



## ORIGINAL STUDY



# Creation and Assessment of an Organizational Climate Analysis Tool in the military environment (SP-q45)

Salvatore Poccia\*   Giuseppe Saracino^

**Abstract** - The purpose of the study is the creation of an assessment questionnaire on the psychological climate in the Armed Forces. To this end, a panel of Italian Army Psychologists, serving at the Operational Forces Headquarters South, selected the academic contributions, they considered most relevant to the military environment. Later, an initial group of items was selected for adaptation and evaluation according to the validity of their content, calculated using the Aiken index. The questionnaire was administered to 1,176 military personnel. The results of this exploratory phase yielded a latent 5-factor model and a 45-item final questionnaire (SP-q).

**Key words:** psychological climate, assessment, teamwork, leadership, psychometrics.

### Key messages:

- The concept of organizational climate is closely related to that of morale.
- A questionnaire to assess the dimensions that contribute to the creation of organizational climate in order to identify its multidimensional nature.

### Introduction

Due to its multidimensional nature, we cannot give a precise definition of organizational climate. That is why there are several one-dimensional questionnaires, characterized by their high specificity but limited ability to provide comprehensive insight.

Among the skills a Commander should have, managerial skills are assuming an increasingly prominent role. For this reason, psychological climate analysis, a practice now established in civilian organizations, is gaining relevance in the military. The increasing prevalence of such interventions requires critical reflection

on the methods and tools employed, which must be based on a sound theoretical framework and adapted to the specific military environment.

A plethora of tools have been developed in the academic field, but none of them can be effectively adapted to the peculiarities of the military environment. This paper aims to develop a tool to assess the many dimensions that contribute to the creation of organizational climate questionnaire. The tool is designed to simultaneously meet the needs of practicality and speed of use psychologists have, while working in military organizations. The Army General Staff defines organizational climate as «the set of perceptions,

beliefs, and feelings that service members have about the organization they belong to» (Army General Staff, 2018). In this regard, psychological climate can be defined as the perceptions individuals have of all aspects of their work experience, that is, organizational climate. In other words, as articulated by Quaglino and Mander (1992), psychological climate can be defined as the perception of organizational climate.

Other studies have examined organizational climate along several dimensions, including Perceived Organizational Support.

In the mid-1980s, a group of researchers in the United States began a systematic study

\* Cap. (Medical Corps, PsyD) Operational Forces Headquarters South.

^ Lt. (Medical Corps, PsyD) at Cecchignola Selection Center.

**Corresponding: E-mail:** [salvatore.poccia@comfopsud.esercito.difesa.it](mailto:salvatore.poccia@comfopsud.esercito.difesa.it)



of the importance that individuals ascribe to feeling valued and to feeling the attention they receive from the organization they belong to. In their research, scholars observed that this perception promotes feelings of belonging and identification with the organization. The workplace - in fulfilling individuals' needs for approval, esteem, and affiliation - can become a significant source of social and emotional resources. In light of its intrinsic connection with aspects of identification, Perceived Organizational Support has been identified as a crucial element in assessing climate in military settings.

In the life of every military person, the ethical component takes on a special significance: the moral integrity of a military person does not end with the fulfilling of a code of ethics. It becomes something deeper, having to do with a sense of integrity that must permeate the organizational culture of every unit. For this sense of integrity to permeate at all levels, the example set by those in leadership positions is crucial.

As defined by Simons (2002) (5), the integrity and trustworthiness of leaders is manifested both in the coherence between «words» and «deeds» and in the ability to deliver on promises made. Given the importance of integrity in the military environment, we decided to assess it at two levels: direct superiors and the chain of command of the unit to which they belong. To assess both, we used items adapted from the work of two research groups, the first by Dineen, Lewicki and Tomlison (2006) (6) on the integrity of leaders (understood here as «direct superiors») and the second by Mayer and Davis (1999) (7) on the integrity of Top Management (understood here as the chain of command of the unit).

Closely related to behavioural integrity is trust. Trust was also included in the theo-

retical frame of reference by the panel of psychologists because of its central role in all relationships, including professional ones (Avallone, 2010) (8). In particular, the selection of items for this dimension was based on those used in the work of Mayer and Davis (1999) (9). In the creation of a military climate questionnaire, we need to mention the concept of fairness. In particular, the chosen construct refers to Colquitt's (2001) (10) studies on organizational justice. The author describes the model as divided in three categories:

- distributive justice: the perceived sense of justice is determined by comparing what was received with what was considered fair to receive;
- procedural justice: refers to the perceived fairness of the procedures governing the organization's distribution of resources (Shore and Shore, 1995)(11);
- interactional justice: focuses on people's perceptions of how they were treated in the various human resource management processes, respect and sensitivity in communicating, and transparency in decision making.

