

Archived Content

Information identified as archived on the Web is for reference, research or record-keeping purposes. It has not been altered or updated after the date of archiving. Web pages that are archived on the Web are not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards.

As per the [Communications Policy of the Government of Canada](#), you can request alternate formats on the "[Contact Us](#)" page.

Information archivée dans le Web

Information archivée dans le Web à des fins de consultation, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Cette dernière n'a aucunement été modifiée ni mise à jour depuis sa date de mise en archive. Les pages archivées dans le Web ne sont pas assujetties aux normes qui s'appliquent aux sites Web du gouvernement du Canada.

Conformément à la [Politique de communication du gouvernement du Canada](#), vous pouvez demander de recevoir cette information dans tout autre format de rechange à la page « [Contactez-nous](#) ».

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE / COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
CSC 29 / CCEM 29

EXERCISE/EXERCICE NEW HORIZONS ...

IMPROVING THE SELECTION OF CANADIAN FORCES RECRUITERS

By /par Major G.A. Cornfield

This paper was written by a student attending the Canadian Forces College in fulfilment of one of the requirements of the Course of Studies. The paper is a scholastic document, and thus contains facts and opinions which the author alone considered appropriate and correct for the subject. It does not necessarily reflect the policy or the opinion of any agency, including the Government of Canada and the Canadian Department of National Defence. This paper may not be released, quoted or copied except with the express permission of the Canadian Department of National Defence.

La présente étude a été rédigée par un stagiaire du Collège des Forces canadiennes pour satisfaire à l'une des exigences du cours. L'étude est un document qui se rapporte au cours et contient donc des faits et des opinions que seul l'auteur considère appropriés et convenables au sujet. Elle ne reflète pas nécessairement la politique ou l'opinion d'un organisme quelconque, y compris le gouvernement du Canada et le ministère de la Défense nationale du Canada. Il est défendu de diffuser, de citer ou de reproduire cette étude sans la permission expresse du ministère de la Défense nationale.

ABSTRACT

This essay examines the Canadian Forces' (CF) recruiter selection process and how it might be improved to optimize a cost-effective resource. The thesis statement is: The CF must examine the process and criteria by which recruiting personnel are selected to ensure the very best, most appropriate and most effective personnel are assigned to this integral function.

It illustrates common recruiter shortcomings, and the flaws in the CF recruiter selection protocols. There is little in the way of Canadian research on military recruiters and no continuity in the recruiting organization, hence the paper draws heavily on the recruiter selection protocols of the United States of America, highlighting practices that may be fiscally possible for the CF to adopt. The utility and feasibility of using performance evaluations, automated selection methods, and personality tests as selection tools are discussed and dismissed.

The essay recommends the development of an aggressive internal communication plan to enlarge the recruiter pool, the inclusion of experienced recruiters in the selection process and the incorporation of realistic job previews.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I could not have accomplished this essay without the generous assistance and advice of the persons listed below. This acknowledgement in no way implies that the listed persons agree with all of the conclusions and recommendations herein. It is merely a way to acknowledge their invaluable contributions.

Col J.A.R. Tremblay, Commander Canadian Forces Recruiting Group (CFRG), Borden, Ontario, Canada.

LCol P.D. Grandmaison, PD Recruiting Project, NDHQ, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

LCol J.M. Uchiyama, D Strat HR, NDHQ Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

LtCol R. F. Wendel, Assistant COS (G7) Training, Marine Corps Recruiting Command, USMC, United States of America.

LCol M.P. Zuwerkalow, G3, CFRG Borden, Ontario, Canada.

LCdr D.E. King, CO CFRC Atlantic, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

Maj J.M. Stouffer, Standards and Training, CFRG Borden, Ontario, Canada.

Capt J.D. Beavis, Adj CFRC Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Capt D.A. Howe, CFRG, Borden, Ontario, Canada.

CWO (Ret'd) R.W.J. Hollingworth, former CFRG CWO, Borden, Ontario, Canada.

CWO J.R.D. Houde, CFRG CWO, CFRG, Borden, Ontario, Canada.

CWO R. Seldon, UWO CFRC Halifax, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

WO D. Durocher, UWO CFRC Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

WO P. Lucas, UWO CFRC Winnipeg, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

WO L. Prevost, UWO CFRC Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

Sgt D. Whitbread, UWO CFRC Vancouver, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

The Canadian Forces (CF) has 98 non-commissioned officers (NCOs) employed as recruiters.¹ In the fiscal year ending in April 2002, they were charged with finding 5800 non-commissioned members (NCM) and 1200 officers suitable to enrol into the Regular Force, yet the actual intake was 4552 NCMs and 852 officers, shortfalls of 21.5% and 29% respectively.² This is a concern, for as an internal briefing noted in November of 2002, attrition continues to outpace recruitment to such a degree that "...it could take the Canadian Forces as long as 30 years to achieve a stable population profile."³ While recruiting shortfalls can be attributed to a combination of factors ranging from the economic outlook, to the public's opinion of the military, the impact and efforts of the recruiters are significant factors as they are the front line troops who interact with the Canadian public. Indeed, their efforts are critical, for as one study notes, "... competing job opportunities, educational and career aspirations and youth attitudes towards the military, [are going to require the CF] to compete more aggressively in the marketplace to regain the competitive position it once held."⁴ Hence, the recruiters' effectiveness and the recruiting mission will be paramount if manning levels are to improve.⁵

¹ There are a total of 80 Regular Force members and 18 Class C Reserve members employed in recruiter positions at 32 locations across Canada. E-Mail, Moodie, LCol Doug. [Moodie.DA@forces.gc.ca]. 4 Nov 2002.

² LCol Doug Moodie, *CFRG FY02-Year End Business Plan Review* (Canadian Forces Recruiting Group: file 1950-4 (DComd) 15 May 2002.

³ LCdr Bob Ibel, "Canadian Forces Recruiting Project Briefing for the MHRPPC," 21 November 2002 (unpublished power point slides and speaking notes), and April 2002 Auditor General's Report – Chapter 5 Main Points, 5.5.

⁴ Partenaires Delta Partners, *Canadian Forces Recruiting Improvement Study* (Ottawa, On: n.p., 2000), pp 17-18. hereafter cited as "Delta Partners."

⁵ US, Navy Personnel Research Studies and Technology, *Sailor 21: A Research Vision to Attract, Retain, and Utilize the 21st Century Sailor*, 14 December 1998, pp 12-15 accessed at [www.msci.Memphis.edu/~ida/v12-14-98.pdf] on 8 March 2003. hereafter cited as "Sailor 21," and LTC Don Jenkins, "Recruiter Selection: Making the Better Choice" (unpublished Strategy Research Paper, US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 1999), pp 13-18.

Admittedly, military recruiter competence, capability and capacity are not the only areas requiring enhancement to address intake shortfalls. Ideally, additional HR and budgetary resources would be allocated to meet the recruiting challenge. Massive advertising campaigns would be launched, lucrative enrolment incentives created, and CF units tasked to carry out extensive outreach activities. In the current funding environment such things are unlikely to happen. The CF has initiated studies to streamline recruit processing, but it has yet to examine a critical aspect of recruiting operations to learn where it may maximize its return on investment. Specifically, the CF must examine the process and criteria by which recruiting personnel are

se3.75t12 0 0 12sr the pertybe st m

the paper will propose steps that are economically feasible for implementation: the development of an aggressive internal communication plan to enlarge the recruiter pool, the inclusion of experienced recruiters in the selection process and the utility of realistic job previews.

While the quality and quantity of training received is a major factor affecting recruiter performance, an examination of training is beyond the scope of this paper. With resource constraints unlikely to relax in the near term, the paper will assume that Canadian Forces Recruiting Group (CFRG) will continue to provide 10 days formal training to new recruiters. Similarly, while rumours of plans to out-source CF recruiting surface periodically, it will be assumed that the uniformed CF recruiter will continue to represent the CF to the Canadian public. It is acknowledged that both the Military Career Counsellor and the recruiting clerical staff can influence prospects and applicants, however, since their involvement normally begins after an employment application has been submitted, this paper will focus on the first contactors – the NCO recruiter.

Recruiters, or “head hunters,” are an established part of an increasingly competitive employment landscape. Job fairs and career days teem with representatives from both private and public sectors seeking to fill vacancies. In recent years, the competition to hire employees with technical skills or proven potential has accelerated. Given Treasury Board’s stringent controls on salaries and bonuses, the CF is not positioned to compete with the private sector in respect to monetary incentives. Where the private sector has the flexibility to attract desirable prospects with lucrative salaries and a variety of recruitment incentives, the CF is restricted to

under ADM HR(Mil) (2001). During that time recruiting went from a multi-zone set up to one recruiting operation group, to reporting directly to the commander of the formation.

the Department of National Defence's (DND) limited advertising budget, and traditional recruiting activities conducted by a small cadre of recruiters. Treasury Board did authorize modest signing enrolment bonuses for certain target groups, but nonetheless the CF continues to have more than 3000 vacant positions.⁷ Clearly, additional action is required to improve the likelihood of meeting manning requirements, and since the CF has few other options, focusing on recruiters may well be the most cost-effective. Indeed, a US Department of Defense (DOD) study notes that, "... the marginal cost of achieving an additional high-quality recruit by means of a recruiter is less than by most other means, especially military pay."⁸

A recent CF study of applicant motivators confirms the effectiveness of the recruiter. While "friends and family with CF experience" is the most influential factor reported by those seeking employment with the CF (35.1%), the second most influential factor is the CF recruiter (13.2%).⁹ Once the initial contact is made, it is the recruiter who has the strongest impact on the prospect's decision to apply.¹⁰ It is noteworthy that following a \$3 million CF advertising campaign, only 33.2% of applicants chose the electronic and print media as the advertising most influencing them, whereas 33.3% of applicants listed the recruiter or the recruiting display as the

⁷ April 2002 Auditor General's Report – Chapter 5 Main Points, 5.1.

