



# DND Your-Say Survey

## *Research Proposal*

Irina Goldenberg  
*Civilian Personnel Research and Analysis  
Personnel and Family Support Research*

DGMPRA TM 2009-021  
November 2009

Defence R&D Canada  
Director General Military Personnel Research & Analysis

Chief Military Personnel

# **DND Your-Say Survey**

*Research Proposal*

Irina Goldenberg  
Civilian Personnel Research and Analysis  
Personnel and Family Support Research

**Director General Military Personnel Research & Analysis**

Technical Memorandum

DGMPRA TM 2009-021

November 2009

Author

**(Original signed by)**

---

Irina Goldenberg, PhD

Approved by

**(Original signed by)**

---

Catherine Campbell, MASc

Section Head – Personnel and Family Support Research

Approved for release by

**(Original signed by)**

---

Kelly Farley, PhD

Chief Scientist – Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis

The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as the official position of the Canadian Forces, nor of the Department of National Defence.

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of National Defence, 2009.

© Sa Majesté la Reine (en droit du Canada), telle que représentée par le ministre de la Défense nationale, 2009.

## Abstract

---

Today, employee surveys are a common management tool in successful organizations. As such, implementation of the *DND Your-Say Survey* is proposed with the intention of providing Assistant Deputy Minister (Human Resources – Civilian) (ADM (HR-Civ)) with empirical information on key personnel issues in an effort to help inform human resource planning and policy development. This paper outlines the purposes of the *DND Your-Say Survey*, summarizes the research on the increased use of employee surveys in recent years, describes the regularly-administered employee surveys used in Chief Military Personnel (CMP) and in the U.S., U.K., and Australia, and explains the benefits of the *DND Your-Say Survey* over and above the *Public Service Employee Survey*. Methodology, including survey and model development, sampling, and procedure are outlined.

## Résumé

---

De nos jours, les sondages auprès des employés sont des outils de gestion courants dans les organisations prospères. À ce titre, la mise en œuvre de l'enquête « À vous la parole » du MDN a été proposée dans le but de fournir au Sous-ministre adjoint (Ressources humaines – Civils) (SMA(RH-Civ)) des données empiriques sur les principales questions liées au personnel afin de contribuer à la planification des ressources humaines et à l'élaboration de politiques. Dans cet article, on décrit brièvement les objectifs de l'enquête « À vous la parole » du MDN, on propose un résumé des recherches sur le recours accru aux sondages auprès des employés au cours des dernières années, on décrit les sondages auprès des employés couramment utilisés par le Chef du personnel militaire (CPM) ainsi qu'aux États-Unis, au Royaume-Uni et en Australie et on explique les avantages de l'enquête « À vous la parole » du MDN en plus du Sondage auprès des fonctionnaires fédéraux. On y donne un aperçu de la méthodologie, incluant l'élaboration de l'enquête et du modèle, l'échantillonnage et la procédure.

This page intentionally left blank.

## Executive summary

---

### DND Your-Say Survey: Research Proposal

**Irina Goldenberg; DGMPPRA TM 2009-021; Defence R&D Canada – DGMPPRA; November 2009.**

Employee surveys are increasingly seen as integral to good human resource management practice (Schuler & Jackson, 1999), and research into their use indicates that many organizations in both the private and public sectors now undertake annual employee surveys as a matter of course. As such, the *DND Your-Say Survey* is intended to provide ADM (HR-Civ) with empirical information on key personnel issues in an effort to help inform human resources planning and policy development.

Regularly administered employee surveys are not new to the Canadian Forces (CF). Chief Military Personnel (CMP) regularly administers several standardized and well-validated employee surveys to provide information on key personnel issues, including the *CF Your-Say Regular Forces Survey* used to obtain information about Canadian Forces members attitudes and opinions across a wide spectrum of human resource issues; the *CF Retention Survey*, used to explore work and non-work related factors that affect the retention of CF personnel; and the *Unit Morale Profile (UMP)*, used to provide information to Commanding Officers by evaluating the attitudes and perceptions of unit members, including job satisfaction, performance, motivation, stressors, commitment, career intentions, and feedback on leadership and team dynamics.

Similarly, the defence organizations of our allies regularly survey their civilian employees for HR management and planning purposes. For example, the U.S. Department of Defence (DoD) has been administering the *Status of Forces Survey of Civilian Employees (SOFSC)* on an annual basis since 2001, the U.K. Ministry of Defence (MoD) has been administering the *Continuous Attitude Survey (CAS)* two times a year since 2002, and the Australian Defence Force (ADF) has been administering the *Defence Attitude Survey (DAS)* on an annual basis since 1999.

The *DND Your-Say Survey* is intended to provide information on a range of personnel issues such as organizational culture, commitment, productivity, retention, career development, and military-civilian working relationships. Specifically, the aims are to 1) provide empirical data on employees' attitudes, perceptions, experiences, and workplace behaviours related to key personnel issues and concerns; 2) establish baseline indicators and monitor progress on these regularly assessed areas; 3) provide a vehicle for investigating specific issues of import as they arise and in a timely manner; 4) fill in measurement gaps identified in the Level 0 Performance Management Report (Van Tilburg, 2008); and 5) provide a means for employees to communicate with leaders and decision makers.

Although over-surveying may be a concern given that all federal public service employees, including DND civilian employees, are asked to complete the *Public Service Employee Survey (PSES)*, an internal organizational survey has additional value, and can provide a number of benefits over and above the PSES. In particular, the *DND Your-Say Survey* may be tailored to examine issues that are of particular importance to DND, such as, the issue of military-civilian

working relations and work culture; analyses may be conducted to examine the relationships among workplace issues in a more holistic fashion, rather than just describing these issues in isolation of one another; annual administration of the *DND Your-Say Survey* will allow for the continuous monitoring of progress in key areas by collecting baseline information and conducting re-assessments on a regular basis, as well as providing timely information to managers and decision-makers; the use of focus sections will provide a vehicle for examining specific issues of import as they arise and in a timely manner, as well as the reduction of individual subject matter surveys; and unlike the *PSES*, the *DND Your-Say Survey* will make greater use of standardized and validated scales. Moreover, the issue of survey fatigue may be avoided by ensuring that employees are not surveyed in consecutive administrations.

The proposed survey instrument was developed through a consideration of ADM (HR-Civ) issues and priorities and an examination of existing personnel surveys, including, but not limited to, the *CF Your-Say Regular Forces Survey*, the *CF Retention Survey*, the *CF Unit Morale Profile* surveys, the U.S. *SOFS-C*, the U.K. *CAS*, and the Australian *DAS*. The format of the survey is modeled on the *CF Your-Say Regular Forces Survey*, with each administration being comprised of three parts: a classification section, a core section, and a focus section. The classification section will consist of demographic variables such as age, sex, occupation and region. The core section will be used to regularly measure the same central organizational factors over time to allow for monitoring, comparisons, and trend analyses. A specific focus section or sections will be included in each administration to provide a means of conducting in-depth research or measuring topical issues of interest.

Employee surveys are increasingly seen as an integral tool for good human resource management. The *DND Your-Say Survey* is intended to inform ADM (HR-Civ) on key personnel and organizational issues and how these fit together, enable the monitoring of change and the evaluation of new and existing programs and policies, and provide a means for employees to communicate with leaders and decision makers. Ultimately, this initiative is intended to provide strategic guidance and maximize the extent to which planning and policy development is informed by empirical information.

# Sommaire

---

## DND Your-Say Survey: Research Proposal

**Irina Goldenberg; DGMPPRA TM 2009-021; R & D pour la défense Canada – DRASPM; Novembre 2009.**

Les sondages auprès des employés sont de plus en plus perçus comme un aspect essentiel à la bonne gestion des ressources humaines (Schuler & Jackson, 1999). D'ailleurs, si l'on observe les pratiques à cet égard, on constate que de nombreuses organisations, autant dans le secteur privé que dans le secteur public, ont couramment recours à des sondages annuels auprès des employés. À ce titre, l'enquête « À vous la parole » du MDN vise à fournir au SMA(RH-Civ) des données empiriques sur les principales questions liées au personnel afin de contribuer à la planification des ressources humaines et à l'élaboration de politiques.

