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INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

My thesis seeks to examine the factors associated with enlisted service member’s decisions to voluntarily leave the military after his or her contractual term of service expires. Furthermore, I focus on gender-related workplace issues, such as sexual harassment and sex discrimination, and how they might affect different workplace satisfaction and perceived organizational support and ultimately retention. The following section is organized into four major subsections, the civilian workforce, military organization, the military workforce, and the importance of military retention. The first section gives a brief overview of women’s representation in the civilian workforce. The second section provides readers unfamiliar with the structure of the U.S. military a rudimentary overview. The third section builds on the first by briefly describing women’s in the U.S. military. The final section introduces the importance of retention in the military, which is the overarching topic of interest of this research.

Civilian Workforce

Over the past decade, workplace diversity in the civilian sector is slowly beginning to parallel the socio-demographic makeup of the United States; however, debates continue to surround women’s representation and equality, especially in male-dominated career fields (Bobbitt-Zeher 2011). For example, in 2010, 11.8 percent of swore officers were females (U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation 2010), compared to 9.8 percent in 1995 (U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation 1995). This fifteen-year period represents an increase of 20.4 percent in the number of swore female officers in the U.S. While the increase is substantial, women are still unrepresented in policing (Franklin 2007).
Past research shows that women, compared to men, are not only underrepresented in many civilian career fields, but they are also more disadvantaged when participating in the workforce (Reskin and McBrier 2000; Williams 1995; Bobbitt-Zeher 2011). For example, some of the inequalities that working women face include: unequal pay for comparable work, slower promotion rates, and lower retention rates (Shannon and Kidd 2003; Blau and Devaro 2007; Stoker and Crawford 2008). Within the past few decades, women have become increasingly visible in upper management positions; however, there is still a disparity between the number of women entering a given profession and the number of women who remain in it and then get promoted to upper-level management positions (Eagly and Carli 2007; Baumgartner and Schneider 2010). In 2015, for example, only 4.8 percent of the Standard & Poor’s 500 (S&P 500) had females as chief executive officers (CEOs) (Egan 2015).

From an organizational perspective, the recruitment and retention of skilled employees is an important aspect of maintaining a trained and seasoned workforce (Dawley, Houghton Bucklew 2010). The acquisition and preservation of human capital are increasingly important as the structure of the workplace continually changes. Indeed, the cost of turnover and labor shortages in industries such as health care and skilled labor highlights the importance of retaining skilled employees (Levanon, Cheng, and Paterra 2014). These fields are projected to see labor shortages by 2025. Health-related occupations are expected to experience a labor shortage because of an increased demand for health care professional and a decrease in the number of people entering the labor force. For example, the number of baby boomers that will require medical care will overshadow estimated population growth (0.15 percent by 2030), leaving more people requiring care and fewer people to provide such care (Levanon, Cheng, and Paterra 2014). Skilled labor is also likely to see a labor shortage in the upcoming decades. Unlike
health-related occupations, the skilled labor storages are not due to an increase in job demand, instead, the shortage is predicted to occur because of a decreased number of young people entering these occupations. Skilled labor fields at the most risk of shortages include water treatment system operators, crane operators, and construction inspectors (Levanon, Cheng, and Paterra 2014).

**Military Organization Overview**

Although my study will focus primarily on enlisted personnel, I begin with a brief overview of the military organization. All branches of the military are stratified into three classes: commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel. Commissioned officer are designated O-1 (second lieutenant or ensign) to O-10 (four-star general or admiral). Warrant officers, generally highly skilled technicians without the command authority of commissioned officers, are designated WO-1 (e.g., an entry-level Army helicopter pilot) to WO-5 (master-level technical and tactical experts). Enlisted personnel are designated E-1 (new recruit) to E-9 (Master Chief Petty Officer or Command Sergeant Major).¹ Per the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2016), enlisted personnel typically do the following (see Table 1).

As we can see in Table 1, officers are responsible for managing enlisted members and performing specialty functions that required advanced degrees, while enlisted personnel are responsible for the completion of day to day operations.

---

¹ Note that enlisted does not refer to how a person may have entered the military originally (volunteered or drafted). It is only a rank identifier.
Table 1. *Comparison of Officer and Enlisted Duties*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Type</th>
<th>Typical Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Enlisted       | • Participate in, or support, military operations, such as combat or training operations, or humanitarian or disaster relief  
• Operate, maintain, and repair equipment  
• Perform technical and support activities  
• Supervise junior enlisted personnel |
| Officer        | • Plan, organize, and lead troops and activities in military operations  
• Manage enlisted personnel  
• Operate and command aircraft, ships, or armored vehicles  
• Provide medical, legal, engineering, and other services to military personnel |

As a closed and hierarchical organization, promotion to positions of higher authority and increased technical skill can only come from within, and after years of prescribed experience. Military service is also contractual, with terms of enlistment ranging from two to eight years. Prior to the expiration of one’s contract, all Service Members must either reenlist or “opt-out” (leave the service). Regardless, one must also remain in uniform and in one’s assigned job and duty station (stateside or overseas) until released. Unlike civilians, failure to fulfill one’s contract can bring severe consequences, including fines, loss of pay and benefits, and imprisonment (United States Code § 886). The decision to reenlist is thus deliberate, requiring rational decision-making and long-term planning. This can mean waiting years before one can leave the military, regardless of motivation.

Herbert (1998) has categorized four branches of the U.S. military (Army, Navy, Marines and Air Force) according to their general antagonism toward women in their ranks. While the U.S. Coast Guard falls under the armed forces, it was excluded from Hebert’s (1998) analysis. The U.S. Coast Guard was excluded because of its organizational differences from the other four
branches. The Armed Forces, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and the Public Health Service all fall under the term “uniformed services,” however only the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, and Department of the Air Force are defined as military departments (United States Code § 101). U.S. Coast Guard is housed under the Department of Homeland Security, where the other four branches are housed under the Department of Defense (DoD). She argues that the Navy is the most antagonistic toward women, while the Army and Marine Corps fall in the middle. The Air Force is the most accepting of women (Herbert 1998). The Air Force’s relative openness toward women might stem from being the newest (established in 1947 versus the late 1775s for the others). The Air Force’s high enlistment standards, coupled with its emphasis on technical ability over physical strength, also helps level the playing field for men and women alike. Only about 0.27 percent of enlisted Airmen are in combat specialties. The Army and the Marine Corps, the largest and smallest branches, respectively, they also have the highest proportion of members in combat specialties (e.g., infantry, armor, artillery, Special Forces, and various combat ships and boats): 28.03 percent enlisted soldiers and 24.17 percent of Marines. The Marine Corps also has a unique mentality toward women Marines. When the first women joined the Marine Corps they were “Women Marines—that is, women first, Marines second” (Herbert 1998:37). For example, early female Marines were issued makeup kits and required to attend etiquette classes. The Marine Corps now trains everyone—women and men alike—to be a Marine rifleman first. However, 56 percent of women Marines surveyed by Herbert (1998) stated they feel pressured to present themselves in a feminine way. The response may allude to the history of women in the Marines, where women were expected to maintain her feminine identity, while still developing the skills needed to be a Marine.
Finally, Herbert (1998) sees the Navy as the most antagonistic toward women. It’s long history of men living and working together at sea for months on end, and in nearly complete isolation from women, is an important contributing factor. The Navy’s cavalier attitude toward women, and perhaps outright disdain, has been well documented by major media events such as the event that took place during the Tailhook symposium in 1991. During the conference, there were 83 reports of sexual assault and harassment. Many of the incidences occurred in a ritual known as the “gauntlet.” During the “gauntlet” women were lured to a six-foot-wide, dimly lit hallway that was lined with men and the made to walk down the hallway. While walking through the crowd of men, women reported having their clothes ripped off, as well as being groped and assaulted (Kempster 1993). More recently, in 2014 the first women were assigned to submarines. While assigned to the ballistic missile submarine Wyoming, three female officers were secretly filmed for over a year while undressing and showering. It is unclear how widely the films were distributed, as they were only discovered when passed along to a submarine officer on a different vessel (Myers 2014).

