

7. *Friendly Working Relationships.* Studies indicate that turnover of personnel is lowest and operating results best in divisions where a good group relationship exists.

8. *A Sense of Participation.* Being a "member of the team" is very important to most people. Letting a person know *what* is to be done and *why* it is to be done increases the significance of the job and, therefore, the satisfaction of doing it.

9. *Knowledge of Accomplishment.* A person gets tremendous satisfaction when he feels he is doing a good job and giving a "good day's work for a good day's pay." One piece of work completed can give an officer the urge for more accomplishment. A sense of achievement helps the individual see the difference between effective action and mere "activity." This personal sense of achievement is one of the most important factors of motivation to the kind of people who normally do best in our field.

10. *Recognition of Individual Accomplishment and Effort.* A supervisor, merely by showing interest in the work, can emphasize the importance of the job and, at the same time, give a feeling of being treated as an individual. Both criticism and praise are means of recognizing individual effort. Any man would rather have an error criticized than to be completely ignored.

11. *Competition.* Some competition between officers on an individual basis is most effective in motivation because individuals are directly, personally responsible for a winning or losing effort. Group competition often helps stimulate better teamwork and group spirit. Friendly competition between divisions will result in increased morale and esprit-de-corps. Considerable caution must be exercised in the use of individual competition for motivation. Too much competition between unequals will almost certainly result in the demoralization of some individuals and, therefore, a reduction in team effort.

12. *Periodic Performance Appraisal.* A formal realistic evaluation of the officer is an essential aspect of motivation. An officer is anxious to know how his work is appraised so that he may improve his performance where warranted and, at the same time, be aware of the areas in which he is performing satisfactorily.

CONCLUSION

An officer's interest, attitude, and performance depend to a large extent on how well he is motivated to do his job. Providing a motivating job atmosphere begins with the assumption that an officer wants to do a good job. Such a job atmosphere is sustained by being alert to early symptoms of demotivation and correcting them immediately. You will properly motivate your officers by:

1. Showing the officer that he has the opportunity to increase his value to the agency, which will in turn increase his job security and promotion possibilities.
2. Providing him more responsibilities as he demonstrates his capacity to accept them.
3. Provide him further training, if practical, to increase his security.
4. Providing a work atmosphere in which the officer can make decisions and demonstrate abilities which would not be evident in a "closed in" type of job environment.

THE EFFECTS OF PLANNING AND REGULATIONS ON ENFORCEMENT

*By Ray G. Henry District Supervisor
Tennessee Game and Fish Commission*

According to the Webster's dictionary furnished me by the Tennessee Game and Fish Commission, planning is defined as the process of an orderly arrangement of all the parts of an overall design or objective.

Enforcement is the foundation on which the superstructure of a game and fish program is erected. Therefore, all planning, good or bad, has its effects on the

enforcement program. In the field of game and fish management, or the wise use of our wildlife resources, enforcement is the most essential part of any plan where people are involved.

In your own state, who is charged with the responsibility of planning hunting seasons, fishing seasons, the means and methods by which the surplus wildlife may be harvested? Who is responsible for the formation of regulations that will apply to and govern the activity of the people who participate in the sport of hunting, fishing and boating? Who is responsible for planning access to the waters in your state? Are the regulations in your state designed to manage and protect the wildlife species or fish populations, or are they, in fact, designed to manage people? Is enforcement given due consideration and made an essential part of this planning?

If your answer to the questions I have just asked is that enforcement is considered a cardinal part of the planning in your state, you are fortunate; and, without further knowledge, I do not hesitate to state that you have a fine game and fish program.

In order to have a good, strong, effective game and fish program, the planning must be done on an overall basis. It must take into consideration all areas of the state, all species of game, all species of fish, and all the people who will be affected. One part of a state cannot be developed and another left undeveloped. Hunting cannot take precedence over fishing and vice versa. One species of game or fish cannot dominate all others in the mind of the planners.

If the planning for people and the regulations resulting from such planning do not take into consideration the enforcement aspects, the basic structure of your game and fish program will deteriorate. Planning and enforcement are fundamental, and are the vital parts of a game and fish program, by which the whole program is supported.

