

12

While few organizations would willingly identify as being unfriendly to veterans, articulating what being veteran friendly means is an ongoing challenge. As such, organization leaders may struggle to explain the term, beyond reporting a need to support military veterans. This knowledge gap could contribute toward the high turnover rates of military veterans, particularly within their first 2 years of employment. To lessen these struggles, the authors propose a framework focused on building and sustaining a veteran-friendly organization. The framework provides an opportunity for organization leaders to improve their knowledge and preparation for creating a lasting veteran-friendly culture. The paper introduces veteran employment challenges, offers a review of literature on veteran-friendly organizations, details the proposed framework on veteran-friendly practices, and concludes with a reflection on the framework and implications for organizations and scholars interested in supporting veteran career transitions.

A Guide for Training Organizations to Promote Veteran-Friendly Practices

Michael J. Kirchner, Sarah E. Minnis, Faith Stull

Despite having little to no programming in place, many organizations report being friendly and supportive of veterans. Upon being asked to define *veteran friendly*, organization leaders may struggle to explain the term, beyond reporting a need to support military veterans. This knowledge gap could contribute toward the high turnover rates of military veterans—particularly within their first 2 years of employment (Maury, Stone, & Roseman, 2016). Developing and maintaining a veteran-friendly workplace requires a willingness to learn about veterans' unique experiences and capabilities, motivation to engage veteran-friendly organizational practices, and commitment from organization leaders to continue promoting the hiring and supporting of veterans. As such, there is a clear opportunity to improve organization leaders' knowledge and preparation for creating a lasting veteran-friendly culture.

We begin by outlining career transition obstacles faced by veterans, as well as addressing the current challenges shared by employers seeking to hire

and retain former service members. Next, we provide a review of existing literature on veteran-friendly organizations before introducing our proposed framework on veteran-friendly practices, which can be used by organization leaders to develop and uphold a veteran-friendly culture. The framework will guide a discussion regarding the key stakeholders, strategies, and timeline for implementation. Challenges of the proposed framework will be offered along with anticipated impacts. We conclude with a reflection on the framework and implications for organizations and scholars interested in supporting veteran career transitions.

Significance

As Kirchner and Minnis (2018) noted, few organizations would willingly identify as being unfriendly to veterans, though articulating what being *friendly* means is an ongoing challenge. Confusion surrounds the term as even employers who have received the veteran-friendly designation often struggle to elaborate upon its meaning (Kirchner, Thompson, Holloway, & Hoffman, 2019). Accordingly, little consensus as to the definition of veteran friendly (or “military friendly”) exists. Regardless of such uncertainties, many organizations put forth considerable effort and resources to identify, attract, and hire veterans (Curry Hall, Harrell, Bicksler, Stewart, & Fisher, 2014; Harrell & Berglass, 2012). Kirchner and Minnis (2018) found organizations that identified as being military friendly demonstrated support of veterans through: (1) recruitment and hiring, (2) professional development and learning, (3) community outreach, and (4) reporting of veteran employment data/demographics. Further, Orion Talent (2018) found 99% of participating organizations, regardless of size, geographic location, or industry, recruit military talent. Another study conducted by Military Times discovered surveyed organizations’ on average allocated approximately 20% of their recruiting budgets to attracting veterans (Altman, 2015). Additional instances of support of veteran hiring are demonstrated by organizations in both public and private sectors, such as representatives attending veteran-specific job fairs, connecting with military bases, committing to the 100,000 Jobs Mission, and participating in Hiring Our Heroes initiatives (Harrell & Berglass, 2012). Put simply, the desire to be viewed as veteran friendly is evident, but few guidelines are available to help organizations defend the claim.

