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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to articulate a post-positivist philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. A multi-faceted, qualitative approach was used in this research. The study was phenomenological, in that it was an attempt to describe, in the postmodern spirit, the essence of international agricultural and extension education. In so doing, it was hoped that the statement of philosophy generated by this research would be both evolutionary and non-exclusionary as regards social divisions such as race, class, and gender. For this study, philosophy was defined as the set of rules and/or laws a person or group uses to make meaning of the world he/she/it lives in. Post-positivism was defined as the belief that the current methods of social research, which are based on positivistic assumptions, are inadequate in the describing human complexities and that new ways of generating knowledge in the social and human sciences are required.

The method used for developing this philosophy combined historical research, philosophical analysis, dialogical interviewing, and hermeneutic interpretation. A central part of this research was the analysis of a series of in-depth interviews with members of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education or AIAEE.

Background

This study was seated within what is popularly referred to as a paradigm shift. The original idea of paradigms and paradigm shifts was introduced by Thomas Kuhn in his 1962 book, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. In that work he explained that a paradigm must have the following two characteristics: first, it must be unprecedented enough so as to attract an enduring group of adherents away from any competing modes of activity and second, it must be open-ended enough to leave all sorts of problems for the redefined group of practitioners to resolve (p. 3). Kuhn went on to explain that transformations of paradigms, or paradigm shifts, were "revolutions" and that "the successive
transition from one paradigm to another via revolution is the usual developmental pattern of mature science" (p. 12).

In recent years, such paradigm shifts have been taking place in education, (van Manen, 1990; Stanage, 1987; Usher and Bryant, 1989; Lather, 1991, Oliver, 1992); in sociology (Wilson, 1970; Douglas, 1970; Smith, 1987; Reuther, 1992); and in agriculture (Rodale, 1948; Berry, 1976; Jackson, 1980; USDA, 1989). The paradigm shift taking place in education and educational sociology can be traced back to the works of John Dewey (1913, 1916, 1920, 1934) and the social reconstructionists, beginning with Harold Rugg in the 1930s (McNeil, 1990; Stanley, 1992). It continues today with the work of scholars like Freire (1970), Gramsci (1971), Giroux (1983, 1988), and Lather (1986, 1991). The paradigm shift taking place in agriculture began with the early movement of the "organic agriculturalists" (Bailey, 1911; King, 1919; Howard, 1947; Rodale, 1949) which recently became mainstreamed into what is known as the "sustainable agriculture" movement.

Much of the criticism of the old paradigms used in both educational sociology and in the agricultural sciences is based on the larger paradigm shift that is taking place in the sciences following advancements made in quantum physics (Capra, 1985; Hayward, 1987; Wilbur, 1986). These changes documented the shift away from an atomistic, Newtonian concept of the physical universe towards the quantum/process view which followed Einstein's work on Relativity Theory.

The implications of that work, which took several decades to filter down into the social sciences, have had a profound effect on both how we see cultures and how we do our work as educators. This is to say that education is also undergoing a shift in paradigm which is moving it away from the strict, presumably value-free, positivistic/reductionistic mode of research towards one that is more humanistic; one which accepts the reality that positivistic, quantitative research is often inadequate in describing human behaviors.

As they make this shift from the positivist to the post-positivist paradigm, many researchers are questioning whether or not the traditional educational research methods and philosophies are appropriate for studying the attitudes and opinions of non-western
cultures and of women and minorities (Giroux 1988, Apple 1982, Smith 1987, Lather 1991, Stanley 1992). Alternative methodologies are being suggested which may offer appropriate alternatives for research in international agricultural and extension education.

The Problem

The difficulties which developing nations face today are enormous. These include issues which divide humans such as class, race, and gender; others concerning cultural displacement; and still others concerning the ethics of agricultural and industrial modernization. Development researchers like Todaro (1985, 1989), for example, have suggested that solving these problems might entail measures as drastic as restructuring a developing country's governmental and economic agencies or changing the attitudes of the local people. Questions then arise such as "What are the ethics of development?" and "How can these kinds of changes be initiated as effectively and efficiently as possible"?

The academic field of study known as agricultural and extension education has both a body of knowledge and documented history of research which can provide valuable tools and services in answering such questions. This discipline, however, grew up in a philosophically conservative time and with a fairly homogeneous clientele. As such, it is reasonable to ask, "Is the philosophy of agricultural and extension education appropriate to use in international development?." And if it isn't, "What would such a philosophy be?" There is however, no comprehensive study in existence today that one could turn to answer such questions. The problem which this study sought to shed light on then, was "What does a post-positivist philosophy of international agricultural and extension education look like?"

Purpose And Objectives

The purpose of this study was to articulate a post-positivist philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. To accomplish this purpose, the following objectives were set:
1. To locate agricultural education, as practiced in the United States, both historically and philosophically.

2. To make an in-depth study of the past and present philosophies of education and educational sociology, as deemed germane to international agricultural and extension education.

3. To solicit and analyze the philosophical views and opinions of practitioners of international agricultural and extension education as expressed by members of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education.

4. To synthesize the above information and produce a new, post-positivist statement of philosophy for international agricultural and extension education.

This study was based on two assumptions. The first was that it is necessary for a field of study like international agricultural and extension education to have a working philosophy upon which or around which members of this field can discuss essential issues, such as "what is the meaning of development?" and "what is the value of education in the international development setting?" The second was that the positivistic and reductionistic paradigm, as it has been developed and used in the applied agricultural sciences (see below, p. 11), needs to be supplemented with a qualitative, post-positivist paradigm in order to answer questions of a social or philosophic nature.

**Need For The Study**

In recent years, major political and economic changes have reshaped our world in ways that would have been difficult to imagine just five years ago. The ending of the Cold War and the subsequent crumbling of the Iron Curtain, along with the recent signing of the Israeli-Palestinian Peace accord, offer hope to a world torn by fear and paranoia for over forty years. Yet with all of this hope, the fate of the world’s poor has not improved much (Mutfwang and Foster, 1992). A lot of research and development work has been done by governmental and non-governmental agencies to change this situation (Kartinsky, 1990; Acker, Marley and Bunderson 1992). In carrying out this work, it has become clear that agricultural and extension education can make a significant contribution
to the improvement of the lives of poor people in the developing countries (Raman, 1992).

Agricultural and extension education has, in recent years, sought to meet this challenge by expanding its focus from one whose traditional role was to train vocational agriculture teachers and extension agents in the United States to one which is now developing the leaders for a whole new territory, the developing countries of the world (Hoffmann 1992; Kitinoja and Miller 1992).

To many people, however, the importance of agricultural and extension education is poorly understood. For example, the Association for Agricultural and Extension Education (AIAEE), in a recent pamphlet entitled "Common Denominator" (1992) wrote:

One way to bolster agricultural production is by developing educational systems geared toward people within the agricultural sector... However, in some cases, the importance of agricultural and extension education is still poorly understood and is frequently given low priority.

One reason for this lack of understanding is that often the practitioners of agricultural and extension education do not themselves understand the philosophical assumptions upon which their discipline is based. More importantly, the question arises as to whether the philosophical assumptions upon which agricultural and extension education has traditionally rested are appropriate in an international setting (Woog 1991; Campbell and Martin 1992).

According to Williams (1991) agricultural and extension education is grounded in the foundational disciplines of the biological and the physical sciences and the human sciences of psychology and sociology. These in turn, rest on certain epistemological and ontological principles and assumptions. The basic philosophical principle underlying the hard sciences is positivism, while the human sciences are struggling with a post-positivistic (or postmodern) revolution (Borg and Gall, 1989:18-25).

Many of the issues brought up by the post-positivists are relevant to the practice of international agricultural and extension education. This is particularly true in the developing countries, where so many of the issues have to do with women's rights and the problems of the economically and politically oppressed (Mullei, 1991; Lauderdale 1992).
How one approaches these kinds of problems depends on how one sees the world, that is, upon one's philosophy. What, then, are the historical and philosophical roots of agricultural education? And what is the philosophy of the men and women who practice international agricultural and extension education today? Do they differ according to things such as gender or place of origin? Do they include notions regarding gender and economic marginalization? Is there a consensus among these practitioners, which would allow us to say definitively, that the philosophy of international agricultural and extension education is "such and such"? These are the kinds of questions upon which this study focused upon.

**Educational Significance**

This study was educationally significant in several ways. First, it offered a qualitative research model for education, set in the post-positivist paradigm. In so doing it legitimized historic research, hermeneutic analysis, and phenomenological interpretation. It also acknowledged diversity and reflected human "opinion," both of the researcher and of the research participants, as an important part of educational research. Second, this study offered a philosophy for vocational education in general, which was appropriate at the international level. Finally, it added depth to Williams' (1991) model of agricultural education by building a philosophical foundation upon which that model can better rest.

**Operational Definitions**

1. Development - Development is the process by which a poorer nation raises the standard of living of its people by contributing to their health and education, their self-esteem and their opportunity to make choices (Todaro, 1989).
2. Paradigm - A paradigm is an outstandingly clear phenomena or process: an archetype.
3. Phenomenology - Phenomenology is a philosophical school of thought which claims that one can only "know" the "essence" of an object; one can never really know the object itself. For phenomenologists, understanding rests in the
experiencing of these essences. Phenomenologists attempt to see things from the subjects’ point of view and therefore try to retain the subject’s own words.

4. Post-positivism - Post-positivism is the epistemological belief that the current methods of research in the human sciences are obsolete and that new ways of generating knowledge are required (in Lather, 1986a). Lather (1986b) also wrote that post-positivism is a critique of the inadequacies of positivist assumptions in the face of the complexities of the human experience.

5. Radical education - This theory, following Bowles’ and Gintis’ (1976) correspondence theory and Gramsci’s (1973) ideas about political hegemony, claimed that public schools were agencies of the dominant culture and that they reinforced existing forms of domination.

6. Critical theory - Critical theory refutes the positivists' claims to knowledge of objective truth and of universal laws regarding education and the social sciences (Lather 1991, Usher and Bryant 1989). It points out, instead, that observation is both theory-laden and socially constructed, and is, as such, problematic.

7. Postmodernism - This is a philosophy which argues that the dualisms which dominate Western thought are inadequate for understanding a world of multiple causes and effects which interact in complex and non-linear ways. It is, in other words, a way of recognizing multiple voices and multiple realities.

8. Poststructuralism - Poststructuralism is a philosophy which refutes the positivists’ use of metatheories and metastructures, e.g., capitalism, the "Enlightenment" as a way of describing human behavior. It argues that the opposition between human agencies, i.e., action and empowerment, and social structures is part of a larger ideology that attempts to limit our knowledge of the inter-dependence between the agencies and the structures themselves (Whitson and Stanley 1988).

9. Deconstruction - Deconstruction is a process by which metatheories and other 'texts' are broken down into their constituent parts in an attempt to understand their underlying philosophy. Deconstruction theory was related to works in

10. Hermeneutics - Hermeneutics is concerned with the elucidation of rules for the interpretation of texts, including human institutions, discourse and actions. Gadamer (1979) defined hermeneutics as "letting what seems to be far and alienated speak again."

11. Reconstructionism - Reconstructionists believe that we live in an economically biased community and that the public schools should be used "to help reconstruct society in such a way as to resolve our social and cultural crises" (Stanley 1992:21).

12. Feminist theory - Feminist theorists' argue that the language and politics of institutions such education have a built-in bias against women and minorities and that this bias discredits these people's life experiences. Feminist theorists advocate a philosophy built upon plurality and multiplicity. They also claim that the researcher must be included in the research. Finally, they advocate the use of research in improving the lives of those researched.

13. Agricultural Education, agricultural education, extension education, and agricultural development. These terms have been used somewhat interchangeably in this thesis. While this was the author's intent, it should be noted that to many practitioners, these each have separate meanings. Generally speaking, Agricultural Education is a field of study dedicated to the training of high school vocational agricultural teachers and, more recently, extension workers. It does so by combining teaching and learning methods with knowledge and experience in farming and agriculturally related enterprises. Training in Agricultural Education has to a large extent, been mandated by federal legislation following the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917.

Agricultural education, on the other hand, is a general concept which includes education in any of the various fields of study that would be included in a typical College of Agriculture, e.g., agronomy, entomology, animal nutrition, etc.
The early writers on agricultural education predated the distinction between agricultural education and Agricultural Education. In recent years there seems to be confusion and animosity between these two areas of study. Agricultural Educators have expressed concern as to the quality of education in the agricultural classes. Agricultrualists have wondered as to the value of the whole field of Agricultural Education.

Extensionists have generally come out of the ranks of the agriculturalists and agricultural scientists. They tended to be specialists in specific areas of agriculture, i.e., soil scientists, seed specialists, home economists, etc. One of the critiques made by Agricultural Educators is that such specialists were never trained as communicators, as educators are, and as such, were not able to evolve with the agricultural times. Today, this argument goes, when farmers are both well educated and well informed, extension is about communications and networking more than it is about specialization. The Agricultural Education discipline is working to get more people trained in education and communications working as extension education.

Finally, there is the fairly new area of study which could be called international agricultural development education. This is the real subject of this study. A majority of the people on the planet are still rural and live by subsistence agriculture. Historically, the agricultural development field of study has failed to help create better lives for these people. The author of this study believes that a) education is the key to development and b) that development specialists need to be trained as educators and communicators as well as specific disciplinary specialists if international development is to be successful.

Following these designations, this study tended to use the above mentioned phrases interchangeable except in cases where one or another were specifically called for. In addition, in the interview section, Chapter IV, an effort was made to use the words as they were used by the participants.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to articulate a post-positivist philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. In order for this to happen, it was necessary to develop a clear understanding of two different areas of study. The first was the history of agricultural and extension education, as it developed in the United States. The second was the history and present status of the philosophy of education, as it related to international agricultural and extension education.

Agricultural education in the United States has had a long and honored history; one which helped America become one of the great bread baskets of the world, and helped rural people play an important role in the development of this country. As a field of study, agricultural education began as a way of teaching vocational agriculture and rural development. Starting from John Dewey's aphorism about "learning by doing," it developed a flexible philosophy which has been able to change over the years to meet the demands of various stake-holders, e.g., the farmers, the extension service, the government funding agencies, etc. This philosophy was pragmatic and experiential in nature and was based on the hypothetical-deductive, scientific research paradigm and the Protestant "work ethic." It was, fundamentally, about human resource development.

The philosophy of agricultural education is also political because, as Dewey and so many others have pointed out, education is by nature political. In reading of the history and philosophy of agricultural education, its political nature is not however, apparent, except for a consistent mentioning of "democracy." But the meaning of this concept is never clearly spelled out. So the question arises, "Democracy for whom?" This question and others like it are of a philosophical nature and are of great importance for agricultural and extension educators as they reach out to be of service in other parts of the world.
What Is Philosophy?

Because this is a study of philosophy, it is necessary to explain what the term means. Traditionally, philosophy could be described as "the love of wisdom" (Stanage 1987). But what is wisdom? Western philosophy, since the time of the early Greeks, has defined wisdom as knowledge that is situated in the four virtues, that is, in justice, prudence, courage, and self-moderation. The next question is, What is knowledge? Concerning this, Stanage (p. 28) wrote "[Dewey and Plato] begin by describing knowledge as a person's perceptions of the everyday world." Stanage explained that knowledge (maybe knowing is more precise) is the process of continually examining, through discourse with one's self (contemplation) and with others, one's perceptions of the world, then making judgements about those perceptions and, in so doing, defining one's world. So having a philosophy has come to mean having a set of rules by which one judges the validity of one's perception of the everyday world. In other words, philosophy is an examination of "the meaning of life."

In more recent times, post-positivist philosophers have demanded that philosophy examine "the meaning of life" in four specific areas. They are: first, cosmology, or how the universe came to be; second, ontology, or the nature of being; third, epistemology, or the nature of knowledge itself, and fourth, axiology, or ethics.

Also, according to Mitchum and Mackey (1983), there are two kinds of questions to ask when inquiring into the nature of the world. First order questions have to do with the material world, e.g., "what would be the best material or technique to use to produce a certain product?" Second order questions have to do with understanding the meaning of the non-material world, e.g., "how will using a new technology effect a given culture?" Philosophical question are of the second order in that they are "why" questions that are trying to find meaning in life. In addition, Mitchum and Mackey (p. 1) explained that "philosophical problems depend in some important respect not upon empirical information but upon reason and understanding."
Philosophy then is about the rules (or laws) used to make sense out of the everyday world. These rules and laws however, also need to be grounded somewhere. In classical Western philosophy, epistemologically, knowledge (of one’s reality) lies somewhere along a continuum which ranges from an idealist’s view of the world to that of the realist. Idealists, following the works of Plato, believe that there is no external reality apart from our knowledge or consciousness of it. Thus, they believe that the real world is made of ideas, essences and archetypes. It requires, in other words, a "mind." Realists, following Aquinas, believe that material things exist independently of being perceived and claim that only that which can be grasped with the five senses is real (Edward, 1967). As such the categorically deny the existence of "mind." There are many schools of thought which belong both within and between these two, such as empiricism, pragmatism, rationalism, and existentialism.

In the modern Western world, a realist philosophy, championed by Bertrand Russell and the Logical Empiricists, has prevailed since the early part of the twentieth century. This period can be described philosophically as positivistic, reductionistic, and empirical. It was a world in which the validity of judgements and conclusions concerning the nature of reality depended on their so-called objectivity and rationality. In recent times, this notion of validity is being challenged, as post-positivist philosophers seek to ground validity in the experience of the individual within his or her community.

An assumption that this study was based on was that the philosophy of traditional agricultural education is grounded in realism and that it offers an empirical and pragmatic view of the world. It is further assumed that for a philosophy to be able to address the multiplicities and complexities of today’s global society, particularly where it concerns development in Third World countries, it will have to adopt new post-positivist elements that can better handle such diversity.
Agricultural Education

Agricultural Education: A Historical Perspective

Introduction  Agricultural education is an old and well established area of study in the United States. Soretire (1968) mentioned the Philadelphia Society for Promoting Agriculture, founded in 1780, as being one of the first organizations in the United States designed to deal with agricultural education. According to Johnstone (1854:16), we owe much of our early ideas about agricultural practices and agricultural education to the British. He wrote,

One of the first efforts made to arouse the minds of farmers of this country...was that of the...men who organized the New York State Agricultural Society in 1835. Those men had observed the good effects of the Royal Agricultural Society of England and resolved to awaken in their own State and country a spirit of inquiry similar to that which had been aroused by their English prototype.

Not long after Johnstone's writing, citizens and politicians throughout the United States joined forces to further advance the lives of farmers and rural people with the creation of the land-grant college system, enacted by the Morrill Act of 1865. Of this, Kandel (no date), wrote the following for the Carnegie Foundation:

...the major thrust of Morrill's arguments in 1857 and 1862 was to deplore the decline of American agriculture due to a lack of scientific knowledge. [Morrill] said, "...that this bill would lift up the intellectual and moral standard of the young and industrial classes of our country" (quoted in Morel and Goldenstein, 1985:117).

In addition to giving the reason the U.S. needed such schools, Morrill claimed that it was wrong to call the proposed colleges "agricultural colleges" since he was interested in a broad education (Morel and Goldenstein, 1985:117). One can see, when reading this statement, that philosophical debates were already taking place over just what the role of education should be. Moreland and Goldenstein (1985:120) continued "this vagueness must have been widely shared by educators [as there was] great debate whether their chief purpose was to provide vocational education only or a liberal education combined with some vocational applications."
Soretire (1968:2) stated that the original plan of the land-grant colleges was to have the farm students attend the colleges. This however, did not work as well as expected so other programs were developed. The first of these was the establishment of the agricultural experiment stations by the Hatch Act of 1887. The second was the creation of the state extension services by the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. The third was the creation of vocational agriculture programs for the high schools, which were eventually funded through the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917.

Developing the high school programs was a problem. Soretire (1968:3) wrote that the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, formed in 1906, was instrumental in stimulating states to pass state vocational training acts. The philosophy of this and similar societies was to create "incentive aid" which encouraged local school boards to establish vocational education programs while maintaining local control.

President Theodore Roosevelt addressed this problem in 1907, stating that

We of the United States must develop a system under which each citizen shall be trained so as to be effective individually as an economic unit and fit to be organized with his fellows so that he and they can work in efficient fashion together (from True, 1929:359, quoted in Soretire 1969:18).

It is clear in this statement that Roosevelt saw vocational education as both an economic necessity and as a socializing process.

Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 The culmination of the actions by these different organizations and state agencies was the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. The purposes of this act were:

* to provide for the promotion of vocational education;
* to provide for cooperation with the state in the promotion of such education in agriculture and the trade and industries;
* to provide for cooperation with the state in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and
* to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure (U.S. Congress. 64th, 1st. session, quoted in Kahler 1967:1).
Also, according to Section 10 of the Smith-Hughes Act, the main purpose of such an education was to make young people fit for employment on the farm or in the farm home. The Bill also stated that the school needed to provide directed or supervised practice in agriculture (from Leising, 1976:2).

The Smith-Hughes Act allocated federal funds to the different states for the purpose of agricultural education. These funds were to be matched by state and local funds. The money was to be used for the training and salaries of teachers, supervisors and directors of agriculture, home economics, agricultural economics and industrial subjects. The Act also provided for a "Federal Board for Vocational Education." The funds were not to be spent on buildings or equipment (Soretire, 1968:21-23). To receive these monies, the state had to submit a plan detailing how they would spend it.

As mentioned above, the Act of 1917 required supervised agricultural experience. This was certainly not a new idea. Rousseau and Pestalozzi had advocated supervised educational practice in Europe as early as the 18th century (Leising, 1976). More recently, this practice has been discussed by Frobel, Dewey, Warmbod, Lamar and others (ibid).

Not all educators however, agreed that vocational agriculture education was a good use of money. Leising (1976:4-5) mentioned several of these. For example, Lamar (1971:164) questioned whether supervised practice was still appropriate in the changing world of work. And Johnson (1968:15) discussed the legal aspects of vocational agriculture with regard to the legal obligations of the federal acts of 1917 and 1963. Kahler (1967:4-8) cited several other examples between 1917 and the passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, where there was both public and political unrest regarding the value of vocational agricultural education.

Magill (1977:7) summarized the history of vocational agriculture studies by stating that the national program objectives published in 1931, 1940, and 1955 gave the primary purpose of vocational education in agriculture between the years 1917 and 1963 as being "to train present and prospective farmers for proficiency in agriculture."
National Vocational Education Act of 1963

The National Vocational Education Act, passed in 1963, broadened the scope of the original Smith-Hughes Act and its supplements by adding flexibility, providing for career counselling and employment training, expanding the age-groups covered and providing for the needs of people with special educational handicaps (Schmitt 1977). The objectives of this new Act were:

1. To develop agricultural competencies needed by individuals engaged in or preparing to engage in production agriculture.
2. To develop agricultural competencies needed by individuals engaged in or preparing to engage in agricultural occupations other than production agriculture.
3. To develop an understanding of and appreciation for career opportunities in agriculture and the preparation needed to enter and progress in agricultural occupations.
4. To develop the ability to secure satisfactory placement and to advance in an agricultural occupation through a program of continuing education.
5. To develop those abilities in human relations which are essential in agricultural occupations.
6. To develop the abilities needed to exercise and follow effective leadership in fulfilling occupational, social, and civic responsibilities.

According to Schmitt (1977:3), all of the vocational education acts, from Morrill's initial act through to the 1976 Amendment to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, reflected the fact that Congressmen were being pressured by their constituents to provide better educational training. Congress therefore, provided monies to motivate the schools to change in the desired direction.

Although one can glean an approximation as to the philosophical ideas which underlie the kinds of legislation discussed above, it is difficult to get a precise sense of what that philosophy was. The role that the Federal Government played seems to have been one of providing money for the training of farmers and farm wives in practical skills and for training teachers in agricultural and home economics education. Little mention was made of socializing skills until the later Acts. To gain a deeper understanding of exactly what the philosophy of agricultural education was during those times, writings of
a different sort must be examined, specifically, writings by people involved directly, as educators, with agricultural education.

**Agricultural Education: A Philosophical Perspective**

**An Early Philosophy of Agricultural Education** At its onset, agricultural education was part of a broad-based approach to rural education. The idea of making rural improvement a national issue was brought before President Roosevelt in 1906. As a result, the Country Life Commission was appointed in August, 1908. The Commission listed several factors that negatively affected rural families. Chief among them was the need for education. The Commission wrote,

> Everywhere there is a demand that education have relation to living, that the schools should express the daily life, and that in the rural districts they should educate by means of agriculture and country life subjects. It is recognized that all difficulties resolve themselves in the end into a question of education (Senate document #705, 1909, quoted in Bailey, J.C., 1948).

So, as early as 1906, the importance of relevant education was being discussed as was the idea rural life development. For example, L.H. Bailey (1909:3) began his book *The Training of Farmers* with the lines "The so-called rural problem is one of the great public questions of the day. It is the problem of how to develop a rural civilization that is permanently satisfying and worthy of the best desires." And in the preface to Nolan’s *The Teaching of Agriculture* (1918:viii), Davenport wrote "That measure [success] is found in the performance of those who actually go to the land, live there, and succeed; for, after all, the fundamental purpose of our great system of agricultural education is to insure a better agriculture and make a country life as nearly perfect as possible."

L.H. Bailey was fairly articulate about the role of education. He wrote that education should

> ...assist the farmer to rely on himself and to be resourceful, and to encourage him to work with other farmers for the purpose of increasing the profit ableness of farming and of developing a good social life in rural communities (Bailey 1909:10).
He continued, "All citizenship must rest ultimately on occupation, for all good citizens must be workers of one kind or another...." A good citizen, he concluded, "must be actively interested in the public welfare, and be willing to put himself under the guidance of a good local leader..." (Bailey 1909:12).

According to Bailey, proper education is needed for this to happen, education which must start at the elementary level. How? Bailey (1909:150) explained that

We must begin with the child’s world and not with the teacher’s world, and we must use the common objects, phenomena and activities as means of education. When these...are agricultural (as they are in a rural community), then agriculture becomes a means of education... That is to say, in such cases agriculture (which is the sum of the community life) becomes the real backbone and motive of the school.

Nolan (1918:2), writing nine years after Bailey added that the aims of vocational agricultural education should be to give the student "preparation for wholesome and successful farming and country life" and the skills needed to be a successful farmer. He also explained that agricultural education should be part of a larger educational picture which would produce "an educated country gentleman who works with his hands and gathers about him all the best things which civilization afford."

Good education depended on good teaching which depended, in turn, on good teachers. The well educated vocational agricultural teacher, according to Nolan (1918:163), must be a thorough scientist and a technically trained agriculturalist. He should also have studied rural sociology, agricultural economics, public speaking and "other work to liberalize his general training." He should also have a thorough understanding of educational principles, psychology, and management, etc. Nolan (1918:163) added that "It is especially important that the teacher of agriculture be liberally educated and a man of affairs, for it is usually expected that he not only give instruction to his pupils in school, but that his influence and activities extend outside of the school to the rural life of the community."

Of equal interest was the fact that Nolan devoted an entire chapter to nature study. For Nolan, studying nature was important for two reasons. First, doing so teaches
observation. He wrote "The method of all nature-study should be observational. The teacher and pupils must here escape from textbooks and four walls. Nature-study and agriculture are live subjects and they are out-of-doors. Pupils must see real things and think for themselves" (Nolan 1918:15). The second reason for studying nature was that it helped students understand the conservation of natural resources. This was important, Nolan believed, because the teaching of agriculture must result in the wise use and conservation of these natural resources.

Another example of the roots of agricultural education can be found in Smith's (1929:30-31) survey of vocational agricultural educators, done in 1923, which stressed that not only does the agricultural education student have the right to choose "the vocation best suited to his capacities," but that society also has the right to "demand of him that he attain his maximal growth and that he spend himself in social service." Smith (p. 38-43) also claimed that as life in rural America evolved, so too must the ideals of the rural community. The vocational agriculture teacher was to play an important part in the development of these ideals. The new community ideals envisioned:

1) community agencies functioning as organisms;
2) community life activities analyzed by representative community agencies;
3) programs for the improvement of farm and home practices formulated by committee;
4) public school programs as an integral part of the community programs; and
5) the vocational agriculture teacher as a community agent.

Eaton's 1923 text, *Vocational Education in Farming Occupations: The Part of the Public High School* however, showed that the philosophy of agricultural education was beginning to change. Eaton agreed with the above authors on the importance of "a philosophy of social purpose in organization, and an organization contributing to the achievement of that purpose" (p. 7). His approach was a little more sophisticated than that of his predecessors. For example, he included a discussion of socialism vs. democracy. He also made a nice transition from L.H. Bailey's idea of environment and conservation, e.g., "It is the duty of the farmer to leave his farm better than he found it" (p. 29) to John Dewey's idea of environment e.g., "Thus, environment is, perhaps, as Dewey tells us,
best defined as consisting in those situations which affect the conduct, thoughts, emotions and attitudes of men” (p. 31-32).

Eaton (p. 40) went on to say that there were four general purposes for education, namely:
1. the adjustment of the individual to his environment,
2. social efficiency,
3. self-realization,
4. individual growth which comes from the continuous reconstruction of experience.

Eaton also claimed there were three fundamental principles which governed education. These were:

A. That education is modification. All education consists in changes in the mode of action, thought and feelings of human beings (p. 46).
B. That the business of the educator was the making of stimulus-response bonds in the educand. The main problem for the educator was deciding which bonds the student should make (p. 47).
C. That education is about being able to transfer newly acquired skills. Transfer demanded that the situations be made up of common elements (p. 48).

Philosophically, Eaton (p. 45) saw education in a dualistic and hierarchical manner. This view reflected the philosophy of Watson, Thorndike and the other behaviorists. He explained that education was

the formal process of interaction between the conscious and purposeful manipulator of environment, the 'educator,' at the one pole, and the conscious, but so far as the aim of education is concerned, not purposeful educand, at the other pole.

It can be seen that by the time of Eaton’s writing, in 1923, the philosophy of agricultural education was becoming complex and was drawing elements from several different sources. The importance of socialization (a social reconstructionist’s ideal) was carried over from earlier times. Also, a humanistic focus on the development of the individual was stressed. Elements from Dewey’s pragmatic education theory were also included, such as the ideas of education as change and transfer. Finally, aspects of behavioral theory were being added, which stressed the dualistic and hierarchic nature of education.
Eaton also discussed the importance of both supervised work on farms and supervised employment in agricultural education. In his discussion, Eaton claimed that the supervised work needed to be complimented with classroom work that was balanced between academic and non-academic (or vocational) classes.

From the above writings, one can begin to get a sense of the philosophy of the founders of agricultural education. Farm settlers were an individualistic lot, separated by significant distances and bad roads. But the nation was growing and agricultural production needed to catch up with the rest of the country. For this to happen, the infrastructure of rural life needed to be improved, along with agricultural production methods. At the same time, there began to be a change in philosophy, as the writings of Thorndike and the early behavioralists began to influence the "psychology" of education. Such changes continued to take place throughout the middle third of the twentieth century.

**Agricultural Education from the Thirties to the Seventies**

Agricultural education during the first third of the twentieth century was, for the most part, seated in the humanistic and pragmatic philosophy of John Dewey and focused on training men and women in the practical skills needed to run a successful farm, on the development of a more proficient agriculture system, and on the development of rural communities. During the second third of the century more emphasis was placed on the "science" of education, as educators came more under the sway of the positivistic philosophy which arose during that time and held sway as the predominant philosophy in mainstream education until the nineteen sixties.

Cook (1936), for example, continued the emphasis on both classroom work and supervised farm experience. He claimed that the ultimate purpose of agricultural education was to "train the individual to think in order that he may solve the problems, both social and economic, which he may meet, and to prepare him for complete living" (Cook, 1936:13). He then added to that list the "worthy use of leisure time" and ethical character.
Stewart (1938), in his essay "Teacher Education" explained that more emphasis was being placed on developing better teachers. He wrote "The newer trends of teacher education today tend rather to relate themselves to the more specific practices of teachers and to the improvement of their programs..." (p. 56). He maintained however, that the local farms "...constitute the natural educational settings in which problems of farming are discerned and attacked" (p. 57). As such, he supported on-farm experience.

What became important within the institutions of teacher training was the improvement of the teacher education programs themselves. An important aspect of this improvement was the development of job placement for the graduates for, as Stewart (1938) pointed out, those graduating from production agricultural programs knew they would have jobs. Therefore, in order to attract good people, teacher training needed to be able to do the same.

Another area of importance was the development of effective and up-to-date teaching materials. Stewart wrote that "A forward-looking program of agricultural education always involves recognition of changing social and economic needs, and of the contributions of scientific and technical knowledge to the new problems arising" (p. 57). He explained further that originally, farmer training involved teaching "scientific agriculture" or the practice of applying [pure] scientific principles to agricultural problems. Then came technical science teaching, then social and economic training. From these came the professional aspects of agriculture. As a profession, he explained, specific materials had to be developed, sorted and evaluated so as to best "train teachers." He wrote, "The future of teacher education lies in the direction of more and better materials and methods and more focusing of attention upon what is to be done in the education of the people on the land (p. 58)."

Stewart also emphasized the importance of supervised training. He wrote "Supervised participation is rapidly becoming the core of agricultural education" and continued (p. 58),

If the best way to learn is by doing, then the principle holds as true of the student teacher as of the student farmer. This places directed observation
and directed teaching—under supervision—as the central emphasis on the professional side of a teacher's preparation. The prospective teacher must have representative experiences, which include such things as administration, getting to know the people of the community, supervising pupil's farming programs and making commercial contracts.

Fitzgerald (1936), a follower of Dewey's, explained that "Vocational agriculture...is an attempt to give the individual those necessary experiences [which] enable him to keep an open mind in all problems and to change his procedures as he finds this necessary in a constantly changing social and economic world" (in Schmitt, 1977:8).

Aderhold's essay of 1940 also took a Dewian approach to education. Quoting Dewey (1931:582-584), he began by stating that "The schools, like the nation, are in need of a central purpose which will verify and guide all intellectual plans" (p. 2). He then explained that a nation's education system must contribute to the "ends of the society in which it lives." To accomplish such a goal in the U.S., education needed to be grounded in democratic action. This, in turn, required an understanding, by the population at large, of the problems faced by the citizens (Aderhold 1940:4).

Aderhold claimed that the major objectives of education should be to promote reflective thinking for the individual and to promote group living on an intelligent basis of cooperation for the group (his italics, p. 4). This could be accomplished at both the individual and group level, by encouraging the use of the scientific method of thought, that is, by drawing inferences and formulating hypotheses about problems, by then testing those inferences, and finally by drawing sound conclusions from the tests. Aderhold (1940:8) concluded by writing:

vocational education in agriculture...will strive to discover the real needs and problems of an economic and vocational nature, and to help farmers and farm boys toward the attainment of higher standards of living through the use of intelligence in solving these problems. It will be genuinely concerned with a better understanding of the farmer and farm boy, and their total environment.

It is interesting to note here that Aderhold was, in essence outlining the beginnings of the concept of needs assessment back in 1940.
During the 1940s and 1950s agricultural education maintained its status quo. The nations' economy was doing well, the country was growing in status and power, and agriculture was becoming more efficient and effective as a result of agricultural chemical and mechanical advances. Farmers were starting to make middle class livings and moving into the economic mainstream. Agricultural educators acted to support the scientific revolution in science, while at the same time keeping their own profession basically unchanged.

Warmbrod and Phipps (1966) summarized changes in the focus of agricultural education from its inception until the 1960s. They explained that prior to 1917, agriculture was taught as an informational or general education subject. Following Smith-Hughes, there was an increase in the number of classes focusing on vocational agricultural and a reduction of classes more oriented towards general education. This trend reflected objectives of federal financial assistance.

Hamlin (1962) believed that this "specialization" led to an "over-simplification of public school education." Phipps (1956) claimed that the curricula needed to be expanded and that more emphasis needed to be placed on preparation for employment in the non-farm agriculture related industries. He also argued for occupational guidance and job counseling. A survey by the Research Committee of the Southern Region (1956, in Warmbrod and Phipps, 1966:5) also found strong support for training to help people be good citizens, intelligent consumers, and efficient producers.

Warmbrod and Phipps (1966) concluded with the following two points. First, the general public saw agricultural education as being of a vocational nature only. Experts in the field disagreed however, and believed that was too strict a definition. And second, agricultural education should include training not only in vocational agriculture, but in those skills needed to be successful in any occupation, including preparation for advanced education.

The above-noted works led to the creation of the Vocational Training Act of 1963. This Act provided for funding "for vocational education in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects" (quoted in Warmbrod and Phipps, 1966:7).
Philosophical Writings After 1970  

During the last twenty years or so agricultural educators have attempted to more directly define the philosophy of agricultural education. For example, Phipps (1972:15-16) claimed that Agricultural Educators

* are pragmatists,
* emphasize learning by doing,
* emphasize individual self-awareness, work awareness, educational awareness, career orientation, career exploration and career decision making;
* believe in the importance of leadership and citizenship development;
* learn how to work with people who are disadvantaged and handicapped;
* advocate continuation into college to those who have the skills and desire to do so;
* advocate the use of problem-solving as a way of encouraging thinking; and
* believe in community and community service.

This list, however, is more of a statement of what Agricultural Educators do than of who they are. That is, this list does not fit well into the earlier derived definition of philosophy as the rules for making meaning of one's life.

Kahler et al. (1976) also set about defining the philosophy of Agricultural Education for Project 2000. They listed three points as functions of agricultural and agribusiness education: 1) educating individuals for employment in the fields of agriculture and agribusiness, 2) avocational agricultural course work, and 3) issues having to do with the "food crisis." The authors went on to explain that agricultural education: a) is based on decision making through problem-solving, b) is experienced centered, c) addresses both individual and community needs, d) is related to resource management, and e) perceives agriculture as an integrated part of a dynamic, ever changing and increasingly complicated world system.

This again, is more of list of "dos" than of a philosophy. It does however, provide some insight into how Agricultural Educators see their world. That is, Agricultural Educators, following Dewey, see the world as a place that is both experiential and that requires consciousness for problem-solving. It is therefore, neither a realist based philosophy or strictly empirical. It retains the humanist's view of the importance of the individual learner but also points towards the importance of community at both the human, social
level and at the larger natural, environmental level. And finally, it is similar to a post-
positivist philosophy in its recognition of diversity and process.

Love (1978) compared the similarities and differences between agricultural
education and general education as expressed in several areas of philosophy. He described
Agricultural Educators as being pragmatists and as being experientially oriented. Meta-
physically, Agricultural Educators see the world analytically and prescriptively. Further-
more, they believe that the "real" world is that which can be experienced with the senses.
Meaning is not predetermined, it is determined by the individual within the context of
his/her experiences and that of his/her community. Following this, Agricultural Educators
believe that learning to solve current, life-like problems, which are happening at the
moment, is the best way to equip a person to effectively solve problems in the future.

Epistemologically, Agricultural Educators believe that both knowledge and truth
stem from empirical investigation. They also believe that both of these are temporary.
Axiologically, Agricultural Educators place high value on self-activity, association, and
effect. For this reason, vocational agriculture makes use of both out of school work expe-
riences and activities in student organizations as part of its make-up. As such, Love
explained that

...the FFA and all of its associated intra-curricular activities has had a most
significant and unique effect on the development of agricultural education...
Thus, more than any other activity, it explains our philosophy (1978:2-10).

In addition, the improvement of social behavior through participation in the democratic
process is an important aspect in the philosophy of Agricultural Education.

Educationally, Agricultural Educators see themselves as research project directors
and their students as discoverers. Love wrote "Teachers in agricultural education regard
students as experience organisms who deserve individual attention..." and who work in a
"life-oriented environment" (Love 1978:2-10). Also, Agricultural Educators use flexible
curricula which fit the needs of the teachers and their students. And finally, agricultural
education is strongly community based.
To summarize Love's position then, a philosophy of Agricultural Education was primarily a pragmatic one. Note - a simple definition of the philosophy of pragmatism is "what is real is what works." Love also claimed that a philosophy of Agricultural Education is a realist philosophy that demands an empirical view of reality. Reality is individualistic in that the individual can only "know" what he or she has experienced through the senses. One gains knowledge by having experiences, then analyzes those experiences. Note - This concept of "analysis" suggests an atomistic view of the world, i.e., the view that the world will be understood when we are finally able to break it down to its smallest unit.

Love explained however, that reality is also based on the individuals's relationship to a larger community. That is to say, reality is a combination of personal experiences and community support or rejection. In other words, reality is relativistic. Also, because a person's experience and community changes, his or her reality can also change. Love also claimed that metaphysically, ag ed is prescriptive, which means it is governed by rules and/or it has a direction or a vision of what might be.

Philosophically Agricultural Educators see education as the process of experiencing and analyzing, a process they would call problem-solving. As teachers, Agricultural Educators see students as "experience organisms." Also, they see education as hierarchical, in that they see themselves as directors and their students as discoverers. Axiologically therefore, they value their own experiences over those of their students. Furthermore, because the teachers experiences are more valuable and they have "the vision," it is their job to direct the student towards that vision which often includes the concept of democracy. In other words, although education is about "discovery," it is a prescribed discovery with political overtones.

Another example of a recent attempt to articulate a philosophy for Agricultural Education was the one done by the National Summit on Agricultural Education. In 1989 they held a series of meetings to again look at where Agricultural Education is and where it needs to go. In their mission statement, this group explained that the mission of agricultural education was to provide a total dynamic educational system, to aspire to excellence,
to serve people, and to inform the people about agriculture's needs, opportunities and challenges. In attempting to accomplish this, the consortium listed the following objectives:

* to provide instruction in and about agriculture,
* to serve all populations,
* to develop the whole person,
* to respond to the needs of the market place,
* to advocate free enterprise,
* to function as a part of the total education system and
* to utilize a proven educational process, one which includes formal instruction, experiential learning, leadership, and personal development.

This list, while not really philosophical in nature, does suggest a view which is somewhat different than Love's. Specifically, it's emphasis on the "whole" person suggests a move away from viewing the learner simply as a "sense organism," that is, it suggests a move away from a strict empirical view of reality. Also, by including all populations, the market place and free enterprise, it takes a more overt political stand than did Love's.

Barrick (1989) wrote that Agricultural Education is the joining of two distinct disciplines, agriculture and education. According to Barrick, agriculture as a formal educational endeavor began with the Morrill Acts. Soon after, Agricultural Education was divided into a couple of parts. First, agriculture was divided into the science of agriculture and the practice of agriculture. At about the same time, education developed into the study of the principles and methods of teaching and learning. So Agricultural Education became the principles and methods of teaching and learning about agriculture. Its main focus was vocational agriculture at the high school level.

As Love pointed out, things change. Agricultural Education has had to change to meet the changing demands of its clientele. For this to happen, McCracken (1983:3) claimed that "[w]e need intellectual discussion and debate concerning the nature of our program...[which] will require of us that we become academicians and philosophers" (in Barrick, 1989). Barrick listed several points that he claimed were essential for a true discipline of Agricultural Education. The one most relevant to this study is that the
practice of Agricultural Education must be based on sound theory. The importance of Barrick's comments is that he understands that agricultural education has to look deeper into both theory and philosophy. Philosophically, this again suggests a movement away from a realist and empirically grounded philosophy.

Williams (1990) agreed. He picked up on Warmbrod's (1966, 1986) thesis regarding the importance of research by claiming that the discipline of Agricultural Education is only as strong as are its means for verifying existing knowledge, for creating new knowledge, and for disseminating and applying that knowledge. This, he suggested, is done through research. Williams then wrote "Research must be the strongest component of a discipline, serving as a foundation for teaching and extension" (p. 5). In a list of criticisms of Agricultural Education research, Williams listed several weaknesses, including that it is often piecemeal, i.e., not cumulative; that it lacks a sound theoretical framework; and that it lacks depth (p. 6). Again there is an emphasis on the lack of theoretical depth.

Finally, according to Martin (1991), Agricultural Education was based on three critical components: technical agriculture, experiential learning and personal/human development. For Martin, the purpose of teaching agricultural knowledge and skills was to prepare students to be able to use that knowledge and those skills in meaningful ways in their lives. He claimed that one of the best ways of ensuring student understanding was through the use of experiential learning, both in and out of school. More importantly, according to Martin, "The heart and soul of the program is the student" (Martin, 1991:21-22). As such, Agricultural Education was committed to the growth of the individual student in all three learning domains. But more importantly, from a philosophical basis, was that the language used in the statement, e.g., heart and soul, indicated a move away from a strictly empirical based philosophy and towards one which was both humanistic and idealistic.

Summary of Roots of a Philosophy of Agricultural Education The history of agricultural education is long and complicated. It is, as such, difficult to articulate a philosophy of the discipline. The question could also be raised, "do the 'expert'
testimonies cited above truly represent the philosophies of those teachers who have been practicing in the classroom?" Be that as it may, the following paragraphs will attempt to summarize and articulate the philosophy of agricultural education as it stands today in its mainstreamed form.

Prior to the middle of the nineteenth century, there was no such thing as education for the rural (peasant) class. With the advent of mechanized agriculture in England, the British began to educate farmers, so they could take advantage of the advances in science. In America, the government/education/industry complex sought to emulate these British advances.

The philosophy of the time was pragmatic. That is, the purpose of education was to develop men and women who could successfully adopt the new, scientific ways of agriculture and homemaking and who would take leadership roles in the development of democratically based, rural communities. Motivation for funding, on the part of government, was economic and political and in some instances, humanistic.

To accomplish the task of agricultural development, men and women needed to be trained as farmers and homemakers, as high school vocational teachers, and as community leaders. The aim of this education was to teach people, from a young age, to learn from and operate with what was at hand, i.e., from nature, from agriculture, and from the community. The philosophy of the discipline at that time was pragmatic and naturalistic and stemmed from the works of Dewey, Hegel, and Kant.

As time passed, both agriculture and education became more scientific and more specialized. Agricultural science became separated from agricultural education. The latter, following the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, became more narrowly focused on developing a economically effective agricultural sector. The use of federal funding became limited to teaching farm and home making skills at the high school level and at training high school vocational agriculture teachers at the college level. As such, there seemed to have been a move away from community development in the classroom, as training in leadership and democratic processing was switched to extracurricular activities such as FFA.
Following the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act, the philosophy of agricultural education began to change, as did the philosophy of the country as a whole. There was a movement away from the natural and holistic worldviews of people like Bailey and Nolan, which was a reflection of a Kantian Idealism towards a more empirical and positivistic view, as espoused by the behavioralists. This empirical and positivistic philosophy of the behavioralists dominated philosophic thought in America from the 1920s until the mid 1960s. At that time works by some of the European existentialists began to question this dominance, as did the humanists such as Maslow and Rogers. As a result, the positivists began to lose their stronghold on philosophic thought.

In recent times, Love (1978) gave the clearest expression of the philosophy of agricultural education. He supported the view that agricultural education was seated in a pragmatic, realistic, and empirical/experiential philosophy. He also pointed towards an atomistic/reductionistic worldview. Love’s philosophy also suggested an axiological hierarchy in which the teacher’s experiences were seen as more valuable than were the student’s. The job of the teacher, as such, was one of giving direction.

Moving in a somewhat different philosophical direction, Love also stressed that one’s "reality" required validation from one’s community, which suggested that the individual could somehow experience the community’s collective experience. He also claimed that reality could change, which suggests that there is no "real" reality, which is philosophically difficult to grasp against an empirical and realist background. Finally, Love also suggested that agricultural education is prescriptive. For this to be true, some sort of "envisioning of the future" needed to happen which again, is hard to reconcile against an empirical and realistic philosophy.

In the last five years, the philosophy of agricultural education has begun to move away from the realist’s view of the world and to incorporate a more idealistic and humanistic philosophy. Barrick has pointed out the need to develop a stronger theoretical background for agricultural education. Also, Williams’ model of Agricultural Education, showing Agricultural Education as a blending of the "hard" agricultural sciences and "softer" social sciences, makes it clear that the field must turn more towards social
science models of human development and away from the so-called "value-free" hard sciences. His criticism of the discipline's research agenda, particularly of both its lack of theoretical framework and of depth, indicates too, that Agricultural Education will require, as McCracken so aptly stated, that "we become academicians and philosophers."

For this to happen, Agricultural Education must become more involved in the intellectual debates of academia as a whole. And finally, Martin summed up the changes in Agricultural Education by indicating that ag ed professionals must return to a more humanistic approach to education because the discipline is, ultimately, involved in the development of "real" people, as opposed to "experience organisms."

What then, is the philosophy of Agricultural Education today? Ontologically, it is a mixed bag which seems to be moving towards the side of Idealism in that it accepts, as real, such abstract concepts as metaphysics (see Love), theory, and the future. It is also concerned about the "heart and soul" of the discipline. Epistemologically, agricultural education claims that knowledge comes from personal experience. That is, a person "knows" something when he or she has experienced it with his or her five senses. However, for the knowing to have true meaning, the value of the experience must be weighed against the value of similar experiences as confirmed by other members of the community. This reinforces the notion of the reality of abstractions in the philosophy of agricultural education. Axiologically, Agricultural Education seems to place value on accumulated, directed experience and is, as such, hierarchical.

In recent times, agricultural education has also placed high regard on the developing the whole individual to his or her highest potential and is humanistic in that respect. It also supports a politico-religious world view that democracy and the Protestant work ethic are of high value, which is to say that the philosophy of Agricultural Education is in part a conservative reconstructionist one.
Schools Of Thought In Educational Philosophy

Introduction

The philosophies of education are traditionally broken into four or five groups, depending on how the progressive group is broken up. These are: the liberals, also called academics; the behavioralists, also called technologists, the humanists; and the progressives, including pragmatists, post-positivists, social reconstructionists, and radical educators (McNeil, 1990; Elias and Merriam, 1980; Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982). These schools cover the gamut of epistemological possibilities for knowledge. As noted at the end of Chapter I, this study was based on the assumption that a philosophy which meets the requirements of today's international agricultural and extension education will contain many aspects of a post-positivist philosophy.

Liberal Education

Liberal educators trace their roots back to the Platonic tradition of The Academy and the concept of the "learned gentleman" or "philosopher king." This tradition was carried through the Enlightenment by Kant and Hegel, and would therefore be considered an idealist philosophy. It was this tradition that was first established in the United States, at places such as Harvard University. Although there was a level of elitism involved in traditional liberal education, many early Americans who championed the cause of the working class, e.g., Franklin and Jefferson, also took a liberal view towards education (Elias and Merriam, 1980:16).

Liberalism in education is based on the belief that humans are intelligent and rational beings and that "education should be valued for its own sake and considered apart from social goals and social action" (Darkenwald and Merriam 1982:43). The goal of the liberals is wisdom of which, for Darkenwald and Merriam, there are two kinds, practical wisdom, which applies to everyday life, and theoretical wisdom, which is the search for truth about human existence and the world we live in. Theoretical wisdom requires "contemplation of the deepest principles of a subject matter and the reorganization of the connection and relationship to other areas" (Elias and Merriam, 1980:23). It is, for
liberals philosophers, the search for the "good life." The means of achieving wisdom, according to Hirst (1974, quoted in McNeil 1990:71-72), is through the mastery of the fundamentals of rational knowledge, which are: meaning, logical relationships, and a criteria for claiming the truth. Epistemologically they would be considered rationalists.

Modern educators influenced by liberal education philosophy make use of the dialectic (or logical argumentation) as a teaching tool. They also require copious amounts of reading from their students, particularly from the "Great Books." As such, liberal education is said to be a teacher-centered approach, which requires that the instructor be a strong leader and role model.

Educational liberalism has its shortcomings. As mentioned above, liberalism is criticized as being elitist. It is also claimed that liberalism is authoritarian (Hanson, 1949, quoted in Elias and Merriam, 1980:37). Still others question the liberals' claim that the Great Books programs offer a "neutral" world view (Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982:46).

According to McNeil (1990), liberalism, in the form of a curriculum developed around the liberal arts, is making a comeback after some thirty five years of science dominated education which followed Russia's launching of the Sputnik satellite.

Behavioralist Education

Behavioralism was the predominant philosophy in education in America from the 1920s until the mid 1970s. Founded on the work of J.B. Watson and passed on by Thorndike and Skinner, behavioralists believed that "all human behavior is the result of a person's prior conditioning and is determined by external forces in the environment over which a person has little or no control" (Elias and Merriam, 1980:79). It is, as such, in the realist and empiricist schools of philosophy.

Behavioralism was based on three philosophical traditions. The first was Hobbes' idea of "materialism" which suggested that reality can only be explained by the laws of matter and motion and that it can not rely on any appeals to mind or spirit. The second was based on Bacon's rules for scientific realism and empiricism and the views of John Locke. Locke asserted that knowing can only come about through the empirical process.
He also denied that there were such things as ideas. The third tradition was philosophical positivism. In the twentieth century, the "logical positivists" developed a process of linguistic analysis in which, according to Ryle (1943, quoted in Elias and Merriam, 1980:80) "the causes of behavior can be explained by the behavior itself and not by any self, mind, consciousness or 'ghost in the machine." In other words, the logical positivists tried to directly tie reality to the logic of language construction.

The behavioralists’ approach was totally empirical in its view. They claimed that with the proper reward, all behavior could be controlled or in other words, "everyone has his/her price." Thorndike (1913) developed the idea that learning was a process of association, from which he developed the idea of "connectionism," known better today as the S-R (stimulus and response) theory of learning. These discoveries were important in the development of teaching and learning theory and continue to hold a central position in modern education theory.

The work of B.F. Skinner, however, was probably more influential on education than that of the other behavioralists. Skinner began with the premise that the fundamental value of any individual or society was survival. He then developed a methodology which he believed would ensure the survival of both. His system, expounded upon in The Technology of Teaching (1968), sought to use the schools to de-emphasize competition and individualism and to support cooperation and interdependence. Skinner, in this sense, could be considered a social reconstructionist.

To accomplish his goal, Skinner recommended that teachers take on the role of "contingency manager, environmental controller, or behavioral engineer who plans in detail the conditions necessary to bring about desired behavior" (Elias and Merriam, 1989:88). For this to succeed, a complicated system of goals and objectives, and punishments and rewards had to be developed by the teacher or training system. The student was then involved in the educational process in ways which were designed to invoke correct behaviors. These correct behaviors were then rewarded, thus assuring that the learning process would continue. Although Skinner’s goals were very altruistic, the
process of working out rewards for all of the participants could not be done. So Skinner's system never worked as he had envisioned it.

An off-shoot of behavioral methodologies was the development of technological equipment for teaching. Skinner developed a way "to sequence learning tasks toward specific terminal behaviors, elicit overt responses from learners to these tasks, and reinforce correct responses" (McNeil, 1990:53). Once these concepts were understood, it became easier to develop machines and technologies of "programmed learning" that offered set objectives and allowed students to progress at their own pace. In more recent times, communication technologies have evolved and been added into this network of teaching and learning tools, often with much success.

There is a downside to behavioralism, however. The most serious, according to McNeil (1990), is that technological learning has become dehumanized and that the needs of the individual learner are being overshadowed by the needs of technologists and of the economic interests of education-business. Gardener (1985) also criticized the behavioralist approach, claiming that its views were too simplistic and that too many aspects of humanness were unexplainable in behavioralist terms. Still others argued that the behavioral theory was philosophically ungrounded because the very act of having a theory was outside the realms of true empirical belief.

Behavioralist theory had a significant impact on the philosophy of agricultural education. While much of the theory remains valid today, its simplistic view of a very complex being, i.e., the human, and its lack of recognition of the importance of both the cognitive and affective domains in learning theory have made it inadequate as a philosophy of education.

**Humanistic Education**

Like progressive education, humanistic education traces its roots back to classical antiquity. Elias and Merriam (1980) explained that after the "Dark Ages" humanism arose in Renaissance Italy as a revolt against a "dehumanizing...and stultifying authority of a church dominated world..." (p. 110). As a result of this revolt, the Italian Humanists
developed several principles which became the guiding signs for later humanistic philosophers. These were:

a) a revolt against all authorities which tried to control knowledge,
b) an emphasis on intellectual qualities,
c) the idea of the gentleman-scholar, and
d) the seeking of the good-life for all.

Although this sounds much like the principles of the progressives, it differs in that humanists accepted that education was political and the sought development of the whole person, i.e., in the affective, cognitive and psycho-motor domains, whereas progressive educators related primarily to the cognitive domain. More importantly, humanists sought to help others as well as helping themselves.

In 1933, and then again in 1973, the humanists published a statement entitled The Humanist Manifesto in which they spelled out the parameters of humanist philosophy. Included were the following:

1) human nature is naturally good,
2) humans are truly free creatures,
3) people should be recognized for their individuality and uniqueness,
4) the self is the heart of the person; the enhancement of self is achieved through actualizing the individual’s potentialities,
5) each person has the capacity to fulfill his or her highest potential,
6) behavior is the result of selective perception. Humanists, like phenomenologists, believe that reality is what one believes it to be, not what actually exists, and
7) it is one’s duty to become self-actualized to one’s fullest potential and to contribute to the betterment of society (Elias and Merriam, 1982:117-121).

From these principles one can see that humanism is an idealistic philosophy. One can also see from this list that several facets of these principles were evident in Love’s definition of agricultural education, particularly those having to do with individuality and the actualizing of the individual’s potential.

