HERE IS A TRAINING PROGRAM WHICH IS CULTURALLY SENSITIVE AND SUCCESSFUL IN INCREASING EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY.

CULTURALLY SENSITIVE TRAINING

BY LUKE L. BATDORF

In 1971 I was asked by a Canadian Indian group and the Canadian Federal Department of Indian and Northern Affairs to develop a training program for Indians which would be successful in achieving three goals:

1. The training first and foremost must not in any way interfere in the culture of the Canadian Indian;

2. It must be successful in that it develops real skills in the Indian which are marketable in his specific job;

3. It must be skill and social development to the extent that it permits the Indian to participate in the economic rewards of a modern technical society.

I accepted the challenge, and also decided to make it an action-research effort. I had to combine this task with my responsibilities of training graduate students in adult education, many of whom came from developing countries in Southeast Asia, Africa and South America. It was a splendid opportunity for graduate students from other cultures, and many different countries, to develop practical training skills at the same time they were learning about the cross-cultural variable. Eight years later, and after 11 different skill-development training curriculums and volumes of feedback from Indians and trainers in developing countries, I feel confident enough to share this experience. I want to caution that eight years of an action-research effort is a short time, and several hundred trained persons is a small number from which to generalize.

By action-research I mean that I was required to deliver a real training effort. It was necessary that I personally work with Indian people, conduct the training sessions, visit with them and their employers in the work place, at the same time as I installed measuring instruments, collected data and treated data to determine various program component impact. Because measuring instruments must never be allowed to interfere with delivering the service, it makes the management of data extremely difficult and the question of validity rears its head. Nevertheless, we had some sound results. It is not the intention here to bore you with statistical data, charts and technical jargon of the researcher, but I give this as a background so you may be informed that efforts to deal with the cultural variable were not "faith" efforts, but were attempts to introduce some degree of scientific objectivity.

I have three objectives in this presentation:

1. To present a few critical definitions so that it is possible to communicate my conceptual framework. Especially do I want to offer a working definition of culture which any trainer can use.

2. It is my intention to establish that what is called a cultural problem is frequently not a cultural problem, but a problem of a totally different sort.

3. Finally I would like to describe the training process I use rather than to engage in a theoretical discussion of cultural training.

The whole area of culture is a highly charged emotional and moral area. When a person's cul-

ture is perceived as being under threat, an otherwise rational person tends to become emotional and even unreasonable. Then too there are always a dedicated band of "liberals" who have a very vague and fuzzy concept of a "preciousness of culture." They shoot from the hip at any sundry efforts to interfere with this "preciousness." I do not ever want to suggest that we become unemotional about culture, but I do want to suggest that we always remain rational. I also appreciate that the "liberal" reaction to cultural "rape" is a legitimate moral outrage, but I do suggest that culture is something almost impossible to "steal" from a people, and what the "liberal" is trying to protect is not culture at all, but simply a quaint or different way of behavior. And to change behavior is the "name of the game" for trainers and all other types of persons involved in the human resource development enterprise.

So that we can understand each other, and that you can know my conceptual framework, I want to introduce three rather critical definitions. I want to make clear what I mean by "learning," about whom I am speaking when I say "Indian," and what I understand to be culture. You may not agree with these definitions. Indeed, I expect that many of you will take strong exception to both my definitions of learning and culture. Since it is not the purpose to argue these points here, I would ask you to suspend your criticisms and accept that they are the working definitions I use in all my training efforts as an adult educator. They are subjects for another discussion, but not appropriate to this effort.

By learning I mean that outcome resulting from training or a similar educational intervention which either creates a new behavior or increases the efficiency and effectiveness of an old behavior in the repertoire of the trainee's behaviors to the extent that it is measurable and observable. I do not wish to deny the presence of learning in other situations, but I want to stress that in either formal or nonformal learning situations the only way I can effectively measure outcome is on terms of what can be seen and thus measured in terms of human change in behavior. This makes it possible for me to work as an educator, hence I call this my working definition of learning. In passing, as an adult educator I never permit myself to be trapped in the endless debate between education and training. For me the terms are synonymous. It is always an enjoyable debate to have over a bottle of wine, but for the practitioner of change it is always rhetoric.

