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INTRODUCTION

In a previous Note (Salas, 1990,b.) the following hypothesis was tested and confirmed.

"Tertiary educated members of the Engineering, Instructor and Supply branches who are thirty years of age or less possess comparatively more volatile and negative attitudes towards the Navy than do their age and educational peers in the Executive branch." (p.4)

These results were construed within the context of the institutional-occupational hypothesis. (Moskos, 1977)

BACKGROUND

In a previous Note (Salas, 1990,a.) a within-branch analysis of the attitudes of tertiary educated Executive, Engineering and Supply branch RAN officers found that the attitudes of Supply officers over thirty years of age appeared more settled and less negative towards the Navy than their younger counterparts in that branch. (p.15)

The results of an earlier between-branch study (Salas, 1989) suggested that, in general, officers of the Executive, Engineering, Supply and Instructor branches who were in Late Middle and Late Career stages (=>30 years of age) were much more settled and homogeneous in their attitudes towards the Navy than those in their earlier career stages (<=30 years of age). These two sets of results, one branch specific and controlled for education level, the other general with educational level uncontrolled, suggest that officer attitude turbulence might be a function of age/experience and that this effect might be witnessed in the specific case of older, tertiary educated RAN officers.

The point is thrown into relief if viewed within the context of the institutional-occupational (I/O) hypothesis which asserts "that the military was moving away from an institutional format to one more and more resembling
that of an occupational one" (Moskos, 1986)*; or as Janowitz (1977) would put it, the military is gradually becoming civilianized. Empirical support for this position came from Stahl et al (1978) who showed, amongst other results, that junior officers were more occupationally oriented than senior officers, who, in turn, were more institutionalized in their attitudes.

Mean occupational scale scores were seen to increase significantly when the attitudes of two separate samples of U.S. Air Force personnel were compared between 1977 and 1980 by the same authors (1981). (A similar increase was observed within each of these samples by the present writer, in direct proportion to length of service, although this latter phenomenon did not seem to be referred to by Stahl et al in that article.)

Such results appear to be supported by those from analyses within and between officers of RAN branches referred to above where it seemed that older officers might be less occupationally oriented than their younger colleagues, "occupational" being equated broadly here with the possession of more negative attitudes towards the Service and "institutional" with the possession of less critical attitudes.

The present analysis was conducted with the aim of resolving more clearly the evidence which suggests that older RAN officers, more particularly those who are tertiary qualified, might be less occupationally oriented than their younger counterparts and to reveal if this applied differentially according to branch.

AIM

1. To test the following hypothesis.

"Tertiary educated members of the Engineering, Supply and Instructor branches who are older than 30 years of age possess more volatile and negative attitudes towards the Navy than their age and educational peers in the Executive branch."

* Briefly, he defined occupational orientation in terms of self-interest and marketplace principles; the institutional orientation he characterized as self-sacrificing and committed.
It should be borne in mind that within-branch analyses have shown little attitudinal variation between older and younger officers of the Executive branch (Salas, 1990a) which branch was there described as being representative of baseline institutional attitudes at least for the Royal Australian Navy Officer Corps.

2. To discuss the results within the context of the I/O hypothesis.

PROCEDURE

Mean scores of officers older than 30 years of age on eleven RAN Retention Survey attitude Scales were compared across the four branches using ANOVA.

RESULTS

Table 1 below reveals the differential scoring variability between the younger and older, tertiary educated officer subsamples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>≤ 30 Years</th>
<th>&gt; 30 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Estimation (JOBEST)</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Prospects (CP)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction (JOBSAT)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Effectiveness (SE)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (CS)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Commitment (KS)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Motivation (CMS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Satisfaction (SQ)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration Scale (RS)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.4 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignation Propensity (RP)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Factor (FF)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Technical Note 1 for results of a post-hoc analysis.
+ See Annes A.
# From Salas 1990, (b).
The present results suggest that with the exception of one variable (RS Scale) the mean scaled attitudes towards the Navy held by tertiary qualified officers aged over thirty years are virtually homogeneous. In terms of the present hypothesis, the attitudes of those officers who are members of the Engineering, Supply and Instructor branches (ES+I) are not significantly different to those of their counterparts in the Executive branch. Nor are they in fact different from each other. The hypothesis is not supported.