A recent RAND study by Morall, Gore, and Schell (2014) supports the claim of a hierarchy of antagonism toward women in the military. The rate of sex discrimination and sexual harassment experienced by women serving all branches of the military in 2013 was 25.97 percent (Morall et al. 2014:36). Furthermore, they found that 32.16 percent of active duty female Sailors experienced sexual harassment or gender discrimination, compared to 31.43 percent of Marines, 28.62 percent of Soldiers, and 15.66 percent of Airman (Morall et al. 2014:36).
Military Workforce

Women having been supporting the American war effort since the inception of the United States. During the American Revolutionary War, women served on the battlefields as nurses, water bearers, cooks, and laundresses. During the American Civil War women served as battlefield nurses; one notable woman during the civil war was Dr. Mary Walker, a certified surgeon who later received the nation’s highest military award, the Medal of Honor (Spiegel 1996).  

In 1948 Congress passed the Women’s Armed Services Integration Act, granting women permanent status in the military. This act allowed women to be considered qualified to hold veteran status. This act also granted women equal pay to men for the first time in time in the military (National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics 2011). While women could now be permanent members of the armed services, there were exclusionary clauses that restricted women to 2 percent of the military population and prevented women from serving in combat roles (National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics 2011). It was not until 1967 that the 2 percent restriction on total female enlistment was lifted with the enactment of the 1967 Women’s Armed Services Integration Act. This act also allowed women to serve in the military during peace times and allowed women to advance to general and admiral ranks. Even with all the advancements in gender relations, the U.S. military are still far from being a gender-neutral organization.

2 In 1917, the U.S. congress created a law that provides a pension to all recipients of the Medal of Honor. Before the was law was enacted however, 911 names were removed from the Army’s Medal of Honor Roll, Dr. Mary Edward’s was one of the names removed. Therefore Dr. Mary Edwards never received the pension granted under the new law (Spiegel 1996).

3 It was not until the late 1970’s and early 1980’s that laws were passed that allowed women who served prior to 1948 to be formally granted veteran status, which made them eligible for Veterans Affairs benefits including service related medical care and veterans burial benefits (National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics 2011).
The United States military is no exception to the structural patterns of gender workplace composition. In 2000, 14.7 percent of active duty military members were females (U.S. Department of Defense 2004), compared to 15.1 percent in 2014 (U.S. Department of Defense 2014). Comparing these figures to the increase of female police officers (20.4 percent), we see that the military only increased the female workforce by 2.7 percent over roughly the same time period (U.S. Department of Defense 2004; 2014). The demographic similarities can also be seen in top-level leadership. It was not until 2008 that the first woman was promoted to the rank of four-star general. In 2015, 7.9 percent or three out of thirty-eight of military four-star generals/admirals were women (Kapp, 2016).

**Importance of Military Retention**

Technological advances in the military have changed the way wars are fought. Physical strength is no longer the emphasis of many career fields. Instead, many fields rely on highly skilled technical experts, which can perform combat missions miles or even countries away from traditional combat zones (Fletcher, McMahon and Quester 1993). The military’s reliance on technical experts intensifies the need to retain Service Members who hold these skillsets. Retaining skilled Service Members can dramatically reduce replacement and training costs (Wahl and Singh 2006). Consider the marginal costs of training one new junior surface warfare officer (JSWO). In 2006, for example, it cost the navy an average of $54,930 and 12-18 months to fully train and qualify one JSWO for his or her new duties. If that sailor failed to re-enlist or stay in his or her technical field, the navy will have effectively lost the training costs ($54,930). Worse, that junior surface warfare officer also failed to matriculate into a position of higher

---

4 Although turnover can have positive effects on civilian organizations (e.g., replacing poorly performing workers for new ones), since the “navy promotes only from within, voluntary turnover usually has a negative effect” (Wahl & Singh 2006:23)
technical competence and responsibility that often follows one’s first term of enlistment. With the foundation laid, and with the initial $54K outlay for training and qualification costs already spent, the navy nonetheless continues to invest in the training and qualifying of the up-and-coming JSWO for the next step of his or her naval career. In 2006, that additional training cost approximately $61,583. However, if the junior officer fails to reenlist, then the navy has effectively lost $116,513 ($54,930 in initial training + $61,583 in ongoing training).

Enlisted members are also costly to train, take, for example, newly recruited Air Force members. On average, it costs about $37,400 to train each new recruit, or about $1.3 billion annually to train all new recruits, with the estimated cost of attrition around $67 million annually (Manacapilli et al. 2012). Highly skilled niche careers in the military are even more costly. Every military linguist must attend and graduate the Defense Language Institute. This training can take anywhere from twenty-four to sixty-two weeks to complete and averages $200,000 per graduate (Li and Daugherty 2015).

Understanding of the mechanisms that affect voluntary turnover in the military can provide information to stem the loss of highly skilled female military members in their first and subsequent terms of enlistment. Understanding retention patterns in the military could provide valuable insight into improving voluntary retention in other male-dominated organizations and professions, such as law enforcement. My thesis aims to contribute to our understanding of turnover indicators in the workplace by integrating gender-related workplace behaviors into the Job Demand-Control-Support model (Karasek and Theorell 1990). The JDCS is presented formally on page 10 and is the basic retention model I will use in my thesis.
LITERATURE REVIEW

While we know that gender-related workplace issues negatively impact organizational retention, an in-depth analysis of how these gender-related workplace behaviors operate is necessary. My research will add to previous sexual harassment and sex discrimination literature examining whether gender-related workplace behaviors have a direct or indirect effect on retention. Understanding the mechanisms of how gender-related behaviors are impacting workplace retention is necessary to provide policymakers the knowledge base to create and implement effective policies that will retain military members.

Gender-Related Workplace Behaviors

An abundance of existing literature on sexual harassment and sex discrimination show that they are both negatively associated with workplace satisfaction and positively associated with turnover intentions and actual turnover (Shaffer, et al. 2000; Mueller, De Coster, and Estes 2001; Antecol, Barcus, and Cobb-Clark 2009; Glomb et al. 1999).

Sex discrimination. Within the organizational context two types of sex discrimination can be conceptualized, access discrimination and treatment discrimination (Levitin, Quinn, and Staines 1971). Access discrimination can be defined as limitations based on gender at the time an employee is hired. This type of discrimination includes actions such as refusing to hire a certain gender of candidate based solely on gender, lower initial wages, and recruiting procedures that neglect a potential applicant based on sex (Terborg and Ilgen 1975). The second type of sex discrimination defined by Levitin et al. (1971) is treatment discrimination. Treatment discrimination is defined as differential treatment of a member of a particular group once they
have gained access to the organization. Examples of treatment discrimination include “slower rates of promotion, assignment to less attractive or less challenging jobs, lower and/or less frequent raises, and less training opportunities” (Terborg and Ilgen 1975:353). The military defines discrimination as any unlawfully action that denies equal opportunity to persons or groups based sex (U.S. Department of Defense 2015).

**Sexual harassment.** One of the most damaging barriers for women’s career success has been identified as sexual harassment in the workplace (Fitzgerald et al. 1988). Consequences to the individual who experiences sexual harassment include “emotion or physical difficulties, negative feelings about work, and poor job performance” (Fitzgerald et al. 1988:154). Individuals are not the only actors that are affected by sexual harassment; organizations also experience the fallout of sexual harassment in the workplace. Costs to an organization that result from sexual harassment included legal costs, unwanted publicity, and lower work quality.

A meta-analysis of the consequences of sexual harassment in the workplace (Willness 2007) found that sexual harassment in the workplace has a significant effect on job satisfaction and specifically interpersonal job dissatisfaction. The study also confirms previous work (Barling et al. 1996), which found that two aspects of interpersonal job dissatisfaction are affected by sexual harassment, coworker and supervisor dissatisfaction. The reasoning given for this finding is that most cases of sexual harassment are perpetrated by either coworkers or supervisors (Barling et al. 1996).

Willness (2007), looking at job satisfaction, compared military samples to civilian samples. She found that women in work environments with fewer women are at a higher risk of experiencing sexual harassment. A second finding was that sexual harassment affects work satisfaction more significantly for military personnel than civilians, one explanation of this
finding is that the military is focused on teamwork in tasks, whereas civilians have more opportunities to work indecently.

Sexual harassment is defined by the DoD as

“a form of sex discrimination that involves unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when: (1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of a person's job, pay, or career or (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by a person is used as a basis for career or employment decisions affecting that person, or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment” (U.S. Department of Defense 2015:18).