⁸ Beth Asch *et al*, *Military Recruiting and Retention After the Fiscal Year 2000 Military Pay Legislation*, Report prepared for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, National Defense Research Institute (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2002), p 46.

⁹ Capt N.M. Perron, *Canadian Forces Contact Survey Annual Monitoring Report (June 2000-June 2001)*, Department of National Defence, Sponsor Research Report 01-08, September 2001 (Ottawa, On: Director Human Resources Research and Evaluation, 2001), p 7. hereafter cited as "CF Contact Survey 2000-2001." The third most influential is "previous military experience" (13.1%). p 7.

¹⁰ Partenaires Delta Partners, *Canadian Forces Recruiting Improvement Study* (Ottawa ,On: n.p., 2000), p 38. hereafter cited as "Delta Partners." A "prospect" is a person who has expressed interest, but not made formal application. An "applicant" has submitted an employment application form.

most influential form of advertising.¹¹ Such feedback illustrates that the uniformed recruiter has a significant role to play in attraction. If the effectiveness and efficiency of recruiting “... is the result of a complex interaction between several facets of recruiting strategy and resources, recruiter behaviour, and the context within which recruiting is carried out”¹² and if one concedes that the CF has extremely limited resources, then the behaviours and therefore the selection of each CF recruiter is important. This is not to say that recruiters are the only way of meeting manning challenges, but rather that they are credible, cost-effective tools worth optimizing as part of the attraction arsenal alongside recent incentives like signing bonuses for skilled applicants and specialists.

While most recruiters do a credible job of representing the CF, there is room for improvement. The Director of Military Human Resource Requirements captured one shortcoming when he said, “We’ve really been selectors, and not recruiters.”¹³ It is unfortunate that many recruiters have a “screening-out” mindset and a defeatist attitude rather than a sales orientation.¹⁴ Still others are motivated, but lack the requisite skills. For instance, one Canadian Forces Recruiting Centre (CFRC) Unit Warrant Officer (UWO) explains that he has a recruiter

¹¹ DND, “CF Contact Survey 2000-2001,” With respect to the influence of advertising, the remaining 33.1% of applicants stated that no advertising influenced them. p 8.

¹² Dr Kevin Murphy, *et al*, *Report - Evaluating the Marine Corps Recruiting Effort*, Marine Corps Research University, 25 September 2002 (n.p.: Penn State, 2002), p 11.

¹³ Col Gord Grant, DMHRR, quoted in “Canada’s Vanishing Military” in *Report, Canada’s Independent Newsmagazine*, 5 Feb 2001, p 1. accessed at [<http://report.ca/archive/report/20010205/p54i010205f.html>] on 5 April 2003.

¹⁴ Delta Partners, pp 59-60.

“... who is intelligent as heck, but couldn’t sell water in the desert.”¹⁵ Such clear selection failures must be rectified. Given Canada’s geography and the small number of recruiters for the Regular Force, one ineffective recruiter can have a disproportionately negative impact on CF manning levels. Consider that the recruiter is frequently the only contact that many Canadians have with the military. The impact that one recruiter can have on a high school guidance counsellor, a First Nation’s elder, or a prospect at a career fair is significant. One thoughtless remark, or a perceived lack of enthusiasm or knowledge can alienate a prospect or “influencer” in seconds, and there is seldom a second chance.¹⁶ As the Commander CFRG notes, “[r]ecruiters are the front end image of the CF and should be of a quality in sync with our branding....”¹⁷ When recruiter selection fails, two direct consequences can be the alienation of the very audience that the CF wants to attract, and vacant CF positions - consequences that could be minimized through careful a recruiter selection process.

Systemically, this is more than a CFRG problem. When the selection process fails, there is a cost to the CF from the perspectives of personnel management and return on investment. First, when a member lacking the proper motivation or skills is posted to recruiting, that member becomes a burden on peers, thereby diminishing unit productivity. The CFRC may ask to have the member posted and replaced, but only after the recruiter has consumed training dollars and most likely incurred a cost move. Secondly, there is a cost to the CF as a whole when a NCO receives a poor assessment because of failure to succeed as a recruiter, even though that member

¹⁵ Comment by WO Durocher, Unit WO CFRC Toronto, 21 March 2003 during a meeting the author had with the CFRG CWO, CWO Houde and 8 of the CFRC UWOs.

¹⁶ An influencer is any person who has significant influence on the prospect pool, such as guidance counsellors, parents, and First Nations elders.

may be outstanding when employed in his/her Military Occupation (MOC). The impact of that one adverse personnel evaluation report (PER) can wreak havoc, for "... the sergeant's Army career may be damaged (frequently, destroyed), and the Army may lose an otherwise very effective Non-Commissioned Officer..."¹⁸ It is important, therefore, that the CF selects carefully to avoid degrading effectiveness, wasting resources, or damaging otherwise promising careers by placing members in roles for which they are not suited. The recruiter selection and training processes are the mechanisms that should prevent such occurrences.

Recruiting, by its very nature, is a "people-centric" function with a heavy sales component, so each NCO's efforts have a direct effect on enrolments. While a US Navy study claims that "... very little is known about what makes a successful recruiter,"¹⁹ the Commander CFRG has identified qualities that make a difference: pride; interest; motivation, and lack of bias.²⁰ In many US studies motivation, personality and sales ability are frequently identified as

most important of which is their own time.”²² Motivation plays a critical role in recruiter effectiveness, for he must choose to engage the public and repeat the experience month after month.²³ How one finds such recruiters becomes the issue, one that the post-conscription US military studied at length. Before examining some of their findings, it is appropriate to review the current CF protocol which the Commander CFRG describes as “...limited and far from what it should be.”²⁴

Selection of CF recruiters begins with the career manager’s (CM) nomination, followed by unit-level general suitability screening.²⁵ If the member is deemed suitable, an interview is arranged with an officer at the closest CFRC or CFRC Detachment.²⁶ Prior to the interview, the officer reviews the member’s conduct sheet and personnel file, though they provide little beyond biographical and posting data. The protocol recommends contacting the member’s current or former supervisors, but since time is usually short and personnel files are normally hand-carried, the interviewer is unlikely to contact the losing unit unless “red flags” appear during the interview.²⁷ Most interviews take less than an hour, after which the officer makes a subjective judgment on the member’s interest, motivation, and general suitability for recruiting duties.

²² James Dertouzos, “Recruiter Incentives and Enlistment Supply.” Santa Monica, CA : RAND Corporation as cited in Murphy *et al*, “Evaluating the Marine Corps...”p 29.

²³ Michael E Benedict, *The Soldier Salesperson: Selection and Basic Recruiter Training Issues in the US Army*. Research Report 1534, US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Science, July 1989 (Alexandria, Virginia: ARI, 1989), p 1., and Delta Partners, p 66.

²⁴ E-Mail, Tremblay, Col Alain. [Tremblay.JAR@forces.gc.ca]. 29 April 2003.

²⁵ Units are to screen for suitability based on: motivation towards proposed duties, freedom from indebtedness, disciplinary and/or drug/alcohol related problems; appearance, dress, physical fitness and ability to communicate effectively and reflect favourably on occupation. Source: D Mil C screening message template.

²⁶ For financial reasons the closest CFRC is used vice the one that the member might be posted to.

The interview format was standardized by CFRG in 2001 by adapting some elements of the 1996 “Ellis Report” that had been commissioned specifically to formalize selection protocols.²⁸ While the recommendations of the report were never implemented due to their complexity, an impending recruiting restructure, cost, and a lack of corporate will,²⁹ the standard interview that was created from its findings served to reduce the ad-hoc nature of the interview.³⁰ The redesigned interview protocol was created with a specific intent.

[It is designed]... to assist with the identification of the member’s skills and abilities as they relate to recruiting tasks [and]...assist in clarifying the member’s motivation to work in a demanding recruiting environment. ... ensuring that all the core competency areas are appropriately explored and that the most suitable person is selected to fill a recruiting position.³¹

Judged by CF personnel management norms, the selection process seems at first glance to be thorough, yet it has been assessed as being “... not rigorous and seem[ing] to be focused on CF knowledge and experience plus people/ communication skills.”³² The lack of rigour can be detected from the outset in that the process lacks guidelines to provide CMs with assistance in

²⁷ A “red flag” describes a comment made or reaction given that raises concern and requires follow up with to clarify the response.

²⁸ Ellis Associates Selection & Development Systems, “Work Profiling System Analyses of the Military Career Counselor, Recruiter, and Administration Clerk” Unpublished report for CFRETS, Willowdale, On, 1997. (Typewritten).

²⁹ Advice from with LCol Jim Uchiyama, head Recruiting Personnel Selection Officer for CF Recruiting Services at the time in question. (Teleconference 10 March 2003.) A copy of a letter summarizing the report’s implementation recommendations is attached at Annex A.

³⁰ A standard interview asks the same questions each time. A copy of the guidance provided to interviewers is attached at Annex B.

³¹ Captain(N) B.M. Weadon, *Selection of Recruiting Personnel Interview Protocols*. (Canadian Forces Recruiting Group 5671-1 (Comd), January 2001.

³² Delta Partners, p 70.

determining what type of member should be nominated for recruiting duties.³³ From the career manager's perspective the nomination is based mainly on the member's interest in recruiting.³⁴ Consider too that outside of the Combat Arms and "hard sea" occupations, there exist no career-related reasons for CMs to send their people to recruiting positions.³⁵ Indeed, it is significant that recruiting is not listed as a requirement for career progression by any MOC.³⁶ To the contrary, the perception exists that a posting to recruiting duties "... is a career interrupter, not a career enhancer."³⁷ The Director of Military Careers acknowledges that belief and adds amplification. "We know that such perception exists, the same as the perception that if you want a cosy posting and are close to retirement, then you just ask for a posting as a recruiter."³⁸ That observation highlights a critical limitation of the recruiter selection process – that the negative perception of recruiting artificially limits the selection pool. When a CM tells a Senior NCO that a recruiting tour would not be a good move for him, that he would not be promoted because he would be employed outside of his trade, the message is unmistakable.³⁹ Since the CF is a progressively smaller organization, this message spreads quickly, further limiting the willing

³³ E-Mail, Tremblay, Col Alain. [Tremblay.JAR@forces.gc.ca]. 29 April 2003.

