



National Defence

National Defence Headquarters  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0K2

Défense nationale

Quartier général de la Défense nationale  
Ottawa (Ontario)  
K1A 0K2

**CAN UNCLASSIFIED**

DRDC | RDDC



# Military Instructors

## *Understanding Motivation and Job Satisfaction across Two Nations*

Karen J. Rankin, PhD  
Director Research Personnel Generation 2, Canada

Kevin Rounding, PhD  
Director Research Personnel Generation 2-2, Canada

Claire Ford  
DSTL, United Kingdom

Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis

**Terms of Release:** Further distribution of this document or information contained herein is prohibited without the written approval of Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC).

**Defence Research and Development Canada**

**Scientific Report**

DRDC-RDDC-2019-R201

October 2019

**CAN UNCLASSIFIED**

**Canada**

## **CAN UNCLASSIFIED**

### **IMPORTANT INFORMATIVE STATEMENTS**

This document was reviewed for Controlled Goods by Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) using the Schedule to the *Defence Production Act*.

Disclaimer: This publication was prepared by Defence Research and Development Canada an agency of the Department of National Defence. The information contained in this publication has been derived and determined through best practice and adherence to the highest standards of responsible conduct of scientific research. This information is intended for the use of the Department of National Defence, the Canadian Armed Forces ("Canada") and Public Safety partners and, as permitted, may be shared with academia, industry, Canada's allies, and the public ("Third Parties"). Any use by, or any reliance on or decisions made based on this publication by Third Parties, are done at their own risk and responsibility. Canada does not assume any liability for any damages or losses which may arise from any use of, or reliance on, the publication.

Endorsement statement: This publication has been peer-reviewed and published by the Editorial Office of Defence Research and Development Canada, an agency of the Department of National Defence of Canada. Inquiries can be sent to: Publications.DRDC-RDDC@drdc-rddc.gc.ca.

## **Abstract**

---

Instructors are recognized as the cornerstone of military training, and enable militaries to produce the highest calibre and most effective members to meet current and future security demands. However, the high demands of training military personnel to meet today's operational requirements have resulted in militaries in The Technical Cooperation Program (TTCP) engaging in concerted reviews of how to best ensure effective military instructors. Towards this end, TTCP nations' approaches to select, train, and employ military instructors are discussed prior to the presentation of two theoretical frameworks that contribute to understanding the factors that influence military instructors' job satisfaction and motivation towards the role. In this report, two nations, Canada and the United Kingdom, present their individual research to provide an overview of instructor satisfaction/motivation issues facing militaries, as well as the theories, methods, and main results of each nation's study. This culminates in a comparison and discussion of the major satisfaction/motivation factors, the identification of possible interventions to resolve dissatisfiers/ demotivators, and ultimately ways to increase satisfaction/motivation. This collaboration provides a mechanism to capitalize on the strengths, and minimize any weaknesses, in both studies, while expanding our understanding of factors influencing military instructors' satisfaction/motivation.

## **Significance to defence and security**

---

Insight from a joint Canada-United Kingdom project exploring factors that increase the job satisfaction and motivation of military instructors will contribute to the selection and employment of military instructors, and ultimately improve the calibre and effectiveness of the resulting military personnel ultimately responsible for national defence.

## Résumé

---

Les instructeurs sont reconnus comme la pierre angulaire de l'entraînement militaire, et permettent aux armées de produire des militaires du plus haut calibre et des plus efficaces afin de satisfaire aux demandes actuelles et futures en matière de sécurité. Toutefois, la forte demande en personnel d'instruction pour satisfaire aux exigences opérationnelles actuelles a eu pour effet d'engager les armées qui participent au Programme de coopération technique (PCT) dans des examens concertés afin de déterminer le meilleur moyen pour veiller à avoir des instructeurs militaires efficaces. Dans ce but, le rapport décrit les approches des pays du PCT pour sélectionner, instruire et employer des instructeurs militaires, avant de présenter deux cadres théoriques pour aider à comprendre les facteurs qui influencent la satisfaction au travail des instructeurs militaires, et leur motivation à l'égard de ce rôle. Dans le rapport, deux pays, le Canada et le Royaume-Uni, présentent leur recherche individuelle dans le but de fournir un aperçu des enjeux liés à la satisfaction et à la motivation des instructeurs, de même que les théories, les méthodes et les principaux résultats de l'étude de chaque pays. Le rapport se termine par une comparaison des principaux facteurs de satisfaction et de motivation, les interventions possibles pour résoudre l'insatisfaction ou la démotivation, et les moyens pour augmenter la satisfaction et la motivation. Cette collaboration a abouti à un mécanisme pour tirer parti des forces et minimiser les faiblesses, apparentes dans les deux études, et nous permet de mieux comprendre les facteurs qui influencent la satisfaction et la motivation des instructeurs militaires.

## Importance pour la défense et la sécurité

---

Les constatations d'un projet d'étude conjoint Canada/Royaume-Uni, dans lequel on explore les facteurs qui augmentent la satisfaction et la motivation au travail des instructeurs militaires, contribueront à la sélection et à l'emploi des instructeurs militaires, qui, en fin de compte, permettront d'améliorer le calibre et l'efficacité du personnel militaire résultant, responsable de la défense nationale.

# Table of contents

---

Abstract.....	i
Significance to defence and security.....	i
Résumé.....	ii
Importance pour la défense et la sécurité.....	ii
Table of contents.....	iii
List of tables.....	vi
Acknowledgements.....	vii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.1.1 TTCP Nations' Defence Instructors.....	2
1.1.1.1 Composition of Instructors.....	2
1.1.1.2 Selection of Instructors.....	3
1.1.1.3 Training of Instructors.....	4
1.1.1.4 Employment of Instructors.....	5
1.1.1.5 Incentives.....	5
1.2 Aim.....	6
2 Theoretical Frameworks.....	7
2.1 Job Satisfaction.....	7
2.1.1 Preparedness.....	8
2.1.2 Recognition/Meaning.....	8
2.1.3 Resources.....	8
2.1.4 Selection/Attraction.....	9
2.1.5 Students.....	9
2.1.6 Supervision.....	9
2.1.7 Work Environment/Responsibilities.....	10
2.2 Motivation.....	10
2.2.1 Intrinsic.....	11
2.2.2 Extrinsic.....	12
2.3 Comparison of Theoretical Frameworks.....	13
3 CA Instructor Study.....	16
3.1 CA Phase 1.....	16
3.1.1 Methodology.....	16
3.1.1.1 Participants.....	16
3.1.1.2 Instrument.....	16
3.1.2 Results.....	16
3.2 CA Phase 2.....	18
3.2.1 Methodology.....	18

3.2.1.1	Participants.....	18
3.2.2	Results .....	19
3.2.2.1	Workplace Satisfaction Factors.....	19
3.2.2.2	Preparedness.....	19
3.2.2.3	Recognition .....	20
3.2.2.4	Resources .....	20
3.2.2.5	Selection.....	20
3.2.2.6	Students.....	21
3.2.2.7	Supervision.....	21
3.2.2.8	Work Environment.....	22
3.2.2.9	Job Satisfaction .....	23
3.2.2.10	Relative Comparisons .....	23
3.2.3	Summary of CA Results.....	25
4	UK Defence Trainer Capability Study.....	27
4.1	UK Phase 1 .....	27
4.1.1	Methodology.....	27
4.1.1.1	Participants.....	27
4.1.1.2	Instrument .....	27
4.1.2	Results .....	28
4.2	UK Phase 2 .....	30
4.2.1	Methodology.....	30
4.2.1.1	Participants.....	30
4.2.2	Results .....	30
4.2.2.1	Awareness of the Trainer Role.....	31
4.2.2.1.1	Communicating Information about the Trainer Role.....	31
4.2.2.1.2	Awareness of the Benefits Associated with Being a Trainer .....	31
4.2.2.1.3	Matching Expectation with Reality.....	32
4.2.2.2	Motivational Factors .....	32
4.2.2.2.1	Helping Other Learn to Develop.....	33
4.2.2.2.2	Lack of Time .....	33
4.2.2.2.3	Feeling Valued for Trainer Skills.....	33
4.2.2.2.4	Lack of Value Placed on Training.....	33
4.2.2.2.5	Being Recognized for the Work Done .....	34
4.2.2.2.6	Receiving Feedback from Trainees.....	34
4.2.2.2.7	Having the Opportunity to Develop Skills as a Trainer .....	34
4.3	Summary of UK Results.....	35
5	Summary and Discussion.....	37
5.1	Summary and Comparison of Satisfiers/Motivators .....	37
5.1.1	Preparedness .....	37
5.1.2	Recognition.....	37
5.1.3	Resources.....	38

5.1.4	Selection .....	38
5.1.5	Students .....	38
5.1.6	Supervision .....	38
5.1.7	Work Environment .....	38
5.1.8	Overall Job Satisfaction/Motivation .....	39
5.2	Theoretical Linkages .....	39
5.3	Limitations .....	40
6	Recommendations .....	42
6.1	Interventions .....	42
6.1.1	Before Employment .....	42
6.1.1.1	Information-Based Attraction .....	42
6.1.1.1.1	Instructor/Trainer Role Information .....	42
6.1.1.1.2	Benefits of Instructor/Trainer Employment .....	42
6.1.1.1.3	Realistic Job Preview .....	43
6.1.1.1.4	Self-Selection .....	43
6.1.1.2	Selection .....	43
6.1.1.3	Pre-employment Training .....	44
6.1.2	During Employment .....	44
6.1.2.1	Recognition .....	44
6.1.2.2	Recourses .....	45
6.1.2.3	Students .....	45
6.1.2.4	Supervision .....	45
6.1.2.5	Work Environment .....	45
6.1.3	Post-Employment .....	46
6.2	Recommendations .....	46
6.2.1	Defence Leaders .....	46
6.2.2	TEs, TAs, and Stakeholders .....	46
6.2.3	Instructors/Trainers .....	46
6.3	Conclusion .....	47
	References .....	48
	Annex A TTCP Military Training .....	55
	List of symbols/abbreviations/acronyms/initialisms .....	73

## List of tables

---

Table 1: Instructor Satisfiers. ....	17
Table 2: Instructor Dissatisfiers. ....	17
Table 3: Factors Influencing Instructor Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction. ....	22
Table 4: Rank-Ordered Satisfiers. ....	24
Table 5: Rank-Ordered Dissatisfiers. ....	25
Table 6: Table of Motivators and Demotivators (Steele et al., 2016a).....	29
Table A.1: Phases/Stage of Training. ....	55
Table A.2: Structure of Military Training. ....	57
Table A.3: Trainer/Instructor Role. ....	61
Table A.4: Composition of Personnel in Instructor Roles.....	64
Table A.5: Training Traditional Applied to Trainers. ....	65
Table A.6: Selected Trainers. ....	68
Table A.7: Duration in a Trainer Role.....	70
Table A.8: Notable Points. ....	71



## **Acknowledgements**

---

We would like to thank Dr. Dina Kurzweil for her time and effort in providing a detailed, comprehensive, and thought-provoking feedback and comments on this report. Her insight improved the quality of our report.

This page intentionally left blank.

# 1 Introduction

---

In recent years, the high demands of training military personnel to meet today's operational requirements, coupled with severe budget restrictions, have resulted in militaries around the globe, especially nations in The Technical Cooperation Program (TTCP), engaging in concerted reviews of how to best reinvent training to face both challenges (e.g., Raybourn, Schatz, Vogel-Walcutt, & Vierling, 2017; Rounding, Ruscito, & Rankin, 2018; Schatz et al., 2012). Without a doubt, the importance of personnel as any military's most valuable resource is widely accepted, and, as such, considerable resources are devoted to ensuring militaries produce the highest calibre and most effective members to meet current and future demands (Raybourn et al., 2017).

Towards this end, previous studies of military instructors within TTCP nations have focused on a range of issues, from selection to employment duration, to the environmental factors that influence their motivation towards the role, to their satisfaction, all with the intention of improving their efficacy (e.g., Raybourn et al., 2017; Tanguay, & Darr, 2011). Similarly, the TTCP nations have often taken different theoretical approaches towards what might augment the effectiveness of military instruction. A common theme amongst this research is that some military instructors are dissatisfied with their jobs (Rounding et al., 2018) and lack motivation (Steele et al., 2016a, 2016b).

Independent research was conducted by two TTCP nations, specifically, Canada (CA) and the United Kingdom (UK). Both nations approached the issue of military training efficacy from distinct theoretical frameworks. The approach taken in CA was to examine military training from a job satisfaction perspective (Rounding et al., 2018). This perspective assumes that satisfied instructors will be more productive and efficacious. In the UK, researchers framed their approach utilizing a motivational perspective (Steele et al., 2016a, 2016b). To them, focusing on intrinsic, as opposed to extrinsic, motivating factors of the instructor role will attract higher quality instructors, which in turn, will result in higher quality instruction. In this report, the similarities between both theoretical perspectives are discussed.

Herein, we provide a brief overview of each nation's independent research which culminates in a comparison and discussion of the major satisfaction/motivation factors. By triangulating these areas of overlap, a more thorough discussion can be had regarding possible interventions to resolve dis-satisfiers/de-motivators, and ultimately ways to increase satisfaction/motivation. This collaborative merging provides a mechanism to capitalize on the strengths, and minimize any weaknesses, in both studies, while expanding our understanding of factors influencing instructors' satisfaction/motivation. It is hoped that, ultimately, any action taken to augment satisfaction and/or motivation would similarly bolster organizational outcomes—namely military teaching effectiveness and/or instructor performance.<sup>1</sup>

## 1.1 Background

An important aspect towards augmenting training effectiveness is ensuring that the military instruction/training cadre is composed of the highest quality individuals, who are satisfied and motivated to train others (Cranton & Knoop, 1991; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001). A large part of one's job satisfaction and motivation is one's work environment, which for TTCP nations, differs vastly. Below

---

<sup>1</sup> It is important to note that performance (i.e., the outcome) was not measured in either study, but rather assumed as a logical outcome of satisfied and motivated instructors/trainers (as per Arifin, 2016).

is a brief summary of the various compositions of the schools, the varied selection processes, the different methods of training military instructors, the various ways military instructors are employed, and the different incentives that help motivate military instructors across the five TTCP nations.

### **1.1.1 TTCP Nations' Defence Instructors**

Military Instructors<sup>2</sup> are selected, trained, employed, and composed differently (e.g., civilian, Regular Force [Reg F], Reserve Force [Res F], pan military, service-specific, pan occupation, specific Instructor occupation) among TTCP nations, and in some cases within nations. In this section, we summarize information obtained from TTCP panel members regarding these topics.

Briefly, all five nations conduct training in four major phases: basic training, occupation/trade-specific training, element/speciality training, and career/leadership/promotion training. The UK and United States (US) are exceptions to the four-phase training model. For instance, the United States Marine Corps (USMC) has a fifth phase that emphasizes infantry-centric training that all Marines must complete, after basic training, as a baseline before continuing training/education.

Three of the five nations, specifically the Australian Defence Force (ADF), Canadian Armed Forces (CAF), and New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF), structure their training across four organizations/level ones (L1s), which mirror the Navy, Army, Air Force. Each of these three has a fourth organization which varies between nations: The ADF's is Information; the CAF's is Chief of Military Personnel, plus a fifth L1 comprised of Special Forces; and the NZDF's is Commander New Zealand Defence College. These L1s are responsible for the training within their own organization. Within the UK and US, multiple organizations providing training.

After describing the composition of instructors, the chronological phases of an Instructor's career and methods of incentive are summarized across TTCP nations.

#### **1.1.1.1 Composition of Instructors**

The composition of Instructors and the structure in which they are employed not only differs between nations, but it also differs between services within nations. All five nations use a *total/whole force approach* comprising a combination of Reg F, Res F, civilian employees, and contractors. Military Instructors range in rank from Corporal (Cpl) to Lieutenant Colonel (LCol) for the CAF, and from Cpl to Brigadier General/Commodore/One Star/OF6 (BGen/Cmdre; the equivalent Northern Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) officer rank level) for the UK, the ADF, and NZDF. In addition, both the ADF and the NZDF use foreign instructors, both military and civilian, to support specialist roles and where they do not possess the expertise themselves. In the USMC, approximately 10% of all Marines carry the title of Instructor, and are often the rank of Sergeant, Staff-Sergeant, and Captain.

The size of the training structure varies across the nations. CA has roughly 90 training establishments (TEs) and approximately 4,000 military Instructors, and the UK has approximately 140 TEs and 5,000 Trainers. The ADF has 89 schools and approximately 1,345 military Instructors across the three elements,

---

<sup>2</sup> The UK Defence training policy has recently been altered to refer to Instructors as Trainers to reflect the move away from traditional didactic methods of training (Steele et al., 2016a). As a result, herein, the terms Instructor and Trainer are used interchangeably, as they are referring to the same role.

and the NZDF has 949 military and 108 civilian instructor positions. In the US there are approximately three million Instructors, combined across active duty, reserve, and civilian.

#### 1.1.1.2 Selection of Instructors

At times, the philosophy underlying which military members should be employed as Instructors has been challenged in hopes of improving it. From a training perspective, it has been argued that it would be optimal to have the best performers employed as Instructors (Camire, 2014; Tanguay & Darr, 2011). For example, Pilots selected to become Instructors are seen as the *crème de la crème* in the US Air Force (Carretta, 2000). However, in other militaries, such as CA and UK, or in other occupational areas, such as infantry, top performers are not usually posted into Instructor positions, but instead are retained in their primary role or occupation. For instance, the USMC uses a blended approach, depending on the schoolhouse, with some “actively recruiting the *all-stars* from the field” and others assigning Instructors based on scheduling convenience or when a break from deployments is needed (Schatz et al., 2012, p. 3). Rounding and Rankin (2018) described this conundrum as a *catch-22* because military organizations debate about where to employ their limited top performers—in the role (e.g., the field for an infantryman), where they can influence operational outcomes, or in an Instructor role, where they can influence the competencies of many military members.

In CA, although a job analysis had identified the competencies necessary for effective Instructors, very few military members (19%) had been screened for the position (e.g., potential, motivation, suitability; Tanguay & Darr, 2011). This finding was echoed in the study described herein, where only 17% of Instructors completed any selection/screening process, and of those, 53% went through an informal, as opposed to a formal, selection process (Rounding et al., 2018). As such, CA has no formal selection process for Instructors; instead, career managers fill the empty positions as needed, but often the decision as to whom to post is based on availability instead of high performance (Tanguay & Darr, 2011).

The UK encourages suitable individuals to volunteer for Trainer roles, however a recent study (Mundy et al., 2014) revealed that there were at least as many non-volunteers as volunteers in military Instructor roles. In addition to this, the UK has a checkbox incorporated into annual performance appraisals that allows supervisors to identify whether the individual has characteristics commensurate with instructional requirements (C. Ford, personal communication, 2017). In terms of selection, the UK career managers use research-based Trainer characteristics as a guide to identify members who would be appropriate for the Trainer role (C. Ford, personal communication, 2017).

In the NZDF, supervisors are also provided the opportunity to identify members with suitable Instructor characteristics via the annual performance appraisals (J. Houston, personal communication, 2017). Instructors posted to teach basic training undergo a psychological evaluation and interview selection process. For other Instructor roles, the NZDF attempts to select the best person but is also hampered by limited availability. Future plans for the NZDF include a selection process across the phases of training and an accompanying policy (J. Houston, personal communication, 2017). Specifically, the Joint Instructor Excellence selection process is being tested, and current Instructors are undergoing pedagogical/andragogical alignments (e.g., Instructors are assessed and aligned with positions using the Joint Instructor Excellence competency framework, their understanding of pedagogical/andragogical practices and operation inside best practices, and their seeking and developing professional communities of practice).

The ADF bases selection decisions on performance appraisals, but not all suitable members are selected and occasionally members not found suitable are be posted into an Instructor role (D. Bradford, personal communication, 2017). However, in addition, the ADF has a process, albeit limited, for members to apply for these positions and a checkbox in annual performance appraisals permit supervisors to identify possible suitable Instructors (D. Bradford, personal communication, 2017).

In the US, each of the military services and other defence components have developed their own processes, and these processes typically vary (sometimes widely) for enlisted versus officer Instructor assignments, as well as for *training* versus *education* positions (S. Schatz, personal communication, 2017). The latter distinction is strongly entrenched in the US Department of Defence, in large part because budget lines and frequent oversight are divided based on those categories. In addition to a plurality of different Instructor processes, the US also draws from different personnel pools for Instructors, depending on the specific assignment, which may include active duty military personnel, reservists, military civilians, and/or contractors (S. Schatz, personal communication, 2017). Consequently, the selection processes for various assignments vary widely and often involve differing degrees of investment. For instance, in the USMC, many enlisted training Instructor positions have no screening or application process, while other similar Instructor billets (e.g., Drill Sergeant) involve a formal application process and stringent acceptance requirements.

#### **1.1.1.3 Training of Instructors**

In the CAF, non-commissioned members (NCMs) complete a course in Basic Instructor Techniques as part of their Primary Leadership course. This is a mandatory distance education course, but there is no parallel mandatory training for officers. While the CAF offers numerous beginner and advanced courses on the topics of training and training development, for both NCMs and officers alike, these courses are not mandatory.

The UK has mandatory training that precedes posting into an Trainer role, and the level of training for Instructors mirrors that of the particular training role (e.g., Phase 1 and 2 training is for the Phase 1 and 2 training roles, respectively). The ADF and NZDF have similar Instructor training: (a) within the Army, all soldiers and officers are provided with assessor and Instructor skills in corps training, which is mandatory; (b) within the Navy and Air Force, Instructor/facilitator and workplace assessor training is provided only when members are posted to a TE; (c) specific train-the-trainer courses are developed for new training requirements; (d) Instructors/professors at the colleges have professional development (PD) programs; and (e) all Instructors have on-going PD when in training roles.

