

# CAREERXROADS 5<sup>TH</sup> Annual Sources of Hire Survey

Presented on February 23, 2006

By Gerry Crispin and Mark Mehler

## ***Forward: Authors' Notes***

### **Study Goals**

This study is CareerXroads' (CXR) fifth Sources of Hire whitepaper in as many years and continues our discussions about how some of America's most competitive corporations fill their positions. Our efforts are intended to shed light on:

- Where corporations actually get their hires – not what their best guess is, or where their prospects or candidates come from – as valuable as that might be to some.
- How well corporations track, measure and report hires.

### **Study Restrictions**

We invited 192 large, high-profile, name-brand firms to participate in our study during January 2006 by supplying information about their hiring practices for the year 2005. 48 responded but only half that number was able to submit hard numbers for the survey by the end of January. These 24 firms represented an aggregate of more than 1,000,000 employees and filled just over 188,000 positions in 2005.

CareerXroads studies are completely transparent. We want to go beyond offering what specific companies *say they do* and look under the hood to examine how their data is collected. It is here that lessons are to be learned. Everything about our study is open to view in an effort to help employers think more critically and avoid drawing hasty conclusions from this or other studies whose underlying data sets are questionable – and they all are. The really important part of this survey is its error analysis. We have one commitment to non-disclosure - the names of the companies that responded. We can tell you they represent a cross-section of highly recognizable retail, technology, transportation, manufacturing, pharmaceutical and finance firms. Because of their high-profile status they would not want to be singled out so we have honored their concerns by not identifying the survey respondents by name.

## ***Executive Summary***

The annual CXR Sources of Hire Survey is a snapshot of how highly-competitive, high-profile firms maintain and track their source of hire information. *It is not intended to be representative of how all companies find all employees.*

For one thing, respondents must supply their data to us during a narrow window immediately after the close of 2005. You might imagine that with the pervasive use of Applicant Tracking Systems and online application processes that this would be an easy task. Not so. Errors in how data are recorded, confirmed, managed and reported are extensive and pervasive. Companies may be using several different platforms for tracking candidates. Separate functions may oversee full-time hires from external and internal sources. Firms may not include certain locations, levels, functions or even divisions in their results. They simply don't track that for which they don't have responsibility. We attempted to obtain international source of hire data this year from our multinational friends (Canada, Australia and UK), many of whom were directly responsible for these functions, but were not able to do so in the time frame allowed.

Despite the difficulties, the 24 firms that completed our survey indicated they employ 1,041,722 people in the US. 1,340 Recruiters and Sourcers worked on filling 188,062 openings. All things being equal (and of course they are not) that would mean each recruiter/sourcer was responsible for filling roughly 140 openings over 2005 or roughly 12 each month (that's approximately 4 internal and 8 external). We do know that this number is likely inflated. In one example, a substantial number of hires, probably internal moves, were handled without direct recruiter involvement.

### **Key findings for 2005 include:**

- 32% of all open positions were filled by internal transfers and promotions (down from 38% in 2004).
- Employee Referral (27.1%) is arguably the number one external source.
- The impact of the Internet reported here at 24.7% actually approaches one of every three external hires when we add Direct Sourcing to it. In fact, elements of the Internet can likely be attributed to every hire. The Internet is too ubiquitous to measure properly and categories need to be re-defined for future studies.
- Hires attributed to three online job-service destinations (Monster.com, CareerBuilder and HotJobs) average approximately 28.4% of the hires from the Internet (7.1% of all external hires). All other Niche sites account for 22.5% of Internet-related hires (5.6% of all external hires).
- Internet hires attributed to the "Company Website" while questionable (as we consider it a destination not a source) represent 49.2% (12.2% of all external hires) down from a high of 67.9% of Internet hires just two years ago.)
- Temp-to-perm represents only 3.3% of all hires – this is the first time we measured this source directly. However our survey respondents reported that their contingent labor population now averages 18% of their total workforce suggesting significant opportunity.
- There is no silver bullet for diversity hires. Affinity groups and employee referrals are still touted as the most productive.

- 61% of the firms in the survey hired more employees in 2005 than 2004 (17% the same, 22% fewer).
- 38% *believe* they will hire more employees in 2006 (58% the same and only 4% fewer).

