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INTRODUCTION

During the 48th Annual Professional Agricultural Workers Conference (PAWC) in December 1990, Jim Hildreth of the Farm Foundation and Doss Brodnax of the Southern Rural Development Center (SRDC) met with members of the PAWC planning committee to discuss the role of the social sciences at the 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University. Thus began a year-long commitment by Farm Foundation, SRDC, and Tuskegee University to host a pre-conference activity of the 1991 PAWC to address this issue in detail.

Discussion of the role of the social sciences in agricultural research at the national level has already been initiated under the direction of Glenn Johnson and James Bonnen under the aegis of the Social Science Agricultural Agenda Project (SSAAP). The concept of the approach of the meeting at Tuskegee was therefore regional and 1890 land-grant directed. The focus on the Southern region and the 1890 institutions was considered important due to:

1. The historical mandate and ties of the 1890s to minority and disadvantaged citizens;
2. The location of the 1890s in rural areas;
3. The lack of support and funding for social science research at the 1890s; and
4. The more recent establishment of graduate-level social science programs, particularly agricultural economics, at the 1890s.

Entitled Strengthening Social Research at 1890 Institutions and Tuskegee University, the pre-conference program was designed, and is presented in these proceedings, with two functions in mind. The first function is that of information sharing. Prefaced by Johnson's overview of the SSAAP and how its principles can be applied to the Southern region and the 1890s, presentations by Christy and Shuford examine the strengths and weaknesses of social science research as well as current program efforts at the 1890s. For Christy, in particular, socio-economic characteristics and trends in higher education, limited resource farmers, and the non-farm rural economy, suggest fundamental challenges and opportunities for social science at the 1890s; and he says that the future of social science at these institutions lies in the ability to address the needs of people, especially the disadvantaged, more effectively than at alternative institutions. Hill concludes this first section with a "call to arms." That is, social science research has a unique role to play in linking the land-grant system to its rural community base. And, importantly, this comes at a time when the land-grants are being charged to take on a greater role in terms of off-campus programming and service to rural clientele groups.

In disciplinary terms, presentations by Wimberley and Oliver highlight the fact Rural Sociology, as a profession, has a significant role to play in addressing the challenges facing rural America. At the same time, the challenge of adequate funding for social science research cannot be overlooked. In interdisciplinary terms, Maretzki proposes that the goals of social science research can be enhanced by linking with other departments, such as Nutrition and Home Economics, and with other institutions, via grants.

The concept of linkages is examined in detail by Molnar and Smith and Reichelderfer. Molnar proposes that linkages between 1890 and 1862 land-grants can further the research and rural development goals of both institutions; while Smith and Reichelderfer highlight the benefits of linking with the USDA, particularly in the areas of student support, internships, research, and employment opportunities.
The second function of this pre-conference was to provide a forum where participants could work together and brainstorm on how social science research could help fulfill the land-grant mandates of teaching, research and extension/service to the community. The results of the three working groups that are presented in the last section of these proceedings provide an insight into the concerns and promise of social science research at the 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University.

The editors

Acknowledgement:

The program committee members at Tuskegee University want to acknowledge the generous technical and financial support of the Farm Foundation, Southern Rural Development Center, and USDA/ERS for making this pre-conference activity possible.
PART I

Social Science Research at 1890 Institutions and Tuskegee University

Section A

Current Status
AGENDAS AND STRATEGIES
FOR RURAL SOUTHEASTERN AMERICA

Glenn Johnson
Professor of Agricultural Economics
Michigan State University

INTRODUCTION

On the day of the shuttle disaster, the Social Science Agricultural Agenda Project (SSAAP) started its work. As a member of SSAAP's advisory board, T. T. Williams played an important role in determining the work of SSAAP since then. Home economists, rural sociologists, agricultural economists, agricultural historians, and such basic social science disciplinarians as sociologists, economists, political scientists, historians, geographers, and anthropologists have contributed along with technical agriculturalists and rural leaders as well as administrators from the private and public sectors and academia. In all, over 400 social scientists, agriculturalists, and rural leaders have contributed to its work since that date. There has been a substantial emphasis on disadvantaged farm and nonfarm rural groups including African-, Hispanic-, Native-, and Caucasian-Americans, all of whom have been represented by participating social science scholars and others.

SSAAP has been supported by agencies and organizations both within and outside of the so-called "agricultural establishment." Such dispersed support means that SSAAP's conclusions are independent of and uncensored by clearance through any supporting organization.

At the Professional Agricultural Workers Conference (PAWC) meeting in December of 1988, I described the work SSAAP was then planning—here, I first present an overview of what SSAAP has done and then concentrate on what SSAAP has done with respect to the disadvantaged farm and nonfarm groups of the Southeast. I focus on the Southeast because PAWC's concerns tend to center on this region. This should not be taken to indicate that SSAAP regards disadvantaged farm and nonfarm groups to be a unique problem of the Southeast; indeed, they are found nationwide and, for that matter, worldwide.

BROAD CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE INSTITUTIONS
OF THE AGRICULTURAL ESTABLISHMENT (AE)

Overall, SSAAP has concluded that our agricultural and rural institutions and particularly those of our 1862 land-grants:

- Neglect human development and needed changes in rural institutions, organizations, institutional facilities, and programs and policies while giving inadequate attention to rural resources including pollution and contamination problems. This neglect truly shortchanges the disadvantaged farm and nonfarm rural African-American and Caucasian-American groups of the Southeast where PAWC exerts its greatest influence.

- Should continue to work on new technology. Despite a present disproportionate emphasis on technology, new technology is required that is adapted to the needs of disadvantaged farmers and other rural residents of the Southeast.
• Should place greater emphasis on multidisciplinary practical problems and issues and reduce present overemphasis on specialized academic disciplinary efforts but without neglecting them.

• Should place greater emphasis on values and agro-ethics in order to be more effective in solving practical problems and addressing practical issues.

• Should reorient themselves philosophically to permit an eclectic use of different philosophies of science and a wider range of approaches to the study of values and ethical issues. There is a need to use both experience and logic in the objective pursuit of value knowledge for forging prescriptions to solve practical problems and resolve current critical issues.

SSAAP did not conclude that issue-oriented problem-solving work involving human development, institutional improvements, and resources (and the environment) should be expanded at the expense of either:

• Technical advances for production agriculture or

• Relevant disciplinary research in the basic physical and social sciences needed to address farm and rural problems and issues.

Financing Social Science Work

SSAAP’s leadership fears that support for technical advances and basic disciplinary work essential for production agriculture will be lost if presently neglected practical issues and problems are not addressed, such as those involving rural poverty, health care, resource sustainability, disadvantaged farm and rural minorities, gender inequality, teenage pregnancy, the rural aged, substance abuse, and the like.

Part of the financial difficulties now being experienced by our agricultural institutions in financing basic research and work on new technologies for production agriculture arises from the tendency of those concerned with rural societal problems and issues, such as those noted above, to regard our agricultural institutions and "production agriculture" collectively as "the enemy." Consequently, it is folly to conclude that work on these broader societal issues of our farm and rural societies cannot be financed because support for technological work for production agriculture is now being lost—such a conclusion confuses effect with cause; it puts the cart before the horse. Support for continued technological work for production agriculture in our rural institutions now depends on our willingness to address the problems and issues of concern to potential new supporters and clientele groups who now increasingly regard us as road blocks rather than as servants and facilitators. To be effective in addressing the broader societal problems and issues of farm people and rural society, we need multidisciplinary partnerships that focus on such problems and issues.

Correcting the shortcomings in our agricultural institutions that SSAAP has identified need not be expensive since:

• Mobilizing the will to reorient and execute the needed changes requires few resources.

• Multidisciplinary team approaches to practical farm and rural problems and issues would use our present resources more effectively than does the unbalanced, fragmented disciplinary approach now followed.

• Success in addressing practical problems and issues can be expected to increase available funding for both:
— Practical problem-solving and issue-oriented work; and

— The basic disciplinary research deemed to be important and relevant for practical problem-solving and issue-oriented work to assist agriculture, rural societies, and consumers.

What SSAAP Has Produced

SSAAP's primary product is a book entitled *Social Science Agricultural Agendas and Strategies.* The book's 600-plus pages are divided into five separately indexed parts and 10 sections (one for each of 10 agendas listed below). Each section contains a literature review chapter, specially commissioned papers if deemed necessary to supplement existing literature, occasional reprints of useful "phantom" literature, and a chapter presenting SSAAP's detailed agendas for the area. This paper references pages in the book that elaborate on subjects considered briefly herein. Each part of the book has a separate index; and there is an 18-page table of contents to help the reader locate topics of interest and important contributors to rural social science thought.

SSAAP's Agendas Are Not Priorities

To help facilitate the needed reorientations and reorganizations of our agricultural and rural institutions, SSAAP has developed 10 different agendas. These agendas indicate areas in which the rural and basic social sciences can contribute to partnership efforts involving the technical agricultural sciences and the basic biological and physical sciences. It is stressed that SSAAP does not perceive its agendas to be priorities. When one focuses more on practical problems and issues and less on basic disciplinary work, priorities necessarily become specific to localities, times, and situations. Therefore, priorities are best set locality by locality, agency by agency, state by state, firm by firm, household by household, university by university, and agribusiness by agribusiness rather than by a national organization. This is particularly true for the practical local and rural development problems of concern to the professional agricultural workers participating in this conference.

AN OVERALL VIEW OF SSAAP'S TEN AGENDAS

• SSAAP has two agendas for the more traditional kinds of work done to serve:
  — U.S. farmers, farm families, agribusinesses, and consumers, and
  — These same groups in Third World countries.

• There are also four agendas to help:
  — Improve farm and rural institutions—rules of the game, organizations programs and policies, and institutional facilities;
  — Develop the capabilities of farm and rural people;
  — Enhance natural and manmade resources; and
  — Develop technologies.

• SSAAP supports the above six practical agendas with four agendas to improve:
  — Data and information bases;
— Theories and fundamental measurements from the basic social science disciplines;
— The handling of ethics and values and issues involving the philosophy of science; and
— Administration and funding.

STRATEGIC CHALLENGES

SSAAP has also developed strategic challenges for both administrators and social scientists to carry on the reorientations and reorganizations necessary to involve social scientists effectively in partnership efforts to serve rural America.

In Figure 1, administrators and social scientists are challenged by SSAAP to:

- Coordinate three kinds of work—problem-solving, subject-matter, and disciplinary;

- Attain balanced improvement in four sources of progress—institutional improvements, human development, resource enhancement, and technical improvements; and

- Serve four important clientele groups—farmers and farm families, consumers, agribusinesses, and rural societies and nonfarm rural groups through research, teaching, extension, international work, advising, administration, consulting, entrepreneurship, government, and work in rural and farm organizations. In short, all of the ways in which agriculturalists and rural workers serve farm and rural societies in the public and private sectors are included.

DETAILED SSAAP AGENDAS RELEVANT FOR SOUTHEASTERN DISADVANTAGED FARM AND NONFARM RURAL GROUPS

The title of this preconference is "Strengthening Social Science Research at 1890 Institutions" while the main conference is entitled "New Directions in Local and Rural Development." Here, I present detailed agenda items from SSAAP's publications that are particularly relevant for professional social science workers addressing local and rural development problems of disadvantaged farm and nonfarm groups. Further, I concentrate on agenda details geographically relevant to the Southeast and for disadvantaged African- and Caucasian-American groups therein with only incidental attention to Native- and Hispanic-American groups. This paper concentrates on detailed agenda items relevant for both poor Whites and Blacks in the Southeast while recognizing that a higher proportion of Blacks than Whites are disadvantaged even if disadvantaged Whites outnumber disadvantaged rural Blacks nationwide.

SSAAP's agendas are for extension, resident instruction, administration, and governmental and private-sector work as well as research. The 1890 institutions have a practical concern with problems and issues. At the practical end of the spectrum, agendas for research are nearly the same as for the other kinds of work. At that end, we differentiate less sharply between research and other work of social scientists.
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Relevant Agenda Items Pertaining to Domestic Farmers, Agribusinesses, and Consumers

The section of SSAAP's book containing these agenda items has a literature review chapter (pp. II 3-14) with special subsections on small farms, farm management, and home management. There is also a chapter on household studies by Cornelia Butler Flora (pp. II 31-37), another by Wava Haney on women in agriculture (pp. II 38-43), and still another on home economics and human ecology by Margaret Bubolz and M. Suzanne Sontag (pp. II 44-51).

Among the relevant detailed agendas are the following:

- The ongoing bimodalization of farm sizes makes it important to address the highly interrelated business and home management aspects of the small farms common among disadvantaged small and part-time Southeastern farmers. Farm management and home economics are inseparably interrelated on such farms.

- The globalization of agriculture, trade, and finances has profound potential impacts on disadvantaged rural groups both farm and nonfarm. These impacts demand attention of social scientists in our 1890 and 1860 land-grant institutions.

- Work is needed on the structure of our agribusinesses that are not well suited to provide input and product marketing sources for disadvantaged farmers.

- Several of SSAAP's detailed agenda items pertaining to homes, families, food, and nutrition are relevant for disadvantaged rural groups. One of the best sets of such agendas in SSAAP's book is found on pp. IV 72 in a very practical part of a set of specialized agendas for applied basic social science work.

- After a national SSAAP conference in Houston, SSAAP's editorial group developed additional agenda items on:
  - Food consumption and nutrition relevant for the rural disadvantaged; and
  - Needed redistributions of power and resource ownership to benefit disadvantaged rural groups.

Detailed Agendas for International Work

SSAAP's agendas in this area (pp. II 154-159) are relevant for disadvantaged U.S. rural groups to the extent that:

- Experiences in assisting the rural disadvantaged overseas are useful domestically.

- Overseas work is useful in seeing the impacts of the globalization of agricultural and financial markets on disadvantaged rural domestic groups.

