1986 RC Member Survey population.

The 1986 RC Member Survey and the 1986 RC AGR Survey were administered to a sample of approximately 121,000 Guard/Reserve members (including about 13,000 in units previously sampled in 1979) in the United States and Puerto Rico. Five questionnaire versions were used: officer and enlisted members (including technicians and IMAs) (Forms 1 and 2); full-time support officer and enlisted members (Forms 3 and 4), and the commanders of units in the 1979 RF Follow-Up (Form 7).

The 1986 Reserve Components Survey of Spouses of Selected Reserve Personnel (1986 RC Spouse Survey) was a census of the spouses of all those surveyed in the 1986 RC member and the 1986 RC AGR Survey. A questionnaire was sent to approximately 75,000 spouses in English (Form 5) and Spanish (in Puerto Rico) (Form 6) versions.

All of the questionnaires contained a core group of questions similar to those used in previous DoD active and reserve surveys covering members' and spouses' characteristics and current experiences.

C. Survey Populations and Samples

The Reserve Components Common Personnel Data System (RCCPDS) as of 30 October 1985 was used to initially define the population on which the samples were based. In addition to the information used for sampling, RCCPDS contains other administrative data on Guard/Reserve members which were used in data collection. The 1986 RC Surveys contain three units of analysis: military personnel, spouses and couples.

1. Military Personnel

The population for the basic military samples of the 1986 RC Surveys consisted of Selected Reserve trained officer and enlisted personnel; i.e., individuals in the training pipeline were excluded. These personnel are included in the Selected Reserve strength of all reserve components. Therefore, the sample population was smaller by approximately 9 percent from the total population of the Selected Reserve. The basic stratification variable was reserve component. Within each component, personnel were classified by reserve category (RCAT) as defined in RCCPDS, officer/enlisted members status and sex. The four reserve categories are unit members (RCAT = S), non-unit members or IMAs (RCAT = T), military technicians (RCAT = M), and full-time support personnel or AGR/TAR (RCAT = F). The final sample sizes were based on a compromise between the number of questionnaires needed for detailed analyses of special small populations and budgetary constraints. In most strata, the design provided for a 10 percent sample. The sample design also provided for larger sampling ratios of women, officers, Marine Corps Reserve and Coast Guard Reserve personnel. The final stratification scheme along with the sampling ratios is shown in Table 2.1. Within each stratum, a random sample of military personnel was selected with equal probability of selection using the sample numbers shown in Table 2.1. The final sample sizes, by stratum, are shown in Table 2.2.

As indicated above, in addition to the basic sample, approximately 13,000 Army National Guard (ARNG) and Army Reserve (USAR) members of specific units from the 1979 RF Surveys were surveyed. These 145 units had been randomly selected and surveyed in the 1979 RF Surveys and were still in existence in late 1985. Table 2.3 shows the complete follow-up sample, in strata defined on the basis of unit size; i.e., following the classification used in the 1979 RF Surveys. The table shows 12,977 individuals were selected; 7,443 individuals in the ARNG and 5,534 in the USAR. However, some individuals in the ARNG or USAR are in both samples, that is, they were randomly selected as part of the basic sample and happened to be members of 1979 RF Follow-Up. The actual number of additional unique individuals sampled was 11,700: 6,707 in the Army National Guard and 5,013 in the Army Reserve. Put another way, there is an overlap of 1,257 individuals, 736 in the Army National Guard and 521 in the Army Reserve who are in both the basic 1986 RC Surveys sample and the 1979 RF Follow-Up.

Table 2.1. 1986 Reserve Components Surveys Sampling Ratios
for Military Members

| Respondent Type | Reserve Component | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| | ARNG | USAR | USNR | USMCR | ANG | USAFR | USCGR |
| <u>Unit Members (RCAT=S)</u> | | | | | | | |
| <u>Officer</u> | | | | | | | |
| Male | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.40 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.60 |
| Female | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.80 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 1.00 |
| <u>Enlisted</u> | | | | | | | |
| Male | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.20 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.30 |
| Female | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.20 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.30 |
| <u>Non-Unit Members (IMAs) (RCAT=T)</u> | | | | | | | |
| <u>Officer</u> | | | | | | | |
| Male | - | 0.10 | - | 0.40 | - | 0.10 | - |
| Female | - | 0.20 | - | 0.80 | - | 0.20 | - |
| <u>Enlisted</u> | | | | | | | |
| Male | - | 0.10 | - | 0.20 | - | 0.10 | - |
| Female | - | 0.10 | - | 0.20 | - | 0.10 | - |
| <u>Technicians (RCAT=M)</u> | | | | | | | |
| <u>Officer</u> | | | | | | | |
| Male | 0.10 | 0.10 | - | - | 0.10 | 0.10 | - |
| Female | 0.20 | 0.20 | - | - | 0.20 | 0.10 | - |
| <u>Enlisted</u> | | | | | | | |
| Male | 0.10 | 0.10 | - | - | 0.10 | 0.10 | - |
| Female | 0.10 | 0.10 | - | - | 0.10 | 0.10 | - |
| <u>Full-Time Support (FTS-AGR/TAR) (RCAT=F)</u> | | | | | | | |
| <u>Officer</u> | | | | | | | |
| Male | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.40 | 0.10 | 0.10 | - |
| Female | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.80 | 0.20 | 0.20 | - |
| <u>Enlisted</u> | | | | | | | |
| Male | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.20 | 0.10 | 0.10 | - |
| Female | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.20 | 0.10 | 0.10 | - |

Table 2.2. Basic Sample of Military Members Selected
for the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys

| Respondent Type | Reserve Component | | | | | | | Total Selected Reserve |
|---|-------------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|------------------------------|
| | ARNG | USAR | USNR | USMCR | ANG | USAFR | USCGR | |
| <u>Unit Members (RCAT=S)</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Officer | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 3,175 | 3,345 | 1,872 | 976 | 935 | 584 | 890 | 11,777 |
| Female | 385 | 1,340 | 331 | 46 | 163 | 309 | 74 | 2,648 |
| Enlisted | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 30,785 | 15,826 | 7,650 | 6,040 | 5,971 | 3,729 | 2,890 | 72,891 |
| Female | 1,408 | 3,164 | 899 | 224 | 777 | 852 | 300 | 7,624 |
| <u>Non-Unit Members (IMAs) (RCAT=T)</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Officer | | | | | | | | |
| Male | - | 795 | 64 | 208 | - | 651 | - | 1,718 |
| Female | - | 94 | 9 | 39 | - | 164 | - | 306 |
| Enlisted | | | | | | | | |
| Male | - | 291 | 4 | 97 | - | 347 | - | 739 |
| Female | - | 42 | 2 | 13 | - | 85 | - | 142 |
| <u>Technicians (RCAT=M)</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Officer | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 531 | 96 | - | - | 187 | 77 | - | 891 |
| Female | 31 | 13 | - | - | 9 | 7 | - | 60 |
| Enlisted | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 1,548 | 243 | - | - | 1,790 | 672 | - | 4,253 |
| Female | 141 | 29 | - | - | 162 | 55 | - | 387 |
| <u>Full-Time Support (FTS-AGR/TAR) (RCAT=F)</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Officer | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 277 | 280 | 164 | 76 | 92 | 15 | - | 904 |
| Female | 22 | 43 | 16 | 18 | 7 | 2 | - | 108 |
| Enlisted | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 1,523 | 592 | 1,254 | 154 | 441 | 32 | - | 3,996 |
| Female | 188 | 191 | 89 | 34 | 110 | 11 | - | 623 |
| Total | 40,014 | 26,384 | 12,354 | 7,925 | 10,644 | 7,592 | 4,154 | 109,067 |

Table 2.3. 1979 Reserve Forces Follow-Up Survey Sample

| Reserve Component | Unit Size | Selected |
|----------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| <u>Army National Guard</u> | 101-160 | 54 |
| | 41-100 | 2,174 |
| | 101-160 | 3,911 |
| | 161+ | <u>1,304</u> |
| Subtotal | | 7,443 |
| <u>Army Reserve</u> | 0-40 | 270 |
| | 41-100 | 1,043 |
| | 101-160 | 1,863 |
| | 161+ | <u>2,358</u> |
| Subtotal | | 5,534 |
| Total | | <u>12,977</u> |

2. Spouses

The 1986 RC Spouse Survey queried the total population of spouses of married military members who had been randomly selected for inclusion in the military portions of the 1986 RC Surveys. While the accuracy of marital status information in RCCPDS made this administrative data of limited use in selecting married members, it was possible to make a rough estimate of the total number of reservists who were married. It was estimated that approximately 75,000 individuals in the basic and additional samples described above would be married at the time of data collection.

3. Couples

The couple data have been derived by merging survey information provided by married military survey respondents with that given by their responding spouses. A unique aspect of the couple information is the existence of married couples both of whom are Guard/Reserve members. It is clear that, with two distinct probabilities, either or both partners of any dual-Guard/Reserve couple could have been drawn into the military sample. If both partners were selected, both received "military" questionnaires to complete. In addition, both partners also received 1986 RC Spouse Survey questionnaires. Because the spouse questionnaire was sufficiently different from the member questionnaire, both partners were asked to fill out the spouse questionnaire. When only one partner was selected into the member sample, the couple was asked to complete one member and one spouse questionnaire between them.

D. Survey Administration and Response Rates

1. Administration

Data collection for the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys was the responsibility of component-specific administrative units, coordinated by the DMDC, ODASD(G/R M&P) and representatives from each of the reserve components.

Prior to the start of data collection, DMDC provided a contractor, National Computer Systems (NCS), with a tape of the military sample selected from the 30 October 1985 RCCPDS file. The tape contained two types of records. The first type, Record Control Number (RCN) records, defined the location of the targeted military sample. RCN records contained unit addresses for all military members in the survey, numbers of specific questionnaire variants sent to each location, and other information for survey control purposes. (The term "unit" in this context refers to an organizational element of the reserve components such as headquarters, a company or platoon.) The second type, individual records, contained information about each person to be surveyed at each unit. The information included name, Social Security Number (SSN), rank, questionnaire variant assigned to the individual, and the individual's home address. NCS used this information

in producing field materials and in the survey tracking system designed for these surveys.

NCS mailed packages containing questionnaires and related materials directly to approximately 15,000 units in the U.S. and Puerto Rico. On the average, units had 7-10 survey participants. However, many units had only one or two survey participants, while other units (including the 1979 RF Survey follow-up units) had 50 or more survey participants. The survey packages mailed to units contained the following documents:

- o Survey checklist;
- o Printed roster identifying military survey participants and information correction;
- o Alternate return mailing labels for those expected to be absent during the survey administration;
- o Member survey packets (including questionnaires with computer-generated member identification numbers and cover letters, in individually addressed envelopes/survey packets for each member survey participant);
- o Spouse packets (including questionnaires with computer-generated spouse identification numbers and cover letters, in individually addressed envelopes/survey packets for each spouse survey participant);
- o Administration instruction booklet; and
- o Return mail packaging materials.

With minor variations resulting from component-specific organizational differences, the administrative procedures used for data collection were the same in each of the components. The basic process is summarized below:

- o Prior to sending the survey package, a "heads up" letter was sent to the unit commander requesting the name of a point-of-contact (POC) to administer the survey as well as the POC's telephone number.
- o Next, a survey package was sent to the POC or unit commander (if a POC had not been designated). When a survey package arrived at a unit, the POC was responsible for the following actions:
 - o Reviewing, completing, and returning the Survey Checklist to NCS. The checklist allowed survey administrators to specify any deficiencies in the survey package shipment. They were required to complete same and return to NCS.

- o Reviewing, and completing the Survey Roster. Survey administrators reviewed the roster, indicated members who were still in the unit, those who are expected to be absent during the survey administration, and those married. They also verified home addresses and/or provided corrected home addresses and, for married members, provided the spouse's name.
- o Mailing Spouse Survey Packets. The mailing contained Spouse Survey packets addressed "to the Spouse of ..." for all members selected to participate in the survey, since information available prior to the survey was judged inadequate for data collection purposes. Administrators were instructed to destroy packets for unmarried members. For those married, the correct spouse name was to be substituted where possible for "to the Spouse of ..." and addresses verified and corrected where necessary. Corrected packets were then mailed to the home address by the unit point-of-contact -- not given to members to take home.
- o Separating Member Survey Packets and Returning Survey Roster. Using the Survey Roster, administrators were instructed to separate the Member Packets into groups of those who were no longer in the unit, those expected to be absent, and those expected to be present at either the next drill or the one following. The packets for those no longer in the unit were to be destroyed. Packets were mailed to members at home if they were expected to be absent during the administration period. An alternate return mailing label was enclosed, so questionnaires could be returned directly to the contractor. Packets for unit members expected to be at either of the next two drills were held for administration. Annotated survey rosters were then to be returned to NCS.
- o Administering Member Survey. Returning Completed Questionnaires and Questionnaires for Those Unexpectedly Absent During Administration Period. Questionnaire packets were distributed to members during the next drill following receipt of materials or, if any were absent, at the following drill. Units were expected to give time for members to complete the questionnaire during the drill. The survey administrator collected all completed questionnaires in sealed envelopes. After the second drill, completed questionnaires were packaged and mailed to the contractor.

To ensure that data collection procedures were being followed, the survey contractor monitored each stage of the process and sent follow-up letters and special reminders to unit points-of-contact. Follow-up letters were sent if checklists, rosters, and questionnaires were not received within a specified period of time after initial transmittal.

NCS processed completed member and spouse questionnaires, as they were returned, by optically scanning, editing and coding responses onto computer tapes. Follow-ups (including a second questionnaire) were sent to the home addresses of those members expected to be absent from drills, and to spouses, if questionnaires were not received within a specified period of time.

Administrative procedures for individuals identified as IMAs (RCAT = T) were somewhat different. IMAs are programmed in significant numbers in only three components: Army Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve and Air Force Reserve. For the Army and Air Force Reserve samples, computer tapes listing the names, SSNs, and mailing addresses were sent forwarded to NCS. Survey packets were then sent directly to their home addresses. In the Marine Corps Reserve, a survey package containing survey packets was sent to the Personnel Center in Kansas City. There, packet addresses were hand-corrected and mailed directly to the home addresses of IMAs and their spouses.

Data collection from spouses followed another scenario, one less complex than used for the member surveys. As indicated above, questionnaire packets were mailed directly to verified or corrected home addresses from units or from NCS or the Marine Corps Personnel Center in the cases of spouses of IMAs. Following the pattern of the member survey, spouses received an introductory letter and a follow-up letter from component-specific military leaders and, after several weeks, received a second questionnaire. While the units were responsible for mailing the initial questionnaire to the spouses, the follow-up activities were the responsibility of the contractor. Thus, if the unit had failed in following the procedures for the initial mailing, the second mailing insured that at least one questionnaire was sent.

Questionnaires to the 145 unit commanders in the 1979 RF Follow-Up were mailed directly to them by NCS, several weeks after the start of the main data collection activities. For this group, follow-up activities were handled by DMDC. Personal telephone calls were made to commanders from whom questionnaires were not received within a reasonable amount of time.

Throughout the data collection, ODASD(G/R M&P) was informed of the surveys' progress and asked to provide special assistance, e.g., resolving unit specific problems or contacting components who appeared not to be conducting the survey in a timely fashion.

2. Response Rates

As shown in Table 2.2, the basic sample selected for the military member surveys consisted of a total of 109,067 officer and enlisted personnel. Including individuals unique to the 1979 RF Follow-Up Survey, i.e., excluding those who were selected for both samples, a total of 120,787 were to be surveyed.

Data collection for the survey began in February 1986 with the mailing of the initial notification letters to units containing sampled individuals. Because of the dispersion of the sample, varying drill schedules, and the follow-up efforts initiated to improve response rates, the last questionnaires were not received by the survey processing contractor until June 1986. The majority of the questionnaires, however, were filled out in March and April 1986.

Data collection for the spouse survey lagged that of the member surveys initially by several weeks, since the first questionnaires were mailed by the unit. Follow-up efforts, however, lagged even more. The lag resulted from the reliance on verification and corrections of spouse home addresses to arrive from military units. This delay in completing the initial mailing, combined with the requirement to send second questionnaires to spouses who did not respond initially, meant that the last questionnaires for the spouse survey were not received until late July 1986.

One way to assess the response rates among military members is to compare the numbers of questionnaires mailed out with the final numbers received. Table 2.4 provides a complete set of member response rates, by stratum, and the frame count (i.e., the number in the population), the number selected, the number eligible, and the number responding. Table 2.5, an abridgement of Table 2.4, shows the same data by reserve component, for both officers and enlisted members separately and combined.

The unadjusted response rates shown in Tables 2.4 and 2.5 do not account for the fact that some individuals who had been selected for participation from the 30 October 1985 administrative files were no longer members of the unit to which the questionnaires were sent at the time of actual data collection. There are several reasons why this occurs. First, individuals may have totally separated from the armed forces, i.e., were no longer members of any reserve or active component. Second, individuals may have transferred from a reserve component to an active component. Third, individuals may have transferred within the reserve components either to another classification, e.g., individual ready reserve, to another component, or to another unit within their original component. Experience with the reserve components shows that a "losing" unit may or may not have information about the actual status of a "lost" member. For example, an individual may inform his unit that he is totally separating from the reserve components due to geographical relocation but may, in fact, rejoin another unit several months later. Thus, the administrative procedures specified that survey eligible members were only those who were unit members at the time of data collection. (Unit members who were absent during data collection were eligible to participate.)

As can be seen, the unadjusted response rates for all components, officer and enlisted members combined, except the Army, are over 50 percent. Since the Army components constitute a significant portion of the total DoD sample selected, (65 percent), its response rate lowers the (unadjusted) overall DoD total to 53 percent. As is

Table 2.4 1986 Reserve Components Surveys Response Rates
for Military Members, by Stratum

| Stratum | Sex | Reserve Component | Frame Count | Selected | Eligible | Responding | Unadjusted Response Rate | Adjusted Response Rate |
|--|-----|-------------------|-------------|----------|----------|------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| RCAT = F (AGR/TAR) Rank Group = Officer | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | F | USAR | 211 | 43 | 36 | 27 | 62.8 | 75.0 |
| 2 | F | USAFR | 9 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 3 | F | ARNG | 110 | 22 | 22 | 14 | 63.6 | 63.6 |
| 4 | F | ANG | 32 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 71.4 | 83.3 |
| 5 | F | USMCR | 24 | 18 | 11 | 10 | 55.6 | 90.9 |
| 6 | F | USNR | 80 | 16 | 14 | 12 | 75.0 | 85.7 |
| 7 | M | USAR | 2796 | 280 | 237 | 182 | 65.0 | 76.8 |
| 8 | M | USAFR | 146 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 93.3 | 93.3 |
| 9 | M | ARNG | 2803 | 277 | 268 | 187 | 67.5 | 69.8 |
| 10 | M | ANG | 924 | 92 | 91 | 79 | 85.9 | 86.8 |
| 11 | M | USMCR | 190 | 76 | 73 | 59 | 77.6 | 80.8 |
| 12 | M | USNR | 1632 | 164 | 145 | 106 | 64.6 | 73.1 |
| | | Subtotal | 8957 | 1012 | 920 | 696 | 68.8 | 75.7 |
| RCAT = F (AGR/TAR) Rank Group = Enlisted | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | F | USAR | 1909 | 191 | 162 | 76 | 39.8 | 46.9 |
| 14 | F | USAFR | 102 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 81.8 | 81.8 |
| 15 | F | ARNG | 1914 | 205 | 191 | 124 | 60.5 | 64.9 |
| 16 | F | ANG | 1095 | 110 | 104 | 91 | 82.7 | 87.5 |
| 17 | F | USMCR | 167 | 34 | 32 | 24 | 70.6 | 75.0 |
| 18 | F | USNR | 888 | 89 | 81 | 44 | 49.4 | 54.3 |
| 19 | M | USAR | 5920 | 592 | 502 | 278 | 47.0 | 55.4 |
| 20 | M | USAFR | 311 | 32 | 31 | 21 | 65.6 | 67.7 |
| 21 | M | ARNG | 15315 | 1729 | 1611 | 1161 | 67.1 | 72.1 |
| 22 | M | ANG | 4415 | 441 | 431 | 384 | 87.1 | 89.1 |
| 23 | M | USMCR | 769 | 154 | 141 | 86 | 55.8 | 61.0 |
| 24 | M | USNR | 12540 | 1254 | 1107 | 586 | 46.7 | 52.9 |
| | | Subtotal | 45345 | 4842 | 4404 | 2884 | 59.6 | 65.5 |

Table 2.4 (continued)

| Stratum | Sex | Reserve Component | Frame Count | Selected | Eligible | Responding | Unadjusted Response Rate | Adjusted Response Rate |
|---|-----|-------------------|-------------|----------|----------|------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| RCAT = M (Military Technicians) Rank Group = Officer | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | F | USAR | 61 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 53.8 | 58.3 |
| 26 | F | USAFR | 31 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 85.7 | 85.7 |
| 27 | F | ARNG | 156 | 31 | 30 | 24 | 77.4 | 80.0 |
| 28 | F | ANG | 43 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 29 | M | USAR | 963 | 96 | 89 | 66 | 68.8 | 74.2 |
| 30 | M | USAFR | 762 | 77 | 73 | 58 | 75.3 | 79.5 |
| 31 | M | ARNG | 5323 | 531 | 494 | 406 | 76.5 | 82.2 |
| 32 | M | ANG | 1862 | 187 | 183 | 167 | 89.3 | 91.3 |
| Subtotal | | | 9201 | 951 | 897 | 743 | 78.1 | 82.8 |
| RCAT = M (Military Technicians) Rank Group = Enlisted | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | F | USAR | 285 | 34 | 29 | 17 | 50.0 | 58.6 |
| 34 | F | USAFR | 542 | 55 | 50 | 42 | 76.4 | 84.0 |
| 35 | F | ARNG | 1430 | 157 | 135 | 83 | 52.9 | 61.5 |
| 36 | F | ANG | 1613 | 162 | 151 | 134 | 82.7 | 88.7 |
| 37 | M | USAR | 2430 | 323 | 278 | 162 | 50.2 | 58.3 |
| 38 | M | USAFR | 6713 | 672 | 650 | 525 | 78.1 | 80.8 |
| 39 | M | ARNG | 15518 | 1786 | 1671 | 1116 | 62.5 | 66.8 |
| 40 | M | ANG | 17900 | 1790 | 1738 | 1496 | 83.6 | 86.1 |
| Subtotal | | | 46431 | 4979 | 4702 | 3575 | 71.8 | 76.0 |

Table 2.4 (continued)

| Stratum | Sex | Reserve Component | Frame Count | Selected | Eligible | Responding | Unadjusted Response Rate | Adjusted Response Rate |
|---|-----|-------------------|-------------|----------|----------|------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| RCAT = S (Unit Members) Rank Group = Officer | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | F | USAR | 6849 | 1340 | 1124 | 724 | 54.0 | 64.4 |
| 42 | F | USAFR | 1545 | 309 | 282 | 226 | 73.1 | 80.1 |
| 43 | F | ARNG | 1938 | 385 | 324 | 220 | 57.1 | 67.9 |
| 44 | F | ANG | 813 | 163 | 154 | 125 | 76.7 | 81.2 |
| 45 | F | USMCR | 57 | 46 | 43 | 33 | 71.7 | 76.7 |
| 46 | F | USNR | 1668 | 331 | 276 | 206 | 62.2 | 74.6 |
| 47 | F | USCGR | 74 | 74 | 68 | 64 | 86.5 | 94.1 |
| 48 | M | USAR | 34271 | 3345 | 2804 | 2011 | 60.1 | 71.7 |
| 49 | M | USAFR | 5833 | 584 | 541 | 400 | 68.5 | 73.9 |
| 50 | M | ARNG | 31809 | 3175 | 2784 | 1959 | 61.7 | 70.4 |
| 51 | M | ANG | 9353 | 935 | 890 | 739 | 79.0 | 83.0 |
| 52 | M | USMCR | 2440 | 976 | 858 | 671 | 68.8 | 78.2 |
| 53 | M | USNR | 18755 | 1872 | 1629 | 1313 | 70.1 | 80.6 |
| 54 | M | USCGR | 1419 | 890 | 792 | 691 | 77.6 | 87.2 |
| | | Subtotal | 116824 | 14425 | 12569 | 9382 | 65.0 | 74.6 |
| RCAT = S (Unit Members) Rank Group = Enlisted | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | F | USAR | 31687 | 4110 | 3178 | 1541 | 37.5 | 48.5 |
| 56 | F | USAFR | 8534 | 852 | 684 | 485 | 56.9 | 70.9 |
| 57 | F | ARNG | 14216 | 1660 | 1380 | 703 | 42.3 | 50.9 |
| 58 | F | ANG | 7773 | 777 | 690 | 520 | 66.9 | 75.4 |
| 59 | F | USMCR | 1117 | 224 | 172 | 103 | 46.0 | 59.9 |
| 60 | F | USNR | 9425 | 899 | 715 | 471 | 52.4 | 65.9 |
| 61 | F | USCGR | 1009 | 300 | 238 | 165 | 55.0 | 69.3 |
| 62 | M | USAR | 158767 | 19808 | 15272 | 7426 | 37.5 | 48.6 |
| 63 | M | USAFR | 37380 | 3729 | 3168 | 2245 | 60.2 | 70.9 |
| 64 | M | ARNG | 308589 | 36763 | 31648 | 17847 | 48.5 | 56.4 |
| 65 | M | ANG | 59778 | 5971 | 5479 | 4366 | 73.1 | 79.7 |
| 66 | M | USMCR | 30255 | 6040 | 4980 | 3086 | 51.1 | 62.0 |
| 67 | M | USNR | 77747 | 7650 | 6224 | 3791 | 49.6 | 60.9 |
| 68 | M | USCGR | 9739 | 2890 | 2457 | 1788 | 61.9 | 72.8 |
| | | Subtotal | 756016 | 91673 | 76285 | 44537 | 48.6 | 58.4 |

Table 2.4 (continued)

| Stratum | Sex | Reserve Component | Frame Count | Selected | Eligible | Responding | Unadjusted Response Rate | Adjusted Response Rate |
|---|-----|-------------------|-------------|----------|----------|------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| RCAT = T (Non-Unit Members; Individual Mobilization Augmentees) | | | | | | | | |
| Rank Group = Officer | | | | | | | | |
| 69 | F | USAR | 470 | 94 | 80 | 58 | 61.7 | 72.5 |
| 70 | F | USAFR | 825 | 164 | 139 | 123 | 75.0 | 88.5 |
| 71 | F | USMCR | 48 | 39 | 37 | 27 | 69.2 | 73.0 |
| 72 | F | USNR | 44 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 66.7 | 75.0 |
| 73 | M | USAR | 7946 | 795 | 674 | 533 | 67.0 | 79.1 |
| 74 | M | USAFR | 6559 | 651 | 552 | 503 | 77.3 | 91.1 |
| 75 | M | USMCR | 520 | 208 | 203 | 165 | 79.3 | 81.3 |
| 76 | M | USNR | 659 | 64 | 54 | 42 | 65.6 | 77.8 |
| | | | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| | | Subtotal | 17071 | 2024 | 1747 | 1457 | 72.0 | 83.4 |
| RCAT = T (Non-Unit Members; Individual Mobilization Augmentees) | | | | | | | | |
| Rank Group = Enlisted | | | | | | | | |
| 77 | F | USAR | 419 | 42 | 36 | 15 | 35.7 | 41.7 |
| 78 | F | USAFR | 860 | 85 | 72 | 47 | 55.3 | 65.3 |
| 79 | F | USMCR | 62 | 13 | 13 | 6 | 46.2 | 46.2 |
| 80 | F | USNR | 12 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 81 | M | USAR | 2904 | 291 | 247 | 125 | 43.0 | 50.6 |
| 82 | M | USAFR | 3513 | 347 | 294 | 191 | 55.0 | 65.0 |
| 83 | M | USMCR | 483 | 97 | 76 | 28 | 28.9 | 36.8 |
| 84 | M | USNR | 41 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 25.0 | 33.3 |
| | | | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| | | Subtotal | 8294 | 881 | 743 | 413 | 46.9 | 55.6 |
| | | Total | 1008139 | 120787 | 102267 | 63687 | 52.7 | 62.3 |

Table 2.5 1986 Reserve Components Surveys Response Rates
for Military Members, by Reserve Components

| Reserve Component | Frame Count | Selected | Eligible | Responding | Unadjusted Response Rate | Adjusted Response Rate |
|-----------------------|-------------|----------|----------|------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Rank Group = Officer | | | | | | |
| USAR | 53567 | 6006 | 5056 | 3608 | 60.1 | 71.4 |
| USAFR | 15710 | 1809 | 1611 | 1331 | 73.6 | 82.6 |
| ARNG | 42139 | 4421 | 3922 | 2810 | 63.6 | 71.6 |
| ANG | 13027 | 1393 | 1333 | 1124 | 80.7 | 84.3 |
| USMCR | 3279 | 1363 | 1225 | 965 | 70.8 | 78.8 |
| USNR | 22838 | 2456 | 2126 | 1685 | 68.6 | 79.3 |
| USCGR | 1493 | 964 | 860 | 755 | 78.3 | 87.8 |
| ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Subtotal | 152053 | 18412 | 16133 | 12278 | 66.7 | 76.1 |
| Rank Group = Enlisted | | | | | | |
| USAR | 204321 | 25391 | 19704 | 9640 | 38.0 | 48.9 |
| USAFR | 57955 | 5783 | 4960 | 3565 | 61.6 | 71.9 |
| ARNG | 356982 | 42300 | 36636 | 21034 | 49.7 | 57.4 |
| ANG | 92574 | 9251 | 8593 | 6991 | 75.6 | 81.4 |
| USMCR | 32853 | 6562 | 5414 | 3333 | 50.8 | 61.6 |
| USNR | 100653 | 9898 | 8132 | 4893 | 49.4 | 60.2 |
| USCGR | 10748 | 3190 | 2695 | 1953 | 61.2 | 72.5 |
| ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Subtotal | 856086 | 102375 | 86134 | 51409 | 50.2 | 59.7 |
| Reserve Components | | | | | | |
| USAR | 257888 | 31397 | 24760 | 13248 | 42.2 | 53.5 |
| USAFR | 73665 | 7592 | 6571 | 4896 | 64.5 | 74.5 |
| ARNG | 399121 | 46721 | 40558 | 23844 | 51.0 | 58.8 |
| ANG | 105601 | 10644 | 9926 | 8115 | 76.2 | 81.8 |
| USMCR | 36132 | 7925 | 6639 | 4298 | 54.2 | 64.7 |
| USNR | 123491 | 12354 | 10258 | 6578 | 53.2 | 64.1 |
| USCGR | 12241 | 4154 | 3555 | 2708 | 65.2 | 76.2 |
| ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Total | 1008139 | 120787 | 102267 | 63687 | 52.7 | 62.3 |

usually the case, officer response rates were higher than those for enlisted personnel, with the overall DoD officer total (unadjusted) being 67 percent and the enlisted members (unadjusted) being 50 percent.