³⁴ E-Mail: Col Wauthier, [Wauthier Col [JLC@ADM\(HR-Mil\)](mailto:JLC@ADM(HR-Mil))] D MILC@NDHQ], 29 Apr2003.

³⁵ The Combat Arms include recruiting in the "extra-regimental employment" category. Similarly, the Navy uses recruiting as a "shore posting". Both provide respite from the frequent deployments associated with their occupations.

³⁶ E-Mail: Col Wauthier, [Wauthier Col [JLC@ADM\(HR-Mil\)](mailto:JLC@ADM(HR-Mil))] D MILC@NDHQ], 29 Apr2003.

³⁷ Delta Partners p 69. With the notable exception of the CFRC clerk-cadre, the CFRC UWO's agreed with that assessment. The author's first-hand experiences include a CM explaining that the recruiting tour hurt the promotion chances of a Supply NCO; One senior WO refused a posting to CFRC Ottawa as he was convinced it would slow his promotion to MWO.

³⁸ E-Mail: Col Wauthier, [Wauthier Col [JLC@ADM\(HR-Mil\)](mailto:JLC@ADM(HR-Mil))] D MILC@NDHQ], 29 Apr2003.

³⁹ Comment made to CFRC Vancouver's UWO, Sgt Whitbread, by a CM.

recruiter pool. Members wanting to progress decline recruiting duties or their supervisors intervene on their behalf.

Recent experience reveals that certain CMs and Commanding Officers (CO) continue to view a recruiting tour as wasted time and often will resist providing personnel for a position, or send someone who is viewed as being “done” (not likely to be promoted).⁴⁰ If a recruiting tour is not viewed as career enhancing, it should come as no surprise that members do not ask for recruiting duties until late in their careers.⁴¹ Therefore, many CFRC staff “... are older and may not be the best choices for relating to young applicants.”⁴² The negative impact of unmotivated or unsuitable recruiters on unit effectiveness can be considerable. A recruiter with poor public speaking skills, insufficient knowledge of entry programs, or inappropriate conduct creates extra work for all. Fellow recruiters have to visit more than their share of high schools and fairs, or must waste considerable time catching and correcting the unmotivated recruiter’s mistakes. This is simply not satisfactory given the competition’s approach. Success in a competitive labour market requires the recruiter to be the “go-getter” described by one high-tech employer. “[A good recruiter needs]... to demonstrate fearlessness, initiative, a sense of urgency, strong communication skills and a positive attitude.”⁴³ Ironically, recruitment is one of the 10 key areas of the CF’s human resource strategy outlined in HR 2020, so one would expect appropriate

⁴⁰ Author’s first hand experience – Engr CM provided a Commissioned From the Ranks Capt to recruiting, incorrectly assuming that the member had no expectation to rise in rank. Similarly the AF Engrs, MARS and INF MOCs provided only older, non-promotable Capts/ Lt(N) to CFRC Ottawa and its four Dets.

⁴¹ Delta Partners, p 69.

⁴² Delta Partners, p 69. The CFRC UWOs emphasized that age does not prevent a recruiter from being effective if the appropriate motivation is present; however, they agreed that the target audience usually relates better to a recruiter in his 20s - 30s than to one in his late 40s.

⁴³ Director of Recruiting JDS Uniphase as quoted in Delta Partners, p 70.

resources to be assigned to the task.⁴⁴ One recruiter expressed the concept succinctly. “If recruiting is important, then important people should be doing it.”⁴⁵

Indeed, while every recruiter is important to a CFRC CO, and never more so than when a recruiter position is vacant, an unsatisfactory selection interview does not leave a CO with many options. Some CFRCs indicate that they “... really have no choice but to take whoever is sent or do without,” as some CMs offer a member and say “take it or leave it.”⁴⁶ Faced with vacant positions, it is understandable that a unit might accept a less than ideal nominee, or be hesitant to find a member unsuitable, short of finding some glaring character flaw, for fear that an alternate would not be provided. Furthermore, with the selection interview usually conducted at one CFRC for employment elsewhere, finding a marginal nominee unsuitable could mean that one CO makes a decision that results in another CFRC being undermanned.⁴⁷

The US services have encountered similar problems in obtaining recruiters, and have developed a variety of methods to deal with them, including monetary incentives, an approach which the CF deemed unacceptable.⁴⁸ At one juncture, the US Army decided that a recruiter

⁴⁴ Department of National Defence, *Military HR Strategy 2020: Facing the People Challenges of the Future*, COS ADM(HR-MIL) accessed at [www.forces.gc.ca/hr] 2 April 2003.

⁴⁵ Sgt O’Brien, CFRC Toronto recruiter, as quoted by his UWO, WO Durocher, 21 Mar 2003.

⁴⁶ Delta Partners, p 70. Several of the CFRC UWOs at the 21 Mar 2003 meeting agreed that this was true, and E-Mail: LCol HL Simpson, CO of CFRC Toronto 1998-2001 [Simpson.HL@forces.gc.ca], 5 Nov 2002, and E-Mail: Maj (Ret’d) Don Ferguson, CO CFRC Hamilton, 1997-2001, [donald.ferguson2@sympatico.ca], 20 Mar 2002.

⁴⁷ Sometimes the gaining CFRC is called to find out what specifically they are looking for, but usually there is little contact unless there is a borderline call on the nominee’s suitability.

⁴⁸ Many US services offer monetary incentives to their recruiters. Annex C provides specifics. At a 2001 meeting of the NDHQ Recruiting Oversight Committee, senior management discussed offering some incentives for CF recruiters

selection instrument was almost impossible to design, because soldiers' perception of the job were so poor that if one were created, they "... could simply fake bad [sic] on the test and avoid the assignment."⁴⁹ To compensate for this perception, a subsequent study recommended that "... recruiting duty should be an essential component of military career progression."⁵⁰ The USMC deals with the problem by ensuring that a Recruiting Officer sits on every promotion board to fairly represent the Marines who have been on recruiting duty.⁵¹ The US Air Force (USAF) embeds opportunities for advancement within the recruiting system and is sensitive to the need for members to remain "promotion competitive" during their tour in recruiting.⁵² Note that the CF lacks a consistent, pan-MOC guidance to merit boards with respect to recruiting duties.⁵³

An examination of US recruiter selection methods reveals some options for the CF. Recruiter selection became a subject of considerable study with the advent of the all-volunteer force, and the downsizing of the DOD, for "...it became imperative that the recruiting process

and/or serving members to get recruits, but believed that the approach would be unacceptable. Telecon LCol MP Zuwerkalow, G3 CFRG, 23 Apr 2003.

⁴⁹ Benedict, "The Soldier Salesperson...." p 12.

⁵⁰ Harry, J Thie and Christine Fossett, "Military Recruiting and Retention for the 21st Century", Dec 99 accessed at <http://www.mors.org/publications/phalanx/dec99/MRR.htm> on 10 Feb 2003. This paper is a report on the proceedings of a four-day working group chaired by senior officers from US Army Recruiting Command with participation from Navy Recruiting Command, TRADOC, Air Force Personnel Operations Agency and several interested civilian agencies.

⁵¹ Col D.L. McManus, ACOS/G3 Marine Corps Recruiting Command, "Canadian Recruiting Forces Orientation Briefing." (unpublished speaking notes for a power point presentation, 22 March 1999), Slide 21, hereafter cited as "Col McManus, Orientation Briefing."

⁵² Lt Col Karen Smith, Chief HR Development USAF, telephone interview, 10 Oct 2002.

⁵³ E-Mail: Col Wauthier, [Wauthier Col [JLC@ADM\(HR-Mil\)](mailto:JLC@ADM(HR-Mil))] D MILC@NDHQ], 29 Apr2003.

became an efficient one....”⁵⁴ In a pan-service report, the US General Accounting Office (GAO) noted common themes.

Although screening standards vary by the service, the recruiting commands generally use interviews and medical and personnel records to screen and select personnel for recruiting duty the services use different but measurable criteria to evaluate a prospective recruiter’s education, health, moral character, emotional and financial stability, personal appearance and job performance. ... The services also have min and max pay grades and time in-service requirements.... Finally, personnel with performance marks below a certain level are not eligible for recruiting duty.⁵⁵

The USAF’s recruiters are judged more than twice as productive as their peers in the other services.⁵⁶ This is noteworthy as the USAF recruiter selection protocol is unique in three aspects, all of which are absent from the CF protocol: it uses a screening test to assess a potential recruiter’s personality; it uses personnel experienced in recruiting to conduct selection interviews; and, it has measurable criteria to evaluate communication and interpersonal skills.⁵⁷ Much of the USAF’s recruiting success is attributed to its trial and adoption of a commercially available, biographical screening test that determined that recruiters with certain traits were most likely to succeed.⁵⁸ In contrast, the selection focus of the less-productive US Army, Marine

⁵⁴ James Taylor et al., “Development of a Model ...”, p 4.

⁵⁵ US, General Accounting Office, GAO/NSIAD –98-58 Report, *Military Recruiting- DOD Could Improve Its Recruiter Selection and Incentive Systems*, Report to the Subcommittee on Personnel (n.p.:US Senate, 1998), pp 14-15. hereafter cited as “GAO, 1998.”

⁵⁶ “GAO, 1998,” p 18. Success was based on the number of recruits sent to basic each year, but it was acknowledged that that success was partially due to the USAF being the service of choice with the highest number of “walk-ins” [self-referrals who show up asking to join].

⁵⁷ “GAO, 1998,” p 3 and p 15.

