

AD-A219 701

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

STUDY
PROJECT

SOLE-PARENTS AND THEIR IMPACT ON READINESS

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL CHARLEY MARINO, JR.

DTIC
ELECTE
MAR 27 1990
S E D

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

9 FEBRUARY 1990



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

90 03 26 051

UNCLASSIFIED

USAWC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER

SOLE-PARENTS AND THEIR IMPACT ON READINESS

AN INDIVIDUAL STUDY PROJECT

by

Lieutenant Colonel Charley Marino, Jr., AG

Colonel Danny L. Crawford, FA
Project Advisor

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public
release; distribution is unlimited.**

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013
9 February 1990

UNCLASSIFIED

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

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Sole-Parent Soldiers and Their Impact on Readiness		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Study Project
7. AUTHOR(s) LTC Charley Marino, Jr.		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Same		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE February 1990
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 104
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Congress recently has asked the Secretary of Defense to provide a full accounting of the number of sole-parents in the military. The underlying reason for this request is a growing fear that sole-parents may not be willing to deploy because of concern for their children. This study examines the impact that sole-parents, and to a limited extent dual-military parents, have on readiness. Presented is an		

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

historical summary of the sole-parent issue in the Army, a review of pertinent literature and previous studies which dispel the myth that the sole-parent issue is female dominated, and an examination of the systems which the Army uses to account for sole-parents. In addition, the study shows that the family care plan system is seriously flawed because of lack of commander emphasis, and that child care in the military, although greatly improved in recent years, has yet to meet the needs of sole and dual-military parents.

... military family ...

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Charley Marino, Jr., LTC, AG

TITLE: Sole-Parents and Their Impact on Readiness

FORMAT: Individual Study Project

DATE: 9 February 1990 PAGES: 101 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

Congress recently has asked the Secretary of Defense to provide a full accounting of the number of sole-parents in the military. The underlying reason for this request is a growing fear that sole-parents may not be willing to deploy because of concern for their children. This study examines the impact that sole-parents, and to a limited extent dual-military parents, have on readiness. Presented is an historical summary of the sole-parent issue in the Army, a review of pertinent literature and previous studies which dispel the myth that the sole-parent issue is female dominated, and an examination of the systems which the Army uses to account for sole-parents. In addition, the study shows that the family care plan system is seriously flawed because of lack of commander emphasis, and that child care in the military, although greatly improved in recent years, has yet to meet the needs of sole and dual-military parents.

Approved For	
SECRET	☒
CONFIDENTIAL	☐
RESTRICTED	☐
Unclassified	☐

Index
100

A-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.	ii
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Study Objectives.	3
Limitations	3
Assumptions	4
Definitions	4
Background.	5
II. SOLE-PARENTS AND THEIR IMPACT ON READINESS	10
Review of Literature.	10
III. PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH DETERMINING	
THE NUMBER OF SOLE-PARENTS IN THE ARMY.	16
IV. FAMILY CARE PLANS: A BROKEN SYSTEM . . .	21
V. CHILD CARE - A GROWING NEED FOR	
IMPROVING READINESS	25
VI. SURVEY OF FORMER COMMANDERS	30
Purpose of the Survey	30
Analysis of Responses: Sole-Parents. . .	32
Analysis of Responses: Dual-Military	
Parents	39
Analysis of Responses: Child Care	
Facilities.	42
VII. CONCLUSIONS	45
VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS	48
APPENDIX A.	50
APPENDIX B.	59
APPENDIX C.	96
APPENDIX D.	98
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	100

SOLE-PARENT SOLDIERS AND THEIR

IMPACT ON READINESS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study was undertaken because of the perception that sole-parents and, to a lesser extent, dual-military parents have an adverse impact on readiness. The House Armed Services Committee, in its report on the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1990-1991, required the Secretary of Defense to report on the readiness impact of single parents in the military.¹ Although the committee has called for a full accounting of the single parents in the military services, clearly they are more concerned with those who are deployed overseas because this poses a ... "particularly difficult readiness question for wartime operations given that single service personnel may not be willing to deploy because of concern for their children."² A Senate aide said, "It is clear, from talking to commanding officers from all the services, that single parents are viewed as a liability to combat readiness."³ It is not unusual to find commanders quick to relate stories about the problems associated with sole-parents, and it is equally not unusual for the subject of the story to be a female sole-parent. Traditionally, the United States military was dominated by males. With the end

of the draft and the beginning of the all volunteer force in 1973, the demography of the Army changed and the role of female soldiers grew, and it continues to grow today. Commanders are forced to deal with issues such as separate living arrangements in garrison and in the field, fraternization, and the ultimate separator between male and female soldiers--pregnancy. One could argue that it is almost un-American and virtually unthinkable to separate a mother from her child and then send her off to war, yet this is what our current Army policy would do. "Nobody wants to address the essential question about whether single parents should be banned from the military, or if they are allowed to stay in the military, should they receive preferential treatment...."⁴ One can readily see that there is a general assumption that sole-parents do have an adverse impact on readiness, yet empirical data does not exist to support this assumption.

This study shows that sole-parents and dual-military parents, as distinct categories, do not have an adverse impact on readiness. Moreover, this study shows that our concern with having sole-parents and dual-military parents in the ranks stems from our lack of viable personnel accounting procedures, our failure to properly administer family care plans, and our shortage of child care facilities to accommodate the needs of our military families.

STUDY OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this study were to determine if:

- Sole-parents and to a lesser extent, dual-military parents have an adverse impact on readiness in the U.S. Army.
- The Army has adequate means to identify sole-parents and to ensure that their dependent(s) are going to be provided for during periods of parental absences.
- Support facilities are available in adequate numbers to meet the needs of our sole-parents.
- The Army policy regarding recruiting and retention of sole-parents, and (or) dual-military parents, should be changed.

LIMITATIONS

This study is limited to research on U.S. Army sole-parents and dual-military parents and their impact on readiness. With the exception of a survey distributed to the Army officers in the U.S. Army War College Class of 1990, this study reflects information contained in previous studies, reports, regulations, correspondence, data files, and the experience of the author.

ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions were made in this study:

- Active duty soldiers will not be given preferential treatment in time of war because of their parental status.
- If sole-parents, or dual-military parents, do have an adverse impact on readiness the Army will change its retention policy concerning them.
- The rate of sole-parent soldiers will continue to increase/decrease at nearly the same rate as single parent households in the civilian sector.
- If sole-parents and (or) dual-military parents are viewed as a perceived threat to readiness, they could be barred from the active force.

DEFINITIONS

Sole or Single Soldier/Parent is an unmarried U.S. Army soldier, warrant officer or officer who is legally responsible for the care of a minor child(ren) under the age of eighteen and who has physical custody of the child, full or part-time.

Dual Military Parents are those active duty soldiers, warrant officers, or officers who are married to another military member, active or reserve, and who have physical

custody, full or part-time, and legal responsibility for the care of a minor child(ren) under the age of eighteen.

Dependent Care Plan/Family Care Plan/Child Care Plan is a document which, when properly executed allows for a second party to provide for the care/custody of the children of sole/dual-military parents during the service member(s) absence due to military duties.

Readiness is defined as a unit's ability to perform its wartime mission. For the purpose of this study, focus is given to the impact that sole-parents have on a unit's ability to train, deploy and, ultimately, perform in war.

BACKGROUND

Historically, the single parent issue has been considered as a female-related issue, but the fact is that as of September, 1989, there were 24,984 male soldier sole-parents on active duty in the Army as compared to 9,677 female sole-parents.⁵ "Despite the expansion of women soldiers' numbers and occupational roles, the Army is still an organization and institution overwhelmingly comprised of men, controlled by men, and embedded in a culture, lifestyle, and values which society associates with men...."⁶ This view, real or perceived, has its birth with the formation of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps (WAAC) in 1942.

The War Department Regulation governing WAACs stipulated "The WAAC shall not be part of the Army but will be the only women organization authorized to serve with the Army, exclusive of the Army Nurse Corps."⁷ The War Department immediately closed the door on the issue of sole-parenthood or dual-military parents by announcing that married members of the WAAC who became pregnant would be "...immediately given an honorable discharge without prejudice...."⁸ Unmarried WAACs who became pregnant were dealt with more harshly. "An unmarried member certified by medical authority to be pregnant will be given a summary discharge without delay."⁹

Women in the Army Nurse Corps fared no better. According to Major General (Ret.) Jeanne Holm, "...the Army Nurse Corps made a sharp distinction between married and unmarried pregnancy. Pregnant unmarried nurses were given dishonorable discharges which were otherwise reserved for convicted criminals."¹⁰ Women who elected to have abortions, if found out, were also subject to discharge for having committed an illegal act.¹¹

The 1948 Integration Act (P.L. 625) which established the Women's Army Corps provided a means to mobilize women in event of general war. "Instead of serving as a springboard to further integration and equality for women, the act has become the base of a system of institutional segregation and unequal treatment that would shock modern-day civil libertarians."¹² The law would not allow the services to

accept women with children nor permit them to stay on active duty even if the children were acquired by virtue of marriage.¹³ By comparison, male soldiers could only be involuntarily discharged because of moral or professional dereliction or because retention was not clearly consistent with national security interests.¹⁴ No documented instances could be found of male soldiers who were discharged solely based on their parental status, albeit reason would dictate that there were some.

President Harry Truman signed Executive Order 10240 on 27 April 1951 which gave the Service Secretaries the official authority to continue to expel from the services pregnant women, and those who had minor children.¹⁵ Hence the fate of many servicewomen was sealed. The services held their ground on pregnancy discharges until mid-1976 but gradually relaxed their rules on female members having minor children by marriage or adoption. From rarely granting waivers for pregnancy in the 1950's, the services began a program which resulted in a relaxation of the waivers in the 1960's to approving nearly all in the mid-1970's.¹⁶ The policy of not allowing pregnant soldiers to stay in the Army was, for all practical purposes, doomed in 1976. "The Second Circuit Court held, in Crawford vs. Cushman, that the Marine Corps' regulation requiring the discharge of a pregnant marine as soon as pregnancy is discovered violated the Fifth Amendment."¹⁷

From 1976 to date, all services have resisted the temptation to involuntarily discharge sole-parents, male or female. Historically, it is apparent that the sole-parent issue has been focused almost entirely on the female soldier. However, based on the number of male sole-parents in the Army, there is no doubt that the "problem" is one which is male dominated. Moreover, in spite of all of the rhetoric, this study reveals there is a conspicuous absence of empirical data which shows that sole-parent soldiers are a detriment to readiness.

ENDNOTES

1. U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Years 1990-1991, p. 264.

2. Ibid.

3. Rick Maze, "Hill Panel Wants Study of Military Single Parents", Army Times, 17 July 1989, p. 4.

4. Ibid.

5. Defense Manpower Data Center, Statistical Report of Single Parents on Active Duty in the U.S. Army, September, 1989.

6. Martha A. Marsten, "Sex-Role Attributes, Mental Health, and Job Satisfaction Among Enlisted Army Women in Traditional and Nontraditional Military Units", in Women in the United States Armed Forces: Progress and Barriers in the 1980's, ed. by Nancy H. Loring, p. 174.

7. U.S. Army War Department, Womens' Army Auxiliary Corps Regulation (Tentative) 1942, p. 5.

8. Ibid. p. 11.

9. Ibid.

10. Major General Jeanne Holm, USAF (Ret.), Women in the Military, an Unfinished Revolution, p. 71.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid., p. 178.