Over the last one hundred and fifty years, the humanists have split into several different schools, e.g., Existentialists, Scientific Humanists, and Christian Humanists (Elias and Merriam 1980:111). The Existentialists included European writes such as
Nietzsche, Heidigger, Tillich and Sartre. Pratt (1971, in Elias and Merriam 1980:111) explained that the existentialists made the following contributions to education. First, they hypothesized that the individual is not ready-made but is instead, the designer of his or her own being (or essence); second, essence or being is contingent and superfluous, i.e., it changes (also pointed out as a tenant of agricultural education, by Love); third, human life is capricious and absurd; fourth, people must make choices and bear responsibility for those choices (again, pointed out by Love); and fifth, the only meaning in human life comes from relationships. In short, according to the existentialists, the only true meaning there is in life is the meaning we give it as individuals and as social beings. As such, the goal of the existential educator is to help students develop a clear sense of self-hood and deal with the complexities of the modern world.

Because the goal of humanistic education is personal self-actualization, it runs contrary to much traditional educational thinking, which tends to be more conservative and dedicated to the maintenance of the status-quo. According to Maslow (1976:120-121, quoted in Elias and Merriam 1982:123) education should be about "first...learning to be a human being in general, and second, learning to be this particular human being." As such, all education should be about self-actualization.

Regarding education, Rogers (1969) listed the following principles as necessary for learning to take place:

1) personal involvement on the affective and cognitive level,
2) self-initiated discovery,
3) learning must have a pervasive impact on the learners' behavior, attitudes, or personality,
4) personal evaluation by the learner, to see if the experience is meeting his/her needs,
5) the learning experience must be incorporated into the learners' total experience of self, i.e., it must be holistic.


The role of the teacher, for the humanists, is that of a facilitator or helper in the learning process. The role of the learner is to discover what it is that is "necessary,
important and/or meaningful" so that he or she may focus his/her attention and perceptions on that subject or issue.

Again, many of these principles are core features of today's teaching and learning theory and are, to a certain extent extensions of Thorndike's original discoveries. Humanism differs significantly from later behavioralism however, in its focus on self and in the fact that it moves away from the extrinsic punishments and rewards that make up behavioral theory.

**Progressive Education**

According to Elias and Merriam (1980) the origins of progressive education were rationalism, empiricism, and scientific thought. The focus of progressive education was on the empirical use of the senses for learning. This followed the early works of Bacon and Locke and was thus epistemologically in the realist school of philosophy. Darwin's work in observational studies and his theory of development over time were also used as models.

Elias and Merriam (1980:46), claimed that progressive educators advocated "...contact with natural objects, the learning of manual skills and the incorporation of play into the educational experience." Progressive education, in general, was child-centered; its goal was to develop the child to his or her full potential. For example, Fowler (1930:159, in Stanley 1992:7) wrote"...that the child rather than what he studies should be the center of all educational effort." The progressives also advocated experiential learning by using "hands-on" methods for teaching. But for some progressives, such as the pragmatists, this needed to be done within the framework of the larger social setting.

The social writings of Charles Pierce, William James, and John Dewey became the philosophical bases for a form of progressive education known as pragmatism which, according to Elias and Merriam (1980:47-48)"...accept[ed] the methods of science for understanding the human person and solving human problems." Actually, Pragmatism is more of a group of associated theoretical ideas than one particular viewpoint. This is
because it changed as it passed from Pierce to James to Dewey. According to Thayer (1967:432), Pierce was a realist who was interested in developing procedures for "promoting linguistic and conceptual clarity, - successful communications - when men are faced with intellectual problems."

James was more interested in finding meaning in "experienced facts and plans of actions" (Thayer 1967:433). He was considered a moralist who claimed that "to determine the meaning or truth of ideas, one must evaluate their 'practical consequences', their 'usefulness', [or] their 'workability.'" He also claimed that truth was "what is good or expedient in our beliefs." James believed that our thoughts concerning an experience led us to expect a certain reaction and prepare ourselves for that. In other words, our mentality effected our perceptions of reality. His philosophy was concerned with "the way individuals interpret the environing conditions for purposes of successful actions" (Thayer 1967:433).

Dewey was concerned with bridging the dualism between science and values and between knowledge and science. He also taught that all education is political and that schools were the primary place for passing on the concept of democracy. According to Elias and Merriam, Dewey believed that education and democracy were nearly synonymous. He also believed that democracy demanded change. For Dewey, "A democratic education will produce a society that is constantly in a state of greater growth and development" (Elias and Merriam 1980:50).

As pragmatists, the progressives adopted both a relativistic and a pluralistic view of the world. They also claimed that experience was the only real way of gaining knowledge and that the only real way of understanding truth and goodness was through the experiencing of the consequences of one's actions. Pragmatism also emphasized the need to use education as a way of bringing about social change (Elias and Merriam, 1980:48-49). In this aspect, it was connected to the social reconstructionists' school of thought.

A somewhat later development in the progressive movement was "experimentalism," which was more controlled and teacher led than the progressive education of earlier
times. It drew, from Dewey, the utilization of scientific methodology, including methods of criticism, full public inspection, and testing (Elias and Merriam, 1980:50). These methods are also known as "problem solving" and "project and activity methods" (Darkenwald and Merriam 1982:55).

**John Dewey's Pragmatism**  
Agricultural Education often locates itself in the philosophy of John Dewey (Eaton, 1923; Leising, 1976; Schmitt, 1977; McNeil, 1990). According to Thayer (1967), Dewey was concerned with human happiness and satisfaction. The lack of these, in Dewey's opinion, stemmed from doubt. Dewey's chief concern then, was in establishing a method for overcoming doubt. Doubt, for the pragmatists, was an inherent factor in the makeup of human nature. It was also what propelled humans to learn about themselves and their environment. Dewey believed that the way to overcome doubt was by unifying the ideal and the actual (or science and values or knowledge and morals). Dewey's pragmatic philosophy then, offered a way for humans to overcome doubt through inquiry. Dewey described inquiry as a way of "settling the conditions of doubt" and thereby creating satisfaction. He sought to develop a method of inquiry which would answer questions of both a scientific and a moral nature.

For Dewey, education offered the opportunity to teach children how to do proper inquiry. He believed also, that the schools were 'embryonic communities' whose activities reflected the life of the general society. As such, they offered a great opportunity to begin to investigate the difference between "the ideal and the actual" as they applied to a wide range of real social problems. He believed that the job of the teacher was to guide students through the process of inquiry and maintained that teachers had a professional obligation "to suggest lines of activity, and to show that there need not be any fear of adult imposition" (Dewey 1962:203, in Stanley (1992:7-8).

Dewey's basic philosophy stemmed from his childhood. Biographer Stephen Rockefeller (1991) wrote that from an early age, Dewey struggled to overcome the duality he faced between the easy, good-naturedness of his father and his overly religious mother. Rockefeller (1991:2) wrote:
[Dewey] defined the fundamental problem facing an individual and society as the problem of unifying the ideal and the actual. This is the general terminology Dewey used to discuss the problem of human values and the conflict between good and evil. Finding the way to unify the ideal and the actual...in contemporary democratic technological culture is Dewey's central concern as a thinker.

This concern with dualism is evident in Dewey's writing on education, as was his concern with the overemphasis on intellectual development by the traditional progressives. He wrote, for example (from 'Body and Mind: 17-19, in Ratner, 1939:606)

[Education] is a matter of accelerating momentum in the right direction and removing obstacles. Chief among these obstacles are the practices which are associated with the traditional separation of mind and body and the consequent neglect of informed and intelligent action as the aim of all educational development... More than anything else [this dualism] explains the separation of theory and practice, of thought and action.

It was in trying to resolve these dualities that Dewey came to his "learning by doing" theory as a way of achieving "informed and intelligent action." He believed that activity was the ultimate educational ideal and that self-activity was the most effective way to realize the meaning of what was being done (Dewey 1913). He added that it was especially through the use of intermediate objects, such as tools and toys, that humans learn best. As such, work and play can be of equal value in learning because they each required a direct interest in what was being done. This is because each required "an intellectual quality: a remoter end in time [which] serves to suggest and regulate a series of acts" (Dewey, 1913, in Ratner 1939:611-13). As this intellectual quality grows, a clear perception of the results of this series of acts grows with it. With this perception comes a search for more efficient and effective means of obtaining the desired results. Dewey then explained that

It is the business of educators to see that the conditions...are such as to encourage the developing of these intellectual phases of an activity, and thereby evoke a gradual transition to the theoretical type (Dewey, 1913, in Ratner 1939:611-13).
So it was through this process of internalizing and imagining future results that learning takes place at its highest level. This problem-solving, developed within a social context, also allowed people to develop a social conscience and a code of ethics.

Dewey claimed that proper learning takes place only if the learner sticks with this process because

...instead of thinking things out and discovering them for the sake of the successful achievement of an activity, we institute the activity for the sake of finding out something. Then the distinctively intellectual, or theoretical, interest shows itself (Dewey, 1913, in Ratner 1939:611-13).

In other words, one needs to transcend the material goal involved in the activity to reach a higher intellectual goal, which was a sort of "I've got it" at the intellectual level.

Subject matter, according to Dewey, was only interesting to the learner when it was relevant to his or her life. For that reason, the primary focus in teaching needed to be on the present (Dewey, 1913, in Ratner 1939:370). Relevant learning opportunities, he explained, could be found in the student's day-to-day experiences. Experience had two parts; an active part and a passive part. During the active part, the learner "does" something to an object, etc. During the passive part, the object "does" something in return. In other words, learning requires reciprocity. Making meaning of the return, that is, of the consequences of one's actions, is the real essence of learning.

Not all experiences provide equally good learning experiences, however. The ones that work best are those which have an influence upon one's later life. Dewey (1938:16-27, in Leising 1976:8) wrote that "...the central problem of an education based upon experience is to select the kind of present experiences that live fruitfully and creatively in subsequent experiences."

McNeil (1990) claimed that Dewey was concerned with developing an education system that met the needs of the newly developing industrial culture of America. In Dewey's system, "[the students] were to sense questions, doubts, and problems [about social issues] and to find a means of resolving them," wrote McNeil (1990:376). Dewey also believed that the schools needed to teach children how to relate the social effects of
introducing new tools into a culture. Furthermore "[Dewey] proposed that moral motives would develop when children learned to observe and note relationships between the means and the ends in social situations" (McNeil 1990:376). Dewey also suggested that morality was a social matter which was determined through social intelligence and creative force. Social intelligence, for Dewey, meant deciding what was right, first through experimentation and then through judgement. Social intelligence, therefore, required the recognition of different points of view, followed by the reconciliation of those views with one's own perspective.

Dewey also advocated an educational system which changed with the times. Regarding this, he wrote

The reconstruction of philosophy, of education, and of social ideals and methods must thus go hand in hand. If there is especial need of educational reconstruction at the present time, if this need makes urgent a reconsideration of the basic ideas of traditional philosophic systems, it is because of the thorough-going change in social life accompanying the advance of science, the industrial revolution, and the development of democracy. Such practical changes cannot take place without demanding an educational reformation to meet them, and without leading men to ask what ideas and ideals are implicit in these social changes, and what revisions they require of the ideas and ideals which are inherited from older and unlike cultures (Dewey 1938:386, in Schmitt 1977:10).

Much of Dewey's philosophical and educational work is relevant to agricultural and extension education, at both the domestic and international level. First, his explanation of the importance of toys and tools to learning reinforces learning theory by explaining philosophically why such techniques work, i.e., by putting learning at the "intellectual" level. The same can be said regarding his ideas about the active and passive parts of learning and why relevancy is so important for teaching and learning to take place.

Of greater concern for this study however, are those parts of his philosophy having to do with social situations and social actions. This is because international agricultural and extension educators must deal with a diverse set of traditions and cultural viewpoints in their work. As such they must be able to see how to make their teaching opportunities
relevant to their hosts' viewpoints. Also, if learning is truly a reciprocal activity, educators must understand that they have the opportunity to learn as well as teach and in so doing, avoid a hierarchical relationship on their part.

Also, as pointed out at the beginning of this section, Dewey believed that pragmatic philosophy was about humans using inquiry to resolve doubts. And he believed that education was the way to learn appropriate inquiry techniques. Also, Dewey saw schools as microcosms of the world at large. As such, they reflected the kinds of social problems that plague society in general. It was through schooling and education then, that people could learn to be socially responsible citizens. If however, the only effective learning activities were those which were relevant to a person's life, it becomes the school's task to point out or develop the relevancy of seemingly abstract issues, e.g., agricultural issues at the global level. This is important to agricultural education at both the domestic and the international level.

Dewey was concerned with the problems that were arising as his society entered the industrial age. Today's educators should have the same concern as they enter the information/computer age. For, although the tools have changed, the desired results remain the same, that is, to gain satisfaction by removing doubt about one's environment. At the domestic level, this is important because we have entered into an age in which actions that take place on one side of the globe effect people on the other side. As such, our sense of "relevant place" must grow to include not only next-door neighbors, but distant neighbors (and competitors) as well. Our neighborhood must also include things such as the air and oceans and the health of life on the planet in general.

In addition, our sense of "relevant time" has grown as computer modeling and the studies of the "futurists" give us a clearer view of what the results of our actions might be. As a result, educators need to include such information into the relevant world of their students and thus help them to develop a set of ethics which include this larger world. For, as Dewey pointed out, citizens must demand that leaders ask what ideas and ideals are implicit in these social changes and what revisions are required of these ideas and ideals.
At the international level, agricultural educators have an even subtler task. Here they must learn to incorporate into their research the voices of those members of society who have historically been left out of the development picture, such as traditional cultural leaders, the economically disadvantaged and particularly women and people of color. In recent years many post-positivist schools of thought have developed to address such problems.

Post-positivism In recent times, several new elements, mostly introduced from Europe, have been added to the philosophy of education in America. Broadly labeled as post-positivist, the central issue for these philosophies was the refutation of scientific positivism as the premiere paradigm for social research and the development of alternative philosophical theories. Connected with this denial of positivistic assumptions was a call for a change in the social and human sciences which had developed around the positivist paradigm. Included in this group of post-positivist philosophies were ideas such as critical pedagogy, post-modernism, poststructuralism, deconstruction and reconstruction, feminist theory, and conscientization.

Many of the concepts contained in these philosophies are relevant to a new philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. Critical theory continues the discussion of the problems inherent in a hegemonic-state led educational system. Postmodernism and poststructuralism attempt to debunk notions that there are of meta-theories and meta-constructs which "explain the world." They offer instead a plea for acceptance and understanding in a multi-faceted world. In an extension of these ideas, Freire's "conscientization" and the feminist theorists call for multiple voices in sociological and educational research. All of these ideas have relevance to a post-positivist philosophy of international agricultural and extension education.

Social Reconstruction If, as Dewey proposed, the purpose of philosophy is to develop a method of inquiry to overcome doubt and bring about human satisfaction, and if there are social causes for human dissatisfaction, then it is a logical extension that
branches of philosophy would develop whose purpose is "to overcome social doubt" and bring satisfaction to a larger group of people. Such philosophies fall into the category of social reconstruction. There are many branches of social reconstruction which have had an effect on education in general. Several of these are relevant to the creation of a working philosophy for international agricultural and extension education. These will be studied in some depth in the following sections.

Reconstructionists believed that Western, capitalist society was economically biased. Their principle goal, as such, was to develop a utopian society in which both the individual and the community continually worked for improvement through political involvement (Stanley 1992). Reconstructionist educators believed that the public schools should be involved in this process. According to Elias and Merriam (1980:143-144), the reconstructionist (also known as radical) educators drew their history from three European sources; the anarchists, who questioned the nature of authority in society; the Marxists, who advocated a revolutionary change from the capitalist political economy; and the Freudian Left, who advocated a psychology which was concerned with changing political and social structures.

In America, reconstructionism was seen as a "philosophy of dissent" and was most clearly articulated by Rugg (1921, 1923, 1926); Counts (1927, 1938, 1969); and Brameld (1935, 1950, 1971). These men were concerned with eliminating inequality based on class distinctions. Furthermore, they believed that the most exploited people in our society "were unaware of the historically conditioned and socially constructed nature of our institutions and the ideologies used to support them" (Stanley 1992:17). They believed it was the job of public institutions such as education to raise the awareness of such people and to help end social injustice.

McNeil (1990) claimed that the educational purpose of social reconstruction, a la Dewey, was to confront the learner with the many kinds of social problems that were faced by both the individual and humankind. As such, Rugg (in Stanley 1992:23), claimed that "teachers must equip [students] to be constructively critical of contemporary social, economic, and political organizations." McNeil also claimed that for
reconstructionists, the teacher's job was to relate problems of a local, national, and international scale to the lives of the students. It was then the students' job to develop solutions to these problems. To help make all of this work, group participation and community building were emphasized. Teachers were also encourage to help students utilize their out of classroom school time in familiarizing themselves with and working on real life issues.

Many reconstructionists located themselves within the philosophical framework outlined by Dewey, that is, they were socially-conscious idealists who took a hands-on/experiential approach to life and learning. According to Stanley (1992), the reconstructionists were looking for a way to remain philosophically pragmatic while focusing on pragmatism's more radical implications. They sought, for instance, to define democracy as simply a part of a social picture. They were also worried that education was lagging behind real social change. Concerning this, Stanley (1992:11) wrote

The reconstructionists recognized that education could not (and should not) be reformed without a clear sense of existing socio-cultural conditions. They also believed that education neither could nor should be a neutral institution. By its very nature, education is part of the total process of socialization into a culture.

Brameld's (1971) major concern was with America's "idolization of the rugged individual" and with the overemphasis on education for college-bound students at the expense of the working class. He believed that social reality was socially constructed and, as such, society needed to be involved in verifying reality. As a result, he developed the concept of "consensual validation" as a way of accounting for cultural transformation. He wrote

...truths...within any culture are determined...by the extent to which their import is agreed upon and then acted upon by the largest possible number of the group concerned.... These truths become the 'utopian content' of the group mind and reflect the active determination of cultural goals and means (in Stanley 1992:42-43).

Philosophically, then, reconstructionists sought truths that were the results of the group's consciousness.
Counts (1930) agreed with Dewey regarding the relationship between science and education. He qualified his agreement however, by claiming that the quantitative study of the learning process must be harmonized with theory in order for the process to be socially significant (Stanley, 1992:31). On the other hand, Counts blamed Dewey for some of the shortcomings of progressivism. He based his criticism on Dewey's "relativistic" philosophy which sought to "see all sides to every question without making a commitment or taking action until all of the facts are in" (in Stanley 1992:27-28). For Counts, this relativistic philosophy didn't work because, too often, the facts were never in. As a result, judgement was held in a kind of suspended animation and no action was taken. Counts held that this was antithetical to a "doing" philosophy.

Many educators disagreed with the ideals of the reconstructionists. The majority of them believed that society had the duty to inculcate tradition democratic and Christian values through public education. And they wanted to define morality and keep educational inquiries within the bounds of what they labeled the "American Creed" (Stanley 1990:42). Advocates of this kind of "moral education," such as Leming (1981), claimed that educators needed to go beyond the school's traditional emphasis on decision-making skills and include the facilitating of moral education. They also tended to disagree with relativistic ideas such as emphasis on community and consensual validation and claimed instead that their own particular group was best able to define "morals" and the American creed.

Many social reconstructionists were concerned with the bureaucratization of ideology, or what Besag and Nelson (1984) called the "dominant functionalist ideology" which held that our present institutions had evolved because they were the most effective and were therefore, "right." These scholars argued against the functionalists' claim that "what is" justified "what ought to be" (in Stanley 1992:84). Still other, e.g., Bellah, et al. (1984), Lasch (1979, 1984), and Stanley (1992) argued that school curricula usually emphasized a materialistic and functionalist approach to curriculum. As such, the skills and values they taught provided bureaucratic and technological expertise, but failed to develop the competencies needed for the social and political discourse needed for effective

Having defined philosophy as the set of rules used to make sense out of life, it could be said that the social reconstructionists’ philosophy was one which sought to develop a set of rules which stressed justice and economic freedom and prepared students to deal with the economic and political reality of their present and future lives. They believed it was the job of education to point out problems of injustice within their societies and to train people to enter into dialogue in order to solve such problems. The idea of a utopian future was instrumental to the social reconstructionists.

Traditional Agricultural Educators might argue that such information is irrelevant to their discipline because the discipline is apolitical and doesn’t take political stances. As Dewey pointed out however, all education is political to a certain extent. Historically, agricultural education sought to encourage the development of democratic values. Today, FAA’s work with parliamentary procedure carries its own political overtones. With these in mind, it seems clear that agricultural education has, in fact, had its own conservative political agenda.

In a similar fashion, many ag educators bring to the profession their own vision of how good the future could be, both here in the States and abroad. It is difficult to work towards one’s vision of the future, towards one’s utopian world, while remaining apolitical. This is even more true for people who are working in the field of international development. Such work requires balancing one’s need for vision with the political and cultural reality in which one is working. In fact, the very nature of development work is along the order of social reconstruction. For that reason, it is important that international agricultural and extension workers understand the history and philosophy of the social reconstruction movement.

**Radical Education** Like the reconstructionists, radical educators questioned the role and nature of authority in society and advocated an educative psychology which was concerned with changing political and social structures. Some radical educators went so
far as to call for a revolutionary change from the capitalist political economy. While such extremes are far beyond the actions required of agricultural education professionals, many of the philosophical tenants and principles which were espoused by the various schools of thought included in this section are relevant to a sustainable philosophy of international agricultural and extension education.

Radical education theory was developed during the second half of the twentieth century. An early example of a radical education philosophy, called "reproduction (or correspondence) theory," was reported by Bowles and Gintis (1976). This theory claimed that public schools were agencies of the dominant culture and that they reinforced existing power relations and forms of domination. Bowles and Gintis believed that the most effective aspect of the process of domination was the "hidden curriculum" that exercised its influence through the organization of schooling and day-to-day social interaction (Stanley 1992:95).

Another important theme of the radical educators, based on the works of the political sociologist Gramsci (1971), was known as "political hegemony." Gramsci (in Stanley 1992:98), argued that

Hegemony was a process of domination...[which] involved the continuing struggle to structure and control the consciousness of subordinate groups. Therefore, production of knowledge, and hence schooling, was a key component in the state's construction of power.

Bourdieu (1977, 1979) expanded on Gramsci's original thesis by claiming that public schools promoted a "hegemonic curriculum" which both legitimized the dominant culture and marginalized or rejected other cultures and knowledge forms.

This theme was expanded upon by Giroux (1983) in what he called the "hegemonic-state reproduction model." Giroux (1988b) believed that it was necessary to understand history if one was to understand today's culture. Basing his philosophy on the works of Marx and Dewey, he saw education as a way of creating a "genuinely democratic society." Giroux wanted teachers to be more aware of both the history of students from marginalized groups and of the political nature of education. This could best be done "by
enabling students to evaluate society against its own claims and to create different ways of living" (Giroux 1988b:202, in Stanley 1992:102).

Radical educators, like the reconstructionists, were also concerned with moral issues in education. For example, Stanley (1992:111-12) wrote

[R]adical educators must construct a provisional conception of morality... [which] is grounded in those historical referents or instances when people have resisted forms of oppression... Utilizing these historical examples, radical educators can create an emancipatory discourse of possibility and hope.

Stanley felt that a radical theory of morality required that the educators assimilate a view of history from the standpoint of the victims of economic injustice. He concluded by writing "This involves an interpretive bias favoring democracy and justice" (p. 111-112).

Many of the issues raised by philosophers following the radical education model have relevancy to professional agricultural and extension educators. While it is beyond the scope of most in the profession to become deeply involved in the political problems of host countries, the very nature of education as political means that such issues will arise. So the first lesson is simply one of awareness. The issue of hegemonic control over education and curricula is more difficult to deal with and requires development workers to understand the ethical positions of those they are going to work for. As with the issues of creating utopian societies, mentioned above, here too development workers must carefully study a host country's politics regarding the economically marginalized in order to understand that country's educational system. And in a related manner, these same workers need to be careful so as to not unwilling act as extenders of either America's hegemonic leadership or the ideology of the donor organization.

Critical Education Philosophy  Critical theorists, like the reconstructionists, were "critical" of the political silence surrounding the control of public institutions and policies by groups interested only in their own advantages. They felt that the education systems of many countries fell into this category. Giroux and Apple, (in McNeil
1980:41), for instance, argued that "the American education system produces a stratified social order that perpetuates the values of dominant social class interests." Critical theorists were also critical of the positivistic philosophy that the U.S. education system is built upon.

Positivism, as mentioned above, is a philosophy developed toward the end of the nineteenth century. It argued against Cartesian idealism, that is, against Descartes' statement, "I think, therefore I am." Positivism was radically realistic and empirical, in the philosophical sense, claiming that only those things which could be known by the senses were real. The positivists were also meta-theorists who claimed that their (scientific) explanation of reality was the only possible explanation because they had exclusive access to "objective truth" and the universal laws governing reality. As such, any statements that differed from theirs were, by definition, wrong. Positivism began as the foundation of the empirical, "hard" sciences and was then adopted as the base of the human and social sciences.

These empirically-based human sciences were, according to Lather (1991: 174), built on the following four assumptions of social positivism:

1) that the aims, concepts and methods of the natural sciences are applicable to the social sciences;
2) that the correspondence theory of truth, which holds that reality is knowable through correct measurement methods, is adequate for the social sciences;
3) that the goal of social research is to create universal laws of human behavior which transcend culture and history; and
4) that the fact/value dichotomy—the denial of both the theory-laden dimension of observation and the value-laden dimension of theory—creates the grounds for an "objective" social science.

Critical theorists categorically denied the positivists' claims to knowledge of objective truth and of universal laws regarding education and the social sciences (Lather 1991, Usher and Bryant 1989). For one thing, as Usher and Bryant (1989:17-18) pointed out, the positivists believed that observation is not problematic. Usher and Bryant argued instead that it is problematic because it is both theory-laden and socially constructed.
These writers concluded by claiming that the failure of positivist researchers to understand this problem led them to develop theories and produce results that a) were not true and b) reinforced and legitimized the very presuppositions their results were based on, that is, that certain social conditions and relations are given and natural (Usher and Bryant 1989:17).

Another example of such criticism was Giroux's (1988c:53) claim that positivist-oriented researcher's faith in scientific reason and instrumental rationality had driven discourse away from the politics of everyday life, while grounding it instead, in analytic procedures rather than in substantive issues. This and similar refutations of positivism (Wilbur, 1986; Hayward, 1987; Borg and Gall, 1989; Lather, 1991; Stanley, 1991) led post-positivist researchers to claim that new models need to be developed for educational research.

Stanley (1991) also remarked that the positivist's move away from substantive issues was worsened by the empiricism and scientism that dominated education and the social sciences in recent times. Apple (1986a:178-79) agreed. He claimed that the first task of a teacher was to educate him or her self concerning the social inequalities in the culture he or she was working in. Only after that had been accomplished could the teacher help others.

Again, it is important to remember that education is, by nature, political. As such, international educators have a responsibility to be aware of what the "politics of place" are when they become involved with a development project. Also, understanding the criticism of positivism made by contemporary critical pedagogists is important in understanding a philosophy of agricultural and extension education that tries to make sense out of today's complex international development scene. For, although it is important to maintain a rigorous, scientific methodology in gathering data using quantitative research techniques, it must be kept in mind that concepts such as objective and value-free are ideals, not reality, particularly when it comes to doing social research.
Postmodernism is a rejection of the positivists' claim that there are objective grounds that can be used for interpreting human behaviors, cultures, and societies. There are several major proponents of postmodern theory, including Baudrillard (1981, 1983a,b); Lyotard (1984), and Rorty (1979, 1982, 1985); Giroux (1988). Stanley (1992:152, following Lyotard) explained that postmodernism was a movement away from the "modern" idea that a single philosophy or scientific approach could legitimize itself by referring to a "metadiscourse." Metadiscourses according to Stanley (1992:152), are those discourses and theories "which claim to be able to critique related (but subordinate) discourses by appeal to some kind of 'grand narrative'" such as capitalism, Marxism, positivism, scientism, structuralism, transcendentalism, etc. Lather (1991:5) added that postmodernism is the refutation of grand narratives, such as "the Age of Enlightenment" and Marx's theory of conflict because such narratives are no longer credible. She went on to explain that

Philosophically speaking, the essence of the postmodern argument is that the dualisms which continue to dominate Western thought are inadequate for understanding a world of multiple causes and effects ...(Lather, 1991:-21).

In other words, the Enlightenment's argument concerning reason over non-reason and Marx's argument concerning the struggle between the proletariat and bourgeois are just too simplistic to use as determinants of rules for make meaning out of today's complicated life. And as pointed out above, the same is true for the empirical model of science.

Postmodernism then, is a reaction in support of the post-positivist worldview. In postmodernism, a multiplicity of philosophies compete in trying to make sense out of what is happening. Postmodernism claims that each of these philosophies has validity if the particular rules of meaning work within the context of world they govern. In addition, postmodernists argue against any claim to a grand narrative or "grand unification theory" which one could turn to for an explanation of why one particular philosophy is better than another. That is, reality is seen as relativistic and contextual by the postmodernists.
The concept of postmodernism is important to this study because it asks agricultural educators to re-examine the metadiscourses which both the positivistic and scientistic view of education were based on. It also questioned whether the current philosophy of the discipline is appropriate for the international setting. That is, it asks educators and other development workers to attempt to understand local philosophies, customs and cultures from the standpoint of the native people.

Poststructuralism  A philosophical idea which is related to postmodernism is poststructuralism. Structuralists such as Chomsky, Skinner, and Levi-Strauss attempted to develop theories which could be used to explain all of the phenomena within their respective disciplines. Poststructuralism was an attempt to get away from the super-theories, meta-discourses, and transcendental meanings that were used by the structuralists. The major concern of the poststructuralists was with "texts" and with what Derrida (1976, 1978, 1988) called "unbounded textualities." Derrida defined these as the "texts" of human life or the "texts of human arrangements, such as institutions, discursive practices, and power arrangements.

The methodology which the poststructuralists developed for debunking metadiscourses and super-theories was deconstruction. Deconstruction theory evolved out of the works in hermeneutics (or textual interpretation) done by Dilthey (1969), Gadamer (1976), Habermas (1971), and Derrida (1976). It was the process of breaking meta-theories and other 'texts' into their constituent parts, in an attempt to understand their underlying philosophies. Stated another way, deconstruction is "...the program of taking texts or cultural phenomena and trying to see what they are really saying in a social, political and sexual context" (Mondo 2000 1993:80).

In poststructuralism and deconstruction, even the meaning of "meaning" came into question. Derrida (1976), for example, claimed that meaning could only be "fixed" when it was in a relationship with a text or a spoken statement. In other words, meaning only existed in relation to other texts, e.g., in discourse with another person, community, etc. As such, there were no "transcendental meanings" because all concepts referred to
previous concepts or prior discussions. Consequently, there was no fixed meaning, as meaning itself was always relative to another discourse.

According to Whitson (in Stanley 1992:205), the benefit of poststructuralism and deconstruction was that they allowed educators to better understand how state mainstream ideologies limited the educators' abilities to understand the relationship between human agency, i.e., personal "empowering" action, and institutional social structures. In other words, by deconstructing the ideology of the elite-dominated state institutions/structures, educators could see how such a mindset had created the dualisms which put human agencies in opposition to state social structures, e.g., the schools, and in so doing, limited the power of both.

There has been much concern about the destabililizing effect which postmodernist and poststructuralist theory might have on social theory. Berstein (1983) need citation attributed this to "Cartesian anxiety" which he described as the fear that our culture will drift into the "abyss of relativism" if we don't maintain our objective knowledge base. Stanley claimed educators could avoid the problem of relativism by combining critical thinking skills with a postmodernist understanding of how the individual strengthened his or her experience of agency through discourse. Derrida (1988), in struggling with the same problem, maintained simply that there was no privileged vantage point outside the "text" to which one might appeal for a correct reading. That is, for Derrida there was no escape from relativism in the practical world.

Poststructuralism, like postmodernism, held some important philosophical elements for the development of a philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. For example, by using poststructural and deconstruction ideas, agricultural educators might be better able to uncover structural dimensions of a host nation's educational system or agricultural ministry which effect the education of farmers and other rural people. Also, by creating "unbounded texts," using qualitative research techniques such as dialogical interviewing, Agricultural Educators and development specialists might better understand their own role in the larger state-hegemonic ideology and how their own work effects human agency. Finally, the process of deconstruction offers a new tool for
agricultural educators which can help them better understand their position as "outsiders." Such an understanding could, in turn, help them develop better two-way communications with their host clientele.

**Critical Pragmatism** In recent years efforts have been made to combine the social consciousness of the critical theorists with the practicality of the pragmatists. The results are known as critical pragmatism. Pragmatists, it will be recalled, were empiricists who had adopted a relativistic and a pluralistic view of the world. Critical theorists argued that that was a mistake because it took William James's dictum—that the truth of something is determined in terms of its practical effects—too seriously (Stanley 1992). Traditionalists tended to believe that anything that was in existence was normal or what is "true and valued is what works in terms of what exists" (Cherryholmes 1988:178, in Stanley 1992).

A critical pragmatism would argue instead, that true knowing is not determined simply by what works. True knowing requires the individual to compare his or her epistemological, ethical, and aesthetic beliefs with his or her own perceptions of truth and reality. After such a comparison, the person must choose between truth and falsity. Then the person must act on his or her choices in both discourse and practice. The manifestations of such actions must then be compared with the belief system of the person's community because, for pragmatists, there are no universal standards outside of community. So knowledge, for the critical pragmatist, is grounded in self-knowing (or self-reflexivity) and reflection on one's community.

Critical pragmatism suggested the way out of the problem of relativism. That was important because when philosopher/educators dispense with meta-discourses and supertheories, practitioners have no where to turn for solid footing. By claiming that the truth can be found in the human heart, the human intellect, and the human community, the critical pragmatists have brought everyday human problems back to the level at which everyday humans can solve them.
Postmodern Reconstructionists

Post-positivist practitioners have offered modern agriculture development professionals new tools to help them understand the complexities of today's global society. But according to postmodern reconstructionists like Stanley and Whitson (1992), the post-positivists failed in their overall task of helping marginalized people find satisfying lives. This is because they failed to help them develop a utopian vision of the future and a way to achieve it. The postmodern reconstructionists have sought to resolve this by offering their own theory of education which had the following purposes:

1) to give students the power to engage in social criticism,
2) to enable students to construct a utopian vision of a preferred social order, and
3) to identify those democratic values which act as a basis for educational praxis (Stanley 1992:206).

The goal of their project was to develop an educational practice which fostered a just democracy in a relativistic world. For this to happen, they claimed, all citizens needed to be educated well enough to participate in critical praxis (political discourse leading to political action) aimed at the betterment of their lives (Stanley 1992:208). According to Stanley, such an education (called critical pedagogy) should include the following three kinds of analysis. It should:

1) examine whether a society functioned in accordance with its professed aims,
2) speculate on a utopian view of human betterment, and
3) consider the values and related conditions that might be required for judging goals and actions.

For postmodern reconstructionists like Stanley then, the major function of education was to teach what he called "practical judgement" which he defined as "the competence needed for praxis or the ability to reformulate old goals, determine new goals and take action to achieve them" (Whitson and Stanley 1992:214). In other words, the postmodern reconstructionists claimed that educators not only needed to be aware of the importance of understanding postmodern theory and deconstruction, but they also needed to incorporate both social awareness and praxis into today's curriculum.
Feminist Theory  

Another important addition to the philosophical school known as post-positivism came from the feminist theorists. Feminist theory was derived from the experiences of early feminist thinkers. Feeling that they had been left out of mainstream research, feminist researchers devised a sociological research theory which was based on the real lives and every day experiences of women. These theorists also argued that a research paradigm that would accurately reflect the lives of women would need to have the following attributes: 1) it would need to be political, 2) it would need to advocate social change, 3) it would need to be self-reflexive, and 4) it would need to be flexible and subject to change.

The core of the feminist theorists' argument was that the language and politics of academic institutions and the research those institutions did had a built in bias towards women and marginalized people. This bias has had the effect of eliminating the life experiences of marginalized people. It has done so by claiming that the lives of such people, e.g., housewives, waitresses, peasant farmers, were not worthy of study. This mindset was similar to the point mentioned at the beginning of this study concerning the lack of education for rural (peasant) people before the introduction of scientific agriculture. Feminist theorists have pointed to such attitudes as problematic.

Another important point, made by Harding (1987), Stanley and Wise (1990), and others was that there was no single feminist metatheory. There was instead, a multiplicity of feminist theories, or standpoints. This was because feminist theories were experientially based, so a particular feminist standpoint only represented those women who shared that experience. In a like manner, clientele groups that international agricultural and extension educators work with will each have their own standpoint which describes how they see the world.

Stanley and Wise (1990:47) claimed that it was important to understand this concept because "once we admit the existence of feminist standpoints there can be no a priori reason for placing these in any kind of a hierarchy; each has epistemological validity because each has ontological validity. Here we have contextuality grounded
truths. " This is equally important for international agricultural educators because it can help them understand that their own personal views have no more ontological or epistemological validity than do the views of their clientele. The skills and information that make up agricultural and extension education only have value to a community if that community understands and accepts the premises of the new skills, information, etc.

Another feminist theorist, Dorothy Smith (1983, 1990), claimed that organizational structures often alienate people from their experiences. Calling her work "institutional ethnography," Smith examined how institutions group women into categories, thereby eliminating the necessity of recognizing everyday problems in these women's lives. In so doing, the institutions were able to turn these people's problems into non-problems and thus, to ignore them. Smith then explained that a 'sociology for women' required a research practice which would "never lose sight of women as actively constructing, as well as interpreting, the social process and social relations which constitute their everyday realities" (in Stanley and Wise, 1990:34-35). Again, the point is that researchers must guard against "objectifying" their research subjects because by doing so, they can only sense what was, but never what is.

The work of Patti Lather (1986a, 1986b, 1991) was also relevant to this study. Lather (1991) stated that her goal was to develop research and teaching methods which would challenge the "relations of dominance" in educational institutions. It was only through understanding and challenging these relations she claimed, that research would begin to include the marginalized, such as women and minorities. What Lather developed was a research methodology which was based in praxis or "the self-creative activity through which we make the world" (1991:11-12). For Lather, praxis was about people taking action which was both political and relevant to their life.

In trying to accomplish her task, Lather (1991) saw the importance of refuting the positivist's paradigm as an appropriate model for human research. Instead, she set about redesigning human science research methods so that they were interactive, contextualized, and invited "joint participation in exploration of research issues" (p. 52). Lather (1991:-53) explained that a praxis-oriented research agenda must meet the following objectives:
1) it must confront issues of empirical accountability, that is, it must question
the need to offer objective grounds for accepting a researcher's descriptions
and analyses; and
2) it must search for workable ways of establishing the trustworthiness of data
developed through critical inquiry (p. 53).

For this kind of praxis to be possible, she claimed, two things needed to happen. First,
the research needed to clarify or somehow benefit the lives of the people it was research-
ing. And second, the lives of those being researched needed to clarify the research being
performed. In other words, research, like all communications, needs to be a two-way
street. To accomplish these ends, Lather (p. 56) suggested the adoption of what she called
emancipatory social research. Such a methodology would support people in their attempt
to make their lives better by encouraging self-reflection and a deeper understanding of
their particular situation. "What I suggest," she wrote (p. 57) "is that we consciously use
our research to help participants understand and change their situations."

The feminist theorists have offered several ideas that are relevant to a philosophy
of international agricultural and extension education. One such idea was that research had
to accurately describe the lives of the people it studied. It needed therefore, to guard
against institutionalizing real people and their problems. Another important point was the
idea that there is no single "feminist" philosophy. There are only feminist standpoints and
different standpoints represent different viewpoints. This is an important thing to remem-
ber when working in areas where there is a lot of diversity. That is, each group might be
quite different.

Finally, there is Lather's concept of a praxis-based emancipatory research
methodology which suggested that if a researcher was involved with a marginalized
group, it was that researcher's duty to raise the person's political awareness of her or his
situation. This may be beyond the role some people in the field of agricultural and
extension education think they should go. That however, should not keep individuals from
including it in their own practices and their own intellectual awarenesses of the political
nature of development work. Another educator who has struggled long and hard to
develop a praxis oriented educational system was Paulo Freire. This study will now examine his contribution to educational research.

Freire's Conscientization  Freire began his pedagogical work as a teacher of adult literacy in the barrios of Sao Paulo, Brazil. He saw education as a political and liberatory exercise. As such, he saw the job of teaching as one of "breaking the cycle of psychological oppression by engaging students in confronting their own lives" (Aronowitz 1992:15). For Freire, oppression came from within as well as from outside a person. That being the case, he believed that the role of education was to free people from "the blind adherence to their own world views as well as to the uncritically examined view of others" (McNeil 1990:37). Freire developed a theory of education that he called "conscientization," which he described as the process learners use to achieve a deeper awareness of their sociological reality and of their ability to transform it through action and personal involvement (Freire, 1970).

The way to accomplish conscientization was through the use of a problem-posing system of education that functioned around the principles of praxis and dialogue. Praxis, as mentioned above, is the self-creative and self-reflective activity people undertake in order to make or name their worlds. Praxis requires both a theory and action. But the action must only be taken after a period of reflection. Freire considered dialogue to be the tool a person used to validate his or her reality (Aronowitz 1992:13). As such, Freire believed that dialogue was the road to freedom. That is, freedom was the result of a person's perception of his or her reality. But dialogue cannot occur when one of the parties is in an oppressive relationship with the other. For Freire then, dialogue required that the two parties be equal. The way for that to happen was for members of the "oppressed" group to grant themselves freedom through conscientization.

Freire argued that education was political and entailed the use of praxis and dialogue. This argument is important in articulating a philosophy of international agricultural and extension education because it made clear the political nature of education and expanded the possibilities of education as a way out of oppression. This should be
meaningful in a profession whose end-use clientele are often poor, often women and often uneducated people from the countryside.

**Conclusion** In the above section, a review was made of the traditional and more recent thoughts on the philosophy of education. While agricultural education has drawn liberally from most of these traditional philosophies, they have not dealt much with the political implications of education, as pointed out by the post-positivists. In a homogeneous place like the rural U.S., this is perhaps understandable. For an international agricultural and extension education however, it is a blunder. That is, it is important for educators to understand the political side of education and how various writers have expressed their views about the relationship between education, politics, and freedom.

Of most importance to this dissertation were the concepts put forth by the post-positivists and those advocating recipient empowerment, like Freire and the feminist theorists. These writers shared a common concern for those who are under represented by educational research--the non-elites, women, minorities; the "voiceless." What these writers advocated was the use of education as a means of empowering those populations. Empowering was to be done by legitimizing the participants; by giving them voice; by creating the possibility of utopian visions; and by designing reciprocal research projects in which the researchers offered a returned to the participants instead of just helping themselves.

The various schools of thought represented above suggested that education is more than overt teaching and learning of subject matter. In the post-positivist world, education is a two way street, one of give-and-take, in which teachers and learners can interchange their roles and in which the traditional dualisms, which often suggest that the teachers knowledge has a higher value than that of the learners, are no longer applicable.
Traditional Agricultural Education

The purpose of this study was to articulate a post-positivist philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. The method used for developing this philosophy combined historical research, philosophical analysis, dialogical interviewing, and hermeneutic interpretation. In the first part of this chapter a historical review was made of agricultural education and its accompanying philosophy, as it developed in the United States. In the latter part of this chapter, a review was made of those philosophies, past and present, which have or may contribute to a post-positivist philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. The next task was to synthesize these two sections in order to articulate a philosophy based on these literature reviews.

Understanding a group's philosophy entails understanding how that group perceives "meaning" in four areas: cosmology, ontology, epistemology, and ethics. For this study, it was necessary to begin looking at the philosophy of agricultural and extension education by examining its roots in traditional Western culture. As such, its cosmology was located in the Judeo-Christian/Old Testament, Greek tradition. From that tradition, it gained its image of a God, and would therefore be considered a Theistic culture. From the Old Testament the culture also gained its "emergence" mythology or its sense beginnings as a people; a "myth of the organization" if you will. In other words we Westerners are, generally speaking, a group of people who believe in a Supreme being and in a mythological "beginning" (see Ruether 1992:15-31).

For modern Westerners, however, that was not the end of their cosmology. Following Galileo's work with the telescope and Bacon's philosophical works supporting the Copernican Revolution and "scientific techniques," a mechanized view of the World was developed, from which the various western sciences were produced. Out of these, our twentieth century theory regarding an evolving universe and Darwin's theory of gradual evolution were developed. These were, to a large extent, institutionalized into a form of "scientism" i.e., people forgot they were theories, during the first middle part of this century. A radical form of positivism and empiricism formed around these notions, which
claimed that material objects were the only things that were real and that positivistic science had the only explanation of reality (see Ruether 1992:32-58). In the past twenty years however, the implications of the quantum view of physical reality have allowed for the development of a more relativistic and humanistic view of the world. It is a view which is based on the idea of energy, as opposed to matter. As such, it can include important human characteristics such as feelings and ideas.

Information drawn from the literature review suggested that cosmologically, traditional agricultural educators believe the world is integrated, dynamic, ever-changing and increasingly complicated. They also see the world analytically and atomistically and they see the parts being causally related. They believe in time and the future, as well. This is all within the context of the traditional Western religion and mythological culture. They also see the world prescriptively which means they believe the world is dictated by custom.

Ontologically (the study of "being"), agricultural education is based in pragmatism and the works of John Dewey. The pragmatists claimed that experience was the only real way of gaining knowledge and that the only real way of understanding the meaning of truth and goodness was through the experiencing of the consequences of one's actions. Dewey was concerned with attaining happiness by overcoming doubt. Doubt was a result of the perceived dualism between the real and the ideal. Resolution was obtained by being able to intellectually understand cause and effect relationships. The best way to learn this intellectual skill was through hands-on, experiential learning. The use of toys and tools made this much more effective. The pragmatists also believed that reality was both relativistic and a pluralistic.

The review of literature suggested that agricultural educators see humans as semi-autonomous beings who require "community" for validation. And they see humans as an individual "experience organisms" who can learn about their environment through sensory experiences. They also believe that different people have different levels of native ability in the cognitive, affective and motor-skills domains. They believe these are hierarchical and that higher intelligence is a superior quality.
Agricultural Educators believe that humans can learn and be taught. Therefore, humans can be changed intellectually and morally through education. Humans are also gregarious and can get along well with each other through intelligent cooperation. They learn best through the application of scientific principles, that is through developing a theory about their environment, then experiencing their environment, then comparing their results to what they expected. This is particularly true when the experience involves common objects, phenomena and activities. This principle holds true for groups of humans as well. Humans are also "discoverers." And another person can lead an individual to a discovery. People are plastic and malleable and can, therefore, be manipulated through S-R process, to be modified in a particular way.

Agricultural Educators also believe that "work" is a part of human nature. They believe that one can plan for and achieve future goals. And they believe that people have the potential of self-realization, which intimates that different people have different levels of consciousness. In addition, agricultural educators believe that humans are intelligent and capable of reflective thinking. As such, they need intellectual discussion and debate concerning the nature and need to acquire enough knowledge so as to be academicians and philosophers. Finally, Agricultural Educators believe that the highest quality people can have is the humanness - expressed as "their heart and soul."

Epistemologically (the nature of knowledge), Agricultural Educators believe that both knowledge and truth stem from empirical investigation. They also believe that both of these are temporary, i.e., they change. Agricultural Educators see the world analytically, which means that they break things into smaller parts in order to examine them more closely. They are experientially oriented and believe that the meaning of the "real" world is that which can be experienced with the senses. But the experiences must be verified by the community. Following this, Agricultural Educators believe that learning to make decisions about current, life-like problems, within the community is the best way for a person to learn to effectively solve problems in the future. This works best when it involves direct or supervised experience on a home or school farm.
Ethically, or axiologically, agricultural educators place high value on individualism and self-activity. Agricultural Educators also place high value on community and believe in the improvement of social behavior through participation in the democratic process. They believe in leadership and leadership training and think that "one should know one's place" and be effective as either a leader or a supporter. As such, they believe a broad based education is important. They place high value on hard work. They believe that teaching and learning are valuable. They believe that both society and individuals have an obligation to help in the development of those who have less than they do, i.e., they are humanitarian by nature. Agricultural Educators believe humans should observe, participate, and learn from nature. And they believe that education should do the following: it should serve all populations, it should develop the whole person, and it should respond to the needs of a free market place economy.

Agricultural Educators are "directive" and believe in an information/experience/knowledge hierarchy. As such, they believe that their experiences, and thus their information and knowledge are more valuable than those they are "teaching." They believe however, that they can "cause" the learner to have the right experience(s) and thus learn/grow in the correct direction. Finally, Williams (1990) claimed that the discipline of Agricultural Education is only as strong as are its means for verifying existing knowledge, for creating new knowledge, and for disseminating and applying that knowledge. This, he suggested, is done through research.

A Post-positivist Philosophy of Agricultural Education

In the review of literature given above, many new concepts were introduced which offer insight into a post-positivist definition of an international agricultural and extension education. A new definition of a critical agricultural and extension education can be articulated, one which contains the strengths of both schools of thought. This new agricultural education must remain rational and scientific, but accept that human, social reality is socially constructed, i.e., there is no "reality out there" to appeal to in social situations. Also, it must be pragmatic, but critically pragmatic. Epistemologically the
"practical" part of pragmatism must be socially and culturally defined within the situated
time and place of the research participants, classrooms, extension districts, etc. A critical
agricultural education must also remain focused on human resource development. But it
must be done in a caring and inclusive way, one which validates emotions and the every­
day life of its clientele. And finally, it must own up to its political nature. The new
agricultural and extension education should be utopian in vision. It must advocate a com­
plete and true democracy that includes those who have been typically under-represented in
both educational offerings and in research. It must also help students understand their own
political and social reality.

Cosmologically, a post-positivist philosophy of agricultural education needs to be
broad enough to include both the Judeo-Christian/Geek view of creation, plus the
scientific explanation of creation, plus the various creation and emergence myths from
various other cultures. For example, most Native American groups believe that their tribe
"emerged" from the underworld independently. Yet they don’t deny that the other groups
emerged as well. So somehow an international agricultural and extension education
profession would need to have polytheistic world view which could accept many interpre­
tations of "Supreme Being," including the "Big Bang theory" and the Theory of evolu­
tion.

This view of course, touches on several aspects of post-positivism. It is pluralistic
and relativistic, as were the early pragmatists. And, as suggested by the postmodernists
and poststructuralists, it does away with both the supertheories and meta-discourses which
have supported the hierarchical and elitist views of western scholars and academicians
over the past two hundred years. And in so doing, it created the space for that most
important part of humanness--two-way communications.

Cosmologically, post-quantum theory writers like Hayward, Capra, and Wilbur
suggested a world view that transcended the dualisms of traditional Western thought and
offered in their stead, one which focuses on process, flow, and change. It is a world of
causes and effects, but not necessarily ones which we can discover through physical
observation and measurement. It is a two-way world in which it was understood that the
observer and the observed effect each other, that is, an object unobserved might behave differently that an object under observation. The lessons of such two way relationships are applicable to the human sciences as well.

Following the works of the humanist psychologists, e.g., Maslow, Rogers, Jung, early Agricultural Educators adopted a view of the importance of individuation and self-realization. This theme is central to the works of many post-positivist thinkers and writers. It is important to this study because it offers a development model of two-way mutual development between equals. So for example, I, as an agricultural and extension educator, have a certain body of skills and information to share with a client group. That group, on the other hand, has a certain body of information and skills, which have some track record of having worked effectively over a period of time, and are specific to that particular place and culture. The task then, becomes one of how to combine those two bodies of information so that everyone grows.

The concern by many that the world will fall into a relativistic and nihilistic black hole need not be of too great of a concern. This is because most cultures in recorded history, from Hammurabi's time through today, have had a code of ethics which govern human behaviors. Again, these seem to be underlying human behaviors which can be uncovered through dialogue and agreement which are supportive of all cultures. A more difficult task, as was pointed out by the feminist theorists, Freire, etc., is the need to become "self-realized" through praxis and dialogue. And, as was mentioned by the early agricultural educators, this can be done at the group level as well as at the individual level. In other words, groups like "professional agricultural and extension educators" can raise their collective consciousness through self-reflection and dialogue as well.

And finally, there is the challenge by modern thinkers, from John Dewey to the feminist theorists, to develop an awareness of the political nature of education and to have individuals focus their activities on helping those that are marginalized and under-represented in research be "voiced," recognized, and supported in their struggle against oppression.
The following questions now present themselves. First, using this new definition, what methodology(s) is appropriate for determining if other practitioners in the field of international agricultural and extension education are philosophically in agreement with it? And second, having established an appropriate methodology for examining the practitioner's philosophy, what, then is that philosophy?
CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The best methodologies of qualitative and quantitative research have come from those engaged in active research in which methodology has been subordinated to the ardent desire to know and communicate something significant about human social life (Feagin, Orum, and Sjoberg, 1991:23).

Introduction

In the "Statement of the Problem" in Chapter I of this study, it was noted that professionals in the field of agricultural and extension education had both a body of knowledge and documentation as to the effectiveness of their techniques and procedures in education. It was claimed that this information might help to eliminate some of the food and fiber problems which affect both land and people in the developing countries.

The theories and methods which the agricultural and extension education profession offered to the international development community have had many benefits. There also appears to be some inherent flaws in the philosophy upon which the profession was build, flaws which could undermine the effectiveness of the profession in its attempt to extend its information to others. This study was designed to examine that philosophy and alternatives to it, in the hope of articulating a philosophy of international agricultural and extension education which is conducive to international development in the 1990s.

The study was phenomenological in nature, in that it sought to develop an understanding of the essence of international agricultural and extension education. The method used for developing this philosophy combined historical research, philosophical analysis, hermeneutic interpretation, and dialogical interviewing. To accomplish this task it was necessary to develop a research model which was appropriate for examining philosophical issues (see Figure 1). The project was designed as a qualitative case study of the philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. The study was begun by describing the history and development of agricultural education. Next, the development of the philosophy of agricultural education was traced. Then the various philosophies of general education were review, with particular attention being paid
The philosophy was developed by combining the history of agriculture education with the philosophy of general education. This was then verified through dialogical interviewing. A hermeneutic approach was used to analyze the information. The philosophical essence of international agricultural development education was determined through phenomenological investigation.
to recent developments, termed postmodern, which appeared germane to the development of a *post-positivist* philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. From this work, a post-positivist philosophy of international agricultural and extension education was developed. Next, the philosophical views and opinions of members of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education (AIAEE) were solicited through in-depth interviews. This information was then combined with the previously compiled information to produce a phenomenological definition of international agricultural and extension education which reflected the views of professionals who practice the discipline in their daily lives. A dialogical approach to interviewing was used to gather the data. A hermeneutical and phenomenological approach was used in analyzing and interpreting the data. Several methods were used to check validity, including triangulation, construct validity, face validity, and catalytic validity.

As will be noted below, qualitative case studies provide an excellent opportunity to generate theory in the process of research (a process often referred to as emergent theory). The theory that emerged during this project was that the philosophies' of practitioners of international agricultural and extension education, as represented by members of the AIAEE, would reflect a post-positivist, postmodernist, and social reconstructionist view of education, rather than the positivist view of traditional agricultural education.

**Methods and Procedures**

**Qualitative Research**

What is qualitative research? And when and why is it an appropriate research model? These were difficult questions to answer. The goal of qualitative research, according to Merriam (1988:18), was to develop a holistic understanding of a process or system. She described it as an attempt to understand a "synergistic whole," instead of breaking the phenomena down and studying the parts, which is what quantitative research methods try to do.
Marshall and Rossman (1989) suggested that there was no single method which defined qualitative research. It was instead, composed of a number of methods, e.g., human ethology, ecological psychology, ethnography, symbolic interaction, historical research, etc. What these methods had in common was that each required a systematic study of a phenomena in its natural setting and, when possible, in the everyday life setting of that phenomena. Patton (1985, in Merriam 1988:16-17) described qualitative research as an effort to understand the nature of a particular setting; to see what it meant for participants to be in that setting; and try to figure out what had meanings in the participant's lives.

Also, in qualitative research there are no predetermined hypotheses, nor are there any kind of treatments (Merriam 1988:17). The data collected usually contains detailed descriptions of people, places, things, and ideas. Direct quotations from the research participants about their experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and thoughts are often contained as well. Another feature of qualitative research is that the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis. This is important because, as Merriam (p. 19) pointed out, "the data are mediated through a human instrument rather than through a statistical tool or a machine." As such, the investigator's weltanschauung (or world view) affects the entire research process--from the design, to the collection of data, to the interpretation of the findings. In qualitative research, there are no rigid rules about either the design or interpretation of the material. For quantitative researchers, qualitative research often seems unstructured. Qualitative researchers however, see this as an advantage because it allows the researcher to adapt his questions in order to capture the real life meaning of an incident or phenomena, as it is experienced.

In recent years, qualitative research has gained in importance as an educational research tool because it addresses the more humanistic aspects of education and research. A problem existed, as pointed out by Schratz (1993), in that educational researchers, using quantitative research methods, often reduced the "voices" of research participants to experimental "noise" and attempted to get rid of it in order to create statistically correct research situations. In so doing, Schratz claimed, the researchers suppressed the
individuality of the people being studied. The nature of qualitative research, on the other hand, was to pay attention to the details of an individual's life, within the context of that person's everyday life. In a similar fashion, Feagin, et.al. (1991:23) claimed that qualitative procedures were important because they brought researchers closer to real human beings and to everyday life, and thus offered the researcher a "deep and rich" understanding of social action. As such, the qualitative approach offered a complex and often pluralistic view of the world, rather than the simple and uniform view described by empiricists.