⁵⁸ “GAO, 1998,” p.17. The traits, in order of importance, were assertiveness, empathy, self-regard (awareness of strengths and weaknesses), problem solving ability, happiness and optimism, interpersonal relations, emotional self awareness (ability to recognize one’s own feelings) and reality testing (ability to distinguish between what you see and what is)

Corps and Navy, concentrates on a member's past performance in non-recruiting positions, similar to the CF.⁵⁹

The USMC describes itself as taking recruiting very seriously, articulating that it is "... the toughest Marine Corps mission short of actual combat ..."⁶⁰ and approaches the role of filling the manpower needs of the Marine Corps as "... a matter of fanatical zeal."⁶¹ Of note, there is an explicit, high-level endorsement of the recruiter role that is distinctly lacking in the CF's case. One of the four tenets of the USMC's Commanding General's Intent is "making recruiting a duty where Marines want to be assigned."⁶² Interestingly, the USMC does not ask for volunteers for recruiting duty, because "it is too important for that."⁶³ Instead, a Headquarters Recruiter Screening Team travels to bases to conduct briefings. Once again, the importance of recruiting is highlighted by having a general officer open the sessions. The team of experienced recruiters conducts the preliminary interviews, and a second, more in-depth interview is done when the Marine arrives at the USMC recruiter school.⁶⁴

⁵⁹ "GAO, 1998," p 4. While the USAF's recruiters are judged the most productive, the USMC's recruiters are judged most successful as they have made the enlisted mission 7 years in a row while the other services have missed monthly and yearly accession missions. EMail, Wendel, LtCol Robert F. [WendelRF@mcrs.usmc.mil], 5 May 2003.

⁶⁰ Col McManus, Orientation Briefing. slide 1.

⁶¹ Col McManus, Orientation Briefing. slide 3.

⁶² Col McManus, Orientation Briefing. slide 6.

⁶³ Col McManus, Orientation Briefing. slide 15.

⁶⁴ "GAO, 1998," p 15.

Congress directed that the US Army outsource its recruiting at 10 locations beginning in May 2002 to free up soldiers for combat-related duties.⁶⁵ Eighty percent of the staff hired consists of ex-recruiters who are hand picked by former US Army Recruiting Command (USAREC) Master Sergeants. They look for recruiters who are “outgoing, bubbly, who won’t take no for an answer, who have the ability to sell things and have the ‘gift of the gab.’”⁶⁶ The vast majority of Army recruiters remain uniformed personnel until 2007. These field recruiters, 30% of whom are volunteers, are selected from among the very top performing NCOs. Selection is lengthy. The career branches are tasked to supply nominations, and leaders use a checklist to assist in the recommendation decision.⁶⁷ The checklist does not include any measure of communication ability nor involve experienced recruiters in the selection process.⁶⁸

Potential US Navy recruiters are screened by experienced recruiters from the Commander Navy Recruiting Command’s Recruiter Screening Team.⁶⁹ A 1998, in-house study emphasized the need to have ‘the best of the best’ in the recruiting centers to attract new applicants, and the need to enlist the help of young, successful members who can relate to younger candidates.⁷⁰ No such CF direction exists. It is noteworthy that since the Navy has had difficulty filling quotas,

⁶⁵ ArmyLink News “Army Contracts Out Recruiting,” 19 February 2002.

⁶⁶ Mr Wayne Absher, Deputy Program Manager, 10 Company Contract, MPRI Kentucky, USA recruiter project, Telephone interview, 27 Feb 2003. Interesting to note that MPRI had trialed the Western California Psychological Test to select staff, but determined that they were “basically wasting \$40 per person as the guys on the ground were better at identifying the good recruiters.”

⁶⁷ Jenkins, “Recruiter Selection: Making the Better Choice,” p 2 and pp 9-11.

⁶⁸ “GAO, 1998,” p 16.

⁶⁹ “Sailor 21,” pp 12-15.

⁷⁰ “Sailor 21,” as cited in Delta Partners, p 70.

studies are on-going to “...develop a comprehensive recruiter selection system that results in increased productivity of a smaller, more efficient, congenial recruiter force.”⁷¹

In the civilian sector, employee selection research is extensive and themes emerge which may be useful in improving recruiter selection. First, selection tests are regarded as fads. One extensive study notes that computer adaptive testing (CAT) had a 20 year history of being the wave of the future, but failed to live up to its promise.⁷² From 1975-1985 there was a wave of enthusiasm for CAT, yet there remains only one major CAT program in existence – the US military’s.⁷³ Similarly, the value of personality tests for personnel selection used to be rated highly by industry, yet time proved them to be of limited value.⁷⁴ It is interesting to note that the private sector deems that realistic job previews (RJP) “...can lead to higher performance levels, lower turnover, increased job satisfaction, and increased commitment to the organization.”⁷⁵ Finally, a survey of 1500 US agencies found a move away from standard interviews in that 82% conducted the more statistically valid structured oral interviews.⁷⁶

⁷¹ Janet Held, David Alderton, and Ronald Bearden, *Status of the U.S. Navy Recruiter Selection System*, Navy Personnel Research, Studies and Technology (Millington: Tennessee, 2002), p 1.

⁷² As test-takers respond to test items, a CAT "adapts" itself to test takers by selecting the next item to be presented on the basis of performance on preceding items. The CAT constantly attempts to establish the appropriate level for the test taker's performance, and stops testing once the performance is shown to be the test taker's highest sustainable performance. Accessed at [<http://www.carla.acad.umn.edu/CATFAQ.html>] 27 March 2003.

⁷³ Marilyn Gowing, L.W. Slivinski. "A Review of North American Selection Procedures: Canada and the United States of America," *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol 2 (2) (1994), p 105.

⁷⁴ One key 1984 report cited in the source noted below determined that “.. personality inventories had the lowest overall predictive validities of a wide variety of selection devices.” Patricia Rowe, Michael Williams and Arla Day, “Selection Procedures in North America,” *International Journal of Selection Procedures*, V2 n2, (April, 1994), p 76.

⁷⁵ Premack and Wanous (1985) as quoted in Benedict, “The Soldier Salesperson” p 10.

⁷⁶ Gowing *et al.*, “A Review of North American Selection Procedures ...,” p 104. The statistics come from a 1992 International Personnel Management Association survey, (The closer a number is to 1, the more valid the results, so

So how can the CF improve recruiter selection? A member's experience and performance should be considered, but as acknowledged, the personnel file contains little relevant information. One cannot expect PER scores to be important recruiter selection tools, other than setting a minimum standard -- that a member is a superb crewman or marine engineer does not mean that equal strength exists in other areas. PERs indicate willingness to work, and to a certain extent, satisfaction with the CF. While PERs do assess oral and written communication, the benchmarks are not linked to sales-oriented communication. Recruiters, however, need to possess "...the ability to effectively interact with the general civilian population."⁷⁷ The US military is careful to say that while recruiters need to meet high selection standards, and that such standards ensure recruiters are selected from among the military's best NCOs, those standards "...do not necessarily identify those who possess or can develop the good communication and interpersonal skills needed to become successful recruiters."⁷⁸ Research confirms this need to avoid a "halo effect," for when a large cross section of recruiter research was examined, it was found that validities of .20 or lower were found for most research attempts trying to match sales abilities to performance ratings and peer nominations.⁷⁹ So while CF personnel files and PERs may assist in recruiter selection, they cannot be used in isolation, because they do not measure sales ability or interpersonal skills.

.2 is very low whereas .5 and higher is viewed as good.) The mean validity coefficient for unstructured interviews is .3 whereas the mean validity coefficient for structured interviews is .62.

⁷⁷ "GAO, 1998," p 15.

⁷⁸ "GAO, 1998," p 14.

Should the CF adopt a selection test to measure these skills? In 1986 the USMC designed a recruiter test that established a direct link between performance measures and scores on selection tests.⁸⁰ However, a 1989 Army study found that the data from personality tests were poor predictors of recruiter performance.⁸¹ The problem was that the research focused on only one criteria in any given predictor set, and there was no agreement on what was the most appropriate criterion. The expert opinion was that “... the research to validate various sales personnel selection instruments in the military have resulted in few (if any) stable validities on which one would want to base a multi-million dollar selection program.”⁸² However, a 1996 USAF study “... found that recruiters with certain traits were more likely to succeed than recruiters who lacked those traits.”⁸³ The US Army re-emerged as a proponent of personality testing in 1998 after a small, informal survey of recruiters determined that they could predict which NCOs would make successful recruiters.⁸⁴ Their profiling efforts came to the conclusion that “... a “balanced” personality with some emphasis in certain areas are [sic] more likely to

⁷⁹ Benedict, “The Soldier Salesperson...” p 6. The closer a number is to 1, the more valid the results, so .2 is very low whereas .5 and higher is viewed as good, hence the recruiter with the best sales skills was not necessarily assessed the highest.

⁸⁰ David C. Atwater, Norman M. Abrahams, and Thomas T. Trent, *Validation of the Marine Corps Special Assignment Battery [SAB]*, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, (San Diego, California, 1986), pp vii-viii. “USMC recruiters who obtained the lowest composite scores had, in addition to the lowest average production, the highest rate of failure to complete their tour of duty. Increases in production aligned with increased scores even more dramatically. The test was validated using over 1000 current USMC recruiters... as SAB scores increased, production increased.”

⁸¹ Benedict, “The Soldier Salesperson...” p 8.

⁸² Benedict, “The Soldier Salesperson...” pp 3-4.

⁸³ “GAO, 1998,” p 17.

