

ASVAB Student Testing Program Recruiter Survey – 2006

**Richard Riemer, Jane Styer
Defense Manpower Data Center
Personnel Testing Division
Student Testing Program**

**Data Recognition Corporation
Survey Services**

**August 2007
Technical Report: DMDC 07-0064**

**Prepared by: Data Recognition Corporation
Survey Services
13490 Bass Lake Road
Maple Grove, MN 55311**

**Prepared for: Defense Manpower Data Center
Personnel Testing Division
Student Testing Program
400 Gigling Road
Seaside, Ca 93955**

This report was prepared for the Director of Accession Policy, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness). The technical project officer for this report was Dr. Jane Styer, Personnel Testing Division, Defense Manpower Data Center. The chief analyst was Dr. Richard Riemer, Personnel Testing Division, Defense Manpower Data Center. The views, opinions, and findings contained in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed as an official Department of Defense position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.

**Additional copies of this report may be obtained from
Defense Technical Information Center
ATTN: DTIC-BRR
8725 John J. Kingman Rd., Suite #0944
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218
Or from:
<http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/order.html>
Ask for report by ADA 457 555**

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE*Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188*

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code)

ASVAB Student Testing Program

Recruiter Survey – 2006

**Richard Riemer, Jane Styer
Defense Manpower Data Center
Personnel Testing Division
Student Testing Program**

**Data Recognition Corporation
Survey Services**

**August 2007
Technical Report: DMDC 07-0064**

Acknowledgments

The Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) is indebted to numerous people for their assistance with the *ASVAB Student Testing Program Recruiter Survey – 2006*, which was conducted for the Director of Accession Policy, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness).

A number of people contributed to the development of the survey. Student Testing Program staff at the Personnel Testing Division, the Military Entrance Processing Command, and several of the Military Entrance Processing Stations (MEPS) were directly involved in developing the questionnaire. We are especially appreciative of the time and effort expended by MEPS and recruiting personnel at the Nashville TN, Minnesota MN, Louisville KY, and Phoenix AZ MEPS for reviewing draft versions and taking part in focus groups.

Andrea Zucker and Dennis Drogo provided valuable information and insights about surveying recruiters. Dr. Curt Gilroy and Capt Chris Arendt were directly involved in coordinating the survey effort with the recruiting commands. We are grateful to the following individuals for their assistance in identifying recruiters who were eligible for the survey: Jeffrey Krieger USAREC, Charles Price MSG USAREC, Sheila Johnson CNRC, Kevin Sullivan CNRC, Tracy Perry Capt AMCRC, Dirk Palmer AFRS, and Dr. Paul DiTullio AFRS.

Data Recognition Corporation played a major role in the creation of the survey, collection of the data, and preparation of this report.

Dr. Dan Segall and Kathy Moreno ensured that the necessary resources were available to conduct the survey and provided empirical oversight. Dr. Jane Arabian, Associate Director of Accession Policy, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), provided policy oversight.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	xi
Survey Methodology	1
Report Organization	4
Recruiter Demographics	9
Mission Support	29
Recruiting Process	52
Program Enhancements	131
Student Testing	152
Write-in Comments	166
References	219

Appendices

Appendix A: Survey Content	171
Appendix B: Survey Communications	185
Appendix C: Sampling and Weighting Methodology	195

List of Tables

1. <i>Number of Respondents and Estimated Population by Reporting Categories</i>	6
2. <i>Q18 -- What is your branch of Service/Reserve Component?</i>	10
3. <i>Q19 -- How long have you been assigned to recruiting duty?</i>	12
4. <i>Q20 -- Please mark the box that best describes the predominant characteristic of your recruiting zone.</i>	15
5. <i>Q21 -- Please indicate your geographic region.</i>	18
6. <i>Q22 -- Are you a production recruiter?</i>	21
7. <i>Q23 -- How many NPS contacts did you recruit in the last 12 months?</i>	23
8. <i>Q24 -- What is your best estimate of the percentage of these contacts that had participated in the ASVAB Student Testing Program?</i>	26
9. <i>Q1A-F -- In which of the following areas of the ASVAB Student Testing Program have you received training? (Mark all that apply).</i>	32

10.	<i>Q2A-H -- Where have you received training for the ASVAB Student Testing Program? (Mark all that apply)</i>	36
11.	<i>Q3 -- Has the training you received adequately prepared you to market the ASVAB Student Testing Program?</i>	39
12.	<i>Q4A,B -- I receive good support from the MEPS for:</i>	43
13.	<i>Q4C -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? The ASVAB Student Testing Program is effectively marketed to the schools in my area.....</i>	46
14.	<i>Q5A-H -- What types of support for the ASVAB Student Testing Program do you think would make you more productive as a recruiter? (Mark all that apply).....</i>	50
15.	<i>Question 12A-G Overall -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?</i>	52
16.	<i>Q7A-H Overall -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions?</i>	53
17.	<i>Q8A-F Overall -- Please indicate whether you consider each of the following to be a primary, secondary, or peripheral role of the ASVAB Student Testing Program.</i>	54
18.	<i>Q6 -- In your current assignment, do you recruit Non Prior Service (NPS) contacts?</i>	56
19.	<i>Q7A -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? ASVAB Student Testing Program</i>	58
20.	<i>Q7B -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? High School lists/student directories</i>	61
21.	<i>Q7C -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? Referrals from applicants</i>	64
22.	<i>Q7D -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? Local advertising</i>	67
23.	<i>Q7E -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? National leads (e.g., direct mail-outs, 800-number, internet)</i>	70
24.	<i>Q7F -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? Community colleges.....</i>	74
25.	<i>Q7G -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? 4-year colleges/universities</i>	78
26.	<i>Q7H -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? Local merchants/community contacts.....</i>	81
27.	<i>Q7I -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? Recruiter assistance (HRAP, HARP, RAP, PRASP, Boot Leave, etc.)</i>	84
28.	<i>Q7J -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? Recruiting station walk-ins</i>	87
29.	<i>Q8A,C,F -- Please indicate whether you consider each of the following to be a primary, secondary, or peripheral role of the ASVAB Student Testing Program.</i>	90

30.	<i>Q8B,D,E -- Please indicate whether you consider each of the following to be a primary, secondary, or peripheral role of the ASVAB Student Testing Program.</i>	94
31.	<i>Q9A -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? I regularly talk with potential recruits about the benefits of the ASVAB Student Testing Program (e.g., helps you to get to know your interests, strengths, explore possible careers).</i>	97
32.	<i>Q9B --To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? In my experience, when uniformed personnel proctor the High School ASVAB Test, it helps to establish a connection with students that can be useful later in recruiting.</i>	100
33.	<i>Q10,11 -- How much would you say the ASVAB Student Testing Program helps increase the number of qualified leads over the: Q10 -- short term (i.e., over the next 12 months), or Q11 – long term (i.e., over the next 1–2 years)?</i>	104
34.	<i>Q12H -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Overall, I believe the ASVAB Student Testing Program is helpful to my recruiting efforts within the high school population.</i>	107
35.	<i>Q12A -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? The ASVAB Student Testing Program is a valuable source of leads for me.</i>	110
36.	<i>Q12B -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? The ASVAB Student Testing Program provides more leads than I would have gotten otherwise.</i>	113
37.	<i>Q12C -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? The ASVAB Student Testing Program increases my access to schools.</i>	116
38.	<i>Q12D -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? The ASVAB Student Testing Program is an effective recruiting tool for me.</i>	119
39.	<i>Q12E -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? If the ASVAB Student Testing Program were discontinued, my recruiting efforts would suffer.</i>	122
40.	<i>Q12F -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? The ASVAB Student Testing Program makes my recruiting job easier.</i>	125
41.	<i>Q12G -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Considering everything, I feel that the time I spend on the ASVAB Student Testing Program is worth the recruiting payoff.</i>	128
42.	<i>Awareness and Non-awareness of the STP enhancements as helpful to both students and recruiters.</i>	132
43.	<i>Awareness and Non-awareness of the STP enhancements as helpful in educating students about military career options.</i>	132
44.	<i>Q13 Overall -- Please mark all of the ASVAB Student Testing Program Components that you are familiar with.</i>	133
45.	<i>Q13A-F -- Please mark all of the ASVAB Student Testing Program Components that you are familiar with.</i>	135
46.	<i>Q14A,B -- The ASVAB Student Testing Program was recently enhanced in several ways.</i>	139
47.	<i>Q14C,D -- The ASVAB Student Testing Program was recently enhanced in several ways.</i>	143
48.	<i>Q14E-F -- The ASVAB Student Testing Program was recently enhanced in several ways.</i>	147

49.	<i>Q15 -- How well does the newly redesigned ASVAB Student Testing Program educate students about career options in the military?</i>	150
50.	<i>Q17 -- Overall, how satisfied are you with the ASVAB Student Testing Program?</i>	154
51.	<i>Q16B -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement? The ASVAB Student Testing Program is beneficial for a wide variety of students, not just students who are interested in military careers.....</i>	157
52.	<i>Q16A -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement? The association of the ASVAB Student Testing Program with the military reduces the number of students who participate in the Program.</i>	160
53.	<i>Q16C,D -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?</i>	164
54.	<i>Q25,26 – Open-ended comments.</i>	168

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The Directorate of Accession Policy in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness has policy oversight for the Department of Defense Enlistment Testing Program (ETP) and Student Testing Program (STP). The *Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery* (ASVAB) is employed in the ETP as a screening assessment with military Service applicants. The ASVAB is also administered in high schools and post-secondary institutions, along with an interest inventory and various other career exploration and planning tools, to provide students with a cost-free, comprehensive career exploration and planning program, the STP. The program also educates students about potential training and career opportunities in the military and provides recruiters with qualified recruiting leads. While the STP is offered to 10th, 11th, and 12th grade high school students, only 11th and 12th grade students can use their STP scores to enlist.

The STP was recently redesigned. Initial changes were implemented in 2002 that included a new three-factor aptitude model of competencies and a new OCCU-Find built upon a competency-based linkage between the ASVAB tests and the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) ratings for the occupations in the Department of Labor's occupational taxonomy, the O*Net. The redesign culminated with the implementation of a new interest inventory, *Find Your Interests* (FYI). The FYI is available as both a paper-and-pencil, self-scoring version and an online version at www.asvabprogram.com. All of the program materials and the two websites (www.asvabprogram.com and www.CareersInTheMilitary.com) were updated in terms of content and functionality prior to the start of the 2006 school year. The revised STP was evaluated by the three primary user groups: students, high school counselors, and military recruiters.

The Recruiter Survey was one of three surveys used in a comprehensive program evaluation of the revised STP. This survey was fielded for the purposes of (a) determining the perceived usefulness and value of the revised program for recruiting and (b) identifying future program needs.

Key Findings

Highlights drawn from each of the major sections of the Recruiter Survey (Recruiter Demographics, Mission Support, Recruiting Process, Program Enhancements, and Student Testing) are presented below.

Recruiter Demographic Highlights

Most recruiters were Army, fewest from Air Force – Among the Service Branches, Army recruiters comprised the largest subpopulation (51%). Air Force personnel comprised 8% of the recruiter population, Naval personnel comprised 21% of the recruiter population, and 19% were Marine Corps recruiters.

Most recruiters had one to six years of recruiting duty – The majority of recruiters had one or more years of recruiting duty (82%) but less than six years of recruiting duty (86%).

Production recruiters were well represented in the sample – The majority of recruiters indicated they were production recruiters, 82% overall.

Production recruiters achieved 16.5 Non-Prior Service (NPS) contacts on average – The majority of recruiters were involved with recruiting NPS contacts (76%). Overall, production recruiters reported recruiting an average of 16.5 NPS contacts in the previous 12 months.

Two in ten NPS contacts participated in the STP – Overall, recruiters estimated that nearly one-fifth (18.6%) of their NPS contact recruits had participated in the STP.

Mission Support Highlights

Overall, fewer recruiters trained to conduct interpretation sessions or did not train at all – The most common areas of training provided to recruiters included administering the STP (42%), helping students explore careers (42%), interpreting scores (41%), and marketing the STP to schools (40%). Relatively fewer recruiters (28%) had received training in conducting an interpretation session. Moreover, slightly less than a third of the recruiters had not received training in any area of the STP (29%).

Overall, more recruiters received training on-the-job – The highest percentage of recruiters received training on-the-job (42%), followed by self-teaching (34%).

Half of all recruiters felt adequately prepared to market the program – Overall, recruiters were split evenly about being adequately prepared to market the program (53% yes, 47% no).

Most received good support for administering, fewer for interpreting – More than half (59%) of the recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that they received good support from the MEPS for administering the ASVAB. Fewer (41%) agreed or strongly agreed that they received this support for interpreting the test.

Less than half of recruiters agreed that the STP was effectively marketed to local schools – Only 42% of recruiters overall agreed or strongly agreed that the STP was effectively marketed to schools in their area. Remaining responses were evenly split with 29% of recruiters disagreeing or strongly disagreeing, or neither agreeing nor disagreeing (29%).

Most recruiters thought more marketing support would make them more productive – The majority of recruiters (58%) thought more marketing support would make them more productive as recruiters. The next most frequently marked response was more training in marketing (45%).

Recruiting Process Highlights

Nearly all recruiters recruited Non Prior Service (NPS) contacts – The vast majority of recruiters (94%) recruited NPS contacts in their current assignments; only 6% did not.

Over two-thirds thought STP had high importance – Over two-thirds (69%) of recruiters thought that the STP had high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it third out of ten lead sources listed.

Over three-quarters thought high school lists/student directories had high importance – Over three-quarters (77%) of recruiters thought that high school lists/student directories had high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it second out of ten lead sources listed.

Recruiters rated referrals from applicants as most important– The vast majority of recruiters (84%) thought that referrals from applicants was of high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it first out of ten lead sources listed. There were very few differences among groups in terms of the level of importance of this lead source.

Over half of recruiters rated local advertising as highly important– The majority of recruiters (58%) thought that local advertising had high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it fourth out of ten lead sources listed. There were very few differences among groups in terms of the level of importance of this lead source.

About half rated national leads as having high importance– Slightly more than half (53%) of recruiters thought that national leads had high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it sixth out of ten lead sources listed.

Half of recruiters rated community colleges as having high importance– Half (50%) of recruiters felt that community colleges had high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it eighth out of ten lead sources listed.

One-third thought 4-year colleges/universities had high importance– Only one-third (33%) of recruiters rated 4-year colleges/universities as highly important for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it tenth out of ten lead sources listed.

Less than half find local merchants/community contacts important– Fewer than half (44%) of recruiters rated local merchants/community contacts as having high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it ninth out of ten lead sources listed.

More than half considered recruiter assistance as highly important– Over half (55%) of recruiters said that recruiter assistance had high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it fifth out of ten lead sources listed.

Half of recruiters considered recruiting station walk-ins as highly important– Slightly more than half (51%) of recruiters rated recruiting station walk-ins as having high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it seventh out of ten lead sources listed.

The STP serves multiple purposes – Overall, recruiters understood the role of the STP to be more than just generating recruitment leads. Nearly two-thirds (65%) of all recruiters cited generating recruitment leads as a primary role of the STP. An equal number (64%) of recruiters cited educating students about military careers as a primary role of the program. These roles were followed closely by the purpose of helping students view the military positively (59%).

The STP serves career-related roles – Overall, recruiters were more likely to perceive the career-related roles of the STP as being primary. Nearly two-thirds (64%) of all recruiters cited encouraging students to discover their interests and skills as a primary role. More than half (55%) of all recruiters also cited promoting student career exploration as a primary role of the program. The role of promoting continuing education after high school was clearly

perceived as being more peripheral or secondary; only 44% of recruiters indicated this role as primary.

Benefits talked about on a regular basis – Nearly three-quarters of all recruiters (71%) regularly talked with potential recruits about the benefits of the STP.

Uniformed test proctors established a connection with students – Overall, nearly three-quarters (71%) of all recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that uniformed personnel proctoring the ASVAB helped to establish a connection with students that could be useful later in recruiting.

Between two-thirds and three-quarters said STP increased qualified leads over short term and long term – Slightly less than three-quarters (72%) of recruiters reported that the STP helped increase the number of qualified leads somewhat or significantly over the next 12 months. Meanwhile, 68% of recruiters said that the STP helped increase the number of leads somewhat or significantly over the next 1-2 years.

Three-quarters believed STP was a valuable source of leads – Slightly less than three-quarters (72%) of recruiters felt that the STP was a valuable source of leads.

Half agreed that the STP provided more leads – Slightly more than half (52%) of recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that the STP provided more leads than they would had gotten otherwise.

Half agreed that the STP increased access to schools – Slightly more than half (53%) of recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that the STP increased access to schools.

Two-thirds agreed that the STP is an effective recruiting tool – About two-thirds (64%) of recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that the STP was an effective recruiting tool.

About half agreed that recruiting would suffer without the STP – Slightly more than half (53%) of recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that their recruiting efforts would suffer without the STP.

More than half agreed that the STP made their job easier – More than half (60%) of recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that the STP made their recruiting job easier.

About two-thirds felt time spent on STP was worth the payoff – Slightly fewer than two-thirds (62%) of recruiters agreed that time spent on the STP was worth the recruiting payoff.

Three-quarters believed STP was helpful for recruiting high school students – About three-quarters (73%) of recruiters felt that, overall, the STP was helpful to their recruiting efforts within the high school population.

Program Enhancements Highlights

Most recruiters familiar with Summary Results Sheet, fewer with *Career Exploration Guide*, and very few with others – The majority of recruiters (59%) were familiar with the Summary Results Sheet. Less than half (46%) were familiar with the *Career Exploration Guide*. Between 15% and 21% of recruiters were familiar with other program components.

Recruiters lacked awareness of STP enhancements, few explored on-line resources –

Only slightly more than a quarter of recruiters said they were made aware of program enhancements during training (28%) and had explored STP on-line resources (26%). Many more said they were not made aware of enhancements during training (38%) and had not explored on-line resources (41%).

Most recruiters agreed or were neutral about website helpfulness, STP enhancements making recruiting easier –

The majority of recruiters were either neutral or agreed that STP websites were helpful to students who were interested in exploring military careers (48% agreed or strongly agreed; 47% neither agreed nor disagreed). The majority of recruiters were also either neutral or agreed that STP enhancements would make it easier to recruit qualified candidates (42% agreed or strongly agreed; 54% neither agreed nor disagreed).

Most recruiters neutral about STP enhancements increasing student access and student interest in military –

The majority of recruiters were neutral (55%) toward or agreed or strongly agreed (41%) with the assertion that STP enhancements would make it easier to interest students in exploring a military career. Similarly, the majority of recruiters were neutral (58%) toward or agreed or strongly agreed (37%) with the assertion that STP enhancements would make it easier to gain access to students.

Vast majority of recruiters either favorable or neutral toward military career educational quality–

Almost all recruiters were either favorable or neutral toward the military career educational quality of new STP (52% said it educates well or very well, 44% said it educates neither well nor poorly).

Student Testing Highlights

Most were satisfied with the STP – About two-thirds of all recruiters (67%) were satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the STP.

Most believed the program benefits a wide variety of students – Nearly three-quarters of all recruiters (72%) agreed or strongly agreed that the STP was beneficial for a wide variety of students, not just students who were interested in military careers.

Program association with the military was not widely seen as reducing student participation – Less than half of recruiters (43%) believed that the association of the STP with the military reduces the number of students who participate in the program.

Majority believed the current conflicts made it more difficult to interest participants – The majority of recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that the current military conflicts in the world made it difficult to interest students (62%), or schools, counselors, or principals (61%) in participating in the STP.

Group Comparison Highlights

Recruiters with more knowledge of the program and more prepared to market the STP tended to be more positive about most issues than those with less knowledge and not as prepared –Among recruiters who were aware of the STP enhancements:

- 72% considered encouraging students to discover their interests and skills a primary role of the STP.
- 86% regularly talked with potential recruits about the benefits of the STP.
- 82% felt uniformed personnel proctoring the ASVAB helped to establish a connection with students that could be useful later in recruiting.
- 81% reported the STP increased leads over the short term.
- 79% reported the STP increased leads over the long term.
- 86% reported the STP was helpful for recruiting high school students.
- 85% reported the STP was a valuable source of leads.
- 80% agreed the STP was an effective recruiting tool.
- 76% agreed the STP made their recruiting job easier.
- 80% agreed the time they spent with the STP was worth the recruiting payoff.

A consistent finding was that recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements tended to be very positive about them:

- 84% believed the STP websites were helpful to students who were interested in exploring military careers.
- 81% believed the enhancements that were made to the STP would make it easier to recruit qualified applicants.
- 81% believed the enhancements would make it easier to interest students in exploring a military career than if the enhancements had not been done.
- 75% believed the enhancements would make it easier to gain access to students than if the enhancements had not been done.
- 80% reported the redesigned STP did well or very well in terms of educating students about career options in the military.

Recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements were more satisfied overall with the STP and more positive about the program applying to a wide variety of students.

These findings indicate that increasing recruiter knowledge about these enhancements may help to increase the marketing effectiveness overall.

Training delivered via diverse methods – The different branches of the Military were inconsistent with each other in terms of where training took place. This could imply that to be effective, training programs may need to be tailored for each Service Branch. It could also imply that there may be ways to standardize training, especially in ways that borrow best practices from each Service.

Survey Methodology

Questionnaire and Materials Development

Materials developed for this survey effort included the survey instrument, an invitation to participate in the survey process, and reminder letter/e-mail communications.

Recruiter Survey – The Recruiter Survey was one of three surveys used in a comprehensive program evaluation of the revised ASVAB Student Testing Program (STP). This survey was fielded for the purposes of (a) determining the perceived usefulness and value of the revised program for recruiting and (b) identifying future program needs. The content development process was driven by the research objectives and informed by various sources and stakeholders associated with the objectives. A summary of this development process follows.

A draft content map based on the objectives was created as a working document and served as a guide early in the development process. Initial content input was gathered from STP surveys administered in previous years, principals within the STP, and from review of the new STP materials. An initial draft of the survey was constructed and subjected to an iterative review process. The review process involved various parties, including Dr. Jane Styer, the Technical Point of Contact, and Dr. Jane Arabian, Associate Director of Accession Policy, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), in addition to several ASVAB STP subject matter experts.

Following revisions to the initial draft, a second formal draft was subjected to review by staff at Headquarters, Military Entrance Processing Command (HQMEPCOM) and the Education Service Specialists (ESS) Expert Panel Members. Based on their feedback, a third draft was created.

Draft three was a pre-test version of the survey instrument that was subjected to review by recruiters, test coordinating officers (TCO), or education service specialists (ESS) in focus groups and via phone interviews with recruiting command leaders. A total of 25 respondents participated in the focus groups which were held in Minneapolis MN, Lexington KY, and Phoenix AZ. Service representation included Air Force (5 respondents), Army (6), Army Reserve/National Guard (4), Marine Corps (3), Navy (1), and civilians (5). Groups had a mix of 16 recruiters, 5 ESSs and 4 TCOs. In addition, phone interviews were conducted to receive feedback from four recruiting commands at Omaha NE, Buffalo NY, Des Moines IA, and Seattle WA. These interviews captured input from a recruiter, a recruiting station commander, an ESS, and a TCO civilian. Revisions were made to the survey instrument and associated communications based on feedback (e.g., defining frequently used terms, a description of the enhancements made to the program, better placement of the directions).

A fourth draft was again reviewed by STP principals and key ESS contacts. Revisions were incorporated based on this feedback that resulted in draft five.

Draft five content was developed into both a web-based survey instrument and a paper version of the survey (to be used for Marine Corps for whom e-mail addresses had been problematic in the past). The paper version was formatted to fit an 11 x 17 inch, 4-page survey booklet designed for Optical Character Read scanning. Following review of both the paper and web versions, the final version of the survey was approved. Web and paper versions contained the same questions and data fields.

The final survey instrument contained 36 structured items (e.g., agree – disagree questions) grouped under the five main headings of Mission Support, Recruiting Process, Program Enhancements,

Student Testing, and About You. In addition, two open-ended items solicited input on (a) specific aspects of the newly enhanced STP that work well, and (b) the biggest barriers to the successful use of the newly enhanced STP and how the barriers could be overcome. Both a paper version and web-based version of the survey instrument were deployed, and both formats were available to Navy and Marine Corps recruiters. However, only the web-based survey was available to Army and Air Force recruiters. A complete listing of the questions on the final survey is included in Appendix A in this report.

Recruiter Invitation – Parallel to the survey development process, an invitation to participate in the survey was drafted and refined. The draft invitation was also included in the pre-testing process using focus groups and interviews as described above. Feedback from the focus groups and interviews was incorporated, including the suggestion that the invitation should come from the Recruiting Command to (a) gain the attention of the recruiter, (b) convey the message that the survey was an important effort, and (c) stress that the recruiter should participate by completing the survey. A copy of the final content for the invitation is included in Appendix B in this report.

Recruiter Reminder Letter/E-mail Communication – Reminder letter/e-mail communications were also drafted. These communications were subjected to the same review, pre-testing, and revision process described above. A copy of the final content is included in Appendix B in this report.

Sampling

The population of interest for the Recruiter Survey was Active and Reserve enlisted production recruiters for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. The population size was 18,662, and the stratified random sample size was 8,337. The frame was constructed from lists supplied by each Service for the month of June 2006. A scientific sampling procedure was used to ensure that the results would be representative of production and non-production active and reserve recruiters. The sampling frame was stratified by Service and Reserve Component (i.e., Active Army, Active Navy, Marine Corps, Active Air Force, Reserve Army, Reserve Navy, and Reserve Air Force). For more details on sampling, see Appendix C in this report.

Survey Fielding

The survey administration process began on September 18, 2006, when the survey was posted on the website and a communication was sent to all recruiters announcing the survey was available and encouraging them to participate. Subsequent reminders were sent to survey non-responders throughout the field period. Specifically, e-mail reminders were sent on October 4, October 10, October 20, and November 7, 2006. A postal reminder to non-responders was mailed on November 3, 2006. The original survey close date was scheduled for November 15, 2006. However, the field period was extended beyond the original date to allow more time for recruiters to respond. The survey field was closed on November 29, 2006.

Data Weighting

After the September 18-November 29, 2006 fielding of the survey, completed surveys (defined as at least 50% of the questions answered) were received from 2,872 eligible respondents which resulted in a weighted response rate of 37%. Table C-2 in the methods appendix (Appendix C) provides various response rates for each of the Service/Reserve Components. The overall weighted responses rates were as follows:

- Active Army 52%
- Active Navy 18%
- Marine Corps 15%
- Active Air Force 45%
- Reserve Army 52%
- Reserve Navy 23%
- Reserve Air Force 46%

Weights adjust for unequal sampling rates that result from a stratified random sample. They also minimize non-response bias when groups having differing response rates can be identified. To adjust for non-response bias, it is necessary to assume that respondents were missing at random within the non-response adjustment cells. When this assumption is not met, some residual non-response bias will remain.

The responses were weighted with four non-response adjustments so the results would generalize to the population of interest: (a) eligibility status non-response adjustment, (b) completion status non-response adjustment, (c) post-stratification to known stratum sizes, and (d) ratio adjustment to known stratum level production recruiter rates. Tables C-19 and C-22 in Appendix C show the response rates for the variables used to define the non-response adjustment cells: Service, Pay grade group, Race-ethnicity, Component, Years of Service, and Family Status.

Estimation Procedures

Because this survey used a non-proportional stratified sample and there was a non-proportional non-response, weights needed to be applied to the individual sample member responses to ensure that the survey estimates were representative of the recruiter population. The complex sample design and use of weights resulted in underestimation of standard errors and variances by standard statistical software, which influences tests of statistical significance. To accommodate the features of complex design and weighting, margins of error were calculated using Taylor’s linearization variance estimation.

By definition, sample surveys are subject to sampling error. Standard errors are estimates of random variation around population parameters, such as a percentage or mean. The analysis in this report used margins of error (95% confidence intervals) to represent the degree of uncertainty introduced into the survey estimates by sampling and weighting.

Survey Analysis Files

Documentation regarding the requirements for analysis of the data and structure of the basic analysis file for the Recruiter Survey is provided in a separate report, *ASVAB Student Testing Program Recruiter Survey – 2006: Administration, datasets, and codebook* (DMDC, 2007 Manuscript).

REPORT ORGANIZATION

Analytical Procedures

Results are presented by a variety of reporting categories. Respondents were classified by self-report to form the reporting categories for the tabulations. Survey results are reported by Branch of Service, Component, Service/Reserve Component, and Production Recruiter status. Survey results are also presented for other classification variables when the cut of the data for the topic involved noteworthy results. These other classification variables include Recruiting Non-Prior Service (NPS) contacts, Geographic region, Years assigned to recruiting duty, Recruiting zone population density, Preparedness to market the STP, Awareness of STP enhancements, and Perceived MEPS support for administration, interpretation, and marketing. Note that Component and Service/Reserve Component are based on administrative record information to compensate for missing data and small Reserve component group sizes. Definitions for reporting categories follow.

- Service—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force (based on survey self-report).
- Component—Regular, Reserve (based on administrative record data for Army, Navy, and Air Force to offset the number of Reserve non-responses resulting from item non-response to the Service/component question).
- Service/Reserve Component—Active Army, Active Navy, Active USMC, Active USAF, Reserve Army, Reserve Navy, Reserve Air Force (based on administrative record data for Army, Navy, and Air Force to offset the number of Reserve non-responses resulting from item non-response to the Service/component question).
- Production recruiter status—Production recruiter, Not production recruiter.
- Non prior service (NPS) contacts recruited in the last 12 months—Recruits NPS, Does not recruit NPS (coded for those recruiters who reported production recruiter status).
- Geographic region—Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, Southeast, North Central, South Central, West, Pacific.
- Years assigned to recruiting duty—Less than one year, One or more years, Less than six years, Six or more years.
- Recruiting zone population density—Urban, Suburban, Small city/town, Rural.
- Preparedness to market STP—Prepared to market, Not prepared to market.
- Awareness of STP enhancements—Aware of STP enhancements, Not aware of enhancements.
- Perceived MEPS Support for administration—Good support, Not good support.
- Perceived MEPS Support for interpretation—Good support, Not good support.
- Perceived MEPS Support for marketing—Good support, Not good support.

The reporting group breakout tables in this report include (a) the estimates of survey responses for the reporting groups, (b) the margins of error for those estimates, and (c) the tests for comparisons between a reporting group and all other groups.

The margins of error (ME) associated with the estimates are preceded by a '±' symbol. The MEs represent the expected range of estimates that would result from repeated sampling of the recruiter population. Unless otherwise specified, the numbers contained in the tables are percentages, with margins of error at the end of each row. Maximum margins of error are presented when more than one estimate is displayed in a row.

Statistically significant comparisons between a reporting group and all others are shown in superscript and preceded by the plus or minus symbol (+/-). The number following the plus or minus symbol indicates the magnitude of the difference. In this type of comparison, the responses for one group are compared to the weighted average of the responses of all other groups in that dimension.

If the survey estimates are determined to be statistically unreliable, the estimate is not reported. In these instances the estimated is suppressed in the table and replaced by "NR." Estimates are suppressed when the effective sample size is less than 30.

Group Comparisons

Only statistically significant group comparisons of notable size are discussed in this report. Large group differences (in general, 10 percentage points or more) are presented in descending order of magnitude. That is, the largest group difference is presented first. This is then followed by the second largest difference, third largest, etc. The report also notes when small differences (in general, between 5 and 9 percentage points), or negligible differences (in general, between 1 and 4 percentage points) exist among the comparison group subpopulations. When significant group comparisons did not meet the general thresholds for presenting results, they were inspected to see if they were otherwise noteworthy and thereby warranting presentation in the report.

When means of continuous variables are tabulated, group differences with a magnitude greater than two tenths (0.2) of a standard deviation are discussed. This presentation criterion follows from the work of Cohen (1992) who suggested that smaller group differences may not be a difference of practical concern. (Cohen indicated that a standard deviation difference of 0.2 is indicative of a small effect, 0.5 a medium, and 0.8 a large effect size.)

The recruiter attitudes and opinions are tabulated for 35 reporting groups and 86 questions, and each group is compared with all other respondents. As a result of this reporting process, there are 3,010 "all-other" comparisons made, and it should be noted that one percent of these comparisons (i.e., 30) would be expected to be significant just by chance. (Significance was determined when the probability associated with a comparison was less than or equal to .01.)

When comparing group results within the survey, the proportion (or mean) of each group subpopulation is compared to its respective "all other" group (i.e., the total population minus the group being assessed). For example, Army's all other group consists of Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force members. Excluding the subject group subpopulation from the total enables an accurate test of whether the group differs from those not in the group.

When discussing differences, the use of the word "significantly" is redundant and is, therefore, not used. Because the results of comparisons are based on a weighted, representative sample, the reader can infer that the results generalize to the population.

Table 1 shows the number of respondents and the percentage of total respondents in each reporting group. Also shown are the estimated number of members and the percentage of total members in each reporting group. Differences in the percentages of respondents and population for the reporting

categories reflect differences in the number sampled, as well as differences in response rates. When self-report data was missing and group classification could not be determined, the group was labeled "NA/Missing." These NA/Missing groups were generally not reported in the tables because they represent a negligible segment of the population.

Table 1.
Number of Respondents and Estimated Population by Reporting Categories

Reporting Group Domain Label	Sample Count (n)	Observed %n	Sum of Weights (N)	Observed %N
<i>Sample</i>				
All	2,872	100	18,662	100
<i>Branch of Service</i>				
Army	1,528	53	9,393	50
Navy	366	13	3,839	21
Marine Corps	279	10	3,427	18
Air Force	627	22	1,512	8
NA/Missing	72	3	491	3
<i>Component</i>				
Regular	2,236	78	15,690	84
Reserve	628	22	2,851	15
<i>Service/Reserve Component</i>				
Active Army	1,144	40	7,724	41
Active Navy	274	10	3,267	18
Active USMC	279	10	3,427	18
Active USAF	539	19	1,272	7
Reserve Army	424	15	1,925	10
Reserve Navy	101	4	653	4
Reserve Air Force	103	4	273	1
<i>Production recruiter</i>				
Not production	414	14	3,355	18
Production recruiter	2,401	84	14,963	80
NA/Missing	57	2	344	2
<i>NPS contacts recruited</i>				
Not recruit NPS	80	3	512	3
Recruits NPS	2,240	78	13,694	73
NA/Missing	552	19	4,456	24

Reporting Group Domain Label	Sample Count (n)	Observed %n	Sum of Weights (N)	Observed %N
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>				
Less than one year	465	16	3,349	18
1 or more years	2,346	82	14,905	80
NA/Missing	61	2	408	2
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>				
Less than 6 years	2,400	84	15,640	84
6 or more years	411	14	2,614	14
NA/Missing	61	2	408	2
<i>Geographic region</i>				
Northeast	446	16	2,701	14
Mid-Atlantic	151	5	1,064	6
Southeast	604	21	3,919	21
North Central	547	19	3,424	18
South Central	432	15	2,904	16
West	234	8	1,475	8
Pacific	391	14	2,777	15
NA/Missing	67	2	397	2
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>				
Urban	805	28	5,197	28
Suburban	551	19	3,698	20
Small city/town	822	29	5,360	29
Rural	604	21	3,680	20
NA/Missing	90	3	727	4
<i>Preparedness to market STP</i>				
Not prepared	1,336	47	8,643	46
Prepared to market	1,497	52	9,738	52
NA/Missing	39	1	281	2
<i>Awareness of STP enhancements</i>				
Not aware	2,049	71	13,235	71
Aware of enhancements	759	26	5,040	27
NA/Missing	64	2	386	2
<i>Perceived MEPS Support for administration</i>				
Not good support	1,186	41	7,588	41
Good support	1,657	58	10,892	58
NA/Missing	29	1	182	1

Reporting Group Domain Label	Sample Count (n)	Observed %n	Sum of Weights (N)	Observed %N
<i>Perceived MEPS Support for interpretation</i>				
Not good support	1,727	60	10,964	59
Good support	1,121	39	7,522	40
NA/Missing	24	1	176	1
<i>Perceived MEPS Support for marketing</i>				
Not good support	1,654	58	10,721	57
Good support	1,185	41	7,724	41
NA/Missing	33	1	218	1

Recruiter Demographics

This section describes the demographics of the recruiter population. These demographics reasonably reflect the distribution as of the survey field period.

Highlights

- Overall, nearly 2,900 military recruiters participated in this survey effort (see Table 1).
- The recruiters in the sample tended to be production recruiters who recruited Non-Prior Service (NPS) contacts and had one to six years of recruiting duty.

The demographic items are described and interpreted in more detail on the following pages.

RECRUITER DEMOGRAPHICS

Demographics

Q18 -- What is your branch of Service/Reserve Component?

Recruiters from each Service were found in all geographic regions. The nation-wide percentage of recruiters affiliated with each Service was similar within geographic regions. Exceptions are noted in the North Central and Pacific regions. The percentage of Navy recruiters was lower in the North Central region (13%) and higher in the Pacific (26%). The percentage of Army recruiters was lower in the Pacific region (38%). Table 2 provides detailed information.

Table 2.

Q18 -- What is your branch of Service/Reserve Component?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. Army</p> <p>3. Marine Corps</p> <p>5. Army Reserve</p> <p>7. Army National Guard</p> <p>9. Air Force Reserve</p> | <p>2. Navy</p> <p>4. Air Force</p> <p>6. Marine Corps Reserve</p> <p>8. Navy Reserve</p> <p>10. Air National Guard</p> |
|---|---|

	Percent	Percentages										ME
	Respond	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<i>Full Sample</i>	97 ±1	44	19	19	7	7	0	0	2	1	S ±3	
<i>Geographic region</i>												
Northeast	99 ±2	49	17	15	7	9	0	0	1	1	S ±6	
Mid-Atlantic	100 ±0	44	19	18	5	8	0	1	4	1 ⁻¹	S ±11	
Southeast	99 ±1	49	18	14	7	7	0	0	2	2	S ±5	
North Central	99 ±2	46	13 ⁻⁸	22	8	8	1	0	1	1	S ±6	
South Central	99 ±2	41	24	20	7	7	0	0	0 ⁻²	1	S ±6	
West	100 ±0	40	21	22	7	5	1	0	2	2	S ±9	
Pacific	98 ±2	38 ⁻⁸	26 ⁺⁸	22	5 ⁻²	5 ⁻³	0	0	3	1	S ±6	

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=⁻effect size Higher=⁺effect size

ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITER DEMOGRAPHICS

Demographics

Q19 – How long have you been assigned to recruiting duty?

Most recruiters had one to six years of recruiting duty – The majority of recruiters had one or more years of recruiting duty (82%). Only 14% had six or more years of recruiting duty.

Production recruiters were much less experienced – Production recruiters tended to be assigned to recruiting duty for shorter time periods than non-production recruiters. The data showed 77% of production recruiters had less than three years of experience in recruiting, compared to 28% of non-production recruiters. In contrast, 73% of non-production recruiters reported having three or more years of experience, compared to 23% of production recruiters.

Personnel who recruited NPS contacts were less experienced – Personnel who recruited NPS contacts tended to have been assigned to recruiting duty for shorter time periods. Results show 59% of NPS recruiters had 1-3 years of experience in recruiting, compared to 20% of non-NPS recruiters. In contrast, 31% of non-NPS recruiters reported having six or more years of experience, compared to only 7% of those who did recruit NPS contacts.

Reserve personnel were more experienced in recruiting duty – Reserve personnel tended to have been assigned to recruiting duty for longer time periods, with half (50%) of Reserve personnel being in their recruiting assignment for three or more years, compared to 29% of Regular duty. More Regular duty recruiters had been assigned to duty between two and three years (23% Regular duty, versus 11% Reserves).

Active Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force personnel reported more moderate experience levels – Among the Active Service Branches, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force recruiters were more often assigned to recruiting duty for 2-3 years (28%, 30%, and 39% respectively).

Small differences – Small differences were found among groups defined by recruiting zone population density.

No differences – No differences were found among groups for the demographics of geographic region, preparedness to market the STP, awareness of STP enhancements, and good MEPS support for administration, interpretation, and marketing.

Table 3.
Q19 -- How long have you been assigned to recruiting duty?

