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Good morning ladies and gentlemen and welcome to Nashville for our conference, "Changing Environment for the Cooperative Extension Service." We are extremely pleased you have chosen to attend this 3rd Annual Southern Region Program Leadership Conference.

Southern Program Leaders are being joined by Extension Directors and Agricultural Research Directors from thirteen Southern States, Extension representatives of the 1890 Institutions, Extension Program Leaders from our national office, our National Extension Director, the Minnesota Extension Director and some of the most exciting speakers I have seen on a program in a long time.

I want to welcome all the people who are attending our meeting for the first time and would like to ask you to stand.

When the Program Leadership Committee met to plan this meeting, our attention turned to the tremendous changes that are ongoing within Extension and throughout the South, and indeed throughout this nation. There has been a major recession, a shifting of state and national priorities and substantial downsizing of government agencies including higher education. Consequently, Extension and many of its sister organizations have been in the throes of managing downsizing and change that has equaled only by the Great Depression. The Program Leadership Committee felt that dealing with these overwhelming changes was a little like meeting a bear in the woods. You either eat the bear, or it eats you. With that in mind, we decided to put together the program you have before you. During the course of this conference, you will deal with the "Forces of Change" as described by Don Dillman and David Snyder. Those changes will be informational, sociological, demographic, technological, economic and political. You will then have a chance to have Jerry Apps deal with the problem of Empowering Change—The Human Dimension. Each of us must do that if we are to be successful as leaders in our respective assignments. You each will be given a chance to hear a research and extension director share their ideas on how we're to manage the changing relationships between research and extension throughout the South, and how we can make both agencies more effective and efficient. Myron Johnsrud will share with us some of the trends, both past and future, of how change is affecting ES-USDA, and how extension is changing across this nation. A state that underwent massive reorganization at an early point in this national downsizing has been Minnesota, and Pat Borich will share with us the fundamental problems that his state experienced and the concepts they developed to change their system. Finally, Judy Burtner will close our conference by helping us understand the human emotions experienced by each of us and by our faculty and staff as we change to meet our future.

During the course of the next three days, there will be opportunities for us to meet at roundtables and undertake exercises to improve our understanding and to work out practical solutions to the way we want to deal with change as a leadership group. As leaders in the Southern Region, we can and must manage our future for a positive outcome. I have great confidence that each of you will successfully do that. We hope this conference is one step toward that solution and will provide a number of ideas and tools which will allow you to understand and shape your future. And of course, nine and a-half hours have been reserved so that each of you may meet with colleagues of similar programming backgrounds to look at the specific problems of change that are ongoing in your annual program sessions. It is here that your ideas and techniques must be translated into action for implementation in your respective
states. This year we are joined by 1890 representatives to each of the groups, because we know we must deliver programs together if we are to be successful in a downsized organization. Building strong partnerships is absolutely essential between the 1862 and 1890 organizations if we are to meet the future needs of this region.

Now I would like to introduce the Program Committee and have them stand:

Sue Fisher - 4-H Youth Development, University of Florida (our next chair)

Ned Browning - Communications Mississippi State University

Meatra Harrison - Middle Management Texas A&M University

Horace Hudson - Community Development University of Georgia

Martha Johnson - Home Economics Auburn University

Jimmy Richardson - Staff Development Mississippi State University

Ann Thompson - Advisor Auburn University

Doss Brodnax - Ex-Officio Southern Rural Development Center

Bonnie Teater - Ex-Officio Southern Rural Development Center

And although Steve Halbrook, Associate Managing Director of Farm Foundation, is not a member of our Program Committee, the generous support of Farm Foundation helped make this conference possible. Let's give them all a hand.

To begin our program, the first speaker I would like to introduce is Don Dillman.
RURAL AMERICA APPROACHING THE 21st CENTURY

Don A. Dillman
Senior Survey Methodologist, U.S. Bureau of the Census
Professor, Sociology and Rural Sociology
Director, Social and Economic Sciences Research Center, Washington State University

As I prepared for this presentation, I found myself reflecting upon my previous experiences with Cooperative Extension. My roots are as much in extension as they are in rural America, where I’ve spent most of my life.

As a young person in rural Iowa, I remember the extension agent being a frequent visitor in our farm home, and what he told us carried a lot of weight in everything we did, from farm to household management. I was active in extension youth programs, which in those days were synonymous with 4-H, and as a college student spent two summers as an extension trainee. As a rural sociologist at Washington State University, for many years a part of my appointment was as an extension specialist. I administered extension programs as a department chair and later as an acting community resource development program leader. For these reasons, some aspects of Cooperative Extension are quite familiar to me.

Also on my mind as I prepared to come here was how much rural America is changing from what I experienced as a 4-H er, an extension trainee, and as an extension specialist and administrator. The forces pushing us towards the 21st century are creating a rural America unlike any we have ever experienced. The result, is a need for Cooperative Extension to respond in ways that may be hard to envision.

My purpose this morning is to talk about an important aspect of this change. In a nutshell, it is to explain how information technologies are reshaping both the prospects and possibilities for rural places. For the most part, the importance and speed of this change are not well recognized. Many of the issues I will discuss this morning have been described in considerable detail in previous papers I have written and upon which these comments are partly based. References to those works are attached.

THREE ERAS OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION

Community Control Era

Early in this century a rural community was a place that a resident could, and typically did, go about the rounds of daily life and get all of their life needs met—job, school, church, recreation, consumer purchases, medical care, and political participation (Figure 1). If you couldn’t get it locally, so it was said, you probably didn’t really need it.

Rural communities tended to have small and homogeneous populations of farm families plus others dependent upon agriculture, forestry, or other natural resource-based industries. The existence of an overlapping institutional structure, whereby residents for the most part interacted with the same people in every area of life, meant that community norms evolved and were a very strong force of control over people’s lives. As a young person in Southern Iowa, I learned early in life that if my mother said, "What will the neighbors think?" we most likely wouldn’t be doing whatever was being discussed. Perhaps some of you were raised in such a community.

