

THE STATUS OF TRAINING IN STATE PARK SYSTEMS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

by

DARRELL B. CRAIG, B.S. in E.R.

A THESIS

IN

PARK ADMINISTRATION

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Approved

Accepted

August, 1971

AC
805
T3
1971
No. 91
cop. 2

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to Professor James D. Mertes for his encouragement and direction of this thesis and to the other members of my committee, Professors Louis D. Ponthieu and George Tereshkovich, for their suggestions and helpful criticism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	5
III. RESULTS	23
IV. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	55
REFERENCES	61
APPENDIX	64

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Established Training Programs	25
2. Training Policy Statement	27
3. Size of Organization	28
4. Percent of Participation	30
5. Qualified Training Directors	33
6. Size of Training Staff	34
7. Training Facilities	36
8. Assistance from State Personnel Office	38
9. Time Devoted to Planning	39
10. Budget Expenditure	41
11. Reimbursement for Education Costs	43
12. Training for Promotion and Upgrading	45
13. Types of Instructors	47
14. Subjects Covered in Training Program	48
15. Training Methods Used	49
16. Length of Training Sessions	50
17. Determining Training Needs	51

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

This is a study to investigate the planning, implementation, and benefits of in-service training and development programs for state park systems of the United States. Before recommendations for further research or guidelines for the planning and implementation of training programs can be offered, a thorough analysis of the "state of the art" must be presented. Thus, the objectives of the thesis are as follows:

- 1) To examine the status of training and development programs of state park systems of the United States.
- 2) To examine the need for training and development within state park systems of the United States.
- 3) To evaluate the merits of training and development programs to state park systems as viewed by the survey respondents.
- 4) To develop guidelines for planning and implementation of training and development programs within state park systems of the United States.

Need for the Study

This study is important because virtually no research has been directed solely toward in-service training and employee development as it pertains to state park systems. No information is available to individual state park directors that would inform them of the status of in-service training in other state park systems. Furthermore, to the author's knowledge, there is no organization in existence which is currently attempting to provide this type of information.

Virtually all public and personnel administrators agree that there is a need to up-grade certain areas of performance of otherwise satisfactory employees who are lacking in certain skills or attitudes deemed necessary by the organization. At the present, there are inefficiencies in state park operations which exist as a result of inferior or missing skills of personnel at all levels. Yet, there are few methods, including comprehensive training programs, which are designed to rectify these deficiencies in the state park systems.

Alberta Calhoun of the Idaho Personnel Commission states that "at the present time the Personnel Commission has no training staff. This has been proposed in the budget since we recognize the need; but we feel certain

that it will be cut from the budget appropriation."¹

William Gosdin, Director of Park Services in the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department states that:

. . . there is not, at this time, a definite system or policy for employee development within Park Services.
 . . . The recent passage of the Public Employees Training Act makes it possible for the Parks and Wildlife Department to expend funds for training employees
 The Department has not taken advantage of this Act.²

H.D. Matheney, Associate Director of the Missouri State Park Board asserts that:

Reasons too numerous to attempt to relate in this letter have prevented the development of a modern training program within our system. . . . The disadvantages of these methods is our obvious loss of employee efficiency. . . . A false advantage of economy is realized in the eyes of the legislature who appropriates our funds.³

Methodology

Data for this research was collected by the following three methods:

1) A library search for literature concerning the theory and application of in-service training and development including published state park material.

2) The use of a questionnaire sent to all fifty state park system directors in the United States.

¹Alberta Calhoun, personal letter, Feb. 3, 1971.

²William Gosdin, personal letter, Dec. 9, 1970.

³H.D. Matheney, personal letter, Nov. 16, 1970.

3) The use of a survey letter sent to all fifty state park agencies and to a variety of federal agencies which administer recreation areas and programs. The survey letters sought information concerning the type and successfulness of in-service training and development programs currently in existence.

The data was analyzed through the tabulation of answers on the questionnaires to provide specific statements relating to the objectives. Suggestions and comments received from the survey letters are included in the thesis according to their relevancy to the study. A sample questionnaire is included in the appendix.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Training, as a function of business organizations, is a relatively new concept--its main impetus has been since World War II. Most administrative personnel agree there is a need to upgrade specific areas of performance for those "satisfactory" employees who are lacking in certain skills or attitudes deemed necessary by the organization. However, there appears to be a controversy concerning the method by which this improvement can best be attained--is the concept of the in-service training program valid?

Literature concerning the validity of in-service training programs is extensive; however, the subsequent statements summarize the current schools of thought. Brown, a professor at George Washington University, states that "training is the function of helping others to acquire and apply knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes needed by both the individual and the organization."⁴ Because of this, it is probably the most important means of achieving

⁴David S. Brown, "An Old Tool Holds New Promise," Public Management, Vol. 47, No. 11 (November, 1965), 286.

objectives in an organization. However, Brown appears to modify this position as he states:

There are not really any alternatives to training. We may only debate what kind of training program to undertake, how much by way of resources are to be allocated to it, or how it should be undertaken, but there is no real substitute for training as such.⁵

Goode, a training specialist, objects to the philosophy of the preceding statement in that "there is not much point in wasting money on training that does little or no good."⁶

Use of improper training methods and techniques or teaching the wrong things can only result in wasted money and effort.

More research effort must be devoted to determining the best methods of developing the needed knowledge, attitudes and skills to be successful in a given line of work.

Wright, on the other hand, stresses the idea that persons in all levels of the organization can benefit from a well designed and administered training program.⁷ The phrase, "a well designed and administered training program," is the crux of this apparent discrepancy concerning the value of the concept of training.

Each of the preceding authors point out that it is not the validity of the concept of training, but rather the

⁵Brown, p. 286.

⁶Cecil F. Goode, "Research and Results," Public Personnel Review, Vol. 20, No. 1 (January, 1959), 66.

⁷Malcolm J. Wright, "Does Your Organization Have a Philosophy of Training?" Journal of the American Society of Training Directors, Vol. 14, No. 12 (December, 1960), 36.

processes that will result in the development of a successful training program--the procedures involved in the determination of need for training and the determination of the type of program to be implemented--that is controversial.

Although numerous references are available dealing with the subject of training, there has been very little written on the application, including the unique problems or situations, of training methods to outdoor recreation agencies and even less written on the application specifically to state park systems. Part of the reason for this lack of literature is that training in outdoor recreation agencies, if and when it exists, is generally sporadic--institutes and special in-house training seminars at various times during the year. These types of seminars will vary in length, content, etc., depending on topics to be covered and are usually scheduled according to need.

In addition, there is often no department or person solely charged with the responsibility of training or has specialized in the field of training. Training is generally considered one of the functions of management. Attempting to fix the responsibility for training in any company is not a simple matter. Management literature is replete with statements and philosophies related to responsibility in the business organization.