⁸⁴ The test used was the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire and the Shipley Institute of Living Scale. From an interview with a member of The Program Analysis and Evaluation Office of USAREC, paraphrased in Lieutenant Colonel Christine T Marsh, Colonel Jodi S. Tymenson, and Colonel Leonard J. Samborowski, “Seamless Total Army Recruiting: A Concept for the Army After Next.” (unpublished Strategy Research Project, US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 1999), p 35.

make a recruiter successful.”⁸⁵ The debate appears to have ceased - most US services decided the tests were either futile or not cost effective. While the Army had some validated tools prepared, it curtailed implementation because of the operating costs, and because non-volunteers were being assigned to recruiting.⁸⁶

[It was determined that] ...the usefulness of tests for selecting field recruiters is minimal. No further efforts to develop such tests is recommended until such time as 1) the recruiter occupational specialty is perceived as being highly desirable, and 2) only a small proportion of total candidates need be selected.⁸⁷

However, in 2001, in response to difficulties in meeting intake goals, the US Navy updated a recruiter selection battery that it expects to have in use in 2003. While the project promises to decrease the number of recruiters required and deliver significant savings, it requires the testing of 9000 recruiter candidates per year, at a cost of \$500 (\$US) each.⁸⁸ It is interesting to note that in January of 2002 the USMC recommended that a recruiter selection tool under consideration, at a cost of \$345 (\$US) per year for each of 2000 students, not be adopted, as the Commandant was already providing the best NCOs he had to offer.⁸⁹ While the USMC was not concerned with the cost of the test, so much as the added bureaucracy, can 30-40 new CF recruiters per year

⁸⁵ Jerry B Hissong and Plotkin M Harris, “Successful Recruiter Profile Project,” Vienna, May, 1998 as cited in Jenkins, “Recruiter Selection: Making the Better Choice,” p 22.

⁸⁶ Benedict, “The Soldier Salesperson...,” p 5.

⁸⁷ Benedict, “The Soldier Salesperson...,” p vii.

⁸⁸ Janet Held, David Alderton and Ronald Bearden “Status of the U.S. Navy Recruiter Selection System” Navy Personnel Research, Studies and Technology, Millington, Tennessee, 2002. p 3. The Special Assignment Battery had been validated in 1981, but never implemented because the military recruiting climate turned positive in the US. The updated test was administered to 500 recruiters in 2001 and productivity measures were collected in 2002.

⁸⁹ Gallup HRST Screening Tool: CG Decision Brief. (unpublished power point presentation made by the COS/G3 of USMC Recruiting Command to the Commanding General of the USMC, Jan 2002.) EMail, Wendel, LtCol Robert F. [WendelRF@merc.usmc.mil], 5 May 2003, As the primary briefer to the Commandant of the USMC during the decision brief, LtCol Wendel reported that the decision was that adding on additional testing and evaluation would be asking “a bit much.”

justify the cost of developing a test? Indeed, volume is an issue, for computer-based testing requires that the "... volume of testing for personnel selection within the organization must warrant the investment cost."⁹⁰ Until such time as the recruiter nominee pool enlarges to, for the sake of discussion, a 3:1 ratio of recruiter nominees to those selected, it seems unlikely that it is worth developing a CF test. Unless a commercial off-the-shelf test like the USAF's is available, the CF recruiter force is simply too small for CAT and personality test development to be cost effective.

Which lessons learned can the CF apply to improve recruiter selection that do not require large resource influxes? Potential solutions are available to improve CM nomination, the CFRG selection process, and the long-term career implications of accepting recruiting duties.

First and most importantly, a communications plan must be developed and aggressively implemented to eradicate the "career stopping" miasma associated with recruiting. The plan must be targeted simultaneously at members, CMs, COs, and, like the USMC, have whole-hearted buy-in at the Branch Adviser level if it is to succeed. Leadership at all levels must actively and repeatedly encourage talented members to seek a recruiting tour. One step to enhance pride in being selected for recruiting duties could be the creation of a merit list cut off line for selection as seen in the US services. The message that only the newly promoted or those in the top third of the merit list are eligible for recruiting duties would spread very quickly.⁹¹

⁹⁰ Paul M Muchinsky, "Professional Forum: A Review of Individual Assessment Methods Used for Personnel Selection in North America," *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, V2 No.2 (April 1994), p 121.

⁹¹ Indeed, the UWOs recommended that the top fifth of the merit list should be avoided as promotion may be imminent which would result in the CFRC losing the member to a new posting before he completed even a year of the normal three year tour.

Indeed, all recruiter promotions should be publicized. While there is scant hope the CF will offer incentives to recruiters like those offered by the US military, CFRG must find ways to acknowledge effort and excellence in recruiting. Enhancing the image of recruiting is not a new recommendation. The 2000 Delta Report stated:

As an investment in the future viability of the CF, the MAs [managing authorities] need to send their **top young** performers for a term in an [sic] RC. Who better to meet with potential applicants than a member who exudes success? (emphasis added)⁹²

While this recommendation errs in its tacit endorsement of a halo effect, and the CFRC UWOs consider the age issue debateable, the message for attitudinal change is relevant.

For the nomination and pre-screening steps, CMs and COs must be provided with guidelines like those of the US Army to assist them in making their decisions. Moreover, the CF should copy the GAO's 1998 recommendation, and "... use experienced field recruiters to interview in person all potential recruiters and use communication skills as a key recruiter selection criteria [sic]"⁹³ Indeed, there is no reason why potential recruiters could not be interviewed by experienced senior recruiters rather than by officers.

Another way to improve the interview's subjective assessment is to provide the opportunity for a realistic job preview (RJP), as recommended in the 1996 Ellis report and advocated by the private sector. The cost of two to three day's temporary duty at a CFRC is inconsequential when compared to the expense of a cost move. During that time both the

⁹² Delta Partners, p 70.

⁹³ "GAO, 1998," p 6.

potential recruiter and an experienced recruiter and/or interviewer would have a better chance to make informed decisions regarding suitability for recruiting duties.

Additionally, the interviewer must be directed to contact the losing unit supervisor to obtain specific comments on potential recruiters before training and cost move dollars are committed. A phone call facilitates this requirement.

It is unrealistic to expect potential recruiters to be flown around the country to the proposed gaining unit for interviews and RJP; however, when one CFRC is interviewing a potential recruiter on behalf of another CFRC, a teleconference could ensure that the gaining unit is involved in the selection. In all cases the potential recruiter should be given the opportunity to speak to recruiters at the proposed new unit prior to the interview being conducted in order that the nominee has a chance to form an opinion on recruiting duties.

The effectiveness of such changes will be diminished if the CF fails to take care of recruiters once they are within the recruiting system. Recruiting duty must become an acknowledged, valued component of military career progression. Moreover, some assurances must be guaranteed that merit boards will give due consideration to superior and outstanding PERs received from outside of one's primary MOC. The USMC approach of having a recruiting officer sit on each merit board is not considered realistic for CF adoption simply because of the number of MOCs involved. However, national-level direction prepared for merit boards on pan-MOC scoring of recruiting PERs is reasonable. Anything less than positive action in this area will serve only to perpetuate the "career-stopper" perception associated recruiting posts.

The *raison d'être* of the CF recruiter is to find sufficient, suitable applicants to fill the CF's needs. CF recruiters comprise a small group, so the efforts of each recruiter affect the achievement of the intake goals. With youth predisposed to stay in school longer and less likely to choose a military career, the CF faces an increasingly competitive labour market. Since the CF does not have the financial incentive flexibility of the private sector, it must optimize the cost-effective resources to best meet preferred manning levels are met. The most effective influence in an applicant's decision to join the CF is the recruiter, so the recruiter must be selected for motivation, and sales-orientation. To obtain such personnel, recruiting duties must cease to be viewed as career-impeding, and the recruiter pool needs to be broadened to encompass the CF's most talented members. However, talent and motivation must be accompanied by an assessment of sales ability by experienced recruiters in order to get the best return on investment. CFRG should aim for the majority of recruiters to be drawn from the top third of the merit list, and place a strong emphasis on selecting recruiters who show a predisposition to sell the CF as the employer of choice. The image of the tired, end-of-career recruiter with limited speaking abilities, no connection with youth, and devoid of charisma must become a thing of the past. If the CF hopes to meet manning levels it must have a vital, credible, professional recruiter force that is, like its brand, "Strong, Proud."

Bibliography

Absher, Wayne. Deputy Program Manager, 10 Company Contract, USA Recruiter Project, MPRI Kentucky. Telephone interview. 27 Feb 2003.

ArmyLink News. "Army Contracts Out Recruiting." 19 February 2002.

Asch, Beth; Hosek, James A.; Arkes, Jeremy; Fair, Christine C.; Sharp, Jennifer; and Totten, Mark, *Military Recruiting and Retention After the Fiscal Year 2000 Military Pay Legislation*, Report prepared for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, National Defense Research Institute, Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2002

Atwater, David C., Abrahams, Norman M., and Trent, Thomas T. *Validation of the Marine Corps Special Assignment Battery*, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, (San Diego, California, 1986).

Benedict, Michael E. *The Soldier Salesperson: Selection and Basic Recruiter Training Issues in the US Army*. Research Report 1534, US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Science, July 1989. Alexandria, Virginia: ARI, 1989.

Borman, Walter C.; Rosse, Rodney, L.; and Toquam, Jody L. *Development and Validation of a Recruiter Selection Battery*, Report to Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, September, 1981. NPRDC TR 81-20. San Diego, California: NPRDC, 1981.

Canada, Auditor General's April 2002 Report, Office of the Auditor General of Canada. accessed at <http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/domino/reports.nsf/html/0205ce.html>

Canada, Department of National Defence. *Military HR Strategy 2020: Facing the People Challenges of the Future*, COS ADM(HR-MIL) accessed at www.forces.gc.ca/hr 2 April 2003.

Dayton Daily News "Army Recruits Civilians to Recruit Its Soldiers," 21 October 2002.

Ellis Associates Selection & Development Systems, "Work Profiling System Analyses of the Military Career Counselor, Recruiter, and Administration Clerk" Unpublished report for CFRETS, Willowdale, On, 1997. (Typewritten).

Ferguson, Maj (Ret'd) Don, [donald.ferguson2@sympatico.ca], private e-mail message 20 Mar 2002.