**Profiling Points the Direction Not the Comparison**

If we took the *average* of the results reported by our 24 responding firms and they were somehow consolidated as a benchmark, the data would look something like this:

43,400	EEs US
7,840	US F/T (Full-time) Total Positions were Filled during 2005
2,511	Internal Moves and Transfers (or 32% of the Total) 53% of the Internal Moves and Transfers were for Exempt positions
5,329	External Hires (68% of the Total) 59% of the External hires were for Exempt positions
56	Recruiters and Sourcers Filled 140 openings each
» 27.1 %	from Referrals
» 24.7%	from the Internet
» 8.0%	from College
» 7.5%	from Direct Sourcing
» 5.0%	Not Measured
» 5.5%	from Other Sources
» 5.2%	from Career Fairs
» 5.2%	from 3 <sup>rd</sup> party agencies
» 4.6%	from Print
» 4.1%	from Walk-ins
» 3.2%	from Temp-to-Hire

Of course an average profile doesn't really exist. No two firms hire the same way. It is helpful as an exercise to examine a profile like the one above from the "company" level to see how these numbers differ but it would also be dangerous to benchmark your own firm from data that doesn't reflect your unique situation – specifically what your industry leaders are doing.

Is it reasonable to assume that these 24 survey respondents are in a better position to measure the staffing links in their supply-chain? We think so. They obviously are able to generate real-time data about their source of hires. They can continuously improve their staffing process and evolve more productive and more efficient strategies based on data. Recruiters on the front line of companies with source of hire data do not have to guess. They know where their candidates can be found.

**GIGO (Garbage in=Garbage Out)**

But, to draw the conclusion that building a supply chain is as simple as having this data would be premature. The *quality* of the data must be considered as well and we continue to find significant difficulties embedded in the data reported. Some mountains (and occasional mole hills) still need to be climbed. Among them:

- 50% of the responding firms lack some data from one or more functions, levels, locations, class of employee, etc. that they don't track or have any responsibility to audit and incorporate as part of their overall report.
- 5.8% of the data that the survey respondents track is simply unknown – either because of error or failure to collect. Six-sigma we are not.

- A full third of the responding firms have Applicant Tracking Systems (ATS) that cannot or do not “fine tune” their source of hire categories. Only a few employers dig deeper by rigorously surveying new hires during on-boarding. In some cases the ATS’s have more advanced features than corporations are willing to turn on or define properly.
- 12.2% of all hires appeared (from nowhere apparently) at the Corporate website. While the argument that the Company website is a source and therefore is true evidence of branding has merit, this “source” is clearly a mixture that dilutes the impact of other sources.

Until these collection and measurement issues are resolved, analytical methods for improving the staffing supply chain can be challenged.

**As an employer** reading this whitepaper, think about your own Sources of Hire. What is *your* profile and what are the characteristics of the firms you would most likely compare yourself to? Is your data solid enough to act on? What sources of hire are most relevant for your firm’s critical openings? What sources are the most reliable? For what level, job, location etc., can you compare yields? What would you do to improve upon them? How do you allocate your sourcing dollars in 2006 if you don’t have solid data for 2005...until the Spring? Will additional investments in one approach over another enjoy a better yield?

**As a supplier of services** to the corporate staffing community, what is your contribution to your client’s supply chain challenges? Can you support the analysis of sources from performance data of long-term employees? For example, how many interns who became new hires eventually were promoted and are now leaders within the firm? Over five years? At what cost? At what advantage for the firm’s performance?

**As a job seeker** looking to compete for an opening, think about what it will take to get up to bat. Which sources yield the most opportunities...for you? A few years ago we evaluated each link in the hiring process for a large insurance company from the perspective of the candidate. The firm had hired 1000 middle managers that year and 200 of them had come from applications submitted at their website. About 50,000 resumes were active in their database at any point and the chance of getting hired from applying online – and nowhere else (all things being equal), was about 1 in 250. The firm had also hired 200 employees that year from referrals made by their own employees. The difference between these two sources however was that the 200 referral hires was drawn from a total of only 600 referrals! The chance of getting hired by an employee referral in that company during that year was one out of three. Where might you want to invest your time? Repeatedly applying to new positions or networking to find a contact? So, who will refer you?