Adjusted response rates, which take account of the administrative procedures, were calculated by comparing the sample selected as of 30 October 1985 with (a) the survey control files which reflect information received from units as to whether the reservists selected were still unit members when data were collected and (b) for units who did not provide this information, the 30 June 1986 RCCPDS administrative files. This comparison allowed for the identification of both those who do not appear on RCCPDS at all (i.e., were either no longer in the armed forces or had transferred to the regular components) and those who had made various transfers within the reserve components, e.g., changed component, unit, or transferred out of the Selected Reserve. Of the 120,787 individuals initially selected, 18,520 were in fact not eligible for the survey for the reasons noted above. Of these, 7,971 did not appear in RCCPDS in June 1986 and an additional 10,549 were in RCCPDS but at a unit different from the one at which they were selected for the survey, leaving an effective sample of 102,267.

As shown in Table 2.5, after the adjustments are made the overall response rate is increased to 62 percent. The final (adjusted) officer response rate was 76 percent. The enlisted response rate was 60 percent. Except for the Army components, officer response rates were about 80 percent and those for enlisted members were over 60 percent. It is likely that the greater mobility of Army personnel partly explains the lower response rates.

When subgroups of the sample are examined, as shown in Table 2.4, other differences are apparent. For example, among officers, the response rates ranged from a low of 74.6 percent for officers in units to 83.4 percent to officers who were IMAs. Among enlisted personnel, unit members had the lowest response rate, 58.4 percent, and military technicians the highest, 76.0 percent.

The calculation of response rates for spouses is somewhat more complex than that for military members. Unadjusted rates for members were defined as the ratios of the number of questionnaires received to the number mailed out. For military members, the contractor mailed out known numbers to each administrative unit; i.e., the number selected by DMDC. As discussed in Section D.1 above, the contractor provided units with the same number of spouse questionnaires as member questionnaires. Since we know that not all reservists are married, a calculation of unadjusted response rates for spouses in the same way as was done for members is meaningless. The appropriate "mailed out" number should be the number of questionnaires sent out by unit administrators to married members. This number, according to the procedures, should have been reported to the contractor on returned rosters. In fact, some unit administrators did not return rosters and others who returned them did not indicate marital status next to every name. As a result, a determination was made as to the marital status

of each reservist in the sample, using a variety of methods and sources.¹ These population estimates, by stratum, together with the number of spouses responding (i.e., questionnaires received) and response rates are shown in Table 2.6. A summary of these data is presented in Table 2.7.

Examination of Table 2.6 shows variation among various subgroups. Among the spouses of officers, the rates range from 49.3 percent among spouses whose mates are part-time unit members (RCAT = S) to 60.6 technicians. Among the spouses of enlisted personnel, spouses of unit members have the lowest rate, 34.2 percent, and spouses of military technicians the highest, 54.3. Within subgroups, there is variation both by component and by the sex of the spouse. In general, the response rates for female spouses are higher than those for male spouses and the response rates for the Air Force components are highest among the components.

Table 2.7 summarizes the response rate by component. For spouses of reserve officers, response rates for the Army components were the lowest. Rates for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve were slightly higher. The response rates for spouses of enlisted members in the Army components and Naval and Marine Corps Reserve were also the lowest, and considerably lower than rates among spouses of officers. Since the Army components constitute the largest portion of the samples, their low response rates decrease the overall rates.

Examination by DMDC of all the information available on the data collection suggests several reasons for the low response rates to the 1986 RC Spouse Survey. First, we know that 31 percent of units did not return rosters, and that the majority of these were in the Army components. The number of questionnaires returned by spouses from units who did not return rosters was smaller than from those who did return them. This strongly suggests that a considerable number of spouses may never have received questionnaires from the unit; i.e., that administrative procedures were not followed. Additional comment sheets received from spouses who did respond indicate that some received the questionnaire even though it was misaddressed or addressed to a former spouse. These inaccurate unit records may have also been a cause of some spouses not receiving a questionnaire. The response rate data presented in Tables 2.6 and 2.7 assumes that every eligible spouse received a questionnaire. This may not have been the case. Second, it appears that some administrators gave the spouse's questionnaire to the member to deliver, rather than mailing it to a home address in accordance with the instructions provided. We do not know how many of these questionnaires were never received by a spouse. Again, our response rate calculations assume receipt. This also may not have been the case.

DMDC analyses compared the demographic characteristics of members whose spouses returned questionnaires with those of members whose spouses did not. Further, since respondents to the 1986 RC Member Survey and the 1986 RC AGR Survey reported the demographic characteristics of their spouses, DMDC was able to compare the demographic

Table 2.6 1986 Reserve Components Spouse Survey Response Rates,
by Stratum

| Stratum | Reserve Sex Component | Popu- lation Estimate | Eligible | Responding | | Response Rate | |
|---------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| | | Total Spouses | Total Spouses | Spouse | Couple | Spouse | Couple |

RCAT = F (AGR/TAR)
Rank Group = Officer

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|----------|------|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|
| 1 | F | USAR | 100 | 23 | 10 | 9 | 43.5 | 39.1 |
| 2 | F | USAFR | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 3 | F | ARNG | 28 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 30.0 | 20.0 |
| 4 | F | ANG | 22 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 75.0 | 75.0 |
| 5 | F | USMCR | 9 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 6 | F | USNR | 34 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| 7 | M | USAR | 2519 | 244 | 139 | 130 | 57.0 | 53.3 |
| 8 | M | USAFR | 130 | 13 | 9 | 9 | 69.2 | 69.2 |
| 9 | M | ARNG | 2628 | 243 | 168 | 146 | 69.1 | 60.1 |
| 10 | M | ANG | 973 | 84 | 61 | 60 | 72.6 | 71.4 |
| 11 | M | USMCR | 152 | 63 | 38 | 38 | 60.3 | 60.3 |
| 12 | M | USNR | 1538 | 149 | 82 | 78 | 55.0 | 52.3 |
| | | Subtotal | 8140 | 847 | 520 | 482 | 61.4 | 56.9 |

RCAT = F (AGR/TAR)
Rank Group = Enlisted

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|----------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 13 | F | USAR | 974 | 88 | 26 | 24 | 29.5 | 27.3 |
| 14 | F | USAFR | 33 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 15 | F | ARNG | 830 | 91 | 47 | 38 | 51.6 | 41.8 |
| 16 | F | ANG | 645 | 65 | 37 | 34 | 56.9 | 52.3 |
| 17 | F | USMCR | 91 | 18 | 8 | 7 | 44.4 | 38.9 |
| 18 | F | USNR | 746 | 42 | 16 | 15 | 38.1 | 35.7 |
| 19 | M | USAR | 5014 | 477 | 192 | 170 | 40.3 | 35.6 |
| 20 | M | USAFR | 311 | 29 | 18 | 18 | 62.1 | 62.1 |
| 21 | M | ARNG | 13006 | 1439 | 883 | 777 | 61.4 | 54.0 |
| 22 | M | ANG | 3800 | 362 | 252 | 243 | 69.6 | 67.1 |
| 23 | M | USMCR | 520 | 102 | 45 | 36 | 44.1 | 35.3 |
| 24 | M | USNR | 10168 | 878 | 300 | 272 | 34.2 | 31.0 |
| | | Subtotal | 36138 | 3595 | 1826 | 1636 | 50.8 | 45.5 |

Table 2.6 (continued)

| Stratum | Sex | Reserve Component | Popu- lation | Eligible | Responding | | Response Rate | |
|---------|-----|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| | | | Estimate | Total Spouses | Total Spouses | Spouse | Couple | Spouse |

RCAT = M (Military Technicians)
Rank Group = Officer

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|-------|------|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|
| 25 | F | USAR | 26 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 60.0 | 60.0 |
| 26 | F | USAFR | 21 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 75.0 | 50.0 |
| 27 | F | ARNG | 99 | 15 | 12 | 10 | 80.0 | 66.7 |
| 28 | F | ANG | 30 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 29 | M | USAR | 870 | 88 | 48 | 44 | 54.5 | 50.0 |
| 30 | M | USAFR | 586 | 60 | 38 | 35 | 63.3 | 58.3 |
| 31 | M | ARNG | 4705 | 486 | 302 | 286 | 62.1 | 58.8 |
| 32 | M | ANG | 1576 | 166 | 124 | 118 | 74.7 | 71.1 |
| Subtotal | | | 7913 | 828 | 534 | 502 | 64.5 | 60.6 |

RCAT = M (Military Technicians)
Rank Group = Enlisted

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 33 | F | USAR | 97 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 54.5 | 45.5 |
| 34 | F | USAFR | 350 | 31 | 19 | 16 | 61.3 | 51.6 |
| 35 | F | ARNG | 639 | 88 | 33 | 28 | 37.5 | 31.8 |
| 36 | F | ANG | 745 | 74 | 42 | 40 | 56.8 | 54.1 |
| 37 | M | USAR | 2006 | 268 | 121 | 101 | 45.1 | 37.7 |
| 38 | M | USAFR | 5484 | 565 | 351 | 318 | 62.1 | 56.3 |
| 39 | M | ARNG | 12480 | 1483 | 855 | 729 | 57.7 | 49.2 |
| 40 | M | ANG | 14259 | 1478 | 983 | 934 | 66.5 | 63.2 |
| Subtotal | | | 36060 | 3998 | 2410 | 2171 | 60.3 | 54.3 |

Table 2.6 (continued)

| Stratum | Sex | Reserve Component | Popu- lation Estimate | Eligible | Responding | | Response Rate | |
|---|-----|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| | | | Total Spouses | Total Spouses | Spouse | Couple | Spouse | Couple |
| RCAT = S (Unit Members) Rank Group = Officer | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | F | USAR | 3920 | 709 | 300 | 252 | 42.3 | 35.5 |
| 42 | F | USAFR | 750 | 149 | 79 | 71 | 53.0 | 47.7 |
| 43 | F | ARNG | 973 | 188 | 72 | 66 | 38.3 | 35.1 |
| 44 | F | ANG | 468 | 89 | 47 | 47 | 52.8 | 52.8 |
| 45 | F | USMCR | 34 | 25 | 11 | 11 | 44.0 | 44.0 |
| 46 | F | USNR | 1246 | 233 | 110 | 100 | 47.2 | 42.9 |
| 47 | F | USCGR | 63 | 57 | 43 | 42 | 75.4 | 73.7 |
| 48 | M | USAR | 26901 | 2629 | 1323 | 1187 | 50.3 | 45.2 |
| 49 | M | USAFR | 4916 | 492 | 316 | 255 | 64.2 | 51.8 |
| 50 | M | ARNG | 24426 | 2453 | 1376 | 1185 | 56.1 | 48.3 |
| 51 | M | ANG | 7682 | 764 | 506 | 458 | 66.2 | 59.9 |
| 52 | M | USMCR | 2097 | 804 | 445 | 401 | 55.3 | 49.9 |
| 53 | M | USNR | 16722 | 1584 | 894 | 841 | 56.4 | 53.1 |
| 54 | M | USCGR | 1309 | 774 | 520 | 486 | 67.2 | 62.8 |
| | | Subtotal | 91507 | 10950 | 6042 | 5402 | 55.2 | 49.3 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|--------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|
| RCAT = S (Unit Members) Rank Group = Enlisted | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | F | USAR | 11332 | 1647 | 275 | 223 | 16.7 | 13.5 |
| 56 | F | USAFR | 3918 | 422 | 130 | 116 | 30.8 | 27.5 |
| 57 | F | ARNG | 5484 | 682 | 188 | 153 | 27.6 | 22.4 |
| 58 | F | ANG | 3161 | 331 | 137 | 130 | 41.4 | 39.3 |
| 59 | F | USMCR | 373 | 97 | 19 | 14 | 19.6 | 14.4 |
| 60 | F | USNR | 5217 | 486 | 194 | 169 | 39.9 | 34.8 |
| 61 | F | USCGR | 540 | 150 | 63 | 54 | 42.0 | 36.0 |
| 62 | M | USAR | 92108 | 11199 | 3588 | 2934 | 32.0 | 26.2 |
| 63 | M | USAFR | 25075 | 2598 | 1211 | 1063 | 46.6 | 40.9 |
| 64 | M | ARNG | 184063 | 21712 | 9266 | 7509 | 42.7 | 34.6 |
| 65 | M | ANG | 41869 | 4119 | 2365 | 2186 | 57.4 | 53.1 |
| 66 | M | USMCR | 9735 | 2202 | 663 | 556 | 30.1 | 25.2 |
| 67 | M | USNR | 49385 | 4889 | 2180 | 1896 | 44.6 | 38.8 |
| 68 | M | USCGR | 6762 | 2040 | 1072 | 980 | 52.5 | 48.0 |
| | | Subtotal | 439022 | 52574 | 21351 | 17983 | 40.6 | 34.2 |

Table 2.6 (continued)

| Stratum | Sex | Reserve Component | Popu- lation | Eligible | Responding | | Response Rate | |
|---|-----|-------------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| | | | Estimate | | Total Spouses | Spouse | Couple | Spouse |
| RCAT = T (Non-Unit Members; Individual Mobilization Augmentees) | | | | | | | | |
| Rank Group = Officer | | | | | | | | |
| 69 | F | USAR | 324 | 52 | 30 | 29 | 57.7 | 55.8 |
| 70 | F | USAFR | 633 | 108 | 54 | 53 | 50.0 | 49.1 |
| 71 | F | USMCR | 44 | 29 | 18 | 15 | 62.1 | 51.7 |
| 72 | F | USNR | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 73 | M | USAR | 6811 | 666 | 355 | 336 | 53.3 | 50.5 |
| 74 | M | USAFR | 5639 | 554 | 330 | 324 | 59.6 | 58.5 |
| 75 | M | USMCR | 499 | 185 | 109 | 102 | 58.9 | 55.1 |
| 76 | M | USNR | 438 | 55 | 9 | 8 | 16.4 | 14.5 |
| | | Subtotal | 14388 | 1656 | 905 | 867 | 54.6 | 52.4 |
| RCAT = T (Non-Unit Members; Individual Mobilization Augmentees) | | | | | | | | |
| Rank Group = Enlisted | | | | | | | | |
| 77 | F | USAR | 287 | 22 | 6 | 5 | 27.3 | 22.7 |
| 78 | F | USAFR | 642 | 56 | 28 | 26 | 50.0 | 46.4 |
| 79 | F | USMCR | 69 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 36.4 | 27.3 |
| 80 | F | USNR | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 81 | M | USAR | 2651 | 176 | 67 | 61 | 38.1 | 34.7 |
| 82 | M | USAFR | 2926 | 266 | 146 | 136 | 54.9 | 51.1 |
| 83 | M | USMCR | 341 | 81 | 18 | 15 | 22.2 | 18.5 |
| 84 | M | USNR | 54 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Subtotal | 6970 | 615 | 270 | 247 | 43.9 | 40.2 |
| | | Total | 640138 | 75063 | 33858 | 29290 | 45.1 | 39.0 |

Table 2.7 1986 Reserve Components Spouse Survey Response Rates,
by Reserve Component

| Reserve Component | Population Estimate | | Eligible | | Responding | | Response Rate | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------|----------|---------|------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| | Total | Spouses | Total | Spouses | Spouse | Couple | Spouse | Couple |
| Rank Group = Officer | | | | | | | | |
| USAR | 41471 | | 4416 | | 2208 | 1990 | 50.0 | 45.1 |
| USAFR | 12682 | | 1381 | | 830 | 750 | 60.1 | 54.3 |
| ARNG | 32859 | | 3395 | | 1933 | 1695 | 56.9 | 49.9 |
| ANG | 10751 | | 1111 | | 745 | 690 | 67.1 | 62.1 |
| USMCR | 2835 | | 1114 | | 625 | 571 | 56.1 | 51.3 |
| USNR | 19978 | | 2033 | | 1097 | 1029 | 54.0 | 50.6 |
| USCGR | 1372 | | 831 | | 563 | 528 | 67.7 | 63.5 |
| | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Subtotal | 121948 | | 14281 | | 8001 | 7253 | 56.0 | 50.8 |
| Rank Group = Enlisted | | | | | | | | |
| USAR | 114469 | | 13888 | | 4281 | 3523 | 30.8 | 25.4 |
| USAFR | 38739 | | 3971 | | 1905 | 1695 | 48.0 | 42.7 |
| ARNG | 216502 | | 25495 | | 11272 | 9234 | 44.2 | 36.2 |
| ANG | 64479 | | 6429 | | 3816 | 3567 | 59.4 | 55.5 |
| USMCR | 11129 | | 2511 | | 757 | 631 | 30.1 | 25.1 |
| USNR | 65570 | | 6298 | | 2691 | 2353 | 42.7 | 37.4 |
| USCGR | 7302 | | 2190 | | 1135 | 1034 | 51.8 | 47.2 |
| | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Subtotal | 518190 | | 60782 | | 25857 | 22037 | 42.5 | 36.3 |
| Reserve Component | | | | | | | | |
| USAR | 155940 | | 18304 | | 6489 | 5513 | 35.5 | 30.1 |
| USAFR | 51421 | | 5352 | | 2735 | 2445 | 51.1 | 45.7 |
| ARNG | 249361 | | 28890 | | 13205 | 10929 | 45.7 | 37.8 |
| ANG | 75230 | | 7540 | | 4561 | 4257 | 60.5 | 56.5 |
| USMCR | 13964 | | 3625 | | 1382 | 1202 | 38.1 | 33.2 |
| USNR | 85548 | | 8331 | | 3788 | 3382 | 45.5 | 40.6 |
| USCGR | 8674 | | 3021 | | 1698 | 1562 | 56.2 | 51.7 |
| | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Total | 640138 | | 75063 | | 33858 | 29290 | 45.1 | 39.0 |

characteristics of spouses who returned questionnaires with those who did not. The analysis shows that they are quite similar, with one important exception: spouses who responded were somewhat more likely to be white and less likely to be black than members who responded. Among spouses, 9 percent reported they are black and 85 percent said they are white. Among members, the corresponding figures are 11 percent black and 83 percent white (the remainder, about 6 percent, reported they are other races). The difference is found primarily among enlisted members: 10 percent of enlisted members, and 13 percent of spouses of enlisted members reported that they are black. Although part of the difference may arise because of marriages in which the partners are of different races, these figures suggest that, among spouses by Guard/Reserve members, especially spouses of enlisted members, respondents tend to over-represent whites to some extent.

Data on spouses place of birth, as reported by the member and spouse, are nearly identical: 4.5 percent of spouses and 5.1 percent of members reported the spouse was born outside the U.S. to non-military parents.

Similarity of demographic characteristics, however, does not mean that respondents and non-respondents would have similar attitudes and opinions. There is some evidence to suggest that non-respondents are more detached and indifferent to their mates' reserve participation. Thus, the data collected from spouses should be viewed as suggestive rather than definitive. In order to minimize misinterpretation, given the difference in response rates between components, initial reports based on the data from the 1986 RC Spouse Survey will not discuss individual reserve components. Rather, a general discussion of spouse issues for the reserve components in general is presented.

The survey was sent to a cross-section of Guard/Reserve members and their spouses, who represent different durations of service. For any service duration, those who are still in the Guard/Reserve are the "survivors" of the group who entered in the beginning of that time period, since those who left the Guard/Reserve are no longer in the defined survey population. To the extent that members leave because of family conflicts or spouse dissatisfaction, the survey respondents will tend to be ones with relatively favorable views of the Guard/Reserve and its impacts on families. For this reason, the reader should use some caution in interpreting the survey findings on family support for and problems with Guard/Reserve participation.

Finally, examination of Tables 2.6 and 2.7 shows that the response rates for couples are lower than those for spouses. These lower rates result from the administrative procedures which called for independent administration of questionnaires to members and spouses. A response on the part of a member was not a prerequisite for a spouse to receive or complete a questionnaire. In order for a couple to be included in the couple response rates, both the member and the spouse had to return completed questionnaires. What these data show is that for approximately 4,600 completed spouse questionnaires a matching completed member questionnaire was not received.

3. Weighting the Data

To allow time for questionnaire distribution and mailing of packages to units, a gap of several months was planned between sample selection and survey administration. Since questionnaires were sent to individuals selected by name, planning for the surveys could not readily make provisions for surveying new unit accessions between sample selection and survey administration. Further, as discussed above, provisions were made for forwarding questionnaires to individuals who would be absent during the period of data collection. As described in the section of the sample design, other technical considerations resulted in excluding from the sample individuals who were in the training pipeline (RCAT = U). This includes unit members awaiting or attending initial active duty for training and untrained Selected Reservists attending specialty training programs such as chaplain candidates, health, etc.

Because the sampling plan allowed for disproportionate sampling among subgroups in the DoD population, differential weights were required for the different subgroups. In addition, weights were required to adjust for the fact that the sampled subgroups did not respond to the survey in identical rates. When the sample of respondents was weighted, population statistics could be computed, indicating estimates for the population at a given point in time.

Inspection of the dates on which actual questionnaires were filled out indicates that the majority were completed in March and April 1986. However, in selecting a RCCPDS population to which weight adjustments would be made, the decision was made to use the 30 June 1986 file, since it would most likely reflect lag between changes in the field situation at the time of the survey and inclusion of those changes in the RCCPDS files. Weights were calculated separately for the basic sample and for the 1979 RF Follow-Up. A weighting procedure was then utilized in which the 1979 RF Follow-Up sample was combined with the basic sample's ARNG and USAR components. The final combined sample weights can be used to produce consistent estimates of the Selected Reserve trained population as of 30 June 1986. Table 2.8 shows the total component populations, by reserve category and by officer and enlisted status, for which inference can be made using the 1986 RC Surveys data.

E. The Survey Questionnaires

As noted above, the data requirements for the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys were developed by two groups of individuals: those concerned with broad issues of personnel management and those specifically concerned with family issues. In order to address both types of issues in a systematic fashion, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Guard/Reserve Manpower and Personnel) established a committee consisting of representatives from each of the reserve components, as well as representatives from his office and DMDC technical experts. The Committee concurred with the conclusion reached at the time the 1985 DoD Surveys were designed, namely, that new information would need to be collected. The Committee also identified subject areas

Table 2.8. Relationship of Usable Questionnaires to Selected Reserve Population as of 30 June 1986
1986 Reserve Components Surveys

| | Selected Reserve Component | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|----------------------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|-----------|--------|------------------|--|-------|--|
| | ARNG | USAR | USNR | USMCR | ANG | USAFR | DOD | USCGR | Selected Reserve | | | |
| Total Strength ¹ | 448,997 | 611,591 | 224,627 | 94,248 | 111,282 | 153,237 | 1,646,982 | 18,508 | 1,665,490 | | | |
| Total Trained Personnel | 394,378 | 258,964 | 129,300 | 35,897 | 107,449 | 74,251 | 1,000,239 | 12,350 | 1,012,589 | | | |
| <u>Officer</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Generalizable Population | 2,938 | 3,015 | 1,814 | 221 | 1,065 | 164 | 9,217 | -- | 9,217 | | | |
| AGR/TAR | 5,431 | 1,007 | -- | -- | 1,847 | 789 | 9,074 | -- | 9,074 | | | |
| Mil. Technician | 32,816 | 41,395 | 21,491 | 2,620 | 10,201 | 7,554 | 116,077 | 1,571 | 117,648 | | | |
| Unit Member | -- | 8,667 | 850 | 629 | -- | 7,330 | 17,476 | -- | 17,476 | | | |
| Non-Unit Member | 41,185 | 54,084 | 24,155 | 3,473 | 13,113 | 15,837 | 151,847 | 1,571 | 153,418 | | | |
| Total | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Usable Questionnaires | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AGR/TAR | 201 | 209 | 118 | 69 | 84 | 15 | 696 | -- | 696 | | | |
| Mil. Technician | 430 | 73 | -- | -- | 176 | 64 | 743 | -- | 743 | | | |
| Unit Member | 2,179 | 2,735 | 1,519 | 704 | 864 | 626 | 8,627 | 755 | 9,382 | | | |
| Non-Unit Member | -- | 591 | 48 | 192 | -- | 626 | 1,457 | -- | 1,457 | | | |
| Total | 2,810 | 3,608 | 1,685 | 965 | 1,124 | 1,331 | 11,523 | 755 | 12,278 | | | |
| Percent of Generalizable Population Responding | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AGR/TAR | 6.8 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 31.2 | 7.9 | 9.1 | 7.6 | -- | 7.6 | | | |
| Mil. Technician | 7.9 | 7.2 | -- | -- | 9.5 | 8.1 | 8.2 | -- | 8.1 | | | |
| Unit Member | 6.6 | 6.6 | 7.1 | 26.9 | 8.5 | 8.3 | 7.4 | 48.1 | 53.2 | | | |
| Non-Unit Member | -- | 6.8 | 5.7 | 30.5 | -- | 8.5 | 8.3 | -- | 8.3 | | | |
| Total | 6.8 | 6.7 | 7.0 | 27.8 | 8.6 | 8.4 | 7.6 | 48.1 | 48.1 | | | |

Table 2.8. Relationship of Usable Questionnaires to Selected Reserve Population as of 30 June 1986
1986 Reserve Components Surveys

| | Selected Reserve Component | | | | | | | | | | Total DOD | USCGR | Selected Reserve | |
|--|----------------------------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--|-----|--|-----------|--------|------------------|--|
| | ARNG | USAR | USNR | USMCR | ANG | USAFR | Total | | DOD | | | | | |
| <u>Enlisted</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Generalizable Population ² | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AGR/TAR | 17,241 | 7,713 | 15,793 | 1,045 | 5,743 | 426 | | | | | 47,961 | -- | 47,961 | |
| Mil. Technician | 16,159 | 2,583 | -- | -- | 18,790 | 7,239 | | | | | 44,771 | -- | 44,771 | |
| Unit Member | 322,295 | 193,008 | 89,337 | 30,959 | 69,720 | 46,025 | | | | | 751,344 | 10,763 | 762,107 | |
| Non-Unit Member | -- | 4,485 | 46 | 415 | -- | 4,493 | | | | | 9,439 | -- | 9,439 | |
| Total | 355,695 | 207,789 | 105,176 | 32,419 | 94,253 | 58,183 | | | | | 853,515 | 10,763 | 864,278 | |
| Number of Usable Questionnaires | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AGR/TAR | 1,285 | 354 | 630 | 110 | 475 | 30 | | | | | 2,884 | -- | 2,884 | |
| Mil. Technician | 1,199 | 179 | -- | -- | 1,630 | 567 | | | | | 3,575 | -- | 3,575 | |
| Unit Member | 18,550 | 8,967 | 4,262 | 3,189 | 4,886 | 2,730 | | | | | 42,584 | 1,953 | 44,537 | |
| Non-Unit Member | -- | 140 | 1 | 34 | -- | 238 | | | | | 413 | -- | 413 | |
| Total | 21,034 | 9,640 | 4,893 | 3,333 | 6,991 | 3,565 | | | | | 49,456 | 1,953 | 51,409 | |
| Percent of Generalizable Population Responding | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AGR/TAR | 7.5 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 10.5 | 8.3 | 7.0 | | | | | 6.0 | -- | 6.0 | |
| Mil. Technician | 7.4 | 6.9 | -- | -- | 8.7 | 7.8 | | | | | 8.0 | -- | 8.0 | |
| Unit Member | 5.8 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 10.3 | 7.0 | 5.9 | | | | | 5.7 | 18.2 | 5.8 | |
| Non-Unit Member | -- | 3.1 | 2.2 | 8.2 | -- | 5.3 | | | | | 4.4 | -- | 4.4 | |
| Total | 5.9 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 10.2 | 7.4 | 6.1 | | | | | 5.8 | 18.2 | 6.0 | |

¹Source: U.S. Department of Defense. Official Guard and Reserve Manpower Strengths and Statistics. Washington, D.C.: Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs). June 1986, page 1.

