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From the Editor

At its annual meeting during the AIAEE Conference, the Editorial Board of the Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education made an important decision related to manuscripts submitted for publication. The Board voted to eliminate the US$25 submission fee for feature papers submitted for publication. This means that now an author can submit his/her scholarly writing or research without having to pay any money.

This strategic decision was made thanks to the sound financial position of the AIAEE Association and the Journal. The Board hopes that the elimination of the submission fee will spark an increase of manuscripts submitted from AIAEE members and agricultural and extension professionals throughout the world and especially in less developed regions.

So, as Editor, I would ask that you pass this information on to your colleagues in agricultural and extension education in your region, state or country. Please inform them that they are invited to submit their research or scholarly writing to the Journal, even if they are not AIAEE members. If their manuscript is accepted they will be asked to pay the US$10 per page publication fee.

This issue of the Journal included important information and results from the spring AIAEE Conference held in Arlington VA. If you missed it, Tony Tucker’s Keynote Address is included on Page 5. His thoughts on sustainable development and professional partnerships is well worth reviewing. Minutes of the Leadership Team meetings and the AIAEE Business meeting start on page 15.

With fall just around the corner, we must also start thinking about next spring’s AIAEE Conference in Baton Rouge, LA. Calls for Papers and Posters are included on Pages 22-23. New next year will be a Carousel Roundtable session. Call for Carousel Roundtable proposals is on Page 24. I highly recommend you review these calls for presentations and submit your research, project or program summary for presentation at next spring’s conference.

Time really flies when you are having fun. This issue of the Journal marks the half way point in my tenure as Editor. A position announcement for the next Editor of the Journal is included on Page 25. The next Editor would serve a one year term as Editor-Elect for 2001 and a three year term as Editor from 2002-2004. I strongly recommend that you give this excellent opportunity some thought.

The Outstanding Posters and Papers from the conference are listed on Pages 26 and 27. Three of the outstanding papers from the conference are printed in this issue of the Journal. For the first time in a couple of years a synopsis of the papers presented at the AIAEE conference is included on Page 53. Mikel Woods does an excellent job of reviewing the papers for those who could not attend the spring conference. Also included for the first time, are the complete Abstracts from the papers presented this spring.

Finally, for those scholars interested in sharing your writings with our colleagues across the pond, a Call for Papers for the 15th European Seminar on Extension Education is included. I encourage you to review this call and consider submitting your research to this most important conference.
Introduction

I have practiced Extension throughout my career, which started in Zambia in 1960 in public sector extension and for the last 35 years in the South African Sugar Industry in private sector extension, so I shall be drawing on these experiences as they relate to the title of my address.

But first, some general comments. All of us, as extensionists, are almost exclusively dedicated to programmes that promote rural stability through agricultural development. Since the birth of many nations, which was based on man’s burning desire to reach out to unexplored lands and settle into an agrarian way of life, we cannot say we have achieved widespread agricultural sustainability to any great extent.

Here in the States, I am fascinated by the history of the opening of the west by land hungry settlers, while in my own country of South Africa, the great trek of the white pioneers into the interior three and a half centuries ago, and the migration of black tribes from the north were spurred on by the same visions. The early explorers in many other lands also had much the same expectations as agriculture became a burgeoning way of life, and virgin lands yielded a wide variety of food, fibre and fads such as tobacco and more recently drugs, which have generated considerable wealth world-wide, but to a small percentage of the global population.

But the dreams of these early farmers were often dashed by droughts, floods, market uncertainties, soil degradation, diseases and pests, and more recently population pressures. More importantly, their lack of knowledge made farming an increasingly difficult and risky occupation, while the first signs of environmental damage soon appeared. The need to generate knowledge to cope with the problems resulted in the development of agricultural research programmes, which lifted productivity to satisfy the needs of the fast expanding populations and extension became the vehicle for this to happen.

The birth of extension was a natural development as research outcomes gained momentum. New technology was only useful if it was suitably adapted for the right agricultural practices, and adopted by the farmers according to their local conditions.

World-wide, the commercial agricultural sector developed many successful and diverse high-tech farming systems, made possible by innovative research and extension programmes.

But what about the subsistence and small-scale farmers in the third world? Have they been left behind? They too require access to knowledge, albeit at a different level and coupled with the benefits of local experience.

In addition there is another critical dimension: environmental degradation through exploitation of natural resources is a galloping danger to the ability of agriculture to sustain mankind. Population explosions are putting increasing pressure on the land and its ability to produce adequate food.

Urban drift is a serious consequence in many countries as disillusioned rural dwellers seek a better future in the cities, but widespread joblessness there generates extreme poverty, hunger and a breakdown in law and order.
The point I want to stress is that in many countries rural and urban stability is being threatened by the drift of rural people who no longer see a future in farming.

It is for these reasons that extension has a pivotal role to play, indeed it is the vital link between the development of technology (research) and its application by the farmer in its most appropriate form. This will enable the use of best management practices in the most appropriate systems based on sound advice.

I believe we have a great responsibility as extensionists, to improve our effectiveness to attain progress towards a more productive way of life and long term stability in the rural areas.

So why has the extensionist’s impact been at times disappointing and below expectation?

Let us look at some of our apparent weaknesses.

- Invariably the top-down approach has been used “we know what is best for you”, so we failed to focus sufficiently on the client’s needs, preferences and abilities.

- Extension has been traditionally a public sector service, often inflexible, bureaucratic, under-funded and with inadequate resources leading to de-motivated extensionists.

- Programs are often too general, the client base ill defined, the goals not specific and they are spreading resources too thinly with limited results.

- Programs frequently consist of short-term projects, lacking continuity and with little or no follow-up. They should be on-going, long-term commitments if the progress is to be sustainable.

- Extensionists should be compatible, and integrated with the communities in which they work. In addition, their skills, resources and experience should match the needs of the client otherwise credibility is lost.

- Extensionists must work in close association with their resource base of technology and information such as the research centers. In fact they frequently operate in isolation resulting in poor or delayed use of evolving technology.

- It is difficult to make regular, direct contact with farmers, as many have part-time, additional employment and may not be resident on their farms.

- Poor communications where there are no telephones and access where roads are in bad condition make it difficult to set up effective programmes.

- Lack of resources such as audio-visual aids and materials for demonstrations restrict the extensionists impact to carry out good extension programmes.

- Inadequate pre-planning to determine the opportunities for developing new enterprises and stabilizing old with reliable market outlets.

Or, maybe the fault lies with the farmers – are they already self-satisfied and too complacent?

In reality, the old image of farming being a comfortable way of life with sufficient food, material satisfaction and recreation has been lost.

Agriculture has been losing its attractiveness for many as profit margins for the commercial farmer decline, and subsistence farmers see no future in remaining where they are. The challenge for extension is to turn these attitudes around and generate optimism.

Now let me return to the conference theme and the title of my talk, and away from the negatives I have described.

As a supreme optimist, which I contend should be an inborn strength of all extensionists, I believe we have the potential to be the catalyst to rebuild and develop agriculture in the rural areas of countries where farming is losing its appeal. Agriculture is, after all, a pillar of a
nation’s economy and Extension, by helping to establish development through well informed farmers can revive that strength.

But with agriculture presently under extreme pressure from dwindling profit margins and environmental concerns, extension has never had a better opportunity to make its greatest impact.

So let us explore innovative ways of making ourselves smarter extensionists. We need to improve our service delivery and strive for higher levels of achievement. To do this, we must identify the relative merits and weaknesses of the various role players, and the potential for farmers to respond to exploit their combined strengths to make meaningful and sustained progress.

Public Sector Extension

Let us consider the future responsibility of Governments in extension programs.

Last year, in my paper presented at the Trinidad and Tobago conference, I described the limitations in public sector extension in South Africa which can result in negative responses to extension initiatives. These include:

- The inevitable competition for funds and resources between Government departments, with agriculture often having a low priority.
- The need for extension to undertake regulatory responsibilities such as restraining environmental mismanagement; market controls; and land-use permits.
- The allocation of services between the larger commercial farmers (generally large taxpayers who can make a big impact on the economy) or the small-scale farmers (where progress is difficult and slow but the need for development is great).
- Political pressures which often distort the economic priorities.

These weaknesses are recognized in South Africa, and we expect to see significant changes in the delivery of extension.

Without doubt, Government, as a public service provider, must be responsible for and place a high priority on community development in rural areas where there is minimal scope for commercial agricultural development. In this situation, food security, health, education and social resources are the primary needs, with agriculture lower down the priority scale, so we do not see agricultural extension as having a significant role to play.

At the other end of the scale are the large commercial farms which are generally highly developed business enterprises often using advanced systems, and who require specialized advice on technology and economics, which can best be provided by private consultants or extension services who charge appropriate fees. Services from the Government for these farmers should be confined to the implications and application of statutory legislation. However, this privatized trend may result in an elitist service where the most needy farmers cannot afford the assistance they require, for example ADAS in England which only effectively reaches the top 10% of farmers. This imbalance needs to be addressed.

But in between, there is the very important and large group of land users with considerable potential, which we now refer to as the small-scale emerging farmers, and they are an important element in our drive to develop the impoverished rural areas. They generally farm on a few hectares of land; all are resource poor, and they have limited access to finance. To create the right opportunities for change, the following criteria are necessary:

- There is at least one agricultural enterprise or more, which has a reliable and predictable market with long-term stability.
- They need adequate land with security of tenure.
- The farmers must have the will and confidence to succeed.
- There must be facilities for suitable...
enterprise finance.

· All the necessary support services must be available to them, in a coordinated program.

It is in this sector where the best prospects for progress towards sustainable rural development exist, and we must concentrate our limited resources on them. But it requires commitment from all the service providers, in particular reliable extension, which cannot be done solely by Government.

If we can successfully develop real growth in this sector by engaging the private sector and expanding our limited resources, then I am very confident we will see some dramatic progress. As Willem Zijp reminded us last year – we in extension have to mobilize the emerging farmers to take the initiative, have belief in themselves, and be receptive to change. They must make their needs known and put pressure on the decision makers. Without this we may well get off to more false starts.

Private Sector Extension

I will illustrate the potential of the private sector extension by describing the agricultural industry I work in.

The South African sugar industry produces on average 2.5 million tons of sugar per annum mostly in KwaZulu-Natal, which is manufactured from about 23 million tons of sugarcane grown on 420 000 hectares of land by 2 000 large-scale commercial farmers and 47 000 small-scale emerging farmers.

The sugar industry provides the finance to undertake all the research programs on the crop and its product, and two dedicated, integrated extension services ensure that all the sugarcane growers have access to the technology and information generated at its own Experiment Station (SASEX) near Durban. It provides the farmers with the opportunities to apply the best management practices on the crop, developed from comprehensive research programmes, backed by an integrated extension service.

Extension for the commercial farmers is funded through a special levy at a fixed rate per ton of sugarcane produced. However, the emerging farmers do not have the capacity at this stage to pay the levy, yet require good extension to improve their productivity, which at this stage is relatively low.

We therefore entered into an agreement in 1996 with the Government’s Department of Agriculture, who now provide additional extension staff plus a share in the overall costs, to work with our specialised extension staff equipped with the relevant technology to provide a much more comprehensive, skilled and effective extension programme for the emerging farmers, while also attending to their other crop needs.

This partnership is a role model for synergizing the combined strengths of the public and private sectors into a more powerful and effective extension service.

In order to address the need for short-term, seasonal sugarcane crop finance, the SA Sugar Association has for more than 25 years developed its Financial Aid Fund (FAF). This revolving fund releases loans to approved small scale sugarcane farmers at competitive interest rates to cover fertilizer, crop chemicals and planting costs which are recouped from the crop’s proceeds after harvest. The Fund is financed mainly from the sugar industry’s own resources.

A more recent development is the launch of another small-scale farmer finance scheme – an offshoot of FAF, the Rural Finance Savings Organization (RFSO). This enables farmers to invest their savings in village banks and then use it as surety for short to medium term loans for other farming enterprises.

A third fund, the Small Growers Development Trust (SGDT), has been established to provide for the training of these farmers in skills to improve their management capability. To ensure these courses are treated seriously, the farmers pay 10% of the costs with the balance
subsidized from the fund. A number of donors fund the SGDT including the SA Sugar Association itself, and also the premium we receive on exports of sugar to the United States (thank you, Americans, please add another spoonful of sugar to your coffee or tea at the break even if you don’t stir it - it helps our emerging farmer development programs).

Through these sources, our emerging sugarcane farmers have developed the capacity to move from their traditional subsistence sector into the commercial farming sector, and generate new wealth.

In the graph below we can see how yields of sugarcane have increased since the extension program was introduced.

To satisfy ourselves we are on the right track, we calculated the cost: benefit ratio of the Joint Venture to be certain we were not spending more than the increased returns to the growers. It is clear that at 1:12.5 per annum, the investment in extension has been highly beneficial.

This example of how a commodity-based agricultural industry can provide the technology, and financial services for a fully integrated program of research, extension and
development, in partnership with the Government, is worthy of further consideration as a role model elsewhere.

But, there are of course limits to the extent such an organization, together with the Government, can commit themselves to development programs without outside support, and it is to the large players such as the World Bank that they will turn.

There are other examples of agricultural commodities produced in Southern Africa where farmer services are also provided through similar private structures, including the citrus, grape and wine industries in South Africa, tea, coffee and tobacco in Zimbabwe and Malawi, and many of the Agricultural Co-operatives who supply the inputs and market a variety of crops and products on behalf of their farmer members, provide credit and supply extension services. Likewise we heard last year of the Banana Board’s commitment to provide private extension in the West Indies. These services are seen to be better focused, effective and they have made a substantial impact on farm productivity for their particular commodity.
So far, the involvement of the private sector to support farmer services has been mainly restricted to large-scale commercial farming. It is only in recent times we are starting to explore and exploit private sector resources to the benefit of the emerging farmers as I have described. Yet the commercial benefits are potentially large for those who supply farming inputs such as fertilizers, chemicals, seed, fuel, and machinery; those who provide financial services; the co-operatives; and those who transport, process or market the crop. So they should all be seen as important potential sources of farmer support in research, extension and program implementation. There are numerous multi-national companies who generate a substantial income from agriculture, and who reap large financial benefits from their trade with the farmers.

Increased agricultural production through farm enterprise development and greater productivity would mean even greater turnover for these suppliers, justifying further investment in these programs.

The question is – how can this private sector involvement be developed?

We have all to come to terms with the fact that extension and development projects cannot be the responsibility of one provider. They are costly, require specialized skills and considerable resources. We must therefore identify all the potential role players, and create long-term partnerships to develop synergies, which will effectively combine all their strengths in the most constructive and cost effective manner.

However, the challenges we face are to make this buy-in attractive to potential private sector involvement, to co-ordinate the services available and ensure all partners are committed to a long-term program.

This is an issue we should pick up in our plenary session.

In South Africa, we have another interesting example of private sector involvement in rural development. Professor Johan van Rooyen of the University of Pretoria and Director of Agribusiness SA has masterminded a scheme where farm workers become shareholders in the land and the business operations of large scale commercial farms in partnership with the
Consistent with the political initiatives to redistribute under-utilized agricultural land to previously disadvantaged rural people, these projects aim to maintain the strength of economy of scale in large farming enterprises without fragmenting them, while bringing rural dwellers into the enterprise with a direct share in the investment, the decision making processes, and hopefully to benefit from the profits, yet accept the risk that goes with being a stakeholder.

Already there are a number of farms operating within this project, and proving to be highly successful by creating a new opportunity for workers to become partners in market driven farm enterprises and helping them to grow with the wealth tree.

The principles of these farm shareholder schemes are superior to the settlement schemes sponsored by Governments in post-colonial Africa. In Zambia for instance, rural people were relocated onto plots of virgin land within large estate structures, and where the farming operations were organized by management teams requiring minimal input by the settlers. With little say in the operation and no stake in the business other than a small share in the profits, there was minimal motivation for them to become enthusiastically involved. Many of these schemes were not sustainable once the start-up funding was withdrawn and management handed over to the settlers.

The People – The Farmers

They are the ‘raison d’etre’ – the heart of the program yet they are often overlooked in the decision making process.

No extension program can be expected to succeed without the full participation of all the role players, at every stage. Starting with the identification of the problems, developing the solutions, preparing an action plan, implementing the program, regular monitoring of progress, with periodic evaluations of the benefits being obtained are a sequence of essential functions which must be well coordinated at all stages to keep the program well on track.

Referring again to the SA Sugar Industry, we have devised structures to oversee and co-ordinate our extension programs. Known as Extension Coordinating Committees or Research, Extension and Development Committees, they bring together the role players and partners and, importantly, farmer representatives, who meet regularly to monitor progress of programs, report on difficulties, identify solutions, and ensure that follow-up action is executed in a timely manner.

I recall the excellent, award winning paper by JR Vryrens at last year’s conference in which a project to increase rice production in Senegal was described. Meticulous preparation was undertaken before the extension program commenced, starting with the consultation process with the people, in this case the women, who identified important social and dietary needs which were not originally apparent. The involvement of the community from the start boosted the relevance of the project and gained the participants’ confidence who then gave their full commitment to the program. It was an excellent example of a model extension project.

In all extension projects it is essential to identify the leaders, opinion makers and early adopters who are the most influential people to serve on these committees and take over ownership of the programs once they are running smoothly. Farmers are notoriously slow to respond to change, preferring to rely on tried and trusted practices. It is therefore essential to obtain buy-in from the early adopters to avoid the possibility of negativeness or indifference undermining the pace and progress towards success. Extension programs must therefore be phased in as an evolutionary, rather than a revolutionary process. The traditional attitude of the conservative majority is to wait, and look over the fence to gauge how well their more adventurous neighbors, the early adopters are faring, before they accept new ideas. In fact I have always said that only a part of what we know as extensionists comes from our research results, the rest is what we observe from successful, innovative farmers who are quick to adopt and adapt practices to suit their own skills.
and local conditions.

The People – The Extensionists

They are also a most important cog in the wheel; so how do we get the best from them? An Extensionist must identify himself as being a full participant with the people involved in his extension programs.

To achieve this end, he should preferably have a common home language with the farmers, be adaptable to different levels of understanding, live in close proximity to the community, and feel comfortable to mix freely with them to the extent that he is a fully accepted. However, it concerns me when extensionists are unable to relate easily to the farmers. In fact, they sometimes elevate themselves above the people, which is contrary to building confidence, trust and an effective working relationship.

Extensionists must be adequately equipped to be efficient yet are often handicapped by having limited or no resources such as audio-visual aids and demonstration equipment. For each topic we use well-illustrated posters with simple statements written in the vernacular and laminated to make them durable and long-lasting, together with other appropriate tools and aids they need. It is equipment and materials such as these, which could be sponsored by commercial firms to underwrite the costs, while enhancing the quality and impact of the message portrayed. ‘Seeing is believing’ is a proven maxim, and especially with illiterate people. So much more could be achieved by extensionists, given the right resources to implement their programs.

Farmers, especially from poorer communities, are eager to learn and will often walk long distances to attend a talk or demonstration. To give them a bun and pop to refresh them, will prompt an enthusiastic response, with a long-lasting impact and ensure they return the next time – maintaining continuity of the program, which is so important. This again could be sponsored commercially.

Communication and travel difficulties are often restrictive and seen as limiting factors to efficient extension delivery. Setting up rural programs has an added difficulty when there are no telephones, although mobile phones have made it much easier to facilitate contact.

Getting there is another problem if roads are in poor condition. The modern extensionist tends to expect a car to get around in, and if it is not a 4-wheel drive, is reluctant to go deep into the rural areas. Cars and transportation are a major cost of extension programs, and we really need to find a solution to this problem. As a young extensionist in Zambia, I used a bicycle and together with my assistant we moved around from base camp in this way, and I can assure you I had a much better ‘feel’ for the farms and the people, although admittedly it took longer to do so. Is the modern extensionist willing to ‘rough it’ a bit as we did then?

For an extensionist to be strongly motivated and effective there are a number of prerequisites to consider:

· Proper training to provide the right advice at the appropriate level of technology.
· Equipped with the necessary resources to perform efficiently.
· Carefully planned and structured programs each based on a defined target area of farmers with a clear set of goals.
· A well coordinated partnership with all role players to optimize service delivery and outcomes.
· A right sized program to enable adequate client contact and a reasonable chance of success.
· Motivation to generate enthusiasm and job satisfaction is important and should not be overlooked if we are to attract and keep the best people as winning extensionists.

The Value of Agricultural Extension: Its Worth to Rural Development

Before concluding, we must be certain that extension is a good investment. To do this, I will repeat the results of studies made by PA Donovan, and reported in the paper I presented at last year’s conference, in which the value of extension in and the respective costs of public and private sector extension in South Africa were compared.
These studies highlighted the importance of research and extension being closely linked within a single structure as it is in the South African Sugar Association, and showed that research programs depend heavily on extension for effective adoption of technology by the farmers. Over a 30-year period increased yields could be attributed to research and extension in the ratio of 40:60. It also showed that the lag period between new technology provided by SASEX research and its adoption by farmers through effective extension is only 3 years. This was compared with 7 years for extension provided by the Department of Agriculture where research and extension are not operating together, which more than doubles the delay before responses are achieved.

While public sector extension was estimated to yield a positive return of a meager 3%, a number of private sector extension programs in Southern Africa showed a range of very favorable returns on investment in extension ranging from a low of 35% to a high of 236%.

It must be noted however that most of the private extension services studied were commodity based, which is always more likely to give higher returns, than general extension programs provided by Government.

Summary

I will summarize my ideas on future directions for agricultural extension and the respective roles of public and private services to the benefit of rural people. I will draw your attention to the issues which we should be considering as we look for ways to improve our service delivery, and strengthen our impact to enhance the development and stability of agriculture. I have concentrated in particular on those farmers who are emerging from subsistence into commercial farming systems and which offer the best prospect for success.