The Result of Being Lost

And now for our Canadian Indian. First of all, the name is a misname. In 1492 an Italian skipper of three ships sailing west under the Spanish flag made a land fall. This captain was obviously a poor navigator, for he was lost and did not know where he was. Even worse, he was a poor researcher. A great many parts of Europe knew that if a person sailed westward from Europe that there would be a land mass named Vineland, or a variety of other names, but Christopher Columbus did not know this. He thought that he had sailed to India and so the people he met there he called Indians.

Today all the aboriginal people living on the North and South and Central American continent are often called Indians by the Europeans now living on those continents. In Canada there are two aboriginal groups. One is the Indian, a large cultural group scattered primarily in rural ghettoes called reservations from coast to coast, and north to south; the other is a much smaller group in the far north called Inuits, or by some Europeans, Eskimoes. Both groups have been badly treated by the conquering Europeans. I do not want to explore that facit of their culture, for it is a totally different story than the purposes of this paper. Suffice it to say that the aboriginal people were never recognized as a cultural nation when the French and English founded the state of two nations known today as Canada. Instead they were ghettoized by an Act of Parliament, and largely are a people forced to live in abject poverty, fiercely trying to hold on to their culture.

It is only within the past 20 years that they are beginning once more to emerge as a nation with a culture totally other than the European majority culture.

This background is critical to understand the question of cultural identity for the Indian. It is important to recognize that after 500 years of deliberate efforts on the part of a majority group to control the behavior of the Indian, it has only been the behavior which was controlled. The culture has largely remained intact. All attempts to assimilate the Indian or to neutralize them have been successfully resisted by a large part of the Canadian Indian Nation.

What is it which has remained intact? When a training program is asked to train, but not to touch the culture, just what is it the program is not to touch? Rather than answer this question myself, I used the first training session with Indian people to work out a defini-

tion of culture, and validate it with at least 10 subsequent totally different Indian trainees. I shall explain this later. The definition of culture finally settled upon as a working guide in training for aboriginal people in Canada is that culture is the process by which information about how the Indian people store, transmit and retrieve their way of perceiving the world and the structures of their society.

This definition is like information theory which makes clear that the gathering, storing, passing and access to information systems are more important than the message. Consequently culture is not confused with what people do or how they dress or the tools they use and the goods they make, but is related to how they get, store and pass on from one generation to another the information they have relative to their world view.

Hence, culture is not lost when a person changes from walking in the forest with a bow and arrow, stalking a deer to kill it and take home to feed his family, to that of driving in a car on a paved road to an oil field to work for an hourly wage to feed his/her family. Nor is culture lost when a person changes from sitting in a loin cloth chewing a roast to pleasure his senses to that of wearing jeans and drinking beer out of a can to pleasure his/her senses. But culture is lost when one generation no longer has any way of getting information from their parents or elders of the previous generation of how their world is perceived as being structure and how these structures fit together. In this sense culture can only be lost if a person is physically removed from his information base, or insurmountable barriers are put up to prevent them from retrieving their cultural information or having it transmitted to them.

With this definition the Indians had concluded that they had not lost their culture except for one complete tribe in the province of Newfoundland. This tribe, the Beothic, were the victims of a deliberate British policy of genocide. At the same time this same policy was promulgated in Australian Tasmania. Every last member of this tribe was hunted down and killed, and today no one knows anything about their culture. It was neither stored nor transmitted. However, the Indians did conclude that the most serious threat to their culture has occurred within recent years.

Between the Canadian government and the European Christian religion an effort was made to take children from their homes and fly them to distant central missions and government schools for a formal education quite apart and separate from their parents and community. This, along with efforts on the part of government to make the management of Indian affairs easier for the central administration by physically removing whole Indian communities to central places, posed a serious threat to information communication from one generation to another.

Fortunately Indian outrage was so great it was a short lived policy and this procedure for formally educating the Indian, and centralizing their community, has been abandoned. With this definition of culture both the Indians and I felt confident that any training concentrating only on changing behavior would never pose a threat to the transmission of cultural information in the Indian community. It is important to make clear that this definition of culture was not pulled out of a textbook on cultural anthropology, although some textbooks do talk about this type of definition. This definition comes from Indian people themselves throughout the introductory process of training.

Dangers of Big Corporations

I have now given you a definition of learning, of an Indian person and of culture. It is important, as I describe the training process, to keep these definitions in mind, even if you may not agree with them.