	Percent	Percentages					ME
	Respond	Less than one year	1 year, but less than 2	2 years, but less than 3	3 years, but less than 6	6 or more years	
<i>Full Sample</i>	98 ±1	18	29	21	18	14	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>							
Army	100 ±1	18	32 ⁺⁶	13 ⁻¹⁵	20 ⁺⁵	17 ⁺⁵	±3
Navy	99 ±2	19	26	25	16	15	±6
Marine Corps	99 ±2	21	26	30 ⁺¹²	14	9 ⁻⁶	±7
Air Force	99 ±1	13 ⁻⁶	26	34 ⁺¹⁵	17	9 ⁻⁶	±4
<i>Component</i>							
Regular	98 ±1	19	30 ⁺⁷	23 ⁺¹²	17 ⁻⁴	12 ⁻¹⁷	±3
Reserve	98 ±2	15	23 ⁻⁷	11 ⁻¹²	21 ⁺⁴	29 ⁺¹⁷	±5
<i>Service/Reserve Component</i>							
Active Army	98 ±1	18	33 ⁺⁶	14 ⁻¹²	20 ⁺⁴	16	±3
Active Navy	98 ±3	20	29	28 ⁺⁹	14	8 ⁻⁸	±7
Active USMC	99 ±2	21	26	30 ⁺¹²	14	9 ⁻⁷	±7
Active USAF	97 ±2	15	30	39 ⁺²⁰	14	2 ⁻¹³	±4
Reserve Army	97 ±2	18	31	12 ⁻¹⁰	19	21 ⁺⁷	±6
Reserve Navy	99 ±3	11	8 ⁻²²	8 ⁻¹³	24	50 ⁺³⁷	±12
Reserve Air Force	98 ±3	7 ⁻¹¹	8 ⁻²¹	11 ⁻¹⁰	33 ⁺¹⁶	41 ⁺²⁷	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>							
Not production	98 ±3	7 ⁻¹⁴	8 ⁻²⁶	13 ⁻⁹	30 ⁺¹⁵	43 ⁺³⁵	±6
Production recruiter	100 ±1	21 ⁺¹⁴	34 ⁺²⁵	22 ⁺⁹	15 ⁻¹⁴	8 ⁻³⁴	±8
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>							
Not recruit NPS	100 ±1	28	NR	10	21	31 ⁺¹⁷	±18
Recruits NPS	100 ±1	19	36 ⁺²⁷	23 ⁺¹⁰	15 ⁻¹¹	7 ⁻²⁹	±6
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>							
Less than one year	100 ±0	100 ⁺¹⁰⁰	0 ⁻³⁶	0 ⁻²⁵	0 ⁻²²	0 ⁻¹⁸	±6
1 or more years	100 ±0	0 ⁻¹⁰⁰	36 ⁺³⁶	25 ⁺²⁵	22 ⁺²²	18 ⁺¹⁸	±18
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>							
Less than 6 years	100 ±0	21 ⁺²¹	34 ⁺³⁴	24 ⁺²⁴	21 ⁺²¹	0 ⁻¹⁰⁰	±6
6 or more years	100 ±0	0 ⁻²¹	0 ⁻³⁴	0 ⁻²⁴	0 ⁻²¹	100 ⁺¹⁰⁰	±18

	Percent Respond	Percentages					ME
		Less than one year	1 year, but less than 2	2 years, but less than 3	3 years, but less than 6	6 or more years	
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>							
Urban	100 ±0	19	28	20	16	18 ⁺⁵	±5
Suburban	99 ±2	20	29	19	18	15	±5
Small city/town	100 ±1	18	30	21	17	13	±5
Rural	100 ±0	18	29	21	20	11	±13

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size}

NR=Unreliable estimate. ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITER DEMOGRAPHICS

Demographics

Q20 – Please mark the box that best describes the predominant characteristic of your recruiting zone. Urban, Suburban, Small city/town, Rural.

More recruiters worked in small city/town or urban recruiting zones – The majority of recruiters tended to work in either small city/town (30%) or urban (29%) recruiting zones (totaling 59%). The suburban and rural recruiting zones each accounted for 21% of recruiters (totaling 42%).

Navy and Air Force Reserve personnel tended not to be in rural recruiting zones – Fewer recruiters with the Navy and Air Force Reserves were assigned to rural areas (6% and 9%, respectively). Also, Reserve Air Force recruiters tended to be assigned more to urban areas (41%).

Assignments differed among North Central, Western, and Pacific regions – The West region tended to have more recruiters working in urban recruiting zones (38%) but fewer working in small cities or towns (20%). Meanwhile, the North Central region tended to have fewer recruiters working in urban zones (21%). Recruiters working in rural areas were fewer in the Pacific region (8%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of service, component, six years of experience, and good MEPS support for administration and marketing.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of production recruiter, recruit NPS contacts, less than one year of experience, preparedness to market the ASVAB STP, awareness of STP enhancements, and good MEPS support for interpretation.

Table 4.
Q20 -- Please mark the box that best describes the predominant characteristic of your recruiting zone.

	Percent Respond	Percentages				ME
		Urban	Suburban	Small city/ town	Rural	
<i>Full Sample</i>	96 ±1	29	21	30	21	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>						
Army	99 ±1	32 ⁺⁷	19	29	20	±3
Navy	97 ±3	25	20	35	20	±6
Marine Corps	94 ±4	24	26	27	23	±7
Air Force	99 ±1	28	21	29	22	±4
<i>Component</i>						
Active	96 ±2	28	20	30	22 ⁺⁷	±3
Reserve	97 ±2	33	25	27	15 ⁻⁷	±5
<i>Service Component</i>						
Active Army	97 ±1	33 ⁺⁷	18 ⁻⁵	29	20	±3
Active Navy	96 ±3	23	18	36	22	±7
Active USMC	94 ±4	24	26	27	23	±7
Active USAF	97 ±2	25	21	30	25	±4
Reserve Army	97 ±2	31	24	27	19	±6
Reserve Navy	96 ±4	35	30	29	6 ⁻¹⁵	±12
Reserve Air Force	96 ±4	41 ⁺¹²	23	27	9 ⁻¹²	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>						
Not production	96 ±3	32	23	28	18	±6
Production recruiter	98 ±1	28	20	30	21	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>						
Less than 6 years	98 ±1	28	20	30	21 ⁺⁶	±3
6 or more years	99 ±1	36 ⁺⁸	21	28	16 ⁻⁵	±7

	Percent Respond	Percentages				ME
		Urban	Suburban	Small city/ town	Rural	
<i>Geographic region</i>						
Northeast	97 ±3	32	22	26	20	±6
Mid-Atlantic	96 ±7	25	28	27	20	±11
Southeast	98 ±2	25	19	35 ⁺⁷	22	±5
North Central	98 ±2	21 ⁻¹⁰	23	31	26 ⁺⁷	±6
South Central	99 ±2	32	16 ⁻⁶	27	25	±6
West	98 ±3	38 ⁺¹⁰	19	20 ⁻¹¹	23	±9
Pacific	99 ±2	35	22	35	8 ⁻¹⁵	±6
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>						
Not good support	95 ±2	34 ⁺⁸	22	27	17 ⁻⁶	±4
Good support	97 ±2	26 ⁻⁷	20	31	23 ⁺⁵	±3
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>						
Not good support	96 ±2	32 ⁺⁶	22	28	18 ⁻⁵	±3
Good support	97 ±2	26 ⁻⁵	19	32	23 ⁺⁴	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size}

ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITER DEMOGRAPHICS

Demographics

Q21 – Please indicate your geographic region. Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, Southeast, North Central, South Central, West, and Pacific.

Regional representation – Most regions held between 15% (Pacific) and 21% (Southeast) of recruiters. The Mid-Atlantic and Western regions were exceptions to this, as they accounted for only 6% and 8% of recruiting personnel, respectively.

Navy Reserve recruiters tended to be in the Pacific region, not South Central – Recruiters with the Navy Reserves tended to be assigned more to the Pacific region (27%) and less to the South Central (6%) regions.

Recruiters who did not recruit NPS contacts were less common in North and South Central regions – Personnel who did not recruit NPS contacts tended to work somewhat less in the North (9%) and South Central region (7%).

Fewer recruiters were assigned to duty in rural areas in the Pacific region – Fewer recruiters were assigned to duty in rural areas in the Pacific region (6%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of component, service, six years of experience, and good MEPS support for marketing.

Negligible differences – Negligible differences were indicated for the demographics of preparedness to market STP, awareness of STP enhancements, and good MEPS support for administration.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of service component reserve, production recruiter, years of experience, and good MEPS support for interpretation.

Table 5.
Q21 -- Please indicate your geographic region.

	Percent Respond	Percentages							
		North -east	Mid- Atlantic	South -east	North Central	South Central	West	Pacific	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	98 ±1	15	6	21	19	16	8	15	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>									
Army	99 ±1	17 ⁺⁴	6	23	20	15	7	12 ⁻⁶	±3
Navy	100 ±1	12	6	21	13 ⁻⁷	18	9	21 ⁺⁷	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±0	12	6	16	23	16	10	18	±7
Air Force	99 ±1	16	4	22	20	17	10	12 ⁻⁴	±4
<i>Component</i>									
Active	98 ±1	14	6	21	19	17 ⁺⁵	8	16	±3
Reserve	98 ±2	17	8	26	17	12 ⁻⁵	8	13	±5
<i>Service Component</i>									
Active Army	97 ±1	16	6	23	20	15	7	13	±3
Active Navy	99 ±2	13	6	20	13 ⁻⁷	20	9	20	±7
Active USMC	100 ±0	12	6	16 ⁻⁷	23	16	10	18	±7
Active USAF	97 ±2	16	5	21	21	16	9	12 ⁻³	±4
Reserve Army	97 ±2	21 ⁺⁷	8	24	19	13	6	8 ⁻⁸	±6
Reserve Navy	99 ±3	8	9	28	11	6 ⁻¹⁰	9	27 ⁺¹²	±12
Reserve Air Force	99 ±3	13	2 ⁻⁴	28	14	17	13	13	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>									
Not production	99 ±1	16	7	23	17	14	8	16	±6
Production	100 ±1	15	6	21	19	16	8	15	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>									
Not recruit NPS	99 ±2	27	11	20	9 ⁻¹⁰	7 ⁻⁹	5	21	±18
Recruits NPS	100 ±1	15	6	21	19	16	8	15	±3
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>									
Urban	100 ±1	16	5	18	13 ⁻⁸	18	11 ⁺⁴	19 ⁺⁵	±5
Suburban	100 ±1	16	8	20	21	12 ⁻⁵	7	16	±5
Small city/town	100 ±0	12	5	25	19	15	5 ⁻⁴	18	±5
Rural	100 ±1	14	6	23	23 ⁺⁵	19	9	6 ⁻¹²	±5

	Percent Respond	Percentages							
		North -east	Mid-Atlantic	South -east	North Central	South Central	West	Pacific	ME
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>									
Not prepared	97 ±1	16	6	22	17	17	9	13 ⁻⁴	±4
Prepared to market	98 ±1	14	5	21	20	15	7	17	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>									
Not aware	99 ±1	15	6	21	18	16	9 ⁺³	15	±3
Aware	99 ±1	15	5	23	20	17	5 ⁻⁴	15	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>									
Not good support	98 ±1	17	6	19 ⁻⁴	18	16	10	15	±4
Good support	98 ±1	14	6	23	20	15	7	15	±3
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>									
Not good support	98 ±1	17 ⁺⁵	6	19 ⁻⁶	20	15	8	15	±3
Good support	98 ±1	12 ⁻⁵	5	26 ⁺⁷	18	17	8	15	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size}

ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITER DEMOGRAPHICS

Demographics

Q22 – Are you a production recruiter? Yes, no.

Production recruiters were highly represented in the recruiter population – The majority of recruiters (82%) indicated they were production recruiters.

More experienced recruiters were less likely to be production recruiters – Recruiting personnel with six or more years experience as recruiters were less likely to be production recruiters (46%, versus 88% for recruiters with less than six years experience). In contrast, recruiters with less than one year of experience were more likely to be production recruiters (93% versus 79% for recruiters with one or more years of experience).

Active Air Force personnel were more likely to be production recruiters – Across Service Branch and Component, Active Air Force recruiters had the highest percentage of production recruiters (91%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of component and service.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of geographic region, recruiting zone population density, preparedness to market the STP, awareness of STP enhancements, and good MEPS support for administration, interpretation, and marketing.

Table 6.
Q22 -- Are you a production recruiter?

	Percent Respond	Percentages		
		No	Yes	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	98 ±1	18	82	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>				
Army	100 ±1	21 ⁺⁶	79 ⁻⁶	±3
Navy	100 ±0	20	80	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±0	13 ⁻⁷	87 ⁺⁷	±7
Air Force	100 ±0	10 ⁻⁹	90 ⁺⁹	±4
<i>Component</i>				
Active	98 ±1	19	81	±3
Reserve	98 ±1	15	85	±5
<i>Service Component</i>				
Active Army	97 ±1	23 ⁺⁸	77 ⁻⁸	±3
Active Navy	100 ±1	20	80	±7
Active USMC	100 ±0	13 ⁻⁷	87 ⁺⁷	±7
Active USAF	98 ±1	9 ⁻¹⁰	91 ⁺¹⁰	±4
Reserve Army	98 ±2	14	86	±6
Reserve Navy	99 ±3	17	83	±12
Reserve Air Force	99 ±3	13	87	±10
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>				
Less than one year	100 ±1	7 ⁻¹⁴	93 ⁺¹⁴	±6
1 or more years	100 ±1	21 ⁺¹³	79 ⁻¹³	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>				
Less than 6 years	100 ±1	12 ⁻⁴²	88 ⁺⁴²	±3
6 or more years	100 ±0	54 ⁺⁴²	46 ⁻⁴²	±7

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size}
 ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITER DEMOGRAPHICS

Demographics

Q23 – How many NPS contacts did you recruit in the last 12 months?

(This question only applies to production recruiters who answered 'yes' to Question 22.)

Production recruiters achieved 16.5 NPS contacts on average – The majority of recruiters were involved with recruiting NPS contacts (76%). Overall, production recruiters reported recruiting an average of 16.5 NPS contacts in the last 12 months.

Active Air Force and Marine Corps recruited more NPS contacts – Active Air Force and Marine Corps production recruiters reported the highest average of NPS contacts recruited (25.3% and 23%, respectively).

Recruiters with one or more years of experience recruited more NPS contacts – Recruiters who had been in the recruiting duty for one or more years recruited more than those with less than one year of experience. They achieved an average of 18.4 NPS contacts in the last 12 months, compared to 8.5 NPS contacts for recruiters with less than one year of experience.

Negligible differences – Negligible differences were indicated for the demographics of MEPS support for interpretation, preparedness to market the STP, and geographic region.

No differences – No differences in the number of NPS contacts were indicated for the demographics of recruiting zone population density, production recruiter, awareness of STP enhancements, good MEPS support for administration and marketing, and years assigned to duty less than or equal to six.

Table 7.
Q23 -- How many NPS contacts did you recruit in the last 12 months?

	Percent		
	Respond	Mean	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	76 ±2	16.5	±3.0
<i>Branch of Service</i>			
Army	77 ±3	14.4 ^{-4.6}	±3.0
Navy	77 ±6	13.0 ^{-4.0}	±6.0
Marine Corps	74 ±6	23.0 ^{+8.0}	±7.0
Air Force	87 ±3	23.7 ^{+7.7}	±4.0
<i>Component</i>			
Active	75 ±3	17.3 ^{+5.3}	±3.0
Reserve	81 ±4	12.5 ^{-4.5}	±5.0
<i>Service Component</i>			
Active Army	74 ±3	14.8 ^{-3.2}	±3.0
Active Navy	76 ±7	13.7 ^{-3.3}	±7.0
Active USMC	74 ±6	23.0 ^{+8.0}	±7.0
Active USAF	86 ±3	25.3 ^{+9.3}	±4.0
Reserve Army	82 ±5	13.0 ^{-4.0}	±6.0
Reserve Navy	79 ±9	9.6 ^{-7.4}	±12.0
Reserve Air Force	80 ±8	15.4	±10.0
<i>Production recruiter</i>			
Not production	NA	NA	±6.0
Production recruiter	95 ±2	16.5	±3.0
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>			
Not recruit NPS	100 ±0	0.0 ^{-17.0}	±18.0
Recruits NPS	100 ±0	17.1 ^{+17.1}	±3.0
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>			
Less than one year	83 ±5	8.5 ^{-9.5}	±6.0
1 or more years	76 ±2	18.4 ^{+9.4}	±3.0

	Percent Respond	Mean	ME
<i>Geographic region</i>			
Northeast	79 ±5	13.9 ^{-3.1}	±6.0
Mid-Atlantic	77 ±9	18.8	±11.0
Southeast	76 ±5	16.5	±5.0
North Central	78 ±5	17.9	±6.0
South Central	79 ±5	16.8	±6.0
West	78 ±6	16.9	±9.0
Pacific	76 ±5	15.9	±6.0
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>			
Not prepared	78 ±3	15.2 ^{-2.8}	±4.0
Prepared to market	75 ±3	17.7 ^{+2.7}	±4.0
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>			
Not good support	77 ±3	15.7 ^{-2.3}	±3.0
Good support	74 ±4	17.7 ^{+1.7}	±4.0

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size}

NA=Not applicable question. ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question and who reported in question 22 that they were a production recruiters.

RECRUITER DEMOGRAPHICS

Demographics

Q24 – What is your best estimate of the percentage of these contacts that had participated in the ASVAB Student Testing Program?

(This question only applies to production recruiters who answered ‘yes’ to Question 22.)

Two in ten NPS contacts participated in STP – Overall, recruiters estimated that nearly one-fifth (18.6%) of their NPS contact recruits had participated in the STP.

Active Air Force had most participation among NPS contacts – Among the Service Branches, the Active Air Force personnel indicated nearly one-third (32.9%) of their NPS contacts had participated in the STP.

Negligible differences – Negligible differences were found for the demographics of geographic region, awareness of STP enhancements and preparedness to market it, recruiting zone population density, and MEPS support for administration, interpretation, and marketing.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of service component reserve, production recruiter, or years of experience.

Table 8.

Q24 -- What is your best estimate of the percentage of these contacts that had participated in the ASVAB Student Testing Program?

	Percent		
	Respond	Mean	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	69 ±2	18.6	±3.0
<i>Branch of Service</i>			
Army	75 ±3	16.7 ^{-4.3}	±3.0
Navy	67 ±6	17.3	±6.0
Marine Corps	54 ±7	18.9	±7.0
Air Force	85 ±3	31.0 ^{+14.0}	±4.0
<i>Component</i>			
Active	67 ±3	18.6	±3.0
Reserve	79 ±4	18.1	±5.0
<i>Service Component</i>			
Active Army	71 ±3	16.0 ^{-4.0}	±3.0
Active Navy	65 ±7	17.8	±7.0
Active USMC	54 ±7	18.9	±7.0
Active USAF	84 ±3	32.9 ^{+15.9}	±4.0
Reserve Army	80 ±5	18.8	±6.0
Reserve Navy	75 ±9	14.2	±12.0
Reserve Air Force	79 ±8	22.0	±10.0
<i>Production recruiter</i>			
Not production	NA	NA	±6.0
Production recruiter	86 ±2	18.6	±3.0
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>			
Not recruit NPS	90 ±10	5.6 ^{-13.4}	±18.0
Recruits NPS	88 ±2	19.2 ^{+11.2}	±3.0

	Percent Respond	Mean	ME
<i>Geographic region</i>			
Northeast	70 ±5	13.1 ^{-6.9}	±6.0
Mid-Atlantic	69 ±10	13.8 ^{-5.2}	±11.0
Southeast	68 ±5	23.4 ^{+6.4}	±5.0
North Central	73 ±5	15.5 ^{-3.5}	±6.0
South Central	72 ±6	22.8	±6.0
West	69 ±7	26.0 ^{+8.0}	±9.0
Pacific	67 ±6	15.0 ^{-4.0}	±6.0
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>			
Urban	71 ±4	16.5	±5.0
Suburban	68 ±5	12.4 ^{-7.6}	±5.0
Small city/town	72 ±4	19.8	±5.0
Rural	72 ±5	25.7 ^{+8.7}	±5.0
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>			
Not prepared	73 ±3	15.4 ^{-6.6}	±4.0
Prepared to market	65 ±3	22.0 ^{+7.0}	±4.0
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>			
Not aware	70 ±3	16.7 ^{-7.3}	±3.0
Aware of enhancements	67 ±4	23.3 ^{+6.3}	±5.0
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>			
Not good support	72 ±3	14.7 ^{-7.3}	±4.0
Good support	66 ±3	21.2 ^{+6.2}	±3.0
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>			
Not good support	70 ±3	16.0 ^{-7.0}	±3.0
Good support	66 ±4	22.4 ^{+6.4}	±4.0
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>			
Not good support	70 ±3	14.8 ^{-9.2}	±3.0
Good support	67 ±4	24.1 ^{+9.1}	±4.0

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size}

NA=Not applicable question. ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question and who reported in question 22 that they were a production recruiters.

Mission Support

This section examines training toward, and support of, the ASVAB Student Testing Program in terms of the following:

- Areas of training
- Locations of training
- Whether or not training had adequately prepared recruiters to market the STP
- Support for administering and interpreting the STP
- Whether or not the STP is effectively marketed to local schools
- What support for the STP would make recruiters more productive in their jobs

Highlights

- Overall, recruiters indicated they received less training in conducting interpretation sessions (28%) than in other areas of STP support (40% to 42% on areas of marketing, administering, and interpreting the STP or helping student explore careers). However, the lower rating on conducting interpretation sessions does not appear to have been a problem because recruiters ranked more training in conducting an interpretation session lower than three other actions that they thought could make them more effective recruiters. It may also not have been critical for recruiters to have interpretation session training if other supports existed for this aspect of the program (e.g., ESSs or school counselors conducting the session).
- Among the Services, Navy recruiters reported that they received the least training directed toward the STP. Army recruiters' responses suggested that they believed they could be more effective recruiters if they received more program training and support.
- On-the-job training about the program appeared to be the most common. More recruiters said training took place on the job (42%) than other locations. Also, the different branches of the military were inconsistent with each other in terms of where training took place. This could imply that to be effective, training programs may need to be tailored for each Service Branch. It could also imply that there may be ways to standardize training, especially in ways that borrow best practices from each Service.
- Recruiters who were more aware of the STP enhancements indicated they felt more prepared to market the program. This indicates that increasing recruiter knowledge about these enhancements may help to increase the marketing effectiveness overall. Responses from Marine Corps recruiters indicated that they were more ready to market the STP and wanted more marketing support than other branches. Also, Marine Corps recruiters tended to be more positive than other branches in terms of support and marketing.
- Recruiters in general felt that they received more support from the MEPS for administering the STP than interpreting the STP.
- Recruiters who were not prepared to market the program or not aware of the program enhancements believed they would be more productive as recruiters if they received a wide variety of support (e.g., training in administration/interpretation, paired up with a coach/mentor, training in how to help students explore careers).

These items are described and interpreted in more detail on the following pages.

MISSION SUPPORT

ASVAB STP Training

Q1 – In which of the following areas of the ASVAB Student Testing Program have you received training? (Mark all that apply)

Marketing the ASVAB Student Testing Program to schools	Administering the ASVAB Student Test	Interpreting ASVAB Student Test Scores	Conducting an interpretation session	Helping students explore careers	None
40%	42%	41%	28%	42%	29%

Fewer recruiters were trained to conduct interpretation sessions or did not train at all –

The most common areas of training provided to recruiters included administering the STP (42%), helping students explore careers (42%), interpreting scores (41%), and marketing the STP to schools (40%). Relatively fewer recruiters had received training in conducting an interpretation session (28%). However, slightly less than a third had not received training in any area of the STP (29%).

Recruiters aware of the STP enhancements or prepared to market it received far more training –

Recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements and prepared to market it received much more training in all areas (marketing to schools, administering the test, interpreting test scores, conducting an interpretation session, and helping students explore careers) than recruiters who were not aware and not prepared.

Recruiters indicating good MEPS support said they received more training –

Recruiters who indicated they received good support from the MEPS in terms of administration, interpretation, and marketing indicated that they received more training on all five aspects of training. These results were similar to those of recruiters who were aware of the enhancements or prepared to market the program.

Reserves were more likely than Regular duty to receive no training – Reserve personnel were more likely to report receiving no training at all (38% Reserve, 27% Regular).

Service Component Effects –

Active Army recruiters received more training in conducting an interpretation session (36%).

Active Navy personnel reported receiving less training on marketing the program to schools (25%), interpreting test scores (25%), conducting an interpretation session (16%), and helping students explore careers (34%).

Marine Corps recruiters were more likely to report that they had received training in marketing (51%) and less likely to have received no training at all (18%).

Active Air Force recruiters were more likely to have received training in marketing (54%), administering (52%), and interpreting (55%) STP test scores. They were less likely to have received no training at all (17%).

Reserve Navy recruiters reported receiving less training on marketing the program to schools (16%), administering the test (30%), and conducting an interpretation session (17%).

Reserve Air Force personnel reported receiving less training on marketing the program to schools (16%), administering the test (30%), and conducting an interpretation session (13%).

Training received mixed among regions – While no region received consistently more or less training than other regions, isolated differences in training were evident. Recruiters in the North Central region received more training in marketing the STP to schools than other regions (49%). Northeastern recruiters received less training in interpreting scores (33%) and conducting interpretation sessions (18%), but recruiters in the West received more training in conducting interpretation sessions (38%). Recruiters in the Mid-Atlantic region received less training in administering the ASVAB (32%).

Recruiters with more years of experience received more training – Recruiters with one or more years of experience received much more training than recruiters with less than one year of experience in each area except marketing the STP to schools. Also, recruiters with six or more years of experience received more training than recruiters with less than six years of experience in each area except administering the ASVAB.

Non-production recruiters received more training in conducting interpretation sessions – Non-production recruiters received more training than production recruiters in conducting interpretation sessions (38%).

Non-NPS contact recruiters received less training – It was not surprising to see that many recruiters who were not involved with recruiting NPS contacts reported they did not receive training (50%).

Rural recruiters received more training in administering test – Recruiters in rural areas received the most training in administering the ASVAB (51%).

Table 9.

QIA-F -- In which of the following areas of the ASVAB Student Testing Program have you received training? (Mark all that apply).

A – Marketing the ASVAB Student Testing Program to schools

B – Administering the ASVAB Student Test

C – Interpreting ASVAB Student Test Scores

D – Conducting an interpretation session

E – Helping students explore careers

F – None

	Percent Respond	Percentages						
		A	B	C	D	E	F	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	100 ±0	40	42	41	28	42	29	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>								
Army	100 ±0	42	40	44 ⁺⁶	35 ⁺¹⁴	45 ⁺⁶	31	±3
Navy	100 ±0	24 ⁻²⁰	44	27 ⁻¹⁸	16 ⁻¹⁵	34 ⁻¹⁰	36 ⁺⁹	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±0	51 ⁺¹³	45	45	21 ⁻⁹	42	18 ⁻¹⁴	±7
Air Force	100 ±0	47 ⁺⁸	48 ⁺⁶	51 ⁺¹¹	33 ⁺⁵	43	21 ⁻⁹	±4
<i>Component</i>								
Regular	100 ±0	42 ⁺⁹	44 ⁺¹⁰	42	29	43	27 ⁻¹¹	±3
Reserve	100 ±0	33 ⁻⁹	34 ⁻¹⁰	38	26	39	38 ⁺¹¹	±5
<i>Service/Reserve Component</i>								
Active Army	100 ±0	42	40	45 ⁺⁷	36 ⁺¹³	46 ⁺⁷	31	±3
Active Navy	100 ±0	25 ⁻¹⁸	48	25 ⁻²⁰	16 ⁻¹⁵	34 ⁻¹⁰	34	±7
Active USMC	100 ±0	51 ⁺¹³	45	45	21 ⁻⁹	42	18 ⁻¹⁴	±7
Active USAF	100 ±0	54 ⁺¹⁵	52 ⁺¹⁰	55 ⁺¹⁵	37 ⁺⁹	43	17 ⁻¹³	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±0	41	37	38	31	40	35 ⁺⁷	±6
Reserve Navy	100 ±0	16 ⁻²⁵	30 ⁻¹³	37	17 ⁻¹²	34	43 ⁺¹⁴	±12
Reserve Air Force	100 ±0	16 ⁻²⁵	30 ⁻¹³	36	13 ⁻¹⁶	39	42 ⁺¹³	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>								
Not production	100 ±0	45	46	49 ⁺⁹	38 ⁺¹²	48 ⁺⁸	29	±6
Production recruiter	100 ±0	39	42	40 ⁻⁸	26 ⁻¹¹	41	29	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited</i>								
Not recruit NPS	100 ±0	26	37	33	16 ⁻¹²	21 ⁻²¹	50 ⁺²²	±18
Recruits NPS	100 ±0	39	42	40	27	41	28	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>								
Less than one year	100 ±0	34	31 ⁻¹⁴	33 ⁻¹⁰	18 ⁻¹²	34 ⁻¹⁰	33	±6
1 or more years	100 ±0	41	45 ⁺¹⁴	43 ⁺¹⁰	30 ⁺¹¹	44 ⁺¹⁰	28 ⁻⁷	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>								
Less than 6 years	100 ±0	38 ⁻¹¹	42	39 ⁻¹³	26 ⁻¹⁵	40 ⁻¹⁰	29	±3
6 or more years	100 ±0	50 ⁺¹²	48	54 ⁺¹⁵	43 ⁺¹⁷	52 ⁺¹²	27	±7

	Percent Respond	Percentages						
		A	B	C	D	E	F	ME
<i>Geographic region</i>								
Northeast	100 ±0	41	37	33 ⁻¹⁰	18 ⁻¹²	41	26	±6
Mid-Atlantic	100 ±0	32	32 ⁻¹¹	43	30	44	39	±11
Southeast	100 ±0	37	42	39	26	37 ⁻⁶	34 ⁺⁶	±5
North Central	100 ±0	49 ⁺¹¹	48 ⁺⁷	48 ⁺⁸	33	43	22 ⁻⁸	±6
South Central	100 ±0	36	44	39	26	41	30	±6
West	100 ±0	37	43	43	38 ⁺¹¹	43	31	±9
Pacific	100 ±0	41	44	47	32	49 ⁺⁸	24	±6
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>								
Urban	100 ±0	40	41	39	25	40	30	±5
Suburban	100 ±0	42	37	46	31	46	28	±5
Small city/town	100 ±0	36 ⁻⁶	41	39	27	40	30	±5
Rural	100 ±0	43	51 ⁺¹¹	43	33	44	25	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>								
Not prepared	100 ±0	18 ⁻⁴¹	26 ⁻³¹	22 ⁻³⁶	13 ⁻²⁸	22 ⁻³⁷	49 ⁺³⁷	±4
Prepared to market	100 ±0	60 ⁺⁴²	58 ⁺³³	59 ⁺³⁷	42 ⁺²⁹	60 ⁺³⁸	11 ⁻³⁸	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>								
Not aware	100 ±0	34 ⁻²⁰	38 ⁻¹⁵	36 ⁻¹⁸	23 ⁻¹⁷	38 ⁻¹⁴	34 ⁺¹⁷	±3
Aware	100 ±0	56 ⁺²²	55 ⁺¹⁷	56 ⁺²⁰	42 ⁺¹⁹	54 ⁺¹⁷	15 ⁻¹⁹	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>								
Not good support	100 ±0	28 ⁻²⁰	30 ⁻²¹	31 ⁻¹⁸	20 ⁻¹⁴	32 ⁻¹⁶	43 ⁺²⁴	±4
Good support	100 ±0	49 ⁺²¹	51 ⁺²¹	49 ⁺¹⁹	34 ⁺¹⁴	49 ⁺¹⁷	19 ⁻²⁴	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>								
Not good support	100 ±0	33 ⁻¹⁷	36 ⁻¹⁶	32 ⁻²²	22 ⁻¹⁵	34 ⁻¹⁹	38 ⁺²²	±3
Good support	100 ±0	51 ⁺¹⁸	53 ⁺¹⁸	55 ⁺²³	38 ⁺¹⁶	54 ⁺²⁰	15 ⁻²³	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>								
Not good support	100 ±0	35 ⁻¹²	35 ⁻¹⁷	35 ⁻¹⁴	24 ⁻¹⁰	35 ⁻¹⁷	37 ⁺¹⁹	±3
Good support	100 ±0	48 ⁺¹⁴	53 ⁺¹⁸	50 ⁺¹⁵	34 ⁺¹⁰	53 ⁺¹⁹	17 ⁻²⁰	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size}

ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

MISSION SUPPORT

ASVAB STP training location

Q2 – Where have you received training for the ASVAB Student Testing Program?

Recruiter Training School/School House	Recruiting Command	New Recruiter Orientation	MEPS ESS	Non-MEPS ESS	On-the-job, under a supervisor's direction	Self-taught	Other - specify
29%	24%	19%	18%	9%	42%	34%	10%

More recruiters received training on-the-job – The highest percentage of recruiters received training on-the-job (42%), followed by self-teaching (34%).

Recruiters aware of the STP enhancements or prepared to market it trained far more in multiple locations – With the exception of self-teaching, recruiters prepared to market the STP received much more training than recruiters not aware, at every location. On-the-job training differences were not found between recruiters aware of enhancements and those unaware.

Recruiters with good MEPS support received training at diverse locations –The pattern of results among recruiters who indicated they received good support from the MEPS in terms of administration, interpretation, and marketing were similar to those of recruiters who were aware of the enhancements or prepared to market the program. Sources of training among recruiters receiving good MEPS support were better.

- Administration: received more training in school houses, at recruiting commands, from MEPS ESS, and on-the-job.
- Interpretation: received more training in all areas except from non-MEPS ESS and other.
- Marketing: received more training in school houses, at recruiting commands, and on-the-job.

Branches not consistent in location of training received – Marine Corps personnel trained more in school houses (45%) and at recruiting commands (43%), but fewer were self-taught (24%), and none trained with non-MEPS ESS personnel. This was in contrast with Army recruiters, who trained less in school houses (23%) and at recruiting commands (18%), but more with Army ESS (16%). Air Force recruiters trained more with MEPS ESS (28%) and in new recruiter orientations (32%), but less at recruiting commands (13%).

Mid-Atlantic region trained less in some locations – Recruiters in the Mid-Atlantic region trained less in school houses (19%), new recruiter orientations (10%), and on-the-job (30%).

Recruiters with more years of experience trained more with ESS personnel and were more self-taught – Recruiters with six or more years of experience received training more from non-MEPS ESS (19% for six or more years, 7% for less than six years). Also, recruiters with one or more years of experience were more self-taught (37%) than recruiters with less than one year of experience (21%). However, recruiters assigned to duty less than one year

received more training in school houses (37%) than recruiters assigned for more than a year (28%).

Non-production recruiters trained more with non-MEPS ESS – Non-production recruiters received more training than production recruiters from the non-MEPS ESS (18% non production, versus 7% production).

Service Component Effects –

Marine Corps personnel trained more in school houses (45%) and at recruiting commands (43%).

Active Air Force recruiters were trained more by school houses (35%), new recruiter orientation (34%), MEPS ESS (29%), and on-the-job (50%).

Active Army trained more by ESS (18%) and self-taught (39%).

Reserve Army trained less in school houses (20%).

Reserve Air Force trained less at recruiting commands (14%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of recruiting NPS contacts and recruiting zone population density.

Table 10.

Q2A-H -- Where have you received training for the ASVAB Student Testing Program?

(Mark all that apply)

- A – Recruiter Training School/School House**
- B – Recruiting Command**
- C – New Recruiter Orientation**
- D – MEPS ESS**
- E – Non-MEPS ESS**
- F – On-the-job, under a supervisor’s direction**
- G – Self-taught**
- H – Other**

	Percent Respond	Percentages								
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	100 ±0	29	24	19	18	9	42	34	10	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>										
Army	100 ±0	23 ⁻¹²	18 ⁻¹²	17 ⁻⁵	17	16 ⁺¹⁴	42	38 ⁺⁸	11	±3
Navy	100 ±0	29	26	17	15	3 ⁻⁸	45	34	9	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±0	45 ⁺¹⁹	43 ⁺²⁴	24	17	0 ⁻¹¹	38	24 ⁻¹²	7	±7
Air Force	100 ±0	34 ⁺⁵	13 ⁻¹²	32 ⁺¹⁴	28 ⁺¹¹	1 ⁻⁹	48 ⁺⁶	31	10	±4
<i>Component</i>										
Regular	100 ±0	31 ⁺¹⁰	25 ⁺⁵	20	18	9	43 ⁺⁶	33	9 ⁻⁷	±3
Reserve	100 ±0	21 ⁻¹⁰	20 ⁻⁵	16	17	8	37 ⁻⁶	37	16 ⁺⁷	±5
<i>Service/Reserve Component</i>										
Active Army	100 ±0	24 ⁻⁹	17 ⁻¹¹	17	17	18 ⁺¹⁵	43	39 ⁺⁹	10	±3
Active Navy	100 ±0	30	27	17	15	3 ⁻⁷	47	32	7	±7
Active USMC	100 ±0	45 ⁺¹⁹	43 ⁺²⁴	24	17	0 ⁻¹¹	38	24 ⁻¹²	7	±7
Active USAF	100 ±0	35 ⁺⁶	13 ⁻¹²	34 ⁺¹⁵	29 ⁺¹²	1 ⁻⁹	50 ⁺⁸	31	9	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±0	20 ⁻¹⁰	18 ⁻⁶	16	17	10	37	37	17 ⁺⁸	±6
Reserve Navy	100 ±0	22	26	14	13	4 ⁻⁵	37	39	13	±12
Reserve Air Force	100 ±0	30	14 ⁻¹⁰	24	23	1 ⁻⁸	34	31	11	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>										
Not production	100 ±0	25	29	17	22	18 ⁺¹¹	42	39	9	±6
Production	100 ±0	30 ⁺⁶	23	20	17	7 ⁻¹¹	43	33	10	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>										
Less than one year	100 ±0	37 ⁺¹⁰	21	26 ⁺⁸	14	3 ⁻⁸	36 ⁻⁸	21 ⁻¹⁶	9	±6
1 or more years	100 ±0	28 ⁻⁷	24	18 ⁻⁷	19 ⁺⁶	10 ⁺⁶	44 ⁺⁸	37 ⁺¹⁵	9	±3

	Percent	Percentages								
	Respond	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	ME
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>										
Less than 6 years	100 ±0	30	23	20	17 ⁻⁶	7 ⁻¹²	42	33	9	±3
6 or more years	100 ±0	25	29	15 ⁻⁵	25 ⁺⁹	19 ⁺¹¹	45	41 ⁺⁸	10	±7
<i>Geographic region</i>										
Northeast	100 ±0	33	22	22	19	7	39	31	11	±6
Mid-Atlantic	100 ±0	19 ⁻¹¹	25	10 ⁻¹⁰	20	6	30 ⁻¹³	40	14	±11
Southeast	100 ±0	30	20	18	18	8	40	35	10	±5
North Central	100 ±0	31	28	21	15	15 ⁺⁷	48	33	7 ⁻³	±6
South Central	100 ±0	30	21	21	14	5 ⁻⁵	49 ⁺⁸	34	8	±6
West	100 ±0	27	28	21	19	7	44	34	10	±9
Pacific	100 ±0	28	27	18	23	12	39	35	9	±6
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>										
Not prepared	100 ±0	19 ⁻¹⁹	10 ⁻²⁶	11 ⁻¹⁶	8 ⁻¹⁸	4 ⁻¹⁰	28 ⁻²⁶	37 ⁺⁶	16 ⁺¹²	±4
Prepared	100 ±0	39 ⁺²¹	36 ⁺²⁶	28 ⁺¹⁷	26 ⁺¹⁸	14 ⁺¹⁰	56 ⁺²⁸	31 ⁻⁶	4 ⁻¹²	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>										
Not aware	100 ±0	26 ⁻¹⁰	19 ⁻¹⁵	17 ⁻⁹	15 ⁻⁹	7 ⁻⁸	41 ⁻⁶	36 ⁺⁷	11 ⁺⁶	±3
Aware	100 ±0	37 ⁺¹¹	36 ⁺¹⁷	27 ⁺¹⁰	25 ⁺¹⁰	15 ⁺⁸	47	29 ⁻⁷	5 ⁻⁶	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>										
Not good support	100 ±0	24 ⁻⁹	18 ⁻¹⁰	15 ⁻⁷	9 ⁻¹⁵	6 ⁻⁵	34 ⁻¹⁴	36	15 ⁺⁹	±4
Good support	100 ±0	33 ⁺¹⁰	28 ⁺¹¹	22 ⁺⁷	24 ⁺¹⁵	12 ⁺⁶	48 ⁺¹⁴	32	6 ⁻⁹	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>										
Not good support	100 ±0	23 ⁻¹⁵	16 ⁻¹⁸	15 ⁻¹¹	11 ⁻¹⁶	7 ⁻⁵	39 ⁻⁹	38 ⁺¹⁰	13 ⁺⁸	±3
Good support	100 ±0	38 ⁺¹⁵	34 ⁺¹⁸	26 ⁺¹¹	27 ⁺¹⁶	12 ⁺⁵	48 ⁺¹⁰	28 ⁻¹⁰	5 ⁻⁷	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>										
Not good support	100 ±0	25 ⁻⁹	19 ⁻¹¹	16 ⁻⁸	14 ⁻⁸	8 ⁻³	38 ⁻¹⁰	37 ⁺⁷	12 ⁺⁶	±3
Good support	100 ±0	35 ⁺¹⁰	30 ⁺¹¹	25 ⁺⁹	23 ⁺⁹	11 ⁺³	49 ⁺¹²	30 ⁻⁷	6 ⁻⁶	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size}
ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

Training to market the Program

Q3 – Has the training you received adequately prepared you to market the ASVAB Student Testing Program? Yes, no.

No compelling difference overall – Recruiters were split evenly about being adequately prepared to market the program (53% yes, 47% no).

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements were far more adequately prepared to market – Recruiters aware of STP enhancements were more likely to say they were adequately prepared to market the program (76% aware, versus 45% not aware).

Recruiters with good MEPS support were far more adequately prepared to market – Recruiters who indicated they received good support from the MEPS in terms of administration, interpretation, and marketing reported a much higher rate of being prepared to market the STP.

- Administration: 65% with good support, versus 35% without good support
- Interpretation: 73% with good support, versus 39% without good support
- Marketing: 70% with good support, versus 41% without good support

Recruiters who recruited NPS contacts were much better prepared to market – Among production recruiters, recruiters who were involved with recruiting NPS contacts were more likely to say they were adequately prepared to market the program (53%) than non-NPS contact recruiters (32%).

