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Abstract

The debate between organization culture and organization climate has manifested in studies to delineate and define the dynamics of both these phenomena with the only agreement being that one does not exist without the other. This dissertation employed a quantitative analysis of the 2015 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey results to distinguish the compatibility of civilian employees with military service and the culture of their respective Federal agency as determined through their climate assessment. The extant literature supports the premise that the deliberate socialization tactics of military service enculturate the members identity which will be continued once the military member transitions to the civilian workplace. Formulating the survey items into the climate factors developed by Stringer, the research studied the survey results of 10 Federal agencies, comparing the resulting means of the self-disclosed workplace perceptions between the employees with military service and those without. The analysis clearly supported that employees with military service reported a more favorable climate in military affiliated Federal agencies than their counterparts, while conveying a less favorable perception of Federal agencies not affiliated with the military. These results subsequently indicated significant relationships with job satisfaction and turnover intention. This study extends the body of knowledge regarding work role transition and the enculturation of socialization tactics, as well as the relationship of organization climate perceptions and their relationship with organization member behavior outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intention.
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Chapter I: Introduction

Overview

One of the dilemmas facing the modern world is an everchanging and dynamic workforce. Some of the most common pretexts which provoke such change include: (a) advances in science and technology; (b) migration from underdeveloped to developed countries; (c) mergers and acquisitions; (d) shifts in generational workforce domination; and (e) displaced workers from a communal industry or organization (de Lange, 2013; Gallo, 2016; Lennerfors, 2013; Lewin & Zhong, 2013; Mason, 2016). When these influxes concentrate in an organization or industry, the disruptions in organizational operations can occur through a shift in workplace attitudes and perceptions. Organizations and researchers seek to better understand these disruptions through an examination of culture and climate within the organization (Denison, 1996), since the workers inhabiting the various levels of an organization are instrumental to an organization’s ability to identify and address emergent changes in the internal and external operating environment (Beer & Walton, 1987; Burke, 2014; Koller, 2016).

This study explored the effect of cultural compatibility through the self-reported workplace attitudes of United States (US) military veterans working in the US federal government as civilian employees. The purpose of this research was to conduct a comparative study of the workplace attitudes between US military veterans and non-military veterans in the US federal workforce using existing data from the
Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS), formerly the Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) (Office of Personnel Management [OPM], 2016) in order to analyze the effect of a divergent work population on the overall climate assessment of an organization. The study examined two distinct populations in the federal workforce, military veterans and non-military veterans, across three sectors of the US federal workplace. These three sectors consisted of Agencies categorized as either military, para-military, and non-military, contingent upon each agency’s affiliation with the nation’s defense capabilities. The study sought to determine if a shared identity of the military pervades with US military service members after they transition to civilian roles in the federal government, and how it is reflected in this population’s collective attitude towards the organizations in which they work.

The US government’s OPM administers the FEVS annually to government employees to discern workplace attitudes, promote employee engagement, and assist government agencies in human capital management efforts. The present study employed FEVS results for the year 2015, as this year was only one of two surveys conducted that provided veteran status demographics not included in preceding or successive surveys. This study used the responses and demographics provided by the FEVS to analyze and compare responses given by civilian employees who previously served in the US military with those of their coworkers who disclosed no previous military experience. This study assessed their views on the climate of their respective organizations, their trust in their leadership, and their overall level of job satisfaction.
Using the six organization climate factors established by Stringer’s (2002) Climate Assessment Survey, a cross-comparison of the results of the FEVS strived to disclose disparities of the veteran civilian employees’ view of their workplace against those of their non-veteran counterparts. These results were analyzed across various sectors of the federal government based upon the functional vocation of selected government agencies and their alignment with the role of the US military to determine if the job satisfaction expressed by the veteran employees correlated more closely with military government agencies rather than those of non-military government agencies. The purpose of this correlation was to establish the amount of compatibility a distinctly identified workforce has with the organization’s culture as demonstrated by the relative alignment of the group’s workplace attitudes relative to the organization’s alignment with the group’s shared experience. In this case, the proposition was forwarded that civilian employees with military service experience demonstrate a stronger affinity towards organizations aligned with a military mission than towards an organization without military affiliation.

**Background of the Study**

Organizational culture has a profound effect upon its membership through the social process of establishing and imbedding its norms, values, traditions, and customs into the mindsets of its individual members (Morgan, 2006). Organizational cultures are multilayered and should be viewed from both the “whole” and the “individual” perspectives. The culture of an organization, whether it is a team, group,
or corporation, normally exhibits its first two levels of culture either superficially, through artifacts, or normatively, through espoused values that are readily experienced by the outside observer, yet do not fully disclose the true nature of the organization’s culture (Schein, 1999, 2010, 2016). The subliminal effect of the underlying assumptions of the organization’s culture more readily establish the way things are done in the organization (2010). Understanding these underlying values of employees in an organization leads to a fuller understanding of the organization’s culture.

Still, the overlying culture of an organization may not clearly define the accepted norms, values, traditions, and morals of all of its members. Depending on the size of the organization, it will also exhibit differing strata of culture at the macro-, meso-, and micro-levels within the organization (Winslow, 2000). These strata demonstrate a more general integrated culture at the macro-level of the organization, but the culture begins to differentiate at the meso-levels of the organization as subgroups establish their own norms. The culture finally becomes fragmented at the micro-level as individuals inject their own unique values, beliefs, and norms into the group or team level culture (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Winslow, 2000). Further, loyalties become divided as coalitions begin to form at the sublevels of the organization (Morgan, 2006). As these groups begin to coalesce within the organization, they begin to compete with other groups for power, influence, and resources (Smith & Berg, 1987).
While most organizations may strive to homogenize the employees recruited into their organization through the integrative process of socialization, this is not always the case or desirable (Sacco & Bernstein, 2015). Organizations seeking to capitalize on a wide array of skill sets and competencies offered by a diverse workforce should familiarize themselves with the cultural identities of the various groups sought, whom may vary by profession, ethnicity, or level of education and training through self-selection of membership (Barness, Tenbrunsel, Michael, & Lawsono, 2002). These groups bring a cultural identity that may not immediately be conducive to the organization itself, but with proper social transition, can readily adjust to meet their needs and capitalize on their unique skillsets and competencies.

One such group prevalent in the US is military veterans. From 2001 to 2017, an annual average of 256,000 US military personnel transitioned from a military lifestyle to the civilian sector (Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS], 2018). While many of these potential employees have various skillsets that can directly convert to the civilian sector, all of these employees have distinct values and traits that are borne of their tenure in the military service. Yet, many US veterans find themselves either unemployed or underemployed once they separate from the military into the civilian sector (DeGroat, 2016). Additionally, while many civilian employers label themselves “veteran supporters”, they do not often fully acknowledge or take advantage of the benefits that military veterans can bring to their organization and teams (Diffenauer, 2010). Even still, many veterans are not cognizant of the unique
skills they possess or knowledgeable on how to communicate them to potential civilian employers.

The purpose of this study was not to delve into these particular issues faced by US veterans, but rather to examine how a distinct group with its own identity may view the workplace that diverges from that of the general population. Forged by a common background and facing similar workplace hindrances, such groups can emerge as a force of resistance to leadership and change efforts sought by the organization when they fail to recognize and address the issues of these groups. While military veterans come from varying backgrounds, races, religions, and ethnicities, their shared military experience commonly transcends their military life and persists into their civilian role (Soeters, Winslow, & Weibull, 2006).

All members of the US armed forces undergo a prescribed ritual of induction and socialization commonly referred to as “basic training”. The training normally consists of a strict regimen of adherence to standards, direction, and schedules. Each military service member is also subjected to the infusion of a value system that stresses integrity, personal discipline, and teamwork. This training is conducted by all departments of the US armed forces and encompasses all members, whether undergoing training as an enlisted trainee or as an officer cadet. While each services’ training varies in length (anywhere from 8 to 14 weeks), the underlying principles of the training are similar in preparing each member for the possibility of engaging in
combat activities. Advanced military training consists of school attendance to receive the specialized skills and education necessary for each military service member to perform their specific roles and duties. While not as “spartan” as basic training, advanced training still exercises a high level of control over the students. These courses can last from 8 weeks to over a year.

The purpose of the training is to instill into the military service members those practices, roles, and attitudes that have been developed, refined, and reinforced by generations of military predecessors. This socialization process introduces the new members to the “time-honored” role of military member which becomes ingrained into their identity and sense of self (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). In the US armed forces in particular, research following World War II has contributed to honing this training into a psychological reshaping of the military service members to make them more efficient in their combat capabilities and focusing on the accomplishment of their mission (Grossman, 2009). As such, this socialization process is unlike any other experienced by members of a non-military organization and exerts a unique influence on military service members and their perspective of an organization and their responsibilities to it.

In 2017, the military veteran population in the US approximated 20.4 million people, “equal to 8% of the civilian non-institutional population age 18 and over” (BLS, 2018, p. 2) and about 7% of the total civilian workforce. Of the overall veteran
population, approximately 10.3 million were not considered “in the workforce”. Of the veterans in the civilian workforce, about 7.4 million served on active duty during or after Desert Storm/Desert Shield in 1991, often referred to as the Gulf War-era I and II periods. Gulf War-era II encompasses veterans who served on active duty after September 11, 2001 and 4.1 million veterans comprise this population. While there are 1.9 million veterans ages 18 to 34, they are far more likely to seek employment with the US federal government than their non-veteran counterparts (2018).

The influx of veterans into the federal workplace compared to their non-veteran counterparts is indicative of the diaspora entering the workplace both domestically and abroad. The ever-increasing need for employees in the science, technology, engineering, and medical (STEM) fields has opened doors for many job seekers searching both to gain employment in a developed country and to acquire advanced degrees while in their host nation (Lewin & Zhong, 2013). Such a migration has caused organizations to restructure in order to capture this innovation and opportunities offered by these diverse populations that identify with each other. While diaspora is often more closely associated with groups sharing an ethnic origin or background, organizations would be remiss to neglect an examination of the impact on the operational environment by a major group among their membership that share a common identity (Lennerfors, 2013). In this respect, a growing population of veterans within the ranks of the federal workforce bears investigating.
how this population perceives its work environment and the impact it may have on organizational performance.

**Purpose of the Study**

By examining the divergent workplace attitudes of veteran civilian workers against those of the non-veteran employees, this study pursued identifying those attitudes specific to this population group that persists from institutional enculturation after departure from military service. Further, by examining these factors under the variant environments in which federal agencies operate in the military, para-military, and non-military federal government sectors, the research strove to obtain insight to how veterans and non-veterans perceive the variant leadership practices in each sector as indicated by the organization’s climate. Of particular note is the proportion of military veteran employees in each sector, finding the greatest concentration in the military agencies, with decreasing populations in the para-military and non-military agencies, respectively.

In order to arrange and discern the differences of workplace attitudes and job satisfaction, the research aligned selected questions from the FEVS with the questions and definitions used in Stringer’s Climate Assessment Survey. The FEVS items were then grouped accordingly to categorize the attitudes into the six organizational climate factors that Stringer (2002) has identified as (1) Structure, (2) Standards, (3) Responsibility, (4) Recognition, (5) Support, and (6) Commitment, herein referred to
as the Stringer Climate Factors (SCF). The study examined the discernible differences in the SCF between the Military Veteran Employee population (MVE) with those of their Non-military Veteran Employee (NVE) coworkers. As such, differentiating the workplace attitudes between to these two populations facilitated uncovering how the self-identity of military service endures and affects the workplace perspective and job satisfaction of US military veterans as civilian employees.

This study also explored whether workforce factors such as tenure or turnover intention have either a diminishing or enhancing correlation on the workplace attitudes and job satisfaction reported by military veterans. Variation in SCF responses according to workplace tenure would reveal whether or not military institutional enculturation persists the longer the MVE is employed as a civilian in the federal government. Because turnover intention has been linked to job satisfaction, exploring this aspect of employee attitude can reveal whether or not variance in the SCF between the populations correlate with the level of satisfaction expressed by the MVE populations.

**Statement of the Problem**

Much of the extant research focuses on various workplace factors and their correlation to workforce performance; however, there is very little focus on how the effect a community of interest may diverge from that of the workforce in general. When determining the climate of an organization, studies are usually conducted on
the organization as a whole, with change efforts based upon the aggregated workforce perception. These studies fail to confront the possibility that a divergent group within the organization may either skew the results or be lost in them altogether. Yet, such groups may have an indelible impact on the performance of the organization or pose unseen or undiscovered resistance during a change effort that hinders the organization’s chance for success. By examining workforce psychological perceptions at the micro level, the change agent may disclose attitudes or perceptions common to groups with a shared experience that constitutes a community of interest, particularly groups that have undergone collective work role transition, such as displaced workers or military veterans. Such examination is usually reserved for research on the phenomenon of diaspora regarding large groups of immigrants moving and concentrating around the globe (de Lange, 2013), but these principles can also be applied to organizations (Lennerfors, 2013).

**Research Questions**

The scope, direction, and purpose of this study all stemmed from the single research question: *Does cultural compatibility of an individual with an organization, as reflected through climate perceptions, affect organization member behavior outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intention?* In order to establish this distinction, four exploratory questions were addressed:
**Exploratory Question 1:** What are the differences in workplace perception of US federal civilian employees with prior military service experience as compared to their coworkers with no prior military service experience?

**Exploratory Question 2:** How does the military affiliation of a US federal government organization affect the difference of workplace perceptions between employees with prior military service experience with those employees who have no prior military service experience?

**Exploratory Question 3:** How is job satisfaction and turnover intention affected for federal civilian employees with prior military service experience when their workplace perceptions diverge from the perceptions of their coworkers with no prior military service experience?

**Exploratory Question 4:** How does the socialization process mediated by employee tenure facilitate the mitigation of divergence in workplace perceptions as it pertains to employee behavioral outcomes?

**Significance of the Study**

First, this research seeks to emphasize the importance of study in followership, that is, the study of the properties, attitudes, and behavior of being a follower in an organization (Bufalino, 2018). While leadership generally only contributes to approximately 20% of the organization’s success, an overwhelming amount of emphasis has been placed on leadership, while virtually ignoring the roles, responsibilities, and contributions to organizational success of those being led.
In fact, a literature search comparison between leadership and followership on Amazon.com, resulted in over 60,000 returns for books on leadership, while providing a mere 163 books on followership. As well, a search of published journal articles in the Emerald Management online database regarding the two subjects delivered over 1.3 million possible journal articles addressing leadership while proffering less than 3,000 that explored the qualities of being a follower. Even so, much of the extant literature regarding followership is provided through the lens of the leader, further neglecting the importance of the role the follower has within the organization (Bufalino, 2018).

Second, this study aims to emphasize the need to discern and analyze divergent groups, particularly those experiencing collective work role transition who warrant consideration due to the size of their population in relation to the overall organization workforce. By understanding which specific climate factors that affect the job satisfaction and turnover intention of these groups, organizations can better address the concerns that negatively affect performance and the ability to achieve a successful change effort. Further, by examining these groups in various work environments, the study endeavors to establish the correlation of the divergent population with environments more closely affiliated with that which they are accustomed.
Finally, this research proposes to establish the phenomenon of enculturation persistence as it affects any organization experiencing collective work role transition with its members. As distinct groups of people find their way into new organizations, whether due to displacement, career transition, or relocation, concentrations of these disparate groups within an organization may effect evolutionary change in the culture and climate of the organization (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Soh, 2000). Consequently, these changes will affect the internal environment, operations, development, and change efforts of the organization. Identifying these groups and how they perceive the organization and their role in it will prove a critical consideration for leadership in the strategic planning of the organization.

**Assumptions**

This study is precipitated upon five assumptions regarding the target population of military veterans currently employed as civilian employees by the US federal government:

1. All participants who disclosed their military status as having served in the US armed forces underwent and completed both military basic and advanced training.

2. All such participants served a significant amount of time on active duty while attending military basic and advanced training.

3. All respondents were subjected to the induction and socialization process inherent to military basic and advanced training.
4. The military and advanced training experienced by the participants stressed and instilled a value system to include such traits as personal discipline, selfless service, and teamwork.

5. Participants’ continued involvement in the US armed forces, whether in an active or reserve component, continued to reinforce the value system in the participant.

**Definition of Terms**

For the purpose of this study, the following terms were regarded with the assigned meanings:

1. *Acculturation* – A socialization process that occurs when a member from an organization comes in contact with and indoctrinated into a new organization with a culture different from the losing organization (Soh, 2000).

2. *Active duty* – The period of time designates when a military member is in full-time service of the US Armed Forces.

3. *Comparative Perception (CP)* – The measure of a climate factor perception shared by all employees not included in the divergent perception population group.

4. *Divergent Perception (DP)* – The measure of a climate factor perception by a participant sample that significantly differs from that of the entire or
comparative group; may also be reflected by a fragmented population of each group dependent upon demographic control variables.

5. *Enculturation* – The phenomenon that occurs through the process of socialization in an organization when a new member accepts and assimilates the group's values, norms, mores, and traditions, or if they resist or reject them (Soh, 2000). Military members become closely aligned with the identity of the military when they accept and absorb the values, norms, and mores of the military culture.

6. *Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS)* – An annual workplace perception survey administered by the US government’s OPM. The survey is been provided to US government civilian employees to gauge their perceptions on 84 items encompassing the workplace.

