

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Monterey, California



DTIC
ELECTE
FEB 21 1989
S a H D

AD-A204 361

THESIS

A PRELIMINARY STUDY OF NAVY RECRUITERS:
INCENTIVE PROGRAMS AND
THE EFFECTS OF JOB-RELATED STRESS

by

Patricia K. Cruz

December 1988

Thesis Advisor

Mark J. Eitelberg

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

89 2 16 006

Unclassified

security classification of this page

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a Report Security Classification Unclassified			1b Restrictive Markings						
2a Security Classification Authority			3 Distribution Availability of Report Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.						
2b Declassification Downgrading Schedule			5 Monitoring Organization Report Number(s)						
4 Performing Organization Report Number(s)			7a Name of Monitoring Organization Naval Postgraduate School						
6a Name of Performing Organization Naval Postgraduate School		6b Office Symbol (if applicable) 54	7b Address (city, state, and ZIP code) Monterey, CA 93943-5000						
6c Address (city, state, and ZIP code) Monterey, CA 93943-5000		9 Procurement Instrument Identification Number							
8a Name of Funding Sponsoring Organization		8b Office Symbol (if applicable)	10 Source of Funding Numbers						
8c Address (city, state, and ZIP code)		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Program Element No</td> <td>Project No</td> <td>Task No</td> <td>Work Unit Accession No</td> </tr> </table>				Program Element No	Project No	Task No	Work Unit Accession No
Program Element No	Project No	Task No	Work Unit Accession No						
11 Title (Include security classification) A PRELIMINARY STUDY OF NAVY RECRUITERS: INCENTIVE PROGRAMS AND THE EFFECTS OF JOB-RELATED STRESS									
12 Personal Author(s) Patricia K. Cruz									
13a Type of Report Master's Thesis		13b Time Covered From To		14 Date of Report (year, month, day) December 1988					
15 Page Count 66									
16 Supplementary Notation The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.									
17 Cosatl Codes			18 Subject Terms (continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)						
Field	Group	Subgroup	recruiting, recruiters, stress, incentives, Navy						
19 Abstract (continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)									
This thesis focuses on two issues of importance to Navy recruiting: (1) the strengths and weaknesses of the Navy's primary recruiter incentive program, the Freeman Plan, and (2) the possible effects of job-related stress on recruiters. A literature review provides some background information on employee incentive programs, quality of life, and stress. The results of interviews with field recruiters, Chief Recruiters, and Enlisted Programs Officers are examined to see how these individuals assess the problems of recruiting. In addition, survey responses from Navy psychiatrists and psychologists are reviewed for information on the number of recruiters seeking assistance for stress-related illnesses, common diagnoses, and the impressions of specialists concerning the relationship between stress and recruiting. This research suggests that the Freeman Plan does not work for all recruiters and should be modified to account for differences in recruiting difficulty between various recruiting markets. The study results also indicate a need for stress management training for recruiters. <i>Keywords:</i> Stress (Psychology), Naval personnel, Theses. (SDW)									
20 Distribution Availability of Abstract ☒ unclassified unlimited ☐ same as report ☐ DTIC users			21 Abstract Security Classification Unclassified						
22a Name of Responsible Individual Mark J. Eitelberg			22b Telephone (include Area code) (408) 646-3160		22c Office Symbol 54Eb				

DD FORM 1473.84 MAR

83 APR edition may be used until exhausted
All other editions are obsolete

security classification of this page

Unclassified

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

**A Preliminary Study of Navy Recruiters: Incentive Programs and
the Effects of Job-Related Stress**

by

**Patricia K. Cruz
Lieutenant, United States Navy
B.S., University of South Carolina, 1984**

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of**

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
December 1988**

Author:

Patricia K. Cruz
Patricia K. Cruz

Approved by:

Mark J. Eitelberg
Mark J. Eitelberg, Thesis Advisor

Stephen L. Mehay
Steven L. Mehay, Second Reader

David R. Whipple
David R. Whipple, Chairman,
Department of Administrative Science

K. T. Marshall
Kneale T. Marshall,
Dean of Information and Policy Sciences

ABSTRACT

This thesis focuses on two issues of importance to Navy recruiting: (1) the strengths and weaknesses of the Navy's primary recruiter incentive program, the Freeman Plan, and (2) the possible effects of job-related stress on recruiters. A literature review provides some background information on employee incentive programs, quality of life, and stress. The results of interviews with field recruiters, Chief Recruiters, and Enlisted Programs Officers are examined to see how these individuals assess the problems of recruiting. In addition, survey responses from Navy psychiatrists and psychologists are reviewed for information on the number of recruiters seeking assistance for stress-related illnesses, common diagnoses, and the impressions of specialists concerning the relationship between stress and recruiting. This research suggests that the Freeman Plan does not work for all recruiters and should be modified to account for differences in recruiting difficulty between various recruiting markets. The study results also indicate a need for stress management training for recruiters.



Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. PROBLEM	1
B. BACKGROUND	4
1. Rewards for Success	5
2. Price of Failure	8
C. PURPOSE OF RESEARCH	9
D. ORGANIZATION OF RESEARCH	9
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	10
A. INCENTIVE PROGRAMS AND QUALITY OF LIFE	10
1. Lemonias and Woosley	10
2. Modern Materials Handling	11
3. Tausky	11
4. Training Today	12
5. Smith	12
6. Cooke	13
7. Alston	14
8. O'Hara, Gade, Elig, Eaton and Hertzbach	15
B. STRESS	18
1. Stoner and Wankel	18
2. Purington	19
3. Lester	20
4. Hendrix, Troxler and Ovalle	21
5. Cooper	21
6. Moore	21
C. SUMMARY	22
III. METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS	24
A. METHODOLOGY	24
B. RESULTS OF FIELD RECRUITER INTERVIEWS	25
1. New Recruiter	25

2. Mid-Tour Recruiter	26
3. End-of-Tour Recruiter	26
4. Post-Tour Recruiter	27
C. RESULTS OF DISTRICT INTERVIEWS	28
D. RESULTS OF MEDCOM SURVEY	33
E. RESULTS OF COMNAVCRUITCOM (CODE 11) SURVEY	37
F. ARMY AND AIR FORCE RECRUITER INCENTIVE PROGRAMS ...	39
1. Army	39
2. Air Force	43
3. Summary	45
IV. GENERAL FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	46
A. GENERAL FINDINGS	46
1. Is the Freeman Plan An Effective Program For All Navy Recruiters? ..	46
2. Can A Recruiter's Quality of Life be Improved by Modifying the Freeman Plan, Alternative Incentive Programs, or With Changes in the Workplace?	47
3. What Are the Possible Effects of Stress on Recruiters and What Can Be Done to Reduce or Control Stress?	47
4. Is The Stress Experienced by Recruiters Unique to Recruiting?	48
B. CONCLUSIONS	49
C. RECOMMENDATIONS	50
APPENDIX A. RECRUITER QUESTIONNAIRE	52
APPENDIX B. EPO AND CHIEF RECRUITER QUESTIONNAIRE	53
APPENDIX C. CNRC (CODE 22) TRACKING REPORT	54
LIST OF REFERENCES	56
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	59

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	FREEMAN PLAN: POINTS AWARDED TO RECRUITERS BY RECRUIT CHARACTERISTICS	6
Table 2.	FREEMAN PLAN POINT SYSTEM: AWARDS BY QUALIFYING SCORE	7
Table 3.	RESPONSES BY RECRUITER CHARACTERISTICS TO THE QUESTION: DO THE AWARDS AVAILABLE TO RECRUITERS MOTIVATE YOU?	16
Table 4.	INCENTIVE ALTERNATIVES PREFERRED BY ARMY RECRUITERS AND STATION COMMANDERS	17
Table 5.	HARD DISTRICTS: QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INTERVIEWS, 1988	32
Table 6.	EASY DISTRICTS: QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INTERVIEWS, 1988	33
Table 7.	QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO MEDCOM SURVEY, 1988	34
Table 8.	QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO MEDCOM SURVEY, 1988 CONT.	35
Table 9.	QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO MEDCOM SURVEY, 1988 CONT.	36
Table 10.	RESULTS OF COMNAVCRUITCOM SURVEY, 1988	39
Table 11.	ARMY RECRUITER INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM: PRODUCTION POINT VALUES BY RECRUIT CHARACTERISTICS ..	40
Table 12.	ARMY RECRUITER INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM: OVER-PRODUCTION POINT VALUES BY RECRUIT CHARACTERISTICS	41
Table 13.	ARMY RECRUITER INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM: AWARDS BY REQUIRED POINTS AND MAXIMUM TIME PERIOD FOR ACCUMULATING POINTS	42

I. INTRODUCTION

How the recruiting command can expect highly trained technicians who have spent between six to 15 years in their job specialties learning new equipment, teaching new people, keeping up with the tons of manuals and publications everyday to become instant "salesmen" is beyond me! Sure, a certain percentage will make it, but at what cost? . . . How many recruiters would "toss in the badge" tomorrow to get assigned to USS Neverdock? How many would get out tomorrow if they could? How many have gotten out already? How many years of experience has the Navy lost due to an ill-fated assignment in recruiting?

Letter to the Editor, *Navy Times*, 1988 [Ref. 1]

A. PROBLEM

All is not well in the world of Navy recruiting. Mention recruiting duty to anyone, either officer or enlisted, and watch the reaction. This person is not thrilled. This person is not even close to happy. Given the choice, most individuals offered or ordered to recruiting duty would probably rather extend their sea tour or take practically any other assignment. Why is that? Why does recruiting apparently have such a bad name? After all, recruiting is shore duty. People should jump at the chance to have shore duty. So why don't they when a recruiting assignment is offered to them as an option?

A recent article published in *Navy Times* [Ref. 2] detailed some alleged problems being experienced by the Navy Recruiting District (NRD) in Pittsburgh. There are allegations "that the district's leadership harassed recruiters who did not make goal, forbade recruiters to take leave, prevented recruiters from receiving recommended medical treatment, and falsified charges against recruiters to provide excuses for firing them." The rebuttal by the Commanding Officer of NRD Pittsburgh was "The level of effort is not sufficient to meet the goal that's assigned. The resources are in place, the recruiters are in place, and the level of effort as measured by prospecting and processing activity is not sufficient." This issue is still being investigated by the Navy.

What is especially interesting are the letters to the editor of the *Navy Times* [Ref. 1] that were sent in response to the article. All letters published by the *Navy Times* were signed "Name Withheld." The following excerpts from these letters gives a feeling for some current attitudes and perceptions of Naval personnel toward recruiting.

- Recruiting is the first assignment in my 16 years in the Navy where effort and hard work don't count. Recruiting Command cares about the bottom line, "making goal", and not how many hours and effort are put into it. . . . Imagine my surprise after working three consecutive 80-plus hour weeks being told, "Chief, you haven't

done anything because you haven't put anybody in the Navy." . . . My aggregate mileage is approximately 10,000 miles, through all kinds of weather, including being out ahead of the snow plow to get an applicant to the processing station on time (by 6:15 a.m.) to join the Navy. It was not uncommon to start a third of the days each month between 1 a.m. and 2 a.m., returning to my station in the evening and be expected to phone prospects to set more appointments. Recruiters do not have personal problems--after you make goal, you can take a day off to solve your problems. Leave chits routinely get stopped on the Chief Recruiter's desk and word comes back to you that your leave is approved as long as you make goal. . . . It is not uncommon for a recruiter to have several people "eligible" to join the Navy by the Recruiting Manual who can't, because their category is filled up. . . . Everyday recruiters under the pressure of making goal are cashing in their careers by succumbing to the pressure and doing anything to make goal. Some commit the ultimate suicide to their careers by forging documents, going over the hill, etc., all acts that never entered their minds as 4.0 sailors before becoming a recruiter.