As indicated in the preceding section, the US uses a more decentralized approach to the management and training of its Instructors. Each of the military services and other defense components—and often even each schoolhouse—develops its own faculty and staff professional development methods. For example, in the USMC, each formal school is responsible for training its Instructors and ensuring they meet quality standards. New training Instructors are also supposed to attend the Basic Instructor Course delivered by the Train-the-Trainer school. The Basic Instructor Course involves 14-days online training combined with 7-days of in-resident instruction (USMC, 2019). However, individual USMC schools may seek waivers from the centralized courses and instead conduct their own local Instructor preparation training. In recent years, there have been some attempts, both within the USMC and in other US defense components, to develop more centralized Instructor preparation programs (at the component level, not Department of Defence-wide level). For example, the US Army recently consolidated its training and education organizational structures under *Army University*, and within it also established the Faculty and Staff

Development Division to “develop, sustain and promote world class faculty” (Army U, 2019, p.1). Similarly, the US Office of Naval Research has been investing in military Instructor development projects, such as the *Making Good Instructors Great* and *Instructor Mastery Model* initiatives (Vogel-Walcutt, Phillips, Ross, & Knarr, 2015).

#### **1.1.1.4 Employment of Instructors**

The duration of time that one is employed in the Instructor role follows a normal posting length (e.g., two to three years) for the CAF, the UK, the ADF, and generally in the US (for active duty personnel; C. Ford; K. Rankin; D. Bradford; personal communications, 2017 ). According to these sources, both the CAF and ADF utilize temporary duty military personnel to augment vacancies in school staff, as necessary; personnel can be temporarily assigned for the entire duration or only a portion of a course, as is needed. Within the NZDF, posting periods are on average 18 months but can vary by element, with the Navy having the shortest period at a 9-month posting during a ship deployment, and the Air Force having the longest at 3-year postings. The CAF and ADF have chosen to convert some military Instructor positions to civilian positions to maintain continuity, while the UK and NZDF both look to re-employ Instructors into higher level Instructor positions for those who demonstrate the aptitude and desire (C. Ford; K. Rankin; D. Bradford; J. Houston; personal communications, 2017). In most nations, military members are encouraged to return to TEs later in their career, when they are then employed in higher level Instructor roles. Furthermore, in many nations (e.g., CA, US), the Instructor role is viewed as a temporary position (e.g., 2-3 years) because it is viewed as an easier, non-deployable assignment (*shore posting, fixed base, home base*). Finally, as mentioned above, the US uses a different pool of personnel to fill Instructor positions, ranging from active and reserve personnel, to civilians and contractors. Often, civilians remain in an Instructor role for a much longer periods of time, and contractors may act or augment Instructional staffs for many years, although their contracts are usually only about 1-year long with opportunities for an annual extension (S. Schatz, personal communication, 2017).

#### **1.1.1.5 Incentives**

Most nations have or are looking to demonstrate the value placed on the role of Instructor, and provide an incentive to motivate military members to become and excel at the Instructor role. Various incentives have been considered to recognize and motivate Instructors. For instance, the CAF is considering a program similar to the USMC which offers award ribbons for various levels of Instructors (Camire, 2014). This program has well-defined parameters that include instructional time and specific instructional training requirements. Indeed, the CAF study described herein obtained feedback on reactions to the proposed CAF Instructor Recognition Program (Rounding et al., 2018).

Within the UK some branches view the Instructor role as more prestigious, which may incentivize individuals to volunteer for the role (C. Ford, personal communication, 2017).

The US Army awards Instructors with badges based on their level of Instructor qualification: Basic, Senior, and Mastered, which are based on training and experience, and corresponding promotion points that increase with expertise (Villa, 2014). The other US services also award ribbons for certain speciality Instructor assignments, such as for Drill Instructors (S. Schatz, personal communication, 2017). However, not all organizations have followed suit. For instance, in the USMC, some training Instructor assignments are seen as a less-than-desirable mark on a Marine’s career, while in other cases (such as for Drill Instructors) the Marines receive ribbons and esteem for those assignments.

The different branches of the ADF have different incentives. Briefly, the Australian (AS) Army recognizes Instructors by the award of a badge, either the Military Instructor Badge (MIB) or Recruit Instructor Badge (RIB; D. Bradford, personal communication, 2017). In addition, the Chief of Army has endorsed an annual award to recognize outstanding performance from an Army Instructor. The successful candidate will be selected from the recipients of Instructor of the Year Awards from 1st Division, Special Operations Command, and each of the Forces Command Training Centres. General Instructors in the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) and Instructors in the Royal Australian Navy receive no badge. Some of the US defense organizations have similar ways for recognizing outstanding instructors (S. Schatz, personal communication, 2017); for instance, the US Naval Service Training Command and Army's Fort Leonard Wood both recognize their "Instructors of the Year." The ADF takes these recognitions a step further; for instance, the RAAF awards a Military Skills Instructor (MSI) badge, but only to those Instructors who teach basic military skills (e.g., drill, weapons, field craft, navigation). In addition, qualified MSIs are eligible to receive a \$10,000 retention bonus.

## **1.2 Aim**

This report summarizes and compares two distinct studies—CA's investigation of Instructors' satisfaction, and the UK's examination of Trainers' motivation—including their theoretical backgrounds, methods, and results. The aim is to find commonalities and draw parallels between the studies' results, and to use areas of corroboration to identify possible interventions for improving satisfaction/motivation in military Instructors/Trainers.



## 2 Theoretical Frameworks

---

In an effort to understand Instructors in their respective nations, CA used a job satisfaction perspective (Rounding et al., 2018), while the UK examined Instructor issues from a motivation perspective (Steele et al., 2016a, 2016b). The theoretical framework of job satisfaction focuses on various workplace factors that generate positive perceptions or attitudes (i.e., satisfaction) towards one's job. In turn, these positive attitudes regarding the various factors surrounding one's job influence one's effectiveness in that job. In contrast, the motivational theoretical framework focuses on the exertion of effort towards a specific outcome and highlights the ability of intrinsic and extrinsic factors to motivate goal-oriented behaviour (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Intrinsic motivational factors influence one's innate or personal desire to do well (i.e., the Instructor wants to do well), whereas extrinsic factors motivate individuals to do well, so long as these factors are enticing enough to warrant sustained effort (i.e., there are sufficient benefits to doing a good job that entice the Instructor to exert effort; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

As an aside, the mutual impact of motivation on job satisfaction and vice versa is recognized (e.g., Lawlor & Hall, 1970), and the two theoretical frameworks are often confounded. Motivation is a strong correlate of job satisfaction (Bishay, 1996; Davis & Wilson, 2010) and can be thought to subsume job satisfaction (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007). Conversely, it can be thought of as a moderating factor for job satisfaction, as the absence of motivators does not necessarily result in dissatisfaction (Tietjen & Myers, 1998). High levels of job satisfaction can serve as an intrinsic motivator, resulting in sustained effort. Conversely, intrinsic motivation can serve as a rose-coloured glass to interpret workplace satisfaction factors positively, resulting in effective performance (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Similarly, extrinsic factors could serve to bolster (positive; e.g., additional pay) or denigrate (e.g., negative) job satisfaction (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

However, the intent of this paper is not to extricate or de-confound the two theoretical constructs. Indeed, the purpose is the opposite—to examine how two independent studies that approached the data from two different theoretical frameworks can combine their results to shed light on various factors that might (directly or indirectly) augment Instructor effectiveness. Nor is the intent of this paper to establish a causal link between satisfaction and/or motivation with performance; a burgeoning academic literature has already done so (e.g., Bright, 2007; Faragher, Cass, & Cooper, 2005; Judge et al., 2001; Korman, 1999; Lawlor & Hall, 1970; Schleicher, Hansen, & Fox, 2011). Consequently, the focus of this paper is on the organizational features that can influence satisfaction and motivation.<sup>3</sup> We present the theory and research underlying each perspective, and then compare them.

### 2.1 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been studied extensively because of its positive association with organizational outcomes (e.g., increased productivity, performance, retention, reduced attrition and sick days; Judge et al., 2001) and individual benefits (e.g., increased mental and physical health; Faragher et al., 2005; Schleicher et al., 2011). Recent research indicates that low job satisfaction has contributed to attrition in the CAF, with it being cited as the most frequent reason for voluntary release from the CAF (Bremner &

---

<sup>3</sup> Aligned with the academic literature which embraces the satisfaction/motivation-performance link, we assume that augmenting satisfaction and/or motivation, will in turn, lead to positive organizational outcomes (i.e., military training effectiveness).

Budgell, 2017). Moreover, job satisfaction has been shown to influence Instructors' performance and teaching effectiveness (Cranton & Knoop, 1991). Similarly, low job satisfaction has negatively impacted Instructors' productivity (Usop, Askandar, Langguyan-Kadtong, Usop, 2013) and the quality of instruction (Afshar & Doosti, 2016; Pilarta, 2015).

Job satisfaction has been defined in many ways; for the purpose of this study, Schleicher and colleagues' definition was adopted—job satisfaction is an enduring attitude towards one's job that is based on one's evaluation of emotions toward, and behaviours exhibited, at one's job (2011).

There is an extensive amount of research available suggesting a myriad of workplace factors that influence job satisfaction. After considering the overwhelming number of factors that potentially influence job satisfaction, it was decided to focus on factors that were applicable to the CAF and were well established in the academic literature. Accordingly, the following workplace factors that affect job satisfaction were reviewed: Preparedness, Recognition, Resources, Selection, Students, Supervision, and Work Environment (Rounding et al., 2018).

### **2.1.1 Preparedness**

How well prepared and qualified one feels about their job is associated with job satisfaction (Webb, 2007). Not surprisingly, Instructors who feel they are prepared have greater levels of effectiveness, and this, in turn, is positively associated with students' learning (Darling-Hammond, 1990). Similarly, where there is agreement between the persons' capabilities and role demands (i.e., the perception that one possesses the capacity to fulfil the demands of the job, or person-job fit), it is related to overall job satisfaction (Schleicher et al., 2011). Feeling a sense of challenge, but feeling prepared to deal with these challenges, can promote job satisfaction (Kim & Loadman, 1994). Likewise, a perception that teachers<sup>4</sup> have opportunities for PD can also bolster job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001).

### **2.1.2 Recognition/Meaning**

Employee recognition has been positively linked to job satisfaction, as well as workplace motivation (Ali & Ahmed, 2009). Positively perceived organizational rewards are, in turn, related to perceptions of organizational support (Schleicher et al., 2011). Danish and Usman (2010) demonstrated that employee commitment, performance, and motivation can be augmented by reward and recognition programs. Satisfaction with promotional opportunities is positively related to job satisfaction (Schleicher et al., 2011; Spector, 1997). Further, a perception of occupational pride (i.e., that colleagues and others respect the profession) and self-esteem contributes to job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001). Similarly, experiencing greater meaning in ones' work environment is associated with more positive work outcomes (Borgen & Lindley, 2003; Broodryk, 2014; Harris & Thorensen, 2003).

### **2.1.3 Resources**

Also influential on teachers' job satisfaction is the perception that they possess adequate resources to do their jobs, such as training aids and administrative support (Song & Alpaslan, 2015; Webb, 2007). Lacking these resources was found to have a direct negative impact on job satisfaction (Iwu, Gwija, Benedict, & Tengeh, 2013). Suggesting that stress may be a mechanism whereby resources indirectly

---

<sup>4</sup> The role of teachers was considered sufficiently similar to that of Instructors to provide a point of comparison on the research findings being discussed.

impact satisfaction, it has been shown that organizational support regarding curriculum materials (e.g., textbooks) reduces teachers' stress, which in turn, is associated with greater satisfaction (House, 1981, as cited by Song & Alpaslan, 2015; Nguni, Slegers, & Denessen, 2006; Singer, Marx, Krajcik, & Chambers, 2000). Indeed, more recent research has found a direct association between perceptions of organizational support and job satisfaction (Al-Hussami, 2008).

#### **2.1.4 Selection/Attraction**

Aligned with the effort justification literature (Aronson & Mills, 1959), how one is selected for a particular job also impacts job attraction (Barber, 1998). Gilliland (1993) argued that, if the selection process is perceived as unfair, this will result in more negative organizational outcomes, specifically lowered job satisfaction. Further, a lack of control over career decisions that could affect promotion or long-term career goals (career control), which is applicable to individuals who are posted into Instructor roles without volunteering, has been shown to negatively impact job satisfaction and work engagement, and heighten work stress (Chan & Mai, 2015). Teachers' expectations regarding their job (i.e., the benefits and negative aspects) have been associated with job satisfaction—more realistic expectations are associated with greater job satisfaction (Evans, 1997). Indeed, Dunham and Smith (1979) associated perceptions of a negative impact on one's career with decreased job satisfaction.

#### **2.1.5 Students**

The attitude Instructors have regarding their students, particularly negative ones, directly impacts their own job satisfaction (Hawk & Lyons, 2008). Cranton and Knoop (1991) noted that negative feelings toward students must logically reduce teaching effectiveness, and reduce perceptions of self-efficacy, a feeling closely associated with an awareness of one's own ineffectiveness, is associated with job dissatisfaction (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, & Malone, 2006; Klassen & Chiu, 2010). Graham, West, and Schaller (1992) showed an association between interactional immediacy with student and teacher job satisfaction, however, a more recent study by Wilson (2008) suggested that the relationship is more complicated. Wilson posits that a teacher's attitude towards their students is accurately gauged by students, which in turn, could logically result in job dissatisfaction, or satisfaction, depending on the teacher's attitudes. Similarly, Instructors who believe their students are of poor quality have lower levels of job satisfaction (Rajalingam & Nair, 2014). Also, the perception that one's efforts are having little influence on student performance can also negatively affect job satisfaction (Bein, Anderson, & Maes, 1990).

#### **2.1.6 Supervision**

Much literature has extolled the virtues of positive supervisory experiences. Supervisory trust, feedback, consistency between actions and words, and support are all associated with greater job satisfaction (Driscoll, 1978; Schleicher et al., 2011; Thoms, Dose, & Scott, 2002; Wang & Hsieh, 2013). Those supervisors who take an active role in evaluating employees, providing employees with incentives and feedback, and promoting the professional development of their employees, can positively impact satisfaction (Schleicher et al., 2011; Shatzer, 2010). As well, a sense of autonomy and empowerment are significant predictors of teacher job satisfaction (Kim & Loadman, 1994; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005).

### 2.1.7 Work Environment/Responsibilities

Employees who feel overwhelmed, overloaded with work, frustrated, or are faced with organizational constraints (e.g., bureaucratic rules) report reduced levels of job satisfaction (Bremner & Budgell, 2017; Iwu et al., 2013; Schleicher et al., 2011). Similarly, experiencing work-life imbalance or work-family conflict has been shown to be negatively associated with job satisfaction and well-being, and positively associated with increased turnover intentions and stress, and decreased quality of life and workplace effectiveness (Chan & Mai, 2015; Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw, 2003; Haar, Russo, Sune, & Ollier-Malateer, 2014; Thakur & Bhatnagar, 2017). Moreover, work-life imbalance has also been shown to have a negative impact on military members' job satisfaction, and to increase voluntary release from the CAF (Pelchat, 2002; Pickering, 2006), and job satisfaction in the US military (Sachau, Gertz, Matsch, Palmer, & Englert, 2011). A contributor to work overload and imbalance is one's perception that there are too many unnecessary administrative duties, which has been associated with teacher withdrawal and turnover (Albert & Levine, 1988). And finally, the perception that one's coworkers are actively contributing to the organization has also directly and positively related to job satisfaction (Babin & Boles, 1996).

These seven factors provide a research-based understanding of job satisfaction influencers that would be found in the work environment of CAF Instructors. Combined, they are referred to as workplace satisfaction factors, lest they be confused with other factors influencing job satisfaction (e.g., interpersonal relationships, personal predisposition to stress; Rounding et al., 2018).

## 2.2 Motivation

The impact of motivation on organizational outcomes, such as performance, selection, retention, and commitment, has been widely accepted (Bright, 2007; Korman, 1999; Lawlor & Hall, 1970). The underlying premise is that organizational practices (e.g., pay, promotion, vacation, work conditions) have the potential to fulfill employees' motivational needs (e.g., intrinsic and extrinsic), and, as such, impact an employees' motivation to work (Korman, 1999). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors impact goal-oriented behaviour, meaning as these needs are fulfilled, employees exert greater effort towards their jobs (i.e., increase performance; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

The rewarding elements of job roles can also be divided into intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Some studies have identified that intrinsic rewards appear to be more motivating to employees than extrinsic rewards (Steele et al., 2016a, 2016b). However, for intrinsic factors to be motivating, extrinsic factors of the role (e.g., pay, working conditions) must be perceived as substantial and equitable in comparison to other positions (i.e., sufficient enough to remove them as a concern).

For Trainers, there seems to be a lot of attention on the intrinsic elements of the role—for example, job satisfaction from training others and helping them to achieve success (Steele et al., 2016a, 2016b). Less attention, however, has been paid to the extrinsic factors—which, indeed, may be of concern to them.

In several cases, research has found that a combination of both intrinsic and extrinsic factors influence Instructors' motivation and job satisfaction, both positively and negatively. Carbone and Cigrang (2001) presented findings from a research programme intended to improve the attraction, selection, and retention of US Air Force (USAF) Military Training Instructors (MTIs). One hundred job incumbents were measured for global job satisfaction and occupational stress levels. When interviewed, personnel reported long working hours (16- to 18-hour days, 7 days per week in the first 3 weeks of a new *flight* intake), lots

of pressure and competition, relationship and family problems (due to role demands), and high incidences of *burnout*. The authors also administered the Cooper Stress Check that revealed the “demands of work on private life and workload” are the number one factor influencing stress (Carbone & Cigrang, p. 804). In the job satisfaction survey, low satisfaction was negatively related to “top management is concerned about me,” “I feel close to the people at work,” and “I get recognised for a job well done.” Importantly, a sizeable proportion of MTIs reported that they would not volunteer for the job again, citing workload, intrusion of job demands into personal life, and perceptions that command is unconcerned with their problems as major issues influencing their decision (Carbone & Cigrang, 2001). However, the authors concluded that many of the other aspects link to the intrinsic elements of the MTI role, which may be considered attractive, such as the desire to impart knowledge. It seems likely that an emphasis on these intrinsic elements would be more beneficial in attracting people to the profession for the *right reasons*. For example, more money or better conditions of service (extrinsic attractions) could be found in many USAF jobs, and therefore people looking for these things are not necessarily approaching the training role in the same way. However, the authors also noted that without these extrinsic attractions, recruiting effective people into the role may be even more challenging.

It is possible that extrinsic attractions, such as salary, can be viewed as *hygiene factors*, which are motivational factors that cause demotivation when absent (e.g., good salary, job profile, benefits; Herzberg, 1987). Herzberg’s model of motivation proposed two factors influence motivation at work: (a) hygiene factors that demotivate when they are inappropriate or absent, and (b) motivators that sustain effort. A hygiene factor has to be sufficiently commensurate with the individual’s expectations, otherwise extrinsic attractions may act as hygiene factors, impacting motivation by their absence (Herzberg, 1987).

Brunetti (2001) conducted a factor analysis to identify general categories of factors relating to teachers’ satisfaction with their careers. Practical factors, such as salary and benefits, were given the lowest rating in terms of their influence. Professional factors, such as autonomy and subject matter, were identified as having the highest connection with teacher satisfaction. In addition, teachers have indicated repeatedly that helping students learn and grow provides the greatest sense of satisfaction (Brunetti, 2001).

In 2006, a report by the UK Rail Safety and Standards Board (RSSB) examined the perceived attractions and disadvantages of the Trainer role (McGuffog, Butcher & Catchpole, 2006). Helping others, quality of life (e.g., hours of work, weekends free, no shift work) and personal/PD were the top three attractions. Notably, some of the attractions that were listed also appeared under the disadvantages section. For example, remuneration was ranked as the sixth most commonly referenced attraction, but it was also rated as the number one most commonly mentioned disadvantage.

### **2.2.1 Intrinsic**

The examination of literature related to intrinsic motivators revealed that when recruiting high-school teachers appealing to the mission (educating youths), rather than appealing to materialistic incentives, worked better in attracting effective teachers to high poverty schools (Shuls & Maranto, 2014). For instance, Bradley and Loadman (2005) studied the recruitment and retention of high school teachers and identified relationships between qualities associated with the best teachers, incentives connected with career satisfaction, and successful recruiting techniques. They found motivating factors for teachers in their study were intrinsic, more than they were extrinsic. Bradley and Loadman (2005) reported various retention tools focused on enhancing the intrinsic rewards of the role. These included: (a) ensuring schools are conducive to learning and teaching, (b) enhancing teacher and student satisfaction, (c) ensuring that leadership is focused on instruction, (d) establishing well-designed and well-funded

mentoring programmes for new teachers, (e) rewarding teachers for deepening and broadening their knowledge and skills, (f) creating career advancement opportunities, and (h) increasing the prestige of teaching.

One of the best practices found to increase intrinsic motivation is that of evidence-based teaching (McKeown et al., 2014). This practice enables Trainers to use teaching skills rather than delivering prepared, repetitive training material, and as such, is thought to be more motivating for the Trainer as they get to hone their skills, ergo instilling meaning and autonomy into the work. Also, Trainers felt that evidence-based teaching gave them a sense of purpose in their employment, as both the Trainers and the trainees found the approach more fun. Using this method, Trainers were also able to share ideas with others, which made them feel more influential.

Role purpose was also found to be influential in motivating teachers by Volk, Homan, Tepner, Chichester, and Scales (2013). They discussed the intrinsic rewards of being an educator:

The rewards of educating the next generation of nurses. Working with each new group of students allows you to share why you still love nursing; seeing the wonder in their eyes is refreshing, providing renewal for your daily job as a manager (p. 540).