Farms and most other businesses were family-owned and operated. Rural communities were largely self-contained and a few local leaders handled transactions with the outside world. Community development was by self-help projects and local resources. Rural areas were relatively isolated due to poor

1 The opinions expressed in this presentation are the author’s and should not be attributed to the U.S. Bureau of the Census or to Washington State University.
transportation and communication facilities, thus reinforcing community self-sufficiency.

Cooperative Extension, established by the Smith-Lever Act in 1917, was a brilliant innovation. Extension agents were established at "the edge" of communities, neither fish nor fowl, but some of both. They were connected inside the community, but they also were connected to an outside knowledge base, the land-grant university. By becoming accepted members of the community and adhering to community norms, their voice was listened to, but by being connected outside, they became the source of new ideas.

Most rural people were connected to agriculture throughout rural America, a third or more of the nation's entire population was on farms, and rural people were not well off. Any attempt to improve rural life, and also improve food production so that levels of living could be raised throughout society, quite logically should have been focused squarely on agriculture, and that's what extension did. Extension clearly deserves much of the credit for the transformation of rural America during the 20th century.

Mass Society Era

New eras of social organization don't announce themselves with brass bands and blazing neon lights—they creep forward, mostly without notice, like disorganized bands of revolutionary insurgents, until suddenly they appear all around us.

The mass society didn't start with Wheaties or Cheerios, but they were an important part of it. So was the fact that most people got their war news from Edward R. Murrow, and later the evening news from either Huntley and Brinkley or Cronkite.

The mass society was the result of learning that efficiency could best be achieved by developing huge markets and delivering the same product to virtually everyone. It never developed to the extreme of everyone driving only black Model T Fords, but Fordism became the symbol of the developing mass society, when auto workers, because of each doing a tiny part of the construction of each car, reached the point of being able to purchase the cars they helped to produce. Huge assembly lines and giant hierarchically organized corporations, from General Electric to IBM, became the prevailing symbols of what a mass society was all about.

In practical terms it meant that people's commitment was shifted from local community to the corporation. IBM was often referred to as standing for "I've Been Moved!" I went to college during this era, and became friends with a placement officer. I recall one day going to the office of a friend, and he unloaded his sense of exasperation, "Don, every agricultural graduate I've talked to today wants a job in an Iowa town of a few thousand people. I have no such jobs. But, I can place everyone of them in Chicago, Kansas City, Minneapolis, or any other city, but they've got to be willing to move." Times had changed. The mass society meant that large corporations replaced small family-owned businesses, and penetrated small communities with franchises such as Dairy Queen, State Farm Insurance, A and W, Gambles, Montgomery Ward, and International Harvester. The same products became available virtually everywhere.

For Cooperative Extension, this was the start of the struggle between an organizational structure that pitted county agents and specialists against one another, and gave rise to the "standard recommended practice." I remember, during this era, our extension agent's attempt to convince my father to sell his hogs when they reached 200 pounds because it was more profitable, and my father's frustration that he wanted them to get to 250 because he made more money. We had a general farm and, no matter what, we would raise two litters a year. The standard recommendation was a profit maximizing one that assumed an extra litter to make maximal use of the equipment, so it made sense to turn over the hogs sooner. This recommendation, and the frustration experienced by my father, in some ways typifies the mass society—a single recommendation for everyone; that really wasn't what a lot of individuals wanted. In the end, this was the Achilles heel of the mass society for which the advent of the information era provided a solution.
Information Era

The information era is based upon the substitution of information for labor, energy, other resources, and time for the production of goods and services.

The idea is deceptively simple. When a manager or innovator looks at how to save money, produce something for less, or expand a market, he/she can focus on several distinct issues.

Warehouses can be mostly eliminated by insisting upon coordinated, just-in-time delivery of needed materials.

Equipment can be retooled very quickly by computers and software to provide dozens of versions of a product, where in the past the difficulty of re-tooling meant that only one standard product was made.

Multiple pricing structures and purchase requirements can be used to sell a product cheaply to people who won't buy it otherwise, and to sell it at a high price for people or businesses who can't plan ahead, e.g., airfares.

Being able to figure out exact stress points in products makes it possible to remove hundreds of pounds of metal from cars, and development of new alloys and plastics makes it possible to remove additional weight.

In each of these instances, information is being substituted for other resources. The marriage of computers and high speed, high quantity, transmission capabilities means that coordination, precision, and production capabilities unthinkable only a decade or so ago now are routine. This substitution is the driving force behind companies being able to outsource the production of component parts that require tolerances to the thousandths of an inch, resulting in their fabrication in countries throughout the world.

These changes show up in employment figures describing the type of work people do (Figure 2). The percentages of U.S. residents employed in manufacturing and agriculture are declining sharply and the percent employed in services is rising just as sharply. By the year 2000, the person who cannot operate a computer in his or her work, and thus be able to manipulate information quickly, will be an exception to the norm, much like the telephone operator in front of a switchboard became obsolete during our transition to a mass society. These figures don't mean that agriculture or manufacturing aren't important—they simply mean that we are substituting information for other components of production in large amounts, and it takes a lot fewer people to directly produce products.

The telephone can be used to illustrate differences in rural America and how the transmission of information has contributed to economic development. In the first third of the century, the telephone helped farmers through the infamous party line. They could call one another and save enormous amounts of time needed for planning cooperative work efforts, finding out market prices, etc. In the middle third of this century, the telephone, radio, and television contributed to the massification of U.S. society by facilitating the coordination essential for developing large corporations, a development which brought rural America into the mainstream of American society. In particular, the development of long-distance voice phone underpinned these new organizational and production methods.

The convergence of advanced computer and transmission capabilities and, in particular, machine-to-machine communication in the emerging information era provide a basis for new forms of effective organizations. Long-distance outsourcing and coordination of production activities are predicated upon sending massive amounts of information very quickly between distant locations. Facsimile transmission and electronic mail are now commonplace, and we are approaching the point that about half of telephone communications consist of data rather than voice transmissions.