Merriam (1988:16) claimed that qualitative research was an excellent way to answer questions that searched for the meaning of experience or asked the question "Why?" As such, it was ideal for trying to answer philosophical questions and to learn of the essence of each of the participants. This study, then, offered an alternative to the traditional quantitative approach to research. The qualitative approach that was taken allowed the researcher to probe the underlying philosophies of general education and agricultural education. It also allowed him to search the complex world of human opinions and feelings. And by bringing these areas of study together, the author was able to create a holistic view of the philosophy of international agricultural and extension education and gain a sense of where that philosophy might be heading in the future.

The Case Study Method

The project used a qualitative case study as its overall framework. The "case" was the philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. The case study method was chosen because it allowed for an in-depth study of a specific issue. In addition, it provided a good way to develop a theory for the study.

What exactly is a qualitative case study? Merriam (1988: 11-14) defined it as an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomenon, or social unit. Feagin, et.al. (p. 6-7) added that case study methodology encouraged and facilitated theoretical innovation and generalization. Yin (1989:23, in DeHegadas, unpublished thesis, 1993) claimed that a case study was as an attempt to investigate a phenomenon when the
following situations were present: 1) the phenomena was within its real-life context, 2) the boundaries between the phenomena and the context were not clearly evident, and 3) multiple sources of evidence were used. This study met those criteria in the following way. First, the phenomena studied, i.e., the philosophy of international agricultural and extension education, was examined as it related to professionals who practiced the discipline in their everyday lives. This data was collected in the homes or offices of those professionals who had been selected for the study. Second, the boundaries between their philosophic views regarding education and the rest of their lives was never clearly evident. That is, the participants never really functioned separate from their personal philosophies. And third, there were multiple sources of evidence used, including texts, historical documents, philosophical inquiries, and a total of seventeen interviews.

Merriam (1988:199) explained further that case study research demanded a detailed description of the phenomena for the following two reasons. First, case studies provided the reader with a way of "vicariously experiencing the setting of the study." And second, case studies are heuristic in that "they illuminate the reader's understanding of the phenomenon being studied" and in so doing allow the reader to discover new meaning, both in the situation and in her own life. They do so by involving the reader in the story and then allowing her to weigh the evidence which the researcher presented and reach her own conclusion.

Historical Research

Historical research is considered a normal part of the qualitative researcher's repertoire. Borg and Gall (1979), for example, included a chapter on historical research in their Educational Research text book. They defined historical research as the "systematic search for documents and other sources that contain facts relating to the historian's questions about the past" (p. 373). Of equal importance, according to Rury (1993), was the interpretation of data. He claimed that "it is the task of the historian to offer an explanation which goes beyond the evidence at hand" (p. 249).
There are several types of historical research. The traditional method was to give an "objective" view of the past. Today this is seen as close to impossible and it is generally understood that "the interpretation of history is shaped by current events" (Rury, p. 251). Another purpose of history was to explain descriptively how certain events have shaped the past and, in so doing, give the reader a vision of the future. Much of the work in the first part of this study was of a descriptive nature. Another type of historical research sought to synthesize data from the past in an effort to bring to light something that was either unknown or little understood. A final form of historiography, called "reconstructionist history" by Borg and Gall (p. 374) and "revisionist history" by Rury (p. 251), was the attempt to redefine and reinterpret the past and to give voice to those who have often been under-represented by traditional historians, i.e., women, the poor, and people of color.

One thing that these writers agreed on was that, as an "interpretive science" (or art), history was definitely an expression of the individual historian. Regarding this, Rury (p. 249) wrote, "it is the task of the historian to offer an explanation which goes beyond the evidence at hand." But it was equally important for the reader of history to pay attention to the reliability and validity of the historian and his work. Concerning these matters, Borg and Gall suggested that the researcher look for emotionally charged language as a sign of bias and try to find consistencies or what Rury called "the connectiveness of things," both within an author's work and amongst authors. For this study, books, journals, and texts dating back to the middle part of the nineteenth century were consulted in an attempt to find threads of consistency in the disciplines of general education and agricultural education.

Hermeneutics and Phenomenology

The study of hermeneutics began in Europe during the middle part of this century. Originally, it was a methodology for interpreting religious and spiritual texts. Schleiermacher (1977) took the project beyond religious studies and developed hermeneutics into a theory or technology of interpretation (van Manen 1991:179). As such, the primary
concern of hermeneutics was to clarify the rules used for interpreting texts (Thompson 1981:36). Other European scholars such as Heidegger, Ricoeur, and Habermas were important contributors to this school of philosophical thought.

Dilthey (1969) expanded the role of hermeneutic scholarship from one of interpreting the written works of other authors to the idea of re-experiencing their works by re-experiencing their "lived experiences," as expressed in their texts. More recently, Paul Ricoeur has widened the use of hermeneutics to include all human actions or situations, including the poststructuralist's concepts of "texts," "unbounded texts," etc. Today hermeneutics is used as a tool for gaining an understanding of another person's life by interpreting the text of their everyday lives.

The philosopher Kant first used the term phenomenology in differentiating phenomena, which are things as humans perceive them, from noumea which are things as they actually are. Webster (1984) defined phenomenology as the study of the perceptual experience. van Manen (1990:183) defined it as the scientific study of phenomena. So, phenomenology is the study of the difference between what really is and what an observer "sees." Following Husserl (1980), van Manen went on to explain that "phenomenology is the study of the life world - the world as we immediately experience it, pre-reflectively, rather than as we conceptualize, categorize, or reflect on it" (p. 9). It could be said then that a phenomenologist tries to differentiate between the essence of a phenomenon and her perception of it. She does so by looking at the differences between the nature of the object or process and what it means to her. In other words, phenomenology tries to identify the "lived-world," as it is, not as it should be. Because of this, it has been linked with many of the other human sciences, such as sociology, psychology, philosophy, and education.

Lancy (1993) claimed that a phenomenological researcher should avoid many of the principles called for in quantitative research, such as the use of assumptions, the reduction of complex reality into simple variables, and the use of instruments that influence the outcome of the research. Instead, he claimed, the researcher should enter into the research with an open mind and conduct research in which "the conclusions are
post hoc rather than a priori" (p. 9). Lancy also claimed that the goal of phenomenological research was to capture the reality of the subject instead of the researcher's own reality.

van Manen (1990:7), following Heidegger, combined these two ideas into hermeneutic phenomenology. He explained that hermeneutic phenomenology was descriptive (phenomenological) because it paid attention to the way things appear—"it wants to let things speak for themselves." It is also interpretive (hermeneutic) because it is concerned with texts, bounded textuality, etc. (p. 180). And, according to van Manen (1990:7), hermeneutic phenomenology was a "human science which studied people" and was as such, the ideal way to explain "the unique, the personal, the individual..." In so doing, van Manen claimed, the researcher could "avoid the fragmentation of the person." This allowed the researcher to help the research participant see herself as a whole being and as a part of a still larger whole world.

van Manen explained that hermeneutic phenomenology, as a human science, had three parts: investigating "lived experiences," reflecting on those experiences, and then writing about those reflections. To investigate a particular lived situation an investigator needed, first of all, to focus in on what it was that she wanted to investigate. Then she needed to involve herself in the situation in such a way so as to ask the question "what is the meaning of this situation?" To do a thorough job of this questioning, the researcher needed to explore all available resources. Only by working in such a thorough manner could the investigator discover the true meaning of the "lived experience."

The second step, phenomenological reflection, was necessary in order "to grasp the essential meaning of something" (p. 77). Drawing from the works of Husserl (1980), van Manen explained that reflection is two sided. It is easy, he explained, because it is something we do all of the time. It is also difficult however, because it requires that we develop a deep understanding of what it is we are reflecting on. In doing deep reflection then, the investigator must select a theme which is "simple but focused." Articulating this theme was considered an important part of phenomenological reflection.
The real essence of hermeneutic phenomenological research was in the writing. van Manen wrote, "Human science research is a form of writing. Creating a phenomenological text is the object of the research process" (p. 111). Going further, he explained that phenomenology required a form of consciousness that was created by the act of literacy, i.e., by reading and writing. It was, then, the action of reflecting on a "lived experience," while writing about it that gave phenomenological research its strength.

This study was phenomenological in the sense that it was an attempt to gain an understanding of the *essence* of a philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. And it was hermeneutical in that it attempted to deepen that understanding of such a philosophy by hermeneutically interpreting the "lived experiences" of the research participants, as expressed in the *texts* of their interviews.

This study followed van Manen's model for hermeneutic phenomenological investigation. That is, by investigating "lived experiences;" reflecting on those experiences; and then writing about those reflections, the researcher was able to develop a "deep and thick" understanding of those things which the interviewees felt the most strongly about, regarding international agricultural and extension education. Investigating the experiences of professional agricultural educators was done by interviewing them and then studying the interviews. Reflecting on those experiences was done by studying the transcripts and organizing them into stories. Furthermore, by developing an in-depth study of the philosophy of general education and the philosophy of agricultural education before doing the difficult task of interpreting the transcripts, the researcher was able to develop a theme to use as a center point for reflection. Also, writing the interviewee's stories entailed the use of hermeneutic phenomenology in that it forced the researcher/writer to try to enter into each of the participant's lives, through the texts, in order to gain an understanding of that person's feelings, opinions and philosophy. Finally, in developing and writing this whole research report, it was necessary for the author to use phenomenological tools, i.e., multiple sources, open-mindedness, open-ended questions, emergent theory, and hermeneutic interpretation, in an attempt to *see* how international agricultural and extension educators make meaning in their lives.
Dialogic Interviewing

The interviews themselves were conducted in a manner which Patton (1980) called *qualitative interviewing*, Freire (1987) called *dialogical interviewing*, and van Manen (1990) called *interpretation through conversation*. Patton's goal was to introduce qualitative methodology to human science research. He claimed that the purpose of qualitative interviewing was to "find out what is in and on someone else's mind...[and] to access the perspective of the person being interviewed" (p. 197). In his interviewing he included quantitative questions concerning experiences and demographics as well as more ambiguous questions concerning a person's opinions and feelings about a phenomena.

Freire took the process one step further by suggesting that interviewing should be a dialogue rather than an attempt by the interviewer to be "objective," which Freire and most modern-day qualitative researchers would claim is impossible. He also claimed that the real goals of research were to 1) for the researcher to get to know himself as a complete or whole person and 2) for the researcher to help the participant get to know herself and to become a more complete person. Freire's larger goal was to have people have enough self-awareness to understand the political and social reality they lived in and to know that they could take actions to improve that position.

Freire's approach was one of *choosing a theme* and then developing questions around that theme. Following Plato, he claimed that it was only through questioning that one could come to know oneself. Then, through interviewing and questioning, the researcher would come to know the interview participant, and the world at large. Ideally, the participant had a similar experience. Freire wrote, "Dialogue is a moment where humans meet to reflect on their reality as they make and remake it" (1987:99).

Freire claimed that there were two important factors in getting dialogical interviewing to work. One was that the researcher needed to remember that the opinions and views of the interview participant were of equal value to his own. The other was that the researcher needed to maintain a rigorous, logical and coherent structure in leading the interview. Rigor, in the Freirian sense, was historical in that "it [was] a way of being rooted in the time and conditions of the knower" (Shores and Freire, 1987:4). It was also
participative in that it was "a communication which challenge[d] the other to take part, or include[d] the other in an active research" (1987:4). Finally, dialogical interviewing must have a "logic of structure" in that it must fit into the researcher's critical examination of thematic literature and his own sense of reality.

For van Manen, phenomenological interviewing was "a kind of conversational relation that the researcher develop[ed] with the notion he or she wishe[d] to explore and understand" (1990:98). Like Freire, van Manen claimed that it was essential to have a theme around which to converse. Once this was established, a *triad* would be created. The researcher and the participant could then "enter into a conversation" regarding the theme. Again, like Freire, van Manen claimed that it was through questioning that both members were led deeper into the participant's sense of the phenomena being discussed.

To get this deeper understanding, van Manen recommended organizing questions so that they would, first, lead the participant towards gathering her thoughts about the theme, and second, lead her to reflect upon those thoughts. He claimed that if the interview went well, "both partners [could] self-reflectively orient themselves to the interpersonal or collective ground that brings the significance of the phenomenological question into view" (1990:9). For more on the interviews, see the section with that title below.

**Developing A Theory**

According to Merriam (p. 57) cf. Eckstein (1975), a qualitative case study is used to build a theory. The importance of this, she explained, was that it allowed the researcher to integrate the data into a whole, summarize the information, and then offer a general explanation of the phenomenon under study. Case study research therefore, is tied to theory either "as a receptacle for putting theories to work" or "as a catalytic element in the unfolding of theoretical knowledge" (p. 58). Goetz and LeCompte (1984:167), also in Merriam (1988), defined theorizing as the "...process of discovering or manipulating abstract categories and the relationships among those categories." Yin (1984) claimed that theorizing was the process by which researchers examined old issues and situations or
learned about new phenomena and concepts. Feagin, et.al. (1992:13) agreed and explained that as a setting became familiar and as more data were collected, researchers looked for underlying patterns. The authors called these "conceptual categories that make sense out of the phenomenon." The researcher then developed his own theory explaining the phenomena by synthesizing the conceptual categories. Exactly how one "sees" such patterns and categories cannot be precisely explained. Also, different researchers see the same phenomena differently and hence, come up with different theories. Therefore, theories change with researchers and circumstances. According to Goetz and LeCompte (p. 173), speculation is the key to developing theory because it permitted the investigator to look beyond the data and make guesses about what will happen in the future.

Merriam concluded by writing that hunches, working hypotheses, and educated guesses direct the qualitative theoretician's attention toward certain data. It is then up to the researcher to use her analyzing abilities to refine and/or verify her hunches. Using the qualitative case study method, the author of this study was able to develop a theory which explained the relationship between the philosophy of John Dewey, the traditional philosophy of agricultural education and some of the post-positivist schools of philosophy. In so doing, he was also able to speculate on what a sound philosophy of international agricultural and extension education might look like.

Checking Validity

As with all research, an important part of this project was assuring that the results were valid. The concept of assuring validity in qualitative research has been and remains somewhat problematic. Because qualitative research is based on inductive reasoning, is subjective in nature, and deals with specific phenomena, it is not subject to the same rules as quantitative research is. Thus the two, at the level of validity, reliability and generality are rather different. Yet, though qualitative research does not share the same parameters as quantitative, this does not mean that qualitative researchers do not have to take these issue into account. Instead, they have developed a different set of criteria by which to measure their results.
Guba and Lincoln (1985) approached the subject in terms of the "trustworthiness" of the qualitative (or naturalistic) researcher's results. Following Scriven (1971), they believed that the issue was with the data. They claimed that qualitative should mean objective and that the emphasis should be removed from the investigator and put on the data themselves. Then "the issue is no longer the investigator's characteristics but the characteristics of the data: Are they or are they not confirmable?" (p. 300). Lincoln and Guba suggested five techniques for testing trustworthiness. These included checking for credibility, transferability, dependability, confirmability, and doing reflexive journaling.

Concerning credibility, these authors offered five things to look at. They claimed that the results of a research project would be more creditable if the researcher was first of all, involved in activities with the research participants on a "prolonged engagement," if the researchers were involved in "persistent observation," and if the researchers "triangulate," that is, if they cross-referenced both their sources of data and the kinds of data they collect. A second technique for establishing credibility was peer debriefing. In this process, the researcher worked with a peer in analyzing and thus becoming aware of his or her biases and opinions which might affect the research. Peer debriefing also provided a way of testing theory at an early stage of the research. The third tool that Lincoln and Guba provided was negative case analysis. Following Kidder (1981), they explained that negative case analysis was a way of continuously revising the hypothesis until it "fit" all cases. They also expressed that "an insistence on zero exceptions may be too rigid" (p. 312), but that the idea and process were a good guide towards trustworthiness. Lincoln and Guba cited referential adequacy a fourth way of seeking trustworthiness. Following Eisner (1975), they explain that in this process, a portion of the researched materials should be stored on videos and/or tape recordings or somehow "earmarked" until the research had been completed. This data could then be compared to the results. The authors suggested that the stored materials could form a "benchmark against which later data analyses and interpretations could be tested for adequacy" (p. 313). The final tool that Guba and Lincoln offered was member checks, in which the data which had been collected and the conclusion which were drawn were verified by the
stakeholders. They suggested that when possible, the researchers should "arrange a session, perhaps lasting an entire day or even several days, to which are invited knowledgeable individuals from each of the several interested source groups." The stakeholders could then offer feedback on the materials and conclusions. They warned however, that the researchers needed to be careful when working with feedback, to guard against the possibility that the stakeholders themselves might want to bias the results.

Concerning transferability, Guba and Lincoln claimed that this was not really appropriate for qualitative research. They wrote "it is not the naturalist's task to provide an index of transfer-ability; it is his or her responsibility to provide the data base that makes transferability judgements possible on the part of potential appliers" (.p 316).

Dependability was an important aspect in qualitative research, according to Lincoln and Guba. These authors suggested that by copying the same techniques used for establishing credibility, but doing them independently, or by having them done by a second research team, dependability could be assured. Because of the difficulty and expense of such operations however, they also suggested the use of an inquiry audit, in which the data themselves and the process of inquiry are checked over by an independent agent.

Lincoln and Guba also recommended an audit as the best way of assuring confirmability. To do this, they suggested the use of triangulation and reflexive journalling. Concerning the latter, they explained that this technique offered a way for the researcher to keep a daily record of his or her "self (hence the term 'reflexive') and method." The authors wrote "With respect to the self, the reflexive journal might be thought of as providing the same kind of data about the human instrument that is often provided about the paper-and-pencil or brass instruments used in conventional studies. With respect to method, the journal provided information about methodological decisions made and the reasons for making them..." (p. 327).

In summary, Lincoln and Guba made a serious effort at outlining ways which assured stakeholders that the data collected and conclusions worked out by a researcher or group of researchers accurately reflected the stakeholders, i.e., that they were free from
researcher's bias. Guba's and Lincoln's major goal then, was to give qualitative research some kind of credence when it was compared with quantitative research.

Lather (1986, 1991) took a somewhat different and more radical approach. She began with Guba's and Lincoln's call for triangulation, reflexivity, and member checks. As a post-positivist however, Lather did not find it necessary to compare her work with quantitative research. Her concern was more with how the research process operated in making people, both researchers and participants, understand the reality of their life situations. Lather moved from triangulation and member checks to the problem of construct validity. Following Crombach and Meehl (1955), Lather claimed that researchers must pay constant attention to the development of their theories as they related to the people they were theorizing about. That is, researchers must always be asking themselves questions such as "What is the context of our theory" and "Are we building theory, or revising it, or testing it?." The problem, she claimed, was that as research do their work, the data changes their a priori theories. As such, the researchers need to constantly be aware of how they are interpreting the data, from the newly revised theory. More importantly, they need to be aware that the theory is changing, which is often an unconscious act.

Lather was also concerned with face validity. Following Kidder (1982), she claimed that face validity was obtained by "recycling descriptions, emerging analysis, and conclusions back through at least a subsample of the respondents" (p. 271). In other words, face validity asks if the data have face value in the eyes of the stake-holders. This is, in many ways, similar to a combination of Guba's and Lincoln's concepts of triangulation and member checks.

Lather's final approach to accuracy in qualitative research had to do with catalytic validity. Drawing on earlier works of both Brown and Tandon (1978) and Reason and Rowan (1981), she explained that catalytic validity measured to what degree the research itself acted as a catalyst in reorienting, refocusing, or re-energizing the stakeholders "towards knowing reality in order to transform it" (p. 272). Comparing this to Freire's
"conscientization," Lather claimed that valid research was research that helped the participants gain both self-understanding and a sense of self-determination.

More recently, Maxwell (1992) sought to develop a typology for checking the validity of qualitative research. He began by explaining that for him, the goal of qualitative research was to gain an understanding of a phenomena or process. Validity therefore, was a derivative of qualitative understanding. Maxwell claimed too, that the only true standard of validity was the one set by the stakeholders or the "community of participants." He referred back to Kuhn's (1970) concept of paradigm shifts in science and the concept of "normal science." Kuhn maintained that science goes through cycles and that most of the time the rules of science are agreed upon by the "community of scientists" that make up the particular discipline. Maxwell then extended that idea to address qualitative research projects by saying that the validity and results of most qualitative research projects were determined solely by the community in which they are developed.

Maxwell developed a typology which listed five checks for validity. The first was descriptive validity. Descriptive validity, as the name implies, simply described the data. Maxwell broke this category into two parts, primary and secondary descriptive validity. The former described actual physical phenomena which could be sensed with the five senses. The latter dealt with inferential data concerning physical objects, i.e., things that could be inferred from physical evidence even though the observer had not actually experienced them.

Maxwell's second category of validity checks was termed interpretive validity. Interpretive validity differed from descriptive validity in that, while the former described physical phenomena, the latter described the meaning of those phenomena. He wrote that the "accounts of meaning must be based initially on the conceptual framework of the people whose meaning is in question" (p. 289). As such, the events described in interpretive validity must, as much as possible, be described in the participant's own language. He also claimed that the terms used must be "experience-near" (from Geertz, 1974), that is, they must be based on concepts which the participants would use themselves.
An important aspect of both descriptive and interpretive validity was that in both cases, the terminology used to describe the data was not problematic. That is, in both cases the meaning of the language used was agreed upon by the community. What was being validated was the details of the description or interpretation, not the idea of description and interpretation or the techniques themselves.

This led to Maxwell's next category, which was theoretical validity. Maxwell explained that a theory was made up of two parts. The first part was the defining of the phenomena, which were the subjects of the theory. It was these phenomena which were described or interpreted by the first two categories. The second part of a theory described the relationship between the subjects. In this case however, the language of description was not necessarily agreed upon by the community. This was due to the fact that theoretical validity had to account for the explanation of the relationship. In other words, theoretical validity had to explain both the validity of the phenomena themselves and the validity of the relationship. Maxwell then explained "theories...incorporate both descriptive and interpretive understanding, but in combining these they necessarily transcend either of them" (p. 292). Maxwell claimed that theoretical validity had to do with the appropriateness of the application of a theory. He concluded that this appropriateness was again dependent on whether or not the community agreed on such appropriateness.

Maxwell next brought up generalizability as a validity concept. He described generalizability as "the extent to which one can extend the account of a particular situation or population to other persons, times, or settings" (p. 293). Maxwell claimed that, for the most part, generalizability was not a major concern of qualitative research because most qualitative research projects were not set up to be generalized. Where some generalizing did take place, he pointed out, was in the area of theorizing. That is, often a theory describing a relationship between a set of phenomena will be used to create a generalized statement of relationships "within a community." This was particularly true of interviewing, he claimed, because interviews were social situations which involved a relationship. It was important therefore, that the interviewer understands how that relationship affected
the responses and that he or she understand that the responses were specific to the interview and should not be taken out of context.

Maxwell concluded with *evaluative* validity. Concerning this, Maxwell claimed that most qualitative research does not evaluate the things it studies. For more on validity in this study, see below.

**Design of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to articulate a post-positivist philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. To accomplish this purpose, a qualitative case study was designed which incorporated three research techniques: historical research, philosophical analysis, and in-depth interviews. Their use in the study will be explained below.

**Historical Research**

Historical research was used in this study to gain a deeper understanding of the field of study called Agricultural Education. Documents were studied dating from as far back as 1854 and up to the present. An attempt was made to examine both what remained the same throughout that time frame and what changed in agricultural education. A particular attempt was made to explicate the philosophies of the various writers and time periods and to look for threads of continuity that ran through the history of agricultural education. By studying the relationship between various periods in time and the different philosophies, it was possible to develop an in-depth explanation of the philosophy of agricultural education.

**AIAEE History** Because of the importance of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education to this study, a thorough historical analysis was made of that organization. Details of that study follow.

Professional agricultural educators have been practicing their methods and techniques at the international level for close to forty years. Throughout the 1970s, several
members of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Education (AATEA), now the Association for Teachers of Agricultural Education (ATAE), got together as a committee at the organization’s yearly meetings to discuss international agricultural education. Members of this committee decided that the subject of international agricultural education was important enough to have its own organization, so they held a conference in April, 1983, at Sam Houston State University. The meeting was chaired by Dr. David Riley. The theme of the conference was "Utilization of Secondary Agricultural Education Programs for Rural Development in Third World Countries: the Unexploited Element in Development Programs." Other speakers and panelists at the conference included "Pep" Martin, from FAO, Dr. Don Meaders and Dr. Frank Bobbitt, from Michigan State, and David Hartzog, a retired U.N. development worker.

About that program, Dr. Meaders wrote, ",[the conference] was one of the forerunners of the present day AIAEE. Earlier (and subsequent) meetings of the AATEA at annual AVA meetings provided the substantive basis for the eventual organization of the Association for International Agricultural Education" (from a note from Meaders dated 8/9/91). According to Dr. William Thuemmel, from the University of Massachusetts, other people who were instrumental in the founding of the organization were Dr. Jim Christianson, Texas A & M; Dr. Jim Klaus from Virginia Tech; Dr. Paul Marvin from Minnesota and Dr. Eddie Dye from Sam Houston State.

Several attenders of that initial meeting got together again in November, 1983 at Pep Martin’s house near Platteville, Wisconsin, to form AIAE. This group included Thuemmel, who had worked in Taiwan and Guam; Dr. Meaders, who had worked in Taiwan; Dr. Hugh Rouk, an agronomist form Oklahoma State; Dr. Riley who had served in the Peace Corps in Jamaica; Lennie Gamage, from the national FFA office, and Pep Martin, who had worked in Burma.

The group next got together at the "Meeting for International Agricultural Educators," put together by Dr. Riley and held in Kansas City on February 1-3, 1984. The purposes for that meeting were to enhance cooperation between ag ed professionals interested in international development, to improve relations with the World Bank and
USAID, and to explore agricultural education in the developing countries. All of the meetings mentioned above had financial support from USAID, usually through the African Bureau, which was under the direction of Dr. Cynthia Perry.

In April of 1984, the first official Board of Directors meeting of the AIAE was held at the State Department in Washington D.C. At that meeting, the original Constitution and By-laws were drawn up. The purposes of the organization at that time were to:

(a) Provide a medium for exchange of ideas and information relating to programs in international agricultural education
(b) Provide a liaison on international agricultural education between colleges and universities, government agencies, private industries, foundations, international agencies, and international agricultural educators on a global scale.

A total of 34 people participated in the various seminars that were held there. Dr. Burt Swanson, University of Illinois, was elected Chairperson. Members of the first Board of Directors were Dr. Robert Julian of University of Idaho, Dr. Meaders, Dr. Riley, and Dr. Rouk. Lennie Gamage was elected Secretary/Treasurer. It was also decided that there would be an annual meeting each spring and an annual mid-year meeting, usually held in December. Also, in August of 1984, the first call for copy for the AIAE newsletter was put out by Dr. Rouk.

In February of 1985, Dr. Thuemmel put out a "Call for Papers" to be read at the first Annual Meeting of the AIAE. At that time there were 120 members on the AIAE rosters (including eight who were involved in this thesis study). The First Annual Meeting was held at the National 4-H Center in Chevy Chase, Maryland, on April 25-26, 1985. On the day before the regular meeting, a board meeting was held. At that meeting a resolution was passed which stated that the AIAE should

...provide direct and continuous information and support to donor agencies and...strongly encourage the inclusion of appropriate technology transfer components in each and every agricultural development effort including project design, implementation, and evaluation.

At that meeting, Dr. Meaders brought up the idea of developing a journal of international agricultural education.
Fifty-nine people attended the Annual Meeting itself, representing six countries, 20 universities, and several governmental and non-governmental development agencies. Presentations were given and the first annual business meeting was held. Dr. Thuemmel was elected the new Chairperson. Also, a new board was approved. The board members were Dr. Jan Henderson from Ohio State, Dr. Meaders, Dr. Rouk, and Dr. Burt Swanson.

A survey was handed out at the meeting to identify what skills and knowledge areas should be developed into topics for workshops and seminars conducted by AIAE. The areas listed included: youth development, manpower planning and assessment, agricultural teacher education, agricultural education research, education on extension methodologies, institutional development, institutional management, curriculum development, and non-formal agricultural education. Seventy-nine members returned the survey. While the need for workshops on extension methods and curriculum development ranked highest, the report and recommendations prepared by Dr. Riley suggested that the "priorities should be set by local policy makers and research should be conducted accordingly by specialists in each area." He then recommended that a committee be formed to study the issue further and develop a plan of international agricultural education skill and knowledge development.

Dr. Henderson took over as editor of the newsletter and a second newsletter was published in February, 1986. The second Annual Meeting was again held at the National 4-H Center, this time on April 9-11, 1986. At the meeting there were several keynote speakers along with eighteen paper presentations, many of which were done by graduate students. Official attendance was 75. At the business meeting, Dr. Edna McBreen was picked to fill the Board vacancy due to the death of Dr. Rouk. Dr. Clifford Nelson was elected as new Vice Chair, and Dr. Tim Koehnen, from University of Arizona, was elected to fill the position of Recording Secretary. Dr. Maurice Hartley, Rutgers, was also elected to the Board of Directors, as was Donna Nussbaum, from Cornell, who served as the Graduate Representative. Another AIAE Newsletter was published in July. There were 264 names on the August, 1986 membership list.
The next mid-year meeting was in Dallas on December 6, 1986. At the meeting, problems with the updated address list and its effect on the newsletter were discussed. Also, a membership committee was formed to try to increase membership. Another topic of discussion was a proposal to change the organization's name, as suggested by Dr. William Rivera and Dr. Robert Martin, so as to include extension education.

The Third Annual Meeting was held at the National 4-H Center on April 24-26, 1987. It was presided over by the vice Chairman, Dr. Nelson. At the Executive Board Meeting, the following committees were created: Ad Hoc Brochure Committee; Constitution and By-laws Committee; Auditing Committee; Publications Committee; Awards Committee; Nominating Committee and the Conference Program Planning Committee. Members also agreed that the organization needed to direct its attention towards 1) defining and describing international agricultural and extension education; 2) developing an international agricultural and extension education training center; 3) figuring out how to assist developing countries with agricultural education; 4) increasing membership; 5) starting an honorary membership program; 6) increasing the organization's visibility in the development community and 7) identifying ways to increase the organization's involvement in international development.

A letter dated July 21, 1987, came from the letterhead of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education (AIAEE), indicating that the name change had taken effect.

The Association has continued to have annual mid-year business meetings and annual membership meetings. The majority of these have been held at the Washington D.C. area, although some have been held in the mid-west. Membership is at about 300, with members coming from sixteen different countries. Approximately half of the members are graduate students. The newsletter is now published three times a year. The new Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education is scheduled to be published before the end of 1993. In the most recently updated version of the Constitution and By-laws (Summer, 1993), the preamble states that:
The Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education is an organization dedicated to developing new programs and improving or strengthening existing programs and institutions of education in agriculture to have a positive impact on efforts to develop agriculture throughout the world. The Association shall work toward improving the understanding of what constitutes agricultural education in different international settings among public and professional groups concerned with education. The Association shall maintain liaison and working relationships with such groups and institutions and shall provide a medium for the exchange of ideas and information relating to programs of international education in agriculture and rural development.

The objectives of the organization are as follows:

1) To initiate, maintain, and improve communication and liaison with those responsible for aspects of international education in agriculture.

2) To foster acquaintance, fellowship, and understanding among members and to serve as a vehicle for exchange of ideas, philosophy, and professional materials to develop further international education in agriculture as a profession.

3) To articulate more clearly the role of education in agricultural development.

4) To cooperate with other organizations and groups towards:
   a. Adequate preparation of persons for educational tasks and positions in international agriculture.
   b. Encouragement and dissemination of educational research in international agriculture.
   c. Establishment and maintenance of a roster for educators in agriculture who could provide the expertise needed to assist funding agencies and developing nations in planning and implementing programs, and establishing and improving institutions of education in agriculture.
   d. Recognition that persons in international education in agriculture are engaged in a variety of programs and activities, including, but not limited to, formal and non-formal educational programs in agriculture, large group and small group instruction, field or extension supervisory activities, secondary or lower and post-secondary programs, public and private sector sponsored programs, established and pilot programs of agricultural education, and are persons who repre-
sent national and international institutions, organizations, and agencies engaged in education in agriculture.

5) To further the profession of education in agriculture.

Philosophical Analysis

A process akin to historical research was employed in trying to gain an in-depth understanding of the philosophy of education. In looking at education, a brief overview of the philosophy of education, as perceived by the Ancient Greeks, e.g., the Platonic and Aristotelian views, was taken. Then the philosophies of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which are relevant to education, were studied. Again, an effort was made to find threads of continuity in the different philosophies and to identify the differences. Particular attention was given to those areas of philosophy termed \textit{post-positivist}. This was because post-positivist philosophy addresses many of the issues which are relevant to a philosophy of international agricultural education that must function in today's relativistic and multiplistic world.

Next, a study of the history and philosophy of agricultural education was made. The two areas of study seemed to have a connection in the work of the philosopher and educator John Dewey. An effort was then made to develop a philosophy for international agricultural and extension education which built upon the traditional philosophy of Agricultural Education but that was augmented with post-positivist notions, such as the need to deal with all others as equals, the political nature of education and the need to help clients become self-realized using tools like Lather's praxis-oriented research or Friere's conscientization.

A similar process was done concerning the philosophy of education. The various schools of philosophy, e.g., idealism, pragmatism, behavioralism were first reviewed. Then a thorough study was made of the postmodern and social reconstructionist philosophies, as they were deemed able to offer significant insight into a post-positivist philosophy for international agricultural and extension education.
The analysis of this information called for both critical thinking and critical self-reflexivity. Questions such as "what is the meaning of education?" "what is the meaning of research?" and "what responsibilities do researchers have to research subjects?" were contemplated. The philosophy of agricultural and extension education was examined in terms of "the rules one uses in making meaning out of one's life." Still more detailed questions, such as "does an educational organization like AIAEE have a responsibility towards individuals, or is it just responsible to other organizations?" were asked. Another set of questions concerning the author's motives in undertaking this project and how those motives effected both his life and the research were also asked. In conclusion, philosophical analysis, at many different levels, played an important role in this project.

Interviews

In the first two sections of this research project an attempt was made to articulate a philosophy of international agricultural and extension education which was commensurate with a post-modern view of the world. This task was accomplished by reviewing modern and historical documents and reflecting and critically analyzing them from both historical and philosophical points of view.

Having completed that portion of the project, the next thing to do was to compare the results with the views and opinions of the people who work as agricultural or extension educators. This was done by conducting interviews with members of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Educations. Details concerning the interviews are given below.

Demographic Information

The demographics of the research population were as follows. A total of 17 people were interviewed. There ages ranged from approximately 30 years old to approximately 70 years old. The average age was close to 45. The women and international students made up a significantly younger age group than did the U.S. males. One of the people interviewed was retired, one was semi-retired and a third planned on retiring at the end of the school year. One of the international people was
back in her home country. Another was planning on returning at the end of the school year. Also, one of the domestic people was leaving the country soon on an extended overseas assignment. Two of the women that were interviewed were working as consultants in the private sector.

Table 1 - Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From the U.S</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Indian subcontinent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born on farms</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised in small town</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From cities or suburbs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained on farm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS              |        |         |
| Grew up in village                  | 1      | 6%      |
| Moved from village to town          | 2      | 12%     |
| Grew up in city                     | 1      | 6%      |

One was working in the international development field; the other was working in her local. Also, two of the men were working for NGOs. All of the rest of the interviewees worked for U.S. land-grant universities. In summation, of the 17 interviewees, three are now retired from land-grant universities, seven are working for land grant universities,
two are working for NGOs, two are working as private consultants and three are working overseas.

**Participant Selection**  The participants were drawn from a list of names that were suggested by prominent members of AIAEE. This selecting group was made up of Robert Martin, Wade Miller, Jan Henderson, Jim Christianson, Edna McBreen, Donald Meaders, Larry Miller, Robert Agunga, and Ed Persons. This group submitted a total of 62 names.

The following criteria were developed for selecting interview participants:

1. The person had to have been, at some time, an active participant in the organization.
2. An attempt was made to maintain gender and nationality balance.
3. Several of the "founding fathers" of AIAEE were selected in order to gain a perspective of the "traditional" point of view. These people were also prominent on most of the lists.
4. Availability was an issue. Because the researcher traveled to the homes or offices of the interview participants, the selection of some of the candidates depended on whether the interviewer could arrange to visit with them.

**Sample Questions**  See Appendix H for Interview Schedule.

**Human Subjects Review**  A review of the study and list of the interview questions were submitted and approved by the Human Subjects Committee, at Iowa State University.

**Pilot Study**  After the question schedule had been developed and approved by the Human Subjects Committee, a pilot interview was performed. All of the criteria regarding the participant's background, e.g., having international experience, being involved in AIAEE, were met. The interview was conducted over two days, allowing two hours for each interview. The researcher transcribed the interview. Analysis of the data
was started and methods of interpretation were discussed with university staff members specializing in qualitative research.

The Interviews  The interviews were conducted between June 10, 1992 and February 18, 1993. All were done in person by the researcher, usually at the participants’ place of work, except where other arrangements had to be done. Except for a couple of occasions when it was not possible, interviews were conducted in two parts over two days. Two hours were allocated for each session, although that amount of time was usually too long. On two occasions however, the interview session went over the allotted two hours. The total length of time for the interviews ranged from just under two hours to just over four. The average length was approximately three and one half hours.

The interviews were tape recorded then transcribed on to computer disc. Total time for the interviews was approximately sixty hours. The transcriptions averaged approximately 35 pages in length, double spaced.

Analysis of the Data

After the taped interviews had been transcribed onto computer disk, the difficult task of interpreting the data was done. The analysis of the data had two purposes. The first was to develop a biography of the interview participant. The purpose of the biography was to allow the reader to enter into a phenomenological relationship with the interviewee. In phenomenological research, it is hoped that the reader can develop a sense of who the interviewee is and what kinds of experiences the person has lived through. Another way of saying this is that the purpose of the biographies was to help the reader experience the essence of the person interviewed. Once this essence had been captured, the next goal was to describe, through narrative and quotes, that person’s philosophy of international agricultural and extension education and his or her philosophy of how an organization, e.g., AIAEE, could best operate as a development agency in today’s complex world.
To carry out this process, the transcriptions were read through many times. This allowed the researcher to become thoroughly familiar with each of the individual stories and to identify that information which was pertinent to this study. The first reading was made while listening to the tape recordings. This was done to re-familiarize the researcher with the person's voice, in hopes of better recapturing the original event. In that reading, blocks of relevant information were identified for further study. In the second reading, those areas identified as important to the study were read again and specific information was color coded and marginally noted regarding five separate areas: family history, education, work experience, philosophy, and miscellaneous. Each interview was then reread according to each of those categories. That is, all passages concerning family history were studied and the person's family history was constructed. Then all of the passages concerning education were studied, and the person's educational experiences were compiled, etc.

After relevant data were entered into the computer, they were put into a readable story form. This was perhaps the most difficult and most dangerous part of the analytic process, because there was a great potential for the researcher's bias to enter into the story. In order to guard against bias, quotes and more often, paraphrases were used when ever possible. Also, many references were made back to the original source to confirm lines and patterns of thought.

Participants usually began the interviews by giving a broad, linear view of the highlights of their life. The question schedule was then used to fill in details. As such, biographical data were usually easy to follow, although it sometimes got twisted, as people skipped around with the details of their lives. Dealing with philosophical issues was more complex, on the one hand, because people seldom had such issues in the front of their minds. On the other hand, the question schedule was fairly direct in asking questions of a philosophical nature, so people were able to deal with such issues in a rather straight forward manner. Also, because the interviews were done in two parts, the philosophical issues were usually covered the second day and the interviewees were told at the end of the first interview of the kinds of things that would be covered. In that way,
they had the opportunity to think some about those issues before they were asked about them, usually overnight.

Three particular areas were focused on in analyzing the data regarding philosophical issue: the philosophy of Agricultural Education, the philosophy of international agricultural and extension education and particularly of the AIAEE, and the roles of race, class, and gender as they relate to international agricultural and extension education. Again, at one level, direct questions were asked and therefore somewhat easy to answer. However, because these issues dealt with personal biases, these answers had to be placed into the larger context of the person's discussion of her or his life in general. This again called for hermeneutic and phenomenological reflection. It should be noted too, that the researcher attempted to act somewhat like a neutral reporter and simply report what the interviewee said. The nature of this study however, suggested that neither the interviewer or the interviewee are ever really neutral in such a situation.

Developing A Theory

The theory that was developed was: that a for a philosophy of international agricultural and extension education to be effective in the 1990s, it would have to combine the experiential learning and humanistic characteristics of traditional agricultural education with Dewey's concern for intellectual development and social responsibility and with the post-positivist's concern for understanding political reality and a responsibility to the subjects of academic research.

Assuring Validity

The following procedures were followed to assure validity. First of all, triangulation was used in creating the theory. This was done by combining historical research, philosophical analysis, and in-depth interviews. Both common elements and differences were identified in the process. Certain of the elements in the various methods meshed to suggest a post-positivist philosophy for international agricultural education.
Another method used to verify validity was *member check*. The stories and conclusions of six of the interviewees, approximately one-third, were returned to them for verifications. A letter (see Appendix C) was sent with each story asking the person to a) correct any biographical errors and b) call the interviewer if there were any major errors. No major errors were pointed out. The assumption was then made that the stories gave fairly accurate portrayals of the interviewees and their lives and opinions regarding agricultural education. Guba's and Lincoln's *member check* is similar to Lather's *face validity* and Maxwell's *descriptive validity*. All three were a measure of whether the physical details of the research were accurate. As mentioned above, the reconstructions of the individual stories have been verified through feedback from the interviewees. Also, in verifying the conclusions to the participant's stories, they gave what Maxwell would call *interpretive validity*, i.e., they verified that the meanings of the opinions, philosophies, etc., as reported, were accurate.

A more difficult area to check was verifying the theory; what Lather called *construct validity* and Maxwell called *theoretical validity*. Lather approached the problem through "author reflexivity." She claimed that the researcher/writer must constantly be checking herself to understand how the new information was affecting her "revisioning" of the theory. This is critical in qualitative research, where "emergent theories" are the norm. For this project, construct validity was developed by a constant referral to the original statement of purpose. To assure theoretical validity, which Maxwell described as "appropriateness of the applications" the theory will need to be tested in the field. Maxwell also wrote of the need to check *generalizability* of a theory. Again, it is premature to attempt to generalize the theory developed in this study to other situations.

In conclusion, the purpose of this study was to articulate a post-positivist philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. The project was designed as a case study which drew information from three sources: historical research, philosophical analysis, and in-depth interviews. It was hoped that this cross-referencing would offer validity to the theory. In addition, feedback was solicited from one-third of the partici-
pants as to the accuracy of both the facts and interpretations of the phenomenological development of their stories.

**Limitations**

This study had several limitations. The first, which is a general criticism of qualitative research, concerned the cost, in terms of time and money. More people or different people could have been involved in the study had time and money permitted. A more important aspect of the time and money factor however, was that more feedback could have been obtained from the interviewees had time and money allowed. This would have added credence to the validity of the *member check*.

The most serious limitation was the fact that the theory, as a whole, has not been checked against the views and philosophies of members of the AIAEE. This is an important step in validating the theory for, as Maxwell pointed out, the theory is only *appropriate* if it is considered *applicable* by the community of participants, which, in this instance are members of the AIAEE. This lack of follow up was again, due to time and financial constraints. Such follow-up will need to wait until the theory is offered to the Association at one of its Annual meetings or a similar kind of event.

One further limitation was, that until the theory is either confirmed or denied by the participants, it will be impossible to *generalize* it and test its applicability to other groups working in the field of international development.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to articulate a philosophy of international agricultural and extension education which reflected the post-positivist's concerns for authenticity in a relativistic and multiplistic world. A qualitative approach was taken which could reflect human qualities such as "meanings," opinions and feelings. The research problem was approached from several standpoints with the goal of drawing relevant information from each and creating a synergistic whole which offered a new perspective to the age old problem of how one group of human beings goes about trying to help another.
By approaching the problem from a qualitative standpoint, this study was able to draw together information from several sources. In the process, a theory emerged which offered insight into the relationship between the philosophy of John Dewey, the philosophies of general education and agricultural education and that of the post-positivist philosophers. While the information gathered from the individuals involved in this study seemed to be valid, the theory as a whole awaits confirmation from members of the profession.

An interesting note is that there is no exact philosophy of either education or of a group like the AIAEE. There are only philosophies of individual people. And even these change. As a result, a study of this sort can not provide a definitive answer to questions like "What is the philosophy of...?" or "How do members of the AIAEE 'make meaning' of their lives, as they relate to international development?" Rather, this kind of qualitative case study can lead individuals to "critically reflect" on the kinds of questions which the study raised. And the same is true for the group as a whole. That is, through critical dialogue, members can converse, discuss, debate, and argue over roles which issues like race, gender, class, hierarchy, politics, etc. play in international agricultural and extension education. For it is only by bringing such topics to the forefront that progress will be made in solving the problems inherent in these topics.

Now that the design, methods and procedures used in this study have been explained, it is time to look at the results of the interviews.
CHAPTER IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to articulate a post-positivist philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. A qualitative case study approach was used in developing and carrying out this project. The study used hermeneutical and phenomenological techniques in analyzing information. A central part of this research was the analysis of a series of in-depth interviews with members of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education or AIAEE. The technique used in the interviews was "dialogical interviewing" (following Freire 1987). Freire wrote, "Dialogue is a moment where humans meet to reflect on their reality as they make and remake it" (1987:99). In this type of interview, the interviewer participates in a conversational way with the interviewee, in attempt for both people to be drawn deeper into the subject matter. As such, the interviewer acts as the chief instrument in gathering the data. Although a survey schedule was used and all material in the schedule was covered, the interviews were done in a relaxed and free-flowing way. The goal of this process was for the interviewees to reflect on their lives from a historical perspective and to examine the philosophy of agricultural education and the AIAEE from within that context.

Freire stipulated that dialogical interviewing needed to be rigorous, logical, and maintain a coherent structure. Rigor was achieved by locating the philosophical reflections within the historical context of each of the individual's lives. It was also rigorous because it was participatory or active research in that it challenged the participants to take part in the research process. This research also had logic of structure in that it followed an interview schedule which was developed directly from the literature review.

Participant's Stories

Dr. Adams

Dr. Adams is a man in his early thirties who is a professor at a state university in the western part of the U.S. He grew up in a typical middle-class, suburban part of the
eastern U.S. Both of his parents were well educated; his father has a Ph.D. in industrial psychology and was involved in corporate management. His mother has her master’s degree in sociology and worked as a librarian most of her life. Adams is married and has three children.

Adams’ mother was from a farm family. Her father was a dairy rancher in a small college town in Pennsylvania. The grandfather was an early adapter and innovator and, as Adams’ explained, had a monopoly on the milk business in the town. However, when Adams was still young, his grandfather moved to town, so Adams didn’t really spend time around agricultural work until he was grown and on his own. He has a brother and a sister. One works on natural resource issues for the U.S. legislature. The other produces environmental videos.

Adams was very active as a high school student, where he participated in sports and was active in his church group. He was captain of the football team and was offered a scholarship to Harvard University. He turned it down though, saying he just wasn’t interested. Instead, he attended a small, rural community college in Appalachia, which he had visited on a summer vacation. He explained that he really wanted adventure and the cross cultural experience.

Adams has had several important mentors in his life. Two of these were while he was in high school. The first was a humanities teacher who helped him understand the importance of demanding quality in educational situations. The second was a church youth-group leader who helped Adams and his friends to organize around the anti-Vietnam war theme. This experience helped Adams understand the importance of protesting against things which he found objectionable.

The following summer Adams spent in southern Europe. While he was there he visited a high school friend whose father was the headmaster of an agricultural training school in Greece. He did some chores at the school and liked the work. So when he returned to the U.S., he transferred to a small Quaker college which had a working farm. He received his Bachelor’s Degree in agricultural studies there. He then went back to the school in Greece where he coordinated 4-H type projects for two years. While he was
there, he also convinced the school to start an international training and development program in which people from Africa came to the school to get hands-on experience in agricultural development. Those experiences and the mentoring of the headmaster convinced him to pursue international agricultural development as a career. Adams said he learned two important things from this mentor. One was "don't take yourself too seriously." The other was that although life is deadly serious in terms of commitment, it also requires humility, a lightness of touch, and the ability to laugh.

Dr. Adams said that the longer he worked at the school in Greece, the more he realized he wasn’t well equipped to teach what he was teaching. So he returned to the U.S., where he enrolled in two master’s degree programs. The first was in international agricultural development; the second in agricultural education. After completing those programs, he again went overseas, this time to Tanzania, Africa. His jobs there included training farmers and extension workers at an Agricultural Education Institute for the two years. Adams ended up as Chief of Party to the project. While there, he met his fourth important teacher, who is the Dean of the Agriculture College at one of the land-grant colleges in the U.S. Dr. Adams claimed that he realized once more that he still needed to know more about education, so he returned to the U.S., this time to pursue a Ph.D. in vocational education.

Upon completion of his terminal degree, Dr. Adams was offered a teaching and research position at the university where he is currently working. Since he began that position, he has taught, written articles, served in leadership positions and has returned overseas several times. He works in the International Research and Development Office and manages the projects in Africa.

Adams said he thinks that the hands-on model for teaching, as developed by agricultural and extension educators, is a good model for education in the 90s. He thinks that other disciplines should also be mandated to do outreach work. In particular, he believes the extension model will be adopted by other educational disciplines such as, rural education, engineering, and pharmacy. He also thinks it will be more issue oriented in the future and that it will be used as a conflict resolution tool for things like environmental
issues, where education can make a big difference. He also said he thought that extension educators were going to have to become much more reliant on innovations in information technology because funding for personnel expenses was going to continue to decrease. Keeping up with technology, he claimed, was one of the real important reasons to do networking.

An equally important issue concerning agricultural and extension education, Adams claimed, was the need for farmers to develop an understanding of how international issues affect America’s agriculture. He claimed we needed to be asking questions such as

...who is going to bring the clientele in touch with [what’s happening in] the rest of the world and ... Who’s going to help them make this connection so that they can appreciate the global nature of the economies, participate in marketing, participate in information exchange?

Dr. Adams said he sees himself, first of all, as an educator in the area of international development. He said

...the more I saw what was going on [overseas], I realized [rural development] wasn’t a technology problem as much as it was...a human problem in communication, in education and in policy problems...[W]e need to... realize that human beings are what cause change; education is what causes human beings to change.

As an educator, Adams says he is always looking for quality work. In an effort to generate good work, Adams has tried evaluating classes with only two grades: an A or an incomplete. He explained:

You can meet the standards that I expect or you don’t get any grade...until you do. You just keep working at it. And people really related to that. They said - look it’s much more like the real world. When you turn in a report, somebody has criticisms, you re-write it... Take an incomplete! - it’s a management tool, it’s not an insult. Finish when you’re ready. And that’s worked out well and it’s encouraged quality rather than just quickly getting a job done.

Another thing that Adams has tried in the classroom is to incorporated a large number of case studies about women farmers and women students into his teaching materials. He does this because it adds additional elements which make the problem more
complex, hence the higher level thinking/problem-solving skills more effective. For instance, he might ask questions concerning farming women who are not allowed to talk to male development workers or about how an extension worker might reach a person with a help message in an illiterate country.

Dr. Adams is a past president of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education. He explained that he joined AIAEE at the suggestion of his boss when he was working in Africa. Adams said he liked the organization because it gave him the opportunity to meet people he had only heard of or read.

Adams said he sees issues of race and gender as being vital to the discipline of international agricultural and extension education. He pointed out that at both the teaching and research level, almost all of the work in the field has been carried out by white males. If the organization is to be truly effective, however, it will have to change this. He explained that

We have to figure out some radical ways of making this change...If we just have a modest evolution we'll never catch up - there's so few women involved and so few minorities involved. We're lucky to have foreign students involved - just so we have a larger cross-cultural element. But, you know, how many people from historical black colleges and universities are involved with ag ed and extension [or] are involved in AIAEE? Not too many. And the number of women that are active? Obviously very limited.

Adams also brought up the subject of trying to get graduate students more involved with the organization at the committee level. He suggested that through some sort of financial support and mentoring process, the power base of the organization could be expanded, thus giving women and minorities a stronger voice in international development.

Concerning the new AIAEE Journal, Adams explained that he thought it was an important addition to the field—if a high standard of quality can be maintained. He said,

I think it fills a hole that exists. It's a great idea because essentially people like myself have not found the right place to publish...This, I hope, will give me a chance to publish stuff. 'Cause I refuse to write something else just to get it published. As a result,...my publications are presented at
AIAEE proceedings. And, you know, I would never get promoted on the basis of that...So anyway, the journal is coming at a good time for me.

He pointed out, however, that the Journal will not work unless we have a large number of subscribers. He suggested, therefore, that the organization be willing to spend more money on advertising and putting together great programs. "I consider that a good investment" he claimed, because it will increase the membership and promote the Journal. Such action will, in turn, help the organization continue to growth.

Adams claimed that he didn’t think there was such a thing as "A" philosophy of AIAEE, because, as he put it: "We're kind of a loose confederation." He sensed a bit of a dualistic nature to the Association, with the "farmers first" group on one side, advocating participatory research and interdisciplinary approaches to development, and the "traditionalists" on the other, who favor a more academic and quantitative approach. But, he claimed, there are several things which all members have in common. One is a belief that graduate students should have a role in the organization. Another is a sense of philanthropy and good will. He claimed that members "tend to be a little bit evangelistic in promoting what they do and believe others should do the same." As such, he explained, members sometimes become over zealous.

Adams believes that AIAEE should focus on three main areas for the future. One is to educate donor organizations like USAID as to the importance of education in international education. The second, which is somewhat related, is to open up more sources of funding. He also suggested that the organization needs to start looking towards other funding sources, particularly in the NGO and PVO sectors. Finally, Adams claimed that AIAEE needs to begin to develop linkages with the developing parts of the world. He claimed that it is vital that members of the organization, past, present and future, find ways to communicate with one another, so as keep one-another informed as to what is happening in the discipline. Of great importance in this process, he pointed out, was the need to be sure the information flow is two-way and that the developers and donors learn from the client groups and don’t just try to hand out information.
Conclusion

Probably the idea, or ideas, which speak most clearly of Adams are adventurer and innovator. It seems from his early work as an anti-war demonstrator to his choices in college to his teaching techniques at the university, Adams has always been willing to take risks and to follow through on his commitments.

Adams seems to see himself first, as an educator who is convinced that experienced based learning will serve as the best model for the 90s. He also believes that other disciplines will soon have to develop their own extension services. He also thinks that education will become increasingly issue-based and that methods developed in ag and extension education will be used increasingly as a conflict resolution tool. In addition, he stressed the importance of becoming familiar with information technology, as the discipline will become increasingly reliant on the new hardware and software.

Adams believes that an essential part of any education is the demand for quality. And he believes in two way communications. As such, he claimed that a good educator has to be able to bend and stretch, so as to allow the learner the flexibility to do the job right, within the circumstances of that persons life. If you stress deadlines, he claimed, you often get mediocre work in a hurry. If, on the other hand, you stress quality, you need to allow the person the time to do the job right.

Adams believes that international agricultural and extension education, as a profession, needs to take positive action to increase the role of women and people of color who are entering the profession. These people, along with graduate students in general, need to be part of the power structure of the organization if they are to lose their status as "outsiders." This can be done through various means such as financial support and mentoring programs.

Adams is very excited about the AIAEE Journal because it will create a legitimate journal for him to publish in. For it to be successful, he claims, it needs to be of the highest quality. Also, the number of readers needs to expand beyond the current number of members in AIAEE.

Adams sees AIAEE as "multi-faceted" and as a group of members who reflect many opinions as to true nature of international agricultural and extension education.
These range from very conservative to very liberal. However, he claimed, there are a few things that all members share in common and they are the desire to see graduate students participating in the organization and the desire to make the world a better place.

Finally, Adams claimed that AIAEE should have three primary objectives for the future. They were: 1) to educate donor organizations as to the importance of education in international development, 2) to open up more sources of funding; and 3) to develop linkages with the developing parts of the world. With an adequate understanding of the importance of agricultural and extension education and with adequate funding, the profession could do much in making the world a better place to live. And with the expansion of communications technology, this profession should be able to carry the message of agricultural education around the world.

**Dr. Brown**

Dr. Brown is an Assistant Professor of Agricultural Education at a state university in the state where she grew up. Throughout her life, she has been involved in helping others, first as a volunteer working with inner city youth and elders, then as a high school vocational agriculture teacher, and most recently as a professor and academic advisor to undergraduate and graduate students. She said that since her childhood she has wanted to be a social worker. In her current position she has the opportunity to meet and get to know every student in her department, which she finds very exciting.

Brown was raised in an affluent community in the Great Lakes region. Both of her parents worked; her father was in business and traveled a lot; her mother was a nurse. Brown is the middle of three children. Regarding her childhood, she explained that nothing abnormal happened in her home while she was growing up and that she had a "very happy, quiet, very close family."

Brown's father's family was from England; he was the only one of the children born in the United States. Her mother was one of eleven children that grew up on a farm in Indiana. Brown explained that she was very close to her maternal grandmother. Her
family visited the farm in the summers and she kept up a written correspondence with her grandmother throughout her childhood.

One of the best things about growing up in her family, Brown claimed, was that her parents didn’t fall too much into gender stereotypes. She explained that both did house work and yard work. There was a balance that way, so she wasn’t pressured to "be like anybody else." She said that the basic rule was, "if something needed to be done, do it!" The disadvantage in growing up in her family was that, as the middle child, she was the peacekeeper in the family and didn’t learn to face her own problems.