One of the major problems in the lack of a definite body charged with training responsibility is often little organized direction of the training function. In a well designed and administered training program, a philosophy of training is considered paramount. Wright defines a philosophy of training as:

. . . a state of being, an atmosphere, a basic concept present in the minds of the total management group of an organization It is a concept which gives the training of employees proper consideration in all phases of the management activity; consideration which is routine, based upon written policy and established standard operating practices. It is the state of being that exists when it is normal to plan and conduct training. It is an atmosphere which exists when all management people not only accept training as a fundamental management responsibility, but carry it out.⁸

One of the reasons for failure in training programs is the lack of a training philosophy. Top management's role is critically important in that "no one further down the ladder of the management hierarchy will take training seriously if at the top management level the goal of training or the needed outcomes are ignored by management's attitude or behavior."⁹ Thus, during the development of a training program, this pro-training philosophy or attitude provides a climate conducive to training and its

⁸Wright, p. 37.

⁹Douglas H. Fryer, Mortimer R. Feinberg, and Sheldon S. Zalkind, Developing People in Industry: Principles and Methods of Training (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956), p. 27.

application. Training does little good if the trainee is stifled in applying what he has learned or, if during training, he does not perceive a value of training by his superiors. Thus, the philosophy is inherently tied to the success of the program through such aspects as morale, interest, response of the trainees, and support of the supervisors. The development of this philosophy is often the responsibility of the training director or personnel department even though its basis lies in top management.

In reference to training in the field of parks and recreation, the members of the American Institute of Park Executives and the National Recreation Association state that

. . . in small departments the program of in-service training is usually organized by the director of the department . . . in a large organization the planning and development of in-service training programs is the responsibility of the division head.¹⁰

The National Park Service,¹¹ the U.S. Forest Service,¹² the Chicago Park District, and the Milwaukee

¹⁰American Institute of Park Executives and the National Recreation Association, In-Service Training for Parks and Recreation (Washington: National Recreation Association, 1953), p. 9.

¹¹National Park Service, Training Opportunities (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970).

¹²Ruth A. Kovach and William R. Moore, "Training Service Centers in the United States Forest Service," Training Directors Journal, Vol. 19, No. 1 (January, 1965).

County Park System¹³ have an organized and continuous training program; yet, little has been written by the trainers on the specific application of training to public outdoor recreation agencies. Consequently, available literature on the subject of development of training programs stems mainly from business and industry. This literature can be divided into categories: theory and application.

Theory

Learning is a complex function of the motivation and capacity of the individual participant, the training methods, the norms and behavior of the training group, and the general atmosphere of the organization. Thus, no one theory can adequately explain the process of learning--each of the major theories explains some aspects of learning better than others. Furthermore, the

. . . theories of learning seldom, if ever, provide direct answers to the kinds of questions asked by instructors, and laboratory studies of learning do not usually apply directly to the classroom or to the shop. However, training is a set of procedures to facilitate learning¹⁴

¹³E.P. Romilly, "In-Service Training for Park Employees," pamphlet reprinted from Recreation (October, 1950), para. 1.

¹⁴F.A. DePhillips, W.M. Berliner, and J.J. Cribbon, Management of Training Programs (Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1960), p. 78.

This situation arises because theories of learning are concerned with the "how" of learning and, thus, have a limited role in this study. However, it is necessary to present a cursory discussion of learning theory in order to understand the problems encountered in training.

Learning theories can be classified into two categories: the stimulus-response (S-R) theories and the cognitive theories. S-R theories are a derivation of the work of Pavlov in Russia and C.L. Thorndike in the United States. Otto and Glaser, industrial training specialists, state that these theories "are referred to as S-R theories because they typically represent learning in terms of changes in association between stimuli and responses."¹⁵

The simplest of the S-R theories is that of E.R. Guthrie--"combination of stimuli which has accompanied a movement will on its recurrence tend to be followed by that movement."¹⁶ The key to teaching in reference to this type of theory is seeing to it that the proper stimulus is associated with the proper response. The most elaborate of the S-R theories is Hull's theory.¹⁷ Hull's theory "makes

¹⁵Calvin P. Otto and Rollin O. Glaser, The Management of Training (Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1970), p. 102.

¹⁶E.R. Guthrie, The Psychology of Learning (New York: Harper and Row, 1935), p. 26.

¹⁷C.L. Hull, Principles of Behavior (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1943).

use of the work of Pavlov in conditioning and Throndike in 'trial and error' learning. Two of the key concepts in Hull's theory are habit strength and drive."¹⁸ Learning is dependent on association and drive reduction with drive reduction being the basis of reinforcement.

B.F. Skinner, a psychologist at Harvard, represents a major school of thought within the S-R system. He has founded a system based upon descriptive behavior and the concepts of stimulus, response and reinforcement. Skinner distinguishes between two types of learning--respondent and operant. Respondent learning is classical conditioning as described by Pavlov; whereas, operant learning requires that a response lead to a reinforcement.¹⁹ Otto and Glaser state that "in operant learning, the emphasis is on arranging situations so that the response to be conditioned is appropriately correlated with reinforcement."²⁰

The cognitive theories include those from Gestalt psychology. "Theories in this group are closely related to each other with each of them emphasizing perception and perceptual processes. Cognitive theories take the position that learning is a change in perception."²¹ Kurt Lewis and

¹⁸Otto and Glaser, pp. 102-103.

¹⁹B.F. Skinner, Science and Human Behavior (New York: Macmillan, 1953), pp. 65-66.

²⁰Otto and Glaser, p. 104.

²¹Otto and Glaser, p. 104.

E.C. Tolman present the foremost cognitive theories. Thus, while S-R theorists emphasize response and stimulus-response association, cognitive theorists emphasize the processes whereby the stimuli are differently perceived.

Because of the complexity of the various theories and the disagreement among them, learning theories sometimes become a source of confusion for those concerned with the practical problems of training. Otto and Glaser further assert that:

. . . many of the disagreements among the various theories are not relevant to the problems of training. Most of the disagreement concerns matters that are not relevant to the everyday problems of training and teaching, and where the disagreements are related to training the difference is one of emphasis rather than kind.²²

However, many experts, including members of the American Institute of Park Executives and the National Association indicate that the principles of learning which are elicited from learning theories are of utmost importance to those involved in training.²³ Many authors, thus, give a cursory discussion of learning theories and an in-depth discussion and list of the principles of learning and their application to training. Otto and Glaser present the following principles of learning:

²²Otto and Glaser, p. 105.

²³American Institute of Park Executives and the National Recreation Association, p. 12.

- 1) The learner learns what he does.
- 2) Learning proceeds most effectively when the learners' correct responses are immediately reinforced.
- 3) The frequency with which a response is reinforced will determine how well the response will be learned.
- 4) Practice in a variety of settings will increase the range of situations to which the learning can be applied.
- 5) Motivational conditions influence the effectiveness of rewards and play a key role in determining the performance of learned behavior.
- 6) Meaningful learning, that is, learning with understanding, is more permanent and more transferable than rote learning or learning by some memorized formula.
- 7) The learner's perception of what he is learning determines how well and how quickly he will learn.
- 8) People learn more effectively when they learn at their own pace.
- 9) There are different kinds of learning and they may require different training processes.²⁴

Principles of learning identify certain conditions that affect learning.²⁵ The next step is to translate the principle into techniques that are consistent with the objectives of the training program and that fit the available resources.