13. Ibid., p. 124.

14. Ibid., p. 125.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid., pp. 292-297.

17. Ibid.

CHAPTER II

SOLE-PARENTS AND THEIR IMPACT ON READINESS

When the need arises to defend the Constitution in an armed conflict, will sole-parents respond as soldiers, or will there be mass desertions in the ranks? Will sole-parents be able to "hand-off" their children and go to war? These questions seem fundamental to the issue of whether or not sole-parents now have, or will have, an impact on readiness. One could argue that the intense demands placed upon those who serve in the Army have prepared them for the ultimate test--going to war.

..."Frequent moves, isolation from extended family, frequent and sometimes prolonged periods of separation of service members from their spouses and children, residence in foreign countries, and the potential for injury and death..."¹ would seem to suggest that soldiers are aware that they are not in an occupation which gives them a great freedom of choice, but rather in a profession whose stated purpose is to defend democracy. Are sole-parent soldiers prepared to face the realities of their profession? A review of available literature suggests that they are.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Since the early 1970's, some Army major and unit commanders have expressed deep concern that sole-parents and dual-military couples have an adverse impact on

readiness.² As a response to this concern, the General Accounting Office(GAO) led a major study in 1982 to address this issue. After examining Army data and finding it inadequate, GAO surveyed the first line supervisors in 30 active duty units in Germany and Fort Bragg that would mobilize early. First-line supervisors completed questionnaires on 262 sole and dual-military parents and 178 other service members. GAO reported that while there were some problems, most sole and dual-military parents ... "attended and performed work at least satisfactorily and would most likely be available and punctual in the event of war or a national emergency."³ Further, GAO concluded that "the Army lacks a solid basis for restricting the enlistment of sole and inservice parents and for discharging or assigning all sole-parents and one member of inservice parent couples to positions coded as nondeployable."⁴ Lastly, GAO supported the Army policy of handling "...unsatisfactory performance of service members, including sole and inservice parents, on an individual as opposed to a collective basis."⁵

In 1985, the Department of Defense (DOD) conducted a study of approximately 19,000 active duty officers and 70,000 active duty enlisted personnel from all four services. The purpose of the survey was to provide information for policy makers on a wide range of issues. Included in the survey were questions that focused on the relationships between families and readiness. Conclusions

hereafter enumerated are based on a sample of 12,806 active-duty Army enlisted soldiers who participated in the DOD survey. "The results suggest that dependent care arrangements are a problem for a substantial minority of Army personnel (regardless of marital status) for both short-term and long-term situations such as no-notice alerts and unit deployments."⁶ Examination of the data also reveals that "although dependent care problems are of particular concern to single-parents and dual-military parents, parents married to civilian spouses also have dependent care problems."⁷ The author portrays this study as an "interesting first look at the issue of family factors and readiness" but concluded that "additional research specifically designed to address the issue of families and readiness needs to be conducted."⁸ In sum, the problem that links dependents to readiness is the lack of effective family care plans designed to ensure the needs of dependents are met in the absence of the sponsor. How well the Army is doing on the administration of Family Care Plans is examined in detail in Chapter IV.

In June, 1987, Treplitzky, Hedlund, and Nogami examined the performance of 27 single parents (12 officers, 15 enlisted) by conducting in-depth interviews with the single parents and their supervisors. They constructed short case histories by integrating information obtained from both single parents and their supervisors. Although the authors

are quick to note that there is danger in generalizing their conclusions based on such a small sample, their research does validate the findings of two previous large scale studies (Orthner, 1980) and (GAO, 1982) "that negative stereotypes about single parents are unwarranted."⁹ For example, ..."in the event of deployment for war or national emergency, all soldiers except one expressed their readiness to leave their families to fulfill their military obligation."¹⁰ Moreover, the supervisors of the single parents reported that 16 of the 27 single parents performed "at the very top or above average", 7 were "average" and 3 were below average. None were rated "at the very bottom."¹¹ Lastly, supervisors reported almost no problems concerning "lateness, inability to participate (in unit training), and deployment readiness."¹² In sum, Treplitzky, et.al., "convincingly illustrate that there are single parents in the Army whose effectiveness and dedication to their work make them very valuable assets."¹³ The perception that sole-parents, as a group, adversely affect readiness is again refuted.

Yet to be published is a study by Rand Corporation entitled, "Army Family Programs and Readiness Study: Descriptive Tabulations of the 1987 Surveys of Soldiers and Spouses." The final study likely will focus on three main areas: readiness, family well being, and service use and needs. Surveys were mailed to over 12,000 Army soldiers and 7,500 spouses in CONUS, Germany and Korea to include the

soldiers' unit and battalion commanders. The final sample was adjusted to represent 73 percent of the Army's soldiers. Rand has not provided an analysis of the data in their July 1989 working draft, nor have they provided conclusions or recommendations.¹⁴ Based on analysis of the data, the conclusions this author has drawn are as follows. Of the total sole-parent soldiers in the Army (32,667 in 1987 per Defense Manpower Data Center), Rand indicates that only 1/3 are accompanied by their children (10,889). Of those sole-parents accompanied by children, 33.3% are officers (3,626); 39.2% are senior noncommissioned officers (4,268), and 25.9% are junior soldiers (2820).¹⁵ It follows that the Army needs to know the geographical location of the children of sole-parents to accurately assess readiness impact. This issue is addressed in Chapter III. Moreover, Rand will probably conclude that, with some exceptions, sole-parents as a group are not detriments to readiness, but the Army must develop a better means to account for them and build confidence into family care plans. In their survey, Rand noted that 61.1% of the enlisted sole-parents rated Army life somewhat better, to much better than civilian life.¹⁶ This is certainly a factor that relates to readiness in a positive manner.

ENDNOTES

1. Mady W. Segal, "Enlisted Family Life in the U.S. Army: A Portrait of a Community", in Life in the Rank and File, ed. by David R. Segal and A. Wallace Sinaiko, p. 184.
2. General Accounting Office, "Army Needs Better Data to Develop Policies for Sole and Inservice Parents", Report to the Secretary of the Army, p. 11.
3. Ibid., p. 11.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Rebecca M. Pliske, "Families and Readiness: An Examination of the 1985 DOD Survey of Enlisted Personnel," Research Report 1490, p. 28.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid., pp 28, 29.
9. Martha L. Teplitzky, Mark Hedlung, and Glenda Nogami, "Case Studies of Officer and Enlisted Single Parents in the Army: Performance, Retention, and Quality of Life," Technical Report 749, p. 45.
10. Ibid., p. 41.
11. Ibid., p. 11.
12. Ibid., p. 10.
13. Ibid., p. 45.
14. Georges Vernez, Audrey Burnam, Cathy D. Sheebourne, Lisa Meredith, "Army Family Programs and Readiness Study: Descriptive Tabulations of the 1987 Surveys of Families and Soldiers and Spouses", Working Draft, pp. 1-132.
15. Ibid., p. 32
16. Ibid., p. 66.

CHAPTER III
PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH DETERMINING THE NUMBER
OF SOLE-PARENTS IN THE ARMY

In the age of computerization whereby we have the means to capture data, both manually and electronically, and send it around the world in a matter of seconds, it seems absurd that we cannot accurately maintain a data base which is capable of telling the Army leadership how many sole-parents are in the force. The failure on the part of the Army not to be able to develop a viable means to count sole-parents and to determine the domicile of their dependents has far reaching operational, fiscal, and yes, even moral implications. A similar argument could be made for dual-military couples with children. The Army, as an institution, cannot fully recognize the impact that sole-parents have in units in part because their numbers are not accurately portrayed in the automated data bases.

The Army Personnel Survey Office reports that most demographic data reported on active duty soldiers are available through the Officer Master File (OMF) and the Enlisted Master File (EMF).¹ Not reported, but generally known, is that dependency data on the OMF/EMF is highly suspect since it can include numbers on dependents who are only dependent on the soldier for financial support

irrespective of residence, age, or physical ability. To be of primary concern to the Army in terms of readiness, noncombatant evacuation, and child-care needs, the dependent must reside with the sponsor. Routinely, in my years of experience as a personnel officer, dependent data accuracy statistics from Department of the Army Personnel Research Information Data Extract (Pride) system have shown that dependency data on the OMF/EMF to be 100% accurate since there is no built in error edit. The most complete information on family members is provided by the Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System (DEERS), yet it does not have a mechanism for updating dependent location data.² The responsibility for updating the location data rests with the individual soldier and since location does not effect dependents' eligibility for benefits if they are previously enrolled, there is no incentive for the soldier to "waste" his time. Moreover, unit commanders do not have routine access to the DEERS Data Base unless they visit their personnel office, thus the viability of DEERS Data for the company/battalion commander is questionable.

The aforementioned three personnel files are supplemented by data collected through sample surveys, such as the semi-annual Sample Survey of Military Personnel (SSPM) and the Survey of Army Families (SAF).³ Personnel at the Army Personnel Survey Division explain that ... "there is a major concern at DA level that the numbers being reported vary greatly."⁴ They go on to provide what they

consider to be the four major reasons for the inconsistencies:

a. "Different sources are used (and the sources actually reproduce different results).

b. The same sources are used, but the data are drawn at different times.

c. The same sources are used, but the definitions used to specify the demographic characteristics are slightly different.

d. A number of different offices are involved in providing demographic information because no single office has undertaken the mission of maintaining current/standard data."⁵

Because of these inconsistencies, commanders are left without a viable, timely, and accurate data base upon which to make decisions regarding people for whom they are responsible. Unit commanders cannot wait for periodic surveys, which may be useful at the higher levels but not at company or battalion level. Commanders need a system to provide them with accurate dependent data on dependents of both sole-parent and dual-military parents so that they can monitor family care plans and other programs, such as noncombatant evacuation plans, which have both short and long-term readiness implications. Moreover, if we in the Army are going to be able to justify our fiscal needs to

Congress, particularly in a time of declining dollars, we need to be able to speak using hard facts as opposed to refutable figures. No system has ever been perfect, but those which rely heavily on soldier input must either sacrifice accuracy or build in incentives to encourage soldier participation.

Such a system is now in existence--the military pay system. It is not beyond imagination to envision linking together the personnel and finance systems to ensure accuracy of key data items. This has been accomplished with such items as date of rank and promotions. It is not beyond our technical means to capture dependent data and location of dependents. Data could possibly include name and/or relationship, age and sex, and be printed out on the monthly leave and earnings statement. Proper pay is a great incentive for all soldiers to ensure that their records are correct. Cross merging of this data with DEERS and the OMF/EMF would update all systems. Perhaps this is a simplistic view, but nevertheless, it is a step in the right direction. Once sole-parents and dual-military couples are identified to the unit commander, he/she can monitor family care plan preparation to ensure that those soldiers are ready to deploy knowing that their dependents are provided for.

ENDNOTES

1. Army Personnel Survey Division, Soldier Support Center, National Capital Region, Information Paper, "Annual Army Personnel Composite", 3 Jan 89, p. 1.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

CHAPTER IV
FAMILY CARE PLANS: A BROKEN SYSTEM

The greatest impact on readiness which can be attributed to sole and dual-military parents is their failure to properly execute a family care plan to ensure their children are provided for during time of separation. The Army has specific regulatory guidance which details responsibilities for commanders and sole and dual-military parents regarding family care plans.¹ In spite of the aforementioned regulatory guidance, inspection after inspection has shown that compliance is arbitrary at best.

