2006

Correlates of re-enlistment intentions among Army National Guardmembers

Christiana Woodward
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Woodward, Christiana, "Correlates of re-enlistment intentions among Army National Guardmembers" (2006). *Master's Theses*. 3042.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.5n2a-fhxf>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/3042

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

CORRELATES OF RE-ENLISTMENT INTENTIONS AMONG
ARMY NATIONAL GUARDMEMBERS

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Psychology

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Christiana Woodward

December 2006

UMI Number: 1441136

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI Microform 1441136

Copyright 2007 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2006

Christiana Woodward

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Sharon Glazer, Ph.D.

Jonathan Roth, Ph.D.

Leticha Hawkins, NASA Ames Research Center

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

CORRELATES OF RE-ENLISTMENT INTENTIONS AMONG ARMY NATIONAL GUARDMEMBERS

By Christiana Woodward

This thesis examines correlates (organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, perceived supervisor support, procedural justice, and satisfaction with pay) of re-enlistment among 407 members of the Army National Guard. Data were collected through a self-report survey distributed to Army National Guardmembers attending weekend training in one Northeastern state. As hypothesized, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, perceived supervisor support, procedural justice, and satisfaction with pay positively correlated with re-enlistment intentions. Moreover, re-enlistment intentions are influenced more by affective and normative commitment than continuance commitment. Finally, individuals who had been deployed with the National Guard at least once before were less likely to re-enlist than those who had never been deployed. Results suggest that enlistment is influenced more by emotional desires than instrumental needs. Further, support and perceived fairness of how procedures are carried out are important correlates to one's intention to re-enlist.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, and foremost, I would like to thank my parents for their seemingly endless support, love, and commitment to my success. I am forever grateful to them for giving me the confidence to see this project through to completion.

Thank you to Dr. Sharon Glazer for her true commitment to this thesis. Despite the numerous demands on her time, Dr. Glazer always made me feel like completion of this project was a priority, and I genuinely appreciate all of the time and effort that went into the production of a quality product.

I would also like to thank Dr. Jonathan Roth for providing invaluable insight into the structure, history, and current state of the National Guard. I truly appreciate the time and energy he invested in this project. I also thank Leticha Hawkins for her valuable insight on this project, and for her positive attitude and support throughout this process.

I must thank the people of the National Guard for their interest and support for this project. And thank you to the members of the National Guard who took the time to complete this survey - you are the reason this research is being conducted.

Finally, I would like to thank all of the wonderful friends and family that I am so lucky to have in my life. You have each helped to shape the person I am today with your unique contributions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
<i>Summary of Study Goals</i>	3
<i>Practical Significance</i>	3
LITERATURE REVIEW	5
<i>History of the Army National Guard: The Context</i>	5
<i>The Army National Guard Today</i>	6
<i>Background for Study</i>	7
<i>Recruitment and Retention in the Army National Guard: The Problem</i>	8
<i>Organizational Commitment</i>	9
<i>Hypothesis 1</i>	14
<i>Hypothesis 2</i>	14
<i>Perceived Organizational Support</i>	14
<i>Hypothesis 3</i>	15
<i>Perceived Supervisor Support</i>	16
<i>Hypothesis 4</i>	17
<i>Procedural Justice</i>	18
<i>Hypothesis 5</i>	19
<i>Satisfaction with Pay, Pension, and Benefits</i>	19
<i>Hypothesis 6</i>	20

METHODS	21
<i>Participants</i>	21
<i>Measures</i>	21
<i>Organizational Commitment</i>	21
<i>Perceived Organizational Support</i>	22
<i>Perceived Supervisor Support</i>	23
<i>Procedural Justice</i>	24
<i>Satisfaction with Pay</i>	24
<i>Re-enlistment Intentions</i>	25
<i>Procedures</i>	25
RESULTS	27
<i>Preliminary Analyses</i>	27
<i>Tests of Hypotheses</i>	28
DISCUSSION	32
<i>Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research</i>	36
<i>Conclusion</i>	40
REFERENCES	42
APPENDICES	48
Appendix A: Survey	48
Appendix B: Human Subjects-IRB Approval Letter	56

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES	PAGE
1 Partial Correlations Among Study Variables with Age and Deployment Held Constant.....	29
2 Re-enlistment Intentions Regressed on Organizational Commitment Components.	30

INTRODUCTION

The Army National Guard is being called upon to provide support for both domestic and international missions at the highest level since World War II (Army National Guard, n.d.). As a result, deployments are often for as long as two years and Guardmembers are far from their loved ones and the comforts of home for extended periods of time. Consequently, when it is time for someone to decide whether to re-enlist in the Army National Guard, this factor will likely influence the decision. Further complicating this decision are the unknowns – the duration of current military conflicts and the unpredictability of natural disasters. While these cannot be controlled, other factors, such as organizational commitment, organizational and supervisor support, procedural justice (i.e., the extent to which an employee believes that the procedures used by an organization to make decisions are fair and just), and pay satisfaction with respect to the Army National Guard might impact decisions to re-enlist.

This study, therefore, has both theoretical and practical utility. Theoretically, relationships among variables that have been tested before will be tested again in the context of today's (2006) Army National Guard. Possible correlates of re-enlistment (or retention intention) will be assessed, including affective organizational commitment (i.e., an employee's attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization), continuance organizational commitment (i.e., based on the costs of, and alternatives to, leaving an organization), and normative organizational commitment (i.e., an employee's feelings of obligation to an organization) to the Army National Guard, perceived organizational support, civilian supervisor support, procedural justice, and satisfaction

with pay. Practically, results of the study will be presented to the Army National Guard of one Northeastern state where data were collected in order to advise on potential areas for improvement or maintenance of activities.

The subject of whether an employee chooses to remain with, or to leave, the organization for which he or she works has been researched extensively, in numerous contexts and employee populations, including nurses (Donoghue & Castle, 2006), blue-collar factory workers (Koch & Rhoades, 1981), teachers (Ingersoll, 2001), and the National Guard itself (Hom & Hulin, 1981; Hom, Katerberg, & Hulin, 1979). Research on the topic of employee retention often focuses on either an employee's intention to quit or actual employee turnover. Intention to quit occurs when an employee has feelings of wanting to leave an organization, but has not yet left (Firth, Mellor, Moore, & Loquet, 2004). Employee turnover is the actual act of an employee voluntarily leaving an organization (Mowday, Koberg, & McArthur, 1984). In contrast, employee retention occurs when an employee remains with an organization.

Retention of employees is important for many reasons, including financial necessity, employee morale, a sense of continuity, maintenance of culture/climate, and the overall success of an organization (e.g., Maertz & Campion, 1998; Mansell, Brough, & Cole, 2006). In addition to these outcomes, retention of Guardmembers is also important for the safety and security of the nation. Although research on factors influencing retention intention of Guardmembers has been conducted in the past (e.g., Hom & Hulin, 1981; Hom et al., 1979), this research is 25 years old and numerous political, economic, and social events have occurred since that time, which may have had

an impact on what factors relate to retention intentions today. An example of what has changed is the proliferation of the internet, which has allowed Guardmembers to correspond with family members and friends while deployed abroad. Communication access may lessen the impact of separation (Garamone, 2002). Therefore, in this study, factors that might relate to retention intentions are examined in a population of Guardmembers from one Northeastern state.

Summary of Study Goals

The three goals of this study are (1) to examine the relationships between organizational commitment to, and procedural justice within, the Army National Guard and a soldier's re-enlistment intention, (2) to examine the relationship between a soldier's perceived support from civilian organizations and supervisors with re-enlistment intentions, and (3) to determine if satisfaction with the pay, pension, and benefits received from the Army National Guard relate to re-enlistment intention.

Practical Significance

Results of this study have the potential to provide the Army National Guard with concrete evidence of some specific factors impacting soldier decisions to re-enlist when their current obligation is complete. Because improvement of re-enlistment numbers within the Army National Guard is vital to the United States' military operations, results of the present study will provide specific areas that will improve retention among Army National Guard members. This study also might produce results that could assist civilian employers and the Army National Guard in collaborating on ways to encourage individuals to remain in the Guard, while still maintaining viable, rewarding civilian

employment. Understanding the role that civilian employers play in a soldier's decision to re-enlist will provide valuable information on whether this is an area that needs future study and consideration by the Army National Guard and for researchers interested in understanding motives behind re-enlistment decisions.

Following is a review of literature pertaining to each of the main study variables followed by hypotheses. First, some background and historical information on the National Guard will be given. Next, organizational commitment, organizational and supervisor support, procedural justice, and pay satisfaction will be defined, linked to retention or attrition, and discussed in relation to the Army National Guard. Following each main study variable review, hypotheses will be posed.