The enforcement officers I know in the southeastern states are well trained, well informed and conscientious public servants. The knowledge they have of people, the area they work, the wildlife generally, and a head full of good common sense should be utilized to the fullest extent. As conscientious and as well informed as these enforcement officers may be, it will be difficult for them to maintain public support for a game and fish program that is poorly planned or poorly administered.

Once you have lost public support for your program, you have lost the support of the legislature, the judges and the political powers that exist. You may have the most highly trained and skilled game and fish technicians that can be found, and everything done and every regulation made may be biologically sound; but what good are they if the legislature refuses to put the findings of your research people into appropriate laws for the protection of a wildlife species; or, the courts refuse to punish those people who refuse to follow the theories and principles set forth by your technical people in the form of regulations.

The wide reaching branch of learning we call biology is an important part of planning for game and fish management. Certainly it deserves basic consideration; but having knowledge and applying this knowledge to people are usually two completely different fields of endeavor.

The planning for research projects where animals or fish are to be taken from the wild or where the public will be in a position to observe the project should be worked out in minute details with the objectives clearly stated. There should be as much advance notice as possible given to the enforcement people and the general public. The enforcement officers should have adequate knowledge concerning the project to be in a position to discuss it intelligently with interested people. Nothing hurts the public image of a game and fish program more than a poorly planned, haphazard, shot in the dark research project that gets off to a bang; then falls flat with nothing accomplished. Research, for the sake of research, is almost as bad. The enforcement officer can sell only one such project in the area he works. His next attempt to sell a research project, one that is needed and justified, will be met with skepticism or just plain distrust.

Planning for hunting seasons should be based on principles other than the law of supply and demand. Public reaction or hunter reaction to the seasons, means and methods of taking a wildlife species can affect the biological consideration. The seasons should be designed to give all the advantage to the legitimate hunter. The

enforcement, public relations, and landowner point of view must be considered. A season that allows more time than is necessary to take the surplus animals in a wildlife population results in one of two evils: 1. When the season must be shortened or restricted to protect the species, you get an adverse hunter reaction. 2. If you do not, the species suffers.

I'm sure most of you have trout programs in your state or similar programs where fish are literally dumped into the lakes or streams. I am not in a position to argue whether this practice is biologically sound; but I contend a difficult enforcement and public relations situation is created when an excessive number of fish are stocked in a small area; especially fish that have been reared in a hatchery and will eat out of your hand, and expect the Game and Fish Officers to enforce regulations dealing with the season, size, bait and methods of taking these fish.

A refuge or wildlife management area requires numerous regulations, very few of which have to do with wildlife.

When the planners burden the enforcement people with the enforcement of regulations that accomplish nothing, they are wasting valuable time that could be utilized in worthwhile contributions. Am I wrong in asking of the planners: Make regulations designed primarily to take the kind and amount of wildlife that needs to be harvested, protect the rest; and use people management only as a tool to accomplish the primary objective.

Be assured that when only the biological aspects are considered in planning, disaster is the sure end result.

I have noticed a trend in recent years for planning to be centered around the more sophisticated types of hunting and fishing, such as waterfowl, big game, put-and-take trout fishing, etc. Small pressure groups such as the archers, the fly fishermen and the muzzle loaders have influenced the planners in many states to make concessions to them at the expense of other groups. The native species of game and fish that are the bread and butter of any program are being neglected. The money paid by the crappie, bluegill and bass fishermen, in the form of license fees is being used to support and perpetuate put-and-take trout programs. The money paid by the squirrel, rabbit and bird hunters is being used to support and perpetuate waterfowl, big game or exotic species programs. I do not feel the planners are wrong in considering the exotic species or providing for specialized and sophisticated types of hunting or fishing; however, I do feel the planners are wrong when they perpetuate these programs beyond the willingness of the participants to pay for their sport. In many cases, the planners create the demand; thus, causing a heavy drain on funds that could be used to improve basic needs. In much the same manner as the native species of game and fish have become secondary in the minds of some planners, the trend is for enforcement to play second fiddle to the more dramatic field of biology.