- Rural social scientists in both 1862 and 1890 agricultural institutions also have important contributions to make to farmers, rural communities, and consumers of Third World developing countries which, if made by them, would strengthen our own domestic work.
Detailed Agenda Items Concerning Institutional Changes Relevant for the Development of Disadvantaged Rural Areas

SSAAP is concerned with four driving forces for rural development. Institutional improvement is one of the four. The other three are human development, enhancement of natural and manmade resources, and technical advance. Historically, we have devised and are now continually modifying specific institutions to promote the last three; thus institutional change cuts across them all. But such crosscutting is not unique to institutional change because all of the four forces are individually necessary but insufficient for progress. Improved human capability is required to benefit from the other three. The same is true of resources. Broadly defined, technical advance is also necessary to enhance resources, use human capability, and manage institutions.

Institutional changes are now badly neglected by both the 1862 and the 1890 land-grant agricultural institutions. Thus, in a broad sense, SSAAP’s detailed institutional agendas for disadvantaged rural groups are similar to those for advantaged groups except that the deficiencies, needs, and neglect of institutions are even greater for our disadvantaged than for our advantaged rural groups (see pp. III 48-54 of SSAAP’s book):

- Data and information bases for rural communities and disadvantaged groups need major improvement.
- We need better knowledge of the rapid changes taking place in our disadvantaged rural areas in order to define and attack currently relevant issues.
- Local and state policies, organizations, programs, and facilities need assessment, analysis, and redesign to help disadvantaged groups become more capable and independently self-sustaining.
- Work is particularly needed on the fiscal operations and effectiveness of local governments serving disadvantaged groups.
- Group and local government decision making needs to be improved particularly with respect to knowledge of values and of how to handle ethical issues with respect to disadvantaged groups.

In recent years, social scientists concerned with institutional changes have made substantial, fundamental, conceptual, and theoretical progress in an area variously referred to as “constitutional economics,” “transaction costs,” and “public choice.” Political scientists, historians, economists, students of business and public administration, resource analysts, and sociologists have contributed. Three Nobel laureates for economics (Simons, Buchanan, and Coase) have been awarded for fundamental work in this area. This approach is germane to all persons attempting to improve institutional services to disadvantaged farmers, rural societies, and consumers. Persons desiring a summary of developments and promising prospects in this area will find help in the introduction to Part III and in the literature review and final chapters of Secs. 1 and 2, Part II; Secs. 1 through 4, Part III; and Secs. 2 and 3, Part IV of SSAAP’s book. The approach is relevant for improving our institutions for enhancing natural and manmade resources, for generating new technologies and for developing human capital. The American Agricultural Economics Association sponsored a half-day “learning session” on this approach at its Manhattan meeting last summer (1991) to help its membership catch up on this approach. SSAAP judges this approach to be so effective and promising that social scientists in both 1862 and 1890 institutions should get "up to speed" on it.
Detailed Agenda Items Pertaining to the Development of Southern Disadvantaged Rural Farm and Nonfarm People

Initially, SSAAP, like the agricultural establishments that spawned it, underemphasized the importance of improving human beings with educational and training investments. Booker T. Washington would not have made this mistake. Neither would the founders of Berea College in Kentucky that has served disadvantaged Caucasian-Americans from Appalachia. Though SSAAP had a background paper on human capital by Wallace Huffman (pp. III 61-67), it was people like T. T. Williams, Ralph Christy, Adela de la Torres, Refugio Rochin, Peggy Ross, and several 1890 leaders who prompted SSAAP to remedy its own neglect of human development by commissioning additional papers after the Houston conference on disadvantaged Hispanic-, Native-, and Caucasian-Americans. SSAAP also republished Clifton Wharton's outstanding paper on "Education and Tomorrow's Work Force" (pp. III 68-71) and commissioned a special paper on rural health (pp. III 109-121). Participants at this preconference are urged to consult these papers in Part III (pp. III 55-121) as well as the literature review chapters of Sec. 2, Part III, of SSAAP's book. SSAAP's human development agendas are found on pp. III 122-5. Human development is badly neglected by the agricultural establishment nationwide. The neglect is not confined to disadvantaged groups in the South. Although the detailed human development agendas presented here are for both 1862 and 1890 institutions as well as other higher educational institutions and K-12 schools serving the disadvantaged, educational investments also lag for the advantaged rural groups. Wharton's paper makes it clear that we are in national difficulties that go beyond rural versus urban areas or disadvantaged rural people versus commercial farmers and advantaged rural residents.

SSAAP's detailed human development agendas that are particularly relevant for the disadvantaged African- and Caucasian-Americans of the South include:

- Establishment of close participatory iteration between educational leaders and social scientists, on one hand, and the members and leaders of disadvantaged groups on the other.

- More multidisciplinary work on the educational and related problems and issues important for disadvantaged rural people.

- Making redistributive investments in the human capability of the disadvantaged.

- Improved data and information bases concerning local educational facilities and the disadvantaged clientele they serve.

- Special agenda items were developed for disadvantaged rural Caucasian-Americans (the largest disadvantaged group in rural America). Attention should be devoted to their poor elderly, children in poverty stricken families, inadequate schools in poor communities, disillusionment, drug abuse, malnutrition, teen-age pregnancy, and credit and other help for small-scale farm and nonfarm businesses (see p. III 123-124).

- Special agenda items for disadvantaged African-Americans—here needs for social science input are probably more acute here but are so similar to those just listed for disadvantaged Caucasian-Americans that the list is not repeated (see pp. III 123). Even more than for disadvantaged Caucasian-Americans, the need is for redistributive assistance because African-Americans still remain deprived of social rights and privileges enjoyed by otherwise disadvantaged Caucasian-American groups. Both groups need redistributive investments in their human capabilities, other income-producing resources, and technology in order to establish their independence and dignity.
Detailed supporting agendas for the disadvantaged follow later in this paper with respect to the other two driving forces: natural and manmade resources, and technology.

Detailed Agenda Items With Respect to Natural and Manmade Resources of Southern Disadvantaged Farm and Nonfarm Rural Groups

For the most part, SSAAP's resource agendas deal with the resource problems and issues of all agriculture and rural areas—with the evaluation, assessment and utilization of resources; with markets for resource commodities, waste disposal, pollutants, and food-chain contamination, public and private resource decisions; and with the importance of further developing and using the public choice/transaction cost (PC/TC) approach in solving resource problems and in resolving resource issues. Both advantaged and disadvantaged groups are to be served by such agendas. What SSAAP did not address at all adequately was redistributive agendas to give disadvantaged people ownership of enough income-earning natural and/or manmade resources to be combined with their skilled and unskilled human capacity (human capital) to earn enough income to overcome their disadvantages. At this point, attention is called to:

- SSAAP's general resource agendas to be found on pp. III 167-171.
- A chapter by Christy, pp. III 102-108; two chapters on data and information needs by Swanson (pp. III 45-47) and Deavers (pp. IV 13-27); and, again, Wharton's chapter (pp. III 68-71).
- The sections of SSAAP's book that deal with how social scientists can contribute to the making of redistributive choices and decisions to assist disadvantaged farm and nonfarm rural groups include:
  - McClennen's chapter and especially its section on equality (pp. IV 45-46).
  - P. IV 76 on economics.
  - Pp. IV 77-78 on philosophy.
  - P. IV 78 on political science.
  - Those of parts of pp. IV 101-102 germane to making redistributive choices and decisions.

The above implies that SSAAP's resource agendas are inadequate for the redistributive choices and decisions required to assist the disadvantaged. This implies major unstated agenda items of improving social science capacity to contribute to such efforts and then the making of such contributions.

Detailed Agenda Items to Improve Technologies for the Rural Disadvantaged

SSAAP's agendas about technology, like its agendas for resource enhancement, are general and not well focused on the rural disadvantaged. Despite the fact that the 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions of our agricultural establishment are disproportionately technocratic, further technological advances will be required in the decades ahead for both commercial production agriculture and agribusinesses, on one hand, and the rural disadvantaged on the other. SSAAP's agendas deal with how the social sciences can contribute to appropriate technical advances in partnership efforts with technical scientists to:

- improve our technology-generating institutions, in order to
- handle the ethical aspects of making decisions on technical advances, and
- for purposes of this preconference, we should remember that Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver would have sought technical advances to help the disadvantaged. High on the rural social science agenda are efforts to determine what kinds of technical advances are
needed by the disadvantaged people of the rural Southeast in this increasingly interrelated, globalized, and competitive world.

**Detailed SSAAP Agendas About Databases and Information Systems Pertaining to Disadvantaged Rural Groups**

Databases and information agendas are one of SSAAP’s three agendas that cut across the six agendas presented above. The other two crosscutting agendas deal with (1) the basic social sciences and (2) agro-ethics and philosophic orientations. These three crosscutting agendas are indirectly important for problem-solving and issue-oriented work to assist disadvantaged rural people.

Bonnen (pp. IV 4-12) and Deavers (pp. IV 13-27) are concerned about reduced support for our databases and for the obsolescence of our data and information bases relative to the changing problems and issues experienced by our rural societies. Deavers’ chapter indicates that database and information systems inadequacies and obsolescence are probably more acute for rural socio-economic infrastructure and demography than for any other part of our rural system. Louis Swanson (pp. III 45-47) concurs. Remedying data and informational deficiencies for assisting disadvantaged farm and nonfarm people in the South would be greatly facilitated if the entire data and information system were improved and updated.

- SSAAP has presented detailed agendas for overall improvement of our rural data and informational systems that are to be found on pp. IV 28-32 of its book.

- Detailed database agendas were developed and presented in the sections of the SSAAP book on: (1) community development (see pp. IV 28) under the leadership of David Brown, a sociologist and associate experiment station director at Cornell; and (2) human development(see p. III 123) under the leadership of T. T. Williams who is now Regional Director of Health and Human Services in Atlanta.

---

Brown’s group listed detailed agendas to improve data and information on:

- Local economic structures.
- Industrial restructuring.
- Populations and human capital in rural communities.
- Structures of food and fiber sectors in rural communities.
- Technical changes of local consequence.
- Socio-economic structures of rural communities.

---

T. T. Williams’ group focused on the strong need "to enhance our knowledge and understanding of disadvantaged rural individuals and groups." Their agenda items included:

---

Monitoring rural poverty and changes in the status of rural communities, and

---

Helping to establish a national rural and agricultural statistical service to develop an integrated rural database and information system covering populations and human resources, natural resources, community and social services, physical infrastructure, technology and social structure.
It should be stressed that the need for data and information about rural communities and people is not confined to those interested in helping our disadvantaged. And it is not just a concern for the 1890 institutions. It pertains to both Caucasian- and African-American rural communities and societies and to disadvantaged as well as disadvantaged communities and societies.

**Detailed SSAAP Agendas for the Basic Social Sciences That Are Germane to Disadvantaged Rural Groups**

Rural social scientists working on practical problems and issues depend on underlying basic social sciences such as sociology, economics, anthropology, history, political science, and the like. This is especially true when they are working on problems of disadvantaged groups because: (1) solutions to such problems are redistributive while the basic social sciences are deficient theoretically and conceptually as well as in the measurement of welfare needed for researching redistributive solutions to such problems; and (2) the multidisciplinarity of practical problems and issues makes it necessary to use various combinations of basic social and other sciences and disciplines in researching such problems.

Among SSAAP’s detailed agendas for the basic social sciences that are relevant for assisting the rural disadvantaged are:

- **Applied disciplinary agendas outlining what the individual basic social sciences can do.** These agendas are to be found on pp. IV 70-75 of SSAAP’s book where they are listed under subheadings for each basic or auxiliary social science discipline. The practical multidisciplinary problems and issues targeted in these specialized applied disciplinary agendas are often duplicated across disciplines which should be expected when different disciplines are applied to the same problem or issue. In many instances, the applied disciplinary agendas also duplicate work done in the different, more multidisciplinary, rural social sciences. SSAAP’s disciplinary agendas include: processes of change, comparative farm structure studies, culture of agricultural research, biological anthropology, measures of economic development, decision making, flows of farm commodities in markets at all levels, geographic differences in land use, geographic effects of changing comparative advantage, history of agricultural institution, history of federal and state agricultural science policies, philosophic work on values and goals, political linkages and agricultural policies, roles of political variables in revitalizing agricultural institutions, community and institutional viability, resource stewardship, social equity, and cultural diversity.

- **Agendas to remedy theoretical and empirical deficiencies of the basic social science disciplines that constrain problem-solving and issue-oriented work of the rural social sciences -- these are also arranged under disciplinary subheadings.** In general, these agendas do not tend to duplicate multidisciplinary rural social science work on practical problems and issues. They have to do with:
  - Developing better theories for incorporating a discipline’s variables into multidisciplinary analyses of practical problems and issues.
  - Increasing the interpersonal validity of welfare measures for use in making redistributive decisions to solve the problems of disadvantaged rural groups.
  - Extending and further developing the public choice/transaction cost/constitutional analyses of institutional changes of the type needed to assist disadvantaged rural groups.
Detailed Agro-Ethics and Philosophic Agendas Important for Working With Disadvantaged Rural Groups

In SSAAP’s book, there is an extensive literature review chapter (pp. IV 80-92) and a chapter by the philosopher Paul Thompson from Texas A and M University (pp. IV 93-99) that support the agendas developed for this area. Detailed agendas germane to working with disadvantaged rural groups include:

- Establishment of programs on ethical and value issues in agricultural establishment institutes. In the Southeast, important ethical and value issues include those for disadvantaged African- and Caucasian-American rural groups. Both 1862 and 1890 institutions need such programs for teaching, research, and extension.

- Increased capacity to work with both intrinsic and extrinsic values, the latter nonmonetary as well as monetary.

- The use of both experience and logic in generating knowledge of values needed to solve problems and resolve issues that concern disadvantaged rural groups.

- Exploration into whether and how the extensions and expansions of the PC/TC approach suggested in Part III, Sec. 1, Chapter 1, can be built into multidisciplinary, philosophically and technically general, iterative/interactive participative analyses to define and seek evolving, changing optima for improving the public and private institutions that serve rural disadvantaged people.