The concept of autonomy is also taken into account. It refers to the extent to which staff can control the pace and space of their work, including involvement in decision-making. Three components are identified in its description: work method, work time and work criteria. In creating the questionnaire we referenced to the one developed by Breugh (1998) (12).

Interaction among colleagues is another important factor that can affect people's perceptions of their work environment. Organizational contexts that support the ability to collaborate and interact positively create the conditions for better overall engagement.

In order to analyze this dimension, four items related to the relationship between colleagues from the Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment (PFIT) scale developed by Donovan, Drasgow and Munson (1998) (13) were used.

The last four dimensions considered for the construction of the questionnaire are team, communication, job description and incentive, from the Majer and D'Amato (2001) M\_DOQ questionnaire. The 'team' dimension refers to group cohesion and examines the set of behaviors that describe the willingness of group members to cooperate, provide information, support and knowledge. 'Communication' refers to the willingness and clarity in the dissemination of information, both upwards and downwards. The 'job description' factor assesses perceptions of the extent to which each employee knows the scope of their role and the organization's expectations. The incentive factor looks at perceptions of how people are valued, both in terms of recognition and in terms of the opportunities for career development offered.

## Materials and Methods

This is an observational study. The sample size is 1,176 career military personnel who were administered the organizational climate analysis questionnaire (SP-q45) in a military environment. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted using "minimum residual" extraction method and Oblimin rotation. A panel consisting of six Italian Army Psychologists Officers identified, among the constructs in the literature, theoretical references and questionnaires from which they selected an initial set of items for content validity analysis. The 104 items thus obtained were adapted with a



linguistic reformulation more suited to the military environment. Each of the panel members then rated each item as either “essential,” “useful but not essential,” or “not necessary.” Aiken’s index was calculated to determine the content validity of each item. In addition to providing a value between -1.00 and +1.00, this index allows us to test the null hypothesis that the distribution of judges’ ratings was obtained by chance. Item appropriateness rating levels are coded from 0 (the lowest) to “c-1,” where “c” is the number of levels. The number of judges scoring items in a given category is denoted by «n<sub>i</sub>», where «N» is the total number of judges. The formula for calculating the index V is:

$$V = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{c-1} i \times n_i}{N(c-1)}$$

This index varies between -1.00 and 1.00,

and the probability of having obtained the particular judges’ rating distribution can be calculated as:

$$p = \frac{N!}{c^N n_0! n_1! n_2! \dots n_{c-1}!}$$

where “N” is the total number of judges, “c” is the number of levels provided by the evaluation system and “n” is the frequency with which the specific one was evaluated in each level. For the purpose of this paper, items with a “V” index of 0.75 or higher and a random distribution probability of less than 0.05 were considered valid. **Tab. 1** shows the 54 items selected for content validity, the reference construct, the original wording of the item and the version adapted from the panel of psychologists.

Once the selected items had been administered, the Keiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) index of sampling adequacy was used to

verify that the conditions of sampling adequacy and sphericity were met for factor analysis. Jamovi was used as statistical analysis tool.

## Results

The sample for the study consists of 1,176 military personnel (**Tab. 2**), of whom 93.6% are men. Some 83% of the sample graduated from high school, 9.3% graduated from middle school, 6.3% hold a bachelor’s degree and 1.5% hold a master’s degree. Some 51.1% is enlisted personnel career in permanent service, 17.9% are NCOs personnel, and 26.3% is personnel on a fixed term contract (VFP1 - VFP4).

The KMO index (**Tab. 3**) of sample adequacy gave positive results both globally and for all items, as did Bartlett’s test. The results of EFA exploratory factor analysis with “minimum residual” extraction method and Oblimin rotation are shown in **Tab. 4** below.