LITERATURE REVIEW

History of the Army National Guard: The Context

The Army National Guard is a reserve component of the United States military that has obligations to both the individual states and the Federal Government (Stentiford, 2002). As part of the United States Constitution, the President has the right to federalize National Troops as needed (Mahon, 1983). The Army National Guard began as individual state militias, dating back to the Colonial period before the birth of the United States, and is considered to be the oldest component of the United States Armed Forces (National Guard General, n.d.). During the 1800s, the militias were composed of primarily volunteer forces. However, all male citizens were liable to conscription which was utilized when necessary. The Federal Militia Act of 1903 converted this primarily volunteer militia into the National Guard, with significant Federal funding as opposed to the individual states funding their own troops. A result of this Act was that all members of the National Guard wore the same uniforms, carried the same weapons, and attended the same trainings (Doubler, 2001). These troops were regularly activated to intervene and protect citizens during labor strikes, racial tensions, political disputes and natural disasters. In addition, militia troops served in conflicts such as the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, and the Spanish-American War (Mahon, 1983). In addition to the Army National Guard, the Air National Guard was federally recognized beginning in the 1920s (Hill, 1964). This research focuses on the Army National Guard and it is the population surveyed for this study.

The National Guard played an important role in both World War I and World War II, serving in Europe and Asia. Guardmembers were also deployed to the Far East, Europe, and Central America to combat communism during the Cold War (Doubler, 2001). In the early 1950s, one-third of Army National Guard units were deployed to serve in the Korean War (Stentiford, 2002).

It is important to distinguish between the Army National Guard and the United States Army Reserves, as there is often confusion between the two. While both are traditionally composed of reservists (civilians who serve their country on a part-time basis), the chain of command for the Army Reserves is solely within the federal government, with no obligation to state governments (Mahon, 1983). In contrast, the Army National Guard is fundamentally a state force which is under the command of the Governor, but the President has the option of federalizing both Army and Air National Guard troops as needed (Wilson, 1985). With the adoption in 1973 of the Total Force Policy, the National Guard and the United States Reserve Forces partnered with the Active Forces to be prepared to defend and protect the United States and carry out the national security strategy (Lawrence, 1985).

The Army National Guard Today

The Army National Guard of the United States currently has approximately 350,000 members nationwide, with all states and territories having their own Guard units (National Guard Active, n.d.). As a result of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States, more than 50,000 Army Guardmembers were mobilized both in the United States and abroad, with the level of Guard forces in Iraq and Afghanistan

remaining high today (Army National Guard, n.d.). At one point in 2005, half of the combat brigades in Iraq were Army National Guard – a percentage of commitment as part of the overall Army effort not seen since the first years of World War II (Army National Guard, n.d.).

In addition to these commitments in foreign nations, National Guard troops have also been mobilized stateside in large numbers, particularly following Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005. In the largest domestic deployment in the history of the National Guard, the Department of Defense reports that approximately 50,000 Army and Air Guard troops were sent to the Gulf Coast region (Wood, 2006). This was in addition to the nearly 80,000 Army and Air National Guard troops that were serving on active duty worldwide (Army National Guard, n.d.). These recent examples demonstrate clearly how important the National Guard is, both domestically and abroad, in keeping the United States safe and secure.

Background for Study

Research on both intention to quit and turnover has focused on factors that might affect why an employee considers leaving, or actually leaves, an organization. Few researchers (e.g., Gade, Tiggle, & Schumm, 2003) have focused on retention intention, and the majority of retention research has focused on civilian employers. However, research that furthers the understanding of the antecedents for why a Guardmember chooses to stay with or leave the Army National Guard could also be useful for civilian employers as they attempt to uncover why people leave their organizations.

Numerous factors relate to turnover and retention intentions and behaviors, including organizational commitment, organizational support, civilian supervisor support, procedural justice, and satisfaction with pay (Bozeman & Perrewé, 2001; Lakhani, 1988; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001). This is not an exhaustive list of correlates to turnover, but they are the variables that will be examined in this study.

Recruitment and Retention in the Army National Guard: The Problem

Recruitment and retention within the ranks of the Army National Guard has been an issue of concern dating back as far as the early 20th century, when approximately 40% of Guardmembers had been part of the Guard for less than a year, indicating that, at that time, the Guard was composed, in large part, of new and inexperienced troops (Mahon, 1983). Recent history has shown the state of retention, as well as recruitment, to be one of fluctuating numbers and goals. A report by the United States Government Accountability Office found that the Army National Guard has missed its recruiting goals in 2003 (by 18%), 2004 (by 13%), and 2005 (by 20%; United States Government, 2005).

The early forecast for 2006 indicates an improvement in both recruitment and re-enlistment (Miles, 2006). Reasons for this could include the fact that there were fewer deployments to Iraq during 2005 than in the previous years following the initial deployments to Iraq in 2003, and there were more Army National Guard recruiters offering financial incentives to join and encourage others to join (USA Today, 2006). In June 2006 the Army National Guard began offering enlistment bonuses of up to \$20,000 to encourage men and women to enlist in the Army National Guard (National Guard

Benefits, n.d.). It is important to note that at the time data were collected for this study, this enlistment bonus was not yet being offered. Nonetheless, results of this study may help the National Guard understand the value of that additional bonus and whether there are other, non-monetary incentives that may be beneficial.

While recruitment and re-enlistment figures show improvement from previous years, hundreds of thousands of Guardmembers are still deployed abroad and within the United States as part of an overall effort equaled only by the early stages of World War II (Army National Guard, n.d.). It is unclear when the current conflicts will cease or when new needs will arise. Therefore, it is important to look at factors that might impact an individual's decision to re-enlist in the Army National Guard so that efforts can be made to reinforce factors that drive one's decision to re-enlist.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is the strength of an individual's identification with, and involvement in, an organization (Mowday et al., 1979). In addition, definitions of organizational commitment include the extent to which an employee feels loyal to his or her organization, his or her belief in the organization's goals and values, a willingness on the part of the employee to exert effort on behalf of the organization, and an employee's strong desire to maintain organizational membership (Bozeman & Perrewé, 2001). It is clear from definitions of organizational commitment that it is an important factor when looking at the relationship between an employee and his or her organization.

Early studies of organizational commitment, outlined in a meta-analysis by Mathieu and Zajac (1990), identified two distinct types of organizational commitment,

attitudinal and calculated. Attitudinal organizational commitment is how strongly an employee identifies with and is involved in his or her organization. Calculated organizational commitment is based on an employee's feelings that he or she is bound to the organization based upon his or her level of involvement with that organization. While attitudinal and calculated commitment were viewed as two distinct types of commitment, researchers began to discuss the need for the definition of additional types of commitment, indicating that these two definitions were not sufficient in delineating the various commitment types (Mathieu & Zajac; Reichers, 1985). These two types of organizational commitment were the building blocks for what would later become a more refined definition and characterization of this construct.

Organizational commitment has been reexamined and redefined since that initial two-component model. Allen and Meyer (1990) were the first to examine the now widely utilized and relied upon three-component model of organizational commitment. This new structural framework was based on the belief that the concept of attitudinal commitment could be further delineated and defined into two components, normative and affective commitment. The third component is continuance commitment and is akin to calculative commitment. These three components of organizational commitment have been validated (Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). In addition to defining the three components of commitment, Meyer and Allen (1997) also created unique measures of each.

Affective organizational commitment is defined as an employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization (Allen & Meyer,

1990). This type of commitment is also referred to as the “want to” aspect of commitment (Gade, 2003). Continuance organizational commitment is based on the costs of, and alternatives to, leaving an organization (Allen & Meyer). In other words, this is the “need to” aspect of commitment, in which an employee determines his or her level of commitment based upon how strong his or her need is to stay with the organization (Gade). The third component of organizational commitment is normative commitment, or an employee’s feelings of obligation to an organization (Allen & Meyer). This is also considered to be the “ought to” aspect of commitment (Gade).

Researchers of organizational commitment have studied it from a number of angles – as antecedent, as consequence, and as correlate of a number of constructs, including turnover intentions (Bozeman & Perrewé, 2001; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002) and re-enlistment intentions (Gade et al., 2003). In addition to turnover, studies also show that affective organizational commitment is associated with decreased absenteeism and increased performance (Rhoades et al., 2001). From the results of these studies, and others, it is safe to say that employers who are facing high rates of turnover among their employees, as well as counterproductive work behaviors, such as tardiness and absenteeism, would be remiss if they did not look at the level of organizational commitment within their staff as a possible reason for these behaviors (Karrasch, 2003). Because these behaviors can have negative impacts for an organization, knowing the causes would allow employers the opportunity to address these issues and make positive changes.

The Army National Guard is one employer that has recently faced turnover, and the possibility of future retention problems is very real. The importance of looking at organizational commitment in this population is directly linked to its relationship with retention and attraction of a strong and effective group of Guardmembers. Gade et al. (2003) found that both affective commitment and continuance commitment positively correlate with a Guardmember's intention to re-enlist. Past research reveals findings that are consistent with those of Gade and colleagues by demonstrating that organizational commitment has predictive value when it comes to determining re-enlistment intentions among members of the military (Hom & Hulin, 1981; Hom et al., 1979; Kim, Price, Mueller, & Watson, 1996; Martin & O'Laughlin, 1984). However, Hom and colleagues' studies, as well as Kim et al. and Martin and O'Laughlin, utilized a uni-dimensional scale to assess commitment that was based upon the work of Porter and colleagues (Porter & Steers, 1973; Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974, cited in Hom & Hulin; Hom et al.; Kim et al.; Martin & O'Laughlin). This definition of commitment is similar to that of affective commitment in that it views organizational commitment as the extent to which an employee identifies with and is involved in his or her organization (Hom & Hulin). Therefore, the findings of these studies support the contention that affective commitment is predictive of re-enlistment intentions of military personnel.