**As a vendor**, what tools could help this client analyze the value of one channel over the next? Is the employee who was referred performing any better, staying any longer, or getting up to speed faster than employees hired from other sources? If your client is hiring assistant managers in large numbers for a growing retail market, which source of hire yields the greatest number of individuals ready for promotion in six months? Can your system even manage these data fields? Report on them? What are you doing to get your clients prepared to use them?

## Results

### Methodology

Beginning in mid-December 2005, emails were sent to individuals known to CareerXroads principals, Gerry Crispin and Mark Mehler, in 192 different companies. All recipients had corporate staffing responsibilities or direct access to the company's staffing leader. Three reminders were sent after one week intervals during January, 2006.

The emailed invitations contained a link to our Source of Hire survey on SurveyMonkey.com <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=436931616383>. (Feel free to add your own data to see how a study like this gets constructed. It will be up through March 2006).

By the end of January, 48 firms responded – however, only half of the respondents completed the survey by submitting data. Additional calls were made to respondents to clarify their responses and reduce the chance of inaccurate data. Firms that could not supply actual data versus perceptions and guesses were simply not included.

### The Best Source May Be Right under Your Nose

Your firm's own employees are the most likely source for filling open positions. Of the 188,062 positions filled last year, 60,265 or 32% were attributed to Internal Movement. More than half of these openings were exempt level positions (53%).

Individual company results for internal fills ranged from a high of 61% to a low of 6.3%. A third of the firms reported Internal Transfers and Promotions as the source of hire for 40% or more of their open positions. Table 1 below shows the trend over the last four years. Despite the dip this year, we believe the long term trend for competitive companies will be to calibrate their succession and internal development programs to fill 40-50% of their openings in order to ensure strong retention levels for high performers.

**Table 1: Internal vs. External Positions Filled 2002-2005**

Positions Filled	2005	2004	2003	2002
INTERNAL	32.0%	38.4%	35.5%	34.2%
EXTERNAL	68.0%	61.6%	64.5%	65.8%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%

### How Many Recruiters does it take to fill a Pipeline?

The answer to the above question is debatable but we can say that the survey respondents claim to have 1,340 Recruiters and Sourcers on hand to fill their 188,062 openings. These numbers included "full-time equivalent" contract recruiters. What we really don't know is what it takes in additional staff, differences in roles of recruiters and sourcers as well as the roles that other HR professionals play, the differential in time needed to handle internal moves versus external sourcing or the significant differences between recruiting exempt vs. non-exempt, college vs. experienced, technical vs. non-technical, executive vs. professional. On average each professional staff member handled 140 openings last year.

### **Can You Reach Out and Touch...Everyone? Apparently Not.**

The respondents' firms employed 1,041,722 individuals (all divisions, locations, levels/bands, regardless of whether their recruiting organization supported them).

We asked "Is there hiring being done within your firm that you do not perform (or oversee) for functions like sales or classes of employees like union or retail store employees etc.?" Only 50% claimed "We touch or know about every hire or move." Various respondents offered "We don't hire for every... Division, Location, Function (field sales, financial consultants, call centers), or Level (Hourly Workers, Union Workers).

We also asked "Have you formally outsourced staffing – all or in part? What best characterizes your situation? (Assume for the purposes of this survey that outsourcing is defined as a major formal agreement with a single outside firm like Hewitt/Exult to recruit a large portion of your expected hires over a several year period, not a short term engagement of a firm to ramp up current staffing levels). The responses:

- Yes, we outsource all or part of our recruiting. (44%)
- Not yet. We are discussing. (11%)
- No. Considered it and decided against it. (26%)
- No. Haven't considered it. (11%)
- No. Been there. Done that. Brought it back. (8%)

On any given day 189,154 contract, contingent or part-timers were employed by the respondent firms or 18.2% of the total workforce. Over time we suspect this will be an important source for full-time positions. For the moment it is still relatively small. We also asked, "Which of the following best describes your situation for how you hire contingent & part-time workers?" The responses:

- We have a master contract with a single vendor. (65%)
- We have dedicated recruiters and sourcers for these areas. (19%)
- We stay out of this area as much as possible and have little or no responsibility for it. (16%)

Clearly Staffing remains a fragmented function. Truly examining the supply chain requires knowing where all the parts are and how they all fit together.