Application

One of the most pervasive concepts in the literature is that training programs should not be started without careful planning. This means that a definite need should exist before a formal program is developed to alleviate this need. Determining personnel deficiencies in a state

²⁴Otto and Glaser, pp. 106-112.

²⁵Otto and Glaser, p. 112.

park system is concerned with the examination of the methods which specify the deficient areas. This specification of deficiencies or determination of need is generally discussed in the literature in terms of the organization's objectives, strengths, and weaknesses. This demonstrates the uniqueness of each organization's situation. Since each organization is unique, its methods for determining its training needs may also vary or be unique. Luntz, a training specialist, develops this theme when he indicates there is probably no set procedure for identifying needs for training. Luntz states that "just as with the other major segments of the training man's job--arousing interest in training, using appropriate training techniques and evaluating results--it is necessary to adapt the approach to the situation."²⁶

Literature on various methods of identifying training needs is extensive. However, the prevailing concept throughout is the need to establish the disparities between role prescriptions and role behavior--in other words, what are the requirements of the job and how effective is the employee in doing the required work? Miner, a professor at the University of Maryland, summarizes the basic philosophy in the development of training programs:

²⁶Lester Luntz, "Identification of Training Needs," Journal of the American Society of Training Directors, Vol. 13, No. 3 (March, 1959), 6.

The important thing, irrespective of the approach employed, is to develop some conception not only as to whether performance deficiencies are present, but regarding the extent to which training can remedy such deficiencies, and also the type of training that might be most appropriate for the purpose. Thus, a training need analysis should come before any attempt at establishing the method or content of training.²⁷

There is no standard method to establish need, although some methods may be better than others--depending upon the situation. In general, Williams, a private consultant, suggests attitude surveys;²⁸ whereas, Caldwell, a professor of government at Indiana University, suggests manpower surveys and realistic cost data.²⁹ DePhillips, Berliner, and Cribbon, professors of Management and Industrial Relations at New York University, report that "the questionnaire makes it possible to express numerically the results with relative ease . . . but that caution must be the rule in interpreting and drawing conclusions from the results."³⁰ In this manner large numbers of individuals or companies can be sampled with relative ease. Often

²⁷ John B. Miner, Personnel and Industrial Relations: A Managerial Approach (New York: Macmillan Co., 1969), p. 351.

²⁸ Douglas Williams, "Using Attitude Surveys to Determine Training Needs," Journal of the American Society of Training Directors, Vol. 8, No. 6 (November-December, 1954), 7-10, 32-36.

²⁹ Lynton K. Caldwell, "Determining Training Needs for Organization Effectiveness," Personnel Administration, Vol. 26, No. 2 (March-April, 1963), 11.

³⁰ DePhillips, Berliner, and Cribbon, p. 389.

training needs are discovered through the requests for training by line management or direct observation of actual job performance.

Determining which personnel skills and attitudes most need improvement through in-service training is a function of the method employed to determine training needs. However, urgent training needs usually manifest themselves in specific employment problems. Nigro, professor of Public Administration at the University of Delaware, reports that governmental agencies must provide separate training facilities for training activities not duplicated in industry. He states that "the type of activity may not be unique, but its application in a public setting may be so specialized that special training is required."³¹ This type of situation exists in a state park system--specific park situations have particular needs, i.e., plant identification, as well as non-geographical needs, i.e., public relations. Kovach and Moore, training specialists with the U.S. Forest Service, report an analogous situation in the Forest Service--"each man or woman has special training needs. Some of these are pertinent only to an individual or to a local area. Other training needs are common to many in the Forest Service."³²

³¹Felix A. Nigro, Public Personnel Administration (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1959), p. 236.

³²Kovach and Moore, p. 49.

Many of the articles concerning in-service training and development are concerned with a single level of the organization--operative, supervisory, mid-management or top-management. However, some authors stress the need for an integrated training program. E.P. Romilly, in his article, "In-Service Training for Park Employees," states that:

In-service training for all employees is necessary in order to achieve an effective relationship between administration and the employee, between employee and the public he serves Mere rules and regulations governing contacts and operations are not enough. Employees function best when they are made to feel that they are an active part of any program or project, when they understand the basic reasons for and objectives of such programs or projects, and when they have a sense of positive direction. In-service training programs for employees in the lower brackets--those who must meet and handle the public--may cover fundamentals and be devoted more to techniques It becomes necessary to organize and carry out a formal program for both supervisor and employee.³³

Nigro adds that "it is erroneous to assume that lower-level workers do not need public relations training." This is an important area which is only now being recognized. Much of the training in business organizations is skill-oriented. The important areas of social attitudes and emotional factors that contribute to achievement in industry have largely been neglected.³⁴ DePhillips, Berliner, and Cribbon continue this theme by stating:

³³Romilly, para. 2.

³⁴Nigro, pp. 226-246.

. . . it does not take too much thought to recognize that manipulative skill alone does not run a machine or complete clerical tasks The emotional, economic, and social aspects of industry need emphasis in training programs along with the skills necessary for job accomplishment.³⁵

The employees to be trained must be involved in the planning stages of all training programs. Nigro states that "many such programs have failed or produced mediocre results largely because of the resentment or indifference of the people whom they were meant to aid." He continues by stating, "first of all, the employees themselves should be consulted beforehand on their needs for training; they should not be confronted with a management edict on the subject."³⁶ Stewart, a training analyst, indicates that if the trainee does not have the proper potential or attitude, the expended funds will be wasted.³⁷

The following are some of the standard training techniques used by modern business as well as many governmental agencies. Each has its advantages and limitations such as the size of the training group, types of subjects to be learned and costs incurred.

³⁵ DePhillips, Berliner, and Cribbon, p. 40.

³⁶ Nigro, p. 253.

³⁷ Nathaniel Stewart, "External Resources for Training," The Federal Career Service (Washington: Society of Personnel Administration, 1954), Pamphlet No. 8, pp. 79-82.

Lecture.--Lectures are a common verbal technique employed in training. A lecture is an oral presentation prepared and given by a qualified person. The main limitation with the lecture technique is that there is often little or no audience feedback or participation.

Demonstration.--A demonstration is a presentation planned to show the trainee how to perform an act, skill or procedure. It is usually accompanied by visual presentations, questions and trainee involvement. Teaching the proper use of fire fighting tools would necessitate the use of the demonstration training technique.

Films and slides.--A wide range of training films are in existence and can be rented or purchased for use for relatively little cost. Training films can be obtained covering such subjects as public relations, public speaking, first aid, safety, law enforcement and fire fighting as well as most of the trade skills, all of which could be of value to state park systems. Slide and film strip presentations have an advantage over films in that they can be produced easily and economically by training personnel within the organization.