Service Component Effects –

Active Marine Corps and Air Force were more likely to say they were adequately prepared to market the program (67% and 62%, respectively).

Reserve Air Force recruiters were least likely to say they were adequately prepared (39%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of region and years assigned to duty less than, or greater than, one.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of production recruiter, recruiting zone population density, and years assigned to duty less than, or greater than, six.

Table 11.
Q3 -- Has the training you received adequately prepared you to market the ASVAB Student Testing Program?

	Percent Respond	Percentages		
		No	Yes	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	98 ±1	47	53	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>				
Army	99 ±1	50 ⁺⁶	50 ⁻⁶	±3
Navy	98 ±2	53	47	±6
Marine Corps	98 ±2	33 ⁻¹⁷	67 ⁺¹⁷	±7
Air Force	98 ±1	42 ⁻⁵	58 ⁺⁵	±4
<i>Component</i>				
Regular	99 ±1	46 ⁻⁸	54 ⁺⁸	±3
Reserve	98 ±2	54 ⁺⁸	46 ⁻⁸	±5
<i>Service/Reserve Component</i>				
Active Army	99 ±1	49	51	±3
Active Navy	98 ±2	54	46	±7
Active USMC	98 ±2	33 ⁻¹⁷	67 ⁺¹⁷	±7
Active USAF	98 ±1	38 ⁻¹⁰	62 ⁺¹⁰	±4
Reserve Army	99 ±1	55 ⁺⁹	45 ⁻⁹	±6
Reserve Navy	95 ±6	46	54	±12
Reserve Air Force	97 ±3	61 ⁺¹⁴	39 ⁻¹⁴	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>				
Not production	99 ±1	42	58	±6
Production recruiter	98 ±1	48	52	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited</i>				
Not recruit NPS	95 ±6	68 ⁺²²	32 ⁻²²	±18
Recruits NPS	99 ±1	47	53	±3
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>				
Not aware	99 ±1	55 ⁺²⁸	45 ⁻²⁸	±3
Aware of enhancements	99 ±2	24 ⁻³¹	76 ⁺³¹	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>				
Not good support	98 ±1	65 ⁺³⁰	35 ⁻³⁰	±4
Good support	99 ±1	35 ⁻³⁰	65 ⁺³⁰	±3

	Percent Respond	Percentages		
		No	Yes	ME
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>				
Not good support	99 ±1	61 ⁺³⁴	39 ⁻³⁴	±3
Good support	99 ±1	27 ⁻³⁴	73 ⁺³⁴	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>				
Not good support	99 ±1	59 ⁺²⁹	41 ⁻²⁹	±3
Good support	99 ±1	30 ⁻²⁹	70 ⁺²⁹	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size}

ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

MISSION SUPPORT

Support for administering and interpreting the STP

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Q4A – I receive good support from the MEPS for administering the ASVAB Student Test (e.g., ESS arranges the test administration). Agree – Disagree scale.

Q4B – I received good support from the MEPS for interpreting the ASVAB Student Test (e.g., ESS conducts the interpretation session). Agree – Disagree scale.

Most received good support for administering, fewer for interpreting – More than half agreed or strongly agreed that they received good support from the MEPS for administering the ASVAB (59%). Fewer agreed or strongly agreed that they received this support for interpreting the test (41%).

Recruiters aware of the STP enhancements and prepared to market it were more positive about the support they received from the MEPS – Recruiters aware of STP enhancements were more positive than recruiters not aware of enhancements.

- Good support for administering: 78% aware, versus 52% not aware.
- Good support for interpreting: 66% aware, versus 31% not aware.

This pattern of results was the same for recruiters who were prepared to market the STP.

- Good support for administering: 73% prepared, versus 44% not prepared.
- Good support for interpreting: 57% prepared, versus 23% not prepared.

Recruiters with good MEPS support in one action had good support in others – The percent of recruiters reporting good MEPS support for administration was high for recruiters who also reported good MEPS support for interpretation (91%) and marketing (80%). The percent of recruiters reporting good MEPS support for interpretation was also high for recruiters who reported good MEPS support for administration (62%) and marketing (63%).

NPS recruiters reported higher support for administration – Recruiters of NPS recruits reported much higher levels of support (59%) for administration than non-NPS recruiters (39%).

Service Component Effects –

Marine Corps and Air Force tended to be more positive about receiving good support from MEPS for both administering and interpreting the test.

- Good support for administering: 67% and 66%, respectively.
- Good support for interpreting: 53% and 45%, respectively.

Reserve Navy and Air Force personnel tended to be more neutral on this issue.

- Good support for administering: 44% and 49%, respectively.

Small differences – Small differences were found for the demographics of recruiting zone population density and one or more years of experience for both administration and interpretation support from the MEPS.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of geographic region, production recruiter, and six or more years of experience for both administration and interpretation support from the MEPS.

Table 12.**Q4A,B -- I receive good support from the MEPS for:***A – I receive good support from the MEPS for administering the ASVAB Student Test (e.g., ESS arranges the test administration). Agree – Disagree scale.**B – I received good support from the MEPS for interpreting the ASVAB Student Test (e.g., ESS conducts the interpretation session). Agree – Disagree scale.*

	Percent Reporting					
	A - Support For Administering			B - Support For Interpreting		
	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	ME	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	27	59	±3	36	41	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>						
Army	29	57	±3	40 ⁺⁸	36 ⁻⁹	±3
Navy	28	56	±6	32	39	±6
Marine Corps	20 ⁻⁸	67 ⁺¹⁰	±7	29 ⁻⁹	53 ⁺¹⁵	±7
Air Force	28	61	±4	38	44	±4
<i>Component</i>						
Regular	25 ⁻¹¹	61 ⁺¹³	±3	35 ⁻⁸	42 ⁺⁹	±3
Reserve	36 ⁺¹¹	48 ⁻¹³	±5	43 ⁺⁸	33 ⁻⁹	±5
<i>Service/Reserve Component</i>						
Active Army	28	58	±3	41 ⁺⁸	36 ⁻⁷	±4
Active Navy	25	59	±7	29	37	±7
Active USMC	20 ⁻⁹	67 ⁺¹⁰	±7	29	53 ⁺¹⁶	±8
Active USAF	24	66 ⁺⁸	±4	35	47 ⁺⁸	±4
Reserve Army	32	52 ⁻⁸	±6	40	32 ⁻⁹	±5
Reserve Navy	44 ⁺¹⁸	43 ⁻¹⁶	±12	44	35	±12
Reserve Air Force	49 ⁺²²	35 ⁻²⁴	±10	45	36	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>						
Not production	26	63	±6	37	43	±6
Production recruiter	27	58	±3	36	40	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited</i>						
Not recruit NPS	45 ⁺¹⁹	39 ⁻²⁰	±18	50	27	±18
Recruits NPS	26	59	±3	35	40	±3

	Percent Reporting					
	A - Support For Administering			B - Support For Interpreting		
	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	ME	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	ME
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>						
Urban	33 ⁺⁹	53 ⁻⁸	±5	41 ⁺⁷	37	±5
Suburban	27	58	±5	36	39	±5
Small city/town	25	63	±5	34	43	±5
Rural	20 ⁻⁹	65 ⁺⁸	±5	32	45	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>						
Not prepared	34 ⁺¹³	44 ⁻²⁸	±4	42 ⁺¹¹	23 ⁻³³	±4
Prepared to market	20 ⁻¹⁴	73 ⁺²⁹	±4	31 ⁻¹¹	57 ⁺³⁴	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>						
Not aware	32 ⁺¹⁷	52 ⁻²⁵	±3	41 ⁺¹⁷	31 ⁻³³	±3
Aware of enhancements	15 ⁻¹⁶	78 ⁺²⁶	±5	23 ⁻¹⁸	66 ⁺³⁵	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>						
Not good support				52 ⁺²⁶	9 ⁻⁵³	±4
Good support				25 ⁻²⁶	62 ⁺⁵²	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>						
Not good support	40 ⁺³²	37 ⁻⁵³	±3			
Good support	8 ⁻³²	91 ⁺⁵⁴	±4			
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>						
Not good support	37 ⁺²⁴	44 ⁻³⁵	±3	44 ⁺¹⁹	25 ⁻³⁸	±3
Good support	13 ⁻²⁴	80 ⁺³⁶	±4	25 ⁻¹⁹	63 ⁺³⁸	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size}

ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

MISSION SUPPORT

Effective marketing of the STP to local schools

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Q4C – The ASVAB Student Testing Program is effectively marketed to the schools in my area.
Agree – Disagree scale.

Less than half of recruiters agreed that the STP was effectively marketed to local schools – Only 42% of recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that the STP was effectively marketed to schools in their area. Remaining responses were evenly split with 29% of recruiters disagreeing or strongly disagreeing, and 29% neither agreeing nor disagreeing.

Recruiters aware of the STP enhancements or prepared to market it more positive – The majority of recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements tended to agree or strongly agree that the STP was effectively marketed (60% aware, versus 35% not aware). Recruiters who felt they were prepared to market the STP also agreed or strongly agreed more (55% prepared, versus 27% not prepared).

Navy Reserve more neutral – Navy Reserves tended to express more “neutral” opinions about the STP being effectively marketed to schools in their area (50%).

Recruiters receiving good MEPS support in one area also received good support in other areas – The percent of recruiters reporting good MEPS support for marketing was high for recruiters who also reported good MEPS support for interpretation (91%) and marketing (80%).

Southeast more positive, Northeast less positive – Recruiters from the Southeastern region were more likely to agree or strongly agree (50%) that the STP was effectively marketed, and recruiters from the Northeast were less likely (33%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for service, component, one or more years of experience, and recruiting zone population density.

No differences – No differences were found for the demographics of production recruiter and years assigned to duty less than or greater than six.

Table 13.

*Q4C -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
The ASVAB Student Testing Program is effectively marketed to the schools in my area.*

	Percent	Percentages			ME
	Respond	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree/ Strongly Agree	
<i>Full Sample</i>	99 ±1	29	29	42	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	99 ±1	29	31	40	±3
Navy	98 ±2	32	31	38	±6
Marine Corps	99 ±2	27	23	49 ⁺⁹	±7
Air Force	99 ±1	24 ⁻⁶	27	48 ⁺⁷	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Regular	99 ±1	30	28 ⁻⁹	43 ⁺⁷	±3
Reserve	98 ±2	27	37 ⁺⁹	36 ⁻⁷	±5
<i>Service/Reserve Component</i>					
Active Army	99 ±1	29	31	40	±3
Active Navy	99 ±1	34	26	40	±7
Active USMC	99 ±2	27	23	49 ⁺⁹	±7
Active USAF	99 ±1	26	25	50 ⁺⁹	±4
Reserve Army	99 ±1	30	33	37	±6
Reserve Navy	96 ±5	21	50 ⁺²²	29 ⁻¹³	±12
Reserve Air Force	96 ±3	19 ⁻¹⁰	38	44	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	99 ±1	27	28	44	±6
Production recruiter	99 ±1	29	29	41	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited</i>					
Not recruit NPS	99 ±2	34	49 ⁺²¹	17 ⁻²⁶	±18
Recruits NPS	99 ±1	29	28	43	±3

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree/ Strongly Agree	
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	100 ±1	32	35	33 ⁻¹⁰	±6
Mid-Atlantic	98 ±3	29	32	39	±11
Southeast	99 ±1	26	24 ⁻⁶	50 ⁺¹⁰	±5
North Central	99 ±1	27	34	39	±6
South Central	99 ±2	29	25	46	±6
West	99 ±2	32	29	39	±9
Pacific	98 ±2	30	28	41	±6
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	99 ±1	39 ⁺¹⁸	34 ⁺¹⁰	27 ⁻²⁸	±4
Prepared to market	99 ±1	21 ⁻¹⁷	24 ⁻¹⁰	55 ⁺²⁸	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	99 ±1	34 ⁺¹⁷	31 ⁺⁷	35 ⁻²⁴	±3
Aware of enhancements	98 ±2	17 ⁻¹⁷	23 ⁻⁸	60 ⁺²⁵	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	42 ⁺²²	37 ⁺¹⁴	21 ⁻³⁶	±4
Good support	100 ±1	20 ⁻²²	23 ⁻¹⁴	57 ⁺³⁶	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	38 ⁺²²	35 ⁺¹⁵	26 ⁻³⁹	±3
Good support	100 ±1	16 ⁻²²	20 ⁻¹⁵	65 ⁺³⁹	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size}
ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

MISSION SUPPORT

Support that could increase recruiting productivity

Q5A-H – What types of support for the ASVAB Student Testing Program do you think would make you more productive as a recruiter? (Mark all that apply)

	Overall Percent Marked
A. More marketing support	58
B. More ASVAB test administration support from ESS	22
C. Pair me up with a coach/mentor specific to the ASVAB Student Testing Program	23
D. More training in marketing the ASVAB Student Testing Program to schools	45
E. More training in administering the ASVAB Student Test	20
F. More training in interpreting ASVAB Student Test Scores	42
G. More training in conducting an interpretation session	38
H. More training in helping students explore careers	34

Most recruiters thought more marketing support would make them more productive –

The majority of recruiters thought more marketing support would make them more productive as a recruiter (58%). The next most frequently marked response was more training in marketing (45%).

Service Component Effects –

More Active Army recruiters favored additional training in conducting an interpretation session (44%).

Fewer Marine Corps recruiters favored additional training in interpreting scores (29%), conducting an interpretation session (25%), helping students explore careers (21%), and pair me up with a coach/mentor (14%).

Fewer Active Air Force recruiters saw the benefit of more marketing support (46%).

More Reserve Army recruiters saw the benefit of additional training in helping students explore careers (43%).

More Navy Reserve recruiters saw the benefit of additional test administration support (38%). However, fewer saw the benefit of more training in interpreting test scores (25%) or training in conducting an interpretation session (25%).

Fewer Air Force Reserves recruiters saw the benefit of more marketing support (38%) or training in marketing (24%), interpreting test scores (24%), conducting interpretation sessions (24%), and helping students explore careers (23%).

Recruiters not prepared to market the STP and not aware of its enhancements marked responses more frequently – Recruiters not prepared to market the STP chose each option more frequently than prepared recruiters, except more marketing support and more test administration support from ESSs:

- More training in interpreting (46% not aware, 33% aware).
- More training in conducting an interpretation session (42% not aware, 29% aware).
- More training in helping students explore careers (37% not aware, 27% aware).

Recruiters who saw themselves as not receiving good MEPS support would have liked more training or support in the related areas – Recruiters who indicated a lack of administration support from the MEPS desired to be paired with a coach/mentor specific to the STP more (29%) and saw training in administering the STP (26%) as a way to be more productive.

Recruiters who indicated a lack of MEPS support for interpretation saw more training in interpreting the ASVAB test scores (50%), conducting an interpretation session (45%), and helping students explore careers (39%) as ways to improve their productivity.

Likewise, recruiters who indicated a lack of MEPS support in marketing the program saw more marketing support (63%) and more training in marketing the STP to schools (52%) as ways to improve their productivity.

Recruiters with more experience thought more administration support would help; less experienced wanted test administration training – Recruiters with less than one year of experience thought that training in administering the STP would benefit them (29% less than one year, versus 18% more than one year). Recruiters with more than six years of experience thought administration support from ESSs would benefit them (31% six or more years, versus 21% less than six years).

Small differences – Small differences were found for the demographics of production recruiter, recruiting zone population density, and geographic region.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of service component reserve and NPS contact recruiter.

Table 14.

Q5A-H -- What types of support for the ASVAB Student Testing Program do you think would make you more productive as a recruiter? (Mark all that apply)

- A – More marketing support**
- B – More ASVAB test administration support from ESS**
- C – Pair me up with a coach/mentor specific to the ASVAB Student Testing Program**
- D – More training in marketing the ASVAB Student Testing Program to schools**
- E – More training in administering the ASVAB Student Test**
- F – More training in interpreting ASVAB Student Test Scores**
- G – More training in conducting an interpretation session**
- H – More training in helping students explore careers**

	Percent	Percentages								
	Respond	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	100 ±0	58	22	23	45	20	42	38	34	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>										
Army	100 ±0	59	25 ⁺⁶	28 ⁺⁹	49 ⁺⁷	22 ⁺⁴	47 ⁺¹⁰	44 ⁺¹¹	40 ⁺¹²	±3
Navy	100 ±0	54	24	21	44	21	43	38	34	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±0	65 ⁺⁹	15 ⁻⁹	14 ⁻¹¹	38 ⁻⁹	14 ⁻⁷	29 ⁻¹⁶	25 ⁻¹⁶	21 ⁻¹⁶	±7
Air Force	100 ±0	45 ⁻¹⁴	17 ⁻⁶	18 ⁻⁶	39 ⁻⁷	14 ⁻⁷	38	36	27 ⁻⁸	±4
<i>Component</i>										
Active	100 ±0	59 ⁺⁹	21 ⁻⁸	23	46	20	43	38	33	±3
Reserve	100 ±0	50 ⁻⁹	29 ⁺⁸	24	41	22	39	38	37	±5
<i>Service Component</i>										
Active Army	100 ±0	61	25	28 ⁺⁸	50 ⁺⁸	23 ⁺⁵	47 ⁺⁹	44 ⁺¹⁰	39 ⁺⁹	±3
Active Navy	100 ±0	55	21	21	46	21	46	39	34	±7
Active USMC	100 ±0	65 ⁺⁹	15 ⁻⁹	14 ⁻¹¹	38	14 ⁻⁷	29 ⁻¹⁶	25 ⁻¹⁶	21 ⁻¹⁶	±7
Active USAF	100 ±0	46 ⁻¹³	16 ⁻⁷	19	41	13 ⁻⁸	40	37	27 ⁻⁷	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±0	52	27	27	45	23	45	44	43 ⁺¹⁰	±6
Reserve Navy	100 ±0	50	38 ⁺¹⁶	21	37	22	25 ⁻¹⁸	25 ⁻¹⁴	27	±12
Reserve Air Force	100 ±0	38 ⁻²⁰	21	15 ⁻⁸	24 ⁻²²	19	24 ⁻¹⁸	24 ⁻¹⁴	23 ⁻¹¹	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>										
Not production	100 ±0	58	26	22	50	19	44	40	37	±6
Production recruiter	100 ±0	58	22	23	44 ⁻⁷	20	42	38	33	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>										
Less than one year	100 ±0	52	17 ⁻⁷	28	45	29 ⁺¹¹	44	37	30	±6
1 or more years	100 ±0	59 ⁺⁷	24 ⁺⁷	22	45	18 ⁻¹¹	42	39	35	±3

	Percent	Percentages								
	Respond	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	ME
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>										
Less than 6 years	100 ±0	58	21 ⁻⁸	23	45	20	42	38	34	±3
6 or more years	100 ±0	59	31 ⁺¹⁰	22	46	18	41	39	36	±7
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>										
Urban	100 ±0	53 ⁻⁷	27 ⁺⁶	26	46	21	41	39	34	±5
Suburban	100 ±0	61	22	24	48	22	39	39	33	±5
Small city/town	100 ±0	58	19	20	42	18	43	34	31	±5
Rural	100 ±0	62	21	22	47	18	46	44 ⁺⁷	41 ⁺⁹	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>										
Not prepared	100 ±0	55	25 ⁺⁵	32 ⁺¹⁶	57 ⁺²¹	29 ⁺¹⁷	55 ⁺²⁵	48 ⁺¹⁸	44 ⁺¹⁹	±4
Prepared to market	100 ±0	60	21	16 ⁻¹⁵	36 ⁻¹⁹	12 ⁻¹⁶	30 ⁻²⁵	30 ⁻¹⁷	25 ⁻¹⁸	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>										
Not aware	100 ±0	58	22	24	47 ⁺⁶	20	46 ⁺¹³	42 ⁺¹³	37 ⁺¹⁰	±3
Aware of enhancements	100 ±0	59	24	20 ⁻⁴	40 ⁻⁷	19	33 ⁻¹²	29 ⁻¹³	27 ⁻⁹	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>										
Not good support	100 ±0	57	27 ⁺⁸	29 ⁺¹⁰	49 ⁺⁶	26 ⁺¹⁰	46 ⁺⁷	40	36	±4
Good support	100 ±0	59	19 ⁻⁸	20 ⁻⁸	43	16 ⁻¹⁰	40	38	33	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>										
Not good support	100 ±0	58	25 ⁺⁷	27 ⁺⁹	49 ⁺⁹	24 ⁺⁹	50 ⁺²⁰	45 ⁺¹⁶	39 ⁺¹²	±3
Good support	100 ±0	58	18 ⁻⁷	19 ⁻⁷	41 ⁻⁷	15 ⁻⁸	31 ⁻¹⁸	29 ⁻¹⁶	27 ⁻¹¹	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>										
Not good support	100 ±0	63 ⁺¹³	25 ⁺⁶	26 ⁺⁶	52 ⁺¹⁵	22	45 ⁺⁷	41 ⁺⁶	36	±3
Good support	100 ±0	50 ⁻¹³	19 ⁻⁶	20 ⁻⁶	37 ⁻¹⁴	18	39	35	31	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size}
ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

Recruiting Process

This section focuses on the perceived usefulness and effectiveness of the ASVAB Student Testing Program as a recruiting tool, as well as the importance of various lead sources.

Overall, responses in this section consistently indicated that most recruiters saw the STP as a valuable part of the recruiting process (see Table 15). About two-thirds of recruiters considered the STP to be an effective recruiting tool (64%) and considered the time they spent on STP to be worth the recruiting payoff (62%). A majority also agreed the STP made their job easier (60%).

Nearly three-quarters (73%) said that the program was helpful to their recruiting efforts within the high-school population. About half agreed that the program increased their access to schools and that their recruiting efforts would suffer without the program (53% for both).

Table 15.
Question 12A-G Overall -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Percent Strongly agree, Agree
H. Overall, I believe the ASVAB STP is helpful to my recruiting efforts within the high school population.	73
A. The ASVAB STP is a valuable source of leads for me.	72
D. The ASVAB STP is an effective recruiting tool for me.	64
G. Considering everything, I feel that the time I spend on the ASVAB STP is worth the recruiting payoff.	62
F. The ASVAB STP makes my recruiting job easier.	60
E. If the ASVAB STP were discontinued, my recruiting efforts would suffer.	53
C. The ASVAB STP increases my access to schools.	53
B. The ASVAB STP provides more leads than I would have gotten otherwise.	52

Recruiters saw the STP as an important source of leads. Out of ten lead sources, the STP fell third in importance as a source of recruiting leads (see Table 16).

- The top three included referrals from applicants (84%), high school lists/student directories (77%), and the STP (69%).
- Five lead sources fell between 50% and 60%: local advertising, recruiter assistance, national leads, recruiting station walk-ins, and community colleges.
- The bottom two lead sources were local merchants/community contacts (44%) and 4-year colleges/universities (33%).

Table 16.

Q7A-H Overall -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions?

	Percent High Importance
C. Referrals from applicants	84
B. High School lists/student directories	77
A. ASVAB Student Testing Program	69
D. Local advertising	58
I. Recruiter assistance (HRAP, HARP, RAP, PRASP, Boot Leave, etc.)	55
E. National leads (e.g., direct mail-outs, 800 number, internet)	53
J. Recruiting station walk	51
F. Community colleges	50
H. Local merchants/community contacts	44
G. 4-year colleges/universities	33

Additional questions addressed the issue of the value recruiters placed on the program in terms of generating leads.

- A majority of recruiters said that the STP increased their qualified leads “somewhat” or “significantly” over both the short term (12 months or less) and long term (1 to 2 years).
- Most said the program was a valuable source of leads (72%), and about half (52%) said that the program provided more leads than they would have gotten otherwise.

Responses indicated recruiters saw the STP and the testing process as tools through which they could connect with potential student recruits. A majority (71%) indicated they regularly talked with potential recruits about the benefits of the STP. The same percentage (71%) indicated that the presence of uniformed personnel in the testing process (proctoring) helped to establish a connection with students that could be useful later in the recruiting process.

While recruiters tended to see the primary role of the STP as supporting the recruiting process, they did acknowledge that it played a role in promoting career exploration and continuing education among students (see Table 17).

- Most indicated the primary role of the STP was to educate students about military careers (64%) and generate recruiting leads (65%).
- Fewer indicated that the primary role was to promote student career exploration (55%) or to promote continuing education after high school (44%).

Table 17.

Q8A-F Overall -- Please indicate whether you consider each of the following to be a primary, secondary, or peripheral role of the ASVAB Student Testing Program.

	Percent Primary
A. To generate recruiting leads	65
F. To educate students about military careers	64
D. To encourage students to discover their interests and skills	64
E. To promote continuing education after high school	44
C. To help students view the military positively	59
B. To promote student career exploration	55

RECRUITING PROCESS

Make up of recruiters in terms of NPS contacts

Q6 – In your current assignment, do you recruit Non Prior Service (NPS) contacts? Yes, no.

Nearly all recruiters recruited NPS contacts – Most recruiters (94%) recruited NPS contacts in their current assignment; only 6% did not.

Fewer Air Force Reserves and Navy Reserves recruited NPS – Air Force Reserves and Navy Reserves were least likely to recruit NPS contacts, although the majority of their recruits were still NPS (76% Air Force Reserves, 81% Navy Reserves).

Production recruiters recruited NPS contacts more – More production recruiters recruited NPS contacts (96%) than non-production recruiters (82%).

Recruiters with less than six years of experience recruited NPS more – Recruiters assigned to their recruiting duty for less than six years recruited more NPS contacts (96%) than recruiters assigned for more than six years (83%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of service component.

Negligible differences – Negligible differences were indicated for the demographics of geographic region, awareness of STP enhancements, and MEPS support for interpretation and marketing. There was also a negligible difference between recruiters with less than one year of experience and recruiters with one or more years of experience.

No differences – No differences were found among groups for the demographics of recruiter population density, MEPS support for administration, and preparedness to market the STP.

Table 18.**Q6 -- In your current assignment, do you recruit Non Prior Service (NPS) contacts?**

	Percent Respond	Percentages		
		No	Yes	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	100 ±1	6	94	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>				
Army	100 ±1	6	94	±3
Navy	99 ±1	8	92	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±1	2 ⁻⁵	98 ⁺⁵	±7
Air Force	100 ±0	14 ⁺⁸	86 ⁻⁸	±4
<i>Component</i>				
Regular	100 ±1	5 ⁻⁶	95 ⁺⁶	±3
Reserve	100 ±0	11 ⁺⁶	89 ⁻⁶	±5
<i>Service/Reserve Component</i>				
Active Army	100 ±1	5	95	±3
Active Navy	99 ±1	6	94	±7
Active USMC	100 ±1	2 ⁻⁵	98 ⁺⁵	±7
Active USAF	100 ±0	12 ⁺⁶	88 ⁻⁶	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±0	7	93	±6
Reserve Navy	100 ±0	19 ⁺¹³	81 ⁻¹³	±12
Reserve Air Force	100 ±0	24 ⁺¹⁸	76 ⁻¹⁸	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>				
Not production	99 ±1	18 ⁺¹⁴	82 ⁻¹⁴	±6
Production recruiter	100 ±1	4 ⁻¹³	96 ⁺¹³	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>				
Less than 6 years	100 ±1	4 ⁻¹³	96 ⁺¹³	±3
6 or more years	99 ±1	17 ⁺¹³	83 ⁻¹³	±7

Notes: All other contrast at $p < .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size}

ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Importance of the STP as a lead source

How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions?

High importance, Medium importance, Low importance.

Q7A – ASVAB Student Testing Program

Over two-thirds thought the STP had high importance – Over two-thirds (69%) of recruiters thought that the STP had high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it third out of ten lead sources listed.

Air Force Reserves viewed the STP as having lower importance for achieving recruiting goals – Across Service Branch and Component, Air Force Reserves tended to view the STP as having low or medium importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals (57%).

Recruiters with good MEPS support found the STP more important – Recruiters who reported that they received good MEPS support in terms of administration, interpretation, and marketing were more likely to rate the STP higher in importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals.

- Administration: 73% with good support, versus 62% without good support.
- Interpretation: 76% with good support, versus 64% without good support.
- Marketing: 76% with good support, versus 64% without good support.

Recruiters aware of enhancements found the STP more important – Recruiters who were aware of the STP enhancements tended to rate the STP higher in importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals (76% aware, versus 66% unaware).

North Central region found the STP less important – Although a majority of recruiters across all regions rated the program as high in importance, recruiters from the North Central region rated the program less important for achieving recruiting goals (61%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of production recruiter and recruiting zone population density.

Negligible differences – Negligible differences were indicated for the demographic of preparedness to market the STP.

No differences – No differences among groups were found for the demographics of service, component, NPS contact recruitment, and years of experience.

Table 19.

Q7A -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? ASVAB Student Testing Program

	Percent	Percent Importance			
	Respond	Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	93 ±2	8	23	69	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	94 ±2	8	23	69	±3
Navy	91 ±4	11	21	68	±6
Marine Corps	96 ±3	5	27	68	±7
Air Force	85 ±3	7	22	72	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Regular	94 ±2	7	23	69	±3
Reserve	87 ±3	10	25	65	±5
<i>Service/Reserve Component</i>					
Active Army	94 ±2	8	23	69	±3
Active Navy	94 ±4	9	21	69	±7
Active USMC	96 ±3	5	27	68	±7
Active USAF	87 ±3	5 ⁻³	19 ⁻⁵	77 ⁺⁹	±4
Reserve Army	92 ±4	6	25	69	±6
Reserve Navy	80 ±8	19	21	61	±12
Reserve Air Force	75 ±8	18 ⁺¹⁰	39 ⁺¹⁶	44 ⁻²⁵	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	81 ±5	6	18 ⁻⁶	76 ⁺⁸	±6
Production recruiter	95 ±1	8	24	68 ⁻⁷	±8
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	96 ±2	9	24	67	±11
Mid-Atlantic	83 ±9	8	26	66	±11
Southeast	93 ±2	6	18 ⁻⁷	76 ⁺⁹	±6
North Central	93 ±3	9	29 ⁺⁷	61 ⁻¹⁰	±6
South Central	93 ±3	6	18 ⁻⁶	77 ⁺⁹	±9
West	91 ±4	8	30	62	±8
Pacific	92 ±3	9	23	68	±11

	Percent	Percent Importance			
	Respond	Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	92 ±2	11 ⁺⁴	23	66	±5
Suburban	94 ±2	10	25	65	±5
Small city/town	92 ±2	6	23	71	±5
Rural	95 ±3	4 ⁻⁵	21	75 ⁺⁷	±13
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	93 ±2	10 ⁺⁴	24	66	±4
Prepared to market	93 ±2	6 ⁻⁴	23	71	±16
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	92 ±2	9 ⁺⁵	24	66 ⁻⁹	±5
Aware of enhancements	95 ±2	4 ⁻⁵	21	76 ⁺¹⁰	±17
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	91 ±2	12 ⁺⁷	25	62 ⁻¹¹	±4
Good support	94 ±2	5 ⁻⁷	22	73 ⁺¹¹	±12
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	92 ±2	11 ⁺⁷	25	64 ⁻¹¹	±4
Good support	94 ±2	4 ⁻⁷	21	76 ⁺¹²	±7
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	92 ±2	11 ⁺⁷	25	64 ⁻¹¹	±3
Good support	95 ±2	4 ⁻⁷	20 ⁻⁵	76 ⁺¹²	±10

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question and who reported in question 6 that they recruited NPS contacts.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Importance of high school lists/student directories as lead sources

How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions?

High importance, Medium importance, Low importance.

Q7B – High School lists/student directories

Over three-quarters thought high school lists/student directories had high importance – Over three-quarters (77%) of recruiters thought that high school lists/student directories had high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it second out of ten lead sources listed.

Service Component Effects –

More Marine Corps recruiters assigned high importance to student lists/directories (90%).

Fewer Active and Reserve Air Force recruiters assigned high importance to student lists/directories (54% and 37%, respectively).

Recruiters with good MEPS support for administration thought lists/directories were more important -- Recruiters who reported having good MEPS support for administration found student lists/directories highly important (81% good support, versus 71% not good).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of production recruiter, years of experience, NPS recruitment, awareness of STP enhancements and preparedness to market the STP, and MEPS support for interpretation and marketing.

No differences – No differences were found among groups for the demographics of geographic location or population density.

Table 20.

Q7B -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? High School lists/student directories

	Percent Respond	Percent Importance			
		Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	93 ±2	6	17	77	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	94 ±2	5 ⁻³	18	78	±3
Navy	91 ±4	9	18	72	±6
Marine Corps	96 ±3	2 ⁻⁵	8 ⁻¹¹	90 ⁺¹⁶	±7
Air Force	85 ±3	18 ⁺¹³	30 ⁺¹⁴	52 ⁻²⁷	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Regular	94 ±2	6 ⁻³	16	78 ⁺⁶	±3
Reserve	88 ±3	9 ⁺³	19	72 ⁻⁶	±5
<i>Service/Reserve Component</i>					
Active Army	94 ±2	4 ⁻³	17	78	±3
Active Navy	93 ±4	9	18	73	±7
Active USMC	96 ±3	2 ⁻⁵	8 ⁻¹¹	90 ⁺¹⁶	±7
Active USAF	87 ±3	17 ⁺¹²	29 ⁺¹³	54 ⁻²⁵	±4
Reserve Army	93 ±3	6	18	76	±6
Reserve Navy	80 ±8	14	15	72	±12
Reserve Air Force	76 ±8	25 ⁺¹⁹	38 ⁺²²	37 ⁻⁴¹	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	81 ±5	5	13	82	±6
Production recruiter	95 ±1	6	17	76 ⁻⁶	±8
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>					
Not recruit NPS	63 ±12	NR	NR	NR	±18
Recruits NPS	97 ±1	6	18 ⁺⁵	76 ⁻⁵	±6
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than one year	96 ±2	3 ⁻⁴	15	82 ⁺⁶	±6
1 or more years	93 ±2	7 ⁺⁴	17	76 ⁻⁶	±18
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than 6 years	95 ±1	6	17 ⁺⁵	76 ⁻⁷	±6
6 or more years	82 ±4	5	12	83 ⁺⁷	±18

	Percent Respond	Percent Importance			
		Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	93 ±2	7	19	75 ⁻⁵	±4
Prepared to market	93 ±2	5	15	80 ⁺⁶	±16
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	92 ±2	7 ⁺⁴	18	75 ⁻⁷	±5
Aware of enhancements	95 ±2	3 ⁻⁴	15	82 ⁺⁷	±17
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	91 ±2	8 ⁺³	20 ⁺⁶	71 ⁻¹⁰	±4
Good support	94 ±2	5 ⁻³	14 ⁻⁶	81 ⁺⁹	±12
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	92 ±2	8 ⁺⁴	18	74 ⁻⁸	±4
Good support	94 ±2	4 ⁻⁴	14	82 ⁺⁸	±7
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	92 ±2	7 ⁺³	18	75 ⁻⁶	±3
Good support	95 ±2	4 ⁻³	15	81 ⁺⁶	±10

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error. NR=Unreliable estimate. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question and who reported in question 6 that they recruited NPS contacts.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Importance of referrals from applicants as a lead source

How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions?

High importance, Medium importance, Low importance.

Q7C – Referrals from applicants

Recruiters rated referrals from applicants as most important – The majority of recruiters (84%) thought that referrals from applicants were of high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it first out of ten lead sources listed. There were very few differences among groups in terms of the level of importance of this lead source.

Air Force Reserves found referrals from applicants more important for achieving recruiting goals – Air Force Reserve recruiters indicated that referrals from applicants were highly important for achieving recruiting goals (93% high importance, 4% medium importance).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of Service, six or more years of experience, and MEPS support for interpretation.

Negligible differences – Negligible differences were indicated for the demographics of geographic region and awareness of STP enhancements.

No differences – No differences were found among groups for the demographics of component, production recruiter, NPS contact recruitment, one or more years of experience, population density, preparedness to market the STP, MEPS support for administration, and MEPS support for marketing.

Table 21,
Q7C -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? Referrals from applicants

	Percent Respond	Percent Importance			
		Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	93 ±2	2	14	84	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	93 ±2	2	15	82	±3
Navy	90 ±4	2	15	83	±6
Marine Corps	96 ±2	1 ⁻¹	13	87	±7
Air Force	84 ±3	1	8 ⁻⁷	91 ⁺⁷	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	94 ±2	2	15	84	±3
Reserve	87 ±3	2	12	86	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	94 ±2	2	15	82	±3
Active Navy	92 ±4	3	17	81	±7
Active USMC	96 ±2	1 ⁻¹	13	87	±7
Active USAF	87 ±3	1	9 ⁻⁶	91 ⁺⁷	±4
Reserve Army	91 ±4	2	15	83	±6
Reserve Navy	80 ±8	2	6	92	±12
Reserve Air Force	74 ±8	3	4 ⁻¹⁰	93 ⁺⁹	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	81 ±5	2	12	86	±6
Production recruiter	95 ±1	2	15	84	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than 6 years	94 ±1	2	15	83 ⁻⁶	±3
6 or more years	82 ±4	1	11	88	±7
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	96 ±2	1	15	84	±6
Mid-Atlantic	85 ±9	1	16	83	±11
Southeast	93 ±2	2	16	81	±5
North Central	93 ±3	2	15	83	±6
South Central	92 ±4	1 ⁻¹	14	86	±6
West	91 ±4	3	10	87	±9

	Percent Respond	Percent Importance			
		Low	Medium	High	ME
Pacific	92 ±3	2	11	87	±6
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	92 ±2	2 ⁺¹	14	83	±3
Aware of enhancements	94 ±2	1 ⁻¹	14	86	±5
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	92 ±2	2	16 ⁺⁴	82 ⁻⁵	±3
Good support	94 ±2	1	12 ⁻⁴	87 ⁺⁵	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=⁻effect size Higher=⁺effect size ME=Margin of error. Percent responding were recruiters who answered the question and who reported in question 6 that they recruited NPS contacts.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Importance of local advertising as a lead source

How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions?

High importance, Medium importance, Low importance.

Q7D – Local advertising

Over half of recruiters rated local advertising as highly important – The majority of recruiters (58%) thought that local advertising had high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it fourth out of ten lead sources listed. There were very few differences among groups in terms of the level of importance of this lead source.

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of production recruiter, years of experience (less than or greater than six years), NPS recruitment, geographic region, awareness of STP enhancements, and MEPS support for interpretation.

Negligible differences – A negligible difference was found for the demographic of service.

No differences – No differences were found among groups for the demographics of component, population density, preparedness to market the STP, years of experience (less than or greater than one year), MEPS support for administration, and MEPS support for marketing.

Table 22.

Q7D -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? Local advertising

	Percent	Percent Importance			
	Respond	Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	92 ±2	10	32	58	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	93 ±2	9	32	60	±3
Navy	90 ±4	11	30	58	±6
Marine Corps	96 ±2	15	33	53	±7
Air Force	85 ±3	7 ⁻³	35	58	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Regular	93 ±2	11	31	58	±3
Reserve	88 ±3	8	35	57	±5
<i>Service/Reserve Component</i>					
Active Army	94 ±2	9	31	61	±3
Active Navy	92 ±4	12	31	57	±7
Active USMC	96 ±2	15	33	53	±7
Active USAF	87 ±3	7 ⁻³	36	57	±4
Reserve Army	92 ±4	9	37	55	±6
Reserve Navy	81 ±8	5	34	61	±12
Reserve Air Force	76 ±8	7	27	67	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	81 ±5	6 ⁻⁵	30	64	±6
Production recruiter	95 ±1	11 ⁺⁵	32	57	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited</i>					
Not recruit NPS	60 ±12	1 ⁻⁹	NR	NR	±18
Recruits NPS	96 ±1	10	32	58	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than 6 years	94 ±1	11 ⁺⁶	32	57	±3
6 or more years	82 ±4	5 ⁻⁶	32	63	±7

	Percent Respond	Percent Importance			
		Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	95 ±2	10	32	57	±6
Mid-Atlantic	86 ±9	5 ⁻⁵	36	59	±11
Southeast	93 ±2	11	31	58	±5
North Central	93 ±3	13	34	52	±6
South Central	92 ±3	10	30	59	±6
West	90 ±4	8	27	64	±9
Pacific	93 ±3	8	32	61	±6
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	92 ±2	11 ⁺⁴	33	56 ⁻⁷	±3
Aware of enhancements	94 ±2	7	30	62	±5
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	92 ±2	12	33	56 ⁻⁶	±3
Good support	93 ±2	8	30	62 ⁺⁶	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error. NR=Unreliable estimate. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question and who reported in question 6 that they recruited NPS contacts.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Importance of national leads as a lead source

How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions?

High importance, Medium importance, Low importance.

Q7E – National leads (e.g., direct mail-outs, 800-number, internet)

About half rated national leads as highly important – Slightly more than half (53%) of recruiters thought that national leads had high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it sixth out of ten lead sources listed.

Service Component Effects –

More Marine Corps recruiters assigned high importance to national leads (72%).

More Active Navy recruiters assigned high importance to national leads (67%).

Fewer Active and Reserve Army recruiters assigned high importance to national leads (39% and 40%, respectively).

Recruiters with good MEPS support for administration and interpretation found national leads more important – More recruiters who received good MEPS support for administration and interpretation thought national leads were highly important for achieving NPS recruiting goals.

- Administration: 57% with good support, versus 46% without good support.
- Interpretation: 60% with good support, versus 48% without good support.

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of component, population density, awareness of STP changes and preparedness to market the STP, and MEPS support for marketing.

No differences – No differences were found among groups for the demographics of production recruiter, years of experience, and geographic region.