**Tab. 1** – Adapted items.

Construct	Reference source	Original item	Adapted item	V*	p
Perceived Organizational Support	Battistelli and Mariani (2011)	If I have a problem, my organization is ready to help me.	If I have a problem, my Unit is ready to help me.	0.83	0.020
		My organization really cares about my well-being.	My Unit really cares about my well-being.	1	0.001
		My organization is available to offer support if needed.	My Unit is available to assess special needs.	0.83	0.020
		If the opportunity arose, my organization would take advantage of me.	If the opportunity arose, my Unit would take full advantage of my availability.	0.75	0.027
Managers integrity	Dineen, Lewicki and Tomlison (2006) *	I wish my boss would practice what he preaches more often. *	I would like to see my superiors put into practice the suggestions they make more often. *	0.83	0.020
		My boss can afford to do things that I could never do. *	My superiors can afford to do things that I could never do. *	0.75	0.041



Construct	Reference source	Original item	Adapted item	V*	p
<b>Top Management integrity</b>	Mayer and Davis (1999)	Top Management manifests a high sense of justice	My chain of command proves to be fair and correct overall.	1	0.001
		Top Management makes every effort to be fair in relations with others.	My chain of command is committed to being fair in its relations with personnel.	0.91	0.008
		I can be sure that the Top Management stands by its words.	I can be sure that the chain of command stands by their words.	0.91	0.008
		The words and actions of Top Management are not very consistent. *	The words and actions of chain of command are not very consistent. *	0.75	0.041
<b>Trust in Management</b>	Mayer and Davis (1999)	I would gladly leave complete control of my future to the manager of this company.	I would rely on this chain of command to make important choices for my professional future.	0.75	0.041
		I would feel comfortable entrusting the manager with an important issue or problem, even if I could not control their actions.	I would feel comfortable entrusting an important issue or problem to the chain of command.	0.91	0.008
<b>Organizational distributive justice</b>	Leventhal, 1976	Do you consider yourself adequately remunerated for the work you have accomplished?	I consider myself adequately remunerated for the work I have accomplished.	0.91	0.008
		Given your performance, do you think your compensation is fair?	Given my performance, I consider my compensation to be fair.	0.75	0.027
<b>Organizational procedural justice</b>	Thitabaut and Walter, 1975	Have you had the opportunity to express your views and feelings at different HR procedures?	I had the opportunity to express my opinion regarding personnel management (e.g., distribution of tasks, assignment of duties, etc.).	0.75	0.041
	Leventhal, 1980	Were the procedures consistently and evenly applied?	Personnel management is implemented fairly and evenly.	0.91	0.008
		Were the procedures applied without bias?	Personnel management is implemented without bias.	0.83	0.020
		Did the procedures adhere to ethical and moral principles?	Personnel management is implemented in an ethically appropriate manner.	0.75	0.027
<b>Interactional justice</b>	Bies and Moag, 1986	Has the manager treated you politely?	My superiors treat me kindly.	1	0.001
		Did the manager treat you with respect?	My superiors treat me with respect.	0.91	0.008
<b>Affective commitment</b>	Meyer and Allen, 1996	I like to talk about this organization with people who do not work here.	I like to talk about this Unit with people who do not work here.	0.75	0.04
		I really feel that the problems of this organization are also my problems.	I really feel that the problems of this Unit are also my problems.	0.83	0.20
		I think I could easily become attached to another organization, as with this one. *	I think I could easily become attached to another Unit, as with this one. *	0.91	0.008
		I do not feel that I am part this organization. *	I do not feel that I am part this Unit. *	0.83	0.08
<b>Continuance commitment</b>	Meyer and Allen, 1996	It would be very difficult for me to leave this organization now even if I wanted to	It would be very difficult for me to leave this Unit now even if I wanted to.	0.75	0.04
		Too many things in my life would be complicated if I decided to leave this organization right now.	Too many things in my life would be complicated if I decided to leave this Unit right now.	0.75	0.02
<b>Normative commitment</b>	Meyer and Allen, 1996	If I received another offer for a better job, I would not think it right to leave this organization.	If I received another offer for a better job, I would not think it right to leave this Armed Force.	0.75	0.02
		I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to an organization.	I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to a Unit.	0.83	0.008