Les sondages réalisés régulièrement auprès des employés ne sont pas nouveaux au sein des Forces canadiennes (FC). Le Chef du personnel militaire (CPM) effectue de façon courante plusieurs sondages normalisés et bien validés auprès des employés afin d'obtenir des données sur les principales questions liées au personnel, incluant l'enquête « À vous la parole » des FC auprès de la Force régulière, servant à obtenir de l'information sur les attitudes et les opinions des membres des Forces canadiennes touchant une vaste gamme de questions liées aux ressources humaines, le questionnaire des FC sur le maintien des effectifs, servant à connaître les facteurs liés ou non au travail qui influent sur le maintien du personnel des FC, et le profil du moral des unités (PMU), servant à fournir de l'information aux commandants par l'évaluation des attitudes et des points de vue des membres des unités, notamment au sujet de la satisfaction professionnelle, du rendement au travail, de la motivation, des agents stressants, de l'engagement, des intentions professionnelles et en fournissant des commentaires sur le leadership et la dynamique de groupe.

De la même façon, les organisations de défense de nos alliés mènent régulièrement des sondages auprès de leur personnel civil aux fins de planification et de gestion des ressources humaines. Par exemple, le département de la Défense des États-Unis (DoD) réalise chaque année, depuis 2001, le *Status of Forces Survey of Civilian Employees (SOFS-C)* (enquête sur l'état des forces auprès du personnel civil), le ministère de la Défense du Royaume-Uni (MOD) effectue deux fois par année, depuis 2002, le *Continuous Attitude Survey (CAS)* (enquête continue sur les attitudes) et l'Australian Defence Force (ADF) réalise chaque année, depuis 1999, le *Defence Attitude Survey (DAS)* (enquête sur les attitudes de la Défense).

L'enquête « À vous la parole » du MDN vise à fournir de l'information sur un éventail de questions liées au personnel, notamment à la culture organisationnelle, à l'engagement, à la productivité, au maintien des effectifs, au perfectionnement professionnel et aux relations de travail en militaires et civils. Plus particulièrement, ses objectifs consistent à : 1) fournir des données empiriques sur les attitudes, les points de vue, les expériences et les comportements en milieu de travail des effectifs relativement aux principales questions et inquiétudes liées au personnel; 2) établir des indicateurs de référence et surveiller les progrès dans ces secteurs régulièrement évalués; 3) fournir un instrument d'enquête pour étudier des enjeux importants précis au besoin et à temps; 4) combler les écarts de mesure décelés dans le Rapport de gestion

du rendement de niveau 0 (Van Tilburg, 2008); 5) offrir aux employés un moyen de communication avec les meneurs et les décideurs.

Même si l'on peut s'inquiéter du surnombre de sondages menés étant donné que tous les membres de la fonction publique fédérale, incluant les civils du MDN, doivent remplir le Sondage auprès des fonctionnaires fédéraux (SAFF), un sondage à l'intérieur de l'organisation apporte une valeur ajoutée et peut offrir de nombreux avantages en plus du SAFF. Plus précisément, l'enquête « À vous la parole » du MDN peut être personnalisée afin d'examiner des questions qui revêtent une importance particulière pour le MDN, notamment les relations de travail entre les militaires et les civils et la culture organisationnelle de ceux-ci; on peut effectuer des analyses afin d'examiner les relations en milieu de travail d'une manière plus globale plutôt que de décrire les problèmes séparément; la réalisation annuelle de l'enquête « À vous la parole » du MDN permettra de surveiller en continu le progrès réalisé dans les secteurs clés en recueillant des données de référence et en exécutant des réévaluations de façon régulière, tout en fournissant des renseignements opportuns aux gestionnaires et aux décideurs; le recours à des sections de spécialité fournira un instrument d'enquête pour étudier des enjeux importants précis au besoin et à temps et permettra de réduire le nombre de sondages à sujet unique; et contrairement au SAFF, l'enquête « À vous la parole » du MDN pourra tirer davantage profit des échelles normalisées et validées. De plus, le problème du surnombre de sondage pourrait être évité en s'assurant que les employés ne font pas l'objet de sondages supplémentaires.

Le matériel d'enquête proposé a été mis au point en tenant compte des questions et des priorités du SMA(RH-Civ) et à la suite d'un examen des sondages auprès du personnel existants, y compris notamment l'enquête « À vous la parole » des FC auprès de la Force régulière, le questionnaire des FC sur le maintien des effectifs, les enquêtes sur le profil du moral des unités des FC, le SOFS-C américain, le CAS britannique et le DAS australien. Le format de l'enquête s'inspire de l'enquête « À vous la parole » des FC auprès de la Force régulière, où toute réalisation du sondage se fait en trois volets : une section de classification, une section de base et une section spécialisée. La section de classification comprendra des variables démographiques comme l'âge, le sexe, la profession et la région. La section de base servira à mesurer de façon régulière les mêmes facteurs organisationnels centraux au fil du temps afin de permettre la surveillance, les comparaisons et les analyses de tendances. Une ou plusieurs sections spécialisées seront comprises dans le cadre de chaque réalisation du sondage, permettant de réaliser des recherches approfondies ou de mesurer des questions d'intérêt précises.

Les sondages auprès des employés sont de plus en plus perçus comme un outil essentiel à la bonne gestion des ressources humaines. L'enquête « À vous la parole » du MDN vise à informer le SMA(RH-Civ) sur les principales questions liées au personnel et à l'organisation et sur la façon dont ceux-ci cadrent ensemble, à permettre de surveiller les changements et d'évaluer des programmes et des politiques, nouveaux ou existants, et à offrir aux employés un moyen de communication avec les meneurs et les décideurs. En fin de compte, cette initiative vise à fournir une orientation stratégique et à tirer profit au maximum des données empiriques dans le cadre de la planification et de l'élaboration de politiques.

# Table of contents

---

Abstract .....	i
Résumé .....	i
Executive summary .....	iii
Sommaire .....	v
Table of contents .....	vii
List of tables .....	viii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background .....	1
1.1.1 Research on the Use of Employee Surveys.....	1
1.1.2 Chief Military Personnel Surveys in the Canadian Forces.....	2
1.1.3 Civilian Employee Surveys in Other Defence Organizations .....	2
2 Purposes of the DND Your-Say Survey .....	4
3 Benefits of the DND Your-Say Survey Over and Above the Public Service Employee Survey .....	5
3.1 Information on Department-Specific Questions and Issues Under-Explored through the PSES.....	5
3.2 Greater Strategic Guidance: Examination of the Relations Between Workplace Components and the Identification of Key Impacts .....	6
3.3 Monitoring Progress and Performance .....	6
3.4 Vehicle for Examining Current Issues of Interest .....	7
3.5 More Comprehensive Assessment of Workplace Issues Based on Validated Scales....	7
3.6 Issue of Survey Fatigue .....	7
4 Methodology.....	9
4.1 Survey and Model Development .....	9
4.2 Participants and Sampling .....	10
4.3 Survey Administration.....	11
4.4 Procedure.....	11
5 Conclusion .....	12
References .....	13
Annex A .. DND Your-Say Survey: Scales and Items.....	17
Annex B .. Square-Root of N-Proportional Allocation.....	37
List of symbols/abbreviations/acronyms/initialisms .....	39
Distribution list.....	41

## List of tables

---

Table 1: DND Workforce Factors in the Study Model..... 10

# 1 Introduction

---

Today, employee surveys are a common management tool in successful organizations (Brugger, 2007; Hartley, 2001). These surveys serve a number of purposes, including demonstrating a commitment to employee views, taking ‘the pulse’ of the organization and providing information on key organizational issues, getting an objective picture of the significance of existing problems, tracking progress over time, benchmarking against other organizations, supporting additional internal research, and facilitating internal and external reporting (Brugger, 2007; Crail, 2007).

Employee surveys are both ‘mirrors and makers of organizational change’ (Hartley, 2001, p. 184) in that they provide reliable information on key organizational aspects, as well as strategic guidance for targeted action where it is likely to be most beneficial, enabling management to make informed decisions based on real data and not isolated opinions, rumours, or “squeaky wheels”. Particularly in large organizations, employee surveys serve as a powerful form of consultation with the workforce, increasing communication and feedback between leaders/managers and their employees (Hartley, 2001). As such, the *DND Your-Say Survey* is intended to provide the Assistant Deputy Minister (Human Resources – Civilian) (ADM(HR-Civ)) with empirical information on key personnel issues in an effort to help inform human resources planning and policy development.