It is now necessary to look at what Canadians deemed a cultural problem. In 1966 someone in Canada suddenly discovered that the Canadian Indian was not sharing in the great nationwide economic boom. The Canadian-European work force was getting and keeping the jobs. The Indian may at times have gotten a job, but it seems that they were unable to keep the job for any length of time. In 1967, the Canadian government lavishly funded some quasi-governmental action-research corporations for a five-year period to experiment with training and development efforts as they relate to human resource development.

The objective was to experiment and develop ways to return and maintain persons in rewarding and continuing employment. I happened to be a senior officer in one of these corporations. Although our target was all of the Canadian unemployed, one of the major targets for one of the projects, to the extent of a million Canadian dollars a year for five years, was in the north land of a Western Canadian province with a largely dominant Indian population, and an expanding oil industry. I will not describe the efforts of the corporation. At the end of five years a great deal

was learned about training and human resource development, but almost nothing about training the Indian. In that area of Canada the oil industry has not been able to fully incorporate the Indian.

The five-year period was over and the continued effort to find ways for Indian training was abandoned with a feeling that cultural factors were too great to overcome. At the end of this five-year period in 1971 I came to my current university with a personal interest in continuing research in training. An investigation of employees in the immediate vicinity of the university uncovered the fact that two large pulp and paper mills, and one manufacturer of heavy water for the atomic energy industry had made efforts to comply with government regulations to employ labor form minority groups.

After a one-year period only one Indian of the 20 was still employed. The rest had been fired and some had quit before being fired. The conclusion locally was the same as the national one; that was that the cultural problems for Indian people indicated that the Indian was unsuited for a market economy and an industrial society. This view was shared by government, industry and many Indian leaders in positions of cultural leadership. An examination of causes for termination of employment where it was possible to secure the data revealed four major reasons given.

1. Indians did not take supervisory direction;
2. Indians were often late for work and frequently absent from work; justifying their behavior with the excuse that Indian time was a culturally different thing than white man's time.
3. Indians were frequently drunk on the job.
4. Indians were unskilled in their job performance.

All of these behaviors may or may not be true, but what is not true is to call them cultural factors. This is a spurious conclusion. They are exactly the same reasons given in large ghetto areas of cities where no Indians lived, and the same reason given by rural poor. They are behaviors of a person who has learned to be helpless from generations and generations of poverty and powerless conditioning, and having English as a second language. They are also manifestations of latent racism and prejudice. But most important of all they reflect employment policy and practice of employees and the incompetency of industrial trainers. It is not the policy ever of industry to fully train people for employment, but to select trained, or partially trained persons, from the work force who have come through trades, vocational or academic training institutions.

The trainers in industry are not expected to train employees in general, but to train specifically for an industry. The trainers are not competent in educational methodology and technology to train an under-educated adult whose first language is not English. Trainers only know how to train the way they were trained. Very

few are professionally skilled to engage in adult basic education, life skills education, English as a second language education and skill development all at one time. This is a large adult education order. The job description of the average trainer does not include modifying the behavior of a drunken employee or a late clock puncher.

I could go on at length with a further analysis of the problems of Indians not sharing in the development of the Canadian society, but it is not the purpose of this article to do so. It is sufficient to generalize from our analysis that the causes for failure to participate in rewarding employment for the Canadian Indian fit almost exactly a taxonomy of behaviors seen all over the world where people have lived in rural poverty for generations. They have learned the behaviors of helplessness, reinforced by a social racism of a majority culture; an inadequate human resource development strategy of government, and the policy and practice of job specific recruitment, selection and training procedures of employers. Almost never were we able to discover a serious problem relating to cultural differences. And yet all the factors were called cultural problems.

I would, therefore, suggest that the cultural dislocation existing between societies is a mythological problem exaggerated beyond all proportions of reality. What we have is a training problem of how to overcome learned helplessness and not a problem of cultural conflict.

Fighting Back

Fortunately a strong and insightful small group of Indian leaders saw this, and were not willing to accept the judgment of government, industry and their own cultural gurus, that Indians would lose their culture, if trained in new behaviors for a technical society, or that Indians could not be trained because of their cultural heritage.

Currently they are strongly resisting official government policy to use government's newly found respect for Indian culture as an excuse to cut down in training and other educational funds, and to increase welfare funds and economic development monies designed to encourage the Indian to create his own economy apart from the majority culture economy. The Indian leaders will not accept this economic ghetto concept under the guise of helping them be "masters of their own destiny" so that there will be no cultural interference by the majority culture. Indians are secure in their culture and they are demanding adult-skill development opportunities which will permit them to share in the economic growth of Canada, and yet maintain their uniqueness as a culturally different nation in a family of nations known as Canada.