Further, at the time of these studies (e.g., Hom & Hulin, 1981; Hom et al., 1979), which fell between the end of the Vietnam War and the beginning of the Gulf War, Guardmembers were mostly deployed in Europe and Southwest Asia, but this was primarily for overseas training, maintenance, and to begin preparing for war in the

Middle East, not actual combat (Doubler, 2001). In contrast, the current Army National Guard has been relied upon heavily for combat missions in Iraq and Afghanistan, for recovery and relief missions in hurricane ravaged Gulf of Mexico, and most recently to provide logistical support to soldiers patrolling the United States border with Mexico. While a military deployment always has the potential for becoming a dangerous and unstable situation, the context in which Guardmembers are deployed today differs from that of the late 1970s and early 1980s as there are currently numerous active conflicts occurring simultaneously, and those being deployed are often facing extremely dangerous and unstable conditions (Doubler). Therefore, the relationship between commitment to the Army National Guard and re-enlistment intentions is reexamined.

Many studies of organizational commitment using military personnel as subjects have focused only on affective and continuance commitment, without measuring the component of normative commitment (e.g., Gade et al, 2003; Heffner & Gade, 2003). Many researchers looking at organizational commitment in the military felt that normative commitment items were too highly correlated with affective commitment items and therefore were not significantly distinguishable (Gade, 2003; Gade et al.). However, most individuals join the Army National Guard out of a sense of duty to state and/or country, not simply to garner employment, as most (e.g., 62% in one Northeastern state; personal communication with the Executive Director of the Employer Support for the Guard and Reserve (ESGR) of a Northeast state, October 14, 2006) have civilian employment. As a result, it is likely that members of the Army National Guard may feel a greater sense of obligation to remain than a desire or need to remain, and therefore

choose to re-enlist when given the opportunity. Because normative commitment measures the degree to which an individual feels obligated to remain with his or her organization, it is likely that this component of organizational commitment will positively correlate with re-enlistment intentions. In addition, because affective commitment positively correlates with re-enlistment intentions, and affective commitment and normative commitment positively and strongly correlate, it is likely that normative commitment will positively correlate with re-enlistment intentions. Based upon these findings, the following relationships are hypothesized.

Hypothesis 1: Affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment will correlate positively with a Guardmember's intention to re-enlist.

Hypothesis 2: Normative commitment will account for more variance in a Guardmember's intention to re-enlist than any other form of commitment.

Perceived Organizational Support

Perceived organizational support is an employee's belief that the organization for which he or she works cares about his or her well-being and values the contributions that he or she makes (Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003; Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002). Antecedents to perceived organizational support include fairness, supervisor support, organizational rewards, and job conditions (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Fairness, or fairness of treatment, refers to the fairness of decisions made by an organization that affect the employee. A subcategory of fairness

of treatment is procedural justice. In Rhoades and Eisenberger's meta-analysis, perceived organizational support and fairness of treatment (including procedural justice) positively correlate. Also, supervisor support positively relates with perceived organizational support, indicating that an employee who receives support from his or her supervisor will also likely feel a sense of overall support from his or her organization.

A consequence of perceived organizational support is reduced absenteeism (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986). An employee who feels the organization is supportive is less likely to be absent from work on a regular basis. Turnover intentions also decrease as perceived organizational support increases (Ferres, Connell, & Travaglione, 2005; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Although it is known that greater perceived organizational support relates to a decrease in turnover in non-military organizations (Ferres et al.; Rhoades & Eisenberger), it is important to study its generalizability to the military, particularly because turnover and retention are at the forefront of the military's concerns.

Perceived organizational support also relates with affective organizational commitment (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Given that (1) perceived organizational support and affective organizational commitment are expected to correlate positively with each other, (2) affective organizational commitment is expected to correlate positively with re-enlistment intention, and (3) there is a negative relationship between perceived organizational support and turnover intentions, the following hypotheses are posed:

Hypothesis 3: Perceived organizational support will correlate positively with

- a. procedural justice

- b. affective organizational commitment, and
- c. intention to re-enlist.

Perceived Supervisor Support

In addition to support from an organization, employees also perceive support from their supervisor(s), or the person(s) who, at some level, assign their work and monitor their progress and performance. Perceived supervisor support is the degree to which an employee believes that his or her supervisor values his or her contributions to the organization and cares about his or her well-being (Eisenberger et al., 2002). Although both constructs refer to whether an employee feels supported and cared about in his or her workplace and positively correlate, perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support are distinct (Eisenberger et al.; Rhoades et al., 2001).

A vast majority of Army National Guard members also hold civilian jobs (e.g., approximately 62% of the National Guardmembers in one Northeastern state are employed by civilian employers; personal communication with the ESGR Executive Director of a Northeastern state, October 14, 2006), and therefore it is important to look at the support that an individual receives for being part of the National Guard from his or her civilian supervisor, also referred to as perceived supervisor support. Entire groups or organizations, such as ESGR were created to assist civilian supervisors in treating their National Guard employees fairly and equitably (Employer Support, n.d.). The importance of the relationship between members of the National Guard and their civilian employers is made evident by federal laws that protect the rights of individuals who volunteer for military service (Employer Support, n.d.), but it is important that civilian

supervisors genuinely support Guardmembers, not only because that is the law. To emphasize the impact that deployments can have on civilian employment, a study by Allison-Aipa, De La Rosa, Stetz, and Castro (2005) found that when members of the Guard and Reserve are activated, it adversely affects their civilian work environment and can create low morale among coworkers due to their increased workloads.

Eisenberger et al. (2002) examined the relationship between perceived supervisor support and turnover, as mediated by perceived organizational support. Their study found that as perceived supervisor support increases, perceived organizational support increases. Because perceived organizational support is negatively related to turnover (Ferres et al., 2005; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), it is not unusual that supervisor support and employee turnover also relate negatively. However, this relationship has not been studied within the Army National Guard, and doing so would help determine the role of civilian supervisor support in the decision of Army National Guard members to re-enlist.

It is likely that consequences of organizational support and supervisor support would be similar. In this study, the correlation between perceived civilian supervisor support and turnover intentions will be examined. The results of this analysis could demonstrate that the support one receives from his or her civilian supervisor has an impact on that individual's decision to remain with the Army National Guard.

Hypothesis 4: Perceived civilian supervisor support will correlate positively with

- a. procedural justice
- b. perceived organizational support, and

c. intention to re-enlist.

Procedural Justice

Procedural justice is the extent to which an employee believes that the procedures that an organization uses to make decisions are fair and just (Moorman, 1991; Paterson, Green, & Cary, 2002). Perception of fairness is related to an employee's workplace attitudes and organizational citizenship behaviors (i.e., work behaviors that promote effective functioning of the organization; Moorman; Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993). In other words, procedural justice can affect how employees react to decisions made regarding pay (Folger & Konovsky, 1989), organizational change (Paterson et al.), and whether employees exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors (Moorman; Tepper & Taylor, 2003).

Two aspects of procedural justice are structural and social (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Structural procedural justice reflects formal policies that determine how decisions are made regarding employees. Social procedural justice, often referred to as interactional justice, reflects interpersonal aspects of providing information regarding outcomes of decisions. This is particularly noted by whether an employee is treated with dignity and respect when decisions are made regarding him or her, and how the employee is told of the results of this decision-making.

Decision-making in the Army National Guard literally can mean life or death for the Guardmember. Therefore, it is not surprising that in this setting procedural justice is important to soldiers (Tepper & Taylor, 2003). Rhoades et al. (2001) purport that procedural justice, when repeated over time, contributes to employees' feelings that their

organization cares about their well-being, which in turn positively relates to important constructs, such as perceived organizational support and affective commitment.

The study of procedural justice is important because its presence, or lack thereof, can also have significant impacts on an organization. The study of procedural justice within the context of the military has been minimal, often focusing on the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviors (Tepper & Taylor, 2003; Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002). Because of the multiple obligations of the Army National Guard and the need for trained Guardmembers, any factors that might demonstrate an area where the Army National Guard could improve should be investigated.

Hypothesis 5: Procedural justice will correlate positively with a Guardmember's

- a. perceived organizational support,
- b. affective organizational commitment, and
- c. intention to re-enlist.

Satisfaction with Pay, Pension, and Benefits

The relationship between employee satisfaction with pay and retention, both in civilian employment (Currall, Towler, Judge, & Kohn, 2005) and the military (Lakhani, 1988) have been examined. Those studies have shown that low pay satisfaction increases turnover. Research (e.g., DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004; Lakhani; Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid & Sirola, 1998) has also demonstrated that a direct relationship exists between the satisfaction an employee feels with the pay he or she receives from an organization, and in his or her *intention* to leave that organization.