## 1.1 Background

### Research on the Use of Employee Surveys

Employee surveys are increasingly seen as integral to good human resource management practice (Schuler & Jackson, 1999), and research into their use indicates that many organizations in both the private and public sectors now undertake annual employee surveys as a matter of course. For example, a recent poll of 60 organizations, which together employed nearly 235,000 people, found that most carry out surveys of their employees, either using a census of all personnel or using a sampling methodology (Crail, 2007). Similarly, a survey of 1,122 UK managers found that over a quarter (28%) say that their organizations use employee attitude surveys (O’Creevy, 1995). The percentage increases with the size of the organization, with 12% of organizations employing less than 100 employees reporting the use of employee surveys, while in large organizations with over 5,000 employees, just about half (48%) report using such surveys. In another study of 28 UK government organizations at various levels, 22 reported that they had undertaken employee surveys in the previous three years (Hartley, 2001). Indeed, administration of employee surveys has continued to increase, with an estimated 50% of US organizations in the 1980s, to more than 70% in the 1990s (Gilbert, Slaveney, & Tong, 2008).

## **Chief Military Personnel Surveys in the Canadian Forces**

Regularly administered employee surveys are also not new to the Canadian Forces (CF). The CF Your-Say Regular Forces Survey is administered bi-annually (Fall and Spring) by Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis (DGMPRA) on behalf of Assistant Chief Military Personnel in order to obtain information about CF attitudes across a wide spectrum of human resource issues (Norton, 2004; Norton, 2005; Urban, 2007; Urban, 2008). Each Your-Say is comprised of three parts: a classification section, a core section, and a focus section. The classification section consists of demographic type variables such as age, sex, education, income and rank. The core section is used to regularly measure the same organizational variables over time to allow for monitoring, comparisons, and trend analyses. A specific focus section or sections are included in each administration to provide a means of conducting in-depth research or measure topical issues that are of specific interest to leaders at that time. Since its inception in 2004, the CF Your-Say Regular Forces Survey has been an invaluable tool for providing Chief Military Personnel (CMP) with information on key personnel issues.

Moreover, CMP regularly administers several other standardized and well-validated employee surveys to provide information on key personnel issues. The CF Retention Survey is administered systematically to specific occupational groups in order to explore work and non-work related factors that affect the retention of CF personnel, including organizational issues, management, perceptions and expectations, satisfaction with career, and satisfaction with job and member relations (Howe, 2006; Toussaint & Marum, 2007; Villeneuve, Dobрева-Martinova, & Currie, 2004; Williams, 2007).

Similarly, the Unit Morale Profile (UMP) is used to provide information to Commanding Officers (CO) by evaluating the attitudes and perceptions of unit members, including job satisfaction performance, motivation, stressors, commitment, career intentions, and feedback on leadership and team dynamics (Hodgson, 2007). All ranks do not have equivalent access to the CO and, therefore, the UMP survey permits better flow of communication, especially for issues that may be filtered through the chain of command or issues that might otherwise go undetected (Suurd, 2008).

## **Civilian Employee Surveys in Other Defence Organizations**

It is of note that the defence organizations of our allied countries regularly administer internal employee surveys to their civilian personnel (in addition to their military counterparts) for HR management and planning purposes. For example, the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) administers the Status of Forces Survey of Civilian Employees (SOFS-C), an annual employee survey measuring DoD civilian employees' attitudes, opinions, and self-reported experiences and behaviours in order to formulate, monitor, and refine personnel policies and programs (DoD Civilian Personnel Management Service, 2008; Lancaster, Klein, & Wetzel, 2005). Initiated in 2002, the SOFS-C provides data on key personnel issues, allows DoD to establish baselines before implementing new programs/policies, and facilitates the evaluation and monitoring of existing programs. Similar to the CF Your-Say Regular Forces Survey, the SOFS-C includes a series of indicators to track changes over time as well as specific 'hot-button' items included at the time of survey administration (Human Resources Strategic Assessment Program, 2007). It is of note that the DoD civilian employees, along with all federal employees

in the US, are also administered the Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS), which is a biennial survey similar to the Canadian Public Service Employee Survey (PSES) (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2008).

In the same way, the U.K. Ministry of Defence (MoD) administers the Continuous Attitude Survey (CAS), a comprehensive survey of its civilian workforce, two times a year. Initiated in 2001, the CAS aims to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of personnel management policies and programs, and aims to provide the MoD with information about the key predictors of overall satisfaction with the MoD, aspects of work and work conditions. The survey findings are also used to report against some measures of the Defence Management Board's Balanced Scorecard to help illustrate the 'health' of the civilian workforce (Defence Analytic Services Agency, 2007).

The Australian Department of Defence has been administering the *Defence Attitude Survey (DAS)* to its military and civilian employees on an annual basis since 1999, stating that this initiative serves as the primary source for understanding the needs and expectations of its workforce, is highly valued by Senior Defence Leadership, and is essential reading for Defence management members responsible for personnel and human resource development (Directorate of Strategic Planning and Research, 2005). They note that "the data has proven to be invaluable in developing contemporary workplace policies and programs and has had a positive influence on recent retention initiatives and other employee programs" (Directorate of Strategic Planning and Research, 2007, p. 3). Like the US DoD, the Australian DoD carries out this internal employee survey in addition to their *Australian Public Service Commission State of the Service Employee Survey (SSES)* of federal government employees.

## **2 Purposes of the DND Your-Say Survey**

---

The *DND Your-Say Survey* is intended to provide information on a range of personnel issues such as organizational culture, commitment, productivity, retention, career development, and military-civilian working relationships. Specifically, the aims are to:

- a. provide empirical data on employees' attitudes, perceptions, experiences, and workplace behaviours related to key personnel issues and concerns;
- b. establish baseline indicators and monitor progress on these regularly assessed areas;
- c. provide a vehicle for investigating specific issues of import as they arise and in a timely manner;
- d. fill in measurement gaps identified in the Level 0 Performance Measurement Framework (Van Tilburg, 2008); and
- e. provide a means for employees to communicate with leaders and decision makers.

### **3 Benefits of the DND Your-Say Survey Over and Above the Public Service Employee Survey**

---

The *PSES* is an organizational survey administered to all employees across the Canadian Federal Government seeking their opinions and perceptions regarding their work and workplaces. This survey acts as a measure of the overall health of the Public Service, as well as allowing for comparisons of individual departments to the Public Service as a whole. Although the *PSES* provides valuable information regarding the workplace and the workforce, an internal organizational survey, such as the *DND Your-Say Survey*, has additional value and can provide a number of benefits over and above the *PSES*.

#### **3.1 Information on Department-Specific Questions and Issues Under-Explored through the PSES**

According to Treasury Board Secretariat (2008), the “*PSES* focuses on issues common and relevant to the entire federal public service. Departmental surveys may ask similar questions, but focus on issues related to the organization” (p. 5).

Indeed, the *DND Your-Say Survey* may be tailored to examine issues that are of particular importance to DND. For example, the issue of military-civilian working relations and work culture is an important area of research. Although DND employees are civilian, the kind of work they do requires them to work effectively with military personnel as an integral part of the Defence team (National Defence, 2009). It is of note that a significant number of civilians work side by side with their military co-workers at bases across the country and abroad, the majority of civilians are supervised by military managers, and approximately half of DND civilian employees belong to one of the three Environmental Chiefs of Staff organizations (Binnington, 2008). In fact, several research studies, including the 2007 Civilian Well-Being and Retention Study and the 2008 CF Health Service Group Retention Study, indicated a number of concerns related to military-civilian work environment (Lalonde, 2009; McKee & Williams, 2007). However, given that this research was based on focus group methodology, the degree and prevalence of these findings requires cross-validation with the use of a large and representative sample of employees. In a similar vein, in the context of exploring appropriate training for military supervisors and managers of civilian personnel, the Director General Learning and Professional Development (DGLPD) in ADM (HR-Civ) noted that there is a perception that military managers at all levels are not well equipped to carry out civilian HR responsibilities, but emphasized that this perception requires empirical validation (Poliquin, 2009).