- Public sector extension should limit its extension responsibilities to community service development, subsistence farming for food sufficiency and regulatory issues based on legislation. This does not require highly qualified extension staff, but people trained and motivated as community workers.
- Public sector leaders should identify where the private sector can become a role player in extension, and create opportunities to develop appropriate partnerships and structures.
- Emerging commercial farmers present the most urgent need and challenge for development, which is politically, economically and socially important.
- The potential for public and private sector partnerships for emerging farmers is incalculable, but it needs to be identified, tested for suitability, and carefully coordinated with long-term commitments to the programmes.
- Commercial farmers do not require conventional, general extension, but should be serviced by specialist consultants or dedicated commodity extension from the private sector.
- Extension programmes must identify the client base, who must be receptive to change.
- The projects must be right sized for effective delivery, and have clear goals.
- Priorities should be based on long term viability through market analyses, and the potential to expand existing commodities and develop new ones.
- Projects must be environmentally friendly and sustainable.
- Private sector involvement can be obtained from a number of sources which include:
  - Commodity based industries as illustrated by our sugarcane programme.
  - Agricultural suppliers, for example fertilizer, herbicide, machinery, and fuel suppliers.
  - Agricultural co-operatives for markets, credit and services.
  - Processors of agricultural products, for
example wine or fruit juices.

- Financial institutions such as the banks and private sector trusts.

- Farmer representation and active participation in all stages of extension delivery, up to the evaluation of the programme.

- An extension levy, even if it is a fraction of the total cost, would develop a commitment and ownership by the farmers to participate fully in the programmes.

- We see extension programmes being driven and controlled in the following way:

  - A central coordinating committee, board or trust being established for each programme, headed by a principal role player. All role players will be represented on this committee, including meaningful representation from the farmers.

  - The responsibility of this committee will be to plan and implement the extension program, identify problems, provide solutions, monitor its progress, and evaluate its outcomes.

  - The committee will ensure sound partnerships are created, that all participants operate in unison to avoid overlapping, the best skills available will be utilized, with the necessary resources provided, and eventually reach the point where the project is self-sustaining.

  The process is dynamic, and as new priorities arise they will replace those no longer relevant. The overall aim is to create a vibrant, viable and stable group of advancing farmers in the most cost effective and direct way possible. With successful farmers comes the ‘spin-off’ effect on the other, non-farming people in the community by generating new business possibilities that could further enhance the wealth and well-being of the whole community.

**Conclusion**

Extension has the potential to make substantial and sustainable rural progress, provided all the role players from the public and private sectors work together in close harmony with the people who farm the land.

Mr Chairman, I hope that these ideas I have shared with you from my African experiences in public and private extension over the past 35 years have stimulated your minds around the conference theme. Agricultural development is the crux in the process of strengthening rural communities. The importance I attach to developing partnerships between the role players to improve the success rate of extension programs will have prompted you to come up with questions, comments and other ideas when we open up the debate to the floor.
AIAEE
Pre-Conference Leadership Team Meeting Minutes
March 29, 2000

Meeting was called to order by Satish Verma in the Reagan Room of the Quality Inn Hotel in Arlington, VA.

Wade Miller reviewed the 2000 Conference and responsibilities.

Jim Diamond will be conducting the New Member Orientation. Approximately 20 people have registered for this workshop. Also, 20 people have registered for the Writers Workshop which will be conducted by Jim Connors.

John Richardson presented information on changes in the paper presentations. Jim Connors has requested that presenters who have written copies, provide one copy to him. Bruce Lansdale will donate a copy of a new book he has written to each graduate student registered at the conference and providing others for sale to those wishing them.

The Journal editorial review board will meet from 8 to 10 p.m. on Thursday evening.

It was announced that all past presidents have been contacted and asked to give a brief reflection on the Association. All in attendance have agreed to make a presentation.

A memorial presentation will be made for Bob Maxwell, Don Evans, and Frank Byrnes.

The next Leadership Team Meeting will be held at noon on Saturday, April 1, in the Washington Room.

Steve Jones reported that 92 people have pre-registered and others are continuing to register. It is estimated that over 100 will be in attendance.

David Giltrow reported that an AIAEE Foundation was being considered for assistance in areas such as funding for Conference travel, especially for distant locations and other areas that need financial assistance. A proposal for a possible AIAEE Foundation will be presented to the membership.

Jack Elliot reviewed the Publications Committee activities including a possible change to three newsletters annually. He also gave a report on the AIAEE home page.

The membership year was discussed. It was determined that the membership year is July 1 to June 30 of each year. However dues collected at the Conference allow full participation at the conference, and the membership year starting in July.

Awards and Recognition Committee report was reviewed by Wade Miller.

Constitution and Bylaws update was presented by James Christiansen. It was determined that AIAEE would recognize regional chapters “so long as any constitution, Bylaws and activities of the chapter are congruent with, or that is not in conflict with, the goals and objectives of AIAEE.”

Jack Elliot moved and John Richardson seconded to approve the change to the constitution, and to send it to the membership for consideration.

Scholarly Activities were reported by John Richardson. Forty-eight papers and six alternates were
selected for the conference. Due to cancellations, all six alternates have been asked to present. Twelve posters were selected for presentation at the Conference.
Resolution Committee report was presented by Frank Brewer. New certificates will be used and sent to those being recognized by a resolution.

Membership Committee report presented by Jim Diamond. Membership includes:

   42 countries represented
   11 institutional memberships
   322 members
   14 life members

Membership is up by one member this year over last year.
Membership shingles are for sale at the Conference

The treasurers report was presented by Steve Jones including financial transactions between the editor and the treasurer.

University Students Committee report was presented by Katherine Raphael. The auction and survey of graduate students at the Conference was discussed.

Jack Elliot reported that the web site continues to get heavy use and Arizona is willing to continue maintaining it unless someone else wishes to take it over. Wade moved and Jan seconded that we pay $500 to continue the web site. Motion passed.

The 2002 conference site was discussed. Satish indicated that the vote was in support of South Africa for the Conference. John moved and it was seconded that we hold the Conference in South Africa in 2002. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned

Respectfully submitted
Frank L. Brewer
Acting Secretary
President Satish Verma called the meeting of 16th Annual Conference of AIAEE to order on Saturday April 1, 2000.

David Acker presented the AIAEE awards recognition to the following winners:
   Outstanding Service Award- James Christiansen
   Outstanding Young Professional Award- Matt Baker
   Outstanding Leadership Award- Jan Henderson
   Leader of Graduate Students- Kathy Raphael

Outstanding Conference Papers were presented as follows:
   3rd Runner-up- Larry Miller
   2nd Runner-up- Mohammed Chizari
   1st Runner-up- Barnabas M. Dlamini
   Outstanding Paper- Craig Edwards and Bill Thuemmel
   Outstanding Graduate Student paper- Niamh Dennehy

Outstanding Poster awards:
   2nd Runner-up- Peter Ewang
   1st Runner-up- Mikel Woods
   Outstanding poster- Nick Place

Minutes of the 1999 Conference were approved as presented.
Thirteen of the 16 past presidents presented reflections of the past 16 years of AIAEE.

Wade Miller reported on the activities of the Planning Conference Committee and asked participants to fill out the evaluation forms to help with planning for future conferences.

Steve Jones presented the treasurers report as follows:
   Starting balance- $20,370.94
   Expenses- $9,255.70
   Income- $19,447.82
   Ending Balance- $30,563.06 (pre-conference)

Jim Knight moved, Jim Diamond seconded to approve the treasurers report. Motion passed.

Jim Connors presented a report on the Journal. He reported a balance of approximately $9,000 in the Journal account. The Journal board approved the $25 submission fee to be dropped. It was announced that the summer conference issue is being considered to be dropped.
Scholarly Activities - James Christiansen indicated that the committee recommended the following:

Proceedings for 2001 Conference be in both printed and on CD ROM format. After 2001 they will be available only in CD ROM format.

Discussion is ongoing on the issue of journal papers being revised and resubmitted for a blind review if they are not acceptable upon the original submission.

Poster sessions being changed to refereed abstracts. Announcements of any change would be posted on the web and in the June issue of the Journal.

Goal to improve communication with other international organizations.

Constitution and Bylaws—Barbara Ludwig reported that the committee will be reregistering the AIAEE logo, and will provide updates which allow for changes in the organization.

The Resolutions Committee presented three AIAEE resolutions. It was moved by Roger Steele and seconded that the membership adopt the three resolutions. Motion

Membership report was presented by Jim Diamond as follows:

- 14 life members
- 11 institutional members
- 308 members with 75% of membership coming from the U.S., Kenya and Trinidad and Tobago Total membership for 1999-2000 is 322.

The Membership Committee asked each member to invite two people to join the Association. The new member orientation will continue next year.

Mikel Woods presented information on the University Students Committee. He reported that 19 students participated in this conference. $28 was raised from the wine tasting session, $422 from the silent auction, and $25 was donated.

Committee goals are to:
- Revise the student listserv
- Work on student recruitment
- Revise student newsletter
- Continue with fund raising
- Possible pre-conference session in areas such as Grant Writing
- Compile a list of past graduate representatives
- Request consideration of full scholarship for students presenting at Conference
- Acknowledge Kathy Raphael for her work

Other Business:

A memorial tribute of the life and careers was presented on the behalf of:

- Frank Byrnes by Bruce Lansdale
- Bob Maxwell by Layle Lawrence
- Don Evans by Henry Bahn

Old business—no items

New business:

David Giltrow reported on the possibility of a Foundation associated with AIAEE It was moved and seconded that the concept be referred to the Constitution and Bylaws committee. Motion passed.

A motion was made by Wade Miller to recommend to the Constitution and Bylaws
Committee to consider making changes that allows electronic voting within the Association. Motion seconded and passed.

Satish Verma reviewed the details of the Baton Rouge Conference and the selection process for the 2002 Conference site. Proposals were reviewed from Ghana and from the South African Society for Agricultural Extension to hold the Conference in their countries—Satish announced that the Leadership Team recommended the South Africa location for 2002 in Durban, S.A.

-Gustav Düvel presented an overview of the proposed venue at Durban on the Indian Ocean. There will be field trips to game parks, with lodging costs similar or lower than Washington, D.C.

-Roger Steele moved that we select the South African location in 2002 and a letter of appreciation be submitted to Ghana asking them to resubmit at a later time. Motion seconded and passed.

The new Leadership Team election results were announced as follows:

President elect- John Richardson
Secretary- Frank Brewer
Member at large- Gustav Düvel

New president Wade Miller thanked Satish Verma for his leadership of AIAEE and provided closing comments.

Conference adjourned.

Respectfully submitted

Frank L. Brewer
Acting Secretary
Meeting was called to order by Wade Miller. He indicated that he would compile the evaluation of the conference and send to Leadership Team members.

One hundred and one participants registered—all proceedings were given out at the Conference.

Possible future Conference locations:
   2003 at a university location (Minnesota or other)
   2004 is a possibility in Ireland (University College Dublin)

The goal of the planning committee will be to keep the registration fee at Baton Rouge similar to the 2000 Conference in Washington DC.

It was decided that students who have a paper accepted or poster presentation (up to two authors per papers/poster) will receive a scholarship from the Association for their entire registration fee. Motion passed by consensus.

Jim Diamond will investigate possible promotional items utilizing the Association logo. Request passed by consensus.

Jack Elliot moved that both a carousel and poster presentation be included in future conferences. Satish seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Leadership Team supports the continuation of the summer conference issue of the Journal, and that the abstracts of all papers presented at the Conference be included in this issue.

It was decided to put the committee reports on the web site.

Committee budget requests are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference Planning Committee</td>
<td>$1500 approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>$500 approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>$0 approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Publications                 | $3,900 approved | (Including new membership brochures)
|                              | $25 approved  |
| Constitution and Bylaws      | $700 approved |
| Scholarly Activities         | $0 approved  |
| University Students          |             |

It was decided that the written copy of the Conference Proceedings be continued through the 2002 session in South Africa. Moved by Jack Elliot that early registration and hotel registration for all future conferences be the same date if possible. Seconded. Motion passed.

It was announced that the conference is South Africa will be the last week of May, 2002.

The Leadership Team planning meeting for the 2001 Conference in Baton Rouge, LA will be around July 8-10, 2000. Final dates will be sent by Satish. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted
Frank L. Brewer, Secretary
ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL AND EXTENSION EDUCATION

ANNOUNCES A CALL FOR PAPERS
to be presented at the

17th Annual Conference of AIAEE, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA
April 4 through April 7, 2001

AIAEE will accept proposals for papers to be presented at the 17th annual conference that relate to issues in international agricultural and extension education. Topics related to the 2001 conference theme of "Emerging Trends in Agricultural and Extension Education" are encouraged, but all submissions will be given full consideration. Both research and philosophically based papers will be considered. To submit a proposal, one author must be an AIAEE member. Contact Dr. Steve Jones, AIAEE Treasurer, University of Minnesota, 240 Vo Tech Bldg, 1954 Buford Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55108-6078 USA, for membership information. (Tel: 612-625-1287/Fax: 612-625-7031, e-mail: sjones@mes.umn.edu).

New members are invited to submit proposals. Please contact your professional colleagues, both in-country and internationally, about the opportunity to submit a proposal. Each proposal is limited to no more than four pages (title page and three pages of text) and requires the following information:

1. Separate title page with names and addresses of author(s). Please include full contact information, including position and/or title, mailing address, fax number, telephone number, and e-mail address of the author responsible for receiving communications from AIAEE. **The e-mail address is especially important.** Please indicate also on the title page if you are willing to be considered as a participant in the poster session should your proposal not be accepted for a paper session.

2. Three pages of double-spaced text, 10-point font minimum, following the format prescribed below:
   * Introduction
   * Purpose of paper
   * Methods and data sources (or) theoretical/philosophical themes (the problem or issues, with attention to the arguments used)
   * Results and/or conclusions
   * Educational importance

More than one proposal may be submitted. Four copies of each paper proposal must be submitted if not submitted electronically.

Deadline for submitting paper proposals is **September 15, 2000.** Send paper proposals to: Dr. James E. Christiansen, Department of Agricultural Education, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-2116. Tel: (979) 862-3002. Fax: (979) 845-6296. E-mail is <j-christiansen@tamu.edu>. Proposals may be submitted as an E-mail attachment. Each paper proposal will be peer reviewed by three respected agricultural and extension education scholars. The contact author of each paper proposal will be notified in November 2000. Paper specifications will be given to those accepted for presentation. Presenters will be required to register for and pay the conference registration charge.
ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL AND EXTENSION EDUCATION

ANNOUNCES A CALL FOR POSTERS FOR

Emerging Trends in Agricultural and Extension Education
to be presented at the

17th Annual Conference of AIAEE
Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA
April 4 through April 6, 2001

AIAEE is accepting poster proposals related to issues in international agricultural and extension education. Topics related to the 2001 conference theme are encouraged, but all submissions will be given full consideration.

Purpose
To visually present a concept or idea which reflects innovative models of research, educational programming, or evaluation. Each poster proposal requires the following:
1. A title page with name(s) of author(s) including complete contact information (address, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address).
2. A one-page abstract that includes introduction, purpose of poster, major points or information to be shared, conclusions, and educational importance.

Poster guidelines
- maximum size 2’ x 3’ (69 cm x 100 cm)
- posters will be on display one entire day of the conference; presenters are expected to be present during the evening reception
- must be an AIAEE member to submit a proposal--see below for membership information

Awards given for the top three posters. Criteria and points used to judge the selection of outstanding posters are:
- Technical content or information 20
- Originality or innovativeness 20
- Creativity of presentation or ideas 15
- Conveys message (easily understood) 15
- Importance of topic 15
- General appearance (5 points each):
  - well planned design, easily read, 5
  - neat and well constructed 5
- Total possible 100

Deadline for submissions is September 15, 2000.

Send three (3) hard copies or one (1) electronic copy of the proposal to:
Dr. John R. Vreyens, University of Minnesota, International Agricultural Programs, 190 Coffey Hall, 1420 Eckles Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55108, USA (Telephone 612-624-6780; Fax 612-625-3111; E-mail vreyens@tc.umn.edu). For more information, contact Dr. Vreyens. For membership information contact Dr. Steve Jones, AIAEE Treasurer, University of Minnesota 240 VoTech Building, 1954 Buford Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55108-6078 USA (Tel: 612-625-1287; Fax 612-625-7031; E-mail sjones@coa1.agoff.umn.edu).
ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL AND EXTENSION EDUCATION

ANNOUNCES A CALL FOR CAROUSEL ROUNDTABLES FOR

Emerging Trends in Agricultural and Extension Education
to be presented at the

17th Annual Conference of AIAEE
Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA
April 4 through April 6, 2001

AIAEE is proposals for refereed abstracts at carousel roundtables related to issues in international agricultural and extension education. Topics related to the 2001 conference theme are encouraged, but all submissions will be given full consideration.

Purpose
To present using a written and oral format, abstracts of research, theoretical advances, or explanations of an issue for discussion.

Parameters
Carousel roundtables are small group presentations of abstracts. Each presentation is allotted 15 minutes; presenters will lead the carousel roundtable discussion six times to rotating groups of AIAEE members and conference attendees during a prolonged coffee break. Copies of the one-page abstract should be available at the presentation. Presenters must be AIAEE members to submit a proposal--see below for membership information. New members are encouraged to submit proposals.

Each carousel roundtable proposal requires the following:
1. A title page with name(s) of author(s) including complete contact information (address, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address).
2. A one-page abstract that includes introduction, method, major points or information to be shared, conclusions or lessons learned, and educational importance. (10 point font acceptable).

More than one carousel roundtable proposal may be submitted.

Deadline for submissions is September 15, 2000.

Send three (3) hard copies or one (1) electronic copy of the proposal to:
Dr. John R. Vreyens, University of Minnesota, International Agricultural Programs, 190 Coffey Hall, 1420 Eckles Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55108, USA (Telephone 612-624-6780; Fax 612-625-3111; E-mail vreyens@tc.umn.edu). For more information, contact Dr. Vreyens.

For membership information contact Dr. Steve Jones, AIAEE Treasurer, MAST International, 1954 Buford Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55108-6078 USA (Tel: 612-625-1287; Fax 612-625-7031; E-mail sjones@coa1.agoff.umn.edu).
EDITOR

Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education

Position Announcement

The Board of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education (AIAEE) announces the position of Editor of the Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education for the purposes of publishing Volumes 9, 10, and 11.

The duties of the Editor of the Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education include:

- Facilitate the review process for manuscripts submitted to the Journal.
- Publish Volumes 9, 10 and 11 of the Journal.
- Maintain subscription information in cooperation with the AIAEE Treasurer.
- Maintain all financial records for the Journal.
- Serve as Chair of the Editorial Board for the Journal
- Present annual reports on the Journal to the AIAEE Board and Business Meeting

Applicants should send the following information to the Search Committee Chair.

- Seven copies of the candidate’s current curriculum vita
- Letter indicating the candidate’s qualifications to serve as Editor
  and why he/she desires to have the position.
- Letter from the department, organization, or institution head indicating support of the applicant. The letter from the head must address the specific support functions available to the candidate.

Materials should be sent to the Search Committee Chair by January 1, 2001.

Dr. John Richardson, President-Elect
Department of Agricultural and Extension Education
North Carolina State University
PO Box 7607
Raliegh NC 27695
Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education
16th Annual Conference

Arlington VA
March 30-April 1, 2000

Outstanding Posters

Outstanding Poster

Maximizing the Domestic Benefit and Impact of International Extension Involvement

Nick T. Place
University of Florida

1st Runner-Up Outstanding Poster

An Engaging Internship of Discovery

Mikel Stanek
Iowa State University

2nd Runner-Up Outstanding Poster

Integrating Small Farming Systems for Sustainable Rural Household Food Security in South Africa

Peter N. Ewang
University of Zululand
Outstanding Papers

Perceptions and Assessments of Selected Topics by Lithuanian Teachers who participated in Agricultural Education In-Service Seminars in 1999
M. Craig Edwards, Texas A&M University
William J. Thuemmel, University of Massachusetts

1st Runner-Up Outstanding Paper

Partnership Experiences by the University of Swaziland: Implications for Globalization Efforts
Barnabas M. Dlamini, University of Swaziland
Chye-Hean Teoh, University of Swaziland
(Editor's Note: This paper is not included in this issue of the Journal)

2nd Runner-Up Outstanding Paper

Best Management Practices for Ranchers in Iran
Mohammad Chizari, Tarbiat Modarres University
James R. Lindner, The Ohio State University
Reza R. Noorabadi, Tarbiat Modarres University
(Editor's Note: This paper was previously published in Vol. 6, Number 3 of the Journal)

3rd Runner-Up Outstanding Paper

A Coming of Age: Revisiting AIAEE Scholarship
Larry E. Miller, The Ohio State University
Lorilee Sandman, Michigan State University

Outstanding Graduate Student Paper

A Study of Some of the Structures and Procedures for the Funding of Community Groups in the Republic of Ireland
Niamh Dennehy, Kerry County Council, County Kerry, Ireland
Dermot J. Ruane, National University of Ireland-Dublin
James F. Phelan, National University of Ireland-Dublin
Perceptions and Assessments of Selected Topics by Lithuanian Teachers Who Participated in Agricultural Education In-service Seminars in 1999

M. Craig Edwards
Visiting Assistant Professor
College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Texas A&M University, College Station

William L. Thuemmel
Associate Professor
School of Education
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Outstanding research paper from the 16th Annual Conference of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education, Arlington, Virginia, USA, March 29-April 1, 2000

ABSTRACT

This article describes workshop participants and their selected perceptions of the in-service education topics presented during the 1999 professional development seminars sponsored by the American Professional Partnership for Lithuanian Education (APPLE). Sources of the data were 58 teachers and administrators who were employed at high and higher (postsecondary) schools of agriculture in Lithuania. One-half (52%) of the participants in the two workshops taught agricultural subjects. A researcher-developed survey instrument elicited three categories of information from the seminar participants: (a) personal/demographic data, (b) perceptions about trends and the future for education, agricultural education, and agriculture in Lithuania, and (c) assessments about the “importance” of and their self-perceived “ability” to perform the nine competencies presented in the seminars. The descriptors for the “importance” scale were “5” = “Great Importance,” … “1” = “No Importance.” The descriptors for the “ability” scale were “5” = “High Ability,” … “1” = “Negligible Ability.” Cronbach’s coefficient alpha reliability estimates for the rating scales were .77 and .79, respectively. Two-thirds of participants perceived that the general quality of education in Lithuania was either “somewhat” or “much improved” since 1992, and half expressed that “their life as an agricultural educator/educator” was either “somewhat” or “much improved.” The overall mean “importance” rating for all workshop topics was 3.69; the overall mean “ability” rating for all topics was 3.28. For the purpose of planning and designing future workshops, stakeholder consensus needs to be reached regarding the “ideal” target audience for APPLE-sponsored agricultural education seminars.