It was claimed earlier (Salas, 1990, a) that the Executive branch membership could be used as the paradigm for an institutional officer attitude orientation towards the Royal Australian Navy, particularly since few within-branch age effects were apparent when the attitudes of young and old Executive degree holders were analysed separately (Salas, ibid). i.e. the institutionality appeared to be a homogeneous branch phenomenon. The present results can be construed, then, as suggesting that the attitudes of older ES-I branch officers are closer to the institutional paradigm represented by the posture of the Executive branch officers rather than vice-versa.

The two sets of results in the above table clearly illustrate the attitudinal differentials characteristic of the two age groups.

**CONCLUSIONS**

It can be concluded from these results that the argument that officer attitudes reflecting an institutional attitude orientation towards the Navy are more likely to increase or to appear to increase with age/experience/tenure and that attitudes reflecting an occupational orientation are likely to diminish, or appear to diminish, appears substantiated.

Evidence sighted from research in support of the I/O model suggesting that an occupational orientation will displace an institutional one, has not been comprehensively controlled for age, branch or Corps membership, education level or type of tertiary educational credential possessed (technological vs classical) or combinations of these. This reduces the likely utility of such evidence.
Until longitudinal studies appear which trace the incidence of I/O attitudes within the same individuals over the course of their military career the question of changes in I/O orientation, as representative of a process within individuals, cannot be answered.
SUMMARY, REVIEW AND FINAL CONCLUSIONS

Observations were made by the Head of the Royal Australian Navy Regular Officer Careers Study team (Salas, 1990a, page 1) that the attitudes of young, tertiary educated, male Supply branch officers, when interviewed, showed a high level of dissatisfaction with their career prospects and the management of their careers.

An "apparent disenchantment" on the part of tertiary qualified Engineering and Instructor branch officers was also noticed. Added concern was felt by the ROCS team lest similar trends could become apparent as more Executive (Seaman) branch officers continued to gain degrees.

A subsequent within branch study (Salas, ibid) concluded from the results available that young (<30 years) tertiary educated members of the Supply branch were in fact relatively more negative and volatile in their attitudes towards the Navy than were their age peers in the same branch who did not possess a tertiary level education. This conclusion corresponded to the observation of the ROCS team.

The concern that similarly negative and volatile attitudes towards the Navy might gradually become characteristic of membership of the Executive branch as more and more officers belonging to that branch acquired officially encouraged tertiary educational qualifications was not supported in the same within-branch analyses. Attitudes of the tertiary and the secondary educational groups within the Executive branch were largely undifferentiated across a wide variety of topics. This held for both young and older age groupings.

The writer went on to say:

"The threat to the Executive branch of invasion by the more rational, civilian-oriented attitudes typical of the occupational stereotype may be non-existent or minimal at most. In actual fact, according to the present results, the reverse might be occurring. They demonstrate an apparent growth of institutional values, within the three branches studied here, with increasing age and duration of contact with the Navy."
This phenomenon is typified by the attitudes of older, degree holding, Supply officers. These appear far less critical or negative and more settled and accepting of the Service than those of their younger branch counterparts. Older Engineering officers also appeared relatively settled in their attitudes.

Furthermore, the particular role and employment, (and deployment) of Executive branch officers is not unlikely to be a prime factor in the maintainence of this (institutional) orientation, degrees or no degrees. To suggest that the longer the duration of contact with the Service the greater the degree of apparent institutionalization of attitudes which ensues, whatever the branch membership, may not be a truism. The more individual occupational orientation may well be function of youth." (Salas, ibid)

The results of that analysis, then, discounted conjectures which suggested, in terms of the I/O hypotheses, that rising educational levels within the Executive branch of the RAN may be accompanied by a corresponding erosion of the basic institutional orientation of members of that branch.