The community in which Brown grew up was upper-middle class and almost exclusively white. She explained that one Black family moved in when she was in high school, but that was the extent of diversity in her home town. Brown explained that high school was pretty boring for her. She did okay in school, but the homogeneous nature of her community meant that everyone was the same. The curriculum was definitely college prep and Brown said there were only three or four students in her class who left the school building to take vocational training classes. All-in-all, she said, she never felt like she fit in very well there.

Brown remedied this by getting involved with a church youth group that worked with people from the inner city. When she was just thirteen, her group would get together with lower income and ethnically diverse older people. Then, during the summers, when she was fourteen and fifteen, her youth group would go to one of the toughest neighborhoods, in the ghetto in the nearby city, where they would give bible classes in vacant lots. Brown also worked in a culturally diverse job in high school. This was in the kitchen at the hospital where her mother worked. Most of the other workers were Black. Brown especially remembered one older woman who "took me under her wing."

Brown said the high point of her k-12 schooling was the fifth grade because she had a great teacher, who both loved her work and the students. Brown was able to maintain contact with that woman, and she noted that they had visited recently in New York, where the woman holds a high position with a major international development organization.
The work Brown did with the church groups profoundly affected her life. She decided she wanted to be a social worker and was accepted at the state land-grant university. She said she was one of only a few in her class that applied to a state college. She enjoyed her first two years at school and was fairly successful. Again, she was involved with church activities, which helped her by offering a small group situation at a very large school. When Brown applied for admission to the social work program however, she was not accepted. This caused her a great deal of strife because she had been planning on that career from the age of thirteen until she was twenty. She was, at the time, taking a class in horticulture, which she enjoyed, so she changed her major to horticulture and eventually became a horticulture therapist. This was in the early seventies however and she was unable to find a job. She ended up returning to school to get certified as a teacher, then taught high school horticulture for five years.

Brown said she burned out with high school teaching after that time, so when she was offered a "sex equity" grant to return to the state university to get her master’s degree she accepted. After receiving her Master’s Degree in Agricultural Education Brown returned to the classroom. She taught for one more year, then decided to go on for her doctorate degree. To get her doctorate, Brown went to one of the state universities in the deep south, where she eventually received her Doctorate in Education. Brown said she loved the south because the culture was so different from where she’d been throughout her life. She claimed that it was slower and that the people were more open and friendly—"more authentic and more real"—she said. Her relationships there were predominantly with Caucasians, she explained. Her dissertation topic was "time-on-task in horticulture."

After graduating, Brown was offered a one year position at another state university in the midwest. It was there that she was introduced to the ideas about international agricultural education. She said that a staff member at that school not only introduced her to international work, but encouraged her to develop her interests in international education, even though she "had not been in the Peace Corps, didn’t speak three foreign languages and hadn't been overseas." That was during the 1984-85 school year.
The following year Brown was offered the job which she now has. As with all jobs, it has its ups and downs. She really enjoys her interaction with the students. And, as mentioned above, she coordinates the orientation programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, so she gets to meet all of the students that come into her department. She also coordinates the student teaching and the early field experience programs. Brown teaches two undergraduate classes and one graduate seminar. The seminar topic she was teaching at the time of the interview was on "critical issues in international agricultural education," which she said she really enjoyed.

Another part of Brown's work that she really likes is working with international students. She advises several students from central and South America, whom she has been able to accompany to their home country, to direct their research. She said she was developing a real love for Latin culture and hopes to be able to work more in that area. She explained too, that her Spanish was getting good enough so that she was able to make a presentation in Spanish recently.

What Brown struggles with, she explained, is the bureaucracy of academia. She said that when she began her new job, she worked hard to get promotion and tenure. But now that she has it, she has become disillusioned with the whole process. She said she finds it somewhat "meaningless" and "lacking in any lasting value." She added that

I found [tenure] more--fake--like I knew how to play the system and I did it and then I got there. And I...don't necessarily feel good about my dossier and what I've put together.

She said that after her earlier desire to be a social worker, and with all of the volunteer work she has done and still does, that she feels she is being successful by the department's standards, but not by her own. She then told a story about a women she knows, who was in a position similar to hers, who left to go into the seminary. Brown then suggested that the problem might be gender related, in that the things women need for self-fulfillment are different than what an academic department offers for incentive.

For one thing, Brown explained, "I'm just not into the new breed for power--for trying to get it. I am not into conflict, I avoid it--wouldn't make a good administrator that
way." And as a result, she believes she will never make it up the career ladder to full professor. Brown explained that things were different when she was with other women. She said that she didn't feel the power struggle when she was with other women, and there wasn't so much at stake about looking good on paper. Also, she said that it was easier to talk about how she felt when she was with other women, much more so than when she was around men.

On the other hand, she admitted to the possibility that she might just be going through mid-life crisis. She said that in the position she now holds she was learning how to take charge of her life. And when asked what she would be doing in the future, she speculated that she would have stayed at her job until her retirement, and then gone on to do more volunteer work.

Generally speaking, Brown said she had not been discriminated against due to her gender. In fact, she said, both the people who had been her advisors and her bosses had always encouraged her. She did say however, that there was always a sort of covert discrimination towards her as a women. But nothing enough to get in her way. So gender did not seem to be a big issue, in her opinion, in the areas of agricultural and extension education or the AIAEE.

What Brown did see as a problem in development work was an attitude of superiority by development workers, one in which the workers approach problems with the attitude that "we help them because they are needy." She said this was a particularly sensitive area for her because it was an attitude that she too fell into. And she explained that upon taking her first trip overseas, she had to start asking, "What does it really mean to have a good life?" This is a question she is still asking, both about the people she works with and about her own life.

Brown explained that she struggled with the issue about what is "best" for any group of people. Which meant that she had to question the actions of people who did development work, both in her department and throughout the United States; people who approached development problems with the attitude that "what I have is good, and therefore you should replace what you have with what I have." She believes that many of the
people who do development work that way have ulterior motives; that their purpose for doing the work is both selfish and self-serving. As a result, Brown believes that development workers need to get more honest with themselves.

In a similar vein, Brown expressed concern about members of the AIAEE who were insensitive or not appreciative of other cultures, which she attributed to ethnocentrism. She said she felt that people were caught up in a dualistic battle over superiority and inferiority. This had affected her own life on several occasions having to do with her receiving an Ed.D. from a southern university. She said people in the north wanted to look down on her, even though she was sure she had received an excellent education.

Brown felt that an interesting debate in the agricultural and extension education field had to do with whether there was a difference between the area of study domestically and the same at the international level. She explained that some professionals in the discipline believe that learning techniques are universal and that teaching therefore, is not culturally specific. Others believe that learning is culturally specific and that it is necessary therefore, to understand a particular culture before one attempts to apply various aspects of teaching techniques. Brown said she leans toward the latter, though she is struggling to understand the position of the former. She also explained that in her own research and in the work she is doing with her international students, she uses a systems approach to analyzing particular situations, and so has not had to deal with the topic specifically. She concluded by saying that she thinks that international agricultural education has to be a combination of both—that the bigger model of ag education, including program planning, curriculum development, teaching and learning theory, evaluation—are necessary everywhere. Yet, how they are applied requires an understanding of specific settings, cultures, etc.

Dr. Brown explained that she became involved with AIAEE in its early years. She said she attended the first official meeting, in 1984. During the early years she used the organization and the friends she’d made there as a support group in her efforts to be involved with international work. She defined the AIAEE as "a group of individuals who have pretty diverse backgrounds and experiences, but have a pretty homogeneous base,
i.e., they are almost all based at universities and colleges of agriculture. The mission of the organization, in Browns's opinion, is to network, to examine international issues as they relate to the profession, and to ask questions such as "where should we put our focus?" and "who do we serve?"

Brown believes that the organization has developed all of the essential parts needed to form a stable organization, e.g., officers, constitution, officers, an annual meeting, etc. As such, she thinks that AIAEE should be able to do some serious work. She said she is troubled by the organization however, because it still doesn't seem to have a sense of direction. She said that she liked the idea of networking and keeping each other informed about what one and the other is doing. But she hasn’t yet figured out the reason for the connection. And she is not sure anyone else has either. She says that simply passing on information about what she or someone else is doing is a pretty low level of communications.

What Brown would like is for the organization to find some way in which members could begin to assist one another with research and programmatic issues in international agricultural and extension education. She explained that with the group's expertise, members could easily be working on projects like infusing a global awareness into secondary, post secondary and university level agricultural education in almost any country. But, because of the lack of focus and the fact that organizational members seldom actually work together, Brown said that she has a hard time seeing the AIAEE as a "doing" type of organization which "actually develops papers, documents or seminars." Brown also expressed concern that if members don't modernize quickly, the organization will miss the opportunity to communicate with younger students. She thinks that AIAEE needs to begin to use computer communications as quickly as possible.

Brown perceived the philosophy of the AIAEE to be as follows: We are a group of professionals who come together for the purpose of educating and informing each other and other professionals in the field of international development of our ways of development in the international arena. Our task is to answer the following types of questions: "how is agricultural education, i.e., teacher and extension education, related to
development in the international arena?" and "what is the role of ag ed in bringing about an awareness of international agriculture to the educational public at large?" We also need to inform the development community that agricultural and extension education, as a profession, has already developed and documented a body of knowledge, i.e., teaching and learning theory, research procedures, curriculum development, program planning, and evaluation, which has an important role to play in international development. Brown added that, in the future, it might be good to have something along the lines of a university administrative cabinet that could communicate officially with other development groups, maybe like UNESCO, USAID, or USDA, in addressing policy matters and developing joint proposals.

**Conclusion** The essence of Brown's life seems to be that she is driven by service work. Perhaps this a reflection of her mother's work as a nurse. Perhaps it is the result of things she learned as a child, working with her church's youth group. Whatever it was that started it, Brown continues to be of service to others, both as a paid professional and as a volunteer.

Brown's story creates the sense that her career has come about haphazardly. She began thinking she would be a social worker and ended up, or at least is, at present, a university agricultural education professor. Again, the connection lies in the fact that they are both about caring for others. What Brown brings to ag ed is a sense of nurturing, a characteristic often associated with "womanness" and perhaps a characteristic needed in an area of study like international development.

Brown's concern about the intrinsic value of both the tenure and promotion system of the U.S. universities, on the one hand, and about the whole of the development business on the other also deserves attention. If, as educators and extension specialists, we are already filled with preconceived ideas about what others need to do, to advance in the world, we will never be able to hear what it is that they think they need to do to better themselves. And if that is the case, we are probably doing them a disservice. In a related area, Brown's concern about the superiority/inferiority duality is a good example of the
argument that many postmodernists, and particularly feminist theorists are making concerning how reducing issues down to dualities, e.g., "I'm better than you are," makes it very difficult for other opinions and views to be heard.

Brown sees the AIAEE, as a homogeneous group of individuals who have formed an organization in order to network and to promote the expertise of professional agricultural and extension educators. She senses that the organization has developed all of the essential parts needed to form a stable organization. But, because of the lack of focus and the fact that organizational members seldom actually work together, Brown said that she has a hard time seeing the AIAEE as an action sort of organization which "actually develops papers, documents or seminars."

Brown said that, although she thinks that networking is important, she hasn't yet figured out the reason for the connection. And she is not sure anyone else has either. She says that simply passing on information about what she or someone else is doing is a pretty low level of communications. She claimed that the organization needs to find a way for members to work together toward solving some of the problems found in international agricultural development, both in the area of food production in developing countries and in bringing about an awareness of the global nature of food issues to America's school children. And speaking of children, she claimed that if the organization doesn't soon start communicating via computer, it will miss its opportunity to work with the younger generation.

Brown believes that, in answer to the question of Why?, concerning the AIAEE, that its purpose is to educate and inform each other and other professionals in the field of international development that the profession has already developed and documented a body of knowledge, i.e., teaching and learning theory, research procedures, curriculum development, program planning, and evaluation, that can be of great assistance to the creation of effective agriculture programs in the developing nations.

Brown concluded by explaining that AIAEE needs to develop an executive level committee with the power to communicate officially with other development groups in addressing policy matters and developing joint proposals.
Dr. Clark

Dr. Clark is a woman in her early thirties who works as a private consultant in the field of international agricultural extension. She grew up in an intellectual household—her father was a university professor—in a large city on the East Coast. She had no background in agriculture until she became interested in "the world food crisis" in college, and decided to dedicate her life to solving agricultural problems around the world, particularly in Africa.

Clark is the oldest of the six children in her family. As such, she always acted as the "ice breaker." About her role in her family, she said, "I do everything weird first..." Clark attended public schools through high school. She said that as a child, she "was brilliant," and was expected to "be someone" in the world when she grew up. She did particularly well in the sciences and was put into an accelerated school program at an early age. She said, however, that by her final years in high school, she was very bored, a "borderline delinquent, who found little challenge in school," although she was already taking college level classes. Her biology teacher was her only inspiration at that point. She was also very involved in her church organization, where she learned organizational skills and edited the church newsletter. She said, however, that she became so disillusioned by the poor behavior of the adults around her that she left the church and hasn't returned since.

By the end of high school Clark was fairly anti-establishment. She explained that because her father was a professor, there was never any doubt that she would go to college. Her mother, who still had five children at home, did not push Clark to go in any special direction, but was enthusiastic in supporting her to "follow her own intuition in seeking out her place in life."

She ended up going to a private, liberal arts college in the East, which was primarily Jewish, making her a minority student. She said she received an excellent undergraduate education. It was while studying there that she became aware of the problems people throughout the world were having with food. She explained that being from the city and having studied in the pure sciences, she had no idea what agriculture
was. Fortunately, she said, she found two mentors who helped her decide to continue her academic career. One was an anthropology instructor, the other was a woman who, besides teaching, was a consultant to the United Nations on world food problems.

With this inspiration, Clark moved to the West Coast to study international agricultural development in a master's degree program. She said one of her main interests in the food crisis was that it seemed to be such a challenge. To further this, she decided to specialize in tropical root crops and the food crisis in Africa. She said "I just chose the most challenging thing; the one I thought would tax me the most."

Clark explained that she had some difficulties with the rest of her education. The trouble was, in getting two master's degrees, one in international agricultural development and one in vegetable crops, and in studying at universities for her Ph.D., no one could really tell her what skills she needed in order to be successful in bringing about an end to the world food crisis.

After finishing her master's degree programs, Clark worked for a year as a researcher, doing post-harvest studies. Following that, she received a language fellowship at a southern university on the east coast, where she studied Yoruba and French. The situation there was not a good one for her however, because she was one of the few women graduate students in the College of Agriculture and the only person in the language fellowship interested in agriculture. She experienced a lot of gender discrimination during that period. She explained that

...daily, I was 'Honey' and 'Sweetheart' and--"Hi Sweetie, what can I do for you?"—and any direct question I asked was not answered—anything I wanted to get involved in was kind of shelved and anything that I was too aggressive about, I got really slammed for.

Her experience was that women have a tough time in agricultural sciences because the people in control "keep a very closed door on who gets into their programs."

In the end, Clark could not get any satisfaction from that program, so she left. She did have time to catch up on her reading at that point and "for really pulling together my thoughts and feelings about the field and my philosophy about ag development, the kinds
So she transferred to a land-grant university in the midwest, where she completed her Ph.D. in Agricultural Education. Her focus in that program was on evaluation.

Clark said she was disappointed by the level of research in the agricultural education department where she studied. She claimed that her instructors were "either studying something that was obvious or they were studying something that was not needed." In one project she was involved in, she claimed her review of literature showed that the objectives of the research were off base. But because the project was funded, they continued the study. The whole thing was a waste, she claimed.

Clark considers herself a generalist. She believes this makes her different from many people in academia, who strive to departmentalize things. She said "I've never felt like I understood anything well enough, unless I expanded beyond and tried to fit it in...the bigger picture."

Now-a-days, Clark does consulting work, mostly in Africa, and mostly, she complained, on a voluntary basis. She said that international extension work requires well developed skills in the hard sciences, in education, and in communications. She added, I can't connect with those people [farmers and marketers] if I'm a researcher. I have to get out there and learn different skills and how to connect with those people. And, I kind of think of myself as--because of my background, very strong in the hard sciences and agriculture, and then very strong in the informal education extension--as my own team. And that's lucky for me, that I have both of them.

But even now, she added, she lacks skills, particularly in how to run her consulting business.

Clark said that she thinks agricultural education is about both agriculture and education. She is concerned about people getting into this field of study who have little agriculture background. But she also senses that being an agricultural technician without teaching skills is equally problematic. Ideally, for Clark, an agricultural educator would have expertise in both areas. When that doesn't happen, the people involved need to "partner up so as to be able to cover both sides of the problem."
Clark also stated that she thought agricultural education programs, in general, needed to become more involved with international issues. She said she liked that the U.S. model was locally oriented, because she distrusted centrally planned extension programs, as they are practiced in many of the developing countries. She said our own national program has outlived its usefulness however, and that we need to become more locally managed, while keeping in mind that we live in a global community.

Clark said that she wants to continue to work in the international scene for a while, then to get into teaching later on. She felt this was the reverse of how it is usually done. But she thought it was a better way, because she would have more experience to base her teaching on. She said that many of her instructors, who were considered "experts" in the field of agricultural education, lacked international experience and "knew next to nothing about field work." "They really mess things up more than they fix them, when they come out for such a short term," she explained. She was also concerned that many of the older, well established researchers were losing their quickness and their ability to think on their feet. As a result, she believed they sometimes don't make the best decisions in the field.

Clark claimed that her first exposure to AIAEE was very refreshing. She said that in AIAEE she finally found people that spoke the same language as she did. Her sense at the start was that the main objective of the organization was to get others in the international agriculture development business to understand the importance of agricultural and extension education. In so doing, AIAEE members could start to have influence in programs and projects and get involved in international advising. Another objective Clark mentioned was networking with agencies outside the university. In her experience as an independent consultant, however, that didn't seem to be happening. She felt that most of the work was staying tied to the universities.

The real goal of AIAEE, as Clark sees it, "is to educate a generation of international ag people." This too, turns out to be a problem however, because the older, more established professors are keeping the good work for themselves. So the new generation doesn't have the opportunity for real "hands on" experience. Clark said she is
also frustrated because after nine years, the organization is still doing the same thing. She explained,

I think it's even had a negative effect, because so much time is spent explaining how important we are, rather than just doing things that are important...you can talk and talk...but we could have been spending this energy showing what we can do.

Clark senses that the organization is still too individualistic and hierarchical and that those who are at the top now have developed a network to "pass around the goodies." What we need to do instead, she said, is to work together. She also believes the organization would be more effective if it took on one major project each year. That way, she reasoned, we could show others what we can do. She listed as examples, producing a research study, an evaluation study, or developing an AIAEE model of how extension could work better. We need to be more creative in developing the agenda for sustainable development, and not just take whatever we can get funded for, she explained. She also suggested that by funding and employing graduates in development work, good things could get done at a reasonable cost, which would serve as an example to others. Clark suggested that we should be asking for large grants from World Bank, etc. in order to test these models.

Clark concluded by claiming that AIAEE needs to expand its professional base by attracting international development specialists from all fields that are connected with agriculture, e.g., ag economics, rural sociology. etc. And we need to be more self-reflective in order to evaluate our progress and see if our goals are still relevant and if we are meeting them. This goes for the proposed journal as well. According to Clark, there are plenty of good journals out there. If this one is just going to say the same thing as the others, why bother? she asked.

**Conclusion** Two things seem to stand out as essential in describing who Clark is. One is a desire to make a difference in the world and the other is frustration at not being able to accomplish this in her own time frame. This shows in her near
"dropping out" in high school, through her troubles in graduate school, and in her recent difficulties at breaking into the field of international agriculture consulting. None of these, it should be noted, seem to stem from either a lack of intelligence or a lack of work. On the contrary, she seems to be very smart and willing to both take chances and to work hard. It seems too, that Clark has enlisted the services of several mentors, who helped her get focused and set her goals at a young age.

The original purpose of AIAEE, as Clark sees it, was to make known the importance of agricultural and extension education in the international development arena. This is so the members of AIAEE could begin to participate in international advising. Another objective was to get members networking with agencies outside the university. But the real goal of AIAEE, according to Clarke, is to educate a new generation of international agricultural extension workers.

Clark’s area of interest is clearly that of international agricultural development. She sees that for this to happen successfully, the hard sciences must be mixed with well developed skills in communications and in educational methodology. If a person doesn’t have all of these skills, then that person needs to partner up with someone who has the skills he or she lacks.

Clark has struggled in her education and her career against both gender and age bias. First, it was difficult for her to identify the information she would need to be an effective development specialist. Second, in gathering the information she needed to do her work while pursuing her Ph.D., she believes she ran into both prejudice and incompetence. And third, having now earned her degree, she is finding it difficult to find work because, in her experience, the "experts" keep the good work for themselves.

Clark believes AIAEE will need to go through several significant changes if it is to accomplish its original aims. For one thing, the leadership should focus on developing one or two significant projects each year which would involve the older members in the organization along with younger members, graduate students and people from outside the AgEd profession. Clark believes we need to take a leadership role in developing an agenda for international sustainable agriculture.
For this to work, we need to combine the hard sciences with communications and teaching skills. Although in some cases, one person will encapsulate both of these skills, for the most part we will need to attract people from other disciplines to join us on interdisciplinary teams. An additional point which Clark mentioned was that we need to be sure that the control of projects remains in the hands of local administrators.

Clark concluded by saying that unless the new AIAEE Journal is going to be something really unique, we should save our time and money. If it is just going to be a forum for congratulating ourselves again it will just be a waste, because there are already a lot of good journals for disseminating information.

Dr. Davis

Dr. Davis is a Professor of Agricultural Education, soon to be retired, at a state university in one of the western states. This will be his second retirement, as he has already retired from a university in the east. Davis has been involved in agricultural education for most of his life and is a past president of the AIAEE. Dr. Davis' wife has a Ph.D. in statistics and measurement and is an administrator at a college in their home state. He has one child—a daughter.

Davis was born and raised in the Pacific northwest. Both of his paternal grandparents were from Sweden. His grandfather worked in several of the trades. Davis' dad was an ag ed teacher and Davis said he can remember going to conferences with his father as early as 1940 and '41. He had two uncles on his father's side. One was a superintendent of schools in the northwest, the other was a research agronomist. On his mother's side, his grandfather was a minister and teacher who completed two bachelor's degrees and a master's degree when he was in his mid-fifties. This family had eight children. His mom was one of the oldest and was able to go to college and get her degree. She spent much of her professional life as a social worker.

Davis' early years were spent on an island in Puget Sound, on property his grandfather had homesteaded. He said there was no electricity on the island until the year he and his parents left, which was 1947. Also, life on the island involved a lot of hard
work, as almost everything had to be done by hand. But it was good, honest work. He said his grandmother cried when the electricity was installed because it meant that life on the island was going to change. Davis attended a three room school house on the island for grades one through seven. It was an interesting situation, he explained, because the older kids had to help teach the younger ones. The result was that the students had to keep going over things as they progressed through the grades, so they really got a good grasp on the basics. This idea of really having a thorough knowledge of the basics stayed with Davis throughout his career. Also, the five teachers at the school all had master's degrees, so the total knowledge base of the island's teachers was high. Davis explained in addition, that being from such a small place, the students knew they needed good educations, because they knew they would have to leave home to find work.

Davis moved to a town on the mainland when he was eleven, where he finished high school. In school, he was active in athletics and the drama club, as well as being a State Farmer in the FFA and an officer in the DeMolay. He also started working full time the summer he turned fifteen, in various aspects of fruit production. He graduated from high school when he was sixteen and went right into college. Davis said that college classes were not a problem and that he did well academically. He also continued in athletics and got involved with the Masons, an activity which he continues to pursue today. He was able to complete work at the university in five years and graduated when he was twenty one. Davis began teaching right after graduating. He was just twenty one at the time.

After teaching for six years, Davis returned to school, and eventually earned his Master's degree and Ph.D. from one of the midwestern land-grant universities. He then took a teaching position at an east coast university, where he taught until his first retirement, in 1986. Davis' interest in international agricultural and extension education dates back to his east coast teaching days.

Generally speaking Davis takes a traditional and fairly conservative view of both general education and agricultural education. He explained, for example, that
... American schools are created to do several things. One...is to have everyone go as far as they can go and that's still a major goal. [The] second thing was to stimulate them into our culture and...we have let this particular goal of education go.

Davis thinks the goal of education is to "take youngsters from where they are to where they ought to be." That is what teaching and learning are all about. But, because students are individuals, each has his or her own learning style. He then explained that some people have a knack for figuring out each student's learning style. But he said, "unless you have a feel for learning styles and for many people, ag education is the best learning style model we have." He then explained that agricultural education is not so much about teaching agriculture as it is about teaching young people how to change. "We're using ag as a vehicle," he claimed. He went on to explain that agriculture educators use agriculture as a teaching method because it deals with tangibles. He then added that it is one of the only educational program [traditional home economics being the other] that integrates youth groups into the system. An addition, agricultural education prepares people to be successful and effective citizens by using problem solving techniques and the application process. The traditional educational method doesn't help in this citizenship building.

Of equal importance, according to Davis, is the need to maintain high standards of quality. He said,

We need to continue to require high standards of quality. Quality should be our number one concern. We should demand that people come up to our standard of quality and not lower our standards.

Davis said that the American school system needs to reexamine the quality of the basic skills in the early grades. If children are competent in the basics when they get into high school, they will be able to develop a much more diverse plan of study in the later years. This will, in turn, enable them to synthesize the vast quantities of information which people are inundated with today. "We're going to have to be like the Swiss," he explained, "and start developing our capital through education." But instead, he complained, we let politics get in the way.
Davis claimed that most of the problems in agricultural and other vocational education programs stemmed from the fact that they were "prisoners of the law." Because federal laws tell ag programs what to do, those laws define agricultural education. And they have defined it as being very skill oriented. This model, Davis argued, does not prepare young people to deal with the complexities of the world. It is not, in other words, doing a very good job. But, he claimed, this is not necessarily what agricultural educators have wanted. He cited for example, that McCracken and Warmbrod wanted to make agricultural education more of an academic field of study fifteen years ago. However, the State Supervisors over-ruled them. In other words, the local politics stymied the development of vocational education.

But being a "prisoner of the law" can work the other way too. For example, under the 1963 Vocational Training Act, the federal mandate for money to agricultural education was lifted. After that, most vocational education money went to JTPA for use in the inner cities. Since then not much emphasis has been placed on agricultural education. This is unfortunate, Davis claimed, because understanding where our food comes from should be a national priority. School systems need to incorporate agricultural education into their broader educational goals. He said, "I don't care if there's no one living on a damn farm, you still need to know about agriculture and where the food comes from."

Another important aspect of agricultural education is that it emphasizes career development and work skills. This is important for the individual because, according to Davis, "a person needs to know how to work to be an adult." It is equally important to the community because a person needs to be able to work in order to contribute to the community. And the community also needs to learn to make good use of the skills that people have acquired. For example, we should use engineers for engineering, not as draftsmen, which requires much less skill.

Davis believes that the schools are going to have to change to accommodate the changing times. For example, he said we may need to move all the technical education into the community colleges and two year technical colleges. People will then have to attend those school first, to obtain a certain type of specified technical degree. Then, if
people want or need to learn about the philosophy and background of a discipline, they can learn that later in a four year college.

Concerning problems having to do with race and gender, Davis claimed that the worse form of prejudice that schools practice is not expecting minority students to perform up to standards, i.e., not requiring a high standard of quality. Going to school is a right, he explained, but being successful is not. It has to be earned. If a person has a diploma, that person should have achieved a certain level of competency. "We can't have low expectations!" Davis believes that schools with high minority enrollments need to focus more on doing a quality job of teaching the basics and not be too concerned about cultural matters.

In following the conservative thinking of traditional agricultural educators, Davis explained that one of the goals of public education should be to teach American values, i.e., democracy and free-market trade. In addition, all education in the United States should be given in English, because that is the official language chosen by the country's founding fathers. Other languages should only be taught as they relate to career and employment opportunities. He then said,

I feel the Indian community and Hispanic community ...have an obligation to extend the kid's educations [about cultural matters] outside of the schools and not leave it to the public. I think the public schools have a responsibility to be sensitive to them, but also to set a set of standards and say--"Okay, achieve."

Davis said that in his experience, "where [schools] put demands in, the kids can achieve and do well."

In order to recruit more women and people of color into agricultural and extension education, Davis suggested that "when we have minority people or women who are successful in agricultural education, we need to set them up as role models so as recruit more people like them." He then went on to explain that students major in school subjects which they are familiar with. Therefore, we need to familiarize more people about the importance and openness of agriculture and agricultural education.
Concerning international agricultural and extension education, Davis claimed that on the one hand, we should have been exporting the land-grant model - with its research, education, and extension. But the model only works if "good feeling" people are involved. So a better approach, Davis suggested, would be to look at a development model based on "the school in the community." This model would be similar to what was developed in the early, rural education days of the U.S. A focus on education, with vocational agriculture and home economics, he claimed, would be a more efficient and cost effective way of transferring technology than exporting sophisticated extension programs.

At the graduate level, Davis believes that students need a broad-based education in technical classes, the social sciences, and in agricultural education. He explained again, that the agricultural education model is effective because it requires that the students combine practical experience with their doctoral works. Because of this, an ag ed graduate is "more likely to be grounded in reality than the person who spent their entire life in academia..."

Davis was at the founding meeting of AIAEE, held at the State Department in 1984. He believes the AIAEE was created in recognition of the fact that agricultural educators had something to offer the international development community. What they had was a synthesis of skills and experiences in organizing extension education. This was something that other development organizations had failed to do. AIAEE's role in international development, according to Davis, was to develop integrators and synthesizers. He said, "Any international project that doesn't have an integrator on its staff is doomed to failure..."

Davis claimed that the traditional ways of education in international agriculture, i.e., bringing international students here to get Ph.D.s in technical areas, doesn't work. The agricultural education and extension model works much better, he claimed, because it prepares people to work with farmers. And AIAEE is important because it informs workers in developing countries about the ag ed model. In so doing, AIAEE can help get other countries to request that agricultural and extension educators become part of the
development process in their countries. And likewise, it can help domestic organizations like the State Department and Winrock understand the need to incorporate career development opportunities into development programs.

The problem with AIAEE, according to Davis, is that "it's not a status group, not good for promotion and tenure." One of the best reasons for doing the Journal therefore, is to raise the group's prestige. Another thing we have to do is to establish credibility within the international community, that is, outside of the university community. The organization needs to improve its relationships with World Bank, USAID, and the USDA. It also needs to get members of those groups to become working members of AIAEE. Davis also claimed that in the future, almost all Americans working in the international field will come from Peace Corps or Mennonites or a similar kind of organization. And they will have a second language. As those people start writing position papers, AIAEE's views will start to become more creditable, he claimed.

Davis said that the organization needs to do three things to ensure their future growth. These are: 1) broaden the organization's appeal, 2) get the Journal going, and 3) attract more young people and encourage them to become active in the organization. He said that in order to get more graduate students, the group is going to need to come up with some funds, because graduate students will go where the money is, and at this time, that is with the scientists and economists.

Concerning the mission and goals of the AIAEE, Davis claimed that the first mission of the AIAEE is to serve as a professional association for people carrying the principles of agriculture and extension education worldwide. Its second mission is that it is a place where these people can get together, interact professionally and share information and experiences about the latest research being done in the field.

According to Davis, the main operational philosophy of the AIAEE has been to "gather together people of a like feeling." But the secondary and perhaps more important objective, has been the development of more status and a higher level of visibility and recognition for the integrators, i.e., for the extension and agricultural educators working in the international community. So the philosophy of AIAEE, in Davis' opinion, is "to
help establish international agricultural and extension education as an academic discipline, to make international ag and extension educators more visible to the international development community, and to make the discipline an acceptable era of international activity."

Conclusion  Three things stand out as essential to Davis and his ideas about agricultural and extension education. The first is the need for good grounding or quality understanding of the basics in education. The second is the need for career development and the learning of "hands-on" skills in education. The third is that agricultural and extension educators are integrators and synthesizers. Davis' own experiences growing up on an island farm, then moving to the mainland, give credence to his demand for a thorough knowledge of educational basics. Because he had that background, he was able to adjust easily to his new environment and do well in school. His concern for educational systems which fail to provide adequate basic education skills, particularly in areas with a high percentage of minority populations, stems from those experiences.

Coupled with this need for a good understanding of the basics was Davis's concern for the development of career awareness and utilitarian work skills. Here Davis was expressing the traditional view of agricultural educators, as expressed in the Smith-Hughes Act. But Davis didn't believed in these parts of agricultural education just as dogma. He believed that organizing education around career development helped the learner because it made education relevant. And he believed that organizing education around the development of hands-on skills stimulated the development of a deeper intellectual understanding of the problem-solving process.

A unique view of agricultural and extension education was Davis' sense that effective members of the profession are "integrators and synthesizers." Agricultural education is, for Davis, the joining together of several different areas of study. These include the technical aspects of agriculture; the technical aspects of education, e.g., teaching and learning theory, evaluation, curriculum development, etc.; and aspects of the
social sciences. And it is specifically because agricultural education has this overview and can sense the bigger picture that it is such a valuable tool for international development.

Davis believes the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education has several functions. The first is to define the discipline of international agricultural and extension education as an academic discipline. The group's origins, according to Davis, were to a large extent social. AIAEE started as a way for people with a common interest to get together and share information about agricultural education and international development. From the group's first meetings, members established two things. The first was that international agricultural and extension education had some important tools to offer the development world. The second was that almost no one in the development community knew anything about the discipline. From these, the second function of AIAEE arose. That was to increase the visibility of the philosophy and methods of international ag and extension educators to the international development community.

Such work is, of course, ongoing. Of equal importance however, is the need to make the discipline an acceptable part of international activity. This can best be done by educating people outside of academia and the profession as to what international agricultural and extension education is all about. Of equal importance in legitimizing the discipline is inviting representatives from other related professions and from the different donor organizations, be they governmental, NGOs, or PVOs, to attend our meetings and meet individual practitioners of the field of study.

Dr. Evans

Dr. Evans is a middle aged man from a small Asian nation. He was a professor of agricultural and extension education in his home country. While working at the agricultural college near his home, he came to know a visiting professor from a U.S. land-grant university. With the support of this man, his new mentor, he and his family were able to come to the U.S. so that he could finish his doctorate. He completed the work on his
dissertation recently, and is currently working in a post-doctoral position here in the United States.

Evans came from a large family which lived in a very remote part of the world. His family lived by subsistence farming. As such, they had little cash. Evans claimed that his parents went through great sacrifice to educate their children. He is the middle of seven children. His three brothers are all college graduates. The two older brothers work for the Department of Education. The younger one is a city engineer. Two of his sisters are uneducated. The third graduated from high school.

Evans' village was a five hour walk from the nearest "motor vehicle road." When he was just five years old, the village elders, including his father, invited a teacher to the village. The teacher lived in the Davis' home. As a result, Davis received special tutoring. The teacher left the village several years later. Evans and his older brother had to move to a town to attend high school. The journey to the village was a four day walk. Although he was just ten years old at the time, he and his brother lived there for a year. It was a very difficult time for him. He said he cried himself to sleep almost every night. The following year however, the village managed to hire a high school teacher, so he and his brother were able to move back home.

Evans had to return to the town where he had studied earlier to complete high school degree. He also took his national matriculation exam, called the SLC or School Living Examination. Evans was the only one from the surrounding villages to pass. He said usually only 30% of those that take it pass. Even his older brother had not passed, which caused problems in his family. After passing the SLC, Evans was admitted to a new university in a nearby town. This school specialized in teaching science. It turned out to not be a very good school however, so the next year he transferred to the National University in the capital. After two years there and another set of grueling examinations, he graduated and became certified to teach. He then returned to his village to teach and help his parents on the farm.

Evans soon discovered that after all those years of schooling he had a difficult time doing farm labor. As a result, he "ran away from home" and moved back to the city. He
supported himself for a while by tutoring an Englishman in his native language. He then discovered that the government was beginning a new agriculture college. He applied and was accepted with a scholarship. The school was supported, in part, with money from USAID. It offered a degree in agricultural education. It was while studying at the agricultural college that Evans met his U.S. mentor, who was working on an evaluation project there. Upon graduation, through the recommendation of his mentor, Evans was offered a faculty position at the agriculture college. He taught traditional ag ed classes for a while, including things like FFA and parliamentary procedures. Evans enjoyed that part of his life, and said

> It was fun and I was excited to be a vocational agricultural education teacher...[My country] had implemented a agricultural school system, vocational - in the high school - like [the U.S.] agricultural education department in the secondary schools.

Then the college decided to terminate it's vocational ag program. It offered instead, a Bachelor's of Science degree in agriculture. Evans explained that by doing so, the graduates could go into production agriculture, agribusiness, or into teaching. After this change, Evans began teaching "non-formal education in agriculture." While he was working at the university he got married to a woman from an area quite far from where he grew up. This was unusual, he explained, because people usually married a person from a neighboring village. His father approved of the marriage however, which indicated that he was "really liberal." Their first child was born the next year.

As a result of his experiences at the Ag College, Evans applied and was accepted to a Master's degree program in another Asian country. So he packed up his things, left his wife and went away for two years. He said he missed his family a lot. On the other hand, the school was attended by people from throughout Asia. As such, he learned as much from the other students as he did from the classes. Upon completion of this schooling, he was granted a Master's in Extension Education. When he returned, he went to work as the Head of the Department of Extension Education and Rural Sociology at the National Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science. While serving in that position, he
had the opportunity to come to the U.S.A. for the first time. That was to attend a ten
week USAID seminar on the Development and Operation of Agricultural Extension
Programs. At the end of the program he took time to visit the American professor who
had acted as his mentor. They discussed Evans’ desire to continue his education. Evans
said that he also made a trip to the university library while he was visiting. He claimed
that it was the number of books at the library and the ease of the retrieval system that
caused him to set his goal on returning to that university.

After a couple of more years, his mentor returned to Evans’ country to evaluate
the Agriculture Institute. While he was visiting, Evans mentioned again that he was
interested in pursuing his Ph.D. His mentor encouraged him. The next year, he was
accepted to the university where his mentor taught. Soon after, he and his family moved
to the United States.

As mentioned above, Evans is currently working here in the States and wondering
what will happen when he returns home. His parents now have a house in the city, where
they have a better opportunity to see the children. They also like the city because it has
safe drinking water and there are medical facilities nearby. But his parents still work in
their old village during the growing season. The country has just changed to a constitu­
tional monarchy, so there is a lot of change taking place and he feels an obligation to be a
part of that change. But there is also a lot of political unrest. Also, the pay in his country
is very low, so he has some interest in staying in the U.S. for a while longer.

Evans said that gender was definitely an issue where he came from. He said, for
example, that when he first went to college there were 177 boys in his class and only 15
girls. And when he went to the agriculture college all of the students were men. This was
ironic, he mentioned, because most of the country’s farmers were women. He added that
in his family, his father and mother and the wives of his two other sons did all of the
farming and that most of the work was done by the women. He said his mother didn’t
talk to men from outside the village, such as government people like the extension agents
or tax people. Because of international funding for education however, things were
changing. Now many of the girls, like his younger sister, get high school diplomas. There is also foreign funding to support young women in the colleges.

Evans claimed that there was a problem with gender bias throughout the Indian subcontinent. He felt that such problems were due to two reasons. One had to do with the dowry system. Male babies were the preferred because families had to provide large dowries for the daughters when they became brides. The other was that women were expected to get married at a young age and start producing grandchildren. He felt that the cultures on the subcontinent needed to start dealing with those kinds of things.

Evans attended his first AIAEE the first year he came to the U.S.A. to go to school. He said someone handed him a "Call for Papers" soon after he arrived. He submitted a proposal and it was accepted. So he was excited about the organization from the start. He believes the organization could be influential in the development of appropriate agricultural technology development in his country. Evans thinks AIAEE has several purposes. The first is to act as a social organization where people come together to renew friendships and share personal experiences. The second is for the sharing of academic findings such as "new issues, new subjects, presentations, intellectual discussions." A third purpose of the AIAEE is to educate the development assistance agencies. To do this well, Evans thinks the Association should invite funding agencies, e.g., World Bank, USAID, Rockefellers, Ford, Winrock, Kellogg, to give presentations at the AIAEE Annual Meeting, outlining their goals and objectives. First, he suggested, the Association needs to explain its own goals. Then it needs to ask questions like "How can your agency be involved?," "How can we work together in order to meet your goals as related to our goals?," and "What can we do together?" He believes if the Association then gives these other organizations the opportunity to participate, they will tell us how our group can support theirs.

AIAEE members, Evans continued, are professional researchers, teachers, and practitioners. Also, they have a great wealth of experience working with the different donor organizations. As such, these people are well suited to coordinate the activities of the larger organizations and for bringing the big organizations together and helping them
to pool resources and be more effective at appropriate agricultural and rural development. By drawing on the expertise of its members, Evans thinks the AIAEE should be able to generate new policy options, new knowledge bases, and new strategies that work in rural and agricultural development programs throughout the world.

But of equal importance, Evans pointed out, is for the group to involve researchers and practitioners from the developing countries. In order to do the kind of work that the group is capable of and to involve people who maybe can't afford to come, the organization should try to get some funding for special projects from groups like Kellogg or from the Japanese. And if the organization could get outside funding, it might be able to buy the time of AIAEE members from their home universities and run projects of its own. Evans said that AIAEE has the talent and the leadership, it just needs the commitment from the membership.

Evans also thinks that the group needs to focus on the Journal. He thinks that the Journal can be a very big drawing card, if it is done right. For that to happen, the editors need to solicit articles from all over the world, not just from America. They also need to broaden the view of what makes up extension a little. Evans then explained that most countries don't have agricultural and extension education programs like the one in the U.S. Instead, they have an education program under the Ministry of Education and a extension program under the Ministry of Agriculture. Evans said the Association has to be sure to target some of its articles to the extension field personnel around the world. Next the group needs to plan the distribution of the Journal very carefully. The organization needs to come up with a plan to get the Journal into the libraries and institutions in the developing countries. To do this, he said, AIAEE will probably have to come up with some way to subsidize the Journal. Perhaps the Journal could be spread electronically as well, he claimed, by using the ERIC system or something similar.

If the group can produce a high quality Journal and get it widely distributed, it can then use the Journal to launch a major membership drive. We have to push hard, he said to recruit members from other countries. In conjunction with the membership drive, the
organization needs to figure out how to have meetings outside of the United States. He said

...if we have a major membership drive, then I think we should think of a regional meeting; moving the meeting...from North America to Europe, to Asia, to Africa, to Latin America, to Africa. Just like other professional societies are doing.

This can only happen through "the personal and professional influence of the existing members," he claimed. Members need to encourage other professionals, particularly those from related fields, to join the Association. Faculty members should also encourage their international graduate students to join because of "the benefits the students could get from participating in [the] annual meeting." And we need to be sure to draw on the experience and free time older members of the profession have, especially those who are retired.

Evans concluded by saying that the organization should take time at its meetings to "praise our colleagues and our graduate students" and our international people. We need to encourage people, he said. And above all, we need to have patience. "We can't do it in two years," he said. "Rome wasn't built in a day. It took years and years."

**Conclusion** What stands out as a very strong personality trait of Dr. Evans is his *enthusiasm*. From the hardships of living in a remote village, to his leaving home at an early age to go to school, to his leaving his family to go away for his Master's degree to the political difficulties his nation is currently going through, Evans continues to display a belief that things in life will work out well.

Evans has a strong belief in the value of agricultural and extension education. And, while he seems to have a particularly high regard for the system developed in the U.S., he believes that the traditional separation of agriculture and education under two different Ministries needs to be appreciated and dealt with by American educators because so much of the world follows that system.

Evens said that gender bias was definitely a factor in the part of the world where he came from. Although women do most of the farm work there, they have the least
access to agricultural education. This seems to be changing however. As western countries become involved in his country’s education system, through offering funding, they are opening up the opportunities for women.

Evans sees the AIAEE as having several functions. These include: 1) serving as a social organization where members can come together to share experiences; 2) providing an opportunity for members to share academic findings concerning new issues, new subjects and providing a forum for presentations and intellectual discussions; 3) educating the development assistance agencies on the benefits of agricultural and extension education to international development. The best way for us to do this, according to Evans, is to explain to those organizations what agricultural and extension education is, then ask them how we can be of assistance to them. He recommended, in other words, a participatory approach to working with these other organizations.

Evans thinks that because AIAEE members have a broad education base, they are well suited to coordinate the activities of the larger donor organizations. By doing so, they could begin to generate new policies and new approaches agricultural and extension development. In order to do this the group needs to solicit opinions from researchers and practitioners from the developing countries. Finally, Evans believes that the AIAEE should always remember to encourage it’s members. And, remind them to have patience.

Dr. Frank

Dr. Frank, who hails from the midwest, is a professor of agricultural education at an eastern university. Frank grew up on a farm near a small resort town, so he became rather cosmopolitan at an early age. He has been overseas for extended periods of time on several occasions. The first was as an army officer in Germany. The second was in the Far East, while working on his dissertation. He also had a long term assignment setting up a land-grant institution on a small Pacific island nation. Frank is a founding member of the AIAEE.

Frank grew up on a dairy farm in the Great Lakes region. His paternal grandparents were born in Germany and homesteaded when they came to America, circa 1870.
His grandfather died about the time Frank was born. His grandmother, who had twelve children, continued to run the family farm, and was a very influential person in his life. Frank's father loved agriculture and loved caring for the land. He believed that "agriculture... was a very important contribution to society." So Frank attributes his interest in agriculture primarily to his father.

Frank's mother's family was of Scotch-English descent. They immigrated to the U.S. from Canada. They too were farmers. In addition, his maternal grandmother was a school teacher, as were his two aunt's on his mother side. So Frank credits his own love of education to his mother's family.

In talking of his early years, Frank explained that his family's farm was near a summer resort town, so he had the opportunity to caddie at the local golf course for wealthy people from the city. This mixing with people became an important part of his life and influenced his decision to leave the farm and go to college. He attended the land-grant university in his home state. Frank says he has always been a generalist. As an example, he said that during his first couple of years at college he took a mixture of classes, including ones from various agricultural disciplines. During his third year his advisor told him that if he took some classes in agricultural education, he could get a job as a teacher, so he followed that path and graduated with a Bachelor's Degree in Agricultural Education.

While in college, Frank took classes in the ROTC. When he graduated, he got a commission in the Army. The summer after graduation, he went to an army training camp, where he had his first experiences with cross-culturalism. There he met Afro-American people for the first time, and had his first experience observing racial prejudice.

After graduation, Frank taught science for one year, then went to Germany as an army officer. There too, he had many multi-cultural experiences, both with other army officers from different ethnic background and different parts of the U.S. and with people from other lands. He also met his wife while he was in Germany. Frank said he enjoyed the atmosphere there well enough to stay for an extra tour of duty.
When he returned home, Frank took a vocational agricultural teaching position in a rural part of his home state. While he was still teaching agriculture, he enrolled in a master's degree program at his alma mater. So he began commuting to campus or to the university's off-campus course sites in his region. His in-service teacher education/evaluator, who became his mentor for the rest of his graduate education and throughout his professional career, encouraged him to return to campus and pursue a doctoral degree. So after teaching for three and one half years, Frank returned to campus and began his PH.D. studies in the Social-Philosophical Foundations of International Education and Agricultural Administration. He received a grant to conduct his dissertation research overseas, accompanied by his mentor, on a joint developmental project. He and his wife spent six months in the Far East on that assignment.

When they returned, Frank finished writing his dissertation and graduated. Soon after, he was offered a position helping to develop a land-grant university on an island-nation in the Pacific. Frank said that his experiences on the island were very valuable, as he had the opportunity to help establish the agriculture college, to develop the curriculum for both the agriculture and home economics departments, to select sites for two agricultural experiment stations, and to convert the extension service from a governmental regulatory function to a university educational function. After finishing that job, the Franks returned to the States. He soon found a job at a land-grant university located in the East, where he still works. Since that time he has left the country several times on short term assignments.

Frank came up through the ranks of traditional agricultural education, and sees himself as a pedagogist whose job is to teach "the science and art of actually teaching—of empowering people to learn to do a better job of agriculture." He explained that he'd always had a "keen interest" in developing educational programs oriented towards helping people. He said he saw the world as interdependent and wanted to combine the "hands on" principles and practices of the vocational education model with the idea of helping others. As such, he was always trying to see how the traditional U.S. model of ag ed could be adapted to situations in other countries.
Frank believes that the most important thing in education, as was pointed out by John Dewey, is to be able to bring everyday life into the classroom. He explained that he saw his job as one of

...preparing my students for their careers...If they were satisfied and pleased with their education, that's what was important, not which particular occupation they were in. Because I see agriculture as a way--by using an approach of things practical, things in the real world, natural, growing--it's not just books and exams and classrooms--but it's really taking life into the classroom.

According to Frank, there are a couple of major problems with agriculture and agricultural policy these days. One is that most of the people in power positions, both here and abroad, are not from farms anymore, so leadership no longer has agrarian roots. As a result, things such as protecting the land are no longer valued. Frank sees the agrarian ethic as being just the opposite. He sees agriculture and the environment as intertwined and he expressed concern over the loss of the relationship between the people and the land. He also sees agriculture from the practical standpoint of making money. For this to work we need to develop an agriculture that is profitable, he said. According to Frank, to do this we need a well educated work force. And we need a good extension service, which can take scientific information and technology and extend it to both farm and non-farm consumers.

Frank explained that he sees agricultural development as an all encompassing way of building communities. It needs to deal with optimizing the total environment, including the food supply, water, housing, education and other institutions, as well as job development. Again, this fits in with the concept of education being most effective when it fits in with real life experiences. He said

I think...working with people in the work place, on the job--helping people see things in an enlightened manner and using the scientific method to address problems--is very important.

He added that although this is important here at home, it is even more important in international work.
Frank said he considers himself a social democrat. He thinks we should spend our money on good, efficient government which has strong public institutions, such as the public schools. He said there is a big difference between the Northeast and the Midwest, as regards government and education. In the Northeast, he said, there is a definite class distinction, which stems from the old industrial mill days. This has carried over into the education system, so that the wealthy people sent their children to private schools, while the children from the working classes attended the not-so-well financed public institutions. In the Midwest, and even more in the Far West, he said, there is more of a spirit of egalitarianism, and education is based more on merit than on class background.

This was a problem for Frank, because where he now lives, there is a stratification between "Vokies" and "Preppies." Furthermore, people in agriculture are looked down on. Instead of this division, he recommended that the [public] money should be recycled [for] better schools, better public health programs, better outreach, whether it's public health, agriculture, whatever it may be to meet people's needs.

He added that institutions have to be designed to halt the greed of people who have good connections and contacts; who can put pressure on the politicians to do things for them. Because, he said, the masses suffer as a result of the greed of a few. Frank thinks this is a very serious problem in the U.S. and is disturbed that the old land-grant philosophy of "enfranchising the masses" is being lost. He suggested that perhaps we needed some kind of large public works project to help bring the nation back together.

In 1983, Frank accepted a summer assignment in Washington D.C., as an agricultural education consultant for an international bureau, under the auspices of USAID. While there, he was invited to attend a workshop concerning international agricultural education, which was being held at Texas. This turned out to be the first (unofficial) meeting of what was to become the Association for International Agricultural Education or AIAEE. He said that several people at the conference were concerned that much of the information about international extension education was "falling between the
cracks of what was agriculture and what was education." So they decided to form a new organization.

Generally speaking, according to Frank, several of these founding members were "a group of mavericks and rebels." Because of this legacy, he pointed out the importance of keeping the doors open to these kinds of people "so that they can keep things moving along." He also expressed a concern that the organization was becoming dominated by mainstream agricultural educators. He said

That's one thing we always need to guard against though—is that it not become too tradition-bound and that our conferences and activities include a wide array of approaches and disciplines. And we have to hear out people that sound like mavericks at our meetings...

The original purpose of the AIAEE was to bring together people who understood the theory and practice of vocational agricultural education and then to apply those principles to problems of development world-wide. Also, it was an attempt to use an inter-disciplinary approach, because some of the members were primarily educators and others were primarily agriculturalists, but in fact, they all worked in both fields.

An important aspect of AIAEE, according to Frank, is its grassroots support. The leadership comes from the members, who have either had international experience or are using AIAEE as a vehicle for getting international experience. Another important aspect of the organization is that "we don't differentiate between faculty, Ph.D.s and graduate students." There are two reasons for this, he explained. First, everyone in this organization is a professional. And second, each person in the organization has had valuable experiences to share with others. So it is this sense of "togetherness" that makes AIAEE what it is.

According to Frank, the international experience is a great liberalizing agent for professionals in agriculture. This is because it makes a person look at other philosophies, religions, cultures, races, geographical entities, etc. When one has looked at these aspects of life, he claimed, one sees how interdependent humans are and yet how there is always more than one way to do something. Frank stressed that AIAEE needs to reflect such
values, along with egalitarianism; that is, AIAEE needs to make a humanitarian contribution to the world. Unfortunately, he added, many development specialists with agricultural science degrees, particularly those without any psychology or sociology background, don’t appreciate this.

Concerning gender issues, Frank said that there was a tremendous need for women and minorities throughout the field of international development and especially in agricultural and extension education. He added,

...in most developing countries, we need to encourage women. Women need to be directly involved-- their opinions solicited on a broad range of issues, such as family planning (which, for Frank, is part of agriculture, in the broad sense)...We need to look at family planning. It reflects quality of life...We should have more women in the organization...And they need to be more in the fields such as public health, rural sociology, and the behavioral sciences.

Frank claimed that as a group, we need to get a grasp of who we are, what we’re doing, where we’re going, and who our audience is. And there are several important themes which AIAEE should address, such as the globalization of our profession, the inter-disciplinary nature of agricultural problems, and environmental issues. And above all, according to Frank, we need to present ourselves, with all of our diversities, as a united group. He said that a united presence would help us attract new members.

Frank said that it is only with this kind of focus that we can appeal to outside donor organizations, which is an important next step for AIAEE. And we should be becoming more politically involved by, for example, getting some resolutions to key people in Congress concerning things like the environment and some political issues.

**Conclusion** Two things come to mind as essential aspects of Frank’s life as an educator. The first is that he is a humanist. This thread winds through his life, from his being in a large family, to the things he learned while caddying, to his sense of the importance of working towards creating a more egalitarian world. Frank seems to be a
"people" person, who consistently emphasizes the need to work for the improvement of life on the planet.

The second essential part of educating a person, according to Frank, is tying the educational experience to the learner's "everyday life," for otherwise the education is not really relevant. For Frank, an education that is tied to the person's daily life is, by nature, an egalitarian one. Frank also believes that agricultural and extension education, particularly at the international level, must draw from a broad base of educational resources, including the sciences, psychology and sociology. This is because agricultural and extension education need to be "community based" and therefore, deal with a wide variety of issues. And it must be relevant to jobs and the world of work, as they relate to a particular community.

Frank also thinks that development education cannot be separated from politics. Government should play an important role in the creation of egalitarian school systems that eliminate the "disenfranchising" of marginal groups, such as women and the poor. And, because he has a strong sense of the "agrarian ethic" he is concerned about the small amount of experience that our leaders have with caring for the environment.

According to Frank, the original purpose of the AIAEE was to bring vocational agricultural educators together, along with interested people from other disciplines and to apply the principles of agricultural education and the land-grant model to agricultural development problems in the developing world. Frank said the original members were "mavericks" and free thinkers, and that it is very important to keep this kind of energy in the organization.

The strength of AIAEE, in his opinion, is that it welcomes everyone; that it doesn't "differentiate between faculty, Ph.D.s and graduate students" because it sees all of these people as professionals." This is also the source of AIAEE's weakness, because its members have great difficulty in defining themselves, and as such, of presenting a united front.

Frank thinks that there is a tremendous need for women and minorities in agricultural and extension education. And they need to be directly involved. Frank said that
AIAEE members need to be versed in a wide variety of issues, including family planning, because it is these sorts of things that reflect the quality of one's life.

Frank believes that the next important step for AIAEE is to take stock of itself, to define who it is and where it is going. We then need to take some action, such as writing our own grant proposals and perhaps, begin lobbying in Washington to bring about changes in environmental and political policies. Frank concluded by saying that AIAEE needs to make a humanitarian contribution to the world.

Dr. Graham

Dr. Graham, who recently retired from the faculty of a midwestern land-grant university, was a founding member of the AIAEE. Graham grew up on the Great Plains during the Dust Bowl. As such, he suffered many hardship in his early years. However, a good mind, hard work and scholarships got him through college. He has dedicated his life to agricultural education and has been a driving force in extending the agricultural education concept overseas.

Graham's parents were tenant farmers. He was the second son and third of six children. He said he felt that he was lucky because when he was young, the towns near where he grew up formed a consolidated school district. As a result, he was able to attend grades K-12 in his home district, which was a rare occurrence in those days. He also learned to respect community participation in local schools, a subject which remained important to him throughout his career.

During his youth, Graham was expected to work on chores around the house and on the farm. His parents used horses to work the land, but in the summer between the ninth and tenth grade he got a job driving tractor. The following year he moved in with some neighbors, where he worked for room, board and some spending money. During high school, Graham excelled both scholastically and in sports. He also read as much as he could. He said he was pretty frugal in those days, saving almost all of his money for college. He did, however, spend some on subscriptions to magazines such as Boys Life, The Open Road for Boys, and Time Magazine.
Graham's scholarly activities led to his being chosen valedictorian of his class. He was offered three different scholarships when he graduated. He chose the Regent's Scholarship to the College of Agriculture at the land-grant university in his home state. He said about that time, "I enrolled in ag ed because I had some image that I wanted to be a teacher of agriculture." Graham worked at several jobs when he first arrived at college. One provided for his room, one for his food and one for money for books. So with his little bit of savings and his scholarship for tuition, he was set. And he made the honor roll.