Veteran career transitions have received increased attention since the attacks on September 11, 2001. The attention and corresponding resources allocated by organizations to support their transitions have led to a reduction in veteran unemployment rates, which frequently are below nonmilitary counterparts (U.S. Department of Labor, 2020); however, this shift should not signal employment challenges are resolved. In fact, the transition from the military to civilian employment sector can be quite problematic. As Edelman (2018) reported, many surveyed Post 9/11 veterans had trouble locating a position at the level they wanted and/or a job in their desired field for

numerous reasons, including a lack of experience (40%), education level (39%), skills or certifications (40%), and industry contacts (37%). Unrealistic job expectations and/or underpreparedness for the career transition likely exacerbate postmilitary employment challenges (Kintzle et al., 2015; Zogas, 2017). Moreover, lower wages, underemployment, and high turnover are enduring concerns, with nearly one-third of veteran job seekers reporting being underemployed and almost two-thirds of veterans leaving their first nonmilitary job within 2 years (Barrera & Carter, 2017; Kasperkevic, 2017; Maury et al., 2016). Whether skill mismatch, unchallenging work, lack of career development, and/or inadequate human resources services, each issue is a significant contributor to poor veteran retention rates (Maury et al., 2016). Thus, while veterans are pointedly recruited and more likely to be hired than their civilian counterparts, employment challenges are far from obsolete (Barrera & Carter, 2017).

Though reductions in unemployment are favorable, there is limited understanding regarding the effect of veteran-friendly practices on other organizational outcomes (Kirchner & Minnis, 2018; Kirchner et al., 2019). In fact, 2019 was an encouraging year for veterans, with December 2019 marking the 16th month in a row veteran unemployment rates were lower than nonveteran unemployment rates (U.S. Department of Labor, 2020). Beyond unemployment, evidence validating the impact of being veteran friendly on retention, satisfaction, profitability, and consumer perceptions is largely unknown. In support, Kirchner et al. (2019) found employers were not evaluating the impact of veteran-friendly programming on organizational outcomes. This lack of assessments is, perhaps, surprising simply because many employers focus efforts on identifying, attracting, and hiring veterans (Curry Hall et al., 2014; Harrell & Berglass, 2012). Therefore, data which scrutinizes the return on investment from being veteran friendly stands to reveal best practices and guide implementation processes.

Despite promising advantages, literature on and models for creating a veteran-friendly culture are largely unaddressed. Of value to employers and veterans alike, veteran-informed cultures stand to improve veteran connections to the workplace, increase engagement, and boost retention rates (Crenshaw & Maddy, 2017). To achieve a positive return on investment, employers must become knowledgeable of the needs, challenges, and strengths of veterans, particularly because military and civilian cultures can greatly differ (Crenshaw & Maddy, 2017; McCormick et al., 2019). Cultural differences including structure, roles, career progression, rules of conduct, and values are often dissimilar between military and nonmilitary organizations (Hudson, n.d.), with one survey finding 81% of veterans, 75% of civilians, and 80% of employers reporting the typical citizen struggles to understand veterans (Edelman, 2018). The pervasive knowledge gap further stresses the need for a detailed framework outlining how employers can create a veteran-friendly culture.

History of Veteran-Friendly Practices

Engaging in veteran-friendly practices has become a hallmark for most organizations, particularly in the Gulf War II era of the past 20 years. Using the *veteran-friendly* moniker to denote an organization's willingness to support veterans, attract them for hire, and demonstrate interest in being recognized by the community as a preferred place to do business has become standard practice across multiple industries (Kirchner & Minnis, 2018; Kirchner et al., 2019). Organizations of all sizes have used the veteran-friendly label to make themselves more attractive to consumers and employees alike. Despite a lack of substance and programming behind their statements, organizations have been intentional in their messaging to veterans. This distinction does not suggest that organizations are intentionally misportraying their stance on veterans; rather, it should be used to recognize that there are bad actors who may choose to use veterans for their own financial benefits rather than provide the kind of support the veteran community needs.