7. *Job Satisfaction Quotient (JSQ)* – Job satisfaction entails the sense and level of contentment an employee experiences internally regarding their job. This contentment is affected by both internal (motivational) and external (hygiene) factors (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). The JSQ is an overall score derived from the FEVS combining the responses from FEVS participants regarding their level of satisfaction with their work, organization, and compensation.

8. *Military Agency* – These are federal agencies that are classified as the US military under the Department of Defense and directly conduct and manage the nation’s warfighting functions and capabilities. The
concentration of military veteran civilian employees in these agencies is 43-57%.

9. **Military Veteran Employee (MVE)** – The population of FEVS respondents who disclosed they had prior military service. This includes all employees who responded they retired from active military service, served on active duty in the military but were separated or discharged, or served in the Reserves or National Guard.

10. **Non-military Agency** – These are federal agencies that, while tangentially may support the Department of Defense warfighting functions, provide domestic services as their primary function. The concentration of military veteran civilian employees in these agencies is 7-17%.

11. **Non-military Veteran Employee (NVE)** – The population of FEVS respondents who disclosed they had no prior military service.

12. **Non-veteran** – This term generally means a person who has not served in the military. In some cases, it also encompasses military personnel who did not serve on “active duty,” usually encompassing the Reserve and National Guard components of the US Armed Forces. For the purpose of this study, it will include only those FEVS participants who responded they had no military status.

13. **Para-military Agency** – These are agencies that are either closely related to US military agencies, providing support to personnel or warfighting
functions, or are engaged in law enforcement activities. The concentration of military veteran civilian employees in these agencies is 28-33%.

14. **Shared Perception (SP)** – The aggregate organizational climate perception reflected by all employees in the agency or sector, regardless of military service.

15. **Stringer Climate Factors (SCF)** – This term will be used to refer to the six organization climate factors developed by Stringer (2002) as a means of describing the various aspects of the organization used to measure shared or divergent workforce perceptions. These six factors, as defined by Stringer, are:

   a. **Structure** – “Reflects employee's sense of being well organized and having clear definition of their roles and responsibilities” (p. 65).

   b. **Standards** – “Measure the feeling of pressure to improve performance and the degree of pride employees have in doing a good job” (p. 65).

   c. **Responsibility** – “Reflects employee’s feelings of ‘being their own boss’ and not having to double-check decisions with others” (p. 66).

   d. **Recognition** – “Indicates employee’s feelings of being rewarded for a job well done. This is a measure of the emphasis placed on reward versus criticism and punishment” (p. 66).

   e. **Support** – “Reflects the feeling of trust and mutual support that prevails within a work group” (p. 66).
f. **Commitment** – “Reflects and employee’s sense of pride in belonging to the organization and their degree of commitment to the organization’s goals” (p. 67).

6. **Turnover Intention (TII)** – Based on the survey response, this term involves whether the FEVS participants are considering leaving their organization within the next year.

16. **Veteran** – This term often means any military member who has served on active duty in a military service for an extended period of time and has transitioned to the civilian sector (DeGroat, 2016; Diffenauer, 2010). However, for the purpose of this study, it will include all FEVS participants who responded they had a military status of Retiree, Separated or Discharged, or Reserve or National Guard.

17. **Work Role Transition** – This term describes a change in work status such as when an employee moves from one organization, profession, sector, or level of responsibility to another in which they are not wholly accustomed and must undergo a period of socialization and familiarization with the new role in order to achieve efficacy (Nicholson, 1984).

**Summary**

Each year, hundreds of thousands of military veterans transition from a military lifestyle to a civilian role. Many of these veterans seek and find employment in the US federal government, and changes in hiring practices favoring the hiring of
veterans has stimulated an increase of military veterans into the federal workforce. Due to the nature of the unique experience undergone by their service in the US armed forces, military veterans are instilled with a distinct set of traits and attitudes that may not mirror those of their federal civilian coworkers with no military background. Understanding these differences between two disparate groups within the federal workforce will assist managers and decision-makers in better acknowledging and addressing the forces at work in the workforce when implementing change effectuated by the dynamics of the internal and external environments.

Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov (2010) contend that national cultures have unique characteristics that have developed over the years and are infused into the values of the indigent people of each country. While these characteristics may be observed at the macro-level of the culture, natural enculturation of the individual while residing in their nation of origin will affect their underlying values and become part of their self-identity (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Goffman, 1959). Likewise, as globalization of business continues, and as large groups around the world migrate to other areas to seek employment, opportunities, or even refuge, understanding the shared experiences of these groups becomes more critical to organizations. Immigrants will tend to seek out communities of like culture, thereby affecting both the infrastructure and workforce of the local community. Further, communities of practice, such as health care and information technology, attract new members from
all over the world, and as these populations relocate to new areas offering greater opportunities, the local cultures are likely to be affected with the introduction of these diverse groups.
Chapter II: Literature Review

Introduction

The foundation of the research was predicated on both the researcher’s pre-knowledge as well as the extant literature regarding organizational culture and climate. While much has been published regarding organizational culture and climate, in recent years, climate has received a lesser degree of attention, but it is no less important. In fact, much of the earlier research on culture and climate often juxtaposed one with the other until the focus became discerning one from the other (Denison, 1996). While culture and climate have been determined to possess distinct characteristics, they are intricately entwined and crucial to understanding the dynamics of interactions and behaviors of the members of an organization.

The role of pre-understanding, that is the knowledge, experience, or influences already possessed by the researcher (Gummesson, 2000), provided the fundamental line of inquiry underlying the theoretical framework of the research in recognizing two distinct communities of workers employed by the US federal government. The literature review explores the ties that are inherent to culture and climate, and the processes that inculcate members into and within an organization. These processes include socialization and the formation of organizational identity and self-identity, and how these processes are affected by work-role transition. Of particular interest is how these processes shape the perceptions of the members of an organization through enculturation and acculturation, and what relationship the
identities have for affecting the members’ workplace behavioral outcomes as reflected in job satisfaction and turnover intention.

While the study was initially guided by the researcher’s pre-understanding of these two communities in the federal workforce, the ensuing literary review and analysis manifested into the underlying theoretical framework to advance and support the research premise. The majority of the literature was garnered from online databases to include Business Source Complete (EBSCO), Elsevier, Sage, Emerald Insight, and ProQuest. The search provided an abundance of research and theoretical discourses in the form of journal articles and dissertations regarding the subject topics. And while a proliferation of literature has recently arisen exploring military veterans in the workplace, the line of theoretical review was confined to the examination of culture, climate, socialization processes, and the organizational behavioral outcomes of job satisfaction and turnover intention as relevant to the study. While the former would more likely appear to be the subject of the literary research, the true essence of the study lies with the examination of two distinct communities in a shared workplace possessing distinct cultural differences as reflected in the shared experiences of their respective members. Thus, the exploration of comparison between federal civilian employees with military service experience and those employees without military service experience was maintained as a foundation for the study and not necessarily a focal point.
Culture and Climate

Stringer (2002) contends that determinants of an organization’s culture are its leadership practices, organizational arrangements, strategy, external environment, and historical forces. The importance of identifying these determinants is knowing which ones can be controlled by the organization. Culture is also defined as the aggregation of collectively shared underlying values, assumptions, and beliefs that are practiced by an organization and reinforced with newcomers (Cameron & Quinn, 2011; Schein, 2010, 2016; Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013; Stringer, 2002). This includes the artifacts of the organization (e.g., its logo, slogan, product, facilities, or policies) and the espoused values the organization holds up as its core competencies and traits (Schein, 2010, 2016). Culture can be assessed by examining an organization’s values, beliefs, myths, traditions, and norms (Schein, 2010; Stringer, 2002) which facilitates problem-solving and decision making in order to adapt to changes to the internal and external environments (Schein, 1983, 2010; Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013). Culture is a shared understanding of an organization designed to give meaning to internal and external factors that affect the organization and its members (Burke & Noumair, 2015). Culture is often viewed as “how things are done here” (Burke & Litwin, 1992; Cameron & Quinn, 2011; Schein, 2010; Stringer, 2002), although not always readily observable.

Culture and climate are often interpreted as similar phenomenon but have very distinctive traits. While the two are inextricably interrelated, they cannot be
interchanged. Culture is deemed the background dynamics of an organization that are not easily discerned or defined, while climate is in the foreground, apparent in the workforce’s day-to-day attitudes regarding their work, teams, leadership, or any combination of the cultural determinants currently affecting the organization (Burke & Litwin, 1992; Burke & Noumair, 2015). Culture is difficult to change, as it is shaped and formed by the establishment of values and leadership practices exhibited by the founding members of the organization and their successors (Burke & Noumair, 2015; Ernest, 1985; Schein, 1983, 2010; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Climate is more readily adaptable to emerging environmental conditions dependent upon the actions of the organizational leaders when properly diagnosed (Stringer, 2002). The level of climate assessment poses another possibility since workplace attitudes aggregated at the organizational level have the most impact on outcomes (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013), while individual assessments tend to have the most impact on overall attitudes (Baltes, Zhdanova, & Parker, 2009).

Ouchi and Wilkins’ (1985) meta-analysis of the extant literature of organizational culture studies up to the mid-1980’s acknowledged an influx of such studies conducted by academics in the fields of anthropology and psychology, while focused on the discipline of business management. Nonetheless, they pointed out that much of the work is owed the fields of sociology and social psychology. The authors cited the qualitative work of researchers such as Geertz (1973) who used a semiotic approach – that is, looking at language and symbols to gain the native’s perspective
of the world. In contrast, Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) point to “ethnoscientists,” such as Ward Hunt Goodenough, who believe that culture “is the system of standards or rules for perceiving, believing, and acting that one needs to know in order to operate in a manner acceptable to the members of the culture” (p. 461).

In their review, Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) reported that recent studies also sought to determine a culture-based success of Japanese firms but were primarily concerned with the structure and administration of the organization rather than the underlying operating norms. Hofstede and colleagues’ quantitative work in the 1970’s contended that a national culture permeated the organization and shaped the business operations and decision-making processes (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010); however, critics such as Javidan (2006) found this work did not well define an organization’s culture, while others such as McSweeney (2002) questioned his methodology in applying a predetermined culture at the national level as homogenous to organizations within that country. Wilkin’s and Ouchi (1985) asserted that a hybrid of both a quantitative and qualitative approach to examining an organization’s culture could provide the depth required to truly understand an organization’s culture.

Cameron and Quinn (2011) maintain that the dimensions and elements of organization culture are broad in scope and cite several approaches for describing and measuring culture, such as strength (e.g., Sathe, 1983; Schein, 1984), holographic versus idiographic (Albert & Whetten, 1985), speed of feedback (Deal & Kennedy,
Cameron and Quinn (2011) put forth their own Competing Values Framework (CVF) as an empirically sound instrument to measure cultural to primary cultural dimensions, which are the degrees of focus and control exercised by the organization which form four quadrants in which to describe an organization’s culture. The CVF model focuses on two values spectrums based on the amount of control or discretion exerted by the organization on lower levels, and whether the organization uses an internal or external frame of reference when exercising control or allowing discretion. The x-axis provides a continuum of focus ranging from internal focus and integration to external focus and differentiation. This dimension measures the amount of collaboration versus competition that the organization stresses as its mode of operation. The y-axis provides a spectrum of flexibility and discretion versus stability and control, that is, the amount of autonomy and decision-making afforded the members of the organization. The resultant quadrants establish four types of organizational cultures which are: (1) Hierarchy, (2) Market, (3) Clan, and (4) Adhocracy.

The Hierarchy (Control) culture is characterized by stability and formalized systems of control such as policies, rules, and centralized authority. This organization focuses on the internal environment of the organization to ensure coordination of decision-making and quality control of goods or services provided by the organization.
The *Market* (*Compete*) culture is identified by a need to stress stability and control while focusing on external factors or transactions. Organization decision-making adapts to external opportunities and changes in the external environment. The major goal of the “market” culture is to maximize transactions with its external stakeholders, using economic mechanisms as its means of control.

The *Clan* (*Collaborate*) culture focuses on the internal organizational ability to collaborate and operate as a team, stressing shared values, goals, and beliefs, while allowing a greater degree of autonomy and decision-making by the members. The goal is to engage employees and foster commitment, allowing innovation and creativity to supersede rules and control. This type of organization is often described as a having a “family” environment, promoting participation and team work (Hann, Bower, Campbell, Marshall, & Reeves, 2007) and has been found to have the strongest correlation to produce an innovative internal environment (Naranjo-Valencia, Jimenez-Jimenez, & Sanz-Valle, 2011).

Adaptability and responsiveness to external factors are the qualities of the *Adhocracy* (*Create*) culture. This type of organization exercises high levels of discretion and autonomy in order to quickly adjust to changes in its external organizational environment. This is characteristic of organizations in turbulent
markets and normally do not have a centralized authority, allowing groups to remain flexible in size, purpose, and process.

Much of the literature generating the study of organizational climate is dependent upon the motivational research conducted by McClelland (Burke & Litwin, 1992; Stringer, 2002). Climate is the perceptions and attitudes the individual members (Rousseau, 1988) of the organization reveal about the organization through their work, interactions, and communications that indicate how motivation is aroused or suppressed, thus affecting performance (Baltes, Zhadanova, & Parker, 2009; Burke & Litwin, 1992; Stringer, 2002). It can be viewed as the “meanings people attach to interrelated bundles of experiences they have at work” (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013, p. 361), or rather “how things are going right now” (Burke & Litwin, 1992; Cameron & Quinn, 2011; Schein, 2010; Stringer, 2002). Climate is more a reflection of the extant attitudes members have regarding the internal and external environment of the organization at a given time, and can signify whether the internal and external environments are in sync with the organizational culture, or if dissonance caused by one or more of the cultural determinants is present (Burke & Litwin, 1992; Stringer, 2002). Organization members draw upon their own values to assess the workplace attributes and their significance to the individual in order to form their perceptions and attitudes and form cognitive meaning (James et al., 2008). These attitudes affect the way members interact with team members and leadership and how they may react to changes in the environment (Burke, 2014; Burke & Litwin, 1992).
Baltes, Zhadanova, and Parker (2009) contend that climate should be determined as consisting of two constructs, the organizational climate and the psychological climate. James and James (1992) define psychological climate as “the meanings that people impute to their jobs, co-workers, leaders, pay, performance expectations, opportunities for promotion, equity of treatment, and the like” (as cited in James et al., 2008, p. 6). The psychological climate concerns the perceptions of the individual, whereas the organizational climate focuses on the aggregated perception of the organization as a whole and is a distinct perception from that of the individual. Further, psychological climate is discerned into two distinct perspectives, that of the individual referent and of the organizational referent (Baltes, Zhadanova, & Parker, 2009). The individual referent views the organizational climate from the manifest perception of the member as self, while the organizational referent examines the individual’s awareness from a group perspective.

Using an instrument that measures psychological climate from both the individual and organizational frame of reference, Baltes, Zhadanova, and Parker (2009) found that members disclose a more positive outlook of the organization when viewed from the individual referent than that of the organizational referent. They credit this result to Social Comparison Theory, that asserts individuals compare themselves to others in order to determine where they stand in the social order of a given group dimension. In respect to the study, members that view their situation
(individual referent) more positively than that of their coworkers (organizational referent) leads to a higher level of espoused job satisfaction (Baltes, Zhadanova, & Parker, 2009). Conversely, members who viewed their situation more negatively to that of their coworkers resulted in decreased job satisfaction. The authors also refer to various studies by James and colleagues that determined the psychological climate is affected by four factors: “role stress and lack of harmony, job challenge and autonomy, leadership facilitation and research, and work group cooperation” (Baltes et al., 2009, p. 671).

Parker and colleagues’ (2003) meta-analysis of climate perceptions and work outcomes provides empirical research that studies of both organizational climate and psychological climate have indicated significant impacts on an organization. The authors point out that research on organizational climate has demonstrated the ability to predict organizational outcomes, while psychological climate studies may allow predictions on work environment and outcomes such as job satisfaction and job performance. They found that overall individual attitudes were more indicative of the effect of leaders and the work unit than their own job or role perceptions, which was also reflected in motivation and performance. Their analysis substantiates the premise that psychological climate has a stronger positive relationship to job satisfaction than to that of work performance or motivation. Yet, the study also supports that the positive relationship of job satisfaction with motivation and performance are mediated by workplace attitudes.
A meta-analysis conducted by Schneider, Ehrhart, and Macey (2013) explored extant studies regarding organizational climate and culture. The emphasis was to determine the significance of the climate research conducted as it pertains to the level of analysis, the foci of the research, and the strength of climate’s effect on the organization. The authors also provided a section that proposes the integration of climate and culture studies and theories in order to provide more practical implications. They found that while climate is normally studied in a formal quantitative approach using surveys, culture has been researched using both a qualitative approach, using such methods as interviews and ethnography, and a quantitative approach. While early studies examining workplace climate initially investigated the role of the organizational level of climate, studies proliferated in the 1960’s and 70’s primarily examining the psychological climate, which focused on the individual level. Climate research waned as research on organizational culture emerged in the 1980’s, but more recently, organizational culture research has been surpassed by a resurgence in the interest in the aggregated organizational climate, which is regarded as more impactful on organizational outcomes and change efforts.