Table 23.

Q7E -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? National leads (e.g., direct mail-outs, 800-number, internet)

	Percent Respond	Percent Importance			ME
		Low	Medium	High	
<i>Full Sample</i>	92 ±2	15	32	53	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	93 ±2	23 ⁺¹⁶	37 ⁺¹⁰	40 ⁻²⁶	±3
Navy	90 ±4	8 ⁻⁹	27 ⁻⁷	66 ⁺¹⁷	±6
Marine Corps	96 ±2	3 ⁻¹⁵	25 ⁻⁹	72 ⁺²⁴	±7
Air Force	84 ±3	10 ⁻⁵	30	59 ⁺⁷	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	93 ±2	14 ⁻⁶	32	54 ⁺⁷	±3
Reserve	87 ±3	20 ⁺⁶	33	47 ⁻⁷	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	93 ±2	23 ⁺¹⁴	38 ⁺¹⁰	39 ⁻²³	±3
Active Navy	92 ±4	7 ⁻¹⁰	27	67 ⁺¹⁷	±7
Active USMC	96 ±2	3 ⁻¹⁵	25 ⁻⁹	72 ⁺²⁴	±7
Active USAF	87 ±3	11 ⁻⁴	32	56	±4
Reserve Army	90 ±4	24 ⁺¹⁰	36	40 ⁻¹⁴	±6
Reserve Navy	80 ±8	13	28	59	±12
Reserve Air Force	75 ±8	5 ⁻¹⁰	21 ⁻¹¹	73 ⁺²¹	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	81 ±5	13	36	51	±6
Production recruiter	95 ±1	15	32	53	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>					
Not recruit NPS	63 ±12	5 ⁻¹⁰	NR	NR	±18
Recruits NPS	96 ±1	16	32	52	±3
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	90 ±3	14	35	51	±5
Suburban	93 ±2	11 ⁻⁵	36	53	±5
Small city/town	92 ±2	15	30	55	±5
Rural	95 ±3	20 ⁺⁶	28	52	±5

	Percent Respond	Percent Importance			
		Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	92 ±2	18 ⁺⁶	34	49 ⁻⁷	±4
Prepared to market	93 ±2	13 ⁻⁵	31	56 ⁺⁷	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	92 ±2	17 ⁺⁷	33	50 ⁻⁸	±3
Aware of enhancements	94 ±2	10 ⁻⁷	32	58 ⁺⁷	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	90 ±2	17 ⁺⁴	37 ⁺⁸	46 ⁻¹¹	±4
Good support	94 ±2	14	29 ⁻⁸	57 ⁺¹¹	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	91 ±2	17 ⁺⁵	35 ⁺⁶	48 ⁻¹²	±3
Good support	93 ±2	12 ⁻⁵	29 ⁻⁶	60 ⁺¹²	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	91 ±2	16	34	50 ⁻⁷	±3
Good support	94 ±2	13	30	57 ⁺⁷	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error. NR=Unreliable estimate. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question and who reported in question 6 that they recruited NPS contacts.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Importance of community colleges as lead sources

How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions?

High importance, Medium importance, Low importance.

Q7F – Community colleges

Half of recruiters rated community colleges as highly important – Half (50%) of recruiters felt that community colleges had high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it eighth out of ten lead sources listed.

Recruiters not recruiting NPS contacts in last 12 months found community colleges more important – Recruiters who had not recruited NPS contacts in the last 12 months rated community colleges as highly important for achieving NPS recruiting goals (79% non-NPS, versus 47% NPS).

Non-production recruiters rated community colleges as more important – Non-production recruiters rated community colleges as highly important for achieving NPS recruiting goals (63%), more so than production recruiters (47%).

Service Component Effects –

Fewer Active Navy and Air Force recruiters assigned high importance to community colleges (34% and 38%, respectively).

More Reserve Army and Air Force recruiters assigned high importance to community colleges (64% and 65%, respectively).

Army recruiters rated community colleges as more important – More recruiters with the Army thought that community colleges were highly important (57%). Fewer Navy recruiters rated community colleges as highly important (38%).

Recruiters with more experience rated community colleges as more important – More recruiters with one or more years assigned to recruiting duty thought that community colleges were highly important for achieving NPS recruiting goals (52%) than recruiters with less than one year (41%). Also, more recruiters with six or more years of experience thought community colleges were highly important (65%) than recruiters with less than six years (48%).

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements rated community colleges as more important – Recruiters aware of STP enhancements thought community colleges were more important for recruiting than recruiters not aware of those enhancements (60% aware, versus 46% not aware).

Rural recruiters found community colleges least important – Recruiters in rural areas found community colleges less highly important for achieving recruiting goals (42%).

Western region found community colleges less important – In the Western region, recruiters found community colleges less highly important for achieving recruiting goals (40%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographic of MEPS support for interpretation.

No differences – No difference was found between recruiters who reported good and not good MEPS support for administration and marketing. Also, no difference was found between recruiters prepared and not prepared to market the STP.

Table 24.

Q7F -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? Community colleges

	Percent	Percent Importance			
	Respond	Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	93 ±2	14	36	50	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	94 ±2	11 ⁻⁵	32 ⁻⁸	57 ⁺¹⁴	±3
Navy	91 ±4	16	47 ⁺¹³	38 ⁻¹⁵	±6
Marine Corps	96 ±2	16	36	48	±7
Air Force	85 ±3	20 ⁺⁷	38	42 ⁻⁹	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Regular	94 ±2	15 ⁺⁷	37 ⁺⁷	48 ⁻¹⁴	±3
Reserve	88 ±3	8 ⁻⁷	30 ⁻⁷	62 ⁺¹⁴	±5
<i>Service/Reserve Component</i>					
Active Army	94 ±2	12	33 ⁻⁶	55 ⁺⁹	±3
Active Navy	93 ±4	18	48 ⁺¹⁴	34 ⁻¹⁹	±7
Active USMC	96 ±2	16	36	48	±7
Active USAF	87 ±3	21 ⁺⁸	40	38 ⁻¹³	±4
Reserve Army	92 ±4	8 ⁻⁷	28 ⁻⁹	64 ⁺¹⁶	±6
Reserve Navy	81 ±8	5 ⁻⁹	40	55	±12
Reserve Air Force	76 ±8	13	23 ⁻¹³	65 ⁺¹⁵	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	81 ±5	9 ⁻⁶	28 ⁻¹⁰	63 ⁺¹⁵	±6
Production recruiter	96 ±1	15 ⁺⁶	38 ⁺¹⁰	47 ⁻¹⁵	±8
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>					
Not recruit NPS	63 ±12	3 ⁻¹¹	19 ⁻¹⁷	79 ⁺²⁹	±18
Recruits NPS	97 ±1	15	38 ⁺⁸	47 ⁻¹²	±6
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than one year	96 ±2	16	43 ⁺⁸	41 ⁻¹¹	±6
1 or more years	93 ±2	13	35	52 ⁺⁹	±18
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than 6 years	95 ±1	14	38 ⁺¹²	48 ⁻¹⁶	±6
6 or more years	82 ±4	10	26 ⁻¹²	65 ⁺¹⁷	±18

	Percent Respond	Percent Importance			
		Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	96 ±2	14	35	51	±11
Mid-Atlantic	87 ±9	11	33	56	±11
Southeast	93 ±2	13	35	52	±6
North Central	94 ±3	16	37	47	±6
South Central	93 ±3	14	37	50	±9
West	91 ±4	15	45	40 ⁻¹¹	±8
Pacific	93 ±3	13	35	53	±11
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	91 ±3	9 ⁻⁷	36	55 ⁺⁷	±5
Suburban	94 ±2	14	36	51	±5
Small city/town	93 ±2	16	35	50	±5
Rural	95 ±2	18 ⁺⁵	40	42 ⁻¹⁰	±13
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	93 ±2	15	39 ⁺¹⁰	46 ⁻¹⁴	±5
Aware of enhancements	95 ±2	11	28 ⁻¹¹	60 ⁺¹⁴	±17
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	92 ±2	15	38	47 ⁻⁸	±4
Good support	94 ±2	12	33	55 ⁺⁸	±7

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.

Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question and who reported in question 6 that they recruited NPS contacts.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Importance of 4-year colleges/universities as lead sources

How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions?

High importance, Medium importance, Low importance.

Q7G – 4-year colleges/universities

One-third thought 4-year colleges/universities had high importance – Only one-third (33%) of recruiters rated 4-year colleges/universities as a highly important lead source for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it tenth out of ten lead sources listed.

Service Component Effects –

Fewer Active Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force recruiters assigned high importance to 4-year colleges/universities (23%, 19%, and 12%, respectively).

More Active Army and Reserve Army recruiters assigned high importance to 4-year colleges/universities (41% and 53%, respectively).

Army found 4-year colleges/universities more important, other branches less – Army recruiters thought that 4-year college/universities were more important for achieving recruiting goals (43%) than the other three Service Branches (Navy 25%, Marine Corps 19%, and Air Force 15%).

More experienced recruiters found 4-year colleges/universities more important – More recruiters assigned to recruiting duty for six or more years tended to rate 4-year colleges/universities as highly important for achieving recruiting goals (45%) than recruiters assigned to recruiting duty for less than six years (31%).

Non-production recruiters rated 4-year colleges/universities as more important – More non-production recruiters rated 4-year colleges/universities as highly important (43%) than production recruiters (31%).

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements found 4-year colleges/universities more important – Recruiters aware of STP enhancements were more likely to find 4-year colleges/universities highly important for achieving recruiting goals (41%) than recruiters not aware of enhancements (30%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of population density, geographic region, and MEPS support for interpretation and marketing.

No differences – No differences were found among groups for the demographics of preparedness to market the STP, years assigned to duty less than or greater than one, and MEPS support for administration.

Table 25.

Q7G -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? 4-year colleges/universities

	Percent	Percent Importance			
	Respond	Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	93 ±2	29	38	33	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	93 ±2	18 ⁻²³	38	43 ⁺²¹	±3
Navy	90 ±4	35	40	25 ⁻¹⁰	±6
Marine Corps	96 ±3	47 ⁺²²	34	19 ⁻¹⁷	±7
Air Force	84 ±3	50 ⁺²²	35	15 ⁻¹⁹	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Regular	94 ±2	31 ⁺¹³	38	30 ⁻¹⁸	±3
Reserve	87 ±3	18 ⁻¹³	34	48 ⁺¹⁸	±5
<i>Service/Reserve Component</i>					
Active Army	94 ±2	19 ⁻¹⁸	40	41 ⁺¹⁴	±3
Active Navy	92 ±4	36	41	23 ⁻¹²	±7
Active USMC	96 ±3	47 ⁺²²	34	19 ⁻¹⁷	±7
Active USAF	86 ±3	55 ⁺²⁷	33	12 ⁻²²	±4
Reserve Army	92 ±4	15 ⁻¹⁶	32	53 ⁺²³	±6
Reserve Navy	79 ±9	26	36	38	±12
Reserve Air Force	74 ±8	23	48	29	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	81 ±5	22 ⁻⁹	36	43 ⁺¹²	±6
Production recruiter	95 ±1	31 ⁺⁹	38	31 ⁻¹¹	±8
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>					
Not recruit NPS	63 ±12	6 ⁻²⁴	NR	NR	±18
Recruits NPS	97 ±1	31	38	31 ⁻⁸	±6
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than 6 years	95 ±1	31 ⁺¹⁰	38	31 ⁻¹³	±6
6 or more years	82 ±4	20 ⁻¹¹	36	45 ⁺¹⁴	±18

	Percent Respond	Percent Importance			
		Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	96 ±2	32	36	32	±11
Mid-Atlantic	84 ±9	26	38	36	±11
Southeast	93 ±2	25	36	39 ⁺⁸	±6
North Central	94 ±3	31	40	29	±6
South Central	92 ±4	29	36	35	±9
West	91 ±4	28	43	29	±8
Pacific	93 ±3	33	39	28	±11
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	91 ±3	25 ⁻⁶	39	37	±5
Suburban	93 ±3	30	39	31	±5
Small city/town	93 ±2	31	36	33	±5
Rural	95 ±3	32	39	29	±13
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	92 ±2	33 ⁺¹¹	38	30 ⁻¹⁰	±5
Aware of enhancements	94 ±2	21 ⁻¹¹	38	41 ⁺¹¹	±17
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	92 ±2	31	39	31 ⁻⁵	±4
Good support	94 ±2	27	36	36 ⁺⁵	±7
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	91 ±2	30	40	30 ⁻⁶	±3
Good support	95 ±2	28	36	36	±10

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error. NR=Unreliable estimate. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question and who reported in question 6 that they recruited NPS contacts.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Importance of local merchants/community contacts as lead sources

How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions?

High importance, Medium importance, Low importance.

Q7H – Local merchants/community contacts

Less than half found local merchants/community contacts important – Less than half (44%) of recruiters rated local merchants/community contacts as having high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it ninth out of ten lead sources listed.

Recruiters with good support from MEPS for interpretation found local merchants/community contacts important – Recruiters who received good MEPS support for interpretation found local merchants/community contacts as highly important for achieving recruiting goals (51%), compared to recruiters without good MEPS support for interpretation (40%).

North Central recruiters found local merchants/community contacts less important – Fewer recruiters from the North Central region found local merchants/community contacts highly important (36%) than recruiters from other regions.

Marine Corps recruiters found local merchants/community contacts less important – More Marine Corps recruiters found local merchants/community contacts of low importance for achieving recruiting goals (25%) than recruiters with other Services.

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of awareness of STP changes, preparedness to market the STP, and MEPS support for marketing.

No differences – No differences among groups were found for the demographics of component, production recruiters, recruiting NPS contacts, years of experience, population density, and MEPS support for administration.

Table 26.

Q7H -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? Local merchants/community contacts

	Percent Respond	Percent Importance			
		Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	92 ±2	14	41	44	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	93 ±2	10 ⁻⁸	42	48 ⁺⁷	±3
Navy	90 ±4	13	42	44	±6
Marine Corps	96 ±2	25 ⁺¹³	38	37	±7
Air Force	83 ±3	17	44	39 ⁻⁶	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	93 ±2	15	41	44	±3
Reserve	88 ±3	12	41	47	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	93 ±2	10 ⁻⁸	42	49 ⁺⁸	±3
Active Navy	93 ±4	15	43	42	±7
Active USMC	96 ±2	25 ⁺¹³	38	37	±7
Active USAF	86 ±3	17	46	37 ⁻⁸	±4
Reserve Army	92 ±4	14	42	44	±6
Reserve Navy	80 ±8	6 ⁻⁹	39	56	±12
Reserve Air Force	75 ±8	16	35	48	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	81 ±5	11	42	47	±6
Production recruiter	95 ±1	15	41	44	±3
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	95 ±2	11	43	47	±6
Mid-Atlantic	86 ±9	17	40	43	±11
Southeast	92 ±3	13	42	45	±5
North Central	93 ±3	20 ⁺⁷	44	36 ⁻¹⁰	±6
South Central	93 ±3	12	39	48	±6
West	89 ±4	11	38	51	±9
Pacific	93 ±3	16	39	45	±6

	Percent Respond	Percent Importance			
		Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	92 ±2	18 ⁺⁷	41	41 ⁻⁶	±4
Prepared to market	92 ±2	11 ⁻⁷	41	47	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	92 ±2	16 ⁺⁷	42	42 ⁻⁹	±3
Aware of enhancements	94 ±2	9 ⁻⁷	39	51 ⁺⁹	±5
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	91 ±2	17 ⁺⁷	43	40 ⁻¹¹	±3
Good support	94 ±2	10 ⁻⁷	39	51 ⁺¹¹	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	91 ±2	14	44 ⁺⁷	42 ⁻⁶	±3
Good support	94 ±2	15	37 ⁻⁷	48 ⁺⁶	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p < .01$: Lower=⁻effect size Higher=⁺effect size ME=Margin of error.

Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question and who reported in question 6 that they recruited NPS contacts.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Importance of recruiter assistance as a lead source

How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions?

High importance, Medium importance, Low importance.

Q71 – Recruiter assistance (HRAP, HARP, RAP, PRASP, Boot Leave, etc.)

More than half considered recruiter assistance as highly important – Over half (55%) of recruiters said that recruiter assistance had high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it fifth out of ten lead sources listed.

Service Component Effects –

More Marine Corps recruiters assigned high importance to recruiter assistance (69%).

Fewer Reserve Air Force recruiters assigned high importance to recruiter assistance (34%).

Recruiters with good MEPS support for interpretation found recruiter assistance more important – Recruiters who reported receiving good MEPS support for interpretation tended to find recruiter assistance more important for achieving recruiting goals (61%) than recruiters without good MEPS support for interpretation (50%).

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements found recruiter assistance more important – More recruiters aware of STP enhancements found recruiter assistance highly important as a lead source (62%) than recruiters not aware of enhancements (52%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of preparedness to market the STP and MEPS support for administration and marketing.

Negligible differences – A negligible difference was indicated for the demographic of years assigned to recruiting duty less than or greater than one.

No differences – No differences were found among groups for the demographics of production recruiter, recruiting NPS contacts, geographic location, years assigned to duty less than or greater than six, and population density.

Table 27.

Q7I -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? Recruiter assistance (HRAP, HARP, RAP, PRASP, Boot Leave, etc.)

	Percent Respond	Percent Importance			ME
		Low	Medium	High	
<i>Full Sample</i>	92 ±2	12	34	55	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	93 ±2	13	34	53	±3
Navy	90 ±4	16	36	48 ⁻⁸	±6
Marine Corps	96 ±2	4 ⁻¹⁰	27	69 ⁺¹⁸	±7
Air Force	84 ±3	11	38 ⁺⁵	50	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	93 ±2	10 ⁻⁹	34	56 ⁺⁸	±3
Reserve	87 ±3	19 ⁺⁹	33	48 ⁻⁸	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	94 ±2	12	34	53	±3
Active Navy	92 ±4	15	37	47	±7
Active USMC	96 ±2	4 ⁻¹⁰	27	69 ⁺¹⁸	±7
Active USAF	87 ±3	6 ⁻⁶	41 ⁺⁸	53	±4
Reserve Army	91 ±4	18 ⁺⁷	34	48	±6
Reserve Navy	79 ±9	17	32	52	±12
Reserve Air Force	74 ±8	39 ⁺²⁸	27	34 ⁻²¹	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	80 ±5	12	32	56	±6
Production recruiter	95 ±1	11	34	55	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than one year	95 ±3	8 ⁻⁴	36	56	±6
1 or more years	92 ±2	12	33	54	±3
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	92 ±2	13	36	50 ⁻⁹	±4
Prepared to market	93 ±2	10	31	59 ⁺⁹	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	92 ±2	14 ⁺⁷	35	52 ⁻¹⁰	±3
Aware of enhancements	95 ±2	7 ⁻⁶	31	62 ⁺¹⁰	±5

	Percent Respond	Percent Importance			
		Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	91 ±2	15 ⁺⁵	36	50 ⁻⁸	±4
Good support	94 ±2	10 ⁻⁴	32	58 ⁺⁸	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	92 ±2	14 ⁺⁵	36 ⁺⁶	50 ⁻¹¹	±3
Good support	94 ±2	8 ⁻⁶	31	61 ⁺¹¹	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	91 ±2	13 ⁺³	35	52 ⁻⁶	±3
Good support	94 ±2	9 ⁻⁴	32	58 ⁺⁶	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question and who reported in question 6 that they recruited NPS contacts.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Importance of recruiting station walk-ins as a lead source

How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions?

High importance, Medium importance, Low importance.

Q7J – Recruiting station walk-ins

Half of recruiters considered recruiting station walk-ins as highly important – Slightly more than half (51%) of recruiters rated recruiting station walk-ins as having high importance for achieving NPS recruiting goals, which placed it seventh out of ten lead sources listed.

Active Army found recruiting station walk-ins more important, Marine Corps less – Recruiters with the Army tended to find recruiting station walk-ins as more highly important (58% high importance, 10% low importance), but fewer Marine Corps recruiters did (39% high importance, 24% low importance).

No differences – No differences were found among groups for the demographics of production recruiter, component, years of experience, geographic location, population density, preparedness to market the STP, awareness of STP changes, and MEPS support for administration, interpretation, and marketing.

Table 28.

Q7J -- How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions? Recruiting station walk-ins

	Percent	Percent Importance			
	Respond	Low	Medium	High	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	93 ±1	16	34	51	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	94 ±2	12 ⁻⁸	32	56 ⁺¹¹	±3
Navy	91 ±4	18	35	46	±6
Marine Corps	96 ±2	24 ⁺¹⁰	37	39 ⁻¹⁴	±7
Air Force	85 ±3	17	32	51	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	94 ±2	15	34	51	±3
Reserve	88 ±3	19	34	48	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	94 ±2	10 ⁻¹⁰	31	58 ⁺¹³	±3
Active Navy	93 ±4	18	36	46	±7
Active USMC	96 ±2	24 ⁺¹⁰	37	39 ⁻¹⁴	±7
Active USAF	87 ±3	15	34	52	±4
Reserve Army	92 ±3	16	35	49	±6
Reserve Navy	80 ±8	23	32	45	±12
Reserve Air Force	76 ±8	26 ⁺¹⁰	29	44	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	81 ±5	12	32	56	±6
Production recruiter	96 ±1	16	34	49	±3

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.

Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question and who reported in question 6 that they recruit NPS contacts.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Perceptions about STP role in recruiting purposes

Please indicate whether you consider each of the following to be a primary, secondary, or peripheral role of the ASVAB Student Testing Program.

Q8A – To generate recruiting leads

Q8C – To help students view the military positively

Q8F – To educate students about military careers

	Percent Primary Role
A. To generate recruiting leads	65
C. To help students view the military positively	59
F. To educate students about military careers	64

The STP serves multiple purposes – Recruiters understood the role of the STP to be more than just generating recruitment leads. Nearly two-thirds (65%) of all recruiters cited generating recruitment leads as a primary role of the STP. An equal number (64%) of recruiters also cited educating students about military careers as a primary role of the program. These roles were followed closely by the purpose of helping students view the military positively (59%).

Service Component Effects –

Fewer recruiters in the Marine Corps (52%) and Reserve Air Force (40%) assigned a primary role to (A) generating recruiting leads.

More Active Army recruiters assigned a primary role to (C) helping students view the military positively (65%), while fewer Reserve Air Force recruiters assigned a primary role to helping students view the military positively (43%).

More Active Army recruiters assigned a primary role to (F) educating students about military careers (68%), while fewer Navy recruiters assigned a primary role to educating students about military careers (56%).

North Central region rated educating students about military careers as less primary – Recruiters in the North Central region were least likely to rate the role of the STP to educate students about military careers as primary (54%).

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements rated helping students view military positively as more primary role – Recruiters aware of STP enhancements were more likely to rate the role of the STP to help students view the military positively as primary (67% aware, versus 56% not aware).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for at least one of the three roles for the demographics of component, production recruiter, recruiting zone population density, preparedness to market the STP, and MEPS support for interpretation and marketing.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of NPS contact recruiter, years of experience, and MEPS support for administration.

Table 29.

Q8A,C,F -- Please indicate whether you consider each of the following to be a primary, secondary, or peripheral role of the ASVAB Student Testing Program.

A – To generate recruiting leads

C – To help students view the military positively

F – To educate students about military careers

	Percent Respond	Percent Primary Role			
		A	C	F	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	100 ±1	65	59	64	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	100 ±1	69 ⁺⁹	64 ⁺⁹	67	±3
Navy	98 ±2	64	53 ⁻⁸	57 ⁻⁹	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±0	52 ⁻¹⁵	58	69	±7
Air Force	100 ±1	66	51 ⁻⁹	59 ⁻⁶	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	100 ±1	65	59	65	±3
Reserve	99 ±1	63	58	61	±4
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	100 ±1	70 ⁺⁹	65 ⁺¹⁰	68 ⁺⁶	±3
Active Navy	99 ±3	65	52 ⁻⁹	56 ⁻¹⁰	±7
Active USMC	100 ±0	52 ⁻¹⁶	58	69	±7
Active USAF	99 ±1	71 ⁺⁷	52 ⁻⁸	59 ⁻⁶	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±1	66	59	61	±5
Reserve Navy	96 ±5	60	61	63	±10
Reserve Air Force	100 ±0	40 ⁻²⁵	43 ⁻¹⁶	57	±9
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	98 ±3	70	64	67	±6
Production recruiter	100 ±1	63 ⁻⁷	58	64	±3
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	100 ±1	62	56	66	±6
Mid-Atlantic	96 ±7	60	55	62	±10
Southeast	100 ±1	71 ⁺⁸	64	69	±5
North Central	100 ±1	60	52 ⁻⁹	54 ⁻¹³	±5
South Central	100 ±0	72 ⁺⁹	61	69	±6
West	100 ±0	58	66	66	±8

	Percent Respond	Percent Primary Role			
		A	C	F	ME
Pacific	100 ±1	59	61	65	±6
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	99 ±1	69 ⁺⁶	63	68	±4
Suburban	100 ±1	64	61	64	±5
Small city/town	100 ±0	62	58	63	±4
Rural	100 ±0	63	54	62	±5
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	99 ±1	62 ⁻⁸	56 ⁻¹⁰	62 ⁻⁹	±3
Aware of enhancements	100 ±1	71 ⁺⁹	67 ⁺¹⁰	71 ⁺⁹	±5
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	62	56 ⁻⁷	61 ⁻⁸	±3
Good support	100 ±1	67	63 ⁺⁷	70 ⁺⁹	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Perceptions about STP role in non-recruiting purposes

Please indicate whether you consider each of the following to be a primary, secondary, or peripheral role of the ASVAB Student Testing Program.

Q8B – To promote student career exploration

Q8D – To encourage students to discover their interests and skills

Q8E – To promote continuing education after high school

	Percent Primary Role
B. To promote student career exploration	55
D. To encourage students to discover their interests and skills	64
E. To promote continuing education after high school	44

The STP serves career-related roles – Recruiters were more likely to perceive the career-related roles of the STP as being primary. Nearly two-thirds (64%) of all recruiters cited encouraging students to discover their interests and skills as a primary role of the STP. More than half (55%) of all recruiters also cited promoting student career exploration as a primary role of the program. The role of promoting continuing education after high school was clearly perceived as being more peripheral or secondary: only 44% of recruiters indicated this role as primary.

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements saw these roles as more primary – Recruiters aware of the enhancements made to the program tended to provide higher ratings than recruiters not aware of the enhancements, in terms of these roles as being primary.

- Promote student career exploration:
64% aware, versus 51% not aware.
- Encourage students to discover their interests and skills:
72% aware, versus 60% not aware.
- Promote continuing education after high school:
56% aware, versus 39% not aware.

More Army recruiters considered the role of the STP to promote continuing education primary, fewer Navy – Army recruiters tended to see promoting continuing education after high school as more of a primary role (54%), but fewer Navy recruiters did (36%).

More Recruiters receiving good MEPS support saw role to promote career exploration as more primary – The recruiters who indicated they received good support from the MEPS in terms of administration and interpretation tended to view the STP role to promote student career exploration as more primary.

- Administration: 59% with good support, versus 49% without good support.
- Interpretation: 62% with good support, versus 50% without good support.

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for at least one of the three roles of the STP for the demographics of one or more years of experience, preparedness to market the STP, geographic region, and MEPS support for marketing.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of component, production recruiter, NPS contact recruiter, recruiting zone population density, and six or more years of experience.

Table 30.

Q8B,D,E -- Please indicate whether you consider each of the following to be a primary, secondary, or peripheral role of the ASVAB Student Testing Program.

B – To promote student career exploration

D – To encourage students to discover their interests and skills

E – To promote continuing education after high school

	Percent Respond	Percent Primary Role			
		B	D	E	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	100 ±1	55	64	44	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	100 ±1	55	66	50 ⁺¹²	±3
Navy	98 ±2	52	56 ⁻⁹	36 ⁻¹⁰	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±0	55	64	37 ⁻⁹	±7
Air Force	100 ±1	57	64	42	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	100 ±1	55	64	43	±3
Reserve	99 ±1	54	63	48	±4
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	100 ±1	55	66	49 ⁺⁹	±3
Active Navy	99 ±3	52	57 ⁻⁸	36 ⁻¹⁰	±7
Active USMC	100 ±0	55	64	37	±7
Active USAF	100 ±1	60 ⁺⁶	65	43	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±0	57	66	54 ⁺¹¹	±5
Reserve Navy	96 ±5	47	55	35	±10
Reserve Air Force	99 ±2	44	63	39	±9
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	98 ±3	55	64	40	±6
Production recruiter	100 ±1	55	63	45	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than one year	99 ±1	61 ⁺⁸	66	47	±6
1 or more years	100 ±1	53 ⁻⁸	63	43	±3

	Percent Respond	Percent Primary Role			
		B	D	E	ME
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	100 ±1	52	63	46	±6
Mid-Atlantic	96 ±7	43	58	33	±10
Southeast	99 ±1	57	65	48	±5
North Central	100 ±1	53	63	41	±5
South Central	100 ±0	54	64	49	±6
West	100 ±1	55	61	36 ⁻⁹	±8
Pacific	100 ±1	60	66	43	±6
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	99 ±1	51 ⁻⁷	62	45	±4
Prepared to market	100 ±1	58 ⁺⁸	65	43	±3
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	99 ±1	51 ⁻¹³	60 ⁻¹²	39 ⁻¹⁷	±3
Aware of enhancements	100 ±1	64 ⁺¹³	72 ⁺¹²	56 ⁺¹⁶	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	49 ⁻⁹	59 ⁻⁸	41	±4
Good support	100 ±1	59 ⁺¹⁰	66 ⁺⁷	46	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	50 ⁻¹²	61 ⁻⁷	42 ⁻⁶	±3
Good support	100 ±1	62 ⁺¹²	68 ⁺⁷	47 ⁺⁵	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	52	62	43	±3
Good support	100 ±1	58 ⁺⁶	66	46	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=⁻effect size Higher=⁺effect size ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Talking with students about the benefits of the STP

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Q9A – I regularly talk with potential recruits about the benefits of the ASVAB Student Testing Program (e.g., helps you to get to know your interests, strengths, explore possible careers).

Agree – Disagree scale.

Benefits talked about on a regular basis – Nearly three-quarters of all recruiters (71%) talked regularly with potential recruits about the benefits of the STP.

NPS recruiters talked about benefits much more than non-NPS recruiters – Recruiters involved with recruiting NPS contacts tended to talk about the benefits of the STP with potential recruits on a more regular basis than recruiters not involved with NPS contacts (72% NPS, compared to 40% non-NPS).

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements or prepared to market the program talked about benefits more – Recruiters who were aware of the STP enhancements (86% aware, compared to 65% unaware) or felt prepared to market the program (81% prepared, compared to 61% unprepared) were more likely to regularly talk about the benefits of the STP with potential recruits than recruiters who were not aware or not prepared.

Recruiters receiving good MEPS support talked about benefits more – The recruiters who indicated they received good support from the MEPS in terms of administration, interpretation, and marketing were more likely to regularly talk about the benefits of the program with potential recruits than recruiters who were not receiving good levels of support from the MEPS.

- Administration: 79% with good support, versus 60% without good support.
- Interpretation: 82% with good support, versus 63% without good support.
- Marketing: 82% with good support, versus to 63% without good support.

Recruiters in Southeast talked about benefits more – Recruiters in the Southeast were more likely to regularly talk about the benefits of the STP with potential recruits (80%) than in other regions.

Rural recruiters talked about benefits more – Recruiters in rural areas tended to regularly talk about the benefits of the STP with potential recruits more (79%) than recruiters in other areas.

Reserve Navy and Reserve Air Force recruiters talked about benefits least – Reserve Navy and Air Force recruiters tended to talk about the benefits of the STP with potential recruits least of all the Services (Navy 53%, Air Force 42%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of component and six or more years of experience.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of production recruiter and one or more years of experience.

Table 31.**Q9A -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?*****I regularly talk with potential recruits about the benefits of the ASVAB Student Testing Program (e.g., helps you to get to know your interests, strengths, explore possible careers).***

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Full Sample</i>	100 ±1	10	20	71	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	99 ±1	7 ⁻⁵	18	74 ⁺⁶	±3
Navy	100 ±1	14 ⁺⁶	23	63 ⁻¹⁰	±6
Marine Corps	99 ±2	9	19	72	±7
Air Force	99 ±1	11	20	70	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	100 ±1	9	19	72 ⁺⁷	±3
Reserve	100 ±1	11	24	65 ⁻⁷	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	99 ±1	7 ⁻⁴	18	74 ⁺⁶	±3
Active Navy	100 ±0	13	22	66	±7
Active USMC	99 ±2	9	19	72	±7
Active USAF	100 ±1	9	16	75	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±0	8	20	72	±6
Reserve Navy	99 ±3	17	30	53 ⁻¹⁹	±12
Reserve Air Force	98 ±3	20 ⁺¹¹	38 ⁺¹⁹	42 ⁻²⁹	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	100 ±1	8	24	69	±6
Production recruiter	100 ±1	10	19	71	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>					
Not recruit NPS	98 ±3	20	40 ⁺²¹	40 ⁻³²	±18
Recruits NPS	100 ±1	10	18 ⁻⁷	72 ⁺⁶	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than 6 years	100 ±1	9	18 ⁻⁸	72 ⁺⁸	±3
6 or more years	99 ±1	11	26	64 ⁻⁸	±7

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	100 ±1	12	21	67	±6
Mid-Atlantic	99 ±2	6	27	67	±11
Southeast	99 ±1	8	12 ⁻¹⁰	80 ⁺¹²	±5
North Central	99 ±2	12	24	65 ⁻⁷	±6
South Central	100 ±0	5 ⁻⁵	22	74	±6
West	100 ±1	12	20	69	±9
Pacific	99 ±1	12	18	70	±6
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	100 ±1	10	22	69	±5
Suburban	100 ±0	14 ⁺⁵	20	66	±5
Small city/town	99 ±1	8	19	72	±5
Rural	100 ±1	7	14 ⁻⁷	79 ⁺¹⁰	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	100 ±1	14 ⁺⁸	26 ⁺¹¹	61 ⁻¹⁹	±4
Prepared to market	99 ±1	5 ⁻⁹	14 ⁻¹²	81 ⁺²¹	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	100 ±1	11 ⁺⁶	24 ⁺¹⁴	65 ⁻²⁰	±3
Aware of enhancements	99 ±1	4 ⁻⁷	10 ⁻¹³	86 ⁺²¹	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	13 ⁺⁶	27 ⁺¹³	60 ⁻¹⁹	±4
Good support	100 ±1	7 ⁻⁶	14 ⁻¹³	79 ⁺¹⁹	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	12 ⁺⁶	25 ⁺¹²	63 ⁻¹⁹	±3
Good support	99 ±1	6 ⁻⁶	13 ⁻¹¹	82 ⁺¹⁹	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	12 ⁺⁶	24 ⁺¹¹	63 ⁻¹⁸	±3
Good support	100 ±1	6 ⁻⁶	13 ⁻¹¹	82 ⁺¹⁹	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Uniformed personnel as proctors for the ASVAB

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Q9B – In my experience, when uniformed personnel proctor the High School ASVAB Test, it helps to establish a connection with students that can be useful later in recruiting.

Agree – Disagree scale.

Uniformed test proctors established a connection with students – Overall, nearly three-quarters (71%) of all recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that uniformed personnel proctoring the ASVAB helped to establish a connection with students that could be useful later in recruiting.

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements or prepared to market the program were more positive about uniformed test proctors – Recruiters who were aware of the STP enhancements (82% aware, compared to 68% unaware) or felt prepared to market the program (78% prepared, compared to 64% unprepared) were more likely to agree or strongly agree that uniformed personnel proctoring the ASVAB helped to establish a connection with students that could be useful later in recruiting.

Recruiters receiving good MEPS support were also positive about uniformed test proctors – The recruiters who indicated they received good support from the MEPS in terms of administration, interpretation, and marketing were more likely to agree or strongly agree that uniformed personnel proctoring the ASVAB helped to establish a connection with students that could be useful later in recruiting.

- Administration: 78% with good support, versus 62% without good support.
- Interpretation: 78% with good support, versus 67% without good support.
- Marketing: 79% with good support, versus 66% without good support.

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of recruiting zone population density and service.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of component, production recruiter, NPS contact recruiter, years of experience, and region.

Table 32.

Q9B --To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

In my experience, when uniformed personnel proctor the High School ASVAB Test, it helps to establish a connection with students that can be useful later in recruiting.

	Percent	Percentages			ME
	Respond	Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Full Sample</i>	100 ±1	7	22	71	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	99 ±1	6	22	72	±3
Navy	100 ±1	8	25	67	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±0	6	15 ⁻⁸	79 ⁺⁹	±7
Air Force	99 ±1	13 ⁺⁶	21	66 ⁻⁶	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	100 ±1	7	21	72	±3
Reserve	100 ±1	7	26	68	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	99 ±1	7	22	72	±3
Active Navy	100 ±1	8	24	68	±7
Active USMC	100 ±0	6	15 ⁻⁸	79 ⁺⁹	±7
Active USAF	100 ±1	13 ⁺⁶	21	66 ⁻⁶	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±1	7	23	70	±6
Reserve Navy	100 ±0	6	33	61	±12
Reserve Air Force	98 ±3	12	25	63	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	100 ±0	6	21	74	±6
Production recruiter	100 ±1	7	21	71	±3
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	99 ±1	7	24	70	±5
Suburban	100 ±1	8	21	71	±5
Small city/town	100 ±1	7	22	71	±5
Rural	100 ±1	7	16 ⁻⁷	77 ⁺⁷	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	100 ±1	9 ⁺⁴	27 ⁺¹⁰	64 ⁻¹⁴	±4
Prepared to market	100 ±1	5 ⁻⁴	17 ⁻¹⁰	78 ⁺¹⁴	±4

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	100 ±1	7	25 ⁺¹²	68 ⁻¹³	±3
Aware of enhancements	99 ±1	6	12 ⁻¹³	82 ⁺¹⁵	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	8	30 ⁺¹⁴	62 ⁻¹⁶	±4
Good support	100 ±1	6	16 ⁻¹⁴	78 ⁺¹⁶	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	8	25 ⁺⁹	67 ⁻¹¹	±3
Good support	100 ±1	6	16 ⁻⁹	78 ⁺¹¹	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	9 ⁺⁵	25 ⁺⁸	66 ⁻¹³	±3
Good support	100 ±1	4 ⁻⁵	17 ⁻⁸	79 ⁺¹³	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Increases in the pool of qualified leads over the short and long term

Q10 – How much would you say the ASVAB Student Testing Program helps increase the number of qualified leads over the short term (i.e., over the next 12 months)? Scale responses from Significantly increases the number to Has no effect at all.

Q11 – How much would you say the ASVAB Student Testing Program helps increase the number of qualified leads over the long term (i.e., over the next 1-2 years)? Scale responses from Significantly increases the number to Has no effect at all.

A majority of the recruiters said the STP increased qualified leads over short term and long term – Almost three-fourths of recruiters (72%) reported that the STP helped increase the number of qualified leads somewhat or significantly over the next 12 months. More than two-thirds of recruiters (68%) said that the STP helped increase the number of leads somewhat or significantly over the next 1-2 years.

Recruiters with good MEPS support said the STP increased qualified leads over short and long term – Those recruiters with good MEPS support for administration, interpretation, and marketing said that the STP helped increase the number of qualified leads.

- Administration:
Short term 78% with good support, versus 64% without good support;
Long term 73% with good support, versus 60% without good support.
- Interpretation:
Short term 78% with good support, versus 68% without good support;
Long term 75% with good support, versus 63% without good support.
- Marketing:
Short term 79% with good support, versus 68% without good support;
Long term 75% with good support, versus 63% without good support.

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements more positive – Recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements said that the program helped increase the number of leads somewhat or significantly in the short term (81% aware, versus 69% not aware) and long term (79% aware, versus 64% not aware).

Southeast said the STP increased qualified leads more over the short term – Recruiters from the Southeast region tended to say that the STP helped increase the number of leads in the short term more than other regions (81%).

Recruiters who had recruited NPS contacts in previous year said the STP increased leads – Recruiters who had recruited NPS contacts in the previous 12 months said that the STP increased leads somewhat or significantly.

- Short term: 73% NPS, versus 55% non-NPS.
- Long term: 68% NPS, versus 56% non-NPS.

Fewer Reserve Air Force recruiters said that the STP increased leads somewhat or significantly over the long term (57%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of service, production recruiter, preparedness to market the STP, and population density.

No differences – No differences were found among groups for the demographics of component, recruit NPS contacts, or years of experience.

Table 33.

Q10,11 -- How much would you say the ASVAB Student Testing Program helps increase the number of qualified leads over the: Q10 -- short term (i.e., over the next 12 months), or Q11 – long term (i.e., over the next 1–2 years)?