In 1941, following the bombing of Pearl Harbor, Graham joined the U.S. Army Reserves. It wasn't until 1943, however, that he was activated. He received training in field artillery and engineering and was called to the front in 1944, for the D-Day invasion. He fought in the Battle of the Bulge.

Graham returned to the States in January of 1946 and immediately went back to school. He was able to transfer some credits he'd earned while in the service, and was eligible for the G.I. Bill, which helped financially. He also became involved in several campus organizations, such as the YMCA and the inter-religious council, where he was introduced to things like parliamentary procedure. He graduated with distinction in 1947. Upon graduating, Graham was offered a fellowship at a neighboring state university, but turned it down in favor of a teaching job.

Graham worked as a vocational agriculture teacher for three years at a small school in a rural corner of his home state. Working there reinforced his ideas about the importance of community participation in local schools. Unfortunately, he also learned how incompetence at the state Department of Education can harm school programs. After teaching for three years, he returned to his alma mater to get his master's degree. He finished that in a short time, then went back to teaching. While at his second teaching job, he got married.

After teaching for another two years, Graham and his family decided to move east, so that he could pursue his doctorate. He had three different options to choose from, each with a different emphasis. He chose the one that focused on creating good administrative
relationships between the state board of education and the local schools. After he finished his class work and while he was still working on his dissertation, he went to work for the state Department of Education. It was while working there that he first got involved with vocational educators from other countries.

He worked for the Department of Education for about two and one half years, then got a job in Extension at the state university. He was assigned to an underdeveloped part of the state where various government agencies were attempting to revitalize the economy. He spent part of his time directing student teachers. The rest of his time was spent working as part of a "systems approach" team, trying to find solutions to some of the area’s economic problems.

The work that he and his team members were doing in community development caught the attention of some international development experts. As a result, he was given the opportunity to go to the far east for a two year period, as an agricultural education advisor at one of the provincial agricultural colleges.

The school system where he went to work was very different from the U.S. system. For example, there agriculture was taught at a separate high school, which operated a fairly large farm. This was because each family only owned a little piece of land, so there was no space at home for a student to have an individual project. For this and similar reasons traditional U.S. methods, such as problem-solving methodologies and local advisory boards, didn’t work well. Regarding those experiences, Graham stated

I began to sense that...if we’re going to help them, we’ve got to adapt some basic principles. And I guess I have spent more than 30 years trying to figure out how to do that.

Graham and his family returned to the States in the winter of 1963. He returned to his adopted country the following summer to do follow up work, and has been back many times for additional research and consultation. He has also been invited to several other countries since then, as an agricultural education advisor. He explained that when he first became involved in international work he wanted to experience a lot of different countries. But his advisor suggested that he specialize in one country—that he first become well
acquainted with the educational system and the political and cultural systems of one other country. He followed that advice, and is glad that he did because now, when he visits a new school system, he can compare it to two different systems. He explained that this allows him to see and understand things much more clearly than if he only had the U.S. system for comparison.

During the early 80s, Graham’s department at the university went through some major changes. It was moved from the College of Education to the College of Agriculture. Today, the department contains three undergraduate programs: one in agricultural communications, one in agribusiness and natural resource education (where the teacher education program is housed), and one in environmental education. There is also a graduate program in which one can emphasize either agricultural teacher education or adult/extension education.

Because of its past affiliation with the College of Education, the theoretical and philosophical focus of the department is on education. This causes some problems, Graham explained, since the department is related to the College of Agriculture on its financial and practical basis. He went on to say

I think that our department has been characterized over the years as having a strong philosophical, psychological base in education, but with faculty members who have an agricultural background—who can bring to the program the actual linkages with agricultural technology.

As mentioned earlier, Graham believes that one of the most important aspects of agricultural education is good community relations. In order for that to happen, he explained, the ag ed teacher must, first of all, be an expert at analyzing his or her community. Then he or she must integrate the vocational ag program into the community. The agricultural education teacher must take on the role of a community leader to accomplish this. But for this to work, said Graham, he or she must have a broad based education and the ability to comprehend a broad range of problems.

In order to prepare students for these kinds of challenges, most classes at the undergraduate level at Graham’s university are designed to cover the broad base. It is at
the graduate level then, that emphasis is placed on specific educational classes such as curriculum planning, evaluation, supervised experience, etc. In this way the students, when doing their teacher training field work, can put the theoretical information to direct use. Graham said he believes that it is important for teacher or extension education students to immediately put into practice what they have learned.

Graham also explained that he thinks agricultural education needs to change its emphasis. As the number of farm and rural people decreases, there seems to be less of a need for traditional agricultural education. What is needed instead, he explained, is a much more comprehensive understanding of the importance of agriculture for the society as a whole. He explained that

"My line of thinking is that agricultural teacher education needs to be in the forefront, helping to broaden the base of teaching agriculture and teaching about agriculture in the school systems...In our basic general studies program, there needs to be a way of getting at an introduction of agriculture as a part of the society, not just agriculture as part of the economy."

A good way to do this, according to Graham, is through the use of in-service, summer workshops for social studies teachers. This is very important, Graham claimed, because the time is rapidly approaching when our politicians and policy makers, who are making decisions about agricultural, won't know a thing about it. And that, he claims, is true in most countries in the world.

Graham and other agricultural specialists with international experience began, as early as 1975, to get together at other national meetings, e.g., American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture (AATEA), to talk about international issues relevant to agricultural education. This began to cause a disturbance at some of these other meetings, so plans were made to form a separate organization, which evolved into the Association for International Agricultural Education (AIAE) in 1984 and the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education (AIAEE) in 1987.

Graham talked about the importance of AIAEE as a networking organization and about the principles which he thought were important. The first of these was that AIAEE
should stress the necessity of performing a thorough needs assessment when beginning a new development project. He said we need to go into international situations and ask the people what they want. And he emphasized that we need to talk to the farmers themselves and not just the government people.

He also thought that it was important that the needs assessment instruments be understood within the context of the particular country and culture in which the work was being done. "We tend to design these questionnaires and then analyze the information from an American, scientific point of view," he explained, instead of from the perspective of the client.

Another important issue, according to Graham, is attitude. For example, we need to understand the difference between farmers and peasants. In the far east, Graham explained, there was a lot of government officials who didn't understand why he kept referring to the "peasants" as farmers. He had to explain that he kept thinking "that they’re people—that they have occupations—that they’re not just peasants."

It seems, however, that the new AIAEE Journal is, in Graham’s opinion, the most important thing happening in AIAEE’s near future. He sees the Journal as an important way for us to disseminate information, particularly to the larger audience of development specialists. He suggested that AIAEE, as a group, write a grant and get some funding. With this money, we could finance subscriptions to the Journal for libraries in the developing countries.

Finally, Graham said we need to encourage people outside of Agricultural Education to become active members of the AIAEE. He claimed that it is important to get other people who are involved in international development to come to our meetings, to submit papers, and to participate.

Conclusion  The concepts that best capture the essence of Dr. Graham’s life are focus and hard work. The focus of Graham’s life has been agricultural education. He has just retired from a long, successful career as an agricultural educator. Much of what got him to that point was hard work, from growing up during the dust bowl, through the
reconfiguration of his department at the state university, to the development of the Association for International Agriculture and Extension Education.

Graham's years of service have assured his participation in the development of agricultural education, both here and abroad. He believes there are several important issues which must be dealt with in order to have a successful agricultural education program. One is that the successful agriculture educator must have a broad base of information as a foundation from which to operate. This should contain education and experience in agriculture, along with a sound theoretical base in philosophy, psychology, and teaching and learning theory. Another is that agriculture has to be community minded. This means that it must be based on a thorough community needs assessment. Then, once the results of this assessment are understood, the ag teacher must assume a leadership role within the community. Graham also thinks that the whole focus of agricultural education needs to change, from being oriented towards rural, farm-based children to one that is oriented to the ever growing number of urban and suburban children.

In Graham's opinion, AIAEE's major function is as a networking and communications forum and as a way of carrying the message of agricultural and extension education. He believes that any new project should start by gathering information with a thorough needs assessment. This assessment needs to correctly represent the philosophy, culture and values of the people it is reflecting upon. As such, it must guard against a western philosophic chauvinism. Dealing with the gathered information can best be done by an interdisciplinary team, so the next thing AIAEE needs to do is to recruit (make itself appealing to) those that are outside of AIAEE. A good way for that to happen, according to Graham, is through the Journal.

Graham believes the Journal will be a great asset to AIAEE and to the field of international agricultural development. As such, Graham recommended we seek foundation support for disseminating the Journal.
Dr. Hall

Dr. Hall is a women in her early forties. The interview with her took place at her home, located in the suburbs of a major midwestern city, not far from where she grew up. She comes from a small town newspaper family. Both of her parents were political activists, so she grew up being socially conscious and with the desire to make the world a better place to live in. After finishing her master's degree, Hall and her husband spent several years doing development work in Africa. She currently spends her time as the mother of a pre-teenage son, as an educational consultant, and as a part time instructor at the state university.

Hall grew up in a small farming community which is a couple of hours drive from the large city where she now lives. As a young man, Hall's father was a union organizer on the east coast. Her mother grew up on a farm outside of the community where Hall was raised. Her mom left home to go to college, then moved to Washington D.C., where she worked for one of the U.S. Senators. While there, she met Hall's father. They married and returned to the midwest to start the paper. Hall's maternal grandfather was also a political activist and was involved in the farm movement during the 1920s-30s. So Hall came from a very politically minded family. She claimed that both of her parents were "socialistic" and said of her family, "We're representing the underdog, that's our goal in life."

Hall was raised in town, along with her three brothers and one sister. She said that on the one hand, she hated small towns because of the "boxes the town's people put others in." On the other hand, she spoke caringly about how she knew almost everyone in town and could stop most any place in town for a visit on her way home from school. Hall said she loved school and always did well in it. She graduated with a high ranking in her class and was involved in many extra-curricular activities. She claimed that even at that age she could easily have been categorized as "driven."

Because both of her parents worked at the newspaper, Hall and her siblings were watched over after school by a housekeeper, whom Hall said was "like a second Grandma." This woman was an important person in Hall's life, who taught her homemaking
skills and helped her with her studies. Also, her grandmother and her aunt and uncle still lived on the family farm, so Hall spent a lot of time there, both on the weekends and during the summer. She said that one of her favorite early memories was being alone in the woods at the back of the farm.

After graduating from high school, Hall went off to a small, rural branch of the state university, but she was not happy there, as she never felt as though she fit in. The following summer she took a special class in small town newspaper editing. This was kind of a surprising turn of events, because, as Hall explained, she'd resented the newspaper when she was a child because it consumed all of her parents' time. As a result, she thought she would never be involved with newspapers as a grown-up. She found, however, that she liked the summer class, so she transferred to the university's main campus to pursue a degree in journalism. She said that her department was small and supportive and that she was able to accomplish her goal there, which was "to be a good student." She learned, while there, that she loved research and she was good at curriculum development and evaluation.

After graduation, Hall went to work for the vocational education division of the state Department of Education, where she worked as a legislative reporter and editor of a departmental newsletter. Her boss was a friend of her father's and was very active politically at the state level. This woman became Hall's mentor and a major influence in her life. Hall said she learned several important rules of life from this woman, including: 1) you never know who your friends are until something tragic happens; 2) don't believe that anything in life is secure; and 3) always laugh at yourself first, then people will accept you. But the most important thing she learned, or that reinforced what she had learned from her parent's, was the necessity of standing up for what you believe in.

During this time, Hall became involved in the struggles for equal rights of the American Indians, Chicanos and Afro-Americans in her city. She also learned, at that time, of women's struggles for economic parity. While working for the Department of Education, Hall helped establish a national association for vocational education communicators, of which she served as president for a time.
After working for the Department of Education for five years, Hall left her job and returned to school. She enrolled in an intensive Master's Degree program in "Leadership in Vocational Education." She spent most of her time there studying how school districts use evaluations and then how they disseminate the information they'd collected. She claimed that the best thing that happened to her while in her M.A. Program was that the program gave her "intellectual excitement about education." The other good thing that happened to her there was that she met Paul, the man that would become her husband.

Paul was a returned Peace Corps volunteer. He was working on his Master's Degree in agricultural education and was interested in international development work. Hall said that she started going to some of the international agriculture meetings and that she became interested in what they were doing and in the process of international agricultural education. Then she and Paul got married and went to Africa, as contract employees, for a USAID project in Northern Africa. They spent 2 1/2 years there.

While in Africa, Hall worked on evaluation and dissemination of information at first, then wrote curriculum materials for the extension unit which her husband worked for, up in the nearest city, which was about 300 miles away. Hall said it was a very interesting and rewarding experience to live so far from "civilization." For, as she explained, "...it fed into that need to maintain myself as somebody unique. And Paul and I came out with a very successful project--lots of materials developed, that other people have since taken and used for other things."

Also, the Hall's son was born while they were in Africa. He was delivered by a missionary doctor and was the first American to be born in that area in over twenty years.

Hall also explained that she became very disillusioned with the international development bureaucracy while working in Africa, "which claimed to know all the answers, but never really asked the right questions." She said that she and her husband spent the first six months in Africa doing needs assessment, which the project leaders thought was a waste of time. She believes, however, that the effort was what made their part of the project successful, while the overall project had very little impact.
When the Halls got back to the United States, they returned to school in order to pursue their doctorate degrees. Hall said she could have gone back into journalism, but because she intended to continue to work internationally, she thought it would be good to have a degree that said "agriculture" on it. So she spent three years studying education and agricultural education. She explained that she took a lot of classes in the College of Education because she felt that it was important to understand educational theory, which the agricultural education department glossed over in favor of "the practical."

After receiving their Ph.D.s, the Halls moved to an east coast university, where she taught communications and published the College of Agriculture’s alumnus newsletter. It was during this period that Hall became involved with the AIAEE. After working at the university for a year and a half the Halls moved back to the city where she’d come from and where they presently live. Her husband now works with international students at the university and with the State Extension Service.

As mentioned above, Hall has her own public relations business now. Her services are targeted primarily towards educational facilities. Also, because of her son’s learning disabilities, she has become very active with the parent advisory council for her school district. She concluded her interview by saying that while she and her husband still hope to do more work overseas, they will probably remain in the U.S. until their son is out of high school.

Hall is critical of agricultural education, as it is taught at the land-grant institutions. In expressing this, she admits that she did not experience ag ed in the class room, either as a student or as a teacher. As an "outsider," however, she believes she can see some fundamental flaws in the ag ed philosophy. The major flaw, as she sees it, is the lack of theory backing up the "practical" aspects of the discipline.

For Hall, agricultural education is a field of study that was created by adopting and adapting a lot of practices from other disciplines. An example she gave was in the area of communications, which can be traced back to John Dewey’s work. According to Hall, ag ed adopted the activities that go along with Dewey’s theory, but never seemed to understand the theoretical bases from which those activities came. And so, she explained,
in agricultural education the instructors do a lot of communications kinds of activities, but they stop there, without explaining why the activities were chosen or why they work. She then said, "If you don’t have an understanding of what the theory was driving at, then you can’t take the activity and pull it back down and give it its base."

The big problem, she claimed, is that the discipline has taken concepts like Dewey’s philosophy, picked out parts of it, then said "well this looks good...we’ll keep this part." In the process, they’ve taken things totally out of context. So, she explained, ...

...that is why things like the curriculum class offered in the department is a dangerous class--because it doesn’t go back and grapple with philosophy--whereas in the courses I took over in [the Department of] Education, we had to go back and deal with the philosophy from which those different curriculum sprung. Once you do that, then you can make a decision.

Hall claimed that part of the problem might be that ag ed sees itself as "training people to be professionals," but not as educating people anymore. As a result the students don’t have a broad enough base in things like literature, the arts and philosophy to be able to see the big picture about what’s really going on. Another problem, as Hall sees it, is that ag ed has been basing a lot of its activity on secondary sources, and not going back to the primary sources to make sure they are being interpreted correctly in the secondary sources.

Hall said she has the same concern about international work in general. She said she heard ag educators saying things like, "Well, we could take our great concepts, like FFA and supervised student development, and just ship that off to Africa...It worked here, it will be good there." Her reaction to such a mind set was

Oh my God, they haven’t looked at the culture. They haven’t looked at...the things in the culture like spiritual belief. They haven’t looked at a whole lot of things that would...ground...and then determine what activities would follow. And so, it is scary to me. It’s theory. I have a great deal of appreciation for theory.

Hall reiterated many times her basic philosophy of international development. For her, it needs to start with a thorough needs assessment at the grassroots level. This has to examine the cultural, spiritual and political aspects of the community, as well as the
technical aspects, like agronomy and the economy. And it has to come from people whose primary motivation is to help others. For this to work however, we have to overcome our nationalistic view that people from other countries should want what we have. Hall thinks we need to ask the people we are working with, particularly graduate students that are studying in the U.S., "Do you really want what we have here? Is our system the model for how you envision your home country to be?"

Hall has a unique approach to things such as the "women's issues" in development. Her feeling is that, in development work we are dealing with people first, and then with specific cultures. It is, therefore, wrong to separate out the women from the rest of the culture. She said

I think we need to deal with people and the questions need to be, 'What do people need?' and 'How then can we best serve those people that?' If a needs assessment indicates the need for gender specific researchers, so be it. The problems arise when we predetermine who should go in.

For Hall then, development is a matter of what will work within the context of the specific culture. For that reason, she advocated the use of multi-disciplinary teams to do research. An important member of the team, according to Hall, is the person that keeps challenging the activities and prescriptions that the team comes up with. That person should always question why the team is doing a particular task. He or she also needs to ask how the philosophies of the donor's culture and the recipient's culture come together.

Hall spent several years as an active member of AIAEE. She said she was attracted to the organization because its members were people who really seemed to care about others. She explained that she joined AIAEE for two reasons. First, she was sure that exporting scientific and agricultural technology alone wasn't helping much in development. And second, she believed that agricultural educators could help put together teaching materials to support scientists and teach the people in other fields to be better teachers.

Hall said she became disenchanted with AIAEE after several years because they didn't seem to be going anywhere. It seemed that as agricultural educators, the members
lacked the depth to understand the theories which underpinned the principles of ag education. In a similar way, the members seemed to lack the depth to develop a strong philosophy of the organization. And, she added, the group "can’t have a philosophy unless they are willing to stop and reanalyze who and what they are, as agricultural educators." She then expressed concern whether the organization was mature enough to do that kind of analysis.

Hall also talked about the need to network with other organizations, such as the International Federation for Home Economics organization. She explained that when groups isolate themselves, they lost sight of their own shortcomings. In order to grow, she claimed, the first thing the group needs to do is to recognize that it has a problem. And sharing helps to do that, she explained. Once that’s been done, other questions can be asked and answered, such as "Who can best accomplish this task?" "Can we, as an organization do this best?" "Are we really addressing the problems in development?" and "Is there really a purpose for our still being in existence?"

Hall concluded by expressing the need for diversity in agricultural education, if it is to be a successful contributor to international development. She believes we need people from diverse backgrounds and with diverse interests. And, as mentioned above, we need a broad-based education because the problems we deal with are very broad based within a particular culture.

**Conclusion** A good word to describe Hall is *crusader*. This can be seen in her struggle to "represent the underdog," a message she learned as a child and which she continues to carry with her in life. This idea manifested itself in her work with minorities in her early career, later in her work in international development, and more recently in her work with the parent advisory council at her son’s school.

Of almost equal importance to Hall is the understanding that both the theoretical and the practical aspects of education are equally important. That is, it is not only important to know what to do, i.e., to have teaching skills; it is equally important to have an understanding of why those skills work and to be able to think through the skills
development process and then transfer the principles which underlie a particular skill to a different situation.

According to Hall, this is especially true when it comes to training people for international agriculture and extension education. To begin with, we need to have a broader based curriculum and teach more theory. In addition, we need to become more focused on educating people, instead of simply training them for a job.

Hall believes that it is essential to start international education projects with a thorough needs assessment. This should not only measure technical needs, but also help the researcher develop an understanding of the specific culture’s philosophy, spirituality, social order and economy. Then, after one has become familiar with the particular culture one is dealing with, he or she can apply teaching and learning theories to the situation, in order to develop appropriate teaching and learning skills. Also, according to Hall, the best way for educators in the U.S. to familiarize themselves with this process at the international level is to utilize the knowledge and information of international graduate students that are studying here at the American universities.

Hall thinks that AIAEE was started by people who had their hearts in the right place, that is, they had a deep desire to help others. She also thinks there is a vital need for a group like AIAEE because it is agricultural educators who can help put together teaching materials to support scientists and teach people in other fields to be better teachers.

Hall is concerned however, that the organization got off the track. Because ag educators tend to ignore theory, she claimed, the members lack the depth of understanding needed to develop a strong organizational philosophy. What the members of AIAEE need to do, according to Hall, is to become self-reflective and, at the same time, situate themselves in a primary philosophical and theoretical base. The group then needs to identify where it is at philosophically, so it can know which direction to go in the future. The group also needs to both attract members from other disciplines and make itself available to participate as members of multi-disciplinary research teams. Such teams must also be self-reflective and open to criticism and change.
A final objective which the members of AIAEE should pursue is to overcome our nationalistic view that people from other countries should want what we have. It is important that we are not pre-disposed to see situations from a biased point of view.

Dr. Ives

Dr. Ives is from an African country. He received his undergraduate degree from a university in his home country. He then worked as the district Extension officer. Later he directed an institute for field communication and agricultural training, which was part of a large internationally funded agricultural development project. The funding organization for that project provided Ives with a scholarship to study agricultural communication in the United States. His project at home closed, so he stayed to get his doctorate in communication. Today, he is an assistant professor at a midwestern land-grant university.

Ives comes from a subsistence farm family living in a rural part of his country in equatorial Africa. His family members live in an extended family compound, which is made up of homes for his father, his father's wives and his brothers and their families. He has three older brothers and a younger sister. The family cultivates about twenty acres, growing a large variety of both foodcrops and livestock including a few horses. Ives said his father manages the compound and lands. His mother, he said, excels in the production of traditional crafts.

Ives claimed that it is easy, on the one hand, to idolize country life. But it has its problems as well. He claimed that "We have to temper the ideal with the reality to come up with some kind of a middle of the road agricultural policy, which we have to go by." In talking about his home country, Ives said that what he remembers best is that everyone was very honest, which meant that people back there were trustworthy and dependable. He is now married to a women from a near-by village. She has a bachelor's degree in home economics and is just finishing work on her nursing degree. They have three children.

Ives was the first in his family and in his village to get a doctorate degree. The school he attended, which was about seven miles from his home, was not built until he
was five or six. By that time, his brothers were already too old to start. Because the school was too far for him to commute each day, he moved in with relatives at a very young age. At that point he returned home on the weekends. Ives said that everyone in his family worked hard to support him financially throughout his schooling.

His elementary school classes were taught in his native language. When he finished that, he moved even further away, to a boarding school, where he did his middle school training. There most of his classes were in English. After completing middle school, he went to a government secondary school in the nearest large city. He then went on to study at a small agricultural college. After working for a while, he returned to college to study farm management.

After graduation, Ives held several extension and development positions in his country. These led to his appointment as the director of a field communication and agricultural training institute, which was sponsored by a World Bank grant. This project was designed to train farmers and to develop an agricultural and economic development network in his country. Ives’ group was in charge of manpower and human resource development training. To accomplish their task, Ives and his colleagues did a lot of brainstorming and what he called "problem solving extension." In this process, the extension agents came to the training centers at the beginning of each week to find out what resources were available that week and what might be available in the future. That way the agents could be honest and "get real" with their clients. It was through this process that he came to realize that the essence of extension was communication and that he needed more extensive training in communication theories and methodologies if he was going to be able to develop an effective extension service. In the process of coming to this realization, he also learned to be self-reflective and to ask questions like "Who am I?" "Where am I going?" "What am I accomplishing?" and "What do I want to accomplish?"

Ives had pretty good success with his program. He did what he did well, but could not explain why his methods worked. He said:
We were able to look at problems and try to brainstorm and try to find solutions. It was that perspective—and even though I was doing all that, I really didn’t have the theoretical...underpinnings to explain, rationally, why I was doing what I was doing.

To increase his effectiveness, the donor agency decided to send him to the U.S. to study communication. While he was here working on his masters degree, his old project closed. He was offered an airplane ticket home, but no job. Fortunately, he said, the university where he was studying liked his work and offered him a scholarship to finish his Ph.D. After completing his master’s degree in journalism and Ph.D. work in mass communications, he was hired as an associate professor in the Department of Agricultural Education at one of the state universities in the midwest.

Ives said that he is excited about the things he learned in his schooling and enjoys sharing them with his students. He believes that subjects like mass communication, behavioral modification strategies and social marketing can all make important contributions to an effective extension system. He said that now he understands the "science of communication," which he believes is essential information for extension workers. For Ives, most people see extension as a production problem. He sees it as a communication problem.

Ives sees himself as a person with an agricultural background, trained in extension, and with a career in international extension and development. His primary interest, he claims, is in helping the oppressed, which he approaches in two ways: through his teaching and advising and through research in development communication. He teaches a total of six different classes. One of his favorites is an undergraduate class on writing about contemporary issues in American culture. In this class, the students are offered a topic which they first discuss and then write about. The articles they write must be fit for publication. Ives believes that this discussion and rewriting is an ideal way to teach critical thinking.

For his research work, Ives and his colleagues work within a framework which they call development support communications or DSC. According to DSC theory,
development specialists will only see change when they understand that the players in the
development game are neither saboteurs or criminals trying to rip off projects. For DSC
theorists, all players want to work for the common good. But, because problems arise,
and the players lack adequate communication skills, blame gets put on others. This, in
turn, causes resentments to be built up, which then causes the problems to escalate.
Therefore, the way to successful development work is by teaching good communication
skills.

Ives believes, furthermore, that there is a big problem with leadership in develop-
ment projects. As he sees it, executives of development projects continue to move up the
career ladder, even when the projects they manage are unsuccessful. He believes that
there should be international laws passed which say that if a donor comes into a country
and disrupts that country's life style, they should be held legally responsible for either
seeing that the project succeeds or righting the problems they have caused in introducing
the project in the first place.

Ives is quick to point out however, that the governments of developing countries
must be held equally accountable. The politics of development, he explained, circle
around this issue of power and responsibility, as it is shared by the major donors and the
governments of developing countries. The irony of development, he said, is that the two
groups always blame the other for failure, while they pocket the money and leave the
people to suffer. Ives believes that what is important, therefore, is to get back to grass-
roots development, which can best be done by an extension system that is well schooled
in communication.

Spreading this message is Ives' mission. He explained

...as far as the Third World is concerned, I feel that we need to be able to
get our act together. We can't continue to blame the industrialized countries
for our underdevelopment. At the very best, they can only help. When
someone's helping you, they should not be controlling you...we must look
more and more to inside the Third World for the solutions and then we
make a stand: "This is what we want to do!" Then we can go to the First
World and say "Will you help us or not?"
Another problem Ives sees with development work is that donor agencies often preach about the benefits of democracy, but they don't practice it in their relationships with developing countries. He said "So what [they] are really saying is democracy is good for you, but we will continue to tell you what to do." As Ives sees it then, talk of local participation is just rhetoric; it is something to be practiced at the bottom end of the development project, but not at the top. To address this issue, Ives asked questions such as "What kind of training is needed for an expert who will implement local participation programs and growth with equity programs?" and "Does anyone have that kind of training?"

Ives believes that the major difficulty for poor and oppressed people throughout the world is "the lack of opportunity to make themselves into something." And one of the best ways to correct this lack of opportunity is through education. He said "The key to development is not economics, but education," and added "the aspects for discrimination is money, but the hidden real cause of lack of money is education."

For Ives, one of the main problems with agricultural education is that it lacks depth in its study of the theory which stands behind concepts like practical application. Another problem is that it lacks the broad based educational foundation which is needed by people involved in development work. He believes one should be well versed in philosophy, sociology, anthropology, education, etc.

The reason for this lack of theory in ag ed is that it is really a composite of practices and theories from other disciplines. And because we draw from so many other disciplines, Ives is concerned that we suffer from a misconception when we call ourselves a discipline. Perhaps seeing ag and extension education as a field of study would be more to the point. Another similar issue is whether we should be seen as a branch of the department of education or as part of the department of agriculture. Ives thinks we might gain legitimacy in the international development world if we were more a part of agriculture, which might give us the same benefits as, for example, the animal science people.
Extension and development education, according to Ives, should be best seen as a systems perspective. When you begin to cut across disciplines, he said, you realize the integrated nature of the process. Development, he explained, "is a web." What's even more important, he continued, is to understand that the web is built on issues, not on disciplines. When the issues change, so does the network. In this systems approach to development, then, you bring in different experts as you need them, but just for a specific period of time. These are what Ives called the come and go people. They are supplemental to the professional extension workers, i.e., those who work with the real farmers and who are concerned with the action process. In order for this to work, Ives claimed, we need to re-envision the idea of the extension worker—to see him or her as a person who is a whole development worker—one who can identify problems and bring in resources for a whole variety of problems, ranging from technical agronomic problems to health problems to social issues.

Ives said that for him, the appeal of AIAEE is that the people involved "have their hearts in the right place." Its an organization which one can feel a part of, he said—a group to which one can relate. Ives sees AIAEE right now as in a growing stage. Their major focus is trying to find ways to get international people to belong to the organization. Their strength is in their ability to develop relationships with international development assistance organizations.

Ives believes that AIAEE should stand for ag ed and extension which, for him means communication. He believes that AIAEE needs to deal with issues like defining itself and specifying its role in both agriculture and in education. He believes a sign of success will be when AIAEE members are called upon for their expertise by these development organizations. To do this, from a communication theory standpoint, one must approach the situation in a non-threatening way. And AIAEE seems to be doing this well.

Ives also believes that the organization has some shortcomings. One is that there is such a diversity of interests by the members, it is difficult for the group to gain a focus. Another, he said, was that perhaps the ag ed professors profess too much, and don't listen to the experience of the international students enough. His point is that if a professor has
only been out of the country for a couple of weeks or a couple of months, he or she could learn a great deal by listening to the experiences of those who grew up in these different countries. Still another problem Ives sees is a continuing focus on the land grant system of extension and not enough study of farming systems research, the T & V (training and visit) systems or new systems. A final difficulty Ives perceives is that as a group, we lack self-reflection and critical thinking about ourselves. As a result, Ives sees AIAEE as a social group which is good at congratulating itself, but seldom looks at its own shortcomings.

Ives believes AIAEE should pursue the following common goals: 1) create a friendly environment with the donor agencies; 2) link up and influence federal government ministries of agriculture; and 3) the most important goal should be to develop a common curriculum for international ag and extension education which would cover the various extension systems and have a strong philosophical and theoretical base, as well as practical aspects. The reason this is so important is because the old model we follow is not valid in international development. If we are to gain respect, we "need to get real."

In concluding, Ives explained that

the philosophy of AIAEE...is to promote understanding of the principles of agricultural education and extension and how best we can apply those to the development of agriculture...[I]t also should look at the role of the educator in society as a whole, and see how we are meeting that role. So it's a challenge for us [and] at the same time an opportunity, in the sense that I see educationists playing a leading role in social change and that is the opportunity. The challenge is we've got to show that we can do that.

He added that he thought it will take some time before the organization becomes successful in changing development, but "the key to a successful organization is the willingness to open the door to change." And AIAEE has that.

Conclusion  The essence of Ives' message is "communication." Early in his career, Ives learned that one needs to understand "the science of communication" if one is
to be an effective extension agent. As a result, Ives has dedicated his life to bringing a stronger focus on communication skills to extension education.

Ives' theory of extension education evolved through several stages. While director of a manpower training institute, he developed what he called "problem-solving extension" in which his agents learned to be absolutely honest with their clients regarding available inputs. This allowed for a trust to be built, so the farmers came to depend on the extension agents for reliable advise.

More recently, Ives has been working on what he calls development support communication (DSC), which again, rests upon the development of trust among the stakeholders in a development project. According to DSC theory, through good, honest communication, faith and trust can be built among stakeholders, which eliminates blame and resentment. When these hurdles are overcome, progress can be made. DSC theorists, then, see the development of good communication skills as the way to overcome distrust and carry out successful projects, as opposed to blaming others for their lack of success.

Ives sees several shortcomings in the field of international extension education. One of these is ineffective leadership in development projects by both the governments of the developing countries and by development project executives. Another is that, although the agencies from the donor nations tell the people in the developing countries they need to become democratic, they seldom deal in a democratic way with the recipient countries.

Ives sees education as the real solution to development problems. When a person has a good education, that person can make informed decisions about which direction he or she wants to head in the future. Ives sees some problems with ag and extension education however. The most important thing, according to Ives, is that they begin to see that development is a broad based and multi-disciplinary effort, so students interested in development need a knowledge base which includes studies in education, psychology, philosophy, economics, sociology, and, most importantly, communication. And they need to be able to combine those skills into a systems approach to development.

Ives believes that AIAEE needs to focus on several areas. The first is defining who we are, which he sees as problematic because the interests of the members are already so
diverse that its difficult to get a focus. The second is the recruitment of international people and people from other disciplines into the organization. The third is the development of relationships with international development assistance organizations. Another important goal for AIAEE should be the development of a curriculum for international ag and extension education which would have strong philosophical and theoretical bases and cover practical educational skills as they have been developed by the various extension systems. Finally, Ives thinks AIAEE must always be willing to change.

Ives believes that the philosophy of AIAEE is to understand and apply the principles of agricultural education and extension to the development of agriculture. He said that because education is such an important aspect of development, being effective educators is our real challenge.

**Dr. Jama**

Dr. Jama is a recent graduate of the Ph.D. program at one of the midwestern land-grant universities. He was originally from the southern part of India, but has been in the United States for most of the last six years, completing work on both his Master’s degree and his Ph.D. He has recently gone to work for a private development agency located in the Great Lakes region. Dr. Jama is married to a woman from a village not far from his home. His wife has her Master’s Degree in Electrical Engineering. They have one young child—a son.

Jama was born in a small town about 70 miles from one of southern India’s major cities. He lived with his maternal grandparents as a young boy because his parents were both working. His father was a government administrator. His mother, a school teacher. The town where Jama grew up was both the seat of the district administrative offices and a Hindu religious center. Living in a religious center was interesting, Jama said, because there were lots of festivals and observances throughout the year. Growing up in that town was influential, as Jama is still a serious follower of his family’s religious customs and traditions.
His home town was also the center of a silk weaving industry which produced saris that were famous throughout India. Jama's maternal grandfather worked in the weaving industry and also taught English. His maternal grandmother came from a farm family. When the grandparents passed away however, the land was split among the siblings. Jama's parents leased out their section. The mother would go occasionally to collect produce as the share cropping fee. The journey was seldom worth what it cost however, so his mother eventually sold the land. His paternal grandmother was also a teacher.

Jama attended school near his home. Classes in the first four years were given in Tamin, the native language of his area. From fifth to eleventh grade he had classes in Tamin, math, science, English, and social studies. He said school was pretty boring. The teachers would come into the class room and read to the students. The students were expected to take notes, then pass the tests. He said there was no room for either participation or creativity. Besides, he said that his inspiration (and pressure) came from his father.

Jama's father thought that education was the only way to be economically mobile within India's culture. Also, the father had earned a Master's degree in Administration as an adult student, through correspondence work, while he was working and raising his family. As a result, he made the children study almost all of the time when he was home. Jama said that this made school easy for him and that it was more or a social experience--where he went to be with his friends--than a scholastic experience. Jama also mentioned that his parent's were very protective of him, so that he did not work at all until he graduated from college. While this had advantages for sure, he said it also had "the disadvantage of not allowing me to face up to my own hardships and not facing the challenges of today's economic reality."

After the eleventh grade, Jama moved to the big city, where he attended one year of pre-university courses, then went on to the university. He explained that getting into a university in India was very competitive, due to the large population and the relatively small number of good paying jobs, all of which required university education. As with
here in the U.S., the best jobs were in the professions like medicine, engineering and law. To get into those schools one needed very high grades on the standardized tests in math and science. Because Jama did not have high enough grades on the math test, he chose agriculture, which ranked right below scientific courses like electronics, because he was assured of a job in that area of work.

Jama is the oldest of seven children in his family. As a result of the father’s strong belief in education, all of the children have either completed or are working on advanced degrees. Jama said that it was a family project, and that as one of the children completed a degree and went to work, that person would help support another family member who was still in school. Jama’s siblings are now working or going to school in several different countries around the world.

The university Jama attended was about 400 miles from his home. His studies were in general agriculture and were similar to courses in the United States, only he had comprehensive finals at the end of each semester. Like here, he studied general sciences for the first two years, then specialized in crop sciences during the third year. His fourth year courses included farm management, economics, extension, horticulture and plantation crops and management. Dr. Jama thought that India’s education system was pretty good. The advantages of the system were that it had a well integrated curriculum and incorporated a lot of hands-on activities. Jama seemed to have enjoyed his college years and the excitement of growing up away from home.

Upon graduation, Dr. Jama went to work for the Ministry of Agriculture. He worked there for six and one half years. During that time he had several jobs. The first was as a Plant Introduction Assistant, working on a project in which the government was trying to introduce new crops to a predominantly rice growing area. After one and one half years of that, the World Bank inaugurated a program to introduce the training and visitation (T & V) system to his area. Dr. Jama held two positions working with the T & V system. The first was as a support person, supervising the T & V extension workers and providing technical and administrative assistance. The second was as the district Subject Information and Training Specialist.
Jama said he didn't think the T & V system worked very well, mostly because it failed to take human nature into account. He explained, for example, Farmers...in the fields, they are like businessmen. They want to be productive for business. They don't want to waste time to go to the neighbor's field. Maybe for friends and relatives! [That's] a very good source for extension communication. But [the extension worker] cannot select one contact and say, "Hey, we are giving this message [to you], give it to ten other people you know." That can not work.

Dr. Jama also explained that the system was hampered by a lack of creativity, which he speculated might be a result of the top-down nature of the educational system. With the T & V system, it turned out that the same message would be given each year for the same crop. So the extension workers got bored. Also, few workers knew how to take ownership of their part of the project and make it work. Jama felt that, generally speaking, that was inherent to the program. Not everyone was so stymied, however. Jama did mention two men who acted as mentors in helping him see how an extension system could work well. Both men were creative and hard working. Both had figured out how to get the system to work for them. And above all, in addition to knowledge of technical agriculture, they both had excellent people skills.

After six and one half years working for the Ministry, Dr. Jama decided to return to graduate school. After checking into several possibilities, he chose a university in America's heartland, where he was offered an assistantship in a technology and social change program. His major at the university was Agricultural Education. He also spent time working in the anthropology department with the goal of tying the study of indigenous knowledge in developing countries to agricultural education. Much of Jama's interest became focused on this area of study, including his dissertation work, which he did back in India.

Dr. Jama thinks of his work in terms of "nonformal education" and explained that because people learn from experience and because indigenous people had worked out successful "experiences" over generations, such experiences could be grouped into an "indigenous knowledge system." Because such information was not taught in schools,
etc., it was considered to be part of the informal information system. Jama then explained:

I see indigenous knowledge as a day to day life experience. To me, indigenous knowledge is any type of knowledge or the familiarity of a situation that has not been disseminated through formal education [such as] classroom, research, extension. If it has been developed and disseminated by the local people, then I call it indigenous knowledge.

For his dissertation research, Dr. Jama developed a model for incorporating indigenous knowledge into formal agricultural extension research projects. It was both a quantitative and qualitative study which identified a large number of indigenous practices in his home district, then evaluated those practices in terms of their importance regarding production, economic impact, and socio-cultural impact. Jama then explained that this was an important step in legitimizing indigenous people and their knowledge systems because it gave scientists and bureaucrats a way to quantify the value of various indigenous practices. A final point which Jama pointed out was that once the important practices have been identified, they need to be developed, so as to make the indigenous systems more productive where possible. For Jama, the real secret to development was in identifying how the client group already worked, then improving on those processes. This was much more effective than trying to introduce totally new products or practices, he claimed.

Jama then explained that the work he was doing at the time of the interview was developing journal articles and the like, in order to institutionalize the use of indigenous knowledge so that it would become part of policy making in the development sector.

Dr. Jama said that he thought the AIAEE was an excellent organization in the area of international development. He claimed that he had not noticed any discrimination within the organization regarding race or gender. He did feel however, that there was a shortage of international members and students on the Board of Directors. In fact, he felt that the Association needed to work harder, as a whole, in giving encouragement to the graduate members. He suggested also, that if there was a way to do it, it would be good to have presentations from the stakeholders point of view and not always from the point of view of the funders and developers.
Dr. Jama believed the organization should try to put together one or more group projects. He said he understands that it will be hard to compete with the economists and the agronomists. Be that as it may, Jama felt that agricultural and extension education has a lot to offer the field of international development, particularly if they begin to incorporate more studies of indigenous knowledge into their projects. As for what part he could play in this, Dr. Jama explained that he sees one of the most important roles of a development worker as being able to identify effective indigenous systems. He said

...members of AIAEE who are working in various countries, they have a direct link...with both the farmers--the target audiences--and the intermediate communicators--that is, the extension agent--to identify...[the] efficient extension worker and how he's learning from the people. And very important [is] knowing how to bring impetus-efficient tools that people are using; how to communicate those kinds of tools to the critics through this media - through AIAEE...

To assist development workers in working with indigenous knowledge, Jama suggested that AIAEE should dedicate a session at one of its annual conferences to the use of indigenous knowledge in international agricultural and extension education. Dr. Jama said that he thinks AIAEE needs to keep a holistic view in its approach to extension education. He thinks the organization should make a list of all of the people who are involved in extension development, including the funding agencies, research stations and the various people involved in technology development. Then AIAEE should develop a sort of marketing program in order to see how best to approach these different organizations. After that, members of the Association could form smaller groups of members with different areas of expertise or even consortiums involving different organizations. That way ag and extension educators could have a greater influence on the direction development work is taking.

Jama said that he felt the primary role of the AIAEE was to communicate [to its members] just what was happening in the field...in a most efficient and effective way; in the sense that if research is conducted in 1988, what's the use of providing the research in '92 or '93.
He also thought the group should demand abstracts of its papers so people could more easily know and keep track of what other members are working on. He also recommended that more case studies be given at the meetings. Finally, Dr. Jama expressed dismay at the prospect of having to pay an expensive submission fee for the new Journal. Such action he declared, will only reinforce the lack of representation by graduate students. He suggested that graduate students, or anyone, should be able to submit a paper at no cost. Then, if it is accepted, the people with little money but something important to say could figure out some way to pay for it.

Conclusion Probably the concept which best encapsulates Dr. Jama is "a concern for indigenous knowledge." Having grown up in an area which was both steeped in traditional religion and industry and in European education and bureaucracy, he is in a good position to see the importance of using indigenous knowledge to help raise the living standards of people in developing countries. And that way is to understand and support the systems the people have developed themselves, rather than to try and replace those systems with imported, but alien systems. The underlying concern for Jama is first, the legitimization of indigenous agricultural practices and then the legitimization of indigenous people themselves.

Dr. Jama believes that for agricultural development to work effectively, workers must identify how client groups already work, then improve on those processes. In order for funding agents and government workers to understand this process, extension workers need to be able to document and evaluate indigenous technologies in terms of their effectiveness regarding production, economic impact, and socio-cultural impact. Development workers must then be able to institutionalize these information gathering and evaluation procedures in order to have indigenous knowledge become part of policy making in the development sector.

Dr. Jama believes that the AIAEE has both strengths and weaknesses. He believes that the group, in general, is very warm and open in accepting new members, particularly women and people from the developing countries. He also thinks the organization is
important because it strives to communicate the "state of the art" in extension education and development as it is related to the international scene. It is not without its difficulties, however. The most serious of these seems to involve a lack of representation by graduate students and international members. So, for instance, although graduate students make up a large part of the membership, they are not equally represented on the Board of Directors or on committees. Also, the expense of the Journal will prevent poorer people from submitting articles. In a sense, then, this goes back to the same problem of not incorporating indigenous knowledge to the group or by the group itself, i.e., in a de facto way, the organization de-legitimizes poorer people.

As to the future, Dr. Jama said that he thinks that the AIAEE should take a greater role in leadership in development. To do this, AIAEE must do two things. First of all, it needs to market itself to the various funding agencies from the government, private, and NGO sectors. Then it must pool its resources and even join with other organizations in working towards changing the donor organizations so that they are more responsive to the needs of people in developing countries and so they understand the importance of legitimizing indigenous people and their knowledge systems.

Dr. Link

Dr. Link is the head of international programs at a university in the eastern United States. Both of her parents were from Texas. Link was raised on the family ranch there. Her father had the opportunity to go to Africa for an extended period when Link was in her teens. She has loved both international work in general and Africa in particular ever since. She has had an exciting and rewarding career and has progressed rapidly up the career ladder. Her husband is a university professor. They have no children.

Link came from well established families on both sides. Her father's family came from Germany several generations ago and settled in New York. Her great grandfather was sent back to Germany for his education. Her paternal grandfather was a geologist and an explorer who, as a young man, walked across South America. Her mother's family also originated in Germany. They too, moved to the States several generations ago and
were considered "pre-independence" Texans. Her grandmother had gone from Texas to Virginia in 1890 to go to college. She eventually became a teacher. Link explained, "...my family has just been educated beyond all recognition. I guess this is just something that we really believe in...

   Link said that there were "two very strong matriarchs" in her family. One was an aunt on her father's side, who had graduated from Vassar in 1912. She was instrumental in the early development of nursing schools in Peking and in Taiwan. The other was a sister of her maternal grandmother, whose family owned the ranch where Link was born. This aunt believed strongly in education and was very supportive of Link's educational pursuits. Link said that in her family

   ...there was never an idea that we all ought to stay home. There was this thing that you ought to go out there and make it in the world...; this philosophy that you grew up with that says "go out there and go where the jobs are and tackle the world."

There was also a "very loving family environment" which was equally important for the support it offered the children.

   Link moved around a lot as a young girl. She attended kindergarten in Texas. Then she spent a couple of years up north while her father was in graduate school. After that she returned to Texas for several years. She claimed that she was very active in 4-H at that time. Concerning that period, she said "I found 4-H to be an area where I could compete very successfully. I have always been extremely competitive. I'd do almost anything for a blue ribbon or an A." Her father got his overseas assignment when Link was just finishing junior high school. She spent the next three years in Africa. She said going to school there was interesting because, of the three hundred students in the school, only six were of European decent. The overall experience was wonderful. She said "I am forever grateful for my parents for having given us [she and her brother] that opportunity." She then explained that not only did she get to meet a lot of wonderful native people, she also got to meet many Americans who were, or would become, important in the
international development field and who were important in her later career. She finished high school in the northeastern part of the U.S.

Link decided when she came back to America that she liked overseas work and wanted to be involved in international development as a career. She chose to go to a university in the area where she was living and major in nutrition in the Home Economics Department. She said that from the start she was attending graduate seminars on international development. She then explained that because of her experience, she was welcomed in these classes and that the professors were very supportive of her efforts. Also, Link was doing her undergraduate work during the time of the student riots in the late 1960s. In the unrest, the university she attended developed a senate, whose job it was to oversee everything that was non-academic. The senate was made up of 1/3 students, 1/3 faculty, and 1/3 staff. Link was elected to the senate. She said it was a great experience because she got to know quite a few of the professors personally and got to serve on committees with Nobel Prize winners. As a result, she said "I really felt that I was an integral part of that university when I was an undergraduate." She then added that her assistantships in her graduate studies also made her feel like a part of the university. Link met her future husband while working on her Bachelor's degree. After graduation, she worked for a while as an extension agent. After that, she convinced her husband that they should go back to school for their Master's degrees. Link claimed, "I think that I have always had a lemming-like tendency to go back to school when I couldn't figure out what else to do."

Link and her husband headed back to the southwest for graduate school. She got an assistantship in an agricultural education department. At the time, she explained, there were not many women in agricultural education. She then said that the people in the department were a bunch of "good old boys." She then went on to explain that

Nobody has ever mistreated me in that field. They are gentlemen at that university and I use that term accurately. They have done everything they could to help me in terms of my career.

Link said that the experience was so good that she and her husband decided to finish their Ph.D.s. They went back north to where they had received their Bachelor's
degrees. After two years in residency, Link was offered a teaching position back in Texas. It was in a rural part of the state. She said she had different philosophical views than the rest of her department, and the situation was not really good. Fortunately, she was offered a job in the department where she had worked on her Master’s degree. Link really enjoyed her work in that department. Again, everyone there supported her. She said she thinks her’s was the first tenured tract position offered to a women in an agricultural education department. She worked there for three years. Then she was offered a position with USAID in Washington, doing development work in Africa. It was a job which she couldn’t pass up.

Link worked for the USAID project for four years. Her main focus was on policy and evaluation related to the development of agricultural education at institutions of higher learning in Africa. She claimed that she was part of an interdisciplinary team and that she was the only one there from agricultural education. Eventually however, project funding dried up, so she had to move on. She explained in addition, that the bureaucratic hassling at USAID was very hard for her to handle. After she left Washington she got a job with the Chancellor’s office at a state university system, where she was the Associate Director of International Programs. The bureaucratic scene there however, was almost as bad as it had been working for the federal agency. So when her current position opened up, she jumped at the opportunity. She is currently Director of International Programs for the university, a job she has been working at for two and one half years.

Link explained that in her current job, her main responsibility is to help international visitors link up with the right people at the university. Then, if the university wants to continue a relationship, she has to help the different parties develop some kind of concrete plan before the visitors leave. At this point she is working with universities from China, Mexico and several in Africa. She is also part of a team effort to internationalize the university-wide curriculum. And she serves on several national and governmental committees. Last, but not least, Link said she still advises students and tries to teach at least one course per year.
Link said that her career to date has been very rewarding and very satisfying. She said she is still somewhat ambitious and would someday like to be Dean of a College of Agriculture or perhaps, director of a state extension service. And ultimately, she has set her sites on becoming a college provost and then a college president. She said, following the advice she’d received as a child, that whenever she is offered a higher position, she goes through the application ritual. She said she thinks "that as soon as you stop looking for another job, they’ve got you. They can treat you any way they want to treat you." She said that it wasn’t personal, it was just part of the system. She added that "thinking of the future gets [her] adrenalin flowing and makes [her] think about things in a more exacting and analytical way."

Link lamented over the changes which were happening in higher education. She claimed that we have the best graduate education system in the world. That system is based on pure research. But much of the pure research that is done at universities will never lead to a direct profit. As a result, it is being canceled. But, she claimed, research that leads to a profit should be done by the private sector, for the private sector. But basic research should be done for everyone at the state universities. She was afraid however, that research was being dictated by big business. For her, this showed a lack of leadership in higher education. She went on to say,

...this is what scares me, from the top, from the deanships of agriculture, from department chairs - we are in a time in higher education now where we need people who have visions, who are consummate diplomats, who can really make a difference for our world population...This is a time requiring profiles in academic courage.

Such people do not seem to be materializing however. She then pondered why it was that university presidents or provosts or attorneys don’t have graduate assistants.

Link believes that the profession of international agricultural and extension education has several responsibilities it needs to fulfill. The first of these is the need to look at the discipline from both an international perspective and from a domestic perspective. She then explained,
I think that we cannot and should not go to all parts of the world and do
good or do exciting or whatever it is that we are doing, and ignore the
facts that those places link our home state and our home institutions.

The second responsibility of the profession is to assist the citizens of the various states to
understand how dependent they are on exports and imports. We need to establish the link
between domestic agriculture and international agriculture. She said she does not think the
profession has done a good job of that. Furthermore, it seems like one of the things
AIAEE should really be involved with is helping students develop a sufficient understand­
ing of world economics and of the global agricultural system and to know they fit in that
world. The third issue Link raised, which involved ethics, had to do with how practi­
tioners of agricultural and extension education assist and work with other countries. She
said "the operative term is work with people from other countries." She was concerned
because some professionals still talk about "the truth and the light of the American Way
being given to the heathens." This was way off-base, she felt. She saw the role of
agriculture and extension professionals to be "the voice of the client or the voice of the
student."

When asked about discrimination based on class, race, and gender, Link said she
believes the profession, as a whole, has done a good job avoiding bias. She said she has
never been held back because of her gender. And she senses the same is true about race.
On the other hand, she explained that she’d been doing research to see if African students
in this country acknowledge the role of women in African agriculture. By and large, she
said, they don’t. She attributed this to ignorance and bad advising on the part of the ag
school faculties. She then said,

...there are a lot of blind spots in agriculture and in agricultural education,
but I do not think they are based on sexism or racism. I think they are
based on just the lack of knowledge or lack of exposure.

Link claimed that this indicated the need for faculty members to get some international
experience. It indicated too, that "in all of agriculture there has been a denigration of the
social sciences," which is something the profession needs to remedy.
Link believes that as professionals, agricultural educators and extension professionals have to examine development projects very closely before they get involved with them. "We can't just take on a project because AID is offering a lot of money" she said. First we have to make sure that the proposed outcomes are worthwhile. If we study the RFPs, she claimed, we should be able to judge if the project is really worthwhile. But the biggest responsibility, Link claimed, was for people in universities and in education to be ethical. Because, she said, if you can't trust educators, who can you trust?

According to Link, there are two principles upon which the AIAEE rests. The first is its non-exclusionary policy. The second is that it is pretty much non-hierarchical. Concerning the first, Link claimed that this has been particularly important regarding graduate students in the organization. While graduate students have not been included on every committee, she said, the association has made sure that they have been at all of the meetings and that they have been interacting with people. This is also important because people of various backgrounds have joined AIAEE and as such "we aren't always talking to ourselves" the way other organizations do. Link also claimed that the non-hierarchical nature of the organization encourages informal interactions. She explained "I feel that when I am at those meetings, everybody is talking to everybody else and so we are all influencing one another."

She said that she sees the group at a place in time when it will have to decide soon about its future. When the Journal comes out, she continued, the organization will have to decide if it wants "to be a nice homey group or turn into vicious, back-biting professionals." In the past, she claimed, the right person has been elected President at the right time. As a result, the organization has developed at just the right pace. But, she said, she really believes that it was, to a large extent, luck.

Link thinks the prospect of publishing a high quality Journal is very exciting. She said the editors need to be very selective about what kind of articles they choose to publish, because "...there is already enough garbage being published. We don't need to add to that." She also said the editors need to be careful to not fall into the trap of requiring everything to be statistically analyzed. The editors should include qualitative
methods such as historical research and policy analysis. After they have selected high quality articles and put out a quality Journal, the organization should send "teaser copies" to let others know what to expect. Then, she said, after practicing for a short while, the Association should "go public." In her perception, the goal of the Association should be to have the Journal on the shelves of major libraries throughout the world.

**Conclusion** The idea that best captures Dr. Link's nature is *success*. Link's success as a woman in a male dominated world can be attributed to several factors. One is plain hard work. Another is the fact that she has always been willing to take chances. She has also had the knack of being at the right place at the right time, which has helped. Yet another is her motivation and ambition. This ambition is in the sense of "strongly desiring," as opposed to being "pretentious." Motivation comes, to a large extent, from her upbringing, particularly through her father's success and the strong influence of the two matriarch/mentors she grew up with.

Link's life and career have also been strongly influence by her early experiences in Africa. As a result of this experience, she decided at an early age to get involved in international development. Her attendance of graduate seminars as a beginning student and her work with the university senate attest to her desire to be successful in the field of international development.

Link worries about the quality of leadership in higher education. Her concern is that the research agenda of our nation's universities is becoming dominated by the needs and monetary power of big business. She believes the private sector should do its own applied research, not the universities. The public universities should be focused on pure research. She said the fact that the research agenda is going the other way indicates a lack of leadership in higher education. This lack of leadership, she thinks, is the main problem in education today.

Link thinks that international agricultural and extension educators have several responsibilities. The first is to remember that their commitment is to the state where their university is. The second is to help their students understand that their state is not
isolated; that it is part of a global network. Educators need to help students understand the link between what happens in the world and what happens in their backyards. The third responsibility of ag ed professionals is to remember that their job is to "work with" their clientele, not to tell them what to do. For Link, the role of ag and extension professionals is to be "the voice of the client or the voice of the student."

Link believes that agricultural and extension education, as a whole, is relatively free of prejudice in terms of race and gender. She said she has never been held back on account of her gender. On the other hand, she has noticed that international students are often ill-advised by professors who have a lack of knowledge about international issues. She claimed that this should be remedied by having all professors who are involved with international students get some kind of international experience. She also believes that people in the profession have a moral and ethical obligation to thoroughly examine new projects. This is to determine if the projects will, in fact, do any good for the clients. We can't just be taking on projects because they bring in money, she claimed.

For Link, there are two things about AIAEE that stand out. The first is that it is open to almost anyone who is interested in international agricultural and extension education. The second is that it has, since its inception, encouraged the involvement of graduate students. The benefit of the first point is that there are always fresh ideas being offered to the group. Hence, the group continues to grow. The value of the second point is that "everybody is talking to everybody else and so we are all influencing one another."