### **What's in the cards for 2006?**

61% of the respondents actually hired more new employees in 2005 than 2004 (17% hired the same number. 22% hired fewer last year than the year before).

A year ago we asked employers to predict what they would do in 2005. Their answers indicated a generally strong year for 2005 and mirrored the actual results above. 62% predicted that 2005 would see an increase, 32% predicted a decrease and 6% expected no change.

For 2006 and perhaps not unexpected, are predictions that seem to consolidate the past year's gains. Only 4% of the employers predict they will hire fewer employees in 2006 than 2005. 38% will hire more. 58% expect to hire the same number.

## Sources of Hire

While we continue to refine what we ask employers about their sources of hire it is clear that two sources, employee referrals and hires attributed to the Internet, continue to play the largest roles as shown below in Table 2.

**Table 2: Traditional Sources of Hire**

SOURCES	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Employee Referrals	27.1%	31.7%	28.5%	26.6%	23.3%
Internet	24.7%	29.6%	31.8	27.0%	20.5%
College	8.0%	5.6%	2.4%	Not surveyed	Not surveyed
Direct Sourcing	7.4%	6%	2.6%	Not surveyed	Not surveyed
Print	4.6%	5.5%	3.8%	4.8%	Not surveyed
Career Fairs	5.2%	3.2%	2.8%	3.2%	Not surveyed
3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Agencies	5.2%	3.2%	1.2%	Not surveyed	Not surveyed
Walk-in	4.2%	Not surveyed	Not surveyed	Not surveyed	Not surveyed
Temp-to-Hire	3.2%	Not surveyed	Not surveyed	Not surveyed	Not surveyed
ALL Other	5.5%	15.2%	26.9%	38.4%	56.2%
Just Don't Know	5.0%				
Total	100	100	100	100	100

**Employee Referrals** are assumed to be such a traditional source of quality hires that it is too often taken for granted. Companies need to determine from their employees who refer others, just what their relationship is – and offer appropriate incentives to do so. In the future emphasis must be placed on differentiating the referrals that lead to better performance, faster on-boarding and increased retention. Technologies that support referral management coupled with solid programs are already helping to increase this category. It is not uncommon to see referrals accounting for 35-50% of all hires among firms that promote employee referrals. On the other side of the equation, new strategies and applications now exist to support job seekers in reaching employees through association databases and social network applications.

**The Internet** may be so ubiquitous, in that it permeates every aspect of the hiring process, that it has begun to lose meaning and value as a distinct category. The Internet may be more appropriately viewed as a medium for communication and research rather than as a source. Almost every source of hire can now claim to have elements of the Internet embedded into it – somewhere, somehow. In this study the Internet reflects hires driven to the firm from specific and niche job boards as well as the corporate website. We could make a case that Direct Sourcing is also an Internet driven source – see Direct Sourcing.

**College Hires** are up. We found that responding firms hired 5.9% off college campuses and 2.2% additional were attributed to intern and summer programs. We believe we'll see this latter number go up in the next year as firms target college students earlier in their education.

**Direct Sourcing** is an attempt to get at internal sourcing practices of employers whose strategies include proactively identifying and tracking down candidates. These results show significant increases. We asked about these practices with follow up questions and were told:

- We mine resume databases (other than our own company). (78.3%)
- We cold call & follow up on research generated leads. (70%)
- We generate and follow up on Non-Employee Referrals. (52.3%)
- We restrict Direct Sourcing to Top Level positions. (4%)

40% of the respondents also told us that mining external databases was a *small* portion of their Direct Sourcing numbers. 20% don't track these numbers and roll them into an Internet category without breaking them out. This would suggest that the direct access to candidates by employers through lists, search engines, specialized databases and social application networks (to name just a few approaches) will continue to offer alternatives to third party agencies. In fact, in other surveys we've noted a significant increase in hiring from third party firms to fill recruiter openings.