Needed Research and Strategies Pertaining to Administration and Funding:

- Part V of SSAAP’s book deals with needed research and strategies to help our agricultural establishment institutions correct their imbalances and shortcomings vis-a-vis the social sciences that are listed at the beginning of this paper. If the 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions and other agricultural institutions are to successfully address the problems and issues important for the South’s disadvantaged rural Whites and Blacks, they must change administratively and financially. Seven SSAAP chapters (pp. V 3-52) by administrators and leaders consider research needed on funding and administration and strategies as well. Chapter 8, Part V, presents the administrative research agendas and strategies that were developed by administrators and others participating in SSAAP’s Houston conference (pp. V 55-60) and by SSAAP’s editorial group (pp. V 60-61) after the Houston meeting.

- The research agendas and strategies of Part V are crucial to making our agricultural establishment institutions more responsive to the human and societal needs of all of our rural and farm people including the disadvantaged of our rural Southeast (pp. V 53-63), but do not divide easily into those germane and not germane for helping the disadvantaged. Southeastern 1862 and 1890 administrators and social scientists are urged, therefore, to examine those pages in their entirety for help in seeing what is needed to be more responsive to the problems and issues facing rural communities and people, both farm and nonfarm, and disadvantaged as well as advantaged.

Challenges are extended to both administrators and social scientists (pp. V 66)

- Specific Challenges for Administrators: Administrators are challenged (pp. V 66-67) to:
— Develop administrative flexibility to work on the problems and issues of rural societies and agriculture.

— Recognize that administrative needs increase as an administrative unit's problem-solving and subject-matter efforts increase relative to its disciplinary work.

— Use entrepreneurially inclined professionals to define problems and issues, develop projects and programs, mobilize resources, and conduct short-term multidisciplinary problem-solving and subject-matter efforts.

— Increase budget flexibility for pursuing critical new problem-solving and subject-matter initiatives by:
  
  • aggressively seeking "soft money" for current problems and issues,

  • using proportionately more short-term contractual, nontenured professionals and,

  • even withholding some percentage of a unit's "hard money" to be "earned" by those in the unit who are willing to address new, critical, multidisciplinary problems and subjects.

— Increase planning for research, resident instruction, extension, and public service, with stress on important current practical problems and issues, while leaving finance to follow rather than to determine plans of work.

— Require the training of new and the retraining of some existing administrators and "working professionals" to make them more aware of the:

  • Important differences between disciplinary and multidisciplinary problem-solving and subject-matter work.

  • Great differences in needs, characteristics, and relevant capabilities of the various disciplines, applied fields, and units for which they are responsible. This includes recognizing the important differences that exist between the needs of rural social scientists and those of the technical biological and physical agricultural scientists for office space, assistants, computers, secretaries, etc.

— Rethink, reorganize, and rebalance administrative processes so that the priorities coming to the fore are based on careful consideration of not only the biological and physical but also the social science dimensions of problems and issues. This requires that social scientists be routinely involved in the planning and execution of problem-solving and subject matter programs and projects.

— Establish advisory groups of qualified rural and basic disciplinary social scientists so that they can:

  • Make appropriate contributions to multidisciplinary problem-solving and subject-matter efforts while, a the same time,
• Bring about the needed advances in their basic social science disciplines.

— Restore and increase promotion, salary adjustment, and recognition credit for problem-solving and subject-matter work in agricultural experiment stations, extension services, and other agencies by recognizing that such work can be of high quality and reflect scholarly objectivity and excellence.

— Develop closer research, teaching, extension, and other linkages between: (1) the rural and basic social sciences and (2) the basic and agricultural biological and physical sciences.

— Address the problems and issues of disadvantaged rural farm and nonfarm African- and Caucasian-Americans in the Southeast, and to develop closer linkages for cooperation are needed between:

• Land-grant universities within regions.

• The 1862 and 1890 land-grant universities in each state.

• Rural social science departments with biological and physical agricultural science departments, on one hand, and disadvantaged groups facing their problems and issues, on the other.

• Rural social science associations and the national, state, and local policy- and priority-setting organs of the USDA/land-grant system.

— Recognize the importance and value of problem-solving and subject-matter work for the many different clienteles of our agricultural institutions.

— Facilitate contributions of basic social science disciplinarians to:

• The multidisciplinary problem-solving and subject-matter work of our agricultural and rural institutions.

• Overcoming the deficiencies of their disciplines for the problem-solving and subject-matter work of our agricultural institutions.

— Press for funding of:

• Work on the social science dimensions of the multidisciplinary subjects and problems of our disadvantaged rural people and groups.

• Competitive grants for the basic social science disciplines to help them overcome the disciplinary deficiencies that now constrain our work on practical multidisciplinary farm and rural problems and issues.

— Endeavor to broaden their own philosophic orientations and those of their administrators to facilitate work with values.
Specific Challenges for Social Scientists: Social scientists are challenged to:

- Serve as "entrepreneurs" in developing problem-solving and subject-matter work in such presently neglected areas as assistance to disadvantaged farm and nonfarm rural groups.

NOTES


3. A copy of this book has been made available to each preconference attendee. The book is available to others from Michigan State University Press, 1405 S. Harrison Rd., 25 Manly Miles Bldg., East Lansing, MI 48823–5202; FAX 1-800-678-2120; for $20.00 plus $5.00 handling. Visa and Mastercard charges are accepted. A 25-page executive summary and a public relations document were also written -- copies of them and of this paper are being distributed to all participants of the PAWC. Both the book and the executive summary are uncopyrighted and, hence, can be freely photocopied for use in meetings and conferences except for three chapters in the book that are indicated to be copyrighted elsewhere.

4. The Cuban population of Florida is quite urbanized and differs markedly from Hispanic groups of Mexican origins in Texas and farther west. There are also marked differences between the relatively small groups of Native Americans in the Southeast and the larger, often highly organized groups of Indians and Eskimos in the West, the Northwest, and Alaska. One difficulty encountered in classifying ethnic groups is that Mexicans are made up of various combinations of Native American and Caucasian (substantially Spanish) blood, while Cubans and Puerto Ricans carry more Caucasian, relatively more African, and relatively less Native American blood. In any event, the main concern here is with disadvantaged rural African- and Caucasian-American groups in the Southeast. It should not be forgotten that, nationwide, Caucasian-Americans constitute the largest ethnic group of disadvantaged farm and nonfarm rural people in the United States.
SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH AT 1890 INSTITUTIONS:
CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Ralph D. Christy
Professor of Agricultural Economics
Cornell University

INTRODUCTION

With the passage of enabling legislation (Second Morrill Act, 1890), the 1890 colleges and universities were established to provide training to African-Americans in the fields of agriculture, home economics, the mechanical arts, and other useful professions. Under the premise of legal separation of the races in the South, they were established in response to the earlier development of the land-grant system in 1862 (First Morrill Act). Today, sixteen 1890 land-grant institutions and Tuskegee University remain actively engaged in carrying out their land-grant mission. This conference comes at a particularly critical point in the history of 1890 land-grant colleges and universities. As these institutions embark on a second century of service, it is timely to examine the challenges and opportunities which influence the effectiveness and survival of the 1890 land-grant system. The social sciences (agricultural economics, rural sociology) make up an important component of these comprehensive colleges and universities.

The objectives of this paper are to:

1. Review contributions of recent social science-based national projects and draw from those experiences useful frameworks that will aid in our understanding change in rural America.

2. Identify characteristics [selected socio-economic] of change in three important arenas for 1890 institutions: higher education, African-American farmers, and nonfarm rural residents.

3. Suggest some institutional innovations 1890 institutions may consider in assessing research agendas and public policy for the rural disadvantaged.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF NATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE PROJECTS

Two recent national projects bear mentioning as we focus on the social sciences within the 1890 institutions. First, the American Agricultural Economics Association, Committee on the Opportunities and Status of Blacks in Agricultural Economics, initiated in 1989 a conference "Past, Present and Future of 1890 Land-grant Colleges and Universities" which commemorated a century of service these institutions provided the nation. The goal of the conference was to recognize the contributions of 1890 land-grant institutions and to highlight the Agricultural Economics and Rural Development Programs at these colleges and universities. Specifically, the conference had four objectives: (1) to provide an overview of the historical development of the 1890 institutions; (2) to present a current description of the resident instruction, research, extension, and international development programs at these schools; (3) to offer views of future roles 1890 institutions will play; and (4) to suggest alternative institutional designs for 1890 institutions, in particular, their colleges of agriculture, in order to enhance the status and opportunities for African-American agricultural scientists and professionals. Although this conference was a comprehensive treatment of 1890 research, teaching, extension and international programs, it was
one of the only centennial programs sponsored exclusively by social scientists. This conference produced an edited volume (Christy and Williamson, 1991) which captured the thoughts of research scientists, land-grant administrators, and national leaders on the future of 1890 institutions.

The second important national project involves the five-year effort of the Social Science Agricultural Agenda Project (SSAAP). SSAAP, under the executive directorship of Professor Glenn Johnson, attempted to respond to a failure of society: lack of public support given the rural social sciences. This project has resulted in several products including two major conferences (Springhill, Minnesota 1986 and Houston, Texas 1988) and a comprehensive edited book, Social Science Agricultural Agendas and Strategies. The need to focus further on human resources lead to the cooperation of SSAAP and the Professional Agricultural Workers Conference (PAWC) held at Tuskegee University, December 1988, from which the proceedings, Rural Development Issues of the Nineties: Perspectives from the Social Sciences was produced.

The SSAAP made use of philosophic inquiry (i.e. types of knowledge and problems) and the theory of change (institutions, human resources, technology, and natural resources) to shape a direction. The theory of change provides a framework which seeks to explain change by identifying fundamental forces that influence economic progress: institutions, human capability, technology and physical resources:

- **Institutions** represent the constellation of rights and duties that determine domains of private choice for individual members of society.

- **Humans**, with their evolving capacity in knowledge, are resources who create and manage the technology and form institutions.

- **Technology** refers to the knowledge and techniques for improving human welfare and for performing tasks in ways that involve less effort or are more effective.

- The final ingredient influencing economic change, **natural resources**, involves the biological and physical resources that constitute the physical infrastructure of society.

This framework allows for the examination of those problems of rural U.S. economies and related policies involving the technological, institutional, human and physical resources. Although these forces are listed separately, interdependence among them is implied as no development process can escape the influence of one source of change without involving the others. The theory of change further gave support for the inclusion of human resources as a major influence on social change and on the rural social sciences research agendas.

**Socio-economic Characteristics of a Changing Rural Economy: Implications for 1890 Institutions**

As the 1890 land-grant colleges and universities celebrate a century of service, many new challenges in this era of post-civil rights emerge. These challenges are multidimensional, having significant implications for the changing economic, social, and political realities for African-Americans and for the nation at large. In keeping with the land-grant mission, development of human capital through formal education, development of knowledge, and dissemination of information are necessary for the full participation of African-Americans in the mainstream of this country. While building upon their strengths and traditions, 1890 institutions are not only seeking to maintain an identity in an environment that is
dynamic and complex, but also to develop capabilities in areas where other institutions have committed little or no resources. This is no small challenge! Meeting this challenge requires 1890 institutions to consider the changes occurring in three arenas: higher education (African-American college students), farmers (limited resource) and non-farm rural residents.

Higher Education

Because of the unique economic characteristics of education and a philosophy which advocates accessible educational opportunities for the masses, government has played a significant role in the development of institutions for higher learning in the United States. Historically, state and local governments have provided greater support for schools than the federal government has. Notable exceptions are the federal involvement given to land-grant institutions, the civil rights obligations required by the Supreme Court (Brown vs. Board of Education, 1954), the aerospace initiatives taken as a result of the launching of Sputnik in 1957, and the war on poverty established by the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964 (Jaynes and Williams, 1989). Although state governments initially were reluctant to provide full support for 1890 land-grant institutions, in more recent years they have placed greater emphasis on education, motivated by a strategy to enhance economic development and to facilitate efficiency and coordination in allocating and using public funds for higher education. The commitment to 1890s by state government varies. The federal government, on the other hand, has pursued a strategy enhancing and developing Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) to ensure educational opportunities for all citizens. The future of the 1890 institutions and of educational opportunities available to African-Americans will no doubt be determined by the actions of government at both levels, national and state. Some would add, private sector and the alumni of 1890 institutions.

A comprehensive study documenting the educational goals, strategies, and programs of African-Americans reached the following conclusions relevant to excellence and equal educational opportunities (Jaynes and Williams, 1989):

1. Substantial progress has been made toward the provision of high-quality, equal, and integrated education.

2. Compensatory education programs—Head Start and Chapter I—have overall positive (although sometimes short-term) effects on the academic achievement of disadvantaged students.

3. Persistent and large gaps in the schooling, quality, and achievement outcomes of education for blacks and whites exist.

4. Schools do substantially affect the amount of learning that takes place.

5. Blacks’ status in higher education, as undergraduates, graduates, and faculty, has worsened or stalled since the mid-1970s.

6. Separation and differential treatment of blacks continues to be widespread in the elementary and secondary schools and in different forms in institutions of higher learning.

Conclusions five and six have particular implications for 1890 institutions. The number of undergraduate degrees earned by African-Americans has declined continuously since 1976, representing the greatest losses of all ethnic groups (Carter and Wilson, 1989). Among African-American students,
male students’ college completion rates have declined much faster than African-American female students. This downward trend also appeared in post graduate studies: a 31.8 percent loss in masters degrees and a 22.1 percent loss in doctoral degrees from 1978 to 1988 (Carter and Wilson, 1989). Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) awarded 35.8 percent of the African-American bachelors degrees in 1987. The number of degrees awarded by HBCUs declined by 8.2 percent between 1982 and 1987, largely due to the closing, the merging, or the changing status of schools (Carter and Wilson, 1989). Significant losses in African-American college graduation rates, particularly at the graduate school level, suggest further declines in African-American representation on faculties within the nation’s colleges and universities. With the absence of positive role models at many colleges and universities, African-American students often experience social alienation and racial discrimination (Steele, 1989). Therefore, an important challenge to 1890 institutions (and to all institutions of higher learning) is to increase the enrollment, retention, and graduation rates of African-American students.