Introduction/Theoretical Framework

Lithuania is one of the Former Soviet Republics that regained its independence with dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. It has often been referred to as one of the “Baltic States,” a group of nations that includes its northern neighbors Latvia and Estonia; it is an East European nation that is slightly larger than the state of West Virginia. Lithuania shares terrestrial borders with Kaliningrad, a Russian oblast to the southwest; with Poland to the south, Belarus to the south and east; and Latvia to the north. The Baltic Sea forms its western border.

As a Soviet Republic, Lithuania was a major exporter of agricultural products to other parts of the Soviet Union; these goods were “primarily processed meat, dairy products and fish” (U. S. Department of Commerce, 1998, p. 3). As recently as 1997, the United States Department of State estimated that nine percent of Lithuania’s Gross National Product (GNP) resulted from “Agriculture/forestry” (p. 2). Further, according to the Lithuanian Ministry of Education and Science (EURYDICE Lithuanian Unit, 1999), for the year 1997 “about 21.7% of the working population was engaged in agriculture” (p. 1). So, agriculture and the natural resource system is a significant part of...
the Lithuanian economy.

However, following the break-up of the Soviet Union many of the markets for Lithuania’s agricultural commodities were lost (United States Department of Commerce, 1998). Further, while these traditional markets were disappearing Lithuania’s agricultural infrastructure underwent massive reform, shifting from a highly centralized, state-controlled system that included state and collective farms to one that was privatized into agricultural companies and family-owned units (Meyers, Kazlauskiene, & Giugale, 1999). “By January 1, 1997, less than 1,700 of the large scale farms survived [initially there were nearly 4,300] with an average size of less than 400 hectares, while the number of family-owned farms had increased to 196,000” (Meyers et al., 1999, pp. 5-6). Meyers et al. (1999) posit that less than half of the “family farms” are functioning units.

Moreover, there are many economic, social, cultural, and political challenges systemic to the era of “transformation” in which Lithuania now finds itself. A significant component of this sea of change is the Lithuanian agricultural and natural resource system, including its educational institutions and their primary stakeholders. Arguably, at least one key group are the educators that staff Lithuania’s high and higher schools of agriculture.

During the summers of 1996 through 1999, in-service education programs for agricultural school teachers and administrators in Lithuania were a part of the continuing professional development efforts of the American Professional Partnership for Lithuanian Education (APPLE) in cooperation with the Lithuanian Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) and the Ministry of Education and Science (MOES). APPLE is a non-profit, non-governmental organization devoted to providing professional development opportunities for Lithuanian educators. One of APPLE’s primary goals is to “empower Lithuania’s educators by putting them in possession of recent, relevant, and progressive educational research and practice” (APPLE, 1999).

The 1999 APPLE-sponsored agricultural education in-service “strands” (i.e., one-week workshops/seminars) were conducted at Kaunas and Rietavas, Lithuania. Assessments were made of the perceptions held by seminar participants—both agricultural and non-agricultural educators. This paper describes selected characteristics of the participants, their perceptions of the “importance” of the seminar topics, their self-perceived levels of “ability” to perform those competencies inherent in the seminar topics, and their perceptions about trends and the future for education, agricultural education, and agriculture in Lithuania.

Researchers (Thuemmel & Meaders, 1999) have concluded that, “Some major leadership challenges in vocational education planning for agricultural development in Lithuania include program evaluation, teacher education, curriculum revision, [and] assuring adequate resources at the school/college levels” (p. 6). Further, these researchers stated, “secondary and tertiary schools (high schools and postsecondary technical schools or colleges) should reflect the rapidly changing science, technology, and business of agriculture” (p. 6). It appears that an important component of these and similar recommendations (Cerych, 1997; Roffé, 1996; Ruffio & Barloy, 1995) involves the need for providing current and timely in-service education for those teachers and administrators who are integral for effective implementation of these and other significant reforms in the Lithuanian agricultural education system. Moreover, Roffé (1996) posited that, “the accompanying processes of educational reform have introduced new challenges for which they [Lithuanian educators] were ill prepared in terms of skills and knowledge” (p. 122). In support, Connors and Brousseau (1997) found that Lithuanian vocational teachers (including agriculture) needed more in-service education to assist them in developing appropriate teaching methodologies and related instructional materials for vocational courses.

Regarding the assessment of needs for the purpose of providing requisite education, Witkin (1984) stated, “Effective needs assessment provides the basis for decision making on priorities either for program development or
entrenchment” (p. x). Moreover, concerning adult education (e.g., in-service education for agricultural educators), Knowles (1980) contended that adults tend to expect an “immediacy of application” (p. 53) for much of their learning; and, therefore, they value learning that they deem most “important” in the present or near-term. Earlier, Knowles (1978) theorized that as individuals mature they become increasingly self-directive. One could conclude that as teachers gain experience, their powers for reflective learning and self-perception are enhanced—including self-perception of ability. Although ability and performance are not always synonymous, reflection and self-perception are key elements in the professional growth of teachers and are to be encouraged. Thuemmel, Meaders, Mannebach, and Brousseau (1998) maintained that knowing and understanding the perceptions held by Lithuanian agricultural educators regarding their needs for in-service education was very important for the successful delivery of professional development.

So, what are the perceptions of Lithuanian educators who participated in the 1999 APPLE-sponsored in-service education seminars, regarding “importance” of and their self-perceived “ability” to perform related competencies? Also, what were these educators’ perceptions about trends and the future for education, agricultural education, and agriculture in Lithuania?

**Purpose of the Study**

The primary purpose of this study was to describe selected characteristics of educators (both agricultural and non-agricultural) who were employed at high and higher (postsecondary) schools of agriculture in Lithuania, to assess their perceptions concerning the “importance” of and their “ability” to perform the activities that were presented during the in-service seminars, and to describe their views about trends and the future for education, agricultural education, and agriculture in Lithuania. Similar assessments have been conducted by United States agricultural educators at the close of APPLE-sponsored in-service seminars in Lithuania in 1996 (Connors & Brousseau, 1997), in 1997 (Thuemmel et al., 1998), and in 1998 (Edwards, Meaders, & Brousseau, 2000). This series of research studies provides a chronological assessment of the impact of APPLE-sponsored in-service efforts in agricultural education in Lithuania. Further, it provides an opportunity to refine and improve assessment instruments and procedures employed by the guest agricultural educators. As a result of this feedback, APPLE, the Lithuanian MOA and MOES, and the American agricultural educators who have been involved with this Baltic state are better able to plan future in-service activities for Lithuanian agricultural educators.

**Methods/Procedures**

Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used to collect the data. Sources of the data were 58 teachers and administrators who were employed at high and higher schools of agriculture in Lithuania. The participants attended one-week APPLE-sponsored in-service education workshops (“Ag Strands”) held at Kaunas and Rietavas, Lithuania during the summer of 1999. Workshop topic presentations by four American agricultural educators were delivered in English, while English language specialists from two Lithuanian universities translated each guest lecturer’s presentation “simultaneously” into Lithuanian as it was being delivered. The researchers developed a survey instrument that elicited three categories of information from the seminar participants: (a) personal/demographic data; (b) perceptions about trends and the future for education, agricultural education, and agriculture in Lithuania; and (c) assessments about the “importance” of and their self-perceived “ability” to perform the competencies presented in the seminars.

Items for the first two categories were modified from instruments used in previous years by American agricultural educators who served as in-service education providers (Connors & Brousseau, 1997; Edwards et al., 2000; Thuemmel et al., 1998). The third category asked participants to “rate” both the “importance” of and their “ability” to perform the nine in-service education topics (competencies) using a five-point Likert-type
scale. The descriptors for the “importance” scale were “5” = “Great Importance,” “4” = “Much Importance,” “3” = “Average Importance,” “2” = “Little Importance,” “1” = “No Importance.” The descriptors for the “ability” scale were “5” = “High Ability,” “4” = “Much Ability,” “3” = “Average Ability,” “2” = “Low Ability,” “1” = “Negligible Ability.” Cronbach’s coefficient alpha reliability estimates for the rating scales were .77 and .79, respectively. The questionnaire items were reviewed and validated by consensus of the researchers, and then translated into Lithuanian by an English language specialist from the Lithuanian University of Agriculture. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations.

Results and/or Conclusions

As shown in Table 1, three-fourths of the participants were female and one-fourth were male. Nearly 40% had attended a pedagogical institute, and an additional 40% had attended an agricultural or veterinary academy; however, less than 20% were university graduates. Approximately, three-quarters of the participating educators had over 10 years of professional experience. Nearly nine-in-ten were full-time teachers, and their school settings were almost evenly divided between high and higher schools of agriculture. However, only about one-half (52%) of the participants in the two workshops taught agricultural subjects. Among those agricultural educators (N=30), the subject(s) they taught were distributed among mechanics, plant and soil sciences, economics, animal science, and agricultural processing. Slightly less than two-in-three taught three or fewer different subjects each semester while the other one-third taught four or more different courses.

Concerning pupil load, nearly half of the teachers taught from 101 to 200 students each term while the remainder either taught more or fewer pupils per semester. Slightly less than half reported teaching students who were 14 to 17 years of age, while slightly more than half were teaching older students. Nearly six-in-ten teachers indicated that after leaving school their students began working in the private sector; one-fifth stated that their students gained employment with the State. However, less than four percent of educators identified their students as opting for additional education at a professional or technical school.

More than two-thirds of participants perceived that the general quality of education in Lithuania was either “somewhat” or “much improved” since 1992 (Table 2). Further, half expressed that “their life as an agricultural educator/educator” was either “somewhat” or “much improved” since 1992. However, fewer than one-in-five of the participants indicated that the economic condition of Lithuanian farmers was either “some” or “much improved” since 1992. Half perceived that a farmer’s situation had worsened. Regarding the outlook for agricultural education/education during the next five years, slightly more than half predicted “some” or “much” improvement while the remainder felt there would be “little or no change.” Only a relatively small minority of participants, 12% and 22%, respectively, would either encourage their son or daughter to prepare for a career in agriculture or prepare to become an agricultural teacher/teacher (Table 2).

As shown in Table 3, the overall mean “importance” rating for all workshop topics was 3.69 or slightly more than halfway between “Average Importance” and “Much Importance.” The highest rated topic based on importance was “A Method of Experiential Education: The Use of Field Trips in Instruction” (M=4.30). Additionally, one other topic was rated between “Much…” and “Great Importance”; it was, “Motivating Students to Learn” (M=4.29). While the topics, “Psychology of Learning” (M=4.05) and “Integrating Academic and Vocational Education” (M=4.02), were rated only slightly higher than “Much Importance.” One topic had a mean rating score of below “Average Importance”; it was, “A Method of Experiential Education: The Michigan Poultry Improvement Program” (M=2.75) (Table 3).

The overall mean “ability” rating for all topics was 3.28 or slightly more than “Average Ability” to perform or implement the topic or competency (Table 3).
Table 1

Selected Characteristics of Participants Who Attended the Agricultural Education In-Service Education Workshops in Lithuania During the Summer of 1999 (N=58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Institute</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural or Veterinary Academy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience as an Educator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 or more years of experience</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Administrator</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural High School</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Higher School</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Specialty(ies)/Subject(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics/Machinery</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Science/Soil Science/Land Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics (accounting, marketing, and/or management)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Science/Animal Husbandry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Products/Processing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Agricultural Subject(s)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Different Subjects Taught each Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 different subjects</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more different subjects</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Taught each Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 or fewer students</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 - 200 students</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 200 students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Students Taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 17 years of age</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or more years of age</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Students go after Leaving Your School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin working in the Private Sector</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin working for the State</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter a Professional or Technical School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., military service)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aOne participant did not answer this question.*
Table 2


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trends/Future Questions</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How has the quality of education in Lithuania changed since 1992?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much improved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat improved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat deteriorated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the quality of your life as an agricultural educator/educator changed since 1992?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much improved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat improved</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat deteriorated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much poorer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the economic status of farmers changed in Lithuania since 1992?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much improved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some improvement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no change</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat deteriorated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much poorer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will the quality of agricultural education/education change during the next five years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will improve much</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will improve some</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will decline some</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you encourage your son/daughter to prepare for a career in agriculture?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you encourage your son/daughter to prepare for a career as an agricultural teacher/teacher?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Seminar Participants’ Ratings and Rankings of Importance and Self-Perceived Ability for In-Service Education Topics Provided During the 1999 APPLE-Sponsored Agricultural Strands in Lithuania (N=58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-Service Education Topics</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Ability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Method of Experiential Education: The Use of Field Trips in Instruction</td>
<td>57a</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Students to Learn</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology of Learning</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56b</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Academic and Vocational Education</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of Teaching Agriculture</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57a</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Method of Experiential Education: SAE Programs</td>
<td>57a</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised Agricultural Experience Programs: Keeping and Management of Records</td>
<td>57a</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57a</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Student Organizations: The National FFA Organization</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Method of Experiential Education: “MI Poultry Improvement Program”</td>
<td>56b</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Topics that were either rated high for their “importance” or low for teachers’ “ability” to perform represent potential future in-service priorities.

The highest rated topic based on participants’ perceived “ability” was “A Method of Experiential Education: The Use of Field Trips in Instruction” (M=4.07). Two in-service topics had mean rating scores of below “Average Ability”; they were, “Vocational Student Organizations: The National FFA Organization” (M=2.53), and “A Method of Experiential Education: The Michigan Poultry Improvement Program” (M=2.31) (Table 3). The former topic was at the mid-point between “Average…” and “Low…” while the latter topic was approaching “Low Ability.”

Implications and Recommendations for Future Practice

The resources of many non-governmental and/or non-profit organizations are frequently very limited. Further, the importance and relevance of a resource intensive activity (i.e., an in-service education initiative delivered in an international setting) should provide guidelines for determining future resource allocations (Witkin, 1984). To this end, Waters and Haskell (1989) stated that, “Gathering data from potential clientele and actively involving them in the process of identifying potential educational programs increases the likelihood of implementing relevant educational programs” (p. 26). Moreover, assessing participants’ perceptions regarding their “ability” to implement “change” (i.e., topics/competencies) and gauging their perception of the “importance” of that change can be invaluable information. This type of client feedback will help to ensure that future agricultural education in-service efforts in Lithuania are both efficacious and relevant. Recommendations for future research and practice include:
1. Careful thought needs to be given to which Lithuanian educators should be invited to participate in future APPLE-sponsored in-service seminars and workshops. Only about one-half of the participants involved in the 1999 workshops were agricultural educators (teachers of agricultural subjects). While all seminar participants were employed either by secondary or postsecondary agricultural institutions, nearly one-half of these educators did not teach agricultural courses. On the one hand, faculty team-building can be enhanced by involving both agricultural and non-agricultural educators in the agricultural education seminars; however, on the other hand, expectations (including perceived importance of topics and competencies) by seminar participants can be effected by the mix of educators involved. Consensus needs to be sought out among all parties involved (APPLE, MOA, MOES, and agricultural educators—both U.S. and Lithuanian) regarding the target audience for future agricultural education seminars.

2. Malcolm (1999) stated that “the CEECs [Central and Eastern European Countries] have a substantial proportion of their population living in rural areas,” and “while no longer the dominant form of employment, farming and its associated industries remain significant for the well being of local communities” (p. 32). So, the “condition” of agriculture and factors related to it still hold great sway over agrarian economies, living standards of rural citizens, and other aspects impacting quality of life in the portion of Lithuanian society that is agriculturally-based.

In general, this study found that educators perceived that the status of education and agricultural education in Lithuania was “improving”; however, the condition of farmers was viewed more negatively. Future research should attempt to identify the reason(s) for this perception, the potential role(s) that Lithuanian agricultural educators might play in reversing this trend (e.g., targeted adult farmer education programs), and the requisite in-service education needs of teachers, so that they might be better prepared to assist in meeting the training needs of farmers as well as other rural citizens whose livelihoods are or will be related to agriculture. Likewise, if, overall, teachers perceive that “their” situation has “improved,” why would so few (Table 2) “encourage” their own children to select agriculture, agricultural education, or education as a career choice? Recognizing that there still exists a substantial need for a well-educated and modern workforce in the food, agricultural, and natural resource system in Lithuania (Malcolm, 1999; Meyer et al, 1999; Roffe, 1996; Ruffio & Barloy, 1995; Thuemmel & Meaders, 1999), this “position” may warrant further study.

3. Similar to findings of other researchers (Edwards et al., 2000; Thuemmel et al., 1998; Thuemmel & Meaders, 1999), those topics that were rated as “much” or higher in “importance” (Table 3) should be strongly considered for inclusion in future in-service seminars. Further, it is recommended that the lowest rated of all workshop topics, “A Method of Experiential Education: The Michigan Poultry Improvement Program” (below “average” in perceived importance), be reviewed for its appropriateness for future in-service education strands. However, previously highly rated experienced-based learning topics (Edwards, et al., 2000) and other “comparable” experiential education activities should be considered for inclusion in the future.

4. Edwards et al. (2000) reported that teachers rated examples of American agricultural education students’ SAE programs as having a very high degree of “usefulness.” However, two topics closely related to market-oriented, entrepreneurial principles, that is, “A Method of Experiential Education:  SAE Programs” and “Supervised Agricultural Experience Programs: Keeping and Management of Records,” were only rated between “average” and “much importance.” Why were these participants’ ratings less supportive than earlier findings? Do these findings demonstrate an incongruence of “perceived” versus “prescribed” needs on the part of Lithuanian teachers and the American agricultural educators, or are they more a result of delivery methodology? For example, at the 1998 APPLE-sponsored Ag Strand in Utena, two American high school agriculture students were on hand to present and describe their SAE programs; while the 1999 SAE related topics were presented “vicariously” and lacked direct-
anecdotal presentation. Accordingly, future in-service providers are encouraged to re-double their efforts to demonstrate a tangible “connection” between the “theoretical” and the “theory-in-use” aspects of SAE programs.

5. It would appear that a society attempting to inculcate basic democratic principles would place high value on a youth organization such as the FFA. However, seminar participants rated the concomitant topic as merely “average” in “importance.” Perhaps, within the context of presenting this unique dimension of the American agricultural education model, the participants too strongly identified with the implicit time demands on the part of the teacher/advisor that many FFA activities require. A concomitant degree of negativism may be understandable considering the current “anemic” level of teacher salaries in Lithuania (Thuemmel et al., 1998).

Another explanation might be that the participants associated the FFA with a remnant of their recent past, that is, they identified the FFA with the Soviet-era Komsomol or Young Communists’ League (Sokova, 1998). This may be an important line of inquiry for those concerned with the youth leadership development component of international agricultural education and its implementation in a post-communist society. Yet, recognizing that intra-curricular leadership development activities (e.g., the FFA) are a widely accepted and highly valued component of the American agricultural education model, future in-service initiatives should continue to explore the role of youth leadership development in the “context” of agricultural education in Lithuania (Edwards et al., 2000; Thuemmel et al., 1998; Thuemmel & Meaders, 1999).

(Moreover, since this study was conducted, these investigators have had contact with officials of the Lithuanian Young Farmers’ Circles Union (LYFCU), which appears to be the “historic” and the “re-emerging” Lithuanian analog to both the National FFA Organization and American 4-H youth leadership development models. The LYFCU may be a “mechanism” for achieving the aforementioned aim.)
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Abstract

This article examines emerging definitions of scholarship and challenges AIAEE members to develop a body of scholarly knowledge. If we are to become a “discipline,” then we, as a profession, need more than common interests evolving from practice.

Introduction

Is AIAEE “coming of age”? Is it reaching a stage of maturity, after 16 years, such that a core of knowledge is evolving in the discipline or is its knowledge base still a conglomerate of disparate studies conducted in varied countries, much like “trivial pursuit,” without thematic themes? If we attempt to develop partnerships with the private sector, then can we develop a vocabulary that transcends “researchese” and constitutes the new forms of scholarship?

Many current thinkers define scholarship as multidimensional; that is, scholarship can be exhibited through research, teaching and outreach activities (Glassick, et al., 1996). AIAEE members need to consider the dimensions of scholarship as they continue to evolve a definition of excellence for the discipline. What is our standard for excellence? Does it simply vary with the unique judgement of the referees for the journal or the paper sessions for our meetings? Are we a profession?

A profession has an organized body of knowledge with an unique language and vocabulary. The body of knowledge embodies an accumulation of scholarly efforts of many sorts. Does AIAEE have an organized body of knowledge that meets certain standards or is it just an accumulation of stories? How are we to define scholarship in AIAEE?

Many colleges and universities are wrestling with the issue of what defines “scholarship.” There are those who argue that scholarship involves discovering or creating new knowledge, or at least synthesizing knowledge in a new way. From this perspective, scholarship is generally synonymous with research. Further, the traditions of the hard, basic sciences helped provide this definition with an orientation toward positivistic lines of inquiry. However, even within the category of evidencing research as scholarship, there are other ways of knowing. The researchers in qualitative research, phenomenology, ethnography, single subject research, grounded theory, case study methods, historical, philosophical, interpretative or critical science would quickly verify this contention. In the arts, performances and exhibits may illustrate scholarship. In architecture, the unique design or critique might evidence scholarship. Might one exhibit scholarship through teaching and service as well? What definitional standards for scholarship will AIAEE members encounter in the future? What are the implications for a practice-based field such as AIAEE? As scholarship is redefined in the academy, this paper begins to explore the implications for the scholarly development of agricultural and extension education theory and practice.

Theme: Current Models of Scholarship

Webster’s New World Dictionary definitions of “scholar”, “scholarly” and “scholarship” included terms such as “specialist in a particular
branch of learning”; “having or showing much knowledge, accuracy and critical ability”; and “the systematic knowledge of a learned person, exhibiting accuracy, critical ability and thoroughness” (Warmbrod, 1991). Academic scholarship, by these definitions, could be exhibited not only through research but also through teaching and service activities.