Construct	Reference source	Original item	Adapted item	V*	p
Autonomy (method)	Breught, 1998	I am allowed to choose how best to organize my work (methods).	In performing the tasks assigned to me, I have a fair amount of autonomy.	0.75	0.04
		I am free to choose the best way to do my job (the procedures I use).	I have freedom to choose strategies to solve tasks appropriate to my role	0.83	0.20
Autonomy (scheduling)	Breught, 1998	I have some leeway in determining the order of the activities I need to perform.	I have some leeway in determining the order of the activities I need to perform.	0.75	0.04
Autonomy (criteria)	Breught, 1998	////	////		
Working with colleagues	Donovan, Drasgow and Munson 1998	Colleagues help each other.	Colleagues help each other.	0.83	0.02
		Colleagues argue with each other. *	Colleagues argue with each other. *	0.75	0.04
		Colleagues criticize each other. *	Colleagues criticize each other. *	0.83	0.008
		Colleagues treat each other with mutual respect.	Colleagues treat each other with mutual respect.	0.91	0.008
Team	Majer, D'Amato 2001	In my Unit/office, people support each other.	In my Unit, people support each other.	0.75	0.02
		In my Unit/office, the atmosphere is tense. *	In my Unit, the atmosphere is tense. *	0.83	0.02
		In my Unit/office, people understand each other.	In my Unit, people understand each other.	0.75	0.04
		In my Unit/office, people help each other.	In my Unit, people help each other.	0.83	0.008
		In my Unit/office, personal ambitions matter more than team spirit. *	In my Unit, personal ambitions matter more than team spirit. *	0.83	0.02
		In my Unit/office, there is a strong spirit of cooperation.	In my Unit, there is a strong spirit of cooperation.	0.83	0.02
Job description	Majer, D'Amato 2001	My role at the Unit/office is not well defined. *	My role at the Unit is not well defined. *	0.75	0.04
		My job allows me to follow a task from start to finish.	My job allows me to follow a task from start to finish.	0.91	0.008
		My job is clearly defined.	My job is clearly defined.	0.91	0.008
		I am fully aware of the scope and limits of my responsibilities.	I am fully aware of the scope and limits of my responsibilities.	0.83	0.02
Communication	Majer, D'Amato 2001	It is often difficult to know where to find information. *	It is often difficult to know where to find information. *	0.75	0.04
		It is difficult to understand according to what criteria awards are given. *	It is difficult to understand according to what criteria awards are given. *	0.75	0.04
		Information is not always spread through official channels. *	Information is not always spread through official channels. *	0.91	0.008
		It is difficult to obtain clear, precise and certain information. *	It is difficult to obtain clear, precise and certain information. *	0.75	0.04
		Information spreads quickly.	Information spreads quickly	0.75	0.04
Incentivation	Majer, D'Amato 2001	Internal development is preferred to external recruitment.	Personnel are motivated for personal development and the acquisition of new skills.	0.66	0.2
		Attempts to do things differently are valued in my company.	Attempts to improve procedures are valued.	0.83	0.02
		Initiatives and personal success are viewed positively.	Initiatives and personal success are viewed positively.	0.83	0.008
		In my company, the incentive systems are clear and applied fairly.	The reward system is impartial.	0.75	0.04
*index "V" => to 0.75 and with a random distribution probability less than 0.05; p<0.001 and <0.05					



**Tab. 2 – Sociodemographic data (n.1.176).**

Variables	Frequency	%
Age	36 / DS 9.96	
Sex	1101 (M) 74 (F) 1 (N/A)	93.6 % 6.3 % /
Education		
Middle school	8	9.3
High school	13	83
Bachelor's degree	16	6.3
Master's degree	17	1.5
Categories		
VFP1/VFP4	308	26.3
Enlisted personnel	601	51.1
NCO	210	17.9
Not specified	17	1.4

**Tab. 3 – Measure of Sampling Adequacy KMO.**

ITEM	MSA	ITEM	MSA
Globale	0.955	28	0.504
1	0.970	29	0.524
2	0.935	30	0.974
3	0.970	31	0.950
4	0.956	32	0.952
5	0.965	33	0.935
6	0.952	34	0.907
7	0.962	35	0.963
8	0.950	36	0.964
9	0.978	37	0.956
10	0.966	38	0.890
11	0.944	39	0.924
12	0.960	40	0.904
13	0.968	41	0.972
14	0.951	42	0.962
15	0.968	43	0.969
16	0.970	44	0.976
17	0.981	45	0.935
18	0.930	46	0.973
19	0.917	47	0.958
20	0.963	48	0.948
21	0.970	49	0.957
22	0.940	50	0.960
23	0.912	51	0.960
24	0.959	52	0.949
25	0.961	53	0.966
26	0.893	54	0.961
27	0.935		
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity			
$\chi^2$	dgl	p	
12144	1431	<.001	