The implications of these three eras for many social and economic activities are shown in Figure 3, where the dominant form of activities shown at the left are specified for the
three eras, beginning with telecommunications (also see Dillman, 1986; 1990).

The shift from community control to the information era doesn't just "make possible" shifts in the orientations described above, but makes them mandatory. We are not talking about a simple shift in one aspect of our society or the world; we are talking about a megashift that permeates nearly every facet of life.

**A Personal Example of Change**

When I describe changes like those outlined above, my comments are often met with skepticism about whether the change is really happening. Even if it is happening, people sometimes argue that is occurring slowly enough that for practical purposes it can be mostly ignored and left to later generations to deal with. My response is no to both questions. Perhaps a personal example will help illustrate the rapidity of change and why it cannot be left for later generations to cope with.

I was raised in the 1940s and 50s in rural Iowa. Our party-line phone number was two longs and two shorts. When my parents shouted the words "long distance" I knew they would continue to shout into the phone (transmission was pretty bad), and my brother and I were to be quiet or leave the room (which we never did, because long distance was exciting in those days). In the 1960s I went to college, still before telephones in the U.S. had area codes, and long distance was still expensive enough that calls home were quick and to the point—never for a long visit. In one of my part-time jobs I was allowed to operate a calculator with a square root function—a real honor. The calculator cost about $648 (in 1962 dollars). A few years later the new mainframe computer on the Iowa State University campus went from 64k to 128k and required graduate students like myself to "guess" how much of the computer we needed for data runs so that we wouldn't be charged for excess space.

The changes from then until 1980 were tremendous but, still, few people spoke of an information age. About that same time I edited a book, *Rural Society in the U.S.: Research Issues for the 1980s*. The aim of the book was to be comprehensive, yet there was not a single paragraph in it arguing for studying the impact of information technologies on rural people or places.

I had no idea in 1980 that only a decade later:

1. There would be four computers in my house (one with less value than a 10-year-old used car), each of which would have 2-10 times the power of the mainframe computer which I was trained on during graduate school.

2. That I would live in a place with 100 channels on television, or that before coming to Nashville to give this talk I would use those channels to check the weather, and another to see if my plane was on time at the airport.

3. That I could send a package to Europe, or about anywhere, overnight, and check its progress by calling up certain telephone numbers.

4. That I would solve a library research problem, that would have taken me several days, by sending a message via Bitnet (or Internet) at 5:00 P.M. to the scholar at the University of Heidelberg who was likely to know what sources had the information I wanted, and have an answer waiting for me in my computer at 8:00 the next morning.

5. That the office of virtually every business in the U.S. would have (access to) a facsimile machine, or that many businesses would refuse to buy products from businesses without a facsimile machine.

6. That many small rural businesses would find it mandatory to order supplies by modem—mail or voice orders would not be permitted.

7. That nearly everyone I really need to talk to would have voice mail on their phone.

8. That the Survey Research Center I direct in Pullman, Washington, would do more than
1.5 million dollars worth of surveys each year; that all of the 30-40 employees would need to have computer skills that surpassed those of the director, and that we would have customers in distant cities, many of whom we had never met face-to-face.

9. That a person interested in buying 300 enameled cloisonne quilting pens for a nonprofit organization to sell would fax the designer an order to a small town in the midwest, which would fax the order to Korea, and the order could be sent back in a few days.

10. That each of the items I buy from my grocery store would be itemized on the sales slip, by name, by simply sweeping a "barcode" across a light-reader on the sales counter, or that one firm could analyze the data to see how often individual customers buy artichoke hearts, catsup, or any other produce.

11. That I could spend nearly two years 2000 miles away from my bank, and have no need to open a checking account, thanks to cash machines.

12. That I would use a computer and a communication system (Prodigy) at home to send letters to friends across the country.

13. That I would order all of my shirts by mail in order to get my exact fit which is not carried by most department stores.

14. That I would take a short trip to Mexico, and the American Express bill for parts of it would beat me home.

15. That national firms with shops in upscale malls throughout the U.S. would be run from small towns in Utah and Colorado, and each night the headquarters would have complete inventories of that day's sales.

16. That I would be able to order pizza from a small town in Eastern Washington by calling a toll free number nearly 300 miles away.

17. That my car dealer would be able to locate in 15 minutes the only car at any dealership in the Pacific Northwest of a desired model with four doors and electric windows.

Information technologies now permeate our lives in ways not thought possible by most of us only a decade or so ago. The age of telematics, or the information age, has gone past the insurgency stage to now being directly in front of us, and it cannot be ignored. Regardless of whether one lives in rural America or urban America, or some other country of the world, it's necessary to deal with it, and to do so on nearly a daily basis.

Robert Reich, in The Work of Nations has described many of the implications for work of the information age. It should be mandatory reading for everyone concerned about employment creation or improving quality of life. In it he describes three types of future jobs: routine work, in-person service work, and symbolic analysts. Routine work is going to go where wages are lower and, if it is to be kept in the United States, it will only happen with significantly lower wages. The second type of worker is the in-person service provider. There will be lots of these types of people in the future. How well they are rewarded will depend in large part on the wealth of the people they directly serve. Symbolic analysts are information workers. Fundamentally, they create procedures for producing goods and services, and are the creators of "value" in the information age. Unlike the mass society, in the information age, the wealth of companies will less and less reflect their buildings, equipment, and land, and more and more reflect the quality of their symbolic analysts.

At present our society is not doing a very good job, in either rural or urban America, of instilling in young people the skills needed to be
the highly-valued symbolic analysts who provide the basis for future economic development. Relatively few young people develop foreign language skills or math skills to a high level of proficiency, and large numbers do not finish high school. Most people have little contact with people from other countries. In the mass society, when one attempted to design and market products, what one needed to know was what on average could be made and sold to a huge national market. Most of those decisions were made at the topic of a corporate hierarchy. In the information age, and the world economy that has resulted, opportunities exist for marketing towards specialized markets throughout the world. This requires that entrepreneurs have an understanding of, and perhaps more importantly an appreciation for, other cultures and societies. Our relative isolation from the rest of the world, the result of physical distance and one language, was ideal for development of mass production methods; however, these factors are now one of the major barriers that make it difficult for us to compete with other countries.