It was later shown (Salas, 1990b) that when the attitudes of young, tertiary educated RAN officers were compared in turn to those of their age and educational counterparts in the Executive branch, Engineers had the most negative attitude differentials, followed by Education and Supply branch officers. Once again Executive officers were seen to display the paradigm of institutional attitudes towards the Navy with the Engineering branch reflecting the greatest occupational orientation. (Salas 1990b)

Finally, in an effort to more clearly establish the effects of age upon the incidence of institutional/occupational orientations the Scaled attitudes of older members of the above four branches (\( \geq 30 \) years) were compared between branches in the present study. As argued, results showed that the attitudes of these tertiary educated, older representatives of those branches were comparatively homogeneous compared with the attitudes towards the Navy of their younger counterparts, (\( \leq 30 \) years) confirming the suggestion that occupational attitudes appear to be found less frequently amongst those with greater duration of contact with the organization.
CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions drawn from the results of the three studies summarized above are

a. occupational attitudes in the Royal Australian Naval Officer Corps appear to be associated with the possession of very marketable, tool or "meal ticket" tertiary educational qualifications which are keyed to specific civilian employment reference groups.

b. this phenomenon is more apparent amongst younger (≤30 years) than older officers who possess such qualifications and it appears to diminish with age/duration of contact with the Navy.

c. the attitudes of members of the Executive branch, whether old or young, educated to tertiary or to secondary levels only, tend to be homogeneous. This branch can be taken as the paradigm of institutional orientation in-as-much-as members appear to be more value driven and emotionally more committed to the ideals of a Naval career than do the other three (ES+I) branches which show varying degrees of occupational orientation.

d. the lack of education based, marketable linkages to civilian employment reference groups amongst members of the Executive branch plus their particular employment and deployment could underwrite a propensity for them consistently to perceive the RAN as their primary employment and career reference group. This perceptual complex could, in turn, incline them to favour institutional ways of relating to the organization and prone to resist civilianized, occupational, market-driven methods of approaching problems of pay, conditions of service and professional development. This branch-specific phenomenon is not seen to be accounted for by the I/J hypothesis which, as it stands, seems to be too generalized.
The lower apparent incidence of the possession of occupational attitudes found in the present studies, notably amongst older, tertiary-educated Engineering, Supply and Instructor officers seems to confirm, in these three instances at least, that the I/O hypothesis might hold up in an Australian military setting. i.e. as provided for by the I/O model oncoming younger cohorts tend to show more distinctive occupational attitudes, here measured by the extent of negative attitudes towards the Navy, in comparison with those who joined some 10+ years earlier. The older officers would appear to possess a lower incidence of occupational attitudes when both cohorts were tested for this at the same time.

However, in the case of the Executive branch this phenomenon did not appear. Officer attitudes throughout that branch appeared to be homogeneous whether respondents were old or young, possessed degrees or no degrees or a combination of both conditions. The I/O hypothesis does not seem at present to provide a ready explanation for this differential branch effect, although it might ultimately.

This result can be explained however by the relating of occupational attitudes to the possession of technological or "tool" degrees which are in turn directly and immediately linked to civilian reference groups. Executive branch members do not possess these particular sorts of tertiary educational credentials*, therefore, it is argued, they are and remain predominantly institutional in orientation. (possible exceptions could be trained air pilots, air observers, air traffic controllers and those with computer expertise.)

The practical significance of this lies in the fact that the Executive branch comprises about 50% of RAN Officer strength.

* They mostly possess classical Arts or Science degrees.
The lower incidence of occupational attitudes amongst older, senior Engineer, Supply and Instructor officers could be attributable also to the operation of effects other than those projected by the I/O hypothesis as follows.

a. because of the more negative and volatile attitudes of younger occupationally oriented officers of the Engineer, Supply and Instructor branches the more disaffected would probably have left the Navy by age thirty or thereabouts leaving a residue of less occupationally oriented officers in those branches. This explanation has been previously forwarded to account for higher levels of commitment found amongst older officers. (Salas, 1989). Differential branch resignation rates tend to support this explanation (Salas, 1990(b) p.25).

b. as argued earlier (Salas, 1990 a, b) prolonged duration of contact with the Navy could promote the growth of an institutional orientation. This is not to be confused with the process of "re-institutionalization" provided for by Moskos, (see above quotation).

c. occupationally oriented officers may also separate voluntarily after achieving short term objectives which they aimed for by joining in the first place. Being occupational (= rational, calculating, unsentimental, realistic) their motivation for joining could reasonably be imagined to involve the calculated benefits of a short term period of service to optimize or maximize some aspect of their overall long term career plan.

Asked why engineers joined such a non-entrepreneurial, non-marketplace oriented social institution as the Services, a young RAN Engineer officer explained that it was not uncommon for members of that profession to contemplate a period of military service upon graduation or after a couple of years in the civilian labour market for reasons which are listed below.