Link believes that the AIAEE is at a crossroad which involves size and structure. It is necessary, on the one hand, for the Association to grow in size and status, so that it becomes legitimate for people in their struggle for tenure and promotion. Once this happens however, there is a good possibility that the group will lose it's "homey" nature and turn into a group of "vicious, back-biting professionals." Link also thinks that the status of the group will be tied directly to the quality of the new Journal. For that reason, the Association needs to turn out a high quality journal that covers qualitative and well as quantitative research. Then it needs to guarantee that the Journal is widely distributed. If these two things happen, more quality people will be attracted to the Association. Link
explained, in conclusion, that the organization has always come up with the kind of leadership it needed at a particular point in its evolution. She believes that will continue to happen, because the quality of the people already involved is so high.

Dr. Marks

Dr. Marks is an administrator/professor at a land-grant university in the southwest, not far from where he grew up. He is Hispanic, bi-lingual, and comes from an agricultural background. He began his international work while working for his father, when he was still in high school. Since then he has worked at several land-grant universities and in Central and South America, where he has represented both the private and public sectors. He is currently an officer in the AIAEE.

Marks' family has been involved in agriculture for several generations. His father, although not highly educated, was innovative, entrepreneurial, and successful at agriculture. Marks worked hard throughout his youth, both in school and on the farm. He learned leadership skills early, through involvement in 4-H, school sports and FFA. His father helped him learn good work skills and to be an independent thinker. About his father, Marks said,

...he moved us through this hierarchy of tasks. You weren't gonna drive tractor until...you did all of those manual, menial kinds of things...So there was a method that you had to follow. Having been given some responsibility and fulfilled that responsibility, then you were allowed to do others.

Marks' father offered him a 640 acre farm when he graduated from high school. His mother, however, encouraged him to go to college. Marks claimed that this "go for it" attitude from both his family and from his school, led him to develop a positive self image early in life. He explained, for example, that one of his high school teachers told him that since he was Hispanic and bilingual, he was already different from most of the other students, so he didn't need to worry about "being different" any longer. Marks claimed that this freed him to get on with his own life without worrying too much about
what others thought of him. It also encouraged him to be a risk taker, which has, in turn, opened many doors for him.

After completing high school, Marks alternated his time between going to school and working. He received a Bachelor's Degree with majors in agricultural education and animal science. For his Master's thesis, he focused on alternatives in teacher training. As an example, he and his colleagues developed an internship program for students who did not plan on going into teaching. This idea, he explained, came directly from his own experiences in school. For his Doctorate, Marks focused on the competencies needed by professionals in extension.

Marks held several kinds of jobs during this period, many of which had an international flavor and took advantage of his language skills. He worked in South and Central America, both for private business and for a couple of universities. He was also a vocational agriculture teacher for three years, during which time he worked first with inner city kids and later with reservation Indian children. These were valuable experiences, he explained, because they made him adapt the agricultural education structures, e.g., 4-H and FFA, to meet the needs and circumstances of his clientele. For example, one of his big lessons was in figuring out that the competitive nature of traditional 4-H and FFA projects was not appropriate in either of the above situations. Instead, he needed to develop cooperative projects, where individuals came together in a sharing way, instead of trying to out-perform each other all of the time.

Because of his background, Marks sees agricultural education from a very pragmatic, job oriented point of view. For him, education that is not relevant in the real world of work is of little value. He said

I try and always maintain the element of real world needs, from the standpoint of the private sector...And so I see an educational role, but the educational role, I think, has to be based on real world needs and experience.
According to Marks, this is difficult because a false dichotomy has been created between the universities and the private sector. As a result, students are not really prepared for the world of work when they graduate.

To overcome this, Marks thinks that educational institutions and the private sector should cooperate more. For this to work, the land-grant education programs need to be broader-based and deal more with the analysis and solving of problems on a larger scale. He said, "our programs give too much prescription and not enough emphasis on analysis." This will become an even bigger problem in the future, according to Marks, because "the time is coming when we will no longer be able to teach [production] farming kinds of skills at the university level. They will have to be learned at the community college level." At the university level, higher level skills, such as teaching and marketing will be taught.

Working with the private sector also has benefits for students, both economically and from an educative point of view. Marks explained that if an AgEd Department is doing its job and communicating with the real world of work, there should be funding for interns and assistantships that will benefit the individuals, the department and nation. Also, freed from the burden of economic insecurity, students can be more involved and more creative in their studies.

Marks explained that he thought agricultural education needed to make some serious changes. For one thing, he questioned the need for core courses, and stressed instead the need to look at an individual's goals and background, so as to understand what that person wants to do and what he/she needs to accomplish to meet those goals. Marks also pointed out that different learners have different learning styles. For example, although "hands on" is the best way of learning for many people, its not necessarily the case for all learners. So we have to be adaptive and offer training possibilities for as many types of learners as we can. In other words, he said, we have to know and teach to our audience accordingly.

Marks also believes that we need to deal with the bigger picture of agricultural education, that is, with informing the general public about the international nature of
agriculture. This is the only way we can gain support for international studies in agri-cultural education programs. Marks claimed that international education benefits both international and domestic students because it helps them all understand the competitive nature of the world economy.

Concerning international agricultural and extension education, Marks stressed the need to examine the various systems developed for extension around the world, and the value of drawing from all of these systems in trying to meet a set of particular needs. He claimed that "we need to look for the opportunities to make the alterations to fit the needs." He claimed too, that we need to look at what the real goal is and not get too hung up on the process of getting there. We also need to be open to new educational technologies. Marks explained, as an example, that maybe its not necessary to go to a foreign country and set up a high school shop. Maybe we can use videos and satellite feeds, etc., to pass on the information, then let the students get their hands on experience through an SOE or OJT program.

Marks claimed that extension education must be even more diverse than ag education because extension workers need to address a multitude of problems, such as health issues, social issues and agricultural problems. As such, international extension education should be more theoretically based and include classes in adult education, rural sociology, training in adoption and diffusion, educational psychology, etc. It also needs to deal with leadership, with sharing and cooperation, and with helping people to be better team players. In other words, according to Marks, extension training is

...not only imparting information about growing more corn or soy beans or strawberries, but the networking and the functioning within the community--the opportunity for taking a holistic approach to doing development.

And this, of course, must be built on cooperation with the private sector.

Also, agricultural and extension educators have to learn to communicate with people from other fields. The community can't be helped, Marks claimed, if developers divide it up between disciplines and then fail to communicate among themselves. In other words, we need to take a more inter-disciplinary approach to international agricultural and
extension education. Marks said "I don't think we can afford to be turf oriented any­
more." And even more importantly, we have to include the clientele in the process.

Marks was at the first official meeting of AIAEE, in 1984. He said the group was
initially created to provide its members with a forum--a place to work together and to be
involved in dialogue and discussion. Marks believes the organization has done well at
bringing in international people, both as members and as speakers. And he believes that
the organization has matured to the point where it can begin to set the international
development agenda, instead of following it.

Marks thinks the group needs to become more proactive and be more creative. He
said,

I don't think that continuing to meet every year in Washington and doing
the same thing that we've done for the last nine years is taking us any­
where. We [now] have the opportunity to do some things that are new, that
are different...we can analyze what's out there and begin to forge a new
agenda for the organization and for our individual institutions.

What we need to do instead, he explained, is to sit down with those various agencies and
dialogue about our capabilities and how we would like for them to work with us. We also
have to be willing to take more risks. These risks should focus on the larger view of
economic development, not just on the production of more commodities.

A big problem in AIAEE, he said, is that to a large extent all we've done is talk
to ourselves. Now its time for us to ask questions of people outside the profession, like
bankers and others from finance and industry. And we need to learn to listen. He believes
that people will give us good advice, if we listen to them. But, he warned, "if we are
going to be successful in new circumstances, it'll pay us to pay attention to others. We
need to listen first, then we can be creative and go about doing our own thing."

Marks then added that not only do we need to listen, but we need to ask the right
questions. We need to analyze where we've been and what the patterns are in interna­
tional development. And they need to be the right questions, such as "Why do we exist?"
"Where do we want to be in five years?" and "How do we get there?" This is because
many of the countries in the developing world need so much more than vocational
education. Marks said "We can't develop new professionals for the future unless we involve them."

AIAEE also needs to change its attitude towards the graduate students, according to Marks. This opinion stems from his own experiences as a graduate student, when he held salaried, full time positions at the same time he was studying. Marks believes that as soon as a student is accepted into a doctoral program, that person should be treated as a colleague and a professional. And as soon as possible, the new person should be put into a position of responsibility so that he or she can put into practice some of the things that person is being taught. He added that the reason that the profession was not doing this was because they were guarding their limited funds. But the reason for their limited funds was that they "haven't been willing to embrace a new idea, a new concept."

Marks said that there is a lot of rhetoric about "change agent" in extension education and that he sees himself as a change agent within AIAEE. Again, reflecting on his own experiences, he said he'd always bucked the system and he wanted to do the same in AIAEE. Because, "You should always grow. Go for broke or forget about ever growing and then just go back to the smaller unit and call it good."

Marks said that personally, he has not had much problem with discrimination, largely because of his own attitude. Concerning the AIAEE, he believes the organization needs to encourage young women and minorities to become involved in international development work. He sees AIAEE as moving in that direction by inviting more women and international people to be speakers at the annual conferences.

**Conclusion** The essence of Marks' view is that education can not be separated from the world of work and that educational institutions should not be separated from the private sector. This opinion stems from Marks' own experiences, first in working with his father when in high school and second, in the positions that were offered to him as he was working his way through graduate school.

Marks has a grand view of agricultural and extension education. He believes we need to teach agricultural educators to both listen to and teach to the needs of the
individual client. To do this, we need to practice those principles ourselves. Using modern technology can also assist in this. In addition, we need to stress the importance of studying agriculture from the international perspective, that is, of helping our students understand that agriculture is part of the global economy.

Agricultural and extension education need to have both a better theoretical and more interdisciplinary resource base. This is particularly true for extension education, because extension specialists need to deal with such a wide variety of issues, e.g., health, sanitation, education, agriculture, etc. In the future, it will become even more important to develop interdisciplinary teams of specialists to work on development projects. Cooperation will become the key to success. Ag and extension education will have an important role in this process, by developing instructional procedures and communications processes.

Marks watched the AIAEE develop as a way for agricultural and extension educators to come together regularly to exchange information and to develop a network for future communications. As Marks sees it, this has been accomplished. We need to now become more "proactive" by defining exactly what we do, and then by taking leadership in creating teams of development specialists to improve the record of international development. To pull this off, we need to be good listeners first. Basically, we need to practice what we preach. It is important, in this process, to listen to and include everyone in our projects - graduate students, women, and minorities.

Dr. Norton

Dr. Norton was born and raised on a small dairy farm in America's corn belt. Norton's father kept his farm small so that he could take better care of the land. He believed it was more important to caretake the land than to be modern and innovative. The farm was located near a small college town where the children went to school. Norton said there was always a tension between the farm kids and the "townie" kids. These two dualities have, in many ways, epitomized the struggles in Norton's life. That is, he has struggled with trying to reconcile the differences between city and country life.
and between the call for high agricultural production, on the one hand and the need to
maintain a high ethical relationship with the land on the other. Norton is married to his
college girlfriend. They have a young daughter.

Norton traced his ancestry back to Scotland and Ireland. He thinks his great, great
grandparents came to the U.S. during the time of the Irish potato famine. His great
grandfather on his mother's side was a farmer in the area where Norton grew up. Both of
his grandfathers grew up in the area as well. Norton's paternal grandfather was known
around the community as a "shrewd trader," he said. His father and his uncle both bought
farms in the area following World War II. Norton's father was fairly conservative, kept
his farm small and didn't take on much debt. As such, he was able to support his family,
but never accumulated much. His uncle, on the other hand, got into hog production in
order to make a lot of money. He had to borrow heavily to set up his production facilities
and when hard times came he was not able to carry himself through.

The Norton's dairy farm only had about fifteen cows. Much of the work was done
by hand. He said his father eventually did take on more land, and that he seemed more
interested in the crops than the animals. The family stayed working with small tractors
and a five crop rotational cropping system. About his farther's farming method, Norton
said

...he probably had some sensitivity to the need to be a stuart of the land
and the farm...I think maybe, he had an intuitive sort of belief that it was
really important to try to maintain the integrity of variance of the land
itself...[and that]...there was a real value at having a system that would
provide organic or sustainable system...that it was more than just a busi­
ness. That it was a life style.

Norton said his mother was very pragmatic and concerned about his father
working too hard. And she was concerned about getting into debt. As such, she didn't
want the farm to get any bigger. On the other hand, Norton and his older brother (there
were six children in the family) wanted to modernize and put in a milking parlor and
modern equipment. So the father was caught in the middle of this family debate. He
solved the problem by pretty much doing his own thing. He worked hard, fed his family and put the children through college.

Norton’s father died when Norton was a freshman in college. It was a sudden thing and caught everyone unprepared. The family sold off the cows and equipment because neither of the two older boys wanted to farm and the younger son was not yet old enough to take on the responsibility. Norton’s mom is now living in their home town with his sister. The family is in the process of selling off the land. Norton said that when he looks back on his family and his youth, he sees that

...farming [was] really more than just a business...it was our family. But now, as I look at our family -- we’re scattered out and we don’t really have any kind of strong connections to that way of life.

Norton believes that his family story is typical of rural families throughout the United States, where the move is to larger farms and less people. He expressed sadness over the loss of rural America communities. He also noted that not only does there seem to be a loss in the quality of rural communities, but there is a corresponding deterioration of the rural environment. The conclusion that Norton drew from all of this was that

...development is really much more than just producing enough food [or] helping people to be able to create a viable business. [T]here is a very emotional level ...it is really a lifestyle that involves families... We need to look carefully at [the] qualitative aspects of agriculture.

Norton said that FFA played a crucial role in his development as a young man. Being from a small farm outside of a small town, he really couldn’t participate in many after school activities, like sports. Also, his family almost never left the farm because they always had milking or other chores. The FFA created the opportunity for him to successfully experience life off the farm. He claimed that it really challenged him to look outside of himself and his small community and begin to dream bigger dreams. Through FFA judging contest, Norton got to go to both state and national judging championships. He also had good advisors in FFA and learned some higher thinking skills and higher levels of verbalization. But the most important thing that FFA did for him was that it enhanced his self-esteem and made him feel "okay" about being a kid from the country.
Norton went to the land-grant university in his home state. He started in pre-vet medicine, but soon realized he was not cut out for that kind of schooling. After switching majors a couple more times he settled in to agricultural education because it allowed him to combine his many interests. While at school he was also involved with a Christian fellowship group. It was in that group that he met his wife. It was also in that group that he was introduced to concepts of international development work. He went with the group to Mexico during the summer of his junior year and later went to work with Native Americans in Canada. He said those experiences deepened his concept of *stewardship*. And they were his first experiences doing "service work." As such, they helped him to understand that he needed to do work that was "beyond myself."

After graduating in December, Norton got his first job as a teacher. The school had a good reputation in FFA. However, it was located in an area that was becoming suburbanized. As such, the school had a lot of discipline problems, which Norton was not prepared to deal with as a beginning teacher. As a result, he left under bad circumstances. He explained that that period was one of the true low points in his life. In reflecting back over his life to that point however, Norton saw that the difficulties he experienced at that time were important in his understanding of what learning is all about. He claimed that

...people need to learn to learn how to fail and how to learn from [their] failures. It's not learning, it's not trying to avoid failure, because if you try to avoid failure then I don't think that you will develop into your potential.

Soon after he left that position however, he was offered a another teaching job in a school district not far from where he'd been raised. There were two agricultural education teachers at that school, so Norton was able to get some mentoring and learn the profession. And because the area was purely agricultural, he could relate well with the students. Also, his wife, who had a degree in elementary education, was able to get a job in the same district.

Not long after starting their teaching careers the Nortons decided that they wanted to become more involved with international work. They first went to a small church related, liberal arts school for their master's degrees. They pursued degrees in
interdisciplinary studies, with a heavy load of classes in the area of communications, and were granted Master's Degrees in Education. Norton claimed that it was while working on his Master's degree that he began to develop a sense of what development was all about. He explained that while he was there, he started to think about the principles of community development and the need to allow people to participation in and take ownership of their own development. This was juxtaposed to the ideas which he had been indoctrinated with while growing up, ideas which suggested that agricultural development was linear and hierarchical.

Another thing which Norton learned at graduate school was that community development work would only be successful when it dealt holistically with a community. Norton explained,

...in international development work you can't just deal with one aspect of a person or groups' life—that what you do in one area, say agriculture, effects all aspects of those people's lives. [We need to] interact with people on a level that they are coming from...

After finishing school, Norton and his wife went to Nigeria as aid workers for a religiously affiliated PVO. It was 1978. The World Bank was sinking a lot of money into that country. The people Norton went to work for were still operating under the old "production oriented approach" to agricultural development. These people were well intentioned, he explained, but they were inexperienced in development work. Norton's assignment was to design a program which would provide extension services and supplies to farmers in one of the agricultural districts of Nigeria. Specifically, he and his wife were to train three extension workers who were each responsible for about fifty villages. The extension model the Ministry was using was what Norton called a "pre-teen T & V system" and was pretty inadequate for dealing with the problems of such a large area. Norton said that in some ways project was successful. It did introduce rural farmers to the Western world and to more modern agricultural techniques. But in the long run, he believed that it didn't really help the people very much. He then explained that in his
opinion, "development should leave people better off than they were before the development began." In the project he was involved with however, the farmers were introduced to subsidized government inputs, so their production went up. But when Nigeria's oil money dried up, the subsidies were cut off. By that time the farmers had abandoned their traditional ways of agriculture; their native seed stock, etc. So in the end, many of them ended up worse off than they would have been had there been no "development" in the first place. Also, the failure of the development programs placed added stress on families. This caused many of the families to break up, which then put additional stress on traditional villages. It was kind of a vicious circle, he said. Norton claimed he and his wife struggled with trying to make the system work for four years. Finally they gave up and decided to come back to the States in order to return to school and study for their Ph.Ds.

They chose to return to a large university in America's midwest, where they had some connections from their earlier graduate work. Norton did his graduate work in "non-formal" education. He focused on the work that international graduate students were doing in agriculture at his university. He was particularly interested in understanding the relevance and practicality of their studies to doing development work when they returned home. Norton's graduate studies with international students led to his current working for an NGO here in the U.S., where he manages programs for international students.

Norton has worked at his current job for over four years now. He explained that his job responsibilities are changing with the times. Today he is much more involved with human resource management and institutional development in the developing countries. In particular, he is

...working with African educational training institutions to try to help strengthen their capabilities to provide training that is practical and relevant to the developing needs of those countries.

He is also interested in working with governmental and non-governmental, "grass roots" organizations including extension organizations and PVOs. Norton claimed that his goal at work is to develop linkages between the African training institutions and the new
grass roots organizations. He plans on expanding his work and help develop better linkages between the formal and non-formal extension organizations; between extension organizations and the non-governmental community, and between extension and the training institutions and universities. He cited, as an example, a program he has worked on at one of the African Universities, where he helped set up a new agricultural program. In it, a students can earn a BS degree with a focus in a specific agricultural science, e.g., agronomy or animal science. In addition, the student can supplement the technical classes with a wide variety of social science classes. The goal is to help agricultural workers understand that agricultural problems require social as well as technical solutions. What Norton really wants to do however, is to revolutionize international extension by making it responsive to the needs of farmers and villagers.

Norton believes that native people who haven't been "indoctrinated" by the formal education process have a lot to teach those of us who have. Formal education, he claimed, often suppresses our curiosity. It also causes people to have a narrow view of the world--what he called "perceptual problems"--which might be helped by spending time with indigenous people. He thinks that indigenous ways of thinking and learning might be more conducive for developing an understanding of social structures within the context of a group's physical and social environment. This is also true, Norton contended, in providing continuity with the past and in understanding what might happen in the future.

Norton believes that the agricultural education profession has suffered from racial and gender biases. He said he is also concerned with an apparent age bias towards younger people in the profession. He felt that such things were in contradiction to the profession's growth, particularly in the area of international development. Norton believes we need to become much more able to recognize the capabilities and contributions of people, regardless of their status or age; gender or race. And he added that with the AIAEE, the biggest of these problems is with age discrimination. He claimed that while it is important to respect our elders, there are many younger people, particularly from the developing countries, who have a lot of experience and should be called upon as resources. But instead, they are often treated as "juniors and as students."
Norton has been a member of the AIAEE since it began. He has attended all but one of the annual meetings. One of the biggest problems with AIAEE, according to Norton, is that it is too focused on academia. Norton said he sometimes thought it should be called the "association to promote international opportunities for American professors in international agricultural extension education." In other words, he said, it is a group for American educators more than a group for international educators. For the organization to be really successful, he said, the academic types will need to give up the idea that AIAEE is for them and start acting as if the organization is there to meet the needs of the people. He added that the group was making progress towards involving international people. But, he claimed, there was always a "mainstream thread that keeps pulling it back towards being self serving in the university communities in the United States."

Norton, as mentioned above, is not a member of academia. As such, he said it is becoming increasingly difficult for him to stay involved because "the primary network for communications occurs within the AG ED professional network, e.g., the holding of the semi-annual meeting in conjunction with the annual ADA meeting." Norton also expressed concern over the strong link between AIAEE and USAID. Again, because he is working for an NGO, he senses that the strong ties between AIAEE and USAID are detrimental to the association's ability to work with other NGOs and PVOs. AIAEE needs to find some way to make itself appealing to the greater development community, he claimed.

Norton then explained that he doesn't see the organization doing much to establish linkages with agricultural educators in other countries. Individuals, from universities, have established linkages. But the organization as a whole has not. Nor does the AIAEE seem to have any systemized way of developing linkages with other groups. Solving that problem should have a high priority, according to Norton.

In trying to articulate the philosophy of AIAEE, Norton claimed that the overall goals of the organization were good. But, if it is to truly be an international organization, it will need to "foster development of other regional affiliates." It will also need to develop ways communicating with the affiliates around the globe efficient and effective.
To do this, Norton suggested that the AIAEE may need to help develop "affiliate groups." It could then act as a catalyst in getting those groups up and running. Once this happened, the Association could start getting people from other countries to serve in leadership roles in the organization. Perhaps this could be started right away, on a committee basis, he claimed. Then the members that returned to their home countries could begin to develop networks and affiliate organizations in their regions. For all of this to happen, of course, the organization will need to come up with some funding. Once this has happened, the organization could do the following things:

1) provide active (instead of reactive) leadership to the developing communities;
2) free up some of the creative energy of people in the profession;
3) make more of a case for the utilization of indigenous practices and indigenous knowledge; and
4) combine hard technologies with soft technologies to produce agricultural systems development.

Conclusion The idea which best encapsulates Dr. Norton's being is community. Included under this title should be the ideas of rural community and community development. Since his childhood, Norton has struggled to make sense out of the idea of community. For Norton, community should be seen in its largest sense, one that includes caretaking the land as well as caring for one's family. When this idea is extended into international development, it should then include the indigenous knowledge and practices of the people who traditionally occupy a piece of land.

The basis for Norton's philosophy can be tied to his father's relationship to his own farm, to lessons in personal development he learned in the FFA, and to his own spiritual beliefs. As a child growing up, Norton felt as though the farm itself was his family. And his father did his best to provide adequately for the land, the animals and the people. From FFA he learned the value of looking at the "big picture" and of mentoring. And the fellowship he felt within his religious group taught him what a community could really be like and helped him to define "stewardship" at its highest level.
Norton was able to tie these concepts together in developing his own idea of what international development should be. According to Norton, the real goal of development is to "leave people better off than they were before the development began." And for this to happen, development specialists such as agricultural and extension educators needed to take a holistic approach to their jobs. This requires that, first of all, that we understand where the participants are coming from - at many different levels, e.g., technically, culturally, socially, psychologically. Secondly, it requires that extension specialists include the local people as participants in both the planning and implementation phases of any project. And third, the project must be designed and carried out in such a way that the participants can take ownership of the project and continue it after the donor organization leaves.

This last concept in many ways reflected the lessons that Norton learned in FFA, lessons about working hard and taking chances and, in so doing, gaining self respect. According to Norton, learning to take chances, which is synonymous with learning to accept failure, is one of the most difficult and most important lessons there is in life. For without risking failure, a person or group of people can not take ownership of the things to which they are connected. He also seemed to question this concept as it relates to international agricultural and extension educators. Norton believes that too much academia gives a person a narrow view of the world. Because of this, agricultural and extension educators need to learn to listen to native views and to try to build upon indigenous ideas and practices.

Norton believes that a bright spot in the development picture is the work of the "grass-roots organizations," which are usually native run NGOs and PVOs. He believes developing linkages between the state and national universities in the developing countries and these grass root organizations will be one of the best ways of doing effective development work.

Norton has been a member of AIAEE since it began. He believes the group has many good ideas about communications and networking. But he also thinks that the group has some shortcomings. He pointed to two in particular. The first had to do with age bias.
Norton believes that the older and more powerful members of the group treat younger members somewhat condescendingly—that there is a hierarchy of power which discriminates against people particularly by age, but also by gender and nationality. He also believes that the organization has to make efforts to attract people from outside of academia and outside of the traditionally defined discipline of "Agricultural Education."

Norton suggested that the Association should attempt to remedy this by creating or helping to create "affiliate groups" around the world. In this way, it would develop a more diverse group of people who could be involved in the power structure. In this way, Norton explained, the group could become truly an association of international agricultural and extension educators.

Norton concluded by coming back to the themes of community and stewardship. If AIAEE is to be successful, it must strive to build a community which is linked together through those kinds of caring feelings that are inherent in the idea of stewardship. That is, the bottom line for AIAEE must focus on a spiritual concern for the well being of all those that the group comes in contact with. And in so doing, it must take a proactive role in developing creative and imaginative leaders. It must also, utilize state of the art technologies while at the same time incorporating indigenous practices and knowledge. Only in this way will it be able to produce sustainable systems for agricultural development.

**Dr. Peters**

Dr. Peters is a woman from central Africa. She did her undergraduate schooling in her home country. She then received a second undergraduate degree in Scotland. Later she traveled to America to get her Master’s. And she received her Ph.D. in agricultural education a couple of years ago from one of the land grant universities in the central part of the U.S. She currently teaches at the National University in her country. She is the African representative to an international religious organization as well. Peters grew up in a colonial atmosphere. Her nation became independent in 1980.
Peters was born in a farming area of her country. She was raised by her grandmother during her early years. This was because her mother and older sister were farming and her father had moved to an urban area to find employment. Both of Peters' parents had minimal academic educations. Even so, her father was able to work as a teacher when he first moved to the city. He eventually became a police officer, a job which he retired from after twenty eight years. Peters decided when she was still a young girl that she did not want to be a farmer. She said

...even at that very early age [eight] I noticed that women worked the hardest. They did most of the work in the fields. So I grew up with this ideal - from the hard working Shona women always in the fields or doing something. I don't have many memories of women sitting down in a lazy atmosphere. And personally, I did not quite enjoy doing agricultural work.

Peters completed her first five years of school in her village. After that, she moved to town to live with her father. As a police officer, he had to move to a different town occasionally. So Peters went to several different school all over her country. Also, Dr. Peters was the second of five children in her family. So as her younger siblings grew older, they came to live with her and her father in the cities. Peters also got involved with the YWCA while she was in high school. This connection helped her with one of her first jobs.

Peters went to college in her home country. In her junior year there were just eleven black women and about five hundred men at the school. The school was based on the British system. Her degree was in English literature and poetry. She explained that towards the end of her studies, the English poetry was making her very depressed. She decided she didn't want to spend her life being depressed, so she started studying sociology. She explained that studying her situation brought her out of the darkness of her depression. Studying sociology however, was very risky because black women could only find jobs in the medical or teaching professions at that time.

Soon after graduating she got a job as Executive Director of the YWCA in her country. From the start, Peters said she "gravitated toward a participatory approach" in working with others. She said she wanted to "enable people to realize who they were or
what they wanted to be." She adopted that approach partly from her studies in sociology and partly because she’d had the same experiences when she first went to school. One of the best things that happened to her during that period was she had the opportunity to go to Uganda in 1972 for a World Council of Churches "Women’s Training Seminar." While there, she got to meet many high powered and high profiled women. One who particularly caught her attention was the Foreign Minister of Uganda. Peters said the woman left a lasting impression on her when she said something like "if a woman does not know how to use her feminine characteristics to a position of advantage...[within] a corporate setting, then that woman is truly disadvantaged." At the time, Peters said, she was a real fighter. As she’s matured, however, the wisdom of that woman’s words have sunk in. Now she is on the board of international organizations and she always behaves with decorum.

After working at the YWCA for two years, Peters left Africa to pursue a second degree. She went to Edinburgh, Scotland, where she studied community development. After finishing that degree, she went to America where she earned her Master’s degree in Extension and Adult Education, with a minor in Rural Sociology. For her Master’s thesis she made a review of African women in subsistence farming under the colonial system. Having completed her Master’s degree, Peters returned home and started teaching in the Department of Adult Education at the National University. She explained that it was through interacting with the her students that she began to develop an interest in what the native people of her country knew "before they were taught in the colonial education system."

Peters’ interest in the indigenous knowledge of her people eventually brought her back to the U.S. to get her Ph.D., or what she called her "union card." She had been a college instructor for eleven years when she decided to come back. She said she had a clear objective when she returned, which was to consolidate her experiences and put them into a political framework. To do this, she explained, she needed to acquire some additional technical expertise. One of the best things that happened was that, as a student again, she got to study other university professors and then reflect on her own teaching
style. This, she claimed, really helped her to further develop her participatory style of teaching. The reflection was extremely important she explained, because she came to understand that "people will teach the way they have been taught." In other words, it didn't matter so much what a professor said as it did how the person behaved.

Another thing that Peters picked up on was that American students like to share in the classroom. Many international students, particularly those whose English skills are not high, were intimidated and didn't want to compete. Peters thought such behavior was counterproductive for international education. She encouraged foreign students to share by saying that she was proud to be able to speak any English, as it was her second language. Most Americans, she noted, could only speak one language.

To understand the extension system in her country, Peters said, you have to start by remembering that it has only recently emerged from the colonial system. European settlers believed that the indigenous people had "total assumed ignorance" before they arrived. So they "embedded a total top down approach" in which "the extensionist knows, the farmer doesn't know." In the opinion of the white overlords, the native farmers were "conservative" and "superstitious" she explained. Even today, when most of the extension people are Natives, the system remains a very strong top down approach because the workers have been trained in the west. So, she claimed, it was difficult to get educators to pay any attention to the study of indigenous knowledge. She continued by saying that even though the Native people seem to be in charge of politics, the old colonialists still control the economy and, as such, really control the power.

Peters said that when she first heard about the AIAEE she was very excited. She was a graduate student at the time. And she said that the name implied that she would see "a lot of agricultural and extension educators from all over the world." Such was not the case however. What she encountered was "a group or American professors interested in so-called international...[who] came with their group of international students." She said that the impression she got was very dualistic; that she sensed that the U.S. educators saw themselves as different from the rest of the world. She then explained
to me there is that mental framework, of us and them. Where as for me, when I say "I am going to a meeting of international...ag and extension educators," I am thinking in a global context. Yea, it might be global...but my [home country] status is secondary.

Peters then went on to explain that she doesn't necessarily think the situation is bad. She just thinks it is misleading. She thinks it would be better to call the organization something like "the American Association for International Agricultural and Extension Educators." She said that the dual nature of the group was most manifest in the fact that almost all of the faculty were Americans and almost all of the international people were students. So it created an American faculty/international student duality. For her, that did not fit in to the idea of "global" because it is, ultimately, a top-down approach. She then explained

Where I find it disturbing is that, until we get to that understanding [of what international means], we have this situation of American professors responsible for so called international students. And we now have that top-down approach - which we will transfer. We are coming to America to learn and to get these degrees. It is a pure model of technology transfer...It is like an embedded philosophy reflected in our relationship...[And then] superimpose the gender issue on top of that.

So this ties back to the idea that people teach the way they have been taught. And if they are taught in this dualistic world of teacher/student and American/foreign, then they will continue to pass that on. And this, for Peters, is antithetical to her concepts of participatory or international or global.

Peters concluded by saying that the Association was started by "good hearted" people and that it's intentions seem to be in the right place. And it is still young! She hopes that in ten or fifteen years it will overcome the dualities and become truly international. Starting affiliate groups on other continents will be good, she thinks. The Association, however, needs to take leadership in "try[ing] to bring in the international elements, in the form of deliberate moves." "[T]his is one thing where you have to deliberately work and create the international aspect," she claimed. And it would help to develop "joint research" projects, instead of the traditional professor/student duality, she added.
Conclusion  The concept that best represents Peters philosophy of international agricultural and extension education is *transcending duality*. Having grown up in a colonial world of "us" and "them," which was carried over to a dualistic world of male and female, in which women were stuck with the difficult agricultural chores, Peters was sensitized to the different sorts of values that were attached to different groups. This is something she has attempted to overcome in her own work as a professor by using a participatory approach in working with others.

Peters holds a high ideal over what the terms "international" and "global" should stand for. In her mind, the essence of these concepts seems to be that autonomous countries should be treated as equals. Her sense is however, that it is more often the case that in international situation in which the U.S. is involved, it is the U.S., as separate from the rest of the world.

She also believes that the AIAEE furthers this sense of duality rather than bringing an end to it. This is made evident by the fact that by and large, the group is composed of American faculty members with their international graduate students. For Peters, this is clearly a top down, hierarchical model. And because the professors are almost exclusively white males, the model contains elements of both racism and sexism. These however, are covert and probably not intentional. In fact, Peters thinks the organizers of the organization are good people with good intentions. The real danger, in Peters mind, is that people teach in the way they are taught. Her concern is that both American students and international students will go on to treat their students in this dualistic and hierarchical method after they become professionals.

Peters believes that the AIAEE needs first of all to gain an understanding of this point of view. Then they need to be deliberate in taking a leadership role towards real equality. Some of the methods which will lead to this are to adopt participatory education practices, to have faculty members work with graduated students as team members, and to assist in the development of AIAEE affiliate groups in other countries. If the group is not going to take such actions, it should change its name to more accurately reflect the fact that it is primarily an American organization.
Dr. Roberts

Dr. Roberts has been involved in international education for his whole adult life. It has only been in recent years however, that he has focused on agriculture extension education. He is currently working as a Professor in an Agricultural and Adult Education program at an east coast university. He is of Hispanic descent. Although he is a native of the United States, Roberts has spent a lot of his life in other countries. He has written over 100 articles, edited several books and still leaves the country regularly as a consultant.

Roberts grew up in the downtown area of a large city in the deep south. He said he was from one of those "old southern families which had gone broke after the Civil War." He added that he grew up in a "highly educated, but poor environment." As such, Roberts said he was hawking newspapers on the street at age six. Roberts' father was from Latin America. His mother was of Scottish/English decent. He was raised by his grandmother. Roberts' grew up in what he called "a tough neighborhood." There were a lot of gangs and such. He said he didn't do particularly well in high school because he was usually hanging out downtown, learning about "street life." As such, he said he could have easily gone astray. Fortunately, a couple of things saved him. Mostly it was his competitive nature. He said he "literally" grew up at the YMCA. The director of the "Y" took an interest in his development and became his first mentor. Through this man's encouragement, he became a state champion swimmer, which eventually led to his receiving a scholarship to University of North Carolina. He was also involved in the Boy Scouts, where he eventually made it to the highest rank of Eagle Scout. Being in the Scouts was a good experience, he said. The reason was that it was tough growing up in his neighborhood because of the gangs, etc. The Scouts were equally tough however, because he had to do outdoor work in the swamps surrounding his town, where there were alligators, snakes, and very large mosquitos. Roberts also did a lot of agricultural work in the summers as he was growing up. He said he worked on tobacco farms, corn fields, and in a turkey hatchery. In reflecting over his childhood, Roberts said, "I was so
busy just surviving that I never thought about it. But now I can kind of stop and, what is it that Wordsworth said, 'trauma recollected in tranquility'?

Roberts accepted his scholarship at University of North Carolina. He said he didn’t do well his first year because he just didn’t understand the social pressure to "study and get ahead." He said he was reading and writing a lot, but not the right things. He even lost his scholarship because he wasn’t obeying the training rules for the swim team. In his second year however, he met a young women and fell in love. She was doing well in school and encouraged him to study. He did and ended up making the Dean’s List and graduating Cum Laude. His degree was in French Literature. He said he "wanted to plunge into literature because literature fed his intellect. And the international connection with cultures fed a connection with other human beings." He also got another athletic scholarship. The second one was on the gymnastics team. He and his girlfriend got married at that time too.

After graduation, the Roberts moved to Washington, D.C. He said that from a young age, he was interested in learning about the world. As such, he had tried to join the Navy when he was just sixteen. And he explained later, "...I feel a little more comfortable intellectually and culturally with people who have an international experience and international perspective." Roberts got his first job in Washington at the Library of Congress, working as an assistant editor in charge of Latin American studies. That led to his first overseas assignment, which was with the Organization of American States. The position there was in Central America. He stayed for four and a half years. After completing the OAS assignment, Roberts finally got the opportunity to go to France, where he’d wanted to go since he got into college. He got a job there working for UNESCO. His original job was working in the "Out of School" or "non-formal" education program. He specialized in the "out of school youth education program." After doing his initial work at UNESCO headquarters, he was assigned to work in Ghana. After that, Roberts had several positions in Eastern Europe. As he progressed in his career with UNESCO, Roberts got out of the youth programs and became more involved in adult education and the "life-long-learning" program. Roberts claimed that one of the best
things about his job with UNESCO was that he "worked from the international side, not from the American side." He explained that he was a civil servant for the UN. As such, he got to look at the United States from an objective point of view, about which he said, "...it use to pain me to see the lack of leadership of [the American] delegation."

While in Europe, he also developed an interest in Buddhism and Taiji. He said he was introduced to the ideas by his wife. Then he added,

A lot of times women are leaders in our lives. We don't pay much attention to these other [things because we're] busy making money and in generally being important and taking action out into the "real world." And...they try to pay attention to their personal lives..."

After working with "life-long-learning" programs for five years, Roberts decided to return to the U.S. to pursue his Master's degree. He said he'd only planned on being in school for one year. However, his interest in adult education theory and practiced got peaked, so he decided to stay and get his Ph.D. Roberts said he started volunteering as an ESL teacher working with under-educated immigrants at a store front, adult education school when he arrived on campus. After a year, he was hired as the director of that program. As a result of that work, he received a one-of-a-kind certificate from the state for "Teaching English and Motivation." This was because he had been motivating his students "to grip their lives, and grab their lives, and begin to do something with it..."

Robert's Master's degree was in Economics. His Ph.D. was in Adult Education. His dissertation was entitled "Critical Change Among Adults."

Roberts said that at that time, there were several different theories about adult learning and adult development. One centered on motivating the learner in a way similar to the Dale Carnegie courses. Another one, which was considered a radical approach, focused on getting the adult student to assume an entirely new cultural identity. Still another claimed that the best way to change or grow as an adult was through therapy. Roberts said he noticed that the techniques for change differed in each of those approaches, but the message underlying them all was the same. That message was that the
individual had "to find himself." So, in working at the ESL school, he focused on guiding people towards finding themselves. He said,

I'd push them to think about it; [to] imagine what [they'd] want to do. And we'd go into some kind of scenarios and fantasies and - I used a little bit of Warren Zigler's 'futures invention'...in which instead of extrapolating the future, or falling into it through crisis management, [you invent it].

He added that in his opinion, helping adults through developmental changes was not so much about "shifting gears" as it was about "changing vehicles."

Roberts finished his degrees in a couple of years, then returned to his job with UNESCO. But after a short time back he got restless. He realized that wanted to be a part of the academic community. So he returned to the U.S. Following his returned, he held several positions around the country, mostly concerning adult education. In the process, he also opened his own consultancy business. He eventually got a teaching position at the university where he now works. The position he got hired for was to teach Adult Education. At that school, this subject was taught through the College of Agriculture's Department of Extension and Adult Education. This then was his entrance to the field of agricultural and extension education.

Roberts is basically a humanist. He explained,

I've always wanted to contribute something. I never knew what. But I think that in 1984-85, I really saw clearly that [in] agricultural extension...I had a little something to contribute...so I decided literally to dedicate myself to that.

He said that when he started at the university he had a 100% teaching assignment in adult education, mostly in program development. After a couple of years however, he came to see agricultural extension as a very important part of international development. Roberts locates extension education as a provider in the larger institutional frameworks of adult education. In order to explore and develop this idea he set up a center for the study of extension development. He also co-authored the first compilation of agricultural extension systems worldwide.
Roberts sees extension in a two-fold way. First, he sees the development of extension programs as being part of the larger framework of policy and institutional development. That is, extension program development is part of institutional development, which is, in turn, part of overall policy development. He claimed, in other words, that to understand program development or program evaluation, one first needed to understand the particular program within the context of the institution the program was a part of. And then one needed to understand the institution within the larger context of the policy, at the governmental or business level, which governed or managed the institution. The second important aspect of extension, following Axson, was that extension per se, is part of a larger development process. Roberts then explained that extension is "not just a link with research, but part of the entire agricultural development process of credit, supplies, research, marketing, transportation, public relations, and so forth."

As far as Roberts is concerned, there are two important skills which graduate students need to have to complete their studies. The first is knowing what research is and how to do it. The second is knowing what a good piece of writing is and how to do it. He said knowledge of educational skills, educational theory and educational paragons is important. But he claimed, they will all change. And to those that claim a teacher needs to teach the student how to think, Roberts replied

...my theory is that if you learn to do the research - if you learn what research is and how to do it and if you learn what good writing is and how to do it, then you have learned to think. [It's] the writing...[it's] putting it on paper...

Roberts said he was concerned about the state of affairs of education now-a-days. His concern had to do with the desire of government officials to "privatize" everything. Roberts believes that government has some responsibilities to the public; and quality, public educational institutions were one of those. Connected to this was the fact that the first thing to suffer when there are budget cuts is education. "And if it's agricultural education it even goes faster," he claimed. Next in the logical progression come "if it's
international agricultural education, it goes even faster." These ideas reflect Roberts' belief that one needs to understand policy in order to understand the education system.

Roberts joined the AIAEE in the second or third year of its existence. As he sees it, the organization has two main purposes. The first is to act as a *symbolic community* to agricultural and extension professionals. The second is to offer professionals *a place to debate* the advantages and disadvantages of different processes and policies having to do with agricultural development. Concerning the former, Roberts said that at AIAEE’s Annual Meetings, professionals can come together to share ideas and consider some of the major themes that have been raised by the international development agencies. It is also a place where graduate students can come together and "to get their research published and to give them a certain renown." Concerning the latter, Roberts claimed that there are a lot of controversial issues in international extension development. And although there are commentaries and critiques at the end of each paper presentation session, he believes there should also be formal debates. This is because

...some of us who have been in the field have...a greater familiarity with things. And you don't put all that out in "A" paper...[It] doesn't come out like that. You need a different arena for some of those things to come out. So I think that’s an area that might conceivably be developed.

Concerning the philosophy of AIAEE, Roberts said that he wasn’t sure the organization should have "A" philosophy. First of all, he said, most of us are not trained as philosophers, so we shouldn’t be putting on airs, as if we know what philosophy is all about. Instead, he claimed,

...we should be an organization [open] to a variety of positions and ideas...We should recognize ourselves as... a symbolic community, all of whom are concerned with agricultural development...[This community] should provide some arenas for people to take positions, so that others can become more familiar with what those positions are and gain a better construct of what the hell it is they think - cause that's how you really learn what it is yourself.

Roberts believes that rather than having a philosophy, the Association should talk of having a perspective. Otherwise, he said, we run the risk of taking a position. And all
positions, he continued, rest upon ideological fantasies, which he thought the organization needed to avoid.

Along a similar line of thinking, Roberts thinks members need to guard against taking positions from outside their disciplines, e.g., sociology, anthropology, etc. Idealistically, it would be good for extension personnel to take cross-disciplinary approaches, he said. But who would pay for generalities like an extension educators’ views on rural sociology? He said being a generalist might be okay in one’s office, but it never works in the field because a person in the field is hired to do a specific task. On the other hand, Roberts admitted, development specialists do have to take a holistic approach if they are going to get involved in a project. To do so, they can ask questions like, "What has developed?" "Is it economic growth?" "Is it basic need?" "Is it social equity; economic equity?" "Is it something else?" "What is it?" "What you’ll discover," he claimed, "is that it is very difficult to talk about these things as though there’s one truth or one answer. There’s the agribusiness side, the cultural side, the sustainable side." He concluded by repeating that the organization should not try and take a position on these things. Instead, this should be addressed by it’s individual members. What the organization should provide is a forum where such members can come together, as separate intellects with different perspectives and points of view. Then, through debate, dialogue, and discussion, these different views can be examined. He concluded by saying "Maybe [AIAEE's] philosophy should be not to have one! Other than making a cohesive, symbolic professional community."

Roberts said he has not been very active in AIAEE for the last couple years for two reasons. The first is that he has been very busy with his consultancy work and has been out of the country a lot lately. The second is that his major focus upon joining AIAEE was to get the organization involved in studying policy. He wanted to study how governmental policy related to international agricultural extension. He said he wanted "to get all the different policy statements from all the countries and begin to develop a data base on policy relating to agricultural extension." Others in the group however, thought it should take and defend a particular policy position. He saw this as getting away from the
kinds of things an organization like AIAEE should do. So between the two, he has missed a couple of annual meetings. But, he claimed, he'll be back. He said he wants to get involved with the policy committee again.

**Conclusion**  
The concept which best captures Dr. Roberts' essence is *symbolic community*. It seems that such communities have always been a big part of Roberts' life. These include a whole string of communities, beginning with the YMCA and Boy Scouts. In later life it included the OAS, the WHO, UNESCO, and the "academic community" which he now is a part of. These, for Roberts, are "symbolic" in that they are communities which are made up of autonomous individuals who have joined the community for mutual benefit and support. For Roberts, professionals in the agricultural and extension education profession make up such a community.

Roberts has always been attracted to the international scene. His undergraduate work in French literature, he claimed "fed his intellect and his need to be with other humans." Since that time, he said he has always felt more comfortable being around people who have had international experiences. Another thing which has captured Dr. Roberts' interest for most of his professional life has been adult education. He worked for many years with "life-long-learning" programs at the international level. And for the past ten years, he has tied this to agricultural development through his interest in extension education. One of the important things which he learned in his work with adults is that the essence of adult learning is that the learner has to first of all "come to know himself" as he is. Only after that has happened can he change to become something else. For Roberts, motivating adult learners was not so much about "shifting gears" as it was about "changing vehicles."

Roberts has a couple of deep concerns about education. The first has to do with what graduate students need to learn in the university programs. In his opinion, there are only two really important things a student needs to have when he or she leaves college. The first is the ability to do research. And the second is the ability to write well. Teaching information and skills is secondary because each will change with time. And,
Roberts added, a well researched and well written piece of text is proof that a person can think. The other thing that concerns Roberts is the move away from a federal investment in public education.

Roberts sees extension education as having two parts. The first is that extension program development is part of institutional development, which is, in turn, part of overall policy development. The second is that extension is part of a larger development process of agricultural development which includes the study of credit, supplies, research, marketing, transportation, and public relations.

Roberts sees the AIAEE as a symbolic community, where members come together to share ideas and views on issues relevant to agricultural and extension education. This community also provides a safe place for graduate students to enter the profession, by giving them a place to present their papers and to "gain some renown." In Roberts’ opinion, AIAEE needs to provide one more service. That is, it needs to offer a place where members with opposing views on relevant issues can come together for formal-like debates. Many of the issues facing extension development are very complicated. Paper presentations don’t really deal with these problems at a very deep level. Debate, discourse, and open discussions are ways in which members could get to that depth. Such a forum, then, would be a good way to involve and educate the membership.

Roberts also asserted that, in general, professionals should stick to their professions. He then added that we live in a very complex world which does not, in reality, fall into neatly divided "professions." We need therefore, to be studying agricultural and extension education from a cross-disciplinary view. The best way for this to happen, he repeated, was for the Association to provide a forum for the discussion and debate of these kinds of issues.

Finally, because Roberts sees the extension education profession as a symbolic community, he feels that it should not take stands concerning specific federal policies. Again, it should provide forums where information concerning all sides of a policy could be prevented. But ultimately, only individual members should voice specific opinions, not the Association itself.
Dr. Smith

Dr. Smith is just about to retire as the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources at a land-grant college in the eastern U.S. He was raised on a small, family farm in a rural part of the midwest. After graduation from college, he and his wife started their own farm on two different occasions. In both cases, they were called to serve as educational advisors in Africa and so they gave up farming. The Smiths have four children and four grandchildren. Dr. Smith said he and his wife will probably stay where they are after retirement because they have a lot of friends in the area and because they like the cultural life offered by the university.

Smith said he can trace part of his family history back to Norway. His maternal great grandfather on his father's side was born there at the beginning of the nineteenth century. He immigrated to the U.S. and settled in Indiana. Everyone else Smith knows of, on both sides, were from his home state. Most were farmers. His paternal grandfather died from an accident when he was still young. The widow kept the farm, but moved to town and became a school teacher. Both of his parents had diplomas from a small religious college in the area. Smith's mother's family was also from the area. It was a large family with eleven children. The family moved to Idaho when his mom was a young girl. His parents met in college.

Smith had two older sisters. They both graduated from the same school as did his parents. He said he didn't want to follow in their footsteps, so he stayed at home for a year and helped his father on the farm. Then he went to college. The school he chose was affiliated with the one his parents and sisters had gone to. However, he did not have to live up to the reputation of the rest of the family there, which made him happy. He completed two years, then transferred to the state university to study agriculture. He continued to farm during the summers and weekends to help with his expenses. Smith graduated just in time to get drafted for the Korean war. He spent two years in the military. One of those years however, was spent in a city near his home, so he was still able to help his father during spring planting and harvest. Smith got married to a local woman while he was in the service.
After his discharge, Smith and his wife got into the egg farming business. Along with some neighbors, they were raising chickens and shipping a semi-trailer full of eggs to New York City each week. Smith said about this period, "They were hard times, but very interesting and very educational." Smith wasn’t making much money at farming, so he decided to go back to school and get a teaching certificate. His first teaching job was part-time, teaching veterans how to farm. Not long after, he got a permanent vocational agriculture teaching position at a newly consolidated school district. He taught there for two years.

Towards the end of his second year, Smith got a phone call from the private college where he had first gone to school. They were establishing a school in one of the African countries, and wanted he and his wife to go there and set it up. Smith said that timing-wise, everything about the project was wrong. He had business commitments, his wife was pregnant, and it was the wrong time in the horticulture cycle. But the Smiths thought it sounded like a great opportunity, so they sold their equipment, packed up, and headed off to Africa.

They stayed for two years. Smith said the project "kind of languished" because the sponsoring school was really not set up to administer it very well. So they returned to their farm, bought new equipment, and went back to farming. In the mean time, Smith went back to the university and got his Master’s degree in Agricultural Education. He spent two years there, teaching part time in his home town, while his wife ran the farm. About the time he graduated he was contacted by the university where he now works. They had picked up the African contract he had worked on earlier, and wanted him to join their staff and take the project over again. Only this time he would have support from the university back home.

The Smiths talked it over and decided to take the position. So they sold all of the animals and equipment again and headed back to Africa. He headed up a small interdisciplinary team there. Their job was to develop an agricultural education system for the country. The program came under both the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Education. The Smiths stayed in Africa for four years that time. Towards the end of their
stay they were visited by the Dean of the College of Agriculture from the supervising university. He told Smith that he'd like to keep him employed back in the States, but could only do so if Smith "joined the club," that is, got his Ph.D. So when Smith returned, he got into a graduate program and got his Ph.D. Smith said graduate school was pretty tough. He was about 42 years old. And he had a lot of experience. Plus he had a wife and four children. So it was difficult being told what to do by professors with less years and less experience. Fortunately, he had a good advisor. They made a deal. The advisor told him what to do and Smith did it. In that way he was able to get his Ph.D. in just two years.

Smith then went back to the university. He was given a job managing a rural development project. Again, he was part of an inter-disciplinary team. The team was doing integrated resource management in a very rural and very rugged part of the state. The university was looking for someone who could "speak the language of the people." Smith said he worked on that project for four years. He said it was a great time and that today, twenty years later, he still has great relations with many of the people he met then.

At the end of that assignment, Smith was again asked to go to Africa. The new assignment was to a different country than where the family had been before. So he accepted the task and packed himself, his wife, and his children up and headed back to Africa. Smith's job that time was heading up a Agricultural Manpower Project. The team had several tasks. They were suppose to upgrade the agricultural education part of the National Agricultural Training Institute. To do so, they needed to improve the curriculum, develop teaching materials, upgrade teachers with Bachelor's degrees to Master's degrees, and improve the overall quality of the teacher education program. Smith said it was a good project. But it was being undertaken at the wrong time. He explained that the country's leader was very enlightened in some respects. But he just didn't understand economic development. As a result, the living conditions were terrible. The country was at war with its neighbor at one point. There was always a shortage of goods. He said that overall, it was a very difficult time for him and his family, but "a good experience for the kids and me..."
After spending four years there, the Smiths returned to the States. Smith worked his way through several administration jobs, ending up in his current position as Dean of the College of Agriculture. He said that his favorite job was as Associate Dean and Director of International Programs for the College. He said "It was just fun - 100% fun." That was because he and his wife were able to entertain a lot of foreign visitors. Also he got to work with the international students quite a bit. And he got to travel. He then explained that his current job is not nearly as much fun. As Dean, he has overall administration and leadership responsibilities for the college and experiment station. He does not have responsibility for the extension system. He explained that the political hassles in the state made the job pretty frustrating. He then said,

I still enjoy more than half of what I do. I hate an awful lot of what I do: I hate the internal politics of this institution; I hate the internal politics of this state. I think they’re very detrimental to our long term future. I love the work that I do with the students here; I love the work that I do with the community groups out there in the state. So when you balance it all out, it’s still fun, but it’s getting closer - down there to where it’s soon going to be 51/49 [\%].

He then explained that both he and his wife were looking forward to retirement. He said he’d still like to work on projects for the university, and maybe teach some. But he is ready to get out of administration.

Smith claimed that agricultural educators tend to be a bit provincial. Some in the profession, he described as "red-neck, traditional, sort-of 'agie" kinds of people. On the other hand, many of the people with international experience have had the opportunity "to readjust" and are, as a result, more open. The more traditional people have a difficult time dealing with diversity issues like race, gender and sexual orientation. According to Smith, much of this goes back to family traditions and things like the interpretation of the Bible. Smith explained

...we’re seeing [the pendulum] swing back and forth now - in legal rulings and everything else - where people have said "well, you’ve gotta take a better view on this..." In essence, what they’ve said [was] "well, let the pendulum swing...back in the middle, where it ought to be." We ought to
be intelligent enough to pick that path, but we’re not. So I’d say, on those issues, that that’s something that we ought to pay attention to.

Smith then explained that the agricultural and extension education profession has a responsibility to present a very balanced view because it is in a leadership position.

Smith said that in his experience there is no real philosophy of international agricultural and extension education, when you get out into the working world. He said that there is a general agreement about agricultural education amongst Americans, most of whom came from land-grant institutions. But at the international level, with people from many different countries, there is little agreement. The overall discipline, he claimed, is fairly conservative and still has "a pretty firm commitment to the three legged stool." In other words, most in the discipline are still committed to technical solutions to human problems. And because the technicians have the solutions, they bring with them an elitist approach to the whole teaching/learning process, rather than an egalitarian approach. Smith then explained that as far as he can tell, an uneducated, rural woman farmer has the same capacity to learn as does the "kid who’s had everything in life paid for him and is in the university." So for Smith, they should each be treated the same way when it comes to education.

One of the leadership challenges in international development, in Smith’s opinion, is to take the best from the various systems and to get people to work together through team-building. But to do so is very challenging, because there is no reward system for being a good team member in the academic community. On the contrary, Smith said, academia "encourages an adversarial and...turf protecting mentality." Much of this is related to the promotion and tenure system. Smith explained that he ran into this problem personally. Most of his work was in the sphere of rural economic development, both in his state and in Africa. As such, there were not many places for him to publish. Also, many of his counterparts at the university didn’t think he was behaving "professorially" because he was merely "helping people." To overcome this, Smith was forced on two occasion, to appeal directly to the University President in order to progress up the promotion ladder. Smith thinks this is a serious problem, and one which the profession
needs to tackle. Once it has been dealt with, processes like "team-building" will become more important in the profession.

Smith thinks that international development will become even more important in the future. And he claimed that if traditional agricultural education doesn't accept and start incorporating the international perspective into its curriculum, it will become a thing of the past. He said he will continue to preach what he has been preaching for years, which is "get yourself ready for an international calling because the need for people that are well trained isn't just gonna go away." Smith believes there will be a continuing call for people with higher degrees to go to the universities and training institutions in the developing countries to help upgrade their programs.

To meet this calling, the profession needs to train people differently than they did in the past. The new training is going to be both time consuming and expensive. But, Smith claimed, anybody that is going to get into the international scene is going to have to go through some kind an apprenticeship or have some international field experience.

Smith identified two ways of internationalizing the curriculum. The first was to pull an instructor out of the classroom and send him to work in an international situation. Then, by sharing his experiences in the classroom, the instructor will be able to help the students understand the complicated nature of the development process. The second way is to train instructors to be open enough so that when students ask them questions involving international situations which they can't answer, they'll be able to say, "Okay, that's a good question. We'll get back to that tomorrow." Then they can go home and research the answer. In either case, administration has to provide the time and money for the professionals to gain an understanding of the international situation.