In a 1982 sample survey, GAO identified 86 sole and dual-military parents in Germany who required family care plans and found that only 53% had been counseled regarding their need for a family care plan. Moreover, commanders had approved less than one-third of the 86 sole and dual-military couples' family care plans.² The situation has not improved over time. In a 1983 world-wide survey of military personnel conducted by the Soldier Survey Division, Soldier Support Center, when asked if their family care plan will work, some 6% of the enlisted sole and dual-military parents respondents indicated that they did not have family care plans; nor did 3.4% of the officers.³ More recently, in June 1989 the Inspector General, Western Command (WESTCOM) after inspecting units in Hawaii, Guam and

American Samoa found family care plans either were not filed or never reviewed to ensure accuracy.⁴ In response to the results of the investigation, an Army family policy official was quoted as saying "the results of the investigation are not surprising, and probably would be found in any military command."⁵ Most disturbing is that the report indicated, "When commanders and first sergeants were asked about the deployability of their single parent service members, all but one answered that their single parent soldiers would not be deployable."⁶ Clearly, command emphasis at all levels is required to correct a longstanding problem. Simply put, commanders must identify soldiers who need family care plans, insist that they execute them in the required time-frame, and initiate separation action for those who do not comply.

As discussed in Chapter III, the Army needs to assist unit commanders in identifying those who need family care plans, but in the absence of a viable automated system, there is no substitute for chain of command involvement. In October, 1989 the Army Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, sent a message to all army commanders and staff announcing a revision of AR 600-20 concerning family care plans. The revision now allows commanders to delegate counseling, but not approval authority, for family care plans; provides strong emphasis for commander consideration of separation of soldiers who do not comply with requirements, and provides for a "close the loop" document that the guardian must

complete and have notarized.⁷ This aforementioned document ensures that the guardian is in receipt of a power of attorney naming guardianship; has all necessary documents required to provide financial, medical, educational, quarters and substance support for the soldier's dependents, and lastly, agrees to accept responsibility for the dependents.

Although the administration of the family care plan requirements is an administrative burden to both soldiers and commanders, as long as we have sole and dual-military parents in the ranks, we have both a regulatory, as well as a moral obligation to ensure compliance. As with other programs or policies such as the weight control program, those who do not comply need to be separated. There is every indication that the Army leadership has focused on the problems associated with family care plans and that improvements are forthcoming. Only time will tell.

ENDNOTES

1. U.S. Department of the Army, Army Regulation 600-20, pp. 14-15. (hereafter referred to as "AR 600-20").
2. General Accounting Office, "Army Needs Better Data to Develop Policies for Sole and InService Parents," Report to the Secretary of the Army, p. 10.
3. Soldier Survey Division, Soldier Support Center, Sample Survey of Military Personnel as of February 1983, p. 22.
4. Rick Maze, "Army Inspectors Blast Pacific Childcare Plans," Army Times, 21 August 1989, p. 6.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. U.S. Department of the Army, Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, Message, SUBJECT: Family Care Plans, AR 600-20, 19 October 1989.

CHAPTER V

CHILD CARE - A GROWING NEED FOR IMPROVING READINESS

In 1978, the Department of Defense designated child care centers as community facilities for which the Government has responsibility.¹ The services, according to a 1982 GAO study, have recognized that child care programs can have an impact on retention, job performance and readiness.² Likewise, a 1987 study by Rand Corporation simply states, "The relationship between general services and military outcomes is intuitively the strongest with regard to the effects of child care on readiness."³ Lastly, in a March 1989 report to some members of Congress, the General Accounting Office noted, "DOD considers child care to be an essential service because this care supports readiness by reducing duty time lost as a result of conflicts between parental responsibilities and unit mission requirements."⁴ As the number of sole-parents and dual-military parents continue to grow, the pressure on the services to continue to expand child care facilities and child care programs will also continue. No notice alerts and deployments place a tremendous burden on sole and dual-military families, as do the extended duty hours that our soldiers are often called on to work. The availability and reliability of child care is becoming a growing readiness issue. "Data from a 1984 Army Survey found that more than

61,000 enlisted and 10,000 officer families lost job or duty time or missed an Army sponsored activity because of the difficulty of finding child care."⁵

We have come a long way in our efforts to provide child care to meet the needs of our soldiers. Gone for the most part are the days when the only "child care" or baby sitting service available was largely a wives' club function typically housed in a facility that would hardly meet today's health and safety standards. Today we have attractive child development centers where care to military children is mostly provided by trained care-givers and family day care homes where trained individuals provide care. We are now at a juncture in deciding how much is enough. Do we make the space in terms of child care meet the demand? If we accept, as the services have, that child care does impact readiness, we have no choice but to find the means to meet the demand for child care with priority given to those who most need it--sole parents and dual-military couples.

Some commanders have recognized the aforementioned priority of need and have responded accordingly. In a recent survey on child care at 213 CONUS installations, GAO reported..."at nearly half of the installations with children waiting for care, commanders have determined that categories of military families--such as single parents and those with both parents in the military--should have priority in receiving center care...."⁶ One could easily argue

that the Department of Defense (DOD) should mandate that priorities for child care be given to sole-parents and dual-military couples in that of "... 213 CONUS installations with child development centers, 185 (87%) maintained waiting lists with the names of 24,729 children."⁷ Included in the 24,729 children are 717 children of single Army parents and 962 children of dual Army couples.⁸

There is a need for expanded child care; the need relates to readiness, and the services have responded. The number of children who could receive care in a child development center in CONUS alone expanded by 25% by the end of fiscal year 1984 to 9 February 1989.⁹ Growth in the capacity of family day care homes has grown by over 600 percent in the same aforementioned time frame. Child care is not only a priority for the Army and the other services, but also in Congress where bi-partisan support is the norm. The Senate version of the 1990 Defense Authorization Bill contained a provision for providing federal matching funds for money raised by user fees. Sponsors of the plan believe that the additional dollars will allow the services to double its child care capacity in two years.¹⁰ Likewise, a House-Senate conference committee approved the 1990 Military Construction Appropriations Bill which included funding for 40 new child care centers or major additions even though DOD had only requested 21 child care projects.¹¹

The emphasis on the availability of child care since 1978 has met a real need of our military parents and in doing so has directly contributed to readiness. The demands that military life places on our soldiers are undoubtedly more severe than those of most civilian professions.

"Normal" duty includes time away from children on temporary duty, readiness exercises, deployments and work days that often extend into the night and weekends. Child care is especially critical to the growing number of sole-parents and dual-military couples we have in the ranks (Appendix C). With the continued emphasis on child care by both DOD and Congress, it is likely that child care concerns and their impact on readiness will greatly decline in the years ahead even in the face of declining dollars. The need has been recognized, and it is being addressed.

ENDNOTES

1. General Accounting Office, Military Child Care Programs: Progress Made, More Needed, Report to the Secretary of Defense, p. 1.
2. Ibid.
3. Georges Vernez and Gail L. Zellman, Families and Mission: A Review of the Effects of Family Factors on Army Attrition, Retention, and Readiness, p. 43.
4. General Accounting Office, Military Child Care: Extensive, Diverse, and Growing, Report to Congressional Requesters, p. 17.
5. Vernez and Zellman, p. 43.
6. General Accounting Office, Military Child Care: Extensive, Diverse, and Growing, Report to Congressional Requesters, p. 29.
7. Ibid., p. 33.
8. Ibid., p. 72.
9. Ibid., p. 30.
10. Rick Maze, "Child Care Reform Calls for No Fee Increase," Army Times, 18 September 1989, p. 4.
11. Rick Maze, "Child Care Center Funds Get Boost," Army Times, 6 November, 1989, p. 10

CHAPTER VI
SURVEY OF FORMER COMMANDERS

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY

The purpose of the survey (Appendix A) was to quantify the views of former battalion and brigade commanders regarding a range of issues concerning sole and dual-military parents and their impact on readiness. Former commanders were chosen as the target population since it is generally accepted that they will be the future senior leaders of the Army responsible for policy formulation and execution. The survey includes both opinion (perception) and fact-finding questions relative to family care plans, Army assignment, enlistment, and retention policies, adequacy of child care facilities, and the probability of availability of sole/dual-military parents in time of conflict.

KNOWN SHORTCOMINGS

The survey was constructed in such a manner that respondents were asked to recall information regarding the numbers and types of soldiers in their most recent command. The majority (80.6%) concluded their command in calendar years 1988 or 1989.

METHOD

A total of 169 surveys were distributed to former battalion and brigade commanders who are resident members of the United States Army War College Class of 1990. The officers were provided one week to complete the survey. One hundred twenty-five surveys (74%) were returned; of those returned, 124 were usable. A follow-up to determine why 44 officers elected not to complete the survey was not conducted. Of those who returned surveys, none commented regarding ease (or lack of) completion.

PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS/UNITS

All respondents were male and the majority (96%) commanded at battalion level, three (2.4%) commanded brigades or brigade equivalent commands, and two (1.6%) commanded depots. Combat arm commands were most typical with a frequency of 60 (48.4%) followed by combat service support (23/18.5%) and combat support (20/16.1%) commands. The remainder of units included training, recruiting and other. Of the 124 respondents, the following reported having sole-parents and/or dual-military parents in their commands:

Sole-Parents/Respondents	Dual-Military/Respondents
Enlisted Males - 92	Officer/Officer - 69

Enlisted Females -	68	Enlisted/Enlisted -	99
Officer Males -	20	Officer/Enlisted -	22
Officer Females -	20		

The respondents commanded units in CONUS (60.5%) followed by USAREUR (23.4%), and Korea or other OCONUS (16.2%). A total of 73.4% indicated that their units deployed away from garrison for at least two days on an annual basis. Over 57% of the respondents reported monthly or quarterly deployments.

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES: SOLE-PARENTS

The responses to the survey are contained, in analytical form, at Appendix B. Also included is a guide which allows the reader to correlate the appropriate survey question with the appropriate survey response.

FAMILY CARE PLANS

Respondents indicate they felt, on the average, 82.5% of their enlisted sole-parents had constructed viable family care plans for short-term deployments (30 days or less) and that 60% had plans for long-term deployments (over 30 days). Additionally, former commanders reported a high degree of confidence in officer sole-parent family care plans (short-term 94.1% and long-term deployments, 87.2%). Lastly, 91.3% of the commanders reported checking family

care plans on their enlisted sole-parents at least annually as compared to 75% of the officer sole-parents. Based on their responses, it is apparent that commanders have a reasonable expectation that the vast majority of their soldiers and officers will participate in short-term deployments, but that confidence in family care plans wanes for long-term deployments. Even though most commanders report checking family care plans for adequacy, there is a noticeable lack of confidence in the viability of the plans. As one officer put it, "Family care plans won't work when the balloon goes up. We are deceiving ourselves." Perhaps the recent changes in the administration of family care plans as outlined in Chapter IV will go a long way to build commanders' confidence in the system. In the short term the Army has a problem, yet we do not know if it is real or perceived.

RESPONSE TO DEPLOYMENTS

When asked to describe their sole-parents' response to deployments, commanders indicated that their officer sole-parents would respond promptly. Responses indicate that less than 6% were more likely or much more likely to respond late when compared to all other officers. Moreover, commanders felt that 26.5% were prone to be less likely to be late than other officers. In contrast, when asked about the enlisted sole-parent soldiers response to deployments,

29.9% indicated that they were more likely or much more likely to be late than other enlisted soldiers, and 16.5% were less likely or much less likely to be late than other enlisted soldiers. Not addressed in the survey was the individual commander's response to officer and enlisted sole-parents who responded late for deployments. The commanders have again underscored the need for air-tight family care plans and the necessity to discipline and ultimately discharge those sole-parents who fail to develop them in a timely manner. (Appendix D provides an overview of discharges)

REAR DETACHMENT

When asked to respond to why sole-parents remained in the rear detachment during unit deployments, a distinct minority (17%) indicated that family considerations were more important. The survey does not provide for further analysis as to the reasons why family considerations were more important, but the data does show that "special consideration" is not being given to sole-parents in any manner which could be construed to be wide-spread.