$\chi^2$ - Chi-squared test; relevant for p<001

**Tab. 4 – Factorial saturations.**

	Factor					Uniqueness
	1	2	3	4	5	
5	0.738					0.422
3	0.727					0.444
30	0.682					0.331
41	0.661					0.314
13	0.642					0.487
46	0.622					0.321
10	0.619					0.417
17	0.605					0.350
9	0.594					0.456
1	0.561					0.474
15	0.519					0.428
7	0.516					0.485
2	0.503					0.635
53	-0.491		0.466			0.361
24	0.476	0.333				0.418
4	0.464					0.483
37	0.449			0.384		0.350
20	0.419					0.557
22	-0.393					0.713
19	-0.386					0.816
47	0.348					0.520
6	-0.339					0.736
23						0.774
48						0.899
18						0.814
31		0.892				0.208
42		0.834				0.202
25		0.802				0.217
16		0.659				0.406
44		0.607				0.281
8		-0.546				0.502
27		-0.526				0.532
14		-0.445				0.630
21		0.405				0.587
26						0.898
49			0.726			0.396
51			0.698			0.288
33			0.646			0.490
32			0.624			0.445
52	-0.368		0.556			0.388
54	-0.476		0.542			0.375
34			0.524	-0.326		0.571
50	-0.364		0.512			0.494
43			0.424			0.440
11						0.780
40				0.797		0.369
39				0.722		0.409
35				0.698		0.393
38				0.515		0.746
45				0.472		0.539
12				0.396		0.621
36				0.392		0.550
29					0.789	0.369
28					0.743	0.441

The "Minimum Residual" extraction method was used in combination with an "Oblimin" rotation.



The resulting model has a good fit and the five extracted dimensions together explain 50.8% of the variance. For the sake of completeness, the inter-correlations of the extracted factors are listed below (**Tables 5, 6, 7**).

The scoring of averages and sample standard deviation was for Factor 1 (Average 34,8 and SD 11,9); Factor 2 (Average 10 and SD 6,9); Factor 3, (Average 23,3 and SD 7,7); Factor 4, (Average 23,8 and SD 5); Factor 5, (Average 6,1 and SD 2,2). The overall climate construct score was 38 mean and SD 19.7.

Depending on the results of the EFA, items that did not have satisfactory levels of saturation (less than 0.3) and that satu-

rated simultaneously and to about the same extent on multiple factors were eliminated. This screening work led to the creation of the final version of the questionnaire, the individual items of which are given below, aggregated by factor.

The first factor was defined as “trust in the Unit” and consists of 18 items. Factor No. 2 was defined as “relational dynamics” and consists of 9 items. Factor No. 3 was defined as “involvement” and includes No. 9 items. Factor No. 4 includes No. 7 items and has been defined as “autonomy and work management.” Factor No. 5 was defined as “instrumentality” and consists of No. 2 items (**Tab. 8**).

## Discussion

Organizational climate represents a balance between the demands of the work environment and the resources the person has to cope with them. It is inevitably intertwined with the well-being of the organization they work in and where they spends much of their everyday life. It is a dynamic, ever-changing condition. This balance is the result of complex assessments that people make regarding their work context.

The climate construct is characterized by a multiplicity of variables/factors, physical work environment among others. The military world is more complex and characterized by its own specificity that makes it unique and difficult to analyze with an approach geared toward adapting external tools to its peculiarities. Among other things, the concept of organizational climate is closely related to that of morale. Morale represents a “conditio sine qua non” to enable the Service to achieve the increasingly ambitious goals it sets for itself. Morale is a psychological condition of the individual or a group of individuals; it conditions determination and performance resilience, affects discipline, cohesion and unit efficiency. Therefore, the organizational climate in an Armed Force is closely related to psychological readiness and operational efficiency. In this regard, it is important to note those who are part the organization perceive operational efficiency and organizational climate in the same way. Therefore, we can assume that a good level of efficiency is almost always combined with a good organizational climate.

On the contrary, inefficient organizations are dysfunctional and generate phenomena of frustration of important needs, such as esteem and self-actualization.

**Tab. 5 – Measures of Model Adaptation.**

RMSEA 90% CI			Test del Modello				
RMSEA	Inferiore	Superiore	TLI	BIC	$\chi^2$	gdl	p
0.0501	0.0470	0.0535	0.884	-4652	2177	1171	<.001

**Tab. 6 – Factor Loading.**

Fattore	Carichi SS	% della Varianza	% Cumulata
1	10.20	18.89	18.9
2	6.37	11.80	30.7
3	5.02	9.30	40.0
4	4.30	7.96	48.0
5	1.53	2.84	50.8

**Tab. 7 – Interfactorial Correlations.**

	1	2	3	4	5
1	—	0.625	-0.504	0.486	-0.0113
2		—	-0.437	0.399	-0.1176
3			—	-0.283	0.0823
4				—	0.1407
5					—