Many current writers have defined scholarship as multidimensional. Boyer (1990), for example, maintained that work in the professorate has four separate but overlapping dimensions: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching. Rice and Richlin (1993) have proposed similar dimensions. Discovery entailed adding new knowledge through research. Integration involved employing higher level cognitive functions to construct “meaning” from isolated facts, concepts and constructs. Application occurred when knowledge is “responsibly applied to consequential problems” (Boyer, 1990); it is distinctly different from the usual service activities documented in curriculum vitae -- e.g., serving on committees, advising organizations, and contributing to departmental activities. Glassick, Huber and Maeroff (1997) discussed how they perceive that each should be assessed.

Scholarship through teaching emphasized the acquisition of knowledge that can be acquired only by professors who are informed and intellectually engaged teachers (Warmbrod, 1993a). Shulman (1986) defined teaching not only as the transmitting of knowledge but also as the transforming and extending of knowledge, while Warmbrod (1993a) and other writers note that an effective way to learn is to teach.

Rice and Richlin (1993) proposed that these four views of scholarship (scholarship as discovery, integration, application and teaching) are discrete types but form a conceptual whole that is every bit as important as the parts. They further noted that in the redefinition of scholarship the goal is not to elevate practice above research and theory but that the “art” of practice has been so mystified that it has often been summarily dismissed; however, it should be viewed on a more even plane.

In a literal sense, then, scholarship includes those things which scholars do: they teach, they research, and they serve their discipline/professions, the university and society. However, teaching is not always scholarly, some is routine and not effective. Similarly, there is research which is too mechanical to be called scholarly and there is service which has more to do with departmental “housekeeping” than knowledge building. Is the research of AIAEE too routine and does it merely deal with trivial issues?

What makes an activity scholarly? A Michigan State University report on university outreach (1993:2) offers defining parameters:

The essence of scholarship is the thoughtful creation, interpretation, communication or use of knowledge that is based in the ideas and methods of recognized disciplines, professions, and interdisciplinary fields. What qualifies an activity as “scholarship” is that it is deeply informed by accumulating knowledge in some field, that the knowledge is skillfully interpreted and deployed, and that the activity is carried out with intelligent openness to new information, debate and criticism.

Oregon State University also provides a succinct definition:

Scholarship is original intellectual work based on a high level of professional expertise whose significance is validated by peers and which is communicated in appropriate ways so as to have impact on or significance for publics beyond the university, or for the discipline itself.

Therefore, scholarship, deals with important and significant topics, ideas and concerns; the intellectual substance -- the content -- with which scholars deal is important, significant, vitally critical to the discipline or area of specialization. Scholars do not deal with trivia and unimportant matters. Scholars are not satisfied with conventional wisdom; the title of
scholar is not achieved or bestowed by self-proclamation, but by one's peers (Warmbrod, 1993; 1993a). Miller (1991) identifies scholarship and substance as major concerns with which a profession must be concerned. “The teaching-research polarity sets intellectual substance and educational process at odds. And not only are disciplinary content and teaching methods separated, they also are hierarchically arranged so that research is always viewed as superior to teaching” (Rice & Richlin, 1993). However, must not teaching, too, deal with substantive, scholarly content? Scholarship is not discrete and exclusively the province of research but includes all of the Boyer categories.

**AIAEE Scholarship**

If discovery, integration, application and teaching of knowledge are central to the mission of higher education and if they are often categorized as research, service and teaching; what is the significance for AIAEE? A dialogue concerning the dimensions of scholarship and the implications for the profession is needed. As starters, AIAEE academicians and practitioners might consider the following questions:

- How can AIAEE -- again, both academicians and practitioners -- demonstrate scholarship through research, service and teaching? What are the ways in which this is typically done?

- What kinds of evidence qualifies such activities as scholarly? Does a contribution in only one of the areas of discovery, integration, application and teaching suffice for a person to be declared a scholar? Must scholars in AIAEE contribute to all four dimensions?

- How do we assure scholarly standards?

- How do we meet the responsibilities of being a professional and scholar while moving the profession “down the road to knowing” (Miller, 1993) and, thereby developing a theoretical basis for the discipline which extends beyond conventional wisdom and practice?

- How can we assure that new entrants to the field are professionally socialized to contribute to scholarship in AIAEE as well as practice? How do we go about preparing future scholarly practitioners capable of operating in arenas with the new definitions of scholarship?

- Finally, who decides what is “scholarship”, what is “scholarly”, and who is a “scholar”?

These and related questions warrant wide discussion. Ways of thinking about just two of these questions will be elaborated here. Outreach teaching and outreach service are expanded as these are two common activities of many AIAEE members.

**Evidencing AIAEE Scholarship**

A recent University of Wisconsin report, *The Wisconsin Idea and Outreach* (1994), proposed categories of evidence that would help document the scholarly nature of activities in the outreach research, teaching and service functions (See Appendix A). These expanded categories of evidence, intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive, might prove useful to AIAEE members. The categories also offered possible measures of quality for the discipline to consider. Oregon State University (Appendix B) has also created similar categories.

The report suggested that evidence of outreach research might include: (1) publications and presentations (books, monographs, chapters, articles, bulletins, reports; delivery via instructional technologies) including those for practitioners and the public; (2) internal and external review of research process, outcomes and impact; (3) approval of research proposals for external funding; (4) awards, honors, citations for creative works, and applied research; (5) evidence of impact of scholarship or practice in the field; (6) evaluation of innovative clinical procedures; and (7) evidence of impact on public/private policy makers.

Suggestions to document outreach teaching include: (1) observation reports by colleagues, peers and teaching assistants; (2) assessments by students, participants, trainees, clients; (3) enrollment demand by clientele; (4) syllabi,
teaching plans, materials, development of new courses; (5) reflection on learning outcomes by students, employers, etc., producing changes in professional practice; and (6) approval of funding for curriculum development.

Evidence of outreach service might include: (1) reports of benefits to recipients; (2) new ideas gained that have an impact on research; teaching agenda; (3) evidence of change in public policy; and (4) reports; evaluations of service.

When these scholarly activities act in combination, suggested evidence included: (1) national or international recognition of professional contribution, by leaders (both academicians and practitioners) in the field; (2) manifest demand for professional assistance; (3) detailed assessment of outcomes; and (4) national/international awards of recognition by associations in the field.

The AIAEE Scholarly Practitioner

Checkoway writes (1991:224):

*Quality research, teaching and service are emerging as complementary activities in many professions and field. The new vision is one in which excellence in one activity is increasingly inseparable from other activities in accordance with the best traditions and highest standards of the academic community.*

The emerging conceptualization of scholarship can provide a renaissance to the practice-based field of AIAEE where categories are often blurred between research, teaching and service. The challenge to AIAEE is to further develop and support academicians and practitioners as reflective or scholarly practitioners (Sandmann, 1994). Such scholarly practitioners will need to have both the inclination and well-honored skills in knowledge generation, application and transmission. Skills must continually be improved. Much of our research is fraught with methodological errors in sampling, design and/or analysis. Research, simply, must get better.

The current multidimensional definition of scholarship can energize and discipline AIAEE. Our scholarship has, too often, tended to be accounts, stories, if you will, of projects and activities. Account after account of study abroad programs and study tours, for example, do not advance the knowledge base of the discipline unless someone analyzes these experiences and makes meaning from them for the discipline (Miller & Sandman, 1998). Hopefully, this article will stimulate a fuller and more vigorous discussion on the implications of such a conceptualization for theory and practice within AIAEE, and on the role of AIAEE and internationalization efforts of universities in the continued shaping of the definition of scholarship. Without a scholarly basis (a pedagogy of substance), the profession will retrogress, atrophy and die.
Appendix A
Documenting Scholarship: Some Examples

Teaching and Learning: In a teaching portfolio

Describe your original and most significant scholarly contributions to teaching and learning.

Document impacts of your contributions on student learners, in terms of outputs such as enhanced student understanding, retention, behavioral change and subsequent performance.

Document your communication of scholarly contributions to educator peers, and summarize evidence of peer acceptance, recognition, or adoption of your contributions.

Summarize student, and peer (or public) evaluations of your courses, course materials, curricula, and teaching or advising methods.

Summarize evidence of your leadership and contributions of successful team efforts, as a scholar.

Discovery

Describe your original and most significant discoveries and scholarly contributions.

Document the impacts of your contributions in terms of outputs such as advancement of scientific discovery and understanding within and beyond your area of inquiry, and public benefits attributable to your scholarship.

Document your communication of scholarly contributions to peers, and summarize evidence of peer validation, acceptance, or use of your contributions.

Summarize evidence of your leadership, and contributions to successful team efforts, as a scholar.

Integration

Describe your original and most significant accomplishments in creating new and different understandings and uses of information.

Document the adoption and applications of your integrative contributions by others.

Document your communication of scholarly achievement to public and peer audiences, and summarize evidence of their recognition, acceptance and use of your scholarship.

Summarize evidence of your leadership, or contributions to successful team efforts, as a scholar integrator.

Application

Describe the original and most significant applications from your scholarship of application.

Document the impacts of your communication of contributions to users, publics, and peers, and summarize evidence of their recognition and use of your contributions.

Document the impacts of your creative development of new materials, technologies, or uses in terms of results such as scope of use, markets, and benefits of your contributions.

Summarize evidence of your leadership, and contributions to successful team efforts, as a scholar.
## Appendix B: Forms of Scholarship

Scholarship creates something that did not exist before that is validated and communicated to others; new understanding in the minds of students, new knowledge about ourselves and our universe, new beauty that stimulates the senses, new insights, and new technologies and applications of knowledge that can benefit humankind (College of Agriculture, Oregon State University, Corvallis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the scholarship</th>
<th>Teaching and Learning</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Artistic Creativity</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With learners, develops and communicates new understanding and insights; develops and refines new teaching content and methods; fosters lifelong learning behavior.</td>
<td>Generates and communicates new knowledge and understanding; develops and refines methods.</td>
<td>Interprets the human spirit, creates and communicates new insights and beauty; develops and refines methods.</td>
<td>Synthesizes and communicates new or different understandings of knowledge or technology and its relevance; develops and refines methods.</td>
<td>Develops and communicates new technologies, materials or uses; fosters inquiry and invention; develops and refines new methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary audiences for scholarship</th>
<th>Teaching materials and methods: Classes: Curricula; Publications and presentations to educator peers and broader publics,</th>
<th>Peer-reviewed publication and presentations; Patents; Public reports and presentations.</th>
<th>Shows, performances and distribution of products, reviews, news reports: copyrights; peer presentations and juries, publications.</th>
<th>Presentations, publications, demonstrations, and patents.</th>
<th>Demonstrations and presentations to audiences: Patents: Publications for users; Periodicals and reports; Peer presentations and publication.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners; Educator peers.</td>
<td>Various publics; Peers; Patrons; Students.</td>
<td>Users; Educators; Students; Peers,</td>
<td>Users; Customers; Educators; Peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary means of communicating scholarship</th>
<th>Primary criteria for validating scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Originality and significance of new contributions to learning; depth, duration and usefulness of what is learned, lifelong benefits to learners and adoption by peers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How scholarship is documented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and Learning</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Artistic Creativity</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching portfolio; summaries of primary new contributions, impacts on students and learning, acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions,</td>
<td>Summaries of primary contributions, significance and impact in advancing knowledge, new methods, public benefits; communication and validation by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions,</td>
<td>Summaries of primary contributions, public interest, and impact; communication to publics, peer recognition and adoption; evidence of leadership and team contributions,</td>
<td>Summaries of primary contributions, communication to users, scope of adoption and application, impact and benefits; acceptance and adoption by peers, evidence of leadership and team contributions,</td>
<td>Summaries of primary contributions, communication to users, significance and scope of use and benefits; commercial and societal value; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

Integrated social and economic local development aspirations of community groups are attainable with support from local, State and private organisations. In this study, the support structures providing funding and other assistance, the qualifying criteria outlined by support structures and the constraints encountered by community groups were examined. Local sources of funds were the most important for initial funding, followed by State, regional and financial institutions. On-going sources of finance for community groups were derived from the re-investment of profits from commercial activities and through grants from support structures. Community groups identified problems in accessing funds as delayed decision-making, late arrival of money, lack of internal co-ordination and a negative attitude towards certain types of projects. Applications were rejected because they were not within the remit of the support structure’s work, or because the type of application was unsuitable. The results also showed that the support structures with different objectives had similar underlying philosophies for support. This was evident through the organisations’ stance on policy development and job creation. A systematic approach by community groups in locating and identifying suitable support structures is an important finding of this study.

Introduction

Over the past fifteen years community groups throughout the Republic of Ireland (ROI) have increased in number and strength. This involvement includes working with specific groups such as women, families, the elderly, young people and minority groups, which are primarily in disadvantaged communities. These groups, both large and small, rural and urban, are involved in many different aspects of their communities’ development, from training, income maintenance, welfare rights, job creation, community education and creativity to community enterprise, environment, unemployment, poverty and health.

The Irish State supports community endeavours by providing resources to State agencies e.g. FAS Training and Employment Authority, Teagasc (Irish Extension Service), regional authorities e.g. Southern Health Board, area development agencies e.g. Leader Companies and ADM (Area Development Management) Partnerships, and local bodies e.g. County Enterprise Boards. Support for community projects may also come from the private sector, principally local businesses and financial institutions.

The development of local partnership structures allows for flexibility, making it easier to tailor responses to the particular combination of problems facing the particular area or group of people. In the designated areas supported by the Irish Government Local Development Programme (OPLURD), local communities are engaged, together with statutory agencies and social partners in local partnership structures, to inform, influence, direct and maximise the benefits of existing mainstream programmes.

Traditionally in Ireland, the national extension service had a significant involvement in advising community groups. With the introduction of charges for services in the mid 1980’s this activity decreased in importance. In the interim other structures (e.g. Leader companies, Partnerships and County Enterprise Boards) established advisory and training activities for communities and groups involved in rural
development projects. Currently most extension-type advice for communities is now delivered through the newer structures with Teagasc playing a minor role.

Since the 1970’s there have been a series of National agreements and understandings that promote partnership relationships in the Republic of Ireland (ROI) between Government, Trade Unions and Employers. Social partnership in ROI is based upon a commitment to competitiveness alongside a desire to achieve equity at all levels. Local communities are now playing an increasing and important role in strategies aimed at tackling disadvantage in rural Ireland. This is evidenced in State reports, which have examined community development as a potential source of employment creation for rural communities (CEC, 1988; LEDA, 1995; NESC, 1994; NESF, 1996; PCW, 1994; PESP, 1991; TFLTU, 1995). The fundamentally important role of Community Development as a strategy in integrated social and economic local development is recognised at National and European levels and in the Community Development and Community Support Framework (CSF), 1994–1999, of which the Operational Programme for Local, Urban and Rural Development (OPLURD) is a sub-programme. The principles are reflected in the area-based sub-programme of the ROI’s National Development Plan (1994-1999). Local partnerships and State agency programmes focus on community development as the mechanism through which groups and communities can achieve full participation in society (LEDA, 1995). The statutory agencies, however, retain the main responsibility for the programme and the authority to decide on controls and expenditure (Commins & Keane, 1994).

Research studies have shown that inadequate funding has been an important constraint in the development work of community groups (Faughnan and Kelliher, 1992; Wims 1995). Difficulties are experienced by community and voluntary groups in resourcing the expansion of existing activities, developing new services and in securing core funding for administration, management and overheads (Faughnan and Kelliher, 1992).

Aims and Objectives

This paper examines the range and diversity of community group projects in County Kerry, in the Southwest of the Republic of Ireland. The specific objectives were: (1) To identify the projects that were in progress by the community groups, (2) To determine sources of capital used in these projects, (3) To examine the criteria used by community groups in selecting potential funders (4) To highlight funding problems and to ascertain how those were addressed by community groups and (5) To obtain information on and views of support structures regarding community projects and the benefits for funders in supporting community groups.

Research Methodology

The case study method was selected as the most suitable approach to research the structures and procedures for funding community group projects. The utility of this study is further enhanced by the fact that the methodology used required first-hand information from those involved in community development and support agencies, as the main basis of research. Thirty community groups, operating in County Kerry were identified from State, County and local partnership sources. Ten of these groups reflecting a diversity of projects were invited to engage in the study and eight agreed to participate. Interview questionnaires for community groups were prepared and pre-tested to insure the adequacy of the information sought, to estimate the duration of the interview and to highlight sensitive issues. The questionnaire obtained information on the history of the group, the number of people employed, the type of projects undertaken and the sources of funding for same as well as the problems encountered in sourcing funding. The interview technique was chosen as it provided an opportunity to seek additional information where relevant and to clarify areas that were unclear or incomplete. Support structures, which provide funding and other assistance (e.g. advice) to community groups in Kerry, were identified. In order to establish whether or not these support structures were realistic funding sources for community groups, secondary information published by a number of support structures (e.g. annual reports marketing reports etc.), was compiled and researched and contact was made with a sample of organisations that provided support to community projects. Eight support structures were identified and local representatives were interviewed for their views in relation to funding community projects. A questionnaire that was developed for this purpose was used, not in the rigid sense, but as a base to guide the interview. The questionnaire sought information on the type of support structures, the types of support given to communities, the reasons for giving the support and their level of involvement with the projects.

Results

Community Groups

All 8 groups interviewed had elected a
committee. Five had established sub-committees to work on individual areas of development (e.g. Tidy Towns, Tourism etc.). Among the eight groups, 69 local projects were developed. Table 1 shows the diversity of project activities and are grouped into six major classes, as devised by Wims (1995). The community groups interviewed are numbered one to eight. A total of 132 jobs were created from among the 69 projects. Ninety-eight of these

Table 1

Project Activities undertaken by the Community Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Project</th>
<th>Community Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical walks</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water resources</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niche tourist markets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional literature</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist information offices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to fishermen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise workspace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business support services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling waste products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handskills</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centres</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility for social activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising social events</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of the elderly</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crèche/playgroup facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural / Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of old sites</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum/ Heritage centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Crafts and music classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidy Town activities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining and cleaning beaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion work</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sewerage scheme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

positions were part-time and 27 were employed on a seasonal basis (June-Sept) while 7 full-time jobs were created. Of the 132 jobs created, local people filled 122 of these. Respondents indicated that State sources were the most important for funding projects to employ staff. The main source of employment for the projects was FAS National Training and Employment Authority which employed 72 people in total. This funding was mainly under the State Community Employment Scheme, which provided part-time contractual work to unemployed people who work in projects that respond to locally identified needs.

Kirby (1995) argued that community groups
have to resort to these channels to meet staffing requirements because of the absence of ‘more adequate sources of funding’. These restrictions can result in a constant turnover of staff, which can disrupt projects of a social nature (e.g. day-care centre, crèche etc.) and as a consequence increase the workload of the community group.

Groups were also asked to identify their initial and on-going sources of finance. Table 2 shows the sources of funding support from all sources for each community group. The categories of support identified were: (1) Local bodies and organisations, (2) State (3) Regional bodies which themselves received a state subvention and (4) Financial institutions. The most common source of funding obtained by the groups examined was raised from within the local community. This money was raised through donations from outside the area, local business contributions and local fund-raising activities. Only one of the eight groups examined did not engage this activity (Table 2). State sources of funding were also very significant in the projects examined. In some cases funding levels of 65%-75% of the groups’ total funding was achieved from State sources and these funds were used mainly to pay wages and for training.

Initial funding was obtained mainly from State and regional sources with little in terms of sponsorship being obtained from financial institutions. The level of support recorded varied and depended on the type of project. In addition to securing funding to initiate their projects, groups were also asked about the requisite funding to maintain these projects on a continuing basis. The main source of finance identified for on-going activities came from profits generated from the projects and from locally raised funds. This demonstrates their strive for self-sufficiency. The reduction in State support at the later stages of development is compensated for by increased support from local bodies and business. Once the profile and credibility of the groups were well established, private funds and sponsorship seemed easier to access. In general loans were not considered appropriate for funding community projects.

Table 2

Sources of Funding for Community Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Funding</th>
<th>Community Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Support</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising &amp; Social events</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local &amp; Business contributions</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and Semi-state Support</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Development Management (EU-funded)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Social Welfare</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Environment</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS (Training &amp; Employment Authority)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Lottery Funding</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association Training Travellers Centres</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Agencies</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry County Council</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Health Board</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork and Kerry Tourism</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kerry Development Partnership</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Tralee</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry Parent and Friends of the Mentally Handicapped</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Institutions</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding from abroad</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most common benefit for support structures was the creation of jobs in rural communities. This was more common with the State support structures. The groups interviewed argued that evaluation of the contribution by a support structure should not solely be measured on the financial return from the project being supported or the employment created. The majority of these support structures were shaped by a National Development Policy which had, as one of its aims, to help communities to get valuable work done that would otherwise have been impossible without their support (e.g. training resources, construction and environmental work etc.). The capacity of community projects to employ the skills and talents of the local community and the unemployed was also a common benefit identified. This is a particularly relevant benefit for programmes involved in employment and training. Two of the benefits identified by community groups as relevant to the support structures in the financial sector were an enhanced profile within the community and public recognition of their support.

Open political recognition of the work of community groups by Government would raise the profile of the work that these groups undertake. It would also positively stimulate other groups throughout the country to form and develop active community groups.

Finally the concept of wider community involvement was raised with people having a fundamental role in their community activities. However, it was not specified how this might be achieved. Better utilisation of local resources and talents was also identified as a possible means of reducing costs.

**Support Structures**

Five State-supported structures and three private structures participated in the study and were representative of state, regional, local bodies and financial institutions. It was apparent from the findings that while the support structures interviewed, had different objectives; their underlying philosophy was similar. This was evident in a number of areas but particularly with respect to the organisations’ stance on policy development and job creation. The basic philosophy of a majority of the state-bodies was the assistance of community group projects towards the creation of sustainable employment without causing job displacement. The provision of training and educational opportunities for local communities was also evident.