²The 1986 RC Member Survey and the 1986 RC AGR Survey. Differences between the sum of the generalizable populations from the surveys and Total Trained Personnel shown above are due to rounding.

covered in previous efforts which would be important to reevaluate, as well as new areas for which survey data would be helpful.

An outline which consolidated all of the requirements was then circulated to all interested OSD offices and individuals. These included researchers who had utilized previous reserve survey data, especially the 1979 RF Survey, both within DoD and in other government agencies as well as Committee members.

1. Questionnaire Development

Following general agreement on content, DMDC prepared draft questionnaires. In constructing the questionnaires, special attention was paid to ensuring comparability, whenever possible, with previous military and civilian survey efforts. The most heavily relied on questionnaires were those from the 1979 Reserve Studies Surveys and the 1985 DoD Surveys.

Draft questionnaires were reviewed by the same groups involved in developing the data requirements and, after agreement was reached, the questionnaires were prepared by DMDC for pretesting.

The pretesting was conducted in iterative fashion; that is, problems identified in one pretest were corrected prior to the next. Correction generally involved modification of items or clarification of instructions. In some instances, however, the pretests identified subject areas which had been overlooked in assembling the data requirements. By the time the questionnaires were considered final, formal and informal pretests had been conducted with officers, enlisted members and spouses. Both officer and enlisted members participated in pretests at an Air Force Reserve Unit and Coast Guard Reserve unit in Richmond, VA, an Army Reserve unit at Ft. Meade, MD., an Army Guard Dental Unit in Iowa City, Iowa, a Naval Reserve unit in Baltimore, MD. and an Army Reserve unit in Boston, Mass. Full-time support personnel participated in pretests at Andrews Air Force Base, MD (DC Air National Guard) and in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs). The major changes resulting from the pretests are discussed below.

In the original planning, it had been assumed that separate questionnaire variants were needed for officer and enlisted members who are not unit members, i.e., individual mobilization augmentees (IMAs). Visits to the three components (Army Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve and Air Force Reserve) who utilize IMAs led to the conclusion that IMA issues were quite similar to those of unit members. Thus, IMAs could receive the basic member questionnaires. Codes preprinted on the questionnaires would, however, allow data from this population to be analyzed separately.

The pretest at the Army Guard Dental Unit in Iowa City, Iowa, highlighted the importance of addressing training issues in detail. Members were particularly concerned that the only time they get to practice their skills was during Annual Training. Questions dealing

with training were expanded, including the addition of a question assessing the percentage of time spent working in the member's primary occupation.

The utilization of time, both training time and time required for meeting reserve obligations, came up in several Army National Guard and Army Reserve locations. To address these concerns, a question asking the number of unpaid hours (monthly) spent at drill locations was added.

The Naval Reserve pretest was especially helpful in clarifying differences in nomenclature between its members and members of other reserve components. One example is the use of the abbreviation ACDUTRA (Active Duty for Training) instead of Annual Training (AT) as used by most other reservists. As a result, in many places, the questionnaires provide for alternate terminology, e.g., Annual Training/ACDUTRA and MOS/Rating/Specialty.

In developing the FTS-AGR/TAR questionnaire variants, DMDC relied heavily on the 1985 DoD Survey of Officer and Enlisted Personnel. A pretest conducted with FTS-AGRs of the DC Air National Guard, and discussions with several TARs, clarified differences between components utilizing FTS personnel, as well as differences between FTS personnel and active duty personnel in the regular components. For example, some National Guard AGRs had difficulty answering the questions that related to PCS moves, since the relocation process is different for full-time support members from that of active component members. Accordingly, the questionnaire was modified to account for the differences. Questions on career status were also modified to account for component differences.

For all membership categories, questions about military background presented problems, since some of the distinctions which are analytically important are difficult to communicate in a questionnaire. For example, initially FTS-AGR/TARs were asked how long they had served on active duty, followed by a question asking how long they had served in the Guard/Reserve. Individuals with prior active duty time, Selected Reserve time and FTS tours encountered problems. Attention to wording, question order and asking for estimates of time spent in different categories clarified some of the problems. Inspection of the data, however, indicates that not all problems of this type were resolved.

A pretest theme, one corrected in the revisions, was a sentiment that more questions should be asked about the interface between reserve obligations and benefits and civilian employment and benefits. Questions about loss of overtime pay at civilian jobs, medical benefits, and related issues were subsequently added.

As a result of all the pretests, the questionnaire underwent considerable refinements. Questions were deleted, added and reworded for clarity and simplicity so that respondents would have little trouble

in answering them. In the final iterations, comparability with previous research was reviewed and attention was paid to questionnaire length. Where question modifications were marginal in improving clarity, but where the modification would lose comparability, the original wording was restored.

The spouse questionnaire was also subjected to rigorous pretesting and underwent important changes from the initial questionnaire to the final one. In the initial versions, the spouse was asked many questions which assumed greater familiarity with the reserve components than proved to be the case. In the end, most of these questions were excluded and the questionnaire oriented more towards understanding what spouses knew, the types of information they would be interested in having, and detailed information about themselves.

2. Questionnaire Contents

A total of seven questionnaire forms were used in the data collection for the 1986 Reserve Components Surveys. For the member surveys, two nearly identical pairs were developed. The difference is primarily in terminology and in the inclusion of some items which pertain specifically only to officers or only to enlisted members. Form 1 was used for all officers, except FTS-AGR/TARs and Form 2 for all enlisted personnel, except FTS-AGR/TARs. Form 3 was for FTS-AGR/TAR officers, and Form 4 for FTS-AGR/TAR enlisted personnel. Form 5 was used for all English-speaking spouses and Form 6 was a direct translation, into Spanish, for spouses who elected to use it in Puerto Rico. (The spouses in Puerto Rico received both an English and a Spanish version of the questionnaire in the same envelope.) A seventh form for the commander of the 1979 RF Follow-Up units was almost identical to that used in the 1979 RF Surveys.

1986 RC Member Survey. The first section of each of the regular member survey questionnaire (Forms 1 and 2), "Military Background," collected basic data such as reserve component, pay grade, number of active duty years, number of years in the reserve components and the different components in which the respondent had served. For Officers, procurement source was ascertained. Section II, "Military Plans," probed the respondent's future plans by asking the likelihood of staying in the reserves under current conditions, as well as under several hypothetical management options (e.g., an increase in drills and/or Annual Training), number of good years, plans to elect the Survivor Benefits Plan, plans for the next year, and participation reasons. Officers were asked about their current obligation, its completion date and if they intended to participate at the end of their obligation.

Section III, "Military Training, Benefits and Programs," asked the respondents how they were trained for their current Primary MOS/Specialty/Rating or Designator and the time spent working in that skill. Respondents were asked to assess the similarity between their civilian job and their reserve job. Respondents were queried about Annual Training, their Guard/Reserve earnings, educational benefits, unit

training objectives, and their opinion on training, promotions, leadership, supervision and unit morale. This section also included special questions for military technicians, e.g., did they serve as technicians and, if so, how long they had been so employed.

Section IV, "Individual and Family Characteristics," focused on basic demographic facts such as sex, age, marital status, aspects of educational attainment, number of dependents and whether or not dependents were handicapped. Married respondents were asked to provide basic demographic data about their spouses, as well as information about spouse military participation.

Section V, "Civilian Work," included detailed questions about labor force participation, such as civilian occupation and industry, type of employer, hours and weeks worked in the previous year, and earnings. Questions dealing with the interface between civilian employment and reserve participation were included here, as well as questions about spouses' employment. Section VI, "Family Resources," asked the respondents about additional income sources, debts and monthly mortgage and the effects on their income should they be mobilized for 30 days or more.

The last section, Section VII, "Military Life," elicited attitudes toward time spent on selected activities, plus interest in receiving information on Guard/Reserve benefits and programs. The questionnaire concludes with a set of items measuring satisfaction or dissatisfaction with selected aspects of military life, e.g., pay and allowances, commissary privileges, retirement benefits, unit social activities, and the opportunity to serve the country. The final item measures overall satisfaction with participation in the Guard/ Reserve.

1986 RC AGR Survey. Like Forms 1 and 2, the first section of each of the FTS-AGR/TAR questionnaires (Forms 3 and 4), "Military Background," collected basic data such as reserve component, pay grade, number of active duty years, number of years in the reserve components and the different components served in. For officers, procurement source was ascertained. Section II, "Present and Past Locations," asked questions about the length of stay, expected stay, and problems encountered both at the present location and in moving to the location.

Section III, "Military Plans," probed the respondent's future plans by asking the likelihood of staying in the FTS program, number of good years, plans to elect the Survivor Benefits Plan, plans for the next year and participation reasons. Officers were asked about their current obligation, its completion date and if they will continue to participate following the end of their obligation.

Section IV, "Individual and Family Characteristics," focused on basic demographic facts such as sex, age, marital status, aspects of educational attainment, number of dependents and whether or not dependents were handicapped. Married respondents were asked to provide basic demographic data about their spouses, as well as information

about spouse military participation. With minor differences, this section is identical to Section IV in Forms 1 and 2.

Section V, "Military Compensation, Benefits and Programs," asked about the benefits being received by the respondent, as well as the availability and level of satisfaction with a broad range of family programs. Section VI, "Civilian Labor Force Experience," and Section VII, "Family Resources," focused on the household's labor force participation and earnings, non-wage or salary sources of income, debts and monthly mortgage payments.

The last section, Section VIII, "Military Life," elicited respondents' perceptions of unit problems and unit morale. The questionnaire concludes with a set of items measuring satisfaction or dissatisfaction with selected aspects of military life, e.g., pay and allowances, interpersonal environment, retirement benefits, and overall satisfaction with military life.

1986 RC Spouse Survey. The spouse questionnaires (Form 5 in English, Form 6 in Spanish), consisted of five major sections. Section I, "The Guard/Reserve Community," collected information about the kind and size of community in which the household lived, transportation arrangements for the member, and information about the spouse's participation in volunteer activities. It also included questions about knowledge of and participation in Guard/Reserve activities and interest in information about benefits and programs for families in the reserve components.

Section II, "Family Military Experience," asked about the spouse's military background and the member's military background and career plans from the spouse's perspective. Section III, "Your Background and Family," focused on basic demographic facts such as sex, age, educational attainment, number of dependents and whether or not they were handicapped. Spouses with young dependents were asked about their child care arrangements.

Section IV, "Family Work Experience," focused on the households' labor force participation and earnings, non-wage or salary sources of income, expenditures in military exchanges and commissaries, and debts. The section includes items on community social services and an assessment of family problems resulting from the member's reserve participation.

The last set of questions, Section V, "Family Concerns," asked about aspects of family preparedness, e.g., wills and life insurance, military services which might be utilized in case of mobilization/deployment of the member, and community social problems. It concluded with a set of satisfaction measures with various features of the member's participation in the Guard/Reserve and with overall satisfaction.

Respondents to all of the surveys were provided with the opportunity to make additional comments or recommendations on all topics,

whether or not the topic was included in the questionnaires. For this purpose, a separate page was provided, without identification, but with space to indicate reserve component and status, i.e., enlisted or officer personnel or spouse.

1986 RC Unit Commander Survey. Form 7 was developed for administration to unit commanders in units included in the 1979 RF Follow-Up Survey. The major purpose of this effort was to collect information about characteristics of unit commanders and their opinions about both unit activities and environments so that changes since 1979 could be studied. The design necessitated, by definition, a questionnaire as close to that used in 1979 as possible.

Section I, "Unit Characteristics," Section II, "Unit Personnel," and Section III, "Unit Drill and Annual Training Activities," asked for objective data about the unit, as well as an assessment of personnel, training activities, equipment, and overall unit functioning. Section IV, "Your Guard/Reserve Activities," asked about time spent on various activities and an assessment of whether it was sufficient or not. Section V, "Your Opinions," addressed the unit commander's view of unit problems, priorities given to unit activities by headquarters, and a comparison of the unit in 1986 with its condition five years previously. Section VI, "Your Military Background," and Section VII, "Individual Characteristics," collected military and civilian demographic information similar to that collected from officers in the other survey questionnaires.

ENDNOTES

¹Thus, "population estimate" in Tables 2.6 and 2.7 refers to the estimated total number of spouses in the reserve population. For a discussion of marital status in the 1986 RC Surveys see Appendix A. 1986 RC Surveys: Survey Weighting Methodology in 1986 Reserve Components Surveys: Selected Reserve Officer and Enlisted Personnel-- User's Manual and Codebook or 1986 Reserve Components Surveys: Full-Time Support Officer and Enlisted Personnel-- User's Manual and Codebook.

3. CHARACTERISTICS OF SPOUSES AND FAMILIES OF GUARD/RESERVE MEMBERS

A. Introduction

The effects of members' Guard/Reserve participation on families and the family's support for their participation vary according to the characteristics of spouses, marriages and families. These data provide the background for the analysis of the situation of families of part-time unit members.

In this chapter, we first describe the marital status of different categories of reservists and for the different components, as background to the description of the family situation of married members. Next, we describe the military status and experience of spouses of these members, including both husbands and wives of members. The remaining analyses describe the largest and most important group of spouses: wives of part-time Guard/Reserve members in units, restricted to wives who are themselves civilians. (As we discuss in Chapter 1, this includes wives who are members of the Guard/Reserve, but excludes wives who are on active duty in any of the services.) These descriptions of civilian wives and families include: social and demographic characteristics (e.g., age, education, race/ethnicity); duration of marriage and whether the member's decision to join the Guard/Reserve was made before or after the marriage; dependents and family life course stage; and where the family has lived, and for how long. In the text, some comparisons are also made between the family situation of Guard/Reserve members and that of active duty members, based on prior analyses of the 1985 DoD Survey of Officer and Enlisted Personnel and Military Spouses (Griffith et al., 1986).

B. Marital Status of Guard/Reserve Members

Table 3.1 shows that the majority (61%) of Guard/Reserve members are married (in a first marriage or remarriage, or separated), most of them in first marriages.¹ An additional 31 percent are single (never-married). The proportion married is higher for officers than enlisted members (78% vs. 58%) and higher for men than women members (63% vs. 41%). When we consider men who are part-time unit members, who represent the largest number of members and whose families are the primary focus of the present analyses, the same pattern is evident (Table 3.2): overall, 60 percent are married, and 32 percent have never married; and, comparing officers with enlisted members in this category, more than three-fourths (79%) of officers and half (57%) of enlisted members are married.

Table 3.3 presents data on part-time unit members' marital status by Reserve Component. The data for men who are part-time unit members show some important differences. The U.S. Marine Corps Reserve (USMCR) has a much lower percentage married than any other group (34%, compared with more than 50% for the other components); this reflects the fact that enlisted members in the USMCR have a much lower than average proportion married (30%). The USMCR is the only component in

Table 3.1. Members' Marital Status by Sex

All Members

| Sex / Marital Status | Enlisted Member | Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------|
| Male | | | |
| Married for first time | 47.9 % | 67.1 % | 50.8 % |
| Remarried | 10.6 | 13.1 | 11.0 |
| Widowed | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Divorced | 7.1 | 6.8 | 7.0 |
| Separated | 1.5 | 0.9 | 1.4 |
| Single, never married | 32.7 | 11.7 | 29.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 46707 | 10353 | 57060 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 776 | 137 | 913 |
| Female | | | |
| Married for first time | 26.4 % | 40.2 % | 28.5 % |
| Remarried | 10.0 | 11.2 | 10.2 |
| Widowed | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Divorced | 17.4 | 16.3 | 17.3 |
| Separated | 2.7 | 1.5 | 2.5 |
| Single, never married | 43.0 | 30.0 | 41.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 4702 | 1925 | 6627 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 88 | 16 | 105 |
| Total | | | |
| Married for first time | 45.7 % | 64.2 % | 48.5 % |
| Remarried | 10.5 | 12.9 | 10.9 |
| Widowed | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| Divorced | 8.1 | 7.8 | 8.1 |
| Separated | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.5 |
| Single, never married | 33.8 | 13.6 | 30.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 51409 | 12278 | 63687 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 864 | 153 | 1018 |

Source: Member Questionnaire: Q. 61,75

Table 3.2. Members' Marital Status by Sex and Reserve Category

Part-time unit members

| Sex / Marital Status | Enlisted Member | Officer | Total |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------|
| Male | | | |
| Married for first time | 46.2 % | 65.6 % | 48.8 % |
| Remarried | 9.7 | 12.6 | 10.0 |
| Widowed | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Divorced | 7.0 | 7.1 | 7.0 |
| Separated | 1.5 | 0.9 | 1.4 |
| Single, never married | 35.4 | 13.6 | 32.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 40561 | 7787 | 48348 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 686 | 104 | 790 |
| Female | | | |
| Married for first time | 25.7 % | 40.3 % | 27.9 % |
| Remarried | 9.0 | 10.1 | 9.2 |
| Widowed | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.6 |
| Divorced | 16.3 | 16.9 | 16.4 |
| Separated | 2.7 | 1.4 | 2.5 |
| Single, never married | 45.7 | 30.5 | 43.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 3989 | 1596 | 5585 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 77 | 14 | 90 |
| Total | | | |
| Married for first time | 44.2 % | 62.7 % | 46.7 % |
| Remarried | 9.6 | 12.3 | 10.0 |
| Widowed | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| Divorced | 8.0 | 8.2 | 8.0 |
| Separated | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.5 |
| Single, never married | 36.5 | 15.5 | 33.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 44550 | 9383 | 53933 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 762 | 118 | 880 |

(continued)

Table 3.2. Members' Marital Status by Sex and Reserve Category

Military technicians

| Sex / Marital Status | Enlisted Member | Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------|
| Male | | | |
| Married for first time | 66.0 % | 71.5 % | 67.0 % |
| Remarried | 15.7 | 16.5 | 15.8 |
| Widowed | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.4 |
| Divorced | 8.2 | 6.4 | 7.9 |
| Separated | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.2 |
| Single, never married | 8.8 | 3.0 | 7.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 3299 | 697 | 3996 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 41 | 9 | 50 |
| Female | | | |
| Married for first time | 29.0 % | 20.9 % | 28.4 % |
| Remarried | 13.3 | 21.6 | 13.9 |
| Widowed | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Divorced | 29.1 | 28.6 | 29.1 |
| Separated | 2.7 | 1.8 | 2.6 |
| Single, never married | 25.2 | 27.1 | 25.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 276 | 46 | 322 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Total | | | |
| Married for first time | 62.9 % | 69.7 % | 64.1 % |
| Remarried | 15.5 | 16.6 | 15.7 |
| Widowed | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.4 |
| Divorced | 9.9 | 7.1 | 9.4 |
| Separated | 1.2 | 1.9 | 1.3 |
| Single, never married | 10.2 | 3.8 | 9.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 3575 | 743 | 4318 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 45 | 9 | 54 |

(continued)

Table 3.2. Members' Marital Status by Sex and Reserve Category

IMAs

| Sex / Marital Status | Enlisted Member | Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------|
| Male | | | |
| Married for first time | 56.7 % | 72.7 % | 67.4 % |
| Remarried | 16.4 | 11.9 | 13.4 |
| Widowed | 1.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| Divorced | 4.8 | 7.0 | 6.3 |
| Separated | 1.9 | 0.5 | 1.0 |
| Single, never married | 18.9 | 7.6 | 11.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 345 | 1243 | 1588 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 8 | 16 | 24 |
| Female | | | |
| Married for first time | 35.3 % | 48.6 % | 41.6 % |
| Remarried | 23.5 | 18.4 | 21.1 |
| Widowed | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| Divorced | 22.0 | 7.3 | 15.0 |
| Separated | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| Single, never married | 17.8 | 24.2 | 20.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 68 | 214 | 282 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Total | | | |
| Married for first time | 52.9 % | 70.6 % | 64.3 % |
| Remarried | 17.7 | 12.5 | 14.3 |
| Widowed | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| Divorced | 7.9 | 7.0 | 7.3 |
| Separated | 1.8 | 0.6 | 1.0 |
| Single, never married | 18.7 | 9.1 | 12.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 413 | 1457 | 1870 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 9 | 17 | 27 |

(continued)

Table 3.2. Members' Marital Status by Sex and Reserve Category

AGRs

| Sex / Marital Status | Enlisted Member | Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------|
| Male | | | |
| Married for first time | 56.5 % | 69.9 % | 58.8 % |
| Remarried | 19.7 | 18.7 | 19.5 |
| Widowed | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Divorced | 7.3 | 4.3 | 6.8 |
| Separated | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.6 |
| Single, never married | 14.7 | 5.8 | 13.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 2502 | 626 | 3128 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 42 | 9 | 50 |
| Female | | | |
| Married for first time | 30.1 % | 26.5 % | 29.8 % |
| Remarried | 17.0 | 12.0 | 16.6 |
| Widowed | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Divorced | 22.4 | 21.5 | 22.4 |
| Separated | 2.4 | 5.1 | 2.6 |
| Single, never married | 27.3 | 34.9 | 27.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 369 | 69 | 438 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 6 | 1 | 7 |
| Total | | | |
| Married for first time | 53.0 % | 67.1 % | 55.3 % |
| Remarried | 19.3 | 18.3 | 19.2 |
| Widowed | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Divorced | 9.3 | 5.3 | 8.7 |
| Separated | 1.8 | 1.4 | 1.7 |
| Single, never married | 16.4 | 7.7 | 15.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 2871 | 695 | 3566 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 48 | 9 | 57 |

Source: Member Questionnaire: Q. 61,75,RCAT

Table 3.3. Part-time Unit Members' Marital Status by Sex and Reserve Component

ARNG

| Sex / Marital Status | Enlisted Member | Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------|
| Male | | | |
| Married for first time | 46.3 % | 62.1 % | 47.7 % |
| Remarried | 9.9 | 14.1 | 10.3 |
| Widowed | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Divorced | 7.0 | 6.5 | 7.0 |
| Separated | 1.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 |
| Single, never married | 35.0 | 16.1 | 33.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 17857 | 1958 | 19815 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 308 | 31 | 339 |
| Female | | | |
| Married for first time | 25.3 % | 31.6 % | 26.0 % |
| Remarried | 7.8 | 14.1 | 8.5 |
| Widowed | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.4 |
| Divorced | 13.5 | 17.4 | 13.9 |
| Separated | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.9 |
| Single, never married | 50.2 | 33.8 | 48.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 703 | 221 | 924 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 15 | 2 | 17 |
| Total | | | |
| Married for first time | 45.3 % | 60.3 % | 46.7 % |
| Remarried | 9.8 | 14.1 | 10.2 |
| Widowed | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Divorced | 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.3 |
| Separated | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.7 |
| Single, never married | 35.7 | 17.1 | 34.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 18560 | 2179 | 20739 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 322 | 33 | 355 |

(continued)

Table 3.3. Part-time Unit Members' Marital Status by Sex and Reserve Component

USAR

| Sex / Marital Status | Enlisted Member | Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------|
| Male | | | |
| Married for first time | 44.0 % | 64.4 % | 47.6 % |
| Remarried | 8.6 | 11.8 | 9.2 |
| Widowed | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
| Divorced | 7.0 | 7.8 | 7.1 |
| Separated | 1.6 | 0.8 | 1.4 |
| Single, never married | 38.7 | 14.7 | 34.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 7428 | 2016 | 9444 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 161 | 34 | 195 |
| Female | | | |
| Married for first time | 21.9 % | 39.9 % | 25.2 % |
| Remarried | 7.2 | 9.2 | 7.5 |
| Widowed | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Divorced | 15.7 | 19.6 | 16.4 |
| Separated | 3.4 | 1.2 | 3.0 |
| Single, never married | 51.3 | 29.4 | 47.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1539 | 722 | 2261 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 32 | 7 | 40 |
| Total | | | |
| Married for first time | 40.3 % | 60.0 % | 43.8 % |
| Remarried | 8.4 | 11.3 | 8.9 |
| Widowed | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Divorced | 8.4 | 9.9 | 8.7 |
| Separated | 1.9 | 0.9 | 1.7 |
| Single, never married | 40.8 | 17.3 | 36.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 8967 | 2738 | 11705 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 193 | 41 | 234 |

(continued)

Table 3.3. Part-time Unit Members' Marital Status by Sex and Reserve Component

USNR

| Sex / Marital Status | Enlisted Member | Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------|
| Male | | | |
| Married for first time | 48.8 % | 70.4 % | 53.1 % |
| Remarried | 9.9 | 11.6 | 10.2 |
| Widowed | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Divorced | 7.3 | 6.9 | 7.2 |
| Separated | 1.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 |
| Single, never married | 32.7 | 10.2 | 28.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 3795 | 1315 | 5110 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 79 | 20 | 98 |
| Female | | | |
| Married for first time | 30.1 % | 55.1 % | 33.8 % |
| Remarried | 14.3 | 6.8 | 13.2 |
| Widowed | 0.6 | 1.9 | 0.8 |
| Divorced | 19.7 | 11.3 | 18.5 |
| Separated | 2.0 | 1.1 | 1.9 |
| Single, never married | 33.2 | 23.7 | 31.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 469 | 205 | 674 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 11 | 2 | 13 |
| Total | | | |
| Married for first time | 46.6 % | 69.1 % | 51.0 % |
| Remarried | 10.4 | 11.2 | 10.5 |
| Widowed | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Divorced | 8.8 | 7.2 | 8.5 |
| Separated | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.1 |
| Single, never married | 32.7 | 11.3 | 28.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 4264 | 1520 | 5784 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 89 | 21 | 111 |

(continued)

Table 3.3. Part-time Unit Members' Marital Status by Sex and Reserve Component

USMCR

| Sex / Marital Status | Enlisted Member | Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------|
| Male | | | |
| Married for first time | 25.8 % | 68.5 % | 29.1 % |
| Remarried | 2.8 | 11.7 | 3.5 |
| Widowed | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| Divorced | 2.7 | 5.6 | 3.0 |
| Separated | 1.2 | 0.9 | 1.2 |
| Single, never married | 67.4 | 13.0 | 63.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 3087 | 668 | 3755 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 30 | 3 | 32 |
| Female | | | |
| Married for first time | 30.6 % | 41.3 % | 31.1 % |
| Remarried | 6.7 | 5.2 | 6.7 |
| Widowed | 0.0 | 3.7 | 0.2 |
| Divorced | 8.9 | 11.2 | 9.0 |
| Separated | 2.6 | 5.2 | 2.7 |
| Single, never married | 51.3 | 33.5 | 50.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 103 | 33 | 136 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | | | |
| Married for first time | 26.0 % | 67.8 % | 29.2 % |
| Remarried | 2.9 | 11.5 | 3.6 |
| Widowed | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| Divorced | 3.0 | 5.7 | 3.2 |
| Separated | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.2 |
| Single, never married | 66.8 | 13.5 | 62.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 3190 | 701 | 3891 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 31 | 3 | 34 |

(continued)

Table 3.3. Part-time Unit Members' Marital Status by Sex and Reserve Component

ANG

| Sex / Marital Status | Enlisted Member | Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------|
| Male | | | |
| Married for first time | 54.1 % | 68.9 % | 56.1 % |
| Remarried | 11.7 | 11.3 | 11.7 |
| Widowed | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Divorced | 7.9 | 7.2 | 7.8 |
| Separated | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Single, never married | 24.8 | 11.3 | 23.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 4366 | 739 | 5105 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 62 | 9 | 71 |
| Female | | | |
| Married for first time | 27.0 % | 42.4 % | 28.4 % |
| Remarried | 8.2 | 13.3 | 8.7 |
| Widowed | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.2 |
| Divorced | 18.0 | 10.6 | 17.3 |
| Separated | 2.4 | 1.6 | 2.3 |
| Single, never married | 44.2 | 31.3 | 43.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 520 | 125 | 645 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 8 | 1 | 9 |
| Total | | | |
| Married for first time | 50.9 % | 66.8 % | 52.9 % |
| Remarried | 11.3 | 11.5 | 11.3 |
| Widowed | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Divorced | 9.0 | 7.5 | 8.8 |
| Separated | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.4 |
| Single, never married | 27.1 | 12.9 | 25.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 4886 | 864 | 5750 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 70 | 10 | 80 |

(continued)

Table 3.3. Part-time Unit Members' Marital Status by Sex and Reserve Component

USAFR

| Sex / Marital Status | Enlisted Member | Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------|
| Male | | | |
| Married for first time | 51.3 % | 67.9 % | 53.6 % |
| Remarried | 13.3 | 13.6 | 13.4 |
| Widowed | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Divorced | 8.3 | 6.7 | 8.1 |
| Separated | 1.2 | 0.8 | 1.2 |
| Single, never married | 25.5 | 10.6 | 23.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 2245 | 400 | 2645 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 37 | 6 | 43 |
| Female | | | |
| Married for first time | 32.2 % | 33.3 % | 32.3 % |
| Remarried | 11.5 | 11.5 | 11.5 |
| Widowed | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| Divorced | 18.6 | 14.1 | 17.9 |
| Separated | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Single, never married | 35.9 | 39.9 | 36.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 485 | 226 | 711 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 9 | 2 | 10 |
| Total | | | |
| Married for first time | 47.7 % | 60.5 % | 49.5 % |
| Remarried | 13.0 | 13.2 | 13.0 |
| Widowed | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Divorced | 10.2 | 8.3 | 10.0 |
| Separated | 1.2 | 0.9 | 1.2 |
| Single, never married | 27.4 | 16.8 | 25.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 2730 | 626 | 3356 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 46 | 8 | 54 |

(continued)

Table 3.3. Part-time Unit Members' Marital Status by Sex and Reserve Component

USCGR

| Sex / Marital Status | Enlisted Member | Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------|
| Male | | | |
| Married for first time | 54.9 % | 69.6 % | 56.9 % |
| Remarried | 11.6 | 16.2 | 12.2 |
| Widowed | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Divorced | 7.1 | 6.7 | 7.1 |
| Separated | 0.8 | 1.3 | 0.9 |
| Single, never married | 25.3 | 5.8 | 22.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1783 | 691 | 2474 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 10 | 1 | 11 |
| Female | | | |
| Married for first time | 37.5 % | 53.5 % | 38.7 % |
| Remarried | 14.8 | 19.8 | 15.2 |
| Widowed | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
| Divorced | 19.6 | 6.7 | 18.7 |
| Separated | 1.2 | 4.7 | 1.5 |
| Single, never married | 25.2 | 15.3 | 24.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 170 | 64 | 234 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | | | |
| Married for first time | 53.2 % | 68.7 % | 55.2 % |
| Remarried | 11.9 | 16.4 | 12.5 |
| Widowed | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Divorced | 8.3 | 6.7 | 8.1 |
| Separated | 0.8 | 1.5 | 0.9 |
| Single, never married | 25.3 | 6.3 | 22.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1953 | 755 | 2708 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 11 | 2 | 12 |

Source: Member Questionnaire: Q. 3,61,75

which the percentage of women enlisted members who are married exceeds that for males. The overall proportion of male part-time unit members who are married ranges from one-third (34%) for the USMCR to two-thirds for the Air Force Reserve (68%), Air National Guard (69%), and Coast Guard Reserve (70%); the Navy Reserve (64%), Army National Guard (60%), and Army Reserve (58%) are somewhat lower in the proportion married. Within each component, officers are more likely to be married than are enlisted members. With the exception of the Marine Corps Reserve, however, over half the enlisted members in every component are married, as are three-quarters or more of the officers.