Conference.--A conference or symposium usually consists of the techniques listed above as well as periods for open discussion and debate. Conferences may last several hours

or several days. There are several advantages to the conference technique such as: any number of persons may participate; a large number of topics can be covered; and intensified learning can take place in a short period of time.

Programmed instruction.--Programmed instruction consists of a variety of techniques. Usually it is in the form of a reading assignment with questions at the end. A problem is presented and the trainee is asked to solve the problem. Answers are provided and the material gives immediate feedback to the trainee.

Simulation.--Simulation techniques vary, but the principle is the same. The trainee acts out or goes through the motions of performing a particular exercise or task. A driving simulator used to teach safe driving to high school students is a prime example of a simulator technique.

The T group (training group) is another type of simulation technique. A T group is usually composed of six to twelve members plus a trainer. It is basically a discussion group with three purposes: "to help individuals learn how to learn; to help individuals learn how to give help to others; and to develop an effective group membership."³⁸

³⁸Otto and Glaser, p. 332.

In-basket is another simulation technique commonly used. The in-basket technique's main purpose is to "train learners to make decisions, prepare reports, handle correspondence, and generally become proficient at writing communications."³⁹ The learner receives his training exercises through his "in-basket," just as if it were an actual administrative task to be performed.

In-service training is primarily a tool designed to up-grade the performance of satisfactory employees within an organization. Its concepts, principles, and practices are derived from the fields of business, industry, education, and psychology. Since in-service training is a relatively new function, its definition and validity are, at times, disputed. Consequently, the current schools of thought and processes involved in successful in-service training were reviewed. In reference to the field of parks and recreation, a lack of literature specific to the field exists. However, the principles of in-service training used by business and industry are applicable to the field of parks and recreation, needing only minor modifications with respect to the specific purposes and objectives of the particular organization.

³⁹Otto and Glaser, p. 335.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The results of this study include the results of the questionnaire sent to all fifty state park system directors in the United States and information obtained from the survey letters sent to all fifty state park agencies and various federal agencies which administer recreation areas and programs. Thirty-five of the state park systems responded to the questionnaire for a total of seventy percent. All three federal agencies responded.

In addition, the results of two surveys on training subjects were available for use in this study. These surveys concern individual preferences for training subjects and areas and do provide an indication of the types of training opportunities desired by personnel in state park systems. The two surveys came from the states of Idaho and Illinois.

The results of this study are analyzed in terms of the responses to the questions. Included is relevant information received from the federal agencies participating in the survey--the National Park Service, the U.S. Forest Service and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Tables

pertaining to the individual questions are added when enumeration best facilitates explanation. States not reporting the existence of a training program are not analyzed in questions four through twenty.

Although the twenty questions on the questionnaire are completely objective, the manner in which they were answered by the various park directors is subject to close analysis. Each answer on a particular questionnaire must be weighed against other answers on the questionnaire to receive a true picture of the training program of a particular state park system. No attempt will be made at ranking or grading the individual state park systems or training programs.

Presentation of the Results

Question 1.--Does your organization have a training program for its employees? (Refer to Table 1.) Twenty-three answered YES; twelve answered NO.

Seven of the ten states reporting no training program have less than 100 permanent employees, four of the states have between 100 and 250 permanent employees, and only one state (Texas) having more than 250 permanent employees reported that it has no training program. When examining the twenty-three states that reported they do

TABLE 1
ESTABLISHED TRAINING PROGRAMS

Question: Does your organization have a training program for its employees?	Yes	No
Alabama		X
Alaska	X	
Arizona		X
Colorado	X	
Connecticut	X	
Florida	X	
Georgia	X	
Hawaii	X	
Idaho	X	
Illinois	X	
Indiana	X	
Iowa	X	
Kansas	X	
Louisiana		X
Maine	X	
Massachusetts	X	
Michigan	X	
Mississippi		X
Montana		X
Nebraska		X
Nevada	X	
New Jersey	X	
New York	X	
North Carolina		X
Ohio	X	
Oregon	X	
South Carolina		X
South Dakota	X	
Tennessee	X	
Texas		X
Utah	X	
Vermont		X
Washington		X
West Virginia		X
Wisconsin	X	

have a training program, it is necessary to analyze the remaining questions on the questionnaire to determine whether or not they actually do have a sound, comprehensive training program or have merely made sporadic attempts at offering limited training opportunities. The federal agencies responding to the survey letter, the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, also indicated that they have training programs.

Question 2.--Does your organization have a definite policy statement concerning employee training? (Refer to Table 2.) Eleven answered YES; twenty-four answered NO.

While only two of the ten states reporting no training program have a definite policy statement (Texas and Washington) concerning employee training, the majority of the states reporting the existence of a training program do not have a definite policy statement. The federal government, in 1958, set forth the Government Employees Training Act. This act functions as a policy statement for training for the various federal agencies.

Question 3.--How many permanent employees does your organization have? (Refer to Table 3.)

TABLE 2
TRAINING POLICY STATEMENT

Question: Does your organization have a definite policy statement concerning employee training?	Yes	No
Alabama		X
Alaska		X
Arizona		X
Colorado		X
Connecticut		X
Florida		X
Georgia	X	
Hawaii		X
Idaho	X	
Illinois	X	
Indiana		X
Iowa	X	
Kansas	X	
Louisiana		X
Maine		X
Massachusetts		X
Michigan	X	
Mississippi		X
Montana		X
Nebraska		X
Nevada		X
New Jersey		X
New York	X	
North Carolina		X
Ohio		X
Oregon	X	
South Carolina		X
South Dakota		X
Tennessee		X
Texas	X	
Utah		X
Vermont		X
Washington	X	
West Virginia		X
Wisconsin	X	

TABLE 3
SIZE OF ORGANIZATION

Question: How many permanent employees does your organization have?	1-100	100-250	250-500	500-1000	1000-5000
Alabama	X				
Alaska	X				
Arizona	X				
Colorado	X				
Connecticut		X			
Florida			X		
Georgia			X		
Hawaii			X		
Idaho	X				
Illinois				X	
Indiana			X		
Iowa	X				
Kansas	X				
Louisiana		X			
Maine	X				
Massachusetts		X			
Michigan			X		
Mississippi	X				
Montana	X				
Nebraska	X				
Nevada	X				
New Jersey			X		
New York					X
North Carolina	X				
Ohio				X	
Oregon			X		
South Carolina		X			
South Dakota	X				
Tennessee				X	
Texas			X		
Utah		X			
Vermont	X				
Washington		X			
West Virginia		X			
Wisconsin					X

Questions four through twenty only apply to those state park systems reporting the existence of a training program. In analyzing the remaining questions on the questionnaire, the total number of states involved is twenty-three.

Question 4.--What percentage of your current employees have participated in a formal training program? (Refer to Table 4.)