Whenever I come in contact with a successful rural entrepreneur, I make a point of asking him or her about their reasons for success. When I congratulated one producer of value-added wood products in Montana and asked my usual question, it brought a smile to his face. "Oh, I'm not really a business person. I'm a social worker, and I spent several years working in the Far East. Then Dad died, and the family needed for me to come back home." When he went back home he brought with him a sensitivity to other cultures that helped him to produce and market products they would consume.

CONCLUSION

Whoever first uttered the ancient Chinese curse of "may you live in interesting times" surely did not have in mind the 1990s, but he/she could have—we certainly have them.

The United States is at a critical juncture. We are at the tail end of a mass society in which the central tendency was to rely on petroleum, natural resources, large assembly lines under one roof, mass production of thousands, or millions of identical products, and schools that have tried to instill in people the same basic skills suitable for work in that environment.

We are entering a new era in which information is being substituted for other resources to produce goods and services. The nature of information, and the ability to manipulate it through telecommunications and computerization at all levels of society, requires different skills and methods of organization for success. Producers can produce just what individual customers want and deliver it to them regardless of physical distance and societal boundaries.

People’s attitudes and beliefs are caught somewhere in between. I suspect that even in this room some of you view the mass society as an era you would like to hang on to. Some of you may long for the comfort that many people found in the community control era. Perhaps a few of you are even looking at the information age as a panacea that we should consciously strive to achieve.

My own view of these eras is somewhat philosophical. Each era has or had some attributes I like, but what era we happen to be in is not so much a matter as choice as circumstance. Throughout history, societies have used one resource to near its limits, and then found another to exploit. In the community control era it was hand labor and limited mechanical power applied to natural resources. In the mass society it was energy and mechanical power applied to natural resources, and in the information age it’s symbolic manipulations applied to the production of all manner of goods and services.

Typically, power accrues to those who control the important resources of society. In the community control era power accrued to landowners; in the mass society to the corporate leaders of industrial giants. Recently, I learned of two new personal mansions being built in Seattle, Washington, the state where I now live. One belongs to Bill Gates of Microsoft and the other to one of the McCaw families who own McCaw cellular communications. Their fortunes stem from information age industries.
Finally, let me return to Cooperative Extension and the challenges it faces. It has an incredibly rich heritage of facilitating the change from a community control era to the mass society. In 1917 most of rural America was comprised of farmers and farm families. If a brand new organization at that time were to ask what to do to help rural America, it should have focused on how to make farmers more efficient and improve household production. That, of course, is precisely what Extension did.

If in 1992 we were to take a blue-sky look (make no assumptions about the existing organization or its commitments) and ask what an organization should do to try to help rural America and the larger society of which it is one part, I don't think its primary emphasis would be on agriculture. Only about two percent of the nation and perhaps nine percent of rural counties are comprised of farmers. The fastest growing type of job in rural America during the 1980s was services.

Why not consider concentrating on the largest segments of the population, and on sectors of the economy that are most likely to produce jobs, and on information age skills that are becoming a prerequisite to virtually all of the important jobs available to people? Why not emphasize science education for youth, and other symbolic manipulation skills so critical to their development?

In 1917 the challenge was to bring rural America into the mainstream of American society. In 1992 the challenge is to bring rural America into the mainstream of the world economy; our future depends upon it.
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Figure 1. Three Eras of Social and Economic Organization

Figure 2. United States Work Force Distribution

Figure 3. Examples of Differences in Dominant Activity Orientations, by Era

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>COMMUNITY CONTROL ERA</th>
<th>MASS SOCIETY</th>
<th>INFORMATION ERA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of telephone</td>
<td>Local voice</td>
<td>Long-distance voice</td>
<td>Data transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Hand, mechanical</td>
<td>Petroleum, machine</td>
<td>Electrical computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly valued labor skills</td>
<td>Craft, brute strength work ethic</td>
<td>Assembly, dexterity, follow orders</td>
<td>Manipulate symbols, self-motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant occupations</td>
<td>Agricultural, manufacturing</td>
<td>Manufacturing, service</td>
<td>Service, information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>Local custom-oriented</td>
<td>National, mass-oriented</td>
<td>Worldwide, targeted, niche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkage of producers to consumers</td>
<td>Brokered with local feedback</td>
<td>Limited with general feedback</td>
<td>Substantial, direct, with specific feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed information support</td>
<td>Community specific</td>
<td>Standard recommended practices for all</td>
<td>Individual specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer orientations</td>
<td>Multiple, basic commodities</td>
<td>Single, major commodity</td>
<td>Multiple, value-added products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FAMILIES FORGE THE FUTURE: SUSTAINING THE SOCIAL BASE OF OUR ECONOMIC ENTERPRISE

A Public Policy Assessment

Gregg Edwards, Director
The Academy for Advanced & Strategic Studies
Washington, D.C.

David Pearce Snyder, Managing Partner
Snyder’s Family Enterprise
Bethesda, MD

PREFACE

Since the 1880s, America has relied upon big business and big government to drive the productivity gains on which our pre-eminent prosperity has been based. To support the big industrial corporations and then rechannel their benefits, we created big institutions—our big industrial cities, then their political "machines" during the 1870s and '80s; Federal coordination of business and markets, then public works and welfare in the 1920s and 30s; and big science, then big education in the 1940s and 50s. But since the middle 1960s—and now for more than a quarter century—productivity gains have faltered and financial growth has stalled. The result is major dislocations for many families and especially those looking for good jobs and hoping to have and educate children.