In their 2018 research, Kirchner and Minnis looked at how the term *military friendly*, used interchangeably with *veteran friendly* in their work, could be defined based on the existing programs and strategies used by thirty-one organizations recognized as being *military friendly*. Through their examination, they posited that *military friendly* is "a process of providing transition support to military veterans through four pillars: (a) recruitment and hiring; (b) personal, professional and career development; (c) community outreach; and (d) promotion of veteran hiring practices" (Kirchner & Minnis, 2018, p. 103). Given the breadth of ways in which veterans were engaged by organizations, the themes identified in this definition encapsulate the diverse opportunities made available to veterans throughout the full employee life cycle. While every practice engaged by organizations may not fit neatly into this definition, it provides a worthwhile starting point for further discussion.

Recruiting, hiring, onboarding, and training veterans should be a strategic priority for organizations seeking talented applicants who have diverse skill sets, maintain professionalism, and have a willingness to engage in learning activities to become proficient in their work. Leveraging veteran employees to participate in the recruitment, hiring, and onboarding of new veterans provides an opportunity to build strong organizational affinity with currently employed veterans, as well as offer a role model and mentor for new veteran employees. Long-term veteran employees may be well-equipped to assist new veteran employees because of their shared experiences, common language, similar behaviors, and even learning styles, all of which helps create a pathway for cultural integration into a nonmilitary workplace (Kirchner & Minnis, 2018; McCormick et al., 2019).

Veteran affinity groups and mentoring programs provide opportunities for veterans to engage as a unique population as they transition into the broader organizational and civilian culture. Beginning with the onboarding process, assigning a veteran mentor to newly hired veterans gives them a point of

contact and support as they integrate into the organizational culture. Learning about civilian workplace culture is an important aspect of the overall veteran transition and integration. Similarly, veteran affinity groups offer veterans the opportunity to connect with others who have common military backgrounds and experiences. While veterans may have served during different times and capacities, it is the common experience of military service that often draws veterans together. Having the touchpoints of mentors and affinity groups specifically dedicated to them gives veterans the kind of support that can help them transition into civilian work and a unique organizational situation (Dillon & Advocate, 2017).

Establishing partnerships with veteran-owned and veteran-supportive community organizations has been an important aspect of enacting a veteran-friendly organization in recent years. With numerous organizations focusing fundraising efforts toward veteran service organizations, as well as building partnerships with veteran-owned businesses, organizations have found ways to support veterans in the broader community, which extend outward toward assisting veteran and military families. Of particular importance is organizational recognition by the Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (ESGR) for veteran-friendly practices. The Department of Defense program recognizes organizations upholding the law and supporting employees serving in the National Guard and Reserves (Department of Defense, 2020). These investments and collaborations with veteran-affiliated organizations build brand awareness for veteran-friendly employers while supporting past and current service members, regardless of their affiliation with the organization.

Engaging in veteran-friendly practices is not new or unique to the current generation of veterans. To be sure, one could easily look to government policies leading to civilian engagement on employment as far back as the Revolutionary War (Fox, 2003). It is this commitment to the veterans' reemployment following military service that makes this topic so vital in the discussion of veteran-friendly practices. Additionally, following World War II, the addition of education benefits for veteran postmilitary education, which extends to today, lends credence to the argument that the value of veterans' education and employment continues from the national level to veterans' communities. These measures set the expectation for veteran-friendly initiatives and continue to provide the foundation for organizational veteran-friendly practices.

Framework for Building a Veteran-Friendly Organization

The framework toward building and sustaining a veteran-friendly organization was informed through two learning design models, commonly referred to as ADDIE and SAM. Though distinguishable in nature, the models include aspects related to information gathering and problem diagnosis, program development and implementation, and evaluation and refinement (Allen & Sites, 2012; Dick, Carey, & Carey, 2005). As Merrill (2007) noted, most trainings are not created using a systematic process. This same issue holds true for

organizations proclaiming friendliness to the military. As such, whereas Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation (ADDIE) and Successive Approximation Model (SAM) are most often applied toward training programs, they also inform how organizations may successfully tailor veteran-friendly programming.