In summary, the data on marital status for the Guard/Reserve, overall and by component, show some important variation but also that the majority of part-time unit members are married. The fact that the most of the members are married makes it important to study the effect of Guard/Reserve participation on spouses and families and family support for members' participation.

C. Military Experience of Spouses of Guard/Reserve Members

Table 3.4 shows the military status of spouses of Guard/Reserve members, separately for husbands and wives, by member reserve category.² Among wives of part-time unit members, who are the primary focus of the present analyses, nearly all (93%) are civilians who have never served, either in the active duty force or the reserve components. A small proportion are currently serving in the reserve components (3%) or active duty force (one-half of 1%). Wives of officers and members do not differ in their past or current military experience.

Data for husbands of women Guard/Reserve members show a very different pattern. Almost one-fifth (18%) are currently on active duty, and one-fourth (28%) are currently serving in the reserve components - in total, almost half (46%) of women part-time unit members are married to men who are currently serving. In addition, one-fourth (28%) are married to husbands who formerly served, either on active duty (25%) or in the reserve components (3%). Husbands of enlisted women are very similar to husbands of officers in their patterns of military experience.

Table 3.5 shows comparable data for spouses classified by the member's reserve component, for spouses of all Guard/Reserve members. These data show that, for all components, more than 90 percent of wives have never served in the armed forces, either on active duty or in one of the reserve components. Among husbands of women serving in the Guard/Reserve, the proportion with prior or current service varies considerably more: the category with the highest proportion of husbands with no service is women in the Army National Guard (31%) and Army Reserve (30%); the lowest categories are U.S. Naval Reserve (14%), U.S. Marine Corps Reserve (14%), and the U.S. Air Force Reserve (15%). Husbands of women in several components include a substantial proportion currently either on active duty or in the reserve components. The highest proportions of husbands currently on active duty

Table 3.4. Military Status of Spouses by Sex and Reserve Category

Part-time members in units

| Sex of Reservist's Spouse/ Military Status of That Spouse | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Wife | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 0.4 % | 0.6 % | 0.4 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.3 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Never served in armed forces | 93.3 | 94.0 | 93.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 20114 | 5381 | 25495 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 404 | 84 | 488 |
| Husband | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 18.2 % | 17.8 % | 18.1 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 27.8 | 26.1 | 27.5 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 25.4 | 23.6 | 25.0 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 3.0 | 4.1 | 3.3 |
| Never served in armed forces | 25.5 | 28.4 | 26.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 999 | 657 | 1656 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 30 | 7 | 37 |
| Total | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 1.6 % | 1.9 % | 1.7 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 5.2 | 4.4 | 5.0 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.8 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.8 |
| Never served in armed forces | 88.7 | 88.7 | 88.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 21113 | 6038 | 27151 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 434 | 92 | 526 |

(continued)

Table 3.4. Military Status of Spouses by Sex and Reserve Category

IMAs

| Sex of Reservist's Spouse/ Military Status of That Spouse | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Wife | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 0.7 % | 0.6 % | 0.6 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 5.6 | 2.6 | 3.5 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 4.1 | 2.6 | 3.1 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Never served in armed forces | 89.3 | 93.5 | 92.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 230 | 800 | 1030 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Husband | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 45.7 % | 45.7 % | 45.7 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 9.4 | 15.0 | 12.2 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 37.6 | 25.7 | 31.7 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| Never served in armed forces | 7.3 | 12.4 | 9.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 38 | 101 | 139 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 7.2 % | 3.7 % | 4.8 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 6.1 | 3.5 | 4.3 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 9.0 | 4.2 | 5.8 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.6 |
| Never served in armed forces | 77.4 | 87.9 | 84.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 268 | 901 | 1169 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 7 | 14 | 21 |

(continued)

Table 3.4. Military Status of Spouses by Sex and Reserve Category

AGRs

| Sex of Reservist's Spouse/ Military Status of That Spouse | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Wife | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 1.8 % | 1.6 % | 1.7 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 4.9 | 5.6 | 5.1 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 2.8 | 3.1 | 2.9 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 1.4 | 2.5 | 1.6 |
| Never served in armed forces | 89.0 | 87.2 | 88.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1661 | 500 | 2161 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 32 | 8 | 40 |
| Husband | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 20.4 % | 15.2 % | 20.1 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 28.9 | 47.7 | 30.0 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 25.2 | 22.1 | 25.0 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 6.2 | 0.0 | 5.8 |
| Never served in armed forces | 19.4 | 15.0 | 19.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 137 | 24 | 161 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| Total | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 3.5 % | 2.0 % | 3.2 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 7.2 | 6.7 | 7.1 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 4.9 | 3.6 | 4.7 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 1.9 | 2.4 | 2.0 |
| Never served in armed forces | 82.5 | 85.3 | 83.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1798 | 524 | 2322 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 36 | 8 | 44 |

(continued)

Table 3.4. Military Status of Spouses by Sex and Reserve Category

Military technicians

| Sex of Reservist's Spouse/ Military Status of That Spouse | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Wife | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 0.3 % | 0.2 % | 0.3 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 3.4 | 3.1 | 3.4 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 1.8 | 1.3 | 1.7 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.6 | 1.6 | 0.8 |
| Never served in armed forces | 93.9 | 93.8 | 93.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 2287 | 510 | 2797 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 34 | 8 | 42 |
| Husband | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 12.6 % | 4.1 % | 11.9 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 53.9 | 41.1 | 52.8 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 14.5 | 22.6 | 15.2 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 3.0 | 19.1 | 4.4 |
| Never served in armed forces | 16.0 | 13.1 | 15.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 100 | 22 | 122 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 0.9 % | 0.3 % | 0.8 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 6.0 | 3.9 | 5.6 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 2.4 | 1.7 | 2.3 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.7 | 2.0 | 0.9 |
| Never served in armed forces | 90.0 | 92.0 | 90.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 2387 | 532 | 2919 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 36 | 8 | 44 |

(continued)

Table 3.4. Military Status of Spouses by Sex and Reserve Category

Total

| Sex of Reservist's Spouse/ Military Status of That Spouse | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Wife | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 0.5 % | 0.6 % | 0.5 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 3.6 | 2.8 | 3.5 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.2 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| Never served in armed forces | 93.0 | 93.4 | 93.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 24292 | 7191 | 31483 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 476 | 113 | 590 |
| Husband | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 18.9 % | 20.6 % | 19.2 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 28.7 | 25.7 | 28.1 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 25.2 | 23.8 | 24.9 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 3.2 | 4.0 | 3.4 |
| Never served in armed forces | 24.0 | 26.0 | 24.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1274 | 804 | 2078 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 36 | 9 | 45 |
| Total | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 1.8 % | 2.0 % | 1.8 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 5.4 | 4.5 | 5.2 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.9 |
| Never served in armed forces | 88.2 | 88.6 | 88.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 25566 | 7995 | 33561 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 512 | 122 | 634 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 11,16,24

Table 3.5. Military Status of Spouses by Sex and Reserve Component

ARNG

| Sex of Reservist's Spouse / Military Status of That Spouse | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Wife | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 0.2 % | 0.2 % | 0.2 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 3.4 | 2.6 | 3.3 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.7 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.6 | 1.3 | 0.7 |
| Never served in armed forces | 94.1 | 94.3 | 94.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 10864 | 1846 | 12710 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 207 | 32 | 239 |
| Husband | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 7.5 % | 5.9 % | 7.2 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 35.0 | 37.2 | 35.3 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 22.3 | 22.2 | 22.3 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.7 |
| Never served in armed forces | 31.5 | 30.9 | 31.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 267 | 88 | 355 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 7 | 1 | 8 |
| Total | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 0.4 % | 0.4 % | 0.4 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 4.4 | 3.7 | 4.3 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.4 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.8 |
| Never served in armed forces | 92.1 | 92.1 | 92.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 11131 | 1934 | 13065 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 214 | 33 | 247 |

(continued)

Table 3.5. Military Status of Spouses by Sex and Reserve Component

USAR

| Sex of Reservist's Spouse / Military Status of That Spouse | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Wife | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 0.5 % | 0.6 % | 0.5 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 4.7 | 2.8 | 4.2 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.6 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.9 |
| Never served in armed forces | 91.0 | 94.0 | 91.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 3909 | 1876 | 5785 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 100 | 37 | 138 |
| Husband | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 14.9 % | 14.6 % | 14.8 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 23.9 | 25.5 | 24.3 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 28.0 | 23.0 | 26.7 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 3.5 | 4.1 | 3.6 |
| Never served in armed forces | 29.7 | 32.7 | 30.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 307 | 338 | 645 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 12 | 4 | 17 |
| Total | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 2.1 % | 2.0 % | 2.1 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 6.8 | 5.1 | 6.3 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 5.7 | 4.1 | 5.3 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Never served in armed forces | 84.2 | 87.6 | 85.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 4216 | 2214 | 6430 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 113 | 42 | 154 |

(continued)

Table 3.5. Military Status of Spouses by Sex and Reserve Component

USNR

| Sex of Reservist's Spouse / Military Status of That Spouse | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Wife | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 1.1 % | 1.4 % | 1.2 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 3.9 | 2.6 | 3.6 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.7 |
| Never served in armed forces | 91.9 | 93.1 | 92.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 2456 | 979 | 3435 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 59 | 19 | 78 |
| Husband | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 33.9 % | 31.7 % | 33.5 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 25.5 | 24.0 | 25.2 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 25.5 | 22.4 | 24.9 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 2.6 | 4.3 | 2.9 |
| Never served in armed forces | 12.6 | 17.6 | 13.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 207 | 112 | 319 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 6 | 1 | 7 |
| Total | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 4.1 % | 3.3 % | 3.9 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 5.8 | 3.9 | 5.4 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 4.5 | 3.7 | 4.3 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Never served in armed forces | 84.6 | 88.3 | 85.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 2663 | 1091 | 3754 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 65 | 20 | 85 |

(continued)

Table 3.5. Military Status of Spouses by Sex and Reserve Component

USMCR

| Sex of Reservist's Spouse / Military Status of That Spouse | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Wife | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 0.4 % | 0.6 % | 0.5 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 1.9 | 1.2 | 1.8 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 1.6 | 2.7 | 1.8 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.6 |
| Never served in armed forces | 95.3 | 95.0 | 95.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 721 | 590 | 1311 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 11 | 3 | 13 |
| Husband | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 50.8 % | 45.6 % | 50.1 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 14.5 | 14.2 | 14.4 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 20.3 | 30.6 | 21.7 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Never served in armed forces | 14.4 | 9.6 | 13.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 31 | 33 | 64 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 2.9 % | 2.0 % | 2.7 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 2.6 | 1.6 | 2.4 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 2.5 | 3.5 | 2.7 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.6 |
| Never served in armed forces | 91.4 | 92.4 | 91.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 752 | 623 | 1375 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 11 | 3 | 14 |

(continued)

Table 3.5. Military Status of Spouses by Sex and Reserve Component

ANG

| Sex of Reservist's Spouse / Military Status of That Spouse | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Wife | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 0.3 % | 0.4 % | 0.3 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 2.7 | 5.2 | 3.1 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 2.0 | 3.5 | 2.2 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.8 |
| Never served in armed forces | 94.1 | 90.4 | 93.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 3566 | 689 | 4255 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 59 | 10 | 70 |
| Husband | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 9.8 % | 7.2 % | 9.5 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 43.9 | 40.8 | 43.5 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 20.4 | 23.8 | 20.8 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 3.6 | 7.6 | 4.1 |
| Never served in armed forces | 22.3 | 20.5 | 22.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 216 | 54 | 270 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| Total | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 1.0 % | 0.8 % | 0.9 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 5.6 | 6.9 | 5.8 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 3.3 | 4.5 | 3.5 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 1.1 | 0.8 | 1.0 |
| Never served in armed forces | 89.0 | 87.0 | 88.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 3782 | 743 | 4525 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 64 | 11 | 75 |

(continued)

Table 3.5. Military Status of Spouses by Sex and Reserve Component

USAFR

| Sex of Reservist's Spouse / Military Status of That Spouse | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Wife | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 1.2 % | 0.6 % | 1.0 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 3.7 | 2.3 | 3.3 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 3.1 | 4.1 | 3.4 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.8 |
| Never served in armed forces | 91.4 | 91.8 | 91.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1717 | 692 | 2409 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 34 | 11 | 45 |
| Husband | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 30.2 % | 43.0 % | 33.0 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 22.9 | 14.1 | 21.0 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 28.5 | 28.0 | 28.4 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.8 |
| Never served in armed forces | 15.5 | 12.5 | 14.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 178 | 136 | 314 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| Total | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 4.9 % | 5.3 % | 5.0 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 6.1 | 3.6 | 5.5 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 6.4 | 6.8 | 6.5 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.0 |
| Never served in armed forces | 81.7 | 83.0 | 82.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1895 | 828 | 2723 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 39 | 13 | 51 |

(continued)

Table 3.5. Military Status of Spouses by Sex and Reserve Component

USCGR

| Sex of Reservist's Spouse / Military Status of That Spouse | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Wife | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 0.4 % | 0.6 % | 0.4 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 1.7 | 2.4 | 1.8 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 0.9 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.0 |
| Never served in armed forces | 96.1 | 94.5 | 95.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1059 | 519 | 1578 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 7 | 1 | 8 |
| Husband | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 34.9 % | 40.8 % | 35.5 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 34.5 | 17.9 | 32.8 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 7.2 | 27.4 | 9.3 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 2.5 | 0.0 | 2.3 |
| Never served in armed forces | 20.9 | 13.9 | 20.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 68 | 43 | 111 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | | | |
| Currently on active-duty | 3.1 % | 2.5 % | 3.0 % |
| Currently serving in reserve components | 4.3 | 3.1 | 4.1 |
| Formerly served in active-duty | 1.4 | 2.6 | 1.6 |
| Formerly served in reserve components | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Never served in armed forces | 90.1 | 90.7 | 90.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1127 | 562 | 1689 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 7 | 1 | 9 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 11,15,24

are found for women in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserves (50%), U.S. Coast Guard Reserve (36%) U.S. Naval Reserve (34%), and U.S. Air Force Reserves (33%). The highest proportions with husbands in the reserve components are for women in the Air National Guard (44%), Army National Guard (35%), and U.S. Coast Guard Reserve (33%).

D. Personal Characteristics of Spouses

As noted earlier, the population for this section and later analyses is civilian wives of part-time Guard/Reserve members in units, unless otherwise indicated.

Table 3.6 shows the age of civilian wives of members, for the total population of wives and separately for wives of enlisted members and officers. About two-thirds (67%) of wives are 30 or older, and almost none (2%) are younger than 20. Compared with the wives of active duty military personnel, Guard/Reserve wives are considerably older.³ Only about half (47%) of wives of active duty military personnel are 30 or older, and about three percent are younger than 20. For the Guard/Reserve, as for the active duty force, wives of officers are, on average, older than wives of enlisted members, reflecting the differences in age between officers and enlisted members.

The education of Guard/Reserve members' wives is shown in Table 3.7. More than 90 percent have at least a high school diploma; 89 percent of enlisted members' wives, and 99 percent of officers' wives. About one-eighth (13%) of enlisted members' wives are college graduates, as are nearly half (48%) of officers' wives; five percent of enlisted members' wives and nearly one-fourth (23%) of officers' wives have education beyond the college level. The wives of active duty military personnel are similar with respect to education: 89 percent of enlisted members' wives and 99 percent of officers' wives have at least a high school diploma; eight percent of enlisted members' wives and 47 percent of officers' wives are college graduates; and three percent of enlisted members' wives and 17 percent of officers' wives have education beyond the college level.

The race and ethnicity reported by the large majority of Guard/Reserve members' wives who responded to the survey (Table 3.8) is white non-Hispanic: 80 percent of enlisted members' wives, and 92 percent of officers' wives. Among respondents married to enlisted members, nine percent are black and eight percent are Hispanic, with another three percent of other races. Among respondents married to officers, only two to three percent are from each minority racial/ethnic group.

Among Guard/Reserve members' wives who responded, nearly all are U.S.-born, are American citizens, and speak English as their main language at home (Tables 3.9 and 3.10): approximately 95 percent are U.S.-born, and 98 percent are U.S. citizens; and 95 percent speak English at home. Among those who do not speak English as their main language at home, almost half of enlisted members' spouses and about one-third of all officers' spouses speak Spanish, with the rest divided among a range of other languages.

Table 3.6. Age of Civilian Wives of Members

| Age | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Less than 20 years | 2.6 % | 0.1 % | 2.2 % |
| 20-24 years | 15.9 | 3.4 | 13.7 |
| 25-29 years | 18.3 | 11.2 | 17.1 |
| 30-34 years | 20.3 | 22.7 | 20.7 |
| 35-39 years | 20.8 | 32.0 | 22.7 |
| Over 39 years | 22.1 | 30.5 | 23.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19936 | 5341 | 25277 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 400 | 84 | 483 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,25

Table 3.7. Education of Civilian Wives of Members

| Education | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Less than 12 years | 11.3 % | 1.0 % | 9.4 % |
| High school graduate | 51.0 | 21.0 | 45.6 |
| Some college | 25.0 | 29.4 | 25.8 |
| College graduate | 7.7 | 25.7 | 11.0 |
| More than 4 years college | 5.1 | 22.8 | 8.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 18499 | 5205 | 23704 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 369 | 81 | 450 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,32

Table 3.8. Race/Ethnicity of Civilian Wives of Members

| Race/Ethnicity | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Black | 9.1 % | 2.0 % | 7.8 % |
| Hispanic | 7.6 | 2.7 | 6.7 |
| White | 80.1 | 92.4 | 82.2 |
| Other | 3.2 | 2.9 | 3.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19222 | 5227 | 24449 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 386 | 82 | 468 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, SRACE1

Table 3.9. Place of Birth and Citizenship of Civilian Wives of Members

| | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| <u>Place of Birth</u> | | | |
| In the US | 94.6 % | 94.5 % | 94.5 % |
| Outside US to military parents | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.8 |
| Outside US to nonmilitary parents | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 20131 | 5373 | 25504 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 404 | 84 | 488 |
| <u>U.S. Citizenship</u> | | | |
| Yes | 98.0 % | 98.5 % | 98.1 % |
| No, resident alien | 1.9 | 1.4 | 1.8 |
| No, not resident alien | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 20126 | 5371 | 25497 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 404 | 84 | 488 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,26,27

Table 3.10. Primary Language of Civilian Wives of Members

| Primary Language | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| English | 94.7 % | 97.8 % | 95.2 % |
| Spanish | 2.5 | 0.6 | 2.2 |
| Other | 2.8 | 1.5 | 2.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19906 | 5308 | 25214 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 399 | 83 | 483 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, SLANG1

Table 3.11. Marriage Duration

| Marriage Duration | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 0-1 years | 13.0 % | 5.1 % | 11.6 % |
| 2-4 years | 18.3 | 12.1 | 17.3 |
| 5-9 years | 19.8 | 18.1 | 19.5 |
| 10-14 years | 17.9 | 22.5 | 18.7 |
| 15 or more years | 31.0 | 42.2 | 32.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19802 | 5310 | 25112 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 396 | 83 | 480 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,36

These data need to be interpreted with some caution, since somewhat fewer spouse respondents are black than would be expected from data from members who responded (approximately 9%, compared with 11%). The differences are not large however, and members' reports of spouse place of birth suggest that non-U.S. born spouses are not markedly under-represented in the spouse survey respondents. (See Chapter 2, Section D.)

Overall, the data indicate that wives of Guard/Reserve members are relatively well-educated women, most of them in their 30's or older, and are white, U.S.-born and English-speaking.

Half (52%) of Guard/Reserve members' wives have been married to the member for 10 or more years (Table 3.11), a figure consistent with the relatively older ages of these wives. At the same time, over one-fourth (29%) have been married less than five years. One implication is that, whereas many Guard/Reserve wives probably have a number of years' experience with the members' Guard/Reserve activities, as well as a long-established marriage, a significant minority are relatively new to the marriage and the Guard/Reserve; this group may have special needs for information programs or other family-oriented activities. The length of current marriage for officers' spouses tends to be somewhat longer than for wives of enlisted personnel, as would be expected from the older ages of officers and their wives.

Table 3.12 gives additional information on marriage and Guard/Reserve experience. As this shows, half the wives (50%) report that the member's original decision to join the Guard/Reserve was made before their marriage, and half say the member made the decision after their marriage. Although this means that, in many couples, the wife had no part in the member's original decision to join, her adjustment as a wife of a Guard/Reserve member may have been made easier by the fact that, before the marriage, she knew of the member's Guard/Reserve commitment. Moreover, the relatively long duration of most of the marriages means that the wives have had opportunities to participate in the decision about the member's continued participation over the years. Members' continued participation suggests that many wives are supportive of their decision - a topic that is examined more directly in subsequent chapters on wives' attitudes about the Guard/Reserve, member career goals, and the problems and benefits of Guard/Reserve participation. However, those couples who made a decision that the member should not continue participating in the reserves have not been interviewed. It would thus be helpful to the reserves to conduct a survey of former members and spouses after they have separated.

Tables 3.13-3.15 describe the family situation of Guard/Reserve members. Only one-fifth (20%) of wives say the couple has no dependents and only a slightly larger number (24%) say they have no dependents under 18 (Table 3.13). Officers' families are more likely to have two or more dependents under 18 than enlisted members' families, consistent with the age differences observed earlier, but the differences are small. Two percent have one or more dependents who have permanent physical, emotional, or intellectual handicaps (Table 3.14) which is similar to the proportion for active-duty families.

Table 3.12. Marriage and Member's Decision to Join Guard/Reserve

| When Joined Relative to Marriage | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Before Marriage | 50.1 % | 47.2 % | 49.6 % |
| After Marriage | 49.9 | 52.8 | 50.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 20026 | 5360 | 25386 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 401 | 84 | 485 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,23

Table 3.13. Number of Dependents

| | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| <u>Dependents</u> | | | |
| No dependents | 20.2 % | 16.9 % | 19.6 % |
| 1 dependent | 23.4 | 18.7 | 22.6 |
| 2 dependents | 33.0 | 38.6 | 33.9 |
| 3 dependents | 15.4 | 17.6 | 15.8 |
| 4 or more dependents | 8.0 | 8.2 | 8.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19951 | 5319 | 25270 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 400 | 83 | 484 |
| <u>Dependents Under 18</u> | | | |
| No dependents | 24.7 % | 22.8 % | 24.4 % |
| 1 dependent | 24.6 | 21.3 | 24.0 |
| 2 dependents | 31.0 | 35.7 | 31.8 |
| 3 dependents | 13.7 | 14.1 | 13.8 |
| 4 or more dependents | 6.0 | 6.2 | 6.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19880 | 5308 | 25188 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 399 | 83 | 482 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,37,39

Table 3.14. Handicapped Dependents in Family

| Handicapped Dependents | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Has permanently handicapped dependent(s) | 2.5 % | 2.1 % | 2.4 % |
| Has temporarily handicapped dependent(s) | 2.6 | 1.7 | 2.4 |
| Has dependents, but none handicapped | 74.7 | 79.2 | 75.4 |
| Has no dependents | 20.3 | 17.0 | 19.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19881 | 5309 | 25190 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 399 | 83 | 482 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, HANDEP

Table 3.15. Family Life Course

| Family Life Course | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Wife 29 or younger, no children 18 or under | 11.6 % | 5.6 % | 10.5 % |
| Have children 18 or under | 75.6 | 77.4 | 75.9 |
| Wife 30 or older, no children 18 or under | 12.9 | 17.0 | 13.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19825 | 5299 | 25124 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 397 | 83 | 481 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, LCR1

Guard/Reserve families were classified by family life course stage for the analyses. Family life course is defined by the spouse's age and the presence of dependents under the age of 18. This was done because the effect of Guard/Reserve participation on families is expected to vary by family life course stage. For example, schedule and time conflicts may be greater for families with children than for ones who do not yet have children, have grown children, or are permanently childless. And, among those with no child dependents, both Guard/Reserve experience and spouse expectations may be different for younger and older spouses.⁴

Table 3.15 shows the family life course stage of families of the Guard/Reserve. These are grouped in three stages: couples with no child (under 18) dependents, in which the wife is 29 or younger (pre-parental childlessness); ones with one or more child dependents; and ones in which the wife is 30 or over, who have no child dependents, either because they have never had dependents or the children have grown up and left home ("empty nest" or permanently childless couples). As Table 3.15 shows, three-fourths (76%) of Guard/Reserve families have children in the home; of the remainder, somewhat more are older families with no children still home (14%) than young childless couples (10%). For the wives of active duty enlisted personnel: about the same proportion have children in the home (77%), fewer are older with no children still at home (7%), and more are young childless couples (17%). Wives of active duty officers have about the same proportion with children in the home (77%), about 12 percent are older with no children still at home, and about 11 percent are young childless couples. These differences are consistent with the data showing Guard/Reserve officers' spouses to be older than enlisted members' spouses.

Overall, then, the data indicate that Guard/Reserve families are in the middle years of family life, with children and family responsibilities that may compete with their Guard/Reserve commitment, potentially causing problems for families, members, or units. Family problems reported as a result of Guard/Reserve participation are discussed in Chapter 6.

Frequent family moves, short periods of residence in different locations, living overseas, and living on military installations are important features of the lives of families of the active duty force. By contrast, part-time Guard/Reserve unit members live in the civilian community of the U.S. and do not have to relocate as a condition of their military careers. Tables 3.16 and 3.17 present data on the residence of Guard/Reserve families. (It should be recalled that this analysis is limited to families in which the husband is a part-time member in a unit and the wife is not in the active duty force.) Among families of part-time Guard/Reserve unit members, three-quarters (74%) live in a house they own or are buying, with most of the rest living in rented quarters (Table 3.16). More officers' families than enlisted members' families own or are buying their own home (88% vs. 71%), probably because of their higher socioeconomic status and, to

Table 3.16. Type of Place and Housing Where Family Lives

| | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| <u>Type of Place</u> | | | |
| In military housing on base/installation | 0.1 % | 0.2 % | 0.1 % |
| In large city (over 250,000) | 11.5 | 13.8 | 11.9 |
| In suburb near large city | 10.6 | 23.9 | 12.9 |
| In medium-sized city (50,000-250,000) | 14.9 | 15.9 | 15.1 |
| In suburb near medium-sized city | 6.3 | 8.3 | 6.7 |
| In small city/town (under 50,000) | 32.7 | 24.2 | 31.2 |
| On farm or ranch | 3.7 | 2.7 | 3.5 |
| In rural area but not on farm or ranch | 20.3 | 11.1 | 18.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19879 | 5311 | 25190 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 398 | 83 | 481 |
| <u>Type of Housing</u> | | | |
| Military housing | 0.1 % | 0.2 % | 0.1 % |
| Owned/being bought | 70.7 | 88.0 | 73.7 |
| Rented for cash | 26.4 | 10.4 | 23.6 |
| Someone else owns or no cash rent | 2.9 | 1.4 | 2.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 20052 | 5360 | 25412 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 402 | 84 | 486 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 1,3,17

Table 3.17. Length of Time Family Has Lived in Present Neighborhood

| Time in Neighborhood | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Less than 1 year | 14.1 % | 10.6 % | 13.5 % |
| 1-2 years | 14.0 | 12.4 | 13.7 |
| 2-3 years | 10.1 | 10.7 | 10.2 |
| 3-5 years | 10.7 | 13.2 | 11.2 |
| 5 years or more | 51.1 | 53.0 | 51.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 20085 | 5357 | 25442 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 403 | 84 | 487 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 2,17

some extent, their somewhat older age. By contrast, only 21 percent of wives of active duty enlisted members and 43 percent of wives of active duty officers live in a house they own or are buying.