**Print** publishers have claimed a major comeback since 2003 and a recently published study by the Conference Board, *Looking for Employees in All the Right Places*, would support their assertion. The study showed that even more people use Print in their job search than the Internet. Maybe so, but the authors of the Conference Board study did not track what *actually worked* just what jobseekers used. To be fair, the study was extremely well designed and the sample of 5,000 constructed as representative by age, location and income and, with a 67% response rate was valid and very informative. The study authors, Linda Barrington and June Shelp, showed how as income increased, the shift to the Internet from print was clearly apparent. They also confirmed what we all know (but with real data) that job seekers are unlikely to have used a single source in their job process and this study is the first to outline the combinations that are used – but what combinations are the ones your highest performers are likely to use?

We can't support the fact that Print is any healthier the last few years – at least with large highly competitive firms. We predicted a decade ago that they would settle to 5% and it seems as if they have. We also cannot overlook the fact that Print – especially newspaper classifieds – once laid claim as the dominant source of all hires. Employment Management Association studies as late as the mid-nineties calculated Print at 60%. The gap between print publishers' past success and today's reality is...billions of \$\$\$s – no argument there. However, billions remain and that is where the future of this category will be fought. The good news is that many publishers have built successful online properties. Now, if they could just get them to work in concert with one another (sarcasm alert).

**Career Fairs** are staging a comeback with firms like Dow Jones CareerJournal staking a claim to Diversity Fairs at the professional high-end and an explosion of entry, college fairs and local job fairs across the board. Perspective is important – it is still just 5-6% of hires.

Hires from **3<sup>rd</sup> Party Agencies** have also surged in the last year supporting the notion of the renewed war for talent.

**Walk-in's** are among the many traditional sources we hadn't tracked but now do, reducing the "Other" category to a manageable few.

**Temp-to-hire** and Contract-to-Hire was brought up last year as an increasingly important source of hire – as it should be since Non Full-Time employees account for 18% of the survey respondents respective workforces. We're a little surprised that the number of hires from such a large and accessible source isn't even higher. Perhaps the "firewalls" between employers and the suppliers of contingent workers presents cost or communication barriers. Expect them to get more permeable in the future. We also expect that service level agreements with hiring managers will emphasize temp-to-hire considerations before looking externally.



**All Other** represents what the companies know as additional sources we've not asked about. Rehires and Community Agencies (probably welfare to work) were mentioned. Our first study was merely a means to confirm the importance of the Internet and so had a large "other" category. Today we've really established the major channels and are simply fine tuning.

**Just Don't Know** is our way of capturing the errors reported to us when we personally called and discussed the numbers our respondents reported. In most instances it is simply reporting error – recruiters and new hires who failed to input data as required by their system protocols with no one following up to ensure it was done. In other instances, employers maintained categories that had never had any meaning or had lost their meaning i.e. "unsolicited". This level of error is a substantial challenge for firms who envision a reliable supply chain model as an end goal. The good news is that 29% of the respondents *did* know the source of every hire.

**All Sources are Not Equal: Context is Essential**

It is a mistake to assume all sources are equal. Every channel has a target audience and it may be more productive for hiring in one location, level, skill or function and useless for another.

Look at Table 3 below where we asked survey respondents to tell us the percentage of exempt hires from each source. If, for example, 80% of all your walk-in hires were hourly you would consider it a high value and look to improve the number of walk-ins but, you sure wouldn't be waiting for your next CFO prospect to wander by your offices for a cuppa joe. So, the value you ascribe to any source **MUST** be considered in the context you use it.

**Table 3: % Exempt Hires by Source**

<b>SOURCES</b>	<b>% of Exempt Hires from this Source</b>
3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Placement Agencies	71.4%
Employee Referrals	70.0%
Direct Sourcing	65.0%
College	61.0%
Print	55.6%
Internet	50.0%
Career Fairs	47.8%
Temp-to-Hire	29.4%
Walk-ins	20.0%

This simple point is too often overlooked. Ask and answer for your own firm what % of entry-level hires, director-level hires, etc. are a result of each source you measure as a part of your analysis of its value.

Employer best practices tag each family of jobs to establish if there are source differences by performance. How specific do we need to get about the relative sources we measure to beat the competition? Good question. Why not try and answer it. Are there combinations of sources that increase the likelihood a top candidate will choose us? Answers to these questions are essential before we begin to look at the cost/yield equation.

**To attribute a general “Value Index” to any source of hire is simplistic and misleading.**

Employer best practices tag each family of jobs to establish if there are source differences by performance. How specific do we need to get about the relative sources we measure to beat the competition? Good question. Why not try and answer it. Are there combinations of sources that increase the likelihood a top candidate will choose us? These questions are essential before we begin to look at the cost/yield equation.