Ideally, having Trainers who are keen to impart their knowledge could be key towards increasing motivation and improving Trainer effectiveness.

## **2.2.2 Extrinsic**

One extrinsic reward structure that was introduced by the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command's Institute for non-commissioned officer (NCO) PD (INCOPD) warranted review (Steele et al., 2016a, 2016b). The INCOPD began awarding Army Instructor Badges in the summer of 2014 to "help recognize the professionalism of its NCO educators" and "to bolster the standing of the NCO Instructors who teach the courses in the NCO Education System" (Villa, 2014, para 2).

A lot of times today an assignment as an Instructor is viewed as not adding to a soldier's career enhancement. It's not as highly regarded as, say, a drill sergeant, detachment chief, or some other kinds of assignments that are out there for NCOs. So, we want to change those perceptions (Villa, 2014, p. 4).

As noted above, the three levels of the Army Instructor Badge authorized for award: the Basic Army Instructor Badge, the Senior Army Instructor Badge, and the Master Army Instructor Badge. In addition, serving as an Instructor will also earn junior NCOs promotion points. Soldiers competing for advancement to sergeant and staff sergeant positions can earn 15 promotion points by serving in Instructor roles. It will be of interest to review the impact of this US scheme in the future, as there is an established history of symbolism within defence, with badges and medals being held in extremely high regard by defence personnel and those externally.

From an organizational point of view, career progression is seen in the UK military as the primary motivator and reward for the training role (i.e., enhanced promotion prospects; Steele et al., 2016a, 2016b). Where career progression is not the primary motivator, other factors are reported as playing a part in attracting individuals (i.e., stability, geographical location). Interview data suggest that a high number of individuals seek to get out of training roles in order to control these factors, but then discover intrinsic rewards once in the post. Achievement and personal/professional growth were reported by Trainer

Managers as the main motivators with respect to an USAF training role once an individual is in post (Mundy et al., 2014).

The International Atomic Energy Agency's report (2004) demonstrated that Nuclear Power Plants in their member states faced difficulties in recruiting Instructors, especially from operations departments where individuals have enhanced salaries. In most cases, an assignment to the training organization results in lower pay than a job at the plant. They commented that it is important that training staff are not disadvantaged by an assignment to training, and proposed that plant management should consider methods to remove this disincentive. They recommended several possible solutions including: maintaining rate of pay, compensating lower pay with interesting opportunities (such as involvement in international training projects), providing Instructors with additional (transferable) competencies, or making training assignments a career path for promotions.

## **2.3 Comparison of Theoretical Frameworks**

Examining things from a job satisfaction framework identifies several workplace factors that influence job satisfaction, which in turn, are theorized to impact performance (Judge et al., 2001; Jones, Jones, Latreille, & Sloane, 2008). According to Vroom's (1964; as cited by Johns & Saks, 2011) model of expectancies, work performance is a natural byproduct of satisfying expectations regarding various workplace satisfaction factors. In this sense, satisfaction influences performance directly, as meeting (or not) expectations results in a positive (negative) attitude (i.e., [dis]satisfaction), which in turn naturally increases performance. Indeed, Judge and colleagues (2001) argued that perhaps the strongest relation is that between job satisfaction and job performance. Job satisfaction can result in employee behaviours that can positively impact organizational outcomes such as productivity, retention, and attrition (Judge et al., 2001). Interestingly, Davar and Bala (2012) found that overall satisfaction has a greater link to performance than did facet-level satisfaction, providing support for measuring satisfaction at both the overall and facet level (as CA did).

Low levels of job satisfaction have been found to negatively influence instructors' performance and teaching effectiveness (Cranton & Knoop, 1991), instructors' productivity (Usop et al., 2013), and the quality of instruction (Afshar & Doosti, 2016; Pilarta, 2015). Consequently, the underlying conclusion from these relationships is that instructors with low job satisfaction will not be as effective at teaching as those with higher job satisfaction.

From a motivational perspective, intrinsic and extrinsic factors can be viewed similarly. Intrinsic and extrinsic factors impact motivated goal-oriented behaviour in such a way that is associated with the same organizational outcomes as job satisfaction: performance, retention, selection, and commitment (Bright, 2007; Korman, 1999; Lawlor & Hall, 1970). This perspective argues that satisfying one's intrinsic and extrinsic needs will impact performance, either directly vis-à-vis goal-striving, or indirectly vis-à-vis some other mechanism such as job satisfaction.

Carver and Scheier (1998) posit that fluctuations in motivation impact goal-striving by presenting an apparent gap between the desired state (i.e., wanting to impart knowledge) and the current state (i.e., insufficient time to help students), which results in disengagement from a goal. Individuals perceiving a discrepancy between their desired and current states will cease goal-oriented behaviour, likely resulting in decrements in performance. Alternatively, matching states will result in sustained effort (Carver & Scheier, 1998). Similarly, it can be speculated that the detection of a discrepancy could result in negative attitudes towards the workplace (i.e., low job satisfaction), resulting in reduced goal-striving.

Critically, the frameworks are so similar as to almost be synonymous. In fact, each of the workplace factors that influence job satisfaction described in the job satisfaction framework could be categorized as being an intrinsic or extrinsic motivational factor. For instance, concepts related to preparedness can be viewed as both intrinsic and extrinsic factors: (a) feeling that the job is challenging and being prepared for that challenge can be viewed as an intrinsic motivator; whereas (b) having opportunities for professional development can serve as an extrinsic motivator. Similarly, providing a sense of meaning to one's job can serve as a strong intrinsic motivational factor, and providing organizational recognition of the job one is doing can serve as both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors.

So similar are the two frameworks that, as has been mentioned before, the two are often confounded. Motivation is a strong correlate of job satisfaction (Bishay, 1996; Davis & Wilson, 2010) and can be thought to subsume job satisfaction (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007). Conversely, it can be thought of as a moderating factor for job satisfaction as the absence of motivators does not necessarily result in dissatisfaction (Tietjen & Myers, 1998).

Helping to explain the circular association, a study by Arifin (2015) found that the motivation-performance relationship is partially mediated by job satisfaction. This suggests that job satisfaction is a mechanism whereby motivation impacts performance. Plainly, high levels of motivation are related to higher levels of job satisfaction, which in turn, positively impact performance. Yet still, the direct positive effects of motivation on performance were significant. Critically, Arifin's study has a singular flaw which prevents him from definitively answering the chicken-or-the-egg question: he did not report whether he tested the inverse relationship (a possibility in all correlational models; Baron & Kenny, 1986).<sup>5</sup> However, the key is that job satisfaction and motivation both predicted job performance, independently.

Consequently, the approach taken by this report is that both frameworks can be seen as similarly valid predictors, each contributing their own independent variance to organizational outcomes.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, each framework can be viewed as providing independent input on performance and teaching effectiveness, which are organizational outcomes of particular interest to this research project. It can be concluded that although each nation approached the issue from differing perspectives, the insights provided were similar, and corroborated one another. Thus, this report seeks to triangulate and capitalize on any similarities in the findings to provide a unified approach towards improving the instructor/trainer role.

Next, we will briefly discuss the methods and results, sequentially, for both of the nation's studies. Both countries used a multi-method, two-phased approach involving the collection of qualitative (e.g., interviews and focus groups [FGs]) and quantitative data (i.e., surveys), but they used them in reverse of one another. CA conducted FGs in Phase 1 to identify the issues causing job satisfaction and dissatisfaction with a small but representative sample of CAF Instructors, which informed the development of a survey. In Phase 2, CA collected quantitative data from a census of CAF Instructors. In comparison, the UK collected quantitative data from a large sample of Trainers, which was used to identify the key motivators and demotivators. In Phase 2, FGs/interviews were used to collect qualitative data to gain a better understanding of the underlying issues to enable the development of interventions. As the intent of this report is to present and compare the results of two independent studies, not to regurgitate the papers in their entirety, the reader is

---

<sup>5</sup> Note that as with any correlational relationship, the order of a mediational relationship (i.e., whether motivation impacts job satisfaction, which in turn effect performance, or job satisfaction impacts motivation, which in turn effects performance) cannot be fully tested unless the variables are reversed—which Arifin (2015) did not test.

<sup>6</sup> Please note that testing the correlational-order hypothesis is beyond the scope of this report. Moreover, this report does not measure outcomes (i.e., performance).



encouraged to scrutinize the separate reports by Rounding et al. (2018) and Steele et al. (2016b), respectively, for greater details regarding methodologies, analyses, or results.

## 3 CA Instructor Study

---

The CA Instructor Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction was conducted by Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis at the request of Canadian Forces Training and Development Centre to understand the factors influencing job satisfaction for CAF Instructors and to solicit feedback on a proposed Instructor Recognition Program (Rounding et al., 2018).

### 3.1 CA Phase 1

#### 3.1.1 Methodology

Phase 1 entailed a series of 10 FGs across the four Training Authorities (TAs): Royal Canadian Navy, Canadian Army, Royal Canadian Air Force, and the Chief of Military Personnel (refer to Rounding et al., 2018, for more details). Within each TA, a FG was conducted for officer Instructors and another for NCM Instructors. Five central training areas were visited to maximize representation from as many schools as possible.

##### 3.1.1.1 Participants

Across the 10 FGs, 37 NCMs and 35 officers from 23 of the major schools participated. The average time employed as an Instructor was 4.80 years ( $SD = 4.16$ ), with a range from 7 months to 25 years.

##### 3.1.1.2 Instrument

The structure of the FG was based on the factors identified in the literature review, discussed above, with guidance from the Canadian Forces Training and Development Centre regarding issues facing Instructors. A FG moderator's guide was developed to ensure standardization across all FGs. The topics addressed in each FG were: (a) an overview of the project, its intention, and guidelines for FG participation provided by the researchers; (b) satisfiers of the Instructor role, which included participants individually indicating their top three; (c) dissatisfiers of the Instructor role, which included participants individually indicating their top three; (d) key support elements (e.g., experiences, training, formal education); (e) recommendations to increase job satisfaction; (f) after introducing the concept of an Instructor Recognition Program, a discussion of the benefits and problems associated with such a program; and (g) wrap-up discussion and closing remarks. Also, at the end of each FG, Instructors were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with being an Instructor using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*very dissatisfied*) to 5 (*very satisfied*).

#### 3.1.2 Results

Overall, the FG participants were moderately satisfied with being Instructors ( $M = 3.59$ ,  $SD = .91$ ). FG results were summarized into satisfiers and dissatisfiers, and rank ordered based on a combination of the frequency mentioned in FGs and the frequency of rankings in the top three satisfiers/dissatisfiers portion of the survey (i.e., weighted rank in Table 1). The 11 common satisfiers are rank-ordered from most important to least important. The top satisfier was from the act of teaching and developing others. Satisfiers were then categorized into major themes (Category column on the right), with one satisfier that contained miscellaneous topics not categorized and labelled as not applicable to any major theme.

**Table 1: Instructor Satisfiers.**

Weighted Rank	Satisfier	Frequency	Category
1	Developing junior people/seeing students learn	64	Students
2	Passing on knowledge	36	Students
3	Set daily schedule (predictable, established)	30	Work Environment
4	Personal professional development	27	Preparedness
5	Enjoy teaching/one-on-one with students	16	Students
6	Collaborating with others	8	Resources
7	Sense of responsibility	8	Supervision
8	Other (mentor new Instructors, input to new policies)	7	Not Applicable
9	Flexibility to lesson plan	6	Resources
10	Dynamic environment	3	Work Environment
11	Enjoy being a subject matter expert (SME) in the area	2	Recognition

Similarly, the 19 common dissatisfiers were ordered top-down, with dissatisfaction most often coming from a lack of resources (Table 2). One dissatisfier that contained miscellaneous topics could not be categorized and was labelled as not applicable to any major theme.

**Table 2: Instructor Dissatisfiers.**

Weighted Rank	Dissatisfiers	Frequency	Category
1	Lack of resources (personnel, training, administrative, infrastructure)	59	Resources
2	Too much administration/secondary duties	38	Work Environment
3	Loss of field pay	16	Recognition
4	Poor course development (changes to Qualification Standards and Plans [QSP]/lesson plans take too long)	15	Resources
5	Lack of training for Instructors	14	Preparedness
6	Resources out of date	9	Resources
7	Poor quality students	9	Students
8	School seen as <i>dumping ground</i> for ill/injured	9	Selection
9	Instructors not motivated	8	Selection
10	Other (travel on ships, no sea billet points, inequality between civilian and CAF Instructors, long days for flying units)	7	Not Applicable
11	Chain of command does not listen to Instructor advice	5	Recognition
12	Instructor job negatively affects career path	5	Recognition
13	High tempo (micro-managed)	4	Work Environment
14	Lack of feedback/support	3	Supervision
15	No rewards/recognition for work	2	Recognition

Weighted Rank	Dissatisfiers	Frequency	Category
16	No selection to become Instructors	2	Selection
17	No continuity (constant organizational changes)	1	Resources
18	School policies unclear	1	Resources
19	Time as Instructor too short	1	Selection

Rounding et al. (2018) summarized all FG results into seven categories, with the eighth category being overall job satisfaction: (1) Preparedness; (2) Recognition; (3) Resources; (4) Selection; (5) Students; (6) Supervision; (7) Work Environment; and (8) Overall Satisfaction.

## 3.2 CA Phase 2

### 3.2.1 Methodology

Armed with the results from the FGs, coupled with the literature on job satisfaction, Rounding et al. (2018) developed a 134-item survey that included open-ended questions, items rated using Likert-type scales, and two questions asking participants to rank-order various satisfiers and dissatisfiers from most to least satisfied/dissatisfied, respectively. Items were borrowed or adapted from commonly used scales, where possible, and developed where necessary (e.g., items about Instructor selection, postings, and training; refer to Rounding et al., 2018, for more details). Prospective participants were emailed a Fluid Survey link that solicited their participation. Interested CAF members clicked on the link that redirected them to an anonymous online survey, where they first indicated voluntary, uncompensated, informed consent. The survey was available in both the English and French languages.

In keeping with job satisfaction literature, job satisfaction was measured at both the global level (i.e., overall satisfaction with the job) and the facet levels (i.e., a composite index meant to tap into the top satisfiers from the FGs; Schleicher et al., 2011; Spector, 1997). All items were rated on a scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The single-item predictor was used based on arguments from Scarpello and Campbell (1983) and Schleicher et al. (2011), the latter of whom concluded that composite predictors using multiple individual factors often have overlapping constructs; this would increase variability in the dependent variable, hampering our ability to find significant results (Erceg-Hurn & Mirosevich, 2008; Serbetar & Sedlar, 2016).

A total of 101 of the 134 items were aimed at tapping into the seven workplace satisfaction factors discussed above. Participants were asked to rate their agreement or level of satisfaction on a scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree/dissatisfied*) to 5 (*strongly agree/satisfied*). Responses to the 101 questions underwent a factorial analysis with direct oblimin rotation, and where supported, agreement items were averaged to form 27 composite indices, and the satisfaction items were averaged to form total scores (see Table 3 below). All Cronbach reliability coefficients were above .60.

#### 3.2.1.1 Participants

All military Instructors ( $N = 3,794$ ) employed at all CAF schools were invited via email to participate in an internet-based electronic survey. A total of 1,581 Instructors participated in the survey, which equates to a 42% response rate. Although only 65% of participants chose to indicate their school, of these participants, all 90 schools were represented (100%). Participants were evenly distributed across the Royal Canadian Air Force (37% of participants) and the Canadian Army (34% of participants), Chief of

Military Personnel participants were less represented (19%), and the Royal Canadian Navy had the fewest participants (10%). The majority of participants were Reg F members (95%; versus Res F). Contrary to the overall distribution of ranks in the CAF, where junior NCMs are the largest group, there were more senior NCM participants (41%) than junior NCMs (37%), followed lastly by officer participants (23%). Time in the Instructor role varied, with the average being 2.42 years ( $SD = 2.33$ ). A minority of the participants had been employed in an Instructor role previously (35%;  $n = 558$ ), and their previous employment as Instructors was on average 1.97 years ( $SD = 3.15$ ).

### **3.2.2 Results**

The results are summarized in two parts. First, results in each of the seven major factors are presented based on the averaged responses. Next, the rank-order results for satisfiers and dissatisfiers are presented. Participants were required to rate aspects of the role in relation to one another, which provides additional information over and above rating items individually. It provides an indication of relative importance.

#### **3.2.2.1 Workplace Satisfaction Factors**

First, results in each of the seven major areas are presented: Preparedness, Recognition, Resources, Selection, Students, Supervision, and Work Environment (Table 3). Note that in Table 3, the means ( $M$ ) and standard deviations ( $SD$ s) of the satisfaction items were averaged into a total score and are represented in the bolded light-grey shaded header that represents the seven broad areas discussed above. The 27 workplace satisfaction factor constructs are represented below those headers, unshaded.

##### **3.2.2.2 Preparedness**

Instructors reported they were qualified to instruct, but were not in agreement with regard to feeling prepared to instruct. Additionally, many disagreed with the statement that they were given sufficient time to prepare. Participants were not asked their satisfaction with how prepared they felt.

The majority of Instructors (75%) indicated that they would have benefited from some form of indoctrination period before they began teaching a course, with the average period of recommended indoctrination being 46 days ( $SD = 63$ ). Although 68% of participants had taken the Instructional Techniques course and 49% had taken the Advanced Instructional Techniques course, larger proportions advocated that the courses be mandatory for all Instructors (87% and 77%, respectively). Despite not all Instructors having instructional training, most Instructors reported being prepared to instruct.

Although most participants (85%) were not aware of the program that allowed CFTDC courses to be used to obtain a waiver for a civilian college certificate (e.g., adult education, teaching diploma), a large proportion (68%) indicated interest in pursuing a community college certificate in Teaching and Teaching Adults, with military instructional courses counting towards credit. Furthermore, many participants were willing to pursue the certificate with their own resources (53%) and on their own time (65%), which speaks volumes about motivation towards civilian certification. Accordingly, an indoctrination period, mandatory Instructor training, and a revised college certificate were recommended.

### **3.2.2.3 Recognition**

There was a low amount of satisfaction with the recognition Instructors received for doing their job. Aligned with this, there was little agreement that the job provided recognition and many reported that more formal recognition programs are needed.

The majority of Instructors indicated that it is important for them to be recognized for the job they do as Instructors (59%). While only a small minority of them received additional merit board points for this role (22%), a larger proportion did not know whether they received additional points or not (41%). Forty-one percent were ambivalent about the type of recognition they received for the work they do as Instructors, while 33% were dissatisfied. The need for more formal recognition programs was endorsed by 52% of the Instructors.

When asked about the Instructor Recognition Program: (a) 44% agreed with the 3-tier stratification of Instructors by years of experiences and training; (b) 59% agreed that additional personnel evaluation report points should be based on formal training; (c) 63% agreed extra personnel evaluation report points should be based on the Commanding Officer's (CO's) endorsement; (d) 44% thought Instructors should be recognized with qualification badges/patches based on the competency achieved; (e) 58% believed the Instructor Recognition Program would be beneficial to Instructors; and (f) 52% believed the Instructor Recognition Program would attract other CAF members into Instructor positions. Nonetheless, 44% disagreed with at least some part of the Instructor Recognition Program. Based on these findings, it was recommended that the CAF adapt only those components of the proposed Instructor Recognition Program related to personnel evaluation report points.

### **3.2.2.4 Resources**

Overall, Instructors were modestly satisfied with the amount of resources and support they received. Aligned with the FGs, many reported that there was a lack of resources at their disposal, and that the number of Instructors and support staff was insufficient. Contrary to the FGs, participants felt that there was little need to coordinate with other Instructors.

The amount of PD received by Instructors since being in their role was, on average, 13 days ( $SD = 28$  days). Slightly more than half of the Instructors felt that they received enough PD days (55%). There was a significant difference in the number of days received based on those who were in agreement that they received sufficient PD days ( $M = 19.36$   $SD = 36.18$ ) versus those who were in disagreement ( $M = 6.12$ ,  $SD = 9.23$ ),  $t(726) = 8.86$ ,  $p < .001$ . Recommendations included providing Instructors with formalized PD days and that these PD days should be at least two weeks in duration.

### **3.2.2.5 Selection**

Generally, there was a modest level of satisfaction with the selection process. The majority agreed that there should be a formal process, and similarly, that top performers should be selected. There was modest agreement that the posting length should be elongated ( $> 3$  to 4 years). Contrary to the FGs, participants disagreed that there were negative career implications when posted to a TE.

The fact that 56% of Instructors had requested to be posted into the TE counters a common impression that CAF members are reluctant to be employed as Instructors. However, the motivation for these requests is unknown. With so few Instructors having completed any selection/screening process (17%),

and most of those were an informal selection process (53%; Rounding et al., 2018), it not surprising that 76% of participants advocated (i.e., either *agreed* or *strongly agreed*) for a formal selection process for Instructors. Just over half of the participants supported that Instructor postings should be reserved for top performers (57%; either *agreed* or *strongly agreed*). Contrary to the FG results, wherein participants advocated for postings longer than 3 to 4 years, overall, CAF Instructors reported being satisfied with the posting durations. Accordingly, a formal selection system that contains a realistic job preview (RJP) component was recommended.

### 3.2.2.6 Students

There was a modest level of satisfaction with the students that Instructors teach. Possibly accounting for the level of satisfaction, there is only modest agreement that the quality of students is high. Instructors agreed that they have some influence over the outcomes of their students, and there is little agreement that there is pressure (from above) to both pass failing students or, ironically, to produce good quality students.