- He works 12 to 16 hours a day, six to seven days a week. There is no such thing as a "legal holiday." . . . Recruiters are constantly threatened and humiliated. Superiors spend hours sometimes late into the night, haranguing recruiters if goal is not met. Recruiters are hammered as total failures, losers, lazy, incompetent, worthless and other demeaning names. . . . As for our family, if not for our faith in God and sincere belief in our marriage, we would be another Navy statistic. . . . Recruiting has taken so much physically and emotionally from my husband that even when he does get home he has nothing left to give his family.
- Of course, Recruiting Command officials are going to say that they don't harass recruiters, and that the recruiters are not following procedures, that recruiters are "derelict" in their duties, because they don't dial for dollars or make so many phone attempts per hour or make so many appointments in a day, or hold so many "qualified" interviews. Tools! What tools? What training in sales? One or two weeks in ENRO doesn't make a salesman! Maybe some districts have a sales training program but the one I came from sure didn't! . . . How about "you will be in the office by 7 a.m. and cannot leave until after 8:30 p.m. . . ."
- Your article on NRD Pittsburgh reminded me of my recruiting days. How wonderful they were, working 14 hours a day, normally six days a week, rarely being able to take leave and looking forward to your Zone Sup or Chief Rec coming to your office to tell you what a dirtbag you are and if you don't watch out you're going to be fired. Holidays? What are those? . . . Don't forget sometimes driving 1,000 miles a month, sometimes in weather that even emergency vehicles don't go out in. . . . It would also be nice to let the readers know some of the other good statistics such as the divorce rate and medical problems as a result of the stress of recruiting, or how many good families and careers were trashed because of a career enhancing assignment to recruiting. . . .
- After reading your article on NRD Pittsburgh, I can't help thinking how all districts are just about the same. . . . The command will work you until you drop, take away any and all free time you have and, for those who feel recruiting is not for them, there is no escape, unless you bust to the next lower pay grade. . . . I know some people are good at recruiting and others are not. . . .

Do these letters represent the opinions of sailors across the country? Maybe, maybe not. Whatever the case, recruiting involves long hours--on the road, on the phone, and

often beating the bushes for prospective contracts. Enlisted recruiters work under the pressure of monthly goals. Recruiting in this sense is often referred to as "36 one-month tours." The sole mission of a recruiter is to meet his or her monthly goal. And it is not just a matter of quantity. The quality of new recruits plays a major role. The recruiting goal is a specific mixture of both quantity and quality, which changes monthly based on Navy needs. Sound like an easy job? It's not. With the decline of the eligible enlistment pool, maintenance of high entrance standards for the military, and low unemployment rates, recruiting is getting more and more difficult. [Ref. 3].

There are two problems that emerge from this situation. The first problem concerns recruiter incentives. Doubts have been raised by various individuals in recruiting, from Executive Officers to Field Recruiters, whether the Navy's primary incentive program, the Freeman Plan, is meeting its objectives.

The second problem is quality of life. The Navy Recruiting Command (CNRC) has recently taken note of an increase in the number of recruiters being medically diagnosed as unable to handle the pressures and stresses of recruiting and, as a result, being transferred from recruiting. In a letter to Commander, Naval Medical Command, [Ref. 4], CNRC states that "Navy Recruiting has historically been a high intensity job requiring high quality personnel."

A recruiter may start work at 0330 so that he or she may drive hundreds of miles to pick up a prospective recruit, and then drive many more miles to deliver that individual to a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS), and then drive all the way back to bring the individual home. This recruiter may finish working at midnight. Or a recruiter may work in a District where it's pretty much a 9-to-5 job. A recruiter stationed at a remote location is dependent on the civilian economy and may not have easy access to military exchanges, commissaries, and medical facilities. There is no financial compensation for this situation.¹ Granted, not all recruiters have it rough. But it's the effects of the job, whether in a good location or bad, or whether one has to frequently drive hundreds of miles, that is a major issue.

When speaking to people in recruiting about what their job is like, the word "stress" often comes up. Some say that recruiting is the most stressful job they have ever had. They constantly feel the pressure of the need to "make goal." There may be

¹ Recruiters are given Special Duty Assignment Pay (SDAP), but its purpose is not to compensate for possible loss of privileges. Its purpose is to help obtain high quality personnel for Special Duty Assignments and to sustain adequate manning levels.

significant stress involved just in the process of meeting their recruiting quotas--phone calls, home visits, school visits, driving hundreds of miles, and whatever else it takes to find qualified candidates. This stress is compounded when a recruiter is not making goal. When a recruiter is not making goal, his or her quality of life may be seriously affected. The recruiter will probably be required to work extra hours and will come under even more closer scrutiny from the Zone Supervisor. He or she may also come under pressure from other members in the Chain of Command. Depending upon which District this particular recruiter is in, his or her cohorts at the Recruiting Station, including the supervisor, may also be required to work additional hours and be watched more closely by the Chain of Command until everyone is performing up to par. This does not help to make a happy work place. This may not be an accurate description of what happens at every Recruiting Station; but, in general, it serves to point out that not achieving goal can make a recruiter's life miserable.² Some people have great difficulty dealing with this type of failure-- especially those who may have been top performers in the Fleet.

So, how does a recruiter cope with failure or the pressures of making goal? Preliminary information gathered from people throughout recruiting and medical commands indicates that recruiters demonstrate various behavior patterns. Some have no problems at all. They are natural recruiters. Some start out slowly and eventually "get it together" either through their own initiative or through guidance and on-the-job training from their supervisors. Others just can't produce, and eventually qualify for a Freeman Transfer.³ Still others experience stress-related illnesses, such as alcoholism, depression, divorce, and even suicide. In 1987, 20 recruiters were lost due to an inability to handle stress; and, as of April 1988, eight have been transferred for the same reason. Because these are unprogrammed losses, the recruiting mission generally suffers. [Ref. 4] This is a definite problem.

B. BACKGROUND

The official start of the All-Volunteer Force in 1973 created a lot of changes for military recruiters. They could no longer depend on the mechanism of the draft to motivate enlistments. Competition grew more intense. Now they had to push even harder, and more actively pursue prospective recruits. But recruiters did not necessarily know how to do this. So, the military started to grow its own professional sales force

² Some have said that being a recruiter is miserable enough.

³ This provides an automatic transfer out of recruiting for inability to meet goal requirements.

by instituting formal training for recruiters and cultivating a force of volunteer recruiters. Recruiting commands have since become professional operations populated by "hard-chargers" who know that the rewards for success are great and that the price of failure is high (Ref. 5).

1. Rewards for Success

In 1979, the Navy instituted the Recruiter Productivity and Personnel Management System (RPPMS) or Freeman Plan, as it is more commonly known.⁴ As stated in the Enlisted Recruiting Training and Operating Procedures Standardization Manual (RETOPS - ENL):

The primary purpose of RPPMS is to alter the productivity profile of the recruiter force to one which will have a higher productivity average and enable the Navy Recruiting Command to attain future goals with the number of recruiters allowed under Congressional and DoD ceilings. The secondary purpose is to provide recruiters with timely information, measuring results of efforts, and offering incentives for performance above the standard norm.

In brief, the Freeman Plan is a point accumulation system, which rewards recruiters for individual productivity based on a rolling 12-month average of Freeman points awarded. The number of points awarded is based on the qualitative characteristics of each new recruit. Table 1 shows the points for the various qualitative characteristics.

⁴ The plan was named for Admiral Dewitt Freeman, who, while working as a special advisor to Commander, Navy Recruiting, devised this plan to enhance recruiter productivity by offering a system of awards for top performance.

Table 1. FREEMAN PLAN: POINTS AWARDED TO RECRUITERS BY RECRUIT CHARACTERISTICS

RECRUIT CHARACTERISTICS	POINTS AWARDED TO RECRUITER BY AFQT* CATEGORY				
	I	II	IIIU	IIIL	IV
HS Diploma Grad	116	107	100	90	70
Non-HS Diploma Grad	100	90	85	65	
ALL AFQT CATEGORIES					
NAVETS** CREO***GRP A,B,C			130		
NAVETS CREO GRP D,E			100		
OSVETS**** E4 and above			90		
OSVETS E3 and below			70		
Direct Procurement Enlistment Program					
E4 and above			125		
E3			100		
*AFQT refers to the Armed Forces Qualification Test. AFQT categories and percentile score ranges are as follows: I (93 through 100); II (65 through 92); IIIU (50 through 64); IIIL (31 through 49); IV (10 through 30); V (1 through 9). **Navy Veterans ***Career Reenlistment Objective. CREO groups are tied to manning levels in the various ratings. CREO group A is less than 88% manned, CREO group B is 88-94% manned, CREO group C is 95-103% manned and CREO group D is 104-110% manned. ****Other Service Veterans					
SOURCE: Department of the Navy, Navy Recruiting Command, COMNAVCRUITCOMINST 1133.3C, <i>Enlisted Recruiting Training and Operating Procedures Standardization Manual</i>, p. 8-2.					

By accumulating a sufficient number of points, a recruiter may earn a Certificate of Commendation, Navy Achievement Medal, Voluntary 1-Year Extension⁵ on Recruiting Duty, or Meritorious Advancement.⁶ The number of points needed for these awards is detailed in Table 2.

Table 2. FREEMAN PLAN POINT SYSTEM: AWARDS BY QUALIFYING SCORE

Award	Qualifying Score By Avg Pt Accumulation Per Month
Certificate of Commendation	300
Navy Achievement Medal	350
Voluntary Extension	400
Meritorious Advancement	525

SOURCE: Department of the Navy, Navy Recruiting Command, COMNAVCRUITCOMINST 1133.3C, Enlisted Recruiting Training and Operating Procedures Standardization Manual, p. 8-1.

There are various combinations of recruits that will enable a recruiter to qualify for an award. An example of how the system works is as follows: to be eligible for a Certificate of Commendation, a recruiter would have to average three Mental Group I non-high school graduates or two Mental Group I high-school diploma graduates and one Mental Group IV high-school diploma graduate per month. The mix could change monthly, just as long as it averages 300 points per month for 12 months. One of the difficulties with this is that recruiting standards change monthly. So, one month all Mental Groups may be eligible to join, while the next month maybe only high school diploma graduates in Mental Groups I through IIIU are eligible. Because the upper mental groups are viewed as being more difficult to recruit, accumulating points is not an easy task.

⁵ Must be within 8-10 months of projected rotation date (PRD).

⁶ Must be E4, E5, or E6 and meet all eligibility requirements in accordance with current directives.

In addition to the Freeman Plan, there are other individual enlisted awards programs. These programs include:

- Gold/Silver Wreath Award for Excellence in Recruiting and Recruiting Support
- Enlisted Recruiter of the Year
- Chief Recruiter of the Year
- NUPOC Recruiter of the Year
- Zone Supervisor
- End of Tour, Sustained Performance Awards
- Within Tour Personal Awards

These awards are not as heavily dependent on point accumulation as in the Freeman Plan, and they are awarded through a nomination process. The specific criteria vary, but the general criteria include personal attributes such as:

- Individual's dedication to the recruiting mission.
- Professionalism in the daily conduct of assigned tasks.
- Positive leadership and sound management contributing to mission accomplishment.
- Positive Navy image fostered through the individual's behavior, cooperation, and appearance. (Ref. 6)

2. Price of Failure

The only incentive program that has a price associated with failure is the Freeman Plan. Under this program, if a recruiter does not attain a monthly productivity of 2.0 gross new contracts per month by the sixth month of production, that recruiter will be nominated for a transfer out of recruiting. This is called a Freeman Transfer (Freeman T). (Ref. 7) A Freeman T is not intended to hurt someone's career. Its purpose is to remove someone from recruiting who cannot do the job, in the easiest way possible. It is essentially a no-fault transfer. Although there are no career penalties associated with a Freeman T, there is personal failure. A top performer in his or her regular field of expertise has been told that he or she can't cut it. Top performers are not normally accustomed to hearing that they have failed in what they were assigned to do. Personal failure can be devastating.

There is no real price of failure in the other programs. An individual may not get a Gold Wreath or may not be nominated for Recruiter of the Year, but that doesn't mean that he or she has failed, and the recruiter is not transferred out of the job. relieved of your duties.

The Freeman Plan is where the pressure comes in. It says to the individual, make goal or you're out of recruiting. To some, that may be a blessing in disguise. To others, especially top-notch sailors, it may represent the ultimate failure--failure to do the job that they were assigned to do. This is the high price of failure.

C. PURPOSE OF RESEARCH

CNRC is concerned about the negative environment surrounding recruiting and the number of recruiters who seek assistance for stress-related illnesses. Because the Freeman Plan appears to be the only program that specifically points out failure, it should be examined more closely within the context of how it may add to a recruiter's stress. Assuming that the price of failure is high and that stress-related illnesses are a product of the recruiting environment, the present analysis should be conducted to answer the following questions:

- Is the Freeman Plan meeting its objectives?
- Can quality of life be improved by an appropriate incentive program or other changes in the workplace?
- What are the effects of stress on recruiters and what can be done about it?
- Is the stress experienced by recruiters unique to recruiting?

D. ORGANIZATION OF RESEARCH

This thesis is organized as follows. Chapter 2 consists of a literature review of research on incentive programs--both military and civilian--and on occupational-related stress. Chapter 3 compares Army, Navy and Air Force recruiter incentive programs. The strengths of these programs are discussed with identification of successful factors found in Army and Air Force programs, but not present in Navy programs. Chapter 4 presents some general findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Existing literature abounds with information on incentive programs, quality of life and stress. However, none of the literature reviewed, except for one article, specifically addressed Navy recruiters. As a result, the following literature review should be viewed in general terms with an eye toward understanding how the three issues--incentive programs, quality of life and stress--fit into the world of the recruiter.

Additionally, for the most part, the literature on incentive programs looked at those programs from the point of improving productivity. It is not the intent of this research to prove or disprove that a particular incentive program increases productivity, but rather to determine if the awards offered by particular programs motivate or inspire recruiters.

This chapter is divided into three parts. The first part is a literature review of incentive programs and quality of life. The second part is a literature review of stress. The chapter concludes with a summary of the pertinent literature.

A. INCENTIVE PROGRAMS AND QUALITY OF LIFE

1. Lemonias and Woosley

In an article based on the GAO report, "Does the Federal Incentive Awards Program Improve Productivity," Lemonias and Woosley [Ref. 8] discovered that an effective awards program should consist of at least the following components:

- A direct linkage with specific organizational goals and objectives.
- An objective system for setting and communicating employee work expectations and measuring performance contributions. Employees must be convinced that their efforts and accomplishments may lead to recognition in the form of tangible rewards.
- Managers who are motivated to use and know how to use the program.
- Awards that are timely and relevant to employees' needs. Management needs to determine the type of award which is most likely to stimulate continuing outstanding performance.
- An annual evaluation of the program's results. An indepth evaluation is critical in determining how effective an awards program is in both encouraging and recognizing employee and organization performance excellence.

Out of the 13 Federal personnel award programs that they reviewed, most had few, if any, of the above components.

2. Modern Materials Handling

An article in Modern Materials Handling [Ref. 9] expands on the objective system as seen in Lemonias and Woosley [Ref. 8]. This article cites a four-point program that improves performance and productivity at all levels of the organization:

1. Goal setting through management by objectives for every position. Every employee sits down with his supervisor or manager periodically to set goals which are mutually agreed to.
2. Incentive programs geared specifically to workers, clerical staff, warehouse managers, operating vice president and his staff.
3. A communications program to improve the relationship between labor and management.
4. An on-going training program which enables everyone to perform their job more effectively.

Examples are given of incentive programs for people in different positions throughout the firm. For example, for warehouse employees, the top 10 performers are publicly recognized each week and so are the top 3 warehouses with the best productivity. The top individual performers receive free tickets to sporting events. Each month, the single highest performer gets one day off with pay. Each quarter, all employees of the top warehouse receive a day off with pay. Top clerical staff personnel are awarded weekly with a free lunch; monthly with a \$50 cash bonus; and quarterly with a merit salary increase. Top warehouse managers receive a quarterly cash bonus of \$250 and an extra bonus plus a merit increase for annual performance.

An important statement in this article is, "unless you thoroughly train your managers, you won't have effectively trained employees." Training is essential at all levels of the organization but must start with the managers. And training should be ongoing. There are always new concepts to learn and new ideas to share. This is a form of participative management.

3. Tausky

After examining some data collected by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center in the 1970s on what the respondents to a questionnaire wanted in relation to what they were getting in their job, Tausky [Ref. 10] found that the nature of work, financial compensation and job security are viewed as primary work interests--what the people want, as opposed to what they're getting.

Tausky then looked at the Japanese way of doing things. In Japan, permanent employment is guaranteed and the bonus system is tied to the firm's profitability; the greater the productivity gain, the higher the bonuses. Everyone benefits from the firm's

success or suffers from its failure. This is very much unlike the situation in the United States where the focus is on individual gains and productivity, and awards are not shared.

The author states that "productivity and the quality of work follow on the heels of an appropriate incentive structure." The bottom line is that when there is a match between what is desired and what is received, then there will be satisfaction with quality of work life. When the work itself is seen to be stimulating, the pay is appropriate to the work and peace of mind comes from job security. Then the quality of work life has reached a reasonably satisfactory level.

4. Training Today

This is yet another article that touts the benefits of management by objectives (MBOs). In a long-term study conducted at a division of Philadelphia Life Insurance Company, it was discovered that after supervisors received performance planning training, the employees of these supervisors had noticeable changes in six goal-oriented job dimensions: [Ref. 11]

1. Perceived difficulty of work goals decreased.
2. Clarity of work goals increased.
3. Quality of performance feedback from supervisors improved.
4. Amount of feedback from supervisors improved.
5. Perception of participation in the goal-setting process increased.
6. Employee perception of competition for work goal accomplishment increased.

5. Smith

According to Smith [Ref. 12], knowing what motivates another person is absolutely fundamental to the practice of management. Smith discusses 10 "truisms" about motivation and why he thinks they're false. One "truism" is the carrot, or stick, approach. This may cause movement, but does not create motivation. We can extract motivated behavior, but actual motivation comes from within the individual. Therefore, neither can we provide a person with a motive; but we can trigger changes in the work environment that may elicit motivated behavior.

Another "truism" is that goals or theories for motivating people have general applicability. As Smith states, "there are no universally applicable tools for motivating people."

Yet another "truism" is that incentives and bonuses motivate people. Smith has already claimed that you cannot create motivation, and he goes on here to explain that

incentives and bonuses are reinforcers as opposed to motivators. That's why incentives and bonuses don't work for everyone. When they do work, it's because they reinforce the behavior of individuals who are already well-motivated. This is a crucial concept in motivation. No matter how wonderful management may think an incentive program is, if the individuals aren't motivated, it's not going to make much difference.

Smith acknowledges that different people require different kinds of challenge and different environments to make the most of their capacities. This is very important for management to keep in mind.

6. Cooke

Cooke's report [Ref. 13] was the only study reviewed that specifically addressed incentives in Navy recruiting. His consensus after analyzing the Freeman Plan is that recruiters, especially those in tough markets, may be better off with a competitive compensation scheme that bases rewards on relative performance as opposed to a non-competitive structure (Freeman Plan).

A competitive system is thought to be effective when the variation in production possibilities for different regions or periods is large compared to the variations in relative productivity of recruiters in similar circumstances. It may be less effective if variations in recruiter productivity in similar circumstances is large relative to differences in productivity attributable to the environment, and the number of potential winners is small relative to the number of recruiters.

Through analysis of Freeman Point distributions of all Navy Recruiting Areas from 1980 to 1984, Cooke, based on the assumption that the ability distribution of recruiters does not vary much over time or between regions, concludes that the Freeman Plan is inequitable. Given the above assumption, there is an inequality of opportunity. Therefore, Cooke feels that an alternative incentive system that rewards outstanding performance relative to other recruiters in similar circumstances may improve the equity of the incentive system.

Because there is significant uncertainty involved in the recruiting process, Cooke feels that if individual incentive systems were competitive within areas, then reward opportunities would be equalized across regions for given levels of effort. Recruiters in relatively difficult recruiting areas would not be discouraged by the difficulty of reaching specified point accumulation totals. Instead, they are rewarded according to their ability and effort relative to other recruiters in similar circumstances.

Basically, what Cooke is saying is that rewards under the Freeman Plan are less attainable for recruiters in relatively difficult recruiting areas, because the Freeman Plan

uses a fixed standard in an environment with fluctuating economic conditions. When economic conditions are good for recruiting, incentives are greater, but when conditions are bad, incentives are small.

7. Alston

American industry has been looking at the Japanese way of management for some time now and has been trying to figure out how to implement the same methods in this country. The objective, of course, is being able to produce a quality product, both efficiently and effectively, just like the Japanese.

Alston [Ref. 14] and [Ref. 15] is quick to point out that not all Japanese principles of management can be copied by Americans. There are vast cultural differences that would prohibit the adaptation of all Japanese principles. First, Americans need to understand the three general principles of Japanese work relations. They are:

1. The worker is intelligent.
2. All workers form a family.
3. The group is more important than the individual.

Japan depends on its workers to suggest ways to improve productivity and quality of working life because the workers are assumed to be experts at their jobs. And if anyone can make a reliable suggestion, surely it would be the worker. One way that Americans can do this is by implementing quality circles. A quality circle is when six or more workers and their supervisors get together monthly, or more often, to study how to increase productivity. Members of the group are given lessons on productivity, problem-solving, and quality control, and each is taught how to seek out and solve low productivity situations.

As was discussed in Tausky [Ref. 10], Alston also states that the success of the work group is more important than the individual. Workers are loyal to their company and develop a system of mutual obligations. Workers are never rewarded as individuals, because it is felt that most workers learn from more experienced co-workers and have received advice and support from others. Therefore, no one individual is totally innovative on his or her own, and as a result, the major portion of the reward is given to the worker's total work unit.

Now, one may think that there are bound to be individuals in the work unit that won't work as hard because they know the group is going to be rewarded as a whole. Well, the Japanese have found that those who have been rewarded, even though they

have contributed less, feel obligated to equalize the imbalance by working harder. Group goals and rewards encourage intragroup harmony among the members. Alston thinks the group approach may be too radical for Americans, but thinks it can be adapted by giving the originator of the idea or the most productive member of the group slightly more than the other members.

Examples of group rewards, as simple as they may seem, are recognition of all workers and spouses at a dinner given by the company, or a group picnic paid for by the company, or even a plaque with members' names, hung in a "hall of honor". It is difficult for Americans to see the importance of rewarding the group as a whole, but our testimonial dinner, conventions, and office parties are examples of group rewards.

According to Alston, group rewards work best when there is little turnover and they are not effective in departments where members are forced to compete with each other.

8. O'Hara, Gade, Elig, Eaton and Hertzbach

In a paper titled "Preliminary Assessment of the Army's Incentive Program for Recruiters," O'Hara et al. [Ref. 16] analyzed data from interviews and paper-and-pencil-questionnaires of Army recruiters and station commanders to determine their knowledge and attitudes about the then-current incentive awards program. Recruiter attitudes were examined as a function of gender, performance, satisfaction with recruiting, and recognition received from commanders. To assess recruiter attitudes, the following question was asked: "Do the awards available to recruiters motivate you?" The responses in Table 3 suggest that men are more motivated by the awards than are women, and if you have low job interest, or are performing below 100 percent, you are highly unmotivated.

Table 3. RESPONSES BY RECRUITER CHARACTERISTICS TO THE QUESTION: DO THE AWARDS AVAILABLE TO RECRUITERS MOTIVATE YOU?

Recruiter Characteristics	Responses			
	<u>YES</u> (percent)	<u>NO</u> (percent)	<u>TOTAL</u> (percent)(number)	
Gender				
Male	52	48	100	63
Female	27	73	100	34
% Of Objective Achieved				
Above 100	62	38	100	40
100	40	66	100	25
Below 100	19	81	100	31
Level of Job Interest				
High	59	41	100	54
Low	21	79	100	42
Num. of Certificates Rcvd Per Year From a Higher Command				
High	58	42	100	45
Low	27	73	100	45

SOURCE: O'Hara et al., "Preliminary Assessment of the Army's Incentive Program for Recruiters", p. 66

In addition, to evaluate opinions about the effectiveness of the awards system, station commanders were asked: "Do the awards available to recruiters motivate them?" The responses of the station commanders were as follows:

Response	Percent
YES	45
NO	38
NO RESPONSE	17

What O'Hara et al. found, was that the overall interest in the award system was relatively low. They then looked for alternative incentives by asking recruiters and station commanders, "What would motivate you to do even better in recruiting?" and "What motivates recruiters?" The responses to these questions are summarized in Table 4. It is interesting to note that the station commanders thought that awards were motivating, but the recruiters wanted better pay and benefits, and time off.

Table 4. INCENTIVE ALTERNATIVES PREFERRED BY ARMY RECRUITERS AND STATION COMMANDERS

Incentive Alternative	Recruiters (percent)	Station Commanders (percent)
Awards	N/A	38
Better Pay & Benefits	24	15
Time Off	23	15
Better Opportunity For Promotion	13	19
Choice of Assignment	7	N/A
Personal Approval & Recognition	6	19

N/A--This alternative was not chosen by the respondent. Note: Percents do not sum to the total because respondents could make more than one response and these are not all the responses given.

SOURCE: O'Hara et al., "Preliminary Assessment of the Army's Incentive Program for Recruiters", p. 67

Because this was preliminary research, definitive conclusions could not be made. But some ideas were proposed for further consideration. For example, it was found that "low productivity recruiters might be more motivated by the awards if they had a better chance to get them." And because female recruiters were not as motivated as male recruiters, it may be that awards are an aspect of career objectives for recruiters and, therefore, of greatest interest to males. This idea comes from previous research,⁷ which

⁷ Manhardt(1972) and Schuler (1975).

reported that females show greater interest in social aspects of a job while males show greater interest in career objectives of the job.

The final suggestion was that, because the incentive alternatives proposed by recruiters are more similar to a civilian sales force than other military, the Army could be more confident in using information from civilian incentive programs to develop hypotheses about recruiter incentives.

There has been no follow up to this research. An attempt was made to test changing missioning (goaling) from monthly to quarterly, but was dropped because of conflict with the Battalion Commander's requirements. [Ref. 17]

B. STRESS

1. Stoner and Wankel

Stress is a fact of life. Some occupations have a lot of it, others have very little. Some people experience stress slightly, while others may be incapacitated by it. What is stress and what can be done about it?

Stoner and Wankel [Ref. 18] cite the following definition of stress: ". . .there is a potential for stress when an environmental situation is perceived as presenting a demand which threatens to exceed the person's capabilities and resources for meeting it." There are many causes of stress and these are called stressors. Some common stressors are:

- Quantitative role overloading --"when a person has more work than he or she can complete in a given time."
- Qualitative role overloading --"the employee lacks the skills or abilities needed to complete the job satisfactorily."
- Role underloading --"a person who does not have enough to do. . ."
- Lack of participation in decisions --"people who feel that they are not involved in decisions that influence their jobs experience relatively high levels of stress."
- Change within an organization --"stress can result from any major change within an organization--an alteration in company policy, a reorganization, or a change in leadership. . ."

As we all know, stress can have serious consequences for both our health and job performance. High levels of stress are associated with diabetes, ulcers, and high blood pressure. Stress can cause depression, irritation, anxiety, fatigue, lowered self-esteem, and reduced job satisfaction. If stress continues over a long enough time frame, it can lead to substance abuse as an escape, and to burnout. Stoner and Wankel define burnout as "a state of mind resulting from prolonged exposure to intense

emotional stress and involving three major components: physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion."

In a study conducted by Maddi and Kobasa [Ref. 18] it was found that the ability to handle stress is a function of four characteristics:

1. Personal style and personality --how one tended to perceive, interpret and respond to stressful events.
2. Social supports --the extent to which family, friends, co-workers and others provided encouragement and emotional support during stressful events.
3. Constitutional predisposition --how robust and healthy one's body seemed to be in terms of in-born physical construction.
4. Health practices --the extent to which one stayed in good physical condition through exercise and avoiding destructive behaviors like smoking.

Finally, we come to managing stress. This may occur on two levels--organizational and individual. On the organizational level various changes can be made including decentralization of authority, allowing employees to participate in making decisions that will affect them and adjusting reward systems so that they are viewed as fair and reasonable.

On an individual level, one needs to manage his or her own job and work situation so that the person does not get overwhelmed. Additionally, individuals can develop the habit of being more optimistic and decisive. An easy way for an individual or a work group to learn stress management is through coping skills training. This type of training is facilitated by a qualified person in the field of stress management and teaches people how to recognize stressors, and then how to cope with them.

2. Purington

Both management and the individual employee have a responsibility to learn how to cope with stress. It would benefit management to be interested because stress overload, regardless of the source, takes its toll on the employee which will eventually affect the organization.

Purington [Ref. 19] notes that stress is an inescapable part of life, "but when it puts our bodies under prolonged physical and emotional pressure, the very things which might have been stimulating and enjoyable become destructive and unpleasant." Stress is not normally a matter of concern until the ability to cope with it becomes impaired. In his study, Purington summarizes the works of numerous researchers. Most of these earlier works developed concepts of various stages of stress. One well-known researcher in the field of stress, Selye, defined the stages of stress as:

1. Alarm Reaction --this is the initial reaction when the body is "attacked". The body responds through physiological changes i.e. pulse rate quickens.
2. Stage of Resistance --in this stage, there are both psychological and physiological changes in order to fight the stress. There may be some adjustment to the stressor at this time. If a means is not found for dealing with the stressor, this stage may end with indications of psychosomatic symptoms and mild reality distortions.
3. Stage of Exhaustion --here the individual's defense systems are no longer able to sustain the process of adjustment and gives in to the stressor.

Purington sums up his article by noting that, "Whether or not a stressor actually provokes stress depends a great deal on how a person perceives it." He claims that management has a responsibility in the role of reducing stress and he gives alternatives that are available to organizations interested in stress management. These alternatives are:

- Stress awareness --self understanding of your physical and emotional reactions to various stimuli.
- Stress inoculation learning --individuals learn to understand stress warning signals, admit that they are under or over stressed and develop concrete actions for coping with their specific work situation, personality and goals.
- Participative management --workers take an active role in the decision making process on issues that directly affect their work.
- Bio-feedback --through a series of training sessions, the individual learns how to control their physical response to stress or to develop a healthier attitude towards themselves and their lives.
- Organizational restructure --includes such things as shorter but more frequent breaks, changing work schedules and providing an area where an individual can temporarily escape the stress.

3. Lester

Lester [Ref. 20: p. 47] found it difficult to model all the research findings on stress. Because reactions to stress are different for everyone, the research on stress leans towards "a greater appreciation of individual differences and the matching or mismatching of individual goals," as opposed to development of a unitary concept of stress.

Lester also claims [Ref. 20: p. 49.] that stress management training is based more on insights and practices from the clinical field than from normal science. Because of this, he sees a need for more evaluations of such training. Lester introduces focusing on selection rather than on training. He observes that "it might be productive for researchers to seek ways to characterize organizations in such a way as to promote the selection of employees who will not suffer by being hired into them."

4. Hendrix, Troxler and Ovalle

Hendrix et al., in their paper, "Stress: Its Behavioral and Physiological Consequences" [Ref. 16: p. 58], follow suit with most of the other literature that has been reviewed. They reinforce the facts that if an individual's stress is continually increased, the person will eventually reach a point where performance decreases as the stress level increases. Also, the individual may develop physical problems that may decrease job performance or, if severe enough, may require medical attention. These problems may include ulcers, high blood pressure, allergies, and coronary heart disease.

5. Cooper

In a fairly extensive literature review, Cooper [Ref. 21] focuses in on stress and the person-environment fit (P-E fit), with P-E fit being "conceptualizing stress as a mismatch between the individual and the environment."

One view among the many researchers cited, is that stress may occur "when an environmental situation is perceived as presenting a demand which threatens to exceed the person's capabilities and resources for meeting it, under conditions where he expects a substantial differential in the rewards and costs from meeting the demand versus not meeting it."

Cooper [Ref. 21: p. 9.] offers a conceptual definition of stress. He writes: "Experienced stress is the cognitive and affective perception of, and response to, the multi dimensional environmental influences that impinge on the individual as being unpleasant or disagreeable and that interact with these perceptions to produce negative psychological and physiological outcomes."

Cooper [Ref. 21: p. 22] also recommends the need for further research to:

- Develop a method to measure and quantify stress in particular jobs and organizational environments
- Determine the functional relationships between stress and performance in particular jobs identified as stressful.
- Develop more reliable and valid stress measurement instruments.
- Develop stress scales to measure P-E fit with greater reliability and validity, using the concept of experienced stress as a guide for development.

6. Moore

Dr. John Moore, Director of Recruiter Training, Commander Naval Reserve Force, has incorporated stress awareness and stress management training into the lesson plans for Recruiter Training Orientation, Recruiter-In-Charge training, Zone Supervisor/Chief Recruiter training. Recruiter Management Orientation and Recruiter

Training Seminars. [Ref. 22] Recruiters learn the difference between Type A and Type B people and how to categorize their own behavior. A common theory is that the type of person you are and the amount of stress you are susceptible to are directly correlated.

Type A people:

- Feel general impatience with the rate at which most events take place.
- Always move, walk, and eat rapidly.
- Explosively accentuate words in ordinary speech, whether or not there is a need for such accentuation, and rapidly utter the last few words of most sentences.
- Indulge in polyphasic thought or performance. They strive to think or do two or more things at once.
- Find it difficult to refrain from discussing subjects that interest them in conversation.
- Almost always feel vaguely guilty when they relax.
- Experience a chronic sense of time urgency.[Ref. 22]

Type B people:

- Are generally free of all the habits and traits characterizing the type A person.
- Do not suffer from a sense of time urgency.
- Generally harbor little or no free-floating hostility, and feel little need to display or discuss their achievements.
- Tend to play for play's sake, to find fun and relaxation rather than to compete.
- Relax without guilt. [Ref. 22]

Recruiters learn the characteristics of assertive behavior, which may prevent one from getting into a potentially stressful situation. They learn the symptoms and signals of stress. They do a self-test to determine their personal stress levels. Recruiters learn to deal with stress through both physical training and time management. Dr. Moore claims that all recruiters who have gone through his training program in the last two years can describe their personality type and stress level, as well as how to combat stress. [Ref. 23]

C. SUMMARY

There are many common threads throughout the previous literature with regard to employee incentive programs, quality of life, and stress. In terms of military recruiting, the following important points are noted:

- Employees must be convinced that their efforts and accomplishments may lead to recognition in the form of tangible rewards. [Ref. 8]

- On-going training and training for everyone is important, because the environment is continually changing. [Ref. 9].
- MBOs provide structure. Workers and supervisors both know exactly what is expected in job performance and how and when it will be evaluated. This relieves job ambiguity and is a component of participative management.
- Participatory management can help productivity and worker morale. The worker supposedly knows his or her job better than anyone else and is therefore the most likely candidate to provide reliable suggestions on job improvements and company policies that affect the job. [Ref. 14]
- Motivation cannot be created. Incentives and bonuses are reinforcers. When incentives and bonuses work, it's because they reinforce the behavior of individuals who are already well-motivated. [Ref. 12]
- The Freeman Plan is not effective for recruiters in relatively difficult recruiting areas. There is an inequality of opportunity in a non-competitive compensation system. [Ref. 13]
- Group rewards relieve jealousy and competition.
- Stress is a fact of life, and the level of stress one experiences is based on the individual's perception of the stress. Stress can be conceptualized as a mismatch between the individual and the environment. [Ref. 21]
- Management, as well as the individual, has a responsibility to learn how to cope with stress. [Ref. 19]

III. METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

A. METHODOLOGY

A potpourri of methods was used in the conduct of this research. Because little has been previously done in this area, most of the research was "primary"--that is, interviews using structured and open-ended questionnaires. The emphasis of the interviews was on field recruiters. Four recruiters from Naval Recruiting District (NRD) San Diego were interviewed by phone using the questions presented in Appendix A. The four recruiters were chosen for the interview based on their tenure in recruiting. One recruiter was new to recruiting (4 months on the job), one was mid-tour (18 months on the job), one was end-of-tour (33 months on the job), and one was post-tour (recently retired Chief Recruiter). NRD San Diego recruiters were chosen for two reasons:

1. NRD San Diego's request in support of this thesis.
2. NRD San Diego currently ranks 23rd out of 41 recruiting districts in productivity. Therefore, it represents close to the average recruiting district. As an average district, its recruiters' responses should represent the norm.

In addition to the field recruiters, Enlisted Programs Officers (EPOs) or Chief Recruiters from the five "easiest" districts and the five "hardest" districts were interviewed. The definition of "easy" and "hard" districts is based on rankings presented in the CNRC (Code 22) Tracking Report for FY 86-88. This report ranks districts from bottom to top based on the number of months that the district missed its enlistment contract objective. "Hard" districts are those that have missed their enlistment contract objective the most. "Easy" districts have not missed their enlistment contract objective during the period of the tracking report. There are 14 out of 41 districts that qualify as "easy" districts. The five chosen to be interviewed were randomly selected from among those 14. The questionnaire can be found in Appendix B, and an extract from the CNRC (Code 22) Tracking Report appears in Appendix C.

Some secondary research was done by analyzing responses to two surveys. The first survey was conducted by Commander, Naval Medical Command (COMNAVMEDCOM) (Code 34) in response to a letter from COMNAVCRUITCOM. [Ref. 4]. It attempted to get a feeling for just how many recruiters are seen by Navy psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers, what the diagnoses are, and how many are found fit for full duty and/or recommended for transfer from recruiting duty. The

second survey, from COMNAVCRUITCOM (Code 11) to all Navy Recruiting Areas [Ref. 24], sought similar information as in the first survey, from the recruiting side of the house, with hopes of comparing the two surveys. It is important to note that these surveys were prepared and conducted informally.

Finally, an attempt was made to compare Army, Navy and Air Force recruiter incentive programs. Due to time constraints, Army and Air Force recruiters were not interviewed, so the comparison is based strictly on recruiting regulations from these particular services and information gleaned from their respective recruiting headquarters.

B. RESULTS OF FIELD RECRUITER INTERVIEWS

1. New Recruiter

The new recruiter interviewed is a Second Class Petty Officer who had been recruiting for four months at the time of the interview. He has been in the Navy for seven years and volunteered⁸ for recruiting duty to take a chance at meritorious promotion under the Freeman Plan, because advancement in his rate was tight. He had never been on recruiting duty before and his previous tour of duty was at sea. This recruiter felt that Enlisted Recruiter Orientation School (ENRO) was a good school and satisfactorily prepared him to do his job.

His recruiting station is located in an average area⁹ and he felt that the recruiting goal was relatively easy to obtain. He had already earned his Gold Wreath and felt that the reward/incentive system under both local programs and the Freeman Plan was motivating. He thought Freeman Plan points were a little high--obtainable but not easy.

This Petty Officer said that recruiting has its ups and downs, but that so far he liked it. The stress of the job was related to not making goal and the amount of driving time. He felt there was more stress in recruiting than on a ship. He said it was too early to tell if he would ever volunteer for recruiting again.

He is not married, so could not address the issue of quality of family life and did not think that recruiting affected his quality of life too much. His suggestion for changing the incentive program was to lower the points under the Freeman Plan.

⁸ Volunteering is defined as specifically requesting recruiting duty from the detailer.

⁹ An average area is defined in terms of ease of recruiting.

2. Mid-Tour Recruiter

The next individual interviewed was also a Second Class Petty Officer with one and a half years in recruiting (mid-tour), and nine years in the Navy. He did not volunteer for recruiting duty and his previous assignment had been shore duty. He did not feel that ENRO satisfactorily prepared him for his job. He said the school was too basic and did not address the hardships that a recruiter may face in the field.

This Petty Officer's recruiting station is in a tough area and as a result his station was working 0800 to 2000 Monday through Friday, and most Saturdays because they were not making goal. He felt that the difficulties with making goal were related to the fact that recruiting standards change monthly, based on what the Navy needs and that it is difficult to adjust to the continual changes.

He thought that the Freeman Plan was motivating and a good program, but that in his area, awards were not obtainable. He said that recruiting was the hardest job he'd ever had, and that meritorious promotion under the Freeman Plan was unrealistic because, so far, only one out of 122 recruiters in his district had been selected. With meritorious promotion not seeming feasible, he felt as a recruiter that it was very difficult to compete in his rating for advancement, because he was working out of his rate, did not have the time to properly prepare for advancement exams, and was essentially cut off from what was happening in his rating.

This individual was not married, and did not feel comfortable addressing the question on quality of family life. With regard to his own quality of life, he felt that working hours made it very difficult to take care of personal matters. District incentive programs were motivating because the reward was time off. He would not volunteer for recruiting duty given the opportunity.

3. End-of-Tour Recruiter

The end-of-tour recruiter interviewed was a Chief Petty Officer who had been in the Navy for 19 years with the last three years as a recruiter. He did not volunteer for this duty and had not been on recruiting duty before. His previous tour of duty was at sea, which he loved and preferred over recruiting.

He felt that whether a recruiting goal was easy or not depended on how well one knew the recruiting area. He said that a person has to be aggressive or won't make it as a recruiter. He said that he is constantly recruiting, whether on duty or not. He said that the "kids" who go home directly after work aren't giving it their all. There are always stops to be made--ball fields, school hang outs, wherever an eligible population tends to gather. A recruiter may have to "beat the bushes," but the bodies are there.

This CPO thought that recruiting duty should be geared more towards the younger troops. As a Chief Petty Officer, his motivation was the personal satisfaction he got from recruiting the best people he could for the Navy. With 19 years in and already an E7, he did not find many incentives under the Freeman Plan. He was ineligible as an E7 for meritorious promotion and, though he had received a Navy Achievement Medal under the Freeman Plan, that was not what motivated him. It was just something nice to have.

He said there were a lot of frustrations in general associated with recruiting and that the quality of life wasn't too good. He personally spent more time away from his family while on recruiting duty than when he was on a ship. Because of his tenure in the Navy, his family was more understanding and accepting than for a less-experienced Petty Officer. He said the hours on the job can be very detrimental to a young family. He said when a wife calls at 1900 inquiring where her husband is, and is told that he's on a "home visit," the wife won't always believe that. His suggestion to remedy this is more District CO and XO involvement with spouses and families. He cited a need for an indoctrination for spouses so that they also know what to expect.

This Chief has observed alcohol abuse as a problem among fellow recruiters and he faulted Career Recruiter Force (CRF) personnel for being micro-managers. As much as he has enjoyed recruiting, he wouldn't want to do it again.

4. Post-Tour Recruiter

The final individual interviewed was a recently retired Master Chief Petty Officer who had done three tours of duty in recruiting, two as a Chief Recruiter, during his 33 years in the Navy. As should be obvious, he volunteered for recruiting duty because he is a self-defined "people person."

This Master Chief feels that the Freeman Plan is only motivational to those who are eligible for awards. If you are in a difficult recruiting area, and making goal is next to impossible, the Freeman Plan is not going to inspire you to make goal.

He said that the stress factor is terrible. He is aware of problems ranging from attempted suicide to substance abuse, used in order to get out of recruiting. He is also aware of recruiters experiencing depression and cheating in order to make goal. He himself violated the Freeman Plan by protecting recruiters from a Freeman T and he would do so again. He claims he would never recruit under the Freeman Plan again.

He also cited the Career Recruiting Force as a problem. He said that they are normally put in supervisory positions with little or no leadership training and minimum fleet experience.

Lack of follow-on training is another problem, because later training is hard to enforce due to available man-hours and the difficulty or inconvenience of bringing a recruiter "in" from the field for training. He therefore recommends:

- scrapping the Freeman Plan
- restructuring the goaling to come from CNRC
- doing away with Area level--too many levels to get through to the big guy.
- reducing goals for tough areas
- breaking bad attitude stations up
- giving time off from production

On quality of life issues, he said that his children resented the hours he spent away from home and his wife was not happy with him working weekends. But he also feels that he had a unique family situation--his family was more understanding than average.

As far as promotion opportunities, he has seen promotion boards in action, and he said that promotion boards looked at Letters of Commendation and other laudatory comments on performance evaluations from recruiting duty as "give mes." His final comment was that recruiting duty is even more arduous than sea duty.

C. RESULTS OF DISTRICT INTERVIEWS

The districts interviewed range in size from 65 recruiters to 141 recruiters. These figures include Career Recruiter Force personnel. Not all districts were sure how many of their recruiters were volunteers because this is not a standard statistic that is kept. Of those that did know (3 districts in each category), it is interesting to note that the "easy" districts had volunteer rates that averaged 67 percent, while the "hard" districts averaged 33 percent volunteers. All districts interviewed, except for one, have had recruiters seek assistance for stress-related illnesses or problems in the last year. And all, except two districts, had at least one of the individuals who sought assistance transferred out of recruiting because of the stress-related illness. What is most interesting about these interviews is that, except for the differences in volunteer rates, the results of the interviews don't really give any indication of whether it's a "hard" recruiting district or an "easy" one.¹⁰

¹⁰ Once again, "hard" and "easy" are defined by the CNRC Code 22 Tracking Report for FY 86-88.

When it came to the Freeman Plan, all districts unanimously agreed that whether the Freeman Plan works or not depends on the recruiting area. It does not work in recruiting areas where it is difficult to recruit. It works better where the awards are realistically attainable, i.e., "easy" recruiting areas. It works for some but not for others. It works for recruiters who are competitive and already well-motivated individuals. The most motivating award under the Freeman Plan appears to be Meritorious Advancement. This is a very desirable award to those individuals who are in "tight" rates¹¹. So the question then follows: what do you do about the recruiter who is not motivated or working in a hard area? In all districts interviewed there is heavy emphasis on local level incentive programs. Time off heads the list of desirable incentives. People would prefer more money, but because that is not feasible as an incentive, time off wins out. As one Chief Recruiter pointed out, everyone is motivated differently and you have to find out how to "reach" those individuals. The same incentive does not work for everyone. Local level programs include trophies, plaques, certificates, coffee mugs, dinners, lunches, parties, get-away weekends, tickets to ball games, and so on, in recognition for accomplishments ranging from surpassing goal to turning in a contract package without any errors. When a district or station is not making goal, recruiters need to be motivated to perform all aspects of their job, not just making goal. If the motivation can be maintained, maybe it will take the edge off of not making goal. Goal should not be the end all. There should be an appropriate balance of goal and taking care of the people responsible for making that goal. The point being that the supervisors, or those providing the motivation must be well aware of individual recruiter's needs and act accordingly.

Other tactics for those who are not motivated or are having trouble making goal are retraining and cautious use of the Freeman T. Retraining may pinpoint specific gaps in the recruiter's knowledge or technique. This can be corrected through retraining and follow-up supervision by the Recruiter In Charge (RINC) and the Zone Supervisor. Lack of training because it is too difficult to bring recruiters in from the field was noted as a problem by one of the districts. One of the easy districts said that they made it a point of bringing all their recruiters in once a month for training. They felt it was very important to have the interaction among the recruiters and to maintain a consistent training program. Though it is not spelled out in the Navy recruiting regulations, it was explained during the course of these interviews that a Freeman T is not automatic. It

¹¹ A "tight" rate is one in which it is difficult to get promoted.

is up to the Commanding Officer's discretion to enforce the Freeman T, which implies that if there are extenuating circumstances that are preventing a recruiter from making goal, he will not be automatically transferred under a Freeman T.

One district that was getting ready to make the goal for the first time in a very long period, turned the district around by discontinuing the practice of "on hours"¹², and stopped working 7 days a week and holidays. They emphasized local level awards, and showed an interest in their people. The Chief Recruiter is on the road a lot visiting the recruiters and has an open-door policy. In addition, goal had been reduced to an attainable level and this in itself resulted in positive feedback because the recruiters know that they can now make goal.

The districts interviewed had numerous suggestions on how to improve or change the Freeman Plan as well as national level and local level incentive programs. They are:

1. Scrap the Freeman Plan. The awards offered, such as the Navy Achievement Medal and Meritorious Advancement are already available under other Navy directives.
2. Adjust the Freeman Plan points to reflect the difficulty of the various recruiting markets.
3. Implement a recruiting tour ribbon
4. Give some type of ribbon or medal to those individuals who work in the district or area that wins a national competition level award. This would be similar to the Navy E, where all the members of a department on a ship that wins the Navy E, get to wear the Navy E ribbon.
5. Change the Special Duty Assistance Pay (SDAP). There were a few suggestions concerning SDAP. One was to increase it, one was to include support personnel in those eligible for SDAP and another was to increase out of pocket expenses and include those expenses in SDAP.

A number of issues concerning the CRF were brought up during these interviews and the interviews with the field recruiters. Some people say that the CRFers are ill-prepared to be supervisors and tend to micro-manage because all they know is how to recruit and they don't know how to supervise. Another thought was that CRFers lose track of what is going on in the fleet and therefore do not relate to the field recruiters. Take an individual who comes into recruiting as a second- class petty officer, completes a tour in recruiting, makes first class while on recruiting duty and then applies for the

¹² "On hours" means working from, say, 0800 to 2000 daily because goal is not being achieved.

Career Recruiter Force. He or she is accepted as a CRFer and remains in recruiting for ever and a day. Is something lacking in this person's leadership abilities because of this scenario? Some would argue yes and others would say no. Those who agree, feel it becomes a big problem when this individual gets advanced to Chief Petty Officer (CPO), whether through meritorious advancement or through normal channels. Becoming a CPO is like joining a fraternity, initiation rites and all. It assumes a certain level of knowledge and ability in a specific rate as well as in general leadership. It has been said that when someone is meritoriously advanced or makes Chief after being in recruiting since the time he or she was a second-class petty officer, it is often difficult for him or her to gain the acceptance of peers and the respect of juniors.

Those that argue no, believe in the selection process. They feel that recruiters would not be selected for CRF, meritorious advancement, or recommended for promotion unless they really deserved it and had the potential for good leadership regardless of whether they were in the fleet or had been in recruiting since they were a second class petty officer.

The point is that careful attention must be paid to the selection process. We all know that it is much easier to approve requests for just about anything than it is to disapprove one and have to justify it. And people will slip through the cracks. But recruiting is not the only area in the Navy that is susceptible to this. There are numerous rates in the Fleet where a hot-shot sailor can make CPO in a relatively short time without the prerequisite "experience" that most of us have come to expect. In very technical fields, where you go to school for almost 2 years, you may have less than 6 years experience and make Chief. Hopefully, we're not dealing with a system of just filling in the vacancies, but that all potential candidates are accurately screened before being recommended for any special program or consideration.

By grouping the district responses by the "hard" and "easy" criteria defined earlier, an interesting picture emerges. As seen in Table 5 and Table 6, the "easy" districts have far fewer recruiters seeking assistance for stress-related illnesses and far fewer transferred as a result of these problems. Also, the volunteer rate is higher for the "easy" districts. The numbers indicate that the harder the district, the more likely stress will be found. Consequently, the recruiting environment or market exercises a significant influence on recruiter stress.

Table 5. HARD DISTRICTS: QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INTERVIEWS, 1988

<u>Question</u>	<u>Responses by District</u>				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. How many recruiters do you have?	65	90	65	107	141
2. How many are Career Recruiter Force (CRF)?	6	13	12	10	21
3. How many of your recruiters are volunteers? (percent)	10%*	(a)	50%	50%	(a)
4. How many, if any, have have ever sought assistance for stress related illnesses?	6	13	6*	< 10	12
5. How many, if any, were transferred from recruiting duty as a result of stress related illnesses?	0	5	3*	2*	4*
* approximate					
(a) The district did not know					

Table 6. EASY DISTRICTS: QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INTERVIEWS, 1988

<u>Question</u>	<u>Responses By District</u>				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. How many recruiters do you have?	104	65	74	84	70
2. How many are Career Recruiter Force (CRF)?	13	6	9	13	5
4. How many of your recruiters are volunteers?(percent)	69%*	65%*	70%* (a)		15%
5. How many, if any, have have ever sought assistance for stress related illnesses?	1	4	1	2	0
6. How many, if any, were transferred from recruiting duty as a result of stress related illnesses?	1	1	1	0	0
* approximate					
(a) The district did not know					

D. RESULTS OF MEDCOM SURVEY

The original purpose of this survey was to shed some light on the scenario of a recruiter being recommended for transfer from recruiting duty due to stress-related problems, yet still being found fit for full duty. Two-hundred Navy psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers were surveyed, and there was a 50 percent response rate. As seen in Table 9, Question Number 10, of those that responded, 53.3 percent did not have a conflict with recommending a recruiter for transfer from recruiting, yet still finding the recruiter fit for full duty.

Table 7. QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO MEDCOM SURVEY, 1988

Question	Number of Responses	Response	Percentage of Responses
1. Have you ever seen a Navy/ Marine Corps recruiter for stress or other psychological problems?	105	Yes No	58.1 41.9
2. How many recruiters have you evaluated for continuance in their jobs vice transfer out of recruiting?	105	309 (total for all responses)	N/A
3. How many recruiters have you seen in treatment and for what amount of time?	105	207 time varies	N/A
4. Have you treated the spouse or other family member of a recruiter?	105	Yes No	21.9 78.1
5. What was the diagnosis?	105	Most Common Diagnoses	
		Marital Dysfunction	34.1
		Stress Depression	31.8
		Adjustment Disorder	15.9
		Alcohol and Drug Abuse	15.9
		Mixed Emotional Feelings	2.3

**Table 8. QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO MEDCOM SURVEY, 1988
CONT.**

Question	Number of Responses	Response	Percentage of Responses
6(a). When you treated a recruiter and/or Spouse, was child and/or or spouse abuse included in the diagnosis?	30	Spouse Abuse	18.8
		Child Abuse	14.4
6(b). Alcohol, drug, or gambling abuse or addiction noted?	60	Alcohol	38.8
		Drug	12.2
		Food Gambling	8.8 6.6
7. Have you heard of the Freeman Plan under which a recruiter can be transferred out of recruiting under a "no fault" clause for an inability to successfully recruit?	105	Yes	11.4
		No	88.6
8. Under what circumstances do you recommend relieving someone from recruiting for reason of stress?	59	Psychological	47.5
		Poor Job Performance	28.8
		None	15.2
		Family Dysfunction	5.1
		Alcohol Drugs	3.4

**Table 9. QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO MEDCOM SURVEY, 1988
CONT.**

Question	Number of Responses	Response	Percentage of Responses
9. Under what circumstances do you recommend transferring someone from recruiting for psychological/psychiatric reasons other than a stress related diagnosis?	105	Psychological	25.7
		Poor Job Performance	18.1
		N/A	16.1
		None	12.4
		Ambiguous Answer	11.4
		No Answer	6.7
		Alcohol/Drugs	4.8
		Medical Boards	2.8
		Family Dysfunction	1.9
10. Do you see any conflict or contradiction in recommending release from recruiting duty while simultaneously stating the individuals "fit for full duty?"	105	No	53.3
		Yes	27.6
		N/A	11.4
		Ambiguous Answer	7.6
Number Surveyed	200		N/A

The narrative comments in this survey suggest that recruiting duty calls for people with a unique personality. You can take a 4.0 (top performer) Machinists Mate from the fleet and send him to recruiting duty. He's not successful. He buckles under the pressure, perceived or otherwise, of the job and develops a medically diagnosed stress-related illness. Those surveyed that did not have a conflict with the decision felt that in the majority of cases, if that individual is returned to an environment that he knows he has been successful in, he will be successful again. As one doctor said, "I don't believe 'fit for full duty' means an MM1 can fly an F14, and it frequently doesn't mean he can function as a recruiter either." But it is a judgment call. Not everyone who is recommended for transfer from recruiting duty is found fit for full duty.

But the purpose of using the survey for this particular research was to try to give a broad picture of just how many recruiters have been evaluated by medical personnel, what the diagnoses were, and to summarize the narrative comments of those surveyed.

There are some problems with this survey that prevent an in-depth analysis. First of all, the time frame for the responses was open-ended, so the answers given in response to questions number 1 through 3, for example, could have been in the last year, 5 years or even 20 years. The second problem is that the survey did not determine if the diagnoses of the recruiters were job-related.

What is of most interest in this survey are the narrative comments provided by the doctors. Besides the discussion of "not fit for recruiting but fit for full duty," 12 percent of those that responded specifically stated that they felt when they evaluated a recruiter for stress-related problems, they saw the problem as a mismatch of individual and job. They equate recruiting to a sales job in the civilian world and see the same personality characteristics present in successful salesmen necessary to be successful in recruiting. These characteristics include: aggressiveness, people-oriented personality, extroverted, competitive, personable, and a willingness not to mention defects in the product. Their recommendation was to evaluate the selection process of recruiters and the characteristics of the job and attempt to come up with a system that would enable a more accurate selection of appropriate individuals.

Although only two of the respondents mentioned it, there is an interesting concept addressed in the survey: the identification of a need for stress management training early in the recruiter's assignment-- either at the schoolhouse level or when first reporting to a recruiting command. One doctor noted, "by the time recruiters would come in to see me, they were in extreme distress and feeling that their insurmountable distresses were caused by recruiting duty and all that goes with it." Another noted, "more stress management groups are needed before recruiter reaches point of depression and or violence."

E. RESULTS OF COMNAVCRUITCOM (CODE 11) SURVEY

As with the MEDCOM Survey, it is necessary to first address the several weaknesses of using this survey for research. For example:

- The survey was sent to all Recruiting Areas. Responses from only 12 Recruiting Districts were available at the time of analysis. The survey was to include officers and enlisted personnel and in most responses there is no differentiation in the answers between enlisted personnel and officers.
- As with the MEDCOM Survey, job-related stress was not specified, though some districts did make the distinction in their responses.
- There is no identification of repetition of responses. That is, whether any of the individuals addressed in, say, question no. 1 are repeated in question no. 2--or if they are totally separate cases.

- Of course this survey can only address those cases that are documented. Though this is not necessarily a weakness, it does leave room to wonder just how many more recruiters are having problems and are not coming forward for assistance or may be discouraged from doing so.

The time frame for responses was specified as January 1987 to the present (May 1988). Those districts whose responses were available have a total of 1168 recruiters. The results of this survey are found in Table 10. Without all the responses available, it is difficult to draw any strong conclusions from this survey. If this were a representative sample, one would conclude that 6 percent of the recruiters are being treated for stress-related medical problems and almost 5 percent have been treated for alcoholism and returned to duty. Whether these numbers are high or not cannot be determined at this time.

Table 10. RESULTS OF COMNAVCRUITCOM SURVEY, 1988

Question	Response	Number of Cases
1. Of Officer and Enlisted recruiters who have been seen for psychiatric or stress problems, what was the psychiatric or stress diagnosis?	Severe Adjustment Disorder with Depression	9
	Substance Abuse related to stress	9
	Personality Disorder	6
	Stress due to marital problems/spouse abuse	6
	Situational Stress	4
	Suicidal	2
	Anxiety	2
	Severe Withdrawal	1
	Physical Disorders	1
	Chronic Panic Disorder	1
2. How many recruiters have been treated for alcoholism and returned to duty by Level I, Level II and Level III?		55
3. Look at fault transfers:		
(a) How many?		16
(b) How many cases cited in (a) were adjustment disorders present, but not used as primary cause of transfer?		2
4. How many people are being treated for stress related medical problems, marital counseling, etc.?		77

F. ARMY AND AIR FORCE RECRUITER INCENTIVE PROGRAMS

1. Army

According to *Recruiting Station Administration Update*, the Army's "Recruiter Incentive Awards Program is designed to recognize excellence in recruiting" and "award qualification is based on the accumulation of points during a specific period of time" [Ref. 25]. The earning of points and eligibility for awards in the Army is very similar to

the Navy's Freeman Plan. The Army's mission box is equivalent to the Navy's monthly goal. If mission box is not accomplished (goal not met), production points are awarded as indicated in Table 11. If mission box is accomplished, all recruiters get 50 points. If a recruiter surpasses mission box requirements, overproduction points are awarded as indicated in Table 12.

**Table 11. ARMY RECRUITER INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM:
PRODUCTION POINT VALUES BY RECRUIT
CHARACTERISTICS**

Recruit Characteristics	Points Awarded to Recruiter
Graduates, Seniors, Currently in H.S. AFQT* I-III A	20
Graduates, Seniors, Currently in H.S. AFQT I-III B	5
Prior Service (Regular Army) AFQT I-III A and I-III B	5
Prior Service (Army Reserve)	10
Non-H.S. Graduates AFQT I-III A	5
Graduate Senior AFQT IV and Non-Graduate AFQT III B IV	0
*AFQT refers to the Armed Forces Qualification Test. AFQT categories and percentile score ranges are as follows: I (93 through 100); II (65 through 92); III A (50 through 64); III B (31 through 49); IV (10 through 30); V (1 through 9).	
<i>SOURCE: Headquarters, United States Army Recruiting Command, <u>USAREC Regulation 672-10</u>, p. 3.</i>	

**Table 12. ARMY RECRUITER INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM:
OVERPRODUCTION POINT VALUES BY RECRUIT
CHARACTERISTICS**

Recruit Characteristics	Points Awarded to Recruiter
Graduates, Seniors, Currently in H.S. AFQT I-III A	40 (1st over) 60 (2nd over)
Graduates, Seniors, Currently in H.S. AFQT I-III B	10
Prior Service (Regular Army) AFQT I-III A and I-III B	10
Prior Service (Army Reserve)	20
Non-H.S. Graduates AFQT I-III A	10
Graduate/Senior AFQT IV and Non-Graduate AFQT III B/IV	0
<i>SOURCE: Headquarters, United States Army Recruiting Command, <u>USAREC</u> Regulation 672-10, p. 3.</i>	

After all of the awards listed in Table 13 have been earned, the recruiter is eligible to compete for the Recruiter Ring. This is the ultimate award under the Army's Recruiting Incentive Awards Program. To qualify for the ring, a total of 1,200 points must be earned within 24 months.

Table 13. ARMY RECRUITER INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM: AWARDS BY REQUIRED POINTS AND MAXIMUM TIME PERIOD FOR ACCUMULATING POINTS

AWARD	REQUIRED POINTS	MAXIMUM TIME PERIOD (months)*
1st Gold Achievement Star	240	6
2nd Gold Achievement Star	300	6
3rd Gold Achievement Star	300	6
Gold Recruiter Badge	300	6
1st Sapphire Achievement Star	300	6
2nd Sapphire Achievement Star	300	6
3rd Sapphire Achievement Star	300	6

*The awards must be earned in sequence. After the first 240 points are earned, the six month clock starts again and the recruiter must earn 300 points for the second star.

SOURCE: Headquarters, United States Army Recruiting Command, USAREC Regulation 672-10, p. 2.

Awards in the Army program are not automatic, based on point accumulation. The "whole person" concept of the recruiter is considered. This concept includes factors such as:

- Personal Appearance
- Height and Weight Standards
- Drug or Alcohol Abuse
- Driving Record
- Representation in the Civilian Community

An interesting aspect of the Army program is its team concept. What team concept does is allow for recruiting personnel who meet certain criteria to be awarded 50 points when a higher level of command accomplishes mission box. For example, a recruiter has a mission of 3 TSC I-IIIB's and he gets 2 TSC I-IIIBs and 1 Senior TSC

I-IIIA. The recruiter does not make his or her mission, but the other recruiters at the station make up the difference and the recruiting station makes its overall mission box. The recruiter who did not make mission will get 50 points under the team concept, while the recruiter who made mission and also made up the difference of the other recruiter will get 50 points for making mission plus the appropriate overproduction points. The recruiter who missed mission may take team concept points or the appropriate points as listed in Table 11 on page 40, whichever is highest. Nobody loses.

The final point about the Army is that it does not automatically release anyone from recruiting for failure to produce in a given time frame. If, during the first year of recruiting, a recruiter is having trouble, he or she is retrained under the Transitional Training and Evaluation program. This is an OJT program for Army recruiters that serves as a follow up to formal training. Training emphasizes sales presentations, telephone techniques, and other aspects of recruiting and general salesmanship.

2. Air Force

It is very difficult to compare the Air Force with the Army and the Navy because the Air Force is a somewhat smaller service, requiring fewer recruiters to accomplish its goal. The Air Force had 1,950 recruiters authorized to accomplish a goal of 40,000 accessions in fiscal 1988 compared with the Army's 7,887 recruiters authorized for 113,000 accessions and the Navy's 3,776 recruiters authorized for 93,939 accessions. That's about 20 recruits per recruiter for the Air Force, compared with 14 recruits per recruiter for the Army and 24 recruits per recruiter for the Navy. Making goal has been comparatively easy for the Air Force, and it has fortunately been able to rely on a totally voluntary recruiting force. The Army and Navy are not afforded that luxury. This is not to imply that Air Force recruiters are a group of "happy campers" or that they don't need motivation. In fact, the Air Force does have an incentive program for its recruiters.

The Air Force Recruiting Service Incentive Awards Program "is designed to motivate recruiting personnel, enhance individual and unit morale and promote the accomplishment of Recruiting Service objectives" [Ref. 26]. Recruiters in the Air Force can achieve both group and individual awards. Individual Achievement Awards¹³ include:

- Top Flight Supervisor
- Top Recruiter

¹³ These awards are national-level awards and are awarded by the Recruiting Service Commander.

- Top Rookie Recruiter
- Top Enlisted Programs Recruiter

Individuals are nominated to Air Force recruiting headquarters for these awards. As in the Army and the Navy, these awards are not automatic. For the Air Force, a recruiter must be at 100 percent or more production for a 12-month period, plus the "total person" concept, as explained under the Army's recruiter incentive program, is considered. Other headquarter-level awards and their criteria are:

- Recruiting Service Olympiad --Recognizes recruiters who enlist 80 or more NPS (non prior service) recruits during the fiscal year. Awards range from a Bronze Medal for 80-89 enlistments, to a Gold Medal and name engraved on the "Century Club" Plaque on permanent display in Recruiting Service Headquarters.
- Senior Master Recruiter Badge --This program is the Air Force Recruiting Service Commander's Incentive Program. "It recognizes those enlisted recruiters and enlisted supervisors whose outstanding production enhanced the total mission of Recruiting Service" [Ref. 26: p. 5]. To be eligible for this badge, a recruiter must be on production for the 12 months of the competition year, attain across-the-board status in all assigned goals, and be 155 percent or higher in net reservations.
- Consecutive Year Senior Recruiting Badge --Awarded to those who have attained Senior Recruiter status for two or more consecutive years.
- Master Recruiter Badge-- All recruiters who meet Senior Recruiting Badge criteria are eligible to compete for this badge. Selection is at the discretion of the squadron commander.

Obviously, not everyone can get an award, and Headquarters Recruiting Service recognizes only a select few. Therefore, there is a lot of emphasis on local-level incentives. These range from plaques and trophies to lunches, dinners, parties, special liberty , or whatever it takes to keep the recruiters going. Though some of these local-level programs are formalized and documented in local regulations, others are not. They are ad hoc and used only when needed. All of the services have similar programs.

One Senior Master Sergeant said that Air Force recruiters are motivated because they love recruiting. They want to be there and do the best job that they can. The rewards are just the icing on the cake. Similar sentiments were expressed by the Army and the Navy. Recruiters do their job, because that is what they are supposed to do. Their job comes first, and if there are any extra benefits, they are just that--extra benefits.

At first glance, it would be easy to say that the biggest difference between the Air Force and the Army or the Navy is that the Air Force has an all-volunteer recruiting

force. But given the Air Force's success in recruiting, the size of the service, and the fact that it has more people applying to come in than it can handle, it's easy to see why this Service has an all-volunteer recruiting force. In all honesty, the Air Force does not have the same day-in and day-out challenge of achieving goal that is found in the Army or the Navy.

3. Summary

Basically, all of the services operate in much the same way when it comes to incentive programs. All have national-level competition, but are well aware of the fact that it is a small minority, indeed, that are ever eligible for these major awards. As a result, all Services emphasize local-level incentive programs. These seem to be the heart and soul of recruiting. Time and time again it was stated that you have to take care of your people and know what it is that they need to stay motivated or to get motivated.

IV. GENERAL FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

An extensive literature review was conducted in the fields of incentives, quality of life, and stress. Except for Cooke's work [Ref. 13], no previous research in these areas could be found that pertained specifically to Navy recruiters. As a result, the majority of the research was confined to primary sources, and the findings can only be considered preliminary at best.

A. GENERAL FINDINGS

1. Is the Freeman Plan An Effective Program For All Navy Recruiters?

The evidence presented here suggests that the answer to this question is No. The Freeman Plan works for some but not for others. As was stated in Chapter 1:

The primary purpose of the Freeman Plan is to alter the productivity profile of the recruiter force to one which will have a higher productivity average and enable the Navy Recruiting Command to attain future goals with the number of recruiters allowed under Congressional and DoD ceilings. The secondary purpose is to provide recruiters with timely information, measuring results of efforts, and offering incentives for performance above the norm.

The Freeman Plan has ensured accountability of recruiting efforts and, in this way, has altered the productivity of the recruiter force. It does provide recruiters with timely information. It does not measure results of efforts and only offers incentives for performance above the norm to a select few.

The Freeman Plan does not measure results of efforts because it does not take into account the difficulty of the recruiting market. The points awarded are the same for all recruiters, whether they're recruiting in Boston or Portland, a "hard" area or an "easy" one. A recruiter in Boston may be giving it all he's got and then some, but won't make goal and won't come close to achieving the necessary points for an award under the Freeman Plan. On the other hand, a recruiter in Portland may only have to work half as hard and not have any trouble qualifying for an award. The primary difference, of course, is the recruiting market. There is no instrument in the Freeman Plan to measure effort; it only measures output.

The Freeman Plan does offer incentives for performance above the norm, but only to a select few. Maybe this is its intention; but, if so, it shouldn't be used as the

Navy's primary management program for recruiters. If one believes as Smith [Ref. 12] does, incentives and bonuses don't work for everyone. They are reinforcers, as opposed to motivators. This is in line with what many of the districts interviewed claimed: the Freeman Plan works for those who are already motivated; and it reinforces, rather than creates, that motivated behavior. And if an already-motivated recruiter is placed in a difficult recruiting area, it may not matter how motivated the recruiter is, because the Freeman Plan is not likely to reinforce the motivated behavior.

2. Can A Recruiter's Quality of Life be Improved by Modifying the Freeman Plan, Alternative Incentive Programs, or With Changes in the Workplace?

The answer is emphatically yes. If the Freeman Plan point structure would provide for equal opportunity among all recruiters, the program would probably be more effective. As the plan now stands, if a recruiter is in a "hard" recruiting area, he or she does not demonstrate motivated behavior in response to the Freeman Plan because the points are not seen as readily achievable.

Also, as the interviews with recruiting personnel suggest, people have different motivations and they respond differently to various incentives. Some people get a thrill from having a certificate of excellence signed by the Commanding Officer, others are happy with a pat on the back, while still others would do anything for time off. Being aware of these differences and knowing what works for various individuals is crucial for those in supervisory positions.

3. What Are the Possible Effects of Stress on Recruiters and What Can Be Done to Reduce or Control Stress?

One of the most important things to remember about stress is that any given situation can prove stressful. Whether it's stressful or not depends as much on the individual as on the situation he or she encounters. So, as with incentives, the issue is one that affects recruiters differently. As seen in the MEDCOM Survey, some of the more prevalent effects of stress include marital dysfunction, substance abuse, spouse and child abuse, adjustment disorders, food abuse, and gambling. It is important to note, once again, that it was not stated that these diagnoses were specifically job-related. But, given the line of questioning, it can be assumed that, if the recruiting environment did not cause the problem, it certainly exacerbated it.

The CRUITCOM Survey indicated the same diagnoses and, in addition, included physical disorders, anxiety, withdrawal, depression, and suicidal tendencies as effects of stress. Dealing with stress can be approached in three ways: [Ref. 27]

1. Primary --find out what is causing the stress and get rid of it.
2. Secondary --protect the susceptible population (recruiters) from stress.
3. Tertiary --treat those already afflicted.

Defining what is causing the stress is a difficult task. Because everyone perceives stress differently, there are many variables that would have to be taken into consideration. If one assumes that it's the recruiting environment (i.e., pressure of making goal, the recruiting market, long hours, lots of driving, competition, and being forced to be a "people person" or "salesman" when you're not) that causes the stress, how are these variables then removed from recruiting? Recruiting is always going to have goals; the market will continually change; and, as long as entrance standards remain high, there are going to be long working hours and many miles driven in pursuit of the recruiting mission. If these variables can't be changed, what can? Removing these variables falls under the primary approach, and is perhaps the most difficult.

Twelve percent of the respondents to the MEDCOM Survey saw the problem with recruiters as a mismatch between individuals and their job. If this is true, then the secondary method of dealing with stress would be to improve the matching and selection process of recruiters. This should be the most preferable of the alternatives, but would be a long-range solution. A shorter-range, secondary approach, would be to provide stress management training before a recruiter goes into the field. By making the recruiter aware of what stress is, what the symptoms are, and how to deal with it, the susceptible population could be helped before the problem develops. Dr. Moore's stress training for Naval Reserve recruiters is a good example of the type of training that can be utilized in this case.¹⁴ [Ref. 22]

The third approach lends itself to a more immediate solution and is a necessary approach. Those who are not coping with stress cannot be ignored and swept under the rug. In this approach, stress management is still useful, but it gets more into counseling and therapy at the hands of a professional.

4. Is The Stress Experienced by Recruiters Unique to Recruiting?

Available evidence suggests that recruiting is a particularly stressful assignment. In the narrative comments of the MEDCOM Survey, 9.5 percent of those responding commented that recruiting has unique demands and stressors. The individual recruiters interviewed saw the unique demands as making goal and the physical stress of driving

¹⁴ See page 21

time. It appears that recruiting could more stressful than many other jobs--at least on the surface. But this is conjecture based on what we know about the job and the people and how they are chosen. The stress associated with recruiting does seem to be related to where you are assigned--"hard" or "easy" districts, and perhaps even with the quality of life in a particular geographic area. But without comparing recruiting directly with other Navy jobs, a definitive conclusion cannot be made. Of course, there are other jobs in the Navy that have unique demands and stressors, but the people in other jobs are usually suited to the work as a result of self-selection, screening, and training.

B. CONCLUSIONS

There is strong evidence to suggest that the Freeman Plan does not work across-the-board. The following changes to the Freeman Plan are therefore recommended:

- Revise the point structure to take into consideration the relative difficulty of different recruiting areas. Cooke says that if one assumes the ability distribution of recruiters does not vary much over time or between regions, then the Freeman Plan is inequitable. Therefore, there is an inequality of opportunity between recruiting markets. [Ref. 13]
- Don't start a recruiter on production right away. Give, say, a three-month break-in period for the recruiter to adjust to the new job, get acclimated, and learn the ropes from the other recruiters.
- Do away with the Freeman T for the first six months of recruiting if the recruiter goes on production right away, or for the first three months of production if a recruiter delays going on production. This should alleviate some of the pressure and stress of being under the gun from day one.

In addition, the research indicates that stress may be a problem in the recruiting environment. The following recommendations are provided:

- Of most importance is taking care of those already experiencing stress-related illnesses or problems. Recruiters should not be discouraged from coming forward if they are having problems. Caution must also be exercised, though, to prevent everyone who wants out of recruiting from coming forward, claiming that they too have a problem. Those in supervisory positions need to be trained to recognize a real problem, or there needs to be a qualified individual on board, probably at the Area level, where recruiters can voluntarily go or be sent for evaluation.
- Recruiters and their supervisors need stress management training and they need it early. It should be done during initial training or when first reporting to recruiting duty. At a minimum, these people need to know what stress is, what the symptoms are, and what to do about it.
- The recruiter selection process needs to be revised to improve the match between individual and job. Research has already been done on profiling a successful

recruiter. [Ref. 28] and [Ref. 29]. This profile, along with an appropriate testing instrument, should significantly improve the job-person fit.

- Ideally, recruiters should all be volunteers. This would alleviate the problems people experience from being in a job that they don't want in the first place. This can be accomplished by expanding the size of the Career Recruiter Force or accepting volunteers only.
- Rotate recruiters on and off production. Rotate recruiters off production into a support billet or wherever needed in the command. Or take the recruiter off production and let him or her assist the other recruiters that are on production. Introduce some team work. The point is, give the person a breather.
- Continued careful analysis of goal assignment and accession requirements is necessary. As this research was being concluded, goal had been reduced in the most difficult recruiting Area.
- Open up the lines of communication between Recruiting Command levels. How about a suggestion system, similar to the Navy's "Benny Sug" program, between the recruiters and CNRC? As the Japanese believe, who knows better than the individual worker how to improve productivity and make beneficial changes [Ref. 14].

Finally, some suggestions from the field warrant further consideration. They are:

- Implement a recruiting tour ribbon.
- Award a ribbon or medal to all individuals who work in the district or area that wins an award at the national level.
- Review SDAP to determine the feasibility of the following: including support personnel as eligible for this pay; raising SDAP; and raising out-of-pocket expenses and including them in SDAP.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

This thesis has developed a framework upon which many more research projects can build. The following topics lend themselves to further research:

- The Freeman Plan needs to be evaluated in greater depth to see just how the points and award system can be restructured to take into consideration the inequities across recruiting markets.
- Because the CRUITCOM and MEDCOM Surveys were inconclusive, more formal, scientific surveys could be developed to allow for an in-depth analysis.
- Once the surveys are reworked, the CRUITCOM Survey could be adapted to randomly survey other rates in the Navy, and then compare the results to see if recruiting really is unique. The results could also be used to identify other highly stressful rates. The MEDCOM Survey could be used to survey the Army and Air Force medical personnel to see how their recruiters fare and how those services handle it.
- The Recruiter Questionnaire and the District Questionnaire can be developed into surveys and all recruiters and districts could be surveyed. It is important that all the surveys allow for narrative comments, because it was evident in this research

that the narrative comments and the open-ended questionnaires give a colorful and complete picture of what is going on in the field. Statistics are necessary, but numbers can be manipulated to present the same information in many different lights.

- Dr. Moore's stress training program for Naval Reserve recruiters should be evaluated and validated for use by the regular Navy. [Ref. 22]

The Navy is highly dependent on the abilities of its recruiters to find the proper quality and quantity of personnel to man the Fleet. As a result, recruiters are a very important component of the Navy. This research suggests that, in its quest to obtain high quality enlistees, the Navy needs to take better care of its recruiters. It is crucial that there be a balance between the mission of Navy recruiting and the quality of life for Navy recruiters.

APPENDIX A. RECRUITER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How long have you been in the Navy?
2. What rate are you?
3. How long have you been a recruiter?
4. What was your last tour of duty?
5. Did you volunteer for recruiting duty?
6. Have you been on recruiting duty before?
7. If so, how many times?
8. What is a "typical" work day for a recruiter like?
9. Have you ever had to work weekends?
10. Is it getting more difficult to make goal?
11. What type of incentive do you work for?
12. Do you think the incentive program is a good program?
13. Does it motivate you to achieve goal and/or surpass goal?
14. If you could, what would you change about the incentive program?
15. Does your job affect the quality of your family life?
16. What is your quality of life like? (i.e., stress, family problems, substance abuse etc.)
17. How does your present quality of life compare to your previous tour of duty?
18. Do you enjoy being a recruiter?
19. Would you rather be doing something else?
20. If so, what?
21. Would you volunteer for this duty given the opportunity?
22. Is there anything you would like to add or comment on?

Note: Questionnaire administered, by the author, to field recruiters at various stages in their recruiting tours.

APPENDIX B. EPO AND CHIEF RECRUITER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How many recruiters do you have?
2. How many are Career Recruiter Force (CRF)?
3. How many of your recruiters are volunteers? How many are non-volunteers?
4. How many, if any, of your recruiters have ever sought assistance for stress related illnesses i.e., marital problems, depression, substance abuse, spouse abuse etc.?
5. How many, if any, were transferred from recruiting duty as a result of stress related illnesses?
6. Do you think the Freeman Plan is a good incentive to motivate recruiters to perform above the norm? Why or why not?

Note: Questionnaire administered, by the author, to Enlisted Programs Officers and Chief Recruiters at the five "hardest" and the five "easiest" recruiting districts.

APPENDIX C. CNRC (CODE 22) TRACKING REPORT

Rank	District	No. Months Missed
1	Pittsburgh	26
2	New Jersey	23
3	Harrisburg	22
4	Boston	20
5	Albany	18
6	Indianapolis	15
7	Milwaukee	13
8	Philadelphia	11
8	Buffalo	11
9	Minneapolis	10
10	Richmond	9
11	Louisville	8
12	New York	7
13	Michigan	6
14	St. Louis	5
14	Los Angeles	5
15	Columbus	4
15	Nashville	4
15	Jacksonville	4
16	San Francisco	3
16	San Diego	3
17	Washington	2
17	Little Rock	2
18	Atlanta	1
18	Memphis	1
18	Cleveland	1
18	Kansas City	1
19	Raleigh	0
19	Miami	0

19	Montgomery	0
19	Columbia	0
19	Glenview	0
19	Omaha	0
19	Denver	0
19	Albuquerque	0
19	Dallas	0
19	Houston	0
19	Houston	0
19	New Orleans	0
19	San Antonio	0
19	Portland	0
19	Seattle	0

Notes:

1. From top to bottom districts are ranked from hardest to easiest, with those who missed their monthly enlistment contract objective the most, being considered the hardest and those who missed the least, the easiest.
2. Ranking is based on CNRC (Code 22) New Contract Production Tracking Report for FY 86-88.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. "Recruiter 'Suffering' is Not Confined to Pittsburgh," *Navy Times*, p. 30, 26 September 1988.
2. Mitchell, B., "Pittsburgh Assignment Sours for Recruiters," *Navy Times*, p. 10, 5 September 1988.
3. Telephone conversation between Mr. Carl Kannapel, Code 22, Research and Analysis Division, Plans and Policy Department, Navy Recruiting Command, and the author, 21 November 1988.
4. Navy Recruiting Command Letter 1300: Ser 10/00387 to Commander, Naval Medical Command, Subject: Fit For Full Duty Medical Assessments, 13 April 1988.
5. Burlage, J., "Hard-Charging Recruiters Snare Quality Volunteers," *Navy Times*, p. 29, 1 August 1988.
6. Department of the Navy, *COMNAVCRUITCOM INSTRUCTION 1650.4F*, 13 August 1985.
7. Department of the Navy, *COMNAVCRUITCOM INSTRUCTION 1133.3C*, p. 8-1, 15 January 1987.
8. Lemonias, P.J. and Woosley, J.L., "Productivity and the Federal Incentive Awards Program," *The GAO Review*, v. 14, pp. 31-34, Fall 1979.
9. "A Four-Step People Program Pays Off Big in Warehousing," *Modern Materials Handling*, v. 37, pp. 52-53, 20 January 1982.
10. Tausky, C., "Productivity, Incentives, and the Quality of Work Life," *National Forum: Phi Kappa Phi Journal*, v. 62, pp. 14-15, Spring 1982.

11. "MBO Can Improve Quality of Working Life," *Training Today*, v. 16, pp. 6-8 May 1979.
12. Smith, H.P., "Misconceptions About Motivation," *Training Today*, v. 16, pp. 54-56, March 1979.
13. Center for Naval Analyses CRM 86-269, *Individual Incentives in Navy Recruiting*, by T.W. Cooke, p. 1, 14-15 December 1986.
14. Alston, J.P., "Three Principles of Japanese Management," *Personnel Journal*, v. 62, pp. 758-763, September 1983.
15. Alston, J.P., "Awarding Bonuses the Japanese Way," *Business Horizons*, v. 25, pp. 46-50, September-October 1982.
16. O'Hara, J.W., and others, "Preliminary Assessment of the Army's Incentive Program for Recruiters," paper presented at the Military Testing Association, Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference, San Antonio, Texas, 1-5 November 1982.
17. Telephone conversation between Timothy W. Elig, U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral Sciences, Alexandria, Virginia, and the author, 6 October 1988.
18. Stoner, J.A.F. and Wankel C., *Management*, 3d ed., pp. 535-538, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1986.
19. Purington, C.M., "Management's Role for Reducing Employee Stress," Leadership and Management Development Center Air Training Command, Maxwell Air Force Base, March 1983.
20. Officer of Naval Research; Boston Detachment, *Organizational Stress: A Literature Review* by T. Lester, January 1983.
21. Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, *Stress in Organizations: A Review of the Literature* by B.L. Cooper, July 1987.

22. Director of Recruiter Training, Commander Naval Reserve Force Letter to LT Patricia K. Cruz, Subject: Request For Stress Management Documentation, 8 November 1988.
23. Telephone conversation between Dr. John Moore, Director of Recruiter Training, Commander Naval Reserve Force and the author, 24 October 1988.
24. Navy Recruiting Command Code 11 Memorandum 1000: Ser 11/003051 to Commanders, Navy Recruiting Areas, Subject: Medical Survey of Recruiters, 16 May 1988.
25. Department of the Army, United States Army Recruiting Command, *Recruiting Station Administration Update*, Issue Number J, USAREC Regulation 672-10, pp 1-10, May 1988.
26. Department of the Air Force, Headquarters Air Training Command, *ATC Regulation 900-18*, 25 April 1988.
27. Interview between K.E. Karols, Captain, MC, USN, Defense Personnel Security Research and Education Center, Monterey, California, and the author, 7 October 1988.
28. Zellweger, J.E., *Profile of the Successful Recruiter*, Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, December 1986.
29. Gandolfo, R.R., *Profile of the Successful Recruiter*, Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, June 1987.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

		No. Copies
1.	Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22304-6145	2
2.	Library, Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5002	2
3.	Commander Navy Recruiting Command (Code 10) 4015 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22203-1991	2
4.	Commander Navy Recruiting Command (Code 223) 4015 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22203-1991	2
5.	Commanding Officer Navy Recruiting District, San Diego Navy Training Center, Bldg. 335 San Diego, CA 92133-6800	1
6.	Commander Naval Medical Command (Code 34) Washington, DC 20372-5120	1
7.	Professor Mark J. Eitelberg Department of Administrative Science (Code 54Eb) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5100	2
8.	Professor Steven L. Mehay Department of Administrative Science (Code 54Mp) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5100	2
9.	LT Patricia K. Cruz Navy Recruiting District, San Diego Naval Training Center, Bldg. 335 San Diego, CA 92133-6800	1