Thus, research into military-civilian working relationships and culture in DND is warranted, and is one example of an issue that may be explored by tailoring the *DND Your-Say Survey* to meet the department’s particular needs. Other important issues that could be assessed through the *DND Your-Say Survey* that are not covered by the *PSES* include working climate and team cohesion, employees’ confidence in their skills and abilities, and self-reported job performance. It is important to note that these specific issues need to be explored in the context of more general organizational factors such as engagement, some of which are included in the *PSES*, in order to

elucidate relationships between these factors, and to provide information that is truly of value for strategic guidance. The importance of this holistic type of analysis is elaborated on below.

### **3.2 Greater Strategic Guidance: Examination of the Relations Between Workplace Components and the Identification of Key Impacts**

The value of examining the issues/factors included in an employee survey in a holistic fashion, and in relation to one another, cannot be over-emphasized. Although the *PSES* assesses a range of issues, the results of how the department performs on any given issue have traditionally been presented in isolation (e.g., the level of respondents' agreement on any given question is presented separately) (Public Service Human Resources Management Agency of Canada, 2006). Though certainly informative in its own right, there is much more 'bang for the buck' with respect to the information gleaned, and the utility for strategic guidance, when the *relationships between these key factors* are examined.

For example, how does satisfaction with leadership or with military-civilian working relations affect key outcomes such as engagement and retention? Are some factors more influential to a given outcome than others? How the critical components of the workplace fit together, considering *both* the current level of performance on a given issue, and its impact on key organizational outcomes, provides much greater guidance for the department's efforts to improve the workplace. This removes a great deal of guess-work from the interpretation of survey results, and much more clearly defines the priorities for action that will have the greatest impact for improving the workplace and accomplishing organizational goals.

### **3.3 Monitoring Progress and Performance**

Annual administration of the DND Your-Say Survey will allow for the continuous monitoring of progress in key areas by collecting baseline information and conducting re-assessments on a regular basis. Regular administrations will also enable the provision of timely information to managers and decision-makers, and will allow for the effects of personnel strategies and change initiatives to be examined more directly.

Information gleaned from the *DND Your-Say Survey* may also be used to fill in measurement gaps identified in the L0 Performance Management Report (Van Tilburg, 2008). Indeed, it has been noted that the *PSES* is insufficient in this regard due to 1) changing questions from administration to administration, limiting the ability to monitor key issues, and 2) the 3-year period between administrations being too long to provide up-to-date information (Van Tilburg, 2008). The Performance Management Framework identifies a number of indicators that are captured in departmental databases, such as sick leave usage, percentage of employees receiving training, or EE representation, in order to assess the extent to which DND is achieving key outcomes (Leblanc, 2009a). Nevertheless, given the nature of some of the desired outcomes, measurement of employees' experiences, perceptions, and attitudes can provide important complementary information to augment their measurement. This is particularly true for the L0 strategic objectives of "Promote Wellness and Health" and "Promote Continuous Learning," for which appropriate measurement indicators are still being developed (Leblanc, 2009b).

### **3.4 Vehicle for Examining Current Issues of Interest**

It is proposed that each administration of the *DND Your-Say Survey* will include one or two focus sections in addition to the core survey questions included in every administration. These focus sections, which will change with each administration, will concentrate on personnel issues of current and significant interest to senior management.

Some examples of issues that may be examined with the use of these focus sections include official languages, diversity and employment equity, employee wellness and health, DND communications, the Employee Assistance Program (EAP), and specific change and change management initiatives. Some areas that have recently been examined through the use of focus sections in the *CF Your-Say Survey* include quality of life, diversity, CF transformation, education reimbursement and career transition, Defence Ethics, official languages, and Military Family Resource Centres (Truscott, 2009). In addition to providing an excellent vehicle for the examination of topical issues, as well as the reduction of individual subject matter surveys, the inclusion of the focus sections in the context of the larger survey will allow for the examination of these specific issues in relation to the core survey questions (e.g., how they impact on commitment, productivity, and retention).

### **3.5 More Comprehensive Assessment of Workplace Issues Based on Validated Scales**

Although some of the personnel issues included in the *PSES* will also be assessed in the *DND Your-Say Survey*, the latter is intended to provide a more in-depth examination of each of these workplace issues (as well as examination of relationships among the issues, as discussed above). Most personnel issues in the *PSES* are assessed with the use of several questions per issue, whereas the *DND Your-Say Survey* will make greater use of validated and/or multi-item scales or questionnaires. Not only will this allow for a more comprehensive examination of the different aspects of each issue, using multi-item scales will allow for better examination of their psychometric properties in order to assess their reliability and validity. Moreover, the previously used and validated scales to be included in the survey already have established psychometric properties (e.g., information about which individual items/questions do a good job of assessing the general personnel issue they are intended to tap into; information about how a personnel issue as assessed by a scale predicts other theoretically relevant personnel issues, such as how training opportunities relate to job satisfaction, or how job satisfaction relates to retention intentions). As such, greater use of these validated and/or multi-item scales will enable a more scientifically rigorous examination of the personnel issues they are intended to measure.

### **3.6 Issue of Survey Fatigue**

Survey fatigue may be of concern in considering the implementation of a regular employee survey. However, this issue can be circumvented fairly easily. First, the *DND Your-Say Survey* will be based on a random sample methodology, such that only a subset of personnel will be asked to complete the questionnaire for any given administration. Furthermore, those that will be sampled in any given administration will be taken out of the sampling frame (i.e., the pool

of individuals from which the sample is chosen) for the following two administrations<sup>1</sup>, to ensure that they will not be asked to participate in consecutive surveys.

It is of note that both the U.S. DoD and the ADF attest to the value and importance of their annual employee surveys (Directorate of Strategic Planning and Research, 2007; DoD Civilian Personnel Management Service, 2008), in addition to their civilian personnel being asked to complete federal employee surveys. Indeed, DND employees may come to have greater identification with the *DND Your-Say Survey*, in that it will assess more department-specific issues in lieu of some public service level issues, and will ideally be seen as a way to communicate with senior leaders and decision makers. It is of note that the Canada Public Service Agency and the Treasury Board Secretariat, the purveyors of the *PSES*, have administered joint internal surveys (i.e., the *Workplace Well-Being Survey*) for use with personnel in these two departments (ERIN Research, 2005), also attesting to the fact that such surveys have added value over and above the more general *PSES*.

---

<sup>1</sup> Modeled on the *CF Your-Say Regular Forces Survey* whereby the survey is not administered to the same person more than once in a two year period.

## 4 Methodology

---

### 4.1 Survey and Model Development

The proposed survey instrument was developed through a consideration of ADM (HR-Civ) issues and priorities and an examination of existing personnel surveys, including, but not limited to, the *CF Your-Say Survey*, the *CF Retention Survey*, the *CF UMP* surveys, the U.S. *SOFS-C*, the U.K. *CAS*, and the Australian *DAS*. The format of the survey is modeled on the *CF Your-Say Survey*, with each administration being comprised of three parts: a classification section, a core section, and a focus section. The classification section will consist of demographic variables such as age, sex, occupation and region. The core section will be used to regularly measure the same central organizational factors over time to allow for monitoring, comparisons, and trend analyses. A specific focus section or sections will be included in each administration to provide a means of conducting in-depth research or measuring topical issues of interest.

The DND workforce factors proposed for investigation in the *DND Your-Say Survey* are presented in Table 1. These workforce factors, or variables, are divided into three sets: predictors, mediators, and outcomes. *Predictors* are the independent variables in the research, thought to affect or influence the mediating and outcome variables. These are also the variables that would be the direct target of change, if the research were to indicate the need for such change as a result of particular demonstrated relations with the mediating and outcome variables. These predictor variables are divided into three types, including interpersonal-type predictors, job-related predictors, and career-related predictors. *Outcomes* are the dependent variables in the research, thought to be affected by the predictor variables, either directly or indirectly. These are the ultimate variables that are the focus of many of DND's HR programs and policies. *Mediators* are the intermediary variables that are affected by the predictors and which, in turn, have an effect on the outcome variables. The predictors may affect the outcomes directly, or have indirect (or mediated) influence through their effect on the mediating variables. The actual relationships between these variables, presented in the simplified model below, will be tested empirically using advanced statistical techniques. The actual survey scales and items corresponding to each of these model variables proposed for inclusion in the core section of the *DND Your-Say Survey* are presented at Annex A<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Demographic questions in the classification section, potential focus-section questions, and the open-ended question inviting additional comments from survey participants will be developed for, and included in, the final survey but are not presented in Annex A for the purposes of this proposal.