The explosive growth in the power of computer and communications technology seems poised to transform our industrial economy, and to reignite another era of productivity growth. However, after twenty years of promises, we have seen neither a new burst of productivity nor any major economic and social benefits. Does this mean that computers are just a showy secondary technology, like the typewriter and teletype—important but not, like the printing press and electric motor, truly transforming? No, the history of past technological transitions shows that it takes a generation or two for people to learn how to use a powerful new technology and then to apply that power productively. Almost always, some old institutions—like cities and markets, public works and schools—have to be radically reshaped to support the new applications and to leverage their benefits. These "social technologies" themselves take time, usually a generation, to establish as the means for teaching people how to productively use and responsibly apply the new powers.

During the last century, the family was passively reshaped as many of its productive functions—not just agriculture and food preparation, home industry and crafts, but also health, education, welfare, and entertainment were "professionalized" and transferred to the big new "industrialized" institutions. Now that we are shifting to an information and service economy, the family can no longer be viewed as a mere passive unit of consumption. On the contrary, the family can play an increasingly productive role as the dominant provider of functions—information and services—that are vital, not just for its members, but for large institutions and society as a whole.

Productive uses of information and service technologies depend especially on the qualities of mind and character that families develop and support in their members. Once families are generally involved in using and applying these new technologies, productivity should take off once again. But if policymakers continue to treat families as colonies—backwards clients to be taught ideal behavior, cheap alternatives for supplying secondary services, or passive consumers for commercial products—the capacity for contribution by families and members will not be fully developed, and our collective potential for productivity growth will be greatly cut.
Just as other productive institutions have required support institutions to best realize their productive potential, so must the family. This paper closes with some suggestions on how business practice and government policy can leverage the family’s productive capacity, and speed the adoption of productive technique. We argue that families need to regain a primary role as productive units of society, and that the last century’s revolutionary construction of large institutions need be completed by closing the circle—by big institutions providing supporting information and services to the family such that families can better serve big institutions and society. This "reinvention" of the family can proceed out of the natural needs and ingenuity of its members—so long as other special and ideological interests allow families to forge their own future.

I. Technical Transitions Brings Tighter Times . . .

A. And nations can neither buy nor bully their way to a secure prosperity.

At the beginning of the 1980s—spurred by large-scale and accelerating losses to foreign competition—the leadership of the US business community made a collective commitment to revitalize American productivity through massively refocusing their investments into new workplace technologies.

From the outset, it was commonly understood that the widespread installation of productivity-enhancing technologies would unavoidably cause great social changes and costs. However, because of the absolute need to maintain the nation’s competitiveness in the global marketplace in order to assure our continued prosperity, the concomitant social dislocations were judged to be bearable. Especially since the alternative is to let the country slide into mediocrity, with the resulting wide-spread financial problems and social degradation of a second-or third-rate economic power.

1. Cutting costs and jobs has not built long-term strength. During the 1970s, other strategies against intensifying global competition had been tried, such as cutting labor costs by moving manufacturing to the Pacific Rim or into rural America. Unhappily, these strategies had not produced any major improvements in corporate profits, but they did lead to the permanent loss of millions of high-paying jobs in the US. That loss produced growing social problems, and increasingly aggravated politics throughout the Ford-Carter years.

As the 1980s opened, strategies based on reducing labor costs had not rekindled manufacturing productivity, so business leaders next looked to longer-term strategies based on boosting investment and innovation. Certainly, prior to the late 60s and for well over a century before, America had sustained the world’s highest economic growth rate, based on hard work, high savings, and especially, native smarts as seen in a propensity to invent and to commercialize new, labor-saving devices. In the 1980s and after several decades of consolidating a national network of transport and telegraph, this "Yankee ingenuity" became institutionalized into a continuing flow of invention: with technical breakthroughs mobilized by industrial research labs, with distribution organized by continent-spanning firms. With big industry, the US made itself into the world’s pre-eminent economic power.

2. Consolidating resources into large high-production operations has not raised overall productivity. A century later, in the 1980s, leading industrialists grasped at the same historic pattern, and redirected resources into technical automation and organizational consolidation. Of course, it was assumed that this economic restructuring would provide the income for a expansionary consumer market to buy the products of the new processes. To be sure, over the past two hundred and fifty years of the Industrial Revolution, the jobs displaced by large-scale technical change were always replaced by new employment opportunities in expanding, higher value industries, but usually only after a generation or more of painful dislocations!
By closing inefficient plants, by slicing out layers of middle managers and staff, by buying out weaker competitors (and releasing their inferably "weaker" executives), and by massive borrowing from the growing global capital markets, top corporate leadership undertook a massive restructuring of American industry. Then, after a severe recession with soaring interest rates and unemployment, the bulk of the 1980s did see a moderation of interest rates and of unemployment, and a moderate expansion—impressively lasting the second longest since the Depression. But little of the growth of the '80s came from improved productivity: 50 percent of the growth came from more people working more hours, and 20 percent was financed by debt. (The direct National Debt tripled to $3 trillion, plus the uncontrolled growth of government backed debt, including the backing of Savings and Loans, to another $6 trillion. By comparison, the Gross National Product is about $5 Trillion.)

Unfortunately, the 80s sense of prosperity hasn't much improved the fundamentals. After a decade of unprecedented levels of investment in new workplace technology, overall US productivity has not increased significantly, America's competitive position in world commerce has generally declined, and our mounting trade deficit have made us the world's largest debtor nation. Certainly, the "high tech" strategy is not yet working for most of American industry.

B. America's loss of industrial leadership has led to loss of good jobs—those with interesting work and better pay.

Our "great leap forward" hasn't yet helped American workers either: during the 1980s each year saw on the average of a third to a half of a million skilled US industrial jobs eliminated from our economy by lower-cost or higher-quality foreign producers. Moreover, in addition to the 3 to 4 million high-value American jobs permanently lost to foreign competition, 9 million more high-value US jobs in both industry and management have been eliminated due to automation and to cost-cutting through plant closings, mergers, and overhead reduction measures.

When these displaced employees of the 1980s are combined with the US jobs lost to foreign competition during the late 1970s, 13 to 15 million middle- and upper-income jobs have been eliminated from the American workplace during the past 15 years—about a million good jobs gone each year. At the opening of the 90s we see no slowing of these trends.