PERFORMANCE

When asked to rate the performance of sole-parents, the respondents rated 7.7% as excellent; 21.2% as better than

average; 54.8% as average, and only 4.8% as below average. These responses validate previous findings as cited in Chapter II. When asked how they felt their noncommissioned officers (NCOs) would rate the performance of sole-parents, the greatest variance was noted in the below average rating (16.1%). Although it is difficult to quantify why the respondents felt that their NCOs would rate sole-parent performance lower, one could surmise that they are the first-line leaders who have to deal with associated problems in a more personal mode than officers. In the final analysis, over 94.2% of the sole-parent soldiers were rated as average or above performers by the respondents, and they felt that their NCOs would rate the performance of 80.8% of the sole-parents as average or above. The responses indicate that as a group, sole-parents perform as well, or in many cases, better than their peers.

ASSIGNMENT OF SOLE-PARENTS

The majority of the respondents (52.4%) favor assigning sole-parents to any unit in the Army which is in keeping with current Army policy. By comparison, 43.8% support assigning sole-parents only to non-deploying units and 3.8% favor assignments to support units. One respondent who felt that sole-parents "do not belong in military organizations" may have provided the rationale that is becoming a popular view. He stated, "I feel that if we ever had a crisis/war,

societal influences would dictate that we not deploy sole-parents. I may be wrong but I don't think so." According to the Defense Manpower Data Center, there were 34,661 sole-parents in the Army in September 1989 (Appendix C). To restrict assignment of sole-parents, solely based on numbers, is not a viable option. Moreover, the perception that assignment restrictions would likely create in terms of a "second-class soldier" would not be tolerable either in the Army or in the Courts. Nevertheless, former commanders have voted their feelings which imply that sole-parents are perceived to be a threat to readiness whether they actually are or not.

ENLISTMENT POLICY

As expected, the vast majority (75.2%) supported the Army policy of not recruiting sole-parents unless the individuals took steps to legally provide for guardianship for their child(ren). When asked to comment on the Army's enlistment policy, the following is typical of the responses received. "We should not accept a problem that existed prior to enlistment. We cannot be expected to become a social services agency to solve the U.S.'s problems." Of those who disagree or strongly disagree (18%) with the policy, alternatives were provided such as accepting those with family care plans, or consider each on a case by case basis.

RETENTION OF SOLE-PARENTS

When asked if they agree with the existing Army policy regarding retention of sole-parents who have viable family care plans, 67.3% of the respondents were in agreement as opposed to 32.7% who disagreed with it. Of those who disagreed with retention, reflected were comments such as "sole-parents are a pain," to "If we are going to be a smaller Army, as indicators point out, now is the time to purge the system and retain world-wide deployable soldiers." The latter comment validates the fourth assumption of this study which states in part that if sole-parents are a perceived threat to readiness, they could be barred from the force as the Army gets smaller.

FORMAL TRAINING CONCERNING SOLE-PARENTS

Nearly 63% of the respondents indicated that they have not received any formal training concerning sole-parents, and over 17% said they could not remember having any. Of the 20% who indicated that they were the recipients of formal training, 12.1% indicated that it was of little or no value. This data indicates a real need in terms of educating commanders and other key leaders on the pressures unique to parents who fill two full-time jobs: soldiering and parenting.

DISCHARGE OF FIRST-TERM SOLE-PARENTS

When asked to formulate a policy for the Army regarding sole-parents who are first-term soldiers, 55.2% of the respondents favored retention with a solid family care plan, 30.5% elected to discharge them with an honorable discharge, and 9.5% elected to centralize retention authority at Department of the Army. Although one could argue the merits of immediate discharge, if this policy were adopted the Army would be placed in a situation whereby a double standard would be created, and undoubtedly the policy would be treated as such in the courts. Moral implications would be yet another consideration. Could the Army be forcing abortions by threats of discharge? Would marriages of convenience be a way to beat the system? In my view, retention of those with a solid family care plan is not only the most expedient system, it is also the right choice.

REACTION OF SOLE-PARENTS TO HOSTILITIES

When asked to predict the reaction of their sole-parents in the event of hostilities, 59.2% indicated they would proceed with mission requirements thus executing their family care plan. By comparison 29.1% indicated their sole-parents would absent themselves from the unit for a short-time to take care of family considerations, then return; 11.7% felt that sole-parents would absent themselves

from the unit for a long-term with a possibility of eventual return. These responses underscore the concern that sole-parents may not deploy which is portrayed in the introduction to this paper. Moreover, concerns with how effective family care plans really are seem to weigh heavily on the minds of commanders. The only way to better ensure a proper reaction from sole-parents is to build confidence in the family care plans. This has been mandated by Department of the Army and must be implemented by the commanders in the field. Those who cannot/will not construct a viable family care plan must be immediately processed for separation. (See Appendix C for an overview of separations linked to family considerations)

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES: DUAL-MILITARY PARENTS

FAMILY CARE PLANS

Respondents indicated a relatively high degree of confidence in family care plans for short-term deployments (30 days or less): enlisted married to enlisted (E/E) 85.2%; officer married to officer (O/O) 95.3%; officer married to enlisted (O/E) 88.5%. Confidence in the viability of family care plans for long term deployments drops considerably with: E/E (63.3%); O/O (89.8%), and O/E (78%). It is interesting to note that data reported for dual-military couples for both short and long-term

deployments nearly mirrors that reported on sole-parents. Review of the data indicates that family care plans were checked frequently enough with the exception of O/E when 35.4% of a sample of only 31 reported that they were never checked. Again, the perception that family care plans for long-term deployments are not viable is validated, primarily for enlisted dual-military couples.

RESPONSE TO DEPLOYMENTS

When asked to characterize dual-military parents' response to deployments, 71.3% of the respondents indicated they were as likely to be late as any other soldier or officer, and 20.8 % were portrayed as being less, or much less likely to be late than other soldiers/officers. None were reported to be much more likely to be late, and only 7.9% were portrayed as being much more likely to be late than other soldiers/officers. This question does not ask the respondent to differentiate between long and short-term deployments, but nevertheless does reveal that most dual-military parents, in the view of former senior commanders, can and will respond to deployments with at least the same degree of reliability as other soldiers/officers.

RETENTION POLICY

A number of respondents (23.3%) indicated they

would favor an Army policy of discharging one member of a dual-military parent team which indicates there is a concern, regardless of how sound a family care plan may be, that parental responsibilities may come first in time of conflict. The remainder (76.7%) favor retention of both members, but with the following stipulations: a DA waiver, a sound family care plan, or on a case by case basis. It appears that even though there may be some concern about dual-military parents on active duty, the majority in the Army seem to be meeting our expectations. Policy changes cannot be driven by perceptions without documented evidence to support them. In essence, the Army would be ill-advised to formulate a blanket policy to discharge one member of a dual-military team without proof-positive that readiness is being affected.

RESPONSE TO HOSTILITIES

The respondents were asked to provide their opinion on how the majority of their dual-military parents would have reacted in the event that hostilities broke out. The majority (57.9%) indicated that their dual-military parents would proceed with mission requirements thereby properly executing their family care plans. The remaining 42.1% of the respondents indicated they felt that one or both members would, in essence, put family considerations above

the mission and absent themselves from the unit for either a short or long term (time not defined in the survey). These responses again underscore the importance of the family care planning process and the need to continually check the plans both administratively and through no-notice alerts and deployments. Those who fail to meet mission requirements are not fulfilling their contract to the Army and must be eliminated administratively.

When asked to portray how the majority of soldier parents (civilian spouse) would react to hostilities, an overwhelming majority (88.5%) felt that their soldiers would proceed with mission requirements, yet 11.5% felt that their married soldiers would absent themselves from the unit to take care of their family first. It is reasonable to assume in the event of war some number of soldiers will put personal or family considerations above the call of duty; yet it is difficult to predict with any degree of certainty who these soldiers will be. Programs and policies must be reality based versus perception based. To simply single out a group or class of soldiers as possible "no-shows" in time of war is simply unwise and counterproductive to our readiness goal.

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES: CHILD CARE FACILITIES

As shown in Chapter V, child care facilities do have an impact on readiness. With the number of sole and

dual-military families we have in the Army, the need for affordable child care is a premium demand. All of the services have undeniably responded to the need for child care yet as this survey shows, we still have a way to go.

ADEQUACY OF CHILD CARE FACILITIES

The majority of the respondents (53.9%) rated the adequacy of the child care facility at the installation where they last commanded as good (38.5%) or superior (15.4%). A total of 32.5% rated the facility as poor or fair, and 4.3% rated it as very poor. The greatest criticism of the facilities was the length of the waiting list for care and the lack of overnight capability (both 43.5%). Concern about costs being too high (32.3%) and the hours that the facility operated (20.2%) were also voiced. Only 12.1% of the respondents indicated the facilities were inadequate, but a near equal number (11.3%) stated that they saw no deficiencies in the type of care given or the facility itself. A distinct minority (1.6%) saw the care being provided as substandard.

The respondents have voiced concerns that previous studies, as summarized in Chapter V, have shown that there is a growing need for more child care facilities and that an overnight capability is warranted.

SUMMARY

This survey, which captures the views of former senior commanders concerning a range of issues on sole/dual military parents and their impact on readiness, has shown the following:

- Commanders distrust family care plans primarily for long-term deployments (over 30 days).
- A significant minority are concerned that sole/dual-military parents may place family over mission in the event of war.
- Sole-parents are not generally treated differently from other soldiers concerning deployments.
- Sole-parent soldiers are good soldiers.
- That 47.6% favor assigning sole-parents only to non-deploying or to support units.
- The current policy of not enlisting sole-parents should be continued.
- Sole-parents who have viable family care plans should not be discharged.
- There is a need for formal training concerning sole-parents.
- One member of a dual-military parent team should not be discharged.
- Child care facilities generally have waiting lists that are too long and an absence of overnight capability.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

This study has focused on sole-parents, and to a lesser extent, on dual-military parents to determine if, by family composition, they have an adverse impact on readiness. In the course of the study, the author focused on information contained in previous studies, reports, regulations, correspondence, related literature, data files, and personal experience gained from commanding three forward deployed companies and one battalion and having served as a Division G-1/AG. Additionally, a survey was formulated and distributed to former battalion and brigade commanders who are resident students of the United States Army War College Class of 1990. As a result of analysis of the aforementioned sources, the following conclusions are provided:

- Although there is concern from congressional level through unit level in the Army that sole-parents and similarly dual-military parents may place families before mission in time of war, there is a distinct absence of empirical data to warrant this concern. Based on the data researched, there is yet to be a study conducted which proves sole or dual-military parents are less likely to respond as other soldiers in time of need.

- Many of the concerns associated with sole-parents and dual-military parents are attributed to their historical growth in numbers and the inability of the Army to accurately account for the actual number in the ranks or the geographical location of their dependents. Each automated data base queried provides a different number, and sample surveys have provided yet another number. This inability to accurately portray a growing population has caused concern at the highest level in Congress and also at the unit level down to company-sized units responsible for ensuring that sole/dual-military parents have executable family care plans.

- The family care plan, which was designed to ensure that the dependents of sole/dual-military parents are adequately cared for during parental absence, has been implemented with a varied degree of success. Some commanders have ensured that their sole/dual-military parents have completed viable family care plans and have tested the plans, yet others have totally ignored the requirement. Moreover, many commanders have continuously voiced a perception that family care plans are not an indication of the parents' willingness to deploy. The Army leadership has responded by developing a family care plan that is verifiable. The Department of the Army staff has done its job, and now the commanders must do theirs. A verified and tested family care plan will improve the readiness of sole/dual-military parents and will raise commander confidence.