A Brief History Voluntary Turnover Literature

The voluntary turnover literature has greatly evolved since March and Simon’s (1958) classic book *Organizations*. In *Organizations*, March and Simon posed that job satisfaction and perceived alternatives were the key mechanisms in determining turnover intentions. In the 1970’s, scholars began to build on the voluntary turnover literature by introducing new and more comprehensive models to predict turnover. Mobley’s (1977) Intermediate Linkages Model (ILM) identified the steps employees go through before committing to voluntarily leaving an organization. The model proposed that withdrawal cognitions (i.e. thoughts of quitting and benefits of withdrawing) and job-search behaviors (i.e. perceived work alternatives) are linked with job satisfaction, which is then predictive of actual turnover behavior. It is important to note that Mobley et al. (1979) were among the first scholars to recognize that non-work values, such as the need for immediate gratification and impulsivity, moderate the relationship between turnover intentions and actual turnover. Price and Mueller (1986) further extended the literature by incorporating organizational commitment into the causes of job satisfaction and voluntary turnover. Still, these models of turnover were incomplete.
In the early 1980’s researchers also began to look at how interpersonal relationships at work affect turnover. Exploring how the leader-member exchange relationship predicted turnover Graen, Liden, and Hoel (1982) found that the relationship that develops between a leader and an employee not the leadership style per se is most influential in an employee’s decision to stay with an organization. They found that the leaders-member exchange accounted for almost three times more variance in turnover than leadership style (Graen, Liden, and Hoel 1982).

The second major period in turnover research (1985-1995) shifted focus from the traditional causes, as mentioned above, to exploring contextual variables and personal conditions. Personal conditions include measures of exhaustion, stress, and well-being. Contextual variables include items such as workplace culture and pay systems, as well as person-conflict interface variables, such as perceived supervisor support (Holtom et al. 2008). For example, O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991:492) found that employees whose values (“internalized normative beliefs that can guide behavior”) did not match the organization’s values were more likely to voluntarily leave the organization with twenty months of starting; this conflict in values is often referred to as person-organization fit.

The third period of turnover research spans from 1995 to the present. This period is marked by a continuation in how individual differences and personal relationships predict turnover. During this period, many earlier models of voluntary turnover were empirically tested and expanded upon. For example, Crossley et al. (2007:1031) incorporated job embeddedness (“the combination of forces that keep a person from leaving his or her job”) into traditional turnover models. He found that job embeddedness predicted intentions to search for a new job, intentions to quit a current job, and voluntary turnover.
During this period, the effect of gender on workplace turnover gained much more attention than in previous decades. For example, Elvira and Cohen (2001) found that the gender composition of the workplace affects voluntary turnover for women, but not men. This finding was reproduced by Sacco and Schmitt (2005), who concluded the demographic make-up within work groups was associated with higher turnover rates for “misfits.”

**Job Demand-Control-Support Model**

The Job Demand-Control-Support (JDCS) model was originally created to examine how the social organization of a workplace affects physical health (a personal condition, one of the main focuses of voluntary turnover research between 1985-1995) (Karasek and Theorell 1990). Since then it has been used to examine numerous outcomes related to the well-being, including depression, distress, strain, and job satisfaction (Doef and Maes 1999). The JDCS model states that three dimensions of the work environment: job demand, job control, and social support interact, affecting physical and emotional well-being. The model has two main hypotheses, the iso-strain hypothesis and the buffer hypothesis. The iso-strain hypothesis predicts workers with high demand-low control-low social support jobs, experience the lowest levels of well-being and the highest amount of strain. The buffer hypothesis that states, in high strain jobs, social support moderates the effects of high strain on well-being outcomes (Dollard et al. 2000).

Job control is conceptualized by Karasek and Theorell (1990) as the combination of decision authority and skill discretion. Examples of decision authority are “freedom to make my own decision,” “can choose how to perform work,” and “have a lot of say on the job,” while examples of skill discretion are “job has variety,” “requires creativity,” and “repetitious job (a negative indicator)” (Karasek and Theorell 1990: 337). Job demand refers to the workload one experiences. Examples of questions used by Karasek and Theorell (1990) to measure job
demands include, “no excessive work,” “no conflicting demands,” and “have time to do work” (Karasek and Theorell 1990:337). Social support is defined as “overall levels of helpful social interactions available on the job both from co-workers and supervisors” (Karasek and Theorell 1990:69).

The significance of gender on the social support variable in the JDCS model has mixed support for a variety of different work-related outcomes. Etzion (1984) found that workplace support moderated the relationship between work stress and burnout for males, but not females. Geller and Hobfol (1994) found males and females have similar levels of social support at work (supervisors and coworkers). However, the benefits of social support were different for males and females, males had a negative relationship between both coworker and supervisor support and job-related tensions and occupational psychological distress. The only relationship between the variables for females was between supervisor support and occupational psychological distress. This finding shows that men benefit more from workplace support. Roxburgh (1996) found that women report higher levels of coworker support compared to men, however there was no gender difference between coworker social support and emotional distress. Perrewé and Carlson (2002) found that workplace social support moderated the relationship between family and workplace satisfaction only for women. Baruch-Feldman et al. (2002) found no difference in levels of perceived support from family, coworker, or supervisor for males and females traffic enforcement agents. They also found no significant relationships between social support and burnout or workplace satisfaction between males and females. Van Yperen and Hagedoorn (2003) found no gender-related effects for supervisor or coworker support on intrinsic work motivation in high demand jobs. While workplace support has been studied on multiple types of work-related outcomes, I have not found any research that looks at how sex discrimination or
sexual harassment impact retention via perceived organizational support and workplace satisfaction.

**Job Demand-Control-Support Model and the Military**

Previous tests of the JDCS model focuses on two basic types of workplace social support, that of an employee’s supervisors and coworkers (Chou and Robert 2008; Shimazu, Shimazu, and Odahara 2004). Support has been found for both supervisory support and coworker support, with mixed results indicating which type of support is most beneficial to work-related outcomes, such as burnout, satisfaction, and retention.

I will be adding to this theory by including leadership support, which I believe is conceptually different than supervisor support. In the case of the military, as in other highly bureaucratic organizations, the workplace chain of command is not as simple as the supervisors-coworker relationship. There is often a role of leader, which is usually of only slightly if at all, higher authority in the hierarchy. The function of the leader is to ensure tasks are being accomplished and organized in the most effective way, whereas the supervisor is tasked with more administrative duties. Employees will be in closer proximity to their job leaders than with their supervisors; however, job leaders have less power and overall control of employees.

The U.S. military can be characterized as a high-demand, low-control job, as military members are put in some of the most stressful work conditions (Pflanz and Sonnek 2002; Pflanz and Ogle 2006). Military members have some of the most challenging tasks and often little resources to accomplish those tasks. Service Members are often short on time to complete operational tasks and once completed, are quickly assigned new tasks. The hierarchical structure of the military certainly decreases control. Overall control of a unit is the responsibility of the commanding officer and is then delegated down the chain of command. Enlisted members have
almost no control over tasking and perhaps only modest control over methods to accomplish tasks. Given the structure of the military, social support may be the only dimension of the JDCS model that can be modified in the context of the military. Because social support may likely be the only malleable branch of the JDCS model and because of the prevalence of Service Members who experience sexual harassment or gender discrimination in the military, it is important to understand how gender-related workplace behaviors are affecting social support.

**Workplace Support**

When employees dislike an aspect of their workplace, positively perceiving workplace relationships can influence individuals’ choice to remain in that workplace (Maertz and Campion 1998). In the workplace, individuals have a higher probability of having interactions with other employees who are in close proximity and who are working with the individual toward accomplishing a specific task or goal. This type of relationship is defined as a coworker relationship. High-quality coworker relationships are those who have a set of shared expectations, revolving around obligations and supportiveness (Sherony and Green 2002). The satisfaction with coworkers that results from a high-quality relationship is an attitudinal predictor of turnover (Maertz and Campion 1998).

Interactions between employees and leadership in the workplace are often viewed in the same way at interactions between employees and supervisors (Landry and Vandenberghe 2009). However, I believe there is an important distinction between to two groups, especially from a military perspective. Supervisors in the military can be defined as having overall direction of missions and are responsible for employee evaluations, administrative work, overall responsible for the project, while leaders are intermediates between workers and supervisors, they can serve as both co-workers and supervisors, while they guide the complete of a project. This is an
important distinction because employees will have much more contact with their everyday leaders than they do their supervisors. For a leader-employee relationship to be high quality there must be mutual respect and trust. The leader must find a balance between allowing employees to be autonomous and providing assistance when it is required (Sherony and Green 2002). Gerstner and Day (1997) found that negative exchange between the leader and employee had a negative relationship with turnover intentions.