The educational system is also going to have to come to grips with the need for students to have international field experience. In many cases, Smith predicted, these can be done together. That is, professors and graduate students can do field experiences together in foreign countries. Smith also explained that because the basics of science and technology are already established and are pretty much the same everywhere, students should master them at home, in their undergraduate courses. Working with different
societies and cultures however, can really only be experienced in the field. Finally, Smith claimed, some people do well under field conditions, while others don't. Observing people in field situations therefore, allows administrators to select the people who will be most successful in development projects by seeing how they do with their field experience. But, said Smith, "we haven't been putting that challenge in front of our students."

Smith thinks that appearance is very important in the teaching profession. This is because to be a good teacher, you have to be able to get along well with people. Students are always looking at and checking out the teacher. If they agree with what the person is doing, they tend to learn more easily. Smith claimed "if you're gonna be a teacher, you're effectiveness is how you get along with people; how you interface; what kind of response you can drag out of [the students]."

Smith said it is difficult to judge the effectiveness of our international development programs. The complexity of the problems is immense. It is hard to know if our inability to bring about change was due to our incompetence or to the political instability, graft, and corruption of the host country. On the other hand, he said, if you look at the quality of the individuals that have come out of the different graduate programs, then it seems as though such programs have been very successful. Smith said that when he looks back over his long career, many of his students are still teaching. Others are involved in ministries of education or agriculture. They are still using the basic communications and negotiating skills that they learned early on in their education. In the process of their education, Smith claimed, those individuals chose to take on the responsibility of improving themselves. At that level, he thinks, our agricultural education programs have done very well. He claimed that in education

we are really looking at the development of a human resource and the individual building block is where we start. And [when] you get enough of those building blocks together in the right places, why they can overcome some of the political and social hazards.

Smith thinks the AIAEE has three main purposes. The first is to support one another and to encourage the exchange of information. Smith said that we ought to be
looking into the meaning of an association. "If we're gonna associate," he claimed, "it means we're gonna share." That means sharing our knowledge, information, and expertise. If we do that, we will help each other and help the organization. The second purpose of AIAEE is to operate as an educational organization. To do this, the organization needs to participate in globalizing the ag ed curriculum. It also needs to make itself relevant again by taking a leadership role in international career development. The third purpose of the AIAEE is to educate the development community as to what agricultural and extension education is and how it is important in international development. In other words, the association needs to make more effort to work with the various development agencies "whether they're PVOs, NGOs, government agencies, international agencies …starting with WHO and UNESCO and FAO, but also looking at the major private groups." What is really important however, is that the professional ag educators be on the cutting edge. Other organizations, according to Smith, have time to be bureaucratic. Our profession on the other hand, should spend its time being educators, because that’s what they know best.

Smith thinks the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education is too young to have a well established philosophy of its own. He believes however, that there are a lot of members of the group that "value the concept of family, brought down to the level of a team working together for the common good..." Within this family concept there has always been a leadership role, a supporting role, and a common goal based on mutual benefit. In a family, Smith said, everyone shares and everyone benefits. But that’s not usually the case today. In our society, he pointed out, there are a lot of people who think they ought to get benefits without making a contribution. "We've become so selfish" he declared. Smith sees the AIAEE as being different. Members of AIAEE understand the role of family. They understand teamwork. They support the concepts of mutual effort, mutual responsibilities, and mutual benefits. As a result, the AIAEE is in good shape.

Because the members of the group have developed this family ideal, they have not been terribly guilty of biases and prejudices based on gender and ethnicity. Smith believes
that the members of AIAEE are "fairly humble" and "fairly perceptive." He explained "that bunch of people don't have too many ego problems." He thinks this is due to the fact that most of them have had international experiences. He then explained,

...humility is, I think, something that happens to you when you work overseas - when you're that far away from home, you realize that a lot of other people... know a whale of a lot more about a whale of a lot of things than you do. And yet, you're carrying the hat that says "expert" on it and these people are carrying the hat that says "peasants" and "workers"... [P]eople who make a successful adjustment overseas, I think - their humility increases and I think their ability...to wear the other guy's shoes [increases].

He concluded by saying that AIAEE has done well in recognizing the issues of race, gender, and sex. He also claimed that AIAEE members were better off than many others in terms of "the interpretation of what is professionalism and ethical behavior."

Smith said he would like to see a traditional native style meal prepared and served at each of the AIAEE annual meetings. He said that when he thinks back over his past experiences, the memory of sharing food and conversation at a big communal meal is one of his fondest memories. More importantly, he believes it would be a wonderful way to bring people together because it would eliminate the artificial barriers that are created by being from different organizations or being a professor or a graduate student. In other words, it would help people gain humility and get beyond their ego trips. Or, as he said before, it would help members deepen their sense of family.

Smith then reiterated the need for AIAEE to stay on the front of the adoption curve. In order to do that the organization needs to bring in a variety of viewpoints. Members need to listen and be willing to accept new ideas, even if they don't fully understand or support them. And, he said, "we have to take a stand with the international organizations when they're obviously doing something stupid. And not only take a stand, but say "No-there is a better way to do that!" He then added that it might be beneficial if the Association merged with another international organization in order to gain numbers and strength. But we should only do that if we can maintain the community spirit, he added. Smith concluded by saying that it is important that the group continues to support
both the new comers and the old timers. He said "Youth is great, but experience does count."

**Conclusion** The one word that best captures Smith's essence is *internationalization*. Having started from fairly humble roots as a rural, midwestern farmer and worked his way up the career ladder to become a college dean, Smith has seen that the international experience adds breadth and character to the individual. As such, he believes that the international experience should be a major part of a student's education.

Smith sees education as the development of "human resources," beginning with the individual. And he sees the individual as a building block for a larger sense of order, the next levels being family, then society. For him, the family epitomizes human organization because it involves leadership, support, and common goals. Developing those characteristics allows a group to overcome "political and social hazards." So the development of those "family" characteristics are excellent objectives for any group.

Smith thinks that the discipline is made up of people who come from pretty conservative backgrounds. People entering the profession are often very provincial. As such, they are often pretty closed minded when it comes to issues of diversity such as gender and race. Smith tied this to things like the conservative interpretation of one's cultural and religious beliefs. He has noticed however, that members who have spent time overseas can adjust more easily to what they might consider "unusual" or "abnormal." This is because being far from home helps one develop a sense of humility.

In the long run, Smith thinks the discipline of agricultural and extension education needs to follow a view of agricultural development which balances technical solutions to problems with socio-cultural solutions. This is not really how the majority of agricultural development specialists at the international level function, however. Most people at that level are still pretty committed to finding technical solutions to all problems. And because they can provide the technical solutions, they often come off as being elitist. One of the ways to challenge this is for the discipline to engage in multi-disciplinary teams. This too presents a problem however, since such activities, at the moment, are of little help to a
person in his or her career development. Following these ideas, Smith thinks there are two things which the discipline needs to work on. The first is to develop a sense of openness and trust amongst members so they can work as team members. The second is to develop ways in which openness and good team cooperation can help an individual with his or her promotion and tenure.

Smith thinks that the international side of agricultural and natural resource management will continue to grow in importance. Education in those areas will have to continue to grow as well. The American public and the universities are going to have to figure out how to insure that at least part of the faculty and students receive overseas learning experiences. An efficient way for this to happen would be for students and instructors to work on international projects in teams. This would be the most cost effective way for both the domestic institutions and the international clientele. But before U.S. citizens go overseas they should have demonstrated that they have mastered the essentials of their discipline.

Overall, Smith thinks that Agricultural Education departments have done a pretty good job at the international level. At the institutional level, the record is unclear, he claimed. But at the individual level, a lot of students have turned into great teachers and administrators. That, he claimed, was something the discipline could be proud of.

Smith sees the AIAEE essentially as a big family. They adhere to those family values mentioned above, i.e., leadership, support, and a common goal. Smith believes that AIAEE has several purposes. The first, which was instrumental in the organization's founding, is that it is a support group for ag educators who are interested in international development. Another purpose is to create a forum where members could exchange information. A third purpose of AIAEE is to help Americans understand the relationship between international agriculture and domestic agriculture by globalizing the ag ed curriculum. A fourth purpose is to take a leadership role in international career development. The final purpose of the AIAEE is to educate the development community as to the nature and importance of agricultural and extension education in international development.
Smith believes that the most important thing for the AIAEE is that it needs to stay on the cutting edge of the adoption curve. In order to do that the organization needs to bring in a variety of viewpoints. Members need to listen and be willing to accept new ideas, even if they don't fully understand or support them. The group also has to be willing to take a stand and then defend its position. Smith concluded by saying that it is important that the group continues to support both the new comers and the old timers.

Ms. Zorr

Ms. Zorr is a personnel specialist who manages international students' records at a major mid-western university. The university is in her home state. She received her Bachelor's and Master's degrees there. In between the two degrees, she spent two years in Africa, working with the Peace Corps. She recently received news that she has been accepted into the U.S. Information Agency branch of the Foreign Service Department. She is happy because her position at the university was about to be terminated due to lack of funds.

Zorr grew up in a small town near the confluence of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. Her family on her mother's side had settled in the area several generations ago. They originally came to the States from central Europe. Her father's family had migrated up from the Carolinas. Zorr said her mother and father met after World War II when he was working as a state fruit inspector. The family owned a small manufacturing business in their home town. She lived in town and grew up around the plant. She said her parents had a large garden, but were not agriculturalists.

The Zorr's business manufactured veneered wooden baskets for the hothouse business. Her grandfather had been a school teacher in the area. He started the business with the help of his two son, Zorr's dad and his brother, after he retired from teaching. The company had two plants. One cut the veneer strips, the other steamed and bent them. They also ran a logging operation. Zorr's mother was the company secretary. When Zorr was a child, the company was the major employer in the town. When she got older however, the wooden baskets were replaced by ones made of plastic or peat. As a result,
the company went out of business. After that, Zorr said her parents had to settle for normal jobs in the community. Her father died when Zorr was sixteen.

Zorr’s mother’s family continued to be farmers in the western part of the state. At first they grew apples. More recently they raised cattle. During the summer and holidays Zorr and her family would spend time on the farm. Also, the Zorr’s factories shut down after spring planting and the logging part of the business didn’t start until fall, so the family was able to travel and camp throughout the U.S. Zorr added that, although her family like travelling in this country, they had no interest in the international scene. She also explained that her family was very religious, particularly her mother. That was a strong influence on her, particularly later in life.

Zorr said the school system where she grew up was very small. There were only 125 people in her school. Her graduating class had 27 students. She graduated at the top and was president of her class. She said she liked school and was a member of the honor society. One of the best things that happened in school was that her eighth grade science teacher connected her up with a professor from a state university. She helped him identify flora at a local coal mine. She worked with him for the next four years on a science project, which got an honorable mention at the state science fair. Zorr said she was the only one in her class that went right to the university and graduated.

Zorr’s family was not interested in international issues. She said that the 4-H opened her eyes to international studies. She and her sister, who was two years older, both got involved in 4-H at a young age. First off, on two different occasions, exchange students stayed in her community with the families of other 4-H members. Then, when she was seventeen, which was the summer of her junior year, she had the opportunity to go to Scotland as an exchange student. She stayed with four different families during her summer visit. It really excited her. She said she loves to travel and she loves history and the 4-H exchange program was a good way to learn both. She said 4-H was really important because it offered one of the only opportunities available to gain experiences outside of her community. The other was with the school band. Zorr’s sister had been able to go overseas on a band tour. Zorr was also in FHA for four years. And she joined
FFA her senior year. She said she kind of did it on a bet, because there were no other women in the organization. Zorr headed for the state university when she graduated from high school. She was familiar with the campus because she had visited it several times for state 4-H events. She received a "Child of a Veteran" tuition scholarship for four years. She had access to another scholarship, on the condition she become a teacher, so she began her studies in social science education. Her love of history won out however. She gave up the scholarship, then added political science to her major. Zorr lived at the "4-H House." She claimed that this turned out to be a good choice because the other girls were also from small towns, so they could give good support to one/another. Zorr also got her first job when she went to the university, working as the student secretary for the state 4-H office.

During her junior year, Zorr was given the opportunity to go to Washington, D.C. on an internship program. She claimed that it was the best thing she ever did, because it opened doors and allowed her to meet people involved in international education. Her job there was to take care of international visitors and plan their U.S. trips, i.e., where they would go and who they would meet with. The most important thing she learned there was that "you can't be an expert on everything but you can become an expert on finding out about things."

After finishing her internship, Zorr returned to the university and completed her schooling. She explained that the director of the campus religious organization to which she belonged was very supportive in her decision to get involved with international development. This continues to be an important part of her life even today. Concerning this, she explained,

I felt as a Christian that...what I was suppose to be promoting was peace...[M]y interest and my commitment in my development is part and parcel of my religious belief. I really don't separate the two out. [I feel that the] whole profession is kind of geared toward helping other people.
In the mean time, there had been presidential elections and there was a freeze on federal hiring. As a result, Zorr couldn't find a job in international education. She ended up working at the campus hotel for close to two years.

Eventually Zorr was rehired by the group she had done her apprenticeship with. She worked as a Program Assistant there for two years. Then she decided to return to school for her Master's degree. Just before she was to returned however, she was offered a summer position with the National 4-H office. One of the workers at 4-H had quit unexpectedly and left the organization short handed at a very busy time. So they were looking for someone to run their exchange program who knew both the 4-H and the program. Zorr was the perfect candidate. She said she was really grateful for the experience because she was able to help out the 4-H after it had given her so much.

At the end of the summer, Zorr returned home to go to school to get a Master's degree in Extension Education. She said her mother was having health problems and she felt she needed to be near her. Otherwise she would have gone somewhere else for graduate school. The school thing turned out to be a hassle. She thought she was going to have an assistantship, but when she got to school it fell through. Also, her advisor was of little help, so she had to figure out class schedules and a thesis topic by herself. She eventually found a job in the international ag programs, which turned out to be a good contact for her later in life. She also started applying for a Peace Corps position in the Middle East as soon as she got back to school.

Towards the end of her second year back, Zorr was offered the Peace Corps assignment she wanted. It was in northern Africa. She studied Arabic for two and a half months, then left the States. The Peace Corps operations in the country she was assigned to were a real mess. She said, for example, "I really never had a Peace Corps assignment that had anything to do with what my real skills were in extension education." She concluded by saying of the Peace Corps "it was the best of times, it was the worst of times." She also found out while she was in Africa that her advisor had accepted her Master's degree project and she had been awarded her degree.
Zorr said she enjoyed living in a foreign country, even though it was very difficult living as a single woman in a Muslim country. She said however, that she really liked most of the people she had met there. She added,

I think the important thing...about the people who I’ve worked with [is that] I respected them. And I think that’s how I felt about [my host country’s] culture. I respected their culture. I didn’t always agree with it; I didn’t always like it; but I respected it and I think that’s the key.

When Zorr returned to the States, she visited a friend from the State Department, whom she had worked with on an earlier occasion. Her friend told her of a new program that was opening in her old office. So she made an appointment with the head of the new program. She then explained "I was in the interview with her and by the end of the interview, we were planning out what we were gonna do during the first year." Soon after, she took over her new position as the head of a Manpower Development Project in one of the central African nations. She said she really liked the program. She started out supervising 55 long-term students studying here in America. In two years, she had almost 200 students. With this assignment, Zorr said she switched her allegiance from the Middle East and Muslim countries to the other parts of Africa.

Zorr worked for that project for about three years, until it was discontinued. About that time, her old boss at the university offered her a job as an International Agricultural Development Specialist, which is the job she is just completing. In this position, she has been supervising students from Pakistan and Kenya, all of whom are on USAID grants. She said she has a variety of tasks with this job, including managing student records, coordinating classes, giving training sessions, and showing international visitors around the campus. Zorr added that it was a good thing the USIA position opened up, because the funding was about to run out at her current job. She added that she is looking forward to a career where she doesn’t have to change jobs every two or three years.

Zorr said that the potential job with the U.S. Information Department was an interesting story. She had applied to the State Department in the late 1980s, but had been
told her test scores were not quite high enough, so she was refused entrance. She was contacted later by a group of women who were suing the State Department for discriminating against women in their hiring practices. She joined the suit, but never took much of a role in the case. Then, just recently, she was told that the suit had been settled and that if her scores were competitive, she would be accepted into the Department for training. She was notified during this interview that a specific training date had been scheduled and she was to leave soon for the D.C. area.

Zorr sees herself as a "international agricultural practitioner." By this, she means that although she is not a teacher or professor, she works, and has worked for years, with international students. As such, she feels she has a lot of insights into what works and doesn’t work in international education. But, she claimed, doors had been closed to her for a couple of reasons. For one thing, she explained, international agricultural education is "very much a men’s club." That and the fact that she doesn’t have a Ph.D., have made it very difficult for her to speak up in the profession. She also explained,

...I felt some - not only gender, but also in academic - Ph.D.s are to be listened to and everybody else is to learn from them. But I think there needs to be... some more opportunities for people like myself, who have done this work for several years. [We] have a lot [we] can offer in this area.

She also said that being a young, single women had worked against her in some ways. She said she was often asked to work late and finish jobs for no extra pay. And she said her jobs have been very important to her and that her self-image is tied to her work. She believes that people took advantage of those personality characteristics. She claimed in addition, that there was age discrimination in the AIAEE. Then she explained that "the professors that are at the retirement age... I see... in them more of these paternalistic, sexist if you will, lack of sensitivity toward diversity." She went on to explain that many of the younger people have had to take classes on gender and cultural diversity, so they have been sensitized to these issues. As a result, she thinks such courses have a place in today’s curriculum.
Zorr expressed concern over the future of international agricultural and extension education. She said that with the kinds of changes that were happening to the extension service here in the U.S., it was hard for her to imagine what would become of extension education at the international level. She said that with the country's budget problems, funding sources were drying up for international exchange programs. This worried and saddened her because she thought it would lead to ever fewer face to face contacts between Americans and international students. She also thought this would have a detrimental affect on the AIAEE enrollment.

To remedy this, Zorr claimed members of the discipline were going to have to become better at manipulating the political system. She believed that American universities were one of the country's richest resources and that we should start to market our education system more aggressively abroad. She also thought we should be lobbying our congressmen for better support of international programs. She said

I think that we've kind of gotten off the track somewhere and [are] not really getting to the root... [We're] kind of doing the popular thing instead of doing things that really help people...I think we kind of get complacent, especially in academia...and say - you don't get...involved in trying to influence the political system.

We should also be doing the same concerning the international donor organizations such as the World Bank and the FAO.

Zorr attended her first AIAEE meeting as a graduate student in 1985. She said she sees the organization as having several functions. The first one is that it brings people from diverse backgrounds together to exchange ideas and to learn from each other. The kinds of people it brings together are professors, graduate students, and practitioners like her. In doing so, AIAEE creates another role for itself, which is developing group power. This, in turn, should be used to influence policy. The third important function she sees for AIAEE is the development and publication of the AIAEE Journal. Zorr claimed that for a practitioner, the Journal is really valuable because such people spend their time "worrying too much about insurance forms and visa renewals and whether a student is gonna flunk out or not...and you don't have the opportunity to look at some of the
broader issues..." She added that a journal can help put into perspective some of the work that a practitioner does on a daily basis.

Zorr said she felt like the Association was really coalescing in the last couple of years. She attributes this to the fact that the newsletter is now of high quality and that the membership is growing. Again, she said, the Journal should help to expand the membership. Zorr believes that communications is crucial if the organization is going to continue to grow. She believes that as we get more into things like the E-mail, we should improve our communications capability, even to the point of having committee meetings via E-mail. She also suggested that the organization charge higher dues so as to be able to put on better Annual Meetings.

Zorr concluded by saying that it would be good if AIAEE tried to put together information via an electronic bulletin board which was helpful for new people, like a listing of jobs and conference opportunities. It would also help to have more information available about extension systems or organizations in other countries. Zorr added that she did not think AIAEE should get involved in grant writing because it would mean that members would just be competing against other members.

**Conclusion**  
The one thing that stands out in talking to Zorr about international development is that she sees her work and her own *spiritual* development as being one and the same. Another important part of Zorr's story is that she sees herself as a *practitioner* in the field of international agricultural and extension education. This is because she has spent most of her adult life as a problem solver for people who are not from the United States. As a result, she knows a lot about what their lives are like on a day-to-day basis. Because she is involved full time with the lives of international people, Zorr has a unique perspective of their lives. She believes this kind of perspective should be of great value to the discipline of international agricultural and extension education.

Zorr's approach to international development is a reflection of the complex nature of her upbringing. That is, because she was a member of the family that owned the major manufacturing facilities in her home town, Zorr grew as a city girl in a very rural area.
She was, as a result, pretty adventuresome. This led to her friendship with the 4-H exchange students that visited her town and eventually to her own visit to Scotland as a 4-H visitor. As such, Zorr was able to understand on a personal level the benefits of exchange programs. She has spent much of her working life looking after the welfare of international students visiting the U.S.

Although Zorr has done well in her career in international development, she claims that it has been difficult. She believes these difficulties have, to some extent, been due the fact that she is a young women in a field which is dominated by older men. Another thing that has held her back is the fact that she doesn’t have her Ph.D. Zorr thinks this diminishes the value of the information she can contribute. She regrets this on a personal level. Even more though, she thinks it short changes the international students she works for.

Zorr is worried about the condition of extension education in America, and what that means to international extension education. With less funding, she senses that there will be fewer and fewer international students coming to the U.S. As that happens, there will be even less contact between American students and international students. And that, she believes, is contrary to what should be happening in education today. To remedy this, Zorr thinks that professionals in international education need to become politically active. They need to work as individuals and as groups to lobby both the United States government and international organizations like the World Bank and FAO to continue supporting international education.

Zorr sees the AIAEE as having several functions. One is to bring people together so they can exchange ideas and learn from each other. Another is to organize and, in so doing, create a collective power base. This should then be used to influence policy. Another important function of the AIAEE is to develop and publish the AIAEE Journal. Zorr thinks that the Journal should contain information that will help practitioners understand some of the theoretical problems that are being discussed within the discipline.

Zorr believes that communications is central to the success of the Association. She believes that one of the main reasons the organization is doing well these days is because
it is now publishing a quality newsletter. And creating a quality Journal will contribute much to the organization's success. She also believes that the group needs to spend some time and energy developing an E-mail service which could be used for committee meetings and for listing such things as upcoming conferences and job opportunities. Zorr concluded by suggesting that the Association should raise the annual dues so as to be able to hire better keynote speakers at the annual meetings. And she added that she doesn't think AIAEE should get involved in writing grants.

**Conclusion**

For this research project, in-depth interviews were conducted with seventeen professionals from the international agricultural and extension education field of study. Individuals involved represented five countries on three continents. Two other participants represented ethnic minorities within the U.S. The majority of the rest of the participants have spent extended periods outside of the U.S.

The interviews were conducted using open-ended questions. The interview process was designed to allow the interviewer and the participant to explore, through dialogue, areas which appeared relevant to developing a post-positivist philosophy of international agricultural and extension education. Developing each person's *story* from the transcripts was done from a hermeneutic point of view. That is, an effort was made to recreate each individual's life text. In this way, it was hoped that the reader could come to know each participant. Knowing the individual in this way was used as a contextual background for examining each individual's views concerning the philosophy of international agricultural and extension education.

Each of these *stories* concluded with a brief synopsis. In the synopsis, the researcher tried to capture the important philosophical and organization ideas which each individual expressed regarding agricultural education, international agricultural and extension education and the AIAEE. It is now time to analyze those ideas in an attempt to synthesize them into a coherent statement of philosophy of international agricultural and
extension education. After this has been done, it will be compared to the philosophical
definition of postmodern agricultural and extension education developed in earlier
chapters.
CHAPTER V. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to articulate a post-positivist philosophy of interna­tional agricultural development and extension education. A multi-faceted, qualitative ap­proach was used. The study was phenomenological, in that it tried to discover and describe the essence of international agricultural development and extension education. In doing so, it attempted to articulate a philosophy which was both evolutionary and non­exclusionary as regards social divisions such as race, class, and gender.

For this study, philosophy was defined as the set of rules by which a person or group judges the validity of his/her/its perception of the everyday world. In other words, philosophy is the study of the rules of "the meaning of life." In order to discover these rules, as they apply to the field of study known as international agricultural development and extension education, a number of qualitative research techniques were employed. These included historical research, philosophical analysis, dialogical interviewing, and hermeneutic interpretation. A central part of this research was the analysis of a series of in-depth interviews with members of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education or AIAEE.

This study was based on an assumption that the philosophy of traditional Agricul­tural Education was grounded in philosophical Realism. This philosophy offered an empirical and pragmatic view of the world. It was further assumed that for a philosophy to be able to properly address the multiplicities and complexities of today’s global society, particularly where the development of Third World countries was concerned, an interna­tional agricultural and extension education, or agricultural development education, would have to adopt contemporary, post-positivist elements.

In examining the philosophy of agricultural and extension education, the historical and philosophical views of traditional Agricultural Education, as it developed in the United States, were traced. From this work, a philosophy was outlined. After that phase of the study was completed, the history and present status of the philosophy of general
education, as it related to international agriculture and extension, was examined. Included in this part of the study was a thorough examination of those aspects of philosophy which are referred to as post-positivist and/or postmodern. At the end of that examination, a postmodern philosophy of education was outlined. These two parts were then combined to form a critical, postmodern, and post-positivist philosophy of agricultural development education which would be appropriate at the international level for the end of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty first centuries. This definition and its evolution will be briefly re-examined.

Review of Philosophies

Agricultural Education

Agricultural education began in the middle of the nineteenth century, in response to the development of scientific practices in agriculture. Government officials in the U.S. and Europe realized that efforts were needed to modernize rural, agricultural areas. This was deemed necessary for three reasons. The first was to insure a steady supply of food for the growing number of people living in the cities. The second was to develop agricultural products as export commodities. The third was to support the humanitarian believe that rural people and rural communities were, in the Jeffersonian Ideal, the backbone of a nation.

Government education officials decided that to accomplish the task of agricultural development, rural men and women needed to be trained as farmers and homemakers, as high school vocational teachers, and as community leaders. To accomplish this task, public high schools and colleges were created. At that time, the philosophy of the nation was pragmatic and naturalistic and stemmed from the works of Dewey. It was grounded in the belief that rural people would learn faster and better from an education that was seated in agriculture, the rural community, and the local environment.

With the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, agricultural education became more narrowly focused on developing an economically effective agricultural sector. The use of federal funding became limited to teaching farm and home making skills at the
high school level and at training high school vocational agriculture and home economics teachers at the college level. Less energy was spent on community development. The discipline known as Agriculture Education, as it is practiced today, stems from those federal mandates which were laid out in the 1917 Act. Following the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act, the philosophy of Agricultural Education began to change, as did the philosophy of the country as a whole. There was a movement away from the natural and holistic worldviews of people like Baily and Rodale, towards a positivistic view such as the one held by the Behavioralists. Such a view dominated philosophic thought in America from the 1920s until the mid-1960s.

After the 1960s, works by the European existentialists, humanists, and progressives began to gain popularity among American educators. Love's (1978) work gave the clearest expression of the philosophy of Agricultural Education at that time. He supported a realistic, pragmatic, and empirical philosophy. His philosophy was reductionistic and called for a hierarchical relationship between teachers and students. He also stressed that one's "reality" required validation from one's community. He claimed that reality could change, which suggested that there was no "ultimate" reality to be found. And he suggested that Agricultural Education was prescriptive, in that it worked towards a preconceived future.

More recently, Barrick (1989) and Williams (1990) called for a stronger theoretical background for Agricultural Education. They suggested a blending of the hard agricultural sciences and the soft social sciences and a more refined research agenda. McCracken (1983) added that Agricultural Educators needed to "become academicians and philosophers." And Martin (1991) made a humanistic appeal to Agricultural Education professionals that they become involved with "real people," who think and feel, instead of Love's "experience organisms."

The philosophy of Agricultural Education in the United States is cosmologically steeped in the beliefs, myths, and traditions of both the ancient Judeo/Christian/Greek world and of modern "scientism." As such, it is ontologically Idealistic in its belief that there is more to the world than can be grasped with the senses. Yet it is still firmly seated
in a experiential and empirical epistemology. Axiologically, Agricultural Education values the individual’s experience of the world and the value of education in guiding that experience. It also supports a political/religious belief that democracy and the Protestant work ethic are of high value.

The Philosophy of General Education As It Relates to Agricultural Education

In studying the philosophy of general education, the traditional schools of educational philosophy were looked at first. Specifically, these were the Liberalist’s school, the Behavioralist’s school, the Humanist’s school, and the various schools which come under the heading of "progressive" education. Particular attention was given to several progressive philosophers and/or philosophies.

There does not seem to be much connection between liberal education and traditional Agricultural Education. Liberalism called for "learning for learning’s sake" and the "search for wisdom" while Agricultural Education called for "hands-on" practical learning experiences which were connected to the world of work. Agricultural Educators did however, agree with the Behavioralists in many ways, particularly regarding the importance of experience in the learning process, i.e., philosophically they were both empirically oriented. Following the works of the humanist psychologists, e.g., Maslow, Rogers, Jung, early Agricultural Educators also adopted a view of the importance of the individual and the processes of individuation and self-realization. They were also challenged by the progressives, Dewey, and the social reconstructionists. One such challenge was the need to develop an awareness of the political nature of education. Another was to have educators join in the struggle to create a more just and less oppressive world.

A Critical Agricultural Development and Extension Education

The critical philosophies of several post-positivist theorists were then studied. These were off-shots of the progressive school of educational philosophy. They included the pragmatic works of Dewey; the works of the critical reconstructionists, particularly William Stanley; the Feminist theorist’s, particularly Patti Lather; and the emancipatory
education ideas of Paulo Freire. From this work, a critical, post-positivist philosophy of education was outlined. This new definition of a critical agricultural development and extension education combined the best parts of these classical schools of philosophy with the works of the post-positivists and postmodern thinkers. It was pluralistic at its onset. It remained rational and scientific on the one hand and humanistic and social on the other. This critical philosophy of education was pragmatic, but critically pragmatic.

Cosmologically, this critical philosophy of agricultural development education claimed that all cultures have well developed sets of beliefs, myths, and traditions to make sense out of their world. These sets have equal validity within the context of these particular cultures. That is, they all do well in helping people get through their lives on a daily basis. One of the difficulties of international development work is figuring out how to deal with the multiple cultural belief sets.

Epistemologically, a post-positivist educational pragmatism was socially and culturally defined within the time and place of a particular situation. A critical agricultural education also remained focused on human resource development. But this was done in a caring and inclusive way which validated emotions and the everyday life of the clientele. And finally, this new educational philosophy took responsibility for its own political nature. An agricultural development education also needed to be utopian in vision. It advocated a complete and true democracy which included those who have been typically under-represented in both educational offerings and in research.

A task of post-positivist agricultural development education was to combine traditional Agricultural Education with a post-positivist philosophy, so that everyone in the education/research process grew. In order for this to happen, individual's needed to become "self-realized" through praxis and dialogue. Also, once individuals had become "self-realized," they could come together to form groups which were also "self-realized." In other words, groups like "professional agricultural development and extension educators" must also raise their collective consciousness through self-reflection and dialogue.
An Analysis of the Interview Data

Introduction

The questions for the interviews in this study centered around an interview schedule which included several themes. The questions began by inquiring about the personal life history of each of the participants. The next area focused on education in general. This was followed by questions concerning the participant’s thought and feelings regarding agricultural development and extension education as a field of study. Next came questions about the philosophy and future of the AIAEE. Finally, questions were asked of the participants which centered on the role of gender, race, and class in international development in general and in agricultural and extension education in particular. In the following section, data from the interviews with members of the Association for Agricultural and Extension Education will be broken down and analyzed.

The AIAEE Member: A Composite View

The Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education is made up of a diverse group of people. In selecting the participants for this study, a cross section of this group was sought. In the following, section the biographical information will be analyzed.

No general statement could be made regarding where AIAEE members came from. Thirteen of the people interviewed (76%) were from the U.S. Two others (12%) were from Africa. The other two were from Asia. Ten of the members (about 60%) were born on farms. Two others (12%), both women, were born and raised in small towns. The rest were from cities or suburbs. Only five of them (30%) remained on farms throughout their youth. The rest went to school or spent a lot of time in and around suburban towns of cities. Of the international students, one (6%) spent most of his early life in his village. Two of the others left their villages to pursue their educations. The fourth person was from a city.

As one would imagine, most of the members were high achievers as youngsters. Many were in Honors Society and several became class presidents. Also, many of the
men were highly competitive athletes and two of them were Eagle Scouts. On the other hand, two of the members, one male and one female, said they did poorly in high school. The man got into college on an athletic scholarship. The women got in by having high achievement test scores. Extra-curricular activities were important to almost all of the members in their high school days. These activities included 4-H, FFA, athletics, drama club, music, and in several cases, church related organizations. Two of the American women spent time out of the country while in high school, as did one of the men. Another man left the country early in his college career.

There was not a general trend concerning education among the international members. One member lived in the city and stayed home until he left to go to college. Another left her village at an early age to live with her father and go to school in the city. Another stayed in the village most of the time, but had to leave for one year when there was no village teacher. And the final one left home at an early age and lived outside of his village most of the time. All, of course, were excellent students.

College majors among interviewed members were also diverse, although there was a trend. That is, five of the six (83%) who could be categorized as older American males got their degrees in Agricultural Education. Several people mentioned that they began in the agricultural sciences but switched to Agricultural Education because they didn't like the math/science part of the science curriculum. Outside of that group there was great diversity. Majors ranged from French literature to biology.

Agricultural Education was chosen by a majority of the students for graduate studies. A few studied in other areas and some took two degrees. The other areas mentioned were adult education, international agricultural development, rural sociology, and horticulture. All of the doctorate degrees were in Agricultural Education with one exception. That person received his degree in adult education. All but three of the interviewed members had spent extended periods of time in foreign countries by the time they had finished their Ph.D.s. Two of the women served in the Peace Corps and one man worked overseas with a church organization.
Careers differed as well. The majority of the members interviewed went straight into academic careers. One man worked for the FAO for many years before getting into academia. One of the women worked for USAID for several years, then went to work at a university. Currently, four of the members interviewed (24%) were not affiliated with a university. One woman works for the federal government and one man is with an NGO. Two other women work as private consultants. One is involved with international development. The other has a public relations firm and takes care of her son.

The AIAEE members involved in this study were almost all family oriented people. Two of the women (33% of the women or 12% of the total group) had never been married. Another woman was separated from her husband. Two of the men had been divorced and were remarried. So twelve of the seventeen people (70%) interviewed were living traditional, married lives.

**Essential Characteristics**

In analyzing the data compiled in this study, key words were chosen to identify the essential characteristics of each of the interviewees. These, along with some other short phrases which describe the interview participants, will now be examined. The first thing that came out of the data was that AIAEE members are caring people. They are generally concerned about the welfare of others and about issues such as justice and equality. This concern was most often aimed at the individual, but could also be aimed at groups, e.g., children, women, citizens of a particular country, etc.

Another essential quality of AIAEE members was that they were risk takers. Members were considered "mavericks" or "women in a men's world." They were also described as innovators and adventurers. They'd almost all spent considerable amounts of time in a place other than their native countries. They were also considered to be integrators and synthesizers. Because they came from diverse home and academic backgrounds, members were able to combine information from different disciplines and come up with unique and creative solutions to problems. They also took abroad ideas from their own homes and returned home with ideas they had picked up in other countries. The nature of
the group was also said to be one of "openness." The members typically believed that the membership of the organization should be open to anyone interested in international agricultural development or extension education. And they thought the group should be particularly accessible to women, minorities and graduate students.

Other descriptions of AIAE members included words like "hard worker," "enthusiastic," "successful," and "ambitious." By nature, AIAE members were people who took on challenges, then worked hard to accomplish their ends. They were able to identify problems, then apply their knowledge and skills to those problems, thereby bringing about at least a partial solution.

On Education

Generally speaking, AIAE members taught in a manner consistent with the norms of the discipline of Agricultural Education. They were, first of all, concerned with creating a nurturing environment for learning. They also believed that education had to be relevant to a student's daily life. The best way for the student to learn, members argued, was by tying academic subject matter to the student's day-to-day life. By doing so, the student's studies would be tied to farm life and the rural community. It was also suggested that extra curricular activities used to tie school subjects to the family and the home. Example of this would be the use of 4-H and FFA during the student's school days. Cooperative Extension Service was, in many ways, an expansion of this practice and used for working with adults. Several members stated that the agricultural and extension model was the ideal educational system. As such, they believed that other disciplines would soon have to adopt some form of extension to bring information to the community.

Interview participants felt that education should center on developing a firm grasp of "the basics," although exactly what that encompassed was never clearly stated. It was assumed by this researcher that the basics were reading, writing and math. It was pointed out that this need for a sound understanding of the basics was especially true for educationally underdeveloped areas, both in the U.S. and abroad. For education in the basics to have its full impact, it needed to be relevant to the learner and focus on the "world of
work." This was done by including job related skills and career development in the curriculum.

Participants made several suggestions regarding teaching and learning methods. They believed that subject matter was important. They were also concerned with the fact that subject matter changed fairly quickly. As a result, they claimed that educators had to help students "learn to learn." One of the best ways to accomplish this task was by using a "problem-solving" approach to learning. It was also suggested that demanding quality research and writing skills was a good way to assure that students had both the basics and knowledge of how to learn. Having this knowledge was particularly important at the post high school level. Coupled with these ideas was the view that instructors needed to be flexible and allow learners the time to do quality work. Members claimed that an emphasis on doing a lot of work in a short period of time was counter-productive to having students do high quality research and writing. A final education method called for a "participatory" approach to teaching and learning. It was suggested that the participatory approach was an effective method of education because it transcended the development of hierarchical and "top-down" relations between the instructor and the learner.

AIAEE members also believed that education needed to be broad-based. It was suggested that education should be based in the sciences, in psychology, and in sociology. Also, members believed that education programs should be based on a community needs assessment. This assessment should include technical skills, culture, philosophy, spirituality, and economics. It was also suggested that agricultural development educators should have a theoretical base in philosophy, psychology, and teaching and learning theory. In fact, members of the AIAEE tended to have more concern for philosophical matters and for enlarging the knowledge base than did their counterparts with less concern for international development. They also believed that it was important to understand both the theoretical and practical sides of education equally well. This was because it was important to know "what to do" in a given situation and to know "why" such action was appropriate in that situation.
Other AIAEE members were concerned about the lack of leadership in the profession. Concern was expressed that the research agenda of the state universities was being set by the private sector. It was explained that while on the one hand, vocational education must be connected to the private sector, on the other, publicly funded institutions should be doing "pure research" that could lead to the improvement of everyone's life instead of applied research which might only help private investors.

Another area of importance to agricultural development educators was policy. The development of educational programs, it was noted, was tied to the philosophies of a given institution. Those philosophies were, in turn, tied to governmental policies. As such, policy had a serious effect on education. And this was even more true when the education in question was either of a vocational or international nature. It was necessary, therefore, for development education organizations to study and understand the educational policies of the various nations. Many participants also expressed concern over the government's move away from investing in education. This was seen as a particularly bad time to do this because it was becoming increasingly important to help the public understand the significance of the global economy.

Another area of concern regarding policy had to do with the promotion and tenure system. Many AIAEE members felt that the traditional promotion and tenure systems at the major universities was biased against people in extension and against people involved in international education. They claimed that they had difficulty getting their departments and colleges to apply their international experiences to their promotion schedule. They also found it difficult to get articles published, because there were no journals that had been designed specifically for their field of study. Another related concern was with the shallowness of the promotion and tenure system and the fact that it stimulated competition, secrecy, and dishonesty among professionals, instead of teamwork and trust.

AIAEE members were concerned with many social and cultural issues that are related to education. Several of these have been touched on in the writing above. The first of these was the idea that education is a nurturing profession and that it is about helping others. The second was that education is about developing human resources. If done in a
quality way, it was argued, developing human resources to their fullest potential would help create a society which could overcome the strife the world is experiencing today.

The third socio-cultural issue that interviewees expressed a concern over was that education was political. As such, educators must be proactive in creating an egalitarian education system; one which truly does not discriminate as regards race, class, gender or age. To do this, professionals must work to overcome the dualistic mentality that supports the superiority/inferiority mind sets that separate students from teachers and the United States from other nations.

Another social issue had to do with adult learning patterns. It was pointed out that adult learners were different than young learners. An important part of adult learning has to do with the individual discovering who he or she is - at the moment. It is only by getting re-centered and knowing where one is at in life that one can identify what information he or she needs to change and then go through the changes.

The final interview questions had to do with the future of education. In this regard, members suggested that issue-based education would be the wave of the future, as would some form of extension in all areas of education. In a related area, it was pointed out was that information technology would continue to gain in importance and that using new informational technology was the best way to reach young people with the AIAEE message.

**Agricultural Development Education**

The agricultural development educators interviewed in this study saw themselves, first of all, as a group of individuals who made up a profession. And they saw themselves as professionals who had expertise in various aspects of agriculture, adult education, home economics, and/or rural development. More importantly, they saw themselves as a group whose members were trained as educators. As such, the "product" they had to market was education and educational research.

Agricultural development educators were also trained to see the "big picture." They had this ability because their background and training was not as narrow as was the
training of traditional Agricultural Educators or agricultural scientists. Their backgrounds included skills in technical agriculture, education, extension, research, credit supplies, marketing, transportation, public relations, and the human sciences. As such, they were able to see how the various parts of the development picture fit together. And with this vision of the "big picture," they were less likely to form elitist views than were agricultural scientists.

Members of the AIAEE saw agricultural development education as a discipline that started with the parameters laid out in traditional land-grant style Agricultural Education. To this was added some postmodern additions. They believed that agricultural and extension education should be based on an experiential, "hands-on" style of teaching and learning. They also believed that education needed to be tied to job skills and some kind of a career development process. And it needed to be relevant to the community of which the learner is a member. This concept of community included the environment. Thus, environmental studies were seen as part of agricultural development and extension education.

Agricultural development educators also believed they had a role to play in the local educational arena. Participants saw Agricultural Education as having a commitment to local people. As such, the work of the educator or extensionist was tied to the needs of the state's populous. They believed that at the state level, Agricultural Education needed to change its focus from educating farmers about agricultural technology to educating urban and suburban people about where food comes from. Following this, participants believed that at the international level, agricultural and extension education should be tied to helping local people understand the nature of the global economy and the global society. It should explain to people how globalization affects them in their daily lives.

Another important subject for agricultural and extension educators was the relationship between the individual, the family, and the community. Agricultural development educators believed that education should focus on the individual. This was because the individual is the basic building block of the community. And the basic unit of organization was the family. The family epitomized relationships. In a family there was
leadership, support, and a common goal. And healthy families required clear communications. The healthy family was therefore, the model for the healthy community. In this sense, community development was not different than family development. Much pertinent information regarding families has been developed through the Family and Consumer Sciences departments various colleges and universities. As with Agricultural Education, that discipline also has specialists who are interested in international development.

AIAEE members who were interviewed believed that clear communication was central to a successful education or extension program. Good communication depended on two essential factors. The first was honesty. The second was the ability to listen well. Each of these was, in turn, based on the mutual respect of the people involved in the communication. And respect was based on a belief that intrinsically, all people are of equal value - kind of like the "all men [sic] are created equal" in the U.S. Constitution. Members claimed that when this principle was understood, people dealt with each other honestly and openly - as equals. Doing so eliminated blame and resentment. And the elimination of blame and resentment allowed people to work together.

Members agreed that working together was important because international development is becoming so complicated. They claimed that it can only be successfully dealt with at the "systems" level, by interdisciplinary teams. These multi-disciplinary teams should include specialists in education, communication, philosophy, psychology, sociology, and economics. It was also mentioned that political science should be included in such teams. The reason for this inclusion was because ineffective leadership on the part of the donor organizations and/or national governments was often the cause for development project failures.

Because of the need to understand community at such a broad level, participants agreed that agricultural development and extension studies should be centered on a broad-based curriculum. A central part of the curriculum should deal with communication and team building. This was because the most effective way to deal with agricultural and rural development in the Third World was by using interdisciplinary teams. The major role of
agricultural and extension professionals on these teams was to develop educational programs and materials for professionals in other disciplines. Members also believed that agricultural development education professionals could provide effective leadership for such teams. Another important role for the extension educator was to keep the team tied to the "big picture."

Agricultural development must be done using a holistic approach, members claimed. Agricultural educators and extension workers first needed to determine where the local people were coming from at the level of technology, sociology, psychology, and spirituality. To accomplish this, they needed to gain an understanding of the indigenous agricultural skills and knowledge systems of the people they are working with. Gaining this understanding could best be done by surveying the local people. Once the indigenous practices were cataloged, they needed to be documented in terms of their impact on production, the micro and macro economy, and social and cultural aspects. Then, after the indigenous information had been collected and analyzed, it needed to be institutionalized by incorporating it into the government policies.

Local people needed to be involved, from the start, in the planning and implementation of any new project. Participants claimed that this was the only way that the local people could take ownership of a project. And in taking ownership, they must be allowed to experiment, take risks, and suffer failures. In so doing, they were able to build the program to fit their own needs. In this way they would gain both respect for themselves and respect for other members of the development team. They would also work harder to continue their projects after the donor organizations had left (capacity-building) because they would have their own pride connected with the projects success.

As mentioned above, members of the AIAEE were concerned with issues having to do with human rights and equality. Chief among these concerns were the problems of duality and "otherness." These problems manifested themselves in several ways. For example, duality might manifest simply as the separation between them and us. Or in the school system, it might be the separation between the students and the teachers. It could be seen at the university in the separation between undergraduates and graduate students.
Also, graduate students might be made to feel like an "other" in a gathering of professors and faculty members. It could also be seen as the separation between the United States and the rest of the world; the rest of the world being deemed "others."

AIAEE members had the following suggestions about how the agricultural development education and the extension profession should change. First, they believed that agricultural and extension education needed to broaden its base and strengthen its understanding and teaching of theory. In order to be effective at agricultural development, the field needed to be more philosophically grounded. It also needed to incorporate a basic understanding of human psychology and of developmental sociology. It was also made clear that the profession needed to teach more about teaching and learning theory, particularly at the graduate level. It was claimed that at the graduate level, people should really understand what education is all about, at the philosophical, psychological, and theoretical levels, not just at the practical skills level.

Typically, members of AIAEE were also concerned with a couple of broad issues related to the international agricultural and extension education. The first was with changing the focus of international development to include more education. The second was concerned with developing more egalitarian education systems, both in the U.S. and abroad. Interview participants believed that Agricultural Education offered many good tools to the field of international education. They claimed that the basic components of the discipline, e.g., program development, curriculum development, evaluation, administration, and leadership training, made up a body of knowledge that could be applied to the creation of programs which would result in the rapid development of human resources. In addition, they claimed that vocational education theory, coupled with adult learning procedures, formed an ideal model for education for the twenty-first century.

Participants believed that the solution to development problems was in education. This was because well educated and well informed people made the best decisions. And because education was such an important aspect of development, participants believed that being effective educators was a major challenge to the whole business of development. They also believed that the experiential education and extension models that were
developed at the land-grant universities in the United States were pretty good. Some however, thought more energy should be spent in understanding the models developed elsewhere, particularly by those who were involved in international work. Members also claimed that with an adequate understanding of agricultural development and extension education, and with adequate funding, the profession could do much in making the world a better place to live.

Interviewees claimed that the profession was being held back however, because of cuts in funding to education. This was unfortunate for two reasons. One was that the budget cuts were cutting down on the amount of contact that American students had with people from other countries. The other was that, with the new communications technology, agricultural education professionals were finally getting the tools that would allow them to carry their message around the world.

Views Concerning the AIAEE

It was generally agreed that people who have joined the AIAEE up to this point were good people. They "had their hearts in the right place" and had "good intentions." They were considered to be "open to diversity" and supportive of international workers and students and of graduate students in general. While this was seen as one of AIAEE’s major strengths, it was also seen as one of its weaknesses. Because AIAEE has such a wide, open door policy, members have a wide variety of opinions concerning where the organization should head.

Members were pretty much in agreement concerning the original purposes and functions of AIAEE. They claimed that AIAEE was first organized as a social organization where Agricultural Education professionals could come together to support their common interests in international development and to exchange information. The reasons they wanted to do so were:

1) to define what international agricultural and extension education was;
2) to inform one/another of what was going on in the field of international agricultural development;
3) to inform other individuals and organizations, particularly those connected with funding, what agricultural and extension education was;
4) to establish linkages with the developing parts of the world; and
5) to solicit funding.

These still seem to be essential objectives of the AIAEE, according to the members interviewed in this study.

Because defining the discipline was an essential part of establishing AIAEE, some time will be spent here examining how the members defined it themselves. AIAEE was described, first of all, as a multi-faceted organization. This was because it attracted people from diverse backgrounds and from many countries. These people had varying opinions concerning the nature of agricultural and extension education and international development, which ranged from very conservative to very liberal. In general, the membership came from traditional, conservative agricultural backgrounds. The vast majority however, had considerable overseas experience and had therefore, become more open to diversity.

AIAEE was also seen as an organization of innovators. One of the people interviewed said the organization was started by "mavericks and free thinkers." Others made similar statements, such as "AIAEE has to stay on the cutting edge of the adoption curve" or that the job of the AIAEE was to "communicate the 'state of the art'" regarding extension and development. By "state of the art" this person seemed to be referring to those things already mentioned, e.g., creating a development business built on honesty and trust; beginning projects by listening and doing needs assessment, including local people in project development; and organizing agricultural development projects around indigenous knowledge. Some members suggested that AIAEE should develop its own system of agricultural extension. Such a system would be centered on nurturing, stewardship, and the inclusion of indigenous people and indigenous knowledge systems in development projects.

Along the same lines, another member compared AIAEE to a family. Like a healthy family, he claimed, AIAEE needed some people to assume leadership roles and
others to provide support. More importantly, it needed a common set of goals around which the members could focus. In the early days of the organization, the main goals were to develop a profession and a professional organization. Now that that has been accomplished (and most, but not all, members believed that to be the case) the organization must begin doing outreach work and passing its message on to others in the development community.

Another theme for explaining the AIAEE centered on the idea of a *symbolic community*. In this symbolic community, members came together to share ideas and views on issues relevant to agricultural development education. Such a community also provided a safe place for graduate students to enter into the larger community of international agricultural development. But more importantly, the community should provide a *forum for debate*. The complexity of the issues which agricultural development workers face today are enormous, this argument ran. Thus, these issues could not really be given the in-depth study they required through regular paper and poster board presentations. What was needed was a forum for having traditional debates. In this way, in-depth presentations of the many sides of an issue could be presented to a large group of people. And hopefully, other members would continue to discuss those issues after the debate was over. A process such as this, it was suggested, would be an effective and educational way to disseminate information.

Because the members had diverse backgrounds, it was claimed that they would be good at coordinating the activities of the larger donor organizations. It was also pointed out that members would serve important roles on *interdisciplinary teams* because they could support scientists and technologists. Such support would come in two parts. The first would be by putting together educational materials. The second would be helping people in other fields become better teachers.

*Disseminating information* was seen as another important function of the AIAEE. AIAEE did this through two existing mechanisms and one that was just coming into being. The first way the organization spreads its message was through its *annual meetings*. Attendance at those meetings continues to increase and become more diverse.
The second method the group used to disseminate its message was its newsletter. The newsletter started on shaky grounds, it was pointed out, but is now coming into its own. One member commented that the organization "was doing well these days because it is now publishing a quality newsletter." The third method of dissemination, which the group is just putting the finishing touches on, is the new AIAEE Journal.

AIAEE members that were interviewed were very excited about the Journal. Many thought it would either make or break the organization. The major comment concerning the Journal was that it needed to be of the highest quality. It also needed to take a broad editorial approach. As such, it needed to look for qualitative as well as quantitative articles. It should include articles based on historical research and policy analysis. It should solicit articles from members outside of the United States and outside of the Agricultural Education profession. And it should contain articles which are relevant to practitioners, such as personnel who have to deal with international students on a day-to-day basis.

Members believed that the Journal would be valuable in many ways. Several people who were concerned with tenure and promotion were excited because the Journal would give them a legitimate place to publish. Others believed it would be the best way to recruit new members. In order for this to happen, the articles must appeal to a wide variety of development personnel. If this happens, it will create a good way to recruit both new members and personnel to work on interdisciplinary teams.

Concern was expressed over the cost of the Journal, however. It was pointed out that the submission cost was probably prohibitively expensive for graduate students and perhaps also for professionals from the Third World countries. If that were the case, then the publication of the Journal could be discriminatory and be contributing to the process of separation between the rich and poor. In order to overcome this imbalance, it was suggested that the Association request funding support from an NGO, e.g., Kellogg Foundation. Money received this way could be used to underwrite professionals without the capital to pay the submission and publication costs. It could, in addition, be used to cover the cost of printing and distributing the Journal to international libraries for a
couple of years. After that, the Journal should be able to pay for itself. Distribution at the international level would be a good way of bringing new people, with diverse backgrounds, into the organization.

There were quite a few suggestions concerning what AIAEE should do in the future. One of the first listed and most important was the need for the organization to "define itself and its future." Members suggested that the organization needed to take the time to do some "self-reflection," define itself philosophically, and outline its "primary theoretical base." It was important to do this, it was claimed, because the group would not be able to adequately plan for the future until it had philosophically located itself in the present. In this context, several suggestions were given as to what this philosophy might contain. Members suggested that the AIAEE needed to "make a humanitarian contribution to the world" and to "improve the quality of life" of the people they worked with. It was also suggested that the organization move towards building a community which was based on "caring feelings" and the concept of "stewardship." As with the above statement, this would be based on "a spiritual concern for the well being of those the group came in contact with."

People were unanimous in their belief that the organization had to reach out to attract members from outside of the traditional discipline of academic agricultural and extension education. In particular, members said the group needed to be sure to include more women, minorities, and people from the developing countries. It also needed to attract more people from other academic disciplines and particularly from outside of academia. Members listed a couple of reasons why the Association should work to build a diverse membership. One of the main reasons was so the organization could develop interdisciplinary teams. Another was to start training international agricultural development and extension workers to become leaders of affiliate groups around the world. This would, in turn, create a pool of trained personnel who could return to the mother organization occasionally and participate in its leadership and power structure. Members also claimed that the Association should form an executive-level committee with the power to communicate officially with other development groups and to develop joint
proposals. Such a committee could also lobby the donor organizations to "make them more responsive to the needs of people in developing countries."

Members claimed that the Association needed to continue to attract and keep good people. To do so it needed to maintain a supportive atmosphere. For example, it must learn to listen to its members, particularly the new people. One interviewee said members "need to listen and be willing to accept new ideas, even if they don't fully understand or support them." That is the price of diversity. The Association must also continue to be supportive and offer encouragement to its members. It was suggested that these are things the older members needed to do, to set an example for the younger people. It was also something members needed to practice in the field. In public, as in all of the organization's affairs, members must learn to "practice what they preach," as one of the members so aptly put it. And above all, the Association needed to practice and preach patience.

Several members mentioned that, like traditional Agricultural Education, international agricultural development and extension education should be based on job related skills. It should also be involved with career training for those wishing to get into international agricultural development as a profession. A related comment focused on the development of a computerized bulletin board over the email, which would offer members information on committee meetings, relevant conferences and job opportunities.

Other members claimed that AIAEE must involve itself in training leaders to coordinate interdisciplinary projects. The most important thing about these leaders was that they be both creative and imaginative. Other members could serve as education or extension experts on teams. It was suggested that these teams should be used in all phases of research, from gathering information to improving the record of international development. Like AIAEE itself, such teams would have to be self-reflective and open to criticism and change.

Another important topic that was brought up was AIAEE's stand on policy. It was stated that program development is a function of institutional philosophy which is, in turn, a function of government policy. As such, it was important that the organization begin to
develop a deeper understanding of two things. The first was the policies which dictate international development programs in the U.S. and the second was the policies that govern development projects abroad. It was suggested that the organization begin to compile a data bank of policy information to help members with overseas development work.

It was also suggested that the Association take a leadership role in developing a curriculum specifically designed for professionals interested in international agricultural development education. Related suggestions were that the organization should become more involved in curricula for the pre-college level. For example, AIAEE could get involved in internationalizing the Agricultural Education curriculum in the U.S. It was also suggested that the organization get involved in helping American students understand how international agriculture fits into America’s agricultural system.

Bias and Discrimination in International Agricultural Education and the AIAEE

Although AIAEE was made up of good hearted people, some members felt that there was a certain degree of bias and discrimination within the ranks of the organization. This mostly came in the form of age discrimination. However, issues of gender and class were also brought up.

How did the members of these various groups react to the questions of prejudice? All of the women agreed that there were problems with agricultural education at the international level with regard to women’s role in agriculture. After that, opinions varied. Two of the women, Link and Peters, were leaders in their fields. Link saw problems with Agriculture Educators having a lack of knowledge about the role of women in agriculture around the world. Other than that, everything seemed fine for her. She had been treated well in the Agricultural Education departments she had been involved with and in the AIAEE, where she had served as president. Peters, who is an African woman, had a much different view. She too, had been treated well in Agricultural Education and in the AIAEE. But she was also acutely aware of a separateness between American professors and international graduate students. Peters perceived that professors see students as "their"
students. For her, this represented a class distinction akin to the colonialism she had experienced in her youth. And she sensed that Americans saw themselves as superior to people from other countries. For Peters, this was antithetical to her concept of a "global society."