I trust that my second objective of doing away with myths about the cultural problem in training has been achieved. I suspect that what we have learned in Canada is also what you have learned. In short, there is no serious problem of "stealing" a culture through training. The only problem is one of developing policy and sophisticated adult trainers who know how to work with "learned helplessness," and not be misled into using the excuses for training incompetency as cultural problems.

Before I outline the training process I would like to clarify that we are never actually involved at any time in a specific cultural training activity. It was my decision that any effort at cultural training geared to understanding culture and appreciation of other cultures would lead only to knowledge and better understanding. Understanding is fine, but without skill development the trainee would have no power or credibility to combat racism. Hence the training program may appear to the reader as an ordinary, straightforward skill-development effort.

The difference is the constant effort and attention to divesting behaviors; for example, coming to meetings or work on time, from their cultural overtones, and at the

same time modifying behavior to the extent that the trainee does learn to "come on time." By paying constant attention to each behavior in terms of not only skill development, but also of cultural meaning, two often diverse goals are achieved at the same time, i.e., control of a new skill and a sharper focus on what is really culture. Both give self-confidence and power to a trainee.

I also want to clarify my role as a trainer. Frequently it was said that only an Indian could train an Indian. Although wherever possible Indian trainers were used as co-trainers, it was never a significant factor. It is my contention that any person with interpersonal skills and using human relations training technology can function with any cultural group without knowing very much about that culture. The language difference is the largest barrier for the trainer. It is, however, important for the trainer to convey a personal attitude from the very beginning.

When I work as a consultant with a North American industry, or with a North American government, I communicate an attitude, and have an attitude which is quite different from the one I communicate when I work with Indians or other cultures than my own. When I work with Indians I do not work as a consultant, but I work as a hired technologist in human resource development. When I work with my own culture I am proactive. When I work with another culture I am reactive. In the first instance I diagnose and prescribe, in the second I merely apply technical tools of change. Or another way of putting it is, that when I work for other cultures I am a "hired gun;" I obey orders; in my own culture I expect to participate in the design of the gun and the selection of the target. This may seem like a subtle distinction. Yet it is one every trainer must make from the "gut," if he/she is working in cross-cultural settings.

Finally, I would like to indicate that the process that follows is not the only strategy used by Indian people for human resource development. They have others. This is the only one in which I have been involved, and it is the only one I will presume to describe.

Stage One:
Recruitment and Selection

The Indian people had determined that the first area for change was in the recruitment and selection process. The usual process in Canada was any Indian desiring employment would register with a federal government agency, or merely present himself to an employer in response to a newspaper advertisement. In both cases the potential employee is assessed as skilled and ready for employment, or needing further training and often referred to a training center.

In actual fact what really happened in most cases, because of fair employment legislation requiring employers to employ minorities, the Indian was immediately employed and put to work without training. The results were obvious. There was the high turnover rate with reasons I've already described. Beyond this Indian leaders were saying that the most likely candidates for training and employment were not presenting themselves for selection. Industry and government were only getting as candidates the type of Indian moving from their own culture into the non-Indian culture, and thereby generally a highly confused and rather insecure person, and consequently not likely to be successful in either their training or employment.

The suggestion was made that all recruitment and selection be left completely in the hands of the leaders of each community. They would assume responsibility for referring and keeping their own people employed.

Generally industry and government were unprepared to accept this. They had no confidence that the people with the necessary prerequisites for training or employment would be referred. A tradeoff was made. Each Band (Complete units of Indians under one Chief and his council are normally

referred to as Bands) would select one of their members to be trained as "Social and Employment" counsellors. It would be their role to do some human resource development work in their own Band; select and refer Indians to further training or employment, do counselling and coaching, and generally help the trainee and/or employee maintain and continue successfully in their training or employment. In turn all employees, all training institutions and government offices in the area of a Band would work exclusively through the locally trained counsellor.