Thirty percent of Instructors reported feeling pressured to pass failing students and consistent with this, 65% reported that they felt they had influence over student outcomes. Relatedly, only 34.5% of them *agreed* or *strongly agreed* that the quality of students was high. The issue of forcing Instructors to pass unqualified students should be addressed, as firm, fair, and transparent application of human resource (HR) policies is required. Another issue related to resources and work environment is classroom size. When asked, Instructors indicated that classroom sizes ranged from zero to 110. Note, Instructors with zero students would be employed doing other training tasks, such as course development. Of those who indicated that this was too many students to teach (25%), the average classroom size was 35 students. Instructors satisfied with their classroom size taught, on average, 20 students. Accordingly, reduced classroom sizes were also recommended.

### 3.2.2.7 Supervision

There is only a modest level of satisfaction with the supervision that Instructors receive. Overall, most felt that their supervisors trust them and are managed properly. However, there were far lower levels of agreement with respect to feeling that they are given the autonomy to do their job, a consistent message from their chain of command, and timely and appropriate feedback.

The average number of days of that Instructors were supervised annually was 5, but there was large disparity on this issue ( $SD = 15$  days) with a range from zero (15%) to 25 or more (2.5%), and 80% of participants receiving 5 or fewer days of supervision. Despite this, many (53%) agree that they are being provided with timely feedback. Relatedly, many Instructors feel that they are receiving inconsistent messages from their chain of command: 70% *disagree* or *strongly disagree* that they receive consistent direction from their supervisors. Recommendations were made to increase supervision and provide consistent messages to Instructors.

**Table 3:** Factors Influencing Instructor Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction.

Workplace Factor	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<b>Preparedness</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
Feel qualified to instruct	4.29	0.78

Feel prepared to instruct	3.32	1.08
Given sufficient time to prepare	2.97	1.25
<b>Recognition received</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>1.09</b>
Job provides recognition	3.13	0.94
More formal recognition needed	3.66	0.81
<b>Resources</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>0.70</b>
Provided adequate amount of resources and materials	3.00	0.89
Sufficient number of Instructors and support staff available to assist	2.71	0.76
Frequently requires coordination with others	1.66	0.74
<b>Selection</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>1.31</b>
Formal selection process should be implemented	3.99	0.96
Top performers should be selected	3.60	1.08
Posting lengths are should be longer (> 3-4 years)*	3.02	1.30
Employed at school has negative career implications*	2.77	1.20
<b>Students</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>0.81</b>
Have influence over student outcomes	3.52	1.01
The quality of students is high	3.23	0.68
There is pressure to pass failing students*	2.81	1.10
There is pressure to produce good quality students*	2.27	1.15
<b>Supervision</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>0.76</b>
Supervisors trust Instructors to do the job	3.98	0.91
Instructors are managed/supervised properly (e.g., expectations are provided, work assessed against identified goals)	3.61	0.83
Supervisors provide helpful, timely, and regular feedback	3.25	1.21
Instructors are given autonomy to do their job	2.97	0.84
Instructors receive consistent direction from supervisors (e.g., policy changes)	2.31	0.82
<b>Work Environment</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>0.73</b>
Ability to focus on delivery of learning plans and not their development	3.42	1.26
Have the authority to improve training/lesson plans	3.34	1.16
Work does not interfere with home and family life	2.99	1.06
CAF and school rules and procedures are cumbersome*	2.85	1.00
Few administrative and secondary duties (e.g., scheduling of classes, parades, duty watch)	2.36	0.87
Work tempo at the school is low	2.27	0.82
<b>Overall Satisfaction</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>1.02</b>

Note: \* indicates reverse coded items. NA = Not Applicable.

### 3.2.2.8 Work Environment

Instructors reported a low level of satisfaction with their work environment. Although they had modest agreement that they could focus on teaching rather than developing lesson plans, there was less agreement that they actually had the authority to change lesson plans. Likely accounting for their low satisfaction, Instructors reported that there were a lot of administrative and secondary duties they had to contend with, that the work tempo at the school was high, and that work interfered with home and family life. Contrary to the FGs, Instructors reported that school rules and procedures were not overly burdensome. These



results suggest a degree of dissatisfaction with the work environment, and there was seemingly agreement in this regard as evidenced by a moderate standard deviation ( $SD = 0.73$ ).

Thirty-two percent of Instructors indicated that they were overwhelmed *fairly often* to *frequently*. The average hours worked in a week was 46.5, which is certainly not alarming, but the dispersion of responses ranges from 40 to 100 ( $SD = 13.76$ ), which tells another story. Forty-three percent of the Instructors worked a 40-hour week or less (4% worked less than 40 hours) but the other 57% worked more than 40 hours/week, and 20% worked 50 hours a week and more. Further, when asked in a single item to rate their workload, 79% of participants rated it as *sometimes* to *always too heavy*, and 37% rated their workload as *often* to *always too heavy*. Furthermore, approximately only 42% of Instructors' time is spent instructing; the remainder of their time is spent on administrative duties, secondary duties, and additional taskings. As a result, recommendations were made to decrease the workload, and increase the amount of time spent instructing, while concurrently reducing the amount of time spent on secondary duties and taskings.

### **3.2.2.9 Job Satisfaction**

Overall, despite the seemingly modest degree of satisfaction reported by Instructors for the various workplace factors, job satisfaction was surprisingly high ( $M = 3.97$ ,  $SD = 1.02$ ). Thus, the majority of Instructors (80%) *agreed* or *strongly agreed* that, overall, they were satisfied with their jobs. The composite index (i.e., using several facets to measure job satisfaction), was similarly high ( $M = 4.39$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ ). As well, using hierarchal regression, Rounding and Rankin (2018) found that all workplace factors, except Resources, were significant predictors of overall job satisfaction.

That overall satisfaction was high, yet participants reported comparatively low scores on the various individual workplace factors, suggests we should consider the possibility that: (a) some other, more global, construct could be confounded with job satisfaction (e.g., life satisfaction, CAF satisfaction), or (2) there could be a methodological confound (i.e., job satisfaction was rated last, potentially framing satisfaction as high, given that scores on the various factors were not disproportionately low).

### **3.2.2.10 Relative Comparisons**

Participants were asked to rank order 16 satisfiers from 1 (*most satisfied with*) to 16 (*least satisfied with*) and 21 dissatisfiers in order from 1 (*dissatisfied with*) to 21 (*least dissatisfied with*). Within each list, items that a participant was not satisfied with or dissatisfied with were not ranked (i.e., participants were told that they did not have to rank all items). Rankings were averaged across participants, with lower scores indicating higher levels of satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Table 4 and Table 5, respectively) and ordered in ascending values from most to least satisfied/dissatisfied.

The satisfier "Teaching gives you a sense of accomplishment" was by far the top satisfier—it almost scored lower than one standard deviation of the next lowest ranked item ( $M = 2.98$ ) and had the most popular rating (i.e., the median;  $Mdn = 1$ ). Overall, mean ratings were within 5 ranks of each other, and standard deviations were low, suggesting there was modest amount of agreement amongst participants regarding their top satisfiers. The other top satisfiers were related to aspects of passing on personal experiences, the enjoyment of teaching and helping students, and the mentoring role of an Instructor. The least satisfying aspects, relative to other aspects of the role, were maintaining command, flexibility in terms of content, and the ability to adapt ones' teaching style.

**Table 4: Rank-Ordered Satisfiers.**

Order	Satisfiers	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	Teaching gives you a sense of accomplishment	2.98	1	3.11
2	Bringing personal experiences and job skills to the course	5.94	6	3.21
3	Enjoy teaching/instructing aspect	6.32	5	4.17
4	Challenge of helping students who need it	6.95	7	3.59
5	Mentorship role	7.07	6	4.23
6	Training the future of the CAF	7.27	7	4.26
7	Personal development/re-learning material being taught	7.82	8	4.17
8	Predictability of schedule	8.22	7	5.21
9	Ability to develop student attitudes	8.46	8	3.75
10	Dynamic environment	8.48	9	4.48
11	Collaborating with other Instructors and SMEs	8.57	9	3.72
12	Helping to maintain the <i>purity</i> of the profession	9.09	9	4.66
13	Improving quality of training material	9.97	10	3.91
14	Adapting teaching style to different student learning styles	10.35	11	3.98
15	Flexibility of lesson planning – within the QSP parameters	10.66	12	4.38
16	Maintaining command aspect	13.70	15	3.48

Dissatisfiers were analyzed similarly, but in comparison to satisfiers there were higher mean ratings (e.g., 13 of the 21 have  $M > 10$ ), and the standard deviations were larger. This suggests that there was considerable disagreement amongst participants regarding those items they were most dissatisfied with. The dissatisfiers cover a range of topics that seem to influence the Instructors directly in their role (i.e., lack of personnel resources lack of feedback, lack of motivation, poor quality students) or indirectly influence the quality of Instructors at the TEs (e.g., employed personnel experiencing challenges, lack of Instructor selection process, unclear policies). The dissatisfiers cover a range of topics that seem to be related to the availability (or lack thereof) of resources (e.g., lacking personnel, outdated or no training aids, and lesson plans). Rounding out the top five was dissatisfaction with the stressfulness of the environment. The lack of environmental pay was not in the top 10; this was surprising given that it was a constant and hot topic in every FG. Interestingly, the least dissatisfying aspects were related to receiving feedback, a sense that one's colleagues are actively contributing, and feeling a lack of a personal sense of motivation.

*Table 5: Rank-Ordered Dissatisfiers.*

Order	Dissatisfiers	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	Lack of personnel resources (e.g., not enough Instructors)	4.90	3	4.59
2	Resources out of date (e.g., outdated QSPs, running course while it is being developed)	6.59	5	5.19
3	Lack of training resources (e.g., no training aids, resources controlled by third party)	7.31	6	5.62
4	Course development issues (e.g., changes to training plans/lesson plans take too long/no training plans)	7.45	6	4.76
5	Stressful environment (e.g., micro-managed, high tempo, heavy tempo, heavy workload, lack of supervision)	8.20	7	5.40
6	Lack of continuity in the organization (e.g., expectations change as chain of command changes)	8.34	7	5.19
7	Lack of administrative resources (e.g., no support staff)	8.47	7	5.33
8	Instructor turnover rate too high	8.73	8	5.37
9	Lack of recognition/rewards	10.29	10	6.04
10	Administrative/secondary duties (e.g., parades, course reports, school seen as manning pool)	10.42	11	5.88
11	Lack of Instructor training (e.g., no formal training, no time to prepare course)	10.48	11	5.15
12	Receptivity of command is poor/lack of support from chain of command (e.g., Instructor advice not taken)	10.97	11	5.39
13	Instructor posting affects career path (e.g., out of sight of your occupation, out of career path)	11.23	12	5.63
14	School policies unclear (e.g., differences in schools between East and West coast)	11.34	11	5.00
15	Other Instructors lack motivation to instruct	11.53	13	5.59
16	Lack of Instructor selection process	12.00	12	6.68
17	Lack of environmental pay (e.g., field pay, land-duty allowance, sea pay, aircrew allowance)	12.15	14	7.76
18	Negative/poor quality students (e.g., students lack accountability, standard of students decreased)	12.96	15	5.99
19	Lack of motivation to instruct (e.g., office politics, always teaching same course)	12.98	14	4.91
20	School seen as place for personnel experiencing challenges (i.e., ill, injured, no career prospects)	14.43	17	6.98
21	Lack of Instructor feedback	15.35	17	4.68

### 3.2.3 Summary of CA Results

Overall, many of the issues raised by the FGs were echoed in the larger sample of Instructors who completed the survey, and in turn, a small number of these issues predicted job satisfaction. Explicitly, issues pertaining to Supervision, Recognition, Selection, and Work Environment were key with respect to predicting overall job satisfaction. The factors that increased job satisfaction for Instructors were not the same as the factors that reduced job satisfaction for Instructors. Often the highest dissatisfiers (e.g., lack

of personnel resources, training resources, time for PD, or course development) directly impacted Instructors' ability to focus on teaching, which was the overall highest source of job satisfaction.

We now turn our attention towards the study of motivation in UK Trainers.

## 4 UK Defence Trainer Capability Study

---

As mentioned, the UK Defence Trainer Capability study commenced with a survey (quantitative data; Steele et al., 2016a) and then followed up on survey results with FGs (qualitative data; Steele et al., 2016b).

### 4.1 UK Phase 1

#### 4.1.1 Methodology

In Phase 1, the intent was to first capture a snapshot through a quantitative measure of the current situation across defence in terms of awareness of the trainer roles, and to identify some of the motivating factors and challenges associated with the roles (Steele et al., 2016a). Quantitative data were collected using a survey of Trainers, representatives of the Trainer role (e.g., those who trained Trainers), and those who may volunteer to be Trainers in the future (Potential Trainers) to understand what motivates Trainers. Findings from the quantitative stage formed the basis for Phase 2, namely the FGs and interviews, to collect more detailed qualitative data (Steele et al., 2016a). For greater detail regarding the methodology, analyses, or results, please refer to Steele et al. (2016a, 2016b).

##### 4.1.1.1 Participants

A total of 355 Trainers ( $n = 292$ ; 82%) from all three services and Potential Trainers ( $n = 63$ ; 18%) completed the survey in September/October 2015 (Steele et al., 2016a). This sample represents only a small portion of the 5,000 Trainers (a 7% response rate). Most participants were from the Regular service ( $n = 333$ ; 94%). All three services were well represented: Army ( $n = 132$ ; 37%), Royal Navy (RN;  $n = 141$ ; 40%), and Royal Air Force (RAF;  $n = 82$ ; 23%).

##### 4.1.1.2 Instrument

There were three sections to the Motivational Questionnaire:

1. Demographics;
2. Awareness of the Trainer role; and
3. Motivation Assessment.

The awareness of aspects of the Trainer role was included in order to measure knowledge about the Defence training posts in relation to:

- a. Expectations of the role;
- b. Time commitment required;
- c. Working environment;
- d. Skills needed for the role;
- e. Personal development opportunities;
- f. Opportunities for career progression as a Trainer; and
- g. Financial or other incentives for being a Trainer.

Combined, each of these aspects provide a picture of what to expect within a Trainer role, thus can be used building an RJP (e.g., Cronshaw, Wiesner, Hackett, & Methot, 1997). Each aspect was also either identified as a motivating factor in previous research in its own right or when combined with another. Participants were asked to rate their level of awareness on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*not at all aware*) to 5 (*very aware*).

The Motivation Assessment contained 22 items designed to measure the extent to which participants were motivated or demotivated towards being in a Trainer role. Those in training roles were all asked to rate each item by expressing their point of view based on their experience. Potential Trainers were shown the same items but were asked to rate each item based purely on their opinion of the extent to which they would be motivated to become a Trainer. Participants were asked to rate their level of awareness on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*greatly reduces my motivation to be a Trainer*) to 5 (*greatly increases my motivation to be a Trainer*). The motivating aspects which were assessed were:

- a. Receiving information about training roles: prior to employment;
- b. Expectations of the Trainer role;
- c. Helping others develop and learn;
- d. Feeling valued for Trainer skills;
- e. Recognition of the work those in Trainer roles put in;
- f. Feedback received from superiors and trainees;
- g. Fixed term appointment and length of tour in a Trainer role;
- h. Previous experience of receiving training by a perceived *good Trainer*;
- i. Personal development opportunities;
- j. Career progression within Trainer roles;
- k. Being out of trade and maintaining trade skills whilst in a training post and recognition of Trainer skills on return to a trade role;
- l. The length of the working day and working week in Trainer roles;
- m. Work-life balance;
- n. Location of work; and
- o. Resources available to those in Trainer roles.

#### **4.1.2 Results**

Examination of the final response rate and associated data confirmed that sample sizes were not sufficient to use statistical analysis as originally planned; rank-orders and percentages are presented instead (Steele et al., 2016a). The awareness of the Trainer role findings identified that:

1. Aspects of the Trainer role where there is greatest awareness are largely associated with job context, such that 70% were *very aware* of the Trainer working environment, 68% were *moderately to very aware* of the time commitment required, 72% were *moderately to very aware* of tasks and responsibilities of a Trainer, and 80% were *moderately to very aware* of the relevant skills of a Trainer.

2. However, given that more than 10% of respondents felt they lacked a good understanding of time commitment and tasks/responsibilities of a Trainer, and given the mismatch between expectation and reality reflected in the free text comment above, this area was taken forward for further investigation in the qualitative stage of research.
3. Compared to awareness of job context there was a lower level of awareness of the benefits of being a Trainer. For example, 54% were *somewhat to moderately aware* of opportunities for career progression as a Trainer, 39% were *moderately aware* of the personal development opportunities, and 50% of the overall sample reported that they were *not at all aware* of financial and other incentives associated with Trainer roles.
4. Fifty-two percent of the total sample, irrespective of Service or Trainer type, reported that getting information about the Trainer role would tend to *increase* or *greatly increase* their motivation to be a Trainer. Additionally, just under half (43%) reported that *it depends* (i.e., getting information about the role could increase or decrease motivation). This was considered an area that required further exploration in the qualitative stage.

The results for the Motivational Questionnaire are presented in (Table 6), where the rank-orders are provided for each of the 22 motivating factors for those employed as Trainers and the Potential Trainers. Four of the top five motivators were similar between the two groups (shaded in grey in Table 6). However, those employed as Trainers tended to be motivated by intrinsic factors more so than those who had not yet worked in the role. This information could be exploited as a marketing tool to attract Potential Trainers (Steele et al., 2016a).

**Table 6:** Table of Motivators and Demotivators (Steele et al., 2016a).

Motivating Factor	Potential Trainers	Trainers
Helping others develop and learn	1	1
Feeling valued for my trainer skills	3	2
Being recognised for the work I put in	2	3
Receiving feedback from my trainees	5	4
Having the opportunity to develop my skills as a Trainer	8	5
Receiving feedback on my performance from my superiors	6	6
Having been trained by good Trainers in the past	9	7
The location of my work	11	8
Knowing what is expected of me personally as a Trainer	7	9
Having a good balance between my work and personal life	4	13
Getting recognition of my trainer skills when I return to my trade role	10	10
Being able to progress in a career as a Trainer	20	11
Knowing what to expect of the Trainer role	13	12
Being given the opportunity to continue in a Trainer post beyond tour length	17	14
The resources available to me as a Trainer	12	15
Getting information about the training role	15	16

Motivating Factor	Potential Trainers	Trainers
The length of my tour as a Trainer	16	17
Knowing that I'll only be a Trainer for a fixed amount of time	14	18
The length of my working week	19	20
The length of my working day	18	21
Being out of trade while in a Trainer role	22	19
Being expected to keep my trade skills up to date while being in a Trainer role	21	22

Each motivating factor was examined more closely to gather rich qualitative data using a combination of interviews (line managers, trainers of trainers) and FGs (Trainers) in Phase 2.

## 4.2 UK Phase 2

### 4.2.1 Methodology

A total of 28 two-hour FGs were conducted with Trainers across all services and phases of training (refer to Steele et al., 2016b for more details). The aim of this stage of the research was to further explore the motivating factors and barriers to Trainer, identify ways in which to make the role more attractive to prospective Trainers, and gain an understanding of how information about Trainer posts is currently communicated to provide an RJP (Steele et al., 2016b). FGs were structured using a series of open-ended questions to ensure standardization.

In addition, nine supervisors and managers of Trainers were also interviewed individually. This allowed the researchers to draw on the ideas suggested by Trainers for attracting candidates, exploring their feasibility in greater depth with more experienced respondents and thus increasing the viability of final recommendations for attract strategies. Although the focus for this paper was on Trainers, both groups are included herein as some data was only presented merged across both groups (Steele et al., 2016b).

Qualitative data was analysed using a six-step thematic analysis developed by (Braun & Clark, 2006). This method identifies and analyzes patterns within qualitative data by specifying areas which appeared to be pertinent for further exploration. Given that the qualitative questions from Phases 1 and 2 were identical, data from both phases were amalgamated and are presented below.

#### 4.2.1.1 Participants

Data on FG participants was not collected at an individual level, so instead is presented based on the FGs. Most of the FG were conducted with Regular service members ( $n = 17$ ; 61%). The FGs were not conducted equally across the services: Army ( $n = 12$ ; 43%), RN ( $n = 7$ ; 25%), and RAF ( $n = 9$ ; 32%).

### 4.2.2 Results

Results are presented in two parts: (1) awareness of the Trainer role, and (2) motivational factors (that might *motivate* individuals to volunteer for the role; parts of this results section were taken in part or whole from Steele et al., 2016b).



#### **4.2.2.1 Awareness of the Trainer Role**

A total of three themes were found related to Trainers' awareness of the role: (1) communicating the information about the Trainer role, (2) awareness of the benefits of being a Trainer, and (3) matching expectations with reality.

##### **4.2.2.1.1 Communicating Information about the Trainer Role**

It was identified that formal processes were followed across all Services in terms of providing joining instructions, and terms of reference to individuals prior to commencing in post. Generally, formal information provided about the training roles comprised basic joining instructions (e.g., where to go and who to report to, as well as any prerequisite qualifications required). Some also had access to relevant policy documentation, and in some cases were provided with a handbook of some kind as a guide, but this differed across the Services.

It was apparent that the majority of pre-employment information was obtained by taking the initiative to make contact and ask questions. It was suggested by one FG attendee that those individuals who were less motivated to become Trainers were less likely to actively seek out additional information.

*Some do not choose to be a Trainer and therefore do not seek any information. If the individual does not volunteer for the role they are unlikely to have tried to find information about it, it 'just lands in their lap'. (Army Phase 1 Trainer).*

There was evidence that a certain amount of awareness of the nature of Trainer posts came from having previously attended training at the TE.