Because the majority of Guardmembers also have civilian jobs, the impact of pay satisfaction on re-enlistment intention may not be as great as it would be if the Army National Guard was the individual's only source of income. However, in addition to the pay they receive, members of the Army National Guard may also begin receiving retirement pay at the age of 60, after 20 years of service, if they have sufficient hours of active duty time (not just the required training drills). Other benefits offered to Guardmembers include assistance with buying a home and reimbursement of educational expenses (National Guard Benefits, n.d.). Because these benefits are not always found as part of civilian employment, it is possible that pension and/or benefits influence a Guardmember's re-enlistment intentions more than pay satisfaction. From a practical standpoint, this information is valuable to the Army National Guard because it can help them determine which benefits to continue offering and which are not deemed as important to their members. Therefore, the extent to which satisfaction with Army National Guard pay, pension, and benefits impacts the decision to re-enlist will be included in this study.

Results of the present study will demonstrate if the pay, pension, and benefits that a member of the Army National Guard receives have a relationship with his or her intention to re-enlist. Based on prior studies on pay satisfaction and withdrawal intentions, it is expected that:

Hypothesis 6: Satisfaction with pay, pension, and benefits will correlate positively with a soldier's intention to re-enlist.

METHODS

Participants

Of the 629 participants surveyed, 407 returned completed surveys, yielding a 64.7% response rate. All 407 of the completed surveys were retained and used for purposes of this study. The mean age of the participants surveyed was 33.2 years ($SD = 10.80$ years), and the majority were male (87.2%). In terms of marital status, the majority are married or living with a partner (64.4%), followed by single (23%), and 7% are divorced or legally separated. Of those that responded to the question regarding deployment, the majority, 63% (or 248 Guardmembers), have been deployed before. Of those that have been deployed, and who responded to the question of how many times they had been deployed, 69% (or 167 Guardmembers) have been deployed once.

Measures

Organizational Commitment (see Appendix A, Section A, items 1-19). Nineteen items from Meyer and Allen's (1997) Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scale were used to measure organizational commitment. The original scale contained 25 items; it was revised in 1993 and the 19 items from the revised scale were used in this study. Items 3, 7, 14, and 19 were reverse coded for analyses. These items measure affective commitment (e.g., "I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization"), continuance commitment (e.g., "I believe that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization"), and normative commitment (e.g., "I would feel guilty if I left my organization now"). These items were measured on a five-point Likert-type scale with response options rating from 1 indicating *strongly disagree*

to 5 indicating *strongly agree*. Each item was adapted to the needs of this study, by replacing “organization” with “the Guard.” Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients were .82, for each of affective, continuance, and normative commitment. A Principle Components Factor Analysis, with Varimax rotation, was conducted on the three components of organizational commitment. All items loaded on the intended factors with the exception of the continuance commitment item “If I had not already put so much of myself into the Guard I might consider working elsewhere” (see Appendix A, Section A, item 4). In addition to not loading on the intended factor, when this item was retained the reliability was .78. When the item was removed from the reliability analysis, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient increased to .82. Therefore, this item was removed from further analysis so that the highest level of reliability can be achieved.

Perceived Organizational Support (see Appendix A, Section A, items 23-35).

Thirteen items from the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger et al., 1986) were used to assess perceived organizational support from the National Guard. The original survey contains 36 items, and the 13 items used for this project were chosen based on their high factor loadings and relevance to the topic being studied (e.g., “My civilian organization strongly considers my goals and values with the National Guard”). The items were reworded so that the word “organization” was replaced with “civilian organization” (emphasizing the source of support) and “National Guard” was added to each item (to emphasize support for one’s affiliation with the National Guard). Items 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, and 35 were reverse coded for analyses. All items were measured on a

five-point Likert-type scale with a range of answers from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was .91.

Perceived Supervisor Support (see Appendix A, Section A, items 40-47 and items 48-50). A composite variable for perceived supervisor support was created from two measures. Eight items were adapted from Beehr, King, and King (1990) to measure the level of support soldiers receive from their civilian supervisors. Originally, respondents judged how often they talked with their supervisors on various topics, such as shared personal interests, things they liked and disliked about their workplace, and information about their background and families. The original items were adapted to clarify the source of the support (e.g., his or her civilian supervisor) and the nature of the support (regarding the soldier's affiliation with the National Guard). For example, the instructions were, "Using the scale below, please judge how often you talk about the following subject with your *civilian supervisor*. Circle the number which is most appropriate." Examples of subjects one could talk about were possible National Guard deployments, likes and dislikes about being a part of the National Guard, and problems with commanders in the National Guard. The response options for these items ranged from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*).

Three additional supervisor support items from Rhoades et al. (2001) were included (items 48-50). Item 50 was reverse coded for analyses. As before, the source of support was changed from "supervisor" or "work supervisor" to "civilian supervisor." The instructions for these items were, "Again, thinking about your *civilian supervisor*, and using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with

each statement by circling the appropriate number.” These statements reflected the extent to which respondents felt that their civilian supervisor cared about their well-being and valued their opinions. These items were measured on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A composite variable was created by averaging respondent’s scores on all 11 perceived supervisor support items from both scales. Total Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient for the 11 items was .89.

Procedural Justice (see Appendix A, Section A, items 20-22). Feelings of procedural justice within in the National Guard were measured using three items from Beehr, Walsh, and Taber (1976). Items 20 and 21 were reverse coded for analyses. The survey items were changed by replacing “company” with “National Guard.” An example of a procedural justice item was: “I am usually not told about important things that are happening in the National Guard.” The response format was a Likert-type scale with response options ranging from 1 indicating *strongly disagree* to 5 indicating *strongly agree*. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was .62. A similar (.62) alpha reliability was obtained by Beehr et al. Inter-item correlations were .49 (between items 20 and 21), .31 (between items 21 and 22), and .25 (between 20 and 22). These are around the minimum acceptable inter-item correlations to indicate acceptable reliability (Nunnally, 1978).

Satisfaction with Pay (see Appendix A, Section A, items 64-67). Four items were adapted from the Modified Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire (Heneman & Schwab, 1985) to measure a soldier’s level of satisfaction with pay, benefits, and pension plans offered by the National Guard. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction

with items such as the pay they receive, the value of their benefits, how pay is administered, and the raises they receive. The original items did not specify the source of the pay or benefits. For purposes of this survey, the words “National Guard” were included in each item. An example item is “The benefits I receive from the National Guard.” These four items were measured on a five-point Likert-type scale with response options ranging from 1-*very dissatisfied* to 5-*very satisfied*. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient for this scale was .88.

Re-enlistment Intentions (see Appendix A, Section A, items 51-54). Four items, adapted from Hom and Hulin (1981) and Gade et al. (2003) were used to measure a soldier’s re-enlistment intentions. Item 4 was reverse coded for analyses. The original wording of the items did not include the words “National Guard” to specify where the individual would be re-enlisting, so this wording was added to each item. An example of a re-enlistment intention item is “I will re-enlist in my National Guard unit at the next opportunity.” The response options for this set of items ranged from 1-*strongly disagree* to 5-*strongly agree*. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient for this measure was .81.

Procedures

Respondents in this study were members of the National Guard in one of the Northeastern states of the United States. Guardsmen and women at seven locations throughout the state were surveyed. A total of 629 surveys were distributed and 407 were completed, yielding a total response rate of 64.7%. Surveys were distributed during a weekend training drill in March 2006, which all members of the state’s Guard were required to attend. Everyone present during the training drill was given the opportunity

to complete the survey. For three of the locations, the researcher met with the Unit Leader to give specific directions on how to distribute the survey, how to instruct others to complete it, and how to respond to various potential questions. The researcher then returned to the site of the training drill to collect completed surveys, determine the total number of attendees so that a response rate could be calculated, and answer any additional questions or address any concerns. For two of the units, the researcher personally distributed the surveys to respondents. For two of the units, located in remote parts of the State, the researcher gave the Unit Leaders instructions over the telephone and emailed and faxed copies of the survey for reproduction and distribution. Completed surveys were given to the Unit Leader, but were not placed in sealed envelopes, and then mailed to the researcher by the Unit Leader. The researcher was available via telephone and email throughout the weekend for any of the units that may have had questions or concerns. No questions or concerns pertaining to the content, distribution or administration of the survey were raised, and no complications arose during survey distribution.

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Prior to testing hypotheses, it was important to determine if sex, history of deployment, age, or marital status needed to be held constant. Therefore, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), *t*-tests, and correlations were performed. First, *t*-tests were performed to determine if there were differences between men and women and between those who have been deployed before and those who have not been deployed on the main study variables. Results indicate no significant mean differences for sex on any of the study variables. Significant mean differences were found for deployment and the following variables: continuance commitment $t(373) = -3.11, p < .01$; normative commitment $t(373) = -4.30, p < .01$; procedural justice $t(373) = -2.20, p < .05$; re-enlistment intentions $t(394) = -2.13, p < .05$ and satisfaction with pay $t(373) = -4.30, p < .01$. Those who had been deployed before reported less normative commitment ($M = 3.10, SD = .85$), continuance commitment ($M = 2.68, SD = .86$), procedural justice ($M = 2.86, SD = .81$), re-enlistment intentions ($M = 3.40, SD = 1.11$), and satisfaction with pay ($M = 3.18, SD = 1.0$) than those who had not been deployed before ($M = 3.48, SD = .79$; $M = 2.98, SD = .91$; $M = 3.04, SD = .76$; $M = 3.59, SD = .96$; and $M = 3.62, SD = .87$, respectively). Because significant mean differences were found for deployment status, deployment was held constant in subsequent analyses. Results of an ANOVA indicated no significant mean differences for marital status on any of the study variables, and therefore this will not be held constant.