Another couple of women were younger and at the beginning of their careers. Clark had begun her Ph.D. work in the agriculture sciences. She said she had run into direct sexual harassment and gender bias. She then switched to Agricultural Education where she had not run into any direct bias. But now, as a professional with several areas of expertise, she was finding it difficult to get work and felt that "the experts keep the good work for themselves." Zorr too, said she had felt taken advantage of due to her being a single woman. She also claimed she had been discriminated against because she didn’t have a Ph.D. She felt that that was a sort of class distinction and a disservice to her international clients.

The other two women in the interview group, Brown and Hall, both spoke of being disenchanted with academia. Brown, who is an assistant professor and tenured, said she sensed that the Agricultural Education profession was governed by pettiness and a concern for promotion, tenure, and self-aggrandizement. She was disappointed that there was so little real concern for improving the quality of people’s lives. This was made obvious, she claimed, by the small number of Agricultural Education professionals working together and the lack of any meaningful communication at the group level.

Hall got out of academia to start her own educational public relations business. Her complaint, like Brown’s, was that the profession functioned at a superficial level. It lacked a theoretical base and any deep understanding of human development, she claimed. As such, she believed that there was little chance the profession would make any significant changes in the world of development. These two women were concerned about feminine issues of caring and nurturing. They believed the profession did not deal well with such issues.

The male participants could also be broken into three groups based on age. There was a group of older men who had recently retired or might soon do so. Then there was a
group of middle aged men, who were well established in their careers. And there was a
group of younger men which was made up of members just starting up the career ladder.
Again, everyone was concerned with the lack of women and minorities in agricultural and
extension education and the agricultural sciences. The three younger men, Adams, Evans,
and Norton, were concerned about discrimination based on gender, class, and race.
Adams worried that if the discipline didn't take a proactive role in bringing women,
people of color, and graduate students into the power structure of Agricultural Education,
particularly at the international level, these people would remain "outsiders" and never
become a part of the profession. Evans was concerned with the quality and quantity of
Agricultural Education for women in his home country. He also worried that extension
workers did not spend enough time asking questions of local people in order to find out
what they wanted to do "to help themselves." In a similar way, Jama was concerned that
agricultural development and extension workers from the developed countries seldom
examined the indigenous knowledge systems of their clients. Instead, they tried to
superimpose Western values and technologies on recipients of development programs. He
was also concerned with the cost of the AIAEE Journal, which he believed discriminated
against people from the developing countries. Norton, who works outside of academia,
saw a lot of discrimination in the AIAEE. He felt that the older and more powerful
members treated the younger ones condescendingly. He also felt there was a hierarchy of
power which discriminated against people by age, gender, and nationality.

There were two male members of the Association who were in the middle of their
careers. One was an Hispanic American. The other was from Africa. While each was
concerned with the inclusion of women and minorities in agricultural and extension
education, neither spoke of specific examples of how to bring this about in either agricul-
tural development work or in the AIAEE.

So it came down to a case in which the younger members, both men and women,
believed they were discriminated against because of their ages and in some cases because
of their gender. They also believed there was a certain level of class bias in the rela-
tionship between faculty members and the graduate students. Such discrimination, they
claimed, was perpetuated by the older and more powerful male members of the organization. Interestingly, these older members seemed to believe that there was little, if any, discrimination in the discipline, particularly in the AIAEE. They showed no awareness of the younger members sense of age discrimination and claimed that the AIAEE was indeed different than other organizations in its openness towards graduate students.

In addition, it appeared that among the middle aged group, the men seemed more satisfied with climbing the agricultural education/academia career ladder than did women. The women claimed that the tenure and promotion system was oriented towards more masculine/competitive goals and rewards, rather than towards human behaviors such as nurturing and working together.
CHAPTER VI - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

Introduction

Review

The purpose of this study was to articulate a post-positivist philosophy of international agricultural development and extension education. A multi-faceted, qualitative approach was used. The study was phenomenological, in that it tried to discover and describe the essence of international agricultural and extension education. In doing so, it attempted to articulate a philosophy which was both evolutionary and non-exclusionary as regards social divisions such as race, class, and gender.

In examining the philosophy of agricultural development and extension education, the historical and philosophical views of traditional Agricultural Education, as it developed in the United States, were traced. From this work, a philosophy was outlined. After that, the history and present status of the philosophy of general education, as it related to international development and agricultural extension, was examined. Included in this part of the study was a thorough examination of both post-positivist and postmodern philosophies. The philosophies of Agricultural Education and general education were then combined to form a postmodern, post-positivist philosophy of agricultural development and extension education which would be appropriate at the international level. This information was validated by comparing it to the opinions of practitioners in the field. Seventeen international agricultural development education professionals were interviewed. They were all members of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Educators. The results of the interviews were compared to the earlier derived philosophy to see if there was a "fit." This information will now be re-examined.

Assumptions

It will be recalled that this study was based on the assumption that for international agricultural development and extension education to be successful in the 1990s, it would have to include several notions which were articulated and advocated by the postmodern
philosophers. These included a move away from metatheory and metadiscourse; an end to "top-down" and hierarchical relationships, both in education and in development; the inclusion of the thoughts and feelings of the participants in academic research and aid programs; the teaching of techniques to help learners become self-reflective and self aware; and the designing of programs so as to empower and give ownership to the clients. The goals of this chapter were as follows: first, to articulate a postmodern philosophy for international agricultural development and extension education; second, to scrutinize the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education to see if it had incorporated those philosophical ideals; third, to offer recommendations for bringing agricultural and extension education into the postmodern era; and fourth, to discuss the implications of this study.

A Postmodern Philosophy of Agricultural Development Education

In articulating a post-positivist and postmodern philosophy of agricultural development and extension education, many of the basic tenets of Agricultural Education retained their importance. First of all, the foundation of such an education should be experiential learning. This foundational learning should be based on materials relevant to the learner's day-to-day life experiences. Also, educational studies, at least at the graduate level, should focus on the philosophy and theory of learning. Such studies should include the works of Dewey and the pragmatists, the neo-pragmatists, the behavioralists, and the cognitive scientists, along with the postmodern theorists. Within the context of postmodern philosophy, emphasis should be placed on helping oppressed people understand the political reality of their situations and offering education as a path to personal empowerment and freedom.

A sound philosophy of international agricultural development and extension education must also be broad-based. It must be seated in a wide variety of subjects, including philosophy, psychology, teaching and learning theory, family studies, sociology, economics, and political science. A basic understanding of these subjects is important because agricultural development is, above all, about the development of human
resources. From a philosophical standpoint it would be beneficial for international agricultural development professionals to have a theoretical background in understanding the religious and spiritual values of the groups with whom they are working. Also, they should have a basic understanding of the culture's mythology. In other words, international agricultural and extension workers should have an understanding of those things which make up human culture.

A postmodern agricultural development and extension education would strive to get beyond hierarchical relationships. According to the postmodern philosophers, we are now in an era in which there are no metatheories or metadiscourses which can give grand-explanations of life. Instead, each group/culture has its own set of rules for explaining life's situations. Agricultural development programs must fit into that specific cultural explanation. From the philosophical point of view then, a critical or postmodern agricultural education would have to rest, cosmologically, on the acceptance of multiple interpretations of the origin of the universe, the origin of human existence, the nature of nature, and the nature of God. It should be noted that this does not mean that a development worker needs to accept another culture's interpretation, only that he or she needs to recognize it a legitimate explanation of the world, within that particular culture.

Workers can do a couple of things to gain an understanding of the cultures with which they are about to work. For example, they can do literature reviews of a particular culture's heritage, including a study of the culture's religion and mythology. They can also do a thorough needs assessment, including an assessment of that culture's indigenous agriculture and knowledge systems.

Ontologically [the nature or essence of being], following Dewey, a postmodern agricultural development education would have to rest on the transcendence of duality. In other words, it would have to rest on dissolving the traditional philosophical battle between mind and matter. In so doing, it would have to adopt a view that differs from that of the behavioralists and other empiricists, which states that learning comes only from experience. This new ontology would rest on the belief that mind and body are not
separate and that mental processes have as much to do with learning as do physical, experiential processes.

Epistemologically [the source and nature of knowledge], a postmodern agricultural development education would rest on the belief that at the skill level, experiential learning is the best way to acquire knowledge. But there are, in addition, higher levels of knowledge and ways of critical thinking which are only accessible at the mental level. These levels are best developed through study and discourse concerning complex subjects such as philosophy, theory, and mathematics and through contemplation. Freire's work with "problem-posing" and conscientization are examples of this process of higher ordered thinking.

Axiologically, following Plato, Aristotle, and most other philosophers, a postmodern agricultural development and extension education must deal with the reality that humans, and thus human institutions such as education, are political. This notion must rest on some higher ordered ideals concerning truth and justice and on the belief that education is part of the process of obtaining such ideals. At the international level, these ideals must be realistic. That is, they must deal with the role that dominant cultures have played in the oppression of marginalized people around the world. And they must be proactive in ending such oppression.

Postmodernism and the AIAEE

The members of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education, who were interviewed for this study, indicated that while the Association incorporated some postmodern ideals, it fell short on others. They listed the following as issues relevant to both a post-positivist, postmodern philosophy and the AIAEE: the need to attract quality, caring people to the profession; the interdisciplinary, and hence, relativistic nature of the group; the need to develop a specialized curriculum for international agricultural development education; the need to expand membership; the problems of bias and discrimination; issues concerning social reconstruction and politics; and confusion over whether the group is committed to people or to organizations.
One of the things about the AIAEE exemplified was that quality, caring people are attracted to international agricultural development education. Members of AIAEE are, first of all, concerned about the well being of others. They are also risk-takers who have had a great deal of unique, overseas experiences. As such, they seemed to have the capacity to envision a different world and to work towards change. The founding members were concerned with the lack of representation of the Agricultural Education perspective in international development. So they went about creating an organization to offer their perspective. The newer, younger members, in the same spirit, are trying to keep this dynamic alive by offering suggestions as to where the organization should go next. Many of these suggestions have a definite postmodern ring to them.

For example, members suggested that international agricultural development education requires the development of a new curriculum. This curriculum would contain elements from traditional Agricultural Education, but would also be interdisciplinary in nature. Like traditional Agricultural Education, the new program would require each student to have some agricultural experience in her or his background, e.g., the student should come from a farm or have studied agriculture or a related subject e.g., biology, botany, etc., or have had experience working in extension. This new curriculum should also contain many of the courses which are typical of Agricultural Education departments, such as program development, administration and management, evaluation, world extension system, curriculum development, and teaching and learning methods. In addition, it would offer a series of classes in the human sciences, including anthropological studies in mythology, culture, and religion, along with studies of the family, political sociology, and rural economic development.

The purpose of these classes would be twofold. The first would be to help the student gain an understanding of human nature and human culture. In other words, he or she would need to understand that agricultural development is, essentially, about human resources development. The second purpose, which was touched on above, would be to move the learning process beyond the experiential, problem-solving level and enter into the realms of philosophical contemplation and problem-posing.
A related issue would be the development of interdisciplinary teams. It was claimed by several people who were interviewed that AIAEE needs to take the initiative in developing interdisciplinary teams. It was pointed out however, that as of now, members seldom work together on projects, i.e., as team members. It was also mentioned that although one of the functions of AIAEE is to share information, such sharing is not done at a very deep or meaningful level within the Association. It was suggested, in other words, that members do not communicate among themselves at a very significant level. With that being the case, it was naive to think that members would communicate at a significant level with people from other disciplines.

From a postmodern, post-positivist point of view, these issues bring up an interesting question, namely "why are people attracted to the field of international development education?" Are members involved in this work because they want to make a difference? Are they involved because it is exciting and allows them to travel, etc? Are they in it for the money? Or did they, perhaps, just fall into it? The initial reaction, judging from the comments by interview participants, is that members are quality individuals and that they are involved in development work because they care about people and want to make a difference. It appears however, that the nature of the development bureaucracy, be it governmental or academic, is masculine in its manifestation, in that it stresses competition rather than caring and nurturing, which would be considered more feminine. So one of the questions that AIAEE might want to reflect on is "What is the organization's stand on caring and nurturing as core values?"

In this regard, some feminist theorists have suggested the need to develop a "science with a heart." They claimed that the time has come to develop applied sciences with the understanding that they affect how people (and other living things) feel, behave, and live. Scientists therefore, need to learn to look at the big picture, which would result from their work, before the work is released into the world. And funders should do the same. Dr. Brown touched on this problem when she claimed that the academic professions are competitive and cut-throat when it comes to promotion, tenure, publishing, etc. As such, she claimed, there were few benefits for doing "good deeds." Dr. Smith
agreed when he noted that professors seldom get credit towards promotion and tenure by working either overseas or on interdisciplinary teams and in fact, the opposite often happened. Dr. Link also brought this up, explaining that at the present time, AIAEE is a small, friendly, social kind of group. But as it grows larger and gains in status, issues such as getting published and giving presentations will become more important at the national level. If (when) this happens, she worried, members may become "back biters" in their scramble for promotion and tenure. So again, the question must be asked, "will the profession be one of nurturing and caring about the welfare of others (a postmodern approach) or will it just be another way of being individualistic and of 'doing your own thing'."

Many of the members who where interviewed for this study also expressed a concern over problems of bias and discrimination, particularly with regard to age discrimination. Generally speaking, age discrimination was seen as a kind of class distinction. From a postmodern and post-positivists point of view, age discrimination and class distinction must be seen as reflections of such things as hierarchical privileges, duality, superiority/inferiority, all within the context of metatheory and metadiscourse. For instance, it calls into question the concept of mentoring. Mentoring is a traditional part of leadership training. Webster's Dictionary (1988) defines a mentor as a close, trusted and experienced counselor or guide or as a teacher, tutor, or coach. Thus, mentoring has come to mean guidance from a trusted, older person. But the younger people in these interviews did not reveal that kind of trust. It seems as thought the tradition is breaking down. Why is this so?

It seems that in the cases studied here, the top-down nature which is inherent in mentoring is being called into question. Drs. Hall and Ives both suggested that professors and graduate students should work together as team members. In these teams, each member would bring certain skills to work on a project. The older professors could bring their knowledge and experiences of international development and/or of agricultural and extension education to such teams. But today's graduate students often have an equal amount, or more, of overseas experience than do their professors. Graduate students might also bring new skills to an Agricultural Education department, in the form of new
techniques used in one of the agricultural sciences or with computer or communications technology, etc. It was also pointed out that many of the younger students have had classes on the ethics of class, race, and gender politics. As such, they have been both sensitized to these kinds of issues and have learned to deal with them from a philosophical and theoretical basis. This is something many of the older professors have not yet had to do.

The point is that if educators are wanting to attract top caliber students, particularly at the graduate level, they have to: a) treat them like adults and b) respect and use the information the students bring to the department. The basic, underlying principle here is that teams are made up of equals. In a postmodern, agricultural development system, team members would need to act in a participatory manner. Each member would learn from the other. Each person would understand that her or his perspective is but a small piece of the complex human development process.

Dr. Peters brought up a similar concern regarding discrimination of a different sort. She was concerned with the concept of globalization. Still others touched on the idea of using indigenous knowledge systems in development projects. These ideas point towards the problem of what Peters called the "us vs. them" syndrome. She and others pointed to the problem of creating dualities and then judging people, places, and things as superior or inferior from a narrow, subjective point of view. Philosophically, this problem with duality can be traced back to the Ancient Greeks and the differences between mind and matter (Reuther 1992). From a psychological/spiritual viewpoint, it can to traced to an attempt to substantiate one's "self" by juxtaposing it with "other" (Wilbur 1987). In other words, it's an old philosophical problem, which will probably not be resolved soon. But it is something that practitioners of agricultural development education must discuss and try to come to terms with. Discourse of this kind is essential if the discipline really wants to have things like interdisciplinary teams which actually accomplish their goals or participate in the development of a global village.

Accomplishing such tasks will require agricultural development educators to progress to the next stage of personal development, the stage in which the individual relin-
quishes his or her individual aggrandizement in order to reach a larger goal. Individuals will need to learn to lessen their self interests to form teams. And nations will have to do the same to form a global society. Interestingly, a near perfect model exists here in the U.S. in the relationship between the different states and the federal government. Each has certain rights. And each is limited for the betterment of the whole.

Another postmodern concept that needs to be explored is the reconstructionist's view that education is political. The reader will recall that Love (1978) described Agricultural Education as prescriptive. In other words, Love articulated a reconstructionist approach to the discipline. But it can actually be traced back to the early roots of agricultural education and the writings of L. H. Bailey. This also ties in with both Dewey's and Stanley's view that education is a vital tool in humanity's attempt to create a better world. It appears that, even though most of the participants did not openly call for social change, they all believed that through their good actions, the world might become a better place. Dr. Adams claimed this was a direct goal of his, as did Drs. Brown and Norton. And Norton added, for example, that if development experts don't leave a group in better condition than it was in when they showed up, they've done a pretty lousy job. Most of the rest of the participants seemed to agree. This, of course, echoes Lather's call for research which betters the lives of the participants.

And finally, inherent in the concept of reconstruction is the question "Is it political?" As was mentioned above, philosophers, from the time of Plato on, have speculated about the nature of the ideal state, i.e., they have been political. Agricultural Education has also, from its inception, been concerned with the political nature of agricultural development. This is seen in its consistent concern for the development of the "democratic ideal." Today, with its focus on career development and training for agribusiness and entrepreneurship, it advocates not just the "democratic ideal," but a call for free market, capitalist democracy. This is political! The problem is that professionals graduating from agricultural and extension education programs come out with an economic and political agenda that is somewhat covert, in that it is not often recognized as such. In addition, graduates from such programs often take that political agenda with them overseas. Then the question
arises, "is it an appropriate agenda for all people needing agricultural development assistance"? The point here is not that a group like AIAEE should necessarily be expressing a particular view regarding its political agenda, and this was stressed by Dr. Roberts. It does point to the necessity of the Association helping individual members recognize their own political realities and ideologies, so they know what political baggage they are taking with them when they go to work as agricultural development workers.

Recommendations

The following section on recommendations will be broken into two parts. The first will offer recommendations for the field of agricultural and extension education in general. The second will offer recommendations to the AIAEE. There will, of course, be overlap between these two.

Agricultural and Extension Education

For agricultural and extension education to move into the postmodern era, it will have to do several things. The first is that it will have to make a stronger effort to offer education in a caring and nurturing way. In other words, it must take into account such things as feelings and beliefs. To do this, the profession will have to expand its ontological view of the learner from being simply a "experience organism" or "sense receptor." Agricultural and extension educators must develop a deeper view of humans and human behavior. To do so, they will have to develop a deeper understanding of philosophy, sociology, and of educational psychology. They will also have to learn to listen to their students in a dialogical or two-way communication pattern.

In a related matter, agricultural and extension professionals must also both recognize and begin to come to terms with the difficulties that arise out of a dualistic system of philosophy. They must study the philosophical implications that have arisen from quantum physics and develop a knowledge system that is based on process rather than things. By transcending such basic Western dualisms as mind/matter, spirit/matter and
science/religion (see Reuther 1992), they will also be able to transcend the traditional educational dichotomies, such as us vs them and we are better than you.

One way for this to happen is for instructors to require that students develop a couple of important skills. The first of these is the ability to do quality research. For this to happen, students will need to know how to read, organize, and interpret heavy or deep materials. The second is the ability to write well. If instructors require their students to do quality research concerning the psychological and philosophical nature of education and require them to write well thought out and well developed papers, the discipline will be assured that the students have gained an understanding of the nature of the learning process.

The profession will also have to become more involved with educating urban and suburban students about the food and agriculture chain. As more and more of the population leaves the countryside in favor of city or suburban living, the mandate to educate will move to these population centers. The same, of course, is true for extension services. For agricultural and extension education to remain viable, it will have to adapt itself to the changing requirements of the population. In a similar fashion, the profession will also have to include more information and studies regarding the relationship between international and domestic agriculture. As the world shrinks, with the advent of international communications and the creation of the "global village," life styles even in rural, agricultural areas, will be affected by both human and natural, e.g., climatological, actions across the globe. In a related area, much more attention will have to be paid to the environmental problems associated with agriculture. These include issues already being dealt, such as ground water quality and erosion problems. But they will also have to deal with long term issues such as chemical residue build up in the food chain over time and the need to foster biodiversity. Still more complex issues, such as the use of bio-engineered hormones and gene splicing, require serious study at the ethical and psychological level, along with informed discussion with the public.

Interviewees also stressed that both teachers and learners need to learn to take risks and accept failure because doing so is the only way one can develop self respect. Educa-
tors also need to be sure to "practice what they preach." This is because people don't teach the way they are told/taught to teach. They teach the way they were taught. Therefore, the example that instructors give in the classroom is very important. Educators also need to deal with the fact that more and more of their students are adult learners. As such, they must approach the task of teaching accordingly. As was pointed out in this study, the goal of adult education is to help the learner change. And the necessary first step in that process is to help the learner come to know him or herself. This leads back to the first point and the fact that at the university level, at least, but probably universally, education is for a diverse group of people. As such, it must be oriented towards the individual. And as Professor Dewey pointed out many years ago, the real essence of education is to teach the student to first, understand the consequences of his or her actions, and second, to be able to envision those consequences before he or she takes the action.

The AIAEE

The AIAEE, and perhaps any organization which is striving to be effective in international development education at the beginning of the twenty first century, will have to follow the suggestions given in the section above. There are also recommendations which are specific to AIAEE. One of the first things the organization should do is decide what its utopian vision is of the ideal agricultural and extension development process. This vision should be both humanitarian and political. To discover this ideal, the organization should create a forum for the discussion of issues that are important to the organization and the discipline as a whole. This must provide an opportunity for the presentation of multiple and minority viewpoints. It probably should not be a debate in the sense that there are winners and losers (which continues the us/them, superior/inferior mentality). Instead, it should offer perspectives and a time and place for discussion and discourse. The goals of these activities would be to create an informed constituency which would, in turn, help individuals develop their own particular perspectives and to take ownership of these perspectives. This, in turn, could help the learners develop true pride and self-esteem.
Using a discussion and discourse format, the organization also needs to make a clear decision as to who it wants as members. It appears from the interviews that the organization's rhetoric is that it is opened to just about anyone who is interested in international agricultural development. But there also seems to be a class distinction within the organization, between "Agricultural Education professors from the U.S.A." and others. It seems vitally important that the Association come to grips with this dichotomy by deciding and clearly stating whether or not it is an organization of professors and their underlings (as many perceive it is) or if it is a group of concerned professionals who operate as equals in trying to solve, through education, some of the problems involved in international agricultural and rural development. These issues are important because they need to be resolved before the organization can deal with another important issue, namely, the desire by many of the participants to make the organization multidisciplinary and to have members work on interdisciplinary teams. Both of these seem to be important aspects of the organization's growth. Their success however, will depend on how the people in power chose to deal with "others."

Another issue which seems important is deciding whether the organization's purpose is to help individuals or organizations. Almost all of the interview participants talked about the need to be of service to the people involved in development projects. Yet the organization's constitution and by-laws deal almost exclusively with AIAEE, as an organization, dealing with other development, donor-type organizations.

Finally, if AIAEE members decide they want to work on teams, then a good thing to do would be for some retired members to work with new members in writing grants. Such an arrangement could be of benefit to both parties and perhaps raise the status of the Association by showing that it is an organization which gets things done. One of the important projects they could develop is an AIAEE development model. Another would be a data base on development policies in both the donor countries and in the development policies.
Implications

Several implications can be drawn from this study. The first is that the model for agricultural and extension education which developed in the United States will have to become more open and diverse if it is to retain its value. The model has a lot of strengths. As a result, this country has developed an agricultural economy which is second to none in the world. This development has had a cost, however. Focus on large scale farming and technological innovations oriented towards large scale development has been detrimental to the sustainability of rural communities. This, in turn, has contributed to urban overcrowding. In addition, Agricultural Education has, for the most part, been oriented toward the cultural norms and values of northern European immigrants, to the exclusion of others. In today's world of diversity and change, the discipline must open itself up, not only to people who look different, but to people who think, feel, and act different. And not only must they become more open to the people they want to attract, they must also expand their curriculum and in so doing, incorporate broader-based subject matter and stress the development of critical thinking skills. If it can do so, Agricultural and Extension Education will once again be able to contribute to the positive development of the United States.

One of the best ways for this to happen would be for the discipline, through its mandate to train extension workers, to take on the challenge of aiding the urban poor. It will be recalled that when Morrill first introduced the concept of land-grant institutions, in 1863, his goal was to raise the lot of the rural poor through education. One of the results of the United States government's decision to support the large scale agri-industrial complex is that many of the rural poor of the past are urban poor of the present. A domestic extension education system, which has incorporated the philosophic tenets of post-positivism and postmodernism, and with the support of the traditional land-grant research model, might be the ideal tool for solving the nation's inner city woes.

Development groups such as AIAEE must also strive for diversity. They must make a concerted effort to attract members from a broad spectrum of academic disciplines
and cultural backgrounds. If they do so, they will offer an ideal site for development professionals to work on their own development, as learners and as conscious human beings. It is only by becoming conscious that these professionals will be able to develop both trust in other humans and the insight to envision and bring about a healthier and happier world.

There is also the matter of family studies. One off the reviewers of this study offered the following critique. Although the importance of families was mentioned by several of the interviewees, she noted, no mention was made of the need to include professionals from traditional home economics departments or academicians who focus on family studies. The importance of having agricultural educators and home economists working together was recognized by development educators as far back as Baily. In today's climate of disciplinary isolation however, that line of communication has apparently broken down. This needs to be remedied. It indicates in addition, the magnitude of the problems that arise from academic isolation. The larger implication is that somehow university communities need transcend their masculine competitiveness and begin to act as communities.

Perhaps the most important implication of this study however, was that it indicated the need for a new field of study, one which this researcher calls agricultural development education. Another reviewer of this study expressed concern over the fact that the labels "agricultural education," "agricultural and extension education," and "international agricultural education" were used interchangeably. Such mixing of terms, he claimed, would be frowned on by many who considered themselves traditional Agricultural Educators. As such, it can be argued that the broad based curriculum and interdisciplinary nature called for in this study is inappropriate for existing fields of study. If that is the case, a new discipline or field of study, which is specifically oriented towards international development education is called for.

A postmodern, agricultural development education program could do much to advance international development (and maybe education in general). First, it could cross traditional disciplinary boundaries and, in so doing, eliminate established lines of commu-
communication resistance. It could also develop a curriculum devoted to openness and clear communication at the emotional, intellectual, philosophical, and spiritual levels. It could orient itself towards creating a better world, by practicing as well as teaching equality with regard to age, race, class, and gender. And it could attempt to do what Dewey claimed education should do, which was to help humans achieve happiness and satisfaction by eliminating the duality between the ideal and the actual by leading the learner towards self-awareness.
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APPENDIX A - DESCRIPTOR WORDS

The first set of lists are descriptor words that were picked out as identifying characteristics of the interview participants or their views.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words Describing AIAEE Members</th>
<th>Words describing what AIAEE members do.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adventurer</td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrators</td>
<td>Desire to make a difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesizers</td>
<td>Hard work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>Helping the underdog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>Taking risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard work</td>
<td>Overcome Hardships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crusader</td>
<td>Belief that things will work out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Care or the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman in a man's world</td>
<td>The farm is the family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being at the right place at the right time</td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>Transcending duality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for the land</td>
<td>Seeing autonomous nations as equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. separated from the rest of the world</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic community</td>
<td>Spiritual development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous individuals</td>
<td>Day-to-day life of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility/humbleness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family = leadership, support and common goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Words describing what do they teach

Nurturing
Desire to make a difference
Quality
Need for basics
Career development
Skills
Relevant to everyday life
Focus
Communication
Indigenous knowledge
Education = world of work
Education should relate to the private sector
Success
Community
Rural community
Community development
The "big picture"
Us vs. them
U.S. separated from the rest of the world
Top-down
Hierarchical
Internationalization

Socio-cultural issues

Nurturing
Desire to make a difference
Quality
Integrators
Career development
Crusader
Helping the underdog
Indigenous knowledge
Legitimization
Education = world of work
Education should relate to the private sector
Taking risks
Woman in a man's world
Ambitious
Community
Rural community
Community development
Caring for the land
The farm is the family
Stewardship
The "big picture"
Transcending duality
Us vs. them
Male vs female
Women worked harder
U.S. separated from the rest of the world
Seeing autonomous nations as equals
Top-down
Hierarchical
Symbolic community
Autonomous individuals
Humility/humbleness'
Family = leadership, support and common goals
Spiritual development
APPENDIX B - COMMENTS ON EDUCATION

The next list gives the comments the participants made concerning the general nature of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basics</th>
<th>1. Need to understand the basics.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Importance of stressing quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>basics in minority communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Need to learn to think through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skills and to transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>principles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>1. Education needs to be community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Education needs to be community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Education needs to be based on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community needs assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>1. Using problem-solving as teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Using a participatory approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Graduate students need to graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with two skills:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) the ability to do research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) the ability to write well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>1. Need to make education relevant.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Need to tie education to everyday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life experiences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education needs to relate to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>world of work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Education needs to include career</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>1. Education must be based on quality,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not quantity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad-based</td>
<td>1. Education needs to be broad based - include sciences, psychology, and sociology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Educators must have a broad base of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Need to have a broad-based curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>1. Need to learn to take risks and accept failure because doing so is the only way one can develop self respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Students need to be involved in educational student organizations, etc., to take ownership of their education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. International education will continue to grow in importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Need to develop international projects that include both faculty and students so they can get international experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Other disciplines will have to develop their own variation of extension to take education to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Less funding for international students means that less face-to-face contacts between people from other cultures and American students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>1. Educators should have a theoretical base in philosophy, psychology, and teaching &amp; learning theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Need to understand both the theoretical and the practical aspects of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Need to know what to do and why it works the way it does.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy

1. Concern about the state and federal governments' move away from spending money on education.
2. Educational programs are reflections of institutional philosophies, which are reflections of government or business sector policies.
3. Need to convince federal and state governments of importance of supporting international education.
4. Concern for quality leadership in higher education because the research agenda is dominated by big business.
5. Concern about shallowness of promotion and tenure system.

Socio-cultural issues

1. Education as caring for others.
2. Education as nurturing.
3. Education is political.
4. Education needs to be egalitarian.
5. Need to listen to hear what others want to do to better their own lives.
6. Concern for duality - I'm better than you - not listening.
7. Bias against women in education in other countries.
8. Public education should work towards the elimination of the "disenfranchising" of women and the poor.
9. People don't teach the way they are told/taught to teach. They teach the way they were taught. Therefore, example is very important. So being in dualistic and hierarchical organizations and classrooms teaches dualism & hierarchy.
10. Adult education = coming to know yourself, then changing.
11. Education is the development of human resources.
12. Individuals (as human resources) are the building blocks for families.
13. Families have leadership, support and common goals.
14. Families are the building blocks of society.
15. A clear society overcomes political and social hazards.

The future

1. Experience-based learning will be the model for learning in the 1990s.
2. Education will become increasingly issue-oriented.
3. Information technology will become increasingly important.
APPENDIX C - ON AGRICULTURAL AND EXTENSION EDUCATION

This is a list of the comments made by the interview participants which had to do directly with agricultural and extension education.

On Education:

1. Other disciplines will have to develop their own variation of extension to take education to the community.
2. The solution to development problems is education, which leads to informed decisions.
3. Less funding for international students means that less face-to-face contacts between people from other cultures and American students.
4. With an adequate understanding of the importance of agricultural and extension education and with adequate funding, the profession could do much in making the world a better place to live.
5. With the expansion of communications technology, this profession should be able to carry the message of agricultural education around the world.
6. Because education is such an important aspect of development, being effective educators is our real challenge.

Ag and Ext Educators are:

1. Ag and ext. educators are integrators and synthesizers because they join several disciplines together.
2. Agricultural educators can see "the big picture."
3. Agricultural educators should have experience in agriculture.
4. Ag ed professionals are often conservative, provincial, "red-necked 'aggie'" types.
5. Most ag people have technical backgrounds and technical expertise. They know more
than others about their disciplines. This often leads to elitist views.

6. Agricultural education teachers should assume a leadership role in their community.

7. Incompetence among ag ed professionals experienced at major land-grant university.

8. Ag ed professionals accused of doing research that didn’t need to be done.

9. Professionals who haven’t been overseas often give inaccurate advise to students regarding other countries, particularly dangerous for students from other countries.

10. Ag and ext personnel need to be the "voice of the client."

11. Always need to remember their job is "to work with" the client.

12. Ag and ext personnel need to be the "voice of the client."

Ag and Ext. Ed is:

1. Ag and ext. education contains career development.

2. Ag and ext. education needs to be relevant to the world of work.

3. Ag and ext. education needs to teach hand-on skills.

4. Ag and Extension education is a good conflict resolution tool/process.

5. Ag and ext. education should be concerned about caring for the environment.

6. Need to tie ag ed to environmental ed.

7. Ag ed needs to be community-based.

8. Ag and ext. ed needs to be based on community needs assessment.

9. Needs assessment must include: technical skills, culture, philosophy, spirituality and economics.

10. Need to have a broad based curriculum.

11. Need to form interdisciplinary teams.

12. Ag and ext. education plays a part in multi-disciplinary teams by developing
13. University's first commitment is to the people in the state.
14. Need to help local people understand relevance of International agricultural economy -- global linkages, global economy.
15. Ag and ext. has only a mediocre record at developing international projects.
16. Ag and ext. education has done an excellent job of developing individuals who continue to be good teachers and administrators.

Extension is:

1. Problem-solving extension - built on absolute honesty regarding availability.
2. Extension needs to build trust so farmers know they will get reliable information.
3. Development Support Communication - through good honest communication, trust can be built between stakeholders, therefore eliminate blame and resentment.
4. Development of extension needs to be broad based and multi-disciplinary, including: education, psychology, philosophy, economics, sociology and communication.
5. Need to combine these into a "systems" approach.
6. Ineffective leadership by both development agencies and national governments of developing countries.
7. Extension program development comes out of institutional development which comes out of policy development.
8. Ag development part of a bigger picture which includes credit supplies, research, marketing, transportation, public relations.

Regarding Indigenous Knowledge:

1. Must identify what clients already know, then work to improve that.
2. Extension workers must be able to document what the indigenous knowledge is in terms of:
   a) amount of production
   b) economic impact
   c) socio-cultural impact.
3. Must be able to institutionalize information in order to get it into government policy.
4. Need to take a holistic approach:
   a) know where participants are coming from at level of technology, culture, sociology, psychology, spirituality.
   b) Need to include local people in planning and implementation.
   c) Need to develop programs so that participants take ownership:
      1) gaining self-respect.
      2) accepting failure.
5. Need to build upon indigenous ideas.
6. Need to build linkages between local grassroots organizations and state and national universities.

On Human Rights and Equality:
1. Problem with duality - superiority/inferiority in development business.
2. Lack of diversity tied to traditional culture and religious beliefs.
3. Discrimination based on age and gender experienced at major land-grant university.
4. People with international experience "adjust" more easily to diversity.
5. Profession is pretty much free of gender and race prejudice.
6. Donor countries/agencies talk about democracy but don't treat developing nations democratically.
7. Moral and ethical duty to only bid on projects which have possibility of helping clients.
8. Need for participatory approach.
9. Need to redefine "global" and "international" in an egalitarian way in
which each country has equal status, equal power.

10. Need to be proactive in integrating women and minorities into profession.

11. Need to integrate grad students into power structure.

12. Discipline discriminates against younger people, women and people without Ph.D.s. This short changes international students.

13. New project should start by gathering information with a thorough needs assessment. This assessment needs to correctly represent the philosophy, culture and values of the people it is reflecting upon. As such, it must guard against a western philosophic chauvinism.

Ag and Ext Ed needs to:

1. Change focus from teaching rural people about farming to teaching urban and suburban people about where food comes from.

2. Focus on educating people, not just job training.

3. Difficult to find clear picture of what a good education in International agricultural development would look like.

4. Disciplines of agriculture need to balance technical solutions with socio-cultural solutions.

5. International ag ed needs to mix hard sciences with well developed skills in educational methods and communication.

6. Need to include international career development.

7. Need to develop theory part of education.

8. Ag and ext. education needs better theoretical base.

9. Need to apply theory to specific situation, then create appropriate methods to develop skills.

10. Ag and ext. education needs broad, interdisciplinary base because it deals with
so many issues, i.e., health, sanitation, education, agriculture, sociology.

11. Need to utilize knowledge and information of international graduate students.

12. Need to teach educators to listen to and to teach to needs of individuals.

13. Need to help students understand that agriculture is part of the global economy.


15. Need to pay attention to continuing education of practitioners.

16. Need to teach about extension systems other than land-grant system.
The next list is of comments AIAEE members made concerning the philosophy of that organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>1. The purpose of AIAEE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) is to educate and inform each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) to educate and inform other professionals in the field of international development that the profession has a documented body of knowledge, i.e., teaching and learning theory, research procedures, curriculum development, program planning, and evaluation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) to let others know that this info can be of great assistance to the creation of effective agriculture programs in the developing nations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The original purpose of the AIAEE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) to bring vocational agricultural educators together, along with interested people from other disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) to apply the principles of agricultural education and the land-grant model to agricultural development problems in the developing world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The philosophy (Purpose?) of AIAEE to understand and apply the principles of agricultural education and extension to the development of agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>AIAEE has several purposes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) it is a support group for agricultural educators who are interested in international development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The objectives of the AIAEE are:

1. AIAEE should have three primary objectives for the future.
   a) to educate donor organizations as to the importance of education in international ag and ext. education;
   b) to open up more sources of funding; and
   c) to develop linkages with the developing parts of the world.

The functions of the AIAEE are:

1. The AIAEE has several functions:
   a) to define international agricultural and extension education as an academic discipline.
   b) to be a social organization.
   c) to increase the visibility of the philosophy and methods of international agricultural and extension educators to the international development community.

5. A group whose members share in common:
   a) the desire to see graduate students participating in the organization
   b) the desire to make the world a better place.

6. To generate new policies and approaches to agricultural and extension development.

b) it is a forum where members can exchange information.

c) it helps Americans understand the relationship between international agriculture and domestic agriculture by globalizing the ag education curriculum.

d) it provides a leadership role in international career development.

e) it educates the development community as to the nature and importance of agricultural and extension education in international development.

A group whose members share in common:

a) the desire to see graduate students participating in the organization

b) the desire to make the world a better place.

To generate new policies and approaches to agricultural and extension development.

The objectives of the AIAEE are:

1. AIAEE should have three primary objectives for the future.
   a) to educate donor organizations as to the importance of education in international ag and ext. education;
   b) to open up more sources of funding; and
   c) to develop linkages with the developing parts of the world.

The functions of the AIAEE are:

1. The AIAEE has several functions:
   a) to define international agricultural and extension education as an academic discipline.
   b) to be a social organization.
   c) to increase the visibility of the philosophy and methods of international agricultural and extension educators to the international development community.
d) to make the discipline an acceptable part of international activity.
e) to educate people outside of academia and the profession as to what international agricultural and extension education is all about.
f) to invite representatives from other related professions.
g) to invite representatives from the different donor organizations, i.e., governmental, NGOs, or PVOs, to attend our meetings and meet individual practitioners of the field of study.

2. AIAEE functions:
a) to serve as a social organization where members can come together to share experiences;
b) to provide an opportunity for members to share academic findings concerning new issues and new subjects
c) to provide a forum for presentations and intellectual discussions;
d) to educate the development assistance agencies on the benefits of agricultural and extension education to international development.
e) to explain what agricultural and extension education is, then ask them how we can be of assistance to them - a participatory approach

3. AIAEE’s major function:
a) is as a networking and communications forum and
b) as a way of carrying the message of agricultural and extension education.

4. AIAEE’s functions:
a) to bring people together so they can exchange ideas
AIAEE got started as:

1. AIAEE started as a way for people with a common interest to get together and share information about agricultural education and international development.

2. From the group’s first meetings, members established two things. These were:
   a) that international agricultural and extension education had some important tools to offer the development world.
   b) almost no one in the development community knew anything about the discipline.

3. AIAEE developed as:
   a) a way for agricultural and extension educators to come together regularly to exchange information
   b) a way for agricultural and extension educators to develop a network for future communications.

4. AIAEE has developed a way for ag and ext. educators to exchange information to network for future communications.

AIAEE is:

1. AIAEE as "multi-faceted"

2. AIAEE is a group of members who reflect many opinions re. the nature of international ag and ext. ed. These range from very conservative to very liberal.

3. The organization is important because it strives to communicate the "state of the art" in extension education and development as it is related to the international scene.

4. The organization has always come up with the kind of leadership it needed at a
particular point in its evolution and believes that will continue to happen because the quality of the people already involved is so high.

5. The group has many good ideas about communications and networking.

6. It incorporate indigenous practices and knowledge.

7. Racism and sexism are covert and probably not intentional.

8. The AIAEE is a symbolic community:
   a) members come together to share ideas and views on issues relevant to agricultural and extension education.
   b) the community provides a safe place for graduate students to enter the profession, by giving them a place to present their papers and to "gain some renown."

9. The AIAEE is a big family, in that it has leadership, support, and a common goal.

10. Communication is central to the success of the Association.

11. The organization is doing well these days because it is now publishing a quality newsletter.

AIAEE members are:

1. AIAEE members have a broad education base therefore, they are well suited to coordinate the activities of the larger donor organizations.

2. The original members were "mavericks" and free thinkers, and that it is very important to keep this kind of energy in the organization.

3. AIAEE was started by people who had their hearts in the right place. They had a deep desire to help others.

4. There is a vital need for a group like AIAEE because it is agricultural educators that can help put together teaching
materials to support scientists and teach people in other fields to be better teachers.

5. There is a concern that the organization got off the track. Because ag educators tend to ignore theory, members lack the depth of understanding needed to develop a strong organizational philosophy.

6. AIAEE is composed mostly of professors.

7. The professors are almost exclusively white males, therefore the model contains elements of both racism and sexism.

8. The organizers of the organization are good people.

9. The organizers of the organization have good intentions.

10. Professionals should stick to their professions.

11. We live in a very complex world which does not, in reality, fall into neatly divided "professions."

The strengths and weakness of AIAEE are:

1. The strength of AIAEE:
   a) is that it welcomes everyone;
   b) that it doesn't "differentiate between faculty, Ph.D.s and graduate students"
   c) it sees all of these people as professionals.

2. AIAEE is very warm and open in accepting new members, particularly women and people from the developing countries.

3. Things about AIAEE that stand out:
   a) it is open to almost anyone who is interested in international agricultural and extension education.
   b) it has encouraged the involvement of graduate students.
   c) there are always fresh ideas. Hence, it continues to grow.
d) everybody is talking to everybody else and so we are all influencing one another.

4. The weaknesses of AIAEE:
   a) its members have great difficulty in defining themselves.
   b) its members have great difficulty in presenting a united front.

5. AIAEE furthers the sense of duality.

6. The group is composed of American faculty members with their international graduate students.

7. AIAEE practices a top-down relationships.

8. AIAEE practices hierarchical relationships.

9. Serious difficulties:
   a) lack of representation by graduate students and international members. Although graduate students make up a large part of the membership, they are not equally represented on the Board of Directors or on committees.
   b) the expense of the Journal will prevent poorer people from submitting articles. This goes back to the same problem of not incorporating indigenous knowledge to the group or by the group itself, i.e., in a de facto way, the organization de-legitimizes poorer people.

10. The group has some shortcomings:
    a) age bias - the older and more powerful members of the group treat younger members condescendingly;
    b) there is a hierarchy of power which discriminates against people by age, gender, and nationality.

11. The danger is that people teach in the way they are taught. The concern is that both American students and international students will treat their students in this
dualistic and hierarchical method after they become professionals.

AIAEE needs to:

1. The organization needs to bring in a variety of viewpoints.
2. AIAEE needs to develop an executive-level committee with the power to communicate officially with other development groups in addressing policy matters.
3. AIAEE needs to develop an executive-level committee to develop joint proposals.
4. The group needs to solicit opinions from researchers and practitioners from the developing countries.
5. AIAEE should always remember to encourage its members.
6. AIAEE should always remind members to have patience.
7. There is a tremendous need for women and minorities in agricultural and extension education.
8. Women and minorities need to be directly involved.
9. AIAEE members need to be versed in a wide variety of issues, including family planning.
10. AIAEE needs to make a humanitarian contribution to the world.
11. AIAEE members need to be concerned with the "quality of life" of their clients.
12. The next important steps for AIAEE:
   a) to take stock of itself,
   b) to define who it is and where it is going.
13. We need to take some action:
   a) write our own grant proposals
   b) begin lobbying in Washington to bring about changes in environmental and political policies.
14. AIAEE needs to recruit (make itself appealing to) those that are outside of AIAEE for interdisciplinary teams.
15. Members of AIAEE need to become self-reflective.
16. Members of AIAEE need to situate themselves in a primary philosophical and theoretical base.
17. The group needs to identify where it is at philosophically, so it can know which direction to go in the future.
18. The group needs to attract members from other disciplines.
19. The group needs to participate as members of multi-disciplinary research teams.
20. Teams must also be self-reflective and open to criticism and change.
21. Teams must be open to criticism and change.
22. Members of AIAEE should overcome their nationalistic view that people from other countries should want what Americans have.
23. It is important that we are not predisposed to see situations from a biased point of view.
24. AIAEE needs to do in to recruit (make itself appealing to) those that are outside of AIAEE.
25. AIAEE needs to develop interdisciplinary teams to deal with the gathered information.
26. AIAEE needs to focus on several areas:
   a) defining who we are. This is problematic because the interests of the members are already so diverse that its difficult to get a focus.
   b) recruitment of international people
   c) recruitment of people from other disciplines.
   d) the development of relationships with international development assistance organizations.
   e) the development of a curriculum for international ag and extension education
f) have strong philosophical and theoretical bases

g) cover practical educational skills as they have been developed by the various extension systems.

h) AIAEE must always be willing to change.

27. It needs to market itself to the various funding agencies from the government, private, and NGO sectors.

28. AIAEE should take a greater role in leadership.

29. AIAEE needs to pool its resources or join with other organizations.

30. AIAEE should work towards changing the donor organizations:
   a) so that they are more responsive to the needs of people in developing countries
   b) so they understand the importance of legitimizing indigenous people and their knowledge systems.

31. We need become more proactive:
   a) by defining exactly what we do and
   b) by taking leadership in creating teams of development specialists to improve the record of international development.

32. We need to be good listeners.

33. We need to practice what we preach.

34. It is important to include everyone in our projects - graduate students, women, and minorities.

35. The organization has to make efforts to attract people from outside of academia.

36. The organization has to make efforts to attract people from outside of the traditionally defined discipline of Agricultural Education.

37. The Association should create "affiliate groups" around the world. This would develop a more diverse group of people
who could be involved in leadership and the power structure.

38. AIAEE must strive to built a community which is linked together through those kinds of caring feelings that are inherent in the idea of stewardship.

39. AIAEE must focus on a spiritual concern for the well being of all those that the group comes in contact with.

40. It must take a proactive role in developing creative and imaginative leaders.

41. It must utilize state of the art technologies.

42. It should try to produce sustainable systems for agricultural development.

43. The AIAEE needs to gain an understanding of this point of view, [that people teach how they have been taught] then take a leadership role towards real equality.

44. To do this the group should:
   a) adopt participatory education practices,
   b) have faculty members work with graduated students as team members,
   c) assist in the development of AIAEE affiliate groups in other countries.

45. If the group is not going to take such actions, it should change its name to more accurately reflect the fact that it is primarily an American organization.

46. AIAEE needs to offer a place where members with opposing views on relevant issues can come together for formal-like debates. Paper presentations don't really deal with these problems at a very deep level.

47. Debate, discourse, and open discussions are ways in which members could develop a depth of knowledge.

48. Debate, discourse, and open discussions are a good way to involve and educate the membership.
49. AIAEE needs to study agricultural and extension education from a cross-disciplinary view.
50. AIAEE needs to provide a forum for the discussion and debate of cross-disciplinary views.
51. AIAEE should not take stands concerning specific federal policies.
52. AIAEE should provide forums where information concerning all sides of a policy debate can be presented.
53. Only individual members should voice specific opinions regarding policy, not the Association itself.
54. AIAEE needs to stay on the cutting edge of the adoption curve.
55. Members need to listen and be willing to accept new ideas, even if they don't fully understand or support them.
56. The group has to be willing to take a stand and then defend its position.
57. The group needs to support both the new comers and the old timers.
58. The group needs to spend some time and energy developing an E-mail service:
   a) could be used for committee meetings and
   b) used to list upcoming conferences
   c) used to list job opportunities.
59. Association should raise the annual dues so as to be able to hire better keynote speakers at the annual meetings.
60. AIAEE should not get involved in writing grants.
61. AIAEE is at a crossroad which involves size and structure:
   a) the Association needs to grow in size and status so that it becomes legitimate for people in their struggle for tenure and promotion.
   b) it needs to guard against losing it's "homey" nature and turning into a
group of "vicious, back-biting professionals."

Comments Concerning the Journal

1. The AIAEE Journal because it will legitimate a place to publish in.
2. The Journal needs to be of the highest quality.
3. The Journal needs to appeal to professionals outside of the ag and ext ed discipline.
4. The Journal will create a way for AIAEE to create inter-disciplinary team by recruiting (make itself appealing to) those that are outside of AIAEE.
5. The Journal will be a great asset to AIAEE and to the field of international agricultural development.
6. AIAEE should seek foundation support for disseminating the Journal.
7. The expense of the Journal will prevent poorer people from submitting articles.
8. The status of the group will be tied directly to the quality of the Journal.
9. The Association needs to turn out a high quality journal that covers qualitative and well as quantitative research.
10. The organization needs to guarantee that the Journal is widely distributed.
11. The Journal will attract more quality people to the Association.
12. The Journal should contain information that will help practitioners understand some of the theoretical problems that are being discussed within the discipline.
13. Creating a quality Journal will contribute much to the organization’s success.
Dr. J. R. Smith  
Agricultural Education Department  
State University, USA

Dear Dr. Smith,

We are conducting a research project concerning the meaning of international agricultural and extension education, as it is perceived by professionals in these areas; particularly by members of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education (AIAEE). We would like you to be a participant in this research.

We will be using a qualitative approach in this research project; an in-depth interview technique, which will consist of two interviews of approximately two hours each. The purpose of using this kind of format is to allow you to reflect on those events in your life, which were instrumental in your choosing to become a professional in agriculture and extension education. In a like-manner, we will also look at those events in your life, which led you to become involved in the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education.

Although there is no real hypothesizing in this type of research, we are hoping to identify both the similarities and differences which lead both Americans and people from other countries to become involved in an organization like the AIAEE. We are also interested in your opinion as to the way AIAEE addresses the concerns of women and of people from different cultures and racial groups.

The interview will include questions concerning your perceptions as to the future of both international agricultural and extension education in general, and the AIAEE in particular.

If you choose to participate, we will arrange to do the interviews at your convenience, preferably sometime during this summer (1992). Enclosed is an Informed Consent Agreement, which spells out your role and your rights, as a participant in this study. Please return the consent form by, so that we can arrange for an interview time. We look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Stephen M. Campbell

Robert A. Martin
APPENDIX F - CONSENT FORM

Title: Views of the meaning of international agricultural and extension education by members of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education.

Purpose: To gather in-depth data on members of the AIAEE, who are professionals and/or graduate students in International Agricultural and Extension Education. Data sought will include family of origin information, education and employment history and experience.

Name of Investigator: Stephen M. Campbell
Name of Faculty Supervisor: Robert A. Martin

Name of Participant: ____________________________________________
Address: ______________________________________________________
Phone: _________________________________________________________

The main purpose of this interview is to gather in-depth information on your experiences as an agricultural and/or extension educator, and as a member of the AIAEE. This will include your past and present experiences as a student, employee and professional. I will also be asking questions about your perceptions concerning the future of both international agriculture and extension education, and the AIAEE.

Some of the questions will deal with highly personal behaviors and attitudes. If there is anything you would prefer not to discuss or to discuss at a later time, please let me know. The interviews will take a total of about four hours.

Your participation is completely voluntary and you may decide not to participate at any time. All information will be held in confidence; your name will not be used in any publications or in any public way. I hope you will be willing to answer all the questions, but if there are any you would rather not, just tell me.

I would also like your permission to audiotape the interviews. This helps me keep accurate record of your thoughts and experiences. At any time during the interview, if you do not wish the audiotape to record what you are saying, let me know.

Informed Consent for Research

I have read the description of the research study. I have also talked it over with the researcher to my satisfaction. I understand that my participation is voluntary. I know enough about the purpose, methods, risks and benefits of the research study to give my permission to participate in it.

Name________________________ Date__________________
APPENDIX G - LETTER REGARDING VALIDITY CHECK

Dr. J. R. Smith  
Founders Hall  
State University, USA  

Dear Dr. Smith,  

Greetings! It's been a while since my last communication. Hope all is well with you. Everyone told me qualitative research took a lot of time, but I had no idea exactly how much. Reading and analyzing all of my interviews does seem to be taking forever. However, it is fun and I'm learning a lot about agricultural education, international development and the AIAEE.

The interviews ran from 25 to 50 typewritten pages in length. The real length depended a lot on how much monologue/dialogue there was. I've attempted to reduce these to as short as possible, trying to keep them under ten pages. With seventeen interviews, my dissertation will still be quite lengthy.

I have selected several of the summaries to return to the interviewees, as a way of checking validity. The selection was based on variety, for the most part. I would appreciate it if you would check over the following synopsis with the following things in mind:

1) I have tried to give a brief biographical sketch of each person. Please check what I have written for accuracy of biographical information.

2) Please comment on my interpretation of your philosophy and opinions, as they relate to agricultural education and the AIAEE. I have tried to both carry the meaning of what you were saying and make the text readable. Please note that I do not plan on rewriting much of the work I have done. If I am guilty of grossly misinterpreting the information you gave me in your interview, please let me know so we can deal with it. If you feel different now about a certain item we spoke of, please let me know of that as well, and I will append my writing to say that you now hold a different opinion. If you have any questions, please contact me through Dr. Robert Martin's office. His phone number is (515) 294-0896. Thanks for your cooperation,

Sincerely,

S. Michael Campbell
APPENDIX H - INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Initial Interview

A. Regarding Home life
   1. When and where were you born?
      a. In the city or in a rural area?
      b. In a village or on a farm?
   2. Tell me about your family.
      a. Mother & father -
      b. Grandparents -
      c. Siblings -
      d. Aunts and uncles -
      e. Other important people in your home -
   3. Can you describe the home in which you were born, or where you lived as an infant?
   4. What kind of work did your father do?
   5. What kind of work did your mother do?
   6. Did you spend much time with your grandparents?
   7. Did you spend much time with other elders?
   8. How much time did you spend "in an agricultural setting?"
   9. What is your favorite childhood memory?
  10. What is your least favorite childhood memory, that you feel comfortable talking with me about?

B. Regarding early school years.
   1. What is your first remembrance of school?
   2. Who was your favorite teacher? Why?
   3. Who was your least favorite teacher? Why?
   4. When did you first get involved with an agricultural or extension education function? Explain?
   5. Discuss your middle school experiences.
   6. Discuss your high school experiences.
   7. Were you involved in vocational agriculture projects or classes in high school?
   8. Did your serve as an officer in school or in any vocational agriculture situations?

C. Regarding high school.
   1. Did you have any kind of a mentor while in high school?
   2. What did you do after you got how of high school?
   3. When and why did you decide to study agricultural and extension education?

D. Regarding early work experience.
   1. If you worked, what kind of work did you do?
2. How did you like your job?
3. How did you get along well with your fellow workers?
4. How did you get along with your supervisors?

E. Regarding early married home life.
1. Were you married? Did you have children?
2. Did you have many responsibilities at home?
3. Did your home life influence your decision about what you were doing with your life?

F. Regarding early college experiences.
1. When did you first go to college or university? Where?
2. Can you explain why you picked this school?
3. Did you go straight through to get your degree? Explain.
4. Describe the course of study that you followed.
5. Can you describe why you followed this course?
6. What were the benefits of following this course?
7. What were the shortcomings in following this course?
8. What was the best class you took? Why?
9. What was the worst class you took? Why?
10. Who was your favorite instructor? Why?
11. Who was your least favorite instructor? Why?
12. How would you best describe you undergraduate experience? Explain?
13. Relate your undergraduate experiences to your decision to be involved in agricultural and extension education.
14. Relate your work experiences to you decision to be involved in agricultural and extension education.

Second interview

A. Concerning current work.
1. If you are currently in graduate school, what were you doing before you left home?
2. If you are currently in graduate school, what will you be doing when you return home?
3. Are you currently employed in the field of international agricultural and extension education?
4. Explain your current job.
5. For how long have you been working in this field?

B. Concerning career objectives.
1. As an agricultural and/or extension educator, do you have any specific career objectives?
2. What parts of graduate school were most valuable in helping you meet your career objectives?
3. What parts were least helpful?
C. Concerning social issues having to do with class, race and gender.
1. Do you think/feel that class, race and gender are important issues to look at in terms of international agriculture and extension education?
2. Have you personally experienced discrimination in terms of race, class or gender? Explain.
3. How important is it for AIAEE to examine issues relating to race, class and gender? Explain.

D. Concerning reflections on the future direction of international agricultural and extension education as a field of study.
1. Please explain where you think this field of study is going. Why?
2. Please explain how you see yourself as a change agent in the field of study moving in this direction.
3. Please explain what you think the future holds in store for the AIAEE. Why?
4. Please explain how you see yourself as a change agent in AIAEE taking this direction.
5. How do these two relate?