The proposed framework outlines procedures for leaders and HR professionals to develop a tailored, veteran-friendly program for implementation in their respective organizations. *Identify a Sponsor* centers the framework and denotes the importance of a lead representative in successfully developing, managing, and maintaining a veteran-friendly program. Surrounding the center are four additional circles, connected by a path, which designate the interdependent relationship between each step in the process. The framework is intended to demonstrate flexibility in how organizations may approach the development and maintenance of veteran-friendly programming. Perhaps most important, the framework highlights the required on-going development and maintenance aspect of becoming military-friendly. Each step is further described below.

Identify a Sponsor. The authors place identifying a sponsor in the middle as a means of denoting the importance of having the right people overseeing the management of all veteran-friendly aspects. A sponsor consists of multiple aspects, including (a) identifying a representative who will be responsible for developing and maintaining a veteran-friendly program, (b) collaborating with the representative to determine how the work will be included within their performance evaluations, and (c) determining if a team of collaborating stakeholders is necessary and within the realm of capabilities of the organization. A few notes of consideration for this phase:

1. The representative should have attributes that will allow them to be successful in the role, including but not limited to:
 - being well-versed on the organization's culture;
 - being respected by organization leaders, peers, and subordinates;
 - understanding common military culture, veteran transition challenges, stigmas; and stereotypes, and existing programming; and
 - having a sincere interest in the role, fulfilling all corresponding responsibilities, while maintaining attributes which would be beneficial to serving as a veteran-friendly sponsor
2. Performance evaluations should include clearly defined aspects that relate to the sponsor's role in overseeing veteran-friendly programming including program and employee performance outcomes.
3. If determination is made that the sponsor is a collaborating team, all stakeholders should have their performance evaluations updated to reflect the newly acquired role and responsibilities including program and employee performance outcomes.

Define Veteran Friendly. At the top of the framework, *define veteran friendly* suggests sponsors define what the organization means when identifying as being friendly toward veterans. Within this phase, the sponsor, any collaborating stakeholders, military-affiliated employees, and organization leaders are encouraged to reflect on; discuss; and establish a definition, intention, and vision for being a friendly organization to veterans. While each of these aspects can be loosely defined, there should be a shared understanding from sponsors and affiliated stakeholders when considering the following questions:

1. Why do we want to be and why do we value being a military-friendly organization?
2. Who, specifically, are we supporting? For example, are we supporting military-affiliated employees, local veterans' organizations, transitioning service members seeking direct employment, or student veterans?
3. Based on the population we have determined we will support, what are we looking to offer?
4. Based on the population we have determined we will support, what are we looking to achieve?

Determine Challenges. Whether concurrently or after defining, the framework encourages sponsors to conduct a needs analysis as part of determining challenges faced by military affiliated employees and the organization. Organizations experience unique challenges, based on local economy, industry, governmental regulations, and hiring needs; amidst a host of other obstacles plaguing HR professionals. Veteran job applicants may struggle during the hiring process for a range of reasons including applicant tracking systems which filter out candidates who do not have the right keywords included in their resume or who are unable to describe how their military experience may be relevant to the job they are applying for during interviews. Experienced veteran employees are also likely to reveal challenges during the employment. Examples of these concerns include but are not limited to: (a) fitting into the organization's culture, (b) identifying a sense of purpose, (c) lacking a visible career path, or (d) other mental or physical health issues currently not being addressed. Finally, employees of the organization who are not affiliated with the military may also have challenges that impede an organization's ability to be veteran friendly. Historically, employees have referenced a lack of understanding military culture, concerns about working or communicating with military veterans, and an interest in better supporting military veterans. These challenges can be revealed and greater understood during the needs analysis process. Within the determining challenges phase, the sponsor plays a vital role in understanding the unique employment barriers faced as they relate to the organization, industry, region, and broader economy. Although a needs analysis can be conducted in more than one way, the authors encourage using at least one of the following procedures to move forward:

1. conduct surveys or interviews with organization leaders, military-affiliated employees, and other stakeholders regarding potential military-friendly challenges and opportunities
2. evaluate recruitment, hiring, and onboarding procedures and corresponding results as they relate to military-friendly challenges and opportunities
3. execute an external analysis of the surrounding community regarding veteran homeless, education rates, substance abuse, and other transition issues, if appropriate
4. examine organization results, such as military-affiliated satisfaction, retention, and productivity.