• Both the quality and quantity of child care has improved since 1978, yet there is still a growing need. The Congress and Department of Defense have recognized and responded to the growing need, but there is still room for improvements. Child care has an impact on retention, job performance and readiness. Commanders must continue to voice the need for adequate child care facilities, and equally must be innovative in their approach to policy formulation regarding hours of the facilities, costs, and priority for care.

CHAPTER VIII

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are primarily intended for the Department of the Army; however, the other services should consider their applicability:

- The regulatory guidance currently in being concerning the recruiting, retention, assignment, and utilization of sole/dual-military parents as an entity should not be changed.
- A data base, preferably in conjunction with the pay system, which would identify the name, age, and geographical location of all dependents of active duty personnel should be developed. If this data were to be printed on the monthly leave and earnings statement, it could provide a means for a chain of command verification with the soldier on a monthly basis.
- The recently modified version of the family care plan should be made a Department of the Army Inspector General (DAIG) special interest item for inspection on an annual basis. Moreover, each MACOM should be required to report its family care plan inspection results to the DAIG and include actions taken on those soldiers who did not execute a family care plan.
- Army leadership should continue to guard against policies that would reflect adversely on equal opportunity for those soldiers who fall within certain categories

because of choice or fate. This could certainly pertain to sole/dual-military parents in time of force reductions.

- As part of leadership training, a semi-annual block of instruction regarding the needs/concerns of sole/dual-military parents, their focus in time of war, and the need for viable family care plans should be required. This will serve to both educate the chain of command and to serve as a constant reminder that the military mission will be placed over family concerns in time of need.

- The Department of the Army dictate, based on waiting lists, the priority of child care provided in Army run child care centers. Exceptions could be granted on a case by case basis.

Lastly, based on the number of inter-service marriages, Department of Defense (DOD) should strongly consider developing a child care plan regulation to meet the needs of all the services.

APPENDIX A

SOLE PARENTS AND DUAL-MILITARY PARENTS SURVEY

1. At what level was your most recent command experience?
 - a. Brigade
 - b. Battalion
 - c. Other
2. What type of unit did you command?
 - a. Combat Arms
 - b. Combat Support
 - c. Combat Service Support
 - d. Training
 - e. Recruiting
 - f. Other
3. Where did you last command?
 - a. CONUS
 - b. Korea
 - c. Europe
 - d. Other OCONUS
4. In what calendar year did you complete your last command?
 - a. 1985 or earlier
 - b. 1986
 - c. 1987
 - d. 1988
 - e. 1989
5. To the best of your recollection, how many soldiers and officers were in your last command?

_____	Enlisted males (E1-E9)
_____	Enlisted females (E1-E9)
_____	Officer males (W01-06)
_____	Officer females (W01-06)
6. To the best of your recollection, how many sole parents in the following categories were in your command?

_____	Enlisted males (E1-E9)
_____	Enlisted females (E1-E9)
_____	Officer males (W01-06)
_____	Officer females (W01-06)

IF NO SOLE PARENTS IN YOUR COMMAND, SKIP TO QUESTION 24

7. Of your enlisted sole-parents, what percentage did you feel had viable family care plans for:
- a. Short-term deployments (30 days or less) _____%
 - b. Long-term deployments _____%
8. Of your officer sole parents, what percentage did you feel had viable family care plans for:
- a. Short-term deployments (30 days or less) _____%
 - b. Long-term deployments _____%
9. How often did you or your commanders/staff check family care plans on your enlisted sole parents?
- a. Monthly
 - b. Quarterly
 - c. Semi-Annually
 - d. Annually
 - e. Just before an exercise
 - f. Never
10. How often did you or you commanders/staff check family care plans on your officer sole parents?
- a. Monthly
 - b. Quarterly
 - c. Semi-Annually
 - d. Annually
 - e. Just before an exercise
 - f. Never
11. On the average, how often during your command did your unit conduct extended (over two days) deployments away from garrison?
- a. At least once per week
 - b. At least once per month
 - c. At least once per quarter
 - d. At least semi-annually
 - e. At least annually
 - f. No deployments away from garrison
12. Of the following, which best described your officer sole-parents with regard to their response to deployments?
- a. Much less likely to be late than other officers
 - b. Less likely to be late than other officers
 - c. As likely to be late as other officers
 - d. More likely to be late than other officers
 - e. Much more likely to be late than other officers

13. Of the following, which best described your enlisted sole parents with regard to their response to deployments?

- a. Much less likely to be late than other enlisted soldiers
- b. Less likely to be late than other enlisted soldiers
- c. As likely to be late as other enlisted soldiers
- d. More likely to be late than other enlisted soldiers
- e. Much more likely to be late than other enlisted soldiers

14. When given a choice as to the number of soldiers/officers needed to support a deployment, were sole-parents left in the rear detachment?

- a. Never
- b. Seldom
- c. Often
- d. Almost always

15. When sole-parents were left in the rear detachment, what was the most frequent reason?

- a. Right person because of skill
- b. Family considerations were more important
- c. No special treatment
- d. Someone had to do it
- e. Did not leave anyone back

16. What is your opinion of the performance of sole-parent soldiers in general?

- a. They were exceptional
- b. They were better than average
- c. They were average
- d. They were below average
- e. They were totally unsatisfactory

17. I believe that my non-commissioned officers would rate the performance of sole parents as:

- a. They were exceptional
- b. They were better than average
- c. They were average
- d. They were below average
- e. They were totally unsatisfactory

18. I believe that sole-parents should be assigned

- a. To any unit
- b. Only to support units
- c. Only in non-deploying units

19. The Army does not allow sole-parents to enlist unless they have given up their parental responsibilities legally. What is your feeling toward this policy?

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Agree
- c. Disagree
- d. Strongly disagree
- e. Undecided

Please explain.

20. First term soldiers who become sole-parents can remain on active duty if they execute a family care plan. What is your feeling toward this policy?

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Agree
- c. Disagree
- d. Strongly disagree
- e. Undecided

Please explain.

21. Have you received any formal training in the military concerning sole-parents?

- a. Yes, and it was of great value
- b. Yes, but it was of little value
- c. Yes, but it was of no value
- d. No
- e. Honestly cannot recall

22. If you could determine policy for the Army, what would your policy be with regard to first-term soldiers who become sole parents:

- a. Honorable discharge
- b. Retain only with DA waiver
- c. Retain only with a solid family care plan
- d. Blanket retention without stipulations
- e. Other (please specify)_____

23. If hostilities broke out, or became imminent, while you were in your last command, what do you feel the reaction of the majority of your sole-parent soldiers would have been?

- a. Proceed with mission requirements (execute their Family Care Plan)
- b. Put family considerations first (possible short-term absence, then return to unit)
- c. Place family above mission (long-term absence, with possible return to unit)

IN THIS SECTION, I WOULD LIKE TO FOCUS ON DUAL MILITARY COUPLES

24. To the best of your recollection, how many dual-military parents in the following categories were in your last command?

- a. _____ Enlisted married to enlisted
- b. _____ Officer married to officer
- c. _____ Officer married to enlisted

25. Of your enlisted/enlisted dual military parents, what percentage did you feel had viable family care plans for:

- a. Short-term deployments (30 days or less) _____%
- b. Long-term deployments _____%

26. Of your officer/officer dual military parents, what percentage did you feel had viable family care plans for:

- a. Short-term deployments (30 days or less) _____%
- b. Long-term deployments _____%

27. Of your officer/enlisted dual military parents, what percentage did you feel had viable family care plans for:

- a. Short-term deployments (30 days or less) _____%
- b. Long-term deployments _____%

28. How often did you or your commanders/staff check family care plans of your enlisted/enlisted dual military parents?

- a. Monthly
- b. Quarterly
- c. Semi-annually
- d. Annually
- e. Just before an exercise
- f. Never

29. How often did you or your commanders/staff check family care plans of your officer/officer dual military parents?

- a. Monthly
- b. Quarterly
- c. Semi-annually
- d. Annually
- e. Just before an exercise
- f. Never

30. How often did you or your commanders/staff check family care plans of your officer/enlisted dual military parents?

- a. Monthly
- b. Quarterly
- c. Semi-annually
- d. Annually
- e. Just before an exercise
- f. Never

31. Of the following, which best describes your dual military parents with regards to their response to deployments?

- a. Much more likely to be late than other soldier/officer parents
- b. More likely to be late than other soldier/officer parents
- c. As likely to be late as other soldier/officer parents
- d. Less likely to be late than other soldier/officer parents
- e. Much less likely to be late than other soldier/officer parents

32. Again, as an Army policy maker, what would be your policy regarding one member of a dual-military parent team?

- a. Discharge one or the other
- b. Retain both but only with a DA waiver
- c. Retain both only with a sound family care plan
- d. Blanket retention without stipulations
- e. Other (please specify) _____

33. If hostilities broke out, or became imminent, while you were in your last command, what do you feel the reaction of the majority of your dual-military parents would have been?

- a. Proceed with mission requirements (execute their Family Care Plan)
- b. Put family considerations first (one member, possible short-term absence, then return to unit)
- c. Put family considerations first (both members, possible short-term absence, then return to unit)
- d. Place family above mission (one member, long-term absence, then return to unit)
- e. Place family above mission (both member, long-term absence, then return to unit)

34. If hostilities broke out, or became imminent, while you were in your last command, what do you feel the reaction of the majority of your soldier parents (civilian spouse) would have been?

- a. Proceed with mission requirements (execute their Family Care Plan)
- b. Put family considerations first (possible short-term absence, then return to unit)
- c. Place family above mission (long-term absence, with possible return to unit)

35. Rate the adequacy of the child care facility at the station where you last commanded regarding its meeting the needs of your sole/dual-military parents.

- a. Superior
- b. Good
- c. Fair
- d. Poor
- e. Very Poor
- f. Did not have a child care facility at my installation

36. What was the greatest failure(s) of the child care center? (circle all that apply)

- a. Cost too high
- b. Hours not consistent
- c. Waiting list too long
- d. Facilities substandard
- e. Care substandard
- f. No overnight capability
- g. No noted failure
- h. Other (please specify) _____

Thank you for your time and for your input. Please return this questionnaire to Box 171.

Written Comments (Optional):

APPENDIX B

COMPARISON GUIDE

This guide allows the reader to compare the response data to the appropriate question in the survey (Appendix A).