As mentioned above, there should be a distinction made between supervisors and workplace leaders. Supervisors have less daily contact with employees, while still being overall responsible for employees operationally and administratively. Supervisor satisfaction is interesting, in that studies have found that supervisors act as agents of the organization, thus supervisors represent the views of the organization (Allen and Shanock 2013). Employees often see supervisors support as interchangeable with organizational support (Eisenberger et al. 2002). Research shows that favorable attitudes toward supervisors are negatively related to turnover intentions (Eisenberger et al. 2002).
RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

The following study incorporates organizational workplace literature, as well as social psychological literature and large sample sizes from all branches of the military to explore gender factors that affect retention intentions. Based on previous literature, I tested the following hypotheses:

H1: Experiencing sex discrimination in positively related to experiencing sexual harassment.
   H1a: Females who experience sex discrimination are more likely to experience sexual harassment than males who experience sex discrimination.

H2: Sex discrimination is negatively related to perceived organizational support.
   H2a: Sex discrimination will have a larger effect on females perceived organizational support than males.

H3: Sexual harassment is negatively related to perceived organizational support.
   H3a: Sexual harassment will have a larger effect on females perceived organizational support than males.

H4: Sex discrimination will have a larger indirect effect than direct effect on retention via perceived organizational support and workplace satisfaction.

H5: Sexual harassment will have a larger indirect effect than direct effect on retention via perceived organizational support and workplace satisfaction.
METHODS

This study uses data collected by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) in their 2012 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Active Members (WGRA2012). DMDC conducts surveys “to support the personnel information needs of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (WGRA2012). The data were collected from August 17, 2012 to November 7, 2012 for a sample size of 22,792. The purpose of the survey was to collect information about military sexual harassment, survey question topics included background information about respondents, military workplace demographics, stress, gender-related experiences, unwanted sexual contact, policy, sexual assault training, reaction to sexual assaults, and prior experiences.

The population of the survey consisted of Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force members who were on active duty at the time of the survey and had at least six months of service and were below flag rank (officers ranking O-7 or above) (Defense Manpower Data Center 2013). Participants were contacted via mail and e-mail and asked to take part in a web-based survey. Single-stage, non-proportional stratified random sampling resulting in the selection of 108,478 members to participate in the survey. Member’s responses were removed if they were not on active duty at the time of the survey and if they completed less than fifty percent of the survey. Possible reasons for missing surveys include: unable to locate the participant, participant requested to be removed from survey mailing list, skipped key questions, etc, which resulted in 22,792 respondents, or 21.01%, with a weighted population of 323,102 or 23.53% (Defense Manpower Data Center 2013).
A recent study was conducted by the RAND Corporation looking at survey nonresponse in U.S. military populations (Miller and Aharoni 2015), included in their study was the dataset used for this research, the WGRA2012. They found that younger military members, ages 18-24, tend to have the lowest response rates on online military survey research. Explanations provided by the authors for the lower level of response rates include technological and situational barriers, motivational factors, trust in the confidentiality of the survey, and interest in the topic. While they did find that younger military members are less likely to response to surveys, they also found that the DMDC, which conducts many of the DoD-wide surveys, including the WGRA2012 has a particular advantage when conducting survey research. The study finds that the DMDC

“has an uncommon and advantageous position as a surveyor by maintaining extremely detailed, complete, and timely administrative data for our entire survey frames. Due to this complete sampling frame, DMDC has more extensive information regarding the characteristics of survey nonrespondents prior to conducting nonresponse analysis studies than most other survey organizations know after such studies. For the SOFS\textsuperscript{5} program, DMDC uses this thorough knowledge of nonrespondents both for statistical imputations for item-missing data and nonresponse and post-stratification weighting adjustments to compensate for unit nonresponse. Both of these procedures are specifically designed to reduce nonresponse bias in [SOFS] estimates.” (Miller and Aharoni 2015: 32).

\textbf{Data Restrictions}

The data used for this study was the public use version of the U.S. Department of Defense 2012 Workplace and Gender Relations Surveys Active duty dataset. In the public use version of the dataset most sociodemographic variables were removed or collapsed to protect respondent’s identity. While this makes controlling for common variables, such as age, race, and

\textsuperscript{5} The SOFS (U.S. Department of Defense Status of Forces Survey) is a recurring DoD survey conducted by DMDC. WGRA surveys have the same administrative data available and use the same statistical imputations for item-missing data and weighting adjustments.
SES impossible, there are enough variables to draw out important relationships between workplace support and retention intentions.
DATA ANALYSIS

Table 2 displays summary statistic information for variables including number of observations, means, standard deviations, and minimums and maximums. Table 3 displays correlations between variables. All hypotheses were tested using structural equation models in Stata 13. Gender-related hypotheses were tested using multilevel modeling techniques. Multilevel modeling allows SEM models to be simultaneously estimated for multiple groups, with the ability to constrain parameters to be equal across groups. Those estimates are then used to perform statistical tests to compare the groups.

Table 2. Summary Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Satisfaction</td>
<td>25524</td>
<td>4.178198</td>
<td>0.926556</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Satisfaction</td>
<td>24750</td>
<td>3.407859</td>
<td>0.988085</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker Satisfaction</td>
<td>25203</td>
<td>3.885371</td>
<td>0.809228</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Morale</td>
<td>25294</td>
<td>3.389499</td>
<td>1.119101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Morale</td>
<td>25354</td>
<td>3.181076</td>
<td>1.051576</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Satisfaction</td>
<td>24994</td>
<td>3.816388</td>
<td>0.978021</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Discrimination Experienced</td>
<td>27505</td>
<td>-2.32E-09</td>
<td>0.853049</td>
<td>-0.2229185</td>
<td>4.651408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment Experienced</td>
<td>27505</td>
<td>8.61E-09</td>
<td>0.785087</td>
<td>-0.3151654</td>
<td>2.420397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction with Military Life</td>
<td>25379</td>
<td>3.714764</td>
<td>1.067140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Intention</td>
<td>25412</td>
<td>3.668542</td>
<td>1.419035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Stress in Last Month</td>
<td>23673</td>
<td>2.296371</td>
<td>0.918683</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. *Correlations Among Variables Measured*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sexual Discrimination</td>
<td>0.3479*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervisor Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.2160*</td>
<td>-0.2469*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leadership Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.1983*</td>
<td>-0.2216*</td>
<td>0.5516*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coworker Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.2426*</td>
<td>-0.2151*</td>
<td>0.5486*</td>
<td>0.4866*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Person Morale Level</td>
<td>-0.2113*</td>
<td>-0.2150*</td>
<td>0.4879*</td>
<td>0.4848*</td>
<td>0.5181*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perceived Unit Morale</td>
<td>-0.2065*</td>
<td>-0.1912*</td>
<td>0.4422*</td>
<td>0.4672*</td>
<td>0.5333*</td>
<td>0.7044*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Workplace Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.1554*</td>
<td>-0.1665*</td>
<td>0.4382*</td>
<td>0.4053*</td>
<td>0.4849*</td>
<td>0.6254*</td>
<td>0.4995*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Retention Intention</td>
<td>-0.1604*</td>
<td>-0.1343*</td>
<td>0.2637*</td>
<td>0.2924*</td>
<td>0.2728*</td>
<td>0.4576*</td>
<td>0.3329*</td>
<td>0.4154*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Overall Satisfaction with Military Life</td>
<td>-0.1955*</td>
<td>-0.1731*</td>
<td>0.3283*</td>
<td>0.3478*</td>
<td>0.3584*</td>
<td>0.5262*</td>
<td>0.4074*</td>
<td>0.4792*</td>
<td>0.6686*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Stress Level in Last Month</td>
<td>0.2304*</td>
<td>0.1685*</td>
<td>-0.3147*</td>
<td>-0.3752*</td>
<td>-0.3666*</td>
<td>-0.5027*</td>
<td>-0.3716*</td>
<td>-0.3798*</td>
<td>-0.3276*</td>
<td>-0.4233*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.001
Expected retention was the primary dependent variable. The exogenous variables used to explain retention include sex discrimination and sexual harassment. Other endogenous variables used to moderate the influences of the exogenous variables on the dependent variable included perceived organizational support and overall workplace satisfaction. All constructs were created and tested using confirmatory factor analyses.