As the research progressed, studies shifted focus from investigating the broader spectrum of climate, such as the overall well-being of the workforce, to more focused examination of attitudes towards specific traits, such as the effects of leadership type, programs of the organization such as safety or customer service, or even processes such as decision making or ethical standards. Early studies resulted in
a wide variation of the aspects that define climate but eventually focused on those outcomes that the research desired to affect. Analysis of subunit climate studies indicate that the subunits can discern their own perceptions from that of the higher-level organization climate (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013, p. 365), supporting the validity of differentiation and fragmentation of organizational culture at meso- and micro-levels (Winslow, 2000) and the significance of multi-level analysis.

Schneider, Ehrhart, and Macey (2013) determined that the strength of the correlation between climate and the desired outcome will signify the strength of the climate itself which acts as a moderator between the two. However, there must be variability across subunits in the aggregated climate results in order for climate to be determined as a moderator. Such correlation has been found in studies of both culture and climate where both have shown the propensity to affect like outcomes. For example, an organizational climate that positively moderates customer service may draw similarities to a clan culture which has also been found to facilitate a positive relationship with customer service. Hence, in changing culture, organizations may focus on establishing the type of climate needed to implement and sustain the change, then rewarding positive behavior that propagates the desired climate, which over time embeds itself into the culture of the organization.
**Socialization**

Cultures are socially constructed and sustained by passing on the traits of the culture from one generation to the next (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Schein, 2010). In order for the organizational culture to endure over time, its members must continually introduce new members to the traditions, rituals, processes, symbols, and artifacts over time (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013; Schein, 1983; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Socialization is the method in which newcomers are introduced to an organization and learn to adapt to new jobs and organizational roles, as well as learn the values, abilities, expected behaviors and social knowledge espoused or practiced by members of the organization (Fang, Duffy, & Shaw, 2011; Feldman, 1981; Louis, 1980; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Through such socialization processes, the new organizational member learns to assume their role and adapt their self-identity to present the “self” that is acceptable to the organization (Goffman, 1959). Adequate socialization can positively affect outcomes such as productivity and innovation, retention and tenure, and individual career development (Cable, Gino, & Staats, 2013; Feldman, 1981).

Socialization consists of many differentiated dimensions such that progress of socialization in one dimension does not affect the others and can be measured independently regarding their impact on outcomes (Chao, O’Leary, Wolf, Klein, & Gardner, 1994). The ability to identify a shortfall in a dimension can highlight an
aspect of socialization that may have affected the subject’s career development (Chao et al., 1994). These dimensions consist of:

1. *Performance Proficiency* – The ability to competently perform the assigned work tasks of the job. This entails acquiring the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities required to achieve efficacy.

2. *People* – Becoming involved with other members of the organization: those who will provide direction, assistance, training and coaching; and those to which the member may find commonalities and interests outside the organization needs but are essential to the sense of belonging.

3. *Politics* – Learning and understanding the formal and informal power structures of the organization, where to gain knowledge or influence, and the behavioral patterns expected of the new role.

4. *Language* – Learning the technical terms, jargon, and acronyms utilized within the organization in order to comprehend the flow of communication and information.

5. *Organizational Goals and Values* – This dimension aligns the new member with the larger construct of the organization. It entails understanding the principles, values, norms, and unwritten rules that maintain the integrity and reputation of the organization. This includes learning the expectations of people in positions of power and how the new role is integrated to the overall organization.
6. *History* — Learning the stories, traditions, myths, and rituals that can define appropriate behavior in the organization.

A key component of socialization is the assimilation of the values of the organization by the new member (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Chao et al., 1994; Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013; Schein, 2010). According to Catton, Jr. (1959), values can be viewed as those beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors which are desired or preferred with symbolic and non-symbolic significance and can be partly socially acquired through affiliation with a group. Values can also be conceived by an individual or group as preferable, whether or not they actually are. The values of an organization are often identified as guiding the behavior in which organization members conduct themselves (Schein, 1984), or to discern doing the right thing as determined by the organization (Schein, 2010). Still, overt declarations of values may only be superficial and might not be truly indicative of what organization members truly believe is appropriate behavior.

In fact, the closer an object of value is to the person valuing the object, the higher the value of the object is perceived by the subject person (Catton, Jr., 1959). Therefore, the perceived proximity of the belief or idea that is valued by the person, the stronger the importance of the value is to the person and the stronger the desire to achieve it. For instance, a person may espouse a value shared at a national level but is more likely to hold true to those values that directly affect the family or local
community. The same could be said for a member of an organization, whereas they may profess to share the values of the organization as a whole, but the true loyalty will normally lie with the immediate unit or team. Proximity can be measured on a temporal basis as well as the spatial. An object of desire perceived to be at a long-term distance has relatively less value than that which is necessary to the present. As a person strives to achieve higher needs such as status or esteem, more immediate and pressing needs essential to survival or security will receive more focus and lessen the value of the higher need (Maslow, 1943). And while two persons or groups may have the same set of values, the differentiated proximity of attaining those same values will vary the preference or priority of the values to the persons or groups (Catton, Jr., 1959). As such, attaining the cultural values of an organization during the socialization process is therefore precipitated by the individual’s desire and need to acquire them.

Much of the extant literature exploring socialization is founded or reliant upon the seminal treatise of Van Maanen and Schein (1979) outlining the principles and attributes of socialization as an organizational phenomenon (Cable, Gino, & Staats, 2013). Van Maanen and Schein (1979) define socialization as “the process by which an individual acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role” (p. 211). Further, the socialization process is not solely confined to newcomers of the organization, but rather is experienced by all members as they move laterally or upwardly within the organization itself (Van Maanen & Schein,
1979), lasting as long as six months for newcomers (Cable, Gino, & Staats, 2013), or ongoing for the entire tenure a member spends with an organization (Chao et al., 1994). In essence, socialization provides for members the expectations for day to day conduct in the performance of their new organizational role and will endure throughout their career with the organization. But while this theory provides for a holistic view of socialization processes, it does not include the possibility of incorporating the individuals own sense of self and identity (Cable, Gino, & Staats, 2013).

The organization establishes the socialization of newcomers through various modes and means. These modes and means will determine the approach the organization takes in order to socialize the newcomer to the new role, the approach being determined by the culture of the organization and the target role and could include variations of more than just one approach (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Van Maanen and Schein’s (1979) theory of socialization approach entails collective vs. individual, formal vs. informal, sequential vs. random, fixed vs. variable, serial vs. disjunctive, and investiture vs. divestiture. Other socialization theories, such as Feldman (1981), explore socialization as a three-stage model representing anticipatory socialization, encounters, and change and acquisition. Consequently, socialization processes could also be represented at the organizational, individual, and interactional levels (Fang, Duffy, & Shaw, 2011). Each theoretical model provides an outlook of socialization that observes the processes from various perspectives, giving
credence to socialization as a holistic, cyclic, and enduring phenomenon performed in an organization to enculturate new members.

Van Maanen and Schein’s (1979) collective approach focuses on socializing whole groups of newcomers while the individual approach will engage the single person. In the formal socialization process, the newcomer will be segregated from the tenured members of the organization, such as in military basic training, until such time as they are deemed competent to be integrated into the organization as a whole. Conversely, the informal process finds the newcomer introduced into the general populace of the organization upon entry. The induction of the newcomer may follow a sequential program, that is, the newcomer will progress through the process in discernible steps, whereas the random process is less clear on what benchmarks the newcomer must achieve. The latter process is characterized by a “overseer” who determines to what extent the newcomer has reached an acceptable level of competence in order to advance to the next step (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

Van Maanen and Schein (1979) continue that rather than mark the level of competency, the fixed process outlines specific timelines that will determine when the member may advance to the next phase of the process, while the variable process is more ambiguous and allows for progression when a triggering event occurs, such as the succession or exit of another organization member. A serial approach to socialization provides for a “role model,” usually a veteran member, assigned to the
new member in order to develop them with the long-range expectation of succession and the passing of collective knowledge and experience from the veteran to the newcomer. The disjunctive process sees no such passing of knowledge and experiences since the newcomer is expected to gain such knowledge through their own individual experiential learning. Finally, investiture and divestiture concern the amount of consideration given the new members own identity. In an investiture socialization tactic, the organization seeks to capitalize on the unique characteristics, traits, and abilities possessed by the new member in order to advance and benefit the organization. An organization that practices divestiture, on the other hand, seeks to “mold” the identity of the member to develop the self-image of the individual in order to conform to that of other organization members, usually one that they wish to project to outsiders (1979).

Feldman (1981) advances this line of theory by providing a model of the socialization of new organization members as a three-phase process. Building on extant theories in the literature, Feldman proposes that socialization progresses through the first stage, “anticipatory socialization,” which is the knowledge already possessed by the newcomer before becoming a member of the organization that provides the member with a certain pre-knowledge of the expectations of the new role. Regardless of previous experiences or socialization, newcomers must undergo new socialization when transitioning to a new organization or job role. Transition rituals, that is, letting go of past socialization, is an important phase of the
socialization process in order for the newcomer to assimilate a role as a member of the new organization. In many cases, however, the newcomer may carry past roles into the new role, amending the attributes of the past role to integrate into the new position rather than supplanting the past role (Louis, 1980).

Next, the newcomer “encounters” the new organization in which actual experience with the new organization facilitates some initial adjustment within the newcomer in order to meet the actual role, culture, and expectations of the new organization (Feldman, 1981). However, despite the socialization efforts of the new organization, institutionalized socialization from the previous organization may be difficult for the newcomer to release (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Finally, as the member endures within the organization, self-mastery of skills, values, identity, and relationships are achieved over the long term (Feldman, 1981). As a result, the member undergoes the transition to acquire appropriate role behaviors, develop work skills and abilities, and assimilate the group norms and values expected of organization members.

Fang, Duffy, and Shaw (2011) extend a model of socialization as three possible processes: organizational, focused on organizational indoctrination tactics; individual, focused on newcomer attributes and proactivity; and interaction based, a person-situation process which focus on the individual processes in tandem with the organizational processes. The two most significant approaches of their model are
organizational tactics and newcomer proactivity. Organizational tactics are the means and processes employed by the organization to adequately indoctrinate and prepare the new member for their role, to include the necessary skill development, knowledge acquisition, relationship shaping, and goal setting. Newcomer proactivity is crucial in the socialization process in that organizational tactics alone cannot possibly provide the newcomer with all the necessary information needed to become successful in the new role. A measure of initiative and motivation must be enacted by the newcomer to seek out the information and relationships that will lead to successful integration and performance in the new organization.

A primary mechanism in all three processes is the way in which the newcomer receives information (i.e. social resources, through their personal and professional exchanges with other organizational members) (Fang, Duffy, & Shaw, 2011). The authors state, “to achieve full, socialized membership, newcomers must access and mobilize social resources (e.g., information) embedded in the structures of their social relationships with organizational insiders” (Fang, Duffy, & Shaw, 2011, p. 128). Two outcomes of socialization are learning and assimilation. Learning is the degree to which the newcomer learns the expectations, organizational processes, and history, and develops their ability to perform tasks. Assimilation is the extent to which the newcomer becomes integrated and identified as an individual member and coworker in the organization, team, or unit.
As employees’ career orientations are becoming more mobile, socialization becomes more critical in stimulating and sustaining organizational loyalty. Fang, Duffy, and Shaw (2011) concluded that improper socialization efforts result in employee turnover causing loss of productivity and increased costs as a result of employee replacement. Voluntary turnover is often considered the result of either unrealistic or unmet expectations on the part of the newcomer, the latter of which was found to contribute to job dissatisfaction (Louis, 1980). However, the issue of voluntary turnover is much more complex and could entail more than merely a result of a newcomer’s expectations of the new job role or organization. Still, adequate organizational socialization processes are crucial to the organization to stem voluntary turnover (Louis, 1980).

Consequently, inconsistencies between organizational tactics and newcomer expectations can result in a disruption in the socialization process and compromise the newcomer’s commitment to the organization. Institutional logics are taken-for-granted social information that represent shared organizational understandings of what constitutes legitimate goals and how they may be pursued (Smith, Gillespie, Callan, Fitzsimmons, & Paulsen, 2017). Institutional logics are important to newcomers for the sensemaking and legitimizing of the organizational norms and practices. These are further described as injunctive logics of socialization, those institutional logics that are expected upon entry to the organization by the newcomer, and descriptive logics, which are those institutional logics that are actually
experienced by the newcomer during. Discrepancies between the institutional logics espoused by management, injunctive logics, and those actually practiced in the organization, descriptive logics, lead to a decrease in the members assimilation of the organizational identity and trustworthiness for the organization overall (Smith et al., 2017).

**Work Role Transition**

Entry to a new organization is often viewed as a period of high anxiety and tension for the newcomer (Cable, Gino, & Staats, 2013; Nicholson, 1984; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979), or “a stressful period of uncertainty in which individuals experience feelings of lessened personal control” (Black & Ashford, 1995, p. 423). During socialization, newcomers adapt their identity to the new organization in order to diminish anxiety and uncertainty. Conflict can and often does occur in the individual when the values, beliefs, or norms of one identity opposes those of another identity possessed by the individual (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). While Van Maanen and Schein (1979) focused primarily on the organizational processes of socialization, Nicholson (1984) added the perspective from the newcomer as work-role transition. Nicholson posed that the socialization process is not merely something that is enacted upon the newcomer, but rather an interactive process where the member has an amount of choice dependent upon the context of the new role.
According to Van Maanen and Schein (1979), divestiture tactics, molding the newcomer’s values and behavior to fit that of the organization, is likely to elicit a “custodial response,” while an investiture tactic, integrating the newcomer’s unique characteristics to the role, is result in an “innovative response.” The custodial response provides that the newcomer possesses the values and behaviors of the new role as well as the required skills and undergoes relatively little personal change. The innovative response finds the new member adjusting the new role to fit their own values, behaviors, or skill sets. The integration of these two types of responses will prompt one of three results: (1) a custodial response where the newcomer maintains the status quo both in behavior and job content; (2) content innovation, where the member must undergo significant change to fit the organization; or (3) role innovation, whereas the member initiates change in the role itself.

Nicholson (1984) commented that very little research has been conducted regarding work role transitions and the psychological impact on the individual. More attention has been focused on the technical manner in which the organizations integrate new members into the organization and adapt them to the organization’s needs with much less regard to the individual traits, attributes, and experiences of the new employee. The vast amount of literature relies heavily on the individual’s malleability to conform to the demands of the new role while neglecting the reticence of those individuals who exert their will on the new role to conform to their own expectations or preferences. Further, role transition studies on management
succession regard it more as a controlled organizational practice rather than as organizational change, neglecting the psychological impact of role transitions that have a lasting influence on the overall organization.

Where socialization is the process by which the newcomer undergoes a degree of transition into a new organization, work role transition can be seen as the circumstance that predicates the socialization and will determine the socialization tactics necessary for adequate conversion of either the new member, the new role, or both. Organizations are socially constructed by individuals to generate an outcome with a determined environment, and therefore are subject to change contingent upon the needs of the members to provide an outcome in changing environmental factors, both internal and external (Mohrman & Mohrman Jr, 2011). Nicholson (1984) posits that rather than one of three responses determined by custodianship or innovation, that these are merely factors determined by the circumstance of work role transition. Work role transition can occur when a member joins a new organization, moves within the organization, or accepts a new role within the same organization. It is from this circumstance that will determine the appropriate socialization tactic coupled with the purpose of the transition and needs of the organization. Rather than the limited responses of custodianship or innovation, Nicholson proposes the two distinct approaches of role development and self-development as determining the necessary socialization tactics.
Work role transition can be defined as any occurrence experienced by an employee that generates a significant change to work tasks, expectations, status, organization membership, or position within an organization (Nicholson, 1984). Work role transition theory asks two questions: (1) “How are change and stability interrelated?” and (2) “How does the interaction between individuals and social systems affect each other?” (Nicholson, 1984, p. 172). The individual differences in the characteristics of people and their transitions in work roles will mediate these subsequent relationships and affect the type of outcome experienced. These outcomes are affected by four variables which can be defined by (1) the new role and its requirements, (2) the individual motives and disposition of the transitioning employee, (3) the employee’s past work role socialization and experiences, and (4) the manner in which the new organization introduces and socializes the new employee into the new work role.

Nicholson (1984) explains that this leads to two approaches for transitioning to the new role: (1) the amount of necessary role adjustment; and (2) the amount of necessary personal development. Role development can be seen as the position, requirements, or expectations of the new role adjusting to the personal attributes, skills, and attitudes of the transitioning individual. Personal development, on the other hand, is the adjustments compelled upon the individual to conform to the skill requirements or organizational behavior, practices, or attitudes in the new role. These two approaches can be gaged on a spectrum from low to high need, establishing a
quadrant model discerning four possible modes of transition: (1) Replication, (2) Absorption, (3) Determination, and (4) Exploration (Nicholson, 1984). The model also includes a third dimension which measures the positive or negative affect the mode has on the organization that is dependent upon the objective of the individual in relation to the needs of the organization.