Table 1: DND Workforce Factors in the Study Model

Predictor Variables		Mediating Variables	Outcome Variables
<b>Interpersonal Predictors</b>	Immediate Supervisor	Job Satisfaction	Organizational Commitment
	Team Dynamics	Perceived Organizational Support	Work Engagement
	Military-Civilian Work Relationships and Culture	Personal Well-Being	Performance
<b>Job Predictors</b>	Performance Management	Work Cynicism and Withdrawal	Retention
	Role Stressors (i.e., Role Overload; Role Insufficiency; Role Conflict)	Understanding and Support for Departmental Goals	
<b>Career Predictors</b>	Training	Confidence in Skills and Abilities	
	Career Progression		

## 4.2 Participants and Sampling

The target population is all permanent and temporary DND personnel that have been employed with the organization for at least six months. Personnel with less than six months of service at DND will not be included in the population of interest because respondents' ability to answer many of the questions on the survey requires that they have sufficient and recent exposure to the organization.

The general sample will be selected using stratified random sampling. With this approach, the population is divided into subsets (called strata) before selecting a sample within each of these subsets. This method increases precision of the overall population estimates by ensuring that the number of individuals selected from each stratum for the sample is proportional to the number of individuals in each stratum in the population of interest. The characteristic that will be used to stratify the sample is Level One (L1) organization [i.e., ADM (HR-Civ), CMP, Chief of the Land Staff (CLS), Chief of the Air Staff (CAS), Chief of the Maritime Staff (CMS), Assistant Deputy Minister (Finance and Corporate Services) (ADM (Fin)), Assistant Deputy Minister (Information Management) (ADM (IM)), Assistant Deputy Minister (Materiel) (ADM (Mat)), Assistant Deputy Minister (Science and Technology) (ADM (S&T)), Canadian Operational Support Command (CANOSCOM), Vice Chief of the Defence Staff (VCDS), and Other<sup>3</sup>].

<sup>3</sup> The remaining L1 organizations were collapsed into an "other" category based on size: Assistant Deputy Minister (Infrastructure and Environment) (ADM(I&E)), Assistant Deputy Minister (Public Affairs) (ADM (PA)), Assistant Deputy Minister (Policy) (ADM (Pol)), Canadian Special Operations Force Command (CANSOFCOM), Canadian Expeditionary Force Command (CEFCOM), Canadian Forces Housing Agency (CFHA), Canadian Forces Legal Advisor (CFLA), Chief Military Judge (CMJ), Chief of Review Services (CRS), Canada Command, Judge Advocate General (JAG), (National Search and Rescue Secretariat (NSRS), and Ombudsman.

Given that the size of the L1 organizations vary considerably, simply allocating the size of the strata in the sample to be proportional to their size in the population would lead to very precise estimates for larger strata, such as CLS, but to less precise estimates for the smaller strata, such as VCDS. Thus, the sample strata will actually be allocated or assigned using the square-root of N-proportional allocation in order to maximize the precision of the estimates within each stratum (Statistics Canada, 2003, refer to Annex B).

With an estimated response rate of 35%, it is proposed that 3,000 employees be invited to participate in the first administration of the survey. This would result in an overall margin of error of  $\pm 3\%$  for the actual sample of approximately 1000 respondents, with 95% confidence in the results of the survey.

### 4.3 Survey Administration

It is proposed that the survey be administered on an annual basis, and be available in both paper and electronic formats, based on respondents' access to email. It is anticipated that the cyclical administration of this survey will help to 'brand' it, thereby resulting in high response rates as it has for the CF. However, it is suggested that unlike the CF survey, the DND Your-Say Survey be administered only once a year, both because that ought to be sufficient to keep a 'finger on the pulse' of the issues assessed, as well as the fact that research capacity is more limited as compared to CMP.

Fall 2009 is the proposed time for administration. However, if an annual administration of a PSES subset is administered in the Fall, a Spring time frame would be suitable as well. In either case, the proposed annual PSES will be based on a random sampling methodology, so it will be possible to ensure that the same respondents are not asked to complete both surveys, eliminating confusion or survey fatigue. This would be of value in that cross-validation of the workplace issues that are included in both surveys would be possible.

### 4.4 Procedure

Once approval for administration is granted, a pre-testing phase will be conducted<sup>4</sup>. This process will be useful for assessing problems related to scale selection, discovering problems related to sequencing, and errors in layout or instructions. The survey will be submitted to the Social Science Research Review Board (SSRRB) for approval and any further suggestions for improvement.

A pre-notice letter will be sent out in advance of the survey to inform potential respondents that a survey will be sent to them, explain the nature of the research, and encourage their participation<sup>5</sup>. Approximately one week after the mailing of the pre-notice letter, all individuals selected through the sampling approach described above will be sent the *DND Your-Say Survey* to complete and return. The data collection phase will continue for a period of two months to allow respondents sufficient time to participate. A reminder email or reminder postcard will be sent half way through the administration period to increase response rates.

---

<sup>4</sup> Electronic or hard copies will be sent, depending on target respondents' email access.

<sup>5</sup> Electronic or hard copies will be sent, depending on target respondents' email access.

## 5 Conclusion

---

Employee surveys are increasingly seen as an integral tool for good human resource management. The *DND Your-Say Survey* is intended to inform ADM (HR-Civ) on key personnel and organizational issues and how these fit together, enable the monitoring of change and the evaluation of new and existing programs and policies, and provide a means for employees to communicate with leaders and decision makers. Ultimately, this initiative is intended to provide strategic guidance and maximize the extent to which planning and policy development is informed by empirical information.

## References

---

- [1] Australian Public Service Commission: Australian Government (2007). *State of the Service Employee Survey Results 2006-2007*. Commonwealth of Australia.
- [2] Binnington, C. (2008). *Civilian HR Management in DND/CF*. Presented to the Defence Resources Management Course, 6 November 2008.
- [3] Brugger, C. (2007). *Optimizing employee surveys: Implementing an integrated approach. Military Psychology Service*. Australian Armed Forces Personnel Agency.
- [4] DoD Civilian Personnel Management Service. (2008).  
[http://www.cpms.osd.mil/HRBITS/hrbits\\_index.aspx?mode=print](http://www.cpms.osd.mil/HRBITS/hrbits_index.aspx?mode=print).
- [5] Crail, M. (2007). Employee Surveys lead to workplace changes. *Personnel Today*, 09595848.
- [6] Defence Analytic Services Agency (2007). *HR Strategy Civilian Continuous Attitude Survey 2006/07 Spring*.
- [7] Defence Data Manpower Center (2007) *Info Sheet*.
- [8] Director Civilian Strategic Human Resources Planning (2008). *LI-LO Performance Management Report*. Presented at the Human Resources Management Team Meeting, 7 July 2008.
- [9] Directorate of Strategic Personnel Planning and Research: Australian Government Department of Defence (2005). *Defence Attitude Survey: Summary of Results*. Commonwealth of Australia.
- [10] Directorate of Strategic Personnel Planning and Research: Australian Government Department of Defence (2007). *Defence Attitude Survey: Summary of Results*. Commonwealth of Australia.
- [11] ERIN Research Inc. (2005). *Building a better workplace: Results of the 2005 PSHRMAC Employee Survey*.
- [12] Gilbert, P., Slavney & Tong, (2008). *10 best practices for employee surveys*. BusinessTrainingMedia.com.
- [13] Hartley, J. (2001). Employee surveys: Strategic aid or hand-grenade for organizational and culture change? *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 14, 184-204.
- [14] Hodgson, K. (2007). *Unite Morale Profile report Military Police Branch*.
- [15] Howe, D. (2006). *Building and sustaining a retention culture in the Canadian Forces*. Director Personnel Generation Requirements, DPGR A/RT Report 2006-006.