At the conclusion of the needs analysis, the sponsor should have a greater understanding of the specific issues pertaining to military veterans, the veteran community, and the organization as a whole. These challenges are pertinent in tailoring veteran-friendly programming and services that align with both employee and employer needs. While a number of challenges may be revealed, the authors encourage selection of the most prominent challenges that can reasonably be addressed by the organization, as opposed to attempting to alleviate them all. While selecting prominent challenges, it is imperative that the sponsor considers both the identified needs and feasibility of addressing each challenge prior to proceeding. As such, the defining military friendly and determining challenges phases directly influence the necessary and desired programming.

Establish Programming. In the third phase, the sponsor and any collaborating stakeholders *establish programming* intended to address the identified challenges that coincide with the organization's definition of veteran friendly. The programming could consist of a wide range of services and resources including but not limited to:

- Employee resource groups
- Pay differential for activated employees
- Tailored onboarding of new employees
- Mentoring initiative
- Accelerated development programs
- Preferential hiring
- Designated safe space on location where military-affiliated employees can congregate with other veterans
- Recognition events such as programs on Veterans Day and Armed Forces Day

Thus, the programming phase is used to establish services which will best fit the organization's needs as well as those of both current and prospective military affiliated employees. Any resources or support services should be designed with feedback from those who the initiative intends to assist, to ensure the offering adequately meets the identified challenge(s). Similarly, organization leadership should demonstrate buy-in by providing written

documentation and, if needed, financial, personnel, and time allocations to ensure each service has a reasonable chance to succeed. Implementation of identified programs should be flexible and proceed slowly to allow all stakeholders time to fully develop the program, obtain interest through promotion, seek feedback, address issues, and indoctrinate in the organization's culture.

The *evaluate* phase coincides with the programming phase and should be conducted before and after the establishing programming phase. Regardless of the program or service offered, organizations should expect to see a positive return on investment. Evaluations can consist of assessing the impact of the training on cost-benefits, such as increasing employee awareness of transition issues and training military affiliated employees about the nonmilitary workplace and/or evaluating the return on investment to the organization by reviewing various outcomes including employee satisfaction, retention, productivity, and profitability. Evaluations may also be conducted to examine how military-affiliated employees feel about the services and any learning that has transpired because of the initiatives. Perhaps most important, evaluations of each initiative and veteran-friendly programming as a whole should be a prescheduled and an on-going process. After each evaluation is completed, the results should be examined and revisions made if deemed appropriate and necessary by the sponsor and other influential stakeholders. At the same time, evaluation results may then inform revised goals, challenges, and required programming.

Discussion of the Framework

No organization can be all-encompassing in their attempt to address all veteran transition issues. The range of challenges, combined with organizations' limited resources and capabilities, are barriers that need to be considered by organization leaders and HR professionals in developing veteran-friendly programs. The framework offers an iterative strategy for leaders and HR professionals to indoctrinate veteran friendliness into their organization. The sponsor is surrounded by four phases that are on-going and cyclical. Each phase influences or may be influenced by the others, demonstrating the interconnectedness of the framework. For example, the identified challenges will directly correspond with how military-friendly programming will be evaluated. Although a starting point is proposed in this article, organizations may begin integrating the framework during any of the phases, as identified challenges may suddenly be identified through employee feedback prior to formalizing a process for becoming veteran friendly.