*I think the biggest inspiration to be a Trainer comes from your experience of being trained. (RN Regular Line Manager).*

It was apparent from the FG data that a core method of communicating information regarding Trainer posts was through *word of mouth*. Information about a role gathered from someone who the prospective Trainer knew was considered more trustworthy than other more official sources, such as formal briefings by superiors, and therefore, more valued:

*I knew someone who was here, had a chat. Told me the truth about the hours and said it was rewarding. Gave me a friend view on it. (Regular RAF Phase 1 Trainer).*

##### **4.2.2.1.2 Awareness of the Benefits Associated with Being a Trainer**

It was found that perceptions of impact on career progression varied dependent on career stage. Trainer roles were viewed as more beneficial at an earlier stage of a career, but could disadvantage a more experienced individual at promotion boards who would not be able to demonstrate currency and competence to perform at a higher grade in their trade.

In the FGs, the only financial reward that Trainers were aware of was funding towards courses and personal development. They were asked to comment on whether there were any additional financial incentives that would help to attract more individuals to volunteer for Trainer roles.

There was a general view that fixed financial incentives would attract individuals to volunteer for the wrong reasons; many Trainers and line managers held strong views that individuals should want to do the job for intrinsic rather than extrinsic reward.

#### **4.2.2.1.3 Matching Expectation with Reality**

In the qualitative free text data from the survey (Phase 1), there was some indication of discrepancies between individuals' expectations and the reality of the job (Steele et al, 2016a). For example, comments from the RN perspective specifically referred to working long hours and having less time at home with the family, which was at odds with initial expectations that a shore-based job would lead to increased time with their family. These comments were echoed in Phase 2.

*Didn't realise how busy the role would be. There is a lot more expected of Trainers here in terms of responsibility.* (Regular Army Phase 1 Trainers)

*Harmony time with increased family time turned out not to be the case due to long hours, weekend working and other duties.* (Regular RN Phase 2 Trainer)

It is important to note that, in some cases, Trainers reported that their expectations had been exceeded. For example, one RN FG unanimously agreed that once they had realized their own potential, they thoroughly enjoyed the experience.

#### **4.2.2.2 Motivational Factors**

Findings on the factors which affect motivation to enter into Trainer roles were categorized into six themes: (1) *helping others learn and develop, lack of time*, (2) *feeling valued for Trainer skills*, (3) *lack of value placed on training*, (4) *being recognized for the work done*, (5) *receiving feedback from trainees*, and (6) *developmental opportunities*. These results may contain information from both Phase 1 and Phase 2, where applicable.

Both Trainers and Potential Trainers indicated helping others develop and learn as the highest motivating factor for training posts. They also indicated that being recognized for the work put in and feeling valued for their Trainer skills were the next strongest motivational factors. Potential Trainers then placed having a good balance between work and personal life as a stronger motivating factor than did Trainers (and in fact this was a stronger motivator for them than for participants in any other job role [e.g., supervisors of Trainers]), indicating that work-life balance would be a strong consideration when deciding whether to volunteer for a Trainer role.

Feedback was found to be important to both groups, who reported receiving feedback from *my trainees* as a stronger motivating factor than feedback on their personal performance from superiors, although this was placed in sixth position by both groups. Potential Trainers displayed lower mean scores than Trainers for their top five motivating factors. This could be interpreted as having less awareness of intrinsic rewards than those who have had prior experience in a training role, resulting in lower levels of motivation. It could, however, also be interpreted that respondents who rated intrinsic rewards at a lower point on the scale may not be motivated by these types of rewards and, therefore, would be less inclined to volunteer for a Trainer role.

#### 4.2.2.2.1 Helping Other Learn to Develop

Evidence was seen that helping others to learn and develop was an important motivating factor. For example, in Army Phase 1 Trainer FGs, it was suggested that there was an intrinsic reward in seeing trainees develop and succeed (e.g., graduation ceremonies, which acted as a direct incentive for individuals to enter into the post). Intrinsic reward was also associated with having an influence on trainees whose capbadge was the same as their own who may be working alongside them in the future.

*Training the future generation of officers would be rewarding.* (Regular Army Phase 1 Trainer).

*Seeing them [trainees] pass out. Job satisfaction from that is amazing.* (Regular RAF Phase 1 Trainer).

#### 4.2.2.2.2 Lack of Time

Lack of time was raised as an issue across all Services. Specifically, this refers to the fact that training schedules were described as very full, making it difficult to support trainees who were struggling. This lack of time to fully support students could be seen as a demotivator and as a barrier towards realizing the full potential of other related intrinsic rewards. For instance, having a lack of time could negatively impact intrinsic factors related to helping others learn and develop—without time to do so, the motivational desire to help students learn and develop would be unfulfilled.

#### 4.2.2.2.3 Feeling Valued for Trainer Skills

Whilst the majority of respondents to the questionnaire (Phase 1) had identified feeling valued for their Trainer skills as a motivating factor, it is interesting to note that few Potential Trainer and Trainer respondents in Phase 2 reported that this motivating factor tended to *reduce* or *greatly reduce* motivation to be a Trainer. This suggested a perception among some respondents that Trainer skills were not valued in their organization.

In the RN FGs particularly, it was apparent that Trainers wanted to feel valued by the organization, and when this was openly seen in peers, superiors, and trainees, it acted as a strong motivating factor for the role. In an RN Phase 2 FG, individuals reported that they did feel valued as Trainers and highlighted that they felt that their opinions mattered more in the Trainer role than in comparison to their role on a ship. The group was made up of Leading Hands and Petty Officers who reported they felt well respected as Trainers and were given more responsibility.

Generally, individuals appeared to feel valued by their trainees, but less so by their superiors or the organization as a whole:

*So many skills are gained but the wider Army don't recognise it. ... Seen as high standard, well trained in some units but in others not valued at all.* (Regular Army Phase 1 Trainer)

#### 4.2.2.2.4 Lack of Value Placed on Training

Other Trainers raised issues with the lack of resources and facilities, which they believed reflected the lack of value placed on training by the organization. The paucity of the selection process for Trainers was also identified as a factor that took value away from the role due to a lack of exclusivity. That is, most

Trainers across the Services were aware that it would be very unlikely that any individual would not be recommended for a training post on their Soldier Joint Appraisal Record. In simpler terms, every member is recommended, ergo it is not perceived as a honour or a distinction of high performance.

*[Soldier Joint Appraisal Record] means that there is a tick in the box, but there is no value in it.*  
(RN Regular Phase 2 Trainer)

#### **4.2.2.2.5 Being Recognized for the Work Done**

Findings indicate that there is a perception of lack of value and recognition for the work Trainers do. If passed on through word of mouth, this could potentially act as a disincentive for prospective Trainers. For the most part, Trainers across the Services reported the need for some sort of recognition of the work they put in, especially in association with the hours they work. Line managers agreed with this; some noted they were often surprised at how much hard work was put in by Trainers even though they were undervalued by the organization:

*The recognition for these people. The work that people do here, the contribution to the future of the air force, it's taken for granted.* (RAF Regular Phase 2 Trainer)

#### **4.2.2.2.6 Receiving Feedback from Trainees**

Overall, the feedback process appeared to be encouraged within training, especially in relation to trainee feedback. Some Trainers described trainee feedback as being encouraged at the end of term, but highlighted that completely honest feedback may not be provided as trainees may not feel confident to do this.

Not all Trainers had access to feedback. Some RN Trainers observed that although trainees provide feedback online after a course, this is rarely made available to Trainers delivering the training. This was viewed as a problem with internal communication. Trainers spoke about the positive effects of receiving such feedback and suggested that it is valuable even if not always positive, and that the process helps to build and strengthen the Trainer-trainee relationship:

*Being in the training environment is very rewarding especially when on the receiving end of some good feedback from trainees...* (Regular Army Trainer)

#### **4.2.2.2.7 Having the Opportunity to Develop Skills as a Trainer**

Discussions around PD in the FGs generally indicated that there were key issues relating to preparation for the role. It was highlighted that some Trainers were delivering training without being trained in the subject themselves; preparation took the form of watching other Trainers delivering the course material. This was viewed as having a negative impact on the new Trainer, who would not feel adequately prepared or confident in delivering the content or in dealing with trainee questions. Difficulties and conflicting schedules in terms of access to relevant instructional courses meant that many Trainers across Defence were being taken on risk (i.e., the TE assumed the risk of employing them without adequate instructional training), under supervision, whilst awaiting access to training. It was also thought that posts were not long enough to make a difference in terms of actioning changes for continuous improvement.

Once in post, opportunities to develop skills further differed across the TEs. Phase 1 Regular Defence Trainers described opportunities to gain leadership skills, which were seen as very important, while others had access to courses for personal development as part of their role.

The Defence Train-the-Trainer Version 2 course was regarded very positively across all of the FGs and highlighted as a possible motivating factor for potential Trainers. However, it was felt that the benefits of this course could be advertised more. Trainers generally recognized the value of the training they received and how it would benefit the trainees. Furthermore, many Trainers were very pleased with the opportunities provided to them to obtain widely recognized qualifications associated with training which also enhanced their role. Achieving a Level 5 qualification in Coaching and Mentoring, for example, was seen as useful; it was suggested that advertising this to prospective Trainers could act as a motivating factor.

Trainers highlighted that, although there were good opportunities for personal development offered to them, time constraints were a barrier to pursuing them. Line managers across the Services agreed that time should be available for continuous PD, but accepted that time was often limited. It was suggested that time could be made available between courses and that line managers should make every effort to support personal development that added value to the role.

*Some take advantage of these [opportunities] but it is difficult because the intensity of [the course] does not always allow the Trainer the time. Funding is available and personal development is encouraged, but practically this wouldn't usually be implemented due to time constraints. (Regular Army Phase 1 Trainer).*

### **4.3 Summary of UK Results**

Overall, many of the main motivating factors for becoming a Defence Trainer could be classified as intrinsic rewards. Successfully developing others was the greatest motivator, followed by recognition of effort and expertise both from trainees and the organization. Trainee feedback was perceived to be a positive aspect of the job role, but there was less evidence that Trainers were receiving recognition for their efforts and expertise from the chain of command or the organization as a whole. Opportunities to develop Trainer skills were considered a strong motivating factor, but this was constrained by the lack of availability of courses (e.g., Defence Train-the-Trainer Version 2), and a lack of time and support for continuous PD.

Moderately motivating factors were largely linked to job context and career progression. Work-life balance was identified as not meeting expectations, particularly for the RN, and work locations were identified as both a motivating factor and a disincentive dependent on the TE. Career progression as a motivating factor was largely constrained by perceptions that the Trainer role was not valued by the organization and would not support promotional prospects. This, in turn, was presenting a barrier to talent management as individuals were being discouraged from volunteering for Trainer roles. The importance of the Trainer as a role model and inspiration for potential Trainers was highlighted.

The least motivating factors for Trainers were linked to work-life balance and career, suggesting that they are acting as hygiene factors rather than motivators. There was a general acceptance that the job role would involve long working hours. Key concerns revolved around the inability to maintain currency and competence in the trade while serving in a Trainer role; this made the role less attractive and was

impacting on talent management as it meant some individuals were reluctant to extend in post or volunteer for second tours.

## **5 Summary and Discussion**

---

Despite the differences in theoretical basis and methodologies, there were several similarities regarding the factors influencing Instructors/Trainers. After a comparison of these factors, interventions to address them will be provided.

### **5.1 Summary and Comparison of Satisfiers/Motivators**

A conceptual comparison by nations was conducted based on the seven workplace satisfaction factors identified by CA. From the UK, only Trainers were included in this comparison (i.e., Potential Trainers were removed), where possible. Greatest attention will be paid where the various different findings between the two nations triangulate on a singular result. This was done because a result can be assumed to be a key issue worthy of attention if it can be corroborated by a disparate methodology, in a different nation.

#### **5.1.1 Preparedness**

CA Instructors reported they were qualified to instruct, but were less satisfied with being thrust into the role (e.g., indoctrination requested prior to teaching their first course). They also reported lower levels of satisfaction with the time they have to prepare for classes. Both CA Instructors and UK Trainers reported a lack of adequate preparation for this role (e.g., no formal training, lack of access to incremental, higher-level instructional courses). Within both nations, Instructors/Trainers indicated that PD resources were not equitably available and challenging to obtain due to TE high tempo.

Most Instructors/Trainers were not aware of the additional programs available to contribute to their PD as Instructors (e.g., in CA the civilian college certificate program; in the UK the career progression, PD, financial, and other incentives).

When considering the awareness of the Instructor/Trainer roles, the UK research conducted a fulsome investigation of the aspects of the role that Trainers had possessed. Although most UK Trainers had realistic expectations about the Trainer work environment, time commitment, and tasks, a substantial portion of participants were surprised when faced with higher-than-expected time commitments. Potential Trainers' responses highlighted those areas of knowledge that were lacking (e.g., good work/life balance, positive aspects of helping others develop, PD opportunities), which could be addressed in an RJP. Often, the information obtained about the Trainer role was gained by individuals who took the initiative to obtain it prior to being posted into the role, and via word of mouth. However, this approach neither provides consistent nor necessarily accurate information. Although all UK TEs provided joining instructions, these provided little if any insight into the role, however, a few provided training policies and guidance handbooks.

#### **5.1.2 Recognition**

There were low levels of satisfaction with the amount of recognition CA Instructors received for doing their job. However, there was some agreement that the job provided satisfactory levels of recognition and many, but not all Instructors, reported that more formal recognition programs are needed. Conversely, UK Trainers reported that recognition for their work as Trainers contributed greatly to their motivation

(e.g., motivating factors in top five), although not all Trainers perceived that they were valued. Further, the need for increased recognition was advocated by UK Trainers, especially regarding the hard work and long hours put in, coupled with a lack of appreciation. Some UK Trainers noted the source of feeling valued was more so from the trainees than from superiors.

### **5.1.3 Resources**

Overall, Instructors/Trainers were not highly satisfied with and/or motivated by the amount of resources and support they received. Both noted a lack of resources at their disposal (e.g., too few Instructors/Trainers and support staff, facilities), and lamented that the time allocated for PD was nonexistent. As a result, Instructors/Trainers questioned the value placed on training by the organization.

### **5.1.4 Selection**

Although few CA Instructors underwent any form of selection process, most endorsed the requirement to have a formal selection process to ensure a high calibre of Instructors. Similarly, UK Trainers thought the selection process should create a sense of exclusivity for the role. Again, some Instructors/Trainers advocated for an increase in the standard duration of a posting as an Instructor (e.g., to hone skills, to ensure continuous improvement).

Regarding the perception of negative career implications associated with employment at a TE, CA Instructors during Phase 2 (in contrast to Phase 1) did not perceive this, while UK Trainers did. Among participants, more than half of CA Instructors and approximately three quarters of UK Trainers had requested to be posted to the TE, which does not speak to the motivation underlying this request (e.g., a desire to teach, the perceived employment benefits of employment at a TE [e.g., fixed base/shore posting]).

### **5.1.5 Students**

There was agreement between Instructors/Trainers that the most rewarding part of their role was coaching, developing, teaching, and helping students/trainees to learn and succeed (e.g., highest rated satisfiers/motivators). Nonetheless, both Instructors/Trainers had mentioned concern regarding the quality/calibre of students who graduated the training (e.g., feeling forced to pass unqualified students, feeling pressure to produce high quality students). UK Trainers were motivated by the feedback they received from trainees, although some participants indicated that feedback was not always provided or readily accessible. Training future generations was described as rewarding by personnel in both nations.

### **5.1.6 Supervision**

CA Instructors reported only modest levels of satisfaction with the supervision, autonomy, and timeliness of feedback they were receiving; however, there was some disagreement among participants, indicating there are likely TE differences in supervision and/or feedback. UK Trainers indicated that feedback from supervisors was rare, but mentioned little of autonomy or the quality of feedback.

### **5.1.7 Work Environment**

CA Instructors lamented the rigidity and inability to change lesson plans, the additional duties that took limited time away from their primary role of instructing (e.g., administrative duties, secondary duties,



additional taskings, developing lesson plans). Similarly, UK Trainers noted schedules were too full and lacked the white space (i.e., time not committed to duty/teaching) to help struggling students.

Both CA Instructors and UK Trainers had identified a disparity between expectations and reality regarding work hours and obtaining better work/life balance. Both expected a slower pace at a TE, and that being located at a fixed base/shore posting would improve work/life balance compared to being in an operational role. However, many were surprised that the opposite was the case. Some participants from both nations reported working long hours, high levels of stress, and high work tempo, which produced negative work/life balance (e.g., impacting time with their families). Again, some disparity was found among participants, which likely reflects differences between TEs (e.g., staff, resources) and courses (e.g., teaching basic training requires longer hours).

### **5.1.8 Overall Job Satisfaction/Motivation**

Although the UK study did not have a global assessment of motivation, one is left with the impression that Trainers are motivated about their roles, based on the top motivators (e.g., helping others develop and learn, feeling valued for my trainer skills).

Likewise, overall, CA Instructors, despite numerous dissatisfiers having been identified, reported moderately high levels of job satisfaction. The relative comparison of satisfiers revealed that the act of teaching provides a sense of accomplishment to them. Moreover, those workplace factors causing the greatest dissatisfaction were those that distracted and reduced their ability/time to teach and produce qualified students (e.g., lack of resources, feedback, motivated and qualified Instructors, stressful environment).

## **5.2 Theoretical Linkages**

Although not the aim of this report, a brief foray to tie together the theoretical frameworks is prudent. However, it is important to note that the intent is not to advance theories of satisfaction or motivation, per se. Rather the intent is to discuss the theoretical perspectives in light of the results to help clarify how these frameworks can support further research.

Foremost, it is in the opinion of the two nations that both theoretical perspectives have merit. Often confounded, satisfaction and motivation are both valid approaches towards studying Instructor/Trainer issues. Critically, many of the intrinsic and extrinsic factors found to influence motivation are highly related to the workplace factors identified by using the satisfaction perspective. Indeed, when examining the comparison from the perspective of workplace satisfaction factors, the motivational issues found by the UK studies dovetailed nicely. Much of what was found to motivate or demotivate UK Trainers was also found to be factors of satisfaction or dissatisfaction for CA Instructors.

The results showed that feeling prepared, being recognized for the job one is doing, being given adequate resources, feeling that the job is influential and looked upon favourably, having a sense that one's work is having an impact on students, that supervisors appreciate and value one's contribution, and having sufficient leeway to do the job as one sees necessary, were important aspects of both satisfaction and motivation. Indeed, many of the workplace satisfaction factors could be classified as either intrinsic or extrinsic factors and are each thought to either directly or indirectly impact performance.

According to the job satisfaction framework, Instructor/Trainer job satisfaction is considered an important component of any model of effective instruction because of its direct impact on teaching effectiveness and performance (Cranton & Knoop, 1991; Judge et al., 2001). From this perspective, attitudes regarding various workplace factors impact performance directly, or via one's motivation to exert effort and perform. As a result, it stands to reason that addressing negative workplace factors such as a feeling one is not prepared or valued for one's work, can impact satisfaction, and in turn, increase teaching effectiveness.

Similarly, motivation can greatly impact performance vis-à-vis motivated goal-orientation. From this perspective, a perceived discrepancy between one's desired and current state results in a feeling or attitude (i.e., dissatisfaction) towards one's job, which in turn results in poor performance. Again, addressing issues such as formalizing selection to create a sense of exclusivity in the role would motivate individuals, which, in turn, would result in increased performance.

Consequently, one is left to wonder the exact nature of the relationships. Does satisfaction impact performance directly or indirectly, and what is the role of motivation? Is motivation a precipitating factor or a mechanism? Further research is needed to elucidate the causal nature of the satisfaction-motivation-performance relationships.

### **5.3 Limitations**

As with any studies, there are limitations. At the forefront, this report details two separate, distinct studies with differences in all major areas (e.g., theory, methodology). As such, several conceptual leaps were made with respect to the theory, but attempts were made to limit these differences by drawing parallels between satisfaction and motivation theories. However, as discussed, there are theoretical parallels that can be drawn between the two frameworks. Thus, the complementary nature of the theories can be argued as a strength, not as a limitation.

Along the same lines, one could argue that other limitations include the inability to test which of the two theoretical frameworks, satisfaction or motivation, is predominant, or that the links to the academic discourse on satisfaction/ motivation is weak. However, these criticisms are flaccid given the aim of the report was not to test a theoretical model contrasting the two perspectives. Instead, the aim was to triangulate recommendations that could augment Instructor/Trainer performance.

Further, the methods used to collect the data differed between the two studies (e.g., distinct focus group approaches, different surveys), making the conclusions drawn from these studies theoretical, at best. As such, any similarities or differences between both studies could most easily be ascribed to methodological differences (i.e., not based on attitudinal differences and/or similarities).

Another limitation of the study was the degree of representativeness of study samples due to the voluntary nature of the surveys and focus groups. As such, these results may not represent the target population due to participation rates. However, much was done to ensure representativeness of the samples in both nations: CA found their response rates and participants to be representative of the distribution of the CAF (Rounding et al., 2018), and the UK abandoned quantitative analyses given the questionable representativeness of their sample.

Common method variance bias is another potential limitation, which refers to mindless responding by participants to surveys that vary little in their method of asking questions. In defence of this criticism, the

CA Phase 2 survey required participants to continually shift mindsets between different Likert-type scales, dichotomous response choices, and open-ended questions—those who did not demonstrate the ability to shift mindsets were removed.<sup>7</sup> The UK Phase 2 survey was short, requiring little mindset differentiation. Overall, this is not deemed a large concern to this particular report, given that the triangulation of the overall or general pattern of results is key, not specifics of the individualized data.