**Limited Resource Farmers**

Beyond the above-mentioned challenges within our universities and colleges, the mission of 1890 institutions has also been to create and disseminate new technology and information to limited resource farmers. This mission has been accomplished through the institutions’ research and extension programs which have developed a reputation for a unique expertise in providing technical assistance to limited resource rural clientele. In serving the needs of the African-American farmers, however, 1890 institutions must also recognize the tremendous structural change brought about by technological and institutional forces. African-American farmers have been leaving production agriculture over the past three decades at a rate twice that of white farmers. Many of the remaining farmers, on average, have limited resources and are relatively smaller, in terms of land and sales volumes, than white farmers.

It is widely recognized that the structure of U.S. agriculture has changed substantially over the past three decades. Traditional economic theory does not explain totally the exit of farms, particularly African-American farms, from markets. Institutional forces, which are non-market (agricultural policy, credit, public research, outreach), is a major factor influencing the structure of agriculture. The impact of this structural change on African-American involvement in farming has been great. The total number of minority farms declined 89 percent between 1954 and 1982 compared to a 48 percent exit rate for Caucasian farms. With the exodus of African-American farmers, land ownership by minorities declined from an all-time high of 13.9 million acres in 1920 to 3.4 million acres in 1982. Further, the major loss of minority farms occurred among tenants while the percentage of full owners of minority farms increased.

**Non-farm Rural Residents**

Serving the needs of non-farm rural Americans has likewise been subject to socio-economic and technical transformations which have influenced the research and outreach programs at 1890 institutions. Since the end of World War II, rural America has undergone radical change as its once primary industry, agriculture, experienced remarkable gains in productivity. This economic growth was characteristic of the previous decade but, during the 1980s, rural America experienced structural change and economic dislocation. Fundamental to these economic changes is a new set of more complex problems as our economy shifts toward global markets and service based industries, as federal support for rural communities declines, and as deregulation of financial markets places constraints on sources of private-sector funding.

The analysis of the impacts of the fundamental changes occurring in rural America on the African-American must consider demographic realities. Over 90 percent of the U.S. African-Americans resided in the South at the turn of the century; and despite the tremendous outflow of African-Americans from the rural South, the southern region of this country still contains more than half of the U.S. African-
American population (Lichter and Heaton, 1986). More importantly, Lichter and Heaton further observe that well over 90 percent of all non-metropolitan African-Americans resided in the South. Therefore, an analysis of the social and economic well-being of the rural African-American must focus on the development of the rural South.

One of the most significant characteristics of rural America during the 1980s has been the upward trend in the poverty rate (Table 1). The 1987 Census Bureau data indicated that 16.9 percent of those people living in non-metropolitan areas had incomes below the poverty level, up from 12.6 percent in 1970. The national poverty rate fell from 22.2 percent in 1960 to 13.5 percent in 1987. Sawhill (1986, p. 1082) points out that "most of this progress occurred in the 1960s ... by 1969 the rate had fallen to 12.1 percent. It remained between 11 and 13 percent for the entire decade of the 1970s, and then increased again during the early 1980s." Poverty rates are especially high among racial and ethnic minorities. For example, the poverty rate is 44.1 percent among African-Americans as compared to 13.7 percent for Caucasians in 1987. For all family categories, the poverty rates for African-Americans are three to four times higher than exist in rural America on average.

Table 1: Distribution of U.S. Poverty by Household Types, 1988
(Non-Metropolitan Areas)²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RACES</th>
<th>CAUCASIAN</th>
<th>AFRICAN AMERICAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-headed Household, no husband present</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many segments of rural America are responsive to major sectoral shifts and macroeconomic changes which act as a tide—when the tidewaters are high, they lift all boats and vice versa. However, there is growing evidence that a persistent group, the economically disadvantaged, is a visible component of our society; and this subset, for the most part, seems to be immune to aggregate social and economic forces. Wilson (1987, p. 8) defines the underclass as "that heterogeneous grouping of families and individuals who are outside the mainstream of the American occupational system. Included are individuals who lack training and skills and either experience long-term unemployment and families that experience long-term spells of poverty and/or welfare dependency." The term "underclass," as defined by Wilson, also includes individuals who exhibit socially-deviate behavioral patterns (values and culture) which may differ from rural people experiencing long-term or persistent poverty. To date, little is known about the complex causal links among economic conditions, family structure, and individual or group values.

Although individuals and family units may experience poverty, it is important to note that in some counties—particularly in the South—poverty persists. A county with persistent poverty has had per-capita income in the lowest quintile, i.e., the lowest 20 percent in terms of per-capita incomes among
counties in the U.S. for at least three decades (Bellamy and Ghelfi, 1989). These counties are characterized by having low educational levels, poor health (physical disabilities) and high portions of its population African-American. Bellamy and Ghelfi note that poor counties have lower per-capita income than those counties which improved between 1979 and 1984. Understanding the characteristics of these counties may suggest policy alternatives for enhancing the socio-economic conditions of their residents.

Policy makers at all levels are concerned with the economic health of rural America. Agricultural and rural sector policies are beginning to change. Today agricultural policy is seen to have less of an impact on rural development goals than it did several decades ago when the terms "agriculture" and "rural" were almost synonymous. As the economic organization and public policy environment change, rural development policies must adapt to the changing economic and social conditions to encourage an economic development that will reach disadvantaged groups. Because the cause of poverty is multifaceted and not fully understood, public policy alternatives directed toward the reduction of poverty is misdirected and sometimes conflict in objectives and impacts. It is commonly recognized, though, that individuals experiencing poverty are generally less educated and exhibit unstable employment histories.

Given these important trends in higher education, agriculture, and non-farm rural society, it is imperative that we understand and clarify the important contributions of 1890 institutions to a nation which is undergoing radical transformations. Although these colleges and universities have had a rich history and have developed a reputation for their teaching, research, extension, and international programs, many more challenges currently await them. The need for additional resources and the need for articulating the mission of the 1890 institutions in a desegregated society are just two of the many important challenges.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH AGENDAS AND POLICY DIRECTIONS: IMPLICATIONS FOR 1890 INSTITUTIONS

Research and Outreach Agendas
The Social Science Agricultural Agenda Project has done an excellent job of documenting the impacts of technological, institutional, human and physical forces on rural society. Two fundamental observations fall from the writings of many scientists:

- Limited resources for rural social scientists, and
- Inadequate procedures for setting research and extension priorities.

These observations apply even more so for the social science components of 1890 land-grant institutions.

Further, SSAAP identified a research and outreach agenda related to domestic human development and the rural disadvantaged. SSAAP's agendas related to human development and the rural disadvantaged included:

- Helping reshape the resident instruction, youth, and adult outreach programs of our agricultural institutions to update the skills and capacities of the rural disadvantaged (including women) without neglecting the rural advantaged whose improved skills and capacities are also needed.

- Helping improve the focus on disadvantaged rural groups of the K-12 educational system in rural areas.
• Remedying those deficiencies in the basic social science disciplines (BSSDs) that constrain the ability of the rural social sciences (RSSes) to address human development and poverty problems of disadvantaged groups. With financial and other support from the administrators in our agricultural institutions and elsewhere, rural and basic social scientists should:

- Develop improved conceptualizations of the roles that social, political, anthropological, psychological, geographic, historical, and economic variables play in the processes of human development and poverty alleviation, so that such variables can be better incorporated into multidisciplinary, interactive/iterative systems models and/or scenario analyses of the domains of problems and issues pertaining to human development and disadvantaged groups.

- Try to overcome the long-standing difficulties in the social sciences that result from the questionable interpersonal validity and lack of cardinality of measures of values used to define and resolve equality (redistributive) issues vis-a-vis human development and poverty.

• Improving databases on:

  - Rural "human capital generating" institutions, activities, and the people served by them, and

  - Disadvantaged farm and nonfarm rural groups.

A list of important topics for social scientists interested in rural African-Americans (farm and nonfarm) is provided in the SSAAP final report (Christy, 1991). This list flows from a review of structural change in U.S. agriculture and the social characteristics of non-farm rural residents. Each item on the agenda has research as well as outreach implications. This agenda reminds social scientists of the need to gain further understanding of:

• Relationships between aggregate economic conditions and the economic well-being of the poor;
• Rural-urban labor market linkages;
• Impacts of alternative human capital policies and programs (such as Head Start and Job Corps);
• Relationships among economic structure, family, and individual values;
• New theories of rural development which encompass social, economic, and political variables;
• Impacts of international trade policy on the economic and social well-being of rural African-Americans;
• How economic concentration within the U.S. food system relates to African-American participants in firm ownership and entrepreneurial development;
• Influences of economic structure and public policy on poor female-headed households; and
• New data and information systems needed to monitor and evaluate economic performance.
From Social Science Research to Policy Analysis

Research and policy analysis bear significant differences (Bonnen, 1988). Bonnen informs us that equating the two is erroneous. He states that "policy decisionmaking is essentially a problem-solution matter and has to be described as multidisciplinary and prescriptive (1988, p. 44)." Economic analysis relies primarily on the tools of economic theory. Therefore, public policy analysis requires the use of a group of disciplines and recognizes a characteristic of policy decisions involving values.

Recent studies have evaluated the status of African-Americans in the U.S. (Jaynes and Williams, 1989), reviewed the effects of the War on Poverty on the disadvantaged (Sawhill, 1989), and analyzed the determinants of poverty among rural African-Americans (Allen and Thompson, 1990). After analyzing the impacts of policy failure on rural African-Americans, Allen and Christy offer six policy directives which focus on a comprehensive approach to human resource development in rural areas:

- Provide a safety net for those who are persistently poor;
- Establish assistance programs with incentives for individuals to move toward a stable, self-reliant economic existence;
- Invest in people;
- Expand entrepreneurial opportunities;
- Expand job opportunities for disadvantaged youth; and
- Embrace full equal opportunity and civil rights laws to protect minorities and women with punitive charges against violators.

Social scientists in 1890 institutions have a host of researchable problems and policy issues which require solid analysis. Information generated by this analysis must be directed to public policy decisionmakers as the persistent problems of rural areas which affect the disadvantaged are becoming less likely to be solved through private sector initiatives alone. Therefore, an important target audience for 1890 social science research and outreach efforts will increasingly become public decisionmakers (local, state, and national).

A STRATEGIC PLAN REQUIRES A VISION OF THE FUTURE

After a century of service, the 1890 land-grant institutions are confronted with the question: Where should we go from here? A response to this question must consider the future of these universities as well as the future of African-Americans in both higher education and the larger American society. The 1890 land-grant system has played and will continue to play a major role in human capital development for African-Americans. African-American contributions to a nation which is being drawn closer and closer to a global economy will become, must become, valued higher if the U.S. is to be competitive. Such a response might reflect, for a moment, on two intellectual giants who engaged in very passionate and oftentimes bitter debate on educational philosophies and strategies for African-Americans: Booker T. Washington, the founder of Tuskegee University, and W.E.B. DuBois, the founder of the N.A.A.C.P.

History records the philosophical positions of these great men very clearly. Washington advocated vocational education as a strategy for achieving the goals he envisioned for the African-American community. In a speech given in Atlanta in September 1885, Washington asked for help to secure better education (vocational) for his people and offered in return his acceptance of racial segregation.
Washington stated: "In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress."

DuBois challenged this basic philosophy of Washington in The Souls of Black Folks (1961). He advocated a philosophy and strategy similar to today's civil rights leaders. It should be noted that while there were substantial differences between the two men's philosophies, similarities also existed. DuBois wrote:

So far as Mr. Washington preaches Thrift, Patience, and Industrial Training for the masses, we must hold up his hands and strive with him ... but so far as Mr. Washington apologizes for injustice, North or South, does not rightly value the privilege and duty of voting ... and opposes the higher training and ambition of our brighter minds,—so far as he, the South, or the Nation does this—we must unceasingly and firmly oppose them.

Contemporary views on alternative strategies for African-Americans do not appear to come in a sharp contrast, as they appeared at the turn of the century, given today's society which advocates individual choice and equal opportunity. It is ironic, however, for a society which advocates individual choice and equal opportunity to have in its midst, the conditions in which rural African-Americans exists today. By all relative measures, rural African-Americans are poorer, less educated, experience higher unemployment rates, and a lower health status than any other segment of this society. The 1890 land-grant institutions must seek institutional innovations to address these problems.

Debates regarding the question of institutional design have strong emotional and political implications which, for the most part, have taken place in the courts. Rarely has such a discussion taken place as part of a professional meeting of agricultural scientists and administrators. The options for these institutions are clear: stay the course, reposition to meet the needs of new decisionmakers, improve coordination with selective institutions and selectively merge with other institutions.

The 1890 land-grant institutions have celebrated a century of service to the nation. Socio-economic characteristics and trends in three arenas—higher education, limited resource farmers, and non-farm rural economy—suggest a fundamental challenge and opportunity for these colleges and universities. Given the radical transformations occurring in the U.S. economy, the future of the 1890 institutions lies in their abilities to address the needs of people, especially the disadvantaged, more effectively than alternative institutions. The social sciences are desperately needed in fulfilling the mission of the 1890 institutions as many contemporary problems are closely associated with institutional and human resource constraints. This mission has historically been accepted by these institutions. Now-a-days, the challenge and the opportunity it brings is of major importance to the nation.

NOTES


3. More than 90 percent of the U.S. counties experiencing persistent poverty are located in the South.
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SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH: SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS: ALABAMA A&M UNIVERSITY

James W. Shuford  
Dean and Research Director  
Alabama A&M University

This symposium—"Strengthening Social Science Research at the 1890 Land-grant Colleges and Universities, and Tuskegee University"—is timely. It is extremely important that our institutions develop research objectives which focus on solving problems in urban and rural communities and enhancing family well-being and economic development, particularly in communities with large numbers of low-income residents and minority populations. The above statement is in line with the Joint Council on Food and Agricultural Science's Fiscal Year 1993 priorities for research, extension and higher education.