In order to determine if age should be held constant, partial correlations between age and the study variables were conducted. Significant correlations were found with affective commitment ($r = .27, p < .01$), continuance commitment ($r = .17, p < .01$), normative commitment ($r = .23, p < .01$), enlistment intentions ($r = .23, p < .01$), and pay satisfaction ($r = .21, p < .01$). Because of these significant correlations, age was held constant.

Tests of Hypotheses

Descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, alpha reliability coefficients, and correlations are presented in Table 1. Hypothesis 1 stated that the three types of organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) would correlate positively with re-enlistment intentions. Holding deployment and age constant, this hypothesis was fully supported for affective commitment ($r = .64, p < .01$), continuance commitment ($r = .28, p < .01$), and normative commitment ($r = .59, p < .01$).

Hypothesis 2 stated that normative commitment would account for more variance in re-enlistment intentions than either affective or continuance commitment. A stepwise regression analysis was conducted, holding both age and deployment constant (see Table 2). Based on this analysis, after age and deployment were held constant affective commitment accounted for 36% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .36, F_{\text{cha}}(1, 373) = 233.44, p < .01$) and normative commitment accounted for 3% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .03, F_{\text{cha}}(1, 372) = 18.49, p < .01$). Continuance commitment accounted for less than 1% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .007, F_{\text{cha}}(1, 371) = 5.01, p < .05$). These findings provide partial support for Hypothesis 2.

Table 1

Partial Correlations Among Study Variables with Age and Deployment Held Constant (n = 355)

Variables	M	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Affective Commitment	3.50	.82	.82	.24**	.73**	.44**	.27**	.14**	.64**	.35**	.27**
2. Continuance Commitment	2.83	.89		.82	.41**	.13*	-.01	.03	.28**	.26**	.17**
3. Normative Commitment	3.24	.85			.82	.38**	.26**	.20**	.59**	.36**	.23**
4. Procedural Justice	2.95	.80				.62	.28**	.07	.39**	.31**	.05
5. Perceived Org. Support	3.52	.70					.91	.42**	.30**	.16**	.05
6. Supervisor Support	2.95	.78						.90	.21**	.15**	.01
7. Enlistment Intentions	3.50	1.07							.81	.36**	.23**
8. Satisfaction with Pay	3.36	.97								.88	.21**
9. Age	33.07	10.83									-

Note. Values in bold on the diagonal are estimates of scale reliability.

****** $p < .01$, ***** $p < .05$.

Table 2

*Re-enlistment Intentions Regressed on Organizational
Commitment Components (n = 376)*

Variable	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2
Step 1				
Age	.02	.01	.24**	.06**
Deploy	.19	.11	.09	
Step 2				
Age	.01	.00	.08	.36**
Deploy	.08	.09	.04	
Affective Commitment	.81	.05	.62**	
Step 3				
Age	.01	.00	.07	.03**
Deploy	.00	.09	.00	
Affective Commitment	.57	.08	.44**	
Normative Commitment	.32	.07	.26**	
Step 4				
Age	.01	.00	.06	.01*
Deploy	-.02	.09	-.01	
Affective Commitment	.59	.08	.45**	
Normative Commitment	.26	.08	.21**	
Continuance Commitment	.12	.05	.10*	

Note. Deploy = Whether respondent had been deployed

before as part of the National Guard.

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

Hypothesis 3 was fully supported. After controlling for age and deployment status, perceived organizational support positively correlated with procedural justice ($r = .28, p < .01$), affective organizational commitment ($r = .27, p < .01$), and intention to re-enlist ($r = .30, p < .01$). Hypothesis 4 expected that perceived supervisor support

would correlate positively with procedural justice, perceived organizational support, and intention to re-enlist. This hypothesis was also tested using partial correlation, holding age and deployment history constant. Hypothesis 4 was partially supported. Positive correlations were found between perceived supervisor support and both perceived organizational support ($r = .42, p < .01$) and intention to re-enlist ($r = .21, p < .01$).

Hypothesis 5 was fully supported. Holding age and deployment constant, procedural justice positively correlated with perceived organizational support ($r = .28, p < .01$), affective organizational commitment ($r = .44, p < .01$), and intention to re-enlist ($r = .39, p < .01$). Finally Hypothesis 6, that pay satisfaction would positively relate with re-enlistment intentions was also fully supported ($r = .39, p < .01$).

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine what factors correlate with a member of the Army National Guard's decision to re-enlist when his or her current commitment is complete. This is important because the United States military relies heavily upon the Army National Guard to protect and defend the United States domestically and internationally. Therefore, it is crucial that the National Guard know why people choose to stay, or leave, so it can develop internal strategies to retain them. Results of this study indicate that affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment, procedural justice, perceived organizational support, support from a Guardmember's civilian organization and supervisor, satisfaction with pay, age, and even if the person had been deployed before all relate to a Guardmember's decision to re-enlist.

Results of Hypothesis 1 support the findings of Gade et al. (2003) that organizational commitment positively relates to a Guardmember's decision to re-enlist. As an individual's feelings of commitment to his or her organization increase, so does his or her likelihood of re-enlisting. In addition to examining the relationship between organizational commitment and re-enlistment, past research has shown a relationship between this type of commitment and a decrease in absenteeism and an increase in performance (Rhoades et al., 2001). Therefore, while the result of Hypothesis 1 clearly demonstrates the importance of organizational commitment, it is especially important to track this as it relates to a variety of organizational behaviors. This study looked at three types of organizational commitment (affective, continuous, and normative) and found that they each correlate positively with re-enlistment intentions. Many studies of

organizational commitment in military populations have not looked at normative commitment (Gade et al., 2003; Heffner & Gade, 2003). This study is beneficial because it demonstrates the role that a sense of obligation plays in a Guardmembers decision to re-enlist.

Further, results of Hypothesis 2 indicate that affective commitment, or one's emotional attachment to an organization, explains the most variance in intention to re-enlist. This finding indicates that members of the National Guard are re-enlisting due to an emotional desire to remain, more so than a sense of obligation or need due to lack of choice. This finding is a positive one for the National Guard because it indicates that the people who remain with the Guard truly want to be there. Normative commitment, or remaining with an organization out of a feeling of obligation, accounts for more of the variance in re-enlistment intention than does continuance commitment, or a feeling of having to remain due to a lack of other options. This is also a positive and useful finding because it indicates that Guardmembers are remaining true to the commitment they made, and feel a desire to remain until they have completed their obligation, more so than a need to remain. In other words, emotions and a sense of obligation, more than instrumental needs (e.g., money, tenure, benefits) relate with re-enlistment intentions as affective and normative commitment both reflect emotional states, whereas continuance commitment reflects an instrumental need. Thus, although continuance organizational commitment and re-enlistment intention positively correlate, the correlation is small and the other forms of commitment better explain variance in intention to re-enlist.

Perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support correlate positively with re-enlistment intentions. Research by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) found that perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support are also positively correlated with each other. Therefore, it is not surprising that they both relate positively to re-enlistment intentions, but it is important research because it emphasizes the findings of others. Specifically, these findings corroborate the work of Ferres et al. (2005), who found that increased organizational support results in a decrease in turnover intentions. For purposes of this study, respondents were asked to consider their civilian employers when answering these questions. Therefore, it is evident from the results that the more support a Guardmember receives from the organization and supervisor he or she works for outside of the National Guard, the more likely he or she is to re-enlist. An additional indicator of the importance of civilian employers and supervisors in the lives of Guardmembers is the existence of organizations, such as Employer Support for the Guard and Reserve (ESGR), which have been established to support those civilian employers who employ members of the National Guard (Employer Support, n.d.).

Civilian employers must learn to manage personnel-related issues associated with having an employee who is part of the National Guard. These issues include extended absences from work due to deployments and training drills. In addition, civilian employers must comply with federal laws that are in place to protect individuals who voluntarily enlist in military service. These laws are outlined in The Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act, which was enacted in October 1994 to protect an employee's reemployment rights upon return from military deployment.

Because of recent changes to these laws, organizations such as ESGR are important mechanisms in keeping employers informed, while also supporting the important relationship between a civilian employer and its employees who are members of the National Guard.

Results of Hypothesis 5 indicate that an increase in procedural justice within the National Guard positively impacts a Guardmember's intention to re-enlist. Previous research by Rhoades et al. (2001) found that procedural justice positively correlates to perceived organizational support and affective commitment, which have both been found in this study to correlate positively with re-enlistment intentions. Therefore, results of Hypothesis 5 are consistent with previous research as well as previous findings of the current study. This is valuable information because it indicates that the National Guard should try to include its Guardmembers in the decision-making process, particularly when the decision to be made would affect its members, such as the scheduling of drills or exercises. Ensuring the inclusion of representatives from all levels of the National Guard could have the positive result of increased re-enlistment. Additionally, this research is consistent with previous research has indicated that procedural justice is important to members of the military (Tepper & Taylor, 2003).