Gallup HRST Screening Tool: CG Decision Brief. Unpublished power point presentation made by the COS/G3 of MCRC to the Commanding General of the Marine Corps. Jan 2002. Used with the permission of the Assistant COS for Training MCRC.

Gowing, Marilyn, and Slivinski, L.W.. "A Review of North American Selection Procedures: Canada and the United States of America." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*. Vol2 (2) (1994).

Held, Janet, Alderton, David, and Bearden, *Status of the U.S. Navy Recruiter Selection System*, Navy Personnel Research, Studies and Technology. Millington: Tennessee, 2002.

Ibell, LCdr Bob, "Canadian Forces Recruiting Project: Briefing for MHRPPC." . Speaking notes for a power point presentation. 21 November 2002

Jenkins, LTC Don. "Recruiter Selection: Making the Better Choice". Unpublished Strategy Research Project, US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 1999.

Marsh, Christine T, Lieutenant Colonel; Tymenson, Jodi, S., Colonel; Samborowski, Leonard, J., Colonel. "Seamless Total Army Recruiting: A Concept for the Army After Next." Unpublished Strategy Research Project, US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 1999.

McManus, Col D.L. "Canadian Recruiting Forces Orientation Briefing." Unpublished speaking notes for a USMC power point presentation. 22 March 1999. Used with the permission of the Assistant COS for Training MCRC.

Moodie, LCol Doug, *CFRG FY02-Year End Business Plan Review*. Canadian Forces Recruiting Group: file 1950-4 (DComd) 15 May 2002.

Muchinsky, Paul M. "A Review of Individual Assessment Methods used in Personel Selection in North America." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol 2(2) (April, 1994) pp 118-124.

Murphy, Dr Kevin; Cleveland, Dr Jeanette; and Ross, Dr William T. *Report - Evaluating the Marine Corps Recruiting Effort*, Marine Corps Research University, 25 September 2002. n.p.: Penn State, 2002.

Partenaires Delta Partners. Canadian Forces Recruiting Improvement Study. Ottawa, On: n.p. 2000.

Perron, Capt N.M., *Canadian Forces Contact Survey Annual Monitoring Report (June 2000-June 2001)*, Department of National Defence, Sponsor Research Report 01-08, September 2001 (Ottawa, On: Director Human Resources Research and Evaluation, 2001).

Report, Canada's Independent Newsmagazine, 5 Feb 2001 accessed at [<http://report.ca/archive/report/20010205/p54i010205f.html>] on 5 April 2003

Rowe, Patricia , Williams, Michael, and Day, Arla, "Selection Procedures in North America," *International Journal of Selection Procedures*, V2 n2, (April, 1994).

Simpson, LCol, H.R., [Simpson.HL@forces.gc.ca], E-Mail, 5 Nov 2002.

Smith, Lt Col, Karen, Chief HR Development USAF. Telephone interview. 10 Oct. 2002.

Taylor, James G.; Lindsay, Glenn F.; Mansager, Bard K.; and Weitzman, Ronald A. *Development of a Model to Predict Recruiter Success (Initial Results)*, prepared for Program Analysis and Evaluation Directorate USAREC, September 1995, Monterey, California: Navy Postgraduate School, 1995.

Thie, Harry, J., and Fossett, Christine, "Military Recruiting and Retention for the 21st Century," Dec 99, accessed at [<http://www.mors.org/publications/phalanx/dec99/MRR.htm>] on 10 Feb 2003.

US, General Accounting Office. GAO/NSIAD –98-58 Report. *Military Recruiting- DOD Could Improve Its Recruiter Selection and Incentive Systems*. Report to the Subcommittee on Personnel. n.p.: US Senate, 1998.

US, Chief Naval Education and Training, "Recruiting & Training: the Process Everybody Needs." 26 August 2002. Unpublished power point presentation accessed at [web.nps.navy.mil/~menissen/mn4118/lectures/retrain-process-synopsis.ppt]

US, Navy Personnel Research Studies and Technology, *Sailor 21: A Research Vision to Attract, Retain, and Utilize the 21st Century Sailor*, 14 December 1998, accessed at [www.msci.Memphis.edu/~ida/v12-14-98.pdf] on 8 March 2003

Weadon, Captain(N) B.M., *Selection of Recruiting Personnel – Recruiter Interview Protocol* (Canadian Forces Recruiting Group 5671-1 (Comd), January 2001.

Wendel, LtCol Robert F. Marine Corps Recruiting Command, USMC. Telephone interview. 28 October 2002.

Websites used:

[<http://www.rs.af.mil/rtr.htm>] = HQ Air Force Recruiting Service

[<https://www.mrc.usmc.mil/flash/main.html>] Marine Corps Recruiting Command .

[<http://www.carla.acad.umn.edu/CATFAQ.html>] 27 March 2003



Défense nationale National Defence

Canadian Forces Recruiting,
Education and Training System
Canadian Forces Base Borden
Borden ON L9M 1C0

5760-3 (RRSO)

// June 1997

Ellis and Associates Incorporated
2025 Sheppard Avenue East
Suite 4409
Willowdale ON M2J 1V7

Dear Reg and Marjorie,

I have now had the opportunity to process the material which you provided and the results of our debriefing session in Toronto.

In brief the draft plan for implementation of the selection material which you developed for us is as follows:

Selection Process:

Step 1 - The core competencies would be provided to the Career Managers. The Core competencies would be elaborated upon by including a brief description (similar to the description in the WPS workbook). A list of "the most Important Tasks" would also be included. To make this more "usable" we would provide examples of the type of position or experience which might have similar competencies.

Step 2 - Nominated MCCs/Recruiters/Clerks would have their file forwarded to the nearest CFRC (where a PSO is employed). The file would be reviewed against the competency profile.

Step 3 - Nominated MCCs/Recruiters/Clerks would travel to the nearest CFRC and complete the OPQ. While the OPQ was being scored by the PSO the Senior MCC, Senior Recruiter, or Chief Clerk would provide an RIF and highlight the "Most Time Consuming Tasks" and explain how most CFRCs operate.

Step 4 - The CO, PSO and Senior MCC, Recruiter or Clerk would then conduct a board interview using the suggested structured interview. Primary format will be PBDQ with SI if necessary.

Step 5 - At the end of the interview the Board will determine the "Gap" between the candidate's interview result (based on PBDQ responses).

Step 6 - The results of the OPQ will be used to determine if the gap can be overcome through training. Responses provided to SI questions during the interview may be used to support OPQ results.

Note:

OPQ responses which are contrary to interview results will be overlooked in favour of the candidate. When PBDQ interview results indicate a "gap", favourable OPQ results will be interpreted as indicating that the "gap" can likely be overcome. Where an SI question was used during the interview a favourable response will be used to add confidence to the OPQ result.

1/2

Canada

Annex A
Exercise New Horizons
Maj GA Cornfield
CSC 29

Professional Development

In most cases, the material provided at our national training course will fill the gaps. To supplement the course, my intent is to recommend the use of the Career Architect Material (bridged to "The Successful Manager's Handbook") for recruiting personnel who had gaps upon selection into Recruiting Services.

As discussed, your comments regarding the approach outlined would be highly valued. I appreciate your help with this project and will advise you on where we are going as the project progresses.

Sincerely, *J.M. Uchiyama*

J.M. Uchiyama
J.M. Uchiyama

Major
Recruiting Personnel Selection Officer

SELECTION OF RECRUITING PERSONNEL RECRUITER INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

INTRODUCTION

The selection of suitable personnel to fill recruiting duties is an important undertaking. In the completion of position-related tasks, each and every member of the Recruiting Centre will interact with the public. Given the high profile and unique demands of recruiting work, recruiting personnel are expected to perform their duties responsibly, to communicate effectively, and present a positive and professional image of the Canadian Forces at all times. It is to this end that collaboration between key personnel employed in the Recruiting Centres and researchers from *Ellis Associates – Selection and Development Systems* has resulted in a valid interview tool that will assist Commanding Officers with the selection of suitable personnel to fill recruiting duties in their Centres.

The use of this protocol will assist with the identification of a member's skills and abilities as they relate to recruiting tasks. It will also assist in clarifying the member's motivation to work in a demanding recruiting environment. The questions and impact statements included in the protocol address the relevant core competency areas identified within the Recruiter position profile. This interview protocol has been designed to guide the interviewer through the interview process, thereby ensuring that all the core competency areas are appropriately explored and that the most suitable person is selected to fill a recruiting position.

INTERVIEW PREPARATION

Prior to the interview, the following checks and processes need to be addressed:

- ✓ Review the member's personnel file.
- ✓ Perform a reference check by speaking with member's current and former supervisors.
- ✓ Arrange an appropriate time for the interview. Consider the following factors when setting an appointment: the time of day, interruption of work schedules, and convenience for both parties.
- ✓ Arrange for an appropriate setting, one that affords privacy for both the interviewer and member.

OPENING THE INTERVIEW

As it is not a common practice for Canadian Forces members to be formally interviewed for military positions, it will be necessary to establish at the start of the interview a climate that will facilitate conversation and clarify for the member what they might expect during the interview. To orient and prepare the member, the following points need to be considered:

◆ **Put the member at ease:**

Impression formation will happen immediately for both the interviewer and member. As first impressions influence the interview either positively or negatively, it is important that the interviewer open the conversation with general comments or questions that will help put the member at ease, reduce apprehension and clarify the general tone of the interview. By starting with questions about the weather or other non-controversial topics, rapport can be developed which will facilitate the conversation.

◆ **Purpose of the interview and opening statement:**

Once rapport has been established, move to the interview phase by introducing the purpose of the interview by reading the following italicized introduction:

“Working as a Canadian Forces Recruiter places you in a unique and high-profile position. As a Recruiter, you will be involved with the general public on a daily basis.

Your task is to attract suitable applicants for the Canadian Forces. While presenting a positive and professional image of the Canadian Forces, you will make presentations to a variety of groups, liaise and build working relationships with school counsellors and community leaders.