(a) Starting salaries for civilian graduate engineers are comparatively low in Australia. Higher salaries are available for recent graduates in the public sector. (Survey report in Melbourne Age, 25 June 1990)
(b) the work of new engineering graduates in civilian organizations is purported to be unsatisfying and unchallenging for the first few years. In addition new engineers are perceived as junior or trainee personnel and are generally treated as such.

(c) opportunities for management or leadership experience at graduate level are perceived to be low or non-existent in civilian employment.

(d) The Services on the other hand can be perceived as

a. recognizing the achievements of the young engineering graduate by commissioning him. This provides for instant gains in self-esteem and ego gratification by way of social recognition and in visible signs of worth in the shape of rank within the military environment. He becomes a member of an exclusive social club, the Officers Mess, and is quite likely to find himself rubbing shoulders with various representatives of the Establishment upper crust before too long in a congenial and supportive social environment and perhaps making valuable contacts along the way.

b. providing higher pay than that available for one of his professional experience (or lack of it) in a civilian firm.

c. providing valuable managerial experience. Because of the Navy divisional system he is soon likely to become responsible for non-officer personnel and his management experience begins that much earlier. The Naval engineer would take much less time to reach this point than his counterparts in civilian employment so that after a period of 5 years his management experience is well established, adding to his attraction for potential civilian employers.
To a lesser extent there is the money he has possibly saved over those years plus the return of his pension contributions upon separation. This is money he probably would have cast to the winds as a young civilian and it is now there for him to invest perhaps in minor but still significant ways in the enhancement of his future professional image (e.g. club memberships, etc.)

It is not unlikely, then, that some young graduate engineers perceive joining the Services as a smart way of enhancing their future market value in civilian life and being occupationally oriented they would have no qualms about this. Nor should they. They repay by Return of Service for any Navy sponsored training time and those trained elsewhere have no such obligation and are free to leave at will as the marketplace beckons.

These circumstances could of course apply equally to young graduate dental surgeons and medical practitioners who could be expected to be just as occupationally oriented as engineers and for the same reason.
OVERVIEW

The originator of the I/O hypothesis has stated in relation to the increasing incidence of occupational attitudes in the military that

"The institutional versus occupational thesis seeks to identify an overarching trend while still recognizing that military systems are differentially shaped, depending upon a country's civil-military history, military traditions, and geopolitical positions. Moreover, I/O modalities will interface in different ways even within the same national military system. There will be differences between military services and between branches within them. I/O modalities may also vary along internal distinctions, such as those between officers, noncommissioned officers, and lower ranks; between career and single-term military members; between men and women; between draftees and volunteers; and so on. There may even be trends toward "reinstitutionalizing" the military, either across the board or in specified units." (Moskos, 1986, p.381).

One can conclude from the position stated above that it behoves each branch or corps in each Service in each Western nation to examine its own attitudinal entrails for the incidence and distribution of occupational attitudes and ponder the implications, if any.

In the present context the existence of an occupational attitude orientation was identified with the possession of tertiary educational credentials which are directly linked to specific civilian employment reference groups and the existence of an institutional occupational orientation with the lack of such immediate linkages to civilian reference groups especially amongst officers aged ≤ 30 years.

From the results of the present studies the paradigm for an occupational orientation would be the Engineering branch and that for an institutional orientation the Executive branch with Instructors and Supply officers falling in between these two positions. Differential resignation rates (1985 - 1988) appear to support this conclusion (Salas, 1990,b,p.25). There are implications here for wastage and turnover.
A FAREWELL TO ARMS

The present report based on the data yielded by the 1987 RAN Officer Retention Survey is the last from the desk of the present writer who encounters age enforced retirement in early September of 1990 after many years as a military psychologist.

The full list of the Research Notes in this series (including this one) is provided at Annex B.

In reviewing this series, apart from meeting the original sponsor requirements for timely information (and confirmation) on RAN officer attitudes towards a variety of topics, the following events represent significant peaks of gratification for the present writer.

1. The refutation of the so-called "mid-career crisis" (it appears to be more a late career crisis, if anything) so far as RAN officers are concerned. This and other critiques made of parts of the Ians tour-de-force of the ADF officer scene (which first appeared in 1985) are seen as the first and only known research-based attempts to critically evaluate the results of his analyses. These appear to have gone unchallenged elsewhere over the five years since they became available and seem likely to be enshrined as Holy Writ.