PAST SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Expanding the scientific knowledge base in the social sciences and finding solutions to problems confronting rural and urban communities have been major target areas of the U. S. Department of Agriculture which supported social science research in the School of Agriculture and Home Economics at Alabama A&M University. The first organized research in the social sciences was initiated in 1972 in the Department of Agricultural Education, currently named the Department of Agribusiness. This initial project focused on "Factors Influencing Leadership Development in Rural Communities." Other research projects completed during the Seventies by social scientists in the School of Agriculture and Home Economics are as follows:

- Income Inequality and Its Relationship to Community Structures (funded by CSRS/USDA).
- Community Social Structure and School Free Lunch Participation (Funded by NSF).
- Education Needs Projection and Rural Development: Functional Networks (Funded by Southern Rural Development Center).
- Career Aspirations of Low Income Youth (Southern Regional Project S-120, Funded by CSRS/USDA).
- The Isolation of Factors Related to Levels and Patterns of Living in Selected Areas of the Rural South (First 1890 Regional Research Project, RR1, Funded by CSRS/USDA).

Most of the early social science research focused on determining factors which influenced leadership development and socio-economic studies of low-income communities and limited-resource households in North Alabama. While some of these research studies in the Department of Agribusiness were continued during the eighties, additional social science research projects were initiated in the Division of Home Economics and the Department of Community Planning. Some of the significant research projects completed in the eighties by the Division of Home Economics and the Department of Community Planning are as follows:
• Broadening the Food Preferences of Preschool Children (Funded by CSRS/USDA).

• Garment Fit: Problems and Solutions (Funded by CSRS/USDA).

• Quality Well-Being of Southern Rural Elderly: Food, Clothing, and Shelter (First Regional Research Project in Home Economics at 1890 Institutions, RR4, Funded by CSRS/USDA).

• Imports vs. Domestics: Male Consumer’s Perceptions of Quality and Buying Preferences (Funded by CSRS/USDA).

• Fiscal Austerity and Its Consequences in Local Governments (NE Regional Project, NE 151, Funded by CSRS/USDA).

• Developing Local Support and Funding for Transportation Services in Rural Areas (Funded by DOT).

Agribusiness research in the eighties has included a variety of projects, such as:

• Use of Government Services by Low-income Rural Residents in Alabama (Funded by ERS/USDA).

• Dimensions of Industrialization, Growth and Inequality (Funded by CSRS/USDA).

• Factors Influencing the Survival of Small Farms in the South (1890 Institutions Regional Research Project, RR2, Funded by CSRS/USDA).

• Non-Traditional Land Owners Evaluation of the Conservation Reserve Program (Funded by Alabama Forestry Commission).

• Rural Minority Youth Entrepreneurship Training and Development Program (Funded by TVA).

• Labor Force Experiences of Persons Trained in Colleges of Agriculture (S-200 Regional Project, Funded by CSRS/USDA).

• Farming Systems Research and Development (Funded by OICD/USDA and State Research Funds).

FUTURE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH PRIORITIES

Future social science research in the School of Agriculture and Home Economics at Alabama A&M University will be focused in the Department of Agribusiness and the Department of Community Planning and Urban Studies and the Division of Home Economics. Greater emphasis will be placed on multidisciplinary research among the above referenced academic units and other departments in the School of Agriculture and Home Economics and the University. Some of the School’s current social science research priorities are:
• Farming systems research and extension to:
  — Promote multidisciplinary approach to small farm problems.
  — Advocate on-farm research.
  — Promote more extension specialist and farmer involvement in planning and managing on-farm research.

• Alternative production and marketing strategies for small farmers (gross receipts under $40,000) to:
  — Encourage production of alternatives to traditional enterprises.
  — Identify and study alternative markets.

• Entrepreneurship for economic development in rural and urban areas to:
  — Promote entrepreneurship among rural and urban residents, including youth and retirees.

• Social and agronomic effects of global climate change on small commercial farms to:
  — Model the effects of climatic change on crop production: yield, production costs and profits.

• Well-being of elderly populations in Alabama: Nutrition, Housing and Clothing Research to:
  — Encourage planning for quality retirement.
  — Involve elderly in provision of quality services.
  — Encourage intergenerational understanding of mutual problems.

• Research which focuses on individuals and families.

• Transportation and housing research in rural and urban communities.

• These are a sampling of the areas in which social science researchers in the School of Agriculture and Home Economics will direct their attention in the nineties. Greater emphasis will be placed on multidisciplinary research through the School’s Center for Urban and Rural Research. This Center will combine faculty expertise in the Department of Agribusiness and the Department of Community Planning and Urban Studies with participation from other academic units and the Cooperative Extension Program in research, training and information dissemination.
ONE PERSPECTIVE ON SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH
AT 1890 INSTITUTIONS

Walter A. Hill
Dean and Research Director
School of Agriculture and Home Economics
Tuskegee University

Given the challenges and opportunities confronting rural communities in the nation as a whole and in the southern and border states in particular, there is a compelling need to increase social science research at the 1890 institutions. Though the 1890 institutions have historically focused on minority and at-risk clientele, and have utilized participatory research as a key mechanism for developing science based information to assist rural communities (Baharanyi et al., 1990, 1991; Campbell, 1936; Mayberry, 1989; Neyland, 1990; Williams, 1987, 1988; Williams et al., 1989), funds for such research have been limited. It was not until 1977 that 1890 institutions directly received federal formula funding to initiate sustained research programs in the food and agricultural sciences (Mayberry, 1989). During the 1970s and 1980s the research emphasis at most 1890 institutions was placed on the plant, animal, food, nutritional and environmental sciences. This pattern followed the priorities set by the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ES Chop) and the Cooperative State Research Service. To this day, social science research remains a low priority of these organizations as manifested by projected personnel and funding patterns (ESCOP, 1992).

The discipline and commodity-based research programs at 1862 land-grant institutions during the 1970s and 1980s have not, for the most part, been good role models for 1890 institutions in the development of interdisciplinary research programs that involved social scientists in a manner that adequately addressed issues and problems of the diverse groups and communities in rural America. Throughout rural communities, churches, social organizations, schools, local governments and agencies, with support on an event-by-event basis from local businesses, tackle problems and issues such as youth recreation, education and enrichment activities, anti-drug campaigns, clean-up campaigns and health care. These on-going activities exemplify the will of the people themselves to enhance their development and their quality of life. Research is needed on a community-by-community basis to find out how to enhance this already existing base of talent, energy and goodwill in rural communities. A science-based effort is needed to link these on-going efforts with the agricultural and renewable natural resource base present in specific communities and to create new opportunities in recreation, tourism, education and business.

The science base needed to make this work requires focused, interdisciplinary teams of well-trained, sensitive people who are rewarded for working with individuals and communities over sustained periods of time. The goal of developing sustainable economic enterprises and superior educational opportunities in the communities being served should be the major overall goal of such research.

The 1890 institutions have a great opportunity because of their community-based network, strategic placement—both geographically and historically—and relatively small-sized departments to overcome discipline and commodity-based barriers apparent in larger research and higher education institutions. The 1890 institutions are properly positioned to develop the focused, interdisciplinary teams of social scientists, food and agricultural scientists, and natural resource and environmental scientists, home economists and others needed to get the job done. In this sense “smaller can be better” and, in partnership with the right federal and state agencies and 1862 and other institutions, the opportunities for helping rural communities to develop become almost limitless.

New models for what constitutes success or excellence by faculty and staff as individuals and as teams will have to be developed. A critical and central component of the new model is that students of
diverse majors should be intimately involved in rural development research and outreach projects, as a part of their problem-solving skill development and exposure to interdisciplinary teamwork. We as 1890 institutions must be bold enough to set and quicken the pace, to continue to experiment and improve as we go, and to document the process of issue-based interdisciplinary research for rural development. We must work hand in hand with our constituency over time in order to accomplish this goal. And, our university administrators and federal and state partners must be integrally involved so as to provide the necessary support to sustain the effort over the long-term.

Funding from USDA continues to remain at level funding; state funding for social science research is limited. Thus, we will have to re-address our research priorities as institutions and make a conscious effort to strengthen our social science research capability. This must be done strategically and in cooperation with our federal and state partners to ensure that adequate funding is allocated to sustain this and other important efforts.
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PART I

Social Science Research at 1890 Institutions and Tuskegee University

Section B

Perspectives from Disciplines and Professional Organizations
RURAL SOCIOLOGY AND RESEARCH CHALLENGES

Ronald C. Wimberley
Professor of Rural Sociology
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
North Carolina State University
and
President
Rural Sociological Society

In May, 1985, research in rural sociology started to change. Primed by Rural Society in the U.S.: Issues for the 1980s, a 1982 volume on rural research needs which was produced by the Rural Sociological Society's (RSS) Rural Studies Series and edited by Don Dillman and Daryl Hobbs, rural sociologists, the RSS began to take greater control of the situation that shapes research support, opportunities, and agendas. For it was in May 1985 that the Cooperative State Research Service held the first of a series of research planning symposia through the coordination of rural sociologist Richard Stuby.

In that meeting, representatives of rural sociology programs from many universities realized clearly that they knew little about the research funding process, that they had practically no players in the process, and that the non-social scientists in the funding system often did not understand the role of rural sociology in the larger research agenda. Rural sociological research issues, for example, were not a part of the Department of Agriculture's competitive research program for scientists in the land-grants and other universities across the country.

Today that situation has changed significantly. We have learned and used the process. Rural sociologists are now directly involved in research planning and budget-making. Others have a better view of the role of rural sociology in the research system.

In 1987, the Special Initiatives Subcommittee of the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ES COP) established the Task Force on Agriculture and Community Viability. Consisting of rural sociologists, agricultural economists, and home economists, the Task Force furnished a 1988 report, Agriculture and Rural Viability, which spelled out rural research needs and set forth a program for meeting these needs. This report was followed by another in 1990 on Revitalizing the Rural Economy for Families and Communities. It was sponsored jointly by ESCOP and the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC).

The ideas and research planning network which emerged from these efforts fed into the National Research Initiative (NRI). With the inside leadership of RSS President-Elect James Zuiches, who became an experiment station director during this era, many recent RSS presidents plus dozens of RSS members organized and advanced research funding program proposals through USDA and congressional channels for approval. Another valuable actor in this process has been the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) and its director, Howard Silver.

One product of these efforts is authorization and appropriation for the Markets, Trade, and Policy component of the NRI. This item opens a USDA competitive grants program for rural sociologists and other rural and agricultural social scientists. While the request to Congress was to fund this new area at an initial, foot-in-the-door level of $2 million, the case was so well argued that the appropriation was set at nearly $4 million. Furthermore, the appropriation is expected to increase annually with the expansion of the NRI.
Meanwhile, other new RSS programs have been underway to enhance rural sociological research. In addition to many research and interest groups, committees, and liaisons to other groups and agencies, several new types of efforts have gotten underway.

One new program is minority travel support for participation in annual RSS meetings. This is supported by the Ford Foundation. Another is the RSS Task Force on Persistent Rural Poverty which was fostered by and is led by former RSS President Gene Summers. This large Task Force has nine working groups and will publish a book-length report and other items beginning in 1992. The Task Force is funded by The Kellogg Foundation and the Regional Rural Development Centers.

The need for and contributions of rural sociological research are also accentuated in two books just published the RSS Rural Studies Series through the Westview Press. Both have policy orientations. One is a special decade-perspective volume, *Rural Policies for the 1990s*, and is edited by former RSS Presidents Cornelia Flora and James Christenson. The second book is *The Future of Rural America* and edited by Kenneth E. Pigg. Chapters in these books by many RSS members build on the base of rural sociological research and point to policy needs for rural areas and people.

The 1992 annual meeting of the RSS at Pennsylvania State University on August 16-19 will again be an annual occasion where rural sociologists and related scientists report research developments spanning the spectrum of rural problems. This meeting's theme is "Rurality and the Global Environment" and is to be held with the World Congress of Rural Sociology and the International Rural Sociological Association. The 1990s are a time when social needs of rural areas are foremost. In times past, the research system has focused on such major problems as agricultural technology, productivity, and pest management. With changes in agriculture, natural resources, and the rural environment, it is now the problems of rural people and communities that dominate. It is good that rural sociologists left the 1980s with a stronger understanding and role in the research planning and funding process. Ironically, the prominence of rural research needs comes at a time when many universities are downsizing their agricultural and related research personnel.

In effect, it finally may be rural sociology's turn at bat just as they are starting to turn out the lights in the stadium. Despite the gains we have made, we still face major challenges in acquiring adequate research support and in producing the research required to inform and meet the contemporary rural needs.
RURAL SOCIOLOGY AND RESEARCH CHALLENGES
FOR THE 1890 INSTITUTIONS

Yvonne Beauford Oliver
Associate Professor of Sociology
Fort Valley State College

As I understand it, my task this afternoon is to discuss and perhaps initiate further discussion about rural sociology and research challenges for the 1890 institutions from the perspective of professional associations. Most of my comments will relate to my personal observations and experiences as a member of the Rural Sociological Society (RSS) since 1978.

The Rural Sociological Society has a long history of involvement with the 1890s and, over many years, has been out front in support of the 1890 institutions.

In my comments this afternoon, I will try to do two things:

Identify some of the research challenges for rural sociologists at the 1890 Institutions, and

Indicate a role for professional associations, particularly the Rural Sociological Society (RSS) in addressing the challenges.

It is very difficult to talk about any area of social science research at the 1890s without reference to the Rural Sociological Society. The Rural Sociological Society has a long history of support of the 1890s and has worked diligently to secure funding for the 1890s and bring our scientists into the mainstream of the sociological enterprise.

In 1967 when the process that led to formula funding for research at the 1890s began, the Rural Sociological Society played a key role and exerted significant influence to bring about a more equitable distribution of research funding for the 1890 institutions (Mayberry, 1976).