When the work role transition requires little role or personal development, then the mode of transition is considered to be Replication (Nicholson, 1984). This mode can be found, for example, when an employee moves from one position to another that performs the same work within the same organization or to a similar organization within the same industry (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Louis, 1980; Nicholson, 1984). When an individual moves to a new role in which they are expected to perform different tasks, or to exhibit or attain new skill sets, attitudes, or behaviors, then the onus for change is on the individual to adapt to the new role. The need for personal development is high while role development is static or low. This mode of transition is referred to as Absorption (Nicholson, 1984).

Occasionally, an organization may employ an individual who possesses certain attributes that essentially mold the functions, requirements, and behaviors of the new role to their own expectations. This mode of transition, known as Determination (Nicholson, 1984), demonstrates a situation where role development is high, and the personal development of the individual is relatively low or unchanged.
This type or transition is rare, but can occur in the political arena, or where an organization is specifically seeking role change in their organization. Exploration (1984) describes the transition mode where as both role and personal development are high. This is normally experienced by entrepreneurs breaking into new markets or industries. The needs of both the role and the individual are defined and directed by the external operating environment (1984).

Dependent upon the necessary mode of transition, socialization processes will affect the rate at which the individual attains successful transition. The specific learning requirements of any new role are affected by the degree of similarity between the old and new role (Chao et al., 1994). Formalized sequential processes directed by dedicated personnel leading to cumulative learning are favorable when the need for personal development is high (Nicholson, 1984). Whereas, when the need for role development is high, informal exploratory processes that allow for the emergence for the essential knowledge and relationships necessary in forming and establishing the role. Prior role socialization will necessitate the amount of socialization required for successful transition (Ashforth & Saks, 1995; Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Chao et al., 1994; Nicholson, 1984). This includes the levels of task complexity and the amount of discretion to determine the job role as experienced by the transitioning individual. Further, dependent upon the circumstance, such prior socialization can affect employee attitudes and behavior when transition is to roles with higher or lower complexity, discretion, or both (Nicholson, 1984).
Nicholson (1984) further elaborates that determinants of the proper approach for effective work role transition are seen as novelty and discretion. Novelty is the degree of familiarity the transitioning member has with the role and its task. Discretion is the amount of latitude given the newcomer to adjust or reshape the role to better fit their own values, beliefs, skills, attitudes, or competencies. When Novelty and Discretion are both low, a Replicant approach is the natural response tactic. However, as job complexity increases and does not match the skill sets of the member, a higher degree of personal development is necessitated, and thus the Absorption approach results. On rare occasion, the member may be fully familiar with and possessing the necessary skill sets for the role, but the role needs to be better defined, so a Determination approach is applied. Often times, when the role of the position is ambiguous and the member must develop the role and adjust to emerging needs, then the Exploration approach is employed.

Ashforth and Saks (1995) tested Nicholson’s model (Nicholson & West, 1988) regarding the motivational factors of novelty and personal development to include the member’s need for feedback, and discretion and role development, which entails the member’s desire to control role development and engage their own skills, abilities, values, and attitudes. Ashforth and Saks invited graduating business students to complete questionnaires in the final semester of school, then subsequently after four months and ten months on the new job. While they found that desire for control and feedback did not significantly impact role development and personal
development respectively, the amount novelty and discretion did mediate the effect of
the other. That is, novelty was positively correlated to personal development when
high discretion was present, and discretion was positively correlated with role
development when high novelty was present.

In a concurrent study of graduating MBA students, Black and Ashford (1995)
found a negative relationship between job novelty and self-change. The authors
administered questionnaires to 165 students, of which 69 participants completed
subsequent questionnaires after six months and 12 months of being in a new job.
Their findings led them to postulate that when job novelty is high, the individual may
become more rigid in their own development as a means of maintaining self-esteem.
That is, the greater someone is likely to not know how to perform a task, the more
likely they are to insist they can do it, or to do it in the fashion they are accustomed.
These findings suggest that while socialization tactics may directly affect either job
change or self-change, any relationship does not affect the other in an opposite
manner. Thus, job change and self-change are not outcomes at opposite ends of a
spectrum, but rather two separate outcomes, which would correlate with Nicholson’s
Model of Transition Adjustments as a quadrant rather than a scale. The study further
supports the premise that success of socialization tactics is subject to the self-identity
of the individual.
Identity

While undergoing the socialization process, both the organization and the individual experience transformation of identity. While individuals undergo this process with other individuals in the organization, organizations can be seen to experience socialization with its interactions with other organizations, whether partners, shareholders, or competitors (Albert & Whetten, 1985). The fundamental purpose for identity shaping and maintenance is the survival of the organization or the individual within the environment. Changes in the environment can necessitate the need for redefining identity. This can lead to vacillation between a values-driven identity and one primarily focused on achieving more practical economical means, or the development of an identity that strives to balance both. When a member experiences conflict of identity within a group or organization, they may seek membership elsewhere where the identities are more compatible (Cable et al., 2013; Flynn, 2005).

Two phenomena emerging from socialization are enculturation and acculturation. Enculturation is the process of learning and adapting one’s own culture, or “learning and internalization of organizational beliefs and values” (Soh, 2000, p. 4). Acculturation occurs when two cultures merge, or an individual encounter and is joined into a new culture (Soh, 2000). Psychological acculturation occurs when an individual encounters and is integrated into a new group or organization. The newcomer may assimilate the new culture, that is adapt their identity to fit with the
dominant culture of the new organization. On the other hand, the newcomer may choose to separate their identity from the culture of the new organization, maintaining the distinct characteristics of their identity while still identifying themselves as a member of the new group (Soh, 2000).

The strength of the individual’s enculturation and desire to assume the new culture will determine the individual’s approach to acculturation (Soh, 2000). Soh explains that integration occurs when the individual retains much of the previous culture but assumes the traits of the new culture as well. Assimilation occurs when the individual relinquishes much of the past culture and assumes the characteristics of the new. Separation occurs when the member retains their cultural identity while a member of the new culture without attaining its traits or characteristics. Marginalization occurs when the individual neither retains their old culture or assumes an identity with the new one. Soh’s (2000) research found that values of the new organization that were closely aligned with those of the individual were more readily attained and adopted by the individual, resulting in compatibility of the identities of both the organization and the individual.

Extant literature provides for key aspects of both organizational and individual identity, stressing the development and maintenance for both (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Cable et al., 2013; Flynn, 2005). Organizational identity theory views the organization from two perspectives: (1) How the organization views itself (e.g.
mission, vision, values, public personification); and (2) How the environment views
the organization (e.g. product, market, structure, name and logo) (Albert & Whetten, 1985). The environmental perspective can also be identified as its “reputation”
(Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). Three defining criteria for organization identity are: (1)
Central character – Decision making process that will determine the make-up
direction of the organization; (2) Distinctiveness – That attributes that distinguish the
organization from others; and (3) Temporal continuity – The fashion in which the
organization is able to maintain stability of its characteristics over time (Albert &
Whetten, 1985).

Identity maintenance allows the organization to establish itself within its
community and environment while shaping and maintaining its individualism (Albert
& Whetten, 1985). The organization must maintain the balance between how it views
and presents itself and how the environment perceives it, which is crucial to its
survival in securing the resources it will need to persist. Identity must persist over
time in order to ensure the “health” of the organization, and loss of identity can cause
disruption within the organization. Distinct parallels can be drawn between the
organization and the individual where as both undergo a socialization process to
establish their identities within their environment (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

Much of the extant literature expounds upon the socialization processes as a
continuum of effort ranging from individual focused to institutionalization, but do not
include the possibility of incorporating the individuals own sense of self and identity (Cable et al., 2013). However, this often results in efforts that are designed either to conform the newcomer to the identity of the organization, or to leave the individual to their own devices, which causes more tension by virtue of the uncertainty experienced by the newcomer. The socialization period is the stage of developing the job role where the newcomer must establish their identity within the new organization based upon their perceptions of the acceptable norms, behaviors, and attitudes of the new organization, and intertwining them with their own preferences and personality, thereby establishing their own unique situational identity.

In two separate studies, Cable, Gino, and Staats (2013) explored how organization and employees benefit from socialization processes that emphasize expression of the authentic self by the newcomer. The authentic self is described as the ability to “align our internal experiences (e.g., feelings, values, perspectives) with our external expressions” (Cable et. al., 2013, p. 6). They contend an individual optimizes their performance when they discern authenticity as their “best self” defined as an “individual’s cognitive representation of the qualities and characteristics the individual displays when at his or her best” (Cable et. al., 2013, p. 3). Citing several studies, the authors demonstrate that organizational members find greater satisfaction when they are allowed to express their “authentic self”, that is, behaving and expressing themselves in a fashion that is borne of their own core values, beliefs, and attitudes.
They further conducted two studies to support their proposition. Conducting their first study in the high turnover industry of a customer service call center in India, the Cable et al. (2013) found that socialization processes that focused on indoctrinating and conforming the newcomer to the organization’s norms and values correlated to significantly higher turnover rates, as much as 250%, than with new employees who underwent a socialization process tailored to explore their own individual identities, preferences, and personalities. A second study conducted with US college students demonstrated that socialization processes that promoted self-expression and self-esteem resulted in significantly higher positive correlations in employee engagement, performance, and job satisfaction. These findings are supported by other studies that established links that compatibility between organizational identity and individual identity are positively related to job satisfaction and commitment (Ellemers, De Gilder, & Haslam, 2004), team interaction (Flynn, 2005), and work role transition (Black & Ashford, 1995), and negatively related to turnover (Fang, Duffy, & Shaw, 2011).

**Job Satisfaction**

When exploring the consequential effects of socialization tactics, the natural desired outcome if the successful performance of the job tasks as well as the retention of the new member. Since such a study would entail a longitudinal effort that is beyond capabilities of most researchers, an alternate measure of job satisfaction has been found to be an adequate surrogate for determining a member’s potential to
perform to the expectations of the organization (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001). Job satisfaction is generally viewed as the level of fulfillment an employee experiences from their job tasks, organizational environment, compensation, or team interaction (Kalleberg, 1977; Katz, 1978; Keebler, 2012), and may include the organization as a whole or merely certain aspects of the job (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Job satisfaction must be viewed and measured in its entirety, that is, it must be inclusive of the job attitudes an perceptions of the employee, the type of work performed, the environments in which they perform their work, and the stage in their career in which work is being performed (Katz, 1978), and viewed as “an overall affective orientation on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying” (Kalleberg, 1977, p. 126).

Since the rise of interest generated in job satisfaction as a result of the Hawthorne study (Judge et al., 2001), much of the current theory regarding job satisfaction revolves around Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman’s (1959) work involving the “two-factor” theory involving motivational and hygiene factors affecting the level of satisfaction a person feels about their work (Judge et al., 2001; Kalleberg, 1977). According to Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959), hygiene factors are described as those workplace conditions that provide an extrinsic sense of security in a job role, such as salary, supervision, interpersonal relations, polices, etc. This factor tends to instill a form of avoidance behavior in the worker, whereas the worker desires to avoid financial difficulty, ambiguous work goals, workplace
conflict, or unsafe workplace conditions. When hygiene factors are not considered acceptable to the worker, the worker senses a decreased level of satisfaction in the job. However, when hygiene factors are at an acceptable level, the worker does not necessarily view the job or workplace in a more positive manner, but rather just as acceptable work environment. In this fashion, improvement of hygiene factors can remove the obstacles that can lead to more positive job attitudes (1959).

On the other hand, motivation factors are those aspects of a job that arouse the worker’s innate desire for self-actualization (Herzberg et al., 1959). That is, the worker seeks those conditions of a job that provide fulfillment through a sense of achievement, relevance, and self-development. These are experiences that the worker aspires and directs effort to attain rather than avoid. While hygiene factors, such as a higher salary, may seem an apparent motivating goal for a worker, it is a higher-level need, such as status or validation, that comes with the higher salary, that truly motivates the worker to apply more effort towards completing an objective (1959). However, such intrinsic ambitions are specific to each individual based upon their own values, direction, and sense of self.

To fully appreciate the theoretical framework, Kalleberg (1977) contends that job satisfaction must be distinguished from job rewards which are the specific dimensions of a work role that affect the worker’s level of satisfaction. While these may include hygiene factors, they can also include the intrinsic goals to which the
worker aspires. In this respect, job satisfaction results from the presence of the conditions rather than the resultant benefit gained by the worker. Further the perception of the reward positively correlates to the presence of the motivating factors. In this sense, job satisfaction is affected by the amount of control the worker perceives to possess to enable the realization of a reward. Thus, the higher the sense of gaining the reward a worker has, the higher the job satisfaction. This correlates with Catton, Jr.’s (1959) postulate that a person’s amount of value for desired objective will be dependent upon spatial and temporal proximity.

According to Kalleberg (1977), the reward sought by the worker is determined by their own specific work values which are categorized in six dimensions: intrinsic, convenience, financial, relationships, career, and resource adequacy. The intrinsic dimension can be viewed as Herzberg’s motivation factor in that these are the personal values the worker holds to the performance of the tasks of the work role itself. Convenience provides the worker with the availability to make performance easier to achieve, such as locale of the work place and the commute from home, the work schedule, and adherence to work-life balance. The financial dimension provides the worker with pay, benefits, and job security. Relationships with coworkers not only provides a social outlet while at work, but also the network necessary to accomplish tasks and objectives. If the organization provides opportunity for promotion and advancement, this establishes a positive experience for the worker’s desire for a career. Resource adequacy refers to the need for the worker to access
those resources necessary for successful accomplishment of work, such as equipment, supervisory direction, information, and necessary assistance.

Ongoing studies reveal that the intrinsic factors that motivate a person have a greater positive correlation with overall job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2001; Kalleberg, 1977). Judge, Thoresen, Bono, and Patton (2001) conducted a meta-analysis of 312 studies involving 54,417 participants. They discerned seven models for positing the relationship between job satisfaction and performance. While most of the studies established at least a degree of relationship between the two, only a distinct minority of the studies found no relationship, providing that the preponderance of empirical or theoretical evidence supports the notion that job satisfaction does impact an individual’s job performance, whether directly or as the result of a mediating variable. The authors discovered that the results found that job satisfaction has a significant positive relationship (.30) to job performance.

As also supported by Van Maanen and Schein (1979), Katz (1978) indicated that as employees’ careers progress, they move about an organization or to new organizations, implementing change to tasks, expectations, and roles, thereby triggering work role transition and new socialization processes. Such a transition effects job satisfaction as employees first focus on accomplishing the requisites of the new job, but as efficacy is reached, they later begin to focus on achievement and advancement. In order to test this postulation, Katz (1978) conducted study of federal
workers to determine the correlation of job tenure and satisfaction across five job dimensions. The author found that an interaction of job longevity and task complexity significantly affect overall job satisfaction, but with various results at different junctures of the employee’s career. While newcomers immediately find less satisfaction with autonomy and variety in required skills, these become more important as the employee progresses in tenure, but begin to wane as the employee reach two to three years on the job, as well as the other job dimensions (1978).

Of particular interest in research of job satisfaction is the effect it has on turnover intention. While Judge et al (2001) specifically excluded this outcome from their meta-analysis, interest in this relationship has currently seen a rise (Keebler, 2012). Keebler (2012) conducted research on employees in the aerospace industry to gage the effect of age, tenure, and gender on organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention. The author found a significant positive relationship between commitment and job satisfaction, as well as a negative correlation of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on turnover intention, concluding that organizational commitment and job satisfaction negatively affect turnover intention. In another study, Notgrass (2015) researched Federal employees using the FEVS and found a positive correlation of job satisfaction impacted by various workplace dynamics such a managerial functions and workgroup interaction. Still, this raises the question of whether or not studies on job satisfaction conducted
primarily in Western society may have different implications in non-Western cultures (Kalleberg, 1977; Notgrass, 2015).

Two studies conducted in “non-western” societies found similar results, supporting the premise that while job satisfaction has roots in western culture, its implications are global. Luz, de Paula, and de Oliviera (2018) conducted a study of 261 IT professionals in Brazil using four questionnaires measuring employee commitment, turnover intention, and job satisfaction. Affective commitment is the amount of commitment the employees feels towards the organization itself. Normative commitment is the obligation the employees feels to remain with the organization. The authors found that affective and normative commitment had strongest negative impact on turnover intention. They also found that job satisfaction as measured in compensation (-0.324), promotion opportunity (-0.312), and nature of the job (-0.242) most significantly resulted in negative impact on turnover intention.

In the United Arab Emirate (UAE,) Zeffane and Melham (2017) conducted a study of service sector employees, both public and private, exploring the effect of job satisfaction, perceived organizational performance, trust, and work environment on turnover intention. The authors found that job satisfaction had high significant impact on turnover intention for both sectors. However, other workplace factors affecting turnover intention differed significantly between the public and private sectors. In the private sector, while job satisfaction had the most significant negative impact on
turnover intention (-0.87), trust in the organization and coworkers had the next strongest negative effect (-0.44). On the other hand, the public sector reported that perceived organizational performance had a more significant negative effect on turnover intention (-0.55) than that of job satisfaction (-0.26). As such, their study supports the notion that organizational cultural factors are more likely to have an effect on job satisfaction and turnover intention.