2. The construction and validation of an officer Resignation Propensity Scale is seen to be the most significant so far as practical utility goes. The downside of this has been the reluctance of Navy management to ponder its implementation and the indifference to its potential displayed by the other two Services. Given the usual scenario the Scale, or something along similar lines, will be re-invented some time in the future and applied with cries of acclamation.

3. The coming to grips with the occupational-institutional (I/O) hypothesis and the generation of alternative explanations in terms of the type of tertiary qualifications held and their civilian employment referents for these.
The present writer thanks all those who have assisted him with his researches into the RAN. This includes most Naval psychologists and their staffs at one time or another, notably the Senior Psychologist, Victoria. Special thanks go to the Director of the Navy Psychology Branch for allowing my ideas and labours to flourish in a permissive and benign atmosphere and for his efforts to gain some recognition for the results generated.

Ave atque vale
Technical Note 1

A post-hoc analysis of the ANOVA cell means\# for all four branches on the RS revealed the following interactive picture.

Table 1
POST-HOC ANOVA ANALYSIS
Treatments
Mean Remuneration Scale Score
Officers aged >30 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th>Instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>15.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3*</td>
<td>1.7*</td>
<td>3.86**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sig Diff = 0.05 SU-EXEC, SU-ENG,
= ENG-IO
0.01 = SU-IO, EXEC-IO
Newman-Keuls pairwise comparisons test.

COMMENT

It is evident from the Table 1 that the main variance can be attributable to the relatively high level of satisfaction of the Instructors with their remuneration and to a lesser extent to the relatively low level of perceived satisfaction of the Supply branch members with theirs.

\# Lieutenant G. Lane, Australian Army Psychology Corps, is thanked for this analysis.
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BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SCALES

CAREER MOTIVATION

As noted above, the Career Motivation Scale (CMS) measures the extent of the desire to continue serving.

The scale is comprised of the following items from the Retention Survey Questionnaire. The Section and item numbers follow in parentheses.

1. At present how actively are you considering resignation? (S3Q2)

2. Please give an estimated time-frame in which your contemplated resignation is most likely to be implemented. (S3Q3)

3. At present, how certain do you feel that you could get satisfactory employment in civilian life without much trouble? (S3Q8)

4. Have you actively initiated enquiries about one or more employment prospects outside the Service over the past 2 years? (S3Q9)

5. How many of these enquiries were related to your Navy employment? (S3Q10)

N.B. For this scale, the items were keyed so that a high score indicated a low level of motivation to continue serving and vice-versa. This should be remembered when interpreting Tabled data.

The CMS proved to be unifactorial with a reliability coefficient (alpha) of 0.71. This is a satisfactory result and one which could probably be improved upon. All items were generated by the present writer.
NAVY COMMITMENT SCALE

The following six items were included in the Retention Survey Questionnaire with the aim of measuring officer commitment to a Naval career.

Commitment Scale items (Section 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At present, how committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy career? (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your Navy career to date? (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you that you chose to join the Navy over the other careers available? (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that my values and Navy values are very similar (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy membership has a great deal of personal meaning for me (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How strong is your sense of obligation to the Navy? (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scale is unifactorial with a reliability coefficient (alpha) of .84.

The above instrument was constructed to test the role of organizational commitment amongst RAN officers. A description of the construct is covered in Mowday et al (1982). Broadly speaking, it describes the proclivity possessed by a member of an organization by which he identifies with it to the extent that the views the goals and aims of the organization as HIS goals and aims, its values as HIS values and, figuratively speaking, its existence as HIS existence. Associated with these feelings are a desire to continue to maintain contact with the organization and to repudiate membership of other organizations.
The first three items were generated by the present writer. The "careers available" item was designed to substantiate the choice for a Navy career over alternatives. The "career to date" item establishes a direct link between the satisfaction and the commitment constructs.

The "values" item is modified from the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCL; Mowday et al., 1982). The "personal meaning" item was designed to allow for the expression of broader emotional feelings, (affective commitment) whilst the "obligation" item gives expression to the feeling that one "ought" to remain serving as a duty, out of allegiance or loyalty.

The Affective Commitment (K) Scale comprises the following items from the Retention Questionnaire.