Centering the framework is the sponsor of veteran-friendly programs. Regardless of the organization's resources or commitment toward supporting the military, any related initiative is more likely to be successful if someone is responsible for and evaluated on their performance overseeing veteran-friendly programming. The sponsor also needs to have willingly taken on the responsibility, as opposed to simply having it added to their job duties. Creating any effective program requires time, expertise, and organization support

in order to be effective. Each of these requisites can influence the overall buy-in and commitment a sponsor, as well as supporting stakeholders, will have toward the programs.

Lastly, the *establish programming* aspect of the framework may be the most widely used phase in organizations already in existence; however, this framework appears to be the first instance where the programming is situated as a process for organizations to inform the identification and development of veteran-friendly programs. In many instances, employers may simply replicate other programs. Alternatively, organizations may receive certifications for being veteran friendly, but offer little to nothing in programming or resources. The opportunity to tailor programming toward both the organization and military-affiliated employees should also contribute toward ensuring resource investments into veteran-friendly programming are a positive return on investment. Thus, this framework can serve as an influential guide for organizations interested in furthering their veteran-friendly programming by integrating preidentified goals and challenges into the development and sustainment of programs.

Integration Challenges

While the proposed framework stands to bring about positive organizational outcomes, such as improved retention or productivity, the authors acknowledge its implementation will likely be accompanied by challenges. Fundamentally, knowledge regarding veteran-friendly practices is often limited, and consequently, a strong desire and willingness to learn by organization leaders will be essential. From being able to define the meaning of veteran friendly to establishing programming and appropriately evaluating it, efforts toward obtaining a certain degree of understanding will be required to ensure the framework's success. Moreover, because limited research on the topic currently exists, the effects of organizational outcomes as a result of veteran-friendly practices has yet to be wholly understood. Though the framework is expected to be of value, no conclusive claims regarding its impact on veteran hiring can be posited at this time, potentially impacting organizational buy-in of the framework. Lastly, integration of the framework will require appropriate allocation of resources. In particular, time, capital, and organizational support will be necessitated to develop effective military-friendly practices.

Though the possibility of the aforementioned challenges will never cease to exist, challenges—such as the knowledge gap and buy-in concerns—can be reduced. In particular, the knowledge gap pertaining to veteran-friendly practices can be reduced by involving representatives familiar with veteran transition challenges, associated stigmas and stereotypes, and existing military-friendly programming. In addition, organization leaders are encouraged to regularly seek out guidance and relevant literature to remain up to date on veteran-friendly best practices. External to the proposed framework, there are many informative sources available to employers, such as veteran staffing

agencies, military skill translator programs, veteran employment toolkits, and veteran-specific job sites and career fairs. Regarding organizational buy-in, support for the framework may be increased by communicating the positive implications of being a veteran-friendly organization. Often employers direct significant efforts to hiring veterans but less resources are used to measure outcomes such as retention and performance (Curry Hall et al., 2014), suggesting a lack of understanding regarding potential benefits of employing veteran-friendly practices. Evaluating the return on investment of veteran-friendly programs with implications for recruitment success, job satisfaction, and turnover rates may further increase buy-in.

Implications for Practice and Research

Integrating a veteran-friendly organization utilizing the described model can benefit organizations significantly by incorporating an informed point of contact, wrap-around programming, and thorough assessment to drive ongoing programmatic development. As organizations seek to better meet veterans' needs as part of their overall strategic plans, implementing a cohesive program based on sound research and current best practices has to be considered. While the authors advocate for implementation of the strategies being undertaken by a breadth of organizations as identified by Kirchner and Minnis (2018), organizations may need to scale the strategies based on need and capacity. The recommendation is that organizations find ways to meet their employees' needs for a veteran-friendly organization utilizing the current best practices as identified in this article, as well as through the feedback provided during the needs analysis process.