One-fourth (25%) of Guard/Reserve families live in a large city (population over 250,000) or suburb near a large city; almost the same proportion (22%) live in a medium-sized (50,000-250,000) city or near-by suburb; and somewhat more (31%) live in a city or town of less than 50,000. In addition, one-fifth (19%) live in a rural area, but not on a farm or ranch; and a small number (4%) live on a farm or ranch. Families of Guard/Reserve officers and enlisted members differ somewhat in their patterns of residence by community size and type. Overall, 38 percent of officers' families live in or near a large city, compared with 22 percent of enlisted members' families; most of this difference is accounted for by the proportions living in suburbs near large cities (24% of officers' families compared with 11% of enlisted members' families). Conversely, enlisted members' families are more likely than officers' families to live in a small city or town (population under 50,000) (33% vs. 24%), or in a rural area (24% vs. 14%). These differences are potentially important for several aspects of Guard/Reserve participation, including travel to activities and family interest and involvement.

Half the Guard/Reserve families (51%) have lived in their present neighborhood for five years or longer, with an additional 21 percent having lived there at least two years (Table 3.17). Officers' families have typically lived in their present neighborhood somewhat longer than enlisted members' families, consistent with the higher proportion who are homeowners and their somewhat older age and longer marriage duration. By contrast only about 38 percent of wives of active duty personnel have lived in the same location for more than two years.

These patterns of home ownership and relatively long-term residence suggest the importance of community in the lives of Guard/Reserve members and the status of the Guard/Reserve as a community-based component of the total force.

E. Summary and Conclusions

In the next chapters we explore different aspects of the relationship of the family to the Guard/Reserve. These include the extent to which families participate in Guard/Reserve activities, the problems members' Guard/Reserve participation causes for the family, the spouse's perceptions of family and community support towards Guard/Reserve, as well as the spouse's support for member participation. The data discussed in the present chapter shed light on the reciprocal relationship between the family and the Guard/Reserve.

Some of the main findings concerning this relationship include:

- o Overall, three-fifths (60%) of male part-time unit members are married. Although the proportion is higher for officers

(79%) than enlisted members (57%), the majority of both are married.

- o With few exceptions, wives of part-time unit members are civilians who have no experience of military service (93%). This fact is important in understanding the family's relationship to the Guard/Reserve and its needs for information or services relating to the member's participation. By contrast, three-fourths (74%) of women members are married to men who currently or formerly served in the active duty force or the reserve components.
- o Most respondent wives of Guard/Reserve members are relatively well-educated women, born in the U.S., and married for some time to the member. The large majority of the families have children. Most appear to be established members of their civilian communities, with half having lived in their neighborhood for five years or more and three-fourths owning or buying their home.
- o Families of officers are somewhat older than families of enlisted members (as measured by wife's age, marriage duration, and family life course stage). On several measures of family socioeconomic status (wife's education, home ownership), officers' families achieve a somewhat higher status than enlisted members' families.
- o The data underline important differences between family situation of the Guard/Reserve and the active duty force. In general, wives of Guard/Reserve members are older, with more who have no children still living at home, fewer who are young childless couples, but about the same proportion who have children living at home. Families of Guard/Reserve members are more likely to live in a house which they own or are buying, and to have lived in the same location for a relatively long period than are families of active duty members.

ENDNOTES

¹The figures for married members in these analyses include those who are maritally separated, following the definition used by DoD. The analyses of spouse and family data for this spouse report are based on cases in which the member currently is in an active marriage, and excludes spouses who are maritally separated. This was done for two reasons: (1) spouses living with the member are regarded as the key ones for the study of the relationship between the family and Guard/Reserve; and (2) the quality of data and response rate from maritally separated spouses would be expected to be lower than those for spouses living with the member. The approach of restricting the spouse analyses to those not maritally separated from the member was also used in the Description of Spouses of Officers and Enlisted Personnel in the U.S. Armed Forces: 1985. A Report Based on the 1985 DoD Surveys of Officer and Enlisted Personnel and Military Spouses (Griffith, et al., 1986).

²The military status variable was constructed hierarchically: spouses who had served in more than one capacity were coded as currently serving if they had both current and prior service; and, within each of these two large groups, they were coded as serving on active duty if they had service in both the active duty force and the reserve components.

³Comparisons to the active duty force are based on data from the 1985 DoD Survey of Military Spouses. The specific data used in the comparisons of family life factors in this chapter are presented in Chapter 3 of Description of Spouses of Officers and Enlisted Personnel in the U.S. Armed Forces: 1985. Supplementary Tabulations from the 1985 Surveys of Officer and Enlisted Personnel and Military Spouses, by J.D. Griffith et al., Research Triangle Institute, 1986.

⁴The analyses of the experience of active duty families, reported in Description of Spouses of Officers and Enlisted Personnel in the U.S. Armed Forces: 1985 (Griffith et al., 1986) classified families with children by the age of the youngest child (0-5, 6-11, 12-17). That classification system could not be applied to the reserve survey data because data were not collected on the age of the youngest child.

4. EMPLOYMENT OF SPOUSES OF GUARD/RESERVE MEMBERS

A. Introduction

Spouses of part-time members in units do not face the problems that spouses of the active duty force do, such as frequent moves, periods of living outside the U.S. and being located in areas that may have limited job opportunities. As the previous chapter indicates, most Guard/Reserve wives are relatively long-term residents of their local community and thus are less likely to have suffered repeated discontinuities in their employment history. Most also live in small to large cities or their suburbs, and most live in the U.S.; thus they are likely to be in better labor markets than many active duty wives. In addition, because they are older and have been married longer than wives of active duty members, they are less likely to have preschool-aged children, and thus would have fewer family problems with employment. Finally, like wives of active duty members, wives of Guard/Reserve members are relatively well-educated: nearly all are high school graduates and many, especially among officers' wives, are college graduates or have education beyond that level; thus, in the absence of external barriers, their employment opportunities should be reasonably good. For the most part, we would expect that wives of part-time Guard/Reserve unit members would be very similar in their employment situation to women of comparable age, education, and family status who are married to men who are not in the military.

This chapter describes the employment and occupations of spouses of part-time Guard/Reserve members. It first looks at wives' labor force participation, type of employment, occupations, and reasons for working. It also compares these with comparable data for wives of active duty personnel from the 1985 DoD Surveys, and, where data are available, to women married to men in the U.S. civilian work force.¹ Next, we briefly describe the employment and occupations of men married to women members in Guard/Reserve units, and compare them with husbands of women in the active duty force. Finally, we discuss the implications of Guard/Reserve spouse employment for participation and family support.

B. Employment of Civilian Wives

Tables 4.1-4.3 describe the employment of Guard/Reserve wives, overall and by educational level and family life course stage.

Overall, two-thirds (66%) of the wives are employed in the civilian labor force, a small number (4%) are unemployed, laid off, or looking for work, and almost a third (30%) are not in the labor force for such reasons as being a student, retired, or a full-time homemaker. Officers' wives appear somewhat less likely to be unemployed (2% vs. 5% for enlisted members' wives), but otherwise the two groups do not differ (Table 4.1). Data by educational level (Table 4.2) show the positive association between education and employment expected on

Table 4.1. Employment Status of Civilian Wives of Members

| Employment Status | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| In civilian labor force, employed | 65.2 % | 67.1 % | 65.5 % |
| In civilian labor force, unemployed | 4.8 | 1.8 | 4.3 |
| Not in labor force | 30.0 | 31.1 | 30.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 20065 | 5369 | 25434 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 402 | 84 | 487 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, SSLF1

Table 4.2. Employment Status of Civilian Wives of Members
by Wife's Educational Level

| Wife's Educational Level / Employment Status | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Less than 12 years | | | |
| In civilian labor force, employed | 42.3 % | 51.7 % | 42.5 % |
| In civilian labor force, unemployed | 7.4 | 3.2 | 7.3 |
| Not in labor force | 50.3 | 45.1 | 50.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1908 | 56 | 1964 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 41 | 1 | 42 |
| High school graduate | | | |
| In civilian labor force, employed | 62.2 % | 58.9 % | 61.9 % |
| In civilian labor force, unemployed | 4.8 | 2.3 | 4.6 |
| Not in labor force | 33.0 | 38.8 | 33.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 9358 | 1095 | 10453 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 187 | 17 | 204 |
| Some college | | | |
| In civilian labor force, employed | 72.5 % | 65.1 % | 71.0 % |
| In civilian labor force, unemployed | 4.0 | 1.8 | 3.5 |
| Not in labor force | 23.5 | 33.1 | 25.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 4652 | 1524 | 6176 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 92 | 24 | 116 |
| College graduate | | | |
| In civilian labor force, employed | 80.8 % | 64.6 % | 73.9 % |
| In civilian labor force, unemployed | 2.6 | 1.9 | 2.3 |
| Not in labor force | 16.5 | 33.5 | 23.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1475 | 1335 | 2810 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 28 | 21 | 49 |
| More than 4 years college | | | |
| In civilian labor force, employed | 86.5 % | 80.6 % | 83.6 % |
| In civilian labor force, unemployed | 2.2 | 1.4 | 1.8 |
| Not in labor force | 11.3 | 18.0 | 14.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1014 | 1187 | 2201 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 19 | 19 | 37 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, SEDUC1, SSLF1

the basis of past research on women's employment: 74 percent of college graduates, compared with 62 percent of high school graduates, have paid jobs; most of the remainder are not in the labor force, with only a few reporting they are unemployed. At all but the lowest educational level, wives of enlisted members appear somewhat more likely than wives of officers to be in the labor force. As we discuss below, this appears to be because more enlisted members' wives work for financial reasons, a result consistent with other evidence of higher socioeconomic status among officers' families than enlisted members' families.

In general, Guard/Reserve wives are employed in roughly the same proportions as the general civilian population of wives of similar age.² Based on 1985 Current Population Survey Data, 64 percent of married women aged 16 to 45 are employed, four percent are unemployed, and 32 percent are not in the labor force. By contrast, the proportion of wives of active duty personnel that are employed is only about 44 percent. As for the Guard/Reserve wives, employment is positively associated with education in the general population. Married women who are college graduates have a similar rate of employment (74%), which is higher than for high school graduates (68%). However, high school graduates in the general population have a slightly higher proportion employed than the Guard/Reserve wives.

Data on Guard/Reserve wives' employment status by family life course stage (Table 4.3) show that the percentage employed is higher among women in the pre-parental (or early childless) (78%) and "empty nest" (or late childless) (74%) years than in the years with children (62%), although even the figure for women with children under 18 is relatively high. In the earlier and later life course stages, officers' wives are somewhat more likely than enlisted members' wives to hold paid jobs, but the two groups are very similar during the years with children. The higher employment among officers' wives in the early and later stages suggests greater interest in employment for intrinsic or career reasons. This issue is explored further in the analyses of wives' reasons for working.

Women in the general population who are young and childless are employed at a higher rate (90%) than Guard/Reserve wives, but for women with children (64%) and older "empty nest" wives (78%) the proportions employed are about the same as for Guard/Reserve wives.

The level of employment of civilian wives of members is presented in Tables 4.4 and 4.5. Among Reserve/Guard members wives in paid employment, two-thirds (66%) work full time, a fourth (27%) work part time, and the remainder (6%) are self-employed (Table 4.4). Women with children are more likely to work part time (30%) than are young women without children (21%), or older childless or empty nest women (20%), as Table 4.5 shows. Officers' wives are somewhat more likely to work part time or be self-employed than are enlisted members' wives, especially when they have children. This may be because officers' wives have education and skills that give them more choice of

Table 4.3. Employment Status of Civilian Wives of Members
by Family Life Course Stage

| Family Life Course Stage / Employment Status | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Wife 29 or younger, no children 18 or under | | | |
| In civilian labor force, employed | 76.7 % | 85.1 % | 77.5 % |
| In civilian labor force, unemployed | 7.0 | 4.1 | 6.7 |
| Not in labor force | 16.3 | 10.7 | 15.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1700 | 233 | 1933 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 46 | 5 | 50 |
| Have children 18 or under | | | |
| In civilian labor force, employed | 62.2 % | 63.2 % | 62.4 % |
| In civilian labor force, unemployed | 4.8 | 1.6 | 4.2 |
| Not in labor force | 33.0 | 35.2 | 33.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 15198 | 4134 | 19332 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 299 | 64 | 363 |
| Wife 30 or older, no children 18 or under | | | |
| In civilian labor force, employed | 72.0 % | 78.7 % | 73.5 % |
| In civilian labor force, unemployed | 3.4 | 2.1 | 3.1 |
| Not in labor force | 24.6 | 19.2 | 23.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 2826 | 924 | 3750 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 51 | 14 | 65 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, LCR1, SSLF1

Table 4.4. Employment Level of Civilian Wives of Members

| Employment Level | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Civilian, employed full-time | 68.1 % | 58.2 % | 66.3 % |
| Civilian, employed part-time | 26.4 | 32.2 | 27.4 |
| Civilian, self-employed | 5.5 | 9.5 | 6.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 13184 | 3579 | 16763 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 262 | 56 | 319 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, SSLF2

Table 4.5. Employment Level of Civilian Wives of Members by Family Life Course Stage

| Family Life Course Stage / Employment Level | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Wife 29 or younger, no children 18 or under | | | |
| Civilian, employed full-time | 76.5 % | 83.4 % | 77.2 % |
| Civilian, employed part-time | 21.7 | 13.9 | 20.9 |
| Civilian, self-employed | 1.8 | 2.6 | 1.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1349 | 201 | 1550 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 35 | 4 | 39 |
| Have children 18 or under | | | |
| Civilian, employed full-time | 65.0 % | 53.1 % | 62.8 % |
| Civilian, employed part-time | 28.7 | 36.9 | 30.2 |
| Civilian, self-employed | 6.3 | 10.0 | 7.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 9597 | 2610 | 12207 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 186 | 41 | 227 |
| Wife 30 or older, no children 18 or under | | | |
| Civilian, employed full-time | 76.1 % | 68.0 % | 74.2 % |
| Civilian, employed part-time | 18.9 | 22.4 | 19.7 |
| Civilian, self-employed | 5.1 | 9.6 | 6.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 2010 | 719 | 2729 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 37 | 11 | 48 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, LCR1, SSLF2

jobs and work conditions and, also, may have less financial need to have a full time job.

The level of employment for Guard/Reserve wives can also be compared with the level for wives in the general civilian population and for wives of active duty personnel. Overall, Guard/Reserve wives appear somewhat more likely to work full time than do general civilian wives (66% vs. 55%) who are in the same age range (16-45) and married to men employed full-time in the civilian labor force. Compared with wives of active duty personnel, Guard/Reserve wives are somewhat more likely to work full time: among wives of enlisted men, 68 percent of Guard/Reserve wives and 61 percent of active duty men's wives work full time; among officers' wives, the corresponding percentages are 58 percent and 54 percent. The differences may reflect differences in employment opportunities, job preferences, or family life course factors. One implication for Guard/Reserve family programs and policies is that a substantial proportion of spouses are employed full time, a factor that needs to be taken into account in planning programs and activities for families.

Analyses of data for wives of active duty personnel showed the importance of federal employment for military wives. This is partly because of the availability of federal employment at military installations, the limited private sector employment opportunities in many locations (especially for wives of members stationed outside the continental U.S. (OCONUS)), and service policies and programs designed to facilitate federal employment for wives of military personnel. The situation for wives of the Guard/Reserve force is very different, however, and this is reflected in their patterns of employment. As would be expected for women who live in civilian communities in the U.S., the great majority of employed wives (94%) are employed in non-federal civilian jobs, with only six percent in federal jobs (Table 4.6). (Women who are self-employed are excluded from this tabulation.) By comparison, 19 percent of wives of active duty enlisted members and 18 percent of wives of officers are employed in federal jobs.

Table 4.7 shows the length of time employed Guard/Reserve wives have worked at their current jobs. At the extremes, one-fifth (21%) have had their current job less than a year, and almost two-fifths (37%) have had this job for five or more years. The remainder have had their job one to two years (17%), two to three years (11%), or three to four years (7%). This relative longevity in their jobs is consistent with the relatively long residence at their current locations, and contrasts with the situation of frequently moved wives of members of the active duty force.

The final table on civilian wives' employment status (Table 4.8) shows their occupational categories. Officers' wives are concentrated in professional (42%) and clerical (24%) occupations, with an additional number (13%) in managerial/administrative jobs. enlisted members' wives are less likely to be in professional (19%) or managerial (8%) positions, and more likely to be in clerical (28%), sales (12%),

Table 4.6. Type of Employment of Civilian Wives of Members

| Type of Employment | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Civilian federal employee | 5.5 % | 5.9 % | 5.6 % |
| Civilian employee, non-federal | 94.5 | 94.1 | 94.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 13184 | 3579 | 16763 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 262 | 56 | 319 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, SSLF3

Table 4.7. Length of Time Worked at Present Job
for Civilian Wives of Members
(Wives Employed in 1985)

| Length of Time | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Less than a year | 22.1 % | 17.0 % | 21.2 % |
| 1-2 years | 17.5 | 16.3 | 17.3 |
| 2-3 years | 10.6 | 11.5 | 10.7 |
| 3-4 years | 6.7 | 8.0 | 6.9 |
| 4-5 years | 6.6 | 7.3 | 6.7 |
| 5-6 years | 6.4 | 6.7 | 6.5 |
| 6-7 years | 4.1 | 3.9 | 4.1 |
| 7 years or more | 26.0 | 29.2 | 26.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 13641 | 3652 | 17293 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 272 | 58 | 330 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,48

Table 4.8. Occupation of 1985 Job for Civilian Wives of Members
(Wives Employed in 1985)

| Occupation | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Had no civilian job in 1985 | 0.8 % | 0.7 % | 0.8 % |
| Professional | 19.1 | 42.4 | 23.2 |
| Managerial/administrative | 8.4 | 13.4 | 9.3 |
| Technical | 3.8 | 5.3 | 4.0 |
| Sales | 12.4 | 8.3 | 11.7 |
| Clerical | 28.2 | 23.6 | 27.4 |
| Crafts | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.3 |
| Security | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.7 |
| Operative | 6.4 | 0.8 | 5.5 |
| Transportation | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.9 |
| Laborer | 4.6 | 0.3 | 3.9 |
| Service | 12.6 | 4.0 | 11.1 |
| Farm laborer | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 13725 | 3681 | 17406 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 275 | 58 | 333 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,47

or service (13%) positions. These differences are consistent with what would be expected on the basis of women's education and family socioeconomic status.

Wives of active duty officers are similarly concentrated in professional (48%), clerical (19%), and managerial/administrative (13%) jobs. Wives of active duty enlisted members are very similar to wives of Guard/Reserve members in their occupational distribution, with the exception that more wives of active duty enlisted members are in sales or technical jobs (25%, compared with 16% for wives of Guard/Reserve members), possibly because of differences in access to jobs as a result of active duty families' experience of frequent moves and living in locations with limited job opportunities.

C. Employed Wives' Reasons for Working

Table 4.9 summarizes the data on factors that made a major contribution to employed wives' decision to work. These data are useful for understanding spouse response to Guard/Reserve participation, including both its financial contribution to the family and its competition for family time and activities. In addition, we can compare Guard/Reserve wives' reported reasons for working with those reported by wives of men in the active duty force, to get a better understanding of the similarities and differences in their family economic circumstances.

Financial reasons for working are cited by a large proportion of Guard/Reserve wives: 64 percent say they made the decision to work because they "needed the money for basic family expenses"; 49 percent say they decided to work because they "wanted extra money to use now"; and 35 percent cite "saving income for the future".³ Career and intrinsic reasons for working are cited by substantially fewer women. Thus, for example: 43 percent say they decided to work for "independence/self esteem", and 30 percent because they "just enjoy working"; whereas 33 percent say it was because they "always planned to work/have a career", and 23 percent cite the desire "to gain experience for a future career".

The similarities and differences in reasons between wives of officers and enlisted members are instructive. Essentially, financial need (to pay basic expenses or have extra money to spend) are more important for enlisted members' wives than officers' wives: 67 percent of enlisted members' wives cite the need for money to pay basic family expenses, compared with 46 percent of officers' wives; and 50 percent of enlisted members' wives, compared with 41 percent of officers' wives, say they wanted extra money to use now. On the other hand, two reasons - always planned to work/have a career (38% vs. 32%) and independence/self esteem (50% vs. 41%) - are cited more often by officers' than enlisted members' wives. Other reasons, including savings, enjoyment, and future career orientation are cited by comparable numbers of officers' and enlisted members' wives.

These data are consistent with the results of the analyses of data from the 1985 DoD Survey of Military Spouses (Griffith et al., 1986),

Table 4.9. Employed Wives' Reasons for Working:
Percentage Who Cite Each Reason as a "Major Contribution"

| Reasons for Working | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Needed the money for basic family expenses | 67.2 % | 45.9 % | 63.5 % |
| Always planned to work/have a career | 32.3 | 37.5 | 33.2 |
| Wanted extra money to use now | 50.5 | 40.9 | 48.8 |
| Saving income for the future | 35.4 | 31.8 | 34.8 |
| Independence/self esteem | 41.0 | 49.9 | 42.6 |
| Just enjoy working | 28.8 | 34.5 | 29.8 |
| To gain experience for a future career | 23.7 | 19.3 | 22.9 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,49

and with data reported earlier in this report on the family and economic situations of officers' and enlisted members' families. The most important finding is the importance of financial need as a reason for working, especially among wives of enlisted men. This is the same pattern found in the active duty spouse survey.

From the point of view of understanding the relationship between the Guard/Reserve and families, the importance of financial reasons for employment among Guard/Reserve wives also suggests that members' Guard/Reserve pay is important for families. This may be an important factor in spouses' support for members' Guard/Reserve participation, and may make spouses more willing to accept the competing demands of members' military duty than might otherwise be the case. These issues will be explored in later chapters.

D. Employment of Civilian Husbands of Women Members of the Guard/Reserve

The final tables in the analysis of spouse employment (Tables 4.10-4.13) describe the labor force status, employment, and occupations of civilian husbands of women part-time members of the Guard/Reserve.

It should be recalled, from the data presented in Table 3.4, that almost half (46%) of women part-time Guard/Reserve members are married to men who are currently serving in the armed forces, either on active duty (18%) or in the reserve components (28%). A number of the husbands in the Guard/Reserve also have civilian jobs, and thus are included in the tabulations for civilian husbands presented below. However, both the number who are currently full-time active duty or Guard/Reserve members and the additional numbers who are former members (28%) show the importance of military experience and work for husbands of women Guard/Reserve members.

As Table 4.10 shows, nearly all civilian husbands have paid employment (87%), with the remainder about equally divided between ones who are unemployed (6%) and ones who are students, retired or not seeking work for other reasons (7%). Of those who are employed (Table 4.11), most (84%) work full time; about eight percent work part time, and the final eight percent are self-employed. Compared with husbands of enlisted women, women officers' husbands are somewhat more likely to be employed (92% vs. 86%) and less likely to be unemployed (2% vs. 6%), but the differences are not large. Officers' husbands also appear to be somewhat more likely to be self-employed (12% vs. 7%), but again the differences are relatively small.

Table 4.12 shows that among civilian husbands in paid employment, 15 percent work for the federal government, a figure considerably higher than that for civilian wives. This greater concentration of civilian husbands in federal employment may reflect two factors: (1) some may be former military personnel who obtained federal civilian jobs after leaving the active duty service; and (2) an additional

Table 4.10. Employment Status of Civilian Husbands of Members

| Employment Status | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| In civilian labor force, employed | 86.2 % | 92.2 % | 87.4 % |
| In civilian labor force, unemployed | 6.3 | 2.3 | 5.5 |
| Not in labor force | 7.4 | 5.5 | 7.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Case: | 770 | 509 | 1279 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 23 | 6 | 29 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, SSLF1

Table 4.11. Employment Level of Civilian Husbands of Members

| Employment Level | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Civilian, employed full-time | 84.9 % | 81.1 % | 84.1 % |
| Civilian, employed part-time | 8.0 | 7.1 | 7.8 |
| Civilian, self-employed | 7.1 | 11.8 | 8.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 611 | 467 | 1148 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 20 | 5 | 25 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, SSLF2

Table 4.12. Type of Employment of Civilian Husbands of Members

| Type of Employment | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Civilian federal employee | 16.0 % | 12.7 % | 15.3 % |
| Civilian employee, non-federal | 84.0 | 87.3 | 84.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 681 | 467 | 1148 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 20 | 5 | 25 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, SSLF3

number may be technicians, and thus civilian employees of the Guard/Reserve.

Finally, data on civilian husbands' occupations (Table 4.13) show a pattern of officer/enlisted differences that is generally similar to but more marked than that apparent for civilian wives' occupations. Husbands of officers are concentrated in professional (30%), managerial/administrative (26%), and technical (15%) positions. Fewer husbands of enlisted women are in professional (12%) or managerial/administrative (15%) positions, with somewhat fewer also in technical positions (12%); a larger number (16% vs. 5% for husbands of officers) are in crafts jobs, additional ones (11%) are laborers, and the remainder are scattered among other occupational categories.

E. Summary and Conclusions

This chapter has examined data on the employment of spouses of part-time unit members. The primary focus has been on wives, but data on husbands of women part-time unit members have also been included. In addition, we have made limited comparisons with wives of members of the active duty force and with the general U.S. population of women who are broadly comparable in age and family situation to wives of military personnel. (The specific comparison group used was women aged 16-45 married to men who are employed.) Some of the main findings of these analyses are:

- o Overall, Guard/Reserve wives are very similar to the general civilian population in their employment: two-thirds are employed,; only a small number (less than 5%) are unemployed; and almost a third are not in the labor force. By contrast, somewhat less than half (44%) of wives of active duty personnel are employed, and more are not in the labor force. The major difference in unemployment is the higher proportion unemployed among wives of active duty enlisted members (12% unemployed); wives of active duty officers are similar to Guard/Reserve wives and the general civilian population in the proportion who report themselves as unemployed.
- o Among employed Guard/Reserve wives, two-thirds work full time, a percentage somewhat higher than for the general civilian population or for wives of members of the active duty force. The high proportion of Guard/Reserve wives who are employed, especially since many of them are employed in full time positions, is an important factor for the Guard/Reserve to take into account in planning family programs and activities.
- o The occupational distribution of Guard/Reserve wives of enlisted and officer personnel are generally what would be expected on the basis of the women's education and family socioeconomic status: officers' wives are concentrated in professional (42%) and clerical (24%) positions, with a smaller number (13%) in managerial/administrative positions; the

Table 4.13. Occupation of 1985 Job for Civilian Husbands of Enlisted Members

| Occupation | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Had no civilian job in 1985 | 0.6 % | 1.0 % | 0.7 % |
| Professional | 11.9 | 29.8 | 15.7 |
| Managerial/administrative | 14.8 | 26.5 | 17.2 |
| Technical | 11.7 | 15.0 | 12.4 |
| Sales | 7.2 | 8.7 | 7.5 |
| Clerical | 5.1 | 0.3 | 4.1 |
| Crafts | 15.9 | 5.0 | 13.6 |
| Security | 5.6 | 4.9 | 5.5 |
| Operative | 5.1 | 1.0 | 4.2 |
| Transportation | 5.5 | 1.5 | 4.7 |
| Laborer | 10.7 | 4.7 | 9.4 |
| Service | 5.1 | 1.4 | 4.3 |
| Farm laborer | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 675 | 453 | 1128 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 20 | 5 | 25 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,47

largest group of enlisted members' wives are in clerical positions (28%), with a smaller proportion in professional jobs (19%), and others in service (13%) or sales (12%) positions. Consistent with their relatively long-term residence in their local communities, many have held their current jobs for long periods: three-fifths have had their job for two years or more, and a fourth have been in the job for seven or more years.