**The Internet is Maturing: It’s Time to take its Measure up a Notch**

When we began our first study of Source of Hire in 2001 it was to examine the impact of the Internet. It was easy because the tracking was limited to job postings and the company website. We imagined the Internet evolving as a stage on which numerous Internet driven sources might evolve. The good news is that has happened. The bad news is that the systems and capabilities for tracking it have not adapted and little more than job site postings are still all that is included in this category.

Observations:

- Arguably one out of every three hires is sourced from the Internet if we add Direct Sourcing (7.5%) to the job boards and website hires (24.7% ) reported by our survey respondents. In the future we will look for a better means to measure and combine these disparate sources but it will require improvements in how employer’s to track and measure results.
- A quarter of the survey participants were unable to break out specific hires by job site. These problems were in some cases recruiter-generated and in other cases system-generated.
- Most survey participants had contracts with the three largest sites Monster (74%) CareerBuilder (61%) and HotJobs (39%). One of four respondents had a contract with all three.
- In the table below we calculated the percentage of Internet hires and Total Hires from Monster, CareerBuilder and Hotjobs *only if the respondents had contracts with them.* Our adjustment inflates the real impact of the three top sites in relation to the company web site and niche sites but it is a fairer treatment and consistent with the approach used in prior years.

**Table 4: Internet Sources (Job Sites and Company Website)**

Internet Sources	2005		2004	2003	2002	2001
	%Internet	(% All )	%Internet	%Internet	%Internet	%Internet
Company Web Site	49.2	(12.2)	53.3	67.9	57.7	62.0
All Niche Sites	22.5	(5.1)	16.9	17.6	20.8	24.0
Monster	15.2	(3.7)	8.6	8.7	14.0	9.0
CareerBuilder	9.0	(2.2)	8.1	4.1	5.6	2.5
HotJobs	4.2	(1.0)	6.1	1.8	1.9	2.5

- The good news is that the hires attributed to Corporate Websites as a source continues to drop. This *is* good news because it shows that employers are increasingly recognizing their site as a destination and not a source.

- The three largest sites dominate the scene. The impact of niche sites is spread among hundreds of other sites. We asked firms to identify three niche sites that provided the most hires and the most mentioned were a broad collection: AJB, All retail jobs, Bankjobs, Biospace, Bloomberg, Collegegrad, Centerwatch, Craigslist, Dice, Direct Employers, HCareers, Jobboards.com, Jobs in the Money, LinkedIn, Media Bistro, MSN, Medzilla, Nursing Spectrum, Science Online, SHRM, Work.com, 6 Figurejobs. We would emphasize that these employer *perceptions* of the niche sites that were productive could not always be backed up with data. One company did report 250 hires from Americas Job Bank. 20% of the firms mentioned DICE.
- We did ask survey respondents to identify the number of hires from *Search Engine Optimization* efforts as well as purchasing *Specific Keywords from Search Engines* as a part of their Internet hires. We believe these are emerging channels and subsequent discussion with the survey participants supported this notion. However, respondents said, in every case that they cannot or do not record hires from these sources! To speculate on the numbers they produce would be inappropriate for us to do but it is not a large number...yet.
- We asked what was missed and learned that Rehires and Professional Associations are two areas we did not ask about that employers track and find useful.

**While There is No Silver Bullet for Diversity, Employee Referrals Stand Out**

Few companies have analyzed their diversity hires by source – at least in real time. The table below is drawn from employers’ *perceptions* about their most productive sources and obviously isn’t further refined by level, type of job or location. Still it is a useful exercise. Note that including the “Not Used” category deflates the percentages assigned to Productive and Not Productive.