- [16] Human Resources Strategic Assessment Program. 2007. *Status of Forces Surveys, Recurring Web Surveys of Active, Reserve and DoD Civilian Personnel*. Produced 23 March 2007.
- [17] Lalonde, S. (2009). *Canadian Forces Health Services Group Retention Study*. Report in progress.
- [18] Lancaster, A.R., Klein, R.M., & Wetzel, E.S. (2005). *U.S. Department of Defense Retention Trends*. Defense Manpower Data Center, Department of Defence.
- [19] Leblanc, L. (2009a). *Civilian Performance Management Report FY 08/09*. Presented to the Civilian Human Resources Management Council, 6 April 2009.
- [20] Leblanc, L. (2009b). *Personal communication with senior strategic performance management analyst*. 5 May 2009.
- [21] McKee, B., & Williams, L.M. (2007). *Civilian Well-Being and Retention Project: Qualitative Findings*. Sponsor Research Report 2007:14. Director Personnel Applied Research, National Defence Headquarters, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- [22] National Defence (2009). *Canada First Defence Strategy*.
- [23] Norton, S. (2004). *The Your-Say Survey: A Methodological Discussion*. Technical Note 2004-09. Director Human Resources Research and Evaluation, National Defence Headquarters, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- [24] Norton, S. (2005). *Results form the 2004 Your-Say Survey of Regular Force Members – Unpublished Manuscript*. Sponsor Research Report 2005-13. Director Human Resources Research and Evaluation, National Defence Headquarters, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- [25] O’Creevy, M.F. (1995). *Striking off the shackles: A survey of managers’ attitudes to employee involvement*. Institute of Management: Corby.
- [26] Poliquin, S. (2009). *Update of HR Content in CF Training*. Presented to the Human Resources Management Team, 23 March 09.
- [27] Public Service Human Resources Management Agency of Canada (2006). *What you told us...: Public Service 2005 Public Service-Wide Results*. ISBN 0-662-49269-2.
- [28] Schuler, R., & Jackson, S. (1999). *Strategic Human Resource Management*. Blackwell: Oxford.
- [29] Statistics Canada (2003). *Survey Methods and Practices*. Catalogue Number 12-587-XPE.
- [30] Suurd, C. (2008). *Unit Morale Profile*. Social Science Research Review Board Submission, 19 January 2008.

- [31] Toussaint, V. & Nicholas, M. (2007). *Factors affecting members' decisions to leave the Canadian Forces : A quantitative and qualitative examination of the CF Retention Survey for mobile support equipment operators (MSE Op) MOS ID 00171*. Director Personnel Generation Requirements, National Defence.
- [32] Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat (2008). *PSES questions and answers*. <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/svdg/faq-eng.asp>.
- [33] Truscott, S. (2009). *Your-Say – CF Continuous Attitude Survey – Request for Suggestions for Focus Sections*. Email communication, 7 April 2009.
- [34] Van Tilburg, B. (2008). L1 and L0 Performance Management Report. Presented at the Human Resources Management Team meeting, 7 July 2008.
- [35] Villeneuve, M. & Dobрева-Martinova, T., & Currie, J. (2004). *Buying low attrition or building high retention? That is the question*. Director Military Employment Policy, DMEP-A/RT Report 2004-06.
- [36] Williams, L. (2007). *Factors affecting decisions to leave the Canadian Forces: A quantitative and qualitative examination of the CF Retention survey for Vehicle Technicians*. DRDC CORA TR 2007-25, Defence R&D Canada – CORA.
- [37] Urban, S. (2007). *"They Said" Results from the Fall 2006 Your-Say Administration*. Sponsor Research Report 2007-08. Director Personnel Applied Research, National Defence Headquarters, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- [38] Urban, S. (2008). *Your-Say Spring 2007 Results*. DRDC TM 2008-024, Defence R&D Canada – CORA.
- [39] U.S. Office of Personnel Management (2006). <http://www.fhcs2006.opm.gov>.
- [40] Van Tilburg, B. (2008). Personal communication, 21 August 2008.

This page intentionally left blank.

## **Annex A DND Your-Say Survey: Scales and Items**

---

### **Immediate Supervisor**

To what extent do you agree with these statements about your current supervisor?

**Response Options:**  
**(Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Neutral; Agree; Strongly Agree)**

1. My supervisor is an effective leader.
2. I feel comfortable seeking assistance from my supervisor when attempting to resolve challenges in completing an assignment.
3. When giving me an assignment, my supervisor considers my current workload.
4. My supervisor fully understands the business that s/he is managing.
5. My supervisor inspires me, by example, to do the best that I can.
6. My supervisor treats me fairly.
7. My supervisor treats me with respect.
8. My supervisor gives real consideration to my suggestions.
9. My supervisor expresses appreciation for a job well done.
10. My supervisor gives me useful feedback.
11. My supervisor keeps me informed of things that I need to know.
12. My supervisor encourages me to come up with new and better ways of doing my job.
13. My supervisor consults me on decisions that affect my work.
14. My supervisor is available when I need to discuss something.
15. My supervisor takes an active interest in my career, providing advice and assistance when I need it.
16. My supervisor follows through on his/her promises.

**Source:** PSCHRMAC & TBS "Building a Better Workplace" Departmental Survey

All things considered, how satisfied are you with the leadership provided by your immediate supervisor (the person who writes your PER)?

**Response Options:**  
**(Completely Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Somewhat Dissatisfied; Neutral; Somewhat Satisfied; Satisfied; Completely Satisfied)**

Please rate the effectiveness of your immediate supervisor at managing people.

**Response Options:**  
**Very Low; Low; Moderate; High; Very high)**

**Source:** CF Your-Say Survey

## Team Dynamics

Please rate your degree of satisfaction with the following statements.

**Response Options:**

**(Completely Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Somewhat Dissatisfied; Somewhat Satisfied; Satisfied; Completely Satisfied)**

1. The working relationships in my unit.
2. The respect I receive in my unit.
3. The sense of cohesion in my work unit.
4. The level of cooperation in my work unit.
5. The fair treatment in my work unit (feedback, choice, resolution of complaints).

**Source:** CF Retention Survey

## **Military-Civilian Work Relationships and Culture**

Do you report to a civilian or military supervisor?

- a. Civilian supervisor
- b. Military supervisor

If military, is your supervisor a:

- c. Junior NCM (Cpl/LS to MCpl/MS)
- d. Senior NCM (Sgt/PO2 to CWO/CPO1)
- e. Junior Officer (2Lt/A/Slt to Capt/Lt(N))
- f. Senior Officer (Maj/LDdr to Gen/Adm)

Are there any military members in your unit/workplace?

- a. yes
- b. no

If yes, approximately what percentage of your co-workers are military members?

**Response Options:**  
(0%; 1-10%; 11-20%; 21-30%; 31-40%; 41-50%; 51-60%; 61- 70%; 71-80%; 81-90%; 90% or Higher)

Taking into account that civilian employees and military members have **unique roles and responsibilities**, indicate your degree of agreement with each statement regarding civilian-military relationships and culture within your work unit.

**Response Options:**  
(Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree; Not Applicable/Don't Know)

1. With regard to fairness and equity, civilian employees and military members are treated similarly in my work unit.
2. Civilian and military personnel work together effectively as a team.
3. Military managers recognize the skills and expertise of their civilian employees.
4. Military members recognize the skills and expertise of their civilian co-workers.

5. Civilian employees receive an adequate amount of training opportunities compared to military members.
6. The quality of training that civilian employees receive is similar to what is received by military members.
7. Military managers support training opportunities for their civilian employees.
8. Military managers respect civilian terms and conditions of employment.
9. The quantity of senior management positions designated for military personnel has limited my ability to progress to more challenging positions.
10. Priority hiring of former military members has limited my career progression.
11. I enjoy working in a mixed military-civilian environment.

Please provide any additional comments or observations regarding military-civilian working relationships and environment.

**Source:** Adapted from the DND Exit Survey

## **Performance Management**

To what extent do you agree with these statements about your performance management?

**Response Options:**  
**(Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Neutral; Agree; Strongly Agree)**

1. My supervisor spends the necessary time with me setting and agreeing on my objectives.
2. My objectives state clearly what I need to achieve in my job.
3. I receive regular and constructive feedback on my performance from my supervisor.
4. I understand how my performance is measured.
5. My performance is assessed fairly.
6. I am confident that my line manager can assess my performance.
7. Poor performance is dealt with effectively where I work.

**Source:** Items 1, 2, 3, 6, & 7 - UK CAS; 4 & 5 – The New Zealand Workplace Survey.

## Role Stressors

There are a number of things that cause us to experience stress at work. Some of these stressors may be caused by the nature of the job itself. For each of the statements below, indicate the frequency that each of the statements below occurs in your work.