This question gives an insight into the comprehensiveness of an organization's training program. Only eleven of the states reported that more than half of their employees have participated in a formal training program. The low percentages may be due in part to the fact that some of the state park systems are relatively young. Secondly, several of the states indicated that their programs were directed toward the supervisory and administrative levels of the organization which generally constitute a minority of the personnel in a state park system.

Information is not available as to the percentages of federal employees who have participated in training programs. However, it is this writer's impression from reviewing the literature that virtually all federal employees have participated in training programs.

TABLE 4
PERCENT OF PARTICIPATION

Question: What percent of your current employees have participated in a formal training program?	0-	5-	10-	25-	50-	75--
	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	100%
Alaska		X				
Colorado						X
Connecticut				X		
Florida				X		
Georgia					X	
Hawaii		X				
Idaho					X	
Illinois			X			
Indiana					X	
Iowa				X		
Kansas						X
Maine						X
Massachusetts						X
Michigan						X
Nevada						X
New Jersey					X	
New York			X			
Ohio			X			
Oregon	X					
South Dakota		X				
Tennessee			X			
Utah					X	
Wisconsin				X		

Question 5.--Is your training program handled by another agency such as the State Personnel Office? Four answered YES; nineteen answered NO.

Of the four states reporting that their training program is handled by another agency, Hawaii, Iowa, New Jersey and South Dakota, only one has more than 250 permanent employees. Two of the states, Iowa and South Dakota, indicated that their training programs are handled by state universities.

Federal agencies can and do receive assistance from the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Training. However, most of their training is developed and conducted by their own personnel. The Forest Service and the Park Service both have staffs of training specialists to oversee and carry out training activities. Training programs administered by these agencies cover a wide range of subjects from the basic trade skills to management development. The Forest Service and Park Service both offer courses relating to all aspects of park and outdoor recreation administration. In most cases, these agencies allow persons from state and local agencies to attend their training programs on a "space-available" basis.⁴⁰

⁴⁰U.S. Forest Service, Region 3, Training Handbook (Continental Divide, New Mexico: Continental Divide Training Center), Section I, p. 6.

Question 6.--Is your training program handled by someone specially trained for that position? (Refer to Table 5.)

Eight answered YES; fifteen answered NO.

South Dakota was the only state park system with less than 100 employees reporting that its training program is handled by someone specially trained for the position. South Dakota, however, is one of the states that reported its training is handled by a university. Of the remaining seven answering YES, only Utah has less than 250 employees.

In Region 3 of the U.S. Forest Service, the direction for training emanates from the Regional Forester and his Division Chiefs. For better direction and control, Region 3 has established a Regional Training Committee. The committee is composed of six members plus a permanent secretary. They are the Chief, Division of Fire Control; Chief, Division of Operations; two Forest Supervisors; one Forest Staff Officer; one District Ranger; and the Branch Chief in charge of safety and training, who acts as secretary.⁴¹

Question 7.--How large is your training staff? (Refer to Table 6.)

⁴¹U.S. Forest Service, Region 3, Section I, p. 2.

TABLE 5

QUALIFIED TRAINING DIRECTORS

Question: Is your training program directed by someone specially trained for that position?	Yes	No
Alaska		X
Colorado		X
Connecticut		X
Florida	X	
Georgia		X
Hawaii		X
Idaho		X
Illinois		X
Indiana		X
Iowa		X
Kansas		X
Maine		X
Massachusetts		X
Michigan		X
Nevada		X
New Jersey	X	
New York	X	
Ohio	X	
Oregon	X	
South Dakota	X	
Tennessee		X
Utah	X	
Wisconsin	X	

TABLE 6
 SIZE OF TRAINING STAFF

Question: How large is your training staff?	None	1	2-5	6-10
Alaska		X		
Colorado	X			
Connecticut				X
Florida	X			
Georgia			X	
Hawaii	X			
Idaho	X			
Illinois		X		
Indiana	X			
Iowa	X			
Kansas			X	
Maine				X
Massachusetts	X			
Michigan		X		
Nevada	X			
New Jersey				X
New York			X	
Ohio				X
Oregon			X	
South Dakota	X			
Tennessee			X	
Utah				X
Wisconsin			X	

The size of the training staff in comparison to the size of the organization gives an indication of how much emphasis is placed in the area of employee training and development in each state park system. It is entirely possible that the personnel on training staffs have additional duties other than training. In the case of Maine, which is the only state with less than 100 permanent employees reporting six to ten persons on its training staff, it is probable that the entire training staff does not devote all of its time to training and development activities.

Question 8.--Does your organization have special facilities for training purposes only; such as, specific buildings, classrooms, etc.? (Refer to Table 7.) Ten answered YES; thirteen answered NO.

Special facilities are important in creating the proper learning atmosphere. Acoustically treated rooms and rooms that can be properly darkened for films and slides are important. This question gives an indication of the priority placed upon employee training and development in the individual state park systems.

Examples of special facilities for training purposes within the National Park Service include the Horace M. Albright, National Capital Parks and the Harpers Ferry

TABLE 7

TRAINING FACILITIES

Question: Does your organization have special facilities for training purposes only; such as, specific buildings classrooms, etc.?	Yes	No
Alaska		X
Colorado		X
Connecticut		X
Florida	X	
Georgia		X
Hawaii		X
Idaho		X
Illinois	X	
Indiana		X
Iowa	X	
Kansas	X	
Maine	X	
Massachusetts		X
Michigan	X	
Nevada		X
New Jersey		X
New York		X
Ohio	X	
Oregon		X
South Dakota		X
Tennessee		X
Utah	X	
Wisconsin	X	

Training Centers. Most regions of the U.S. Forest Service also have training centers to meet their localized needs.

Question 9.--Does your State Personnel Office actively assist your organization in its training program? (Refer to Table 8.) Ten answered YES; thirteen answered NO.

Both of the state park systems with over 1,000 permanent employees (New York and Wisconsin) and two of the three systems with between 500 and 1,000 permanent employees (Ohio and Illinois) reported that their State Personnel Office actively assists them in their training programs. Only three of the thirteen states with less than 100 employees (Alaska, Kansas and Nevada) reported receiving assistance from their State Personnel Office.

Question 10.--As head of your organization, how much time do you devote to planning for employee training and development per month? (Refer to Table 9.)

Five state park system directors reported they spend no time planning for employee training and only two directors indicated they devote as much as six hours per month to planning for employee training. The majority of the directors, sixteen, reported they devote between one and five hours per month to planning for training, with seven of the sixteen devoting only one hour per month.