Another limitation is that performance is an assumed outcome of both job satisfaction and motivation. That is, the intent of this TTCP report is to provide recommendations that will augment Instructor/Trainer satisfaction and/or motivation, in hopes that improved satisfaction/motivation will ultimately result in improved military training effectiveness. Neither nation actually measured or attempted to quantify Instructor/Trainer performance or effectiveness. Critically, the inference that improved satisfaction or augmented motivation will result in improved performance or augmented effectiveness is solely based on the burgeoning literature explicating the relationship between satisfaction and motivation, with performance and effectiveness.

In retrospect, an argument could be made that a measure of performance or effectiveness should have been included in these two nation's studies. However, in their defence, the outcome (i.e., performance) was not the intent of either the CA or UK studies. In fact, both sought to simply improve various aspects of the Instructor/Trainer role; the CA study from the perspective of improving satisfaction with the role, and the UK study from the perspective of increasing volunteers to the role. Furthermore, given the expansive literature linking satisfaction/motivation to performance, it is not a large leap to suggest that improved satisfaction or augmented motivation will result in improved military training effectiveness.

Lastly, the results from both nations are simply the aggregated perception of the 29% (CA) and 7% (UK) of Instructors/Trainers who responded to the survey. That is, these results are not touted as definitive. There are two ways of looking at these results. First, if one assumes that potential Instructors/Trainers have a different perception of the role (i.e., those entering the position as an Instructor/Trainer are naïve to the work environment), as the UK data clearly present, then the recommendations herein are simply ways to improve job satisfaction. Contrarily, if we assume that current Instructors/Trainers speak negatively to their peers regarding Instructor/Trainer positions (i.e., others are warned to not choose to volunteer for Instructor/Trainer positions because of a negative work environment), then altering these perceptions, either directly by refuting incorrect perceptions or indirectly by improving the work environment, would be advantageous.

---

<sup>7</sup> Several random responding checks were included to ensure shifting mindsets. Those participants failing these checks were removed from the analyses.

## 6 Recommendations

---

This section presents possible interventions that could enhance Instructors'/Trainers' job satisfaction and motivation, as well as specific recommendations for organizational actors.

### 6.1 Interventions

Below are recommended interventions that could be utilized to augment Instructors'/Trainers' job satisfaction and motivation. These interventions have been categorized based on when they ought to occur. In several cases, the interventions are interrelated as they will influence other interventions (e.g., increasing the prestige of teaching can happen during attraction and while in the role). They are presented in temporal sequence: before employment as an Instructor/Training, while employed as an Instructor/Training, and employment post-Instructor/Training.

#### 6.1.1 Before Employment

There are numerous interventions that can be taken to ensure that motivated, well informed, and skilful applicants apply for the positions. These include: (a) information-based attraction; (b) scientifically-based, rigorous selection procedures; and (c) training of instructional skills.

##### 6.1.1.1 Information-Based Attraction

Recruiting literature stresses the importance of taking the time and effort to have attraction campaigns to ensure the highest calibre of applicants (Barber, 1998). Steele and colleagues (2016b) highlighted the need for both parties—Trainers and employers—to know “what they can mutually expect from each other” (p. 16) based on the psychological contract between the two (Guest & Conway, 2002). There are several ways to achieve this objective:

###### 6.1.1.1.1 Instructor/Trainer Role Information

Research herein shows some disparity between what Instructors/Trainers knew about the role prior to being employed in it (e.g., better work/life balance, no more long hours). Providing detailed information about the Instructor/Training role in question would assist military members with making a choice to volunteer or accept a posting to a TE. Many of the details contained herein highlight the information needed.

###### 6.1.1.1.2 Benefits of Instructor/Trainer Employment

Many currently serving Instructors/Training were unaware of education/PD opportunities, incentives, and benefits available to them (e.g., waivers for a civilian college certificate). Further, the CAF is considering ways to reward Instructors for their service and skills (i.e., Instructor Recognition Program), and create a more positive culture towards training. Although military salaries are traditionally inflexible in militaries, additional pay benefits could be considered to compensate for longer-than-normal work days/periods away from family (e.g., field/sea/airfield duty pay).

#### 6.1.1.1.3 Realistic Job Preview

An RJP is one way to deliver balanced, realistic information about a job to applicants (Evans, 1997). RJP are provided to ensure that applicants are aware of the good, the bad, and the ugly related to a position. Research has shown that applicants whose job expectations are met, report higher job satisfaction and lower turnover intentions (Evans, 1997). The following are things to consider regarding RJP:

1. **Content.** The content of an RJP is important (Catano, Cronshaw, Wiesner, Hackett, & Methot, 1997). RJP could be designed for Instructors/Trainers based on the information provided herein. The following topics could be elucidated upon: (a) work tempo, such as high incidence of *burnout*, demands of work on private life, or quality of life (e.g., hours of work per day, weekends free, no shift work); (b) work environment, such as lots of pressure and competition, better conditions of service, professional development, incentive programs, career impact (both good and bad; e.g., promotion benefits); and (c) the rewards associated with teaching, coaching, and helping younger members/the next generation learn and achieve high standards (intrinsic motivators). In addition to providing realistic job preview information, incoming Instructors/Trainers could also be provided with additional information about training (e.g., policies) and the role (e.g., guidance handbooks); and
2. **Communication medium.** While RJP can take a variety of forms, they need not be costly or resource intensive. The medium used to provide applicants with an RJP can vary from simple (e.g., recruiting poster, online descriptions, information pamphlet) to complex and in-depth (e.g., recruiting video, incumbent recruiters, direct exposure via visits to TEs, peer reference sources, as part of the selection process [e.g., interview process, assessment centre]; Catano et al., 1997). Resources will likely dictate how the RJP information will reach applicants, but it is crucial that the information be provided, even in its simplest form.

#### 6.1.1.1.4 Self-Selection

Developing standardized, comprehensive, and balanced information about the Instructor/Trainer roles will ensure applicants are receiving consistent, accurate messages from trustworthy, official sources instead of via word-of-mouth, which does not necessarily provide accurate information. Ideally, applicants ill-suited for the Instructor/Trainer role will self-select out of the role once provided with this balanced, realistic information (Catano et al., 1997). This is beneficial for any organization, as it often saves the time and resources associated with dissatisfied or poor performing individuals having been placed incorrectly in roles; conversely, those who self-select and have their expectations met have reported reduced turnover intentions, and higher job satisfaction and commitment (Catano et al., 1997).

#### 6.1.1.2 Selection

Both nations recognize selection as a legitimate need for Instructors/Trainers, as evidenced by both nations completing a job analysis for the role in order to develop rigorous selection processes to ensure that the appropriate members are employed in these roles (CA: Tanguay & Darr, 2011; UK: Mundy et al., 2014, and Steele et al., 2016a). Based on the job analysis results, numerous processes and methods were recommended by each nation for improving, developing, and implementing Instructor/Trainer selection systems that are designed to select applicants who not only possess the appropriate knowledge, skills, abilities, and other attributes (KSAOs), competencies, and experiences, but also the motivation to be effective Instructors/Trainers.

At a minimum, military members being considered for employment as an Instructor/Trainer should have a voice in the decision, until such time as a posting into an Instructor role is not perceived to negatively affect promotion or long-term career goals. For example, within the UK, following the research reported herein, the performance appraisal policy was updated to include evidence-based guides for Trainer characteristics to facilitate the identification of those best suited for the role (e.g., volunteering for the position).

In terms of creating a culture of respect for the Instructor/Trainer role, a rigorous selection system has the potential to contribute to this new culture. Applicants who perceive the selection process as fair, representative of the job, and competitive are more likely to recommend others to apply (Barber, 1998).

### **6.1.1.3 Pre-employment Training**

Structured PD plans should be available for all Instructors/Trainers that commences with initial, mandatory beginner instructional training, some period of indoctrination, followed by close coaching and feedback, and continues throughout the duration of employment in the role to ensure highly trained and effective Instructors/Trainers.

Combined, these three types of interventions cover off the workplace satisfaction factors of Preparedness and Selection.

## **6.1.2 During Employment**

Interventions to improve the following areas would have positive benefits on motivation, job satisfaction, and Instructor efficacy, which in turn, will have indirect positive effects on perceptions of the role. The interventions have been categorized using five workplace satisfaction factors.

### **6.1.2.1 Recognition**

The following interventions are suggested to improve the recognition that Instructors/Trainers receive while employed in this role:

1. Formal rewards and recognition programs, such as:
  - a. Recognition utilizing badges based on experience and expertise as an Instructor/Trainer, as is appropriate;
  - b. Additional performance evaluation points to increase the likelihood of promotion;
  - c. Additional promotional criteria points within occupations to recognize the importance of having been employed and trained as an Instructor to expand one's breath of experience and skills; and
  - d. Making training assignments part of a career path for promotions (i.e., mandatory employment as an Instructor/Trainer);
2. Informal rewards and recognition programs that leave Instructors/Trainers feeling valued (e.g., days off, social gatherings, unit top Instructor/trainer awards); and
3. Providing Instructors/Trainers with feedback gathered from students/trainees, when gathered by the organization.

### **6.1.2.2 Recourses**

As most Instructors/Trainers found the lack of resources to be a source of dissatisfaction/demotivation, the following interventions are proposed:

1. Provide sufficient support to teach (e.g., training aids, administrative support, curriculum materials [e.g., textbooks], current lesson plans);
2. Provide sufficient: (a) support personnel, in order to reduce the amount of time Instructors spend on administrative tasks, thus subsequently increasing Instructors' teaching time; and (b) Instructors to reduce overall workload (e.g., extra duties) and teaching workload; and
3. Provide and plan for ongoing PD to hone instructional skills, motivate Instructors/Trainers, and contribute to promotional opportunities, despite high-tempo workload. Ensure PD opportunities are equitable across TEs/TAs.

### **6.1.2.3 Students**

Although developing students/trainees is a source of satisfaction/motivation for Instructors/Trainers, on the flipside, they can be a source of dissatisfaction. Consideration for the following interventions should be taken:

1. Provide support to Instructors/Trainers on decision regarding student outcomes (e.g., permitting failures, re-training, etc.);
2. Either reduce or explain the rationale to Instructors/Trainers for the degree of pressure to pass unqualified students and/or produce quality students. Alternatively, policies regarding the minimum criteria to pass any course should be firm, fair, and transparent; and
3. Reduce classroom sizes to manageable levels or increase the number of Instructors/Trainers teaching larger courses.

### **6.1.2.4 Supervision**

Ensure adequate, timely, regular, and constructive feedback and coaching to Instructors/Trainers across all TEs/TAs from supervisors and chain of command to motivate and empower them, and to increase perceptions of trust. Further, there should be consistency between policies, programs, and expectations.

### **6.1.2.5 Work Environment**

Numerous changes to the work environment could increase job satisfaction/motivation for Instructors/Trainers, which the following interventions would target:

1. Structured workload to create reasonable work schedules that:
  - a. permit compensatory time off for high tempo periods;
  - b. limit work-life imbalance or work-family conflicts; and
  - c. include additional time to assist struggling students (e.g., white time); and
2. Reduced organizational constraints (e.g., bureaucratic rules, an abundance of administration) and onerous duties (e.g., secondary duties, extra taskings unrelated to Instructor/Trainer role or TE, a plethora of unnecessary administrative duties), in order to increase the time spent on instructing.

### **6.1.3 Post-Employment**

After a posting as an Instructor, the following interventions could ameliorate the prestige of being an Instructor/Trainer and/or satisfaction during employment:

1. Posting to position and/or location of choice;
2. Promotion to next rank, when warranted by merit; and
3. The option to remain and/or return to a more advance/senior Instructor role.

Many of these interventions are based on the requirement for the organization (e.g., TE, TA, element/Service) to take steps to overtly place value on training its members by investing in, supporting, and career managing Instructors/Trainers. The creation and implementation of most of these necessitates a strong senior officer to champion these organizational-level changes.

## **6.2 Recommendations**

There were numerous similar recommendations made by both nations on how to improve the attraction, selection, employment, workplace satisfaction/motivation, and career management of Instructors/Trainers with the ultimate goal of ensuring highly qualified, knowledgeable, and motivated individuals are training our Defence Forces. These recommendations are summarized in terms of the organizational actors required to carry them out.

### **6.2.1 Defence Leaders**

As with any major change, a strong leader is needed to champion and support global organizational change (Gille, 2003). Many steps are needed to have all levels change the philosophy of Instructor/Trainer employment from *employing those who are available* to *employing only the best*. An elevation in status of Instructor/Trainer roles would ensure motivated applicants apply, sufficient resources are available to effectively train and employ Instructors/Trainers, and qualified, highly motivated/satisfied Instructors/Trainers return to higher-level roles within TEs.

### **6.2.2 TEs, TAs, and Stakeholders**

This research on Instructors/Trainers should be shared with TE leaders, TAs, and other stakeholders because it would contribute to a better understanding of the factors positively and negatively influencing Instructors'/Trainers' ability to perform effectively (e.g., white time between courses, sufficient teaching staff, instructional training prior to employment in the role).

### **6.2.3 Instructors/Trainers**

Those currently employed in the Instructor/Trainer roles should be encouraged to be vocal about the pros and cons of the roles to both the chain of command and potential Instructors/Trainers. Their voices would ensure shortfalls regarding resources were known and the benefits/deficits of the Instructor/Trainer roles would be better known, thereby helping applicants to make well-informed decisions.



## **6.3 Conclusion**

Combined these two studies provide insight into how to improve the satisfaction and motivation of military members employed out-of-occupation as Instructors/Trainers. The areas of change include sufficient training, recognition, support, and rewarding of Instructors/Trainers. As the changes extend beyond minor changes (e.g., pre-employment information) to systemic changes (e.g., developing and implementing selection systems), higher-level organizational influence may be required to shift attitudes and perceptions about the Instructor/Trainer roles and employment in them. Ensuring that Instructors/Trainers are motivated about and satisfied with their roles has the potential to improve their performance and permit them to become more effective, efficient, and motivational teachers and role models. As Instructors/Trainers are at the forefront of delivering effective training, they motivate, teach, coach, mentor, and model the future generations into warriors, technicians, and leaders. As a result, the pivotal role they play in ensuring military members continue to be operationally prepared to defend their nations nationally and internationally should be considered by organizational leaders.

## References

---

- Afshar, H. S., & Doosti, M. (2016). Investigating the impact of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction on Iranian English teachers' job performance. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 4(1), 97–115.
- Albert, D., & Levine, D. U. (1988). Teacher satisfaction. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 65(3), 47–58.
- Al-Hussami, M. (2008). A study of nurses' job satisfaction: The relationship to organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, transactional leadership, transformational leadership, and level of education. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 22(2), 286–295.
- Ali, R., & Ahmed, M. S. (2009). The impact of reward and recognition programs on employee's motivation and satisfaction: An empirical study. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5(4), 270–279.
- Arifin, H. M. (2015). The influence of competence, motivation, and organisational culture to high school teacher job satisfaction and performance. *International Education Studies*, 8(1), 38–45.
- Army, U. (2019). *The Army University*. <https://armyu.army.mil/FSDD/Home>
- Aronson, E., & Mills, J. (1959). The effect of severity of initiation on liking for a group. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59(2), 177–181.
- Babin, B. J., & Boles, J. S. (1996). The effects of perceived co-worker involvement and supervisor support on service provider role stress, performance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Retailing*, 72(1), 57–75.
- Barber, A. E. (1998). *Recruiting employees: Individual and organizational perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173–1182.
- Bein, J., Anderson, D. E., & Maes, W. R. (1990). Teacher locus of control and job satisfaction. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 14(3), 7–10.
- Bogler, R. (2001). Teachers' multiple roles and skill flexibility: Effects on work attitudes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 684–708.
- Borgen, F. H., & Lindley, L. D. (2003). Individuality and optimal human functioning: Interests, self-efficacy, and personality. In W. Bruce Walsh (Ed.), *Counseling psychology and optimal human functioning* (pp. 55–92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bradley, K. D., & Loadman, W. E. (2005). Urban secondary educators' views of teacher recruitment and retention. *NASSP Bulletin*, 89(644), 2–28.

- Bright, L. (2007). Does person-organization fit mediate the relationship between public service motivation and the job performance of public employees? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 27(4), 361–379.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77–101.
- Bremner, N., & Budgell, G. (2017). *The 2016 CAF retention survey: Descriptive analysis* (Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis Contract Report DRDC-RDDC-C224). Ottawa, ON: Defence Research and Development Canada.
- Broodryk, M. M. (2014). *Meaning in work within the educational sector* (Doctoral dissertation, North-West University). Retrieved from [http://repository.nwu.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10394/10796/Broodryk\\_M.pdf?sequence=1](http://repository.nwu.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10394/10796/Broodryk_M.pdf?sequence=1)
- Brunetti, G. J. (2001). Why do they teach? A study of job satisfaction among long-term high school teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 28(3) 49–74.
- Camire, J. N. M. P. (2014). *Proposal of an instructor recognition program policy*. Briefing Note for Canadian Defence Academy dated 25 Nov 2014. Borden, ON: Canadian Forces Training and Development Centre.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(6), 473–490.
- Carbone, E. G., & Cigrang, J. A. (2001). Job satisfaction, occupational stress and personality: Characteristics of Air Force military training instructors. *Military Medicine*, 166(9), 800–802.
- Carretta, T. R. (2000). U.S. Air Force pilot selection and training methods. *Aviat Space Environ Med*, 71, 1–14.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1981). *Attention and self-regulation: A control theory approach to human behavior*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
- Catano, V., Cronshaw, S. F., Wiesner, W. H., Hackett, R. D., & Methot, L. L. (1997). *Recruitment and selection in Canada*. Scarborough, ON: International Thomson.
- Chan, S. H. J., & Mai, X. (2015). The relation of career adaptability to satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 89, 130–139.
- Cranton, P., & Knoop, R. (1991). Incorporating job satisfaction into a model of instructional effectiveness. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 48, 99–109.
- Danish, R. Q., & Usman, A. (2010). Impact of reward and recognition on job satisfaction and motivation: An empirical study from Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(2), 159.

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1), 1–44.
- Davar, S. C. & Bala, R. (2012). Relationship between job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48(2), 290–305.
- Driscoll, J. W. (1978). Trust and participation in organizational decision making as predictors of satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 21(1), 44–56.
- Dunham, R. B., & Smith, F. J. (1979). Organizational surveys: An internal assessment of organizational health. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Erceg-Hurn, D. M., & Miroseovich, V. M. (2008). Modern robust statistical methods: an easy way to maximize the accuracy and power of your research. *American Psychologist*, 63(7), 591.
- Evans, L. (1997). Understanding teacher morale and job satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(8), 831–845.
- Faragher, E. B., Cass, M., & Cooper, C. L. (2005). The relationship between job satisfaction and health: A meta-analysis. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 62(2), 105–112.
- Gill, R. (2003). Change management or change leadership? *Journal of Change Management*, 3(4), 307–318.
- Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(4), 694–734.
- Graham, E. E., West, R., & Schaller, K. A. (1992). The association between the relational teaching approach and teacher job satisfaction. *Communication Reports*, 5(1), 11–22.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work–family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3), 510–531.
- Guest, D. E., & Conway, N. (2002). Communicating the psychological contract: An employer perspective. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 12(2), 22–38.
- Haar, J. M., Russo, M., Sune, A., & Ollier-Malaterre, A. (2014). Outcomes of work–life balance on job satisfaction, life satisfaction and mental health: A study across seven cultures. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 85(3), 361–373.
- Harris, A. H., & Thoresen, C. E. (2003). Strength-based health psychology: Counseling for total human health. In W. Bruce Walsh (Ed.), *Counseling psychology and optimal human functioning* (pp. 199–227). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hawk, T. F., & Lyons, P. R. (2008). Please don't give up on me: When faculty fail to care. *Journal of Management Education*, 32(3), 316–338.
- Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: how do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 65(5), 109–20.