Measurement Models

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to analyze the relationships between the latent constructs and their observed indicators. The indicators were selected with regards to theory and their statistical properties. For example, all indicators are on the same Likert scale (1-5, where 1 is lowest possible and 5 is highest possible). See Appendix 1 (pp 49-31) for a complete description of indicator variables.

Because the WGRA 2012 dataset is cross-sectional there was no follow up to see if the respondents left the military. Consequently, I used their intention to reenlist (expected retention) as the next best measure of attrition. Three indicator variables compose expected retention: (1) overall satisfaction with military life, (2) intention to reenlist, and (3) stress level in the month prior to taking the survey. In addition to using CFA to assess reliability, I also used Cronbach’s alpha. The whole sample’s alpha for expected retention was an acceptable 0.78 (Kline 2011). Examined separately, the alpha was 0.78 for both males and females.

Perceived organization support has three indicator variables: satisfaction with (1) supervisors, (2) leaders, and (3) coworkers. Supervisor satisfaction reflects the level of agreement that supervisors are trustworthy, equitable, fair in their evaluations, and fair in delegating assignments. Leadership satisfaction was defined as the level of satisfaction that respondents had with their work groups’ leaders’ commitment to quality work, promoting a
positive work environment, and promoting respondents’ well-being. Coworker satisfaction was defined as satisfaction with coworkers’ work effort, work group compatibility, and willingness to help others. The overall alpha for perceived organization support was an acceptable 0.77. Examined separately, the alpha was 0.74 for males and 0.78 for females, both of which fall into the acceptable range.

Workplace satisfaction is comprised of: (1) personal morale level, (2) perceived unit morale level, and (3) intrinsic work values. Both personal morale and perceived unit morale are single-item variables which range from very low (1) to very high (5). Unit satisfaction is a composite variable created by the original researchers to measure intrinsic work values. The public use data set does not include disaggregated items of this variable. Questions used to measure intrinsic work values include, your work provide you with a sense of pride, you make good use of your skills, you like the kind of work you do, you are satisfied with your job as a whole. The overall workplace satisfaction alpha was a very good 0.83. Broken down by gender the alphas were 0.83 for males and 0.81 for females.

**Theoretical Model**

Now turning to the theoretical model presented in Figure 1, the circles and their corresponding Greek letters are the error terms, rectangles signify observed variables or indicators, and oblong circles signify latent variables. The predicted direction of the strength of a path is signified by a plus (+) or minus (-). Maximum likelihood estimation as used to approximate each parameter (Acock 2013).

Modifications to the model were made guided by theory and previous literature. Covariance paths improve on the model by accounting for influential variables that is shared by two measured variables that is not present in the model. A covariance path was added between
the errors of supervisor satisfaction and leadership satisfaction because in the military structure supervisors can also be project leaders. A path was added between leadership satisfaction and coworker satisfaction because coworkers can also be project leaders. The supervisor-leader and leader-coworker are two of the many complexities in the military hierarchy. A covariance path was added between personal morale and perceived unit morale to account for variables that

Figure 1. Conceptual model of Sex discrimination, sexual harassment, perceived organizational support, workplace satisfaction, and retention in the U.S. Military for active duty Service Members.
affect an individual's perception of their own moral and their perception of how they perceive others moral, an example of such a variable would be OPTEMPO (the rate of military actions or operations, including strategic, tactical, service, training, or administrative missions) (Adler, Bartone, and Castro 1997). A covariance path was added between workplace satisfaction and perceived unit morale, as previous research has shown organizational climates to be a key factor in job satisfaction (Jyoti 2013). A covariance path was added between overall satisfaction with military life and intention to reenlist, variables relating to the family, such as base facilities, including childcare or schools may play a role for both variables but cannot be modeling in my analysis. The final covariate path was added between intention to reenlist and stress over the past month. Both stress and intention to reenlist could be effects by variables such as knowledge of upcoming deployments or duty stations outside the United States. Re-estimation of the model produced similar coefficients in the same directions.
FINDINGS

The fit statistics for the final multi-group model indicate a satisfactory fit between the proposed (theoretical) model and the input data from the 2012 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Active Members dataset. The model’s $\chi^2 = 2225.81$ with 75 degrees of freedom, $p < 0.001$ is expected due to the very large sample size $n=22,902$ and the fact that the model is just identified.

The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), a measurement of the amount of error per each degree of freedom, is 0.05, well below the standard threshold of 0.07 indicating a good fit. The confirmatory fit index (CFI) of 0.98 indicates that this model performs 98% better than a null model, which indicates an excellent fit (Byrne 1994). The standardized root mean residual (SRMR) measures how well the model would fit the population's covariance matrix. The SRMR for my model is 0.03, which is well below the recommended value of 0.08. The confident of determinate (CD) is .18, which means that 18.0% of the variation in retention can be explained by variables included in the model. While is 18.0% is normally not considered to be an excellent or even good value for the overall R-square, it does provide a good portion of explanation for a very complicated life decision, whether or not to leave the military. The secondary data provided in the WGRA2012 public use dataset does not allow for modeling other predictors of retention, such as marital status, age, dual military families, the number of children, etc., which undoubtedly play a role in voluntary turnover decisions.
A $\chi^2$-to-degrees-of-freedom difference test was used to assess whether significant gender differences were found for specific paths. This was accomplished by constraining one path to be equal for both males and females, while the rest of the paths were estimated freely, then accessing significance resulting from the $\chi^2_{d}/$degrees-of-freedom (df) ratio (Shippee and Owens 2011).

Standardized coefficients are presented in Figure 2, as well as Table 4. The experienced sex discrimination-to-experienced sexual harassment path ($a_4$) was positive and significant for both males and females and significantly different from each other ($\beta = 0.14$ and 0.33, respectfully; $p < 0.001; a_4$). The proposition that experiencing sex discrimination in positively related to experiencing sexual harassment, hypothesis 1 and 1a ($a_1$) was confirmed. Coefficients for both males and females were significant at the $p < 0.01$, providing support for hypothesis 1. Overall experiencing sex discrimination in the military is positively related to experiencing sexual harassment. This is consistent with previous research that’s links sex discrimination to sexual harassment (Antecol, Barcus, and Cobb-Clark 2009), as well as provides support for the idea of the continuum of harm (U.S. Department of Defense 2014a), a concept that is used in the military to prevent sexual assault. I also found support for hypothesis 1a, females who experience sex discrimination are more likely to experience sexual harassment than males who experience sex discrimination. Path $a_1$ had a larger coefficient for females and is statistically different for males and females.

The experienced sex discrimination-to-perceived organizational support path ($a_1$) was significant and negative for both males and females. Further group testing showed that the strength of the relationship is significantly stronger for females than for males ($\beta = -0.28$ and
-0.13, respectfully; \( p < .001; a_1 \)). In short, Service Members who reported experiencing sexual discrimination were more likely to report lower perceived organizational support, especially for females. Turning to Hypothesis 2 \((a_1)\), sex discrimination is negatively related to perceived
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**Figure 2.** Standardized structural parameter estimates of Sex discrimination, sexual harassment, perceived organizational support, workplace satisfaction, and retention in the U.S. Military for active duty Service Members grouped by sex. Underlined=men, Italicized=women. * \( p < 0.05 \), ** \( p < 0.01 \), and *** \( p < 0.001 \).
Table 4. *Parameter Estimates for Paths among Exogenous and Endogenous Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paths</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Standard Coefficient</th>
<th>Gender Comparison</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exogenous to Endogenous Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Discrimination → Perceived</td>
<td>a₁</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Discrimination → Retention</td>
<td>a₂</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Discrimination → Workplace</td>
<td>a₃</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Discrimination → Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>a₄</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endogenous Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment → Perceived</td>
<td>b₁</td>
<td>-0.34*</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment → Retention</td>
<td>b₂</td>
<td>-0.11*</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06*</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment → Workplace Satisfaction</td>
<td>b₃</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support → Retention</td>
<td>c₁</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.08*</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support →</td>
<td>c₂</td>
<td>1.27*</td>
<td>1.14*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.82*</td>
<td>0.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Retention</td>
<td>d₁</td>
<td>0.71*</td>
<td>0.79*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.98*</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goodness of Fit Measures

- $\chi^2$ = 2225.81
- df = 75
- CFI = 0.98
- RMSEA = 0.05
- SRMR = 0.03
- CD = 0.18

* < .05
organizational support. I found support for hypothesis 2 in both males and females, both coefficients were negative and significant at $p < 0.01$. This finding indicates that both males and female’s experiencing sex discrimination in the military reduces perceived organizational support. I also found support for hypothesis 2a, sex discrimination will have a larger effect on female’s perceived organizational support than males. The coefficients for males and females for path $a_1$ were significantly different from each other at $p < 0.05$. This finding indicates that sex discrimination has a larger effect on female’s perceived organizational support than males perceived organizational support.