TABLE 8

ASSISTANCE FROM STATE PERSONNEL OFFICE

Question: Does your State Personnel Office actively assist your organization in its training program?	Yes	No
Alaska	X	
Colorado		X
Connecticut		X
Florida		X
Georgia	X	
Hawaii	X	
Idaho		X
Illinois	X	
Indiana	X	
Iowa		X
Kansas	X	
Maine		X
Massachusetts		X
Michigan		X
Nevada	X	
New Jersey		X
New York	X	
Ohio		X
Oregon		X
South Dakota		X
Tennessee	X	
Utah		X
Wisconsin	X	

TABLE 9

TIME DEVOTED TO PLANNING

Question: As head of your organization, how much time do you devote to planning for employee training and development per month?	Hours Per Month			
	None	1	2-5	6-10
Alaska	X			
Colorado			X	
Connecticut				X
Florida		X		
Georgia			X	
Hawaii		X		
Idaho		X		
Illinois	X			
Indiana		X		
Iowa			X	
Kansas	X			
Maine	X			
Massachusetts		X		
Michigan			X	
Nevada			X	
New Jersey			X	
New York		X		
Ohio			X	
Oregon		X		
South Dakota	X			
Tennessee			X	
Utah				X
Wisconsin			X	

Question 11.--In your estimation, what percent of your yearly budget is spent on employee training and development? (Refer to Table 10.)

Only two states (Connecticut and Wisconsin) reported that they spend more than two percent of their yearly budget on employee training and development, and only one state (Colorado) spends between one and two percent on training. Eighteen of the states reported spending less than one percent on training while twelve of the eighteen spend less than one-half of one percent.

All federal agencies are authorized to budget funds for training purposes by authority of the Employees Training Act. Because of the extensive training opportunities and facilities of the federal agencies, the percentage of their budgets spent on training is probably higher than most of the states.

Question 12.--Is your training program oriented toward new employees only? One answered YES; twenty-two answered NO.

Only one state, Alaska, reported that their training program was oriented toward new employees only. Several of the states that indicated they do not have a training program said they do offer some sort of indoctrination service for their new employees.

TABLE 10
BUDGET EXPENDITURE

Question: In your estimation, what percent of your yearly budget is spent on employee training and development?	Less Than			
	1/2%	1/2-1%	1-2%	2-5%
Alaska		X		
Colorado			X	
Connecticut				X
Florida	X			
Georgia	X			
Hawaii	X			
Idaho	X			
Illinois*			X	
Indiana		X		
Iowa		X		
Kansas				X
Maine	X			
Massachusetts	X			
Michigan		X		
Nevada	X			
New Jersey	X			
New York	X			
Ohio	X			
Oregon	X			
South Dakota	X			
Tennessee		X		
Utah		X		
Wisconsin				X

*Illinois reported that between one and two percent of the Personnel Budget is spent on employee training and development.

Question 13.--Does your organization have an educational reimbursement plan? (Refer to Table 11.) Eight answered YES; fifteen answered NO.

Only one state park system with less than 100 employees (Idaho) reported that it has an educational reimbursement plan. The lack of an educational reimbursement plan cannot be blamed entirely on the individual park system, as this type of training opportunity is usually established at the state level. A state agency cannot usually reimburse an employee for outside education costs unless legislative action has approved such expenditures on a state-wide basis.

The federal government provides for reimbursement of educational costs for federal employees through the Employees Training Act. In most instances, outside training must be related to the employees official duties in order for the employee to be reimbursed by the federal government. No data is available to indicate what percentage of the various state or federal employees have participated in outside training activities and have received reimbursement.

Question 14.--Does your organization provide for the training of present employees for promotion and upgrading?

TABLE 11
REIMBURSEMENT FOR EDUCATION COSTS

Question: Does your organization have an educational reimbursement plan?	Yes	No
Alaska		X
Colorado		X
Connecticut	X	
Florida		X
Georgia		X
Hawaii		X
Idaho	X	
Illinois	X	
Indiana		X
Iowa		X
Kansas		X
Maine		X
Massachusetts		X
Michigan	X	
Nevada		X
New Jersey	X	
New York	X	
Ohio		X
Oregon	X	
South Dakota		X
Tennessee		X
Utah	X	
Wisconsin		X

(Refer to Table 12.) Sixteen answered YES; seven answered NO.

Five of the seven states answering NO have less than 100 employees. All of the states with more than 250 employees, except Indiana, stated that their training program provides for the promotion and upgrading of present employees. Although personnel can usually use assistance in improving their currently needed skills, no training program should overlook the skills and abilities personnel will need in the future to progress upward through the organization.

The U.S. Forest Service offers several courses through their training program that are specifically required before an employee can be promoted to certain positions. Most of these required courses are in the areas of fire control, use of explosives and timber harvesting procedures.⁴² Both the U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service offer extensive training opportunities to all supervisory and management levels and to potential supervisors and managers. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers appears to concentrate its training efforts toward the more immediate needs of its personnel, although some management development courses are offered.

⁴²U.S. Forest Service, Region 3, Section III, p. 30, Section III, p. 58.

TABLE 12

TRAINING FOR PROMOTION AND UPGRADING

Question: Does your training program provide for the training of present employees for promotion and upgrading?	Yes	No
Alaska		X
Colorado	X	
Connecticut	X	
Florida		X
Georgia	X	
Hawaii	X	
Idaho		X
Illinois	X	
Indiana		X
Iowa		X
Kansas	X	
Maine		X
Massachusetts	X	
Michigan	X	
Nevada	X	
New Jersey	X	
New York	X	
Ohio	X	
Oregon	X	
South Dakota		X
Tennessee	X	
Utah	X	
Wisconsin	X	

Question 15.--Have your past training practices allowed you to utilize your present personnel to fill vacancies that have occurred vertically in your organization? Twenty-one answered YES; two answered NO.

The two states answering NO were Illinois and Indiana; however, Illinois is still in the process of establishing its training program. This question more than any other on the questionnaire depicts how successful the individual directors perceive their organization's training program to be. Although this is a legitimate question, a similar response might have been received if the word "training" had been left out of the question. In other words, state park systems tend to elevate their own personnel to fill vacancies in the organization whether they have a training program or not.

Questions sixteen through twenty and the detailed results of those questions are listed in Tables 13 through 17. From the answers to questions sixteen through twenty, it is relatively easy to determine the type and length of training sessions used, type of instructors conducting the training, the broad areas of course content, and the methods used to determine training needs. It is not, however, possible to analyze the quality of instruction or the degree to which desired change in behavior is affected.