Although certain projects funded under State and regional bodies have provided employment to communities, developing the rural economy was not the underlying philosophy for all agencies. Support from one of the state agencies was not primarily focused on economic development but was created to assist community groups in the community work environment, which provides social services. It was evident in the study that support from funding organisations was not viewed solely in terms of money. It can also incorporate goods (e.g. equipment for offices); services (e.g. advice) trained expertise and training resources (Crowley, 1989; Martin, 1990; Meenaghan, 1983; McDonnell, 1987). This was particularly relevant to the State support structures interviewed in this study. All the support structures provided some form of assistance to community group projects in the form of preparation of business plans and application forms. This information was either published (e.g. in marketing reports, booklets...
Most applications were rejected, not because they were not considered viable in commercial or economic terms and inappropriate to the philosophy of the support structure. Also projects were rejected if there was doubt that the activity presented represented the interests of the majority of the community. It is clear from the results that applications, which are well prepared, well researched and strongly supported by the majority of the community, stand the best chance of success. The process for applying for support should begin many months before applications are made.

### Discussion and Conclusions

The involvement of local groups in the planning, decision making and problem solving of economic and social issues requires the allocation of appropriate resources for this work. This entails a commitment to develop the proficiency of groups to participate in these processes. The research findings showed that finance for community groups came from a variety of sources. Although the most common source of start-up finance identified was raised from within the local community, grant-aid provided by local Partnership Boards, Regional agencies and State bodies was used to initiate projects. State sources of funding were also significant in the projects examined. A reduction in State support however, was evident particularly during the later stages of the projects' development cycle. The main source of finance identified for continuing community activities came from profits generated from project activities and from locally raised funds.

Criteria used by a community group in selecting potential support structures for their projects included whether they would provide other assistance e.g. advice in addition to finance, which was relevant and pertinent to the projects. In this study, the major funding problems for community groups were 1) delayed decision-making, 2) the late arrival of money, 3) lack of co-ordination internally and between support agencies and 4) a negative attitude towards certain types of projects. Partnership is a difficult, complex and challenging relationship because it brings together people and organisations from different backgrounds, interest groups and concerns. With adequate resourcing, a community development approach can unlock a huge reservoir of talents and ideas where projects developed meet the needs of the people. As indicated in this study, job creation is an important part of the policies that shaped these programmes. As expected, the most common method used by support structures to evaluate their contribution to community projects was to: measure the number of jobs...
created on the ground and assist projects through the development process, so that the projects they support continue to function and jobs are maintained for people living in rural areas.

A majority of groups felt the support structures lacked vision and co-ordination. Community groups felt that there was little communication among the different agencies, that funding arrangements were insecure and a clear commitment was lacking.

This study has shown Community Development to be an integral part of local development as it values, stimulates and encourages local people to become involved in defining and developing responses to the problems they experience. At a neighbourhood level it can add an important dimension to meeting the needs of people who feel most isolated and remote from the labour market and from mainline supports and assistance. Local groups with their knowledge and contacts play a key role in reaching those who are alienated and disaffected especially those who are disadvantaged. The results demonstrate that it is not enough to concentrate on one aspect of development to the exclusion of others. The interdependence of social, cultural, recreational, environmental and economic activities must be recognised. By integrating development across a range of activities, the benefits will be reinforced and the results achieved much greater than with individual efforts.

Support structures are significant sources of information and advice for community groups implementing community projects. The study demonstrates that applications and plans require improved research and presentation. Thus the demand for extension-based services in community and rural development type activities is likely to be extended in the future. This need will be met from many sources. It could be argued that the multiple sources of extension advice cause confusion, competition and inefficiencies in resource allocation. However, as these structures are already in place, it is unlikely that any immediate change will be forthcoming in the medium term.

Government in Ireland has traditionally provided some support for community projects but significant input also comes from the local community. While extensive research has been carried out on the procedures and criteria for individual enterprise-type projects, little information is available for group projects. Extension or other advisors, who are assisting projects organised by community groups, require this information and skill if they are to successfully support community groups in this endeavour. The information provided in this study will be useful to practitioners and when added to the total body of knowledge on the subject will provide a useful reference. Individual case studies of successful fund raising strategies can be useful in building models for future use. The models should depict a wide variety of scenarios and have cross-country comparisons. These models could be used in undergraduate and postgraduate curricula in rural development. They could also serve as useful tools for the many outreach programs that aspire to the creation of sustainable rural communities.
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Guided under the conference theme “Partnerships with the Private Sector” the 16th Annual AIAEE Conference was a tremendous experience from the beginning to the end. The conference held in Washington D.C. March 29 – April 1, 2000, attracted over one hundred participants from all over the United States and more than a dozen other countries.

In a manner consistent with past AIAEE conferences, top-notch speakers and quality subject matter were the rule of the forum. Several well-recognized experts including (but not remotely limited to) Bruce Lansdale, Tony Tucker and I. Miley Gonzalez educated and entertained participants about their personal experiences. Two days of concurrent paper sessions paved the way for keynotes and presentations from extension educators and agricultural education practitioners. In addition, a substantial amount of time was set-aside for networking and a poster session highlighting international accomplishments.

Since conference participants were not able to attend all twelve concurrent paper sessions, the following commentary is provided to offer a brief review of the conference from the view of a single attendee. This overview is intended to give those that could not attend the conference or all sessions a taste of what was offered at the AIAEE conference.

Partnerships with the Private Sector

The times ahead will demand new theories, new thinking capabilities, new capacities for transforming research into useful international programming, and new levels of “Partnerships with the Private Sector” capable of designing practical applications for our global society. Conference participants quickly realized that agricultural and extension educators must be ready to innovate, adapt and invent as never before. It became apparently clear that to meet the blitz of new and unfamiliar circumstances in the future, agricultural and extension educators must advance a cooperative behavior through international research and joint projects. Conference presenters showcased their joining of hands with the private sector through twelve concurrent paper sessions – ranging from Burton Swanson and Mohamed Samy’s “Developing an Extension Partnership among Public, Private, and Nongovernmental Organizations” to Nicole’ Gale and Lynn Jones’ “Building International Partnerships Between Students, Land Grant Universities and Business.” As presented in the diverse “Partnerships with the Private Sector” paper presentations, agricultural and extension educators are successfully transcending the cultural and country boundaries to succeed in a global society.


Globalization Perspectives

In "Forces Affecting the Improvement and Implementation of International Perspectives in Texas Secondary Level Agricultural Programs," Larry Bell and James Christiansen of Texas A&M University spoke about the forces affecting the improvement and implementation of international agricultural perspective sin the secondary programs of agricultural science in Texas. Bell and Christiansen found that the forces contributing to the lack of knowledge included 1) failure to utilize instructional materials published in Texas or elsewhere, 2) lack of emphasis on international agricultural perspectives in teacher-training programs an din the state secondary level agricultural education programs, and 3) virtually no interaction between agri-science teachers and stakeholders to enhance teachers’ awareness of economic benefits. The researchers concluded “the importance of this study to agricultural..."
educators is that it reveals a fundamental lack of depth in conventional research on this subject. If any progress is to be made in motivation agri-science teachers to integrate this information in a way that will truly impact the sector, we must approach the matter on two fronts: first, with a better analysis of drives and restraints that affect the implantation of international content; and secondly, with a strong campaign to increase awareness within public institutions and the private sector at the state level for united and interactive collaboration in support of the concept.”

University of Arizona’s Jim Knight, Jack Elliot, and Rick Krenzer’s presentation, “International Interests of Arizona Extension Professionals” concluded that Extension leaders still need to communicate the importance of including international perspectives within Extension programming. Additionally, the researchers contend that supporting and rewarding extension personnel who work in this area is essential if international understanding is going to improve. Finally, they argued for International professional development workshops and activities to be prominent in statewide Extension meetings. The end results of such international inclusion are as Knight, Elliot and Krenzer stated “will be more global Extension staff and ultimately a better served public.”

The final presentation “Globalizing Agricultural Science and Education Programs for America: An Agenda for Sustainable Agriculture, Food, Natural Resources, Rural and Related Human Science Programs” by David Acker (Iowa State University), David Hansen (The Ohio State University), Harold Matteson (New Mexico State University), and David Sammons (Purdue University) provided an in-depth overview of the GASEPA initiative. In this paper the authors presented the new agenda for international programs for the higher agricultural education, research and extension community of the U.S. It was presented that the vision for this agenda is one of globally competent stakeholders, faculty, and students in the U.S. food, agriculture and natural resource sector, who live, compete and work well in an ever dynamic and interdependent world community. In conclusion the authors contend “the challenge before us is significant, especially given the rapid changes which are occurring in communication technologies. The world is fast becoming a truly global community.” Acker, Hansen, Matteson, and Sammons trust that the GASEPA agenda “will resonate positively with the concerns of readers…and seek additional inputs from all concerned in helping to make it even more relevant to future trends and needs.”

**International Partnerships**

Burton Swanson and Mohamed Samy of the University of Illinois talked about “Developing An Extension Partnership Among Public, Private, and Nongovernmental Organizations.” This paper posits a conceptual or policy framework that identifies the comparative strengths of public, private, and nongovernmental organizations to carry out different types of technology transfer, human resources, and social capital development programs. The framework presented by Swanson and Samy, could serve as the basis for developing a sustainable, long-term partnership among these different organizations. The authors contend “This partnership, between public extension, private firms and NGO’s could be a more effective approach in delivering human resource development, technology transfer, and social capital development programs to serve the needs of all groups of farmers in developing countries.”

Clemson University’s Rama Radhakrishna’s “Understanding Roles of Private and Public Sector Extension: Implications for Partnership Efforts” provided an overview of private and public sector extension to identify potential areas of partnership efforts. Radhakrishna’s findings indicated: 1) three different forms of private sector extension—profit, service and voluntary; 2) similarities and differences between public and private sector extension relative to 12 factors; and 3) several benefits and limitations for public and private sector partnerships. Based on research findings, the author recommended that extension educators and donor agencies should come together to create a “synergy” to address issues relative to public and private sector extension partnership efforts, especially in meeting the needs of small and subsistence farmers.

“International Agricultural Exchange Programs Private Sector Partners for Fifty Years A Follow Up Study” presented by Stephen Jones of the University of Minnesota, provided an synopsis of the fifty year history of providing technical and cross cultural learning experiences to young men and women from around the world through international agricultural training programs. The study was a systematic effort to document the value of the Minnesota Agricultural Student Trainee program. Research results concluded that 1) technology exchange did take place, 2) the program was valuable to participant’s professional development, and 3) cross cultural experiences were invaluable in helping international trainees to better understand each other. Finally, Jones contended that the “importance of the study is to show the value of
an international agricultural experience to promote better world understanding and to document the value of the experience to government agencies which authorize the continuation of these programs.”

Nicole’ Gale and Lynn Jones’ “Building International Partnerships between Students, Land-grant Universities, and Businesses: Iowa State University Agricultural Minority Summer Research Internship Program as a Model” paper presented the findings of a qualitative study conducted at their home university Iowa State to provide an in-depth view of opinions and perceptions of minorities towards international agriculture programs. Gale and Jones’ findings concluded, “students seem to be willing to expose themselves to other culture sand gain a sense of respect for other cultures if given the chance to travel internationally.” Finally, the author stated, “the importance of partnerships, collaborative programming and networking for internships can not be overemphasized.

Extension Programs

K.S.U. Jayaratne and Robert Martin of Iowa State University presented on “Educating Women Farmers in Developing Countries: Problems, Constraints, and Alternative Approaches”. K.S.U. and Martin spoke about the significant role that women farmers in developing countries play in production agriculture, however “little or no attention has been paid to meeting the educational needs of women involved in agriculture.” The authors contend, “the major problems associated with extension systems are male centered policies and lack of institutional focus on women farmers’ needs.” It was recommended that national policy should be adapted “to ensure equal opportunities for both men and women regarding resource allocation, recruitment, promotion and programming.” K.S.U. and Martin wrapped up his presentation by talking about in the need for involving women farmers in the extension education process, by doing so; women “will be able direct extension programs in the extension education process, by doing so; about in the need for involving women farmers” K.S.U. and Martin wrapped up his presentation by talking about in the need for involving women farmers in the extension education process, by doing so; about in the need for involving women farmers

Don Russell (College of the Ozarks) and Larry Trede’s (Iowa State University) paper “Using an Urban Agricultural Education Programming Model to Build Partnerships in Extension” explored the potential for using an urban agricultural education program model in extension planning. Russell and Trede maintain, “The model’s process for identifying and prioritizing needs is applicable to a wide variety of programs including many extension programs.” Finally, the author’s believe that “extension would benefit by using a broad-based advisory council to direct the program development and from the evaluation components built into the model.”

The final presentation in this session “Grapecheque: A Creative Extension Program Making A Difference” by Jane Fisher, Megan Hill, Stephen Kelly, and John Whiting of the Institute of Horticultural Development, Victoria, Australia highlighted the framework, structure and impact of the Grapecheque program. The authors stated, “Grapecheque is an extension program…established for winegrape growers throughout the state of Victoria, Australia…to bring growers together to address common local issues…emphasis is on best practice viticulture and developing sustainable businesses.” Fisher, Hill, Kelly, and Whiting declare “the success of Grapecheque has depended on the energy and commitment of the facilitators to the program. One of the outcomes of the processes discussed has been convincing all facilitators of the importance of planning, and of data collection for evaluation.

Extension Systems

William Rivera (University of Maryland) and Willem Zijp (The World Bank) presented a paper “Contracting for Extension Services: An International Perspective” that previewed the findings from a World Bank document on the same subject matter. Rivera and Zijp examined the growing body of experience worldwide with the contracting approach to improving the financing and delivery of agricultural knowledge and concluded “extension services may be improved when contracted out. These improvements include areas related to cost-effectiveness, accountability, relevance,
monitoring, financial and institutional sustainability, and creative media use.”

“The Case Study of the Ukrainian Agricultural Advisory Service” by Anatoliy Tmanov and Donald Evans of the Pennsylvania State University presented their study that estimated the present situation in Ukrainian agriculture regarding the agricultural advisory development. The authors also submitted for review their model of the Ukrainian Agricultural Advisory Service in hopes of providing direction for Ukrainian specialists and enthusiasts in their development of the advisory program. Tmanov and Evans’ state that the advisory service “is to develop and facilitate bilateral educational linkages and technology transfer between the scientist and the producer.” The authors state that the benefits of the Advisory service include: 1) Provide farmers access to information and education, 2) Develop trustful relationships between farmers and agricultural universities, 3) provide service for business plan developing, auditing, financial service, economic advising, and marketing information, 4) Provide information for the study and exploration of common agriculture challenges, 5) development of a rural infrastructure, and 6) Implementation of government agriculture policy.

In “The Transformation of Agricultural Extension Worldwide: An Argument for Federalization, Balance of Powers and Revitalized National Extension Systems” William Rivera (University of Maryland) spoke of changes within agricultural extension over the next decade. The author argues, “Governments will need to reconsider their relationship to their extension clients, namely agribusiness decision makers, intermediaries and consultants, integrators, government bureaucrats, legislators, and regulators.” He further maintains that with the change in Extension’s audience new programs need to be developed to “reflect the world’s rapid urbanization.” As a response to these rapid worldwide challenges and new priorities, Rivera contends “extension as a concept and mode of operation is going to grow in the future…the national institution of public sector extension will once again be reinvented.”

Munir Ahmad, Tanvir Ali, and Andrew Davidson of the University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan presented on the "Effectiveness of Public and Private Sectors Extension: Implication for Pakistani farmers". The authors spoke about the serious reservations that are being raised about the ability of the public and private extension services to deliver effective programming in developing countries like Pakistan. The study presented, concluded that neither the public or private sector is “doing an appropriate job of extension for the development of agriculture in general, nor for the uplift of the farming community in particular, in Punjab, Pakistan.”

Education Models

James Diamond of Delaware Valley College outlined a “Six-Pronged Scheme for China’s Agro-Technical Education” that stressed the need for the implementation of competency-based and modular teaching approaches. Diamond stated that the six-pronged approach, consisting of study tours, fellowships, teaching methods courses, Agro-Technical Training “Outside” schools, Agro-Technical training “In” schools, and Teacher-Teaching-Teachers; impacted the education system by “1) improved the quality of teaching; 2) updated the knowledge base of teachers, 3) broadened the teachers thinking and understanding of people of other nations, 4) increased teachers enthusiasm towards the teaching profession; 5) improved the students ability to learn new technology and skills; 6) new courses were developed and offered; 7) increased farmer education programs; 8) increased financial support from Provincial and Regional Governments; 9) increased number of in-service education programs for teachers; 10) new specialties have been added to the curriculum as some schools; 11) beginning teachers benefited from the teachers improvement courses and, 12) academic administration personnel performance was improved.

Wendy Williams and Frank Brewer of Michigan State University presented “The Perceived Impact of International Training Programs on Personal and Professional Growth of Extension Participants: A Case Study.” The authors found that 1) 73% of respondents had changed much or very much professionally as a result of international training and international involvement; 2) 63% of the respondents felt they had changed personally much or very much; 3) 79% of respondents contended that their community had benefited from international activities; and 4) 64% felt that their were sufficient opportunities for Michigan State Extension Educators in overseas work; while 36% did not feel there were sufficient opportunities. Williams and Brewer concluded by recommending “for further international training programs…adding more reinforcement though reconnection with colleges, and to encourage participants in international activities for all citizens of Michigan.

“Best Management Practices for Ranchers in Iran” by Mohammad Chizari (Tarbiat Modarres University and James Lindner (The Ohio State
Lin Compton and Craig Castro of University of Wisconsin teamed up with Hamidou Tamboura from INERA, Burkina Faso to present “Interdisciplinary Research and ‘Reversal of Learning’: Learning from Field Experience in Burkina Faso.” Compton, Castro and Tamboura’s research provided “insight into the factors and forces influencing an interdisciplinary attempt to document the indigenous knowledge systems of Mossi farmers and Fulani herdsmen in Burkina Faso, West Africa regarding soil-nutrient management and ethnoveterinary medicine practices.” The authors concluded, “The theory and practice of working together, communication, and team building should be discussed and practiced” throughout training/educational programs to prepare interdisciplinary research teams. Topics such as “giving/receiving feedback, building trust with villagers, and building trust among team members” are examples of specific topics that could aid in successful interdisciplinary research.

Small Farmers

“Small farms are very important in North Carolina,” argues John O’Sullivan of the NCA & TSU Cooperative Extension Programs. O’Sullivan’s paper “Reporting Successful Small Farm Educational Programs in North Carolina: Past, Present & Future” concludes that “A clear understanding of the definitions of small farms based on present economic realities is important and would be helpful to 1862 and 1890 land grant institutions.” The author went further to state, “Successful educational programs, using public resources, need to be able to show the success achieved.” In conclusion O’Sullivan stated “With strong evaluation, with dynamic and market-based educational programs, with collaboration of the land grant universities and other interested partners like non-government groups and community colleges, Cooperative Extension at NCA&TSU and NCSU will be able to meet the educational needs of small farms in North Carolina for years to come.”

The research team of Matt Baker, Rick Rudd and Carlton Pomeroy of the University of Florida proposed a theoretical model of the creative process cycle in their second presentation “Tapping into the Creative Potential of Limited Resource Farmers: A theoretical Perspective” The proposed model consisted of an incubation phase, a gestation phase, and an end product or problem solution phase. The authors maintain that the model “will serve to advance our understanding of extension programming with limited resource farmers in a PRA context.” In conclusion Baker, Rudd and Pomeroy state “perhaps we will never know the exact extent to which the inhibitors and/or catalysts of creative attributes influence creative thought. However, similar to other complex psychological concepts (i.e. learning styles), perhaps the most useful way to encourage creative thought is to acknowledge a genuine appreciation for and cognizance of its existence.”

Collaborations
“Building a Global Network for Higher Agricultural Education: The Case of the Global Consortium of Higher Education and Research for Agriculture” by David Acker of Iowa State University kicked off the concurrent paper session on collaboration. Acker’s paper outlined the vision, mission and objectives of the Global Consortium, stating that “the Global Consortium is designed to foster global cooperation for the improvement of higher education and research for agriculture as a prerequisite to solving the food security and environmental problems confronting our world.” Acker concluded by maintaining “It is time for the leadership of higher education in agriculture to step forward and accept the challenge...We can no longer afford the luxury of focusing only on our own institution’s survival.”

Niamh Dennehy, Dermot Ruane and James Phelan of the National University of Ireland presented a study entitled “A Study of some of the Structures and Procedures for the Funding of Community Groups in the Republic of Ireland.” The authors outlined the “support structures which provide funding and other assistance, the constrains encountered by community groups and the qualifying criteria by support structures in relations to financing local community group projects.” Dennehy, Ruane and Phelan concluded that “the importance of a systematic approach by community groups in the location and identification of suitable support structures cannot be overstated.” This study has “shown Community Development to be an integral part of local development as it values, stimulates and encourages local people to become involved in defining and developing responses to the problems they experience.”

Alisa Phillips of Cornell University presented “Learning and Collaborating for Adult Literacy in the Dominican Republic.” Phillips’ paper presented a case of “inter-institutional collaboration as a necessary component for advancing adult education.” The author contends that “the most important lesson that can be gleaned from this Dominican experience is that all stakeholders can contribute to the development of their society; therefore, all members of civil society have to continue looking for ways to seek meaningful collaboration with each other.”

Peter Achuonjiei, Mahamet Rajab, Djimadoungar Doumbaye, Adoum Djibrine, and Al-Hassan Outman, practitioners from Africare and the Republic of Chad presented “Africare’s Experience in Collaboration with Office National pour le Development Rural (ONDR) Extension Agents in Conducting the Baseline Study of The Ouaddat Food Security Initiative (OSFS) in Chad.” This baseline survey captured the existing situations in the project zone, and noted that “remarkable homogeneity in health, nutrition and agricultural production data in the villages studied.” Guided by four objectives: 1) Strengthening the Capacity of Target Communities to Address Food Security Issues 2) Increase Agricultural Productivity, 3) Increase the Value of Family Food Production, and 4) Improve Household Nutrition, the authors concluded that the baseline study “has shown that a majority of the people in the project zone are food insecure; have no action plans for village food security; have little or no agricultural technologies for agricultural production; that transformation of agricultural produce and construction of storage facilities are critical; potable water is in great demand and that 27% of the children suffer from chronic malnutrition.

Economic Development

“A 21st Century Challenge: Extension’s Role in Economic Development of Rural Communities” by Layle Lawrence of West Virginia University lead of the Economic Development session by stating “The need for sustainability of agriculture, the environment, and other aspects of our lives is generally accepted and taken for granted.” Lawrence concluded by stating, “Extension workers are in key positions to lead and influence the (economic development) process.” The author urged extension staff to “continue your good work in agricultural development, and to intensively involve agricultural extension in your efforts to bring about economic and social community development in rural areas.”