Survey Question #---RELATES TO---Response Question

Q 1	Q 1
Q 2	Q 2
Q 3	Q 3
Q 4	Q 4
Q 5	Q 5-Q 8
Q 6	Q 9-Q 12
Q 7	Q 13-Q 14
Q 8	Q 15-Q 16
Q 9	Q 17
Q 10	Q 18
Q 11	Q 19
Q 12	Q 20
Q 13	Q 21
Q 14	Q 22
Q 15	Q 23
Q 16	Q 24
Q 17	Q 25
Q 18	Q 26
Q 19	Q 27
Q 20	Q 28
Q 21	Q 29

COMPARISON GUIDE (con't)

Survey Question #--RELATES TO--Response Question #

Q 22	Q 30
Q 23	Q 31
Q 24	Q 32-Q 34
Q 25	Q 35-Q 36
Q 26	Q 37-Q 38
Q 27	Q 39-Q 40
Q 28	Q 41
Q 29	Q 42
Q 30	Q 43
Q 31	Q 44
Q 32	Q 45
Q 33	Q 46
Q 34	Q 47
Q 35	Q 48
Q 36	Q 49-Q 56

Q1 EXPERIENCE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
BDE	1	3	2.4	2.4	2.4
BN	2	119	96.0	96.0	98.4
OTR	3	2	1.6	1.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.992	Std Dev	.201	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				

Valid Cases 124 Missing Cases 0

Q2 TYPE UNIT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CA	1	60	48.4	48.4	48.4
CS	2	20	16.1	16.1	64.5
CSS	3	23	18.5	18.5	83.1
TNG	4	9	7.3	7.3	90.3
REC	5	3	2.4	2.4	92.7
OTR	6	9	7.3	7.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.210	Std Dev	1.521	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				

Valid Cases 124 Missing Cases 0

Q3 LOCATION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CON	1	75	60.5	60.5	60.5
KOR	2	9	7.3	7.3	67.7
EUR	3	29	23.4	23.4	91.1
OOCON	4	11	8.9	8.9	100.0

TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0
-------	-----	-------	-------

Mean	1.806	Std Dev	1.080	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases	124	Missing Cases	0
-------------	-----	---------------	---

Q4 YEAR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
85	1	1	.8	.8	.8
86	2	3	2.4	2.4	3.2
87	3	20	16.1	16.1	19.4
88	4	37	29.8	29.8	49.2
89	5	63	50.8	50.8	100.0

TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0
-------	-----	-------	-------

Mean	4.274	Std Dev	.877	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases	124	Missing Cases	0
-------------	-----	---------------	---

Q5 NUMBER EM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	4	3.2	3.2	3.2
	1	1	.8	.8	4.0
	2	1	.8	.8	4.8
	10	1	.8	.8	5.6
	20	1	.8	.8	6.5
	40	1	.8	.8	7.3
	45	1	.8	.8	8.1
	48	1	.8	.8	8.9
	50	3	2.4	2.4	11.3
	65	1	.8	.8	12.1
	70	3	2.4	2.4	14.5
	75	2	1.6	1.6	16.1
	80	1	.8	.8	16.9
	85	1	.8	.8	17.7
	105	1	.8	.8	18.5
	125	1	.8	.8	19.4
	130	1	.8	.8	20.2
	135	1	.8	.8	21.0
	150	2	1.6	1.6	22.6
	165	1	.8	.8	23.4
	180	1	.8	.8	24.2
	195	1	.8	.8	25.0
	200	3	2.4	2.4	27.4
	210	1	.8	.8	28.2
	220	2	1.6	1.6	29.8
	240	1	.8	.8	30.6
	250	1	.8	.8	31.5
	270	1	.8	.8	32.3
	275	1	.8	.8	33.1
	300	2	1.6	1.6	34.7
	301	1	.8	.8	35.5
	319	1	.8	.8	36.3
	325	2	1.6	1.6	37.9
	330	1	.8	.8	38.7
	340	1	.8	.8	39.5
	350	1	.8	.8	40.3
	370	1	.8	.8	41.1
	378	1	.8	.8	41.9
	380	1	.8	.8	42.7
	400	2	1.6	1.6	44.4
	402	1	.8	.8	45.2
	408	1	.8	.8	46.0
	420	2	1.6	1.6	47.6
	430	1	.8	.8	48.4
	440	1	.8	.8	49.2
	450	1	.8	.8	50.0
	500	7	5.6	5.6	55.6
	508	1	.8	.8	56.5
	513	1	.8	.8	57.3

Q5 NUMBER EM

515	2	1.6	1.6	58.9
520	3	2.4	2.4	61.3
521	1	.8	.8	62.1
540	3	2.4	2.4	64.5
549	1	.8	.8	65.3
550	3	2.4	2.4	67.7
560	1	.8	.8	68.5
566	1	.8	.8	69.4
568	1	.8	.8	70.2
580	1	.8	.8	71.0
600	4	3.2	3.2	74.2
615	1	.8	.8	75.0
620	1	.8	.8	75.8
630	1	.8	.8	76.6
640	1	.8	.8	77.4
650	6	4.8	4.8	82.3
653	1	.8	.8	83.1
684	1	.8	.8	83.9
705	1	.8	.8	84.7
710	1	.8	.8	85.5
715	1	.8	.8	86.3
750	4	3.2	3.2	89.5
800	2	1.6	1.6	91.1
850	1	.8	.8	91.9
860	1	.8	.8	92.7
875	2	1.6	1.6	94.4
900	1	.8	.8	95.2
1050	1	.8	.8	96.0
1100	2	1.6	1.6	97.6
1200	1	.8	.8	98.4
1300	1	.8	.8	99.2
1600	1	.8	.8	100.0

TOTAL

124

100.0

100.0

Mean 440.492

Std Dev 304.783

Minimum 0.0

Maximum 1600.000

Valid Cases 124

Missing Cases 0

Q6 NUMBER EW

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	50	40.3	40.3	40.3
	3	2	1.6	1.6	41.9
	4	1	.8	.8	42.7
	7	2	1.6	1.6	44.4
	9	1	.8	.8	45.2
	10	6	4.8	4.8	50.0
	12	1	.8	.8	50.8
	15	4	3.2	3.2	54.0
	20	6	4.8	4.8	58.9
	22	2	1.6	1.6	60.5
	24	1	.8	.8	61.3
	25	2	1.6	1.6	62.9
	35	2	1.6	1.6	64.5
	39	1	.8	.8	65.3
	40	4	3.2	3.2	68.5
	42	1	.8	.8	69.4
	44	1	.8	.8	70.2
	45	2	1.6	1.6	71.8
	50	4	3.2	3.2	75.0
	52	1	.8	.8	75.8
	56	1	.8	.8	76.6
	60	2	1.6	1.6	78.2
	66	1	.8	.8	79.0
	68	1	.8	.8	79.8
	75	2	1.6	1.6	81.5
	76	1	.8	.8	82.3
	80	2	1.6	1.6	83.9
	90	2	1.6	1.6	85.5
	94	1	.8	.8	86.3
	100	3	2.4	2.4	88.7
	120	3	2.4	2.4	91.1
	125	1	.8	.8	91.9
	131	1	.8	.8	92.7
	140	1	.8	.8	93.5
	145	1	.8	.8	94.4
	150	1	.8	.8	95.2
	190	1	.8	.8	96.0
	200	1	.8	.8	96.8
	400	4	3.2	3.2	100.0
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	43.637	Std Dev	78.665	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	400.000				
Valid Cases	124	Missing Cases	0		

Q7 NUMBER OM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	1	.8	.8	.8
	1	3	2.4	2.4	3.2
	2	4	3.2	3.2	6.5
	3	6	4.8	4.8	11.3
	4	1	.8	.8	12.1
	5	1	.8	.8	12.9
	6	3	2.4	2.4	15.3
	7	1	.8	.8	16.1
	8	1	.8	.8	16.9
	9	1	.8	.8	17.7
	10	2	1.6	1.6	19.4
	11	1	.8	.8	20.2
	13	2	1.6	1.6	21.8
	14	2	1.6	1.6	23.4
	17	1	.8	.8	24.2
	18	2	1.6	1.6	25.8
	19	2	1.6	1.6	27.4
	20	2	1.6	1.6	29.0
	21	1	.8	.8	29.8
	22	5	4.0	4.0	33.9
	24	2	1.6	1.6	35.5
	25	4	3.2	3.2	38.7
	26	1	.8	.8	39.5
	28	1	.8	.8	40.3
	29	1	.8	.8	41.1
	30	5	4.0	4.0	45.2
	31	1	.8	.8	46.0
	32	2	1.6	1.6	47.6
	35	7	5.6	5.6	53.2
	36	5	4.0	4.0	57.3
	37	1	.8	.8	58.1
	38	2	1.6	1.6	59.7
	39	1	.8	.8	60.5
	40	5	4.0	4.0	64.5
	41	2	1.6	1.6	66.1
	42	1	.8	.8	66.9
	44	1	.8	.8	67.7
	45	11	8.9	8.9	76.6
	48	3	2.4	2.4	79.0
	49	1	.8	.8	79.8
	50	5	4.0	4.0	83.9
	51	1	.8	.8	84.7
	52	2	1.6	1.6	86.3
	54	1	.8	.8	87.1
	60	2	1.6	1.6	88.7
	61	1	.8	.8	89.5
	65	1	.8	.8	90.3
	72	1	.8	.8	91.1
	73	1	.8	.8	91.9

Q7	NUMBER OM				
		75	2	1.6	93.5
		78	1	.8	94.4
		96	1	.8	95.2
		100	3	2.4	97.6
		110	1	.8	98.4
		350	1	.8	99.2
		400	1	.8	100.0

	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0
--	-------	-----	-------	-------

Mean	39.274	Std Dev	49.114	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	400.000				

Valid Cases	124	Missing Cases	0
-------------	-----	---------------	---

Q8 NUMBER OW

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	58	46.8	46.8	46.8
	1	9	7.3	7.3	54.0
	2	12	9.7	9.7	63.7
	3	6	4.8	4.8	68.5
	4	4	3.2	3.2	71.8
	5	8	6.5	6.5	78.2
	6	3	2.4	2.4	80.6
	7	2	1.6	1.6	82.3
	8	4	3.2	3.2	85.5
	9	2	1.6	1.6	87.1
	10	4	3.2	3.2	90.3
	11	2	1.6	1.6	91.9
	12	2	1.6	1.6	93.5
	13	2	1.6	1.6	95.2
	15	1	.8	.8	96.0
	16	1	.8	.8	96.8
	20	1	.8	.8	97.6
	29	1	.8	.8	98.4
	30	1	.8	.8	99.2
	50	1	.8	.8	100.0

	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0
--	-------	-----	-------	-------

Mean	3.718	Std Dev	6.793	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	50.000				

Valid Cases	124	Missing Cases	0
-------------	-----	---------------	---

Q9 SOLE PAR EM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	28	22.6	23.3	23.3
	1	14	11.3	11.7	35.0
	2	17	13.7	14.2	49.2
	3	10	8.1	8.3	57.5
	4	8	6.5	6.7	64.2
	5	11	8.9	9.2	73.3
	6	6	4.8	5.0	78.3
	7	3	2.4	2.5	80.8
	10	12	9.7	10.0	90.8
	12	3	2.4	2.5	93.3
	15	1	.8	.8	94.2
	20	5	4.0	4.2	98.3
	30	1	.8	.8	99.2
	50	1	.8	.8	100.0
	.	4	3.2	MISSING	
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.775	Std Dev	6.773	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	50.000				
Valid Cases	120	Missing Cases	4		

Q10 SOLE PAR EW

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	52	41.9	43.3	43.3
	1	2	1.6	1.7	45.0
	2	15	12.1	12.5	57.5
	3	5	4.0	4.2	61.7
	4	6	4.8	5.0	66.7
	5	7	5.6	5.8	72.5
	6	1	.8	.8	73.3
	7	2	1.6	1.7	75.0
	9	1	.8	.8	75.8
	10	5	4.0	4.2	80.0
	12	5	4.0	4.2	84.2
	14	2	1.6	1.7	85.8
	15	3	2.4	2.5	88.3
	16	1	.8	.8	89.2
	18	2	1.6	1.7	90.8
	20	5	4.0	4.2	95.0
	25	3	2.4	2.5	97.5
	30	2	1.6	1.7	99.2
	50	1	.8	.8	100.0
	.	4	3.2	MISSING	
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	5.458	Std Dev	8.394	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	50.000				
Valid Cases	120	Missing Cases	4		