**Turnover Intention**

Turnover is experienced in every organization, in every country, and every sector. Turnover rates are used to project personnel costs for future recruiting, selection, onboarding, and retention needs when conducting strategic planning (Cho & Lewis, 2012; Yousaf, Sanders, & Abbas, 2015). Turnover intention is generally recognized as an employee’s conscious attitude of their desire to leave the organization, normally within a near term time frame, propagating withdrawal from the organization with the purpose of seeking employment elsewhere (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Much of the extant literature points to the use of turnover intention as a proxy indicator for actual turnover rates (Bedeian, Kemery, & Pizzolatto, 1991; Chen, Ployhart, Thomas, Anderson, & Bliese, 2011; Cho & Lewis, 2012; Cohen, Blake, & Goodman, 2016). Still, studies have shown that turnover intention only plays a small percentage in the actual departure of employees from the organization (Cohen et al., 2016; Jung, 2010; Wright, 1993). The purpose of research in turnover intention is to understand employee workplace attitudes and prevent turnover and the associated
detriment it causes to an organization, whether it be cost, morale, or loss of valuable
skills and competencies (Fazio, Gong, Sims, & Yurova, 2017).

Two key workplace attitudes that affect employee turnover are job satisfaction
and organizational commitment (Harrison, Newman, & Roth, 2006). Steers and
Mowday (1981) presented a causality model describing the influence that
expectations and values have on a member’s sense of identity and attachment, or
affective response, to a job. Such response would be influenced by other factors in the
member’s life, such as spouse employment and work-life balance, in determining
whether or not a member would consider leaving an organization. In turn, this notion
of intention would eventually result in the member actually leaving their job if
favorable or unfavorable conditions came to fruition. This notion could also be
influenced by factors internal to the job or organization such job expectations,
attitudes toward the organization such as environment and experiences, and job
performance.

They also posit that a member may attempt to change negative influencers
before actually committing to leaving the organization. In support of the Steers and
Mowday Model of Turnover, Lee and Mowday (1987) tested the model against ten
hypotheses based on extant literature and turnover theory. They determined that job
performance, met expectations, job values, organizational characteristics, and
organizational experiences generated significant negative influence on the affective
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response of member’s intent to leave. Additionally, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement demonstrated significant incremental negative influence, while additional employment opportunities actually provided little or no significant impact on turnover intention. Consequently, while extant literature of empirical studies has not adequately determined that turnover intention affects job performance (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Springer, 2011), job performance has been found to be an antecedent to a rise in turnover intention signifying withdrawal behavior (Chang, Wang, & Huang, 2013) and negatively correlated to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Chen et al., 2011; Fazio et al., 2017; Keebler, 2012). Thus, the effects of an employee’s turnover intention are relevant and possibly detrimental as an outcome.

Summary

The research clearly shows the integral relationship between organization culture and socialization processes. And while culture and climate bear distinct characteristics, the two interact in determining the perceptions that an employee bears towards the organization, and when the actions of the organization either meet or conflict with an employee’s perception of the culture, the results are reflected in the organizations climate. When expectations are met and the climate is perceived positive by the employee, then the culture is compatible with the employee’s socialization. In addition, such compatibility will be further reflected in member behavior al outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intention.
The expectations of a member are based upon the socialization of the members previous organization and the amount of enculturation that has occurred. During work role transition, that is, moving between organizations or within organizations, the member will undergo new socialization processes designed to acculturate the new member to the gaining organization. The socialization process must serve to adapt the new member to the new role through personal development, or redesign the role to the new member’s capabilities, regarded as role development. The socialization process also serves to assist the new member in reshaping their self-identity as a member of the new organization while also reconstructing the organizations identity through diversity and role development determined by both the capabilities of the new member and emerging needs from within and outside the organization. When the socialization process is adequate, the result is an identity fit for the new member, giving positive effect to the member’s job satisfaction. As satisfaction rises, commitment to the organization increases and the member is less likely to leave the organization.
Chapter III: Methodology

Introduction and Overview

The purpose of the study was to explore the possibility of divergent workplace perceptions expressed by Federal civilian employees who previously served in the US Armed Forces, to determine what those divergent perceptions were, and the relationship they have on the job satisfaction and turnover intention of the studied population. Despite the apparent qualitative underpinnings of the exploration of a workplace phenomenon, a quantitative approach was chosen in order to isolate the presence and general nature of a potential phenomenon yet to be identified. While many academicians may argue that such exploration demands a focused qualitative approach rather than the generalization of a quantitative approach, the empirical nature inherent to quantitative research provides statistical credibility that such a phenomenon truly exists (Poon, 2003). Particularly, in a sample the size as provided by the FEVS, the likelihood of the existence of such a phenomenon to exist increases exponentially, whereby also offering a firmly identified population in which to conduct further research into the qualitative properties of the phenomenon.

The study performed a quantitative analysis of the results of the 2015 FEVS to examine and compare the differences between federal civilian employees who are military veterans with those of their federal civilian coworkers who are non-military veterans. The examination of the data was predicated by grouping the survey
participants by their military status and federal agency. The federal agencies consisted of ten organizations that were subsequently grouped by sector, which entailed the organization’s affiliation with the mission of the US military. The intent of the categorization of participants had two purposes. First, the sample population was separated by military and non-military experience in order to identify the divergent workplace perceptions between those employees who possess military service history and those who do not. The second purpose, federal agency sector, provided the distinction of organizational culture as defined by the federal agencies’ affiliation and alignment with the nation’s military capabilities and mission.

**Research Sample**

The large sample population (N=250,988) examined in this study were US federal civilian employees who participated in completing the FEVS administered by the OPM since 2002 (OPM, 2017). For the selected survey year, the 2015 FEVS, over 900,000 of 1.8 million US federal employees were solicited for the survey, to which over 400,000 completed the FEVS. Since the desired data to be used in the study has already been collected via the FEVS, all available data sets were acquired from the OPM to determine which sets would provide the information necessary to conduct the study. The entire data collection consisted of survey responses and demographic information from 2006-2016. Of the 11 data sets, only two years, 2014 and 2015, contained the demographic information required to establish the military veteran
status of the respondent federal civilian employees, of which the survey from 2015 was selected.

While selection of the most recent data set would have be conceived to be the most pertinent choice, a process of analysis confirmed that the 2015 FEVS data set would be the most relevant to the study. To undergo the rationale for the selection of the 2015 FEVS for the sample participants, the change in total employee strength and its demographics during the fiscal years running from 2012 through 2016 was examined. The federal government operates on the fiscal year (FY) which operates from October 1 until September 30 of the succeeding year, with each FY designated as the year into which it succeeds. Beginning in FY 2009, an increase in veteran hiring resulted from the issuance of Executive Order 13518 Veterans Employment Initiative which fomented an increase of veteran employees from 26% of the workforce in 2009 to over 30% by 2013 (Institute for Veterans and Military Families, 2017). In the period from FY 2012 through FY 2016, the federal government experienced an overall decrease of sixteen thousand civilian employees, while military veteran employment increased by almost twenty-four thousand employees (OPM, 2017). However, this shift in the demographics was not simply the result of accelerated hiring practices of military veterans, but more a continued effort and should be explored further to understand the full scope of the change.
The overall civilian employee population in FY 2012 was approximately 2.06 million employees, of which 612,000 were military veterans, or 29.7% of the overall population (OPM, 2017). In FY 2013, spurred by downsizing efforts in the government through natural attrition, buyouts, and hiring freezes, the overall employee population decreased to 2.02 million while the veteran population decreased to 607,000. This decrease in the veteran population only constituted 11% of the overall turnover, thereby increasing the percentage of the veteran population by .4% within the overall employee population. Continued downsizing efforts resulted in an overall employee population of 1.99 million, but the veteran employee population actually increased to almost 613,000. So, while the federal civilian workforce decreased by 1.3%, the federal veteran employee workforce increased by 1%.

Further, while the federal government began to increase its workforce through FY 2015 and FY 2016 to an overall population of 2.04 million employees, veteran hiring continued to increase exponentially, resulting in a federal workforce with 31.1% military veterans as civilian employees.

Once the 2015 FEVS data set was determined as relevant and adequate, the process of delineating the categories of samples were based upon the available demographic information to designate the control variables of military status, tenure, and agency. Each agency was then screened for its designation into one of the three federal sector categories: (1) military agency, (2) para-military agency, or (3) non-military agency. The resulting division of the participant sample was designed to
provide the data necessary for the comparative analysis of the study and divine the
differences in workplace perceptions among the distinct groups of samples within
their respective sectors, as well as provide insight to deviation among the three
sectors themselves.

The control variable for military status was determined by the 2015 FEVS
demographic item: *What is your US military service status?* Participants could
respond from four provided answers: (1) No Prior Military Service; (2) Currently in
National Guard or Reserves; (3) Retired; or (4) Separated of Discharged.
Consequently, while each positive response itself denotes a distinct characteristic of
military service, the three all denote that the participant did engage in “active”
military service, but more importantly, underwent the socialization/induction process
of basic military training. As such, all positive responses are categorized as MVE,
while the single negative response, “No Prior Military Service”, categorized these
participants as NVE.

In order to determine a participant’s tenure as a federal civilian employee, the
analysis used the 2015 FEVS demographic question: *How long have you been with
the Federal Government (excluding military service)?* Participants chose between
answers (1) 5 or fewer years; (2) 6-14 years; or (3) 15 or more years. The purpose of
this control variable is to distinguish employees between those with a low amount of
federal employment tenure, identified as Lo-ten (LT) participants, and those with
greater tenure, identified as Hi-ten participants. LT participants are employees who have disclosed they possess five or fewer years in federal employment, while HT employees responded with one of the two questions that demonstrate six or more years as a federal civilian employee. As employees persist in a new organization, the socialization of the employee in the gaining organization will slowly supplant the indoctrination of a previous organization. In this respect, Lo-ten participants who have experienced federal workplace employment for a relatively short period will indicate a workplace perception that is significantly different from those HT coworkers who have spent more time in federal employment. The exposure to extended socialization of an organization will moderate MVE workplace perceptions to those of NVE participants.

The federal agencies selected for examination in this study have been divided into three sector classifications dependent upon their alignment with a military purpose or relationship in the US federal government and categorized as military agencies, para-military agencies, or non-military agencies, as mentioned previously. Military agencies provide the military function of the US government with a shared responsibility of leadership and operations between military and civilian personnel. These agencies report a significantly higher population of MVE, averaging 43-57% of the civilian workforce (OPM, 2017), while working alongside a proportionately higher population of military employees in the overall population of the agency. In this respect, the NVE, while still a significant population of the agency, are in a
relative minority with respect to military culture and socialization. However, in the
spirit of the study, the NVE employed by the military agencies still remain within the
distinct majority of the overall population of federal government civilian employees
and provide a critical comparative variable to the study. These agencies include the
Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air
Force.

The sample populations for the other sector categories, para-military agencies
and non-military agencies, were selected for their comparative value of workplaces
not directly influenced by military leadership and culture (See Table 1). While both
agencies consist of military veteran civilian employees, the US Coast Guard which
operates under the Department of Homeland Security, is the only military personnel
assigned under any of these agencies, and the senior leadership is all exclusively
civilian. The para-military agencies serve a direct role in supporting the military
capacity of the US government, while primarily responsible for the law enforcement
function that is analogous to a military organization. The MVE percentages in the
selected para-military agency ranges from 28-33% (OPM, 2017). The para-military
agencies include the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice,
and the Department of Veteran Affairs. The non-military agencies may play a
tangential supporting role to the nation’s military function, but their primary functions
are to provide governmental services to the US population at large. The percentage of
military veteran civilian employees is relatively low, 7-17% (OPM, 2017). These
agencies include the Department of Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Treasury, and the Department of Health and Human Services.

### Table 1. 2015 Federal Agency Employment Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Total Employees</th>
<th>Veteran Employees</th>
<th>% Veteran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Dept of the Air Force</td>
<td>143,521</td>
<td>82,180</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of the Army</td>
<td>223,622</td>
<td>111,760</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of the Navy</td>
<td>201,616</td>
<td>86,760</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para-military</td>
<td>Dept of Veteran Affairs</td>
<td>365,567</td>
<td>120,187</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Homeland Security</td>
<td>187,130</td>
<td>52,226</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Justice</td>
<td>114,776</td>
<td>28,816</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-military</td>
<td>Dept of the Interior</td>
<td>69,757</td>
<td>11,751</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Agriculture</td>
<td>96,567</td>
<td>12,013</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of the Treasury</td>
<td>91,208</td>
<td>10,180</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>85,328</td>
<td>6,253</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the precise sample populations were determined, the use of the response data from the participants was further screened for completeness. In order to provide the data necessary for the calculations used in constructing the variables, responses were required to produce a numerical value (i.e., their relative position on a five-point scale). Some non-demographic items of the FEVS pertinent to this study provided a non-response, i.e. “Do Not Know”, to which no numerical value is assigned. Such responses, as well as blank responses, were not be used in the calculation of the corresponding research variables. Still, the participant was not discounted from the sample since their overall responses could still be valuable in the calculations of other research variables. The sample size after response screening was \( N=271,083 \). From
this sample, only those participants indicating a military status were included, eliminating 20,095 respondents, for a final sample size of N=250,988 (See Table 2).

Table 2. Research Sample Breakout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>19168</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>20162</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>22414</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>17213</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Serv</td>
<td>32806</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td>42798</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>18384</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>19461</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>51038</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>27639</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271083</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.00 Non-Military</td>
<td>171605</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 Military</td>
<td>79383</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250988</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of Information Needed

The purpose of the methodology was to construct composite scores from participant responses to the relevant 2015 FEVS items that align with four employee workplace perceptions that were examined in this study. These four perceptions include: workplace attitudes involving the SCF provided by Stringer (2002); job satisfaction as measured by a JSQ based on Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman’s (1959) work and further elaborated by Kalleberg (1977); turnover intention as
revealed by the TII, which reflects the participants own disclosure whether or not they intend to leave the current organization within the next year; and an Organizational-Retention Cue (ORC), which simply reflects the participants own perception regarding the organization’s internal environment and opportunities which may impact a decision to stay at the organization, also devised by virtue of Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman’s (1959) work.

A combination of the FEVS items resulted in an overall score for each workplace perception contingent upon the responses of the respective participants. Relevant FEVS items were assigned to each examined factor and divided into three categories to provide the data necessary to conduct the analysis. These three categories are: (1) psychological climate, (2) job satisfaction, and (3) turnover intention. Under psychological climate are the SCF established by Stringer (2002). Five FEVS items were assigned to each climate factor based upon their relevance to the definition of each factor as described by Stringer. Accordingly, the job satisfaction category included the JSQ, with five FEVS items that align with internal and external motivational factors in accordance with Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman’s theories. The final category, turnover intention, included the TII, a single item posed by the FEVS regarding the participants near-term intent to stay with the organization, and the ORC, which was derived from two FEVS items in order to appraise a participant’s perception of the desirability of the organization as a workplace.
The resultant scores for each factor provided the baseline data necessary for the study. These scores were then be correlated in order to determine their relationship using two phases. The first phase measured for difference between the MVE sample and the NVE sample to discern the existence of any divergent climate perception among the six SCF. The second phase then tested the climate perceptions for any effect they may have on job satisfaction or turnover intention.

**Research Design**

The research consisted of three phases of quantitative analysis for the corresponding data in order to answer the research question: *Does cultural compatibility of an individual with an organization, as reflected through climate perceptions, affect organization member behavior outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intention?*

**Phase One – Discovering Divergent Climate Perceptions**

The first phase sought to answer Exploratory Question 1: *What are the differences in workplace perception of US federal civilian employees with prior military service experience as compared to their coworkers with no prior military service experience?*

The data analysis entailed a comparison of the mean scores of the six SCF scores between MVE and NVE participants using the demographic information
provided regarding military status (DMIL). The intent of this comparison was to ascertain the existence of DP of MVE participants to those of their NVE coworkers in the US federal workplace. The purpose of this analysis was to discover whether or not the psychological climate perception of the MVE differs from that of the NVE, or of the organization climate as a whole.

_Hypothesis 1:_ MVE participants will disclose an overall DP for each of the organization’s climate factors in relation to that of their NVE coworkers, the overall CP.

**Phase Two – Divergent Perceptions Across Federal Agencies**

The analysis outlined in Phase One was then replicated among the agencies of the three US federal workplace sectors identified as military agencies, para-military agencies, and non-military agencies in order to examine Exploratory Question 2: _How does the military affiliation of a US federal government organization affect the difference of workplace perceptions between employees with prior military service experience with those employees who have no prior military service experience?_

In order to achieve this, the analysis utilized the demographic information that identified the participant by agency. This information was not self-disclosed, but rather included in the metadata of the survey when distributed to the participants and provided in the data sets of the survey results. Given the influence leadership exerts upon the organization (Burke, 2006; Burke & Noumair, 2015; Schein, 2010), military
agencies are most likely to reflect a climate that is most conducive to that experienced by veterans during their military service since leadership is shared by both military and civilian personnel. While this leadership climate may not be nearly as austere towards the civilian employees as that directed towards military personnel, the civilian employees are still subjected to a socialization process and leadership style that reflects many of the principles underlying the socialization of the military service members.