- o Data on wives' reasons for working show the importance of financial reasons, including: money for basic family expenses (cited by 64%); extra money to use now (49%); and saving for the future (35%). Career and intrinsic reasons were also cited, though by fewer women. These include: independence/self esteem (43%); enjoyment of working (30%); and always planned to work/have a career (33%) or experience for a future career (23%). Enlisted members' wives cited financial reasons somewhat more than officers' wives, whereas officers' wives were more likely to give intrinsic or career-related reasons. These patterns are similar to those found for wives of active duty personnel. The differences between officers' and enlisted members' wives are what would be expected on the basis of the higher family socioeconomic status and education of the officers' wives. The importance of financial reasons for spouse employment, for both enlisted members' and officers' wives, suggests that the member's Guard/Reserve pay is likely to be important for many families.
- o Husbands of women part-time Guard/Reserve unit members have a different pattern of employment experience. As noted in Chapter 3, many are current or former members of the armed forces, in either the active duty force or reserve components. The large majority of civilian husbands (87%) are currently employed and, of those, most (84%) work full time. A relatively large proportion (15%) of employed husbands work as civilian employees of the federal government; some of these may be former military personnel now in federal jobs, and some others may be technicians who work for the Guard/Reserve. Employed husbands married to women Guard/Reserve officers tend to be concentrated in professional, managerial/administrative and technical positions; husbands of enlisted women are divided among a number of occupational categories (each with less than one-fifth of husbands), including crafts, managerial/administrative, professional, technical, and laborer.

ENDNOTES

¹The data for wives of active duty military personnel are taken from Chapter 6 of Description of Spouses of Officers and Enlisted Personnel in the U.S. Armed Forces: 1985. Supplementary Tabulations from the 1985 Surveys of Officer and Enlisted Members and Military Spouses, by J.D. Griffith et al., Research Triangle Institute, 1986. Data for other civilian women are from special analyses of the March 1985 Current Population Survey data done by Research Triangle Institute for this study. The population used in this comparison is: wives aged 16-45, married to employed men who are not in the armed forces. Although not a perfect match, this population approximates the age and husband's employment situation represented by the Guard/Reserve.

²Comparisons with Guard/Reserve wives were done using data for women 16-45 in the March 1985 Current Population Survey, married to employed husbands who were not members of the active duty force. The two surveys used somewhat different questions to collect data about employment, but obtained similar measures for use.

³Respondents were asked to indicate the importance of each reason, so the numbers do not sum to 100%.

5. SPOUSE AND FAMILY PARTICIPATION IN GUARD/RESERVE ACTIVITIES

A. Introduction

Spouse and family support are seen as central to Guard/Reserve members' commitment and performance. This chapter and the succeeding chapters examine different aspects of the relationship between the family and the members' participation in the Guard/Reserve. In this chapter we examine: spouse knowledge about programs and activities for family members; spouse interest in information materials and programs; spouse participation in unit programs and activities for families; Guard/Reserve volunteer work by spouses; and factors that prevent participation in family activities. The next chapter (Chapter 6) examines the effects of member Guard/Reserve participation on families; and the final chapter (Chapter 7) analyzes data on spouse and family support for the member's participation.

In these analyses, as in the preceding chapters, tabulations are for civilian wives of part-time Guard/Reserve members in units, unless otherwise indicated.

B. Knowledge of and Interest in Programs and Activities for Family Members

A series of questions asked spouses about their knowledge of and participation in Guard/Reserve programs and activities for family members, and another series asked about their interest in topics that might be included in new Guard/Reserve information materials or programs. In this section we examine the data on spouse knowledge of existing programs and their interest in new information materials/programs; Section C examines the data on spouse participation in programs and activities.

Table 5.1 (detailed in Supplementary Tabulations 5.1a-5.1f) summarizes the data on spouse knowledge of the availability of different programs and activities. With the exception of social events and programs, only a minority of spouses say their husband's unit has these kinds of programs/activities, with a large proportion reporting that they do not know whether such programs exist. Half the spouses (52%) say they know about family oriented social or recreational events and programs; an additional 19 percent say they do not know whether they are available; and 29 percent say their spouse's unit does not have social events.

Few report that they know their husband's unit has programs that provide information on Guard/Reserve participation - ranging from less than 10 percent who say there are meetings about retirement benefits, medical benefits, or meetings for new members, up to 13 percent who say there are meetings about mobilization and 16 percent who report family oriented information programs. The large majority are divided between those who say they do not know whether such events/programs are available and those who say the unit does not have them. This

Table 5.1. Knowledge of Availability of Unit Programs and Activities
by Civilian Wives of Members: Percentage of Spouses
Who Say They Know of Program or Activity

| Knowledge of Programs | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Meetings for families of new unit members | 6.8 % | 6.2 % | 6.6 % |
| Family oriented social events, etc. | 50.8 | 54.9 | 51.5 |
| Family oriented information programs | 15.9 | 18.4 | 16.3 |
| Meetings about reserve medical benefits | 6.7 | 5.6 | 6.6 |
| Meetings about reserve retirement benefits | 7.6 | 6.3 | 7.3 |
| Meetings about mobilization | 13.3 | 11.8 | 13.0 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 6,17

probably reflects a combination of two factors: (1) in a number of cases, the events or programs may not be available at the unit; and (2) in others, spouses may not be aware of events or programs that exist.

These data indicate low knowledge and/or availability of programs and activities for families, especially informational ones. One implication is that special effort is required to ensure that programs are available and that families know about programs designed for them. The components should explore a broad range of program approaches through which to communicate to wives. These could include materials taken home, special briefings for spouses, materials available on video cassettes, movies, or lectures. This is especially important since, as the discussion of the next tables indicates, a number of spouses say they want additional informational programs or materials about the Guard/Reserve.

Table 5.2 presents spouses' interest in receiving materials or attending programs that provide information for family members. These show that spouses are interested in information about the Guard/Reserve mission and the family's role, about benefits, and, to a lesser extent, about the Guard/Reserve organization. Eighty-five percent or more say they are "very interested" or "interested" in information about benefits, including retirement benefits (87%), survivor benefits (87%), and medical benefits (85%). These responses give an indication of the financial importance of Guard/Reserve participation, an issue that we discuss further in Chapter 6.

The Guard/Reserve mission and especially the family's role in the event of mobilization are also important topics to spouses. Eighty-five percent want information on the family's role in the event of mobilization, three-fourths want information on the mission of the member's unit (75%) and the unit's role in mobilization (74%). And, reflecting the impact of Guard/Reserve participation on family life, three-fourths (78%) would like advance schedules for drills and Annual Training/ACDUTRA. (Again the lack of advance schedules and the failure of the unit to adhere to published schedules were matters about which many spouses felt deeply enough to add written comments.) The only topic area that is of relatively low interest to spouses is information on Guard/Reserve organization, and even for this topic, almost half (45%) say they would like information.

For the most part, wives of officers and enlisted members are very similar in their interest in different kinds of informational materials or programs. The major difference is that somewhat more enlisted members' wives than officers' wives are very interested in two types of near-term benefits: educational benefits (38% vs. 26%) and medical benefits (53% vs. 43%). The two groups are similar in their interest in retirement benefits, as well as in information about unit mission and schedule, and the family's role in the event of mobilization.

Table 5.2. Interest in New Information Materials and Programs
among Civilian Wives of Members by Topic:
Percentage Who Are "Very Interested" or "Interested"

| | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| <u>Very Interested</u> | | | |
| Guard/Reserve organization | 14.1 % | 12.2 % | 13.8 % |
| The mission of your spouse's unit | 35.5 | 34.3 | 35.3 |
| The unit's role in mobilization | 37.2 | 39.1 | 37.5 |
| Educational benefits for reservists | 37.5 | 26.4 | 35.6 |
| Medical benefits for reservists | 53.4 | 43.4 | 51.7 |
| Retirement benefits for reservists | 55.4 | 52.4 | 54.9 |
| Survivor benefits for reservists | 53.8 | 52.3 | 53.5 |
| Advance schedules for drills and annual training | 42.5 | 41.0 | 42.2 |
| Family's role in the event of mobilization | 53.0 | 51.3 | 52.7 |
| <u>Interested</u> | | | |
| Guard/Reserve organization | 31.8 % | 30.2 % | 31.5 % |
| The mission of your spouse's unit | 39.6 | 40.1 | 39.7 |
| The unit's role in mobilization | 36.5 | 36.3 | 36.5 |
| Educational benefits for reservists | 35.0 | 31.5 | 34.4 |
| Medical benefits for reservists | 33.3 | 35.4 | 33.7 |
| Retirement benefits for reservists | 32.2 | 33.0 | 32.4 |
| Survivor benefits for reservists | 33.1 | 33.7 | 33.3 |
| Advance schedules for drills and annual training | 36.2 | 35.0 | 36.0 |
| Family's role in the event of mobilization | 32.3 | 33.6 | 32.6 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 9,17

It is interesting to note that large numbers of spouses report wanting informational materials or programs despite the fact that two-thirds (71%) have been married to the member for five years or more (Table 3.11), and half (50%) say the member made the decision to join the Guard/Reserve after the couple's marriage (Table 3.12). These figures on the level of spouse interest in informational materials or programs underline the strength of spouse interest and concern and the importance of seeking ways to communicate effectively with spouses and families, including families of both long-term and recent Guard/Reserve members.

C. Spouse Participation in Guard/Reserve Activities

1. Participation in Programs and Activities for Family Members

The next tables present data on spouse and family participation in programs and activities for family members. Data presented in Table 5.1 showed that relatively few spouses are aware of or have access to these programs, except for social/recreational events. Table 5.3 shows the level of participation among all civilian wives, while Table 5.4 shows the level among those who say that the unit has programs of each kind. As would be expected from the low level of knowledge or availability of programs, the level of participation is generally very low. Although the level of participation is fairly high (ranging from 36% to 77%) among those who know about the programs, in interpreting these numbers it is important to recall that fewer than 15 percent say such programs are available at their husband's unit.

In addition to knowledge of programs and activities, it is important to consider participation in relation to the time or distance from home to unit events. Table 6.1, which is discussed more fully in Chapter 6, shows the length of time spouses report the member has to travel to get to the place where the unit meets or drills. Since unit programs or activities are likely to be held at the same location, this also gives an indication of the travel time that would be involved for families to participate in them. For families of enlisted part-time unit members, about one-third (30%) live within a twenty minute drive of the unit meeting/drill location, and another third (33%) live between 20 and 39 minutes away; in total, four-fifths (80%) of enlisted members' spouses say they live less than an hour from the unit site. Officers' wives typically report longer travel times: only 15 percent say the husband has to travel less than twenty minutes, and one-fourth (27%) travel between 20 and 39 minutes; in total, about three-fifths (62%) of officers' spouses say the travel time is less than one hour. These figures suggest that, even among those who are aware of activities, travel to the unit location may be a significant barrier to participation for a number of families, especially if Guard/Reserve unit activities compete with other activities and demands on family members' time in the home and the local community.

Table 5.3. Participation in Unit Programs and Activities
by All Civilian Wives of Members:
Percentage Who Have Participated At Least Once

| Participation in Programs | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Meetings for families of new unit members | 3.4 % | 4.1 % | 3.6 % |
| Family oriented social events, dinners, etc. | 37.8 | 46.2 | 39.3 |
| Family oriented information programs about Grd/Res | 8.8 | 12.5 | 9.5 |
| Meetings about reserve medical benefits | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Meetings about reserve retirement benefits | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| Meetings about mobilization | 5.8 | 6.0 | 5.8 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 6,17

Table 5.4. Participation in Unit Programs and Activities
by Civilian Wives of Members Who Say Program or Activity is Available:
Percentage Who Have Participated At Least Once

| Participation in Programs | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Meetings for families of new unit members | 43.0 % | 60.4 % | 45.6 % |
| Family oriented social events, dinners, etc. | 75.3 | 84.8 | 77.1 |
| Family oriented information programs about Grd/Res | 54.7 | 67.2 | 57.1 |
| Meetings about reserve medical benefits | 35.8 | 43.9 | 36.9 |
| Meetings about reserve retirement benefits | 34.8 | 41.2 | 35.7 |
| Meetings about mobilization | 42.5 | 49.0 | 43.6 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 6,17

As Table 5.3 shows, with the exception of family oriented social or recreational events, no more than 10 percent of spouses report ever having attended the different types of programs or activities for family members. By contrast, almost two-fifths (39%) have attended social/recreational events one or more times. Programs attended by very few spouses include: family oriented information programs (10%); meetings for families of new unit members (4%); meetings about medical or retirement benefits (3% each); and meetings about mobilization (6%).

Table 5.4 provides data on attendance among those who report that programs or activities of each type are available at their spouse's unit. These range from a high of three-fourths (77%) for social programs/events, down to about one-third for meetings about medical benefits (37%) and retirement benefits (36%). Somewhat more than half (57%) have attended information programs, and more than two-fifths have attended meetings about mobilization (44%). Among those who know about the different types of programs and events, somewhat more officers' wives than enlisted members' wives report having attended one or more times. These and other figures cited below indicate a relatively high level of commitment by officers' wives, considering the problems likely to be posed by the longer travel times they report.

The low percentages of Guard/Reserve wives who have attended these kinds of events or programs contrasts with the large percentages who say they are interested in information materials or programs about these topics, especially about benefits and about mobilization. And, whereas enlisted members' wives are more likely to want information about educational and medical benefits, officers' wives are somewhat more likely to have attended Guard/Reserve events through which they could learn about these topics. These data point to the potential need for enhanced programs and/or methods to facilitate participation by interested spouses and families. To the extent that units have only limited programs, the spouse interest data indicate areas where programs might appropriately be developed. In some cases, lack of information about available programs and materials may be a problem, and this might be addressed through informational materials directed to spouses. Informational materials could directly provide information about topics of interest to spouses, or could notify them of scheduled meetings or programs. In other cases, units may be able to schedule activities at times and locations that would enhance opportunities for spouse and family participation.

2. Volunteer Participation

Tables 5.5-5.7 describe another aspect of spouse Guard/Reserve participation - volunteer work - and compare it with their participation in civilian volunteer work. As Table 5.5 shows, a substantial proportion (42%) of Guard/Reserve members' wives perform volunteer work, either for civilian or Guard/Reserve activities. Most, however, perform only civilian volunteer work (37%), with only five percent performing only Guard/Reserve volunteer work or doing both civilian and Guard/Reserve volunteering. And, whereas Table 5.6 shows

Table 5.5. Volunteer Work in Guard/Reserve and Civilian Activities
by Civilian Wives of Members

| Volunteer Work | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Does Guard/Reserve & civilian volunteer work | 3.1 % | 4.6 % | 3.3 % |
| Does Guard/Reserve volunteer work only | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.4 |
| Does civilian volunteer work only | 34.1 | 53.1 | 37.4 |
| Does no volunteer work | 61.5 | 41.1 | 57.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19161 | 5145 | 24306 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 384 | 81 | 465 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, VOL1

Table 5.6. Volunteer Work in Civilian Activities by Civilian Wives of Members

| Volunteer Work | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| No | 63.0 % | 42.2 % | 59.4 % |
| Yes, frequently (once/week or more) | 12.2 | 26.0 | 14.6 |
| Yes, infrequently | 24.8 | 31.8 | 26.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19200 | 5143 | 24343 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 385 | 81 | 466 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 7,17

Table 5.7. Volunteer Work in Guard/Reserve by Civilian Wives of Members

| Volunteer Work | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| No | 95.6 % | 94.2 % | 95.3 % |
| Yes, frequently (once/week or more) | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| Yes, infrequently | 3.8 | 5.1 | 4.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19380 | 5139 | 24519 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 390 | 81 | 470 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 7,17

that while about one-sixth (15%) of wives frequently do civilian volunteer work, Table 5.7 shows that only one percent say they frequently do Guard/Reserve volunteer work.

As was found for the wives of active duty personnel, more wives of officers than enlisted members are active in volunteer work (59% of Guard/Reserve officers' wives do volunteer work, compared with 39% of enlisted members' wives). Even among officers' wives, however, only six percent do any Guard/Reserve volunteer work; the major difference lies in the much higher proportion who do civilian volunteer work.

It is likely that a substantial proportion of civilian volunteer work is related to children's school or recreational activities, with others doing social service or religious volunteer work. Guard/Reserve volunteer work may be less immediately salient because it is less closely tied to day-to-day family and community life. Additionally, for at least some families the distance or travel time to unit locations is likely to be an additional barrier to volunteer participation. (Travel time to Guard/Reserve unit activities is noted in the preceding section of this chapter and is discussed in Chapter 6.)

Tables 5.8-5.11 present a summary analysis of participation in Guard/Reserve activities by members' wives, overall and by other factors. The outcome measure is whether the spouse reports having ever attended family programs or activities and/or does Guard/Reserve volunteer work.

Table 5.8 shows that about two-fifths (44%) of wives have participated at least once in some Guard/Reserve activity. Data shown earlier (Table 5.3) indicate that, for most, this involved participation in family oriented social or recreational activities. And, as was evident in earlier analyses, wives of officers are somewhat more likely than wives of enlisted members to have participated (50% vs. 42%). Data by family life course stage (Table 5.9) show somewhat lower involvement by younger families with no children than by those at later life stages. This is probably due primarily to the longer duration the older families have spent with the husband as a Guard/Reserve member (and thus, all else being equal, being more likely to have gone to an activity at least once) and, possibly, life course or cohort differences in involvement. The differences are relatively small however, ranging from 40 percent among younger wives with no children up to 45 percent for older wives who have not had children or whose children are over 18.

Table 5.10 presents data on participation by the spouse's employment status. Although it might be expected that the time demands of paid employment would compete with participation in Guard/Reserve activities or volunteer work, these data indicate this is not the case: employed spouses are as likely to have participated as are ones who are unemployed or are not in the labor force.

Table 5.8. Participation in Guard/Reserve Activities and Volunteer Work
by Civilian Wives of Members

| Participation | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Participates in Guard/Reserve activities | 42.0 % | 50.1 % | 43.5 % |
| Does not participate | 58.0 | 49.9 | 56.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19734 | 5295 | 25029 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 395 | 83 | 478 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, ATTEND

Table 5.9. Participation in Guard/Reserve Activities and Volunteer Work
by Civilian Wives of Members by Family Life Course Stage

| Life Course Stage / Participation | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Wife 29 or younger, no children 18 or under | | | |
| Participates in Guard/Reserve activities | 38.3 % | 51.9 % | 39.6 % |
| Does not participate | 61.7 | 48.1 | 60.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1680 | 230 | 1910 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 45 | 5 | 50 |
| Have children 18 or under | | | |
| Participates in Guard/Reserve activities | 42.5 % | 49.7 % | 43.8 % |
| Does not participate | 57.5 | 50.3 | 56.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 14955 | 4074 | 19029 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 294 | 63 | 357 |
| Wife 30 or older, no children 18 or under | | | |
| Participates in Guard/Reserve activities | 43.2 % | 52.5 % | 45.2 % |
| Does not participate | 56.8 | 47.5 | 54.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 2762 | 915 | 3677 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 50 | 14 | 64 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, LCR1, ATTEND

Table 5.10. Participation in Guard/Reserve Activities and Volunteer Work
by Civilian Wives of Members by Employment Status

| Employment Status / Participation | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| In civilian labor force, employed | | | |
| Participates in Guard/Reserves activities | 43.0 % | 51.2 % | 44.4 % |
| Does not participate | 57.0 | 48.8 | 55.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 12930 | 3530 | 16460 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 257 | 56 | 312 |
| In civilian labor force, unemployed | | | |
| Participates in Guard/Reserve activities | 40.8 % | 51.9 % | 41.6 % |
| Does not participate | 59.2 | 48.1 | 58.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 829 | 88 | 917 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 19 | 2 | 21 |
| Not in labor force | | | |
| Participates in Guard/Reserve activities | 40.3 % | 47.8 % | 41.6 % |
| Does not participate | 59.7 | 52.2 | 58.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 5880 | 1669 | 7549 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 118 | 26 | 143 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, SSLF1, ATTEND

From Table 5.11, it appears that those who live in large cities are less likely to have participated than ones who live in smaller places or rural areas. This may reflect differences in the distance to Guard/Reserve activities and, possibly, differences among types of community in the importance of such activities. Again, however, the differences are relatively small, with the percentages ranging from 38 percent for those who live in large cities up to 45-48 percent for those who live in small towns, in rural areas, or on farms or ranches.

3. Factors that Prevent Participation

The preceding analyses of spouse participation in Guard/Reserve activities show that, overall, participation is relatively low, especially in informational activities, despite spouses' expressed interest in information on Guard/Reserve benefits and mission and on the role of the family in the Guard/Reserve. In this section, we present data on the factors that spouses report prevent them from taking part in Guard/Reserve activities as a participant or volunteer (Table 5.12).

The most frequently cited reason for not participating is that there are no family activities available (41%). Only a few (12%) say they do not participate because they are not interested. Other reasons given include: location (17%); not knowing other people (16%); times activities are scheduled (15%); and lack of child care (12%). These reported reasons are consistent with the earlier analyses showing that a substantial proportion report either that activities are not available or that they do not know whether activities are available. These results on reasons for non-participation, taken together with the data on spouse interest, suggest the importance of providing programs and seeking to ensure, through informational activities, scheduling, and other means, opportunities for spouses and families to participate.

D. Summary and Conclusions

This chapter has examined data on spouse and family knowledge, interest, and participation in Guard/Reserve activities. The data show a high level of interest in information and programs, but relatively low participation in any but social/recreational programs. Specific results include:

- o With the exception of social/recreational programs, the majority of spouses report either that, to their knowledge, their husband's unit does not have most family programs or activities, or that they do not know whether the activity is available at the unit. Half the spouses know about family-oriented social or recreational events and programs, although another one-fifth say they do not know even about these events. Less than one-fifth report that their husband's unit has other kinds of programs or events, such as meetings for new unit members, information programs, meetings about mobilization, or about medical benefits or retirement benefits.

Table 5.11. Participation in Guard/Reserve Activities and Volunteer Work by Civilian Wives of Members by Type of Place Where Family Lives

| Type of Place Family Lives / Participation | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| In large city (over 250,000) | | | |
| Participates in Guard/Reserve activities | 35.5 % | 50.4 % | 38.5 % |
| Does not participate | 64.5 | 49.6 | 61.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 2135 | 725 | 2860 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 44 | 11 | 56 |
| In suburb near large city | | | |
| Participates in Guard/Reserve activities | 37.1 % | 47.6 % | 40.5 % |
| Does not participate | 62.9 | 52.4 | 59.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 2165 | 1300 | 3465 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 41 | 20 | 61 |
| In medium-sized city (50,000-250,000) | | | |
| Participates in Guard/Reserve activities | 42.4 % | 51.8 % | 44.1 % |
| Does not participate | 57.6 | 48.2 | 55.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 2830 | 818 | 3648 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 58 | 13 | 71 |
| In suburb near medium-sized city | | | |
| Participates in Guard/Reserve activities | 39.6 % | 45.1 % | 40.8 % |
| Does not participate | 60.4 | 54.9 | 59.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1261 | 433 | 1694 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 25 | 7 | 31 |
| In small city/town (under 50,000) | | | |
| Participates in Guard/Reserve activities | 44.2 % | 51.3 % | 45.1 % |
| Does not participate | 55.8 | 48.7 | 54.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 6268 | 1249 | 7517 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 128 | 20 | 147 |

(continued)

Table 5.11. Participation in Guard/Reserve Activities and Volunteer Work
by Civilian Wives of Members by Type of Place Where Family Lives

| Type of Place Family Lives / Participation | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| On farm or ranch | | | |
| Participates in Guard/Reserve activities | 46.4 % | 54.4 % | 47.5 % |
| Does not participate | 53.6 | 45.6 | 52.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 750 | 133 | 883 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 14 | 2 | 17 |
| In rural area but not on farm or ranch | | | |
| Participates in Guard/Reserve activities | 45.0 % | 53.6 % | 45.9 % |
| Does not participate | 55.0 | 46.4 | 54.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 4047 | 572 | 4619 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 79 | 9 | 88 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 1, 17, ATTEND

Table 5.12. Factors that Prevent Wives' Taking Part
(as Participant or Volunteer) in Guard/Reserve Family Activities

| Factors that Prevent Taking Part | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| NA, no family activities | 41.2 % | 38.1 % | 40.7 % |
| NA, not interested | 12.4 | 12.0 | 12.3 |
| Location | 15.4 | 24.8 | 17.1 |
| Don't know other people | 16.6 | 11.3 | 15.7 |
| Times activities are scheduled | 15.6 | 13.0 | 15.2 |
| Lack of child care | 13.0 | 9.8 | 12.5 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 8,17

The large majority are divided between those who say the unit does not have such events/programs and those who do not know whether they are available.

- o A large proportion of spouses are interested in receiving materials or attending programs that provide information for family members. More than three-fourths are interested in information about benefits, including retirement benefits (87%), survivor benefits (87%), and medical benefits (85%). Large numbers also want other information: 85 percent want information on the family's role in the event of mobilization, 78 percent would like advance schedules for drills and Annual Training/ACDUTRA, 75 percent want information on the mission of the member's unit, and 74 percent want information on the unit's role in mobilization. The topic in which spouses express least interest is information on Guard/Reserve organization, and even on this topic, almost half (45%) say they would like information. The only difference in the interests of spouses of enlisted members and officers is that the former are very interested in two types of near-term benefits: educational benefits and medical benefits.
- o Participation in programs and activities for family members is very low, with the exception of social/recreational programs. Overall, two-fifths have attended social/recreational events one or more times, but only about one-tenth or fewer have ever attended such events as meetings for new family members, information programs, and meetings about such issues as medical benefits, retirement benefits, or mobilization. In part, the low level of participation reflects the low level of knowledge or availability of programs and events. Participation is considerably higher among those who report they know about the programs/activities at the unit, ranging from a high of 77 percent for social/recreational programs, down to about one-third for programs about medical or retirement benefits.
- o The distance to the unit location may be another barrier for at least some families. About one-fifth of enlisted members' families and two-fifths of officers' families live an hour or more away from the unit location.
- o Very few (about 5%) wives of part-time unit members are active in Guard/Reserve volunteer work, although a larger number, especially of officers' wives, do volunteer work in the civilian community. Both the distance to the Guard/Reserve unit location and, possibly, lower salience of Guard/Reserve volunteer work compared with work in the local community may be important factors in this pattern.
- o Participation in family or volunteer activities appears to be somewhat higher among families who live in smaller places or rural areas than among ones living in large cities. This may

reflect differences in distance to Guard/Reserve unit activities, as well as possible differences in community involvement. This is an area where further research appears to be warranted.

- o The reason most frequently reported by spouses for non-participation in Guard/Reserve activities was that no family activities are available (41%). Only a few said they do not participate because they are not interested (12%). Other reasons given include location (17%), not knowing other people (16%), times activities are scheduled (15%), and lack of child care (12%).
- o Taken together, the data on spouse interest in information and programs, the low knowledge or availability of them, and the low rates of participation suggest the value of developing programs and materials that effectively communicate information about the Guard/Reserve and the family's role in relation to it.

6. THE EFFECTS OF GUARD/RESERVE PARTICIPATION ON FAMILIES

A. Introduction

In the preceding chapter, we analyzed spouse and family participation in Guard/Reserve activities. As those data showed, family participation is generally low and many spouses report that programs do not exist or they do not know whether programs are available. The main exception is that a substantial proportion have participated in family oriented social/recreational events. In addition, a number say they are interested in informational materials or programs on several aspects of Guard/Reserve participation, including benefits, the Guard/Reserve mission, and the family's role.

In this chapter we explore another aspect of the relationship between the family and the Guard/Reserve: the effects of members' participation on families. Then, in the final chapter, we relate these and other factors to spouse and family support for the member's Guard/Reserve participation.

The analyses in the present chapter include: several aspects of time use (travel time to Guard/Reserve meetings and drills, member assistance in family child care); problems caused for families by members' Guard/Reserve activities; spouse feelings about the amount of time the member spends on family, Guard/Reserve, and other activities; and the financial contribution made by the member's Guard/Reserve income.

It should be recalled that survey respondents are likely to view Guard/Reserve participation relatively positively, for two major reasons. First, and most important, it would be expected that members whose families experience more conflict or dissatisfaction would be more likely to have left the Guard/Reserve and thus were not surveyed. To address this issue would require data from former Guard/Reserve members and spouses, as well as current ones. Second, some evidence suggests that non-respondents are more detached and indifferent to members' participation, and so respondents may be more positive in their attitudes. For these reasons, the data on effects of members' participation on families (in this chapter) and spouse support for members' participation (Chapter 7) should be viewed as suggestive rather than definitive.

B. Member and Family Time, and Impacts of Time on Family

1. Amount of Member and Family Time

Table 6.1 looks at one aspect of Guard/Reserve time as it affects the family: the length of time it usually takes the member to get from home to the place where his unit trains. For one-fourth (27%) of cases, it takes less than 20 minutes for the member to get to the meeting/drill location, and three-fifths (60%) can get there in less than 40 minutes; at the other extreme, about one-tenth (9%) take

Table 6.1. Length of Time it Takes Member to Get to Place
Where Unit Meets/Drills

| Length of Time | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 0-19 minutes | 29.6 % | 15.2 % | 27.1 % |
| 20-39 minutes | 33.4 | 27.4 | 32.4 |
| 40-59 minutes | 17.2 | 19.8 | 17.7 |
| 1-2 hours | 13.0 | 18.9 | 14.0 |
| 2-3 hours | 4.2 | 9.8 | 5.2 |
| 3-6 hours | 2.3 | 7.2 | 3.1 |
| 6 hours or more | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 20063 | 5355 | 25418 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 402 | 84 | 486 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 5,17

two hours or more, and about one-fourth (23%) take an hour or more. (The percentages are cumulative ones.) Officers are less likely than enlisted members to have a short trip (15% compared with 30% travel less than 20 minutes) and more likely to have a long trip (38% of officers travel an hour or more, compared with 20% of enlisted members). Thus, for some families, especially officers' families, travel times to Guard/Reserve training places may be substantial. In addition, as discussed in Chapter 5, these travel times to unit drill/meeting locations may serve as a barrier to participation in family-oriented programs and activities, for at least some families.