The purpose of this interview is to gather from you information that will help to determine your suitability to work as a Recruiter. We know that this type of work is very different from what you currently do, and have done in your career. Taking this into account, this interview has been structured to explore your experience as it relates to Recruiter tasks. Today, we will discuss issues that concern making presentations, decision making, researching, planning,

use of equipment, and general areas such as working with youth, diversity, and employment at this Recruiting Centre.

Please know that the information that you provide will be treated as Protected B. Taking notes throughout the interview is a routine procedure to ensure that your experience is documented accurately. Hopefully, the note taking won't be distracting for you.

Before we begin, do you have any questions and/or concerns that you wish to discuss?"

THE BODY OF THE INTERVIEW

It is within this phase of the interview that information related to core competency tasks and the member's workplace behaviour will be revealed. If required, Annex D to Chapter 7 of the *Recruiter's Handbook for the Canadian Forces*, provides detailed information on interviewing. Notwithstanding, please consider the following important points prior to working through the core competency interview questions and impact statements:

◆ **Flexibility:**

Some interview situations will call for *discretion* and *flexibility*. As such, addition or deletion of some questions may be appropriate.

◆ **Note Taking:**

The use of discrete note taking is strongly encouraged as this practice helps to accurately document the member's responses and substantiate the selection decision. Although a report from the interview is not generated, interview notes should be maintained. Notwithstanding, in the event that the member is found *unsuitable* for recruiting duties and given the member's right to grieve, it is advisable to produce a report detailing the interviewer's concerns that led to a negative selection decision.

◆ **Attending and Listening Skills:**

As questions are posed, clarified and probed, the use of attending and listening skills such as minimal encouragers (i.e. "oh", "yes", "go on", or "tell me more"), paraphrasing, reflecting feeling and summarizing the member's responses will help initiate and sustain effective communication.

◆ **Scoring Key:**

An interview scoring key is not available. Thus, the interviewer and/or team will be required to use their professional judgement to reach a selection decision.

◆ **Warning Flags:**

Should 'warning flags' be revealed during the review of the member's personnel file, discussions with the member's former and/or current supervisors or during the interview stage, that precludes the attainment of a selection decision, the Unit Personnel Selection Officer (UPSO) and/or Canadian Forces Recruiting Group (CFRG) G3 Standards and Training may be consulted to address any concerns.

◆ **Occupational Personality Attributes:**

Though the core competency questions listed below address Recruiter tasks and work behaviour, it may be useful during the interview to refer to the following occupational personality attributes that have been identified with the Recruiter position profile. Research analysis has resulted in the categorization of the occupational personality attributes into two levels:

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Essential: | ➤ | Judges information based on data/logic |
| | ➤ | Enjoys forming short and long term plans |
| | ➤ | Critically evaluates ideas |
| Relevant: | ➤ | Can sell and be persuasive |
| | ➤ | Prefers to direct or take control |
| | ➤ | Is talkative and outgoing |
| | ➤ | Likes to work with groups/teams |
| | ➤ | Is confident with people |
| | ➤ | Consults others before deciding |
| | ➤ | Likes analyzing others' behaviour |
| | ➤ | Is concerned about details |
| | ➤ | Can switch off work pressures |
| | ➤ | Is ambitious for success |
| | ➤ | Stays calm at important events |

THE CORE COMPETENCY QUESTIONS AND IMPACT STATEMENTS:

Proceed with the interview by reading the following italicized questions and/or statements for each of the core competency areas. Probe each question as required.

Public Relations: Selling the Canadian Forces

◆ ***“Describe your experience in making presentations.”***

Probing Questions:

Overall, how much experience have you had?

What size groups have you presented to?

To what extent have your presentations been prepared vs think on your feet situations?

What do you like/dislike about making presentations?

What sorts of information have you presented (e.g., technical, administrative, training)?

How effective do you feel you are in making presentations?

What kind of feedback have you received?

What kinds of presentations have you made (e.g., formal/informal, lecture, participation, meetings, on-the-job-training, workshops, etc.)?

What kinds of visual aids have you used (e.g., overhead, flipcharts, slides, etc.)?

What kinds of visual aids have you prepared?

◆ ***“Tell us/me about your most successful presentation?”***

Probing Questions:

To whom did you make it?

How did you prepare?

What made it successful?

What key lessons have you learned about making presentations?

◆ ***“Describe your experience as an interviewer.”***

Probing Questions:

What kinds of interviews have you conducted (e.g., hiring, promotions, performance feedback, etc.)

How did you prepare for and approach these interviews?

What have you learned about conducting effective interviews?

◆ ***“Tell us/me about a time when you had to quickly establish an effective working relationship with a group or individual you did not know.”***

Probing Questions:

What was the situation?

How did you approach it?

How effective was your decision? How do you know?

- ◆ *“Think of some of the people or groups that you include in your network of contacts. How do you maintain your relationships with them?”*

Probing Question:

How has this been helpful?

- ◆ *“Describe your experience in representing the Canadian Forces to outside groups or the general public.”*

Probing Questions:

How much experience have you had?

What was the nature of your contact?

Were there any benefits or outcomes as a result of your efforts? If so, what were they?

- ◆ *“Have you ever had to explain or defend something to someone outside the Canadian Forces? Describe the situation and how you handled it?”*

Probing Questions:

What did you do to maintain an effective relationship with the person/group?
How effective were you? How do you know?

Decision Making

- ◆ *“Describe a time when you had to make a decision that benefited one person (or group) but disappointed someone else.”*

Probing Questions:

What was the situation?
How did you approach it?
How effective was your decision? How do you know?
How did the disappointed person react? How did you manage that situation?

- ◆ *“Describe a time when you had to make an important decision but felt you didn’t have enough time to gather all of the information you would have liked.”*

Probing Questions:

What was the situation?
How did you approach it?
How effective was your decision? How did you know?
Did you receive additional information later on that would have changed your decision?
If yes, what did you do with that information?

Learning & Researching

- ◆ *“Describe what you do to stay current in your present field.”*

Probing Questions:

What sources do you usually consult? How often?

- ◆ *“What other areas of interest do you have? What do you do to stay up to date on developments in those areas?”*

Probing Questions:

What sources do you usually consult? How often?

Planning & Implementing

- ◆ ***“Describe the sorts of organizing and planning for which you have been responsible.”***

Probing Questions:

Have you been responsible for planning the work of others or just yourself? How so?
How have you approached planning for more than one task or activity at a time?
How do you manage you own time?

Staff Work & Using Office Equipment

- ◆ ***“Outline your knowledge and experience with computers for us/me.”***

Probing Questions:

To what extent have you actually used computers?
What programs or software packages are you familiar with (e.g., Lotus, WordPerfect, etc.)?
What kinds of documents have you prepared with them? (e.g., correspondence, visual aids for presentations, etc.)?

- ◆ **“Describe your experience with staff work. What type of staff work were you required to do
-at your unit? or
-at your headquarters?”**

Probing Questions:

What sort of experience do you have with sensitive information?
What is your biggest challenge in this area?
What have you done to meet this challenge?

Youth

- ◆ ***“What are your impressions of today’s youth?”***
“What experience do you have working with youth groups?”

Read the following statement:

“Working in recruiting will require that you spend many hours listening, talking and relating to youth. You will deliver recruiting information in the community, at recruiting events, high schools, or within the Recruiting Centre itself, to hundreds of youth and young adults. As these potential applicants come from varying backgrounds and experience, you will meet young people who will present themselves in many differing and unusual styles of dress and hair. You will be required to be open to youth experience, suspend judgement based on outward appearance and behaviour, listen to their concerns, tolerate their naïveté about the military, while providing enthusiastic service.”

“After being read this statement, what difficulties or concerns (if any) do you have with working and recruiting from this age group?”

Diversity

◆ **Read the following statement:**

“To be effective in a variety of cross-cultural recruiting or interview situations will occasionally require the ability to work in confusing and ambiguous environments, attentiveness to differing verbal and non-verbal cues, the knowing and understanding of your own values and the ability to respect others. In supporting the Canadian Forces Diversity Program, you will be required to be proactive in the building and sustaining of relationships with Canada’s Aboriginal peoples, visible minority communities, first-generation Canadians and women’s organizations.”

Probing Questions:

Describe a situation either personally or professionally where you were involved in an interaction with someone from another culture.

What cross-cultural difficulties do you recall encountering?

What approaches did you take to facilitate the interaction?

Do you foresee any difficulty working with people from cultures other than your own?

Large Urban Centres

◆ **Read the following statement:**

“Unlike many Canadian Forces bases that are located near small communities in rural areas, our Recruiting Centres and many of our detachments are located in the downtown core of large urban, densely populated settings. Adapting to the differences between

these two types of locations and physical environments can result in many new types of challenges. For example, in accepting a posting to a Recruiting Centre, you are likely to spend a considerable amount of time away from military and community base support services (i.e. medical, dental, clothing, administration, military housing and family activities, clubs, and daycare)."

Probing Question:

Are there any conditions or concerns (i.e. personal, health, family, education, and/or financial) which would impede your working at a Canadian Forces Recruiting Centre?

Motivation

◆ **Read the following statement:**

"Recruiting is not a typical military job. You will be required to work irregular hours, (i.e. overnight trips, working weekends, evening career fairs etc), refrain from using military jargon and profanities, and interact with the public in a manner that positively reflects upon the Canadian Forces."

Probing Questions:

What interests you most about this position?
What do you think the benefits of this position could be?
Tell me about your concerns about this position?