	Percent Respond	Percent Somewhat/Significantly increases the number of leads		
		Short Term	Long Term	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	100 ±1	72	68	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>				
Army	100 ±1	73	70	±3
Navy	99 ±1	69	68	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±1	75	64	±7
Air Force	100 ±1	75	73 ⁺⁵	±3
<i>Component</i>				
Active	100 ±1	73	69	±3
Reserve	99 ±1	70	66	±4
<i>Service Component</i>				
Active Army	100 ±1	73	70	±3
Active Navy	100 ±0	69	67	±7
Active USMC	100 ±1	75	64	±7
Active USAF	100 ±0	77 ⁺⁵	76 ⁺⁸	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±0	71	66	±5
Reserve Navy	96 ±5	70	68	±10
Reserve Air Force	98 ±3	63	57 ⁻¹¹	±9
<i>Production recruiter</i>				
Not production	99 ±1	74	75 ⁺⁸	±5
Production recruiter	100 ±1	72	67 ⁻⁷	±3
<i>Geographic region</i>				
Northeast	99 ±1	68	66	±6
Mid-Atlantic	99 ±2	67	64	±11
Southeast	100 ±1	81 ⁺¹¹	75 ⁺⁹	±5
North Central	100 ±1	67 ⁻⁷	64	±5
South Central	100 ±0	77	70	±6
West	100 ±1	72	65	±8
Pacific	100 ±0	71	68	±6

	Percent Respond	Percent Somewhat/Significantly increases the number of leads		
		Short Term	Long Term	ME
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>				
Urban	100 ±1	72	67	±4
Suburban	100 ±1	70	66	±5
Small city/town	100 ±1	75	72 ⁺⁶	±4
Rural	100 ±0	74	68	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>				
Not prepared	100 ±1	68 ⁻⁸	65 ⁻⁶	±3
Prepared to market	100 ±1	77 ⁺⁹	71 ⁺⁶	±3
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>				
Not aware	100 ±1	69 ⁻¹²	64 ⁻¹⁴	±3
Aware of enhancements	100 ±1	81 ⁺¹²	79 ⁺¹⁵	±4
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>				
Not good support	99 ±1	64 ⁻¹⁴	60 ⁻¹³	±4
Good support	100 ±0	78 ⁺¹⁴	73 ⁺¹²	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>				
Not good support	100 ±1	68 ⁻¹⁰	63 ⁻¹²	±3
Good support	100 ±0	78 ⁺¹⁰	75 ⁺¹²	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>				
Not good support	100 ±1	68 ⁻¹¹	63 ⁻¹²	±3
Good support	100 ±0	79 ⁺¹¹	75 ⁺¹²	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size}, Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITING PROCESS

STP helpful in recruiting efforts

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Q12H – Overall, I believe the ASVAB Student Testing Program is helpful to my recruiting efforts within the high school population. Agree – Disagree scale.

Three-quarters believed STP was helpful for recruiting high school students – About three-quarters (73%) of recruiters felt that the STP was helpful to their recruiting efforts within the high school population.

Recruiters who recruited NPS contacts in last 12 months agreed more – Recruiters who reported having recruited NPS contacts in the last 12 months agreed more that the STP was helpful for recruiting within the high school population (73% NPS, versus 53% non-NPS).

Recruiters with good MEPS support agreed more that STP was helpful for recruiting high school students – Recruiters who reported good MEPS support for administration, interpretation, and marketing reported higher agreement with the statement that the STP was helpful to their recruiting efforts within the high school population.

- Administration: 83% with good support, versus 59% without good support.
- Interpretation: 83% with good support, versus 66% without good support.
- Marketing: 83% with good support, versus 66% without good support.

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements or prepared to market it agreed more – Recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements and/or prepared to market the STP agreed more that the STP was helpful for recruiting high school students (86% aware, versus 68% not aware; 79% prepared, versus 67% not prepared).

Regular duty agreed more than Reserves – Regular duty recruiters agreed more that the STP was helpful for recruiting high school students (75%) than recruiters with the Reserves (61%).

Rural agreed more – Recruiters in rural areas agreed more (81%) than recruiters in other areas that the STP was helpful in recruiting high school students.

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of production recruiter and geographic region.

No differences – No differences among groups were indicated for the demographics of service and years of experience.

Table 34.

Q12H -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Overall, I believe the ASVAB Student Testing Program is helpful to my recruiting efforts within the high school population.

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Full Sample</i>	100 ±1	6	21	73	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	100 ±1	6	23	71	±3
Navy	99 ±2	8	17	75	±6
Marine Corps	99 ±1	5	18	77	±7
Air Force	100 ±1	7	22	72	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	100 ±1	6	19 ⁻¹²	75 ⁺¹⁴	±3
Reserve	100 ±1	7	31 ⁺¹²	61 ⁻¹⁴	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	100 ±1	6	22	72	±3
Active Navy	99 ±2	8	13 ⁻¹⁰	80 ⁺⁸	±7
Active USMC	99 ±1	5	18	77	±7
Active USAF	99 ±1	6	18	76	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±1	7	27 ⁺⁷	66 ⁻⁸	±6
Reserve Navy	99 ±3	8	40 ⁺²⁰	52 ⁻²²	±12
Reserve Air Force	100 ±0	12	40 ⁺¹⁹	49 ⁻²⁴	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	100 ±0	4 ⁻³	18	78 ⁺⁶	±6
Production recruiter	100 ±1	7	21	72	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>					
Not recruit NPS	99 ±2	3 ⁻³	44 ⁺²⁴	53 ⁻²¹	±18
Recruits NPS	100 ±1	7	20	73	±3

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	100 ±1	8	22	70	±6
Mid-Atlantic	100 ±0	5	25	69	±11
Southeast	100 ±1	4 ⁻³	17	79 ⁺⁸	±5
North Central	100 ±0	7	26	67 ⁻⁷	±6
South Central	99 ±2	6	15 ⁻⁷	79 ⁺⁷	±6
West	100 ±1	6	24	71	±9
Pacific	100 ±1	6	20	74	±6
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	100 ±1	8	24	68 ⁻⁷	±5
Suburban	100 ±1	8	22	70	±5
Small city/town	99 ±1	5	19	76	±5
Rural	100 ±1	4	15 ⁻⁷	81 ⁺¹⁰	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	99 ±1	8 ⁺³	25 ⁺⁸	67 ⁻¹¹	±4
Prepared to market	100 ±1	5 ⁻³	16 ⁻¹⁰	79 ⁺¹²	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	100 ±1	8 ⁺⁵	24 ⁺¹²	68 ⁻¹⁷	±3
Aware of enhancements	100 ±1	3 ⁻⁴	11 ⁻¹³	86 ⁺¹⁸	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	9 ⁺⁵	32 ⁺¹⁹	59 ⁻²⁴	±4
Good support	100 ±1	4 ⁻⁵	13 ⁻¹⁸	83 ⁺²³	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	8 ⁺⁴	26 ⁺¹³	66 ⁻¹⁷	±3
Good support	99 ±1	4 ⁻⁴	13 ⁻¹³	83 ⁺¹⁷	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	8 ⁺⁴	26 ⁺¹²	66 ⁻¹⁶	±3
Good support	99 ±1	4 ⁻⁴	14 ⁻¹²	83 ⁺¹⁷	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p < .01$: Lower=^{-effect size}, higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITING PROCESS

The STP as a valuable source of leads

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

**Q12A – The ASVAB Student Testing Program is a valuable source of leads for me.
Agree – Disagree scale.**

Three-fourths believed the STP was a valuable source of leads – Slightly less than three-fourths (72%) of recruiters felt that the STP was a valuable source of leads.

Recruiters with good MEPS support agreed more that the STP was a valuable source of leads – Recruiters who reported good MEPS support for administration, interpretation, and marketing reported higher agreement with the statement that the STP was a valuable source of leads.

- Administration: 80% with good support, versus 60% without good support.
- Interpretation: 81% with good support, versus 65% without good support.
- Marketing: 81% with good support, versus 65% without good support.

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements or prepared to market it agreed more – Recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements or were prepared to market the program agreed more that the STP was a valuable source of leads (85% aware, versus 67% not aware; 77% prepared, versus 67% not prepared).

Recruiters who recruited NPS contacts in last 12 months agreed more – Recruiters who reported having recruited NPS contacts in the last 12 months agreed more that the STP was a valuable source of leads (73% NPS, versus 51% non-NPS).

Reserve Navy and Air Force agreed less – Fewer Reserve Navy (44%) and Reserve Air Force (51%) recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that the STP was a valuable source of leads.

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of service, geographic region, population density, and years of experience greater than or less than one year.

Negligible differences – Negligible differences were indicated for the demographic of production recruiter.

No differences – No difference was found between assignments of less than and greater than six years of recruiting duty.

Table 35.

*Q12A -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
The ASVAB Student Testing Program is a valuable source of leads for me.*

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Full Sample</i>	99 ±1	8	20	72	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	99 ±1	7	20	73	±3
Navy	100 ±1	12	24	65 ⁻⁸	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±1	6	17	77	±7
Air Force	99 ±1	11	15 ⁻⁵	74	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	99 ±1	8	19 ⁻⁷	73 ⁺¹⁰	±3
Reserve	99 ±1	11	26 ⁺⁷	63 ⁻¹⁰	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	99 ±1	7	20	73	±3
Active Navy	100 ±0	12	19	69	±7
Active USMC	100 ±1	6	17	77	±7
Active USAF	99 ±1	9	13 ⁻⁷	78 ⁺⁷	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±1	10	20	71	±6
Reserve Navy	99 ±3	10	46 ⁺²⁷	44 ⁻²⁹	±12
Reserve Air Force	99 ±2	23 ⁺¹⁵	26	51 ⁻²¹	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	99 ±1	5 ⁻⁴	22	73	±6
Production recruiter	99 ±1	9 ⁺⁴	19	72	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>					
Not recruit NPS	99 ±3	12	37 ⁺¹⁷	51 ⁻²¹	±18
Recruits NPS	100 ±1	9	18 ⁻⁷	73	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than one year	100 ±1	6	23	71	±6
1 or more years	99 ±1	9	19 ⁻⁶	72	±3

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	99 ±1	13 ⁺⁵	20	67	±6
Mid-Atlantic	99 ±2	10	30	60	±11
Southeast	99 ±1	7	15 ⁻⁶	79 ⁺⁹	±5
North Central	100 ±1	9	24	66	±6
South Central	100 ±1	6	16	78 ⁺⁸	±6
West	99 ±2	8	21	72	±9
Pacific	99 ±1	8	19	73	±6
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	99 ±1	10	23	68 ⁻⁵	±5
Suburban	100 ±1	12	18	70	±5
Small city/town	99 ±1	6 ⁻³	18	76 ⁺⁶	±5
Rural	100 ±1	7	17	76	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	99 ±1	11 ⁺⁵	22	67 ⁻⁹	±4
Prepared to market	99 ±1	6 ⁻⁵	17 ⁻⁶	77 ⁺¹¹	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	100 ±1	10 ⁺⁶	23 ⁺¹⁰	67 ⁻¹⁷	±3
Aware of enhancements	99 ±1	4 ⁻⁶	11 ⁻¹²	85 ⁺¹⁸	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	13 ⁺⁸	27 ⁺¹²	60 ⁻²⁰	±4
Good support	100 ±1	5 ⁻⁸	15 ⁻¹²	80 ⁺²⁰	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	11 ⁺⁶	24 ⁺¹⁰	65 ⁻¹⁶	±3
Good support	99 ±1	5 ⁻⁶	14 ⁻¹⁰	81 ⁺¹⁶	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	11 ⁺⁶	24 ⁺⁹	65 ⁻¹⁵	±3
Good support	100 ±1	5 ⁻⁶	14 ⁻¹⁰	81 ⁺¹⁶	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITING PROCESS

The STP providing leads

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Q12B – The ASVAB Student Testing Program provides more leads than I would have gotten otherwise. Agree – Disagree scale.

Half agreed that the STP provides more leads – Slightly more than half (52%) of recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that the STP provided more leads than they would have gotten otherwise.

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements agreed more – Recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements agreed more that the program provided more leads than would otherwise be the case (69% aware, versus 45% not aware).

Recruiters who recruited NPS contacts in last 12 months agreed more – Recruiters who reported having recruited NPS contacts in the last 12 months agreed more that the STP provided more leads than they would have gotten otherwise (53% NPS, versus 31% non-NPS).

Recruiters with good MEPS support agreed more that STP provided more leads – Recruiters who reported good MEPS support for administration, interpretation, and marketing reported higher agreement with the statement that the STP provided more leads than they would have otherwise gotten.

- Administration: 59% with good support, versus 42% without good support.
- Interpretation: 59% with good support, versus 47% without good support.
- Marketing: 62% with good support, versus 45% without good support.

Service Component Effects –

Fewer Reserve Navy (33%) and Reserve Air Force (38%) recruiters agreed that the STP provided more leads.

More Active Air Force recruiters agreed that the STP provided more leads (61%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of years of experience greater than or less than one year, geographic region, and preparedness to market the STP.

No differences – No differences among groups were found for the demographics of component, production recruiter, years of experience greater than or less than six years, and population density.

Table 36.

Q12B -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? The ASVAB Student Testing Program provides more leads than I would have gotten otherwise.

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
Full Sample	100 ±1	17	31	52	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	99 ±1	16	32	52	±3
Navy	100 ±1	17	29	54	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±0	22	33	45	±7
Air Force	100 ±1	14	25 ⁻⁶	61 ⁺¹⁰	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	100 ±1	17	30 ⁻⁶	53 ⁺⁷	±3
Reserve	100 ±1	18	36 ⁺⁶	46 ⁻⁷	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	99 ±1	15	33	52	±3
Active Navy	100 ±1	18	24 ⁻⁸	59	±7
Active USMC	100 ±0	22	33	45	±7
Active USAF	99 ±1	13 ⁻⁵	22 ⁻¹⁰	65 ⁺¹⁴	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±1	17	31	52	±6
Reserve Navy	100 ±0	16	52 ⁺²²	33 ⁻²⁰	±12
Reserve Air Force	100 ±0	26	37	38 ⁻¹⁴	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	100 ±0	15	30	54	±6
Production recruiter	100 ±1	18	31	51	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>					
Not recruit NPS	97 ±4	14	55 ⁺²⁵	31 ⁻²¹	±18
Recruits NPS	100 ±1	17	29	53	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than one year	100 ±1	14	38 ⁺⁹	48	±6
1 or more years	100 ±1	18	29 ⁻⁹	53	±3

	Percent	Percentages			ME
	Respond	Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	100 ±1	20	32	48	±6
Mid-Atlantic	100 ±0	19	36	45	±11
Southeast	100 ±1	14	29	57 ⁺⁷	±5
North Central	99 ±1	19	31	50	±6
South Central	100 ±1	12 ⁻⁶	28	59 ⁺⁹	±6
West	100 ±0	19	30	51	±9
Pacific	100 ±1	20	33	47	±6
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	100 ±1	19	32	49 ⁻⁵	±4
Prepared to market	100 ±1	16	29	55 ⁺⁷	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	100 ±1	20 ⁺⁹	35 ⁺¹⁴	45 ⁻²³	±3
Aware of enhancements	99 ±1	11 ⁻⁹	20 ⁻¹⁵	69 ⁺²⁴	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	21 ⁺⁶	37 ⁺¹⁰	42 ⁻¹⁷	±4
Good support	100 ±1	15 ⁻⁶	27 ⁻¹⁰	59 ⁺¹⁷	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	20 ⁺⁶	33 ⁺⁵	47 ⁻¹²	±3
Good support	100 ±1	14 ⁻⁶	27 ⁻⁶	59 ⁺¹²	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	21 ⁺⁹	34 ⁺⁷	45 ⁻¹⁶	±3
Good support	100 ±1	12 ⁻⁹	26 ⁻⁸	62 ⁺¹⁷	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p < .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITING PROCESS

The STP increasing access to schools

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

**Q12C – The ASVAB Student Testing Program increases my access to schools.
Agree – Disagree scale.**

Half agreed that the STP increased access to schools – Slightly more than half (53%) of recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that the STP increased access to schools.

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements or prepared to market it agreed more – Recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements agreed more that the STP increased access to schools (70% aware, versus 46% not aware). In addition, recruiters prepared to market the STP agreed more that the STP increased access to schools than recruiters not prepared to market it (58% prepared, versus 47% not prepared).

Recruiters with good MEPS support agreed more that STP increased access to schools – Recruiters who reported good MEPS support for administration, interpretation, and marketing reported higher agreement with the statement that the STP increased access to schools.

- Administration: 61% with good support, versus 41% without good support.
- Interpretation: 62% with good support, versus 47% without good support.
- Marketing: 63% with good support, versus 45% without good support.

Mid-Atlantic agreed least – Recruiters in the Mid-Atlantic region tended to agree less than other regions that the STP increased access to schools (39%). They also tended to be more neutral (47%).

Rural recruiters agreed most– Recruiters in rural areas agreed more than recruiters in other areas that the STP increased access to schools (61%).

Reserve Navy agreed less – Fewer Reserve Navy recruiters agreed that the STP increased access to schools (40%).

No differences – No differences were found among groups for the demographics of service, production recruiter, NPS contacts recruited, and years of experience.

Table 37.

*Q12C -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
The ASVAB Student Testing Program increases my access to schools.*

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Full Sample</i>	99 ±1	15	32	53	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	99 ±1	13	32	54	±3
Navy	99 ±2	16	30	53	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±0	18	32	49	±7
Air Force	99 ±1	18	33	50	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	99 ±1	15	31 ⁻⁷	54 ⁺⁹	±3
Reserve	99 ±1	16	38 ⁺⁷	45 ⁻⁹	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	99 ±1	12 ⁻⁵	32	56	±3
Active Navy	99 ±2	17	28	56	±7
Active USMC	100 ±0	18	32	49	±7
Active USAF	99 ±1	17	32	51	±4
Reserve Army	99 ±1	16	36	48	±6
Reserve Navy	98 ±3	14	46 ⁺¹⁴	40 ⁻¹³	±12
Reserve Air Force	99 ±2	23	34	43	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	99 ±2	13	30	56	±6
Production recruiter	99 ±1	16	32	52	±3
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	99 ±2	17	33	49	±6
Mid-Atlantic	99 ±2	14	47 ⁺¹⁶	39 ⁻¹⁵	±11
Southeast	99 ±2	14	29	57	±5
North Central	100 ±1	17	33	50	±6
South Central	100 ±1	14	28	58	±6
West	99 ±2	19	28	53	±9
Pacific	98 ±2	13	32	54	±6

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	98 ±1	19 ⁺⁵	32	49	±5
Suburban	100 ±1	18	36	46 ⁻⁸	±5
Small city/town	99 ±1	11 ⁻⁶	32	57	±5
Rural	99 ±2	13	26 ⁻⁸	61 ⁺¹⁰	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	99 ±1	18 ⁺⁵	35	47 ⁻¹⁰	±4
Prepared to market	99 ±1	13 ⁻⁵	29 ⁻⁶	58 ⁺¹¹	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	100 ±1	18 ⁺⁹	36 ⁺¹⁴	46 ⁻²³	±3
Aware of enhancements	99 ±1	9 ⁻⁸	21 ⁻¹⁵	70 ⁺²⁴	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	19 ⁺⁷	39 ⁺¹²	41 ⁻²⁰	±4
Good support	99 ±1	12 ⁻⁷	27 ⁻¹²	61 ⁺²⁰	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	17 ⁺⁴	36 ⁺¹⁰	47 ⁻¹⁴	±3
Good support	99 ±1	13	25 ⁻¹²	62 ⁺¹⁵	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	18 ⁺⁷	36 ⁺⁹	45 ⁻¹⁸	±3
Good support	99 ±1	11 ⁻⁷	26 ⁻¹⁰	63 ⁺¹⁸	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITING PROCESS

The STP as an effective recruiting tool

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Q12D – The ASVAB Student Testing Program is an effective recruiting tool for me.
Agree – Disagree scale.

Two-thirds agreed that the STP was an effective recruiting tool – About two-thirds (64%) of recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that the STP was an effective recruiting tool.

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements or prepared to market it agreed more – Recruiters aware of STP enhancements agreed more that the STP was an effective recruiting tool (80% aware, versus 58% not aware). In addition, recruiters prepared to market the STP agreed more that the STP was an effective recruiting tool than recruiters not prepared to market it (70% prepared, versus 58% not prepared).

Recruiters with good MEPS support agreed more that STP was an effective recruiting tool – Recruiters who reported good MEPS support for administration, interpretation, and marketing reported higher agreement with the statement that the STP was an effective recruiting tool.

- Administration: 73% with good support, versus 51% without good support.
- Interpretation: 74% with good support, versus 57% without good support.
- Marketing: 76% with good support, versus 56% without good support.

Reserve Navy and Air Force agreed less – Fewer Reserve Navy (42%) and Reserve Air Force (38%) recruiters agreed that the STP was an effective recruiting tool.

Southeast agreed most – Recruiters in the Southeastern region agreed more that the STP was an effective recruiting tool (72%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of years of experience greater than or less than one year, and population density.

No differences – No differences were found among groups for the demographics of service, years of experience greater than or less than six years, production recruiter, and NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months.

Table 38.

*Q12D -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
The ASVAB Student Testing Program is an effective recruiting tool for me.*

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Full Sample</i>	99 ±1	10	26	64	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	99 ±1	9	27	64	±3
Navy	99 ±2	13	24	64	±6
Marine Corps	99 ±1	9	26	65	±7
Air Force	99 ±1	10	26	64	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	99 ±1	10	25 ⁻¹⁰	66 ⁺¹¹	±3
Reserve	99 ±1	10	35 ⁺¹⁰	55 ⁻¹¹	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	99 ±1	8	27	64	±3
Active Navy	99 ±2	13	19 ⁻⁹	68	±7
Active USMC	99 ±1	9	26	65	±7
Active USAF	99 ±1	9	22	69 ⁺⁵	±4
Reserve Army	99 ±1	10	29	62	±6
Reserve Navy	99 ±2	10	47 ⁺²²	42 ⁻²³	±12
Reserve Air Force	97 ±3	18	44 ⁺¹⁸	38 ⁻²⁶	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	99 ±1	9	24	68	±6
Production recruiter	99 ±1	10	26	64	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than one year	99 ±2	7	30	63	±6
1 or more years	99 ±1	11	25 ⁻⁶	65	±3

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/Strongly agree	
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	98 ±2	16 ⁺⁷	27	56 ⁻⁹	±6
Mid-Atlantic	99 ±2	11	28	61	±11
Southeast	99 ±1	6 ⁻⁵	21 ⁻⁶	72 ⁺¹⁰	±5
North Central	99 ±1	11	28	61	±6
South Central	99 ±1	7	23	69	±6
West	100 ±1	10	30	60	±9
Pacific	99 ±2	9	27	64	±6
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	98 ±2	12	28	61	±5
Suburban	99 ±1	13	26	61	±5
Small city/town	99 ±1	8	24	68 ⁺⁶	±5
Rural	99 ±1	8	24	69	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	99 ±1	12 ⁺⁴	30 ⁺⁷	58 ⁻¹¹	±4
Prepared to market	99 ±1	8 ⁻⁴	22 ⁻⁸	70 ⁺¹²	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	99 ±1	12 ⁺⁷	30 ⁺¹⁴	58 ⁻²¹	±3
Aware of enhancements	99 ±1	5 ⁻⁷	14 ⁻¹⁶	80 ⁺²²	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	98 ±1	15 ⁺⁸	35 ⁺¹⁵	51 ⁻²²	±4
Good support	99 ±1	7 ⁻⁷	20 ⁻¹⁵	73 ⁺²²	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	12 ⁺⁵	31 ⁺¹¹	57 ⁻¹⁷	±3
Good support	99 ±1	7 ⁻⁵	19 ⁻¹²	74 ⁺¹⁷	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	13 ⁺⁷	32 ⁺¹³	56 ⁻¹⁹	±3
Good support	99 ±1	6 ⁻⁷	18 ⁻¹⁴	76 ⁺²¹	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Lack of STP would hinder recruiting efforts

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Q12E – If the ASVAB Student Testing Program were discontinued, my recruiting efforts would suffer. Agree – Disagree scale.

About half agreed that recruiting would suffer without the STP – Slightly more than half (53%) of recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that their recruiting efforts would suffer without the STP.

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements agreed more – Recruiters aware of STP enhancements agreed more that their recruiting efforts would suffer without the STP (70% aware, versus 47% not aware).

Recruiters who recruited NPS contacts in last 12 months agreed more – Recruiters who reported having recruited NPS contacts in the last 12 months agreed more that their recruiting efforts would suffer without the STP (54% NPS, versus 35% non-NPS).

Recruiters with good MEPS support agreed more that their recruiting efforts would suffer without the STP – Recruiters who reported good MEPS support for administration, interpretation, and marketing reported higher agreement with the statement that if the STP were discontinued, their recruiting efforts would suffer.

- Administration: 61% with good support, versus 43% without good support.
- Interpretation: 62% with good support, versus 47% without good support.
- Marketing: 62% with good support, versus 48% without good support.

Service Component Effects –

Fewer Reserve Air Force recruiters agreed that recruiting efforts would suffer without STP (41%).

More Active Navy (63%) and Active Air Force (63%) recruiters agreed that recruiting efforts would suffer without STP.

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of component, service, geographic region, years of experience greater than or less than one year, population density, and preparedness to market the STP.

No differences – No differences were found for the demographics of production recruiter and years of experience greater than or less than six years.

Table 39.

Q12E -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? If the ASVAB Student Testing Program were discontinued, my recruiting efforts would suffer.

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
Full Sample	99 ±1	18	29	53	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	99 ±1	17	31	52	±3
Navy	100 ±1	15	25	60 ⁺⁸	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±0	24	30	47	±7
Air Force	99 ±1	16	25 ⁻⁴	60 ⁺⁷	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	99 ±1	17	28 ⁻⁷	55 ⁺⁸	±3
Reserve	100 ±1	18	35 ⁺⁷	47 ⁻⁸	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	99 ±1	16	31	53	±3
Active Navy	100 ±1	15	22 ⁻⁹	63 ⁺¹²	±7
Active USMC	100 ±0	24	30	47	±7
Active USAF	99 ±1	15	22 ⁻⁸	63 ⁺¹⁰	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±0	18	34	48	±6
Reserve Navy	99 ±3	14	39	46	±12
Reserve Air Force	99 ±2	24	35	41 ⁻¹³	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	100 ±1	16	26	58	±6
Production recruiter	99 ±1	18	30	53	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>					
Not recruit NPS	99 ±3	16	49 ⁺²¹	35 ⁻¹⁹	±18
Recruits NPS	100 ±1	18	28	54	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than one year	100 ±1	11 ⁻⁸	35 ⁺⁷	54	±6
1 or more years	99 ±1	19 ⁺⁸	27 ⁻⁹	54	±3

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/Strongly agree	
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	100 ±1	21	28	51	±6
Mid-Atlantic	99 ±2	17	32	51	±11
Southeast	100 ±1	14	27	60 ⁺⁸	±5
North Central	99 ±1	21	31	48	±6
South Central	100 ±1	12 ⁻⁷	27	61 ⁺⁹	±6
West	99 ±1	17	26	57	±9
Pacific	99 ±1	21	32	47	±6
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	100 ±1	17	33	50	±5
Suburban	99 ±1	21	28	51	±5
Small city/town	99 ±1	20	26	54	±5
Rural	99 ±1	12 ⁻⁷	27	61 ⁺⁹	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	100 ±1	18	33 ⁺⁷	49 ⁻⁸	±4
Prepared to market	99 ±1	17	25 ⁻⁸	57 ⁺⁸	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	100 ±1	19 ⁺⁶	33 ⁺¹⁴	47 ⁻²¹	±3
Aware of enhancements	99 ±1	13 ⁻⁶	18 ⁻¹⁵	70 ⁺²³	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	19	38 ⁺¹⁵	43 ⁻¹⁸	±4
Good support	100 ±1	16	23 ⁻¹⁴	61 ⁺¹⁸	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	18	34 ⁺¹³	47 ⁻¹⁵	±3
Good support	99 ±1	16	22 ⁻¹²	62 ⁺¹⁵	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	19	34 ⁺¹¹	48 ⁻¹³	±3
Good support	100 ±1	15	23 ⁻¹⁰	62 ⁺¹⁵	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITING PROCESS

The STP making the recruiting job easier

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Q12F – The ASVAB Student Testing Program makes my recruiting job easier.
Agree – Disagree scale.

More than half agreed that the STP made their job easier– More than half (60%) of recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that the STP made their recruiting job easier.

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements or prepared to market it agreed more – Recruiters aware of STP enhancements agreed more that the STP made their job easier (76% aware, versus 53% not aware). In addition, 65% of recruiters prepared to market the STP agreed or strongly agreed, versus 54% not prepared.

Recruiters with good MEPS support agreed more that the STP made their job easier – Recruiters who reported good MEPS support for administration, interpretation, and marketing reported higher agreement with the statement that the STP made their recruiting job easier.

- Administration: 68% with good support, versus 47% without good support.
- Interpretation: 71% with good support, versus 52% without good support.
- Marketing: 72% with good support, versus 51% without good support.

Reserve agreed less – Reserve recruiters agreed less that the STP made their job easier (46%) than recruiters with the regular active components (62%).

Active Navy agreed more – More Active Navy recruiters agreed that the STP made their job easier (70%).

Northeast agreed least – Recruiters in the Northeastern region agreed least that the STP made their job easier (51%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of service, recruiting zone population density, and years of experience less than or greater than one year.

No differences – No differences were found among groups for the demographics of production recruiter, years of experience less than or greater than six years, and NPS contacts recruited within the last 12 months.

Table 40.

*Q12F -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
The ASVAB Student Testing Program makes my recruiting job easier.*

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Full Sample</i>	99 ±1	11	29	60	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	100 ±1	11	32 ⁺⁶	58	±3
Navy	99 ±1	11	23 ⁻⁸	66 ⁺⁸	±6
Marine Corps	99 ±1	13	27	60	±7
Air Force	99 ±1	10	31	59	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	99 ±1	11	27 ⁻¹⁵	62 ⁺¹⁶	±3
Reserve	100 ±1	12	42 ⁺¹⁵	46 ⁻¹⁶	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	100 ±1	10	30	59	±3
Active Navy	99 ±1	11	18 ⁻¹³	70 ⁺¹³	±7
Active USMC	99 ±1	13	27	60	±7
Active USAF	99 ±1	9	28	64	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±1	12	39 ⁺¹¹	48 ⁻¹³	±6
Reserve Navy	100 ±0	11	47 ⁺¹⁹	43 ⁻¹⁷	±12
Reserve Air Force	100 ±0	18	47 ⁺¹⁸	35 ⁻²⁵	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	100 ±1	9	26	65	±6
Production recruiter	99 ±1	12	30	59	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than one year	100 ±1	7 ⁻⁵	34	59	±6
1 or more years	99 ±1	12 ⁺⁵	28 ⁻⁷	60	±3

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	99 ±2	15	35	51 ⁻¹⁰	±6
Mid-Atlantic	100 ±0	15	33	53	±11
Southeast	100 ±1	8 ⁻⁴	26	66 ⁺⁸	±5
North Central	100 ±1	13	28	59	±6
South Central	100 ±0	9	24 ⁻⁶	67 ⁺⁹	±6
West	99 ±2	12	34	54	±9
Pacific	100 ±1	11	28	60	±6
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	99 ±1	13	33 ⁺⁶	54 ⁻⁸	±5
Suburban	99 ±1	15	29	56	±5
Small city/town	100 ±1	9	27	64 ⁺⁶	±5
Rural	99 ±1	9	24 ⁻⁶	67 ⁺⁹	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	99 ±1	13	33 ⁺⁸	54 ⁻¹¹	±4
Prepared to market	100 ±1	10	25 ⁻⁹	65 ⁺¹²	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	100 ±1	13 ⁺⁶	34 ⁺¹⁶	53 ⁻²²	±3
Aware of enhancements	100 ±1	7 ⁻⁶	17 ⁻¹⁶	76 ⁺²²	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	14 ⁺⁴	39 ⁺¹⁷	47 ⁻²¹	±4
Good support	100 ±1	10	22 ⁻¹⁷	68 ⁺²⁰	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	13 ⁺⁴	35 ⁺¹⁵	52 ⁻¹⁹	±3
Good support	100 ±1	9 ⁻⁴	20 ⁻¹⁵	71 ⁺¹⁹	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	99 ±1	14 ⁺⁶	35 ⁺¹⁴	51 ⁻²⁰	±3
Good support	100 ±1	8 ⁻⁶	20 ⁻¹⁵	72 ⁺²¹	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

RECRUITING PROCESS

Time spent with the STP in recruiting

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Q12G – Considering everything, I feel that the time I spend on the ASVAB Student Testing Program is worth the recruiting payoff. Agree – Disagree scale.

About two-thirds felt time spent on the STP was worth the payoff – Slightly fewer than two-thirds (62%) of recruiters agreed that time spent on the STP was worth the recruiting payoff.

More recruiters with good MEPS support thought the STP was worth it – Far more recruiters with good MEPS support for administration, interpretation, and marketing thought that the time spent on the STP was worth the recruiting payoff.

- Administration: 72% with good support, versus 48% without good support.
- Interpretation: 75% with good support, versus 53% without good support.
- Marketing: 74% with good support, versus 54% without good support.

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements and prepared to market it found STP more worth it – More recruiters aware of STP enhancements and prepared to market the STP felt that the time they spent with it was worth the recruiting payoff.

- Awareness: 80% aware, versus 55% not aware.
- Preparedness: 70% prepared, versus 54% not prepared.

Reserve recruiters agreed less – Fewer Reserve recruiters felt that time spent on the STP was worth the recruiting payoff (49%) than recruiters in the Active components (64%).

Active Navy recruiters agreed more – More active Navy recruiters agreed that time spent on the STP was worth the recruiting payoff (69%).

Recruiters who recruited NPS contacts in last 12 months more positive – Recruiters who had recruited NPS contacts in the last 12 months agreed more that time spent with the STP was worth the payoff (62% NPS, versus 39% non-NPS). Not surprisingly, those who had not recruited NPS were also more neutral (54% non-NPS, versus 29% NPS).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of production recruiter, geographic location, recruiting zone population density, and years of experience less than or greater than one year.

No differences – No differences were found among groups were for the demographics of service and years of experience less than or greater than six years.

Table 41.

Q12G -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Considering everything, I feel that the time I spend on the ASVAB Student Testing Program is worth the recruiting payoff.

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
Full Sample	100 ±1	8	30	62	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	100 ±1	7	31	61	±3
Navy	100 ±1	10	26	64	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±0	8	29	62	±7
Air Force	99 ±1	10	30	60	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	100 ±1	8	28 ⁻¹⁴	64 ⁺¹⁵	±3
Reserve	99 ±1	9	42 ⁺¹⁴	49 ⁻¹⁵	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	100 ±1	7	30	63	±3
Active Navy	100 ±0	10	21 ⁻¹¹	69 ⁺⁹	±7
Active USMC	100 ±0	8	29	62	±7
Active USAF	99 ±1	9	25 ⁻⁵	66	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±1	8	37 ⁺⁸	55 ⁻⁸	±6
Reserve Navy	97 ±4	7	52 ⁺²³	41 ⁻²²	±12
Reserve Air Force	99 ±2	17 ⁺⁹	54 ⁺²⁴	28 ⁻³⁴	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	100 ±1	5 ⁻⁴	26	69 ⁺⁹	±6
Production recruiter	100 ±1	9 ⁺⁴	30	61 ⁻⁶	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>					
Not recruit NPS	99 ±3	7	54 ⁺²⁵	39 ⁻²⁴	±18
Recruits NPS	100 ±1	9	29	62	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>					
Less than one year	100 ±1	5 ⁻⁴	37 ⁺⁹	58	±6
1 or more years	100 ±1	9	28 ⁻⁹	63	±3

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/Strongly agree	
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	100 ±1	9	32	59	±6
Mid-Atlantic	99 ±2	9	38	54	±11
Southeast	100 ±1	5 ⁻⁴	25 ⁻⁶	69 ⁺⁹	±5
North Central	100 ±1	9	34	56	±6
South Central	100 ±1	8	23 ⁻⁸	69 ⁺⁸	±6
West	100 ±0	8	36	56	±9
Pacific	99 ±1	9	29	62	±6
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	100 ±1	9	31	60	±5
Suburban	100 ±0	9	34	57	±5
Small city/town	99 ±1	7	29	64	±5
Rural	100 ±1	8	24 ⁻⁷	68 ⁺⁸	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	100 ±1	10	37 ⁺¹³	54 ⁻¹⁵	±4
Prepared to market	100 ±1	7 ⁻³	23 ⁻¹⁴	70 ⁺¹⁶	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	100 ±1	10 ⁺⁵	35 ⁺¹⁹	55 ⁻²⁴	±3
Aware of enhancements	100 ±1	4 ⁻⁶	15 ⁻²⁰	80 ⁺²⁵	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	11 ⁺⁵	41 ⁺¹⁹	48 ⁻²⁴	±4
Good support	100 ±1	6 ⁻⁵	22 ⁻¹⁹	72 ⁺²⁴	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	10 ⁺⁴	37 ⁺¹⁷	53 ⁻²¹	±3
Good support	100 ±1	6 ⁻⁴	20 ⁻¹⁷	75 ⁺²²	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	100 ±1	10 ⁺⁴	36 ⁺¹⁵	54 ⁻¹⁹	±3
Good support	100 ±1	6 ⁻⁴	20 ⁻¹⁷	74 ⁺²⁰	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

Program Enhancements

This section examines familiarity with, and opinions of, the new STP in terms of the following:

- Familiarity with STP components
- Awareness of STP enhancements
- Extent of STP on-line resource exploration
- Belief that STP websites are helpful to students
- Belief that STP enhancements will make recruiting easier
- Whether or not STP enhancements will make it easier to interest students in military careers
- Whether or not STP enhancements will make it easier to gain access to students
- Opinion of how well the new STP educates about career options in the military

Highlights

- Recruiters were most familiar with the ASVAB Summary Results Sheet and *Exploring Careers: The ASVAB Career Exploration Guide*. In contrast, the majority of recruiters were unfamiliar with the training DVD, the *Find Your Interests* (FYI) interest inventory, and program websites.
- Overall, recruiters appeared to not be aware of STP enhancements. Only slightly more than a quarter (28%) of recruiters was made aware of STP enhancements during training. Consequently, it is not surprising to see that 41% of recruiters said they had not explored the STP on-line resources. Only about half (48% believed the program websites were helpful to those interested in exploring military careers.
- About four in ten recruiters indicated that the enhancements should improve several aspects of the recruiting mission:
 - 42% believed the enhancements would make it easier to recruit qualified applicants.
 - 41% felt the enhancements would make it easier to interest students in exploring a military career.
 - 37% felt the enhancements would make it easier to gain access to students
- A consistent finding was that recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements tended to be very positive about them, versus recruiters who were not aware (unaware recruiters were largely neutral). This difference should be emphasized, as it is by far the largest difference of all the demographic cuts in this section. Tables 42 and 43 provide an overview of the differences in beliefs about the STP broken out by awareness and non-awareness of the STP enhancements. The items presented in these tables are described and interpreted in more detail later in the report.

Table 42.

Awareness and Non-awareness of the STP enhancements as helpful to both students and recruiters.

Survey Item	/	Aware Group vs. Not Aware Group	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree or strongly agree
<i>Q14C. I believe the STP websites are helpful to students who are interested in exploring military careers.</i>				
		Aware of STP enhancements	15%	84%
		Not aware of STP enhancements	58%	34%
<i>Q14D. I believe the enhancements that were made to the STP will make it easier to recruit qualified applicants.</i>				
		Aware of STP enhancements	17%	81%
		Not aware of STP enhancements	68%	27%
<i>Q14E. These enhancements will make it easier to interest students in exploring a military career than if the enhancements had not been done.</i>				
		Aware of STP enhancements	16%	81%
		Not aware of STP enhancements	70%	25%
<i>Q14F. These enhancements will make it easier to gain access to students than if the enhancements had not been done.</i>				
		Aware of STP enhancements	19%	75%
		Not aware of STP enhancements	73%	22%

Table 43.

Awareness and Non-awareness of the STP enhancements as helpful in educating students about military career options.

Survey Item	/	Aware Group vs. Not Aware Group	Neither well nor poorly	Well or very well
<i>Q15. How well does the newly redesigned STP educate students about career options in the military?</i>				
		Aware of STP enhancements	19%	80%
		Not aware of STP enhancements	54%	41%

PROGRAM ENHANCEMENTS

Familiarity with ASVAB STP components

Table 44.

Q13 Overall -- Please mark all of the ASVAB Student Testing Program Components that you are familiar with.

ASVAB STP Component	Percent Familiar
A. ASVAB Student Testing Program Training DVD	15
B. ASVAB Summary Results Sheet (report of student scores)	59
C. Exploring Careers: The ASVAB Career Exploration Guide	46
D. FYI – Find Your Interests (interest inventory)	19
E. www.asvabprogram.com (website that contains the online FYI and OCCU-Find)	15
F. www.CareersInTheMilitary.com (military careers website)	21

Most recruiters familiar with Summary Results Sheet, fewer with *Career Exploration Guide*, and very few with others – The majority of recruiters (59%) were familiar with the Summary Results Sheet. Less than half (46%) were familiar with the *Career Exploration Guide*. Between 15% and 21% of recruiters were familiar with other program components.

Recruiters prepared to market and aware of enhancements were much more familiar – Recruiters who were prepared to market the STP or who were aware of STP enhancements were more familiar with program components than were recruiters who were not aware or not prepared.

- Aware: 63% of recruiters aware of STP enhancements were familiar with the *Exploring Careers: The ASVAB Career Exploration Guide*, compared to 40% of recruiters not aware.
- Prepared: 60% of recruiters prepared to market the STP were familiar with the *Exploring Careers: The ASVAB Career Exploration Guide*, compared to 30% of recruiters not prepared.

Recruiters with good MEPS support had greater familiarity – Recruiter familiarity with the various STP components varied by perceived level of MEPS support. These results are also similar to those of recruiters who were aware of the enhancements or prepared to market the program. Familiarity levels (agree and strongly agree) among recruiters receiving good MEPS support follow.