TABLE 13
TYPES OF INSTRUCTORS

Question: Which of the following sources does your training program utilize for instructors?	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Alaska	X					X	
Colorado		X	X	X	X	X	
Connecticut		X				X	
Florida		X		X	X	X	
Georgia						X	
Hawaii		X				X	
Idaho						X	
Illinois		X		X		X	
Indiana		X		X	X	X	
Iowa		X	X	X	X	X	
Kansas		X		X	X	X	X
Maine		X			X	X	X
Massachusetts		X				X	
Michigan		X	X	X	X	X	
Nevada		X	X			X	
New Jersey		X	X			X	
New York		X		X		X	
Ohio			X			X	
Oregon		X				X	
South Dakota							X
Tennessee		X	X	X	X	X	
Utah	X	X	X	X		X	
Wisconsin	X	X	X	X	X	X	

- A. Full-time trained instructors
 B. Persons from other state agencies
 C. Persons from Federal Government agencies
 D. Faculty members from local colleges
 E. Representatives from private industry and business
 F. Persons from your own organization
 G. Other

TABLE 14
SUBJECTS COVERED IN TRAINING PROGRAM

Question: What subject areas are covered in your training program?	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Alaska						X	
Colorado	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Connecticut	X			X			X
Florida	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Georgia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hawaii		X	X	X			
Idaho						X	
Illinois	X		X	X		X	
Indiana		X		X	X	X	
Iowa	X	X	X	X	X		X
Kansas	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Maine	X	X		X	X	X	X
Massachusetts	X	X	X		X		
Michigan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Nevada		X	X		X	X	
New Jersey	X	X	X			X	X
New York	X	X	X	X		X	
Ohio		X	X	X			X
Oregon	X	X	X	X	X	X	
South Dakota	X	X	X				
Tennessee	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Utah	X	X	X	X	X		
Wisconsin	X	X	X	X	X	X	

- A. Managerial development
 B. Supervisory techniques
 C. Administrative skills
 D. Human relations
 E. Resource management techniques
 F. Trade skills
 G. Other

TABLE 15
TRAINING METHODS USED

Question: What methods of training are used by your organization?	A	B	C	D	E	F
Alaska	X	X			X	
Colorado	X	X		X		
Connecticut	X	X		X	X	
Florida	X	X	X	X	X	
Georgia	X		X	X		
Hawaii	X	X		X	X	
Idaho				X		
Illinois	X	X	X	X	X	
Indiana	X		X	X	X	
Iowa	X	X	X	X	X	
Kansas	X		X	X	X	
Maine	X			X	X	
Massachusetts	X	X			X	
Michigan	X	X	X	X	X	X
Nevada	X	X		X	X	
New Jersey	X	X		X		
New York	X	X	X	X	X	
Ohio			X		X	
Oregon	X	X	X	X	X	
South Dakota			X	X	X	
Tennessee	X	X	X	X	X	
Utah	X	X	X	X	X	
Wisconsin	X	X		X	X	

- A. On-the-job training
 B. Classroom lectures
 C. Programmed instruction
 D. Conferences
 E. Films
 F. Other

TABLE 16
LENGTH OF TRAINING SESSIONS

Question: Which of the following do your training sessions consist of?	A	B	C	D	E
Alaska				X	
Colorado			X	X	
Connecticut			X	X	
Florida				X	
Georgia			X		
Hawaii	X	X	X	X	X
Idaho		X	X	X	
Illinois			X	X	
Indiana		X	X	X	X
Iowa		X	X	X	X
Kansas					X
Maine		X		X	
Massachusetts			X		
Michigan	X	X	X	X	
Nevada				X	
New Jersey			X	X	
New York		X	X	X	
Ohio					X
Oregon	X	X	X		
South Dakota			X		
Tennessee			X		
Utah	X		X	X	
Wisconsin		X	X	X	

- A. 1-2 hour sessions
 B. Half-day sessions
 C. One day sessions
 D. One week sessions
 E. More than one week

TABLE 17
DETERMINING TRAINING NEEDS

Question: What techniques did your organization utilize in determining its training needs?	A	B	C	D	E
Alaska					X
Colorado	X	X	X		
Connecticut	X				
Florida	X	X			
Georgia	X	X	X		
Hawaii					X
Idaho					X
Illinois		X	X		
Indiana	X		X		
Iowa	X				
Kansas					X
Maine	X	X	X	X	X
Massachusetts		X	X		
Michigan	X	X			X
Nevada	X	X			
New Jersey	X		X		X
New York				X	X
Ohio	X				
Oregon	X	X	X		X
South Dakota			X		
Tennessee	X				
Utah	X		X	X	
Wisconsin	X	X	X		

- A. Performance appraisals
 B. Employee questionnaires
 C. Employee interviews
 D. Employee testing
 E. Other

It is important to note that only three states (Alaska, Utah and Wisconsin) indicated that full-time trained instructors are utilized in their training programs. Also, only three states (Maine, New York and Utah) used employee testing to help determine their training needs.

Two independent state surveys, which do parallel each other, also pertain to employee preferences. The first, a pilot study conducted by this writer obtained information from all park managers and their assistants in the Idaho State Parks Department. This research indicates which training subjects the employees feel they need most to enhance their careers. The second study was conducted by the Illinois State Park Department.⁴³

The subjects most frequently requested by the Idaho personnel were: public speaking, interpretation, public relations, personnel management and supervision, and office procedures. The survey of personnel in Illinois revealed that training in the areas of public and community relations is the most desired. Other training subjects most preferred by the personnel in Illinois included law enforcement, office procedures, interpretation, budgeting, public speaking, and report writing.

Detailed information depicting how the federal agencies would answer questions sixteen through twenty is

⁴³Howard Mendenhall, personal letter, May 24, 1971.

not available; however, from a review of the information available it is probable that the U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service utilize most of the techniques listed with each question.

Conclusions

The results clearly demonstrate the variety of approaches and types of in-service training programs that individual state park systems have developed. Although most state park systems acknowledge a need for employee training, few systems appear to place a high priority on in-service training. Virtually all of the state park systems analyzed in this research reveal major areas of inadequacy. The inadequacies most frequently observed are in the areas of primary importance to an effective training program: budgeting, planning, and the quality of personnel charged with training responsibilities.

In analyzing the results of the questionnaires and information obtained from the federal agencies and states, one relationship is constantly present--the larger the system, the more comprehensive the training program. However, one must remember that the quality of training may not correlate with the size of the organization.

It is important to note that over one-third of the states returning a questionnaire have no training program,

and that among the remaining states there appears to be no standard procedure for employee training. No two questionnaires were completed in the same way.

CHAPTER IV

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

After a thorough review of available literature, analysis of the questionnaires, and information received from the survey letters the following recommendations and guidelines are offered:

1. The first and most important step for a state park system is to initiate an official policy statement authorizing and encouraging training at all levels of the organization. The lack of a definite policy statement could be extremely detrimental to what Wright earlier defined as a philosophy of training. The establishment of policies covering the subject of training would have to precede the development of a "healthy" philosophy of training in any organization.

2. Program planning must take place before any attempt is made at training. Only after a thorough analysis of organizational objectives and deficiencies has been made can an appropriate training plan be devised. Planning should include determination of training needs, actual training and an evaluation of the training program.

3. At least one person trained and experienced in developing and conducting employee training must be available to assist any state park system desiring to establish or upgrade a training program. Because there is a definite body of knowledge that a training specialist or director must acquire to be effective in his position, it is only natural to assume that anyone directing a training program needs the benefit of formal training. The training specialist is a "change agent" and must be well schooled in the processes necessary to bring about desired change in a variety of situations.

4. All state park systems should establish a budget specifically for employee training and development. In many cases funds for training purposes are available only because an excess of funds appears in a particular budget within the organization. In years where a limited budget is provided for the organization, no training may take place. All training activities require the expenditure of funds. However, it is generally accepted that if training is needed, a well administered training program is a justifiable expense.