Table 6.2 gives data on travel time by how the member gets to meetings/drills. One question is whether many spouses or other family members spend substantial amounts of time driving the member to Guard/Reserve drills or meetings. The data show this is not the case. For instance, in 46 percent of the families in which the spouse or other family member drives, the travel time is less than 20 minutes, compared with 27 percent of families in which the member drives himself. Thus, travel to Guard/Reserve duty evidently does not take much family time.

Table 6.3 shows data on the usual care giver for the youngest child while the mother works, looks for work, or is in school. The reason for examining these data is that, if the member is a regular provider of significant amounts of family child care, his Guard/Reserve duties may conflict with family ones. As Table 6.3 shows, the member is the usual care giver in only 10 percent of Guard/Reserve families, although he is more likely to be the care giver in families of enlisted members than families of officers (11% vs. 6%). Another 40 percent of families do not have a usual care giver other than the mother because she is not working, looking for work, or attending school. In other families, a non-relative provides child care (21%), whereas in some others (10%), a grandparent is the usual provider. Based on data from Table 6.3, we calculated that the member is the main care giver in 17 percent of families in which the mother is occupied outside the home. Thus, even for families with working mothers, relatively few depend on the member for regular child care.

Wives were also asked how many hours a week the spouse cares for the children while the mother works, looks for work, or is in school. Table 6.4 shows the hours of care the member provides weekly in these families. In two-fifths (41%) of these families, the member does not provide any child care, whereas about one-fifth (18%) of members provide less than a day a week (1-7 hours), and another one-fifth (18%) provide between one and two days a week (8-15 hours). In only eight percent of families does the member provide the equivalent of full time child care (35 hours per week or more). These data, like those on the percentage of members who are main child care providers, suggest that for only a few Guard/Reserve families is the member's service likely to be in conflict with day-to-day child care needs.

Table 6.2. Length of Time it Takes Member to Get to Place
Where Unit Meets/Drills by Who Drives

| Who Drives / Length of Time | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Member drives self | | | |
| 0-19 minutes | 29.8 % | 15.9 % | 27.3 % |
| 20-39 minutes | 33.8 | 28.6 | 32.9 |
| 40-59 minutes | 17.4 | 20.1 | 17.8 |
| 1-2 hours | 12.6 | 19.0 | 13.8 |
| 2-3 hours | 4.0 | 9.5 | 5.0 |
| 3-6 hours | 2.1 | 6.2 | 2.8 |
| 6 hours or more | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 17902 | 4980 | 22882 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 353 | 78 | 431 |
| Spouse/other family member drives member | | | |
| 0-19 minutes | 46.3 % | 21.4 % | 45.5 % |
| 20-39 minutes | 34.6 | 40.1 | 34.8 |
| 40-59 minutes | 11.6 | 13.3 | 11.6 |
| 1-2 hours | 5.5 | 3.1 | 5.4 |
| 2-3 hours | 0.9 | 3.1 | 1.0 |
| 3-6 hours | 0.5 | 19.0 | 1.1 |
| 6 hours or more | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 653 | 29 | 682 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 16 | 1 | 17 |
| Other arrangement | | | |
| 0-19 minutes | 18.1 % | 4.6 % | 16.3 % |
| 20-39 minutes | 28.8 | 8.9 | 26.1 |
| 40-59 minutes | 19.3 | 18.5 | 19.2 |
| 1-2 hours | 20.7 | 19.0 | 20.4 |
| 2-3 hours | 7.6 | 15.6 | 8.7 |
| 3-6 hours | 4.6 | 20.4 | 6.7 |
| 6 hours or more | 0.9 | 12.9 | 2.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1405 | 313 | 1718 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 31 | 5 | 35 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 4,5,17

Table 6.3. Who Usually Cares for Youngest Child
While Wife Works, Looks for Work, or Attends School

| Who Cares for Youngest Child | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Not working/looking for work/in school | 39.3 % | 44.4 % | 40.2 % |
| My spouse | 11.1 | 6.5 | 10.3 |
| Child's brother/sister over 15 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Child's brother/sister under 15 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 2.6 |
| Child's grandparent(s) | 11.3 | 5.0 | 10.2 |
| Other relative of child | 4.2 | 1.4 | 3.7 |
| Child cares for self | 7.9 | 10.1 | 8.3 |
| Non-relative | 20.2 | 26.1 | 21.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 13233 | 3586 | 16819 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 262 | 56 | 318 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,41

Table 6.4. Weekly Hours of Child Care by Member
While Wife Works, Looks for Work, or Attends School

| Weekly Hours of Child Care | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| None | 39.1 % | 50.4 % | 41.0 % |
| 7 hours or less | 17.3 | 23.4 | 18.3 |
| 8-15 hours | 18.9 | 15.5 | 18.3 |
| 16-34 hours | 16.1 | 8.5 | 14.9 |
| 35-59 hours | 7.3 | 1.8 | 6.4 |
| 60 or more hours | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 8105 | 2031 | 10136 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 161 | 32 | 193 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,44

2. Impact of Guard/Reserve Time on the Family

Table 6.5 summarizes spouses' responses to questions about the extent of problems that different features of Guard/Reserve participation cause for the spouse and family. For each feature, the percentage given is those who say it is a "serious problem" or "somewhat of a problem". (The corresponding Supplementary Tabulations, 6.5a-6.5j, give the responses in more detail.)

Overall, a substantial minority report that the different features of Guard/Reserve service are a problem for the spouse and family. These range from a high of 32 percent for drills on such special days as Mother's Day or Easter, down to a low of 14 percent for absence for weekend drills. A number are reported as problems by 20-25 percent of wives: unscheduled Guard/Reserve activities (24%); family emergencies when the member is on Guard/Reserve duty (23%); scheduling family vacations (23%); absence for annual training/ACDUTRA (22%); and time away from the spouse (21%) or from the children (20%).¹ Besides absence for weekend drills, the only time factors reported as a problem by fewer than 20 percent of wives are time away from the member's civilian job (19%), and absence for extra time spent at Guard/Reserve (16%).

One implication of these data is that regularly scheduled time, which families can plan for, is less disruptive than unscheduled activities or other activities that involve conflicts with special family needs - special days, emergencies, and vacations. Several factors are mentioned as problems by a substantial proportion of spouses - up to one-third for drills on special days. This underlines the potential conflict between Guard/Reserve duties and family responsibilities and needs, and the need for informational programs or other approaches to ameliorate the perceived conflict.

In examining the data on family problems, it should also be noted that there are important differences between wives of enlisted members and wives of officers in their report of family problems caused by the member's Guard/Reserve work. The two are generally similar in their perceptions of conflicts at special times (e.g., special family days or family emergencies) and problems because of unscheduled activities though officers' wives are somewhat more likely to report these as problems. In other areas, however, officers' wives are substantially more likely to report problems, by differences of eight percentage points or more. These include: absence for weekend drills; extra time spent at the Guard/Reserve; and time away from the spouse and children.

These differences may be attributable to several factors, including: the greater time and distance the officers travel to Guard/Reserve activities; greater time spent by officers than enlisted members on Guard/Reserve duties; and, possibly, different family life expectations associated with socioeconomic differences between wives of officers and enlisted members.

Table 6.5. Extent of Problems Caused for Family
 by Guard/Reserve Participation:
 Percent Who Say It Is a Serious Problem or Somewhat of a Problem

| Problem | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Absence for weekend drills | 12.9 % | 20.6 % | 14.3 % |
| Absence for annual training | 21.0 | 26.8 | 22.0 |
| Absence for extra time spent at Guard/Reserve | 14.2 | 24.9 | 16.1 |
| Time away from civilian job due to Guard/Reserve | 18.5 | 23.6 | 19.4 |
| Time away from children due to Guard/Reserve | 17.9 | 31.2 | 20.2 |
| Time away from spouse due to Guard/Reserve | 19.6 | 28.3 | 21.1 |
| Drills on special days | 31.4 | 35.2 | 32.1 |
| Unscheduled Guard/Reserve activities | 23.3 | 26.6 | 23.9 |
| Scheduling family vacations | 21.9 | 28.5 | 23.1 |
| Family emergencies when member on Grd/Res duty | 23.4 | 23.3 | 23.4 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,68

The next tables provide data on spouses' assessment of members' time use on Guard/Reserve and other activities.

First, as Table 6.6 indicates, one-fifth (20%) of wives think the member works harder during his time at the Guard/Reserve than at his regular job, while about half (46%) say he works about equally hard, and relatively few (13%) say he works less hard. The remainder say they do not know. A few say the question does not apply because the member is a full-time reservist.²

Asked how they feel about the amount of time the member spends on different activities (Table 6.7), more than four-fifths (84%) of spouses say he spends about the right amount of time on Guard/Reserve activities, virtually none (2%) say he spends too little, and the remaining 14 percent say he spends too much. Considerably more officers' wives than enlisted members' wives say the husband spends too much time on Guard/Reserve activities (26% vs. 12%), a result that is consistent with the finding that more officers' than enlisted members' wives say their Guard/Reserve duty causes a variety of problems for the family.

Other data in Table 6.7 allow us to compare wives' perception of members' Guard/Reserve time with other uses of time. A large proportion of wives say their husband does not spend enough time on leisure activities (54%) or family activities (50%) and, as might be expected, few say the husband spends too much time on family (less than 1%) or on leisure (5%). Civilian jobs, like Guard/Reserve activities, are typically seen as taking about the right amount of time (78%) or too much time (20%), not too little time. Officers' wives are more likely than enlisted members' wives to say the member spends too much time on the civilian job (26% vs. 19%), although the difference is smaller than for Guard/Reserve activities. And, as might be expected from the data on Guard/Reserve and job time, officers' wives are more likely than enlisted members' wives to say the husband spends too little time on leisure activities (66% vs. 52%); the difference is in the same direction but is smaller for family activities (54% vs. 49%).

Overall, these data on family problems and time use point to the conflicts between Guard/Reserve and family responsibilities. Family life is seen by wives as, to some extent, negatively affected by Guard/Reserve participation, and competition for limited family and leisure time is evident. Although these are reasons for some concern and for encouragement of policies to improve the "fit" between family and Guard/Reserve life, it is also important to examine the benefits of Guard/Reserve participation as these are perceived by the spouse, in order to understand the balance of costs and benefits associated with participation and to understand sources of both conflict and support for the member's participation.

Table 6.6. Spouse Perception of How Hard Member Works
During Time at Guard/Reserve

| Spouse Perception | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Works harder than at civilian job | 20.0 % | 21.6 % | 20.3 % |
| Works about the same as on civilian job | 44.3 | 54.3 | 46.1 |
| Works less than at civilian job | 13.2 | 10.4 | 12.7 |
| Does not apply, full-time reservist | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.6 |
| Don't know | 20.9 | 11.9 | 19.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19803 | 5300 | 25103 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 397 | 83 | 481 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,69

Table 6.7. Spouse Feelings about the Amount of Time Member Spends on Different Activities *

| Activity / Spouse Feelings | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Civilian Job | | | |
| Spends too much time | 18.7 % | 26.5 % | 20.1 % |
| Spends about right amount of time | 78.8 | 71.8 | 77.5 |
| Doesn't spend enough time | 2.6 | 1.7 | 2.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 18532 | 5095 | 23627 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 369 | 80 | 448 |
| Family Activities | | | |
| Spends too much time | 0.3 % | 0.2 % | 0.3 % |
| Spends about right amount of time | 50.5 | 45.6 | 49.6 |
| Doesn't spend enough time | 49.2 | 54.2 | 50.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19456 | 5247 | 24703 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 390 | 82 | 472 |
| Leisure Activities | | | |
| Spends too much time | 5.5 % | 2.5 % | 5.0 % |
| Spends about right amount of time | 42.5 | 31.8 | 40.6 |
| Doesn't spend enough time | 52.0 | 65.7 | 54.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19232 | 5239 | 24471 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 385 | 82 | 467 |
| Guard/Reserve Activities | | | |
| Spends too much time | 11.7 % | 26.4 % | 14.2 % |
| Spends about right amount of time | 86.2 | 73.2 | 83.9 |
| Doesn't spend enough time | 2.1 | 0.4 | 1.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19231 | 5228 | 24459 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 385 | 82 | 467 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,70

* Excludes responses of "Does not apply" for each activity

C. Financial Aspects of Guard/Reserve Participation

Table 6.8 and Supplementary Tabulations 6.8a-6.8g show the contribution wives say the member's Guard/Reserve income makes to family finances, overall and by the wife's employment status. Spouses were asked about the contribution this income makes to several aspects of the family financial situation: meeting basic expenses; extra money to use now; and savings for the future. We analyzed these items separately, and also created a composite measure of financial impact, which indicates whether the spouse said the income made a major contribution to one or more of these.

As the last line of Table 6.8 indicates, half the spouses (54%) say the member's Guard/Reserve income makes a major contribution to one or more aspects of the family's financial situation. Nearly a third say the member's Guard/Reserve income makes a major contribution to meeting basic expenses (31%) or to having extra money to use now (32%), and about half that number (16%) say it makes a major contribution to savings for the future. Although there are some differences between officers' and enlisted members' wives, they are moderate in size: fewer officers' wives say the income makes a major contribution to meeting basic expenses (26% vs. 32%), whereas more say it contributes to having extra money to use now (35% vs. 31%) or savings (25% vs. 15%). Except for meeting basic expenses, which is cited as a major contribution of the member's Guard/Reserve income by more wives who say they are unemployed or looking for work (43%) than for employed wives (30%) or ones who are not in the labor force (25%), the wife's labor force status is not strongly related to her evaluation of the contribution the husband's Guard/Reserve income makes. One conclusion this suggests is that, while the financial contribution of Guard/Reserve participation is important to families, for the most part it is not a substitute for income from the wife's work.

Table 6.9 shows, also, that 22 percent of the wives say the member's Guard/Reserve participation is a problem for his pay and promotion chances at his civilian job, although a large proportion (64%) say this is not a problem. Only five percent say they don't know whether it is a problem.

D. Summary and Conclusions

This chapter has examined the effects of members' Guard/Reserve participation on families, focusing on spouse and family time, problems with participation, and financial effects. Major findings include:

- o Travel time to the place where the member's unit meets or drills can be substantial, especially for officers: one-fifth (20%) of enlisted members and two-fifths (38%) of officers travel an hour or more to get there. This can add substantially to the time that Guard/Reserve participation takes from leisure, family, or other activities.

Table 6.8. Contribution of Member's Guard/Reserve Income:
Percentage of Wives Who Say Income Makes a "Major Contribution"

| Contribution | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Meeting basic expenses | 32.5 % | 25.6 % | 31.3 % |
| Having extra money for now | 30.8 | 35.2 | 31.5 |
| Savings for the future | 14.6 | 25.1 | 16.4 |
| Family finances (combined) | 53.5 | 57.9 | 54.2 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,60,FINIMP

Table 6.9. Extent of Problems Caused for Family
by Guard/Reserve Participation: Effects on Pay and Promotion at Civilian Job
due to Guard/Reserve Duty

| Extent of Problem | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Serious problem | 4.9 % | 3.4 % | 4.7 % |
| Somewhat of a problem | 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.3 |
| Slight problem | 10.4 | 10.1 | 10.4 |
| Not a problem | 64.2 | 65.5 | 64.4 |
| Does not apply | 8.2 | 9.4 | 8.4 |
| Don't know | 4.9 | 4.5 | 4.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19704 | 5283 | 24987 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 396 | 83 | 479 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,68

- o At the same time, the data suggest that the member's participation has relatively little effect on two aspects of routine family time use: few spouses or other family members drive the member to duty or drill meetings, so family time is not taken in driving the member; and only a few members regularly provide child care while the mother is at work or school, so Guard/Reserve participation is unlikely to disrupt regular child care arrangements.
- o At least some features of Guard/Reserve participation cause significant problems for a substantial number of families. Most frequently cited as a problem (by 32% of spouses) is the member's participation in drills on special days, such as Mother's Day or Easter. About one-fifth to one-fourth cite unscheduled Guard/Reserve activities, family emergencies when the spouse is on Guard/Reserve duty, scheduling family vacations, absence for Annual Training/ACDUTRA, and time away from the spouse or children. Less frequently cited are two features: absence for weekend drills; and absence for extra time spent at the Guard/Reserve. These results suggest that regularly scheduled activities, which families can plan for, are less disruptive than unscheduled activities, or than ones that can create conflicts with special family needs - such as special days, family emergencies, and vacations.
- o Officers' wives are more likely than enlisted members' wives to report that a number of aspects of the member's Guard/Reserve participation create problems for the family, especially time away from the children and spouse, weekend drills, and extra time spent at the Guard/Reserve. These differences may reflect several factors, including greater time spent by officers in Guard/Reserve duties and travel and, possibly, differences between officers' and enlisted members' wives in family life expectations. Whatever the reason, the data make clear that officers' spouses perceive more problems with Guard/Reserve participation than do spouses of enlisted members.
- o Spouses' feelings about the amount of time members spend on Guard/Reserve activities, their civilian job, and family and leisure activities also indicate conflict between Guard/Reserve and family participation, especially for families of officers. Whereas most spouses say the member spends about the right amount of time or too much time on Guard/Reserve activities and on his civilian job, half say he spends too little on leisure activities (54%) or family activities (50%). And officers' wives are more likely than enlisted members' wives to say the member spends too much time on Guard/Reserve activities (26% vs. 12%), and too little on leisure activities (66% vs. 52%) or family activities (54% vs. 49%).

- o Guard/Reserve participation makes a major contribution to the family financial situation, for both enlisted members' and officers' families. Half the spouses (54%) say the member's Guard/Reserve income makes a major contribution to one or more aspects of the family's financial situation. Nearly a third (31%) say it contributes to meeting basic family expenses or to having extra money to use now (32%), and about half that number (16%) say it makes a major contribution to savings for the future. Enlisted members' wives are slightly more likely than officers' wives to say that the Guard/Reserve income makes a major contribution to meeting basic expenses, and slightly less likely to say it provides savings, or extra money to use now, but overall the differences are modest in size, and the overall picture is one of considerable similarity between the two spouse groups in their perception of the positive financial impact of the member's Guard/Reserve participation.

- o Twenty-two percent of the wives say that the member's Guard/Reserve participation is a problem because of its effect on his pay and promotion at his civilian job, with five percent considering it a serious problem. The majority say this is not a problem.

ENDNOTES

¹Time away from children is reported by fewer wives than time away from the wife because some families have no children. If only families with children were included, time away from children would be more frequently mentioned.

²This may happen for one of several reasons, including: either the spouse or the records may be in error; or, in some cases, the member is a technician. Since technicians are also drilling members, the respondent may have marked both response, but only the first (drilling members) was coded. In any event, only a small number of cases is affected.

7. SPOUSE AND FAMILY SUPPORT FOR MEMBER'S GUARD/RESERVE PARTICIPATION

A. Introduction

The final set of questions about family Guard/Reserve relationships concerns family and community support for member's Guard/Reserve participation. On the one hand, the Guard/Reserve has major effects on family life, through its financial and other contributions to the family, the competition it gives to family and leisure time, and the social/recreational activities it provides for families. On the other hand, family support is often seen as a key component factor in members' commitment to the Guard/Reserve, their successful performance of their duties, and their retention.

In this chapter we examine several aspects of support: the spouse's sense of community support for the member's participation; couple agreement on the member's career plans; spouse perception of reasons for the member's continuing participation in the Guard/Reserve; spouse satisfaction with different features of the member's participation in the Guard/Reserve; the spouse's overall attitude toward the member's participation; and the relationship between member and spouse satisfaction with his participation.

B. Community Support

Spouses were asked their opinion of how different groups/individuals in the community view the member's participation in the Guard/Reserve. These data (Table 7.1 and Supplementary Tabulations 7.1a-7.1e) show a high proportion who believe others view the member's participation favorably. Families are perceived as supportive of the member's participation: half the wives say the member's relatives (49%) and the wife's relatives (50%) are very favorable to his participation; and less than five percent say either family is somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable.

Neighbors' views are also generally perceived as favorable (26% very favorable, 20% somewhat favorable) or unknown (24%); few wives believe the neighbors view the member's Guard/Reserve participation unfavorably (1%). For the most part, the wives believe the member's civilian boss and civilian co-workers are favorable to his participation: 45 percent believe the boss is favorable (22% very favorable, and 22.5% somewhat favorable); and similar proportions believe co-workers are very favorable (19%) or somewhat favorable (24%). Civilian bosses are the category whose views are most likely to be perceived as unfavorable by the wives (14%), with about half as many (7%) seeing civilian co-workers' views as unfavorable. For bosses and co-workers, as for neighbors, a substantial minority of wives say they do not know their views (20% for bosses, 22% for co-workers).

Table 7.1. Spouse's View of Support for Member's Guard/Reserve Participation:
Percentage Who View Support As "Very Favorable"

| View of Support | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Support by neighbors | 25.6 % | 27.5 % | 26.0 % |
| Support by spouse's relatives | 49.0 | 53.2 | 49.7 |
| Support by member's relatives | 47.5 | 56.9 | 49.1 |
| Support by member's civilian boss | 22.1 | 23.9 | 22.4 |
| Support by member's civilian co-workers | 18.7 | 20.2 | 19.0 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 10,17

Table 7.2. Spouse's View of Community Support for Member's
Guard/Reserve Participation

| | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| <u>Family and Neighborhood Support</u> | | | |
| Favorable | 59.7 % | 59.7 % | 59.7 % |
| Neither | 34.6 | 34.5 | 34.6 |
| Unfavorable | 5.6 | 5.8 | 5.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19989 | 5349 | 25338 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 401 | 84 | 485 |
| <u>Workplace Support</u> | | | |
| Favorable | 39.2 % | 42.1 % | 39.7 % |
| Neither | 44.5 | 42.1 | 44.1 |
| Unfavorable | 16.3 | 15.9 | 16.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19796 | 5322 | 25118 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 397 | 83 | 480 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, FAMSUPP, EMPSUPP

Table 7.2 presents summary measures of perceived community support. Measures were created for overall degree of support in the work place (from bosses and co-workers) and local community (spouse and member relatives and neighbors). For each measure, support status was coded as favorable if all sources were very or somewhat favorable; unfavorable if one or more was unfavorable; and neutral otherwise. The findings for these measures confirm the pattern found for the separate support sources. Overall, three-fifths (60%) of spouses say relatives and neighbors are favorable to the husband's Guard/Reserve participation, and two-fifths (40%) say there is a favorable attitude in the work place; only a small minority (6%) say there are any unfavorable family or neighborhood attitudes, and 16 percent say there is some unfavorable perception in the work place. Thus, both the individual and composite measures indicate that wives of Guard/Reserve members perceive the local community as favorable to the member's participation, with few reporting unfavorable views from these sources.

C. Career Agreement

Tables 7.3-7.5 present data on a different aspect of support: the wife's report of how well she and her husband agree on his military and civilian career plans. Spouses were asked to rate their level of agreement on a scale from 1 (very well) to 7 (not well at all). The results indicate very high perceived agreement: 57 percent of wives rate the couple's agreement on the husband's military career plans very high (a rating of 1), whereas only eight percent rate their degree of agreement at the low end of the scale (a rating of 5 to 7) (Table 7.3); as many or more (61%) rate their agreement on his civilian career plans as very high, with only six percent rating it as low as 5 to 7 (Table 7.4). The percentage saying there is high couple agreement on the member's career plans is higher for officers' wives than enlisted members' wives (63% vs. 56% for military career plans, and 70% vs. 60% for civilian career plans), but both are at high levels. And, as Table 7.5 shows, agreement on one type of career plans is strongly associated with agreement on the other. For example, among wives who say the couple agrees very well on the husband's civilian career plans, three-fourths (77%) also say they agree very well on his military career plans, with only four percent rating their agreement as low as 5 to 7.

D. Spouse Satisfaction with Member's Guard/Reserve Participation

1. Spouse Perception of Reasons for Member's Participation in Guard/Reserve

An important issue relative to spouse support for Guard/Reserve participation is the spouse's understanding of the member's reasons for participation. Spouses were asked how much each of a set of factors contributed to the member's most recent decision to stay in the Guard/Reserve. These data are shown in two forms: (1) for each factor, the percentage who said it made a major contribution to the decision is shown in Table 7.6; and (2) Table 7.7 shows the percentage who reported it was a major contribution for each category of reasons.

Table 7.3. How Well Member and Spouse Agree on Member's Military Career Plans

| How Well Member and Spouse Agree | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 1= very well | 55.9 % | 62.6 % | 57.1 % |
| 2 | 17.8 | 19.1 | 18.0 |
| 3 | 9.4 | 7.7 | 9.1 |
| 4 | 8.6 | 4.9 | 8.0 |
| 5 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 3.2 |
| 6 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.8 |
| 7= not well at all | 3.1 | 1.6 | 2.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19854 | 5309 | 25163 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 398 | 83 | 481 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,57

Table 7.4. How Well Member and Spouse Agree on Member's Civilian Career Plans

| How Well Member and Spouse Agree | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 1= very well | 59.5 % | 70.0 % | 61.3 % |
| 2 | 17.0 | 17.4 | 17.1 |
| 3 | 8.3 | 6.2 | 8.0 |
| 4 | 8.6 | 3.6 | 7.7 |
| 5 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 2.4 |
| 6 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 1.2 |
| 7= not well at all | 2.7 | 0.7 | 2.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19824 | 5295 | 25119 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 397 | 83 | 480 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,56

Table 7.5. How Well Member and Spouse Agree
on Member's Civilian and Military Career Plans

| Agree on Civilian Plans / Agree on Military Plans | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 1= Very well | | | |
| Very well | 76.8 % | 78.3 % | 77.1 % |
| 2 | 9.1 | 11.0 | 9.5 |
| 3 | 5.7 | 4.5 | 5.4 |
| 4 | 3.9 | 2.8 | 3.7 |
| 5 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| 6 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.9 |
| Not well at all | 2.1 | 1.2 | 1.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 12132 | 3712 | 15844 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 236 | 58 | 294 |
| 2 | | | |
| Very well | 25.0 % | 25.7 % | 25.1 % |
| 2 | 50.8 | 50.5 | 50.8 |
| 3 | 10.5 | 11.2 | 10.7 |
| 4 | 6.8 | 4.8 | 6.4 |
| 5 | 2.9 | 3.9 | 3.1 |
| 6 | 1.9 | 2.5 | 2.0 |
| Not well at all | 2.1 | 1.4 | 2.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 3322 | 925 | 4247 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 67 | 14 | 82 |
| 3 | | | |
| Very well | 24.9 % | 25.6 % | 25.0 % |
| 2 | 20.0 | 23.9 | 20.6 |
| 3 | 33.7 | 34.2 | 33.7 |
| 4 | 10.8 | 9.7 | 10.7 |
| 5 | 6.1 | 3.6 | 5.8 |
| 6 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.1 |
| Not well at all | 2.3 | 1.0 | 2.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1585 | 315 | 1900 |
| Total Personnel (in 1000's) | 33 | 5 | 38 |

(continued)

Table 7.5. How Well Member and Spouse Agree
on Member's Civilian and Military Career Plans

| Agree on Civilian Plans / Agree on Military Plans | | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 4 | Very well | 22.2 % | 27.1 % | 22.6 % |
| | 2 | 14.5 | 20.8 | 15.0 |
| | 3 | 9.4 | 8.7 | 9.3 |
| | 4 | 39.9 | 32.7 | 39.4 |
| | 5 | 7.0 | 4.3 | 6.8 |
| | 6 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 3.1 |
| | Not well at all | 3.8 | 2.9 | 3.7 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | Number of Cases | 1559 | 186 | 1745 |
| | Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 34 | 3 | 37 |
| 5 | Very well | 25.3 % | 24.6 % | 25.2 % |
| | 2 | 16.0 | 9.4 | 15.3 |
| | 3 | 10.9 | 16.0 | 11.4 |
| | 4 | 13.6 | 17.6 | 14.0 |
| | 5 | 23.9 | 24.6 | 24.0 |
| | 6 | 6.6 | 4.9 | 6.5 |
| | Not well at all | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.7 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | Number of Cases | 471 | 73 | 544 |
| | Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 10 | 1 | 11 |
| 6 | Very well | 20.8 % | 19.4 % | 20.6 % |
| | 2 | 16.0 | 24.1 | 16.9 |
| | 3 | 13.5 | 2.7 | 12.2 |
| | 4 | 11.3 | 13.8 | 11.6 |
| | 5 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 6.1 |
| | 6 | 25.4 | 24.1 | 25.2 |
| | Not well at all | 7.0 | 10.3 | 7.4 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | Number of Cases | 225 | 44 | 269 |
| | Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 5 | 1 | 6 |

(continued)

Table 7.5. How Well Member and Spouse Agree
on Member's Civilian and Military Career Plans

| Agree on Civilian Plans / Agree on Military Plans | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 7= Not well at all | | | |
| Very well | 37.2 % | 36.4 % | 37.1 % |
| 2 | 8.0 | 8.1 | 8.0 |
| 3 | 5.4 | 3.3 | 5.3 |
| 4 | 12.1 | 3.1 | 11.7 |
| 5 | 3.7 | 10.3 | 4.0 |
| 6 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 2.5 |
| Not well at all | 31.0 | 38.8 | 31.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 452 | 33 | 485 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 11 | 1 | 11 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,56,57

Table 7.6. Contribution of Factors to Member's Most Recent Decision to Stay in Guard/Reserve: Percentage Who Say Factor Made a "Major Contribution"

| Contribution of Factors | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Getting credit toward military retirement | 63.0 % | 74.2 % | 65.0 % |
| Pride in accomplishments in the Guard/Reserve | 48.4 | 54.8 | 49.5 |
| Serving the country | 46.7 | 51.3 | 47.5 |
| Needed the money for basic family expenses | 37.8 | 28.2 | 36.2 |
| Promotion opportunities | 34.1 | 45.3 | 36.0 |
| Wanted extra money to use now | 32.9 | 28.6 | 32.2 |
| Just enjoyed the Guard/Reserve | 32.1 | 35.1 | 32.6 |
| Challenge of military training | 24.8 | 23.6 | 24.6 |
| Serving with the people in the unit | 22.8 | 21.3 | 22.5 |
| Saving income for the future | 17.4 | 22.4 | 18.3 |
| Travel/'get away' opportunities | 15.5 | 12.2 | 14.9 |
| Obtain training to help get a civilian job | 12.0 | 4.6 | 10.7 |
| Opportunity to use military equipment | 12.7 | 10.2 | 12.3 |
| Using educational benefits | 10.0 | 5.2 | 9.1 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,76

Table 7.7. Types of Factors Spouse Says Made a "Major Contribution" to Member's Most Recent Decision to Stay in the Guard/Reserve

| Contributing Factors | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Military career/retirement | 66.7 % | 77.6 % | 68.6 % |
| Intrinsic/personal benefits | 51.2 | 57.4 | 52.3 |
| Financial benefits | 48.6 | 44.2 | 47.9 |
| Service to country | 46.7 | 51.3 | 47.5 |
| Social/recreational benefits | 30.6 | 28.4 | 30.2 |
| Military skills/training/experience | 27.0 | 26.9 | 26.9 |
| Skills/training related to civilian employment | 17.4 | 8.4 | 15.8 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17, RSNPATR, RSNFIN, RSNTRN, RSNCAR, RSNSOLD, RSNSOC

The factors most frequently cited were credit toward military retirement (65%), pride in his accomplishments in the Guard/Reserve (50%) and serving the country (48%). These were followed by promotion opportunities (36%), needing the money for basic family expenses (36%), just enjoying the Guard/Reserve (33%), and wanting extra money to use now (32%). Only a small number said that obtaining training in a skill that would help get a civilian job (11%) or educational benefits (9%) made a major contribution to the decision. Similarly, the opportunity to use military equipment (12%) or opportunities to travel or "get away" (15%) were not frequently cited as having made a major contribution.