Results of Hypothesis 6 corroborate the findings of DeConinck and Stillwell (2004) and Lum et al. (1998) who found that satisfaction with pay positively correlates with turnover intentions. Additionally, the results are supported in a study by Lakhani (1988), who found that an individual's satisfaction with his or her pay can impact his or her turnover intentions. However, the National Guard is fairly unique in that the majority

of Guardmembers have paid civilian employment, and other benefits, such as a generous pension plan and financial assistance for education, are offered since members often receive monetary compensation from other sources. Therefore, findings of this study – that pay, benefits and pension relate positively to intentions to re-enlist – are important as they suggest that the National Guard should continue to offer a variety of economic incentives in order to keep Guardmembers on board. Because these additional benefits were offered at the time of this study, it is not possible to determine if pay alone would be sufficient in encouraging re-enlistment, but it can be predicted that the combination of benefits offered has a significant impact on re-enlistment decisions.

One additional factor that related with re-enlistment intentions was whether a respondent has been deployed with the National Guard. Results indicate that those Guardmembers who have never been deployed were more likely to re-enlist. This is important for the Army National Guard to consider as it makes decisions about mandating redeployments and extending current deployments. While deployments are a necessary part of maintaining the National Guard as an effective component of the total United States military force, the impact of numerous or extended deployments should be considered, as this likely impacts an individual's intention to re-enlist. The National Guard, therefore, faces a double-edged sword. More than one deployment might risk losing members for future deployments, but the Guard lacks sufficient manpower, thus requiring multiple deployments of the current members.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

A limitation of this study is that data were collected from the Army National Guard in only one Northeastern State. In order for the data to be more applicable to the National Guard as a whole, data collection should be conducted from a variety of states and also from the Air National Guard. Moreover, the rate of deployment, and the nature and location of these deployments, varies by state and therefore data should be collected from as many units across the country as possible. For example, the state from which data was collected for this study has had one of the top 5 highest rates of deployment in the recent conflict in Iraq (Hench, 2004). The responses given by members of the National Guard in states with fewer deployments may vary greatly from the responses given in the current study.

Another limitation of this study is that data were collected at only one point in time, as opposed to a longitudinal study, which would allow for data collection at varied points in time. For purposes of research on the National Guard, collecting data at different points of time would be advantageous because it would allow the researcher to see the impact of factors such as additional deployments, changes in benefits or incentives, and additional training sessions on re-enlistment.

Two additional limitations of this study are common method variance and same-source error. Common method variance occurs when a respondent gives similar answers to items because they want to be consistent or to help the researcher get at the “right” answer. However, this can cause the items to be highly correlated which would not have been the case if the respondent had answered properly (Gardner, Cummings, Dunham, & Pierce, 1998). Same-source error also can occur when the method of data collection is

self-reported. This type of error occurs when there is no validation of the answers a respondent gives and they are the single source of the data (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). For purposes of this study, also surveying the civilian employers of respondents would give additional validity to the responses. Nonetheless, based on validity and reliability coefficients, common method variance and same source error are not likely problems.

Future research would benefit from comparing actual re-enlistment rates of those individuals who completed the initial survey. Comparing re-enlistment intentions with actual re-enlistment actions would shed light on how many Guardmembers do not follow through with their intended plans, and additional inquiries could uncover why this is the case. The results of this type of study would be beneficial to the National Guard, as it would provide additional insight into why individuals leave when their obligations are complete. Also, inquiring as to whether or not the respondents volunteered directly with the National Guard, or were transferred from another branch of the service, may reveal differences in retention rates that warrant the attention of researchers and the National Guard.

Additionally, future research also should include data collection from the civilian employers of Guardmembers. This would allow for comparison between the perceived support that a Guardmember feels he or she receives from his or her employer, and the level of support for National Guard service that the employer actually feels. Allison-Aipa et al. (2005) did this type of data collection for their study of the impact of National Guard deployment on civilian employers. The results of this study found that, while the deployment of National Guardmembers can be disruptive to a civilian organization and

can have a negative impact on morale, many civilian employers are still supportive of their Guardmembers. This is important data because the current study, and others, have found that the support of a civilian organization and supervisor can influence the re-enlistment intentions of a Guardmember. Therefore, it is important to know whether or not the organization and supervisor truly do support the efforts of their employees, despite the negative impact it may have on their organization.

In addition to needing additional future studies that include data collection from civilian employers, research to determine why members of the National Guard may be reluctant to give researchers contact information for their civilian employers is important to understand. The reasons for why National Guardmembers may not be willing to have researchers contact their civilian employers could be because they are fearful of retribution from their employers, or because they prefer to keep their association with the National Guard distinct from their civilian life and employment. There are likely other reasons as well, and future research should investigate what these are and how they can be mitigated. Additionally, respondents may be full-time students as opposed to having a traditional “employer.” In order to ensure that these Guardmembers are supported, it would benefit researchers to contact the school administrators to determine what level of support they are providing to their students who are members of the National Guard. For example, whether the student is given a deadline extension on his or her assignments if he or she is required to report to National Guard training is a viable question.

Future research should also address the question of the extent to which organizational and supervisor support influences procedural justice, pay satisfaction, and

organizational commitment, which in turn relate to retention intention. Understanding these relationships will provide additional areas in which the National Guard can potentially improve retention. For instance, if a positive relationship is found between supervisor support and organizational commitment, it would be beneficial for the Guard to encourage civilian supervisors to talk with their Guard employees about why they intend to re-enlist and tell them that they support this decision. Moreover, understanding which of these variables carries more weight in predicting re-enlistment intentions when comparing between those who have been deployed before and those who have yet to be deployed should be investigated. This information could help the National Guard to focus efforts on some areas relevant to previously deployed Guardmembers that might not be necessary to focus on for non-deployed Guardmembers.

Conclusion

The Army National Guard is heavily relied upon by the United States military. Therefore, it is important that it understand the feelings of its Guardmembers in terms of re-enlistment intentions and factors that may influence this decision. This study provides support for existing research, as well as providing a current perspective on topics such as organizational commitment, support from civilian employers, procedural justice, and satisfaction with pay. Results indicate that these, as well as whether a Guardmember has been deployed, factor into the decision of a Guardmember to re-enlist, and therefore provide valuable and timely information and guidance on what areas the Army National Guard should focus its retention efforts.

As extended and multiple deployments continue to be necessary for protection of the United States and its allies, it is vital that the Army National Guard understand and act on those factors affecting re-enlistment over which they have some control. By keeping the lines of communication open with Guardmembers, keeping in contact with civilian employers, and providing benefits that are unique to the Guard, they will find that individuals not only are willing to remain, but actually have a desire to do so. This could prove to be extremely valuable in terms of retention efforts for the Army National Guard.

REFERENCES

- Allen, D. G., Shore, L. M., & Griffeth, R. W. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management*, 29(1), 99-118.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Allison-Aipa, T. S., De La Rosa, G. M., Stetz, M. C., & Castro, C. A. (2005). The impact of National Guard activation for Homeland Defense: Employers' perspective. *Military Medicine*, 170, 846-850.
- Army National Guard general information. (n.d.). *About the Army National Guard*. Retrieved October 6, 2006 from <http://www.ngb.army.mil/About/arng.aspx>
- Beehr, T. A., King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1990). Social support and occupational stress: Talking to supervisors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 36(1), 61-81.
- Beehr, T. A., Walsh, J. T., & Taber, T. D. (1976). Relationship of stress to individually and organizationally valued states: Higher order needs as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61(1), 41-47.
- Bozeman, D. P., & Perrewé, P. L. (2001). The effect of item content overlap on organizational commitment questionnaire-turnover cognitions relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 161-173.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in tunneling through the maze. In C. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 317-372). New York: Wiley.
- Currall, S. C., Towler, A. J., Judge, T. A., & Kohn, L. (2005). Pay satisfaction and organizational outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(3), 613-640.
- DeConinck, J. B., & Stilwell, C. D. (2004). Incorporating organizational justice, role states, pay satisfaction and supervisor satisfaction in a model of turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 57, 225-231.
- Donoghue, C., & Castle, N. G. (2006). Voluntary and involuntary nursing home staff turnover. *Research on Aging*, 28(4), 454-472.
- Doubler, M. D. (2001). *I am the Guard: A history of the Army National Guard, 1636-2000*. U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchinson, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.
- Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 565-573.
- Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve. (n.d.). *What is Employer Support for the Guard and Reserve?* Retrieved December 3, 2005, from <http://www.esgr.org/aboutESGR.asp>
- Ferres, N., Connell, J., & Travaglione, A. (2005). The effect of redeployment on organizational trust. *Strategic Change*, 14, 77-91.
- Firth, L., Mellor, D. J., Moore, K. A., & Loquet, C. (2004). How can managers reduce employee intention to quit? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19, 170-187.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 115-130.
- Gade, P. A. (2003). Organizational commitment in the military: An overview. *Military Psychology*, 15(3), 163-166.
- Gade, P. A., Tiggie, R. B., & Schumm, W. R. (2003). The measurement and consequences of military organizational commitment in soldiers and spouses. *Military Psychology*, 15(3), 191-207.
- Garamone, J. (2002). Services respond to electronic age's "mail call!" *American Forces Information Service News Articles*. Retrieved October 13, 2006 from http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Mar2002/n03252002_200203251.html
- Gardner, D. G., Cummings, L. L., Dunham, R. B., & Pierce, J. L. (1998). Single-item versus multiple-item measurement scales: An empirical comparison. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 58(6), 898-915.
- Hackett, R. D., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P. A. (1994). Further assessments of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(1), 15-23.
- Heffner, T. S., & Gade, P. A. (2003). Commitment to nested collectives in Special Operations Forces. *Military Psychology*, 15(3), 209-224.
- Heneman, H. G., & Schwab, D. P. (1985). Pay satisfaction: Its multidimensional nature