Section 6 & item

1. How do you feel about making the Navy your career? (S4Q4)
2. I find that my values and Navy values are very similar. (S4Q14)
3. Navy membership has a great deal of personal meaning for me. (S4Q15)
4. How strong is your sense of obligation to the Navy? (S4Q16)

The K. Scale which purports to isolate the emotional component of commitment is unifactorial and has a reliability coefficient (alpha) of .81.

COMMITMENT - IDENTIFICATION - SATISFACTION

Organizational commitment is a construct which seems co-dimensional with another, older one, that of identification with the organization. In fact, in Mowday et al. (ibid.) the two terms are sometimes used interchangeably.
The Resignation Propensity Scale (RP)

This is described at length in Salas (1988a, b). It is a nine item measure, scores on which provide an index of an officer's tendency towards voluntary separation from the Navy.

R.P Scale

Instruction: You are invited to answer some or all of the questions below, if you wish.

1. How do you feel about your chances of promotion in the Navy?
   Satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Dissatisfied

2. Do you feel in general that you are doing better in the Navy than you could in civilian life?
   Very much better 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very much worse

3. How do you feel about making the Navy your career?
   Very keen to 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Don't want to

4. At present, how committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy Career?
   Very committed 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not committed at all

5. How attractive does the idea of career employment in civilian life appear to you at present?
   Very attractive 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very unattractive

6. Have you had one or more job offers from organizations or individuals outside the Service over the past 2 years?
   No..................1
   Yes, one............2
   Yes, 2 or 3........3
   Yes, more than 3....4
8. Have you ever considered resigning?
   Yes .................. 1
   No .................... 2

9. If you answered Yes to the above item 8, please give an estimated time frame in which your contemplated resigning is most likely to be implemented.
   0-2 mths .......... 1  3-6 mths .......... 2  7-12 mths ......... 3
   13-18 ............ 4  19-30 mths ........ 5  30 + mths ........ 6
   Not Applicable .... 7

Three factors were identified in the RP Scale. It has a reliability coefficient (alpha) of .72.

The Job Satisfaction Scale (JOBSAT)

This measure comprised the following items, all from Section 4 of the Retention Survey Questionnaire.

What sort of chance does the Navy give you to show what you can do? (S4 item 2)

In general, how do you feel about life in the Navy? (S4 item 3; This item also appears in Jans' Career Motivation Scale).

How do you feel about your current Navy Job? (S4 item 9).

At present, how committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy career? (Commitment Scale, CS) (S4, item 11)

How satisfied are you with your Navy career to date? (Commitment Scale, CS) (S4, item 13)

The JOBSAT Scale is unifactorial with a reliability coefficient (alpha) of 0.79.
In a Defence Force with its characteristic all-embracing responsibility for most significant aspects of a member's life and welfare the concept of individual commitment (or identification) seems especially pertinent when evaluating retention/turnover/attrition and attempts at predicting these. This supposition appears strengthened by contemplating, for one, the longer training and more intense indoctrination period characteristic of military employment conditions compared with those conditions of employment in most civilian organizations.

Identification (commitment) has been shown to be associated with assimilation to the Army (Salas, 1967) and assimilation status has in turn been significantly linked to retention over a three-year term.*

In the model used in the study, (ibid) the thesis that a certain prior level of satisfaction with other-rank Army life was a prerequisite of attaining a measure of identification (commitment) with the organization was supported.

In the present study of Navy officer retention, both the satisfaction and commitment (identification) constructs were found to be very highly significantly correlated from a moderate to high degree.

Three SQ items are found in the 9 item Resignation Propensity (RP) scale. The RP Scale, the conceptual reverse of the Career Motivation scale, has been found to be a valid predictor of RAN male, officer resignation activity. (Salas, 1988b).

THE SATISFACTION SCALE QUESTIONNAIRE (SQ)

A ten-item adaptation of a 14 item scale of satisfaction with Army life (Salas, 1967b) was included in the Retention survey.

* unpublished follow-up study of results in Salas (1967).
The SQ is a well documented scale, the results of which have been shown to be implicated in the separation and the re-engagement decisions of other-rank personnel. (Salas, 1984).