5. Employee participation in determining training needs should be encouraged whenever possible. The individual employee must be made to feel that he has an active part in the decision-making process of the organization.

By encouraging employee participation in the planning process of a training program, the employee is more likely to feel that his needs and desires are being considered. Employee interviews and questionnaires should be used along with performance appraisals and tests to determine training needs.

6. Employees at all levels should be encouraged to seek outside training opportunities whenever feasible. Reimbursement of outside training costs to the employee should be made if possible. States that have authorized the partial or complete payment for educational costs incurred on an employee's own time have taken a large step toward developing a positive philosophy toward training and employee development.

7. State park systems not able to secure adequate assistance in developing training programs from their own State Personnel Office can obtain assistance and guidance from the following organizations and government agencies: local colleges and universities; U.S. Forest Service; National Park Service; U.S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Training; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training; American Society for Training and Development; American Society for Public Administration; American Management Association; Public Personnel

Association; Society for Personnel Administration; state park systems with established training programs.

8. The National Conference on State Parks should undertake a program which would result in the development of programmed instructional materials giving advice and planning assistance to all state park systems desiring to establish or improve training programs. The development of high quality training materials would require a committee of qualified persons selected from the fields of management, psychology and education, as well as representatives from state park systems with established training programs. Employee training and development is a modern, complex and highly scientific field in which only qualified, competent persons should take a leading role.

Although the needs and circumstances of each state park system are substantially different, the basic procedures to be undertaken in improving or establishing an effective and comprehensive training program are universal. Ideally, materials developed would outline and furnish guidelines in the individual areas of importance such as: determining training needs, proper selection of training staff, justifying budget requests, proper allocation of funds, special facilities and equipment needed, selection of appropriate training techniques to solve individual training needs, methods of motivating and

involving employees in the program, techniques used to evaluate the program's effectiveness in terms of desired change in employee behavior, and methods used to ensure that the training program is kept up-to-date and relevant to the needs and objectives of the organization. After an adequate manual or text has been compiled, a monthly or quarterly supplement should be provided, in loose-leaf form, enabling training directors to keep up-to-date on the latest techniques and innovations in the field of employee training and development as it pertains to state park systems.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- American Institute of Park Executives and the National Recreational Association. In-Service Training for Parks and Recreation. Washington: National Recreation Association, 1953.
- Brown, David S. "An Old Tool Holds New Promise," Public Management, Vol. 47, No. 11, November, 1965.
- Caldwell, Lynton K. "Determining Training Needs for Organization Effectiveness," Personnel Administration, Vol. 26, No. 2, March-April, 1963.
- DePhillips, F.A.; Berliner, W.M.; and Cribbon, J.J. Management of Training Programs. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1960.
- Fryer, Douglas H.; Feinberg, Mortimer R.; and Zalkind, Sheldon S. Developing People in Industry: Principles and Methods of Training. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.
- Goode, Cecil F. "Research and Results," Public Personnel Review, Vol. 20, No. 1, January, 1959.
- Gutherie, E.R. The Psychology of Learning. New York: Harper and Row, 1935.
- Hull, C.L. Principles of Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1943.
- Kovach, Ruth A., and Moore, William R. "Training Service Centers in the United States Forest Service," Training Directors Journal, Vol. 19, No. 1, January, 1965.
- Luntz, Lester. "Identification of Training Needs," Journal of the American Society of Training Directors, Vol. 13, No. 3, March, 1959.
- Miner, John B. Personnel and Industrial Relations: A Managerial Approach. New York: Macmillan Co., 1969.

- National Park Service. Training Opportunities. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Nigro, Felix A. Public Personnel Administration. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1959.
- Otto, Calvin P., and Glaser, Rollin O. The Management of Training. Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1970.
- Romilly, E.P. "In-Service Training for Park Employees," pamphlet reprinted from Recreation, October, 1950.
- Skinner, B.F. Science and Human Behavior. New York: Macmillan, 1953.
- Stewart, Nathaniel. "External Resources for Training," The Federal Career Service. Washington: Society of Personnel Administration, 1954.
- U.S. Forest Service, Region 3. Training Handbook. Continental Divide, New Mexico: Continental Divide Training Center.
- Williams, Douglas. "Using Attitude Surveys to Determine Training Needs," Journal of the American Society of Training Directors, Vol. 8, No. 6, November-December, 1954.
- Wright, Malcolm J. "Does Your Organization Have a Philosophy of Training?," Journal of the American Society of Training Directors, Vol. 14, No. 12, December, 1960.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX: QUESTIONNAIRE

Please circle appropriate answer.

1. Does your organization have a training program for its employees? Yes No
2. Does your organization have a definite policy statement concerning employee training? Yes No
3. How many permanent employees does your organization have?
1-100 100-250 250-500 500-1000 1000-5000 over 5000
4. What percent of your current employees have participated in a formal training program?
NONE 0-5% 5-10% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%
5. Is your training program handled by another agency such as the State Personnel Office? Yes No
6. Is your training program directed by someone specially trained for that position? Yes No
7. How large is your training staff?
NONE 1 2-5 6-10 11-25 over 25 persons
8. Does your organization have special facilities for training purposes only; such as, special buildings, classrooms, etc.? Yes No
9. Does your State Personnel Office actively assist your organization in its training program? Yes No

10. As head of your organization, how much time do you devote to planning for employee training and development per month?

NONE 1 hour 2-5 hours 6-10 hours more than 10 hours

11. In your estimation, what percent of your yearly budget is spent on employee training and development?

NONE less than 1/2% 1/2-1% 1-2% 2-5% over 5%

12. Is your training program oriented toward new employees only? Yes No

13. Does your organization have an educational reimbursement plan? Yes No

14. Does your training program provide for the training of present employees for promotion and upgrading? Yes No

15. Have your past training practices allowed you to utilize your present personnel to fill vacancies that have occurred vertically in your organization? Yes No

Please check appropriate blank.

16. Which of the following sources does your training program utilize for instructors?

- Full-time trained instructors _____
- Persons from other state agencies _____
- Persons from Federal Government agencies _____
- Faculty members from local colleges _____
- Representatives from private industry and business _____
- Persons from your own organization _____
- Other _____

17. What subject areas are covered in your training program?

Managerial development _____
 Supervisory techniques _____
 Administrative skills _____
 Human relations _____
 Resource management techniques _____
 Trade skills _____
 Other _____

18. What methods of training are used by your organization?

On-the-job training _____
 Classroom lectures _____
 Programmed instruction _____
 Conferences _____
 Films _____
 Other _____

19. Which of the following do your training sessions consist of?

1-2 hour sessions _____
 Half-day sessions _____
 One day sessions _____
 One week sessions _____
 More than one week _____

20. What techniques did your organization utilize in determining its training needs?

Performance appraisals _____
 Employee questionnaires _____
 Employee interviews _____
 Employee testing _____
 Other _____