James Christiansen of Texas A&M University maintained that “Underlying all successful development programs is the thread of seeking out, playing attention to, involving, working with, collaborating with, and obtaining feedback from the intended beneficiaries of development programs, projects, and activities” in his paper “Making Development in Agriculture Happen: What Lessons Have we Learned? What Lessons Have We Not Learned?” Christiansen outlined five conditions existing that must be recognized and considered as they affect the development process; eleven basic, proven principles of program and project management; and, twenty-four factors that take place when managing successful projects or programs. The author concluded with “we can make development in agriculture happen, if we remember that participation by people affected by the development process is necessary.”
Shifting gears, Laura Suazo-Gallardo and Roger Steele of Cornell University summarized a hillside farming and extension experience that developed from a partnership between the Secretary of Agriculture and Livestock and six nongovernmental organizations working in development in Honduras in their paper “From Beneficiaries to Partners: Changing Traditions while Accelerating Development in Honduras.” The authors maintained that “the significance of promoting local male and female farmers as agricultural extensionists and the need of promoting a sharing environment among partnership experiences between public and private sectors” is needed in Honduras. Suazo-Gallardo and Steele concluded by stating “it is important to understand that new partnerships do not form easily or remain strong without considerable attention, effort, and investment by each entity…if participants …can build trust, and establish a climate of respect they can probably find success in their work together.”

“Links for Sustainability: Partnerships in Cuba During the ‘Special Period’” by Carolyn Lane of the University of Minnesota presented a case study of importance of linkages and partnerships between government, educational, public, and private sectors, and their role in strengthening the nation’s food security.” Lane maintains that “Although Cuba is often slighted by the United States government, their perseverance in maintaining their national sovereignty and determination to become more self-sufficient in food production presents a valuable message and model for the world.” The author concludes that “the Cuban experience can be instrumental in developing successful linkages, improving levels of food production, agricultural literacy, intergenerational interaction, environmental preservation, and increased understanding between urban and rural sectors of all nations.”

**Attitudes and Learner Assessment**

Developing partnerships takes another angle in “Reflective Teaching Believes and Practices of Secondary Agricultural Educators in Papua New Guinea: Implications for Agricultural Education and Extension” by Arnold Parapi (The University of Goroka) and Roger Steele (Cornell University). The authors of this paper argue that “reflective practice is educationally attractive and useful for adoption in agricultural education and extension settings. The paper draws from literature on reflective teaching/practice and from recent inquiry conducted by Parapi (2000), advocating the need for more reflective practice. Parapi and Steele, conclude by recommending that “agricultural educators and extensionists increase their efforts to adapt, adopt, and incorporate critical reflection into their professional practices.”

Nick Place (University of Florida) and Donald Evans (The Pennsylvania State University) explored and described the “mutual relationships that exists between The Pennsylvania State University as an international technical assistance provider, the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, and a mid-sized agricultural cooperative in their article “A Case Study Analysis of International Cooperation Between The Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture and The Pennsylvania State University.” The study documented the importance of educational efforts to enhance global knowledge and understanding with a secondary outcome of agricultural market development. In conclusion, Place and Evans maintained “steps should be taken to integrate relevant international perspectives into Extension programming to enhance global knowledge and skills of the U.S. agricultural producers and the general public.”

“Perceptions and Assessments of Selected Topics by Lithuanian Teachers who participated in Agricultural Education In-Service Seminars in 1999” by Craig Edwards (Texas A&M University) and William Thuemmel (University of Massachusetts) described selected characteristics of educators (both agriculture and non-agriculture) who were employed at high and higher (postsecondary) schools of agriculture in Lithuania to assess their perceptions concerning the importance of their ability to perform the activities that had been trained in. Implementing a mixed method approach of inquiry, Edwards and Thuemmel systematically evaluated both the efficacious and relevance of in-service efforts. Recommendations for future research and practice included: 1) careful consideration of participant selection is needed, 2) future research should attempt to identify reasons for the educators not promoting careers in agriculture, 3) experiential education activities should be considered for inclusion into future in-service training, 4) future in-service providers are encouraged to demonstrate a tangible connection between the theoretical and the theory-in-use aspects of SAE programs, and 5) future in-service initiatives should explore the role of youth leadership development in the context of agricultural education in Lithuania.

S.K. Subair of the University of Botswana presented a paper on the “Attitude Towards Sheep and Goat Farming in Botswana: A survey of Agricultural Professionals, Technical Officers, and Farmers.” Subair’s study was “conducted to determine the attitude of Batswanas towards sheep and goat farming in Botswana.” The results revealed that “the three
major actors in sheep and goat farming in Botswana, Professional, Technical Officers and Farmers) are now disposed towards sheep and goat farming.” The author noted that “farmers still believe that sheep and goat farming has little future for them, probably because they are facing some production problems, such as diseases and pests, feeding and feeding marketing.” Subair concluded by stating that these problems are issues that professionals need to work on while Technical Officers need to do more to assist the farmers in the development of sheep and goat farming.

Educator Perceptions Studies

Craig Edwards (Texas A&M University), Donald Meaders (Michigan State University) and James Brousseau (Milan High School, Michigan) presented a paper entitled “Perceptions of Agricultural Educators in the Former Soviet Union on The Usefulness of selected In-service Education topics and Future In-service Education Needs: A cross-case analysis.” The research team’s purpose for conducting the study was “to determine the perceptions of in-service participants regarding the usefulness of topics presented during the APPLE-sponsored agricultural education in-service conducted during the summer of 1998, and to provide information to those responsible for planning future in-serves education for teachers in agriculture in Lithuania. The authors outlined 9 recommendations that should be retained or included into future in-service programming 1) orientation programs, 2) describe and explain vocational education in the U.S. in general and agricultural education in particular, 3) teaching methodologies, 4) youth leadership development activities, 5) principles of experiential learning 6) evolutional and assessment of learning 7) using visioning exercises (see, Thuemmel et al. 1998) and 8) offer “specialty” strands within the realm of agriculture, and 9) continuous stream of client feedback to adapt, adjust and refine programming.

One of two articles in this session by the University of Cape Coast researchers, Festus Annor-Frempong, Moses Zinnah and Alfred Osei-Owusu, titled “Perceptions of Agricultural Researchers and Extension Agents regarding Needed Linkages in Maize Technology Development in the Ashanti Region of Ghana” showed that the research group is “endowed with highly educated research personnel specialized in different areas of maize research.” However the authors noted that the “educational qualification of extension agents is low as compared to researchers…and that inadequate linkage activities lack of resources, incompatible government polices, low incentives and remuneration are some of the major factors limiting closer working relationships between researchers and extension staff.” Annor-Frempong, Zinnah and Osei-Owusu concluded that the need for policy makers to build on the consensus among extension agents and researcher when prioritizing linkage activities in order to avoid duplication of efforts, missing linkages, and misapplication of scares resources.”

The second article by the University of Cape Coast researcher team, lead this time by, Alfred Osei-Owusu, Festus Annor-Frempong and Moses Zinnah, studied the present levels of professional competencies of extension agents in the Central and Northern Regions of Ghana. Their article “Professional Competencies of Agricultural Extension Agents in Ghana: Perceptions of Extension Agents and Their Supervisors in the Central and Northern Regions” should that “extension agents generally possessed a medium level of competency in the nine selected competency areas: Program Planning & Evaluation, Supervision & Leadership, Adult Education, Farm Record & Budgeting, Emerging Issues, Communication & Human Relations, Administration & Programme Execution, Needs Assessment, and Maintaining Professionalism. Thus, the authors concluded that “in the Central Region, more emphasis should be placed on competency in programme planning and evaluation, farm record keeping and budgeting, and communication and human relations.” While, in the Northern region, however, the authors contend that “the focus should be on communication and human relations and emerging issues.”

The final paper in the is session by Awoke Dollisso and Robert Martin from Iowa State University provided the audience with “Perceptions Regarding Farmers’ Motivation to Participate in Extension Programs: Implications to International Agricultural Extension Education.” Dollisso and Martin findings indicated that “farmers may be motivated to participate in educational programs by both delivery-oriented motivational factors and non-delivery-oriented motivational factors.” Based on this finding, the authors recommend that “program planners should consider both categories of motivational factors.” The authors also noted that their respondents contend that “Extension program are irrelevant, and their publications are out-dated.” To remedy this concern Dollisso and Martin recommend that to maintain credibility “Extension needs to revitalize and align its programs with present trends and needs of farmers.”
In "Overseas Technical Cooperation Impact Study: An Evaluation of the Impact of Overseas Assignments on Individual, Organizational and Community Attitudes, Behaviors and Support for International Involvement," Mary Andrews (Michigan State University), Donald Evans (The Pennsylvania State University), Nancy Crago (The Pennsylvania State University), and Nick Place of University of Florida spoke about the impact of overseas technical assignments on the individuals involved in the study, and on the organizations and communities from which they are based. The authors contend that “sending subject matter specialists and county Extension agents on international assignments that closely parallel their roles in the U.S. proved very effective.” The research team concluded that “citizens and professionals in the Extension organization reported high levels of support for international involvements for agencies such as the USDA, for universities and for citizens.”

University of Florida’s Victor Cabrera, Matt Baker and Peter Hildebrand’s presentation, “A formative Evaluation of Valle Grande Rural Institute in Canete, Peru” concluded that “extensionists should consult farmers on any individual basis, as opposed to the current practice of recommending fertilizer rates based upon geographic region within the Canete Valley.” The six-year linear programming model proposed to examine the viability of VGRI clients in adopting either a grape or an asparagus enterprise is as the authors stated “now readily available to use as a consulting tool at the individual household level…and can be used by extensionists to predict differing household livelihood systems responses based upon various scenarios.”

In “Factors Related to the Use of Internet Among Extension Faculty of North Carolina State University” North Carolina State University’s Mitchell Owen and Richard Liles examined and described the relationship of personal attributers, such as gender, age, formal education, tenure, computer experience, and personality; social system factors, such as job responsibility and community size; and intervening factors, such as access, learning approach, computer support, supervisory support, and reward system to the adoption and use of the Internet by educators working for North Carolina Cooperative Extension. Owen and Liles concluded that Field faculty who reported being 1) extraverted are more likely to use the Internet, 2) intuitive are more likely to use the Internet, 3) intuitive-feeling or intuitive thinking are more likely to use the Internet, and 4) sensing-judging are less likely to use the Internet.

The final presentation “Building Partnerships: The Diffusion of Distance Education at the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture” by Kim Dooley of Texas A&M University provided an in-depth overview of the linkage project between The Texas A&M University System (TAMUS) and the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) in April 1997 to develop a videoconference network at IICA headquarters in San Jose, Costa Rica. Dooley reported that “it was concluded that a diffusion gap does exist…and three recommendations emerged to help bridge the diffusion gape and promote the adoption of distance education as an innovation: 1) training and material conversion at a nominal fee should be promoted, and the recognition of innovators/early adopters technicians/specialist, 2) strategic alliances for content delivery should remain a focus of the network, and 3) their should always be a continues upgrading of telecommunication equipment to reach a wide variety of clients.”

Educational Perspectives

In "Institutional Structures for Partnership, Participation and Empowerment in Agricultural and Rural Development," Gustav Duvel of the South African Institute for Agricultural Extension, University of Pretoria proposed “an organizational framework which provides for an institutional linkage between the rural community and the development agent(s).” Duvel stated that “the implementation of this model, designed for both commercial and subsistence farming situations, requires adaptations to situation-specific circumstance, especially in terms of the compromise to be found between a practical ward size and the number of sub-communities that can be effectively consolidated into a cohesive community coincided with it.” In conclusion, Duvel argued “in the spirit of empowerment and ownership…extension services should be directly accountable to communities, and more specifically to the co-ordination bodies (development councils) that represent them…and more optimal would be a direct transfer of development funds to the communities.”

The Ohio State Universities’ Larry Miller and Michigan State University’s Lorilee Sandman’s presentation, “A Coming of Age: Revisiting AIAEE Scholarship” presented a challenge to the AIAEE membership to reevaluate the current scholarship paradigm. Miller and Sandman maintains that “the emerging conceptualization of scholarship can provide a renaissance to the
practice-based field of AIAEE where categories are often blurred between research, teaching and service.” The authors hope their paper will “stimulate a fuller and vigorous discussion on the implications of such a conceptualization for theory and practice within AIAEE and on the role of AIAEE and internationalization continued shaping of the definition of scholarship.”

“Internet Courseware Application to A Study Abroad Experience” by Randy Andreasen of Southwest Missouri State University “sought to determine the feasibility and usefulness of web-based applications to a study abroad program.” Andreasen stated that “students agreed that the intellectual and academic rigors of the program where challenging, adding credence to the ability of technology and the Internet to enhance the education value” of study abroad programs. In conclusion Andreasen recommends that the inclusion of “appropriate technology to enhance and improve student learning” may aid in maintaining high standards of academic integrity in study abroad programs.

Barnabas Dlamini and Chye-Hean Teoh of The University of Swaziland outlined “Partnership Experiences by the University of Swaziland: Implications for Globalization Efforts” and reinforced “the need to establish linkages between…relevant institutions at various levels to pursue…to gain recognition and credibility.” Dlamini and Teoh stated that “the implications of partnerships ensured the sustained ability of development of the university’s human resources, physical facilities and conducive environment for the continued improvement of the quality of teaching-training and research agenda.” The authors concluded with outlining the achievements of the partnerships as: a) an active advisor board that helped faculty and administration to be more creative and open to opportunities; b) mobilization of resources for special programs; and c) improved field attachment or internship programs…which are important and valuable to the students, potential employers, as well as the university. In conclusion “It is only through effective partnerships that the pursuit of the university’s globalization efforts will be able to achieve its goals” stated Dlamini and Teoh when commenting on the educational importance of the university partnerships.

The final paper “Are Constraints Limiting Extension Effectiveness Similar or Different in Various Regions of the World?: A Review and Synthesis of Four Studies” by Rama Radhakrishna of Clemson University examined four studies to “identify constraints that limit effectiveness of extension in three countries – Bangladesh, India and Nigeria.” Radhakrishna, outlined nine constraints that limit extension effectiveness. The nine constraints were: technology, linkage, mobility, equipment, teaching aids, extension training, technical training, organizations, and coordination. In conclusion Radhakrishna stated, “National level extension personnel should be made ware of the specific and local issues that limit extension’s effectiveness. New communications technologies should be developed to create awareness and understand of the local extension issues and problems.”

Final Remarks

The AIAEE conference was a valuable experience. Many of the individuals that I spoke to at this conference find listening to experts and networking with other international and extension educators to be a tremendous way to spend three days each spring. This conference is getting more and more valuable as the years move forward and educators realize that globalization plays a vital role in their professional well being. I hope to see you next year when the AIAEE conference will be held in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
Forces Affecting the Improvement and Implementation Of International Perspectives in Texas Secondary Level Agricultural Programs

Larry G. Bell and James E. Christiansen
Texas A&M University

Forces were analyzed that affected the improvement and implementation of international agricultural perspectives in the secondary programs of agricultural science in Texas. Objectives included determining the current level of implementation, identifying factors influencing implementation, and estimating their relative strength.

Survey methodology, based on force-field analysis, was used to measure the effect of 13 variables on the implementation of 16 selected international perspectives. Variables included perceptions of the relevance of, knowledge about, and support for teaching those perspectives. The population, 1,515 agriscience teachers, received 750 surveys distributed by mail and at teacher workshops and conferences; 120 were collected and analyzed. Path analysis was used to determine which variables had the greatest influence on implementation.

Current implementation ranged between somewhat adequately and inadequately (five-point scale) and was subject to more restraining effects than driving effects. Variables with the strongest direct and indirect effects on implementation (in order by relative strength) were 1) knowledge of the perspectives, 2) knowledge gained (by personal initiative, from stakeholders, and from teacher-training), 3) personal relevance, and 4) general support from all stakeholders. Other forces related to relevance and support had no statistically significant influence on implementation.

Forces contributing to lack of knowledge included 1) failure to utilize instructional materials published in Texas or elsewhere, 2) lack of emphasis on international agricultural perspectives in teacher-training programs and in the state secondary level agricultural education programs, and 3) virtually no interaction between agriscience teachers and stakeholders to enhance teachers awareness of economic benefits.

International Interest of Arizona Extension Professionals

Jim Knight, Associate Professor
Jack Elliot, Associate Professor
Rick Krenzer, Graduate Student
The University of Arizona

Seventy-nine percent (100/126) of Arizona Extension personnel participated in a study that investigated their International Interests. All of the Extension personnel were involved in some type of international activities. About half of the Extension personnel have included an international dimension into their Extension efforts. However, ninety-two percent of the participants indicated an interest in including international efforts into future Extension programs. Sixty-five percent of the participants expressed an interest in an out-of-country assignment. Extension personnel perceived barriers to including international efforts into future Extension programs included lack of time, lack of financial support, language skills, not a program priority and family commitments. Extension personnel's perceived barriers to participation in an out-of-country assignment included lack of time, lack of financial support, family commitments, language skills and not a program priority. Extension personnel's competencies that would enhance international programming activities included 64% of the respondents showed fair or higher level of language skills other than English. Other areas with high levels of inclusion were committee development, program planning, volunteer training and facilitation. Extension leaders still need to communicate the importance of including international perspectives within Extension programming. Supporting and rewarding Extension personnel who work in this
area is essential if international understanding is going to improve. International professional development workshops and activities need to be prominent in statewide Extension meetings. Highlighting outstanding Extension personnel will create a model for others to follow. The end result will be a more global Extension staff and ultimately a better served public.

Globalizing Agricultural Science and Education Programs for America: An Agenda for Sustainable Agriculture, Food, Natural Resources, Rural and Related Human Science Programs

David G. Acker, Director
International Agriculture Programs
Iowa State University

David O. Hansen, Director,
International Programs in Agriculture
Ohio State University

Harold R. Matteson, Assistant Vice President
International Programs
New Mexico State University

David J. Sammons, Director
International Agriculture Programs
Purdue University

The UASEPA agenda is an attempt to begin to deal with the rapid restructuring of national economies and national development policies that occurred in the wake of the breakdown of the centralized socialist economies of the world. In this paper we present the “new” agenda for international programs for the higher agricultural education, research and extension community of the U.S. The vision for this agenda is one of globally competent stakeholders, faculty, and students in the U.S. food, agriculture and natural resource sectors, who live, compete and work well in an ever dynamic and interdependent world community. The corresponding mission is to incorporate an international dimension into teaching, research, and extension programs so that (1) our graduates understand and appreciate the global environment in which agriculture functions, (2) our research and extension programs have access the best ideas and technologies regardless of where they are generated or developed, and (3) the above strengthen U.S. international competitiveness within a sustainable global agricultural system.

Comprehensive objectives include: (1) enhancing global competitiveness of U.S. agriculture through human resource development; (2) development and dissemination of information about global market, trade and business opportunities; (3) mutually beneficial collaborative global partnerships (4) promoting trade through global economic development; and (5) promoting global environmental quality and stewardship of natural resources.

Developing an Extension Partnership among Public, Private, and Nongovernmental Organizations

Burton E. Swanson and Mohamed M. Samy
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

This paper posits a conceptual or policy framework that identifies the comparative strengths of public, private, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) to carry out different types of technology transfer, human resource, and social capital development programs. First, public extension appears better suited to undertake a wide range of extension programs dealing with natural resource management, crop and livestock management, farming systems, other technical and management issues. Second, private sector firms have access to research and development in other countries, therefore they can provide farmers with superior technologies, and with information and educational programs to complement these new technological products and services. Third, NGOs are well suited to assist the rural poor through different types of social capital development programs. Driven by social goals, most NGO staff members are highly motivated and well equipped to organize small-scale, marginal, and women farmers into groups so they can better access technology and resources.

This framework, based on a comparative analysis of each set of institutions, could serve as the basis for developing a sustainable, long-
term partnership among these different organizations. This partnership, between public extension, private firms, and NGOs, could be a more effective approach in delivering human resource development, technology transfer, and social capital development programs to serve the needs of all groups of farmers in developing countries.

**Understanding Roles of Private and Public Sector Extension: Implications for Partnership Efforts**

*Rama B. Radhakrishna, Specialist
Program Evaluation and Staff Development
Clemson University Cooperative Extension Service*

In recent years there has been a renewed interest for linking public and private sector extension efforts. Extension professionals around the globe are searching for new ways to link the best of public and private sector extension. This study was to provides an overview of private and public sector extension to identify potential areas of partnership efforts. Findings indicated: 1) three different forms of private sector extension--profit, service and voluntary; 2) similarities and differences between public and private sector extension relative to 12 factors--organization, goals, orientation of farm knowledge, emphasis, personnel, mobility, cost effectiveness, incentives, funding, coordination, accountability and decision making; and 3) several benefits and limitations for public and private sector partnership. Based on the findings, it was recommended that extension educators and donor agencies should come together to create a synergy to address issues relative to public and private sector extension partnership efforts, especially in meeting the needs of small and subsistence farmers.

**International Agricultural Exchange Programs Private Sector Partners for Fifty Years A Follow Up Study**

*Stephen P. Jones
University of Minnesota*

International agricultural training programs have a fifty year history of providing technical and cross cultural learning experiences to young men and women from around the world. The objectives of these programs are to 1) provide technology exchange, 2) provide an educational program, 3) to provide for a cross cultural experience. These programs use private sector partners as host trainers. The trainees often live and work with families. The study provides a systematic effort to document the value of MAST program to alumni. A systematic research effort was completed to determine this value. Results clearly show that technology exchange did take place, that the program was valuable to their professional development, and that the cross cultural experiences were invaluable in helping international trainees to better understand each other. The importance of the study is to show the value of an international agricultural experience to promote better world understanding and to document the value of the experience to government agencies which authorize the continuation of these programs.