- International Atomic Energy Agency (2004). *Development of instructors for nuclear power plant personnel training*. International Atomic Energy Agency Meeting: Vienna, Austria.
- Iwu, C. G., Gwija, S. A., Benedict, H. O., & Tengeh, R. K. (2013). Teacher job satisfaction and learner performance in South Africa. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 5(12), 838–850.
- Johns, G., & Saks, A. M. (2011). *Organizational behaviour: Understanding and managing life at work* (8th ed.). Toronto, Prentice Hall.
- Jones, M. K., Jones, R. J., Latreille, P. L., & Sloane, P. J. (2008). Training, job satisfaction and workplace performance in Britain: Evidence from Workplace Employee Relations Survey 2004. IZA Discussion Paper # 3677, September 2008.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376–402.
- Kim, I., & Loadman, W. E. (1994). *Predicting teacher job satisfaction* (Technical Report, Ohio State University). Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED383707.pdf>
- Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher sex, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 741.
- Korman, A. K. (1999). Motivation, commitment, and the “new contracts” between employers and employees. In A. I. Kraut, and A. K. Korman (Eds), *Evolving practices in human resource management: Response to a changing world of work* (pp. 23–40). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.
- Lawlor, E. E., & Hall, D. T. (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54(4), 305-312.
- McGuffog, A. L., Butcher, F. D., & Catchpole, L. J. (2006). *Research programme management: Trainer and trainer manager competence, rail safety & standards board: London*. Accessed at <http://www.rssb.co.uk/pages/research-catalogue/t588.aspx> on 14/07/14
- McKeown, R., MacLean, P., Russell, H., Kelly, C., Ralston, B., Heath, N., & Maitland, A. (2014). *TIN 2.014 Task 2 Understanding Training delivery final report V2*. Reference number UC-DHCSTC\_I2\_T\_T2\_014\_2/004.
- Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2007). Finding workable levers over work motivation: Comparing job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Administration & Society*, 39(7), 803-832.
- Mundy, D., Bailey, M., Stephens, V., Steele, C., Arthur-McGuire, J., & Glynn, D-M. (2014). *TIN 2.051 – Phase 1 The Defence Trainer Capability – Trainer selection, reward and career management*, O-DHCSTC\_I2\_T\_T2\_051/002.
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in

- primary schools: The Tanzanian case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 145–177.
- Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 29(1), 38–54.
- Pelchat, D. (2002). *Canadian Forces pilot retention study* [Director Human Resources Research and Evaluation Sponsor Research Report 2002-11]. Defence Research and Development Canada, Ottawa, ON.
- Pickering, D. I. (2006). *The relationship between work-life conflict/work-life balance and operational effectiveness in the Canadian Forces* (Defence Research and Development Canada Technical Report, 2006-243). Toronto, ON: Defence Research and Development Canada.
- Pilarta, M. A. B. (2015). Job satisfaction and teacher's performance in Abra State Institute of Sciences and Technology. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 15(4), 81–85.
- Rajalingam, N., & Nair, V. N. (2014). Impact of students' profile on job satisfaction of the teachers in Tirunel Veli District. *International Journal of Business and Administration Research Review*, 1(5), 109–115.
- Raybourn, E. M., Schatz, S., Vogel-Walcutt, J., & Vierling, K. (2017). *At the tipping point: Learning science and technology as key strategic enablers for future defense and security*. Conference Paper, Interservice/Industry Training, Simulation, and Education Conference (I/ITSEC), Orlando: FL.
- Rounding, K., & Rankin, K. J. (2018). Job satisfaction in the CAF: The catch-22 of producing the most effective soldiers. *Res Militaire*, 8(2). <http://resmilitaris.net/index.php?ID=1028104>
- Rounding, K., Ruscito, F., & Rankin, K. J. (2018). *Canadian Armed Forces instructor satisfaction and dissatisfaction* (Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis Scientific Report DRDC-RDDC-R220). Defence Research and Development Canada, Ottawa, ON.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54–67.
- Sachau, D. A., Gertz, J., Matsch, M., Palmer, A. J., & Englert, D. (2011). Work-life conflict and organizational support in a military law enforcement agency. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 27(1), 63–72.
- Scarpello, V., & Campbell, J. P. (1983). Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there? *Personnel Psychology*, 36(3), 577–600.

- Schatz, S., Bartlett, K., Burley, N., Dixon, D., Knarr, K., & Gannon, K. (2012). *Making good instructors great: USMC cognitive readiness and instructor professionalization initiatives*. Conference Paper. Interservice/Industry Training, Simulation, and Education Conference (I/ITSEC), Orlando: FL.
- Schleicher, D., Hansen, S. D., & Fox, K. (2011) Job attitudes and work values. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Vol. 3. Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization* (pp. 137–189). Washington, DC: APA.
- Serbetar, I., & Sedlar, I. (2016). Assessing reliability of a multi-dimensional scale by coefficient alpha. *Revija za Elementarno Izobrazevanje*, 9(1/2), 189–195.
- Shatzer, R. H. (2010). A comparison study between instructional and transformational leadership theories: Effects on student achievement and teacher job satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. AAI3399100).
- Shuls, J., & Maranto, R. (2014). Show them the mission: A comparison of teacher recruitment incentives in high need communities. *Social Science Quarterly*, 95(1), 239–252
- Singer, J., Marx, R. W., Krajcik, J., & Chambers, J. C. (2000). Constructing extended inquiry projects: Curriculum materials for science education reform. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(3), 165–178.
- Song, S., & Alpaslan, M. M. (2015). Factors impacting on teachers' job satisfaction related to science teaching: A mixed methods study. *Science Education International*, 26(3), 358–375.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Steele, C., McClay, S., Mundy, D., Fowler, R., Bicknell, A., Solowiej, K., & Arthur-MacGuire, J. (2016a). TIN 2.051—Phase 2 the Defence trainer capability: Trainer selection, reward, and career management. Interim report—Research question 2-1: What does a good trainer look like and what opportunities exist to broaden the volunteer pool for training roles? BAE Systems O-DHCSTC\_I2\_T\_T2\_051/016 Version 3. Defence Human Capability Science & Technology Centre, UK.
- Steele, C., McClay, S., Mundy, D., Fowler, R., Bicknell, A., Solowiej, K., & Arthur-MacGuire, J. (2016b). TIN 2.051—Phase 2 the Defence trainer capability: Trainer selection, reward, and career management. Final report—Research question 2-1: What does a good trainer look like and what opportunities exist to broaden the volunteer pool for training roles? BAE Systems O-DHCSTC\_I2\_T\_T2\_051/018 Version 3. Defence Human Capability Science & Technology Centre, UK.
- Tanguay, D., & Darr, W. (2011). *Canadian Forces instructor attributes: A job analysis of the instructor position on basic courses* [Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis Technical Note 013]. Defence Research and Development Canada, Ottawa, ON.
- Thakur, S. J., & Bhatnagar, J. (2017). Mediator analysis of job embeddedness: Relationship between work-life balance practices and turnover intentions. *Employee Relations*, 39(5), 718–731.

- Thoms, P., Dose, J. J., & Scott, K. S. (2002). Relationships between accountability, job satisfaction, and trust. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 13(3), 307–323.
- USMC. (2019). Marines: The official website of the United States Marine Corps. <https://www.marines.mil/>
- Usop, A. M., Askandar, K., Langguyan-Kadtong, M., & Usop, D. A. S. O. (2013). Work performance and job satisfaction among teachers. Work performance and job satisfaction among teachers. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(5), 245-252.
- Villa, P. (2014). New Army Instructor Badges a key step to professionalize NCOES instructors. *NCO Journal*. Accessed at <http://ncojournal.dodlive.mil/2014/05/06/new-army-instructor-badges-a-key-step-to-professionalize-ncoes-instructors/> on 22/07/14
- Vogel-Walcutt, J. Phillips, J., Ross, K. & Knarr, K. (2015). Marine Corps Instructor Mastery Model: A foundation for Marine faculty professional development. In *Proceedings of the Interservice/Industry Training, Simulation and Education Conference (IIITSEC)*. Arlington, VA: National Training and Simulation Association.
- Volk, S., Homan, N., Tepner, L., Chichester, M., & Scales, D. (2013). The rewards and challenges of becoming a clinical instructor. *Nursing for Women's Health*, 17(6), 539–542.
- Wang, D. S., & Hsieh, C. C. (2013). The effect of authentic leadership on employee trust and employee engagement. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 41(4), 613–624.
- Webb, A. G. (2007). *New teacher job satisfaction: Effects of general job facets and teacher job specific facets* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3293574).
- Wilson, J. H. (2008). Instructor attitudes toward students: Job satisfaction and student outcomes. *College Teaching*, 56(4), 225–229.



## Annex A TTCP Military Training

The table below provides a summary of five TTCP nations' Instructor/Trainer characteristics provided by each nation's panel member for all five nations. Seven open-ended questions were asked to gain a better understanding of each nation's (a) Defence training, in general and structure within Defence; and (b) Instructor/Trainer roles, composition (e.g., Reg F, Res, F, civilians), training, selection, and duration of employment. This information was summarized in the body of this report.

**Question 1:** How many phases/stages of training are there (provide a brief description)?

*Table A.1: Phases/Stage of Training.*

AU	CA	NZ	UK	US
<p>Broadly, the ADF have four similar phases of training, they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ab Initio:</b> Basic Initial training for commissioned and NCMs of all Services. Conducted at individual Service TEs;</li> <li>• <b>Initial Employment Training (IET):</b> Trade training for skills applicable to employment stream. Conducted at TE specific to trade. Some are joint training managed by Joint Training Managers (JTM; e.g. Signals, Police, Intelligence, Music:</li> </ul>	<p>There are four broad types of training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Basic training:</b> Initial basic training to obtain basic military qualifications for NCMs (BMQ) and officers (BMOQ), normally conducted at one central training establishment for all of CAF.</li> <li>• <b>Occupation/Phase training:</b> For NCMs, occupation specific training is conducted at a branch TE with 3 distinct phases at the start of one's career (QL3) and as junior NCMs (QL5),</li> </ul>	<p>There are four broad types of training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Basic Training:</b> Single Service for initial recruit training for junior ranks. Officers attend Joint Officer Induction Common Training (JOICT) then Single Service induction training.</li> <li>• <b>Trade specific training:</b> This training is for both junior ranks and officers, and is conducted in Single Service establishments. Where the training is common across the three services</li> </ul>	<p>There are four broad types of training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Phase 1 training:</b> Initial basic training conducted at a training establishment.</li> <li>• <b>Phase 2 training:</b> Trade specific training, normally conducted at a training establishment (with an option for pre-course learning/subsequent workplace training such as log books).</li> <li>• <b>Phase 3 training:</b> Specialist skills training (e.g., equipment specific courses) conducted</li> </ul>	<p><b>USMC:</b> In general, there are three broad stages of training.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Initial/indoctrination training:</b> This includes training such as boot camp or Officer Candidate School (OCS), and is the basic minimum requirement to become a full-fledged service member.</li> <li>• <b>Infantry-centric training:</b> Following boot camp or OCS, each Marine also attends infantry-centric training which ensures that every Marine is capable of serving as</li> </ul>

AU	CA	NZ	UK	US
<p>Army JT; Catering, Physical Training, Training Systems);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Career Education and Training:</b> Further (intermediate/advanced) career training post-IET. Conducted at trade specific TE, normally same as IET TE but can include civilian colleges and foreign Defence and/or civilian training;</li> <li>• <b>All Corps/muster/category promotion training:</b> Common training at individual Service level but also includes joint not-trade specific training ranging from junior ranks to star ranks, such as Joint Operations courses. This includes Professional Military Education (e.g., Command and Staff College and Defence &amp; Strategic Studies).</li> </ul>	<p>and, for some occupations, as a senior NCM (QL6). Officers' occupation training is conducted in phases until they reach the operationally functional point, when an individual is considered qualified in their occupation, and may include on-the-job training (OJT) or platform training (e.g., Helicopter training at a unit for Navigators).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Element/Specialty Training:</b> This includes training specific to the element (e.g., Sea Training, Winter Warfare, Escape and Evasion) or specialty employment (e.g., Close Protection Operators, Source Handlers) that is conducted either locally or at a TE.</li> <li>• <b>Leadership courses:</b></li> </ul>	<p>training is delivered through the Defence Training Institute (DTI) for Catering, Explosives Ordnance, Physical Training, Health, Military Police, Firefighting, Instructors/Learning Designers, and Drivers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Element/Specialty Training:</b> This training is focused on specific environments, (e.g. Sea Training, Chemical Biological Radiation Nuclear Damage Control (CBRNDC), Sea Survival, and Central Flying School for Navy/Air force pilots and aircrew. Specialist courses both in NZ and with Allied Services.</li> <li>• <b>Career/Promotion courses:</b> Leadership courses at all levels are embedded within environmental promotion courses from Lead Self, to</li> </ul>	<p>either at a training establishment or franchised to a unit to deliver or delivered at a unit (with option for pre-course learning/subsequent workplace training such as log books).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Career courses:</b> Underpinning education and leadership courses which must be completed throughout an individuals' career (generally conducted at a training establishment with DL elements).</li> </ul>	<p>a rifleman, and every officer is capable of serving as a rifle platoon commander.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Military Occupational Training:</b> Following the infantry-centric phase, each member attends initial military occupational specialty (MOS) training. MOS training focuses on the skills required to meet the needs of the force.</li> <li>• <b>Professional Military Education:</b> Next, professional military education (PME) becomes the final and most enduring phase in a service member's career; attendance is typically rank/grade specific and is often a requirement for future promotion.</li> </ul> <p>Each "phase" can be broken down into discrete sub-phases. Also, advanced-MOS</p>

AU	CA	NZ	UK	US
	For NCMs, leadership courses are completed during an individual's career and are dependent upon promotion. Some are via distance learning (DL), while some are conducted at a training establishment with some DL portions. Officer leader education is provided at the Canadian Forces College, at two stages: to becoming a LCol and a BGen.	Lead Teams, to Lead Leaders for both Non-Commissioned and Commissioned Officers. Further leadership training is delivered centrally by the Institute of Leadership Development (ILD), and is tied to promotion. NZ Command and Staff College (CSC) provides a Joint Warrant Officer CSC and Intermediate and Advanced CSC's for Officers. All courses are residential.		training can occur several years after initial MOS training (if required); it is dependent on the specific MOS whether or not the training even exists.  <b>Joint Training:</b> There is no Joint standard for training, but the Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation (ADDIE) model is recommended when asked.

**Question 2:** What is the structure of your military training?

*Table A.2: Structure of Military Training.*

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
The ADF Defence Capability is managed by four capability managers (i.e., Maritime, Land, Air and Information). These capability managers are collectively responsible for defining and assuring the Single-service and	The CAF has five L1s (L1; Army, Air Force, Navy, special forces, and Chief of Military Personnel) training authorities (TAs) who are responsible for all individual and group training, and training	The NZDF has four training providers: the three single service Chiefs through their Training Command, and the Commander New Zealand Defence College (NZDC) for all common training.	The UK MoD separates the requirement setting authority from the training and the delivery authorities. The Training Requirements Authority (TRA) represent the end-user of the trained output and is the authority for	<b>USMC:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>From an instructor perspective:</b> A Marine is expected to be introduced to training through classroom instruction and/or demonstrations.</li> </ul>

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
<p>Joint capability requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service Chiefs are the owners of the learning requirements for members of their service.</li> <li>• Group Heads are the owners of learning requirements for any job performance specific to their own group.</li> <li>• The Chief Joint Capability is the owner of the Joint learning requirements.</li> <li>• Where two or more Services or Groups require the same learning outcomes, a single Service or Group is appointed to manage the delivery of that training.</li> </ul> <p>The ADF also awards National Vocational Units of Competency and Qualifications through its Registered Training Organisation.</p>	<p>establishments, including instructors, within their element. Common training (e.g., BMOQ, leadership courses) are the responsibility of the Chief of Military Personnel. There are 60 training establishments/units in the CAF, which employ approximately 4,000 military instructors.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruit Training for NCMs is delivered by the environmental Training Commands. Commissioned officers received Joint induction delivered by NZDC, and then environmental training through single service training commands.</li> <li>• Initial trade/branch training is delivered by environmental training commands with Joint trades (e.g., Catering, Drivers, Pilots, Physical training, etc.) delivered by NZDC. This will expand to include Intelligence and Cyber.</li> <li>• Joint Professional Military Learning (JPML) is governed by NZDC through the ILD. This is an ongoing project to ensure alignment across all environmental</li> </ul>	<p>defining the Role Performance Statement (RPS) and evaluating whether the training meets the requirement. A Training Delivery Authority (TDA) will be responsible for defining <i>how</i> the training is conducted in order to meet the training requirement. The TDA is not always the end deliverer; one TDA can be responsible for several training establishments who conduct the training.</p>	<p>Once the Marine is introduced, they will be coached during the <i>practical application</i> portion of the class to gain familiarity and to further develop their understanding of the material/subject. Finally, each Marine is expected to demonstrate their competency with the newly gained skill or knowledge through individual assessments. They will continue to learn and develop on their own and at their permanent duty station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>From an institutional perspective:</b> All knowledge and/or skills that a Marine gets through formal training is expected to be further developed by OJT. The formal training system is limited in terms of resources</li> </ul>

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
		<p>commands and extends to civilian and foreign Defence and tertiary training.</p> <p>Promotion Training incorporates ILD leadership at the junior levels of both non-commissioned and commissioned officers within the environmental training establishments. Intermediate/ advanced courses are delivered by NZDC through ILD or CSC.</p> <p>The Future 2025 Strategic Plan identifies the implementation of NZDF wide learning policy (Project KEN) JPML, the establishment of a Defence Academy (Project RURU) and the implementation of the Instructor Capability Framework (ICF) to provide a common set of competencies for all instructors.</p>		<p>(time/money) and is expected to produce enough individuals with certain minimum competencies to staff the force. Each military unit has a training and development plan that ensures individuals and teams are further trained to meet the unit's training and readiness requirements. The formal training and education system is staffed with personnel trained in formal school management, curriculum development, and formal instruction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>From an individual perspective:</b> Each member must pass indoctrination training, get an MOS, and continue with professional education. As the training and</li> </ul>

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
				<p>education continues, the focus tends to shift from the psychomotor to the cognitive domains of learning. Furthermore, the individual is expected to read and learn about their profession of arms through an appropriate level (rank-specific) reading program. Each member is also expected to learn and contribute to meeting the specific requirements of their home station/unit.</p> <p><b>Joint Training:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Joint Learning Continuum is a coordinated progression of integrated and disciplined learning processes and events to prepare Department of Defence (DoD) personnel to specified joint</li> </ul>

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
				performance standards. This continuum of professional learning instils habits of mind, skills, abilities, and values through education, training, self-development, and experience. The application of the Joint Learning Continuum will affect the career-long achievement, documentation, and tracking of joint experience, joint training, and joint education for all DoD members (officers, enlisted, government civilians, and contractors).

**Question 3:** What trainer/instructor roles do you have?

**Table A.3:** *Trainer/Instructor Role.*

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Services have similar trainer/instructor roles when posted to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within TEs, the hierarchy mirrors traditional units: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instructors</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	NZDF have trainer/instructor roles as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On Job Trainers</li> </ul>	The UK MoD manages all trainer roles through the Defence Trainer Capability. This goes	<b>USMC:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depending on our use of the term, nearly 10% of all</li> </ul>

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
<p>TEs as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructor</li> <li>• Assessor</li> <li>• Senior Instructor</li> <li>• Chief Instructor</li> <li>• Directing Staff/Facilitators – higher education staff</li> <li>• Mentors/Coaches</li> <li>• Commandant of the School</li> <li>• Standards Officers</li> <li>• Training Developers</li> <li>• Multi-media instructional designers</li> <li>• Currently each Service trains its instructors and assessors through their individual courses.</li> <li>• The ADF employs its own instructors for all categories of training requirement.</li> <li>• The ADF utilises partnerships with universities and other contracted service providers for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructor Supervisors</li> <li>• Company/Squadron Commanders</li> <li>• Chief Instructor</li> <li>• Standards Officers</li> <li>• Program Evaluators</li> <li>• Commandant of the School</li> <li>• CA trains all NCMs by providing them with a course in Basic Instructor Techniques (BIT). Instructors are offered an online BIT course to refresh skills and an Advanced Instructional Techniques is also available. Some TEs provide their own instructional training, but anecdotal evidence suggests this is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructors</li> <li>• Senior Instructors</li> <li>• Chief Instructor/Head of School/ Flight Commander</li> <li>• Mentors/Coaches</li> <li>• Commandant of the School</li> <li>• Learning Designers</li> <li>• Multi-media developers</li> <li>• Specialised Educational Staff (Learning and Development Officers, Principal Learning Adviser, Principal Learning Designer, Senior/Adult Learning Tutors, Advanced Learning Designers, Learning Evaluators, etc. – all of which</li> </ul>	<p>beyond those delivering training to encompass the supervisors and managers of the training capability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Defence Trainers – Phase 1 &amp; 2</li> <li>• Defence Trainers – Phase 3</li> <li>• Defence Workplace Trainer</li> <li>• Defence Trainer Supervisors</li> <li>• Defence Trainer Managers</li> <li>• Commanding Officer of TEs</li> <li>• Train the Trainers (T3)</li> <li>• Train the Trainer Trainers (T4)</li> <li>• Short-Term Training Teams (STTT) and Monitor, Mentor, Train (M2T)</li> <li>• <i>Specialised Educational staff (Training Management Specialist Officers, Higher Education Lecturers).</i></li> </ul>	<p>Marines carry the title <i>instructor</i>. Their roles vary significantly, but all contribute to the training and/or educational development of every Marine. Every instructor goes through a training syllabus to be designated as an appropriate instructor. Each formal school has the responsibility and requirement to train its instructors to meet its own needs. Many instructors have a basic and advanced version or title of their role; the advanced role is usually the most experienced and most highly qualified person. For example, even drill instructors and flight training instructors have instructors; they are usually the most experienced and</p>



AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
specialist training and/or academic requirements (such as Medical, Engineering, strategy).	the exception rather than the rule.	<p>belong to NZDC).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently NZ Army trains its instructors and assessors through their promotion courses. Royal New Zealand Navy (RNZN) and (Royal New Zealand Air Force) (RNZAF) rely on instructor training from NZDC/DTI/ Defence Training Systems School (DTSS). Learning Designers are initially trained through NZDC/DTI/DTSS.</li> <li>The NZDF employs its own instructors (both military and civilian) for all categories of training requirement.</li> <li>The NZDF utilises partnerships with universities and other contracted service providers for specialist training and or academic requirements (such as Medical,</li> </ul>		<p>highly regarded subject matter experts among their respective groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have instructors responsible for every part of a Marine's training and development. They range from drill instructors to classroom instructors to martial arts instructors; they also range from formal to informal. For instance, the unit commander is the person responsible for training his/her unit. Some training occurs without a formally trained and designated instructor, but is not without an experienced and recognized authority to ensure training was conducted in accordance with current doctrine and procedures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Joint Schoolhouses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The three</li> </ul>

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
		Engineering, Strategy).		<p>schoolhouses belonging to the Joint Staff typically consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Director/Officer in Charge (OIC)</li> <li>• Training Coordinator</li> <li>• Team leads for various courses</li> <li>• Instructors</li> </ul>