This was done, and the model for the training of this first group of social counsellors became the model essentially for the training of subsequent groups. The only major changes were in the area of job performance behaviors which naturally needed to be different for each group.[1] Generally speaking, almost every Band of Indians in Canada now has a trained paraprofessional social and employment counsellor. Other training institutions have been involved in the training of these paraprofessionals, hence their skills may vary. But as far as we know, the procedure for training described here is the only one which mixes behavior development with cultural clarification.

Stage Two:
Setting Learning Objectives and Checking for Cultural Relatedness

When a call goes out from employees or governments to the Social Counsellor to provide recruits for either training or employment, the first task is to check with counsellors in neighboring Bands to determine the labor or trainee potential. If there are only one or two recruits desired, the nearest counsellor to the employer will make the selection. If more are needed each Band will select one or more for training until the quota is filled.

Each social counsellor then secures a copy of the job description and begins to orientate the trainee through some communications and interpersonal counselling while he/she is still in his/her home community. At this point the social counsellor begins the process of making clear the distinctions between culture and job behavior. If there is need for only one or two employees the next step is to refer the person directly to the employer expecting him/her to provide the subsequent training to the recruit through the training department. A fair amount of lead time is required to achieve this.

When there is need for a large number of employees in the same, or similar skills — this is the most common occasion — they are grouped into learning groups of no less than eight and no more than 15 and training is contracted to a competent adult trainer who has some experience in Indian training if possible. At this point the trainees are taken on salary or wages as apprentices upon the condition that they immediately participate in training.

The groups of trainees are immediately sent to one central training center for a solid week (30

hours) for the purpose of participating in setting learning objectives, determining the length and schedule of training, clarifying behaviors and culture, and contracting to learn. The central sites best suited are either industrial training centers or residential adult education centers. We have also learned that distance from the trainee's home and the training site is a critical variable. Effectiveness of training diminishes if the trainee is further than a day's journey by air or other means of transportation from their home community.

At the first session of the first week the critical checking for culture begins. The facilitator/trainer should have some skill in values clarification training. However, it is important *not* to use the values clarification training tools. The job description is the tool for cultural clarification. Whether there is a precise job description or not the major objective for the trainees is to go over item by item the job description and examine the job behaviors, and if there are no clear behaviors given, to rewrite the description in behavioral terms. No knowledge areas are allowed to be stated at this stage. Each behavior is then written as a learning objective. Hence the trainer must often stop to train the group in objective setting skills. Once the group learns this skill they quickly distinguish between behaviors and knowledge.

After the learning objectives are stated as learning behaviors they are then checked item by item for their impact or meaning in relation to Indian culture. At this point four critical insights are suddenly clarified and achieved.

1. Each member of the group now "owns" his job description and it is clear whether or not he can or wants to continue in employment and learn the skills.

2. The job as a culture threat is removed because few of the behaviors are related to culture.

3. They need not be alarmed about their culture disappearing because it is almost impossible to define it clearly enough in any case.

4. The areas in which they "feel" a preciousness or uniqueness are safe from change. In this sense they learn that what they see as unique or precious is often not seen as such by other fellow members of the group, and thereby learn that their cultural identity is often related to their personal needs for identity rather than tribal identity.

Once these four insights are made visible and public to the group on a flipchart, or some other technique, the irrational element of the cultural question is removed, and the group is impatient to get on with the next task. However, it has been our experience that at this point every single group has insisted that even though culture may have little to do with their job, they want the opportunity during subsequent training sessions to explore their culture further.

At this point a contract is made that in every 30 hours of skill-development training at least four hours will be devoted to examination of cultural issues with a cultural leader as a resource person and the trainer as facilitator. This constant presence in all training sessions of a nature and skilled native cultural leader, and the systematic approach to the examination of culture, is a powerful tool for motivation in skill development and maintaining workers in future employment. Whether the training is for engineers, managers, social workers, gauge operators, or rural development workers this second stage is critical. It provides to the trainee a clarity of their own culture and helps to guarantee to them that future training and employment will not rob them of cultural dignity.

Stage Three:
Setting the Learning Curriculum and Contracting with Cultural Conditions

The first contract for learning has been made. The group agreed to examine culture. Now the task is to take all the learning behavioral objectives identified from the job description and established as culture free, and place them in an orderly sequence and establish a time frame to develop these skills. Even though the trainer may have done this with a previous group, it is necessary for contracting that the group do it themselves. They will frequently call upon the trainer for some professional recommendations relative to how long it may take to master a rather complex set of behaviors, but generally the group, with the trainer as facilitator, can sequence their own learning curriculum. This task is usually done easily and quickly.