- Administration: familiarity greater for good MEPS support with all components except the training DVD and [asvabprogram.com](http://www.asvabprogram.com) website.
- Interpretation: familiarity greater for good MEPS support with all components except [CareersInTheMilitary.com](http://www.CareersInTheMilitary.com) website.
- Marketing: familiarity greater for good MEPS support for the Summary Results Sheet and the *Career Exploration Guide*.

Recruiters who recruited NPS contacts more familiar with some components – Recruiters involved with recruiting NPS contacts were more familiar with the Summary

Results Sheet (59% NPS, versus 25% not NPS) and the *Career Exploration Guide* (44% NPS, versus 24% not NPS).

More experienced recruiters more familiar with some components – Recruiters with one or more years of experience were more familiar with the Summary Results Sheet (61% more than one year, versus 51% less than one year) and the *Career Exploration Guide* (50% more than one year, versus 31% less than one year).

Likewise, recruiters with six or more years experience were more familiar with the training DVD (25% more than six years, versus 13% less than six years), *Career Exploration Guide* (60% more than six years, versus 44% less than six), and the CareersInTheMilitary.com website (29% more than six years, versus 20% less than six).

Service Component Effects –

Fewer Reserve Navy and Reserve Air Force recruiters were familiar with the Summary Results Sheet (38% and 48%, respectively), the *Career Exploration Guide* (26% and 30%, respectively), and the FYI inventory (10% and 4%, respectively).

Marine Corps recruiters were more familiar with the Summary Results Sheet than were other branches (71%).

Rural recruiters most familiar with Summary Results Sheet – Recruiters in rural areas tended to be more familiar with the Summary Results Sheet than recruiters in other areas (69%).

Non-production recruiters more familiar with some components – Non-production recruiters were more familiar with the *Career Exploration Guide* (59% non-production, versus 44% production) and the CareersInTheMilitary.com website (29% of non-production, versus 19% production).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographic of geographic region.

Table 45.

Q13A-F -- Please mark all of the ASVAB Student Testing Program Components that you are familiar with.

- A. ASVAB Student Testing Program Training DVD (training for conducting ASVAB interpretations)**
- B. ASVAB Summary Results Sheet (report of student scores)**
- C. *Exploring Careers: The ASVAB Career Exploration Guide***
- D. FYI - *Find Your Interests* (interest inventory)**
- E. www.asvabprogram.com (website that contains the online FYI and OCCU-Find)**
- F. www.CareersInTheMilitary.com (military careers website)**

	Percent Respond	Percentages						
		A	B	C	D	E	F	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	100 ±0	15	59	46	19	15	21	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>								
Army	100 ±0	16	57	49 ⁺⁶	21	14	21	±3
Navy	100 ±0	13	56	38 ⁻¹⁰	13 ⁻⁷	13	18	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±0	17	71 ⁺¹⁵	51	23	16	22	±7
Air Force	100 ±0	10 ⁻⁵	56	45	14 ⁻⁵	17	25 ⁺⁵	±4
<i>Component</i>								
Active	100 ±0	15	61 ⁺¹²	47	19 ⁺⁴	15	21	±3
Reserve	100 ±0	12	49 ⁻¹²	42	15 ⁻⁴	14	22	±5
<i>Service Component</i>								
Active Army	100 ±0	16	57	48	21	14	20	±3
Active Navy	100 ±0	14	60	40	13 ⁻⁷	14	18	±7
Active USMC	100 ±0	17	71 ⁺¹⁵	51	23	16	22	±7
Active USAF	100 ±0	10 ⁻⁵	58	48	16	18	25 ⁺⁵	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±0	14	54	49	17	15	22	±6
Reserve Navy	100 ±0	10	38 ⁻²²	26 ⁻²¹	10 ⁻⁹	10	19	±12
Reserve Air Force	100 ±0	10	48 ⁻¹¹	30 ⁻¹⁶	4 ⁻¹⁵	12	28	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>								
Not production	100 ±0	20 ⁺⁶	65 ⁺⁸	59 ⁺¹⁶	20	17	29 ⁺¹⁰	±6
Production recruiter	100 ±0	14	58	44 ⁻¹²	18	14	19 ⁻⁹	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>								
Not recruit NPS	100 ±0	19	25 ⁻³⁵	24 ⁻²³	9 ⁻¹⁰	10	15	±18
Recruit NPS	100 ±0	14	59	44 ⁻⁷	18	15	19 ⁻⁷	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>								
Less than one year	100 ±0	12	51 ⁻¹⁰	31 ⁻¹⁸	16	9 ⁻⁷	15 ⁻⁷	±6
1 or more years	100 ±0	16	61 ⁺¹²	50 ⁺¹⁹	19	16 ⁺⁶	22 ⁺⁷	±3

	Percent Respond	Percentages							ME
		A	B	C	D	E	F		
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>									
Less than 6 years	100 ±0	13 ⁻¹⁰	58	44 ⁻¹¹	18	14	20 ⁻⁷	±3	
6 or more years	100 ±0	25 ⁺¹²	65	60 ⁺¹⁶	23	17	29 ⁺¹⁰	±7	
<i>Geographic region</i>									
Southeast	100 ±0	15	64 ⁺⁷	44	18	15	20	±5	
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>									
Urban	100 ±0	17	53 ⁻⁸	45	18	13	18	±5	
Suburban	100 ±0	13	60	48	19	14	24	±5	
Small city/town	100 ±0	14	60	46	16	16	19	±5	
Rural	100 ±0	14	69 ⁺¹³	50	24 ⁺⁷	16	24	±5	
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>									
Not prepared	100 ±0	8 ⁻¹³	45 ⁻²⁵	30 ⁻³⁰	10 ⁻¹⁶	8 ⁻¹²	13 ⁻¹⁴	±4	
Prepared to market	100 ±0	21 ⁺¹²	71 ⁺²⁶	60 ⁺²⁹	26 ⁺¹⁵	20 ⁺¹¹	27 ⁺¹³	±4	
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>									
Not aware	100 ±0	9 ⁻¹⁹	56 ⁻¹¹	40 ⁻²⁰	13 ⁻¹⁸	9 ⁻²⁰	16 ⁻¹⁶	±3	
Aware of enhancements	100 ±0	29 ⁺²⁰	69 ⁺¹⁴	63 ⁺²³	33 ⁺²⁰	31 ⁺²²	34 ⁺¹⁸	±5	
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>									
Not good support	100 ±0	11 ⁻⁷	48 ⁻¹⁸	35 ⁻¹⁹	12 ⁻¹¹	9 ⁻⁹	14 ⁻¹²	±4	
Good support	100 ±0	17 ⁺⁶	66 ⁺¹⁷	54 ⁺¹⁹	23 ⁺¹¹	18 ⁺⁸	26 ⁺¹²	±3	
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>									
Not good support	100 ±0	11 ⁻¹⁰	52 ⁻¹⁶	38 ⁻¹⁹	14 ⁻¹¹	10 ⁻¹¹	17 ⁻⁹	±3	
Good support	100 ±0	20 ⁺⁹	68 ⁺¹⁵	57 ⁺¹⁹	25 ⁺¹¹	21 ⁺¹⁰	26 ⁺⁹	±4	
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>									
Not good support	100 ±0	12 ⁻⁷	52 ⁻¹⁵	41 ⁻¹²	16 ⁻⁷	13 ⁻⁵	19	±3	
Good support	100 ±0	19 ⁺⁷	67 ⁺¹⁴	53 ⁺¹²	22 ⁺⁶	18 ⁺⁵	23	±4	

PROGRAM ENHANCEMENTS

Knowledge of recent STP enhancements

The ASVAB Student Testing Program was recently enhanced in several ways (e.g., recently updated military careers website, FYI, website for career exploration, etc.). Please let us know your experience with these recent enhancements by rating the items below.

Q14A – During my training for this mission, I was made fully aware of the recent enhancements to the ASVAB Student Testing Program (e.g., web-based career exploration tools such as FYI and OCCU-Find). Agree – Disagree scale.

Q14B – I have explored the ASVAB Student Testing Program on-line resources. Agree – Disagree scale.

Recruiters lacked awareness of STP enhancements, few explored on-line resources –

Only slightly more than a quarter of recruiters said they were made aware of program enhancements during training (28%) and had explored STP on-line resources (26%). Many more said they were not made aware of enhancements during training (38%) and had not explored on-line resources (41%).

Recruiters prepared to market the STP far more aware of enhancements, explored resources more –

Recruiters who felt they were prepared to market the STP were far more aware of enhancements (39% prepared, versus 14% not prepared). They also explored on-line resources far more (36% prepared, versus 15% not prepared). In addition, recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements overwhelmingly indicated they had explored on-line resources more (65% aware, versus 11% not aware).

Recruiters with good MEPS support were more aware of enhancements, explored resources more –

Recruiters who indicated they received good support tended to be more aware of program enhancements and tended to explore the program resources more. For instance, the difference in awareness of enhancements between recruiters who indicated good support and those who did not was sharp and clear.

- Administration: 36% with good support, compared to 15% without good support.
- Interpretation: 44% with good support, versus 16% without good support.
- Marketing: 39% with good support, versus 19% without good support.

Likewise, recruiters with good MEPS support had explored the STP on-line resources more.

- Administration: 33% with good support, versus 15% without good support.
- Interpretation: 40% with good support, versus 16% without good support.
- Marketing: 37% with good support, versus 18% without good support.

Western region more neutral – Recruiters in the Western region tended to be less aware of STP enhancements (18%) and explored on-line resources less (18%). This region tended to be more neutral on these points (44% awareness of enhancements; 43% on-line exploration).

Army explored on-line resources more; Navy less aware of enhancements – Army recruiters tended to have explored on-line resources more than other branches (30%). A greater number of Navy recruiters said they were not made aware of enhancements during training (47%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated in at least one of the two questions for the demographics of component, production recruiter, and six or more years of experience.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of NPS contact recruiter, one or more years of experience, and recruiting zone population density.

Table 46.

Q14A,B -- The ASVAB Student Testing Program was recently enhanced in several ways.

A. During my training for this mission, I was made fully aware of the recent enhancements to the ASVAB Student Testing Program (e.g., web-based career exploration tools such as FYI and OCCU-Find).

B. I have explored the ASVAB Student Testing Program on-line resources.

	Percent Reporting							
	A - Made Fully Aware				B - Explored On-Line Resources			
	Disagree	Neither	Agree	ME	Disagree	Neither	Agree	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	38	34	28	±3	41	32	26	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>								
Army	34 ⁻⁹	36	30 ⁺⁵	±3	36 ⁻¹⁰	33	30 ⁺⁸	±3
Navy	47 ⁺¹¹	33	20 ⁻⁹	±6	48 ⁺⁸	31	21 ⁻⁷	±6
Marine Corps	42	29	28	±7	49 ⁺⁹	32	19 ⁻⁹	±7
Air Force	38	35	27	±4	39	32	28	±4
<i>Component</i>								
Active	38	33 ⁻⁶	29 ⁺⁷	±3	42	32	26	±3
Reserve	39	39 ⁺⁶	22 ⁻⁷	±5	38	37	24	±5
<i>Service Component</i>								
Active Army	32 ⁻¹¹	36	32 ⁺⁸	±3	36 ⁻¹⁰	33	31 ⁺⁹	±3
Active Navy	49 ⁺¹³	31	20 ⁻⁹	±7	50 ⁺¹⁰	29	21	±7
Active USMC	42	29	28	±7	49 ⁺⁹	32	19 ⁻⁹	±7
Active USAF	38	32	30	±4	39	30	31 ⁺⁵	±4
Reserve Army	40	36	24	±6	39	34	27	±6
Reserve Navy	35	45	20	±12	36	43	21	±12
Reserve Air Force	38	47 ⁺¹³	15 ⁻¹³	±10	37	46 ⁺¹⁴	16 ⁻¹⁰	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>								
Not production	33	36	31	±6	38	32	30	±6
Production	40 ⁺⁷	33	27	±3	42	32	25	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>								
Less than 6 years	40 ⁺⁸	33	28	±3	43 ⁺⁹	32	26	±3
6 or more years	34	39	28	±7	35	36	29	±7

	Percent Reporting							
	A - Made Fully Aware				B - Explored On-Line Resources			
	Disagree	Neither	Agree	ME	Disagree	Neither	Agree	ME
<i>Geographic region</i>								
Northeast	38	34	28	±6	38	35	27	±6
Mid-Atlantic	37	40	24	±11	36	41	24	±11
Southeast	40	30	30	±5	40	27 ⁻⁷	33 ⁺⁹	±5
North Central	39	31	30	±6	45	32	23	±6
South Central	38	33	29	±6	41	31	28	±6
West	37	44 ⁺¹¹	18 ⁻¹⁰	±9	39	43 ⁺¹¹	18 ⁻⁹	±9
Pacific	39	34	27	±6	46	30	23	±6
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>								
Not prepared	50 ⁺²¹	36	14 ⁻²⁵	±4	51 ⁺¹⁸	33	15 ⁻²⁰	±4
Prepared	29 ⁻²⁰	32	39 ⁺²⁴	±4	33 ⁻¹⁸	32	36 ⁺²¹	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>								
Not aware	53 ⁺⁵³	47 ⁺⁴⁷	0 ⁻¹⁰⁰	±3	52 ⁺³⁹	37 ⁺¹⁵	11 ⁻⁵⁴	±3
Aware	0 ⁻⁵³	0 ⁻⁴⁷	100 ⁺¹⁰⁰	±5	14 ⁻³⁸	21 ⁻¹⁶	65 ⁺⁵⁴	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>								
Not good support	42 ⁺⁶	43 ⁺¹⁵	15 ⁻²¹	±4	45 ⁺⁶	40 ⁺¹³	15 ⁻¹⁹	±4
Good support	36 ⁻⁶	28 ⁻¹⁴	36 ⁺²⁰	±3	39	27 ⁻¹³	33 ⁺¹⁷	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>								
Not good support	46 ⁺¹⁸	39 ⁺¹²	16 ⁻²⁹	±3	47 ⁺¹³	37 ⁺¹¹	16 ⁻²⁴	±3
Good support	28 ⁻¹⁷	27 ⁻¹²	44 ⁺²⁸	±4	34 ⁻¹³	26 ⁻¹¹	40 ⁺²³	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>								
Not good support	43 ⁺¹¹	38 ⁺⁹	19 ⁻²¹	±3	47 ⁺¹²	35 ⁺⁶	18 ⁻¹⁹	±3
Good support	32 ⁻¹¹	29 ⁻⁹	39 ⁺²⁰	±4	35 ⁻¹¹	28 ⁻⁷	37 ⁺¹⁸	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p < .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.

PROGRAM ENHANCEMENTS

STP websites help students explore military careers; enhancements help recruit

The ASVAB Student Testing Program was recently enhanced in several ways (e.g., recently updated military careers website, FYI, website for career exploration, etc.). Please let us know your experience with these recent enhancements by rating the items below.

Q14C – I believe the ASVAB Student Testing Program websites are helpful to students who are interested in exploring military careers. Agree – Disagree scale.

Q14D – I believe the enhancements that were made to the ASVAB Student Testing Program will make it easier to recruit qualified applicants. Agree – Disagree scale.

Most recruiters agreed or were neutral about website helpfulness, STP enhancements making recruiting easier – The majority of recruiters were either neutral (47%) or agreed (48%) that STP websites were helpful to students who were interested in exploring military careers. The majority of recruiters were also either neutral (54%) or agreed (42%) that STP enhancements was make it easier to recruit qualified candidates.

More recruiters prepared to market STP or aware of its enhancements found websites helpful to students and thought STP enhancements would improve recruiting – The majority of recruiters prepared to market the STP were favorable about the websites (58% prepared, versus 37% not prepared) and enhancements (51% prepared, versus 31% not prepared).

The majority of recruiters aware of STP enhancements were also favorable about the websites (84% aware, versus 34% not aware) and enhancements (81% aware, versus 27% not aware).

Recruiters who were not prepared or not aware did not really disagree more often; they simply had much larger neutral responses. This is probably because most did not feel knowledgeable enough to agree or disagree. It is a key finding that recruiters who were actually aware of STP enhancements were much more positive about its potential in assisting recruiting efforts and helping students.

Recruiters with good MEPS support believed websites were helpful and made recruiting qualified applicants easier – The pattern of results for recruiters who indicated they received good support from the MEPS in terms of administration, interpretation, and marketing were similar. Those with more support tended to see the websites as more helpful and believed recruiting efforts would be easier.

- Administration: 58% with good support, versus 34% without good support.
- Interpretation: 65% with good support, versus 36% without good support.
- Marketing: 59% with good support, versus 40% without good support.

Likewise, recruiters with good support agreed that the STP enhancements would make it easier to recruit qualified applicants.

- Administration: 50% with good support, versus 29% without good support.
- Interpretation: 59% with good support, versus 30% without good support.
- Marketing: 55% with good support, versus 32% without good support.

Service Component Effects –

More Reserve Air Force recruiters were neutral about the STP websites being helpful to students who were interested in exploring military careers (59%).

Fewer Reserve Air Force recruiters believed STP enhancements would make recruiting qualified applicants easier (28%). However, Reserve Air Force recruiters were more likely to be neutral (68%).

Southeast agreed most that STP websites were helpful to students – Recruiters in the Southeast region agreed most that STP websites helped students who were interested in exploring military careers (57%).

Small differences – The demographic of branch of service showed only small differences for the enhancements making it easier to recruit qualified applicants.

Negligible differences – Negligible differences were found for the demographics of NPS contact recruiter and one or more years of experience.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of six or more years of experience, production recruiter, and recruiting zone population density.

Table 47.

Q14C,D -- The ASVAB Student Testing Program was recently enhanced in several ways.

C. I believe the ASVAB Student Testing Program websites are helpful to students who are interested in exploring military careers. Agree – Disagree scale.

D. I believe the enhancements that were made to the ASVAB Student Testing Program will make it easier to recruit qualified applicants. Agree – Disagree scale

	Percent Reporting							
	C - Helpful To Students				D - Easier To Recruit			
	Disagree	Neither	Agree	ME	Disagree	Neither	Agree	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	5	47	48	±3	4	54	42	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>								
Army	5	46	48	±3	4	54	43	±3
Navy	5	48	47	±6	5	54	41	±6
Marine Corps	5	45	50	±7	5	53	42	±7
Air Force	4	51	45	±4	3	61 ⁺⁸	36 ⁻⁶	±4
<i>Component</i>								
Active	5	46	49	±3	4	53 ⁻⁶	43 ⁺⁷	±3
Reserve	6	51	43	±5	5	59 ⁺⁶	36 ⁻⁷	±5
<i>Service Component</i>								
Active Army	5	46	49	±3	4	52	44	±3
Active Navy	6	47	47	±7	5	53	41	±7
Active USMC	5	45	50	±7	5	53	42	±7
Active USAF	4	48	47	±4	3	59	38	±4
Reserve Army	7	49	44	±6	6	58	37	±6
Reserve Navy	3	55	42	±12	3	61	36	±12
Reserve Air Force	3	59 ⁺¹²	38	±10	4	68 ⁺¹⁴	28 ⁻¹⁴	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>								
Not production	5	45	50	±6	3	53	44	±6
Production	5	47	48	±3	5	54	41	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>								
Less than 6 years	1 ⁻⁴	63	36	±18	2 ⁻³	57	41	±6
6 or more years	5	46	49	±3	5 ⁺³	53	42	±3

	Percent Reporting							
	C - Helpful To Students				D - Easier To Recruit			
	Disagree	Neither	Agree	ME	Disagree	Neither	Agree	ME
<i>Geographic region</i>								
Northeast	5	44	51	±6	5	50	45	±6
Mid-Atlantic	6	49	45	±11	5	56	38	±11
Southeast	5	38 ⁻¹¹	57 ⁺¹¹	±5	5	49	46	±5
North Central	5	52	43	±6	5	60 ⁺⁷	35 ⁻⁸	±6
South Central	5	50	44	±6	4	53	43	±6
West	5	52	42	±9	4	59	36	±9
Pacific	5	47	48	±6	3	52	45	±6
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>								
Not prepared	8 ⁺⁵	55 ⁺¹⁶	37 ⁻²¹	±4	6	64 ⁺¹⁸	31 ⁻²⁰	±4
Prepared	3 ⁻⁵	39 ⁻¹⁶	58 ⁺²¹	±4	3	45 ⁻¹⁸	51 ⁺²⁰	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>								
Not aware	7 ⁺⁶	58 ⁺⁴²	34 ⁻⁴⁹	±3	5 ⁺³	68 ⁺⁵¹	27 ⁻⁵⁴	±3
Aware	1 ⁻⁶	15 ⁻⁴⁴	84 ⁺⁵⁰	±5	2 ⁻³	17 ⁻⁵¹	81 ⁺⁵⁴	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>								
Not good support	7 ⁺³	59 ⁺²¹	34 ⁻²⁴	±4	6 ⁺³	65 ⁺¹⁹	29 ⁻²²	±4
Good support	4 ⁻³	38 ⁻²¹	58 ⁺²⁴	±3	3 ⁻³	46 ⁻¹⁹	50 ⁺²⁰	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>								
Not good support	6 ⁺²	57 ⁺²⁵	36 ⁻²⁸	±3	5	65 ⁺²⁷	30 ⁻²⁹	±3
Good support	4 ⁻²	32 ⁻²⁵	65 ⁺²⁸	±4	3	38 ⁻²⁷	59 ⁺²⁹	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>								
Not good support	7 ⁺⁴	53 ⁺¹⁵	40 ⁻¹⁹	±3	6 ⁺³	63 ⁺²¹	32 ⁻²³	±3
Good support	3 ⁻⁴	38 ⁻¹⁵	59 ⁺¹⁹	±4	3 ⁻³	42 ⁻²⁰	55 ⁺²³	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.

PROGRAM ENHANCEMENTS

STP enhancements interest students in military, increase recruiter access to students

The ASVAB Student Testing Program was recently enhanced in several ways (e.g., recently updated military careers website, FYI, website for career exploration, etc.). Please let us know your experience with these recent enhancements by rating the items below.

Q14E – These enhancements will make it easier to interest students in exploring a military career than if the enhancements had not been done. Agree – Disagree scale.

Q14F – These enhancements will make it easier to gain access to students than if the enhancements had not been done. Agree – Disagree scale.

Most recruiters neutral about STP enhancements increasing student access and student interest in military – The majority of recruiters were neutral (55%) toward or agreed or strongly agreed (41%) with the assertion that STP enhancements would make it easier to interest students in exploring a military career. Similarly, the majority of recruiters were neutral (58%) toward or agreed or strongly agreed (37%) with the assertion that STP enhancements would make it easier to gain access to students.

Recruiters prepared to market STP or aware of its enhancements thought STP enhancements would make it easier to gain access to students and interest students in military – About half of recruiters who indicated they were prepared to market the STP agreed or strongly agreed that its enhancements would make it easier to gain access to students (46% prepared, versus 26% not prepared) and interest students in military careers (50% prepared, versus 30% not prepared).

The majority of recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements also agreed or strongly agreed that STP enhancements would make it easier to gain access to students (75% aware, versus 22% not aware) and interest students in exploring military careers (81% aware, versus 25% not aware).

Recruiters who were not prepared and were not aware had a much larger neutral response. This is probably because most did not feel knowledgeable enough to agree or disagree.

Recruiters with good MEPS support thought STP enhancements would make it easier to interest students in military and to gain access to students – Recruiters receiving good MEPS support were more apt to think the enhancements would make it easier to interest students in exploring military careers. This held whether the support they received was in administration, interpretation, or marketing.

- Administration: 50% with good support, versus 27% without good support.
- Interpretation: 57% with good support, versus 29% without good support.
- Marketing: 54% with good support, versus 31% without good support.

Likewise, recruiters with good MEPS support agreed that access to students would be made easier due to STP enhancements.

- Administration: 45% with good support, compared to 24% without good support.
- Interpretation: 53% with good support, compared to 26% without good support.
- Marketing: 49% with good support, compared to 28% without good support.

Air Force Reserves agreed less, more neutral about STP enhancements increasing student access – Reserve Air Force recruiters agreed less (24%) and were more neutral (72%) about STP enhancements making it easier to gain access to students.

Fewer Western recruiters agreed – Recruiters in the Western region agreed or strongly agreed less than other regions that STP enhancements would make it easier to interest students (30%) and to gain access to students (28%).

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of component for both questions, and branch of service for access to students.

Negligible differences – Negligible differences were indicated in at least one of the two questions for the demographics of years of experience less than or greater than one year, NPS contact recruiter, and recruiting zone population density.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of years of experience less than or greater than six years and production recruiter.

Table 48.***Q14E-F – The ASVAB Student Testing Program was recently enhanced in several ways.******E. These enhancements will make it easier to interest students in exploring a military career than if the enhancements had not been done. Agree – Disagree scale.******F. These enhancements will make it easier to gain access to students than if the enhancements had not been done. Agree – Disagree scale.***

	Percent Reporting							
	E – Easier to interest students				F – Easier to gain access			
	Disagree	Neither	Agree	ME	Disagree	Neither	Agree	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	4	55	41	±3	5	58	37	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>								
Army	4	55	41	±3	4	57	39	±3
Navy	4	58	38	±6	4	63	33	±6
Marine Corps	4	56	40	±7	8	57	35	±7
Air Force	2 ⁻²	57	40	±4	3	63 ⁺⁵	34	±4
<i>Component</i>								
Active	4	55	41	±3	5	57	38	±3
Reserve	4	60	36	±5	4	63	33	±5
<i>Service Component</i>								
Active Army	4	53	43	±3	4	55 ⁻⁶	41 ⁺⁷	±3
Active Navy	5	57	38	±7	4	63	33	±7
Active USMC	4	56	40	±7	8	57	35	±7
Active USAF	2 ⁻²	56	42	±4	3	59	37	±4
Reserve Army	4	61	35	±6	4	63	33	±6
Reserve Navy	4	59	38	±12	4	60	36	±12
Reserve Air Force	2	61	37	±10	3	72 ⁺¹⁴	24 ⁻¹³	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>								
Not production	3	54	42	±6	3	57	40	±6
Production	4	56	40	±3	5	58	36	±3

	Percent Reporting							
	E – Easier to interest students				F – Easier to gain access			
	Disagree	Neither	Agree	ME	Disagree	Neither	Agree	ME
<i>Geographic region</i>								
Northeast	4	55	41	±6	6	57	38	±6
Mid-Atlantic	6	56	38	±11	5	60	35	±11
Southeast	3	50 ⁻⁷	47 ⁺⁸	±5	4	52 ⁻⁸	43 ⁺⁸	±5
North Central	4	61	35	±6	5	65 ⁺⁹	30 ⁻⁹	±6
South Central	3	55	42	±6	3	59	38	±6
West	7	64	30 ⁻¹²	±9	6	66	28 ⁻¹⁰	±9
Pacific	4	53	43	±6	5	53	41	±6
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>								
Not prepared	5	65 ⁺¹⁸	30 ⁻²⁰	±4	5	69 ⁺²⁰	26 ⁻²⁰	±4
Prepared to market	3	47 ⁻¹⁸	50 ⁺²⁰	±4	5	49 ⁻¹⁹	46 ⁺¹⁹	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>								
Not aware	4	70 ⁺⁵⁴	25 ⁻⁵⁶	±3	5	73 ⁺⁵³	22 ⁻⁵³	±3
Aware	3	16 ⁻⁵⁴	81 ⁺⁵⁶	±5	5	19 ⁻⁵⁴	75 ⁺⁵²	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>								
Not good support	6 ⁺³	68 ⁺²¹	27 ⁻²⁴	±4	7 ⁺³	69 ⁺¹⁹	24 ⁻²²	±4
Good support	3 ⁻³	47 ⁻²⁰	50 ⁺²³	±3	4	51 ⁻¹⁷	45 ⁺²⁰	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>								
Not good support	5 ⁺²	66 ⁺²⁶	29 ⁻²⁸	±3	6	69 ⁺²⁶	26 ⁻²⁷	±3
Good support	2 ⁻³	40 ⁻²⁵	57 ⁺²⁸	±4	4	43 ⁻²⁵	53 ⁺²⁷	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>								
Not good support	5 ⁺³	63 ⁺¹⁸	31 ⁻²²	±3	6	66 ⁺¹⁹	28 ⁻²¹	±3
Good support	2 ⁻⁴	45 ⁻¹⁸	54 ⁺²²	±4	4	47 ⁻¹⁹	49 ⁺²¹	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.

PROGRAM ENHANCEMENTS

New STP educates students about military career options

Q15 – How well does the newly redesigned ASVAB Student Testing Program educate students about career options in the military?

Scale responses from Very well to Very poorly.

Vast majority of recruiters either favorable or neutral – Almost all recruiters were either favorable (52%) or neutral (44%) toward the military career educational quality of new STP.

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements and prepared to market it much more favorable – Recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements were more favorable about the new STP educating students about military career options (80% aware, versus 41% not aware). Similarly, more recruiters who were prepared to market the STP were favorable (64% prepared, versus 39% not prepared).

Recruiters with good MEPS support were more favorable about military career educational quality – Recruiters who indicated they received good support from the MEPS in terms of administration, interpretation, and marketing tended to be more favorable about how well the STP educated students about military career options.

- Administration: 62% with good support, versus 37% without good support.
- Interpretation: 68% with good support, versus 41% without good support.
- Marketing: 66% with good support, versus 42% without good support.

Recruiters who did not recruit NPS contacts more neutral – Recruiters not involved with recruiting NPS contacts were more neutral about the military career educational quality of the new STP than those who did recruit NPS contacts (62% non-NPS, compared to 43% NPS).

Reserve Air Force less favorable, but more neutral – Fewer Reserve Air Force recruiters thought the new STP educated students well or very well about military career options (37%). However, 61% said it educated neither well nor poorly.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of branch of service, geographic region, years of experience, production recruiter, or recruiting zone population density.

Table 49.

Q15 -- How well does the newly redesigned ASVAB Student Testing Program educate students about career options in the military?

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Very poorly/Poorly	Neither well nor poorly	Well/Very well	
<i>Full Sample</i>	95 ±1	4	44	52	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	96 ±1	3	44	52	±3
Navy	94 ±3	6	48	47	±6
Marine Corps	96 ±3	3	38	59	±7
Air Force	93 ±2	2	47	51	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	95 ±1	4 ⁺²	43 ⁻⁶	53	±3
Reserve	94 ±2	2 ⁻²	49 ⁺⁶	49	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	95 ±2	4	43	53	±3
Active Navy	95 ±3	6	48	46	±7
Active USMC	96 ±3	3	38	59	±7
Active USAF	93 ±2	3	44	54	±4
Reserve Army	95 ±2	2 ⁻²	49	50	±6
Reserve Navy	92 ±6	2	46	51	±12
Reserve Air Force	91 ±5	2	61 ⁺¹⁷	37 ⁻¹⁶	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	96 ±3	4	41	55	±6
Production recruiter	95 ±1	4	45	52	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>					
Not recruit NPS	88 ±11	NR	62 ⁺¹⁹	31 ⁻²²	±18
Recruits NPS	96 ±1	4	43	53	±3
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	93 ±2	6 ⁺⁴	55 ⁺²⁰	39 ⁻²⁵	±4
Prepared to market	97 ±2	2 ⁻⁴	35 ⁻²⁰	64 ⁺²⁵	±4

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Very poorly/ Poorly	Neither well nor poorly	Well/ Very well	
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	95 ±2	5 ⁺⁴	54 ⁺³⁵	41 ⁻³⁹	±3
Aware of enhancements	99 ±1	1 ⁻⁴	19 ⁻³⁵	80 ⁺³⁹	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	93 ±2	6 ⁺⁴	56 ⁺²⁰	37 ⁻²⁵	±4
Good support	96 ±2	2 ⁻⁴	36 ⁻²⁰	62 ⁺²⁴	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	94 ±2	6 ⁺⁵	53 ⁺²²	41 ⁻²⁷	±3
Good support	96 ±2	1 ⁻⁴	31 ⁻²²	68 ⁺²⁶	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	94 ±2	6 ⁺⁵	53 ⁺²¹	42 ⁻²⁴	±3
Good support	96 ±2	1 ⁻⁴	33 ⁻¹⁹	66 ⁺²⁴	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
NR=Unreliable estimate. Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

Student Testing

This section examines the following:

- Recruiter overall satisfaction with the ASVAB Student Testing Program (STP)
- Perceptions of the program's applicability/benefits to student populations
- Perceptions of the possible effects of the association of the ASVAB Student Testing Program with the military in terms of student participation rates.
- Perceptions of the possible effects of world conflicts on ease of interesting students, schools, counselors, or principals in participating in the program

Highlights

- Overall, most recruiters were satisfied with the STP.
- Most recruiters believed the program benefited a wide variety of students, not just those who were interested in military careers.
- The association of the STP with the military in general was not widely seen as hindering student participation.
- Recruiters did perceive the current military conflicts as barriers in that they negatively influenced interest in program participation for students and schools.
- There were some differences in opinion among the reporting groups. For instance, Regular duty personnel tended to be more satisfied with the program than were the Reserves. Among the Service Branches, the Marine Corps tended to see the broadest applicability in that the program benefited a wide variety of students. The Marine Corps also tended to be the most positive about several aspects of the program.
- Recruiters with more knowledge of the program and more preparation for marketing tended to be more positive about most issues in this section. For instance, they were more satisfied overall with the STP and were more positive about the program applying to a wide variety of students.

These results are described and interpreted in more detail in the following pages.

STUDENT TESTING

Overall satisfaction rating on the STP

*Q17 – Overall, how satisfied are you with the ASVAB Student Testing Program?
Satisfied – Dissatisfied scale.*

Most were satisfied with the STP – About two-thirds of all recruiters (67%) were satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the STP.

NPS recruiters much more satisfied – Recruiters who had recruited NPS contacts in the previous 12 months were much more satisfied with the STP than those who had not recruited NPS (68% NPS, versus 35% non-NPS). Non-NPS recruiters were much more neutral (54% non-NPS, versus 23% NPS).

Recruiters aware of STP enhancements or prepared to market it were more satisfied – The majority of recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements reported being satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the STP (87% aware, versus 60% not aware). Recruiters who felt they were prepared to market the STP tended to be more satisfied (81% prepared, versus 52% not prepared) with the program.

Good MEPS support indicative of higher satisfaction – The satisfaction levels for the recruiters who indicated they receive good support from the MEPS in terms of administration, interpretation, and marketing were similar to those of recruiters who were aware of the enhancements or prepared to market the program.

- Administration: 80% with good support, versus 49% without good support.
- Interpretation: 82% with good support, versus 57% without good support.
- Marketing: 83% with good support, versus 56% without good support.

Service Component Effects –

Fewer Reserve Army (59%), Reserve Navy (54%), and Reserve Air Force (51%) were satisfied with the STP.

More Active Air Force (75%) and Marine Corps (76%) recruiters were satisfied with the STP.

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of recruiting zone population density, geographic region, and production recruiter.

No differences – No group differences were found for the demographic of years of experience.

Table 50.**Q17 -- Overall, how satisfied are you with the ASVAB Student Testing Program?**

	Percent	Percentages			ME
	Respond	Dissatisfied/ Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied/ Satisfied	
<i>Full Sample</i>	97 ±1	8	25	67	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	99 ±1	8	28 ⁺⁷	64 ⁻⁶	±3
Navy	97 ±2	10	24	66	±6
Marine Corps	98 ±2	7	17 ⁻¹⁰	76 ⁺¹¹	±7
Air Force	98 ±1	7	22	71	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	97 ±1	8	23 ⁻¹³	69 ⁺¹²	±3
Reserve	96 ±2	7	36 ⁺¹³	57 ⁻¹²	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	97 ±1	8	27	65	±3
Active Navy	97 ±3	11	21	68	±7
Active USMC	98 ±2	7	17 ⁻¹⁰	76 ⁺¹¹	±7
Active USAF	97 ±2	7	18 ⁻⁷	75 ⁺⁸	±4
Reserve Army	97 ±2	7	34 ⁺¹⁰	59 ⁻⁹	±6
Reserve Navy	93 ±6	7	39 ⁺¹⁵	54 ⁻¹⁴	±12
Reserve Air Force	95 ±4	4	45 ⁺²¹	51 ⁻¹⁷	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	99 ±2	4 ⁻⁵	26	70	±6
Production recruiter	98 ±1	9 ⁺⁵	24	67	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>					
Not recruit NPS	91 ±10	11	54 ⁺³⁰	35 ⁻³³	±18
Recruits NPS	98 ±1	9 ⁺⁴	23 ⁻⁶	68	±3

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Dissatisfied/ Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied/ Satisfied	
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	98 ±2	8	31 ⁺⁷	61 ⁻⁷	±6
Mid-Atlantic	98 ±3	8	32	60	±11
Southeast	99 ±2	9	18 ⁻⁹	72 ⁺⁶	±5
North Central	97 ±2	7	27	66	±6
South Central	99 ±2	7	23	70	±6
West	99 ±2	9	26	64	±9
Pacific	98 ±2	8	22	69	±6
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	98 ±2	8	29 ⁺⁶	63 ⁻⁶	±5
Suburban	99 ±1	10	28	62	±5
Small city/town	97 ±2	8	19 ⁻⁸	72 ⁺⁷	±5
Rural	99 ±1	6	23	72	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	96 ±2	13 ⁺⁹	35 ⁺¹⁹	52 ⁻²⁹	±4
Prepared to market	97 ±1	4 ⁻⁹	16 ⁻¹⁹	81 ⁺²⁹	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	97 ±1	10 ⁺⁷	30 ⁺¹⁹	60 ⁻²⁶	±3
Aware of enhancements	97 ±2	3 ⁻⁷	10 ⁻²⁰	87 ⁺²⁷	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	96 ±2	13 ⁺⁸	38 ⁺²²	49 ⁻³¹	±4
Good support	97 ±1	5 ⁻⁸	16 ⁻²²	80 ⁺³¹	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	96 ±1	11 ⁺⁷	32 ⁺¹⁸	57 ⁻²⁵	±3
Good support	97 ±2	4 ⁻⁷	14 ⁻¹⁸	82 ⁺²⁵	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	96 ±2	12 ⁺⁹	32 ⁺¹⁷	56 ⁻²⁶	±3
Good support	97 ±1	2 ⁻¹⁰	15 ⁻¹⁷	83 ⁺²⁷	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

STUDENT TESTING

Breadth of applicability/benefit of the STP

Q16B - The ASVAB Student Testing Program is beneficial for a wide variety of students, not just students who are interested in military careers. Agree – Disagree scale.

Most believed the program benefited a wide variety of students – Nearly three-quarters of all recruiters (72%) agreed or strongly agreed that the STP was beneficial for a wide variety of students, not just students who were interested in military careers.

NPS recruiters agreed much more – Recruiters who had recruited NPS contacts in the previous 12 months agreed or strongly agreed more that the STP was beneficial for a wide variety of students than those who had not recruited NPS (72% NPS, versus 52% non-NPS). Non-NPS recruiters were much more neutral (47% non-NPS, versus 24% NPS).

Recruiters aware of the STP enhancements or prepared to market it saw broad benefits – The majority of recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements agreed or strongly agreed that the program benefited a wide variety of students (90% aware, versus 66% not aware). Recruiters who felt they were prepared to market the STP also tended to be more positive (80% prepared, versus 64% not prepared) about the program benefiting a wide variety of students.

Good MEPS support indicative of broader benefits – The results for the recruiters who indicated they received good support from the MEPS in terms of administration, interpretation, and marketing were similar to those of recruiters who were aware of the enhancements or prepared to market the program.

- Administration: 82% with good support, compared to 58% without good support.
- Interpretation: 84% with good support, compared to 64% without good support.
- Marketing: 83% with good support, compared to 64% without good support.

Service Component Effects –

More Marine Corps recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that the STP benefited a wide variety of students (81%).

Fewer Reserve Navy (48%) and Reserve Air Force (53%) agreed or strongly agreed that the STP benefited a wide variety of students.

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographics of component, geographic region, and recruiting zone population density.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of production recruiter and years of experience.

Table 51.