In January 1969, Dr. C. H. Williams, Assistant to the Administrator, Federal Extension Service, presented an address before the Development Committee of the RSS entitled "Developing Relationships Between Social Scientists in the Predominantly White and the Predominantly Negro Land-Grant Colleges—including Tuskegee Institute" (Mayberry, 1976, p.48). In his presentation, Dr. Williams noted that "the current policies of allocating research grants make it impossible for the predominantly Negro colleges to compete with larger and stronger predominantly white institutions. Therefore," he said, "special consideration must be made to ensure adequate financial support for Negro colleges (Mayberry, 1976, p.49)."

As a result of Dr. Williams’ presentation, the RSS appointed the Subcommittee on the Development of Sociology in the Predominantly Negro Land-Grant Colleges, chaired by Dr. Thomas R. Ford. Other members of the committee were: Dr. Alvin L. Bertrand, Professor of Sociology, Louisiana State University; Dr. Morgan C. Brown, Professor of Sociology, Southern University; Dr. Richard Morrison, President, Alabama A&M University; Dr. C. A. Williams; and Dr. M. Lee Taylor, Chairman of the Development Committee and Director, Urban Studies, Louisiana State University at New Orleans (Mayberry 1976, p.49).

Thus, efforts which originated with the Rural Sociological Society and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), grew to include other organizations, and resulted in an increase in funding from $283,000 under PL 89-106 to a FY-72 allocation of $12,600,000 (See Mayberry, 1976, pp.48-54 for a more complete discussion).
Included in the process which resulted in increased funding for the 1890s was a commitment by the RSS to take responsibility for increasing the involvement of the predominantly Negro Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in research and extension activities. This was to be accomplished, in part, through such activities as the development of cooperative programs and funding by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) for cooperative research projects and regional conferences (Mayberry, 1976, pp.50-52).

Also included in the process which led to increased funding was a meeting of Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin, with presidents of the 1890s and their deans to discuss their major problems and ways USDA might assist with solutions. The meeting came about at the suggestion of President Morrison.

In a speech presented later which was related to this process, Dr. Morrison would say:

"More important to this group of institutions than anything at the present time is to have the opportunity to make use of their ability to serve a large segment of the population—the low-income groups, especially in rural America—who may benefit from the kinds of services they are capable of providing. If they can secure funds which are needed to support approved, planned programs, they will get the job done". (Leadership and Learning, p.20) (emphases added.)

This was a very important statement. It targeted the client groups for the 1890s—the low-income rural population, and reflected one of the first challenges for the 1890s—to secure funding. The goal of serving the low-income rural population, especially the black low-income rural population, has come to be commonly referred to as a mission for which the 1890s are "uniquely qualified" to fulfill. Thus, two of the challenges for rural sociologists have been there from the beginning—(1) to secure adequate funding for programs; and (2) to serve the needs of the rural black, low-income population.

Among the problems addressed over the years by rural sociologists and other 1890 scientists are rural poverty and the plight of black, especially low-income/limited resource farmers and their households. In spite of all that has been done, poverty is as pervasive as ever and black farmers are a dying breed. We are challenged to do something about both of these sets of conditions.

The situation of black farmers, for example, is and should be of particular concern to the 1890 land-grant community. In 1920, there were almost 926,000 black farmers in the United States; they comprised one-seventh of all farmers. The number was just over 57,000 in 1978, and just under 23,000 in 1987. According to the 1987 Census of Agriculture, blacks were 1.1 percent, one in every 91 of all farmers in the United States. Between 1920 and 1987, the number of black farmers in the United States decreased 97.5 percent. If current trends persist, there will not be a single traditional black farmer left in the United States by the year 2020.

The plight of black farmers is summarized in a short lament reported in the draft of Leadership and Learning: An Interpretive History of Historically Black Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. A Centennial Study (forthcoming). Mr. Rodalton Hart, a 39-year-old Mississippi farmer and a graduate of Jackson State University reflected on the tough job (the challenge) facing black land-grant institutions when he said:

"You don’t have anyone who understands farming anymore. Farmers are disappearing; and there’s nobody replacing them. I couldn’t encourage my son to go into farming; the system is geared up to get me (small farmers)—he won’t even have a chance" (Leadership and Learning, p. 18).
The 1890 land-grant community, especially, including rural sociologists, agricultural economists, and extension personnel, in collaboration with other scientists, must demonstrate that they really do understand the problems encountered by farmers.

Thus, a major challenge for the 1890s is to retard the rate of decrease in the number of black farmers. This can be accomplished, in part, by encouraging young blacks to choose farming and agriculture, and making sure they have a chance of succeeding. One strategy for addressing this challenge is the initiation and more extensive utilization of programs which help to change negative attitudes about agriculture and which help young people to learn that any career/occupation that can be pursued outside of agriculture can be pursued within agriculture—and often with greater pecuniary rewards. Another strategy involves providing young people with positive, hands-on experiences in farming and agriculture, as through young farmer apprenticeship programs which include young people—male and female—from urban as well as rural areas.

Because of the low educational levels and advanced age of most black farmers, strategies which provide person-to-person assistance must be utilized more extensively. Demonstration farms are a proven vehicle for helping farmers, and all 1890s should provide demonstration/model farms for their clientele. Greater partnerships and alliances must be forged between resident instruction, research, and extension at the 1890s to effectively deal with problems related to the decreasing number of black farmers.

There are numerous other problems plaguing populations which we often find ourselves saying we are "uniquely qualified" to serve. Among these are drug abuse, teenage pregnancy, crime, and problems affecting black males. Rural sociologists and other social scientists must critically evaluate factors contributing to these problems and suggest alternative programs which help instill pride in young people, help them to dream and to envision steps necessary to make their dreams a reality.

Another major challenge is human capital development. Education is not the solution to all of our problems, but education has always been the most dependable vehicle out of poverty and to an improved quality of life for the majority of black Americans. For whatever reasons, our youth do not possess the skills to enable them to shed poverty status. Neither, do they possess the skills that enable us to feel good and secure about our future, the future of this country into the 21st century and beyond.

In 1988-89, only two blacks (females, by the way), received a doctorate in computer science; eight blacks were awarded doctorates in mathematics; 15 received doctorates in agriculture and natural resources; 32 received doctorates in the physical sciences; and 30 received doctorates in engineering. Of the 1071 doctorates awarded to blacks in 1988-89, 87 or approximately 8 percent, were earned in the areas of agriculture and natural resources, engineering, and physical science (U. S. Department of Education, 1988-1989).

On June 8, 1990, the New York Times reported:

No other minority group produced as small a proportion of science and engineering doctorates as blacks. Of the 624 Ph.Ds awarded to Asians, more than two-thirds—426—were in science and engineering; for Hispanics, it was 186 of 569; and for American Indians, it was 37 of 93.

On the other hand, no other group had as many doctorates in education as blacks. Almost half of the black doctorates—389—were in education.

It is projected that by the year 2000, blacks and Hispanics will comprise about one-half of all labor force entrants. What does/will it mean when an increasing proportion of our population...of our labor force, is less and less well educated in all areas, but especially in science, as we enter an increasingly technological world that is becoming more and more competitive?
Rural sociologists and other scientists at the 1890 institutions are challenged to find successful ways to encourage and promote the training of black scientists; to renew our discipline and develop the talent to preserve the prominence of the United States.

Perhaps one of the greatest research challenges is reflected in the bottom line—money. We need funds and other resources to address the many problems experienced by clientele of the 1890 institutions. Potential resources for the 1890s include our professional associations. The Rural Sociological Society and other professional associations may be among the most underutilized resources available to the 1890s.

While we often want to "do our own thing in our own way," much can be accomplished by working with and within established systems and organizations. The Rural Sociological Society, potentially, can serve as a vehicle again, in securing additional funding for social science research.

With the federal research funding pie shrinking and the growing insistence on cooperative and collaborative efforts as a requirement for competitive funding, colleagues in the Rural Sociological Society may be of assistance.

Overall, the 1890s have not fared well with respect to securing competitive grants (Thompson, 1990). Perhaps one reason is that we have not sought competitive grants in large numbers. Another reason is that all too often successful grantsmanship is related to the reputation of the scientist and/or institution requesting support. We are making progress, but comparatively few 1890 scientists and institutions have the advantage of some 1862 and other large institutions. Cooperate, collaborate, and participate in sharing the competitive research dollars!

The same holds true with publications. In the "publish or perish" world of academia, reputation is often associated with number of publications. We often hear about difficulties in getting manuscripts published and about the small number of articles published by blacks in journals of the professional associations. But how many of us submit articles, and how many of us get discouraged too early in the review process and fail to follow through in heeding suggestions for revisions?

While we are talking about participating, participation in professional associations is one vehicle for establishing and/or enhancing a professional reputation. It doesn’t matter much if you have the best research plan, the best message...if there is no one to communicate it to. The support of professional peers can be a step toward dealing with many challenging situations. It is often said that "birds of a feather flock together". Even if you’re a mule, you get a lot more attention when you strut with the thoroughbreds.

For several years now, the Rural Sociological Society, with support from the Ford Foundation, has made available travel grants to annual meetings. Many of us have taken advantage of these travel grants. And in many cases, involvement is limited to that which is required by the grant—e.g., attend the reception, the Presidential Address, and the business meeting. We must do more than what is required.

Become involved and support colleagues who are involved! Use the networks available through the professional associations to develop both personally and professionally, to sharpen skills, and to develop a reputation. And, as you grow, help others to grow through additional experiences made possible through active involvement in the professional associations. For example, many of the professional associations offer special grants and fellowships to minority faculty and students. Accept the challenge and opportunities provided by the professional associations.

In summary, there are many challenges facing rural sociologists and other social scientists. Among them are challenges to revitalize rural America; to find ways to encourage young people, especially young blacks, to choose farming and agriculture, and to make sure they have a chance of succeeding; to find ways to encourage and promote human capital development; and to aid in improving the quality of life of rural Americans by helping to bring about improvements in their social, economic, and political conditions.

In a nutshell, the research challenge for rural sociologists and other social scientists is to Make a
difference! Especially for the 1890s, the challenge is to make a difference, especially for those whom we say we are uniquely qualified to serve—the underserved, the rural black, low-income population.

Rural sociologists must continue to investigate and to critically evaluate the conditions of rural, low-income populations with a focus toward practical solutions. In many instances, new measures of success must be implemented. The new measure of success will not be the number of people contacted or the number of brochures distributed. Rather the measure of success must be the extent to which successful changes are effected—the extent to which we make a difference in the quality of the lives of the people we serve. Professional associations such as the Rural Sociological Society can be instrumental in helping scientists to make a difference.
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STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH AT 1890 INSTITUTIONS AND TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY: HOME ECONOMICS AND RESEARCH CHALLENGES
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It is generally recognized that both rural sociology and agricultural economics are disciplines that contribute significantly to the social science research base at the 1890 institutions. Although there are notable exceptions, social scientists in these disciplines, who are generally male, have not typically established collaborative research programs with their colleagues in home economics, who are generally female. This situation persists even though many of these women can contribute valuable insights into issues such as the dynamics of household and family decision making, consumer behavior, and gender, race and age bias. All of these are factors that are of concern to rural sociologists and agricultural economists who are trying to understand social and economic systems in rural communities. My purpose today is to suggest that home economics and specifically the content areas of community nutrition, household economics and family studies have a significant contribution to make to the social science research base.

One needs to look beyond gender to explain the relative absence of home economists from the 1890s social science research arena. Part of the answer, I believe, may lie in the fact that until fairly recently home economics faculty members at the 1890 institutions did not generally possess earned doctorates and were therefore neither prepared nor expected to engage in academic research. It is also the case that most home economics departments at the 1890 institutions have relatively small numbers of faculty members to teach a large number of home economics courses. These courses are often required for home economics teacher certification by state departments of education, and therefore cannot be eliminated without limiting career opportunities for home economics graduates.

When large numbers of the home economics graduates from 1890 institutions found employment as teachers, particularly in segregated southern schools, the need to serve this market was very real. Today, however, there are other more specialized home economics content areas that offer viable career opportunities for black youth. These areas include hospitality management, fashion design and merchandising, community nutrition, dietetics, food science, housing and design, human services administration, consumer and family economics, and family relations.

In many of the research-oriented 1862 institutions, general home economics and home economics education has disappeared from the college catalogue, partly at least because the declining demand for home economics teachers is being met by programs at teacher training institutions and smaller liberal arts colleges. As a result, the number of undergraduate students selecting either a general home economics or a home economics education major at the 1862 land-grant universities has declined. A pattern of increasing specialization within home economics that is prevalent at the 1862 institutions has been less common at the 1890 institutions, partly at least because there are relatively few home economics faculty members at each institution, only a fraction of these faculty have terminal degrees in specialized areas, and most of the programs, until recently, offered only the baccalaureate degree.

One consequence of having a department with a relatively small number of faculty teaching a large number of undergraduate courses is that faculty do not have the luxury to develop specialized expertise or to pursue research interests. Without the opportunity to teach specialized upper-division and graduate level courses and to supervise the work of graduate students, there has been little incentive for those who teach in departments of home economics at 1890 institutions to pursue a doctorate.
At many of the 1862 institutions, schools and colleges of home economics have been reorganized and renamed in recent years. When this happens it generally reflects a new mission or focus for the unit, e.g. the development of human resources, a study of the ecological relationship between individuals and their near environment, an understanding of the role of the consumer in society, or the empowerment of the family in its function as the basic social unit of society. Within these reorganized units, that often have names like Human Ecology, Family Sciences, Consumer Sciences or Human Resources Development, are relatively autonomous academic departments. These departments award baccalaureate and graduate degrees in applied social and biological sciences areas like human development and community nutrition that encompass several academic disciplines. The appearance of these new administrative units reflects the fact that home economics today is not a monolithic discipline, but rather an integrated field that draws upon, and can contribute to, a number of academic disciplines, including the social sciences.