**Table 5: Perceptions about Sources of Diversity Hires**

Source	Employee Referrals	Major Job Boards	Diversity Career Fairs	Agencies	Company Affinity Groups	Niche Diversity Job Boards	Dedicated Diversity Sourcers	Dedicated Diversity Recruiters
<b>At least Somewhat Productive</b>	96%	75.0%	70.8%	65.2%	61.9%	50%	26.1%	14.3%
<b>Not Productive</b>	4%	20.8%	29.2%	13.0%	9.5%	50%	8.7%	14.3%
<b>Not Used</b>	0%	4.2%	4.2%	21.7%	28.6%	0%	65.2%	71.4%

If every employer used every source (and the ratios between them remained the same), the order in Table 5 above would change to the one shown below:

**Table 6: Comparison of Productive to Unproductive Responses**

Source	Somewhat Productive
Employee Referrals	96%
Company Affinity Groups	87%
Agencies	83%
Major Job Boards	78%
Dedicated Diversity Sourcers	75%
Diversity Career Fairs	71%
Niche Job Boards	50%
Dedicated Diversity Recruiters	50%

## ***Final Thoughts***

Dozens of recommendations would be overkill. We have three recommendations for employers:

### **Measure it**

Sources of hire are one important element in truly understanding Staffing Supply Chains. *Not* perceptions about what you think they are but the real deal.

- Revisit your broad categories like Print and Job Boards but then engage the job seeker to drill into subcategories – specific publications and sites. *And then go back and ask if there wasn't another source that also contributed. Let's start measuring what really happens. We suspect but do not know about the interactions between sources that really engage the best candidates to apply, prepare, compete and succeed in becoming employees.*
- Eliminate your Career Site as a source or, specifically identify how it is a source i.e. if the person was targeting your company as a strategy (and why) or, if they were surfing your site for products and their attention was drawn to your jobs pages. This is valuable data but a smaller part of the overall strategy than half of all Internet hires. (We aren't ignoring the fact that your site is a critical component in nearly all your hires – just not the source.)
- Annually review and add sources such as candidates driven to your site through results from general or specialized search engines or, ads and links associated with the purchase of keywords on these search engines or rehires, temp-to-perm, etc.

### **Account for all of it**

The completeness, quality and consistency of your measures are essential if you want to achieve any level of reliability and validity in your analysis – and that will drive your credibility within your firm when you develop plans for improvement.

- Are there hires of any kind that take place in the firm we do not at least know about? Track them down. What is missing may be important to what isn't.
- How many ways do you collect information about sources of hire? 84% of our survey respondents used pull-down menus on their online application form; 40% used a new hire self-report during on-boarding and 28% relied in part on recruiters' questions during the interview. In our opinion 100% of all *new hires* should complete a survey with follow-up as necessary as a part of their on-boarding process. No excuses. No exceptions. All hires of *all* kinds. If only to evaluate the quality of data gathered separately.

However you measure, do it with commitment. In our survey and follow-up, it was clear that at least 5% of new hire sources were simply unrecorded.

### **Analyze it**

The pipeline is the thing...or the supply chain if you prefer.

- What are the differences in source across levels, special skills, location, predicted performance, etc. and within each what is the yield? If you can analyze new hires, you can work backward to the applicant pools you drew them from. At a 20,000 foot level you'll be better prepared to invest appropriately in the most effective sources.
- At the ground level, share SOH metrics on your recruiters' dashboard. Knowing what has worked and what hasn't – especially as a real time exercise – will help recruiters choose or work on improving their individual productivity and efficiency.

We believe that a disciplined approach to Source of Hire as one critical component in your staffing process will move the entire employment function forward as a business partner.

We Wish You Good Hunting!

### **About CareerXroads: The Staffing Strategy Connection**

Gerry Crispin and Mark Mehler are committed to writing, researching and sharing their adventures, opinions and data about evolving staffing models with members of the HR profession, CXR Colloquium members, clients and friends. Passionate about how firms design and build staffing processes, the technology to enhance them and the systems to manage them, Gerry and Mark strive to observe and influence new and evolving models that aspire to world-class, measurable standards and satisfy every stakeholder.

They want to know more about the 'playing fields' where candidates and employers meet and they are more than a little curious about how they treat one another: specifically how Job Seekers 'game' their next career move while Employers tout their latest opportunities.

They are always on the lookout for stories about staffing challenges, benchmarks, and results as well as the people who live the stories they tell.

(For more on CareerXroads and CareerXroads' Colloquium go to [www.careerxroads.com](http://www.careerxroads.com) or [www.careerxroads.com/colloquium/colloquium.htm](http://www.careerxroads.com/colloquium/colloquium.htm) )