**Q16B -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?
The ASVAB Student Testing Program is beneficial for a wide variety of students,
not just students who are interested in military careers.**

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Full Sample</i>	98 ±1	4	24	72	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	99 ±1	3	25	72	±3
Navy	100 ±1	6	29	65 ⁻⁹	±6
Marine Corps	98 ±2	3	16 ⁻¹⁰	81 ⁺¹¹	±7
Air Force	98 ±1	4	23	73	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	98 ±1	4	23 ⁻¹⁰	74 ⁺¹⁰	±3
Reserve	97 ±2	3	33 ⁺¹⁰	64 ⁺¹⁰	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	97 ±1	3	25	72	±3
Active Navy	100 ±1	7	25	68	±7
Active USMC	98 ±2	3	16 ⁻¹⁰	81 ⁺¹¹	±7
Active USAF	96 ±2	4	19 ⁻⁵	77 ⁺⁵	±4
Reserve Army	97 ±2	3	26	71	±6
Reserve Navy	96 ±5	3	49 ⁺²⁶	48 ⁻²⁵	±12
Reserve Air Force	98 ±2	5	41 ⁺¹⁷	53 ⁻¹⁹	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	100 ±1	3	21	76	±6
Production recruiter	99 ±1	4	25	72	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>					
Not recruit NPS	93 ±10	1 ⁻³	47 ⁺²⁴	52 ⁻²¹	±18
Recruits NPS	99 ±1	4	24	72	±3

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	99 ±2	3	25	72	±6
Mid-Atlantic	99 ±1	2	31	67	±11
Southeast	100 ±1	4	19 ⁻⁶	76	±5
North Central	98 ±2	3	25	71	±6
South Central	100 ±1	4	27	69	±6
West	99 ±1	5	26	69	±9
Pacific	99 ±1	4	21	76	±6
<i>Recruiting zone population density</i>					
Urban	99 ±1	3	29 ⁺⁷	67 ⁻⁷	±5
Suburban	99 ±2	4	25	70	±5
Small city/town	99 ±1	3	21	76	±5
Rural	100 ±1	4	19 ⁻⁶	77 ⁺⁶	±5
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	97 ±1	5	31 ⁺¹³	64 ⁻¹⁵	±4
Prepared to market	98 ±1	3	17 ⁻¹⁴	80 ⁺¹⁶	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	98 ±1	4 ⁺²	30 ⁺²¹	66 ⁻²³	±3
Aware of enhancements	98 ±2	2 ⁻²	9 ⁻²¹	90 ⁺²⁴	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	97 ±1	5	37 ⁺²²	58 ⁻²⁴	±4
Good support	98 ±1	3	15 ⁻²²	82 ⁺²⁴	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	97 ±1	4	31 ⁺¹⁷	64 ⁻¹⁹	±3
Good support	98 ±2	3	13 ⁻¹⁸	84 ⁺²⁰	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	97 ±1	4	31 ⁺¹⁷	64 ⁻¹⁹	±3
Good support	98 ±1	3	14 ⁻¹⁷	83 ⁺¹⁹	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

STUDENT TESTING

Military association effect on the use/acceptance of the STP

Q16A – The association of the ASVAB Student Testing Program with the military reduces the number of students who participate in the program. Agree – Disagree scale.

Program association with the military was not generally seen as reducing student participation – Overall, less than half of the recruiters agreed (43%) or were neutral (43%) about the association of the STP with the military reducing the number of students who participated in the program. Only 14% reported that they believed military association did not reduce participation.

Program-aware/marketing-prepared recruiters tended to see military association as reducing participation – Most recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements tended to agree that the association of the STP with the military reduced student participation (64% aware, versus 35% not aware). Likewise, recruiters who felt they were prepared to market the STP had a greater tendency to say the association reduced participation (48% prepared, versus 38% not prepared).

Recruiters with good MEPS support tended to see military association as reducing participation – The results for the recruiters who indicated they received good support from the MEPS in terms of administration, interpretation, and marketing were similar to those of recruiters who were aware of the enhancements or prepared to market the program.

- Administration: 50% with good support, versus 33% without good support.
- Interpretation: 52% with good support, versus 37% without good support.
- Marketing: 49% with good support, versus 38% without good support.

Marine Corps, Reserve Navy, and Reserve Air Force recruiters were less likely to agree that military association reduced STP participation – Fewer recruiters in the Marine Corps (35%), Reserve Navy (30%), and Reserve Air Force (22%) agreed that the association of the STP with the military reduced the number of students who participated in the program.

Small differences – A small difference was indicated for the demographic of geographic region.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of production recruiter, NPS contacts recruited in last 12 months, years of experience or recruiting zone population density.

Table 52.**Q16A -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?****The association of the ASVAB Student Testing Program with the military reduces the number of students who participate in the Program.**

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Full Sample</i>	97 ±1	14	43	43	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>					
Army	99 ±1	11 ⁻⁶	44	44	±3
Navy	99 ±1	14	40	46	±6
Marine Corps	98 ±2	22 ⁺¹⁰	43	35 ⁻¹⁰	±7
Air Force	98 ±1	14	42	44	±4
<i>Component</i>					
Active	98 ±1	14	41 ⁻¹⁰	45 ⁺¹¹	±3
Reserve	96 ±2	15	51 ⁺¹⁰	34 ⁻¹¹	±5
<i>Service Component</i>					
Active Army	97 ±1	11 ⁻⁶	43	46 ⁺⁵	±3
Active Navy	100 ±1	14	36	49	±7
Active USMC	98 ±2	22 ⁺¹⁰	43	35 ⁻¹⁰	±7
Active USAF	97 ±2	13	38	48 ⁺⁵	±4
Reserve Army	97 ±2	15	48	37	±6
Reserve Navy	94 ±6	12	58 ⁺¹⁶	30 ⁻¹³	±12
Reserve Air Force	97 ±3	19	59 ⁺¹⁶	22 ⁻²¹	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>					
Not production	100 ±1	11	43	46	±6
Production recruiter	99 ±1	15	43	42	±3
<i>Geographic region</i>					
Northeast	98 ±2	15	43	42	±6
Mid-Atlantic	98 ±2	14	49	37	±11
Southeast	99 ±1	13	38	49 ⁺⁸	±5
North Central	99 ±2	12	46	42	±6
South Central	99 ±2	13	42	45	±6
West	99 ±1	19	45	36	±9
Pacific	99 ±1	16	43	41	±6

	Percent Respond	Percentages			ME
		Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree/ Strongly agree	
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>					
Not prepared	97 ±1	12	50 ⁺¹³	38 ⁻⁹	±4
Prepared to market	98 ±1	16	36 ⁻¹⁴	48 ⁺¹⁰	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>					
Not aware	98 ±1	14	51 ⁺²⁸	35 ⁻²⁷	±3
Aware of enhancements	99 ±1	14	22 ⁻²⁹	64 ⁺²⁹	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>					
Not good support	97 ±1	11 ⁻⁵	56 ⁺²²	33 ⁻¹⁷	±4
Good support	98 ±1	16	34 ⁻²¹	50 ⁺¹⁷	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>					
Not good support	97 ±1	13	51 ⁺¹⁹	37 ⁻¹⁵	±3
Good support	98 ±1	15	32 ⁻¹⁸	52 ⁺¹⁵	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>					
Not good support	97 ±1	12 ⁻⁵	49 ⁺¹⁵	38 ⁻¹¹	±3
Good support	98 ±1	17 ⁺⁵	34 ⁻¹⁵	49 ⁺¹¹	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

STUDENT TESTING

Effect of current world conflicts on interest in the STP

Q16C - The current military conflicts in the world make it difficult to interest students in participating in the ASVAB Student Testing Program. Agree – Disagree scale.

Q16D – The current military conflicts in the world make it difficult to interest schools, counselors or principals in participating in the ASVAB Student Testing Program. Agree – Disagree scale.

Majority believed the current conflicts made it more difficult to interest participants – The majority of recruiters agreed or strongly agreed that current military conflicts in the world made it difficult to interest students (62%) or schools, counselors, or principals (61%) in participating in the STP.

Recruiters aware of the STP enhancements were strong believers in the negative influence of world conflicts – Recruiters who were aware of STP enhancements reported that current military conflicts made it difficult to interest students and school officials in participating in the STP.

- Conflicts make it more difficult to interest students:
74% aware, versus 57% not aware.
- Conflicts make it more difficult to interest schools, counselors or principals:
75% aware, versus 57% not aware.

NPS recruiters agreed much more – Recruiters who had recruited NPS contacts in the previous 12 months agreed or strongly agreed more that military conflicts in the world made it difficult to interest both students (63% NPS, versus 43% non-NPS) and schools/school officials (61% NPS, versus 46% non-NPS).

Navy Reserves and Air Force Reserves less positive, more neutral than Active Navy – Recruiters with the Navy Reserves and Air Force Reserves tended to agree less with, and be more neutral about, the statement that current military conflicts made it difficult to interest students and school officials in the STP.

- Difficulty interesting students in STP:
47% of Reserve Navy agreed or strongly agreed, 45% of Reserve Air Force agreed or strongly agreed.
- Difficulty interesting schools, counselors, or principals in STP:
47% of Reserve Navy neither agreed nor disagreed, 47% of Reserve Air Force agreed or strongly agreed.

Active Navy recruiters tended to agree more that military conflicts made it difficult to interest students in the STP (71%).

Recruiters with good MEPS support tended to believe in the negative influence of world conflicts –

Conflicts made it more difficult to interest students: The pattern of results for recruiters who indicated they received good support from the MEPS in terms of administration was

similar to that of recruiters who were aware of the enhancements (67% with good support, versus 55% without good support).

Conflicts made it more difficult to interest schools, counselors, or principals: Likewise, the pattern of results for recruiters who indicated they receive good support from the MEPS in terms of administration and interpretation were similar to those of recruiters who were aware of the enhancements.

- Administration: 67% with good support, versus 54% without good support.
- Interpretation: 68% with good support, versus 58% without good support.

Marine Corps production recruiters showed less concern about conflicts making it difficult to interest school officials – Responses from production recruiters within the Marine Corps (18%) indicated they were less concerned about current military conflicts in the world making it difficult to interest schools, counselors, or principals in participating in the STP.

Small differences – Small differences were indicated for the demographic of component with respect to interest of students participating in the STP. Small differences were also indicated for the demographics of branch of service, component, geographic region, recruiting zone population density, preparedness to market the STP, MEPS support for STP marketing, and one or more years assigned to recruiting duty with respect to interest of schools/school officials.

No differences – No differences were indicated for the demographics of production recruiter, years of experience, and recruiting zone population density with respect to student interest in participating in the STP. Likewise, no differences were indicated for the demographics of production recruiter and six or more years experience in the recruiting duty with respect to interest of schools/school officials participating in the STP.

Table 53.

Q16C,D -- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

C. The current military conflicts in the world make it difficult to interest students in participating in the ASVAB Student Testing Program. Agree – Disagree scale.

D. The current military conflicts in the world make it difficult to interest schools, counselors or principals in participating in the ASVAB Student Testing Program. Agree – Disagree scale.

	Percent Reporting							
	C - Interest Students				D - Interest Schools			
	Disagree	Neither	Agree	ME	Disagree	Neither	agree	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	9	29	62	±3	9	29	61	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>								
Army	8	31	61	±3	8	31	62	±3
Navy	8	25	67	±6	7	28	65	±6
Marine Corps	13	29	58	±7	17 ⁺⁹	26	57	±7
Air Force	11	29	60	±4	9	30	61	±4
<i>Component</i>								
Active	9	28 ⁻⁸	63 ⁺⁸	±3	10 ⁺⁴	28 ⁻⁸	62	±3
Reserve	9	36 ⁺⁸	55 ⁻⁸	±5	6 ⁻⁴	36 ⁺⁸	58	±5
<i>Service Component</i>								
Active Army	8	31	62	±3	8	30	62	±3
Active Navy	9	20 ⁻¹¹	71 ⁺¹¹	±7	8	24	68	±7
Active USMC	13	29	58	±7	17 ⁺⁹	26	57	±7
Active USAF	10	26	63	±4	8	28	65	±4
Reserve Army	9	32	59	±6	7	32	61	±6
Reserve Navy	5 ⁻⁴	49 ⁺²¹	47 ⁻¹⁵	±12	NR	47 ⁺¹⁹	53	±12
Reserve Air Force	13	41 ⁺¹²	45 ⁻¹⁷	±10	13	39	47 ⁻¹⁵	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>								
Not production	11	27	61	±6	8	26	65	±6
Production	9	30	62	±3	10	30	61	±3
<i>NPS contacts recruited in the last 12 months</i>								
Not recruit NPS	3 ⁻⁶	54 ⁺²⁵	43 ⁻¹⁹	±18	2 ⁻⁸	52 ⁺²⁴	46	±18
Recruits NPS	9	29	63	±3	10	29	61	±3

	Percent Reporting							
	C - Interest Students				D - Interest Schools			
	Disagree	Neither	Agree	ME	Disagree	Neither	agree	ME
<i>Geographic region</i>								
Northeast	6	30	64	±6	6 ⁻⁴	29	65	±6
Mid-Atlantic	8	31	61	±11	9	38	53	±11
Southeast	9	24 ⁻⁷	67 ⁺⁷	±5	11	24 ⁻⁶	65	±5
North Central	12	30	58	±6	12	30	57	±6
South Central	7	30	63	±6	7	29	64	±6
West	9	35	57	±9	9	34	57	±9
Pacific	12	28	60	±6	11	28	62	±6
<i>Prepared to market STP</i>								
Not prepared	7 ⁻⁴	32 ⁺⁵	61	±4	8	33 ⁺⁷	59	±4
Prepared	11	26 ⁻⁶	63	±4	10	25 ⁻⁸	64 ⁺⁶	±4
<i>Aware of STP enhancements</i>								
Not aware	9	34 ⁺¹⁶	57 ⁻¹⁶	±3	9	34 ⁺¹⁷	57 ⁻¹⁷	±3
Aware	9	17 ⁻¹⁷	74 ⁺¹⁷	±5	9	15 ⁻¹⁹	75 ⁺¹⁹	±5
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>								
Not good support	8	38 ⁺¹⁵	55 ⁻¹¹	±4	7 ⁻⁴	39 ⁺¹⁷	54 ⁻¹²	±4
Good support	10	23 ⁻¹⁴	67 ⁺¹³	±3	11	22 ⁻¹⁶	67 ⁺¹³	±3
<i>MEPS Support for interpretation</i>								
Not good support	8	32 ⁺⁷	59 ⁻⁶	±3	8 ⁻⁴	35 ⁺¹⁴	58 ⁻⁹	±3
Good support	10	25 ⁻⁷	66 ⁺⁷	±4	11	21 ⁻¹⁴	68 ⁺¹¹	±4
<i>MEPS Support for marketing</i>								
Not good support	8	32 ⁺⁷	59	±3	8 ⁻⁴	32 ⁺⁷	61	±3
Good support	10	24 ⁻⁹	65 ⁺⁶	±4	12 ⁺⁴	25 ⁻⁷	63	±4

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error. NR=Unreliable estimate.

Write-in Comments

The following two opened-ended items were included in the survey to allow respondents the opportunity to provide feedback at the end of the survey.

Q25: What 1 - 2 specific things about the new enhanced ASVAB Student Testing Program work well?

Q26: What are the 1 - 2 biggest barriers to the successful use of the new enhanced ASVAB Student Testing Program and how can we overcome these barriers?

Overall, 38% of the recruiters offered comments on what works well with the new enhanced STP, and 41% provided comments on the barriers to successful use of the STP.

Recruiters with more than one year of recruiting duty commented more – Recruiters with more than one of recruiting duty were more likely to offer comments on what worked well (41%, versus 30%) and on the biggest barriers (44%, versus 30%).

Service Component Effects –

Fewer Marine Corps recruiters commented on what worked well (27%) and the biggest barriers (32%).

Fewer Active Air Force recruiters commented on what worked well (30%) and the biggest barriers (31%).

The open-ended items resulted in many comments that were addressed in the survey and some that were not covered in the survey items. The latter comments are important as they are suggestive of what ought to be included in a future survey. The comments have been clustered as follows:

1. General comments about the STP.
 - Favorable opinion of the program.
 - Reports of unfamiliarity with the program and/or with the recent enhancements to the program.
2. Need for more training and marketing.
 - Need more training on the STP and how to market the program.
 - Need more training on conducting interpretation sessions with students.
 - Reports that school officials, counselors, parents, and students were not knowledgeable about the purposes of the STP or what the program could do for students. This negatively impacts whether a school tests and, if a school tests, whether it tests all of their students in a grade or offers the test only to those students who sign up for testing. Finally, if the school officials and counselors were not educated about the program, they were not able to educate and appropriately motivate students. Hence, the students either don't sign up for testing or take the test as a way to get out of classes for 3.5 hours. As a result, recruiters reported that too many of the students didn't take the test seriously.
 - Need more support in marketing the STP to school officials.
 - Need more pre-testing sessions to educate and motivate students on the STP.

- Need more training in marketing the program.
 - Marketing of the program should not be done by Military Service personnel. The association with the military had a negative impact on participation and, when testing is mandatory, whether the students were motivated to do well on the test.
 - Need more advertising of the STP.
3. Recruiters reported two primary, circumstantial barriers to ASVAB testing.
- With other mandatory testing, schools were saying there is no time for additional testing.
 - Recruiters reported the current administration, attitudes toward the military, and conflicts in the world were having a negative impact on schools and students participating in the program. Schools were less likely to participate, or if they were testing, they had changed from mandatory testing to voluntary testing and they were selecting more restrictive score-release options.
4. The last group of responses consists of recruiter's frustrations with aspects of the STP and statements on how they perceive the program should operate.
- The write-in responses ran the gamut from supporting testing of 10th grade students to seeing it as a waste of time.
 - Comments about the value of recruiters' role in proctoring the ASVAB were mixed; many reported this was a waste of their time.
 - A number of recruiters wanted testing of 11th and 12th grade students to be mandatory for schools.
 - Recruiters reported various difficulties and frustrations in getting score results: the new opt-out, the time it takes to get the score results back, and score-release options that hold release of the scores.
 - A few recruiters indicated difficulties with ASVAB test administrators (e.g., no shows, unsupportive or negative comments).

Table 54.

Q25,26 – Open-ended comments.

Q25: What 1 - 2 specific things about the new enhanced ASVAB Student Testing Program work well?

Q26: What are the 1 - 2 biggest barriers to the successful use of the new enhanced ASVAB Student Testing Program and how can we overcome these barriers?

	Percent Respond	Percent Reporting Comments		
		Question 25. What Works Well	Question 26. Biggest Barriers	ME
<i>Full Sample</i>	100 ±0	38	41	±3
<i>Branch of Service</i>				
Army	100 ±0	45 ⁺¹³	46 ⁺¹¹	±3
Navy	100 ±0	37	40	±6
Marine Corps	100 ±0	27 ⁻¹⁴	32 ⁻¹¹	±7
Air Force	100 ±0	33 ⁻⁶	32 ⁻⁹	±4
<i>Component</i>				
Active	100 ±0	38	40	±3
Reserve	100 ±0	43	42	±5
<i>Service Component</i>				
Active Army	100 ±0	44 ⁺⁹	45 ⁺⁸	±3
Active Navy	100 ±0	37	40	±7
Active USMC	100 ±0	27 ⁻¹⁴	32 ⁻¹⁰	±7
Active USAF	100 ±0	30 ⁻⁹	31 ⁻¹⁰	±4
Reserve Army	100 ±0	44	44	±6
Reserve Navy	100 ±0	39	36	±12
Reserve Air Force	100 ±0	44	37	±10
<i>Production recruiter</i>				
Not production	100 ±0	38	42	±6
Production recruiter	100 ±0	39	41	±3
<i>Years assigned to recruiting duty</i>				
less than one year	100 ±0	30 ⁻¹⁰	30 ⁻¹³	±6
1 or more years	100 ±0	41 ⁺¹⁴	44 ⁺¹⁷	±3

	Percent Respond	Percent Reporting Comments		
		Question 25. What Works Well	Question 26. Biggest Barriers	ME
<i>Geographic region</i>				
Northeast	100 ±0	36	41	±6
Mid-Atlantic	100 ±0	41	44	±11
Southeast	100 ±0	42	42	±5
North Central	100 ±0	42	46	±6
South Central	100 ±0	35	34 ⁻⁸	±6
West	100 ±0	38	41	±9
Pacific	100 ±0	39	43	±6
<i>MEPS Support for administration</i>				
Not good support	100 ±0	42 ⁺⁶	43	±4
Good support	100 ±0	36 ⁻⁶	39	±3

Notes: All other contrast at $p \leq .01$: Lower=^{-effect size} Higher=^{+effect size} ME=Margin of error.
Percent responding are recruiters who answered the question.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY CONTENT

COMPLETION INSTRUCTIONS

- This is not a test, so take your time.
- Select answers you believe are most appropriate. If you feel a question does not apply to you, please leave it blank.
- Use a blue or black pen.
- Please PRINT where applicable.
- Place an "X" in the appropriate box or boxes.

Right Wrong

- To change an answer, completely black out the wrong answer and put an "X" in the correct box as shown below.

Correct Answer Incorrect Answer

- Do not make any marks outside of the response and write-in boxes.

MAILING INSTRUCTIONS

- Please return your completed survey in the business reply envelope. (If you misplaced the envelope, mail the survey to ASVAB Survey, C/O Data Recognition Corp (G5300), PO Box 5720, Hopkins, MN 55343).
- If you are returning the survey from another country, be sure to return the business reply envelope only through a U.S. government mail room or post office.
- Foreign postal systems will not deliver business reply mail.

LIST OF FREQUENTLY USED TERMS

DMDC is short for Defense Manpower Data Center.

ESS is short for Education Service Specialist.

ASVAB Student Testing Program is the same as the Career Exploration Program.

ASVAB Student Testing Program **enhancements** include:

- ASVAB Student Testing Program Training DVD
- ASVAB Summary Result Sheet
- Exploring Careers: The ASVAB Career Exploration Guide
- FYI – Find Your Interests
- www.asvabprogram.com
- www.CareersInTheMilitary.com

PRIVACY NOTICE

Providing information on this survey is voluntary and anonymous. There will be no effort to trace any information back to an individual. The use of a survey ticket number is simply to ensure a secure entry to the on-line survey and to prevent multiple responses.

There is no penalty if you choose not to respond. However, maximum participation is encouraged so that data will be complete and representative. Your survey responses will be treated as confidential. In no case will the data be reported or used for identifiable individuals.

MISSION SUPPORT

1. In which of the following areas of the ASVAB Student Testing Program have you received training? (Mark all that apply)
 - Marketing the ASVAB Student Testing Program to schools
 - Administering the ASVAB Student Test
 - Interpreting ASVAB Student Test Scores
 - Conducting an interpretation session
 - Helping students explore careers
 - None

2. Where have you received training for the ASVAB Student Testing Program? (Mark all that apply)
 - Recruiter Training School/School House
 - Recruiting Command
 - New Recruiter Orientation
 - MEPS ESS

- Army ESS or Navy ESS
- On-the-job, under a supervisor's direction
- Self-taught
- Other

3. Has the training you received adequately prepared you to market the ASVAB Student Testing Program?.....

	Yes	No
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4a. I receive good support from the MEPS for <u>administering</u> the ASVAB Student Test (e.g., ESS arranges the test administration).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
4b. I receive good support from the MEPS for <u>interpreting</u> the ASVAB Student Test (e.g., ESS conducts the interpretation session).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
4c. The ASVAB Student Testing Program is effectively marketed to the schools in my area.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

5. What types of support for the ASVAB Student Testing Program do you think would make you more productive as a recruiter? (Mark all that apply)

- More marketing support
- More ASVAB test administration support from ESS
- Pair me up with a coach/mentor specific to the ASVAB Student Testing Program
- More training in marketing the ASVAB Student Testing Program to schools
- More training in administering the ASVAB Student Test
- More training in interpreting ASVAB Student Test Scores
- More training in conducting an interpretation session
- More training in helping students explore careers
- Other

RECRUITING PROCESS

6. In your current assignment, do you recruit Non Prior Service (NPS) contacts?

- Yes
- No → Skip to question 8

7. How would you rate the overall importance of each of the following lead sources for achieving your NPS recruiting goals/missions?

	High importance	Medium importance	Low importance
a. ASVAB Student Testing Program.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. High School lists/student directories.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Referrals from applicants.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Local advertising.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. National leads (e.g., direct mailouts, 800 number, internet).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Community colleges.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. 4-year colleges/universities.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Local merchants/community contacts.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Recruiter assistance (HRAP, HARP, RAP, PRASP, Boot Leave, etc.).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Recruiting station walk-ins.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Please indicate whether you consider each of the following to be a primary, secondary, or peripheral role of the ASVAB Student Testing Program.

	Primary	Secondary	Peripheral
a. To generate recruiting leads.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. To promote student career exploration.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. To help students view the military positively.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. To encourage students to discover their interests and skills.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. To promote continuing education after high school.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. To educate students about military careers..	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
9a. I regularly talk with potential recruits about the benefits of the ASVAB Student Testing Program (e.g., helps you to get to know your interests, strengths, explore possible careers).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
9b. In my experience, when uniformed personnel proctor the High School ASVAB Test it helps to establish a connection with students that can be useful later in recruiting.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

	Significantly increases the number	Somewhat increases the number	A little effect on the number	Very little effect on the number	Has no effect at all
10. How much would you say the ASVAB Student Testing Program helps increase the number of qualified leads over the <u>short term</u> (i.e., over the next 12 months).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. How much would you say that the ASVAB Student Testing Program helps increase the number of qualified leads over the <u>long term</u> (i.e., over the next 1 – 2 years).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
12a. The ASVAB Student Testing Program is a valuable source of leads for me.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12b. The ASVAB Student Testing Program provides more leads than I would have gotten otherwise.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12c. The ASVAB Student Testing Program increases my access to schools.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12d. The ASVAB Student Testing Program is an effective recruiting tool for me.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12e. If the ASVAB Student Testing Program were discontinued, my recruiting efforts would suffer.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12f. The ASVAB Student Testing Program makes my recruiting job easier.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12g. Considering everything, I feel that the time I <u>spend</u> on the ASVAB Student Testing Program is worth the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

recruiting payoff.

12h. Overall, I believe the ASVAB Student Testing Program is helpful to my recruiting efforts within the high school population.....

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

PROGRAM ENHANCEMENTS

13. Please mark all of the ASVAB Student Testing Program Components that you are familiar with:

- ASVAB Student Testing Program Training DVD (training for conducting ASVAB interpretations)
- ASVAB Summary Result Sheet (report of student scores)
- Exploring Careers: The ASVAB Career Exploration Guide
- FYI - Find Your Interests (interest inventory)
- www.asvabprogram.com (website that contains the online FYI and OCCU-Find)
- www.CareersInTheMilitary.com (military careers website)

14. The ASVAB Student Testing Program was recently enhanced in several ways (e.g., recently updated military careers website, FYI, website for career exploration, etc.). Please let us know your experience with these recent enhancements by rating the items below:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. During my training for this mission, I was made fully aware of the recent enhancements to the ASVAB Student Testing Program (e.g., web-based career exploration tools such as FYI and OCCU-Find).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
b. I have explored the ASVAB Student Testing Program on-line resources.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
c. I believe the ASVAB Student Testing Program	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

websites are helpful to students who are interested in exploring military careers.....

d. I believe the enhancements that were made to the ASVAB Student Testing Program will make it easier to recruit qualified applicants.....

e. These enhancements will make it easier to interest students in exploring a military career than if the enhancements had not been done.....

f. These enhancements will make it easier to gain access to students than if the enhancements had not been done.....

<input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>				

15. How well does the newly redesigned ASVAB Student Testing Program educate students about career options in the military?

- Very well
- Well
- Neither well nor poorly
- Poorly
- Very poorly

STUDENT TESTING

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

16a. The association of the ASVAB Student Testing Program with the military reduces the number of students who participate in the Program.....

					Strongly Disagree
					Disagree
					Neither Agree nor Disagree
					Agree
					Strongly Agree
<input type="checkbox"/>					

16b. The ASVAB Student Testing Program is beneficial for a wide variety of students, not just students who are interested in military careers.....

<input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>				

16c. The current military conflicts in the world make it difficult to interest students in participating in the ASVAB Student Testing Program ...

16d. The current military conflicts in the world make it difficult to interest schools, counselors or principals in participating in the ASVAB Student Testing Program.

17. Overall, how satisfied are you with the ASVAB Student Testing Program?

- Satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied

ABOUT YOU

The information in the following section will only be used for research purposes. Your responses are confidential. Results will only be reported by groups (e.g., region, branch of service).

18. What is your branch of Service/Reserve Component?

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Army | <input type="checkbox"/> Marine Corps Reserve |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Navy | <input type="checkbox"/> Army National Guard |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Marine Corps | <input type="checkbox"/> Navy Reserve |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Force | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Force Reserve |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Army Reserve | <input type="checkbox"/> Air National Guard |

19. How long have you been assigned to recruiting duty?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> less than one year | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 years, but less than 6 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 year, but less than 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 or more years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 years, but less than 3 | |

20. Please mark the box that best describes the predominant characteristic of your recruiting zone.

- Urban
- Suburban
- Small city/town
- Rural

21. Please indicate your geographic region.

- Northeast (CT, MA, ME, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT)
- Mid-Atlantic (DC, DE, MD, VA, WV)
- Southeast (AL, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN)
- North Central (IA, IL, IN, MI, MN, ND, NE, OH, SD, WI)
- South Central (AR, KS, MO, OK, TX)
- West (AZ, CO, ID, MT, NM, NV, UT, WY)
- Pacific (AK, CA, HI, OR, WA)

22. Are you a production recruiter?

- Yes
- No → skip to 25

23. How many NPS contacts did you recruit in the last 12 months?

24. What is your best estimate of the percentage of these contacts that had participated in the ASVAB Student Testing Program?

%

ADDITIONAL INPUT

25. What 1 – 2 specific things about the new enhanced ASVAB Student Testing Program work well?

26. What are the 1 – 2 biggest barriers to the successful use of the new enhanced ASVAB Student Testing Program and how can we overcome these barriers?

APPENDIX B: SURVEY COMMUNICATIONS

September 18, 2006



Dear Recruiter:

The Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) has contracted with Data Recognition Corporation to conduct an assessment of the recently enhanced ASVAB Student Testing Program.*

This survey solicits input from production recruiters (and some command personnel) in order to gauge the perceived use and usefulness of the ASVAB Student Testing Program. You were selected to participate in this research project and your input is critical.

Please begin the survey as soon as possible and complete it no later than **October 15, 2006**. You may be asked up to 26 questions and the survey should take no more than 10-15 minutes to complete. The survey is being administered via the Internet.

To complete the survey, please go to this website:

www.asvabsurvey.com

and enter the following survey ticket number.

Thank you.

Kris Fenlason, Ph. D.
Director of Organization Effectiveness
Data Recognition Corporation

*If you are not familiar with the recent enhancements to the Student ASVAB Program, please take a few minutes to investigate the following websites:

www.CareersInTheMilitary.com

www.asvabprogram.com Access Code: 120qq

November 3, 2006

Dear Recruiter:



The Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) has contracted with Data Recognition Corporation to conduct an assessment of the recently enhanced ASVAB Student Testing Program.*

This survey solicits input from production recruiters (and some command personnel) in order to gauge the perceived use and usefulness of the ASVAB Student Testing Program. You were selected to participate in this research project and your input is critical.

The survey is available on the Internet. Or you may complete the survey using the enclosed paper version. If you choose to complete the paper survey, please return it at your earliest convenience in the enclosed, postage-paid envelope.

The survey field period has been extended. Please begin the survey as soon as possible and complete it no later than **November 15, 2006**. You may be asked up to 26 questions and the survey should take no more than 10-15 minutes to complete.

To complete the survey on the Internet, please go to the following website:

www.asvabsurvey.com

and enter the following survey ticket number.

Thank you.

Kris Fenlason, Ph. D.
Director of Organization Effectiveness
Data Recognition Corporation

*If you are not familiar with the recent enhancements to the Student ASVAB Program, please take a few minutes to investigate the following websites:

www.CareersInTheMilitary.com

www.asvabprogram.com Access Code: 120qq

EMAIL ANNOUNCEMENT

September 18, 2006

ASVAB RECRUITER SURVEY

Your Ticket Number:

Dear Recruiter:

The Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) has contracted with Data Recognition Corporation to conduct an assessment of the recently enhanced ASVAB Student Testing Program.*

This survey solicits input from production recruiters (and some command personnel) in order to gauge the perceived use and usefulness of the ASVAB Student Testing Program. You were selected to participate in this research project and your input is critical.

Please begin the survey as soon as possible and complete it no later than October 15, 2006. You may be asked up to 26 questions and the survey should take no more than 10-15 minutes to complete. The survey is being administered via the Internet.

To complete the survey, please go to this website: www.asvabsurvey.com
Once you access the Web site, you will need to enter the following Ticket Number:

Thank you.

Kris Fenlason, Ph. D.
Director of Organization Effectiveness
Data Recognition Corporation

*If you are not familiar with the recent enhancements to the Student ASVAB Program, please take a few minutes to investigate the following websites:

www.CareersInTheMilitary.com

www.asvabprogram.com Access Code: 120qq

EMAIL REMINDER 1

October 4, 2006

ASVAB RECRUITER SURVEY

Your Ticket Number:

Dear Recruiter:

The Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) has contracted with Data Recognition Corporation to conduct an assessment of the recently enhanced ASVAB Student Testing Program.*

We have received many surveys and want to thank all of you who have taken the time so far to answer the survey. If you have not had a chance to participate, please take the time to complete the survey soon.

You were selected to participate in this research project and your input is critical. It only requires 10 – 15 minutes of your time.

Please take the survey by logging on to the following Web site: www.asvabsurvey.com
Once you access the Web site, you will need to enter the following Ticket Number:

Thank you.

Kris Fenlason, Ph. D.
Director of Organization Effectiveness
Data Recognition Corporation

*If you are not familiar with the recent enhancements to the Student ASVAB Program, please take a few minutes to investigate the following websites:

www.CareersInTheMilitary.com

www.asvabprogram.com Access Code: 120qq

EMAIL REMINDER 2

October 10, 2006

ASVAB RECRUITER SURVEY

Your Ticket Number:

Dear Recruiter:

The Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) has contracted with Data Recognition Corporation to conduct an assessment of the recently enhanced ASVAB Student Testing Program.*

If you have already taken the time to take the ASVAB Recruiter Survey, thank you. If you have not had a chance to complete the survey, please try to take the time today to do so. You were selected to participate in this research project and your input is critical. It only requires 10 – 15 minutes of your time.

If you have partially completed the survey, but have not clicked the “Submit” button, please go back, log onto the Web site, complete as many items as you can, and submit the survey to us.

Please take the survey by logging on to the following Web site: www.asvabsurvey.com
Once you access the Web site, you will need to enter the following Ticket Number:

Thank you.

Kris Fenlason, Ph. D.
Director of Organization Effectiveness
Data Recognition Corporation

*If you are not familiar with the recent enhancements to the Student ASVAB Program, please take a few minutes to investigate the following websites:

www.CareersInTheMilitary.com

www.asvabprogram.com Access Code: 120qq

EMAIL REMINDER 3

October 20, 2006

ASVAB RECRUITER SURVEY

Your Ticket Number:

Dear Recruiter:

The Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) has contracted with Data Recognition Corporation to conduct an assessment of the recently enhanced ASVAB Student Testing Program.*

If you have already taken the time to take the ASVAB Recruiter Survey, thank you. If you have not had a chance to complete the survey, please try to take the time today. You were selected to participate in this research project and your input is very important. It only requires 10 – 15 minutes of your time.

Please take the survey by logging on to the following Web site: www.asvabsurvey.com
Simply click on this address to go directly to the Web site. If this does not work, "copy and paste" this address into the Web address box of your Internet browser. Once you access the Web site, you will need to enter the following Ticket Number:

If you have partially completed the survey, but have not clicked the "Submit" button, please go back, log onto the Web site, complete as many items as you can, and submit the survey to us.

Thank you.

Kris Fenlason, Ph. D.
Director of Organization Effectiveness
Data Recognition Corporation

*If you are not familiar with the recent enhancements to the Student ASVAB Program, please take a few minutes to investigate the following websites:

www.CareersInTheMilitary.com

www.asvabprogram.com Access Code: 120qq

EMAIL REMINDER 4

November 7, 2006

ASVAB RECRUITER SURVEY

Your Ticket Number:

Dear Recruiter:

The Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) has contracted with Data Recognition Corporation to conduct an assessment of the recently enhanced ASVAB Student Testing Program.*

If you have already taken the time to take the ASVAB Recruiter Survey, thank you. If you have not had a chance to complete the survey, please try to take the time today as the survey will only be available for a short period of time. It only requires 10 – 15 minutes of your time.

Please take the survey by logging on to the following Web site: www.asvabsurvey.com Simply click on this address to go directly to the Web site. If this does not work, "copy and paste" this address into the Web address box of your Internet browser. Once you access the Web site, you will need to enter the following Ticket Number:

If you have partially completed the survey, but have not clicked the "Submit" button, please go back, log onto the Web site, complete as many items as you can, and submit the survey to us.

Thank you.

Kris Fenlason, Ph. D.
Director of Organization Effectiveness
Data Recognition Corporation

*If you are not familiar with the recent enhancements to the Student ASVAB Program, please take a few minutes to investigate the following websites:

www.CareersInTheMilitary.com

www.asvabprogram.com Access Code: 120qq

APPENDIX C: METHODS

Appendix C

**ASVAB Student Testing Program
Recruiter Survey – 2006**

**Sampling and Weighting Methodology Report
Richard Riemer
Defense Manpower Data Center**

August 2007

Sampling & Weighting Methodology Report

Introduction

The population of interest for the *ASVAB Student Testing Program Recruiter Survey – 2006* was Active and Reserve enlisted production recruiters of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. The population size was 18,707, and the stratified random sample size was 8,363. The frame was constructed from lists supplied by each Service: Ms. Sheila Johnson of Navy Recruiter Service, Capt. Perry of Marine Corps Recruiting Service, Mr. Jeffrey Krieger of Army Recruiting Command, and Dr. Paul N. DiTullio of Air Force Recruiting Service. Table C-1 identifies the component levels and stratum definition.

Table C-1.

Component levels.

1. Active Army
2. Active Navy
3. Active USMC
4. Active USAF
5. Reserve Army
6. Reserve Navy
7. Reserve Air Force

Stratum Definition.

- If Service =1 then Strata =1;
- If Service =2 then Strata =2;
- If Service =3 then Strata =3;
- If Service =4 then Strata =4;
- If Service =5 then Strata =5;
- If Service =6 then Strata =6;
- If Service =7 then Strata =7;

Key Sample Design Parameters

Eligibility and Response Rates. Table C-2 shows the estimated eligibility and response rates for the strata. The eligibility rate of greater than, or equal to, one year recruiting experience (GE1Year) was based on actual data for Army and Navy and estimated for USMC and USAF.

Table C-2.

Eligibility and Response Rates.

Strata	Response	Eligibility	GE1Year
1. Active Army	0.40	1	0.66
2. Active Navy	0.34	1	0.64
3. Active USMC	0.31	1	0.70
4. Active USAF	0.31	1	0.70
5. Reserve Army	0.42	1	0.69
6. Reserve Navy	0.29	1	0.79
7. Reserve Air Force	0.50	1	0.80

Domain Constraints. Table C-3 shows the population domains used as a basis for allocating the sample. It shows 14 population domains (Domain), descriptions of each domain (Label), the population count (PopCount), and the half-width-confidence-interval input as a constraint on the sample allocation (HWCI-In). Career indicates more than one year of recruiter experience. The All Domain constraint was set lower than .05 because the budget would allow for a slightly larger sample size; this resulted in a slightly more proportional sample and lower design effects.

Table C-3.

Domain Constraints.

Domain	Label	PopCount	HWCI-In
1	All Domains	18,707	0.02
2	Active	15,851	0.05
3	Reserve	2,856	0.05
4	Army	9,649	0.05
5	Navy	3,955	0.05
6	USMC	3,549	0.05
7	USAF	1,554	0.05
15	All Domains*Career	12,610	0.05
16	Active*Career	10,547	0.05
17	Reserve*Career	2,063	0.05
18	Army*Career	6,397	0.05
19	Navy*Career	2,612	0.05
20	USMC*Career	2,485	0.05
21	USAF*Career	1,116	0.05

Sample

Stratum Results. Table C-4 shows the stratum number (Stratum), population count (Frame), the sample size before response rate adjustments (Allocation), the sample count (Sample), the sampling fraction (Pct), and the stratum label (Label). Determination of the number of people who would be sampled for each stratum was facilitated by using a sample-planning tool developed for Defense Manpower Data Center (Kavee & Mason, 1997). A formal mathematical procedure (Chromy, 1987) based on Karush-Kuhn-Tucker theory was used in the sample-planning tool to determine an optimized sample size and allocation – a sample that would achieve at minimal cost (i.e., minimum sample size) the precision levels required for each analytic domain. The Kuhn-Tucker theory provided an optimal solution to satisfy precision constraints (e.g., ± 5 percentage points) imposed on estimates of prevalence rates in key reporting domains. Researchers iteratively modified the inputs to the sample-planning tool to arrive at acceptable precision levels for reporting domains that would be of particular interest to policy officials. Table C-5 shows the frame and sample counts after the duplicates were removed.

Table C-4.*Stratum level sample allocation before duplicates were removed.*

Stratum	Frame	Allocation	Sample	Pct	Label
1	7,724	889	2,222	28.80	1. Active Army
2	3,297	526	1,547	46.90	2. Active Navy
3	3,549	595	1,919	54.10	3. Active USMC
4	1,281	372	1,200	93.70	4. Active USAF
5	1,925	344	819	42.50	5. Reserve Army
6	658	126	434	66.00	6. Reserve Navy
7	<u>273</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>81.30</u>	7. Reserve Air Force
	18,707	2,963	8,363	44.70	

Table C-5.*Stratum level sample allocation after duplicates were removed.*

Stratum	Frame	Allocation	Sample	Pct	Label
1	7,724	889	2,222	28.80	1. Active Army
2	3,297	526	1,547	46.90	2. Active Navy
3	3,549	595	1,919	54.10	3. Active USMC
4	1,272	372	1,192	93.70	4. Active USAF
5	1,925	344	819	42.50	5. Reserve Army
6	658	126	434	66.00	6. Reserve Navy
7	<u>273</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>81.30</u>	7. Reserve Air Force
	18,698	2,963	8,355	44.70	

Domain Results. Table C-6 shows the domain constraints and the domain results: the half-width-confidence-interval expected from the survey returns (HWCI-Out), the estimated sample size prior to response rate adjustments (Allocation), the expected sample size (n), the expected percent sampled (Pct Sampled), and the variance inflation design effect for the domain that results when all of the competing domain constraints are satisfied (Design Effect).