The responses by categories of factors (Table 7.7) provide a useful overview of reasons for participation. Most frequently mentioned (69%) were career reasons (retirement benefits, promotion opportunities); three categories that were similar in their frequency of mention were intrinsic or personal benefits (pride in accomplishments, enjoyment of Guard/Reserve participation) (52%), service to country (48%), and financial benefits (money for basic expenses, to use now, or to save) (48%). Much less frequently cited were social/recreational reasons (serving with people in the unit, travel or "get away" opportunities) (30%), military skills training (opportunity to use military equipment, challenge of military training) (27%) and training related to civilian employment opportunities (using educational benefits, obtaining skills training that would help get a civilian job) (16%).

There are some differences by the husband's officer or enlisted status. Military career reasons are more often mentioned by wives of officers than enlisted members (78% vs. 67%), and skill training to help get a civilian job is more often mentioned by enlisted members' wives (17% vs. 8%). For the most part, however, the differences are small, suggesting that wives of both groups share the same perception of the husband's reasons for Guard/Reserve participation. Moreover, the reasons most frequently cited by both officers' and enlisted members' wives are ones that are likely to be highly valued and to give strong justification for participation: military career and retirement credit; service to country; pride and enjoyment; and financial benefits. We would expect that this perception of the member's participation would be associated with positive attitudes toward his participation. In the next sections, we look first at data on spouse satisfaction with specific features of his participation, and, next, at her overall attitude toward it.

2. Satisfaction with Features of Member's Participation in the Guard/Reserve

Spouses were asked their level of satisfaction (from very satisfied to very dissatisfied) with different features of the member's Guard/Reserve participation. Table 7.8 shows the percentage satisfied, neutral, and dissatisfied with each.

Table 7.8. Spouse's Level of Satisfaction with Features of Member's Participation in Guard/Reserve

| Spouse's Level of Satisfaction | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Opportunity to Serve One's Country | | | |
| Satisfied | 74.4 % | 76.9 % | 74.8 % |
| Neither | 23.9 | 22.4 | 23.7 |
| Dissatisfied | 1.7 | 0.7 | 1.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19768 | 5282 | 25050 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 396 | 83 | 479 |
| Military Pay and Allowances | | | |
| Satisfied | 63.9 % | 81.9 % | 67.0 % |
| Neither | 22.1 | 12.1 | 20.4 |
| Dissatisfied | 13.9 | 6.0 | 12.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19836 | 5286 | 25122 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 397 | 83 | 480 |
| Military Retirement Benefits | | | |
| Satisfied | 61.0 % | 72.4 % | 62.9 % |
| Neither | 30.3 | 21.7 | 28.9 |
| Dissatisfied | 8.7 | 5.9 | 8.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19679 | 5262 | 24941 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 394 | 82 | 477 |
| Acquaintances/Friendships | | | |
| Satisfied | 55.9 % | 54.3 % | 55.6 % |
| Neither | 39.1 | 41.5 | 39.5 |
| Dissatisfied | 5.1 | 4.1 | 4.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19764 | 5287 | 25051 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 396 | 83 | 479 |

(continued)

Table 7.8. Spouse's Level of Satisfaction with Features of Member's Participation in Guard/Reserve

| Spouse's Level of Satisfaction | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Time Required at Guard/Reserve Activities | | | |
| Satisfied | 54.8 % | 46.6 % | 53.4 % |
| Neither | 33.8 | 34.1 | 33.9 |
| Dissatisfied | 11.4 | 19.3 | 12.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19692 | 5275 | 24967 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 394 | 83 | 477 |
| Opportunities for Education/Training | | | |
| Satisfied | 38.4 % | 29.1 % | 36.8 % |
| Neither | 48.4 | 62.1 | 50.8 |
| Dissatisfied | 13.1 | 8.8 | 12.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19642 | 5265 | 24907 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 393 | 83 | 476 |
| Other Military Privileges | | | |
| Satisfied | 27.2 % | 30.9 % | 27.8 % |
| Neither | 47.9 | 46.3 | 47.6 |
| Dissatisfied | 25.0 | 22.8 | 24.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19687 | 5273 | 24960 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 394 | 83 | 477 |
| Unit Social Activities | | | |
| Satisfied | 22.0 % | 22.6 % | 22.1 % |
| Neither | 57.5 | 62.3 | 58.3 |
| Dissatisfied | 20.5 | 15.1 | 19.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19649 | 5264 | 24913 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 393 | 83 | 476 |

(continued)

Table 7.8. Spouse's Level of Satisfaction with Features of Member's Participation in Guard/Reserve

| Spouse's Level of Satisfaction | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Commissary Privileges | | | |
| Satisfied | 21.7 % | 19.3 % | 21.3 % |
| Neither | 40.8 | 39.5 | 40.6 |
| Dissatisfied | 37.5 | 41.2 | 38.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19692 | 5272 | 24964 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 394 | 83 | 477 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,77

Several features are sources of satisfaction for large percentages of Guard/Reserve wives: the opportunity to serve the country (75%); military pay and allowances (67%); and military retirement benefits (63%). Other features that many wives report satisfaction with are: acquaintanceships or friendships (56%); and the time required at Guard/Reserve activities (53%). For several other features, lower percentages satisfied are accompanied by relatively large numbers who are neutral, probably because the features are not available or known, or are not very important to the spouse (e.g., social activities, educational benefits). In one case, commissary privileges, where there was considerable dissatisfaction, policy changes since the survey was conducted have changed the situation so that the data are no longer relevant.

Similarities and differences in the views of officers and enlisted members' wives are consistent with earlier findings and other data. More officers' wives than enlisted members' wives are satisfied with military pay and allowances (82% vs. 64%) and with military retirement benefits (72% vs. 61%), which is consistent with differences in pay and benefits. Fewer officers' wives are satisfied with the time required at Guard/Reserve activities (47% vs. 55%), as might be expected from the larger proportion who say that Guard/Reserve activities cause problems for the family and that the member spends too much time on Guard/Reserve activities. And enlisted members' wives, more of whom say skills training is important, are more satisfied with opportunities for education/training (38% vs. 29%). In major areas, including the opportunity to serve the country and friends/acquaintances, the two groups do not differ, however, underlining the commonality of the Guard/Reserve experience.

3. Overall Attitude to Member's Participation

Finally, the survey asked spouses how favorable their overall attitude is toward the member's participation in the Guard/Reserve. In these tables, we first give the overall level for all spouses, and then examine the relationship of a variety of factors - financial importance of Guard/Reserve income, spouse employment, spouse participation in Guard/Reserve activities, community support, family problems attributed to participation, and the member's reasons for participation - to how favorably the spouse regards his participation.

Overall (Table 7.9), the large majority of spouses are very favorable (54%) or somewhat favorable (31%) to the member's participation, with only a few saying they are somewhat or very unfavorable (7%); moreover, officers' and enlisted members' wives are very similar in their responses to this question.

When the data are examined by other factors, several findings are evident. As Table 7.10 shows, the percentage very favorable is:

- o higher among those who say the member's income makes a major contribution to family finances than among those who say it does not (59% vs. 48%);

Table 7.9. Spouse's Overall Attitude Toward Member's Participation
in Guard/Reserve

| Spouse's Overall Attitude | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Very favorable | 53.3 % | 55.7 % | 53.7 % |
| Somewhat favorable | 30.6 | 30.8 | 30.6 |
| Neither favorable or unfavorable | 9.3 | 6.8 | 8.8 |
| Somewhat unfavorable | 4.8 | 5.3 | 4.8 |
| Very unfavorable | 2.1 | 1.5 | 2.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 19893 | 5295 | 25188 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 399 | 83 | 482 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,78

Table 7.10. Spouse's Overall Attitude Toward Member's Participation
in Guard/Reserve by Family Factors:
Percentage Whose Attitude is "Very Favorable"

| Factor | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Contribution of member's Guard/Reserve income | | | |
| Major contribution | 58.7 % | 60.1 % | 58.9 % |
| Less than major contribution | 47.1 | 49.8 | 47.5 |
| Spouse employment status | | | |
| In civilian labor force, employed | 53.2 % | 56.5 % | 53.8 % |
| In civilian labor force, unemployed | 55.4 | 61.6 | 55.8 |
| Not in labor force | 53.0 | 53.5 | 53.1 |
| Spouse participation in Guard/Reserve activities | | | |
| Participates | 56.4 % | 59.7 % | 57.0 % |
| Does not participate | 51.0 | 51.8 | 51.1 |
| Sense of family/neighbor support | | | |
| Favorable | 62.7 % | 64.7 % | 63.1 % |
| Neither favorable nor unfavorable | 40.6 | 44.9 | 41.4 |
| Unfavorable | 30.9 | 27.2 | 30.3 |
| Sense of workplace support | | | |
| Favorable | 66.3 % | 67.6 % | 66.5 % |
| Neither favorable nor unfavorable | 46.2 | 47.7 | 46.5 |
| Unfavorable | 41.2 | 45.3 | 41.8 |
| Whether participation causes serious problems | | | |
| Serious problems | 32.3 % | 30.9 % | 32.0 % |
| No serious problems | 60.0 | 64.3 | 60.7 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,78,FINIMP,SSLF1,ATTEND,FAMSUPP,EMPSUPP,FAMPROBS

- o not related to spouse employment status;
- o higher among spouses who participate in Guard/Reserve activities or volunteer work than among those who do not participate (57% vs. 51%);
- o strongly related to perceived family/community support for the member's participation (ranging from 63% among those who perceive support, to 41% who feel it is more neutral, and 30% among those who perceive some negative feeling); and similarly for perceived work place support (the corresponding figures are 66%, 46% and 42%); and
- o negatively related to the perception that Guard/Reserve participation causes serious problems for the family (32% among those who report serious problems vs. 61% among those who do not say there are serious problems because of Guard/Reserve participation).

The spouse's view of the importance of different types of reasons for the member's participation is also related to the favorableness of her view of his participation. As Table 7.11 shows, the percentage very favorable is:

- o much higher among those who say service to country made a major contribution to his decision to participate than among those who do not (67% vs. 42%) and among ones who say personal/intrinsic reasons (pride, enjoyment) were important than among those who do not cite them (68% vs. 38%);
- o higher among wives who say military career reasons (retirement benefits, promotion) were important (59% vs. 42%);
- o higher among those who report military skills/experience were important reasons than among others (70% vs. 48%);
- o higher among those who cite social/recreational reasons for the member's participation (67% vs. 48%); and
- o higher among those who say financial reasons made a major contribution to the decision to participate (56% vs. 51%).

Taken together, these findings underline the importance of several kinds of member and family factors for favorable spouse attitudes toward participation. These include the sense of community support, spouse participation in activities, the relation of member Guard/Reserve participation to valued individual, family, and national goals, and the sense that personal, material, and other benefits result from participation. It is also important to note that one factor - the sense that Guard/Reserve participation causes serious problems for the family - is negatively related to spouse favorableness to member participation.

Table 7.11. Spouse's Overall Attitude Toward Member's Participation
in Guard/Reserve by Reasons for Participation:
Percentage Whose Attitude is "Very Favorable"

| Reason / Importance of Reason | Spouse of Enlisted Member | Spouse of Officer | Total |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Service to country | | | |
| Major contribution | 66.2 % | 67.9 % | 66.6 % |
| Less or no contribution | 42.1 | 43.6 | 42.4 |
| Personal/intrinsic reasons | | | |
| Major contribution | 67.8 % | 68.5 % | 67.9 % |
| Less or no contribution | 38.3 | 39.1 | 38.4 |
| Military career reasons | | | |
| Major contribution | 59.6 % | 57.4 % | 59.1 % |
| Less or no contribution | 40.7 | 50.7 | 42.0 |
| Military skill/training reasons | | | |
| Major contribution | 69.3 % | 70.8 % | 69.6 % |
| Less or no contribution | 47.5 | 50.6 | 48.0 |
| Social/recreational reasons | | | |
| Major contribution | 66.8 % | 66.2 % | 66.7 % |
| Less or no contribution | 47.4 | 51.9 | 48.2 |
| Financial reasons | | | |
| Major contribution | 56.0 % | 57.7 % | 56.3 % |
| Less or no contribution | 50.7 | 54.5 | 51.4 |

Source: Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 17,78,RSNPATR,RSNPER,RSNCAR,RSNSOLD,RSNSOC,RSNFIN

E. Member Satisfaction with Guard/Reserve Participation

The final analysis examines the relationship between the spouse's overall attitude toward the member's participation in the Guard/Reserve and the member's overall satisfaction with his participation. Data for this analysis came from the reports of both members of surveyed couples. The study surveyed a sample of Guard/Reserve members and their spouses. A couple data file was created by merging the responses of married members and their spouses. The data for the analysis of satisfaction with Guard/Reserve participation come from the independent, self-reported information provided by each partner. This approach allows us to examine the relationship between members' and spouses' satisfaction directly, at the level of the couple unit. The questions asked were, for the spouse, "What is your overall attitude toward your spouse's participation in the Guard/Reserve?", and, for the member, "Overall, how satisfied are you with your participation in the Guard/Reserve?" The spouse attitude variable has five categories, running from "very favorable" to "very unfavorable"; the member satisfaction variable has seven categories, running from "very dissatisfied" to "very satisfied". Because of the importance of pay grade, pay grade is also included in the tables. Table 7.12 presents data for enlisted Guard/Reserve members, and Table 7.13 presents data for officers. For the present analyses, the outcome measure we consider is the percentage of members who are in the top two categories (6 and 7) on satisfaction with their Guard/Reserve participation.

First, the totals for Tables 7.12 and 7.13 show: (1) satisfaction is slightly higher for officers than enlisted members (61% vs. 55%); and (2) within each group, satisfaction is somewhat higher among senior than junior members. Next, the totals by spouse attitude category show an effect of spouse attitude within each group: the more favorable the spouse attitude toward the member's participation, the higher his satisfaction with his participation. Among enlisted men, the percentage satisfied ranges from a high of 63 percent among those whose wives are very favorable to their participation, down to 34 percent among those whose wives are very dissatisfied. Among officers, the corresponding range is from 68 percent down to 41 percent.

Although it is not possible to demonstrate a simple causal relationship between spouse attitude and member satisfaction, the strong positive association between the two factors points to the importance of spouse satisfaction with the member's Guard/Reserve participation, and lends support to programs and policies that support the spouse and family of members of the reserve components.

F. Summary and Conclusions

This chapter examines several aspects of support for the member's Guard/Reserve participation. These include: spouse sense of community support for participation; couple agreement on the member's career plans; spouse perception of member's reasons for continuing participation; spouse satisfaction with aspects of Guard/Reserve participation; the spouse's attitude toward the member's participation;

Table 7.12. Member Satisfaction with Guard/Reserve Participation
by Spouse Satisfaction and Pay Grade for Enlisted Personnel

| Spouse Satisfaction / Member Satisfaction | E1-E4 | E5-E9 | Total |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Very favorable | | | |
| 1 (very dissatisfied) | 4.4 % | 4.2 % | 4.2 % |
| 2 | 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.7 |
| 3 | 5.1 | 4.0 | 4.4 |
| 4 | 13.0 | 8.7 | 10.0 |
| 5 | 16.0 | 14.5 | 15.0 |
| 6 | 27.9 | 32.0 | 30.7 |
| 7 (very satisfied) | 29.3 | 33.2 | 32.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1787 | 7718 | 9505 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 68 | 150 | 218 |
| Somewhat favorable | | | |
| 1 (very dissatisfied) | 3.8 % | 2.6 % | 3.0 % |
| 2 | 4.9 | 3.9 | 4.3 |
| 3 | 8.1 | 6.4 | 7.0 |
| 4 | 18.6 | 14.2 | 15.7 |
| 5 | 22.1 | 19.3 | 20.3 |
| 6 | 26.1 | 33.3 | 30.8 |
| 7 (very satisfied) | 16.4 | 20.2 | 18.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 1098 | 4142 | 5240 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 42 | 80 | 123 |
| Neither favorable or unfavorable | | | |
| 1 (very dissatisfied) | 3.8 % | 3.9 % | 3.9 % |
| 2 | 8.7 | 5.5 | 6.8 |
| 3 | 8.0 | 7.3 | 7.6 |
| 4 | 24.4 | 16.6 | 19.8 |
| 5 | 20.7 | 18.2 | 19.2 |
| 6 | 22.1 | 29.9 | 26.8 |
| 7 (very satisfied) | 12.2 | 18.6 | 16.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 379 | 1176 | 1555 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 15 | 23 | 38 |

(continued)

Table 7.12. Member Satisfaction with Guard/Reserve Participation
by Spouse Satisfaction and Pay Grade for Enlisted Personnel

| Spouse Satisfaction / Member Satisfaction | E1-E4 | E5-E9 | Total |
|--|--------|-------|--------|
| Somewhat unfavorable | | | |
| 1 (very dissatisfied) | 7.5 % | 3.8 % | 5.2 % |
| 2 | 9.1 | 3.1 | 5.3 |
| 3 | 12.4 | 7.9 | 9.6 |
| 4 | 25.3 | 18.4 | 21.0 |
| 5 | 18.5 | 18.4 | 18.5 |
| 6 | 18.3 | 29.5 | 25.2 |
| 7 (very satisfied) | 8.9 | 18.9 | 15.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 198 | 605 | 803 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 8 | 12 | 20 |
| Very unfavorable | | | |
| 1 (very dissatisfied) | 14.9 % | 8.3 % | 11.8 % |
| 2 | 7.6 | 8.8 | 8.2 |
| 3 | 9.5 | 8.3 | 8.9 |
| 4 | 26.9 | 14.0 | 20.9 |
| 5 | 16.5 | 14.8 | 15.7 |
| 6 | 11.2 | 27.9 | 19.0 |
| 7 (very satisfied) | 13.2 | 18.0 | 15.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 113 | 199 | 312 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 5 | 4 | 9 |
| Total | | | |
| 1 (very dissatisfied) | 4.7 % | 3.7 % | 4.1 % |
| 2 | 5.3 | 3.8 | 4.3 |
| 3 | 6.9 | 5.3 | 5.8 |
| 4 | 17.1 | 11.5 | 13.4 |
| 5 | 18.6 | 16.4 | 17.1 |
| 6 | 25.6 | 32.0 | 29.9 |
| 7 (very satisfied) | 21.8 | 27.2 | 25.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 3575 | 13840 | 17415 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 138 | 270 | 408 |

Source: Enlisted Questionnaire: Q. 4,125 Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 78

Table 7.13. Member Satisfaction with Guard/Reserve Participation
by Spouse Satisfaction and Pay Grade for Officers

| Spouse Satisfaction / Member Satisfaction | W1-W4 | 01-03 | 04 or higher | Total |
|--|-------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| Very favorable | | | | |
| 1 (very dissatisfied) | 3.7 % | 2.6 | 4.5 | 3.6 |
| 2 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 3.3 | 3.9 |
| 3 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 2.8 | 3.1 |
| 4 | 6.0 | 8.8 | 4.6 | 6.6 |
| 5 | 13.5 | 17.0 | 12.4 | 14.5 |
| 6 | 36.0 | 37.9 | 37.5 | 37.6 |
| 7 (very satisfied) | 33.5 | 25.6 | 34.8 | 30.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 346 | 1145 | 1517 | 3008 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 5 | 21 | 23 | 48 |
| Somewhat favorable | | | | |
| 1 (very dissatisfied) | 1.9 % | 2.2 | 2.9 | 2.5 |
| 2 | 7.6 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 4.5 |
| 3 | 5.9 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 7.1 |
| 4 | 6.7 | 12.4 | 8.6 | 10.1 |
| 5 | 17.6 | 21.7 | 21.2 | 21.1 |
| 6 | 47.5 | 36.4 | 39.5 | 38.9 |
| 7 (very satisfied) | 12.8 | 15.9 | 16.7 | 15.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 188 | 611 | 786 | 1585 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 3 | 12 | 12 | 26 |
| Neither favorable or unfavorable | | | | |
| 1 (very dissatisfied) | 0.6 % | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.3 |
| 2 | 14.4 | 11.3 | 2.3 | 7.8 |
| 3 | 18.7 | 8.5 | 4.4 | 7.6 |
| 4 | 21.5 | 16.2 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| 5 | 18.7 | 23.9 | 18.3 | 21.2 |
| 6 | 14.3 | 27.1 | 34.6 | 29.3 |
| 7 (very satisfied) | 11.9 | 10.4 | 21.5 | 15.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 30 | 161 | 154 | 345 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 |

(continued)

Table 7.13. Member Satisfaction with Guard/Reserve Participation
by Spouse Satisfaction and Pay Grade for Officers

| Spouse Satisfaction / Member Satisfaction | W1-W4 | 01-03 | 04 or higher | Total |
|--|-------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| Somewhat unfavorable | | | | |
| 1 (very dissatisfied) | 3.4 % | 0.5 | 3.2 | 1.9 |
| 2 | 2.8 | 4.2 | 6.1 | 4.8 |
| 3 | 3.4 | 14.3 | 8.0 | 10.6 |
| 4 | 14.3 | 21.8 | 15.2 | 18.3 |
| 5 | 16.0 | 29.1 | 17.9 | 23.2 |
| 6 | 45.3 | 18.2 | 37.8 | 28.9 |
| 7 (very satisfied) | 14.7 | 12.0 | 11.7 | 12.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 32 | 106 | 118 | 256 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Very unfavorable | | | | |
| 1 (very dissatisfied) | 2.8 % | 5.1 | 5.0 | 4.9 |
| 2 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 6.5 | 5.7 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 3.8 | 5.1 |
| 4 | 2.8 | 22.8 | 2.4 | 13.5 |
| 5 | 50.1 | 26.0 | 30.4 | 29.4 |
| 6 | 44.4 | 15.5 | 33.9 | 24.6 |
| 7 (very satisfied) | 0.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 16.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 8 | 40 | 36 | 84 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | | | | |
| 1 (very dissatisfied) | 3.0 % | 2.4 | 3.8 | 3.1 |
| 2 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 3.6 | 4.4 |
| 3 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 4.5 | 5.0 |
| 4 | 7.4 | 11.5 | 7.0 | 9.0 |
| 5 | 15.6 | 19.9 | 15.9 | 17.7 |
| 6 | 39.3 | 35.0 | 37.9 | 36.8 |
| 7 (very satisfied) | 24.4 | 20.6 | 27.2 | 24.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of Cases | 604 | 2063 | 2611 | 5278 |
| Total Personnel(in 1000's) | 8 | 39 | 40 | 87 |

Source: Officer Questionnaire: Q. 4,125 Spouse Questionnaire: Q. 78

and the relationship between spouse attitude and member satisfaction with Guard/Reserve participation. Major findings include:

- o For the most part, spouses perceive community views of the member's Guard/Reserve participation as favorable or very favorable. Half the spouses say the member's relatives (49%) and the wife's relatives (50%) are very favorable to his participation; half (46%) say that neighbors' attitudes are at least somewhat favorable; and similar proportions think the member's civilian boss (45%) and civilian co-workers (43%) are at least somewhat favorable. For the most part, spouses do not believe others have unfavorable views of the member's participation; the highest percentage seen as unfavorable is civilian bosses (14%), followed by seven percent for co-workers.
- o The majority of spouses rate the couple's level of agreement on the member's career plans as very high (57% for military career plans, and 61% for civilian career plans). Additionally, agreement on one area of career plans is strongly associated with agreement on the other.
- o Spouses were asked what factors contributed to the member's most recent decision to stay in the Guard/Reserve. The most frequently categories of reasons were: military career (retirement benefits, promotion opportunities - 69%); intrinsic or personal benefits (pride in accomplishments, enjoyment of Guard/Reserve participation - 52%); service to country (48%); and financial benefits (money for basic expenses, to use now, or to save - 48%). Much less frequently cited were social/recreational reasons (serving with people in the unit, travel or "get away" opportunities - 30%); military skills training (opportunity to use military equipment, challenge of military training - 27%); and training related to civilian employment opportunities (using educational benefits, obtaining skills training that would get a civilian job - 16%). For the most part, spouses of enlisted members and officers cited the same reasons for participation. The main difference was the greater emphasis by officers' wives on military career reasons (78% vs. 67%), and the emphasis by enlisted members' wives on skill training to get a civilian job (17% vs. 8%).
- o Spouses expressed satisfaction with a number of aspects of the member's Guard/Reserve participation, including: the opportunity to serve the country (75%); military pay and allowances (67%); military retirement benefits (63%); acquaintanceships or friendships (56%); and the time required at Guard/Reserve activities (53%). Differences between officers' and enlisted members' wives are evident for only a few aspects, and these are generally consistent with other findings on differences between their experience and perceptions. Most notably, more officers' wives than enlisted members'

wives are satisfied with military pay and allowances (82% vs. 64%) and with military retirement benefits (72% vs. 61%), while fewer officers' wives are satisfied with the time required at Guard/Reserve activities (47% vs. 55%).

- o Overall, the large majority of spouses are very favorable (54%) or somewhat favorable (31%) to the member's Guard/Reserve participation; officers' and enlisted members' wives are very similar; and only a few wives (7%) say they are somewhat or very unfavorable to his participation.
- o When the data on spouse attitudes are examined by other factors, the proportion favorable to the member's participation is positively related to: the spouse's sense that the member's income makes a major contribution to family finances; spouse participation in Guard/Reserve activities or volunteer work; and perceived family/community support for the member's participation. It is negatively related to the perception that Guard/Reserve participation causes serious problems for the family.
- o Spouse favorableness to member participation is also positively associated with high importance of different reasons for his continuing participation, including: service to the country; personal/intrinsic reasons (pride, enjoyment); career reasons (retirement benefits, promotion); financial reasons; military skills/experience; and social/recreational reasons.
- o Data for couples show that favorable spouse attitudes to the member's Guard/Reserve participation are positively associated with member satisfaction with his participation. Conversely, members whose spouses have neutral or unfavorable attitudes are much less likely to have highly favorable views of their own participation.

Taken together, these data underline the importance of member, family, and community factors for favorable spouse attitudes toward the member's Guard/Reserve participation, and of the spouse's attitude in relation to the member's satisfaction.