As previously stated, enforcement is affected by all planning; but more directly by the regulations that result from planning. A regulation that does not offer protection for a wildlife species that is not fair and equitable to all the hunters and fishermen, clearly and simply stated so as to be understood by the courts and the general public, does immeasurable harm to a game and fish program. A regulation that requires interpretation by the planners or the enforcement officer is worse than no regulation. The modern trend is to enact more laws and make more regulations in a frustrated effort to manage people.

As enforcement people, we are not always in a position to plan for long range game and fish management programs. We are in a position to plan for the future within our own divisions. For example, what kind of an enforcement program would you have if the average age of your enforcement officers was twenty-five? Compare, in your mind, the type enforcement program you would have if the average age of your enforcement people was fifty. If your thinking concurs with mine, we are in agreement that youth is essential to wildlife law enforcement. This is not to say there is no place for the experienced, dedicated, sound, responsible officer who has reached middle age or past, but we would not be realistic if we did not recognize that creative thinking goes hand in hand with the vitality of youth. Enthusiasm, energy and the desire to sell and prove one's self is also a characteristic of youth. With these thoughts

in mind, we should plan for an early retirement for our enforcement officers. Very few cases would merit the continued employment of a Game and Fish Officer over fifty-five years of age, and few of us would earn our keep after we have reached the age of fifty. Retirement at an early age will pay for itself through increased efficiency and production. The legitimate hunter and fisherman would be assured a fair chance to harvest the surplus wildlife and also a continuation of their sport.

We should plan for more and better training for our officers. This training should not be in law enforcement alone, but should include the biological and public relations fields as well. We need more officers who can enforce the laws on Saturday, make a speech on Saturday night, investigate a fish kill on Sunday morning, capture a bear or deer with the modern drugs available on Sunday afternoon and then sing in the church choir or sit in the "A-Men" corner on Sunday night. This may sound farfetched, but this is the type man we need. If we cannot hire them — then we must train them.

We must share an equal, or even greater, responsibility in poor planning and poor regulations than the planners and technical people I have mentioned earlier. We attempt to present ourselves as rugged individualists, all knowing and all wise; but, in fact, we sit on the sideline while unwilling to share the responsibilities of planning and the formation of regulations and snipe at those people who are responsible. We are the advocates of the status quo — no change. The hunting and fishing seasons, the means and methods of taking wildlife in the Southeast are, for all practical purposes, the same as they have been for the past twenty-five years. When a new idea or method is advanced by one of our own people or by other responsible people, we immediately resist the proposed change, and in many cases "dream up" unrealistic reasons why the thinking is bad.

I would like to present two challenges to you, the representatives of the enforcement divisions at this meeting. These will require much time and much thought by you and your people if you accept the challenge. First, I challenge you to prepare complete regulations for all areas of activity that are presently regulated in your state. Make the regulations clear, concise, and as few in number as possible, to accomplish the objective. Strive for new and original ideas. Start with the thought in mind that no regulations exist; that it is your responsibility to manage the people and the wildlife involved. State and justify your reasons for each regulation and what you hope to accomplish by it. When you have completed your work, compare it with the regulations that now exist. If you have done your work well, used your own thinking and the thinking of the enforcement people, I am confident you will find you are wasting a considerable amount of time enforcing regulations that accomplish nothing.

My second challenge is for you to present your regulations to the planners in your state. Be prepared to defend them until competent and sufficient reasons are offered to change or alter them. Do not accept flimsy excuses or personal preferences. Accept the responsibility for the regulations.

Without accepting this challenge, all or in part, how can we in good faith criticize without offering something better, or something constructive. Then, and only then, will enforcement take its rightful place in planning and the formation of regulations.

SUMMARY OF THE EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND

*By Christ G. Christis, Director
Maryland State Retirement Systems*

Earning money is not too difficult. Spending money is easy. The greatest problem you probably find, as most people do, is saving money. Saving is no easy task. It requires more self discipline than most people are willing to impose upon themselves. At the end of 15 or 20 years, we realize that we have nothing to show for all the money we have made during that time. We start to feel uneasy because we realize