By implementing suggested veteran-friendly practices using the model as described, organizations have the potential to provide support to military-affiliated employees while creating opportunities for others to learn about and recognize the benefits of employing veterans. As discussed, the identify challenges phase is useful in addressing both veteran and nonveteran employee knowledge gaps that may impede an organization's ability to act veteran friendly. Once knowledge deficiencies are identified, education and development programs can be designed so that veterans have an opportunity to continue learning in concert with their professional colleagues. Collective learning, as part of veteran-friendly practices, provides an opportunity for veterans to also bring their unique knowledge, perspectives, and skills to the educational environment and address their nonmilitary employees about any challenges, stigmas, or questions they may have.

Engaging veteran-friendly initiatives can be done in concert with larger organizational diversity programs. Building a comprehensive veteran-friendly organization will be largely dependent on the number of veterans employed, veterans' willingness to connect with other veterans, and other employees' interest in supporting the initiative. Without an engaged population of veterans and nonveterans, it will be challenging to curate the support needed

for many of the recommended best practices. In that case, it may be wise to investigate the reasons for lack of interest and support as well as build iterations of the best practices that can be implemented and scaled as the need arises. Most important, investing in building a veteran-friendly organization presents opportunities for long-term organizational growth and sustainability.

Organizations implementing veteran-friendly practices also present an opportunity for researchers to continue evaluating the success of such practices in supporting and engaging veterans as well as building stronger, more integrated employee populations. Whether through qualitative interviews, case studies, or action research scenarios, studies examining the development and sustainability of veteran-friendly organizations is an opportunity for adult learning researchers. Through this framework, practitioners would benefit from studies examining the impact of a systematic approach toward being veteran friendly. Further studies on the type of initiatives which yield the highest return on investment would provide critical direction toward the development of a research-supported model for veteran-friendly employers. Lastly, comparative studies might reveal some industries experience more impactful organizational outcomes as a result of their veteran-friendly programming than other industries. Each of these research areas would inform the future of nonmilitary organizations' support of military veterans.

Conclusion

This paper provides an outline for organization leaders and HR professionals to explore their understanding and approach toward being veteran friendly. To date, few researchers have proposed veteran-friendly recommendations or guidelines, which has limited both scholars' and practitioners' understanding of the term. Between high underemployment, low job satisfaction, and poor fit, a gap exists regarding proper integration of military veterans in organizations. Veterans, as well as the organizations seeking to hire them, should expect a clearer understanding and corresponding strategies in place to become and maintain veteran-friendly status. Until then, veteran career transitions will continue to demonstrate the ongoing military-civilian divide and veteran-friendly organizations will remain an aspirational but unattainable goal.

References

- Allen, M., & Sites, R. (2012). *Leaving ADDIE for SAM*. St. Paul, MN: American Society for Training and Development.
- Altman, G. (2015). *Best for Vets: Employers 2015 rankings are out*. Retrieved from <https://www.militarytimes.com/education-transition/2015/04/13/best-for-vets-employers-2015-rankings-are-out/>
- Barrera, C., & Carter, P. (2017). Challenges on the home front: Underemployment hits veterans hard. Retrieved from https://www.callofdutyendowment.org/content/dam/atvi/callofduty/code/pdf/ZipCODE_Vet_Report_FINAL.pdf
- Crenshaw, K., & Maddy, L. (2017). *Building and sustaining a veteran-informed culture: A guide for HR professionals*. Society for Human Resource Management.