1. With fewer new high-value jobs, take-home pay looks stagnant for another decade. Meanwhile, the numbers of middle- and upper-income jobs created by high-growth and hightech businesses have fallen far short of original expectations. This "jobs problem" is not that the quantity is low (huge numbers of jobs have been created and our lower unemployment rate is the envy of Europe); the problem lies in the quality and economic pay-off of the jobs created. Large numbers of routine, lower-paying jobs is the price a country pays for lower productivity. While 3/4 of the jobs eliminated in the US since 1970 have been middle- and upper-income jobs, less than one-fourth of the new jobs created during that same period are estimated to have been middle- and upper-income positions.

As a consequence, median household income in America—when measured in terms of real buying power—has fallen steadily since the mid-1970s. Furthermore, Labor Department employment forecasts indicate that these trends—of lots of poorer jobs with fewer good jobs, and of sluggish income growth—will continue through the end of the '90s.

2. These declines mean increasing challenges for American families. With real purchasing power for workers in child-bearing years virtually stagnant or falling since 1967 and likely through the '90s, this means that job and financial prospects for most American families for over a third of a century—almost two generations—will have been much worse than those for their forbearers for the preceding 130 years. This cannot help but have a profound impact on family life and culture of this country.
Our most reliable long-range forecasts make it clear that millions of American households will be forced to cope with mid-career displacement and declining financial prospects for at least another decade. These discouraging career and financial prospects present yet another decade of major challenges to most young people forming families and to many mature people struggling to keep their families together. These trends greatly trouble older people (and their mature children) because retirement incomes will likely lag as the general prosperity slackens, and as investment and pension-payments suffer compared to costs.

C. With the boom over, society disperses, leaving big cities behind.

1. Until the 1970s, US internal migration was primarily from family farms to the cities. Mass migration has been the life-story of the American people, from the 65 million immigrants to these shores, and from the movement of young people from farms to cities and industrial jobs as a result of the continuing technological transformation of agriculture. In 1875, 75 percent of the US population was on farms; today it’s 3 percent and still declining. A sixth of the farmers (or one-half percent of our population) produces 85 percent of the yearly agricultural value—all we need for ourselves plus most high-value exports—leaving most of the other five-sixths of farmers financially distressed.

Agriculture may be tiny, but it is the foundation for about 20 percent of our market economy that goes for food and land-based products. Farm and forest related employment, although continually under pressure from technological change for a hundred years, still accounts for about half the livelihood of half the roughly 60 million who live in non-metropolitan regions, a quarter of this country’s population. This 60 million figure has remained almost constant since the beginning of this century; until recently these people produced 50 percent more children per-capita than the metropolitan population—and so the pre-60’s internal population growth of this country migrated from non-metropolitan to metropolitan areas. The Family Farm was the core family of the country.

2. Now rural areas are (re)industrializing. As technology and the “Green Revolution” spread through the Third World, and politics induced excess agricultural production in the industrial nations, a global food surplus produced a crisis on the American farm. Yet, for the first time, and only for the ’70s, there was a “Rural Renaissance”, but just for those outlying areas served by the rail and highway networks connecting big metropolitan areas. As the current techno-economic revolution distressed large numbers of workers in the cities, and led industrialists to relocate factories, a back-flow of people and jobs moved to these “connected” parts of the countryside. Rural areas began to industrialize again (as they once were before the industrial revolution).

3. Big capital investment, with its manufacturing jobs, is leaving the cities. While middle-class jobs were lost from our urban industrial areas, the good new jobs went elsewhere. For example, because the new high-tech production facilities are much less labor-intensive, they need not be sited in populous urban areas where business operating costs are normally 20 percent to 25 percent higher than in rural areas. During the ’70s, freed from the necessity to tap a large labor pool, a growing proportion of our high-tech manufacturing moved out of the cities in a cost-cutting strategy called “greenfielding.” When US political and trade protection from foreign competition promoted the building of new steel and auto plants, they didn’t return to Cleveland; Pittsburgh; or Flint and Pontiac, Michigan. They went to Marysville, Ohio; Smyrna, Tennessee; and Plymouth, Utah.

4. Good new jobs, and family formation, are going ex-urban. The new industrial zones of the ’80s are clustered along the vast stretches of the interstate highway system, around regional airports, and scattered all along our waterways and long coastlines—to free-trade zones next to mini-ports with automated hand-
ling for container ships. Or, to the degree that the new high-tech operations are relatively small-scale and high-value—such as aircraft, computer, or medical instrumentation—and require professional sophistication and continual redesign, plants are placed near university towns and resort or park-like campuses which attract and keep scarce technical workers. In both cases, the settings are away from the problems of the cities, yet close to crucial facilities of civilization (and so not too rural). These new "parks" are now the geographic source for technical innovation, and their digital communication networks are now the busy marketplaces for new ideas; they have displaced much of the creativity that was once the central growth factor of big cities\textsuperscript{26}. Note that neither big cities nor most rural areas are now attractive to most creative enterprise with their new high-value jobs, vital workers and families.

D. Many able workers and their families follow the jobs out, leaving older cities with shrinking population and resources.

Originally, America’s industrial cities grew large not because they were efficient communities; they weren’t. In fact, dys-economies of scale increase the costs of social services in most cities over 300,000 to 350,000 population. Our cities grew large during the past century because they permitted the development of increasingly productive, labor-intensive manufacturing. But now that the US economy is shifting from labor-intensive production to information-intensive production, industry no longer needs to bear the added costs of urban operations with its expensive land and labor, higher taxes and politicized regulation. Thus, just as the open-hearth blast furnace and the manual assembly line are rapidly becoming obsolete production technologies, many large cities are becoming obsolete social technologies. Since 1980, the population of almost all US cities with over a half-million persons has shrunk\textsuperscript{26}, along with their economic bases\textsuperscript{27}. This dispersion of population and production out of urban centers and into exurbs can be expected to continue through the end of this Century, posing increasingly intractable social, political and economic problems for most large US cities\textsuperscript{28}.