Q11 SOLE PAR OM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	100	80.6	83.3	83.3
	1	11	8.9	9.2	92.5
	2	4	3.2	3.3	95.8
	3	2	1.6	1.7	97.5
	4	1	.8	.8	98.3
	5	1	.8	.8	99.2
	10	1	.8	.8	100.0
	.	4	3.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	.367	Std Dev	1.195	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	10.000				
Valid Cases	120	Missing Cases	4		

Q12 SOLE PAR OW

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	98	79.0	81.7	81.7
	1	15	12.1	12.5	94.2
	2	3	2.4	2.5	96.7
	5	2	1.6	1.7	98.3
	10	1	.8	.8	99.2
	20	1	.8	.8	100.0
	.	4	3.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	.508	Std Dev	2.142	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	20.000				
Valid Cases	120	Missing Cases	4		

Q13 ENL SHT DEP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	5	4.0	4.9	4.9
	10	2	1.6	1.9	6.8
	25	2	1.6	1.9	8.7
	30	1	.8	1.0	9.7
	40	1	.8	1.0	10.7
	50	6	4.8	5.8	16.5
	60	1	.8	1.0	17.5
	66	1	.8	1.0	18.4
	70	1	.8	1.0	19.4
	75	6	4.8	5.8	25.2
	80	8	6.5	7.8	33.0
	85	1	.8	1.0	34.0
	90	10	8.1	9.7	43.7
	95	1	.8	1.0	44.7
	100	57	46.0	55.3	100.0
	.	21	16.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	82.583	Std Dev	28.277	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	100.000				
Valid Cases	103	Missing Cases	21		

Q14 ENL LONG DEP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	14	11.3	13.7	13.7
	5	3	2.4	2.9	16.7
	10	4	3.2	3.9	20.6
	15	1	.8	1.0	21.6
	20	2	1.6	2.0	23.5
	25	3	2.4	2.9	26.5
	30	3	2.4	2.9	29.4
	33	1	.8	1.0	30.4
	40	2	1.6	2.0	32.4
	50	16	12.9	15.7	48.0
	60	3	2.4	2.9	51.0
	75	5	4.0	4.9	55.9
	80	2	1.6	2.0	57.8
	90	6	4.8	5.9	63.7
	95	4	3.2	3.9	67.6
	100	33	26.6	32.4	100.0
	.	22	17.7	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	60.029	Std Dev	38.438	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	100.000				
Valid Cases	102	Missing Cases	22		

Q15 OFF SKT DEP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	1	.8	2.8	2.8
	30	1	.8	2.8	5.6
	80	1	.8	2.8	8.3
	90	1	.8	2.8	11.1
	95	2	1.6	5.6	16.7
	99	1	.8	2.8	19.4
	100	29	23.4	80.6	100.0
	.	88	71.0	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	94.139	Std Dev	20.152	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	100.000				
Valid Cases	36	Missing Cases	88		

Q16 OFF LONG DEP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	2	1.6	5.6	5.6
	50	3	2.4	8.3	13.9
	60	1	.8	2.8	16.7
	75	1	.8	2.8	19.4
	80	1	.8	2.8	22.2
	85	1	.8	2.8	25.0
	95	2	1.6	5.6	30.6
	100	25	20.2	69.4	100.0
	.	88	71.0	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	87.222	Std Dev	26.470	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	100.000				
Valid Cases	36	Missing Cases	88		

Q17 SOLE ENL CHECK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MO	1	28	22.6	26.9	26.9
QT	2	49	39.5	47.1	74.0
SA	3	18	14.5	17.3	91.3
AN	4	4	3.2	3.8	95.2
EX	5	2	1.6	1.9	97.1
NV	6	3	2.4	2.9	100.0
	.	20	16.1	MISSING	
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.154	Std Dev	1.104	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				
Valid Cases	104	Missing Cases	20		

Q18 SOLE OFF CHECK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MO	1	8	6.5	18.2	18.2
QT	2	15	12.1	34.1	52.3
SA	3	7	5.6	15.9	68.2
AN	4	3	2.4	6.8	75.0
EX	5	3	2.4	6.8	81.8
NV	6	8	6.5	18.2	100.0
	.	80	64.5	MISSING	
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.045	Std Dev	1.765	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				
Valid Cases	44	Missing Cases	80		

Q19 UNIT DEPLOY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
WK	1	6	4.8	5.7	5.7
MO	2	39	31.5	37.1	42.9
QT	3	32	25.8	30.5	73.3
SA	4	10	8.1	9.5	82.9
AN	5	4	3.2	3.8	86.7
NO	6	14	11.3	13.3	100.0
	.	19	15.3	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.086	Std Dev	1.435	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				
Valid Cases	105	Missing Cases	19		

Q20 SOLE OFF DEPLOY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MLL	1	4	3.2	11.8	11.8
LL	2	5	4.0	14.7	26.5
AL	3	23	18.5	67.6	94.1
ML	4	1	.8	2.9	97.1
MML	5	1	.8	2.9	100.0
	.	90	72.6	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.706	Std Dev	.836	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	34	Missing Cases	90		

Q21 SOLE ENL DEPLOY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MLL	1	5	4.0	5.2	5.2
LL	2	6	4.8	6.2	11.3
AL	3	57	46.0	58.9	70.1
ML	4	25	20.2	25.8	95.9
MML	5	4	3.2	4.1	100.0
	.	27	21.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.175 Std Dev .817 Minimum 1.000
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 97 Missing Cases 27

Q22 REAR DETACHMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NR	1	28	22.6	29.2	29.2
SEL	2	55	44.4	57.3	86.5
OFT	3	13	10.5	13.5	100.0
	.	28	22.6	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.844 Std Dev .638 Minimum 1.000
Maximum 3.000

Valid Cases 96 Missing Cases 28

Q23 RSNS REAR DET

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RP	1	28	22.6	29.8	29.8
FC	2	16	12.9	17.0	46.8
NST	3	28	22.6	29.8	76.6
HAD TO	4	16	12.9	17.0	93.6
NONE	5	6	4.8	6.4	100.0
	.	30	24.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.532 Std Dev 1.259 Minimum 1.000
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 94 Missing Cases 30

Q24 SOLE PERFORMANCE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EX	1	8	6.5	7.7	7.7
BA	2	22	17.7	21.2	28.8
AV	3	68	54.8	65.4	94.2
BEL AV	4	6	4.8	5.8	100.0
	.	20	16.1	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.692 Std Dev .698 Minimum 1.000
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 104 Missing Cases 20

Q25 RATED BY NCO

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EX	1	7	5.6	6.7	6.7
BA	2	18	14.5	17.3	24.0
AV	3	59	47.6	56.7	80.3
BEL AV	4	20	16.1	19.2	100.0
	.	20	16.1	MISSING	
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.985	Std Dev	.792	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 104 Missing Cases 20

Q26 ASSIGN SOLE POLICY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ANY	1	55	44.4	52.4	52.4
SPT	2	4	3.2	3.8	56.2
NDU	3	46	37.1	43.8	100.0
	.	19	15.3	MISSING	
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.914	Std Dev	.982	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				

Valid Cases 105 Missing Cases 19

Q27 ENLIST POLICY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SA	1	45	36.3	42.9	42.9
AG	2	34	27.4	32.4	75.2
DIS	3	12	9.7	11.4	86.7
SDIS	4	8	6.5	7.6	94.3
UND	5	6	4.8	5.7	100.0
	.	19	15.3	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.010	Std Dev	1.173	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 105 Missing Cases 19

Q28 RETENTION SOLE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SA	1	19	15.3	18.3	18.3
AG	2	51	41.1	49.0	67.3
DIS	3	19	15.3	18.3	85.6
SDIS	4	15	12.1	14.4	100.0
	.	20	16.1	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.288	Std Dev	.931	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 104 Missing Cases 20

Q29 FORMAL TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YGV	1	6	4.8	5.7	5.7
YLV	2	13	10.5	12.4	18.1
YNV	3	2	1.6	1.9	20.0
NO	4	66	53.2	62.9	82.9
UNK	5	18	14.5	17.1	100.0
	.	19	15.3	MISSING	
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.733 Std Dev 1.068 Minimum 1.000
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 105 Missing Cases 19

Q30 POLICY FT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
HD	1	32	25.8	30.5	30.5
DA	2	10	8.1	9.5	40.0
FCP	3	58	46.8	55.2	95.2
OTR	5	5	4.0	4.8	100.0
	.	19	15.3	MISSING	
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.390 Std Dev 1.070 Minimum 1.000
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 105 Missing Cases 19

Q31 HOSTILITIES AND SP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
PROC	1	61	49.2	59.2	59.2
FCF	2	30	24.2	29.1	88.3
FAMSN	3	12	9.7	11.7	100.0
	.	21	16.9	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.524	Std Dev	.698	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	103	Missing Cases	21		

Q32 NO DUAL EM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	21	16.9	17.6	17.6
	1	8	6.5	6.7	24.4
	2	18	14.5	15.1	39.5
	3	9	7.3	7.6	47.1
	4	7	5.6	5.9	52.9
	5	9	7.3	7.6	60.5
	6	3	2.4	2.5	63.0
	7	2	1.6	1.7	64.7
	8	5	4.0	4.2	68.9
	10	12	9.7	10.1	79.0
	12	2	1.6	1.7	80.7
	15	6	4.8	5.0	85.7
	16	1	.8	.8	86.6
	20	6	4.8	5.0	91.6
	24	1	.8	.8	92.4
	29	1	.8	.8	93.3
	32	1	.8	.8	94.1
	40	3	2.4	2.5	96.6
	50	2	1.6	1.7	98.3
	60	1	.8	.8	99.2
	99	1	.8	.8	100.0
	.	5	4.0	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	8.824	Std Dev	13.929	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	99.000				
Valid Cases	119	Missing Cases	5		

Q33 NO DUAL OFF

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	50	40.3	42.0	42.0
	1	26	21.0	21.8	63.9
	2	21	16.9	17.6	81.5
	3	6	4.8	5.0	86.6
	4	6	4.8	5.0	91.6
	5	3	2.4	2.5	94.1
	7	2	1.6	1.7	95.8
	10	3	2.4	2.5	98.3
	15	1	.8	.8	99.2
	30	1	.8	.8	100.0
	.	5	4.0	MISSING	
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.798 Std Dev 3.533 Minimum 0.0
 Maximum 30.000

Valid Cases 119 Missing Cases 5

Q34 NO MIXED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	97	78.2	81.5	81.5
	1	16	12.9	13.4	95.0
	2	5	4.0	4.2	99.2
	5	1	.8	.8	100.0
	.	5	4.0	MISSING	
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	

Mean .261 Std Dev .670 Minimum 0.0
 Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 119 Missing Cases 5

Q35 DUAL ENL SHT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	1	.8	1.0	1.0
	10	1	.8	1.0	2.0
	33	1	.8	1.0	3.1
	40	1	.8	1.0	4.1
	50	16	12.9	16.3	20.4
	70	1	.8	1.0	21.4
	75	7	5.6	7.1	28.6
	80	4	3.2	4.1	32.7
	90	3	2.4	3.1	35.7
	95	3	2.4	3.1	39.8
	100	60	48.4	61.2	100.0
	.	26	21.0	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	85.235	Std Dev	23.170	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	100.000				
Valid Cases	98	Missing Cases	26		

Q36 DUAL ENL LONG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	15	12.1	15.5	15.5
	5	1	.8	1.0	16.5
	10	2	1.6	2.1	18.6
	15	1	.8	1.0	19.6
	25	3	2.4	3.1	22.7
	30	3	2.4	3.1	25.8
	33	1	.8	1.0	26.8
	40	1	.8	1.0	27.8
	50	16	12.9	16.5	44.3
	60	2	1.6	2.1	46.4
	70	1	.8	1.0	47.4
	75	6	4.8	6.2	53.6
	80	2	1.6	2.1	55.7
	90	3	2.4	3.1	58.8
	95	1	.8	1.0	59.8
	100	39	31.5	40.2	100.0
	.	27	21.8	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	63.330	Std Dev	38.277	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	100.000				
Valid Cases	97	Missing Cases	27		