- and measurement. *International Journal of Psychology*, 20, 129-141.
- Hench, D. (2004, March 14). The war in Iraq: One year later. *Portland Press Herald*, pp. 1A.
- Hill, J. D. (1964). *A history of the National Guard*. Harrisburg, PA: The Stackpole Company.
- Hom, P. W., & Hulin, C. L. (1981). A competitive test of the prediction of re-enlistment by several models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66(1), 23-29.
- Hom, P. W., Katerberg, R., & Hulin, C. L. (1979). Comparative examination of three approaches to the prediction of turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64(3), 280-290.
- Ingersoll, R. E. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534.
- Karrasch, A. I. (2003). Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment. *Military Psychology*, 15(3), 225-236.
- Kim, S. W., Price, J. L., Mueller, C. W., & Watson, T. W. (1996). The determinants of career intent among physicians at a U.S. Air Force hospital. *Human Relations*, 47, 947-976.
- Koch, J. L., & Rhodes, S. R. (1981). Predictors of turnover of female factory workers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 18, 145-161.
- Lakhani, H. (1988). The effect of pay and retention bonuses on quit rates in the U.S. Army. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 41(3), 430-438.
- Lawrence, R. (1985). Foreword. In B. Wilson (Ed.), *The Guard and Reserve in the total force* (pp. 9-27). Washington, DC: National Defense University.
- Lum, L., Kervin, J., Clark, K., Reid, F., & Sirola, W. (1998). Explaining nursing turnover intent: Job satisfaction, pay satisfaction or organizational commitment? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 305-320.
- Maertz, C. P., & Campion, M. A. (1998). 25 years of voluntary turnover research: A review and critique. In C.L. Cooper & I.T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 49-81). London: Wiley.
- Mahon, J. K. (1983). *History of the militia and the National Guard*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

- Mansell, A., Brough, P., & Cole, K. (2006). Stable predictors of job satisfaction, psychological strain, and employee retention: An evaluation of organizational change within the New Zealand Customs Service. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13(1), 84-107.
- Martin, T. N., & O'Laughlin, M. S. (1984). Predictors of organizational commitment: The study of part-time Army reservists. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 25, 270-283.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20-52.
- Miles, D. (2006). Recruiting, Retention Rates Remain High for 10th Straight Month *American Forces Information Service News Articles*. Retrieved October 13, 2006 from http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Apr2006/20060410_4777.html
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76 (6), 845-855.
- Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P., & Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6 (3), 209-225.
- Mowday, R. T., Koberg, C. S., & McArthur, A. W. (1984). The psychology of the withdrawal process: A cross-validated test of Mobley's Intermediate Linkages Model of Turnover in Two Samples. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(1), 79-94.

- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- National Guard active Guard and Reserve information. (n.d.). *Information centers: Resources at your fingertips*. Retrieved October 6, 2006 from <http://www.1800goguard.com/info/active.html>
- National Guard benefits information. (n.d.). *Attain financial freedom: Secure your future*. Retrieved October 6, 2006 from http://www.1800goguard.com/money/money_other.html
- National Guard general information. (n.d.). *About the National Guard*. Retrieved October 6, 2006 from <http://www.ngb.army.mil/About/default.aspx>
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw- Hill.
- Paterson, J. M., Green, A., & Cary, J. (2002). The measurement of organizational justice in organizational change programmes: A reliability, validity and context-sensitivity assessment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 393-408.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 72, 531-544.
- Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10, 465-476.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 825-836.
- Stentiford, B. M. (2002). *The American home guard*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.
- Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C. (2003). Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(1), 97-105.

- United States Department of Defense. (2005, September 5). *Guard Troops Put Lives on Hold to Respond to Katrina*. Retrieved November 20, 2005, from http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Sep2005/20050904_2616.html
- United States Government Accountability Office. (2005, November). *Military personnel: DOD needs action plan to address enlisted personnel recruitment and retention challenges*. Retrieved October 7, 2006 from <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d06134.pdf>
- USA Today. (2006). *Army Guard barely misses recruiting goal*. Retrieved October 7, 2006 from http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2006-10-03-guard-recruiting_x.htm
- Wilson, B. J. (1985). *The Guard and Reserve in the total force*. Washington, DC: National Defense University.
- Wood, S. (2006). Guard Demonstrating Versatility, Capability, Chief Says. *American Forces Information Service News Articles*. Retrieved October 13, 2006 from http://www.defenselink.mil/news/May2006/20060504_5023.html
- Zellers, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1068-1076.

APPENDIX A

Survey

San José State
UNIVERSITY

College of Social Sciences
Department of Psychology

One Washington Square
San José, CA 95192-0120
Voice: 408-924-5800
Fax: 408-924-5605
<http://www.psych.sjsu.edu>

The California State University:
Chancellor's Office
Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico,
Dominguez Hills, East Bay, Fresno,
Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach,
Los Angeles, Maritime Academy,
Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona,
Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego,
San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo,
San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus

Reenlistment and Retention in the National Guard Informed Consent for a Survey Questionnaire

Dear Maine National Guard members,

I am a graduate student at San Jose State University in San Jose, California. I am studying for my Master's Degree in Industrial/Organizational Psychology. This survey, and the information that I gather, will all be used to complete my Master's Thesis. I was born and raised in Bangor, and have many ties to Maine, and that is why I chose to collect data from all of you. I have received the approval and support of the National Guard to conduct this survey.

This survey will examine your thoughts and feelings regarding different aspects of your employment with the National Guard, your current and future career plans, and the support you receive from various sources. The purpose of this survey is to find out the reasons why some soldiers choose to reenlist in the Guard, and what factors might influence this decision. This information is being acquired for **research purposes only**. Your responses will remain **confidential**. Only the researcher and research advisor will have access to the data of individual respondents; information you provide will be held the strictest confidence. Please do not sign or write your name on this survey; we would like to keep your responses anonymous.

The survey consists of three sections. The first section of the survey asks questions related to the National Guard, your civilian employer/supervisor, and your spouse/partner (if applicable). The second section asks information about you that is being collected for statistical purposes only. The third section gives you the opportunity to provide feedback in your own words, to a number of questions.

Completion of the survey is entirely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time. You do not have to answer questions that you do not want to answer. Choosing not to participate in completion of this survey will not affect your relations with San Jose State University or the National Guard. No individual from the National Guard will have access to individual data or the completed surveys. They will receive a summary of the aggregated results, well as a copy of my completed thesis. Questions in this survey are not expected to cause harm or discomfort to any participant. Completion of survey indicates your willingness to participate in this study. Overall results of this study may be published.

The questionnaire will take about 15 minutes to complete. Should you have any questions, comments, or concerns about this research, please call me, Christiana Woodward at (408) 802-5818. For further information or questions you may also contact Dr. S. Glazer, research advisor at (408) 924-5639. Any complaints about the research should be made to: Dr. S. Bienenfeld at (408) 924-5600. Questions about research subjects' rights or research-related injury may be presented to Pam Stacks, Ph.D., Associate Vice President, Graduate Studies and Research at (408) 924-2480.

Your time and effort is much appreciated.

Christiana Woodward
Masters Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
San Jose State University
San Jose, California 95192-0120
cewoodward@gmail.com

Sheila Bienenfeld, Ph.D., Chair
Department of Psychology
San Jose State University
sbien@sbcglobal.net
(408) 924-5639

Research Advisor:
Sharon Glazer, Ph.D., Assoc. Professor
Department of Psychology
San Jose State University
San Jose, California 95192-0120
sglazer@email.sjsu.edu

Pam Stacks, Ph.D., Associate Vice
President, Graduate Studies & Research
San Jose State University
San Jose, California 95192
(408) 924-2480

Please read the following instructions carefully.

- We ask that you respond to each statement honestly and as accurately as possible.
- There are no right or wrong answers.
- Your answers are anonymous.
- We ask that you try to answer all the questions so that we could gain a clear picture of your perceptions.