### Response Options:

**(Never; Rarely; Sometimes; Fairly Often; Frequently, If not Always)**

1. At work I am expected to do many different tasks in too little time.
2. I work under tight deadlines.
3. I am expected to do more work than is reasonable.
4. My work fits my interests and skills.
5. My talents are being used in my work.
6. I feel as though my job has a good future.
7. I understand what is acceptable personal behaviour on the job (for example, dress, language).
8. The priorities of my work are clear to me.
9. I have a clear understanding of how my supervisor wants me to spend my time.
10. I have more than one person telling me what to do.
11. My supervisors have conflicting ideas about what I should be doing.
12. I feel like I have conflicting loyalties at work.

**Source:** Unit Morale Profile and CF Retention Survey); Includes the dimensions of role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role conflict

## Training

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

**Response Options:**  
(Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Neutral; Agree; Strongly Agree)

1. I am satisfied with access to learning and development opportunities in my organization.
2. If I need formal training to do my current job, I am confident that it will be approved.
3. I have sufficient access to learning and development opportunities to improve my skills.
4. I receive the training and development I need to carry out my job properly.
5. If respondent disagreed with the last statement, they will be asked: What prevents you from receiving the training/development you need?

**Response Options:**  
(I choose not to receive it; I don't know what training and development is appropriate for my job; budget is insufficient to cover costs; I have not got time for it; lack of supervisor support)

**Source:** 1 & 3 – Australian Defence Force Defence Attitude Survey;  
2 – PSHRMAC;  
4 & 5 – UK Continuous Attitude Survey

## **Career Progression**

Please rate your degree of satisfaction with the following statements regarding your career progression at DND?

**Response Options:**

**(Completely Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Somewhat Dissatisfied; Somewhat Satisfied; Satisfied; Completely Satisfied)**

1. My rate of career advancement thus far.
2. Future career advancement opportunities in this department.
3. The way competencies and advancement are linked.
4. The fairness of the evaluation process.
5. Career opportunities.
6. My professional growth and development.
7. My career overall.

**Source:** Adapted from the CF Retention Survey

## Job Satisfaction

There are positive and negative aspects to every job. Together, they determine our satisfaction with the work we do. Using the 5-point scale below, please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

**Response Options:**  
(Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Neutral; Agree; Strongly Agree)

1. I feel my work is important.
2. Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.
3. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.
4. I have too much to do at work.
5. All in all I am satisfied with my job.
6. I have too much paperwork.
7. I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.
8. I feel my efforts are rewarded appropriately.
9. There are few rewards for those who work here.
10. I am satisfied with the contribution my work makes to the CF/DND.
11. My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.
12. Time is taken to recognize my achievements.
13. In general, I don't like my job.
14. I feel that the work I do is appreciated.
15. In general, I like working here.

**Source:** CF Unit Morale Profile (Subscales included are Nature of Work; Work Limitations; Recognition; and General Satisfaction)

## Perceived Organizational Support

Often our satisfaction with our job is linked to whether or not we feel valued by the organization. This section asks you to describe the level of support you receive from the CF/DND. Using the 5-point scale below, please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

### Response Options:

**(Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Somewhat Disagree; Somewhat Agree; Agree; Strongly Agree)**

1. Help is available from the CF/DND when I have a problem.
2. The CF/DND tries to make my job as interesting as possible.
3. The CF/DND would ignore any complaint by me.
4. The CF/DND fails to appreciate any extra effort from me.
5. The CF/DND strongly considers my goals and values.
6. The CF/DND really cares about my well-being.
7. If given the opportunity, the CF/DND would take advantage of me.
8. Even if I did the best possible job, the CF/DND would fail to notice.

**Source:** CF Retention Survey and CF Unit Morale Profile

## Well-Being

How satisfied with you with your:

**Response Options:**

**(Completely Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Somewhat Dissatisfied; Somewhat Satisfied; Satisfied; Completely Satisfied)**

- Health
- Standard of Living
- Achievements
- Personal relationships
- Links to the general community
- Links to the Defence community

How would you rate your own mental health? **(mental health covers a range of conditions or experiences such as depression, anxiety, stress levels, alcohol or drug usage, etc.)**

**Response Options:**

**(Very Poor; Poor; Fair; Good; Very Good)**

Overall, how would you rate the current level of stress in your personal life?

**Response Options:**

**(Extremely High; High; Medium; Low; I do not feel Stressed)**

**Source:** Australian Defence Force DAS

Overall, how would you rate the current level of stress in your work life?

**Response Options:**

**(Extremely High; High; Medium; Low; I do not feel Stressed)**

**Source:** US Status of Forces Survey – Civilian (response options modified).

## Work Cynicism

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

**Response Options:**  
**(Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Somewhat Disagree; Somewhat Agree; Agree; Strongly Agree)**

1. I am more cynical (doubtful) about whether my work contributes anything.
2. I just want to do my job and not be bothered.
3. I have become less enthusiastic about my work.
4. I doubt the significance of my work.

## Psychological Withdrawal

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

**Response Options:**  
**(Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Somewhat Disagree; Somewhat Agree; Agree; Strongly Agree)**

1. My focus on my job has changed from being something I am proud of to simply being a means to a pay check.
2. I am still professional at work, but I just do not put as much effort as I used to.
3. My body goes to work; my mind does not.
4. I ask myself these days, why go out of my way to do these extra things when I really do not have to.
5. I find I fluctuate between hate and apathy when thinking about work.
6. I am less engaged in issues at work than I used to be.

**Source:** CF Retention Survey

## Understanding and Support for Department's Mandate and Goals

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

**Response Options:**

**(Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree nor Disagree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)**

1. I clearly understand the goals and mandate of DND.  
**Source:** UK CAS & PSCHRMAC Survey
2. I believe these DND objectives are important.  
**Source:** UK CAS
3. I fully support the goals and mandate of this department.  
**Source:** PSCHRMAC Survey
4. I understand how my work contributes to the objectives of DND.  
**Source:** UK CAS
5. I know what I can do to help this department achieve its goals and mandate.  
**Source:** PSCHRMAC Survey
6. I have a good understanding of how my job contributes to the support of the Canadian Forces.  
**Source:** DND Exit Survey
7. I have a clear understanding of how I contribute to my unit's/section's goals.  
**Source:** Australian ADF
8. I have a clear understanding of how I contribute to the Defence mission.  
**Source:** Australian ADF

## Confidence in Skills and Abilities

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following using the scale below.

**Response Options:**  
**(Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Neutral; Agree; Strongly Agree)**

1. I understand my role and responsibilities in my job.
2. I understand how my work contributes to the overall effort of the organization.
3. I understand the duties and responsibilities of the other personnel in my work group with whom I need to interact.
4. I understand the duties and responsibilities of the personnel in other work groups with whom I need to interact.
5. I am confident in my ability to use the skills and tools required for my job.
6. The training I've received has prepared me well to carry out my job duties.

**Source:** Adapted from the CF UMP

Overall, how well prepared are you to perform your duties in support of your organization's mission?

**Response Options:**  
**(Very well Prepared; Well Prepared; Neither Well nor Poorly Prepared; Poorly Prepared; Very Poorly Prepared)**

If poorly or very poorly prepared: Please explain why you feel poorly prepared to perform your duties in support of your organization's mission

**Source:** US SOFS-C

## **Organizational Commitment**

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

**Response Options:**  
**(Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)**

1. I speak highly of DND as a great place to work
2. I am willing to “go over and beyond” in my job to help DND be successful
3. I feel a strong sense of commitment to DND and the CF mission
4. I am motivated to perform my job
5. I would recommend DND to others as a great place to work
6. I am proud of my career at DND

**Source:** DND Exit Survey

## Work Engagement

The following 9 statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, select 1, if you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by selecting the appropriate number (2 to 5) that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

### Response Options:

**(Never; Rarely; Sometimes; Fairly Often; Frequently, If not Always)**

1. At work, I feel bursting with energy.
2. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.
3. I am enthusiastic about my job.
4. My job inspires me.
5. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.
6. I feel happy when I am working intensely.
7. I am proud of the work that I do.
8. I am immersed in my work.
9. I get carried away when I'm working.