The SQ items used in the Retention Study are listed below:

1. How well do you think the Navy is run?
   Very well 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very badly

2. What sort of chance does the Navy give you to show what you can do?
   A very good chance 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 A very poor chance

3. In general, how do you feel about life in the Navy?
   Very satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very dissatisfied

4. How do you feel about making the Navy your career?
   Very keen to 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Don't want to

5. How do you feel about your chances of promotion in the Navy?
   Satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Dissatisfied

6. Do you feel in general that you are doing better in the Navy than you could in civilian life?
   Very much better 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very much worse

7. Do you think you have improved and bettered yourself by being in the Navy?
   Very much so 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all

8. How satisfied are you with your Navy pay?
   Very satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very dissatisfied

9. How do you feel with your current Navy job?
   Very satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very dissatisfied
10. Men and women coming into the Navy expect things from their future Navy life. How well would you say that your expectations have been met?

Much better than expected 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Much worse than expected

The present version of the SQ does not cover the possible universe of content. Satisfaction with supervision is one important omission. Intention to re-engage, a potent item in reflecting general satisfaction in the other rank version of the SQ, was excluded as being inappropriate in the officer setting.

Item 3 ("In general, how do you feel about life in the Service?") has a history. This item first saw the light of day in Australia as part of the Satisfaction Scale Questionnaire (Salas, 1967). It originally appeared in "The American Soldier" (Stauffer et al, 1949) as part of a Guttman scale of satisfaction with Army life.

The SQ has 2 factors with a reliability coefficient (alpha) of .82. With item 8 (pay) removed the SQ becomes unifactorial.

OTHER SCALES

The most important of these in the present context would be the Resignation Propensity (RP) Scale and the SQ, a measure of satisfaction with Navy life in the Retention Survey.

The Service Effectiveness (SE) Scale.

This measures attitudes towards the efficiency of the Navy as an employer. It includes opinions about career management.

SE scale items are as follows: (The origin of each item is given in parentheses.)

How well do you think the Navy is run? (S4 item 1)

What sort of chance does the Navy give you to show what you can do? (S4 item 2)

In general, how satisfied do you feel with Navy life? (S4 item 3)

How satisfied are you with the current RAN Officer Personal Reporting System? (Section 2, item 8)

How satisfied are you with the quality of RAN Personnel management (including officer Career Planning)? (Section 2, item 9)

How effective do you think is the dream sheet system? (Section 2, item 10)

The SE Scale is unifactorial with a reliability coefficient (alpha) of 0.79.

The Remuneration Scale (RS)

This instrument scales attitudes towards service and civilian pay and the financial costs of being a member of the Navy. The RS is made up of the following items. Origins of items are given in parentheses.
How satisfied are you with your Navy Pay? (S4 item 8)

How does your Navy pay (+ allowances, benefits etc) compare with the money you think you could expect to receive in civilian life? (Section 3, item 15).

Financial costs of being in RAN (e.g. removals) - (as a resignation influence; Section 5, item 17)

The R. Scale is unifactorial and has a reliability coefficient (alpha) of 0.65.

The Career Prospects Scale (CP)

This device measures officers' attitudes towards their future Naval career. The scale is made up of the following items from the Retention Survey questionnaire.

1. Officers have expressed the observation that there are comparatively few billets at future rank levels which have much interest in them. This implies posting an officer to positions for which he/she is not a volunteer. How does, or will, this situation apply to you?

2. How satisfied are you with the quality of the RAN personnel management (including officer Career Planning?) (Section 2, item 9)

3. How do you feel about your chances of promotion in the Navy? (Section 4, item 5)

4. At present how committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy career? (Section 4, item 11)

5. Unattractiveness of likely future posting locations or job (as a resignation influence) (Section 5, item 10)

This scale proved to be bi-factorial with a coefficient (alpha) of 0.62.
Note

The Career Prospects Scale was excluded from earlier analyses when it was discovered that item 5 from Section 4 of the questionnaire (promotion chances) had been omitted from it.

Promotion prospects are integral to the assessment of future career prospects, at some stages perhaps more than at others. (three of the nine items used by Jans (1988) in his career prospects scale alluded to "promotion".)

JBEST

This consists of one item which scales an officer's perception of the degree of availability to him of civilian employment. It reads as follows.

"At present how certain do you feel that you could get satisfactory employment in civilian life without much trouble?" (Section 3, item 8)
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