The next related task raises some cultural questions. The task is to determine how these behaviors are to be learned; what stimuli are necessary and what learning procedures and conditions are appropriate. It is important to understand that conditions of employment and learning were set prior to coming to the training center. The trainee was taken on the condition he/she came back after the first week and present to his/her supervisor a learning contract listing the skills to be learned and the

time schedule for learning them. The constraints of their employment are usually that they can be away from work no longer than one week at a time and at no more frequent intervals than four weeks to qualify for one week's paid educational leave. This serves the purpose of giving the apprentice a chance to implement learned skills in the work place for at least a four-week period under direct supervision. After the first week the trainee actually gives the supervisor a copy of his/her learning curriculum and has him/her sign it as a contract.

In the preparation of the learning curriculum the trainee helps decide how to cluster some related skills and which ones he/she wants to learn first and how they want to learn them. It now becomes clear that some skills, not many but still a few, will require some knowledge levels. At this point a cultural threat appears and it must be examined. There are three identified levels of threat. The first is an unconscious fear of new knowledge interfering with his cultural knowledge. For example, in the case of decision-making skills for supervisors or managers there is the need to explain the cultural process of the industry. This at first seems to be in conflict with the cultural process of consensus decision making, and when there is no consensus there is no decision. When this is examined the trainee, by being job specific, learns that he/she can make management decisions in relation to the job without altering his/her value of consensus seeking, and since both are behaviors in any case they really do not alter the way they get information about their cultural world at all.

This first level soon is reduced completely as a threat. The second level is that of language. Language is seen as the mode of knowledge transmission. In Canada most training is in either French or English. Neither is the first language of the Indian. However, in each group there may be as many languages as there are tribes represented, and often each does not understand the other. Where possible trainees are invited to put knowledge statements in their own language. If there is a written language it is tested in writing for cultural impact. Almost always, after this exercise, because the knowledge is job and behavior specific, it is proven to be a non-cultural threat. Agreement is easily reached that for purposes of training the common language, understood by all, will be used with the understanding any time trainees wish to communicate in their own language they are free to do so, but at the risk others may not know what was said.

The third level of threat, and by far the most serious is really not cultural at all, but since it is related to "saving face" it is examined as culture. It is the fear of failure. Previous formal learning experiences in the life of the trainee were often filled with the pain associated with failure in tests, or reading assignments or ridicule for poor academic performance. At this stage the facilitator must outline and make clear what is meant by the adult learning process of "learning by doing." The facilitator contracts with the group not to have any written assignments between sessions, nor written tests. Trainees are free to read as much or as little as they like. The only test will be performance. The assumption is that if a behavior can be performed the knowledge necessary to that behavior has been learned.

With these three levels of threat removed, and culturally verified, the question of mode and stimuli are also solved. In the process of threat reduction what has become clear is that the trainee will have a laboratory condition for learning stimulated by all sorts of games, visual aids and counselling. The proof of learning will be the ability to perform in the work place.

The curriculum is now formally written with behaviors specified, the standards of performance in the learning objective, the dates, times and places for learning, and

the resources to be used if they are able to be identified at this stage. This total package becomes the contract which the trainee signs for learning and the trainer signs for delivering the learning opportunity. It is then taken back to the employer or a designate, the supervisor, for signing and to the Band Chief or his designate, the social counsellor for signing. All systems are now culturally acceptable and all that remains is the hard work of learning the skills to the standard specified.

Stage Four:
Evaluation and Reward Within a Cultural Setting

After the training program is complete the question of evaluation and reward pose another problem. The procedures for evaluation are usually rather straightforward. They have been written in the standards for the learning objective. There is serious trouble if it is not specified prior to the second session of training. If the job description is so vague as to be untranslatable into specific behaviors training should be abandoned after interpersonal and communication training is completed. The Chief or his designate, the social counsellor, then become the sole determiners of the trainee's skill development. The chances are that if jobs cannot be put into behaviors that there is no job to do, but a position to fill. If this is the case, the position is usually a political position and the culture must be free to use their own criteria for evaluation. Evaluation using performance criteria is never a cultural problem since the behaviors are those agreed upon by the trainee and cultural leader as usually represented in the social counsellor.