The experienced sex discrimination-to-expected retention path ($a_2$) was significant, and negative for females only ($\beta = -0.04$, $p < 0.001$; $a_2$). This indicates that experienced sex discrimination has a very modest though significant deleterious effect on expected retention—but only for women. The experienced sex discrimination-to-workplace satisfaction path ($a_3$) was significant not significant for males or females. Further examination of the indirect paths to expected retention (paths $a_3$ to $d_1$; $a_1$ to $c_1$) is warranted. I address this issue below.

Moving to sexual harassments direct paths, the experienced sexual harassment-to-perceived organizational support path ($b_1$) was significant and negative for both males and females ($\beta = -0.22$ and -0.23, respectfully; $p < 0.001$; $b_1$). Furthermore, males and female’s coefficients are significantly different at $p < 0.001$. This evidence supports hypothesis 3 ($b_1$), sexual harassment is negatively related to perceived organizational support. Findings indicated that both male’s and female’s coefficients were negative and significant at $p < 0.01$, suggesting that experiencing sexual harassment in the military reduces perceived organizational support. I also found support for hypothesis 3a, sexual harassment will have a larger effect on female’s perceived organizational support than males. Male’s and female’s coefficients for path $b_1$ were
significantly different from each other, with the coefficient for females being larger than the coefficient for males. This indicates that experiencing sexual harassment has a greater impact on female’s perceived organizational support than male’s perceived organizational support. The experienced sexual harassment-to-expected retention path \((b_3)\) was significant and negative for both males and females \((\beta = -0.06 \text{ and } -0.13, \text{ respectfully; } p < 0.001; b_3)\) however, the strength of the association was not significantly different for males and females. The final direct path for experienced sexual harassment-to-workplace satisfaction \((b_2)\) is only significant for males \((\beta = -0.03, p < 0.05; b_2)\).

Turning to the middle of Figure 2, the perceived organizational support-to-workplace satisfaction path \((c_2)\) was significant and positive for both males and females \((\beta = 0.82 \text{ and } 0.85, \text{ respectfully; } p < 0.001; c_2)\), the strength of the association was also very strong for both genders. Furthermore, the strength of the association is stronger for females than for males. This indicates that how individuals perceived support in their workplace has a large effect on their workplace satisfaction levels, especially for females. The perceived organization support-to-expected retention path \((c_1)\) is significant and negative for both males and females \((\beta = -0.08 \text{ and } -0.20, p < 0.05 \text{ and } 0.001; c_1)\). This finding shows that perceived organizational support has a bigger impact on expected retention for females than males. The last direct path in the model is the workplace satisfaction-to expected retention path \((d_1)\). Both coefficients were significant and positive for both genders \((\beta = 0.98 \text{ and } 1.00, p < 0.001; d_1)\) as well as significantly different for males and females. This echoes previous literature that had linked workplace satisfaction to expected retention (March and Simon 1958; Price and Mueller 1986).

Moving to indirect paths effects, see Table 5 for indirect path’s coefficients and \(p\)-values. Experienced sexual discrimination does not have a direct effect on expected retention for males
Table 5. Indirect Effects on Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficient</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex Discrimination → Perceived Organizational Support → Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex Discrimination → Perceived Organizational Support → Workplace Satisfaction → Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex Discrimination → Sexual Harassment Perceived Organizational Support → Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex Discrimination → Sexual Harassment → Workplace Satisfaction → Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex Discrimination → Sexual Harassment → Perceived Organizational Support → Workplace Satisfaction → Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex Discrimination → Workplace Satisfaction → Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Harassment → Perceived Organizational Support → Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Harassment → Perceived Organizational Support → Workplace Satisfaction → Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Harassment → Workplace Satisfaction → Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(β = -0.01, \( p > 0.10 \)) and only a small effect for females (β = -0.04, \( p < 0.01 \)). However, all indirect paths from \textit{sex discrimination} \rightarrow \textit{expected retention} that go through the \textit{perceived organizational support variable} are significant for both males and females at \( p < .05 \). The indirect path \textit{sex discrimination} \rightarrow \textit{sexual harassment} \rightarrow \textit{workplace satisfaction} \rightarrow \textit{expected retention} is significant only for males (β = 0.004, \( p < 0.05 \)). The indirect path \textit{sex discrimination} \rightarrow \textit{workplace satisfaction} \rightarrow \textit{expected retention} is not significant for males or females. These indirect paths indicate that sex discrimination, without also experiencing sexual harassment, affects retention through \textit{perceived organization support}, as opposed to having a direct effect on retention or an indirect effect through workplace satisfaction. Regarding sex discrimination’s indirect effect on retention (hypothesis 4; \( a,c, \) and \( d \) paths). Support for hypothesis 4 was found by examining the direct and indirect effects coefficients presented in Table 6. The direct effect of sex discrimination on retention is not significant for males and has a very weak coefficient for females, while the indirect effect and total effect are both significant and have substantially larger coefficients. This finding indicates that sex discrimination affects retention indirectly through sexual harassment, perceived organizational support, and workplace satisfaction, as opposed to directly.

Moving from \textit{experienced sexual discrimination} to \textit{experienced sexual harassment}. Both indirect effect paths from \textit{experienced sexual harassment} \rightarrow \textit{expected retention} that go through the \textit{perceived organizational support variable} are significant for both males and females at \( p < 0.05 \). However, the indirect path \textit{sexual harassment} \rightarrow \textit{workplace satisfaction} \rightarrow \textit{expected retention} is significant for only males (β = -0.028, \( p < 0.001 \)). This finding demonstrates that experiencing sexual harassment only has an indirect effect for females when passing through \textit{perceived organizational support}. Finally looking at sexual harassment’s indirect effect on
Table 6. Standardized Effects for SEM Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Total Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Organizational Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Discrimination $\rightarrow$ Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-0.13***</td>
<td>-0.03***</td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-0.28***</td>
<td>-0.07***</td>
<td>-0.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment $\rightarrow$ Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-0.22***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-0.23***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Harassment at Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Discrimination $\rightarrow$ Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>0.14***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.13***</td>
<td>-0.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.31***</td>
<td>-0.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workplace Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Discrimination $\rightarrow$ Workplace Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.82***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.82***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0.85***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.85***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support $\rightarrow$ Workplace Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.03***</td>
<td>-0.18***</td>
<td>-0.15***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.19***</td>
<td>-0.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Discrimination $\rightarrow$ Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.13***</td>
<td>-0.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-0.04***</td>
<td>-0.27***</td>
<td>-0.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support $\rightarrow$ Retention</td>
<td>-0.08**</td>
<td>0.80***</td>
<td>0.72***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-0.20***</td>
<td>0.84***</td>
<td>0.64***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0.98***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.98***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Satisfaction $\rightarrow$ Retention</td>
<td>1.00***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-0.06***</td>
<td>-0.13***</td>
<td>-0.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-0.13***</td>
<td>-0.16***</td>
<td>-0.29***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, and ***p < 0.001.*
retention, (hypothesis 5; b,c, and d paths), I found partial support for this hypothesis. For males, the indirect and direct effects were both significant \((p < 0.01)\). The indirect effect was larger than the direct effect, indicating that the indirect effect of sexual harassment on retention is greater. For females both the direct and indirect effects are significant, however, the indirect effect and direct effect are similar in magnitude. This finding indicates that indirect and direct effects of sexual harassment on retention are equally important in predicting retention for females. The significance of individual indirect paths also provides partial support for hypothesis 5. The indirect path \(sexual harassment \rightarrow workplace satisfaction \rightarrow expected retention\) is only significant for males, indicating that experiencing sexual harassment only effects expected retention for females when the path includes perceived organizational support.
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

What does this analysis add to our understanding of retention in the military? By looking at factors such as sex discrimination and sexual harassment, my analysis confirms the importance of these types of behaviors in retention decisions. The key findings indicate that sex discrimination for males and females and sexual harassment for males work indirectly through perceived organizational support and workplace satisfaction to affect retention and indirectly through perceived organizational support for females. A second important finding is that sex discrimination is positively related to sexual harassment. This means that Service Members who experience sex discrimination are more likely to experience sexual harassment. This finding reiterates the importance of maintaining an environment free of sex discrimination as a prevention method for sexual harassment and sexual assault.