The para-military agencies, while not necessarily under military leadership, consist of a relatively high population of military veterans, and the organizational missions directly support the military agencies in national security or service to veterans. The para-military agencies are likely to reflect an organizational climate similar to that of the military agencies, but not to the same degree. MVEs are likely to display a slightly significant DP to that of their NVE counterparts. Conversely, non-military federal agency management consists strictly of civilian leadership and are less likely to reflect an organizational climate reflective of the military or para-military agencies. MVE are likely to indicate a significantly higher DP to that of NVE. These predictions also coincide with the concentration of military veteran civilian employees who may shape the culture and climate of the organization at the meso- and micro-levels of the agency.

Hypothesis 2a: The MVE DP in military federal agencies will reflect higher mean scores than the NVE CP.
Hypothesis 2b: The MVE DP in para-military federal agencies will reflect higher mean scores than the NVE CP.

Hypothesis 2c: The MVE DP in non-military federal agencies will reflect lower mean scores than the NVE CP.

Each sector provided these correlations subdivided by each agency included in the respective sector. The purpose of this analysis was to test the MVE divergence to identify the relationship regarding organizational culture compatibility.

Phase Three – Testing for effect on Organization Member Behavior Outcomes

The third phase of analysis employs two steps in seeking to answer Exploratory Questions 3 & 4. The first step examines the correlations of the climate factors in order to determine the impact each has on the others as well as the employee behavioral outcomes of job satisfaction and turnover intention. Exploratory Question 3 is: How is job satisfaction and turnover intention affected for Federal civilian employees with prior military service experience when their workplace perceptions diverge from the perceptions of their coworkers with no prior military service experience?

Each MVE SCF was correlated to the JSQ to determine if the respective factor demonstrates any relationship to the level of satisfaction expressed by the participant through the JSQ. To further explore the possibility of the effect of MVE SCF DP on
the relationship to performance, these factors were also measured against the TII. The purpose of this test was to ascertain if the relationship of the SCF to the TII, supporting that DP affect organization member behavior outcomes as expressed by the divergent population. Due to the arbitrary nature of the TII, which does not discern the actual reason an employee may intend to leave an organization, the TII was also tested against an ORC, which identified the degree to which the employee views the organization as a desirable place to work. The purpose of this measurement worked on the proposition that factors other than the SCF would effectuate an employee’s conscious intent to leave an organization.

Hypothesis 3a: The employee workplace perceptions as reflected by the SCF and ORC will have a positive relationship with job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3b: The Employee workplace perceptions as reflected by the SCF and ORC will have a negative relationship with turnover intention.

The second step to Phase Three of the analysis sought to determine the effect that extended socialization has on employee behavioral outcomes as posited by Exploratory Question 4: How does the socialization process mediated by employee tenure facilitate the mitigation of divergence in workplace perceptions as it pertains to employee behavioral outcomes?

The overall aggregated means were subdivided according to the FEVS demographic item, “How long have you been with the Federal Government
(excluding military service)?” The response options provided three possible replies: (A) Five years or fewer; (B) 6-14 years; and (C) 15 or more years. For the purpose of this research, these population groups were identified as HT for five years or fewer, MT for 6-14 years, and HT for 15 years or more. The resulting means were then compared for differences between tenure groups and the overall difference between the lowest and highest tenured groups. The three tenure groups were then subdivided by their military status, that is MVE and NVE. They were then further subdivided based upon the respective response to turnover intention, whether or not the respondent considered leaving the organization within the next year. The analysis sought to segregate those who intended to leave and are more likely to demonstrate a DP lower than those who intend to stay. Employees who intend to stay with the organization are more apt to demonstrate a higher perception of the organization which will likely rise as they gain tenure and become more socialized within the organization over time.

**Hypothesis 4:** Socialization processes will mitigate the amount of divergence in workplace climate perceptions, positively affecting workplace climate perceptions and job satisfaction.

**Analysis of the Psychological Climate**

*Stringer Climate Factors (SCF)* – The analysis of the SCF was the focal point of the study, which are identified as Structure, Standards, Responsibility, Recognition, Support, and Commitment (Stringer, 2002). The FEVS items assigned
to each SCF were selected based upon the accuracy in which each item addresses the
description that Stringer assigned to each factor. The entire survey was screened to
determine which items best aligned with the SCF. While the results of the screening
may have aligned more items to some SCF, these items were further screened to
determine those items that most closely aligned with factor definitions in order to
maintain balance among all the factors. Additionally, some items which could have
been aligned with more than one factor received additional scrutiny or were discarded
as too arbitrary to definitively measure either factor.

The participant scores for the SCFs were calculated as a mean of the
composite scores of the five FEVS items assigned to each factor (See Table 3). The
responses provided for each item were a five-point Likert scale. The majority of these
FEVS items were posed as statements to which the participant responded on a range
from 1-Strongly disagree to 5-Strongly agree. Some of the FEVS items assigned to
factors in this category were posed as questions, to which the participant responded
on a range from 1-Very poor to 5-Very good, or 1-Very dissatisfied to 5-Very
Satisfied. The resultant mean of the composite scores rated the participant’s
perception of each climate factor on a range from 1-Low to 5-High, reflective of the
amount of favorability exhibited by the organization for each climate factor.
Table 3. Summary of SCF Items Used for Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure (SCF1)</th>
<th>Standards (SCF2)</th>
<th>Responsibility (SCF3)</th>
<th>Recognition (SCF4)</th>
<th>Support (SCF5)</th>
<th>Commitment (SCF6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 6. I know what is expected of me on the job.</td>
<td>Item 8. I am constantly looking for ways to do my job better.</td>
<td>Item 1. I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills in my organization.</td>
<td>Item 22. Promotions in my work unit are based on merit.</td>
<td>Item 9. I have sufficient resources (for example, people, materials, budget) to get my job done.</td>
<td>Item 4. My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19. In my most recent performance appraisal, I understood what I had to do to be rated at different performance levels (for example, Fully Successful, Outstanding).</td>
<td>Item 16. I am held accountable for achieving results.</td>
<td>Item 3. I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things.</td>
<td>Item 25. Awards in my work unit depend on how well employees perform their jobs.</td>
<td>Item 20. The people I work with cooperate to get the job done.</td>
<td>Item 5. I like the kind of work I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 56. Managers communicate the goals and priorities of the organization.</td>
<td>Item 23. In my work unit, steps are taken to deal with a poor performer who cannot or will not improve.</td>
<td>Item 30. Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.</td>
<td>Item 31. Employees are recognized for providing high quality products and services.</td>
<td>Item 26. Employees in my work unit share job knowledge with each other.</td>
<td>Item 7. When needed I am willing to put in the extra effort to get a job done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 58. Managers promote communication among different work units (for example, about projects, goals, needed resources).</td>
<td>Item 46. My supervisor provides me with constructive suggestions to improve my job performance.</td>
<td>Item 43. My supervisor provides me with opportunities to demonstrate my leadership skills.</td>
<td>Item 32. Creativity and innovation are rewarded.</td>
<td>Item 48. My supervisor listens to what I have to say.</td>
<td>Item 61. I have a high level of respect for my organization's senior leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 64. How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?</td>
<td>Item 57. Managers review and evaluate the organization’s progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.</td>
<td>Item 63. How satisfied are you with your involvement in decisions that affect your work?</td>
<td>Item 44. Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile.</td>
<td>Item 59. Managers support collaboration across work units to accomplish work objectives.</td>
<td>Item 71. Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your organization?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Job Satisfaction

Job Satisfaction Quotient (JSQ) – This factor was based on Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman’s (1959) work regarding internal and external factors personal to the individual as motivational effects determining their level of satisfaction with a job. The items selected for this factor were based upon the ability
to accurately ascribe value to internal and external motivational factors that affect the level of job satisfaction (See Table 4).

The JSQ was calculated in the same manner as the SCF. The five FEVS items assigned to the JSQ were a combination of both statements and questions, to which the participant responded to the same 5-point Likert scale described for the SCF, with respect to whether the item is a statement or question. The resultant mean of the composite scores conveyed the participant’s expressed level of job satisfaction on a range from 1-Low to 5-High.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JSQ FEVS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 6. I know what is expected of me on the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19. In my most recent performance appraisal, I understood what I had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to do to be rated at different performance levels (for example, Fully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful, Outstanding).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 56. Managers communicate the goals and priorities of the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 58. Managers promote communication among different work units (for example, about projects, goals, needed resources).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 64. How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Summary of JSQ Items Used in Survey

Analysis of Turnover Intention

Turnover Intention Indicator (TII) – The turnover intention factor was a bit more complex, since the aim was to not only discern not if the participant intended to
leave the Agency within the next year, but to explore possible factors affecting the intent. The relevant FEVS item, included in the demographic section of the survey, provided four possible answers, one posed response which indicated no intention of leaving the organization within the next year, and three other possible responses that indicated that the respondent did plan to leave. The responses provided for this item in the demographic information did not indicate the underlying reasons for the participant to anticipate leaving their current organization. In order to determine whether this intention depends on the organization itself, the level of job satisfaction, or both, the turnover intention indicator was measured against the job satisfaction quotient and organization-turnover indicator to determine if there was any correlation of the turnover intention to the level of satisfaction with the job or organization as expressed by the participant.

While the relevant FEVS item used to measure this factor had four possible answers, it was only calculated on a 2-point scale. The posed responses for this item consisted of either a no or yes response, to which a value of 0 was assigned to a “No” response, and a value of 1 was assigned to any of the three possible affirmative responses. The purpose for this ascription was that the sole purpose of this factor was to determine whether or not the participant consciously foresaw departing the organization within the next year. The provided “Yes” responses offered additional information as to where the participant expects to transfer their employment upon departure from the organization, which added no value to the study, and was therefore
irrelevant. The TII FEVS item used was: *DLEAVING – Are you considering leaving your organization within the next year, and if so, why?*

*Organization-Retention Cue (ORC)* – The purpose for this factor was to examine the level of satisfaction disclosed by the participant regarding the organization as a viable place to work. While the first item provides a general perception of the organization, the second discloses one of the important aspects that most employees consider regardless of their actual intent to seek such a position within their organization. This ties very closely with the turnover intention of the participant as it relates to job satisfaction. However, while the perception of opportunity to get a better job within an organization may affect job satisfaction, it is more important to examine it from the perspective of retention in the organization and its possible effect on turnover intention.

The TII score was measured against the ORC, which served to discern whether an underlying reason for leaving the organization is due to factors internal to the organization or for possible personal cogent reasons, of which disclosure of such reasons is not provided by the survey. While not a pure measure for the true reason for employee turnover, the ORC sought to establish the relationship with turnover intention for the effect that the organization itself may play in the turnover dynamic. The two FEVS items used to measure the ORC contained a statement and a question which provide the participant the same 5-point Likert scale as the items used for the
SCF and JSQ. A mean score was calculated from the respective responses and assigned as the ORC score. The two ORC items used were: Item 40. I recommend my organization as a good place to work; and Item 67. How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?

**Data Collection Methods**

The data used for this study was obtained from the OPM website at https://www.opm.gov/fevs/public-data-file/. The data sets are provided by OPM for public use, therefore no Institutional Review Board approval was required. The website also provides the FEVS Final Report and Technical Report for each available year. The FEVS Technical Report outlines the methodology OPM used in order to secure the data. The FEVS is administered as a web-based survey that invites the sample participants to complete the survey at their own location and a time of their own convenience during working hours. OPM uses a stratified selection from a register of the total population of full- and part-time federal employees. OPM obtains agency internal organization information for each employee to ensure the integrity of the stratification used for the sample. The resulting sample size was 903,060 federal civilian employees. Once the sample was selected, an invitation to participate in the survey was sent to the government e-mail of each participant. The invitation provided a web link personal to the participant to log on to the website and complete the survey. Once the participant followed the link, the system generated a random control number assigned to the survey response to assure the participant’s anonymity. The
register of the sample participants is not released for public use, nor is it made available to the participating government agencies. The 2015 survey was conducted from April 27, 2015 to June 12, 2015.

The 2015 FEVS instrument consisted of 98 survey items covering topics in the following areas: Personal Work Experiences; Work Unit; Agency; Supervisor; Leadership; Satisfaction; Work/Life; and Demographics. During the course of the survey, the disposition of each sample was maintained to determine the completion rate. The participant only needed to complete 25% of the survey items to be considered complete. The final 2015 FEVS data sets were provided by OPM in the form of Microsoft Excel .csv spreadsheets and contained all the responses included for the 98 items. No personally identifiable information for the participants was included in the data sets. Responses are identified by the randomly generated control number assigned to each participant at the onset of completing the survey.

Data Analysis and Synthesis

The appropriate variables were identified in order to structure the analysis. The independent variable consisted of each of the SCF with control variables delineating military status as either military (n=79,383) or non-military (n=171,605). The independent variable is mediated by the federal agency which will correlate with culture compatibility as a moderating variable. The dependent variables are the
organization member behavior outcomes of job satisfaction and turnover intention (See Figure 1).

**Figure 1. Culture-Climate Compatibility Model**

The 2015 FEVS data set acquired from the OPM were input and analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics software. The appropriate FEVS items were compiled and grouped according to their respective SCF, as well as the JSQ, TII, and ORC factors. In order to establish the correlation of the FEVS items to their relative SCF, reliability test using Cronbach’s Alpha was conducted for each factor. Cronbach’s Alpha is a common test to check for consistency among multiple survey items that are summated to provide a single value, with the intent of identifying relevance of the survey items to each other on a scale of 0 to 1, where an acceptable range is normally .65-.80 (Vaske, Beaman, & Sponarski, 2017). Each factor in the study provided a Cronbach’s Alpha higher than .70, evidencing the viability of the factor groupings (See Table 5).
Table 5. Reliability Statistics of FEVS Items Used to Define Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means for each factor were calculated for the overall population, the MVE population, and the NVE population. Each population mean was then further calculated by the respective federal agency. A comparative analysis was then conducted on each the means between populations for each factor to determine the level of divergent perception (See Appendix A). The purpose of this comparison was to measure each difference of each factor between the MVE and NVE regarding each agency to determine if the MVE perception means aligned more closely with the military federal agencies than with the non-military federal agencies. The difference of means between the two populations would reveal the populations’ alignment with the leadership provided within the agency, thereby by gaging the level of organization cultural compatibility.
The final analysis of the data consisted of conducting an analysis of variables (ANOVA) on the SCFs to determine the effect each had on the organization member behavior outcomes of job satisfaction and turnover intention. Specifically, the regression analysis sought to examine not only the effect, but to also gage the effect the factors revealed when moderated by cultural compatibility as demonstrated by the difference of coefficients across agencies for the MVE population.

Limitations/ Delimitations

The federal government regulates the scale of pay and how pay raises are allocated based upon tenure. And while pay grade is based upon the classification of each job dependent upon its level of responsibilities, each agency makes their own determination of what that level of responsibility will be. Thus, an employee in one agency with the same skill level as another, may receive a higher grade of pay by virtue of the level of responsibility placed upon that position. As such, this could affect job satisfaction in the manner that an employee may have a high regard for their work but feel they are not adequately compensated for their performance. This would not be a result of the regard that a supervisor may have for an employee, but simply the result of a tightly regulated standard for determining pay. To compensate for this possibility, the JSQ integrates the FEVS item which allows the participant to assess their level of satisfaction with the pay received for the work they perform.
This study is relegated to using those questions provided by the FEVS alone. The FEVS is designed to provide organization leaders with the information they need to determine the areas in which their employees may seem less satisfied with their work or organization. This study must use those questions that most clearly identify areas regarding job satisfaction as interpreted to be aligned with the SCF, as defined by Stringer (2002). A careful analysis of the FEVS items was performed against the standards for the climate factors to ensure the items used for each factor are closely aligned with the definitions provided by Stringer.

The FEVS demographics provide military veteran status based on three criteria: (1) Currently in the National Guard or Reserve; (2) Retired; and (3) Separated or Discharged. The demographics do not provide information on the amount of active military service each respondent may have actually experienced, nor the tenure of the National Guard or Reserve members. DeGroat (2016) contends that Reserve component servicemembers maintain a status in the civilian sector and do not undergo a transition similar to those members leaving active military duty. Still, since all military members must enter active duty to undergo the same amount of indoctrination upon entrance into military service, all three responses will be considered in the population of MVE. Consideration will be given with the discretion of how actual tenure in the civilian sector may affect the level of enculturation demonstrated by the individual member.
The FEVS demographics do not discern whether the service was performed as an enlisted member or a commissioned officer. The military professional education system provides the skills and education necessary for enlisted members to oversee the execution of tasks at lower ranks, while progressively expanding the education to an operational level as the member progresses through the enlisted ranks. Commissioned officers, however, begin receiving a broader base of professional development early in their career, progressing to strategic and global operations at higher levels of rank. Still, despite the difference in the progressive professional education of enlisted and commissioned military members, both educational tracks are undergirded by the same value system employed during military basic and advanced training.
Chapter IV: Findings

This quantitative study sought to answer the research question: Does cultural compatibility of an individual with an organization, as reflected through climate perceptions, affect organization member behavior outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intention?, which generated four exploratory questions to guide the analysis. The study consisted of three phases of analysis that examined existing survey data from the 2015 FEVS administered each year by the OPM to answer each exploratory question. The sample size used for the 2015 FEVS was N=250,988. The data was first analyzed to determine if DP existed between federal MVE compared to their NVE counterparts. The data was then examined to determine if cultural compatibility existed for MVE in federal agencies aligned with the US government’s military functions, and finally, what relationship such compatibility may have on organization member behavior outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intention. This chapter will provide the results of the analysis that answers the research and exploratory questions.