SECTION A: Your Input

INSTRUCTIONS: Please circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

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

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my military career with the Guard.	1	2	3	4	5
2. One of the major reasons I continue to be a soldier is that leaving the Guard would require considerable personal sacrifice. Another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I do not feel any obligation to remain with the Guard.	1	2	3	4	5
4. If I had not already put so much of myself into the Guard I might consider working elsewhere.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The Guard has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I owe a great deal to the Guard.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I do not feel emotionally attached to the Guard.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave the Guard right now.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Right now, staying with the Guard is a matter of necessity as much as desire.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel that it would be right to leave the Guard now.	1	2	3	4	5
11. One of the few negative consequences of leaving the Guard would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I really feel as if the Guard's problems are my own.	1	2	3	4	5
13. The Guard deserves my loyalty.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I do not feel like 'part of the family' in the Guard.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I believe that I have too few options to consider leaving the Guard.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I would feel guilty if I left the Guard right now.	1	2	3	4	5
17. It would be very hard for me to leave the Guard right now, even if I wanted to.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I would not leave the Guard right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to the Guard.	1	2	3	4	5

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

20. I am usually not told about important things that are happening in the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
21. Decisions at the National Guard are usually made without consulting the people who have to live with them. 1 2 3 4 5
22. Meetings are usually held to discuss work changes and problems with myself and the other members of the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
23. My civilian organization strongly considers my goals and values with the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
24. My civilian organization disregards my best interests when it makes decisions that affect me, because of my National Guard affiliation. 1 2 3 4 5
25. My civilian organization really cares about my well-being when I am serving with the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
26. My civilian organization would fail to understand my absence due to a National Guard deployment. 1 2 3 4 5
27. My civilian organization feels there is little to be gained by employing me for the rest of my career because of my affiliation with the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
28. My civilian organization would grant a reasonable request for a change in my working conditions to better accommodate my commitments to the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
29. If I were laid off, my civilian organization would prefer to hire someone who is not part of the National Guard, rather than take me back. 1 2 3 4 5
30. My civilian organization is willing to help me when I need a special favor for the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
31. My civilian organization would show very little concern for me if I were deployed with the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
32. My civilian organization feels that hiring me was a definite mistake due to my affiliation with the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
33. My civilian organization is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability, when faced with National Guard deployment. 1 2 3 4 5
34. My civilian organization would understand if I were unable to finish a task on time due to a National Guard deployment. 1 2 3 4 5
35. If my civilian job were eliminated, my civilian organization would prefer to lay me off rather than transfer me to a new job because of my commitment to the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
36. I am interested in the history of the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
37. I am interested in the history of the United States Armed Forces. 1 2 3 4 5
38. I feel as if I am part of the tradition of the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
39. I feel as if I am part of the tradition of the United States Armed Forces. 1 2 3 4 5

INSTRUCTIONS: Using the scale below, please judge how often you talk about the following subjects with your *civilian supervisor*. Circle the number which is most appropriate.

Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

40. My civilian supervisor and I discuss things that are happening in my personal life with regards to the National Guard, such as possible deployment. 1 2 3 4 5
41. My civilian supervisor and I talk about how I dislike some parts of my work with the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
42. My civilian supervisor and I discuss the bad things about our work with the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
43. My civilian supervisor and I talk about problems that I have with my commanders in the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
44. My civilian supervisor and I discuss the good things about being part of the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
45. My civilian supervisor and I talk about how the National Guard is a good organization to be affiliated with. 1 2 3 4 5
46. My civilian supervisor and I discuss the rewarding things about being part of the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
47. My civilian supervisor really cares about my well-being. 1 2 3 4 5

INSTRUCTIONS: Again, thinking about your *civilian supervisor*, and using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the appropriate number.

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

48. My civilian supervisor values my opinions. 1 2 3 4 5
49. My civilian supervisor strongly considers my goals and values. 1 2 3 4 5
50. My civilian supervisor shows very little concern for me. 1 2 3 4 5

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use the following scale to rate the next four items.

Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Undecided	Likely	Very Likely
1	2	3	4	5

51. I will reenlist in my National Guard unit at the next opportunity. 1 2 3 4 5
52. I would recommend to other people that they enlist in the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
53. If given the option today, I would choose to stay with the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
54. I will not stay with the National Guard until I am eligible for retirement. 1 2 3 4 5

INSTRUCTIONS: This section asks about *spouse/partner* support. Using the scale below, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements. Please respond to this section *only if applicable*.

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

55. One of my greatest sources of comfort when things get rough is being with my spouse/partner. 1 2 3 4 5
56. During times when I have to go through something painful, I usually find that having my spouse/partner with me makes it less painful. 1 2 3 4 5
57. When I have not done very well on something that is very important to me, I can get to feeling better simply by being with my spouse/partner. 1 2 3 4 5
58. If I had to leave for a National Guard deployment, my spouse/partner would have a hard time managing household responsibilities. 1 2 3 4 5
59. If my job with the National Guard gets very demanding, my spouse/partner will take on extra household responsibilities. 1 2 3 4 5
60. When I have to be away from home due to my duties with the National Guard, I know that my spouse/partner is taking care of things at home. 1 2 3 4 5
61. If I were to be deployed with the National Guard, my spouse/partner would help me find the information I need to have before I left. 1 2 3 4 5
62. My spouse/partner makes me feel good about my decision to be part of the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
63. If deployed with the National Guard, knowing that my spouse/partner would be waiting for me at home would help ease my mind. 1 2 3 4 5

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use the following scale to indicate your level satisfaction with the pay and benefits you receive from the National Guard.

Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

64. My take-home pay from the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
65. The pay structure of the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5
66. The pension plans the National Guard offers. 1 2 3 4 5
67. The benefits I receive from the National Guard. 1 2 3 4 5

SECTION B: About You

INSTRUCTIONS: This information is being asked for *statistical purposes only* so that we can describe the characteristics of the group that responded to this survey, as a whole. No individual can be identified through these questions.

1. Sex (please circle response)
 - 1 Male
 - 2 Female

2. Age (as of last birthday; please write numbers clearly) _____

3. Education Level (Please indicate the highest level of education you have completed by circling the corresponding number)
 - 1 Some High School
 - 2 GED
 - 3 High School Graduate
 - 4 Some College/Technical Training
 - 5 College Graduate
 - 6 Some Graduate Training
 - 7 Graduate Degree
 - 8 Other _____

4. Current Marital Status (please circle response)
 - 1 Single
 - 2 Living with a Partner
 - 3 Married/Remarried
 - 4 Legally Separated
 - 5 Divorced
 - 6 Widowed
 - 7 Other _____

5. How long have you been married/living with your current partner (if applicable; please write numbers clearly)?
 _____ years _____ months

6. How many dependent children do you have (if applicable; please write number clearly)? _____

7. What Branch of the National Guard are you a member of? (please circle response)
 - 1 Army National Guard
 - 2 Air National Guard

8. Have you ever been deployed with the National Guard? (please circle response)
 - 1 Yes (if yes, how many times? _____; please write number clearly)
 - 2 No

SECTION C: Your Feedback

INSTRUCTIONS: In the following section we request feedback (please write clearly and legibly; feel free to use additional sheets if necessary and indicate the item number to which you are further responding).

1. Please indicate any reasons why you might not reenlist when your current obligation is completed.

2. Please indicate what the National Guard could do to increase the likelihood of you reenlisting.

3. Please indicate what your current *civilian employer* (if applicable) can do to encourage you to reenlist in the National Guard.

Thank you for your participation!

APPENDIX B
Human Subjects – IRB Approval Letter

**San José State
UNIVERSITY**

Office of the Provost
Associate Vice President
Graduate Studies & Research

One Washington Square
San José, CA 95192-0025
Voice: 408-924-2427
Fax: 408-924-2477

E-mail: gradstudies@sjsu.edu
<http://www.sjsu.edu>

To: Christina Woodward
227 Easy Street #D
Mountain View, CA 94043

From: Pam Stacks,
Interim AVP, Graduate Studies & Research

Date: Jan 31, 2006

The Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board has approved your request for exemption from human subjects review under category "B" in the study entitled:

"Reenlistment and Retention in the National Guard"

This approval is contingent upon the subjects participating in your research project or the subject's data collected for the research project being appropriately protected from risk. This includes the protection of the anonymity of the subjects' identity when they participate in your research project and concerning all data that may be collected from the subjects. The Board's approval includes continued monitoring of your research to assure that the subjects are being adequately and properly protected from such risks. If at any time a subject becomes injured or complains of injury, you must immediately notify Pam Stacks, Ph.D. Injury includes but is not limited to bodily harm, psychological trauma, and release of potentially damaging personal information.

Please also be advised that all subjects need to be fully informed and aware that their participation in your research project is voluntary, and that he or she may withdraw from the project at any time. Further, a subject's participation, refusal to participate, or withdrawal will not affect any services that the subject is receiving or will receive at the institution in which the research is being conducted. This approval is granted for a one-year period and data collection beyond Jan 31, 2007 requires an extension request.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (408) 924-2480.

Cc: Dr. Sharon Glazer

The California State University:
Chancellor's Office
Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico,
Conninguez Hills, East Bay, Fresno,
Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach,
Los Angeles, Maritime Academy,
Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona,
Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego,
San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo,
San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus