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PROBLEM

Recognizing the need to enhance the effectiveness of its recruiting efforts across the force, the Department of the Air Force (DAF) is determined to integrate its recruiting activities, which are currently distributed across six accession sources, into a more unified approach. Total Force Recruiting (TFR) aims to unite the previously siloed entities, standardize processes, and optimize technologies. The DAF asked the RAND Project AIR FORCE (PAF) to provide strategic assistance and to gather information that could be used to guide and monitor progress toward achieving the TFR concept.

APPROACH

RAND PAF analyzed data from existing documents, Total Force Recruiting Council (TFRC) meetings, in-person focus groups, and organizational change literature to develop a conceptual model of what must change in the transformation to TFR as well as how to accomplish it. Using insights drawn from these sources, PAF designed and administered an online survey to all recruiters in the DAF enterprise from November 2019 through January 2020. The purpose of this survey, Total Force Recruiting Panel: Technology and Integration Survey, was to establish a current baseline to provide a snapshot of data about the state of TFR and results that TFRC leaders can use to inform TFR initiatives.
# FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TFR knowledge and perspectives | • Over 90 percent report knowing what TFR means, but explanations are mixed  
• A sizable minority of Regular Air Force and Air National Guard respondents doubt TFR benefits and cite competition as a barrier | • Further define and disseminate a concrete, detailed definition of the end state for TFR  
• Enhance engagement with recruiters by addressing recruiters’ concerns about TFR |
| Lead sharing (recruiter networks) | • Lead sharing is occurring among all recruiting entities  
• Formally documented leads underrepresent lead sharing in the Air Force  
• Acquaintanceship and proximity increase the probability of lead sharing  
• Applicant fit is the primary reason for sharing, and incentives can encourage more sharing | • Fully and individually explore the nature of a lead-sharing relationship with each entity to establish realistic norms based on entity differences  
• Manage recruiter expectations about the desired flow of leads shared between the different entities  
• Build and sustain relationships among recruiters from different entities  
• Use lead-sharing incentives and evaluate their effectiveness  
• Monitor, and provide support for, informal lead sharing  
• Assess differences in lead sharing among recruiters |
| Technology perceptions     | • Primary recruiter technologies have time delays and are not interoperable, but some entities’ technologies are perceived as useful | • Plan for how technology (e.g., a single Customer Relations Management tool or other options) will support larger TFR objectives  
• Determine how the organization, policy, and training for technology should be aligned to TFR |

NOTE: The Total Force Recruiting Panel: Technology and Integration Survey was administered online and completed by 1,105 respondents across all six DAF recruiting entities (42-percent response rate).