The 1890 institutions, like the 1862s, are affected by the rapid changes that are taking place in the field of home economics. Administrators can respond to these changes in several ways. First, administrators can phase out home economics programs using the argument that they are no longer relevant and/or that the home economics faculty lack academic qualifications.

Secondly, administrators can retain a skeleton home economics department that offers a small number of currently popular programs such as fashion merchandising and hospitality management that will attract large numbers of undergraduate students and that can be staffed by faculty without terminal degrees. These faculty can be hired at lower salaries than faculty with Ph.D degrees, but they cannot be expected to participate fully in the academic enterprise and they may not be tenurable or promotable within the institution. This strategy on the part of administrators is the academic equivalent of "keeping them barefoot and pregnant." Staff will be required to earn their keep by generating high numbers of student credit hours, but little else will be expected of them. In various and often insidious ways, the message will be sent throughout the institution that home economics is an academically inferior department.

Finally, a third strategy that will benefit home economics programs and strengthen the social sciences at 1890 institutions is to build from a base program in home economics an academic unit that has as its mission the application of the social and biological sciences to the problems that black families face. This strategy requires both vision and the commitment of resources on the part of administrators. It cannot be done overnight, but it is a strategy with considerable institutional "pay off" potential. The kind of women and men who must be hired to fill faculty positions in a "new home economics" department will not come cheap, nor will they be satisfied with inadequate equipment or a lack of travel funds to attend and present papers at professional meetings. These individuals will be courted by other institutions, by industry and by government. They will demand the opportunity to engage fully in scholarly activities that generate research and program dollars for the institution as well as provide the basis for refereed journal articles and other professional publications. Their professional participation will enhance the stature of their institutions, increase the cooperative efforts among all institutions, and, most importantly, maintain the 1890 institutions' credibility in the communities from which they draw their students.

Let me illustrate the sort of integrated program for which leadership could be provided by departments of home economics at 1890 institutions by describing the Center for Research on Diet, Lifestyle and Cardiovascular Disease in Black Alabamians. The Center is headed by Dr. Ralphenia Pace who chairs the Department of Home Economics in the School of Agriculture and Home Economics at Tuskegee University (Figure 1). It was established in 1990 with a three-year grant from USDA's Capacity Building Grants Program. The Center has as its goal a reduction in the excessively high rate of hypertension and heart disease that is found among the black residents of rural Alabama. To reach this goal the Center is taking a novel, participatory research approach.

At the core of the Center's program is a carefully controlled clinical study in which a group of free-living residents of Macon County consume meals containing either sweet potato green tips (the experimental diet) or other vegetables (the control diet) in two of their three daily meals. During the
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six-week dietary study, when participants are eating all of their meals in a laboratory setting, they also attend nutrition education sessions. In these classes, the dietary and other long-term lifestyle changes that are necessary to reduce the risk of cardiovascular disease are explained and discussed. At the conclusion of the study the subjects are responsible for teaching others in their communities what they have learned. Faculty and staff from Tuskegee University will monitor their activities in order to discover ways to better support them and future participant researchers in their task of reaching rural black communities with life-saving information.

A second clinical trial to be conducted by the Center involves soybean products and is designed to determine if soybeans, like sweet potato green tips, have desirable effects on blood pressure and serum cholesterol, since both of these plants are sources of omega 3 fatty acids. An important consideration in this program is the fact that research on both soybeans and sweet potatoes has been carried out at Tuskegee University since the days of George Washington Carver. The work of the Center for Research on Diet, Lifestyle and Cardiovascular Disease in Black Alabamians is, therefore, a logical extension of the mission of the institution in home economics, agriculture, and rural community economic development.

One goal of USDA’s Capacity Building Grant Program is to link institutions that were established under the 1862 and the 1890 land-grant acts. It should therefore be noted that Penn State University is intimately involved with the Center as are the Agricultural Research, Cooperative State Research and Extension Services of USDA. I obviously cannot speak for the federal cooperators, but we at Penn State view collaboration with Tuskegee University as an exciting opportunity to work with colleagues with whom we share a common belief in the importance of multi-disciplinary research that extends the university into the community for the mutual benefit of individuals and families and the land-grant institutions dedicated to improving the quality of their lives.
PART I

Social Science Research at 1890 Institutions and Tuskegee University

Section C

Linkages
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN 1890 AND 1862 Land-grant INSTITUTIONS:
IMPLICATIONS FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Joseph J. Molnar
Alumni Professor
Department of Agricultural Economics
and Rural Sociology
Auburn University

INTRODUCTION

Compared to their 1862 counterparts, the 1890 rural development programs tend to focus on certain counties and categories of the rural poor and disadvantaged (Mayberry, 1989). Joint activity between institutions tends to be infrequent and sporadic, though a number of instances of joint action can be cited. Ambivalence and mixed incentives tend to shape orientations toward collaboration held by both 1890 and 1862 institutions.

This paper examines institutional relationships between 1890 and 1862 faculty, departments, research, and extension units as they relate to the problem of rural underdevelopment. Particular attention is paid to factors facilitating and inhibiting the development of collaborative working relationships between institutions and among internal components of the land-grant university. It endeavors to identify structural conditions that perpetuate separation and pluralistic ignorance among researchers and rural development personnel. Although the general nature of these relationships across the South are of interest, the focus of this paper is on patterns and examples that characterize the three land-grant institutions found in Alabama.

In contrast to urban conditions, rural poverty is more likely to be caused by low wages, unemployment, depression in the agricultural and other extractive sectors, and state and local welfare eligibility rules that exclude significant proportions of the poor (Molnar and Traxler, 1991; Tickameyer and Duncan, 1990). Land-grant university responses to rural poverty are largely channeled through efforts generically titled "rural development programs." The variety and depth of these activities is not at issue here, but the focus is on the nature and extent of the ties between 1890 and 1862 researchers in these endeavors.

Institutional linkages include formal and informal relationships. There are incentives and barriers to the formation of both kinds of ties, and there are costs and benefits to their continued elaboration and maintenance. Regardless of what happens among land-grant universities, larger issues related to public understanding of agriculture, federal support for research, and the national racial climate must be considered in projecting the future of institutional relationships in the rural development process. It is clear that rural poverty is increasing, particularly among children, and that the land-grant universities must account for their part of the lack of progress in resolving the problem (Bane and Ellwood, 1989; O'Hare, 1988).

NATURE OF COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Interinstitutional relationships can be considered to vary in type and intensity (Molnar, 1978). One typology of the intensification of interorganizational relationships suggests that boundary spanning actors must first be aware of each other before they interact; they must interact before they act jointly; and they must act jointly before establishing formal ties or arrangements. Boundary spanners are individuals whose
positions, interests, or official responsibilities propel them to seek or receive contact with other institutions (Molnar and Rogers, 1979). Research directors and extension program leaders most often serve these functions.

Individuals must have some way of meeting or finding out about their counterparts in other institutions in the state. Once parties are aware of one another, letters, telephone calls, meetings, joint activities, joint programs, and shared resources reflect increasingly intensive levels of interdependence. Such interorganizational interdependence is viewed as desirable if it provides otherwise unachievable joint outcomes (Molnar and Rogers, 1982). Collaboration is also productive when joint efforts allow third-party resources to flow to support an interinstitutional venture. For example, the Alabama Agriculture and Forestry Leadership Development program obtained a high level of funding from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation for an activity that was collaboratively planned and implemented by the state’s three land-grant institutions (Molnar et al., 1985).

Joint activity also may allow more efficient use of taxpayer resources, particularly in a poor state with relatively low levels of funding for higher education spread over many small institutions. Such activity may be better termed coordination, involving interinstitutional contacts to sequence and otherwise mesh activities to better serve the public weal (Molnar and Rogers, 1985). Coordination is manifest in many different forms, but is largely reflected in a cumulative pattern of adjustment and mutual cooperation in programming, planning, and service.

Coordination is a process that is intended at one level to enhance organizational effectiveness. It also reflects the political economy of race that characterizes the two historically autonomous institutional systems. Coordination is often difficult to attend to when universities are preoccupied with internal problems and concerned about preserving institutional identities.

The motivation for seeking relationships is often ambivalent at the institutional level. In some cases, 1890 university programs are differentiated by the racial category of the clientele. In other instances, the 1862 universities fail to consider the prospective benefits of 1890 partnerships. Specifically, they often overlook the strengths associated with intimate connections to minority communities that 1890 schools bring to the rural development process.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Historical differences in the mission and constituency continue to bear on present-day relationships between the 1890 and 1862 universities. Instruction has been the dominant focus of the 1890 institutions. For many years, extension efforts to assist predominantly minority communities have been small and underfunded. Recently, research funding has expanded and the mission of 1890 institutions has generalized somewhat toward small farm as well as minority constituencies.

Whether both sets of institutions share common goals and objectives with respect to rural development is an empirical question (Molnar and Lawson, 1984). Clearly, 1890 institutional objectives center on the advancement and well-being of the minority population of the state. The 1862 schools have a broader focus on the state as a whole, but small town, Main Street, middle class residents seem to be a central focus for extension and other rural development program efforts. One observation to be made is that Native American and Hispanic populations, both characterized by high rates of poverty, do not find a central source of assistance in either set of institutions.
LEVELS OF RELATIONSHIPS

Interinstitutional ties exist on multiple levels and in multiple contexts. Some states have a Board of Regents or comparable statewide entity for coordinating higher education. Others govern higher education through a single statewide system with varying degrees of autonomy granted to the various campuses. In many cases, common status as land-grant universities with agricultural programs brings 1890 and 1862 leadership together in common cause. In some cases, rivalry and competition for priority, program, and prestige is a concern.

There is little or no interaction between the institutional governing boards of Alabama's land-grant universities. Trustees of the separate institutions do not typically interact or share decision making information. In the context of a weak central governance for higher education, relationships between the schools are fundamentally competitive.

At the administrative level, land-grant university presidents generally have little contact with each other within a state. Deans and directors with common substantive interests, particularly in agriculture and rural development, often interact to establish boundaries, divisions of labor, and to negotiate joint outcomes or products. One example of such limited collaboration is a recent Alabama extension publication that lists the various offerings of the three land-grant institutions in a common format (AES, 1992).

At the departmental and operating unit level, relationships fundamentally reflect interpersonal efforts and commonality. Faculty with coinciding research interests occasionally join to submit research proposals, conduct collaborative research, and coauthor publications. The actual record of these efforts is very thin, however, as a number of barriers seem to inhibit collaboration.

BARRIERS TO COLLABORATIVE ACTIVITY

Propinquity and face-to-face interaction are fundamental ingredients in fostering more complex forms of joint activity. Distance is a major factor separating and insulating faculty and other institutional actors from one another. In Alabama, it is possible for Auburn and Tuskegee personnel to drive to and from Huntsville for a meeting in one day, but the four-hour drive is a formidable barrier to more than occasional joint meetings. Even the 25 miles that separates Auburn and Tuskegee represents an additional transaction cost that inhibits frequent interaction. Nonetheless, the core of efforts to collaborate involves the willingness to bear and share such costs for the purpose of gaining a larger objective.

Another barrier to greater interinstitutional collaboration is associated with unsynchronized institutional cycles. Although Auburn follows a quarter system, its calendar is still different than that of Alabama A&M, which also organizes its teaching program by quarters. And this is further complicated by the fact that Tuskegee University follows a semester system. When teaching cycles do not resonate, the scheduling of conferences, meetings, and other forms of joint activity are complicated. When the inner lives of two institutions are beat at different rhythms, additional difficulties often constrain the joint efforts of otherwise willing faculty and administrators. In a notable act of administrative courage, the president of University of Alabama in Huntsville unilaterally declared a change from a semester teaching schedule to a quarter system to facilitate sharing of facilities, student co-registration, and other factors that would serve to bring the University of Alabama in Huntsville and Alabama A&M University closer together (Molnar, Dunkelberger, and Salter, 1981).
JOINT EFFORTS IN RESEARCH

The record of research relationships in rural development is very sparse. The era of Title V funding, with monies earmarked for rural development research, was marked by little 1890 involvement. In recent years, as 1890 research funds from federal and state sources have expanded, separate research programs have evolved. Occasionally, faculty from the various institutions have been invited to serve as reviewers or resource persons for various specific activities. Otherwise, a wide gulf has tended to separate the institutions.

Research efforts could be expanded through increased interaction at state-level professional meetings and other venues. One joint session on rural development programs took place at the Alabama Academy of Science Annual Meeting in 1985. Some exchange of seminars and visits have occurred in the meantime. Subsequent efforts have led to the formulation of research proposals for joint funding and other efforts. Recently, both Environmental Protection Agency and Department of Energy cooperative research programs (EPSCOR) have endeavored to foster collaboration by increasing the flow of federal research monies to the state.

JOINT EFFORTS IN EXTENSION

Extension activities have been the focus of judicial intervention to foster and direct joint action, a division of labor, and occasional instances of resource sharing. Both 1890 and 1862 extension services have tended to serve identifiable population segments. While 1862 directors endeavor to maintain that all residents comprise their clientele, in reality various studies have demonstrated that middle-class, rural, farm, and small town whites tend to be the central participants in most 1862 extension programs. The 1890 programs tend to focus on small, limited-resource farm populations. Urban and rural nonfarm, working class people tend to be bypassed and somewhat alienated from both extension systems. The poor white tends to be underserved by all components of the land-grant system (Flynt, 1989).

THE FUTURE OF 1890-1862 RELATIONSHIPS

A number of forces in society, including the climate for funding of higher education in the state and other dynamics of state budgets, will continue to shape the political economy of interinstitutional relationships. Federal budget deficits will continue to constrain the flow of monies to experiment stations and extension services. The continuing shrinkage in the number of farms and the relative contribution of agriculture to the state economy is leading to declining or steady levels of state funding in real terms for research activities. The ongoing national crisis of confidence in the extension service will serve to force institutions to seek partnerships as well as increase the difficulties of maintaining them. Collaboration is difficult to sustain in an era of scarce resources.