E. We can’t afford to move our families and economy to new sectors with old methods.

1. \textbf{The new economic regions are costly to build.} Given the long history and large momentum of these demographic trends, the close of the '90s should find most of our population and economic activity redirected into a new American "middle ground"—the far suburbs, and increasingly, the exurbs and metropolitan periphery. Building this neo-metropolis will be expensive. The needed transportation links haven’t been preplanned and installed, and so traffic is on the verge of stalling (with commuter drive-times expected by the year 2005 to be three to ten times longer\textsuperscript{29}). The costs for exurbia of new roads, rails and airports will now be extra-large since these facilities will require overcoming political opposition, and paying for and removing the current homes and businesses of hundreds of thousands of families. Because of the distances and the extra costs for roads, utilities, extra schools, and other infrastructure, the mature costs for new development areas is at least twice as high as it is within existing metropolises.

2. \textbf{The nether regions of inner cities and rural outlands are too big to let slip, but too costly to support.} To either side of this new middle-ground lies the bulk of the outer rural, declining small town, and inner city areas. These older regions, representing facing technologies, are in economic and social decline, with their support structures aging and no longer sustained by their own economic activity. Their populations (combined, of over 100 million, or almost 40 percent of our total population) have much higher rates of birth, death, poverty, and out-migration of the young and able; these populations already absorb most of government services not related to defense and debt. With further decline, their needs (and the costs) will continue to escalate.

While these declining locales already have an infrastructure of public works, it has been
poorly maintained for many years; the bill just to repair (and as needed, replace) roads, bridges, waterworks and other necessities totals more that $6.5 billion. This cost is beyond our ability to pay any time soon—$80,000 per US household, or almost $200,000 each for house-holds in the declining areas (US median household income is $30,855). This would require a mobilization several times the size of that for World War II.

F. Governments won't be able to pay for needed infrastructure or social programs.

1. The tax base for government intervention is shrinking. Overall, our best available data make it clear that the near-term future of the nation offers limited prospects for improved general prosperity, and that tens of millions of US households will experience diminished economic circumstances. Moreover, our declining sense of prosperity means that public resources will continue to be reduced as well. Just as median household income has fallen over the past 15 years, average US corporate profits have also been stagnant for more than a decade. Thus, the relative size of our tax base for public sector revenues has been shrinking since the mid-1970s, and current forecasts suggest that this trend will continue at least into the mid-1990s, if not beyond.

2. In the meantime government programs must come out of current accounts. The increasing public-sector austerity of the past 10 years is largely the consequence of the current techno-economic transition, and its accompanying decline in profitability and in productivity growth. The bitterly contested political decisions—Supply-side fiscal policies, the taxpayers' revolt and the Gramm-Rudman Act—have merely been the political devices by which this public-sector austerity has been achieved. Similar austerity measures, and political battles with similar arguments, have been fought with similar results in countries all over the industrial world for the last 20 years.

Of course, our country could decide to change its 60-year pattern of keeping government revenues at about a quarter of the economy. (This is a total tax rate of one third of all receipts, and almost the lowest of industrialized countries; compare this with the high end of European tax rate at a half of receipts, which takes a third of the economy, that is 17 percent more, actually not a large range of variation.) Our pattern now, first established during the Depression in the '30s and maintained during the era of general growth since, is based on a consensual balancing between the need for rewards to attract capital investment (so the elites can develop industry) and the need for helping the masses get an education and get over temporary disasters (so they can develop their "human capital", that is, their health, aptitudes and skills). Since our 150-year long growth period is faltering, a great issue of the '90s will be: Which is more important now, human or industrial capital?

G. To avoid having a largely mediocre American Middle Ground (with a small command and high-tech elite) we must look for a new approach for revitalization.

1. The continuation of current trends presents an unacceptable vision of a society polarized by their work. It's not just the physical and social conditions in America that may be compromised by the current transformation. The quality of life on the job depends greatly on the quality of the work—whether it is interesting and meaningful; boring and insignificant work actually is harmful to health. The workplace trends of the past decade, plus the job market projections for the remainder of this century, suggest a distressing vision of the future to an increasing number of observers: a post-industrial economy based on information and service, an economy which is run by a relatively small, highly-paid technocratic elite which provide the information, and in which the vast majority provide the service—in low-paid consumer assistance, data-driven clerical jobs and routinized technical tasks.

2. So, we must look for a new approach for revitalization. Given our overall sluggish economic performance, the government can't afford to pay for programs which would substantially augment the well-being of scores of mil-
lions of the "working poor". Especially given the social consequences of subsidizing a whole generation to expect a protected higher standard of living than they have earned, nor should we do so even if it were affordable. So our only realistic recourse is to devise whatever accelerated economic development and social change necessary to rekindle productivity. But how, when—as we next discuss—the traditional remedies of research, education and public volunteerism, can't be expected to work within the required time?

II. The Traditional Bridges Won't Reach to Keep us Above Troubles of a Tech Transition

In spite of the substantial and growing social costs of our technological revolution, the leadership of U.S. business has no alternative but to maintain their commitment to productivity improvement for economic survival. And since, so far as anyone can tell, technical improvements have accounted for about three-fifths of productivity gains over the last two hundred years, this means we must continue large-scale investment in applied research and, presumably, capital-intensive technology. Further, business leadership must remain committed to the assumption that high-tech industry will ultimately create millions of new, high-value jobs necessary to keep up markets for their goods. Yet, as we have seen renewal of a general vibrant prosperity seems at least a decade or so away, and neither industry nor government has the money or the moxey to deal with the intervening problems. In previous transitions, new institutions arose (by transforming older institutions to serve new functions) as "social technologies" to overcome the obstacles. What kinds of functions must our newly revitalized institutions now serve?

A. We must bridge over, or shorten the technological transition.

While the socio-economic realities of the past 15 years and the forecasts for the remainder of this century strongly support the gloomy vision of America’s transition to a service-based economy, the history of previous technological workplace revolutions suggests that the goal of a broadly-prosperous high-tech, knowledge-based economy remains valid and achievable. But history also tells us that such workplace revolutions typically take 30 to 40 years, during the first half of which the general levels of economic well-being in society temporarilly decline.