**Building International Partnerships between Students, Land-grant Universities, and Businesses: Iowa State University Agriculture Minority Summer Research Internship Program as a Model**

*Nicole Gale
Graduate Student
Iowa State University*

*Lynn Jones
Iowa State University*

A qualitative study was conducted using interviews of selected interns who are currently attending Iowa State University and who have participated in the Agriculture Minority Summer Research Internship Program. Qualitative research will provide an in-depth view of the participants based on their opinions and perceptions of minorities. The purpose of this qualitative paper is to introduce the concept of building international partnerships among students, land-grant institutions, and businesses. Recruitment and retention of minorities in the field of agriculture is essential to increase numbers. By introducing an international component, we are then preparing minority students for opportunities in a global society.
Early intervention programs such as this one serve the need of informing underrepresented groups about the field of agriculture and the career opportunities available.

**Educating Women Farmers in Developing Countries: Problems, Constraints, and Alternative Approaches**

K. S. U. Jayaratne
Robert A. Martin
Iowa State University

Women farmers in developing countries play a significant role in production agriculture, childcare, and housekeeping. However, their educational needs have not been met by national extension systems. Critical analysis of national extension systems in developing countries shows that the problems associated with extension systems and various constraints associated with women farmers have led to this situation. The major problems associated with extension systems are male-centered policies and lack of institutional focus on women farmers’ needs. The needs of women must be addressed in order to reach women farmers in developing countries. We must accept the fact that women play a significant role in agriculture-based economies of developing countries and adopt a national policy that ensures equal opportunities for both men and women regarding resource allocation, recruitment, promotion, and programming. This policy should empower women and ensure that they have an active involvement in extension programming and the delivery process. If women farmers are actively involved in the extension education process, they will be able to direct extension programs to meet their needs and interests.

**Managing Extension Programs in Iran**

Mohammad Chizari
Tarbiat Modarres University
Tehran, Iran

James R. Lindner
Senior Research Associate
The Ohio State University

Ahmad Mohsanie

Ph.D. Candidate
Tehran University
Karaj, Iran

Perceptions of extension agents regarding programming and management practices of their managers in the Central Province of Iran were determined. Agents felt managers involved them in planning and implementing programs. However, neither agents nor managers kept farmers informed about programs and program objectives. Managers were perceived to have consideration for agents, but were less effective due to a lack of authority in personnel, budget, and fiscal matters. Study recommendations included greater involvement of farmers and managerial authority commensurate with responsibilities.

**Using an Urban Agriculture Education Programming Model to Build Partnerships in Extension**

Donn H. Russell
Iowa State University

Larry D. Trede
Iowa State University

There are many models that are used in developing and implementing extension programs around the world. This paper will explain the Model for Developing Urban Agriculture Education Programs and explore its potential use in extension planning. The model has incorporated in it building a diverse group of stakeholders (partners) to ensure that the program is representative of the desires of the community. The model is also futuristic in its application as it predicts current curriculum needs and what the curriculum needs will be in five years. This model consists of three phases: Input, Process, and Product, with built-in evaluation steps throughout the model and summative evaluation at the end of the model. The input stage emphasizes building linkages (partnerships) with individuals and groups in both the public and private sectors.
Grapecheque: A Creative Extension Program Making A Difference

Jane R. Fisher, Megan Hill, Stephen Kelly and John Whiting
Institute for Horticultural Development
Victoria, Australia

Grapecheque is an extension program that began in July 1997. It was established for winegrape growers throughout the state of Victoria, Australia. It is a state government funded program that aims to bring growers together to address common local issues. The emphasis is on best practice viticulture and developing sustainable businesses. The program is group based and uses adult learning principles.

Contracting for Extension Services: An International Perspective

William M. Rivera
University of Maryland

Willem Zijp
Principal Agricultural Services Specialist
The World Bank

The present paper previews the findings to date from the forthcoming World Bank document on Contracting for Extension Services, and examines the growing body of experience worldwide with the contracting approach to improving the financing and delivery of agricultural knowledge.

Case Study of the Ukrainian Agricultural Advisory Service

Anatoliy A. Tmanov
Ph.D. Candidate
The Pennsylvanian State University

Dr. Donald E. Evans
The Pennsylvanian State University

This study was conducted to estimate the present situation in Ukrainian agriculture regarding the agricultural advisory activity development and generalized research data for development of the appropriate model of the Ukrainian Agricultural Advisory Service. The countries of the former Soviet Union are undergoing rapid changes in their agricultural systems of producing food and fiber as they dismantle the big collective farms. Now, Russia, Ukraine, and other countries of the former Soviet Union are searching for an agricultural extension model on which to build an educational system. There are many studies devoted to the problem of agricultural consulting service development in the world. They are different in terms of the structure, management, functions, and financing sources, although they have the same goal to provide the agricultural producer with the necessary knowledge and information. Ukraine is beginning to develop its advisory network.

The Transformation of Agricultural Extension Worldwide: an Argument for Federalization, Balance of Powers and Revitalized National Extension Systems

William M. Rivera
University of Maryland

Within the next decade what has been known as agricultural extension is likely to be barely recognizable. Many of the current common problems will remain but new priorities, new media of communication, new content interests, and new clientele will increasingly occupy governments in the 21st century. A wide assortment of extension changes are already occurring (OTA 1986, Rivera & Gustafson 1990) driven by policy, the changing nature of agricultural information and technology, telecommunications, and various other forces including urbanization, world trade and globalization in general.

During the 1980s and 90s, the world gradually experienced a power shift (Mathews 1997) toward market-oriented economies. This political and institutional paradigm shift essentially called for (a) reduction of public sector services; (b) experimentation with new service delivery structures, including a growing interest in privatization; and decentralization of activities with shared responsibilities between national and local governments and also with private user companies and associations. In some countries, the shift also heralded the end, or diminishment, of both the academic study of
agricultural extension and university outreach programs for extension inservice training. The National Agricultural University La Molina in Peru (Rivera 1998) and various universities in the United States, dismantled their national extension preservice education and inservice training programs. This dismantling took place at a turning point that contributed to the end of a major phase in the history of public sector agricultural extension (Rivera 1990).

Effectiveness of Public and Private Sectors Extension: Implications for Pakistani Farmers

Dr. Munir Ahmad
University of Agriculture
Faisalabad, Pakistan

Tanvir Au
University of Agriculture
Faisalabad, Pakistan

Andrew P. Davidson
University of New England
Armidale, NSW, Australia

Worldwide, the public sector continues to provide agricultural extension services to farmers. Now, however, serious reservations are being raised about the ability of the public service to deliver these services, especially in developing countries like Pakistan, which is faced with serious financial difficulties. Consequently, the government is looking for alternative extension paradigms that are based on cost-effectiveness and clientele-oriented. To this end, the government of Pakistan seems inclined towards privatising the provision of agricultural extension services.

Six-Pronged Scheme for China’s Agro-Technical Education

James E. Diamond
Delaware Valley College - Doylestown PA

The Government of China and United Nations Development Program in December, 1997 ended a five-year project titled “Strengthening Agriculture Education in Northwest China.” The project was designed to go to grassroots units to help people strengthen agriculture, solve problems, promote rapid, steady, and balanced growth by making use of foreign funds in the hinterlands, and focusing on farmers education. Officials from the Ministry of Agriculture announced that all 365 agro-technical schools in China will implement these teaching reforms. This paper describes agro-technical schools in China and the approach used to introduce teaching reforms.

The Perceived Impact of International Training Programs on Personal and Professional Growth of Extension Participants: A Case Study

Wendy Williams
Former Graduate Student
Michigan State University

Frank Brewer, Professor
Michigan State University

Internationalization has become a larger component of life in the United States. To assist the residents of Michigan in living in this increasingly small world Michigan State University Extension has encouraged their staff to take international training programs and assignments and to use these experiences in their work/life. This study was conducted to gather information on how international programs have impacted the professional and personal lives of extension staff. Michigans Extension Staff who had attended the International Extension Training Program course by Michigan State University Extension between 1988 and 1998 were surveyed for impacts they perceived in themselves, their family; clientele, and co-workers.

Best Management Practices for Ranchers in Iran

Mohammad Chizari
Tarbiat Modarres University
Tehran, Iran

James R. Lindner
Senior Research Associate
The Ohio State University
The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of ranchers in Noorabad Township of Luristan Province of Iran of their learning needs and preferred program delivery methods. A sample of 102 ranchers were selected using a systematic sampling technique with a random entry point. Data were collected through personal interviews with each rancher. Major conclusions were that ranchers need to learn a variety of rangeland conservation and management concepts. Overgrazing, appropriate method of salting rangeland, water time, pitting, ripping and furrowing, techniques for saving water, preventing soil erosion and general deterioration of rangeland. The choice of education methods, season and location of educational programs, and recruitment methods for educational programs were also investigated in this study. The low level of literacy, migratory patterns, and significant learning needs of ranchers in the study pose a special challenge for the office of Extension and Training of the Forest and Range Organization of Iran.

Interdisciplinary Research and ‘Reversals of Learning: Learning from Field Experience in Burkina Faso

Dr. J. Lin Compton
University of Wisconsin - Madison

Dr. Hamidou Tamboura
INERA, Burkina Faso

Craig Castro, PhD Candidate
University of Wisconsin - Madison

Current approaches to agriculture research and development emphasize three key elements: employing multidisciplinary teams of scientists, farmer participation in the research process, and the nature of interaction between scientists and non-scientists to solve the real problems that farmers confront on a daily basis. The need to integrate farmer knowledge and scientist knowledge in the context of agricultural development is accepted by most analysts today and is expected to result in more sustainable forms of agriculture development. While these goals are recognized around the world as worthy of effort and concern, there is insufficient knowledge about what methods, strategies and techniques are most appropriate. This is especially true in regard to interdisciplinary approaches to such work.

Reporting Successful Small Farm Educational Programs in North Carolina: Past Present & Future

Dr. John M. OSullivan
Farm Management & Marketing Specialist
Cooperative Extension Program
North Carolina A&T State University

Small farms are very important in North Carolina. There have been dramatic changes in the numbers of small farms and in the enterprise mixes that make small farms successful.

This has posed an important challenge for Land Grant University Cooperative Extension in North Carolina. Other challenges facing Cooperative Extension are changes in the definition of small farms and developing plans to report successful results and outcomes of the educational programs offered by Cooperative Extension. Using the experience of NCA&TSU Cooperative Extension small farm program over the past twenty-five years as a model, challenges and ways of meeting those challenges are discussed.

Creativity of Low Resource Farmers in the Dominican Republic

Matt Baker, Associate Professor
Rick Rudd, Assistant Professor
Canton Pomeroy, Graduate Student
Agricultural Education and Communication
University of Florida

Creativity is an essential element in the participatory extension programming process. The purpose of this study was to examine the creative attributes of low resource farmers in the Dominican Republic. The Torrance Test for Creative Thinking (TTCT) — Form A was used to assess creative attributes. When compared to
normative data from the United States, the subjects scored low on the TTCT. Based upon raw TTCT scores, the subjects differed little based upon sex and age. It was suggested that the TTCT might be culturally bound, and that further research would be needed to verify the appropriateness of the instrument.

**Developing Market Niches for Small Farmers: Heifer Project International’s Experience with the Private Sector**

*Kathleen Earl Colverson, Program Manager Heifer Project International*

Limited resource, minority farmers contribute to agricultural production in the United States, but are often faced with more extensive obstacles than other small farmers. Many of these farmers have less education, and lack resources to participate in alternative methods of agricultural production and marketing. This project presents a successful collaboration between government, non-governmental and private organizations for working with limited resource farmers. The cooperative that has been created allows full participation by all members, and an opportunity to market agricultural products outside the traditional framework. The development model is transferable to other locations, and has been successfully utilized worldwide.

**Tapping into the Creative Potential of Limited Resource Farmers: A Theoretical Perspective**

*Matt Baker, Associate Professor
Rick Rudd, Assistant Professor
Carlton Pomeroy, Graduate Student
Agricultural Education and Communication University of Florida*

Limited resource farming in the developing world takes place in highly elaborate systems. Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) techniques are often used by extensionists to mobilize marginalized communities; strengthen relationships between communities and external institutions, and develop practical extension programs based upon authentic community needs. Creative thinking is one of the key attributes put to use by extensionists and limited resource farmers in successful PRA experiences.

The purpose of this paper was to propose a theoretical model of the creative process cycle based upon a thorough literature review. The proposed model consists of an incubation phase, a gestation phase, and an end product or problem solution phase. In addition a time dimension to creativity is presented. It is anticipated that the model will serve to advance our understanding of extension programming with limited resource farmers in a PRA context.

**Building a Global Network for Higher Agricultural Education: The Case of the Global Consortium of Higher Education and Research for Agriculture**

*David G. Acker
Director, International Agriculture Programs
Iowa State University*

This paper identifies some of the challenges facing agricultural universities worldwide, describes the Global Consortium of Higher Education and Research for Agriculture and its response to these challenges, and discusses the potential impact of this form of global networking on food security and environmental sustainability worldwide. Higher education conferences held during 1998 and 1999 in Amsterdam, Kiev, Moscow, and Panama City identified problems of agricultural universities including declining enrollments, lack of funding, inadequate engagement with clientele, curricular irrelevance, intellectual inbreeding, provincialism, and slow response time to societal shifts. In searching for creative solutions to some of these problems, global networking makes good sense. Through international, multi-university cooperation, individual universities can gather new ideas, capitalize on others strengths, can reduce costs, and avoid duplication of effort. The current landscape of institutions engaged in the improvement of higher education in agriculture is a patchwork rather than a network. The Global Consortium is designed to foster global cooperation for the improvement of higher education and research for agriculture as a prerequisite to solving the food security and environmental problems confronting world. Ultimately, solutions to global food insecurity will be scientifically and
politically based. One of the jobs of agricultural universities is to prepare the human resources to effectively work in both of these spheres. More broadly, agricultural universities, in the words of Richard Bawden (1999), ought to subscribe “to the vision of the university as a direct agency of social development.” Such a vision forms the philosophical underpinnings of the Global Consortium of Higher Education and Research for Agriculture.

**A Study of Some of the Structures and Procedures for the Funding of Community Groups in the Republic of Ireland**

*Niamh Dennehy, Housing Liaison Officer, Kerry County Council, Tralee, Co. Kerry, Ireland.*

*Dr Dermot J. Ruane & James F. Phelan*

*National University of Ireland, Dublin*

The integrated social and economic local development community goals may be more easily realised when support from local, State and private organisations is forthcoming. In this study the support structures which provide funding and other assistance, the constraints encountered by community groups and the qualifying criteria outlined by support structures in relation to financing local community group projects were examined. The support structures were local organisations, State, regional and financial institutions. Local sources of funds were the most important for initial funding, followed by State, regional and financial institutions. On-going sources of finance for community groups were derived from the reinvestment of profits from commercial activities, as well as from State, regional sources, and financial institutions. Community groups identified problems in accessing funds as delayed decision-making, late arrival of money, lack of co-ordination internally and among support structures and a negative attitude towards certain types of projects. Applications were rejected because they were not within the remit of the support structures work, or because the type of application was unsuitable. The results also showed that the support structures with different objectives had similar underlying philosophies for support. This was evident through the organisations’ stance on policy development and job creation. A systematic approach by community groups in locating and identifying suitable support structures is an important finding of this study. Researching the policies followed and the criterion used by support structures has the potential to reduce the number of problems encountered by community groups in assessing funding.

**Learning and Collaborating for Adult Literacy in the Dominican Republic**

*Alisa Phillips*

*Masters of Professional Studies Candidate*

*Agricultural Extension and Adult Education*

*Cornell University*

This paper is based on research that I conducted with an adult literacy campaign in one educational district in the Dominican Republic. The adult literacy movement promotes inter-institutional collaboration as a necessary component for advancing adult education. The purpose of this research was to gain an understanding of what stakeholders have learned through their experience of collaborating together in this campaign.

In this experience, collaborating networks and relationships are very interconnected with stakeholders learning. Collaboration is manifested through human interactions, emotional expression, volunteerism, resource sharing, and connections people make to common experiences. Learning is important for collaboration because it implies critical analysis and reflection on the past and future. Participants in this study analyzed and reflected on issues ranging from traumatic to rewarding educational experiences. Students and facilitators connect from their daily interactions and common experiences of living in their community. Facilitators, field staff, and program affiliates relate to their shared knowledge and experience working with adults. The most important lesson that can be gleaned from this experience is that all stakeholders can contribute to the development of their society; therefore, all members of civil society have to continue looking for ways to seek meaningful collaboration with each other.
Africare's Experience in Collaboration with Office National pour le Development Rural (ONDR) Extension Agents in Conducting the Baseline Study of the Ouaddai Food Security Initiative (OFSI) in Chad

Peter Nang Achuonjei
Africare Office
Republic of Chad

Mahamet Saleh Rajab
Africare Abeche

Djimadoungar Doumbaye
Africare Abeche

Adoum Djibrine
Africare Abeche

Al-Hassan Idris Outman
Africare NDjamena

Analysis of the Baseline Survey (BLS) data shows a remarkable homogeneity in health, nutrition and agricultural production data in the villages studied. The level of poverty and food insecurity seems consistently severe, as measured by stunting of children, extreme variability by year in agricultural production, and consistently-low material resources of families. The majority of villagers are subsistence farmers, relying largely on rainy season field crops (millet, sorghum, peanuts) and livestock. Labor intensive traditional agricultural techniques are the norm, along with a limited amount of manual processing of agricultural products. Most harvested products are kept for household consumption, stored in traditional clay bins susceptible to fire. In the season of scarcity, some families rely on the sale of vegetables and animals to make it through difficult times. In total, less than $800 is earned by the average family from agricultural and animal sales. It is not clear from this study the proportion of annual cash flow that this represents. Market information is generally obtained through neighbors, and is otherwise difficult to come by. The diet is simple, consisting primarily of millet or sorghum, and families often reduce the number of meals and/or the size of portions during the “hungry season” which precedes the harvest. Twenty-seven percent of the children are generally malnourished and a very large number are sick, commonly with diarrhea, fever or cough. Virtually none has had childhood vaccinations. The women have had no formal education and work long days, often caring for the family without assistance. They collect water from non-potable sources, often at great distance by donkey or on foot.

A 21st Century Challenge: Extension's Role in Economic Development of Rural Communities

Dr. Layle D. Lawrence
West Virginia University

The need for sustainability of agriculture, the environment, and other aspects of our lives is generally accepted and taken for granted. A case is made in this treatise for extension personnel to accept a leadership role in assuring sustainability of rural communities through nontraditional assistance in economic development activities. Acceptance of this challenge may, in fact, result in maintaining sustainability of extension itself. While government policies generally focus on economic development through big business and big industry, the potential for long-term economic development in rural communities lies in production type, value-added, small businesses and industries, including those in agriculture. Rationale for extension’s involvement and the role extension can play in rural community economic development is discussed. Examples of potential value-added enterprises, largely with local products with which extension personnel are familiar, are suggested.

Making Development in Agriculture Happen: What Lessons Have We Learned? What Lessons Have We Not Learned?

James E. Christiansen
Texas A&M University

Underlying all successful development programs involving, working with, collaborating with, beneficiaries of development programs, projects, is the thread of seeking out, paying attention to, and obtaining feedback from the intended and
activities.

Five conditions exist that must be recognized and considered as they affect the development process. They are: a) Social, cultural, technological, economic, and environmental issues must be linked in defining problems and solutions. b) Despite an ever-increasing mutuality among human cultures, the reality is that “way down deep” we behave differently considering the cultural context in which we move. c) A universal program strategy for development does not exist. We cannot follow a single model for development. Instead, we have to engage in strategic planning. d) Differing perceptions exist ways of making development happen. e) Introducing changes may fail and steps to minimize the consequences must be taken. Seventeen questions to minimize such consequences are presented.

At least 11 basic, proven principles of program and project management exist that result in successful development. Twenty-four factors have been identified that take place when managing successful projects or programs that are not present or are handled inadequately when managing unsuccessful projects. Having enough money to operate a program or project does not guarantee success if nonmonetary principles of development are ignored.

Applying principles of development that pay attention to the human dimension is the key. Successful development in different places, times, and under different conditions where these factors have been present show that we can make development in agriculture happen.

From Beneficiaries to Partners: Changing Traditions while Accelerating Development in Honduras

Laura Suazo-Gallardo
Roger E. Steele
Cornell University

It is not very common that small farmers living in hillside areas under poverty conditions in developing countries are invited to become local extensionists. Agricultural extension is traditionally associated with the extension of knowledge from schools, governmental institutions, or private organizations that represent a source of scientific information. However, priceless sources of local farming knowledge and local ways to extend that knowledge already exist in any community in the world. This paper describes the LUPE/CARE/NGOs extension program that included local farmers (women and men) as the main actors of such extension program in Honduras. This program was the first hillside farming and extension experience that developed from a partnership between the Secretary of Agriculture and Livestock and six nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) working in development in Honduras. LUPE/CARE/NGOs was funded primarily by USAID, while CARE in Honduras acted as the umbrella organization. This paper addresses the significance of promoting local male and male farmers as agricultural extensionists and the need of promoting a sharing environment among partnership experiences between public and private sectors.

“Not all diffusion of information needs to be through program efforts or under program auspices. Indeed, one mark of a successful program is that its sages regarding technology, incentives, and organizational structure get ed through the efforts of local people” (Uphoff, Esman & Krishna 1998,

Links for Sustainability: Partnerships in Cuba During the “Special Period”

Carolyn S. Lane
University of Minnesota

The nation of Cuba during the crisis period of the 1990s provides an intriguing case study of the importance of linkages and partnerships between government, educational, public, and private sectors, and their role in strengthening the nation’s food security. The determination of the Cuban people to maintain their national sovereignty and increase their level of self-sufficiency in food production through sustainable methods presents a valuable message and model for the world. Strengthening linkages has been a critical factor in achieving their measures of success.
Reflective Teaching Beliefs and Practices of Secondary Agricultural Educators in Papua New Guinea: Implications for Agricultural Education and Extension

Arnold C. Parapi (Ph.D.)
The University of Goroka
Papua New Guinea

Roger E. Steele (Ph.D.)
Cornell University

The authors of this paper argue that reflective practice is educationally attractive and useful for adoption in agricultural education and extension settings. The paper, drawing from literature on reflective teaching/practice and from recent inquiry conducted by Parapi (2000), advocates the need for more reflective practice. Reflection, particularly when incorporated as an integral part of the teaching process, is a valuable approach that should be used in all agricultural education and extension efforts.