CONCLUDING THE INTERVIEW

Just as the opening of the interview is for setting the tone, the closing of the interview is for summarizing what has been discussed and clarifying future action. At some point the available time will be over, or the communication will be complete, and it is time to end the interview. The conclusion should be by mutual agreement and not be rushed. When both parties recognize that the end of the interview is near, the following points are to be addressed:

Annex B
Exercise New Horizons
Maj GA Cornfield
CSC 29

- ◆ Summarize the essential points of the interview and clarify with the applicant the content of those points.
- ◆ If possible, inform the applicant of your recommendation – “suitable” or “unsuitable” for employment in recruiting.
- ◆ Explain and clarify the next step in the selection process.
- ◆ Clarify any questions and/or concerns the applicant may have.
- ◆ As with the start, conclude the interview with informal conversation and a farewell.

ADDITIONAL INFO ON OTHER FORCES

1. USMC⁹⁴ –

- a. Number of recruiters:
71 Officer Selection Officers
2747 (Regular 1-tour recruiter) MOC 8411
430 (career recruiter) MOC 8412
- b. Training - For regular recruiters (MOS 8411) training consists of 7 weeks (37 training days) in classes of an average size of 220. For career recruiters (MOS 8412) training is 5 weeks (25 training days) in duration in an average class size of 30. Ten-15% of both groups are screened out of recruiter training and approximately 5% fail.
- c. “The tour of duty is best described as thirty-six separate tours, because there is a fresh quota each month....A successful recruiting tour is very likely to lead to promotion. However, a recruiting tour is thought of as a potentially risky career path (risks of visible failure are seen as lower in some other assignments) and only about 20% of non-career recruiters serve as recruiters voluntarily.”⁹⁵
- d. Special duty pay in the amount of \$375(\$US) (\$450 effective 1 Oct 2003) representing the highest special duty allowance for any enlisted service member, increased opportunities for meritorious promotions (Some marines can advance two grades within a three year period), and choice of duty station have assisted in recruiting recruiters. In recognition of the outstanding efforts and the unique challenges they face, the Corps ensures a Recruiting officer sits on every promotion board to fairly represent the Marines who have been on recruiting duty.
- e. “Over 75% of Marine Corps recruiters work more than 60 hours per week (in other [US] Services this percentage ranges from 42-67%). Over 75% report voluntarily not taking leave because of job demands. Over 75% of recruiters report spending part of their leave on recruiting-related tasks. Over 80% report pressure to continue recruiting after achieving goals.”⁹⁶

2. US Navy⁹⁷

- a. Number of recruiters: There are approximately 5000 Navy recruiters (10% of the yearly accession goal of 50,000).

⁹⁴ Col McManus, “Orientation Briefing” slide 20-21 and Marine Corps Recruiting Command website [<https://www.mcrc.usmc.mil/flash/main.html>] accessed 9 April 2003.

⁹⁵ Dr Kevin Murphy, *et al*, *Report - Evaluating the Marine Corps Recruiting Effort*. p 21.

⁹⁶ *Ibid*, p 22.

⁹⁷ Primary sources for US Navy information are Janet Held, *et al* “Status of the U.S. Navy Recruiter Selection System,” and “Sailor 21,” pp 12-15.

b. Training consists of a four-week course, the curriculum of which is undergoing a major change to focus more on recruiters and applicants being engaged in interactive dialogue and information seeking behaviours, rather than the recruiter delivering a scripted dialogue.

c. 60% of recruiters are volunteers for recruiting duty and are given a duty station preference and, if available, are guaranteed recruiting duty in the location of their choice. If there are not sufficient volunteers, E-4s and above who are up for orders are made available for recruiting duty and are detailed where CNRC needs recruiters.

d. The Navy believes that being a recruiter builds character and personal integrity, however, there are so many negative aspects to the recruiting job that much needs to be done to convince the sailor that he will benefit in the long run if not the short. There is a perception that the three year recruiter duty will cost a sailor educational opportunities, promotions and career advancement.

e. Recruiters receive special duty pay of \$375 (\$US). In addition, sea duty credit is granted for some locations with as much as 24 months reduction in the next sea tour. To cover off advancement issues, recruiting provides a unique opportunity under the guise of the Recruiter Excellence Incentive Program. This involves command advancement to E7 (Board). The option is also provided to attend college in uniform during normal working hours, and a laptop is provided while on recruiting duty.⁹⁸

3. US Army

a. Presently, the US Army has over 6500 recruiters in the field, with s,800 trained each year.⁹⁹ In October 2002 the US Army began a five year, \$172.4M (\$US), Congressionally-directed trial using contractors to take over some support work so active-duty personnel could focus on duties related to combat readiness.¹⁰⁰

b. A large number of recruiting offices will continue to have uniformed personnel until the trial ends in 2007. To fill the uniformed positions the Dept of the Army (HQDA) selects only the top performing non-commissioned officers to become field recruiters. Detailed recruiters serve a three-year tour with USAREC. Volunteers comprise 30% of the detailed recruiter force. USAREC Recruiting Operations team determines the projected number of new recruiters required and tasks the various career branches to

⁹⁸ US, Chief Naval Education and Training, "Recruiting & Training: the Process Everybody Needs." (unpublished power point presentation, 26 August 2002), accessed at [web.nps.navy.mil/~menissen/mn4118/lectures/ retrain-process-synopsis.ppt.] 15 Apr 03.

⁹⁹ Information taken from an abstract of a US presentation to "The Technical Cooperation Program" (TTCP), E-Mail: Nicole Steele, Senior Psychologist – research, Psychology Research and technology Group, DOD [Nicole.Steele@defence.gov.au].

¹⁰⁰ "Army Recruits Civilians to Recruit Its Soldiers," Dayton Daily News 21October 2002.

supply nominations. The MOS mix of recruiters in 1999 were Combat Arms 37%, Combat Support 31.5% and Combat Service Support 31.5%.

c. The USAREC Recruiting Operations Team screen the records of the nominees as well as the records of those who volunteered based on the USAREC's Recruit the Recruiter Team visits to Army installations. Over 50% of non-volunteers are typically assigned to their choice of one of the five recruiting brigades.¹⁰¹

d. Training consists of an intensive six-week course. Only after an extensive "probationary" period may a new recruiter officially change his Military Occupation Specialty (MOS) and become a "cadre" recruiter (referred to as a 79R).

4. USAF¹⁰²

a. The USAF has approx 1650 enlisted recruiters and a small group of specialist officers who concern themselves with recruiting doctors, pilots and scientists, bringing the total number of recruiters up to 2000. Prior to the year 2000, all recruiters were volunteers.

b. Recruiters are chosen from two sources, volunteers and selectees. Volunteers are the preferred method of selection however, if a requirement remains unfilled the Recruiter Selection Process mandates that [Air Force Personnel Command] AFPC select the most eligible member to fill these requirements. If a member meets the eligibility criteria referenced in the above section and has been on station more than 8 years he is vulnerable for "selection" by AFPC. The Recruiter Screening Team screens all applications for recruiting duty. This screening process is purposely rigorous and extensive, designed to ensure the best possible person/job match and likelihood for success as an Air Force Recruiter. There are measures within the non-volunteer selection to compensate for those who try to "fail" the screening test. If the only thing they "fail" is the test, and everything else is good, the test results are disregarded and the orders cut. Every effort is made to place selected applicants in their areas of preference, however, this cannot be guaranteed. However, if a member is a volunteer [for recruiting duties], he will not be assigned to a location without his consent.¹⁰³

c. Recruiters receive special duty assignment pay (SDAP - \$375.00 per month), however, this pay is not designed to offset the expenses associated with living off base. SDAP is authorized and intended to attract and retain NCOs to the responsibilities of recruiting duties. Also, authorized out-of-pocket expenses associated with the recruiting job are reimbursable up to certain limits. Off-duty employment for recruiters assigned to

¹⁰¹ Source for the way the Army used to select recruiters is Jenkins, "Recruiter Selection: Making the Better Choice," p 2 and pp 9-11..

¹⁰² Unless otherwise footnoted, the info in this section was obtained from a telecon with Lt Colonel Karen Smith, Chief HR Development Lackland AFB Recruit School. 10 Oct 2002.

¹⁰³ An almost verbatim excerpt from the USAF recruiter website.
[http://www.rs.af.mil/rtr.htm#METHOD_OF_SELECTION]

Annex C
Exercise New Horizons
Maj GA Cornfield
CSC 29

any recruiting office is strictly prohibited. Prospective recruiters must be able to subsist on their military pay.

5. Little information is available regarding other western forces. What information has been found is not particularly helpful in addressing the CF recruiter selection issue. For interest only the following information is provided

a. Australian Defence Force - The ADF outsourced recruiting activities on a one-year trial basis in 2000.¹⁰⁴ They have decided to retain uniformed recruiters and selection begins with the member volunteering or the CM identifying him as a nominee. The nominee pays a visit to the local recruiting center for an interview, tour and an overview of recruiting duties. The recruiting centre staff makes a recommendation on the member's suitability for recruiting duties to the CM, who then decides upon a posting for the member.¹⁰⁵ Recruiter training is done by a combination of distance education training followed by a two-week residential component.

b. Royal Air Force¹⁰⁶ - There are no special selection procedures for officers chosen for recruiting duties. It is a posting like any other. Where non-commissioned personnel are concerned, they volunteer for these duties and are interviewed by the Desk Officers [career managers] to make sure they are suitable. There is no set interview protocol. Both officers and airmen attend the same 6-week course.. and if it becomes apparent that they are not going to be suitable for the duties they will “fail” the course.

c. The Royal Navy and the British Army both have a five-week recruiter training course.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁴ Partenaires Delta Partners, p 47.

¹⁰⁵ Source – e-mail from Maj Damian O’Keefe, Section Head: Test Development and Validation Psychology Research Group, CP2-5-095, Department of Defence, Canberra, Australia.

¹⁰⁶ Source – e-mail from Anne Brackley, Senior Psychologist, Research & Management Information, Directorate of personnel & Training Policy, Royal Air Force Personnel & Training Command, RAF Gloucester. 6 December 2002.

¹⁰⁷ D/DSP Pol M&W/15/3/7 11 October 2002. Letter from Mr GR Mole Service personnel Policy Manning & Welfare, Ministry of Defence, London.