- Retrieved from <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/talent-acquisition/pages/building-a-veteran-informed-culture.aspx>
- Curry Hall, K., Harrell, M. C., Bicksler, B., Stewart, R., & Fisher, M. P. (2014). *Veteran employment: Lessons from the 100,000 Jobs Mission*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Department of Defense. (2020). *Who is ESGR?* Retrieved from <https://www.esgr.mil/AboutESGR/Who-is-ESGR>
- Dillon, P. A., & Advocate, V. (2017, October). *Veterans in the workplace: Myths and realities*. Paper presented at the conference of the Many Futures of Work: Possibilities and Perils, Chicago, IL.
- Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2005). *The systematic design of instruction*. London, UK: Pearson.
- Edelman. (2018). *2018 veterans well-being survey*. Retrieved from <https://www.edelman.com/sites/g/files/aatuss191/files/2018-10/2018-Edelman-Veterans-Well-being-Survey.pdf>
- Fox, Jr, W. F. (2003). Deconstructing and reconstructing the veterans benefits system. *Kansas Journal of Law & Public Policy*, 13, 339.
- Harrell, M. C., & Berglass, N. (2012). *Employing America's veterans: Perspectives from businesses*. Center for a New American Security. Retrieved from <https://www.cnas.org/publications/reports/employing-americas-veterans-perspectives-from-businesses>
- Hudson, D. (n.d.). *Understanding military vs. civilian culture*. Retrieved from <https://www.job-hunt.org/veterans-job-search/military-vs-civilian-cultures.shtml>
- Kasperkevic, J. (2017). *The veteran unemployment rate is down but that doesn't mean they are doing great*. MarketPlace. Retrieved from <https://www.marketplace.org/2017/11/10/economy/veteran-day-employment-jobs-numbers/>
- Kintzle, S., Keeling, M., Xintarianos, E., Taylor-Diggs, K., Munch, C., Hassan, A. M., & Castro, C. A. (2015). *Exploring the economic & employment challenges facing U.S. veterans: A qualitative study of volunteers of America service providers and veteran clients*. USC Center for Innovation and Research on Veterans and Military Families. Retrieved from <https://cir.usc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/CIR-VOA-Report-FF.pdf>
- Kirchner, M., & Minnis, S. (2018). Engaging military friendly in organizations: An empirical-based definition. *Journal of Veterans Studies*, 3(2), 94–108.
- Kirchner, M., Thompson, H., Holloway, K., & Hoffman, L. (2019, February). *Defining military-friendly: An examination of employers' strategies for hiring and retaining veterans*. Poster presented at the meeting of the Academy of Human Resource Development International Research Conference in the Americas, Louisville, KY.
- Maury, R., Stone, B., & Roseman, J. (2016). *Veteran job retention survey*. Syracuse University Institute for Veterans and Military Families. Retrieved from <https://ivmf.syracuse.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/VetAdvisor-ReportFINAL-Single-pages.pdf>
- McCormick, W., Currier, J., Isaak, S., Sims, B., Slagel, B., Carroll, T., ... Albright, D. (2019). Military culture and post-military transitioning among veterans: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Veterans Studies*, 4(2), 287–298.
- Merrill, D. M. (2007). The proper study of instructional design. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (2nd ed., pp. 336–341). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Orion Talent. (2018). *Veteran hiring survey*. Retrieved from <https://www.oriontalent.com/recruiting-resources/veteran-hiring-survey/thank-you.aspx>
- U.S. Department of Labor. (2020). *Newsletter*. Retrieved from <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/vets/newsletter>
- Zogas, A. (2017). *US military veterans' difficult transitions back to civilian life and the VA's response*. Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, Brown University. Retrieved from <https://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/papers/2017/us-military-veterans-difficult-transitions-back-civilian-life-and-va-s-response>

MICHAEL J. KIRCHNER is an assistant professor of organizational leadership at Purdue University Fort Wayne. He primarily conducts research exploring veteran career transitions, military leader development, and employee onboarding.

SARAH E. MINNIS is an assistant professor in the Master of Science in Human Resources program at Western Carolina University. She earned her PhD at Texas A&M University and has a primary research interest in military veterans' academic and career transition post military service.

FAITH STULL is an Innovation Fellow at enFocus Inc. She is a recent graduate from Purdue University Fort Wayne, where she earned her master's degree in organizational leadership. Primarily, she conducts research on veteran career transitions.