In conclusion, my study began with the idea that sex discrimination and sexual harassment affect retention decisions of military members indirectly through perceived organizational support and workplace satisfaction. Five hypotheses, with three gender-related sub-hypotheses were tested in this paper, using a sample of U.S. active duty Service Members to conduct a multi-group structural equation model. Support was found for hypotheses 1 through 4 and partial support was found for hypothesis 5.

My study supports findings in pervious turnover literature (Shaffer, et al. 2000; Mueller, De Coster, and Estes 2001; Antecol, Barcus, and Cobb-Clark 2009; Glomb et al. 1999) that both sex discrimination and sexual harassment are negatively associated with workplace satisfaction and negatively associated with retention.
The above analysis also adds to the previous literature concerning the support aspect of Karasek and Theorell’s (1990) Job Demand-Control-Support model. Previous studies that have examined social support in the workplace have focused solely on job-related outcomes related to perceived organizational support, such as workplace satisfaction, burnout, stress levels, and retention (Doef and Maes 1999). My study goes beyond the outcomes of perceived organizational support by examining how sex discrimination and sexual harassment impact perceived organizational support, and in turn how perceived organizational support then affects retention.

Finding presented in the study also add to the literature on the significance of gender in the perceptions of organizational support. Previous studies have found mixed results for the significance of gender on social support’s effect on workplace outcomes. Previous studies have found a relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace outcomes for only males (Etzion 1984), only females (Perrewé and Carlson 2002), different types of social support matter differently for males and females (Geller and Hobfol 2004), and no gender difference in the relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace outcome (Roxburgh 1996; Baruch-Feldman et al. 2002; Hagedoorn 2003). My research adds to this body of literature by examining the indirect effects of perceived organizational support. My research found a relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace satisfaction for both males and females, with females benefiting significantly more than males.

My findings lend credit to the larger argument presented in this paper, sex discrimination and sexual harassment are costly to organizations in terms of voluntary retention. Service Members in the United States military are seen as an investment; they are trained to use and maintain highly sophisticated equipment and acquire unique skills throughout their military
training. When Service Members experience sex discrimination and/or sexual harassment they are less likely to remain in the military and become a loss that could have been prevented. Knowing the impact that such experiences have on retention allows policy makers to focus in on problematic behavior and organizational climates, to create targeted strategies to prevent instances of Sex discrimination and harassment from happening in the workplace. Past research has examined the relationship between levels of satisfaction with different workplace positions, but no research to date has collectively examined how co-worker, leader, and supervisor satisfaction levels predict voluntary turnover intentions.

**Limitations**

Surveys are not without their weaknesses; especially using secondary survey data to analysis. One limitation of the survey method is that they are subject to reactivity, such as respondents giving what they perceive as the socially acceptable answers. The inability to directly observe respondents’ behavior and motives for decision-making is also a weakness of survey research. Participants may lie about or not accurately remember answers to questions on the survey. The WGRA2012 dataset is a cross-sectional measure of respondent’s behaviors and motives; this presents a challenge in explaining changing motivations across the lifespan for making career decisions (Singleton and Straits 2010).

The DMDC data were collected for the specific purpose of analyzing sexual assault in the military. Because of the special purpose of the dataset relatively few survey questions were asked pertaining to job satisfaction and general organizational support attitudes. A dataset tailored to workplace satisfaction, perceived organizational support, sex discrimination and sexual harassment would be indispensable in furthering research on the causal mechanisms affecting retention. Another limitation of the WGRA2012 dataset is that it is a public release.
version. The public release version of the dataset collapses many variables and leaves many others completing out. Variables such as age, ethnicity, and marital status are not included in the public release version, which would have greatly enhanced my research.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX 1

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES FOR VARIABLES IN PROPOSED STRUCTURAL MODEL
### Appendix 1

**Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges for Variables in Proposed Structural Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Items</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Factor 1: Sexual Harassment**  
SEXATTN - How often in the past 12 months has someone in your work place…  
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?  
Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said "No"?  
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?  
Intentionally cornered you or leaned over you in a sexual way?  
SEXHAR - How often in the past 12 months has someone in your work place…  
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?  
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (e.g., attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)?  
Made offensive marks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?  
Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior?  
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (e.g., by mentioning an upcoming review)?  
Treated you badly for refusing to have sex?  
Implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative? | 1.12 | 0.32 | 0.71 | 0.87 |

1 = Did not experience  
2 = Experienced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Items</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Factor 1: Sexual Harassment**  
SEXATTN - How often in the past 12 months has someone in your work place…  
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?  
Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said "No"?  
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?  
Intentionally cornered you or leaned over you in a sexual way?  
SEXHAR - How often in the past 12 months has someone in your work place…  
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?  
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (e.g., attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)?  
Made offensive marks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?  
Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior?  
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (e.g., by mentioning an upcoming review)?  
Treated you badly for refusing to have sex?  
Implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative? | 1.11 | 0.32 | 0.82 | 0.87 |

1 = Did not experience  
2 = Experienced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Items</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Factor 1: Sexual Harassment**  
SEXATTN - How often in the past 12 months has someone in your work place…  
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?  
Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said "No"?  
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?  
Intentionally cornered you or leaned over you in a sexual way?  
SEXHAR - How often in the past 12 months has someone in your work place…  
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?  
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (e.g., attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)?  
Made offensive marks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?  
Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior?  
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (e.g., by mentioning an upcoming review)?  
Treated you badly for refusing to have sex?  
Implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative? | 1.11 | 0.32 | 0.82 | 0.87 |

1 = Did not experience  
2 = Experienced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Items</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Factor 1: Sexual Harassment**  
SEXATTN - How often in the past 12 months has someone in your work place…  
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?  
Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said "No"?  
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?  
Intentionally cornered you or leaned over you in a sexual way?  
SEXHAR - How often in the past 12 months has someone in your work place…  
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?  
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (e.g., attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)?  
Made offensive marks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?  
Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior?  
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (e.g., by mentioning an upcoming review)?  
Treated you badly for refusing to have sex?  
Implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative? | 1.11 | 0.32 | 0.82 | 0.87 |