**Source:** Unit Morale Profile

## **Self-Reported Performance**

This section asks you to rate aspects of your own performance. Using the 5-point scale below, please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

**Response Options:**  
**(Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Somewhat Disagree; Somewhat agree; Agree; Strongly Agree)**

1. I believe that I do my job efficiently.
2. I consider myself competent.
3. I consider myself hard working.
4. I consider myself productive.
5. I believe I am effective in contributing to the attainment of my work unit's objectives.

**Source:** CF Unit Morale Profile

## Retention and Career Intentions

Please respond to the following questions using the provided scales. Do you intend to leave the CF within \_\_\_\_\_. (Please answer for all three timelines.)

**Response Options:**  
(Definitely Not; Probably Not; Uncertain; Probably Yes; Definitely Yes)

1. One (1) year?
2. Three (3) years?
3. Five (5) years?

**Source:** CF Retention Survey and CF Your-Say Survey

How actively have you searched for a job with another organization in the past year?

**Response Options:**  
(Not at all; Inactively; Somewhat Actively; Actively; Very Actively)

**Source:** CF Retention Survey

In the coming year, do you plan to look for another job?

**Response Options:**

- No;
- Yes, I plan to look both inside and outside the Federal government;
- Yes, but only outside the Federal government;
- Yes, but only within the Federal government;
- I have not decided whether to look for another job)

If Yes above.

How important is each of the following as a reason for your plans to look for a new job?

**Response Options:**

**(Very Unimportant, Unimportant, Neither Important nor Unimportant, Important, Very Important)**

- Personal reasons (e.g., location, family desires, commuting time)
- The work (e.g., use of skills and abilities, ability to work independently, level of stress)
- Working relationships (e.g., relationships with coworkers, supervisors, customers)
- Opportunities for advancement/recognition (e.g, training opportunities, performance awards, advancements)
- Better pay
- Job security
- Other

**Source:** US SOFS-C

## **Annex B Square-Root of N-Proportional Allocation**

---

With proportional allocation (i.e., N-Proportional allocation), the sample size in each stratum is proportional to the population size of the stratum. Therefore, a greater proportion of the sample is allocated to the larger strata, such as CLS, and a smaller proportion of the sample is allocated to the smaller strata, such as VCDS. This procedure results in the sampling fraction being the same in each stratum and equal to the overall sampling fraction (Statistics Canada, 2003). Given that the size of the L1 organizations vary considerably, simply allocating the size of the strata in the sample to be proportional to their size in the population would lead to very precise estimates for larger strata, but to less precise estimates for the smaller strata. Thus, it was decided to allocate or assign the sample strata using the square-root of N-proportional allocation in order to maximize the precision of the estimates within each domain. In this case the allocation parameter is equal to the ratio of the square-root of the population size in the stratum to the sum of the square-root of the population size of all strata. The size of the overall sample, however, is the same using both of these methods.

This page intentionally left blank.

## **List of symbols/abbreviations/acronyms/initialisms**

---

ADF	Australian Defence Force
ADM (HR-Civ)	Assistant Deputy Minister (Human Resources – Civilian)
CAS	Continuous Attitude Survey
CF	Canadian Forces
CMP	Chief Military Personnel
CO	Commanding Officer
DAS	Defence Attitude Survey
DGLPD	Director General Learning and Professional Development
DGMPRA	Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis
DoD	Department of Defence
EAP	Employee Assistance Program
FHCS	Federal Human Capital Survey
MoD	Ministry of Defense
PSES	Public Service Employee Survey
SOFS-C	Status of Forces Survey of Civilian Employees
SSRRB	Social Science Research Review Board
UMP	Unit Morale Profile

This page intentionally left blank.

# Distribution list

---

Document No.: DGMPPRA TM 2009-021

## **LIST PART 1: Internal Distribution by Centre**

- 1 CMP List 1
- 1 DG CORA
- 1 DRDC CORA Chief Scientist
- 1 DRDC CORA Library (1 copy)
- 2 DRDKIM Library (2 copies)
- 1 DRDC/DGSTO/DSTP
- 1 DGMPPRA
- 1 DGMPPRA – Chief Scientist
- 1 DGMPPRA – Deputy DG
- 1 DGMPPRA – Personnel Generation Research - Section Head
- 1 DGMPPRA – Personnel and Family Support Research – Section Head
- 1 DGMPPRA – Organizational and Operational Dynamics – Section Head
- 1 DGMPPRA – Team Leaders
- 1 DRDC (Toronto)
- 1 ADM(HR-Civ)
- 1 ADM(HR-Civ) COS
- 1 DGCESP
- 1 DGCHRMO
- 1 DGLPD
- 1 DGLRC
- 1 DCSHRP

---

22 TOTAL LIST PART 1

## **LIST PART 2: External Distribution by DRDKIM**

- 1 Library and Archives Canada

---

1 TOTAL LIST PART 2

**23 TOTAL COPIES REQUIRED**

This page intentionally left blank.

**DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA**

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall document is classified)

1. ORIGINATOR (The name and address of the organization preparing the document. Organizations for whom the document was prepared, e.g. Centre sponsoring a contractor's report, or tasking agency, are entered in section 8.)  DGMPPRA 101 Colonel By Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0K2		2. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION (Overall security classification of the document including special warning terms if applicable.)  UNCLASSIFIED	
3. TITLE (The complete document title as indicated on the title page. Its classification should be indicated by the appropriate abbreviation (S, C or U) in parentheses after the title.)  DND Your-Say Survey: Research Proposal			
4. AUTHORS (last name, followed by initials – ranks, titles, etc. not to be used)  Goldenberg, I.			
5. DATE OF PUBLICATION (Month and year of publication of document.)  November 2009	6a. NO. OF PAGES (Total containing information, including Annexes, Appendices, etc.)  54	6b. NO. OF REFS (Total cited in document.)  40	
7. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (The category of the document, e.g. technical report, technical note or memorandum. If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g. interim, progress, summary, annual or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.)  Technical Memorandum			
8. SPONSORING ACTIVITY (The name of the department project office or laboratory sponsoring the research and development – include address.)  DGMPPRA 101 Colonel By Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0K2			
9a. PROJECT OR GRANT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable research and development project or grant number under which the document was written. Please specify whether project or grant.)		9b. CONTRACT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable number under which the document was written.)	
10a. ORIGINATOR'S DOCUMENT NUMBER (The official document number by which the document is identified by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this document.)  DGMPPRA TM 2009-021		10b. OTHER DOCUMENT NO(s). (Any other numbers which may be assigned this document either by the originator or by the sponsor.)	
11. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY (Any limitations on further dissemination of the document, other than those imposed by security classification.)  Unlimited			
12. DOCUMENT ANNOUNCEMENT (Any limitation to the bibliographic announcement of this document. This will normally correspond to the Document Availability (11). However, where further distribution (beyond the audience specified in (11) is possible, a wider announcement audience may be selected.)			

13. **ABSTRACT** (A brief and factual summary of the document. It may also appear elsewhere in the body of the document itself. It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified documents be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall begin with an indication of the security classification of the information in the paragraph (unless the document itself is unclassified) represented as (S), (C), (R), or (U). It is not necessary to include here abstracts in both official languages unless the text is bilingual.)

Today, employee surveys are a common management tool in successful organizations. As such, implementation of the *DND Your-Say Survey* is proposed with the intention of providing Assistant Deputy Minister (Human Resources – Civilian) (ADM (HR-Civ)) with empirical information on key personnel issues in an effort to help inform human resource planning and policy development. This paper outlines the purposes of the *DND Your-Say Survey*, summarizes the research on the increased use of employee surveys in recent years, describes the regularly-administered employee surveys used in Chief Military Personnel (CMP) and in the U.S., U.K., and Australia, and explains the benefits of the *DND Your-Say Survey* over and above the *Public Service Employee Survey*. Methodology, including survey and model development, sampling, and procedure are outlined.

14. **KEYWORDS, DESCRIPTORS or IDENTIFIERS** (Technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a document and could be helpful in cataloguing the document. They should be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location may also be included. If possible keywords should be selected from a published thesaurus, e.g. Thesaurus of Engineering and Scientific Terms (TEST) and that thesaurus identified. If it is not possible to select indexing terms which are Unclassified, the classification of each should be indicated as with the title.)

Employee Survey; Your-Say Survey; ADM(HR-Civ)



[www.drdc-rddc.gc.ca](http://www.drdc-rddc.gc.ca)