Q37 DUAL OFF SHT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	10	1	.8	1.6	1.6
	50	3	2.4	4.7	6.3
	75	1	.3	1.6	7.8
	80	1	.8	1.6	9.4
	90	1	.8	1.6	10.9
	95	1	.8	1.6	12.5
	99	1	.8	1.6	14.1
	100	55	44.4	85.9	100.0
	.	60	48.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	95.297	Std Dev	15.602	Minimum	10.000
Maximum	100.000				
Valid Cases	64	Missing Cases	60		

Q38 DUAL OFF LONG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	3	2.4	4.7	4.7
	50	5	4.0	7.8	12.5
	70	1	.8	1.6	14.1
	75	1	.8	1.6	15.6
	80	1	.8	1.6	17.2
	90	2	1.6	3.1	20.3
	95	1	.8	1.6	21.9
	100	50	40.3	78.1	100.0
	.	60	48.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	89.844	Std Dev	24.575	Minimum	0.0
Maximum	100.000				
Valid Cases	64	Missing Cases	60		

Q39 DUAL MIX SHT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	1	.8	5.0	5.0
	50	2	1.6	10.0	15.0
	80	1	.8	5.0	20.0
	95	2	1.6	10.0	30.0
	100	14	11.3	70.0	100.0
	.	104	83.9	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 88.500 Std Dev 25.960 Minimum 0.0
Maximum 100.000

Valid Cases 20 Missing Cases 104

Q40 DUAL MIX LONG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	3	2.4	15.0	15.0
	40	1	.8	5.0	20.0
	50	1	.8	5.0	25.0
	75	1	.8	5.0	30.0
	95	1	.8	5.0	35.0
	100	13	10.5	65.0	100.0
	.	104	83.9	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 78.000 Std Dev 37.746 Minimum 0.0
Maximum 100.000

Valid Cases 20 Missing Cases 104

Q41 E TO E CHECK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MO	1	26	21.0	26.0	26.0
QR	2	48	38.7	48.0	74.0
SA	3	12	9.7	12.0	86.0
EX	4	5	4.0	5.0	91.0
NVR	5	9	7.3	9.0	100.0
	.	24	19.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.230 Std Dev 1.162 Minimum 1.000
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 100 Missing Cases 24

Q42 O TO O CHECK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MO	1	15	12.1	20.5	20.5
QR	2	29	23.4	39.7	60.3
SA	3	7	5.6	9.6	69.9
EX	4	4	3.2	5.5	75.3
NVR	5	18	14.5	24.7	100.0
	.	51	41.1	MISSING	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.740 Std Dev 1.491 Minimum 1.000
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 73 Missing Cases 51

Q43 O TO E CHECK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MO	1	5	4.0	16.1	16.1
QR	2	12	9.7	38.7	54.8
SA	3	2	1.6	6.5	61.3
EX	4	1	.8	3.2	64.5
NVR	5	11	8.9	35.5	100.0
	.	93	75.0	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.032 Std Dev 1.602 Minimum 1.000
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 31 Missing Cases 93

Q44 DUAL RESP TO DEPL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MLL	2	8	6.5	7.9	7.9
ALL	3	72	58.1	71.3	79.2
LLL	4	14	11.3	13.9	93.1
MLLL	5	7	5.6	6.9	100.0
	.	23	18.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.198 Std Dev .679 Minimum 2.000
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 101 Missing Cases 23

Q45 DUAL RET POLICY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
D ONE	1	27	21.8	23.3	23.3
RET WAV	2	11	8.9	9.5	32.8
RET FCP	3	71	57.3	61.2	94.0
BLK	4	4	3.2	3.4	97.4
OTR	5	3	2.4	2.6	100.0
	.	8	6.5	MISSING	
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.526 Std Dev .973 Minimum 1.000
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 116 Missing Cases 8

Q46 HOSTILITIES AND DP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
P MSN	1	62	50.0	57.9	57.9
ONE FF	2	31	25.0	29.0	86.9
BOTH FF	3	3	2.4	2.8	89.7
ONE LONG	4	11	8.9	10.3	100.0
	.	17	13.7	MISSING	
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.654 Std Dev .953 Minimum 1.000
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 107 Missing Cases 17

Q47 HOSTIL AND CIV SPOUSE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
P MSN	1	100	80.6	88.5	88.5
FAM STA	2	11	8.9	9.7	98.2
FAM LTA	3	2	1.6	1.8	100.0
.	.	11	8.9	MISSING	
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.133 Std Dev .390 Minimum 1.000
Maximum 3.000

Valid Cases 113 Missing Cases 11

Q48 RATE CHILD CARE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SUP	1	18	14.5	15.4	15.4
GOOD	2	45	36.3	38.5	53.8
FAIR	3	27	21.8	23.1	76.9
POOR	4	11	8.9	9.4	86.3
VRV PR	5	5	4.0	4.3	90.6
NONE	6	11	8.9	9.4	100.0
.	.	7	5.6	MISSING	
TOTAL		124	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.769 Std Dev 1.441 Minimum 1.000
Maximum 6.000

Valid Cases 117 Missing Cases 7

Q49 COST TOO HIGH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	40	32.3	100.0	100.0
	.	84	67.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.000	Std Dev	0.0	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	1.000				
Valid Cases	40	Missing Cases	84		

Q50 HOURS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	25	20.2	100.0	100.0
	.	99	79.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.000	Std Dev	0.0	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	1.000				
Valid Cases	25	Missing Cases	99		

Q51 WAITING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	54	43.5	100.0	100.0
	.	70	56.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.000	Std Dev	0.0	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	1.000				
Valid Cases	54	Missing Cases	70		

Q52 FACILITIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	15	12.1	100.0	100.0
	.	109	87.9	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.000	Std Dev	0.0	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	1.000				
Valid Cases	15	Missing Cases	109		

Q53 CARE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	2	1.6	100.0	100.0
	.	122	98.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.000	Std Dev	0.0	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	1.000				
Valid Cases	2	Missing Cases	122		

Q54 NO OVERNITE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	54	43.5	100.0	100.0
	.	70	56.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.000	Std Dev	0.0	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	1.000				
Valid Cases	54	Missing Cases	70		

Q55 NO FAILURE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	14	11.3	100.0	100.0
	.	110	88.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.000	Std Dev	0.0	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	1.000				
Valid Cases	14	Missing Cases	110		

Q56 OTHER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	5	4.0	100.0	100.0
	.	119	96.0	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	124	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.000	Std Dev	0.0	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	1.000				
Valid Cases	5	Missing Cases	119		

APPENDIX C

SOLE-PARENTS AND DUAL-MILITARY COUPLES*

SOLE PARENTS ALL GRADES

<u>FY</u>	<u>MALE</u>	<u>FEMALE</u>
1977	16,471 (2.3%)**	1,926 (3.8%)
1979	19,260 (2.8%)	2,950 (5.0%)
1981	28,750 (3.0%)	4,100 (5.9%)
1983	24,069 (3.5%)	6,240 (8.7%)
1985	23,261 (3.4%)	7,127 (9.2%)
1987	24,214 (3.5%)	8,453 (10.3%)
1988	24,325 (3.6%)	8,710 (10.7%)
1989	24,984 (3.7%)	9,677 (11.5%)

MARRIED ARMY COUPLES

<u>FY</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>%***</u>
1988	36,417	4.9
1989	39,146	5.2

*Data provided by the Defense Manpower Data Center,
Monterey, California as of the end of each fiscal
year.

**Percent of respective population

***Percent of total Army strength

APPENDIX D

DISCHARGES*

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>PREGNANCY</u>		<u>PARENTHOOD</u>		<u>DEP/HARDSHIP</u>	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
1977	NA	1693	66	434	3442	489
1979	NA	2759	650	735	2598	447
1981	NA	3306	472	683	1236	287
1983	NA	2245	304	614	1054	282
1985	NA	2019	283	525	1053	270
1987	NA	2054	282	520	1272	394
1988	NA	1935	282	520	1517	408

* Data provided by the Defense Manpower Data Center,
Monterey, California.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Defense Manpower Data Center, Statistical Report of Single Parents on Active Duty in the U.S. Army. Monterey, California. September, 1989.
2. Holm, Jeanne. Women in the Military; An Unfinished Revolution. Navato: Pre idio Press, 1982.
3. Loring, Nancy H., ed. Women in the Armed Forces: Progress and Barriers in the 1980s. Chicago: Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society, 1984. p. 174: "Sex-Role Attributes, Mental Health, and Job Satisfaction Among Enlisted Army Women in Traditional and Nontraditional Military Units." by Martha A. Marsten.
4. Maze, Rick. "Army Inspectors Blast Pacific Child Care Plans." Army Times, 21 August 1989. p. 6.
5. Maze, Rick. "Child Care Center Funds Get Boost." Army Times, 6 November 1989. p. 10.
6. Maze, Rick. "Child Care Reform Calls for No Fee Increase." Army Times, 18 September 1989. p. 4.
7. Maze, Rick. "Hill Panel Wants Study of Military Single Parents." Army Times, 17 July 1989. p. 4.
8. Pliske, Rebecca M. Families and Readiness: An Examination of the 1985 DOD Survey of Enlisted Personnel. Alexandria: U.S. Army Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 1988.
9. Segal, David R. and Sinaiko, H. Wallace., ed. Life in the Rank and File. Washington: Pergamon-Brassey's, 1986. p. 184: "Enlisted Family Life in the U.S. Army: A Portrait of a Community," by Mady W. Segal.
10. Teplitzky, Martha L., et al. Case Studies of Officer and Enlisted Single Parents in the Army: Performance, Retention, and Quality of Life. Alexandria: US. Army Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 1987.
11. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services. National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990-1991. H. Rept. 101-121, 101st Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1989.
12. U.S. Department of the Army, Army Personnel Survey Division, Soldier Support Center National Capital Region. Information Paper. "Annual Army Personnel Composite." 3 January 1989.

13. U.S. Department of the Army. Army Regulation 600-20: Army Command Policy and Procedures. Washington: 30 March 1988.

14. U.S. Department of the Army, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel. Message, "Family Care Plans, AR 600-20. Washington: 19 October 1989.

15. U.S. Department of the Army, Soldier Survey Division, Soldier Support Center, National Capital Region. Sample Survey of Military Personnel. Alexandria: February 1983.

16. U.S. General Accounting Office. Report to Congressional Requestors, GAO/HRD-89-3. "Military Child Care: Extensive, Diverse, and Growing." Washington: 8 March 1989.

17. U.S. General Accounting Office. Technical Report to the Secretary of the Army, GAO-FCPD-82-50. "Army Needs Better Data to Develop Policies for Sole and Inservice Parents." Washington: 1982.

18. U.S. General Accounting Office, Technical Report to the Secretary of Defense, GAO FPCD-82-30. "Military Child Care Programs: Progress Made, More Needed." Washington: 1982.

19. U.S. War Department. Women's Army Auxiliary Corps Regulations (Tentative): Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. Washington: 28 May 1942.

20. Vernez, Georges., et al. Army Family Programs and Readiness Study: Descriptive Tabulations of the 1987 Surveys of Soldiers and Spouses (Working Draft). Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1989.

21. Vernez, Georges and Zellman, Gail L. Families and Mission: A Review of the Effects of Family Factors on Army Attrition, Retention and Readiness. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, August 1987.