**Tab. 8** – Items extracted from the EFA. Final questionnaire.

<b>Factor 1 - Trust in the Unit. This factor can be defined as the trust that staff have in the Unit, the perception that they are supported by it, and fairness in the management</b>		<b>Factor 3 - Involvement. It refers to the feeling of belonging and identification to the Unit, the clarity and consistency of communication processes, the sharing of goals, and the perception of being part of a family.</b>	
1	If I have a problem my Unit is ready to help me	28	I do not feel that I am part this Unit ®
2	In my Unit reward system is impartial	29	I believe that being a military person in this Unit no longer has any meaning ®
3	My chain of command is committed to being fair in its relations with personnel	30	My role at the Unit is not well defined ®
4	I feel treated by my superiors politely	31	In my Unit, the atmosphere is tense ®
5	I can be sure that the chain of command stands by their words	32	I do not feel emotionally attached to this Unit®
6	The words and actions of chain of command are not very consistent ®	33	In this Unit, it is often difficult to know where to find information®
7	I would rely on this chain of command to make important choices for my professional future	34	In this Unit, I do not feel I am part of the family ®
8	My Unit really cares about my well-being	35	In this Unit, it is difficult to obtain clear, precise and certain information ®
9	I would feel comfortable entrusting an important issue or problem to the chain of command	36	In my Unit, people are not sufficiently informed about the decisions made by the command so that they can plan their activities ®
10	Personnel management is implemented in an ethically appropriate manner	<b>Factor 4 - Autonomy and work management. This factor refers to the clarity of roles, tasks and procedures, the perception of having a fair degree of autonomy in performing tasks.</b>	
11	If the opportunity arose, my Unit would take full advantage of my availability ®	37	I had the opportunity to express my opinion regarding personnel management (e.g., distribution of tasks, assignment of duties, etc.)
12	I consider myself adequately remunerated for the work I have accomplished	38	I have freedom to choose strategies to solve tasks appropriate to my role
13	I would like to see my superiors put into practice the suggestions they make more often	39	In this Unit, initiatives and personal success are viewed positively
14	In my Unit, the award criteria are clear and applied fairly	40	I am fully aware of the scope and limits of my responsibilities
15	My chain of command proves to be fair and correct	41	In performing the tasks assigned to me, I have a fair amount of autonomy
16	Personnel management is implemented fairly and evenly	42	I have some leeway in determining the order of the activities I need to perform
17	My job is clearly defined	43	The functions associated with my assignment are clearly defined
18	The people in my Unit try to make newcomers feel at ease	<b>Factor 5 - Instrumentality. It refers to the choice to remain within the Unit due to needs that cannot be attributed to an internal motivational drive, but to a choice of convenience.</b>	
<b>Factor 2 - Relational Dynamics. This factor refers to the existing relationships among staff within the Unit, perceived support, and personal motivation.</b>		44	Too many things in my life would be complicated if I decided to leave this Unit right now ®
19	In my Unit, people help each other	45	It would be very difficult for me to leave this Unit now even if I wanted to ®
20	In my Unit, colleagues criticize each other		
21	In my Unit, personal ambitions matter more than team spirit		
22	In my Unit, people support each other		
23	In this Unit, personnel are motivated for personal development and the acquisition of new skills		
24	In my Unit, people help each other		
25	In my Unit, colleagues argue with each other ®		
26	In my Unit, there is a strong spirit of cooperation		
27	In my Unit, colleagues treat each other with mutual respect		





## Conclusions

The military organization requires from its members a very specific commitment, different from other environments and higher than the usual standards, even in peacetime, for example during training activities, which must reflect real situations and the characteristics of operational activities. The soldiers' determination is a typical character trait, since their work is essentially a confrontation of opposing wills, one of which must prevail over the other. This requires physical strength and endurance for prolonged effort, as well as a resilient character. These qualities should be acquired through training and an appropriate

lifestyle. As a result, those who enjoy comfort and convenience will be less likely to tolerate the hardships typical of operational situations, which require unusual adaptability. Similarly, the willingness to change duty stations frequently – which is a characteristic of being in the military - while adapting to contingency housing standards requires a typically military mindset. All these aspects have led us to produce this work, based on an analysis of the variables and characteristics of climate in the military environment. It represents a need and a first step towards being able to functionally study the construct of climate in a highly specific context such as the military can be.

## Disclosures:

The authors declare that they have no relationship relevant to the contents of this paper to disclose.

Article received on 11/04/2024; reviewed on 02/05/2024; accepted on 07/10/2024.