**Question 4:** What is the composition of personnel undertaking instructor roles?

**Table A.4:** *Composition of Personnel in Instructor Roles.*

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructors across the various phases of training range from CPL Equivalent (E) to One Star military regular and reserve force members, Australian Public Service trainers, civilian college instructors/professors delivering in Defence establishments and Defence personnel attending civilian colleges for training. Includes other</li> </ul>	<p>TAs use a myriad of instructors. The instructor complement is determined based on the availability of regular force members to instruct, and consist of regular and reserve force members, civilians, and contractors.</p>	<p>Instructors across the various phases of training range from Private (PTE[E]) to LTCOL(E) regular and reserve force members, and civilian instructors/professors employed in Defence establishments. Includes other contracted training providers such as Industry Training Organisations (ITO).</p>	<p>This is broken down to meet the needs of each Service or TE. The UK currently employs a <i>whole force approach</i> comprising of regular and reserve service personnel, civilians and contractors.</p>	<p>Broadly speaking, most Service and Joint courses include a mix of regular and reserve force members, civilians, and contractors.</p> <p><b>USMC:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In general, sergeants, staff sergeants (E-5 to E-6), and Captains (O-3) are usually the first-time formal school instructor. Some of them may have had limited and informal experiences as a developing</li> </ul>

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
<p>contracted training providers such as independent Registered Training Organisations (RTO).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Foreign instructors (military and civilian) provide support in specialist roles and also where the ADF does not have the expertise.</li> </ul>				<p>leader at their own unit/station. Senior or Chief Instructors are often second term instructors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In some cases, civilians can serve as instructors, provided they meet the school's requirements.</li> </ul>

**Question 5:** What training is traditionally applied to trainers? Is this mandatory? (Provide a description)

*Table A.5: Training Traditional Applied to Trainers.*

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Army provides instructor and assessor skills to its soldiers and officers through the all Corps training continuum, therefore it is mandatory, and requires no further training of these personnel prior to being posted to a TE.</li> <li>Navy and Air Force provide instructor/facilitator and workplace</li> </ul>	<p>Most Instructors do not receive proper training, and therefore struggle in the role. Although following training is available, it is not mandatory; recent reports indicate that only 20% of instructors have taken any course other than the 1<sup>st</sup> one listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic Instructional Techniques is course is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Army provides instructor and assessor skills to its soldiers and officers through the all Corps training continuum, therefore the training is mandatory. This is currently undergoing review to ensure alignment with the NZDF ICF and its associated standards.</li> <li>RNZN and RNZAF instructors receive instructor/facilitator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Defence Train the Trainer (DTTT) Phase 1 &amp; 2:</b> Must be completed by individuals posted into a phase 1 or 2 trainer role. This is a 2-week residential course and is conducted either centralised or franchised to units. This course covers a range of educational techniques and is based around the</li> </ul>	<p>Each Service trains its instructors and assessors through their individual programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>USMC:</b> All formal school instructors attend a mandatory instructor training course. Some schoolhouses have their own discrete instructor training courses, but the vast majority of MOS-school instructors</li> </ul>

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
<p>assessor training only when personnel are posted to a TE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific Train the Trainer courses are developed with the introduction of all new training requirements as part of the introduction into service of new capabilities/training.</li> <li>Within the Australian Defence College, Directing Staff undergo a PD program to enhance their small group facilitator and coaching skills.</li> </ul> <p>In all cases, instructors will be subject to on-going PD when in training roles within their TEs. This may include obtaining national qualifications in order to deliver and award national qualifications where required. To date, there has not been a One Defence approach to developing a continuum for</p>	<p>mandatory for Master Corporals (MCpls) as it is embedded in the Primary Leadership Qualifications course, which is DL; there are no mandatory courses for officers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instructional Techniques (online).</li> <li>Alternate Instructional Techniques.</li> <li>Small Group Facilitation.</li> <li>Instructor Supervisor.</li> <li>Program Evaluator (online).</li> <li>Some TEs offer their own training and development programs for instructors.</li> </ul>	<p>training through NZDC/DTI/DTSS. Some RNZAF squadrons mandate this training to their instructors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services provide workplace assessor training only when they are posted to a TE that holds training that has been aligned to New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) unit standards/certificates/qualifications.</li> <li>Specific Train the Trainer courses are developed with the introduction of all new training requirements as part of the introduction into service of new capabilities/training.</li> <li>Further instructor professional development is made available to NZDF Instructors through NZDC via DTSS, Defence Learning</li> </ul>	<p>principles of Present, Apply, Review (PAR). This includes a welfare module on Care of Trainees and a module on understanding the Defence Systems Approach to Training. Through continuous PD, a trainer may be awarded the status of advanced practitioner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>DTTT Phase 3:</b> Must be completed by individuals posted in to a phase 3 trainer role as a minimum. However, the higher qualification of DTTT 1 &amp; 2 is accepted. This is a one-week course based around the PAR approach to training.</li> <li>DTTT Workplace: Training delivered to Defence Workplace Trainers who deliver either formal workplace training</li> </ul>	<p>attend the Train the Trainer School (T3S) course. The T3S course is designed to train instructors to “prepare, rehearse, and deliver instruction that promotes transfer of learning using instructional methodologies and techniques that bolster active instruction. The objectives for this course are: the preparation and delivery of instruction, communication strategies, questioning techniques, educational strategies, employment of instructional methods, feedback and assessment, and a variety of supplemental knowledge and skills.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Joint Schoolhouses:</b></li> </ul>

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
developing instructors within the ADF.		<p>(DLearn) and Defence Corporate Training School (DCTS).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In all cases, instructors will be subject to on-going PD when in training roles within their TEs. This may include obtaining national qualifications in order to deliver and award national qualifications where required.</li> <li>• To date, there has not been a One Defence approach to developing instructors within the NZDF.</li> </ul>	<p>or other necessary training not derived from the DSAT process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specialised training for the design and delivery of training using the Defence Learning Environment (the preferred method of delivering eLearning) is offered.</li> <li>• PAR Training: An online refresher training package for Defence Trainers who need to be upskilled in order to deliver training using the PAR methodology.</li> <li>• STTT and M2T training: Specialised training for those who will be deployed to a STTT or M2T role.</li> </ul> <p>Other training is provided for the remaining roles covered by the Defence Trainer Capability but these are more focused on the</p>	<p>Most Joint Courses are Service-led. The three Joint schools within the Joint Staff have an instructor development program. For any course within DoD to be considered <i>Joint certified</i>, an instructor qualification program must be part of the program.</p>

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
			supervision and management of trainers.	

**Question 6:** How are people selected to be a trainer?

*Table A.6: Selected Trainers.*

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
<p>Performance appraisals will identify suitability for instructional roles but this does not guarantee that a member will be posted to an instructional role. Vice versa, a member may be identified as not suitable for an instructional role but necessity to fill an instructional role may see that person posted to it.</p> <p>The ADF has limited processes for members to apply for instructional roles (e.g., submission of a resume). Generally, it will be a Career Manager who will fill positions with the available candidates who are due for postings.</p> <p>Most instructors are willing and capable of fulfilling instructional</p>	<p>Career managers select military members based on the needs of the TA, who are allocated instructor positions based on the training institutions they are responsible for. Ideally the best are selected, but often the available and unfit are posted into instructor positions. Most individuals do not volunteer.</p> <p>The CAF does not currently possess a formal or standardized process for selecting instructors, but research is underway to develop an instructor selection process. To date a job analysis has been completed.</p> <p>Civilians and contractors who are employed into a trainer role will be</p>	<p>In the NZDF, Instructors posted to teach basic training undergo a psychological evaluation and interview selection process. For other Instructor roles, the NZDF attempts to select the best person, but is also hampered by limited availability. Future plans for the NZDF include a selection process across the phases of training and an accompanying policy. Performance appraisals will generally identify a member's suitability for instructional roles, but this does not guarantee that a member will be posted to an instructional role. Vice versa, a member may be identified as not suitable for an instructional role,</p>	<p>Research indicated that a high percentage of individuals had not volunteered to complete the trainer posting. During annual performance appraisals, the Chain of Command must identify the trainer potential of the individual under review. The guidance on conducting this review has recently been updated as a result of research to include specific characteristics relevant to the role of the trainer which would support identification of appropriate personnel. Civilians and contractors who are employed in a trainer role will be assessed against set criteria as demanded by their employer.</p>	<p><b>USMC:</b> There are exceptions, for example, drill instructors who have to apply and meet stringent acceptance requirements; however, most MOS-school instructors are neither pre-screened nor have an application process. They are simply ordered to go to the schoolhouse in order to meet the school's manpower and student production requirements.</p> <p><b>Joint:</b> Joint instructor billets will be filled by the Service assignment managers. Some joint instructors may have been designated a <i>Master Training Specialist</i> in a prior billet (which will be noted in their service record and may give</p>

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
<p>roles, but a few find such roles problematic. Employment of civilian and contractor trainers are more subject to scrutiny of appropriate skills and qualifications in order to meet procurement guidelines for expenditure of Defence monies, and to meet the Defence need.</p>	<p>assessed against set criteria as demanded by their employer.</p>	<p>but necessity to fill an instructional role may see that person posted to it.</p> <p>The NZDF has limited processes for members to apply for instructional roles (e.g., submission of a resume). Generally, it will be a Career Manager who will fill positions with the available candidates who are due for postings. Most instructors are willing and capable of fulfilling instructional roles, but a few find such roles problematic. Employment of civilian and contractor trainers are for the purpose of ensuring continuity, particularly due to military personnel constantly posting in and out of TEs.</p>		<p>them a subspecialty code); however, most individuals do not volunteer. Therefore, though the desire for the best person to be selected as an instructor exists, it's possible that some who are unfit to be posted to instructor position will be selected.</p>

**Question 7:** How long/how often would they do a trainer role? (e.g., is there re-employment of trainers into trainer roles?)

**Table A.7:** *Duration in a Trainer Role.*

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
<p>Most postings to any position within the ADF, including training roles, is 2-3 years. Where instructors have a desire to remain in their position, possibly for geographic stability, they may be given extensions to their posting tenure. Some instructors are placed in positions on a Temporary Duties Order (TDO), in order to augment vacancies until the position can be filled for a full posting tenure. In order to maintain continuity of instructors, some instructional positions have been converted from military positions to Australian Public Service positions. Where training is contracted to external providers, these contracts are subject to periodic review and a re-tendering process.</p>	<p>Posting to TEs are traditionally three years, after which individuals return to normal employment. There are no requisites to have prior experience as an instructor to be posted into higher instructor positions. Many instructors are posted on a temporary basis to augment staff for a portion of a course, for a full course, or series of courses. Civilians and contractors are often employed permanently in their roles.</p>	<p>Within the NZDF, posting periods are on average 18 months, but vary by element, with the RNZN having the shortest at a nine-month posting (deployed ship), and the RNZAF having up to three-year postings.</p>	<p>Training roles for regular service personnel are traditionally 2- to 3-year tour postings. The aspiration with the Defence Trainer Capability is to reemploy Defence Trainers in subsequent roles as Trainer Supervisors and Trainer Managers, continually exploiting additional skills developed in the workplace. Civilians and contractors tend to be employed in the job, therefore will remain in post significantly longer.</p>	<p>Instructor positions for regular Service personnel are traditionally 2- to 3-year tour postings. Ideally those who achieved <i>Master Training Specialist</i> would be reemployed in subsequent positions with higher responsibilities, continually using skills developed in the workplace. In the USMC, active duty instructors are expected to return to their regular MOS assigned job after their instructor tour, but they may return to the schoolhouse for another tour as a senior or chief instructor after several years have passed. Government civilians and contractors tend to hold instructor jobs and remain in the position longer. Civilian instructors are often</p>



AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
				retired military who have served previously as an instructor.

In addition, some nations chose to include other notable points regarding their nation's education and training systems.

*Table A.8: Notable Points.*

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
Collective training requirements abide by additional Defence policy and doctrine. Individual training may occur concurrently in a collective training context, particularly where resources are limited and/or require an integrated platform such as a ship, aircraft etc. Where applicable, preference is for instructors in the collective training context to have similar credentials as those for individual training.		The NZDF has completed a pilot programme and is scaling a model for instructors called Joint Instructor Excellence. In this model, current instructors are undergoing pedagogical/andragogical alignments for instructor best practices that extend beyond classrooms and into the concept of embedding in the workplace. In future, students, having been brought through an education/training system of this model, will find the transition to instructor more natural given the construct and philosophy of instruction has been embedded from their first experience.	Full details of the UK's Defence Trainer Capability can be found within chapter 4 of JSP822 part 1 ( <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/600177/20170317-JSP_822_Part_1-Final.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/600177/20170317-JSP_822_Part_1-Final.pdf</a> )	<b>USMC:</b> Except for a few limited civilian assignments, the Marine Corps does not have permanent instructor duty assignments; there are no permanent Marine Corps instructors. It is considered a 2-to 3-year duty assignment. Extended periods at the schoolhouse is often seen as a detriment to a Marine's career, since it is seen as an easy, non-deployable assignment.  <b>Joint Staff:</b> The integration of individual preparation and collective preparation within force provision and command training programs recognizes that collective capability is built on the knowledge,

AS	CA	NZ	UK	US
		Additional instructor selection criteria have not yet been developed. This model focuses on instructor competencies rather than the subject matter expertise (which they will already bring).		skills, abilities, and attitudes (KSAs) of individuals. Effective integration of education, training, self-development, and experience leads to performance-based outcomes (based on established tasks, conditions, and standards) that achieve readiness for joint duty and joint operations. Additional information regarding Joint Training can be found in the Joint Training Policy (CJCSI 3500.01H) and the Joint Training Manual (CJCSM 3500.03E).

## List of symbols/abbreviations/acronyms/initialisms

---

ADDIE	Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation
ADF	Australian Defence Force
AS	Australia (TTCP abbreviation)
BGen	Brigadier General
BMOQ	Basic Military Officer Training
BMQ	Basic Military Training
CA	Canada (TTCP abbreviation)
CAF	Canadian Armed Forces
CBRNDC	Chemical Biological Radiation Nuclear Damage Control
CJCSI	Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instructions
CJCSM	Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Manual
Cmdre	Commodore
CO	Commanding Officer
Cpl	Corporal
CSC	Command and Staff College
DCTS	Defence Corporate Training School
DL	Distance Learning
DLearn	Defence Learning (NZ program)
DoD	Department of Defence
DTI	Defence Training Institute
DTSS	Defence Training Systems School
E	Equivalent
E-5 to E-6	Sergeants and Staff Sergeants
FG	Focus Group
HR	Human Resource
ICF	Instructor Capability Framework
IET	Initial Employment Training
ILD	Institute of Leadership Development
INCOPD	Institute for Non-Commissioned Officer Professional Development
ITO	Industry Training Organizations

JOICT	Joint Officer Induction Common Training
JPML	Joint Professional Military Learning
JT	Joint Training
JTM	Joint Training Managers
KSAAAs	Knowledge, Skills, Abilities, and Attitudes
KSAO	Knowledge, Skill, Attitude, and Other Attributes
L1	Level Ones
LCol	Lieutenant Colonel
<i>M</i>	Mean
M2T	Monitor, Mentor, Train
MCpl	Master Corporals
<i>Mdn</i>	Median
MIB	Military Instructor Badge
MOS	Military Occupational Specialty
MSI	Military Skills Instructor
MTI	Military Training Instructor
<i>N</i>	Whole population
<i>n</i>	Sample of the population
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NCM	Non-Commissioned Member
NCO	Non-Commissioned Officer
NZDC	New Zealand Defence College
NZDF	New Zealand Defence Force
NZQA	New Zealand Qualifications Authority
O-3	Captains
OCS	Officer Candidate School
OIC	Officer in Charge
OJT	On-the-Job Training
PAR	Present, Apply, Review
PCT	Programme de Coopération Technique
PD	Professional Development
PME	Professional Military Education

Pte	Private
QL	Qualification Level
QSP	Qualification Standards and Plans
RAAF	Royal Australian Air Force
RAF	Royal Air Force
Reg F	Regular Force
Res F	Reserve Force
RIB	Recruit Instructor Badge
RN	Royal Navy
RNZAF	Royal New Zealand Air Force
RNZN	Royal New Zealand Navy
RSP	Role Performance Statement
RSSB	Rail Safety and Standards Board
RURU	Although this is a word and not an acronym, it was included here to provide readers with an explanation that RURU is the Maori word for owl—the bird of knowledge, which is capitalized when used.
<i>SD</i>	Standard Deviation
SJAR	Soldier Joint Appraisal Record
SME	Subject Matter Expert
STTT	Short-Term Training Teams
T3	Train the Trainer
T3S	Train the Trainer School
T4	Train the Trainer Trainers
TA	Training Authorities
TDA	Training Delivery Authority
TDO	Temporary Duties Order
TE	Training Establishment
TRA	Training Requirements Authority
TTCP	The Technical Cooperation Program
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States
USAF	United States Air Force
USMC	United States Marine Corps



DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA		
*Security markings for the title, authors, abstract and keywords must be entered when the document is sensitive		
1. ORIGINATOR (Name and address of the organization preparing the document. A DRDC Centre sponsoring a contractor's report, or tasking agency, is entered in Section 8.)  <b>DGMPRA</b> <b>Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis</b> <b>NDHQ (Carling), 60 Moodie Drive, Building 9S.2</b> <b>Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0K2</b> <b>Canada</b>		2a. SECURITY MARKING (Overall security marking of the document including special supplemental markings if applicable.)  <b>CAN UNCLASSIFIED</b>
		2b. CONTROLLED GOODS  <b>NON-CONTROLLED GOODS</b> <b>DMC A</b>
3. TITLE (The document title and sub-title as indicated on the title page.)  <b>Military Instructors: Understanding Motivation and Job Satisfaction across Two Nations</b>		
4. AUTHORS (Last name, followed by initials – ranks, titles, etc., not to be used)  <b>Rankin, K.J.; Rounding, K.; Ford, C.</b>		
5. DATE OF PUBLICATION (Month and year of publication of document.)  <b>October 2019</b>	6a. NO. OF PAGES (Total pages, including Annexes, excluding DCD, covering and verso pages.)  <b>82</b>	6b. NO. OF REFS (Total references cited.)  <b>93</b>
7. DOCUMENT CATEGORY (e.g., Scientific Report, Contract Report, Scientific Letter.)  <b>Scientific Report</b>		
8. SPONSORING CENTRE (The name and address of the department project office or laboratory sponsoring the research and development.)  <b>DGMPRA</b> <b>Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis</b> <b>NDHQ (Carling), 60 Moodie Drive, Building 9S.2</b> <b>Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0K2</b> <b>Canada</b>		
9a. PROJECT OR GRANT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable research and development project or grant number under which the document was written. Please specify whether project or grant.)	9b. CONTRACT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable number under which the document was written.)	
10a. DRDC PUBLICATION NUMBER (The official document number by which the document is identified by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this document.)  <b>DRDC-RDDC-2019-R201</b>	10b. OTHER DOCUMENT NO(s). (Any other numbers which may be assigned this document either by the originator or by the sponsor.)	
11a. FUTURE DISTRIBUTION WITHIN CANADA (Approval for further dissemination of the document. Security classification must also be considered.)  <b>Further distribution done by approval from Defence Research and Development Canada's Authority</b>		
11b. FUTURE DISTRIBUTION OUTSIDE CANADA (Approval for further dissemination of the document. Security classification must also be considered.)  <b>NONE</b>		
12. KEYWORDS, DESCRIPTORS or IDENTIFIERS (Use semi-colon as a delimiter.)  <b>instructors; instructor satisfaction; instructor motivation; TTCP; UK trainer motivation</b>		

Instructors are recognized as the cornerstone of military training, and enable militaries to produce the highest calibre and most effective members to meet current and future security demands. However, the high demands of training military personnel to meet today's operational requirements have resulted in militaries in The Technical Cooperation Program (TTCP) engaging in concerted reviews of how to best ensure effective military instructors. Towards this end, TTCP nations' approaches to select, train, and employ military instructors are discussed prior to the presentation of two theoretical frameworks that contribute to understanding the factors that influence military instructors' job satisfaction and motivation towards the role. In this report, two nations, Canada and the United Kingdom, present their individual research to provide an overview of instructor satisfaction/motivation issues facing militaries, as well as the theories, methods, and main results of each nation's study. This culminates in a comparison and discussion of the major satisfaction/motivation factors, the identification of possible interventions to resolve dissatisfiers/ demotivators, and ultimately ways to increase satisfaction/motivation. This collaboration provides a mechanism to capitalize on the strengths, and minimize any weaknesses, in both studies, while expanding our understanding of factors influencing military instructors' satisfaction/motivation.

Les instructeurs sont reconnus comme la pierre angulaire de l'entraînement militaire, et permettent aux armées de produire des militaires du plus haut calibre et des plus efficaces afin de satisfaire aux demandes actuelles et futures en matière de sécurité. Toutefois, la forte demande en personnel d'instruction pour satisfaire aux exigences opérationnelles actuelles a eu pour effet d'engager les armées qui participent au Programme de coopération technique (PCT) dans des examens concertés afin de déterminer le meilleur moyen pour veiller à avoir des instructeurs militaires efficaces. Dans ce but, le rapport décrit les approches des pays du PCT pour sélectionner, instruire et employer des instructeurs militaires, avant de présenter deux cadres théoriques pour aider à comprendre les facteurs qui influencent la satisfaction au travail des instructeurs militaires, et leur motivation à l'égard de ce rôle. Dans le rapport, deux pays, le Canada et le Royaume-Uni, présentent leur recherche individuelle dans le but de fournir un aperçu des enjeux liés à la satisfaction et à la motivation des instructeurs, de même que les théories, les méthodes et les principaux résultats de l'étude de chaque pays. Le rapport se termine par une comparaison des principaux facteurs de satisfaction et de motivation, les interventions possibles pour résoudre l'insatisfaction ou la démotivation, et les moyens pour augmenter la satisfaction et la motivation. Cette collaboration a abouti à un mécanisme pour tirer parti des forces et minimiser les faiblesses, apparentes dans les deux études, et nous permet de mieux comprendre les facteurs qui influencent la satisfaction et la motivation des instructeurs militaires.