New means for communication that shorten distances and enhance information sharing will facilitate closer cooperation. Fax machines, computer networks, and teleconferencing facilities all increase the immediacy of contact and exchange. Although never a permanent substitute for face-to-face relationships, the expanded array of communication mechanisms do enhance the conduct and elaboration of interpersonal connections. The obstacles facing otherwise willing communicators are diminishing every day.

All the institutions in Alabama are becoming staffed by new cohorts of faculty and administrators who are increasingly removed from the negative attitudes and resentment of the civil rights era. The new institutional leadership is preoccupied with maintaining the viability and competitiveness of academic
programs and contributing to the progressive and orderly development of the state's resources (Molnar, Thompson, and Beauford, 1988). Declining taxpayer tolerance and commitment to wasteful funding of separate, unequal, less than fully effective institutional structures is also an impetus to change.

The future of interinstitutional relationships lies in establishing partnerships to achieve definable objectives, sharing information and resources to meet state needs, and using collaboration to obtain third party resources. New challenges associated with the advent of biotechnology (Sundquist and Molnar, 1991) and challenges to the federal role in agriculture will face both sets of institutions (Thurow, 1987). The goal is to advance progress both in the state as well as in the careers of individuals who serve through their professions in teaching, research, and extension.

CONCLUSION

This paper has outlined a number of issues related to the barriers and prospects for interinstitutional relationships. The values motivating progress are embedded in the values and traditions of the land-grant system. Progress will depend on firm leadership that is able to articulate and activate a vision of institutional structure that will fully realize the promise for a better tomorrow in rural Alabama.

Rural poverty rates will likely remain high for some time to come, but the character of efforts to reduce poverty is likely to change. Within the land-grant universities, the connections between efforts to ameliorate the suffering of rural poverty and the broader goal of rural development are often tenuous.

More families and children will replace declining numbers of extremely poor elderly individuals, particularly among minorities. Local efforts to provide employment and exploit situational resources will assume growing importance. Before 1862 and 1890 institutions can play a fully effective role in advancing rural development in Alabama, however, they must resolve fundamental internal problems of organization, institutional identity, and resource allocation.

Community self-determination will be a significant theme in coming economic development efforts. For the poor who possess sufficient education, appropriate skills, and productive work attitudes, the opportunities generated by local initiatives will lift some out of poverty.

For the poor unable to participate in the world of work by reason of incapacitation, substance dependence, or other social-psychological conditions, the welfare system will continue to be the support of last resort. Food stamps, health care subsidies, and housing allowances can continue to provide a meager existence. National-level crises in health costs, budget deficit, and nonsocial spending priorities will also adversely affect the well-being of the poor and nearly poor in rural areas (Molnar, Nelson, and McGranahan, 1991). Land-grant institutions have a role to play in facilitating the implementation and productive use of human resource programs.

Bootstrap solutions featuring internal job creation and economic development will ameliorate poverty for some locales. In the context of a healthy national economy, efforts to ameliorate rural poverty must recognize the structural and demographic realities that perpetuate rural poverty in the long term. At the same time, land-grant institutions must continue to help rural locales break the internal cycle that reproduces poverty in subsequent generations. When the national economy falters, the prospects for improvement seem bleak indeed (Sawhill, 1988).

It is difficult to improve on the 1966 conclusion of the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty which established poverty as a result of a web of issues related to: poor health and nutrition; inadequate housing and sanitation services; marginal educational and vocational training programs; the lack of accessibility to services and economic opportunities; and in many cases racism, sexism, and age discrimination. Only by addressing all of these matters can land-grant institutions ameliorate rural poverty and further the process of rural development.
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For many years, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has had special relationships with the 1890 institutions. Recently, those relationships have been strengthened. The change results partly from efforts of the USDA-1890 Leadership Group and partly because USDA agencies have realized that their staff needs to better reflect the composition of the U.S. population.

The Economic Research Service (ERS) sees the 1890 institutions as valuable recruiting sources. ERS envisions joint efforts with the 1890s not only as a means to find students with good potential for graduate training, but also as a means to ensure that the institutions are aware of ERS's needs. For the universities, joint cooperative efforts can lead to opportunities for students and faculty alike.

In recent years, ERS has undertaken a number of special efforts to strengthen relationships with 1890 institutions and has worked to ensure that the 1890s are included in more ongoing activities. Examples of these efforts include:

Capacity Building Grants—ERS has been an active participant in the USDA Capacity Building Grants Program, agreeing to serve as cooperators on numerous grants each year. In 1990 and 1991, four proposals on which ERS was a cooperator, were funded. Since then, ERS has sent staff to several of the schools to give seminars, provide staff to serve as consultants on curriculum development, and worked with several schools to increase the number of summer intern applicants. In 1992, ERS has agreed to act as cooperator on eleven proposals.

Cooperative Education—ERS has two coop education students from the 1890 schools. Both of them will serve as summer interns this year and will continue as coop students in the fall, when one of them will be going to graduate school.

Summer Internships—ERS has made a special effort over the last several years, and even more so this year, to get information to 1890 students about the summer intern program. The response from many 1890 students has been enthusiastic. The final decisions have not all been made, but it appears that at least nine summer interns will be from the 1890s. They survived a very competitive selection process and are an impressive group.

Visits and Seminars—ERS has stepped up its efforts to provide both substantive seminars and recruitment sessions at 1890 institutions this year, already sending staff to six schools.

Research Agreements—ERS currently has research agreements with four 1890 schools. ERS uses these agreements to broaden the agency's research base and to support joint research. These agreements can be initiated by ERS or suggested by faculty at the respective institutions.
Surplus Equipment—In 1991, ERS provided surplus computer equipment valued at $38,000 to four 1890 institutions. As other equipment becomes surplus, such support will continue.

In conclusion, over the coming years, it is hoped that we can jointly solidify our relationships and initiate further cooperative and collaborative endeavors. But this will rely on good, two-way communication and better as well as more frequent interactions between ERS and the administration, faculty and students of the 1890 institutions. The investments required on both parties to accomplish this goal have potentially high returns in terms of strengthened institutions and a broader, more diverse and capable employment base of agricultural social scientists.
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Report by the Working Groups

The sixteen 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University generally possess unique expertise in "reaching the unreach" through relatively specialized and diverse instructional, research and outreach programs. With limited human and capital resources, many of those programs, by necessity, have addressed production problems in the agricultural sector. With changing agricultural production practices resulting in loss of jobs, services and populations in rural areas, the social dimensions that affect important aspects of life—health, environment, labor, transportation, education, among others—now merit increased attention.

Questions remain unanswered, however, on how to improve the quality of life for farmers, agribusinesses, rural societies and consumers served by 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University. Recognizing that the social dimension of many rural problems is usually the most difficult to address, the goal of having working groups was to initiate a process aimed at strengthening understanding and use of social science research primarily at 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University.

The outcome of the three working group discussions is the beginning of an evolving blueprint for enhancing the work of these institutions through social science research.

PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES OF SOCIAL SCIENTISTS AT
1890 INSTITUTIONS AND TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY

The problems and challenges for social scientists at the 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University are multifaceted. They include organizational issues, professional concerns and related matters of concern.

Organizational issues include:

- Tenure
- Low numbers of social scientists.
- Lack of graduate level programs.
- Lack of resources (time, funding) to both hire and support social science teachers and researchers as compared to physical sciences.
- Limited access to decisionmaking processes and policymaking positions.
- Little or no linkage between social scientists and research administrators.
- Few linkages between various social science disciplines (rural sociology, agricultural economics, anthropology, home economics, political science, sociology, etc.).
Professional concerns include:

- Some social scientists are faced with multiple and conflicting expectations, i.e., teaching assignments, research activities and service obligations.
- Social scientists often see themselves as separate from the rest of the university when they should view themselves in a broader context.
- There is a lack of knowledge about what constitutes the social sciences and social science research, i.e., what are the social sciences? what role do the social sciences have to play in community development? what are methods unique to the social sciences? and what results can be expected from social science research?
- Social science research results and information are not always disseminated into the local community; dissemination is critical in order for the community to act with the most timely information possible.

Other related matters of concern include:

- The lack of a clear organizational vision by the 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University for their role in interdisciplinary research programs.
- The closeness of 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University to many national problems, and the increasing demands being made on the academic community for relevancy.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH AT THE 1890 INSTITUTIONS AND TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY**

A specific recommendation was made for a proposal to be written and submitted to the Association of Research Directors (ARD) for the approval by the Council of 1890 Presidents. The proposal would request Farm Foundation and Southern Rural Development Center to support a strategic planning committee focused on strengthening social science research at their institutions. The committee would meet once or twice a year to develop strategic plans for social science research and to develop projects, e.g., a regional project on the Black Belt. This committee would create linkages between the research administrators, social scientists, as well as linkages with the 1862 institutions, USDA/ERS and others. If approved, ARD would appoint members from their respective institutions with one ARD member as a liaison between the committee and ARD.

Solutions to some of the problems limiting social science research at 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University are quite evident, i.e., increased financing for under-funded programs. Remedies to other shortcomings and problem issues are not as easily identified. Recommendations focus on three areas: funding, interdisciplinary involvement and administration.

**Funding:**

- Award equity funding to 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University for social science research.
- Encourage joint funding (1890s, Tuskegee University and 1862s) with public and private funding sources.

Interdisciplinary Involvement:

- Increase involvement of social scientists with appropriate technical fields.
- Increase collaboration to increase efficiency and maximize return to investment.

Administration:

- Require more interaction among 1890/Tuskegee University and 1862 faculties.
- Prioritize issues.

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ADDRESSED IN SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

How can social science research be made more relevant for the classroom? for Cooperative Extension? and for Continuing Education?

Group One considered that the key to making social science research relevant to the classroom, cooperative extension, and continuing education is in encouraging participation in the community by social science researchers and in having community input into setting the social science research agenda.

Problems:

- The social activism of the 1960s seems to be lacking in the 1990s.
- Local community volunteerism is not systematically rewarded.
- There is a lack of communication between:
  - university and local community,
  - university and local Cooperative Extension agents, and
  - state extension staff and local community.

Recommendations:

Since the 1890s and Tuskegee University serve and are often located in low income limited resource areas, opportunities for classroom and extension relevance and community service are available:

For the Classroom:

- Faculty should focus on community issues and use the community as a laboratory.
• Faculty should develop courses and syllabi that focus on social issues/problems, their causes, methods for investigation, means to address these issues, etc.

• Faculty should bring social issues/problems into the classroom via local guest lecturers to spark student interest and to encourage local community participation.

• Interaction should be promoted between faculty and the local community to reach consensus on issues/problems to be addressed and results that are required/desired.

• Faculty and students should address a local community issue/problem in some form.

For Cooperative Extension:

• County agents should periodically lecture on the university campus on "real life" issues found in their communities.

• County agents should participate in research performed in and /or relevant to their communities.

• County agents should be given opportunities to receive instruction on social science issues, methods and information dissemination that will help address the needs of their communities.

• State extension staff should make presentations periodically to local communities.

How can the social sciences be made more relevant in setting research priorities to deal with citizens' concerns and interests?

Group Two considered the situation facing social scientists in Colleges of Agriculture at land-grant institutions and agreed with Ron Wimberley's earlier statement, "It is finally our turn at bat, but they may be about to turn out the stadium lights." Within this framework of urgency and opportunity, a number of specific issues facing social science research at 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University were identified:

Problems:

• Funding is not available for social science research as it is for biotechnology research.

• Applied social science research dealing with real world problems is not highly respected by disciplinary researchers.

• Social scientists often do not find good health care and good schools in the areas where 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University are located; their families suffer as a consequence.

• The 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University get very little funding from state legislatures.
• The 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University are willing to take risks in making their institutions relevant, but it is not clear if anyone is willing to help them absorb the costs of this risk-taking.

• Political pressure from commercial agriculture is brought to bear on Colleges of Agriculture in an effort to prevent them from conducting research that addresses the social and economic issues of disadvantaged populations. This pressure continues despite the fact College of Agriculture budgets are shrinking.

Opportunities:

• 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University have contacts with disadvantaged audiences; thus, the opportunity to engage them in participatory research.

• The 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University will not deny tenure to a productive social scientist who is engaged in problem-oriented rather than disciplinary research.

• The 1862 institutions have not adequately served the needs of disadvantaged white populations and are now being called upon to do so. The 1890s have historically met this need and can capitalize on this strength. (A third of the population in the 400 most persistently poor counties in the U.S. is White).

• The changing demographics of the U.S. may create opportunities for the social scientists at the 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University to help corporations and businesses understand the demands of culturally diverse consumers.

• There are niches in the domestic and international markets that could be met by small southern farmers if the specialized demands of the agribusiness industry were better understood (e.g., grains grown without pesticides for the pet food industry).

• Population shifts from rural to urban or to less rural areas provides an opportunity to tap sources of research funding that addresses the urban/rural interface (NASA and the Forest Service were specifically noted).

• Farm organizations and agribusinesses concerned with the environment were noted as possible collaborators in the social sciences research agenda of the 1890 institutions and Tuskegee University.

How can linkages between the social sciences at the 1890 institutions/Tuskegee University and the 1862 institutions be strengthened?

Group Three felt that encouragement and support from administrations for increased personal contacts and joint programs would strengthen linkages between 1890/Tuskegee University and 1862 institutions and their scientists. This would increase understanding of each others’ research, teaching and service programs.
Recommendation:

Joint programs would include:

- Funding of projects,
- Planning and presentations at state meetings, and
- Faculty and staff development.

How can the linkages between the social sciences at 1890 institutions/Tuskegee University and USDA be strengthened?

Recommendations:

- Increase personal interaction among social scientists to assure common understanding of research.
- Develop joint funded projects/programs for faculty and staff development.
- Involve 1890 and Tuskegee University social scientists in USDA meetings and/or USDA social scientists in 1890 meetings.
- Establish additional liaison positions with social science focus.
- Identify university personnel who will serve as agency contacts for other disciplines.
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