1 = Did not experience  
2 = Experienced
Factors and Items | Range | Mean | S.D. | Factor Loading | α
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
GENBEHS - How often in the past 12 months has someone in your work place… | 1 - 5 | 1.09 | 0.43 | 0.68 |
Other unwanted gender-related behavior? | (1 Never, 5 Very Often) | 1 = Did not experience | 1 = Did not experience | 1.04 | 0.19 | 0.82 |
Factor 2: Sex Based Discrimination
ASGN - During the past 12 months, did any of the following happen to you? If it did, do you believe your gender was a factor?
Your current military assignment has not made use of your job skills.
Your current assignment is not good for your career if you continue in the military.
You did not receive day-to-day, short-term tasks in your military job that would have helped you prepare for advancement.
You did not get a military job assignment that you wanted and for which you were qualified.
CAR - During the past 12 months, did any of the following happen to you? If it did, do you believe your gender was a factor?
You did not have a professional relationship with someone who advised (mentored) you on military career development or advancement.
You did not learn until it was too late of opportunities that would have helped your military career.
You were unable to get straight answers about your military promotion possibilities.
You were excluded from social events important to military career development and being kept informed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Items</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEXDISC - During the past 12 months, did any of the following happen to you? If it did, do you believe your gender was a factor?</td>
<td>1 = Did not experience</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You were rated lower than you deserved on your last military evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your last military evaluation contained unjustified negative comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You were held to a higher performance standard than others in your military job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You did not get a military award or decoration given to others in similar circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you had any other adverse personnel actions in the past 12 months?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3: Perceived Organizational Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPSAT - How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your supervisor?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You trust your supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your supervisor ensures that all assigned personnel are treated fairly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is very little conflict between your supervisor and the people who report to him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your supervisor evaluates your work performance fairly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your supervisor assigns work fairly in your work group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are satisfied with the direction/supervision you receive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 1 - 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 strongly disagree, 5 strongly agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors and Items</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Factor Loading</td>
<td>α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEADERSAT</strong> - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your work group?</td>
<td>Scale 1 - 5 (1 strongly disagree, 5 strongly agree)</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you make a request through channels in your work group, you know somebody will listen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leaders in your work group are more interested in looking good than being good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You would go for help with a personal problem to people in your chain of command.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leaders in your work group are not concerned with the way Service members treat each other as long as the job gets done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are impressed with the quality of leadership in your work group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leaders in your work group are more interested in furthering their careers than in the well-being of their Service members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CWORKSAT</strong> - How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the people in your work group?</td>
<td>Scale 1 - 5 (1 strongly disagree, 5 strongly agree)</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is very little conflict among your coworkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your coworkers put in the effort required for their jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people in your work group tend to get along.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people in your work group are willing to help each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are satisfied with the relationships you have with your coworkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 4: Workplace Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MORALEA</strong> - Overall, how would you rate your current level of morale?</td>
<td>1 - 5 (1 very low, 5 very high)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MORALEB</strong> - Overall, how would you rate the current level of morale in your unit?</td>
<td>1 - 5 (1 very low, 5 very high)</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors and Items</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Factor Loading</td>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKSAT - How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the work you do at your workplace?</td>
<td>Scale 1 - 5 (1 strongly disagree, 5 strongly agree)</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your work provides you with a sense of pride.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your work makes good use of your skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You like the kind of work you do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your job gives you the chance to acquire valuable skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are satisfied with your job as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your day-to-day work is directly tied to your wartime job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5: Expected Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETINT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppose that you have to decide whether to stay on active duty. Assuming you could stay, how likely is it that you would choose to do so?</td>
<td>1 - 5 (1 very unlikely, 5 very likely)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATOVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how satisfied are you with the military way of life?</td>
<td>Scale 1 - 5 (1 very dissatisfied, 5 Very satisfied)</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt nervous and stressed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt that things were going your way?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found that you could not cope with all of the things you had to do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been able to control irritations in your life?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt that you were on top of things?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been angered because of things that were outside of your control?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

SURVEY QUESTIONS FROM 2012 WORKPLACE AND GENDER RELATIONS SURVEY OF ACTIVE MEMBERS
Appendix 2. Survey Questions from 2012 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Active Members

**Sexual Discrimination**

During the past 12 months, did any of the following happen to you? If it did, do you believe your gender factor? Mark one answer for each item.

a. You were rated lower than you deserved on your last military evaluation.
b. Your last military evaluation contained unjustified negative comments.
c. You were held to a higher performance standard than others in your military job.
d. You did not get a military award or decoration given to others in similar circumstances.
e. Your current military assignment has not made use of your job skills.
f. Your current assignment is not good for your career if you continue in the military.
   You did not receive day-to-day, short-term tasks in your military job that would have helped you advance.
  g. You did not have a professional relationship with someone who advised (mentored) you on military development or advancement.
  h. You did not learn until it was too late of opportunities that would have helped your military career.
  i. You were unable to get straight answers about your military promotion possibilities.
  j. You were excluded from social events important to military career development and being kept in the loop.
  k. You did not get a military job assignment that you wanted and for which you were qualified.
m. Have you had any other adverse personnel actions in the past 12 months?
   Possible Answers
   3 No, or does not apply
   2 Yes, but your gender was NOT a factor
   1 Yes, and your gender was a factor

Do you consider ANY of the behaviors which you marked as happening to you in the previous questions to have been... Mark one answer for each item.

a. Sex discrimination?
   Possible Answers
   1 None
   2 Some
   3 All
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Sexual Harassment

How often during the past 12 months have you been in situations involving Military Personnel (Activ Guard/Reserve)
on- or off-duty
on- or off-installation or ship; and/or
DoD/Service Civilian Employees and/or Contractors
in your workplace or on your installation/ship
where one or more of these individuals (of either gender)... Mark one answer for each item.
a. Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?
   Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (e.g., attempted to disc:
   life)?
c. Made offensive and/or non-sexual comments about your appearance or body?
d. Made offensive sexist remarks (e.g., suggesting that people of your gender are not suited for the ki
   g. Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic relationship with you despite your efforts?
h. Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said "No"?
   Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage
   k. Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (e.g., by
   l. Review)?
m. Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?
   Intentionally cornered you or leaned over you in a sexual way?
o. Treated you badly for refusing to have sex?
p. Implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative?
   Possible Answers
   1 Never
   2 Once or twice
   3 Sometimes
   4 Often
   5 Very Often

   How many of these behaviors that you marked as happening to you, do you consider to have been se

   Possible Answers
   1 None were sexual harassment
   2 Some were sexual harassment; some were not sexual harassment
   3 All were sexual harassment
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**Supervisor Satisfaction**
How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your supervisor? Mark one answer for each statement.

a. You trust your supervisor.

b. Your supervisor ensures that all assigned personnel are treated fairly.

c. There is very little conflict between your supervisor and the people who report to him/her.

d. Your supervisor evaluates your work performance fairly.

e. Your supervisor assigns work fairly in your work group.

f. You are satisfied with the direction/supervision you receive.

Possible Answers
5 Strongly agree
4 Agree
3 Neither agree or disagree
2 Disagree
1 Strongly disagree

**Leader Satisfaction**
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your work group? Mark one answer for each statement.

b. The leaders in your work group are more interested in looking good than being good.

c. You would go for help with a personal problem to people in your chain of command.

The leaders in your work group are not concerned with the way Service members treat each other
d. as the job gets done.

The leaders in your work group are more interested in furthering their careers than in the well-being

f. Service members.

Possible Answers
5 Strongly agree
4 Agree
3 Neither agree or disagree
2 Disagree
1 Strongly disagree

**Coworker Satisfaction**
How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the people in your work group? Mark one answer for each statement.

a. There is very little conflict among your coworkers.

b. Your coworkers put in the effort required for their jobs.

c. The people in your workgroup tend to get along.

d. The people in your work group are willing to help each other.

e. You are satisfied with the relationships you have with your coworkers.

Possible Answers
5 Strongly agree
4 Agree
3 Neither agree or disagree
2 Disagree
1 Strongly disagree
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**Personal Morale**
Overall, how would you rate... Mark one answer for each item.

a. Your current level of morale?
   Possible Answers
   - 5 Very high
   - 4 High
   - 3 Moderate
   - 2 Low
   - 1 Very low

**Unit Morale**
Overall, how would you rate... Mark one answer for each item.

b. The current level of morale in your 1
   Possible Answers
   - 5 Very high
   - 4 High
   - 3 Moderate
   - 2 Low
   - 1 Very low

**Workplace Satisfaction**
How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the work you do at your work?
Mark one answer for each statement.

a. Your work provides you with a sense of pride.
   b. Your work makes good use of your skills.
   c. You like the kind of work you do.
   d. Your job gives you the chance to acquire valuable skills.
   e. You are satisfied with your job as a whole.
   Possible Answers
   - 5 Strongly agree
   - 4 Agree
   - 3 Neither agree or disagree
   - 2 Disagree
   - 1 Strongly disagree

**Overall Satisfaction with Military Life**
Overall, how satisfied are you with the military way of life?
Possible Answers
   - 5 Very Satisfied
   - 4 Satisfied
   - 3 Neither satisfied or dissatisfied
   - 2 Dissatisfied
   - 1 Very dissatisfied
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Retention Intention
Suppose that you have to decide whether to stay on active duty. Assuming you could stay, how likely would you choose to do so?
Possible Answers
5 Very likely
4 Likely
3 Neither likely nor unlikely
2 Unlikely
1 Very unlikely

Stress in the Prior Month
In the past month, how often have you... Mark one answer for each item.
a. Been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?
b. Felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?
c. Felt nervous and stressed?
d. Felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?
e. Felt that things were going your way?
f. Found that you could not cope with all of the things you had to do?
g. Been able to control irritations in your life?
h. Felt that you were on top of things?
i. Been angered because of things that were outside of your control?
j. Felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?
Possible Answers
1 Never
2 Almost Never
3 Sometimes
4 Fairly Often
5 Very Often