Table C-6.
Domain Results.

Domain	Label	Pop Count	HW CI-In	HWCI -Out	Estimated			Design Effect
					Allocation	n	Pct Sampled	
1	All Domains	18,707	0.02	0.02	2,963	8,363	44.71	0.93
2	Active	15,851	0.05	0.02	2,382	6,888	43.45	0.92
3	Reserve	2,856	0.05	0.04	581	1,475	51.65	0.86
4	Army	9,649	0.05	0.03	1,233	3,041	31.52	0.90
5	Navy	3,955	0.05	0.04	652	1,981	50.09	0.84
6	USMC	3,549	0.05	0.04	595	1,919	54.07	0.83
7	USAF	1,554	0.05	0.04	483	1,422	91.51	0.71
8	Army*Active	7,724		0.03	889	2,222	28.77	0.89
9	Navy*Active	3,297		0.04	526	1,547	46.92	0.84
10	USMC*Active	3,549		0.04	595	1,919	54.07	0.83
11	USAF*Active	1,281		0.04	372	1,200	93.68	0.71
12	Army*Reserve	1,925		0.05	344	819	42.55	0.82
13	Navy*Reserve	658		0.08	126	434	65.96	0.81
14	USAF*Reserve	273		0.07	111	222	81.32	0.60
15	All Domains*Career	12,610	0.05	0.02	2,020	5,709	45.28	1.24
16	Active*Career	10,547	0.05	0.03	1,595	4,625	43.85	1.24
17	Reserve*Career	2,063	0.05	0.05	425	1,084	52.54	1.10
18	Army*Career	6,397	0.05	0.04	821	2,023	31.62	1.21
19	Navy*Career	2,612	0.05	0.05	433	1,324	50.70	1.12
20	USMC*Career	2,485	0.05	0.05	417	1,344	54.07	1.08
21	USAF*Career	1,116	0.05	0.05	349	1,018	91.25	0.91
22	Army*Active*Career	5,071		0.04	584	1,459	28.77	1.19
23	Navy*Active*Career	2,094		0.06	334	983	46.92	1.15
24	USMC*Active*Career	2,485		0.05	417	1,344	54.07	1.08
25	USAF*Active*Career	897		0.06	260	840	93.68	0.92
26	Army*Reserve*Career	1,326		0.07	237	564	42.55	1.08
27	Navy*Reserve*Career	518		0.10	99	342	65.96	0.98
28	USAF*Reserve*Career	219		0.09	89	178	81.32	0.71

Sample Selection

1. Edit Excel worksheet to add a field named Pop_ID and assign sequential numbers for sorting back to original order.
2. Edit Excel worksheet to add a field named Rand_Num and assign random numbers.
3. Sort file by stratum and Rand_Num.
4. Edit Excel worksheet to add a field named Rand_Seq which is a stratum record counter.
5. Save sample file which includes all records with having within stratum Rand_Seq numbers <= stratum sample sizes.

Computation of Weights

1. *Determine the final disposition of the sample.* Table C-7 shows the final dispositions for the 8,355 sample members (after 9 duplicates were removed). A sample member could fall into more than one category, so the dispositions are assigned hierarchically. Sample disposition variable identifies:

- Administrative record ineligible (none identified)
- Self/proxy-report ineligible (none identified)
- Complete responses
- Incomplete responses
- Non-respondents (blank returns, refusals [none identified], non-locatables, others).

The codes were determined and assigned in the following order:

- Record ineligible were identified when demographic variables from the administrative record were added to the sample file.
- Self-report or proxy-report ineligible were looked into and none were found.
- Incomplete responses were identified when less than 50% of the all answer items (i.e., all items but those within skip pattern) were skipped.
- Other non-respondents were identified by default.

Table C-7.

Sample Disposition Coding (Samp_DC).

Value	Label, F=SAMP_DC.	Count	Percent
1	Record Ineligible	18	.22
4	Complete Eligible Response	2,872	34.37
5	Incomplete Eligible Response	178	2.13
10	Postal Non-deliveries plus Non-locatables	723	8.62
11	Non-respondents	4,564	54.63
		8,355	100.00

The most notable finding at this step was that the rate of non-locatables – postal non-deliverables (PND) – varied greatly among the Components (see Table C-8).

Table C-8.

Observed Rates (unweighted) of Sample Disposition Categories by Component.

Sampling strata	Record Ineligible	Complete Eligible Response	Incomplete Eligible Response	PND	Non-respondents
Active Army	0.00	51.49	3.11	4.82	40.59
Active Navy	0.90	17.71	1.36	17.84	62.18
Active USMC	0.05	14.96	0.83	3.18	80.98
Active USAF	0.00	45.22	2.01	12.08	40.69
Reserve Army	0.00	51.77	3.54	5.86	38.83
Reserve Navy	0.69	23.27	2.30	18.66	55.07
Reserve Air Force	0.00	46.40	4.05	2.70	46.85
All	0.22	34.37	2.13	8.65	54.63

2. *Compute stratum level sampling weights.* Stratum level sampling weights were computed to be equal to the inverse of the probability of selection (stratum population count/stratum sample count). Eight duplicate sample records were identified in the original USAF sample of 1,200. Since the probability of selection for the eight duplicate sample members was $P(A) + P(B) - P(A)*P(B)$, their

weights were adjusted accordingly. Nine duplicate population records were identified in the original USAF population list of 1,281. The original sample and population counts were used to compute the probabilities of selection. (However, the final corrected population count of 1,272 was used for post-stratification.) Table C-9 shows the sum of the sampling weights in the returns file, and Table C-10 shows the distribution of sampling weights across the sample disposition codes.

Table C-9.
Control Counts and Sum of Sampling Weights.

Quantity	Value
Population size (excluding duplicates)	18,698
Sum sampling weights	18,697.95

Table C-10.
Weighted Sample Disposition Code.

Value	Label, F=SAMP_DC.	Count	SumWgt	Wgt %
1	Record ineligible	18	36.23	0.19
4	Complete Eligible Response	2,872	6,942.88	37.13
5	Incomplete Eligible Response	178	434.21	2.32
10	PND	723	1,469.70	7.86
11	Non-respondents	<u>4,564</u>	<u>9,814.92</u>	<u>52.49</u>
		8,355	18,697.95	100.00

3. *Merge administrative record data.* Administrative record data were merged with the returns file to provide demographic variables for the missing data compensation procedures used to create the non-response adjusted weights. However, 18 records in the sample could not be matched to the administrative record; these records were set to record ineligible status.

The sample SSNs were first matched against the Defense Eligibility Enrollment Reporting System (DEERS) daily database extract on August 24, 2006. Those that matched against DEERS were then matched against the military personnel files (Active Duty & Reserve's June 2006 monthly file). A probable explanation for the no-matches is that those members were no longer in the military (i.e., separated) (reference e-mail from Thao, Paulny N CIV DMDC – Tue 12/12/2006 1:25 PM).

The administrative record data provided six demographic variables (see Tables C-11 to C-16).

Table C-11.
Education Level-2 Levels, Weights = samp_wgt.

Label, F=EDUC2.	Count	Sum WGT	Wgt%
Ineligible	18	36	.19
No college / Unknown	6,923	15,712	84.05
Some college	<u>1,414</u>	<u>2,946</u>	<u>15.76</u>
	8,355	18,694	100.00

Table C-12.*Paygrade group, Weights = samp_wgt.*

Label, F=PAY3GRADE.	Count	Sum WGT	Wgt%
Ineligible	18	36	.19
E5 and below	3,092	6,423	34.36
E6	3,310	7,521	40.23
E7 and above	<u>1,935</u>	<u>4,714</u>	<u>25.21</u>
	8,355	18,694	100.00

Table C-13.*Marital status, Weights = samp_wgt.*

Label, F=MARRIED.	Count	Sum WGT	Wgt%
Ineligible	18	36	.19
Not married	1,744	3,948	21.12
Married	<u>6,593</u>	<u>14,710</u>	<u>78.69</u>
	8,355	18,694	100.00

Table C-14.*Race-ethnicity, Weights = samp_wgt.*

Label, F=RACE3ETH.	Count	Sum WGT	Wgt%
Ineligible	18	36	.19
Non-Hispanic White	4,690	10,414	55.71
Non-Hispanic Black	1,753	4,123	22.06
Other	<u>1,894</u>	<u>4,120</u>	<u>22.04</u>
	8,355	18,694	100.00

Table 15.*Family Status, Weights = samp_wgt.*

Label, F=FAMSTAT	Count	Sum WGT	Wgt%
Ineligible	18	36	.19
Single with Child(ren)	659	1,404	7.51
Single without Child(ren)	1,085	2,544	13.61
Married with Child(ren)	5,063	11,251	60.18
Married without Child(ren)	<u>1,530</u>	<u>3,459</u>	<u>18.50</u>
	8,355	18,694	100.00

Table 16.*Years of Service, Weights = samp_wgt.*

Label, F=CYOS.	Count	Sum Wgt	Wgt %
Ineligible	18	36	.19
0 to less than 3	298	742	3.97
3 to less than 6	1,127	2,641	14.13
6 to less than 10	2,825	6,195	33.14
10 to highest	<u>4,087</u>	<u>9,080</u>	<u>48.57</u>
	8,355	18,694	100.00

4. *Identify non-response predictors.* Non-response predictors were identified using logistic regression to regress eligibility status indicator on various demographic variables: Service, Component, Paygrade, Gender, Race-ethnic, Marital status, Education level, Number of children, and Years of service. Table C-17 shows how sample file records would be assigned to the eligibility status

indicator. Note that self/proxy-ineligibles who are identified among sample members returning surveys or contacting Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) are used to also represent ineligibles among sample members who did not return surveys nor contact DRC; however, no self/proxy-ineligibles were identified by the survey control system. Table C-18 shows which factors and factor interactions were found to be related eligibility status identification (Eligibility Status Response Rate). Table C-19 shows the eligibility status response rates for the relevant domain variables. Since no sample members self-reported themselves as ineligible, the Eligibility Status Response Rate is essentially the same as the overall response rate. However some incomplete responses are included in the eligibility status response rate; thus, a second adjustment was needed to account for incomplete responses.

Table C-17.
Response indicator coding.

Sample Disposition Codes	Eligibility Status Indicator	Completion Status Indicator
Administrative record ineligibles		
Self/proxy-report ineligibles	1	
Complete responses	1	1
Incomplete responses	1	0
Refusals	0	
Non-locatable sample members	0	
Other non-responses	0	

Table C-18.
Output from Logistic model of Eligibility Status Response Indicator.

Model Fit Statistics			
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates	
AIC	25094.004	22134.705	
SC	25101.035	22293.348	
-2 Log L	25092.004	22103.705	
R-Square	0.3007		
Max-rescaled R-Square	0.3164		
Testing Global Null Hypothesis: Beta=0			
Test	Chi Square	DF	Pr>ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	2988.2998	20	<.0001
Score	2769.7075	20	<.0001
Wald	2435.8648	20	<.0001
Type 3 Analysis of Effects			
Effect	Wald Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChSq
NSvc	1683.9515	3	<.0001
Pay3Grade	38.6229	2	<.0001
Race3Eth	248.3845	2	<.0001
NSvc*Pay3Grade	38.5445	6	<.0001
NComp*CYOS	24.8777	3	<.0001

Table C-19.

Eligibility Status Response Rates by Related Domain Variables and Domain Variable Interactions.

Domain Variable		Eligibility Status Response Rate
Service		
	Army	0.55
	Navy	0.20
	USMC	0.16
	USAF	0.48
Paygrade group		
	E5 and Below	0.32
	E6	0.41
	E7 and Above	0.48
Race-ethnicity		
	Non-Hispanic White	0.45
	Non-Hispanic Black	0.33
	Other	0.33
Service	Paygrade group	
Army	E5 and Below	0.49
	E6	0.56
	E7 and Above	0.57
Navy	E5 and Below	0.17
	E6	0.24
	E7 and Above	0.24
USMC	E5 and Below	0.11
	E6	0.15
	E7 and Above	0.24
USAF	E5 and Below	0.47
	E6	0.49
	E7 and Above	0.48
Component	Years of Service	
Active	0 to less than 3	0.51
	3 to less than 6	0.36
	6 to less than 10	0.31
	10 to highest	0.43
Reserve	0 to less than 3	0.47
	3 to less than 6	0.49
	6 to less than 10	0.50
	10 to highest	0.47

Eligibility status non-response adjustments were applied to the sampling weights to create an interim eligibility status adjusted weight. This adjustment spread the weights of non-respondents over the self/proxy-report ineligible, complete responses, and incomplete responses. The eligibility status adjusted weight was created by (a) first computing logistic eligibility status response propensities, (b) using the logistic propensity scores to form weighting classes with 50 or more responses in ascending order of response propensity, (c) computing response probabilities in each class by dividing the sum of respondent weights by the sum of all weights in the class, (d) multiplying the reciprocal of the class response probability by the Eligibility Status Response Indicator to create weighting class adjustments which are zero for non-respondents and non-zero for respondents, and (e) multiplying the

sampling weights by the weighting class adjustments. The resulting weights were zero for non-respondents and summed to the population total for eligibility status respondents (minus record ineligible were excluded from the weighting process).

As part of statistical quality control, the adjustments for the strata and other relevant domain variables were evaluated whenever they exceeded 1.5 times the average expected adjustment, to see if trimming or collapsing of strata or domain variables was warranted. In all cases, large adjustments did not warrant changes to the weighting methods because the large adjustments were associated with groups having low response rates and whose accurate representation could be important in reducing non-response bias. The adjusted weights were also evaluated when ever they exceeded 3 standard deviations of the average weights. Finally, the coefficient of variation (CV) for the adjusted weights was compared with the CV of the sampling weights.

A rough estimate for the design effect incurred for differential weighting is $(1+CV^2)$, where CV is the coefficient of variation in the weighting factors (Kish, 1992). The size of the design effect is an important consideration because the effective sample size is inversely proportional to the design effect. Thus, if the design effect is 2, then the effect sample size is half of the actual sample size, and the estimated variances are twice as large as would have resulted with a simple random sample (Kish, 1992).

As part of procedural quality control, the sums of weights and records containing non-zero weights were inspected. The sum of the eligibility status adjusted weights in the returns file equals 18,615.30. Table C-20 shows the control totals for the eligibility status adjusted weights. The eligibility status adjusted weights are less than the sampling weights by the amount of record ineligibles identified in the sample (36.23).

Table C-20.
Control totals for the eligibility status adjusted weights.

Quantity	Value
Population size (excluding duplicates)	18,698
Sum sampling weights	18,697.95
Sum eligibility status adjusted weights	18,661.72

5. Identify incomplete response predictors. Incomplete response predictors were identified by using logistic regression to regress the completion status indicator on non-response predictors identified. Table C-17 shows how sample file records were assigned to the completion status indicator, Table C-21 shows which factors and factor interactions were found to be related completion status, and Table C-22 shows the completion status response rates for the relevant domain variables.

Table C-21.*Output from Logistic model of Completion Status Response Indicator.*

Model Fit Statistics			
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates	
AIC	8692.121	8494.122	
SC	8698.144	8584.466	
-2 Log L	8690.121	8464.122	
R-Square	0.0714		
Max-rescaled R-Square	0.0758		
Testing Global Null Hypothesis: Beta=0			
Test	Chi Square	DF	Pr>ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	225.9986	14	<.0001
Score	234.1269	14	<.0001
Wald	227.1720	14	<.0001
Type 3 Analysis of Effects			
Effect	Wald Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChSq
Educ2*Pay3Grade	77.3046	2	<.0001
NSvc*Race3Eth	41.6868	6	<.0001
Race3Eth*FamStat	111.0437	6	<.0001

Table C-22.
Completion Status Response Rates by Related Domain Variable Interactions.

Education Level	Paygrade group	Completion Status Response Rate
No College / Unknown	E5 and Below	0.91
	E6	0.94
	E7 and Above	0.96
Some College	E5 and Below	0.97
	E6	0.95
	E7 and Above	0.95
Service	Race-ethnicity	
Army	Non-Hispanic White	0.94
	Non-Hispanic Black	0.95
	Other	0.92
Navy	Non-Hispanic White	0.93
	Non-Hispanic Black	0.86
	Other	0.92
USMC	Non-Hispanic White	0.94
	Non-Hispanic Black	0.98
	Other	0.96
USAF	Non-Hispanic White	0.96
	Non-Hispanic Black	0.93
	Other	0.92
Race-ethnicity	Family Status	
Non-Hispanic White	Single With Child(ren)	0.90
	Single Without Child(ren)	0.92
	Married With Child(ren)	0.95
	Married Without Child(ren)	0.94
Non-Hispanic Black	Single With Child(ren)	0.93
	Single Without Child(ren)	0.95
	Married With Child(ren)	0.94
	Married Without Child(ren)	0.87
Other	Single With Child(ren)	0.90
	Single Without Child(ren)	0.92
	Married With Child(ren)	0.92
	Married Without Child(ren)	0.97

6. *Apply completion status non-response adjustments.* Completion status non-response adjustments were applied to the eligibility status adjusted weights to create an interim completion status adjusted weight. This adjustment spreads the weights of the incomplete responses over the complete responses. The computation and quality control procedures for the completion status non-response adjustments are the same as for the eligibility status non-response adjustments. Table C-23 shows the control totals for the completion status adjusted weights.

Table C-23.

<i>Control totals for the completion status adjusted weights.</i>	
Quantity	Value
Population size (excluding duplicates, including ineligibles)	18,698
Sum sampling weights	18,697.95
Sum eligibility status adjusted weights	18,661.72
Sum completion status adjusted weights	18,661.72

7. *Compute post-stratification adjustments.* Within-strata post-stratification adjustments are equal to the sum of the (a) completion status non-response adjusted weights, (b) eligibility status non-response adjusted weights of the self/proxy-report ineligibles – none identified in recruiter sample, and (c) sampling weights of the record ineligibles – identified for sample but not population – all divided by the final corrected stratum population counts (Table C-24).

Table C-24.

<i>Post stratification totals.</i>	
Component	Count
Active Army	7,724
Active Navy	3,297
Active USMC	3,549
Active USAF	1,272
Reserve Army	1,925
Reserve Navy	658
Reserve Air Force	273
	18,698

8. *Construct post stratified weights.* Post-stratification adjustments were applied to the completion status adjusted weights and the eligibility status adjusted weights of the self/proxy-report ineligibles to create the post stratified weights. The final weight count, 18,661.77, reflects an adjustment for the ineligibles found in the sample (see Table C-26). (If no administrative record ineligibles were identified, then the post stratified weights would sum to the original frame counts.)

9. *Compute production recruiter population proportion ratio adjustments.* Estimates of the survey results using the post-stratified weights showed fewer production recruiters than expected. Each recruiting command point of contact was asked to provide a realistic proportion for production recruiters; these were used to impose ratio adjustments on those respondents who reported that they were either production or non-production recruiters. Table C-25 shows large discrepancies among the survey estimates and recruiting command estimates for Navy Active and Reserve, and Marine Corps. A smaller discrepancy also occurred for Air Force Reserve. The Navy and Marine Corps discrepancies may have occurred because the production recruiters were less likely to receive and/or respond to the survey than non-production recruiters. The production recruiter ratio adjustment was carried out within each of the original post-strata and, thus, does not change the effect of the prior

post-stratification.

Table C-25.
AR022 – Are you a production recruiter?

	Sample Counts		Survey Estimates			Navy Recruiting Command Estimates	
	Response Counts	Estimated Population Size	No	Yes	ME	No	Yes
Sample All	2,815	18,318	35	65	±2		
Sampling strata							
Active Army	1,114	7,508	23	77	±3	23	77
Active Navy	273	3,257	43	57	±7	20	80
Active USMC	284	3,511	78	22	±6	13	87
Active USAF	528	1,246	7	93	±2	9	91
Reserve Army	414	1,880	14	86	±4	14	86
Reserve Navy	100	645	21	79	±9	17	83
Reserve Air Force	102	269	9	91	±6	13	87

10. *Construct final weights.* To construct final weights, production recruiter population proportion ratio adjustments were applied to the post-stratified weights of production and non-production. The final weight count, 18,661.77, reflects an adjustment for the 18 ineligible found in the sample when administrative record data was merged with the sample. The weights for these 18 ineligibles summed to 36. Table C-26 shows the number of sample records with non-zero weights at each step of the weighting process. The final number of useable survey responses was 2,872.

Table C-26.
Control totals for the weights.

Quantity	Value	n>0
Population size (excluding duplicates, including ineligibles)	18,698	na
Sampling weights	18,697.95	8,355
Eligibility status adjusted weights	18,661.72	3,050
Completion status adjusted weights	18,661.72	2,872
Weights post-stratified to component population counts	18,661.77	2,872
Final weight post-stratified to production recruiter proportions	18,661.77	2,872

Respondents

Sample Losses

The original sample file contained 8,355 records after 8 duplicates were removed. Losses to the drawn sample are listed in Table C-27. Sample members could be lost from the sample for three main reasons: (a) self-reported or other ineligibility for the survey, (b) inability to locate the sample member, and (c) refusal to participate in the survey or other failure to respond to the survey. A total of 18 sample members (22%) were lost from the final sample through classification as ineligible. Elimination of ineligibles decreased the sample to 99.78% (N=8,337) of its original size.

Table C-27.

Frequency Counts and Percents of the Final Sample Relative to the Drawn Sample

	Sample counts		Weighted estimates of population	
	n	%	n	%
Drawn sample & Population	8,355		18,698	
Ineligible on master files	18	0.22	36	0.19
Self-reported ineligible	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total: Ineligible	18	0.22	36	0.19
Eligible sample	8,337	99.78	18,662	99.81
Not located (estimated ineligible)	0		0	0.00
Not located (estimated eligible)	723		1,470	7.86
Total not located	723	8.65	1,470	7.86
Located sample	7,614	91.13	17,192	91.95
Requested removal from survey mailings	0		0	
Returned blank	0		0	
Skipped key questions	178		434	
Did not return a survey (estimated ineligible)	0		0	
Did not return a survey (estimated eligible)	4,564		9,815	
Total: Nonresponse	4,742	56.76	10,249	54.81
Usable responses	2,872	34.37	6,943	37.13

In general, station addresses were used as the primary addresses of choice. (Procedures used to locate members are explained in a later section that describes the Survey Control System.) Because of this address-update procedure, only 8.65% of the drawn sample (723 of 8,355) was lost because the sample members could not be located. Sampling frame records for this group had missing, incomplete, or out-of-date addresses, and steps designed to obtain complete, current addresses for these records were unsuccessful. Losses attributable to either ineligibility or unlocatability resulted in a sample that was 91.13% of the drawn sample. Individuals in this remaining sample could be further categorized as nonrespondents versus respondents. Nonrespondents included 4,564 sample members who did not return a survey and possibly sample members who contacted the operations contractor (by mail, fax, e-mail, Web, or telephone) and asked to have their names removed from the survey mailing list. Respondents included all sample members who completed 50% of applicable questions. (Applicable questions are those to be completed by all respondents and excluded items that could be

skipped over depending on prior answers.) At the conclusion of the survey fielding, 2,872 eligible, locatable sample members had returned usable surveys.

Location, Completion, and Response Rates

Response rates are generally used to measure the quality of a survey. Although the use of response rates as a single measure of the quality of a survey is overstated, they do provide valuable information on the success of the survey in representing the population sampled (Madow, Nisselson, & Olkin, 1983).

The Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO) has pointed out that varying operational definitions of response rates can lead to misleading conclusions. In an effort to standardize the operational definition and computation of response rates in surveys, CASRO published guidelines and recommendations in 1982 (Council of American Survey Research Organizations, 1982). Beginning in 1995, the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) standardized its methods for calculating response rates using procedures patterned after those advocated by CASRO. More specifically, the DMDC procedures closely follow CASRO’s Sample Type II design.

The main objective of this section is to present response rates that can be used by analysts of the Recruiter Survey data to better understand how well the recruiter population is represented. To accomplish this goal, response rates are weighted so that they are an estimate of the proportion of the population responding (i.e., response propensity in the population). For example, because the sample was selected with differing sampling rates by sampling strata, the response rates are weighted so each stratum accounts for its appropriate fraction when the total response rate is reported. Observed or unweighted response rates are useful for monitoring the survey during data collection. However, when different subpopulations are either under- or over-sampled, weighted response rates are needed to compare response rates for different sample groups.

Table C-28 shows the weighted and unweighted location, completion, and response rates computed for the ASVAB Student Testing Program Recruiter Survey – 2006. The location rate (*LR*) is defined as the proportion of eligible sample members who were locatable. The completion rate (*CR*) is defined as the proportion of the located sample who returned usable surveys, while the response rate (*RR*) is defined as the proportion of eligible sample members who returned usable surveys. The response rate (*RR*) is computed as the product of the location rate (*LR*) and the completion rate (*CR*); that is:

$$RR = LR * CR.$$

These rates are adjusted for ineligible members to account for the unknown eligibility of some members, as described in previous sections.

Table C-28.
Location, Response, and Completion Rates.

Type of Rate	Observed Rate	Weighted Rates
Location (LR)	91.3%	92.1%
Completion (CR)	37.7%	40.4%
Response (RR)	34.4%	37.2%

The location, completion and response rates can be also expressed as ratios of the adjusted located sample (N_L), the adjusted eligible sample (N_E), and the usable responses (N_R) as follows:

The *location rate* is defined as

$$LR = \frac{\text{Adjusted located sample}}{\text{Adjusted eligible sample}} = \frac{N_L}{N_E}.$$

The *completion rate* is defined as

$$CR = \frac{\text{Usable responses}}{\text{Adjusted located sample}} = \frac{N_R}{N_L}.$$

The *response rate* is defined as

$$RR = \frac{\text{Usable responses}}{\text{Adjusted eligible sample}} = \frac{N_R}{N_E}.$$

- Located assumed eligible sample = Located sample – Did not return a survey (estimated ineligible)
- Located Sample = Sample – Record ineligible – Self-report ineligible – Not located
- Did not return a survey (estimated ineligible) = Did not return a survey * Ineligible Rate
- Ineligible Rate = Self-report ineligible – (Self-reported ineligible + Usable survey + Requested removal from survey mailings + Skipped key questions + Returned Blank)
- Assumed eligible sample = Eligible sample – Not located (estimated ineligible) - Did not return a survey (estimated ineligible)
- Eligible sample = Sample – Record ineligible – Self-report ineligible
- Not located (estimated ineligible) = Not located * Ineligible Rate

The rates in Table C-28 were computed using the information from Table C-27 that shows the weighted and unweighted distribution of the located, eligible, and usable samples for the survey. In this table, the adjusted eligible sample and adjusted locatable sample were computed by subtracting the estimated number of ineligible members from the count of members who were not located or who did not return the survey.

Weighted and unweighted CASRO compliant rates are also reported for the full sample and categories of Service, Race, Pay grade, Component, and Years of service in Table C-29. Table C-29 also includes the estimated eligibility status response rate and half-width-confidence-interval (Elig Respond).

In recent years, use of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) guidelines and definitions for computing rates has grown in popularity (American Association for Public Opinion Research, 2004). The CASRO rate definitions used in this report have corresponding AAPOR definitions. The response rate (RR) as defined above corresponds to AAPOR's response rate 3 ($RR3$) that uses the estimate of proportion of cases of unknown eligibility who are actually eligible. The estimate of eligible cases among the cases with unknown eligibility is based on the observed

proportion of eligible cases in the sample. The location rate (*LR*) is equivalent to AAPOR's contact rate 2 (*CON2*) and includes in the denominator only the estimated eligible cases among the undetermined cases. Finally, the completion rate (*CR*) corresponds to AAPOR's cooperation rate 1 (*COOP1*), also known as the minimum cooperation rate. These equivalencies allow the equation of CASRO and AAPOR response rates. In the present case,

$$RR = LR * CR = CON2 * COOP1 = RR3.$$

Table C-29.
Unweighted Sample and Usable Responses, Sums of Sampling Weights, Estimated Eligible Response Rate, and CASRO Location, Completion, and Response Rates.

Group	Unweighted			CASRO				
	Sample	UsableR	SumWgt	Elig	Respond	Locate	Complete	Response
<i>Full Sample</i>	8,337	2,872	18,662	37.20	±0.84	0.92	0.40	0.37
<i>Service Component</i>								
Active Army	2,222	1,144	7,724	51.5	± 1.8	95%	54%	52%
Active Navy	1,533	274	3,267	17.9	± 1.4	82%	22%	18%
Active USMC	1,918	287	3,547	15.0	± 1.1	97%	16%	15%
Active USAF	1,192	539	1,272	45.2	± 0.7	88%	51%	45%
Reserve Army	819	424	1,925	51.8	± 2.6	94%	55%	52%
Reserve Navy	431	101	653	23.4	± 2.3	81%	29%	23%
Reserve Air Force	222	103	273	46.4	± 2.9	97%	48%	46%
<i>Service</i>								
Army	3,041	1,568	9,649	51.54	±1.50	0.95	0.54	0.52
Navy	1,964	375	3,921	18.80	±1.22	0.82	0.23	0.19
USMC	1,918	287	3,547	14.96	±1.08	0.97	0.15	0.15
USAF	1,414	642	1,545	45.42	±0.77	0.90	0.51	0.45
<i>Race-ethnic</i>								
Non-Hispanic								
White	4,690	1,870	10,418	42.44	±1.18	0.93	0.46	0.42
Non-Hispanic								
Black	1,753	493	4,123	30.98	±1.87	0.92	0.34	0.31
Other	1,894	509	4,121	30.19	±1.76	0.90	0.34	0.30
<i>Pay grade</i>								
E5 and Below	3,092	869	6,427	29.38	±1.35	0.90	0.33	0.29
E6	3,310	1,170	7,521	38.45	±1.39	0.93	0.41	0.38
E7 and Above	1,935	833	4,714	45.88	±1.86	0.93	0.49	0.46
<i>Component</i>								
Active	6,865	2,244	15,810	35.84	±0.94	0.92	0.39	0.36
Reserve	1,472	628	2,851	44.76	±1.85	0.91	0.49	0.45
<i>Years of service</i>								
0 to less than 3	298	130	742	44.54	±4.55	0.94	0.47	0.45
3 to less than 6	1,127	379	2,642	34.99	±2.39	0.92	0.38	0.35
6 to less than 10	2,825	790	6,197	30.72	±1.43	0.91	0.34	0.31
10 to highest	4,087	1,573	9,081	41.67	±1.27	0.93	0.45	0.42

Computation of Variance Estimates

Analyzing the dataset with the proper use of the appropriate eligibility indicator (ELIGFLGW) and analysis weight (FINALWGT) in standard statistical programs that assume simple random sampling (i.e., programs that assume that the observations are independent and identically distributed [iid]) will result in accurate point estimates but not accurate variance estimates. Wolter (1985) provides a detailed discussion on methods used for variance estimation from sample surveys including replication, **Taylor series approximation**, and analytic methods.

Data were collected from a non-proportional stratified, single stage, random sample. Responses were weighted up to population totals adjusting for differential sampling and response rates in demographically homogenous groups. As discussed in Wright, George, Flores-Cervantes, Valliant, Elig (2000), with surveys involving complex probability structures, most of the parameter estimates of interest take the form of non-linear statistics. Examples include domain means and proportions where the denominator values are unknown and must be estimated from the sample data. The estimator takes the form of a ratio of random variables (i.e., the ratio of the estimated numerator and denominator totals or counts). In general, ratio estimates are not unbiased, and their variances cannot be expressed in closed form. The variances are, therefore, approximated. The bias in a ratio estimate depends on the variance associated with the denominator total or count and can usually be ignored in samples having a large number of observations. As a working rule, the bias may be assumed negligible if the number of observations on which the estimate is based exceeds 30 or is otherwise large enough so that the coefficient of variation $[SE(x)/x]$ of the denominator is less than .10 (cf., Cochran, 1977, pp. 153-165).

Approximations for the variances commonly take the form of Taylor series linearization or replicate methods, such as those based on re-sampling methods. Variables have been included in the analyses files so that variance estimates can be based on Taylor series linearization computed by SUDAAN (Shah, Barnwell, & Bieler, 1997). for a stratified, without replacement, design. Many of the standard statistical software packages, such as SPSS and older versions of SAS, do not properly compute variance estimates from weighted data that were collected with a design other than simple random sampling. Variables have been included in the analysis file so that Taylor series estimates can be made with SAS survey procedures, or SUDAAN. WesVar Complex Samples[®] (SPSS, 1998) is a computer software program that generates measures of variability (e.g., standard errors, coefficients of variation, and confidence intervals) from a specified set of replicate weights. Examples of SAS code to estimate population statistics are shown below.

SAS weighted point estimates and SRS variance estimates.

```
proc means data=libref.test2 n mean stderr;
var Question1 Question 2 Question 3;
class All Component Service;
ways 1;
weight FinalWgt;
where EligFlgW=1;
```

SAS weighted point estimates and complex variance estimates.

```
proc surveymeans data=libref.test2 total= libref.test2 sumwgt mean stderr ;
strata STRATA;
var Question1 Question 2 Question 3;
domain EligFlgW *All EligFlgW *Component EligFlgW *Service;
```

weight FinalWgt;
SUDAAN weighted point estimates and complex variance estimates.

```
proc descript data=libref.test2 filetype=SAS design=strwor ;
  SUBPOPN EligFlgW=1 ;
  weight FinalWgt;
  nest strata ;
  totcnt _total_ ;
  class All Component Service;
  var Question1 Question 2 Question 3;
  tables All Component Service;
  print nsum wsum mean semean /semeanfmt=f5.3 style=nchs;
```

A comparison of results given the optimized sample is shown in Table C-30. In most cases the complex sample variance estimates are smaller than the SRS estimates. The smaller margins of error can be attributed to the beneficial effects of stratification and the finite population effect associated with sampling without replacement. The improved margins of error would not occur with a stratified random sample where equal sample sizes were chosen within stratum, and response rates were inversely proportional to stratum population size. Table C-30 shows large differences in the weighted and unweighted point estimates for Active*GE1Year, Navy*GE1Year, USAF*GE1Year. Table C-31 also shows large differences among SRS and complex variance estimates for All*GE1Year, Active*GE1Year, Reserve*GE1Year, Army*GE1Year, Navy*GE1Year, and USAF_R*GE1Year.

Table C-30.
Comparison of estimates using simulated results from the optimized sample.

Reporting Domain Label	Point Estimate (%)		Margin of Error (%)				
	obs	SumWgt	Unweighted	Weighted	SRS	SurveyMeans	SUDAAN
All*GE1Year	2029	12,695	65	66	2.1	2.0	2.0
Active*GE1Year	1590	10,547	70	69	2.3	2.2	2.2
Reserve*GE1Year	439	2,148	49	50	4.7	4.3	4.3
Army*GE1Year	837	6,506	62	63	3.3	3.1	3.1
Navy*GE1Year	435	2,617	63	64	4.5	4.1	4.1
USMC*GE1Year	416	2,482	75	75	4.2	3.8	3.7
USAF*GE1Year	341	1,090	63	65	5.1	4.2	4.1
Army_A*GE1Year	589	5,118	67	67	3.8	3.6	3.5
Navy_A*GE1Year	330	2,068	68	68	5.0	4.6	4.7
USMC_A*GE1Year	416	2,482	75	75	4.2	3.8	3.7
USAF_A*GE1Year	255	878	69	69	5.7	4.8	4.7
Army_R*GE1Year	248	1,388	51	51	6.2	5.7	5.7
Navy_R*GE1Year	105	549	49	49	9.6	8.6	8.6
USAF_R*GE1Year	86	211	47	47	10.6	8.2	8.2

Table C-31.

Comparison of estimates using simulated results from an equal allocation sample where response rates were inversely proportional to population counts.

Reporting Domain		Point Estimate (%)				Margin of Error (%)	
Label	obs	SumWgt	Unweighted	Weighted	SRS	SurveyMeans	SUDAAN
All*GE1Year	858	12,011	56	59	3.3	9.1	9.0
Active*GE1Year	331	9,967	67	61	5.3	10.9	10.8
Reserve*GE1Year	527	2,044	50	51	4.3	6.6	6.7
Army*GE1Year	108	5,854	52	54	9.4	17.5	17.2
Navy*GE1Year	276	2,636	55	63	5.7	9.7	9.6
USMC*GE1Year	64	2,381	66	66	11.7	11.6	11.6
USAF*GE1Year	410	1,139	57	65	4.6	4.8	4.7
Army_A*GE1Year	20	4,552	55	55	22.4	22.3	22.1
Navy_A*GE1Year	60	2,118	65	65	12.2	12.0	12.0
USMC_A*GE1Year	64	2,381	66	66	11.7	11.6	11.6
USAF_A*GE1Year	187	916	69	69	6.6	5.9	5.9
Army_R*GE1Year	88	1,302	51	51	10.5	10.1	10.2
Navy_R*GE1Year	216	518	52	52	6.7	5.1	5.1
USAF_R*GE1Year	223	223	47	47	6.6	0.0	0.0

Presentation and Suppression Rules

Point estimates of percentages are rounded to the nearest percent, and their margins of error are rounded up to the nearest percent. Point estimates of means are rounded to the nearest tenth, and their margins of error are rounded up the nearest tenth.

Estimates may be unstable, based on a small number of observations or relatively large variance in the data or weights. Particularly unstable estimates are suppressed. An estimate is Not Reportable when (a) the nominal respondent count is less than 5, (b) the effective respondent count is less than 30, or (c) in the case of estimated percentages, when the transformed relative standard error exceeds .225. The effective respondent count takes into account the finite population correction and variability in weights. The finite population correction may cause the effective respondent count to be larger than the nominal count, while the variability in weights may cause the effective respondent count to be smaller than the nominal respondent count. The transformed relative standard error of proportions is calculated as

$$\text{RSE} = (\text{seproportion} / \text{proportion}) / (-\log(\text{proportion})) \text{ for proportions } \leq .5, \text{ and} \\ (\text{seproportion}) / (1 - \text{proportion}) / (-\log(1 - \text{proportion})) \text{ for proportions } > .5.$$

When the Survey Analysis Macro (Judkins, Zador, Sigman, Broehne, Jones, 2005) is used and the estimated percentage equals 0% or 100%, a convenient substitute for the undefined RSE is computed. Since percentages are rounded to the nearest percent for reporting purposes, proportions of .005 and .995 were conveniently chosen to substitute for estimates of 0 and 100%, and then a RSE with a finite population correction could be computed (FPC_RSE). The allowable threshold for FPC_RSE is the same as for the RSE. When the estimated proportion = 0% (POINTEST=0), FPC_RSE is calculated as:

$$\text{FPC_RSE} = \text{sqrt} \left(\frac{(1-\text{NSUM} / \text{WSUM}) * \text{PP} * (1-\text{PP})}{\text{NSUM}} \right) / \text{PP} / (-\log(\text{PP}));$$

$$\text{where } \text{PP} = .005, \text{ PPP} = \text{PP} / (1 - ((\text{NSUM}-1)/(2 * \text{WSUM}))).$$

When the estimated proportion is 100% (POINTEST=1.0), FPC_RSE is calculated as:

$$\text{FPC_RSE} = \text{sqrt} \left(\frac{(1-\text{NSUM} / \text{WSUM}) * \text{PP} * (1-\text{PP})}{\text{NSUM}} \right) / (1-\text{PP}) / (-\log(1-\text{PP}));$$

$$\text{where } \text{PP} = .995, \text{ PPP} = 1 - (1-\text{PP}) / (1 - ((\text{NSUM}-1)/(2 * \text{WSUM}))).$$

REFERENCES

- American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR). (2004). *Standard definitions: Final dispositions of case codes and outcome rates for surveys*. (3rd ed.). Lenexa, KS: Author.
- Chromy, J. R. (1987). *Design optimization with multiple objectives. Proceedings of the section on survey research methods*, 194-199. Alexandria, VA: American Statistical Association.
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112 (1), 155-159.
- Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO). (1982). Special report: *On the definition of response rates*. Port Jefferson, NY: Author.
- Data Recognition Corporation (DRC). (2007). Frequency and percentage distributions for variables in the survey analysis files: *ASVAB student testing program recruiter survey – 2006*. Maple Grove, MN: Author.
- Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC). (2007). *ASVAB student testing program recruiter survey – 2006: Administration, datasets, and codebook*. Unpublished manuscript. Arlington, VA: Author.
- Judkins, D., Zador, P., Sigman, R., Broene, P., Jones, R. (2005). *Survey Analysis Macro 2: User Documentation* (Version 6). Unpublished manuscript. Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.
- Kavee, J. D., and Mason, R. E. (1997). *DMDC sample planning tool: User's manual* (Version 2.1). (Report No. 97-028). Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.
- Kish, L. (1992). Weighting for unequal pi. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 8, 183-200.
- Madow, W., Nisselson, H., & Olkin, I. (1983). *Incomplete data in sample surveys* (Vol. 1). New York: Academic Press.
- Shah, B. V., Barnwell, B. G., & Bieler, G. S. (1997). *SUDAAN User's Manual*, Release 7.5. North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute.
- SPSS. (1998). *WesVar Complex Samples*. Chicago: Author.
- Wolter, K. (1985). *Introduction to variance estimation*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Wright, L. C., George, B. J., Flores-Cervantes, I., Valliant, R., & Elig, T. W. (Eds.). (2000). *1999 Survey of spouses of active duty personnel: Statistical methodology report* (Report No. 2000-021). Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.