Phase One Results

The first exploratory question: What are the differences in workplace perception of US federal civilian employees with prior military service experience as compared to their coworkers with no prior military service experience? was
answered by conducting a comparison of the mean scores for each factor, which include the six SCF, the JSQ, and the ORC.

*Hypothesis 1:* MVE participants will disclose an overall DP for each of the organization’s SCF in relation to that of their NVE coworkers, the overall CP.

The purpose of this analysis was to identify which climate factor revealed a statistically significant divergence in workplace attitudes. According to widely accepted statistical convention, the large sample size (N=250,988) would most likely result in significant divergence to appear (Lin, Lucas, & Shmueli, 2013). However, the ensuing analysis for the entire sample population demonstrated that the MVE population means for each factor demonstrated relatively little divergence from those means returned for the NVE population. As demonstrated in Table 6, a comparison of the means of the two studied populations resulted in very little divergence that could be determined as statistically significant.

This segregation of the populations resulted in only slightly higher differences in mean scores between the MVE and NVE based on each individual agency’s scores, as exhibited in Table 6. While the modest divergence of overall means scores cannot fully support Hypothesis 1 at the macro-organizational level, the hypothesis is strengthened by examining such divergence at the next level down during Phase Two of the research analysis.


Table 6. Overall Means Comparison (N=250,988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>MVE</th>
<th>NVE</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCF1 Structure</td>
<td>3.498</td>
<td>3.501</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF2 Standards</td>
<td>3.648</td>
<td>3.644</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF3 Responsibility</td>
<td>3.378</td>
<td>3.391</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF4 Recognition</td>
<td>3.096</td>
<td>3.122</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF5 Support</td>
<td>3.555</td>
<td>3.573</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF6 Commitment</td>
<td>3.813</td>
<td>3.842</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSQ Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.690</td>
<td>3.706</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>3.208</td>
<td>3.243</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase Two Results

The next phase of analysis consisted of examining the mean scores by agency and sector to distinguish trends in the participants perceptions of their respective agencies through comparative analysis of mean scores. This sought to answer Exploratory Question 2: How does the military affiliation of a US Federal government organization affect the difference of workplace perceptions between employees with prior military service experience with those employees who have no prior military service experience? The results of each agency were grouped into sectors determined by their affiliation with the US government’s military function (See Appendix A). Each agency was categorized as either military, para-military, or non-military. The mean scores for each agency were aggregated into a sector mean score, comparing MVE mean scores to NVE mean scores and examining the amount of divergence between the two populations for each factor (See Table 7).
The phase two analysis posed three hypotheses:

_Hypothesis 2a:_ The MVE DP in military federal agencies will reflect higher mean scores than the NVE CP. The analysis of the military sector means discloses consistently moderately higher MVE mean scores than NVE mean scores for all factors, supporting Hypothesis 2a. The results are evidence that the MVE population discloses a higher perception for the military agencies than their NVE counterparts.

_Hypothesis 2b:_ The MVE DP in para-military federal agencies will reflect higher mean scores than the NVE CP. The MVE mean scores in the para-military sector reflect moderately lower means for all factors compared to the NVE mean scores. While upon further review of the means by individual agency discloses that one of the three agencies included in this sector actually reported higher mean scores for MVE than NVE, the mixed results cannot conclusively support this hypothesis.

_Hypothesis 2c:_ The MVE DP in non-military federal agencies will reflect lower mean scores than the NVE CP. The comparative mean scores of the NVE

---

**Table 7. Comparison of Means by Sector (N=250,988)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Military MVE</th>
<th>Military NVE</th>
<th>Mn Diff</th>
<th>Para-military MVE</th>
<th>Para-military NVE</th>
<th>Mn Diff</th>
<th>Non-military MVE</th>
<th>Non-military NVE</th>
<th>Mn Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCF1 Structure</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF2 Standards</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF3 Responsibility</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF4 Recognition</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF5 Support</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF6 Commitment</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSQ Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
population are moderately higher than those of the MVE mean scores, thus, supporting this hypothesis. Further, while only two of the three hypotheses were supported by the analysis, these results clearly demonstrate that MVE hold a moderately more favorable perception of military sector agencies than non-military sector agencies. Further, the results also reflect that NVE hold a moderately more favorable perception of non-military sector agencies than military sector agencies. Consistent with the first phase of analysis, averaging means across sectors accounts for a certain amount of homogeneity; when closer inspection of the mean comparison becomes more pronounced at the agency level.

Although not an intended goal of the study, but nevertheless noteworthy, results also revealed that all agencies consistently reported corresponding perceptions of favorability regarding the six SCF, with only one minor deviation. Consistently throughout the analysis, all population scores resulted in SCF₆ Commitment having the highest mean score and SCF₄ Recognition with the lowest. Further, ranking the means of the six SCF followed in such a fashion from highest to lowest: SCF₆ Commitment; SCF₂ Standards; SCF₅ Support; SCF₁ Structure; SCF₃ Responsibility; SCF₄ Recognition (See Appendix A). Such a trend indicates a common perception of the internal organizational environment of the federal workplace, giving credence to the establishment of particular dynamics of the workplace culture in the federal government.
Phase Three Results

The purpose of this phase of analysis was to determine what, if any, effect such a divergence on workplace perception has on the organization and the effect the socialization process may have on mitigating such divergence. To measure any effect the study examined organization member behavior outcomes that have been shown to positively or negatively affect an organization. Thus, job satisfaction and turnover intention were selected to answer Exploratory Question 3: How is job satisfaction and turnover intention affected for Federal civilian employees with prior military service experience when their workplace perceptions diverge from the perceptions of their coworkers with no prior military service experience?

Hypothesis 3a: The employee workplace perceptions as reflected by the SCF and ORC will have a positive relationship with job satisfaction. The analysis for this phase looked at both the means scores for job satisfaction as reflected in the JSQ as well as the correlation of the JSQ on the other factors through a multivariate analysis (MANOVA). A comparison of JSQ means, as shown in Table 8 indicates that MVE have a moderately higher JSQ scores than NVE in the military sector, and moderately lower JSQ in the non-military sector. The MANOVA of JSQ on the remaining factors demonstrates that all factors have a strongly significant correlation to the JSQ with MVE coefficients ranging .714-.823 across all agencies, an NVE coefficients ranging from .669-.805. Amongst all factors in all sectors and agencies, the MVE reflect higher coefficients than their NVE counterpart, evidencing that MVE will experience
a proportionate positive relative change in JSQ when experiencing a change in one of the other factors. Thus, Hypothesis 3a is supported.

Table 8. Turnover Intention Correlations (N=250,988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sorted</th>
<th>TII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>-.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSQ Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF6 Commitment</td>
<td>-.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF3 Responsibility</td>
<td>-.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF4 Recognition</td>
<td>-.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF1 Structure</td>
<td>-.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF5 Support</td>
<td>-.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF2 Standards</td>
<td>-.292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 3b: The employee workplace perceptions as reflected by the SCF and ORC will have a negative relationship with turnover intention. In addition to determining the relationship of the JSQ through the MANOVA, the TII was measured in according to the relationship with the SCF, the JSQ, and the ORC. Each factor returned a significant negative relationship with supporting Hypothesis 3b. Of further interest to the study is the relative strength of the various factors in relation to turnover intention. The SCF with the strongest negative correlation to turnover intention was SCF6 Commitment (-.363). Accordingly, the JSQ demonstrated a significantly strong negative correlation of (-.380). However, the ORC resulted with the strongest negative relationship at (-.411). When broken down to the agency level, the order of SCF alternates by agency; however, ORC and JSQ remain the two
strongest negative correlations, with MVE reporting slightly stronger results than NVE in all cases.

The second step of the third phase of analysis sought to determine the effect that extended socialization processes may have on workplace perceptions. The populations were further divided by military status across the three tenure categories: (1) LT - 5 or less years of federal service; (2) MT - 6–14 years of federal service; and (3) HT - 15 or more years of federal service, as exhibited in Table 9. The resulting means were analyzed and calculated for divergence between the MVE and NVE populations as well as across the tenure groups as provided in Table 10.

### Table 9. Factor Means by Tenure Group (N=250,988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>LT &lt;= 5 years</th>
<th>MT 6-14 years</th>
<th>HT 15+ years</th>
<th>LT &lt;= 5 years</th>
<th>MT 6-14 years</th>
<th>HT 15+ years</th>
<th>LT &lt;= 5 years</th>
<th>MT 6-14 years</th>
<th>HT 15+ years</th>
<th>LT &lt;= 5 years</th>
<th>MT 6-14 years</th>
<th>HT 15+ years</th>
<th>LT &lt;= 5 years</th>
<th>MT 6-14 years</th>
<th>HT 15+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCF1 Structure</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF2 Standards</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF3 Responsibility</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF4 Recognition</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF5 Support</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF6 Commitment</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 4: Socialization processes will mitigate the amount of divergence in workplace climate perceptions, positively affecting workplace climate perceptions and job satisfaction. Hypothesis 4 can only be partially supported since this level of analysis provided a myriad of results that may bear further examination. Table 11 again exhibits that a comparison of the means of NVE with the corresponding MVE in each group resulted in only modest divergence of workplace perceptions. However, a divergence does emerge when considering that the NVE MT and MT populations report lower mean scores than their MVE counterparts, while HT NVE participants score each factor higher than the HT MVE. Further, the results signified a trend of mean scores decreasing as employees transitioned into mid-career of federal service (MT), then recovering as they gained more senior status with higher tenure, regardless on their intent to leave the organization. The lone exception in this comparison is the MVE HT group that does not intend to leave the organization. While all other groups recover a measure of the decrease in means experienced in the MT groups, the MVE HT group that intends to stay reports even lower mean scores.
The comparison of differences of means between the tenure groups segregated by military status also reveals certain trends that are also of note. While most groups in Table 10 experience some recovery of means transitioning from middle tenure to senior tenure, both NVE HT groups report stronger recovery than the corresponding MVE groups as shown in the calculated differences of means in Table 11. This contrasts with the results that MVE LT and MT report higher mean scores for the factors than do the respective NVE groups. And while the MVE report only slightly divergent perceptions of the factors in comparison to the NVE, the tenure trends indicate that MVE means recover less or decrease when transitioning from middle to late career, resulting in lower HT mean scores than their NVE counterparts.

Further, while the divergence between each MVE group and the respective NVE group demonstrates only modest divergence, comparisons of LT and HT tenure groups (See Table 11) within both MVE and NVE populations demonstrate significant divergence in climate perception mean scores, particularly in the two HT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCF1 Structure</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>HT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCF2 Standards</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF3 Responsibility</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF4 Recognition</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF5 Support</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF6 Commitment</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVE-MVE Diff TII Yes</td>
<td>[N=250,988]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JSQ Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCF5 Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ORC         | -0.05 | -0.08 | 0.04 | -0.04 | -0.03 | 0.05 |
groups who reported an intention to stay in their organizations. When comparing the MVE recovery (See Table 11) of employees who do not intend to leave the organization with their NVE counterparts, the means indicate a significant divergence between the MVE and NVE populations. This divergence is primarily the result of the positive recovery of the NVE when transitioning from MT to HT and the negative recovery of MVE experiencing the same transition.

**Summary**

The findings of this study indicate that while federal civilian employees with military experience have modestly divergent workplace perceptions than their coworkers without military experience, they demonstrate a more favorable perception of Federal military agencies than non-military agencies. Such findings support that military veterans more favorably view agencies with which they have a compatible culture and identity. Further, such compatibility results in higher levels of job satisfaction and organization commitment, while mitigating the conscious intent to leave the organization as indicated by employee turnover intention. Employee tenure in the federal service has shown to have varying effects on employee workplace perceptions dependent upon the point in time of the employee’s career and whether or not they are planning to leave their organization. While most employees experience a decrease in workplace climate perception and job satisfaction during the middle of their career, the amount of recovery of positive perception when transitioning to later tenure exhibits a relationship to military status and intent to leave the organization.
Chapter V: Discussion

Conducting a quantitative study entailing dimensions of culture is always a risky venture. Denison (1996) points out the underlying conflict between culture and climate researchers is that while the former is concerned with the importance of understanding the underlying assumptions, the latter concerns themselves with the surface issues reflected by perception surveys. Denison further contends that culture is a description of the internal environmental context of an organization, while climate is an expression or perception of that context. This study, which was conducted a posteriori, predicated by the researcher’s preunderstanding of the culture of military organizations and military service experience shared by military veterans working in a civilian workforce, has linked the connection between the underlying culture and the disclosed perceptions of the workforce. Such a connection serves to identify the level of compatibility a worker has with the organization’s culture, as evidenced by the federal civilian employees with military service experience and the military agencies of the US government.

Cultural Compatibility

As supported by Kalleberg (1977), measuring employee perceptions are indicative of their individual values which demonstrate their level of satisfaction with the organization’s internal environment. Organization leadership controls many of the dynamics of the internal environment, and the employees’ perceptions are means to
measure the effectiveness of those dynamics. As such, the six SCF examined in the study offered the employees the opportunity to present their viewpoints on the level of satisfaction they feel towards these determinants of the organization’s internal environment as well as the organization overall. The most prevalent indicator of the underlying assumptions of the government employees who participated in the 2015 FEVS is the distinct order in which the collective means scores ordered the six factors. In all 10 agencies, regardless of military experience, the participants expressed a high level of commitment to their work and their organization through SCF6 Commitment, which yielded the highest mean scores. In the same manner, SCF4 Recognition resulted in the lowest mean scores across the board. And with only one minor deviation, all other SCF were ranked the same by mean scores for all agencies, evidencing an underlying assumption common to all federal employees.

When examining the mean scores, the results indicated that military veteran employees perceived the environment of the military agencies more favorably than their counterparts with no military service experience. The military veterans consistently scored each factor higher than their NVE coworkers regarding each military agency. Likewise, the NVE agencies, the military veterans consistently perceived the environment less favorably than their non-military counterparts within each agency as reflected in the lower factor mean scores. While the military employees may have expressed higher perceptions of the climate factors in non-military agencies than in military agencies, the perception must be viewed within the
context of the agency in which it was measured. The comparison between the populations in each agency demonstrates the affinity for the internal environment. Further, socialization may have played a role in the perceptions of the employees in that they have become acculturated to a degree to expect certain conditions within the organization and the level of acceptability. Despite the rather modest divergence of the scores, military employees demonstrate that they are more tolerant of military organizations than their non-military coworkers, and in the same fashion do not feel the same level of satisfaction in the non-military agencies.

When taking into account the proportions of military veterans in each agency, the effect of acculturation becomes apparent. In the military agencies the MVE populations comprise about half of the workforce. Coupled with the leadership provided by military service members, the dominant work environment would more likely resemble that of an actual military unit. Conversely, in the non-military agencies, the military veterans are a distinct minority, comprising less than 20% of the workforce, and much less in one of the agencies examined. As such, the socialization of the employees in the respective agency’s culture would naturally acculturate the members to its environmental context. In the case of the military-affiliated agencies, military veteran employees would retain much of the enculturation provided by their previous shared experience, while the employees with no prior military experience would have to become attuned to the distinct culture. As such, employees with military service experience entering an agency with no military
affiliation will need to make greater adjustments to their self-identity to become attuned to a new culture. The findings of this study are indicative of these processes.

In this regard, a point must be made concerning the significance of the amount of divergence between the mean scores of the two examined populations. The majority of the comparisons resulted in a mean difference of less than .10 or greater than -.10. While these results may not signify a strong significance, the overall comparisons provide practical significance in that they support Hypotheses 2a and 2c that a divergence in workplace perceptions exists between the two populations exhibiting preference to one organization culture over another. This fact is important to understand as it denotes a discernible affinity of one population towards the culture of a particular organization. As such, it serves as a starting point for further investigation of the phenomenon.

As noted by Baltes, Zhadanova, and Parker (2009), a study of particular individuals or groups provide insight to the psychological climate perceived by the target studied. The psychological climate provides a more distinct characterization of the internal environment of the organization as opposed to the organizational climate, which only provides an aggregated viewpoint of the organization climate determinants. Such a generalization of a climate study as provided by the organizational climate only serves to impede the ability of researchers in deducing the specific effects a particular groups climate perception may have on the organization as
a whole (Shaw & Grubbs, 1981). Such is the case when subdividing the groups of employees into tenure groups and examining the effect that time has on the perceptions of the employees. All groups experienced a decline in perception transitioning from early in their service to the years in middle of their careers. And consequently, an identifiable divergence in viewpoints emerged between the tenure groups, with the employees with military service experience demonstrating a discernible decline in climate perception despite their intent to remain in their organization. And when compared to the respective group of employees without military service experience who also reported an intent to stay, a significantly lower perception in each factor emerged. As such, this finding would indicate that organization plans to learn from such a climate study should include paying particular attention to this group.