The paper has five primary components. First, reflective practice is introduced. Second, the literature on reflective practice is briefly explored. Third, a summary of the Parapi (2000) study results is presented to reinforce a need for more reflective practice in agricultural education and extension settings. Fourth, the implications of reflective practice for agricultural education and extension are presented. Finally, in the concluding section of the paper, the authors discuss the significance and value of critical reflection to practice of agricultural education and extension.

A Case Study Analysis of International Cooperation Between the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture and the Pennsylvania State University

Nick T. Place
University of Florida

Donald E. Evans
The Pennsylvania State University

This study was conducted to explore and describe the mutual relationships that exist The Pennsylvania State University as an international technical assistance provider, the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture (PDA), and a mid-sized agricultural cooperative (Pennsylvania Dairy Herd Improvement Association - PA-DHIA).

The potential for domestic growth and benefit resulting from international development efforts was documented. A commitment of cooperation and collaboration has been present in achieve mutual benefit from international development programs. People in the United would be more supportive of international ventures if more emphasis was placed on benefit, or if they were aware of such advantages. Pennsylvania, as well as the United has a great deal to gain from proactive, well-designed collaborative international development programs. There is a significant amount of education necessary to help citizens understand these global concepts. Cooperative Extension should be a major national leader in this regard.

Perceptions and Assessments of Selected Topics by Lithuanian Teachers Who Participated in Agricultural Education In-service Seminars in 1999

M. Craig Edwards
Texas A&M University

William L. Thuemmel, Associate Professor
University of Massachusetts

This paper describes workshop participants and their selected perceptions of the in-service n topics presented during the 1999 professional development seminars sponsored by the Professional Partnership for Lithuanian Education (APPLE). Sources of the data teachers and administrators who were employed at high and higher (postsecondary) of agriculture in Lithuania. One-half (52%) of the participants in the two workshops agricultural subjects. A researcher-developed survey instrument elicited three categories of information from the seminar participants: (a) personal/demographic data, (b) perceptions about trends and the future for education, agricultural education, and agriculture in Lithuania, and assessments about the “importance” of and their self-perceived “ability” to perform the nine competencies.
presented in the seminars. The descriptors for the “importance” scale were “Great Importance,” ...
“1” = “No Importance.” The descriptors for the “ability” scale = “High Ability,” ...
“1” = “Negligible Ability.” Cronbach’s coefficient alpha estimates for the rating scales were .77
and .79, respectively. Two-thirds of respondents perceived that the general quality of education in Lithuania was either “somewhat” improved since 1992, and half expressed that “their life as an agricultural educator/educator” was either “somewhat” or “much improved.” The overall mean rating for all workshop topics was 3.69;
the overall mean “ability” rating for all 3.28. For the purpose of planning and designing future workshops, stakeholder needs to be reached regarding the “ideal” target audience for APPLE-sponsored agricultural education seminars.

Attitude Towards Sheep and Goat Farming in Botswana: A Survey of Agricultural Professionals, Technical Officers, and Farmers

Dr. S.K. Subair
University of Botswana
Gaborone, Botswana

A descriptive type of research was conducted to determine the attitude of Batswanas towards and goat farming in Botswana. The target population was 132 in number out of which respondents were drawn using Krejcie and Morgan formula (1970), for determining sample Validity and reliability were done. Data collected were analyzed and it was found that most Batswanas are now having favorable attitudes towards sheep and goat farming.

Perceptions of Agricultural Educators in the Former Soviet Union on the Usefulness of Selected Inservice Education Topics and Future Inservice Education Needs: a Cross-case Analysis

M. Craig Edwards
Texas A&M University

O. Donald Meaders
Michigan State University

James Brousseau
Agriculture Teacher
Milan High School, Michigan

Inservice education for agricultural educators has been a part of the on-going professional development efforts of the American Professional Partnership for Lithuanian Education (APPLE). A purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of inservice participants regarding the “usefulness” of topics presented during the APPLE-sponsored agricultural education inservice (i.e., Ag Strands) conducted during the summer of 1998, and to provide information to those responsible for planning future inservice education for teachers of agriculture in Lithuania. Sources of the data were 22 teachers and administrators in a one-week workshop at the Kaunas Higher School of Agriculture, and 14 educators in a two-week workshop at Utena (n=36). Participants were from both high and higher schools of agriculture in Lithuania. They were asked to rate the “usefulness” of inservice topics using a four-point response scale with “4” = “Very Useful,” “3” = “Somewhat Useful,” “2” = “Not Very Useful,” and “1” = “Not Useful.” Reliability coefficients for the instruments were .95 and .96. The overall mean “usefulness” ratings for all topics by workshop group were 3.52 (Kaunas) and 3.44 (Utena), or halfway between “Somewhat Useful” and “Very Useful.” If multiple Ag Strand workshops are offered in the future, a form of “triangulation” (i.e., a cross-case analysis) should be performed to collect corroborative data about participants perceptions of the “usefulness” of inservice education topics.

Perceptions of Agricultural Researchers and Extension Agents Regarding Needed Linkages in Maize Technology Development in the Ashanti Region of Ghana

Festus Annor-Frempong
University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Moses M. Zinnah
University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Alfred Osei-Owusu
University of Cape Coast, Ghana
Effective linkages between agricultural researchers and extension agents are vital for successful technology development and delivery to meet the needs of farmers. This paper presents the results of a study aimed at assessing the perceptions of agricultural researchers and extension agents regarding the importance (relevance), adequacy and needed linkage activities, and the major problems affecting linkages between researchers, extension agents and farmers.

The data for this study was obtained from 28 maize researchers and 47 randomly selected extension agents in maize technology system in Ashanti Region of Ghana using validated and pretested questionnaires. The needs assessment formula developed by Borich (1980) was applied to determine the needed activities.

The results of the study showed that the research group is endowed with highly educated research personnel specialized in different areas of maize research. However, the educational qualification of extension agents is low as compared to researchers. Significant differences existed between the perceptions of researchers and extension agents regarding the importance and adequacy of selected activities meant to forge linkages among them. The study also identified inadequate linkage activities, lack of resources, incompatible government policies, low incentives and remuneration as some of the major factors limiting closer working relationships between researchers and extension staff. Extension agents need to be involved in priority setting and planning, monitoring and review of impact of research linkage activities. Furthermore, needs assessment, program planning and priority setting, monitoring and evaluation should be given more attention. Based on the significant differences in the perceptions of researchers and extension agents regarding the importance and adequacy of linkages among them, consensus should be reached between both parties when prioritizing linkage activities in order to avoid duplication of efforts and missing linkages.

Professional Competencies of Agricultural Extension Agents in Ghana: Perceptions of Extension Agents and Their Supervisors in the Central and Northern Regions

Alfred Osei-Owusu
University of Cape Coast

Moses M. Zinnah
University of Cape Coast

Festus Annor-Frempong
University of Cape Coast, Ghana

The need to improve upon the performance of extension agents and hence agricultural productivity in Ghana is evidenced by the number of agricultural development programmes that the country has tried since its independence in 1957. In all these programmes, extension agents played a very important role of giving advice to farmers. One of the most critical drawbacks of these programmes is that the long-term desired outcome of improving agricultural productivity has not been achieved. Many studies (Bansal, 1991; Swanson, 1990) have identified incompetence of staff as a major cause of the poor performance of extension organizations in developing countries.

This study was conducted to determine the present levels of professional competencies of extension agents in the Central and Northern Regions of Ghana as evidenced by the agents themselves and their supervisors. The methods the extension agents generally use to acquire the selected agricultural extension competencies were also examined. Self administered questionnaires targeted at the agents and their supervisors were used to collect data. The questionnaires covered competencies which extension agents are expected to possess.

The results of the study showed that extension agents generally possessed a level of competency in the nine selected competency areas. Extension in the Northern Region perceived themselves as possessing higher level of competency than their counterparts in the Central Region. The agents and their supervisors in both regions were unanimous in ranking program planning and evaluation as the most important competency area in which agents...
require training. Competency in needs assessment was ranked the least important area in which agents require training. Majority of the agents indicated that they acquired their present level of competency through seminars and workshops on the job.

The study suggests, among other things, that the curricula of agricultural colleges should be regularly reviewed to reflect the current changes in agriculture. In-service training should be targeted at the specific needs of extension agents. In the Central Region emphasis should be placed on communication, program planning and evaluation, maintaining professionalism and farm record keeping. In the Northern region the focus should be on communication, maintaining professionalism and emerging issues such as environment, gender and population.

Perceptions Regarding Farmers' Motivation to Participate in Extension Programs: Implications to International Agricultural Extension Education

Awoke D. Dollisso  
Iowa State University

Robert A. Martin  
Iowa State University

The purpose of this study was to identify and analyze the perceptions of young farmers regarding their motivation to participate in Extension education programs and to draw implications for program planning in International Agricultural Extension Education. Respondents perceived that motivation to participate in educational programs was driven by both delivery and non-delivery oriented factors. Respondents were motivated by the following delivery oriented motivational factors: hands on learning, field tours, short and organized programs, group discussion, learning through trial and error and variety of teaching methods and visual aids. The respondents are also motivated by non-delivery oriented factors such as: interest in the subject matter, value of the farmer’s expertise, money or profit, special need at the time, recognition of farmer ‘s independence and ownership of the program. Overall, the participants of this study were motivated by intrinsic and extrinsic factors that are delivery oriented and non-delivery oriented.


Dr. Mary P. Andrews, Michigan State University
Dr. Donald E. Evans  
The Pennsylvania State University
Dr. Nancy E. Crago  
The Pennsylvania State University
Dr. Nick T. Place  
University of Florida

The purpose of this evaluation was to document the impact of overseas technical assignments on individuals involved, and on the organizations and communities from which they are based. Population involved in this investigated were the group of extension professionals who participated in the Polish-American Extension Project, and their county and state extension units communities/clientele. The Polish-American Extension Project (PAEP) began in 1989 and ended 995 with a primary objective of improving the structure of Polish agriculture with the goal of increasing agricultural production efficiency and improving rural quality of life (Yeutter in Bahn, The project was established as a joint educational project of the United States Department culture s Extension Service (USDA-ES) and the Polish Ministry of Agriculture and Food iv s (MAFE) Agricultural Advisory Service. Between 1990 and 1995, more than 100 Extension professionals representing 31 land grant universities traveled to Poland to work Over the period of the project, 70 Extension professionals representing 26 states served one or more six-month assignments as advisors. This group and their states/communities the population for this study.
A Formative Evaluation of Valle Grande Rural Institute in Cañete, Peru

Victor Cabrera, M.S., Professor
Valle Grande Rural Institute, Cañete, Peru

Matt Baker, Associate Professor
University of Florida

Peter E. Hildebrand, Professor
Food and Resource Economics
University of Florida

The purpose of this formative evaluation was to assess the appropriateness of recommended fertilization practices for cotton production, and to determine the feasibility of recommending grape and asparagus production to limited farmers in Perú’s Cañete Valley. This evaluation was conducted in ion with Valle Grande Rural Institute, a non-governmental extension on that has worked with limited resource farmers in Cañete for over 30 years. Production records of over 600 farmers were used to develop the cotton functions. Linear programming with data from numerous qualitative and e sources was used to determine the appropriateness of recommending asparagus production. The production function analyses revealed that ists should consult farmers on an individual basis, as opposed to the current of recommending fertilizer rates based upon geographic region within the alley. In no case should grape production be recommend to limited resource and asparagus production should be recommended to this same client group with caution.

Factors Related to the Use of Internet Among Extension Faculty of North Carolina State University

Mitchell B. Owen, Ed.D.
North Carolina State University

Richard T. Liles, Ed.D.
North Carolina State University

The Internet may be one of the most significant technological innovations to affect the contemporary educational institution; it has extensive impact on all aspects of education and all functions of institutions. The purpose of this study was to examine and describe the relationship of personal attributes, such as gender, age, formal education, tenure, computer experience, and personality; social system factors, such as job responsibility and community size; and intervening factors, such as access, learning approach, computer support, supervisory support, and reward system to the adoption and use of the Internet by educators working for North Carolina Cooperative Extension.

Based on the statistical analysis of the data collected and the testing of the thirteen hypotheses that guided this research, the following conclusions were drawn. Members of the field faculty who are female, older, from rural communities, have less graduate education, and more experience in their work are less likely to use Internet. Those with greater computer experience and access to technology are more likely to use Internet. Field faculty who participate in self-directed learning approaches and who rely on local educators or staffs for their primary computer support for using Internet are less likely to use the Internet. Personality was also found to be related to use of Internet. Job responsibility, encouragement by supervisors and the reward system were not found to be related to Internet use.

Building Partnerships: The Diffusion of Distance Education at the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture

Kim E. Dooley
Texas A&M University

A partnership was formed between The Texas A&M University System (TAMUS) and the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) in April 1997 to develop a videoconferencing network at IICA headquarters in San José, Costa Rica. The vision of this partnership was to improve access to information/expertise and to support training and agribusiness development within public and private institutions in the 34 member countries. The Distance Training Center (Centro de Capacitación a Distancia en Costa Rica - CECADI) was inaugurated in October 1998.
With the diffusion of any new innovation, it takes time and strategic planning. Has the vision of this partnership been realized? What are the barriers to the diffusion of distance education as an innovation? What are some of the successes and accomplishments of this endeavor? Who are the change agents and innovators in the process? This evaluative study reviews IICA’s diffusion of distance education as an innovation, based upon interviews and documents of IICA personnel. Recommendations for bridging the existing diffusion gap to promote the further adoption of distance education as an innovation will be shared.

Institutional Structures for Partnership, Participation and Empowerment in Agricultural and Rural Development

Gustav H. Düvel, Professor and Director
South African Institute for Agricultural Extension
University of Pretoria

In promoting development which is consistent with the widely accepted principles of helping self-help, self-determination, empowerment, etc. the question of institutional structures facilitate this, becomes relevant. With this in mind an organizational framework is which provides for an institutional linkage between the rural community and the development agent(s).

Essential aspects of this organizational model are that the community or sub-communities (e.g. farmers associations) are represented in a single mouthpiece functioning as overarching umbrella organization taking responsibility for development, initiating and programs and development actions and co-ordinating them. Subordinate to the single co-ordinating body, are the various program committees with a predominantly function. They are commissioned by the central council to plan and carry out, with the assistance of a development agent. identified development priorities.

The implementation of this model, designed for both commercial and subsistence farming requires adaptations to situation-specific circumstances, especially in terms of the to be found between a practical ward size and the number of sub-communities that can be effectively consolidated into a cohesive community coinciding with it. Other aspects degree to which existing institutions can be used, the direction of institution the nature of community representation and participation.

A Coming of Age: Revisiting AIAEE Scholarship

Dr. Larry E. Miller, Professor
The Ohio State University

Dr. Lorilee Sandman
Michigan State University

Is AIAEE “coming of age”? Is it reaching a stage of maturity, after 16 years, such that a core of knowledge is evolving in the discipline or is it still a conglomerate of disparate studies conducted in varied countries, much like “trivial pursuit”, without thematic themes? If we attempt to develop partnerships with the private sector, then can we develop a vocabulary that transcends “researchese” and constitutes the new forms of scholarship?

Internet Course Ware Applications to a Study Abroad Experience

Randall J. Andreasen
Southwest Missouri State University

Study abroad programs are increasing in interest, scope, and appeal. Of growing concern is the educational nature of these programs. Increasing public awareness of and access to these academic programs pays big dividends. It was with this in mind that the idea of developing an Internet supported course took shape. Prospective study abroad participants are able vicariously sojourn with current study abroad participants perhaps sparking some future interest in international activity participation. This project sought to determine the feasibility and usefulness of web-based applications to a study abroad program. Included throughout this paper are comments taken from the on-line student learning journals.
Partnership Experiences by the University of Swaziland: Implications for Globalization Efforts

Barnabas M. Diamini, Professor  
Chye-Hean Teoh, Senior Lecturer  
University of Swaziland

The partnership experiences by the University of Swaziland with other institutions and/or agencies at the international, regional and national levels during the past twenty years have provided some very useful lessons and guidelines to the university to face the challenges in this new millennium. Public and private sectors and civic society are crucial to the university not only to attain its mission to develop common visions, goals and objectives, shared responsibility and accountability but more important, to sustain its dynamism to improve the quality of academic excellence and professional development. The findings of this paper recognize the need to establish linkages between the university and relevant institutions at various levels to pursue its globalization efforts to gain recognition and credibility. The implications of these partnerships ensure the sustained ability of development of the university's human resources, physical facilities and conducive environment for the continued improvements of the quality of teaching-training and research agenda.

Are Constraints Limiting Extension Effectiveness Similar or Different in Various Regions of the World?: A Review and Synthesis of Four Studies

Rama B. Radhakrishna, Specialist  
Program Evaluation and Staff Development  
Clemson University Cooperative Extension Service

Four studies were examined to identify constraints that limit effectiveness of extension in three countries--Bangladesh, India and Nigeria. In addition, whether or not the constraints are similar or different were also determined. Comparisons were possible because all the four studies used the same instrument. Respondents included field-based extension workers and national level extension administrators. Review of these studies revealed nine constraints that limit extension effectiveness. The nine constraints were: technology, linkage, mobility, equipment, teaching aids, extension training, technical training, organization, and coordination. Both similarities and differences were found relative to the nine constraints when examined by level of respondents and geographic location. Findings indicated that equipment--lack of essential teaching and communication equipment as a major constraint regardless of geographic location or level of respondents. On the other hand, mobility--lack of transportation was identified as a major constraint by Indian extension personnel than Bangladesh and Nigerian extension personnel. Based on the findings, implications were discussed and recommendations offered for further study.
CALL FOR PAPERS
15th European Seminar on Extension Education (ESEE)

August 27th through 31st, 2001
Wageningen, the Netherlands

Submission Deadline: December 31, 2000

The ESEE is a biennial event that is organised in rotation by European centres for training and research in the field of purposeful communication for agricultural and rural development. After the successful meet in Krakow in 1999, the Chair Group Communication and Innovation Studies of Wageningen University, the Netherlands, will co-ordinate the one in 2001.

The Chairperson of the 15th ESEE is:

Prof. Dr Cees van Woerkum, Chair Group CIS
Hollandseweg 1, 6706 KN Wageningen
The Netherlands.
Tel.: + 31 (0)317 484310
Fax : + 31 (0)317 484791
e-mail: cees.vanwoerkum@alg.vlk.wau.nl

Themes of the 15th ESEE

‘Extension Education’ harks back to the early seventies, when the event was organised for the first time in Finland. At that time, the ESEE comprised a relatively small group of Western European centres involved in research and especially training to support the activities of public sector agricultural extension workers who were employed in their hundreds by ministries of agriculture and by farmers’ organisations.

Today, we are facing a different situation. In the first place, Eastern European countries have joined the ESEE. They are preoccupied with transforming their erstwhile collective agricultures. In the second place, in Southern Europe, the crunch is on to change age-old forms of livelihood farming into competitive commercial agriculture, a process which leads to very rapid change in rural populations, community viability, and landscape management. In the third place, the concerns of West European countries have moved on. The armies of public extension workers have gone, or have been privatised or commercialised. The agricultures in those countries are struggling to establish a new contract with society in which the emphasis shifts from efficient production of agricultural commodities to the multifunctional use of green space.

For all of us, the outlook has changed. Where we were first pre-occupied with controlling nature, and then with overcoming scarcity, we are now facing the sobering fact that the future is a human artefact: humans have become a major force of nature, and maintaining the conditions for (human) life is a question of purposeful collective action at the farm, community, regional, national and global levels. Purposeful communication no longer only serves to transfer technology, ensure compliance with policies, or reduce transaction costs, but also to foster interaction, negotiation and collective action to deal with predicaments we have created ourselves.

These predicaments include food safety and loss of consumer confidence; loss of bio-diversity and genetic resources; reduced resilience in the face of ‘surprises’; reduced access to safe drinking water; problems of trade-off among productivity, equity, sustainability and stability; contested land use; loss of viability of rural communities; and increasing domination of life science companies and food industries of agricultural production and food. These and other issues pose severe challenges for researchers, educators...
and facilitators involved in agricultural and rural development.

In the light of these considerations, we propose that the 15th ESEE will have one central main theme and a number of related issues:

**Main theme:**

*Integrating multiple land uses for a sustainable future, with such questions as:*

- How can horizontal and vertical integration result in a sustainable future?
- What do these developments mean for the relationship between agriculture and society?
- How should research, education and professional facilitation be organised to be effective?
- Which technologies (ICT, GIS) and methodologies can stimulate integration?

**Related issues**

(as proposed by us, please make your own additional suggestions):

- Comparison of experiences with emerging advisory services in transitional economies;
- Survival strategies for small-scale family farming;
- Participatory methods, including new facilitation methods, such as future search;
- Curriculum development for training advisors;
- The role of ICT in development;
- Facilitation of biological agriculture;
- Privatisation or commercialisation of agricultural advice;
- Your own choice: please suggest

**Call for Papers**

We invite all those who are interested in presenting a paper, video, poster, practical idea, or debate during the 15th ESEE to submit an abstract of not more than 750 words (2 pages) by December 31, 2000. The abstracts received by that time will be collated in the seminar proceedings (no second volume of proceedings is envisaged). Please indicate in which theme/issue you would like to present your paper. If you have ideas for other themes/issues, please tell us about them.
15th European Seminar on Extension Education (ESEE)

August 27th through 31st, 2001
Wageningen, the Netherlands

Preliminary seminar information

It is anticipated that the costs of the 15th ESEE, including fees, board and lodging, and excursion, will be about Euro 600. You can help us a great deal by early registration using the form below.

Please fill and mail or fax to:

Josje Weijters
Chair group CIS
Hollandseweg 1
6706 KN Wageningen
The Netherlands
Tel.: + 31 (0)317 484310
Fax: + 31 (0)317 484791

Those who receive this call for papers on e-mail can fill electronically to:
Josje.weijters@alg.vlk.wag-ur.nl

Participation in 15th ESEE

Family name: ____________________________
Given name: ____________________________
Institution (if any): ______________________
Street and number: ______________________
Postal code and Town: ____________________
Country: _________________________________
Phone: _________________________________
E-mail: _________________________________
I suggest additional topic: __________________
I plan to present a paper on the following subject: __________________