The reward is a different matter and we have had some conflicting situations with culture at this point. We have yet to work out a truly satisfactory reward system. There are two levels of reward. The first and perhaps the most important poses no problem. Upon completion the trainee is recommended by the chief to be reclassified as a permanent employee with full pay and fringe benefits. We have tried to make this the complete reward system, but the expectations of the Indian community is for some sort of formal recognition of achievement for their trainee.

We have had formal closing ceremonies at which certificates of achievement are issued. Our preference is to have the job title on the certificate and on the reverse side a complete listing of the behaviors the trainee has achieved on a straight pass/fail designation. Pressures from employers at higher levels are such that they want to see scaled ratings. This violates the learning contract and usually comes into conflict with the Indian culture. Indians recognize achievement, but usually shun a comparison of achievement. They understand a behavioral scale rating as able to perform or not able to perform, and accept it, but will not accept industries' frequent efforts to scale employees. More work

needs to be done in this area.

Another item of some significance is, where at all possible, the formal presentation of the certificate of achievement is not made by the manager of the company or the trainer in the training institution, but by the Indian chief of the trainee. This also has not always been possible for political reasons and not cultural. The desirable state is to negotiate at the very beginning of training the detail, but important item, of who actually hands the trainee his physical certificate of achievement.

Conclusion

This model has two main features. It begins, continues and ends with the consultative process of checking and clarifying with the cultural community and its leaders for the cultural impact of training. It is fully participative in the design and standard setting and cultural consideration, by the person being trained. These two factors have made this model completely acceptable to the Indian community. At least over the past eight years, and after many training groups it has never been accused by the Indian community as having a cultural bias. Indeed, it has received warm support from many Indians because it helped establish and clarify many vague parts of their own culture.

Employers have gotten trained employees who stay with them, or if they do not stay they are at least upward mobile in other employment. Some feedback from trainers in other cultures indicate it works for them. I do not know this for a fact, for I have never actually implemented it myself on a controlled action research basis outside of Canada. But I do know some of the trainers who have worked with me as graduate research assistants are using this model in rural and industrial efforts in a few developing countries.

There are several factors which I conclude are necessary for success:

1. All trainees should be from one culture;
2. All trainees must have been out of the formal learning environment, and in the world of work, for at least two years;
3. All trainees must be adults;
4. All trainees must be able to read and write in the training language at better than the functionally literate level;
5. Trainers must be skilled adult educators who can facilitate groups and create non-formal learning environments for adults;
6. Employers must contract to provide paid educational leave to the extent that it meets the terms of the learning contract;
7. Cultural elders must participate in the selection, guidance, evaluation and rewarding of the trainee;
8. Resource persons must refrain from lecture and provide models and learning environment must have all the latest educational hardware available to the area, and it must be culturally acceptable;
9. Organized labor must be prepared to accept the skill training as meeting their craft requirements and admit the trainee; and
10. Employers must engage in some hard long-range manpower planning, and provide lead time for recruitment and selection, as well as thorough job descriptions to the cultural recruiters and the trainer.

The costs are difficult to determine. They vary for each skill development area and depend upon who provides the training. Generally what happens is that employers are prepared to buy into the process on a faith basis until the end of the first week of training. After they see the learning curriculum and assess it, they then can cost it with hard figures and make a decision to become involved or to look for alternate ways of training. In any event the major costs are paid educational leave and the training fee.

Benefits are great in terms of the cultural groups accepting the employer as a resource and friend to the culture. Then, too, there is less labor turnover and far less labor strife which has a cultural overtone. But most important of all, the development agency or employer, rather than posing a threat to the culture actually becomes the means whereby cultural identity is reinforced and clarified at the same time skill development is achieved. This, it seems to me, is human resource development as the responsible employer or developer would want it to be.

REFERENCE

1. Since 1971 several hundred Indians have been trained in this model ranging from clerks to drug and alcohol abuse workers to managers, and even a group of Indian trainers. For a free copy of the first model write to either the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs or the National Indian Brotherhood, Ottawa and ask for *A Training Model for Social Counsellors at St. Francis Xavier University*, by Luke L. Batdorf. For a free copy of *Standards and Guidelines and a Model for the Training of Drug and Alcohol Abuse Workers* by Luke L. Batdorf, write to The National Native Alcohol Abuse Program, The Department of National Health and Welfare, Ottawa.

Luke L. Batdorf is associate professor of Adult Education, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia, Canada.