**Impact on Organization Member Behavior Outcomes**

As indicated in the statistical results, all climate factors demonstrate a strong relationship with both the JSQ and the TII, demonstrating that fluctuations of perception caused by changes in the organization’s internal environment will affect these outcomes. Interestingly, the overall SCF factors that demonstrate the strongest relationship with job satisfaction are SCF$_3$ Responsibility ($p = .775$), SCF$_4$ Recognition ($p = .751$), and SCF$_6$ Commitment ($p = .765$). When compared to the ranking of the climate factors by means, SCF$_6$ Commitment ranked the highest, while SCF$_3$ Responsibility and SCF$_4$ Recognition were ranked the lowest. It would seem
obvious that an increase in commitment on the part of the employee would naturally result in a higher level of job satisfaction. However, the results also demonstrate that employees would be more responsive to an increase of their personal responsibility regarding their work. In regarding recognition in conjunction with responsibility, employees may be communicating that they wish to be recognized for their contributions through increased responsibility.

This premise is supported by an examination of the relationship of the ORC with job satisfaction and the SCF, whereas again we find the same three SFC factors having the strongest effect (See Table 12). The ORC is calculated by answering two FEVS items: Item 40. I recommend my organization as a good place to work; and Item 67. How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization? While both items work in tandem to determine the respondent’s overall perception of the organization, the strong positive correlation ORC has with these SCF promotes the assertion that the employees seek more opportunity to prove their ability at higher levels of responsibility. Concurrently, the relationship also confirms the respondent’s commitment to the organization as well as the contribution the organization itself has on job satisfaction.
Table 12. Overall Pearson Correlations (Climate Factors; N=250,988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JSQ Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>SCF 1</th>
<th>SCF 2</th>
<th>SCF 3</th>
<th>SCF 4</th>
<th>SCF 5</th>
<th>SCF 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSQ Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF 1 Structure</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF 2 Standards</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF 3 Responsibility</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF 4 Recognition</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF 5 Support</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF 6 Commitment</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In respect to the TII, the ORC has the overall strongest negative relationship with the employee’s turnover intention at \((p = -.411)\), while the correlation of the JSQ and TII are \((p = -.380)\), raising the issue that the employee’s perception of the organization itself affects their conscious intent to leave more so than the elements of the job itself (See Table 13). And as with the JSQ and ORC, the SCF with the strongest negative effect on turnover intention are SCF6 Commitment \((p = -.363)\), SCF3 Responsibility \((p = -.343)\) and SCF4 Recognition \((p = -.323)\), further attesting to the shared perception of both all employees regarding the organizational environmental context.

Table 13. Overall Pearson Correlations (Turnover Intention; N=250,988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCF1 Structure</td>
<td>-.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF2 Standards</td>
<td>-.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF3 Responsibility</td>
<td>-.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF4 Recognition</td>
<td>-.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF5 Support</td>
<td>-.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF6 Commitment</td>
<td>-.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSQ Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>-.411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One observation of note is the difference in correlation of SCF with turnover intention between the MVE and NVE when examined at the agency level. Across all factors in all agencies, the results indicate that the MVE correlations show a stronger negative relationship for turnover intention than the NVE correlations. However, this difference in correlations is stronger in the non-military agencies than in the military agencies, signifying that the MVE contemplation for leaving the non-military organization will be more affected by smaller fluctuations in the environment than they would in the military organization. While this would support the premise of cultural compatibility, it could likely be exacerbated by the relatively small percentage the MVE represent in the overall workforce in the non-military agency. Conversely, since the MVE represent roughly half of the military agency workforce, cultural compatibility would diminish the effect on turnover intention.

**Discoveries of Note**

Another interesting discovery that arose during analysis was the trend of perceptions across the factors when examined according to tenure for both the NVE and MVE. Through an examination of tenure in the body of the study, a comparison of means was conducted to test if socialization over time effected any change in the workplace perceptions in the overall population. The FEVS provided a demographic item that categorized employees by years of federal service, delineated as less than 5 years (LT), between 6 and 14 years (MT), and more than 15 years (HT). An analysis was conducted to determine if socialization over the years would result in less
divergent perceptions between MVE and NVE participants. The results showed that the divergence did remain fairly static, further supporting the notion of the persistence of the military enculturation. However, a more interesting discovery came as a result of the comparison.

When comparing all factors by military status and tenure, a trend emerged for all categories that indicated that perceptions for the LT group decreased with the MT group, but then increased with the HT group. On a graph, the trend would appear as the Greek letter “upsilon”. That is, with one exception. The MVE group that indicated that, no, they did not intend to leave within the next year, experienced a decrease in all factors. This brings to question why this group specifically, would experience a decrease in their perception of their organization. Unfortunately, the comparison was not conducted at the agency level, which could have possibly determined if one or more agencies caused the skew. Still, this raises interesting questions as to whether or not this population is experiencing a true decrease in job satisfaction despite planning to remain with the organization, much like the “Retired-on-the-Job” group examined by Duxbury and Halinski (2014). These employees tend to remain in the organization through a notion of commitment or investment, while also experiencing decreased engagement as a result of burnout or a sense of entitlement.

Another discovery came by virtue of the breakout of perceptions by agencies. While the MVE perceptions were more favorable of the military agencies and less so
for the non-military agencies, the divergence of perceptions among all agencies bears some examination. The agency with the highest overall mean scores for both populations was the Department of Treasury, while the Department of Homeland Security registered much lower mean scores than any other agency, registering the only mean score, SCF4 Recognition (2.86), below a score of 3. This is particularly interesting in light of the fact that the Department of Treasury relinquished the US Customs Service and the US Secret Service to the Department of Homeland Security, under the reorganization initiated by the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Ritter & Ball, 2003). Consequently, the Department of Homeland Defense has consistently fallen below the agency median since its inception in 2003 (Partnership for Public Service, 2018). Coincidentally, the Department of Homeland Defense is the only agency outside of the military sector that MVE responded with more favorable perceptions than their NVE counterparts.

Summary

This study shows that the enculturation of a distinct group undergoing transition in the workplace may persist with the employee to the new organization. Military members transitioning into the civilian workplace share a common experience of cultural conditioning not experienced by their coworkers who do not share the experience of military service. As such, even as military members are socialized into civilian employment, they retain much of the values and commitment instilled to them through their service and reelected in their perceptions of the new
organization. These perceptions are particularly evident in the more favorable attitude they disclose concerning agencies that are compatible with the military culture. The importance of this finding being that culture compatibility between the organization and the employee are likely to result in higher levels of job satisfaction and engagement and decreased possibility of employee turnover.

A second level effect disclosed by the study is the exposure of the overall culture of the federal government. While employees profess high levels of commitment, they do not feel they are being recognized for their efforts, nor do they feel they are being entrusted with higher levels of responsibility. The results of the study clearly indicate the possibility of a strategic plan for increasing employee engagement by increasing efforts to properly recognize their employees’ efforts through the employment of increased responsibility. The resulting effect has shown that this course of action may positively influence job satisfaction and commitment, thereby reducing the risk of turnover.
Chapter VI: Conclusions

Overview

This study empirically tested the viability of the theory that cultural compatibility between an employee and the organization will have a positive effect on job satisfaction by examining the self-disclosed workplace perceptions of Federal civilian employees with military service experience as compared to their coworkers without military service experience. The results showed that organization internal climate dimensions have a significant influence on job satisfaction and commitment while demonstrating a negative relationship with turnover intention. Yet, the purpose of this study is not solely a comparison of the workplace perceptions of MVE to their NVE counterparts, rather, it serves to evidence the differences in workplace attitudes of employees as affected by their level of compatibility with the culture of an organization. In this respect, organizations that seek to improve their organization through an analysis of the organization’s climate would fare well to take cultural compatibility into consideration. When recruiting and hiring, organization leadership needs to understand the impact of such a diasporic integration into their organization in order to better capitalize on the capabilities such a group brings to the workplace.

Implications

This study serves as an empirical generalization of the implications for further study by providing support for the proposed model and narrowing determinants of the
dimensions of climate that may affect organization behavior, which can enable managers in their strategic recruiting and socialization practices (Price & Kim, 1993). The proposed theoretical model, that culture compatibility moderates the relationship of job satisfaction, can be tested on other populations who experience the diaspora of transitioning en masse from one organization to another. Consequently, with the ensuing generational demographic from Baby Boomers to Millennials and “Gen-Z”, organizations are likely to encounter a difference in how values are focused by the influx of new generations into the workforce. This is particularly prevalent in the significant difference in workplace perceptions reported in the MVE tenure groups who intend to stay with their organization. As Baby Boomers continue to transition out of the workplace and millennials progress to mid- and late-careers, their workplace perceptions will become more influential in shaping organizational strategies.

Another growing concern in the US is the mobilization and concentration of distinct demographic groups into specified areas. This internal migration not only poses quandaries for local employers to recruit and socialize new employees, but to also ensure adequate job satisfaction to mitigate the possibility of early turnover. As evidenced in the study, military personnel gravitate to the military agencies who are best equipped to assist in the work role transition through a compatible organization culture from which the military service members departed. As such, highly desired candidates are likely to seek and commit to organizations who demonstrate cultures to
which they are better attuned. This trend should be considered by organization leadership when formulating their recruiting and hiring practices.

Further implications of this study are the expansion of such research to the private sector and other industries. As noted, the world is experiencing global migration predicated by the search for advancement, opportunity, or refuge. While organizations may implement strategic recruiting and socializations tactics into their planning, they should also be prepared to plan for changes to their own culture and climate as a result of migration and immigration. One example would be the large influx of health care practitioners from the eastern Asian nations credentialed in eastern medical practices. Health care organizations would be remiss not to investigate the impact this inflow of diverse professional philosophies has on health care organizations still embedded in western medicine practices and philosophy. A second example is the impact that concentrated migration has on the locale’s businesses and infrastructure. Local and state governments must be prepared to address the changing demographics in their areas as such migration will affect not on the local economy and services, but also the voting constituency. The concentration of groups with shared enculturation will not only affect these tangible aspects, but also the make-up of local government as the select candidate who are more likely to reflect their own culture in order to make their geographical cultural environment more compatible to that which they are attuned.
Limitations and Further Research

While the study did encompass a large sample size of government employees, the survey only provided demographics identifying the military status of the participants for two years during the entire expanse of time the survey has been issued. The inclusion of this information in previous or successive years would have created a dense longitudinal study to further support the premise of a defined government culture and the compatibility of military veterans and the military agencies. While the 2015 FEVS data set provided the capability to delve into lower echelons of the government agencies, the scope of the study necessitated keeping the level of analysis to the departmental-level agencies of the government. Such a constraint relegates the scope of analysis to the meso-organizational level, whereas a deeper dive into the micro-organizational levels may provide a wider dispersion of divergence as each sub-agency serves to develop its own form of the designated agency culture.

Additionally, while the study sought to determine the divergence of workplace perceptions of military veterans, this population served as a more acute version of a diasporic group with a shared culture. As previously noted, all military service members undergo a deliberate and intense process of socialization and induction tactics meant to specifically enculture the members to a distinct combination of values, practices, and traditions not likely experienced by other possible diasporic groups. The study is further limited by only establishing the existence of divergent
workplace perceptions and cultural compatibility but is not able to probe into the more precise motives that facilitate the manifestation of these phenomena. Future research employing a qualitative or mixed-method study design would be better suited to revealing these root causes for the divergence of workplace perceptions. Such research would serve to supplement the findings of this study to provide more identifiable causes for the divergence which could translate into actionable practices for affecting change efforts in an organization.
## Appendix A: Comparative Analysis Tables

### Table A-1: Military Agency Comparative Analysis of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Factor</th>
<th>MVE</th>
<th>NVE</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
<th>MVE</th>
<th>NVE</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
<th>MVE</th>
<th>NVE</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCF1 Structure</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF2 Standards</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF3 Responsibility</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF4 Recognition</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF5 Support</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF6 Commitment</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-Lo Comparison</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSQ Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS/OR Difference</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A-2: Paramilitary Agency Comparative Analysis of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Factor</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>NVE</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>NVE</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>NVE</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCF1 Structure</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF2 Standards</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF3 Responsibility</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF4 Recognition</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF5 Support</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF6 Commitment</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-Lo Comparison</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSQ Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS/OR Difference</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A-3: Non-military Agency Comparative Analysis of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Factor</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>NVE</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>NVE</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>NVE</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCF1 Structure</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF2 Standards</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF3 Responsibility</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF4 Recognition</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF5 Support</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF6 Commitment</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-Lo Comparison</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSQ Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS/OR Difference</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table A-4: Climate Factor Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Factor</th>
<th>JSQ</th>
<th>SCF1</th>
<th>SCF2</th>
<th>SCF3</th>
<th>SCF4</th>
<th>SCF5</th>
<th>SCF6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MVE</td>
<td>NVE</td>
<td>MVE</td>
<td>NVE</td>
<td>MVE</td>
<td>NVE</td>
<td>MVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSQ Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF1 Structure</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF2 Standards</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF3 Responsibility</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF4 Recognition</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF5 Support</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF6 Commitment</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A-5: Comparative Means Trend Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Factor</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Non-Military</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Non-Military</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Non-Military</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Non-Military</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Non-Military</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF1 Structure</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF4 Recognition</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF6 Commitment</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSQ Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: 2015 Federal Employee Viewpoint

Survey Items

Item Number and Text

My Work Experience

1. I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills in my organization.
2. I have enough information to do my job well.
3. I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things.
4. My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.
5. I like the kind of work I do.
6. I know what is expected of me on the job.
7. When needed I am willing to put in the extra effort to get a job done.
8. I am constantly looking for ways to do my job better.
9. I have sufficient resources (for example, people, materials, budget) to get my job done.
10. My workload is reasonable.
11. My talents are used well in the workplace.
12. I know how my work relates to the agency's goals and priorities.
13. The work I do is important.
14. Physical conditions (for example, noise level, temperature, lighting, cleanliness in the workplace) allow employees to perform their jobs well.
15. My performance appraisal is a fair reflection of my performance.
16. I am held accountable for achieving results.
17. I can disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal.
18. My training needs are assessed.
19. In my most recent performance appraisal, I understood what I had to do to be rated at different performance levels (for example, Fully Successful, Outstanding).

My Work Unit

20. The people I work with cooperate to get the job done.
21. My work unit is able to recruit people with the right skills.
22. Promotions in my work unit are based on merit.
23. In my work unit, steps are taken to deal with a poor performer who cannot or will not improve.
In my work unit, differences in performance are recognized in a meaningful way.

Awards in my work unit depend on how well employees perform their jobs.

Employees in my work unit share job knowledge with each other.

The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year.

How would you rate the overall quality of work done by your work unit?

My Agency

The workforce has the job-relevant knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish organizational goals.

Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.

Employees are recognized for providing high quality products and services.

Creativity and innovation are rewarded.

Pay raises depend on how well employees perform their jobs.

Policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace (for example, recruiting minorities and women, training in awareness of diversity issues, mentoring).

Employees are protected from health and safety hazards on the job.

My organization has prepared employees for potential security threats.

Arbitrary action, personal favoritism and coercion for partisan political purposes are not tolerated.

Prohibited Personnel Practices (for example, illegally discriminating for or against any employee/applicant, obstructing a person's right to compete for employment, knowingly violating veterans' preference requirements) are not tolerated.

My agency is successful at accomplishing its mission.

I recommend my organization as a good place to work.

I believe the results of this survey will be used to make my agency a better place to work.

My Work Experience

My supervisor supports my need to balance work and other life issues.

My supervisor provides me with opportunities to demonstrate my leadership skills.

Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile.

My supervisor is committed to a workforce representative of all segments of society.

My supervisor provides me with constructive suggestions to improve my job performance.

Supervisors in my work unit support employee development.
48 My supervisor listens to what I have to say.
49 My supervisor treats me with respect.
50 In the last six months, my supervisor has talked with me about my performance.
51 I have trust and confidence in my supervisor.
52 Overall, how good a job do you feel is being done by your immediate supervisor?
53 In my organization, senior leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.
54 My organization's senior leaders maintain high standards of honesty and integrity.
55 Supervisors work well with employees of different backgrounds.
56 Managers communicate the goals and priorities of the organization.
57 Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.
58 Managers promote communication among different work units (for example, about projects, goals, needed resources).
59 Managers support collaboration across work units to accomplish work objectives.
60 Overall, how good a job do you feel is being done by the manager directly above your immediate supervisor?
61 I have a high level of respect for my organization's senior leaders.
62 Senior leaders demonstrate support for Work/Life programs.

My Satisfaction

63 How satisfied are you with your involvement in decisions that affect your work?
64 How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?
65 How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?
66 How satisfied are you with the policies and practices of your senior leaders?
67 How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?
68 How satisfied are you with the training you receive for your present job?
69 Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your job?
70 Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your pay?

Work/Life

71 Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your organization?
72 Have you been notified whether or not you are eligible to telework?
Please select the response below that BEST describes your current teleworking situation.

**Do you participate in the following Work/Life programs?**

74 Alternative Work Schedules (AWS)
75 Health and Wellness Programs (for example, exercise, medical screening, quit smoking programs)
76 Employee Assistance Program (EAP)
77 Child Care Programs (for example, daycare, parenting classes, parenting support groups)
78 Elder Care Programs (for example, support groups, speakers)

**How satisfied are you with the following Work/Life programs in your agency?**

79 Telework
80 Alternative Work Schedules (AWS)
81 Health and Wellness Programs (for example, exercise, medical screening, quit smoking programs)
82 Employee Assistance Program (EAP)
83 Child Care Programs (for example, daycare, parenting classes, parenting support groups)
84 Elder Care Programs (for example, support groups, speakers)
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