The reason for this decline is that the nation’s old, high-value economic core devolves much faster than the new, high-value enterprises are able to grow. And since the older sectors of society are far larger than the new sectors are richer, the average performance of the whole economy usually continues to stall even after the new growth sector is clearly ascendant. It is only when the new economy is much larger and richer that the effects of the new boom are generally felt, and that there are enough resources to pay for the older sectors to join the patterns and prosperity of the new.

1. We need new institutional support for cross-fertilizing technologies, and rapid shared learning of the possibilities. The few detailed engineering and business studies of how technologies develop and make economic impact bear out the economic historians, and provide some lessons. The early years (often lasting several decades) of a powerful new technology is almost a solution in search of problems to solve, a product in search of customers; exploiting its potential is usually a long process of mutual learning between suppliers and users. The early customers are usually other producers who need a more powerful tool to better exploit current markets. Very seldom does government, big science or military funding make a difference; mobilizations can accelerate implementation after the problems are found and solved, as now can be seen in "fast follower" countries. The learning period can be greatly speeded up: The size of the markets of products for producers (in terms of number and diversity, not the financial power of producers), and the efficiency of communication and commerce do
make a big difference in the speed and effectiveness of new power techs.

These factors argue against innovation policies based on any big institutions other than those supporting good communications. Communication of available innovation can take a long time; lead engineers working on advanced new designs very often get most of their technology from their text books, books already 20 years old and written based on technology that was fresh in the labs 20 years before that—a total of 40 years out-of-date.1

Research and development in technology has changed greatly in the century since the first spread of industrial R&D labs from Germany to U.S. continental scale firms; while R&D is still mostly concentrated in a few big companies, during the last 25 years it has become sharply focused on applications. The result has been poorer communication among specialists who no longer share a common experience; therefore, less cross-fertilization and less speedy progress.

Any new policy for sustaining increased growth in technical productivity must address this overall stagnation in rates of broad-scale technological progress, and provide some revitalized institutional support. That support undoubtedly will need to support despecialization and de-concentration of technology into much more numerous and broadly distributed firms supplying producer services, and support more efficient communications, exchanges of information, and problem-solving alliances with other producers. This is what small, family-based networks of friends used to do in the vibrant world cities at the turn of this century.

2. Rapid use of new technologies requires wide-spread technical literacy. The concentration of technology into a relatively few firms and government agencies has another, more long term effect. Currently, about 15 percent of U.S. youth get a college degree in science and engineering (including social science); about 40 percent of those find employment in their degree field within two years (12 percent for social science grads, and 55 percent for engineers).2 A few years later, less than a third of engineering grads are still engineering; generally, most tech-job holders are not long out of college and soon move on to other fields, largely because better jobs for this highly able pool of graduates lie elsewhere. As a result, although at any one time between 2 and 3 percent of our workforce can stay technically competent by practicing their profession, the portion of our workforce that can make a career of technical development or innovation is not much more than one percent.

What a distance we have come from the days when farmers and crafts workers constituted the vast bulk of the work force, and had to be the masters of their own technology! Our culture of technology has shrunk to a tiny fraction of the population, even though we may still believe that technology is the long-term basis for our prosperity. Biographical studies show that people who stay in and do well in science and technology tend to come from a narrow range of background culture; the culture of technology, while still open, is greatly family based.

In applications of innovations, detailed studies show that productive use of new technology usually requires a coalition of technically aware and competent champions. Adopting a new technique involves a lot more than making the purchase. A large fraction of such purchases never pay off, and of those that do, the payoffs typically vary by several hundred percent. Looking at the costs over seven years involved in adopting a new technology, say a computer network in an office or robotic cell in a factory, the costs of the hardware and software represents about 10 to 40 percent of the costs (and 80 percent of that is maintenance and upgrades, not the initial purchase) with all the rest of the costs in organization and orientation (including training). The preponderance of costs and benefits of productive technologies are social, in the device.

Productivity isn't just a matter of capital costs, but mostly depends on the kind of people involved, and how they are managed. Institutions and their cultures are the social technology that provide this payoff. Our big institutions have drifted towards specialization and implementation of older, proven technologies, rather than how to keep ahead of the possibilities.
Consider the parable of the specialized cutting tool. If support functions take an hour to get a part to and from the tool, and the tool once took an hour to do the job, then 100 percent improvement (doubling) of tool speed (so it only takes a half hour) provides 25 percent overall gain. Another doubling gives only 12.5 percent, the next about six percent, and so on, in rapidly diminishing steps. When technical progress is specialized, regardless of how good or cheap it might be, overall progress saturates. Without a more general culture and institutions supporting their diffusion and application on a wide-spread front, new power tools must await general public recognition of their potential, and a general mobilization to exploit the results, before the big impact on productivity can be realized. This usually takes a generation for the broad-based, largely family-supported, reorientation culture to turn.

B. Corporate research isn’t soon likely to create the necessary growth.

Faced with falling competitiveness in the marketplace, existing core enterprises cut overhead costs and close marginal facilities in order to free up capital to invest in R&D, advanced production technology and worker re-skilling. Such investments are not only costly (on the average, actual R&D expenditures over-run original cost estimates by 100 percent to 400 percent), but they are also highly risky. In the U.S., only 12 percent to 20 percent of commercial R&D projects are financially successful; for major leaps in innovation, the success rate is much lower than that. Effective innovation takes time as well, with major R&D efforts routinely requiring three times longer than initially planned. While a very few, highly able firms average 25 to 35 percent return on their R&D investments, most others get only 5 to 15 percent—much less than the costs of borrowing money today; this discourages firms from significant R&D when they face a choice between possible take-overs today versus the need to steadily invest 20 to 30 years before potentially important technologies can be fully exploited. The result of these trends is a long-time slow-down in R&D spending by U.S. firms.

Further delays—and costs—in the exploitation of workplace innovations arise from the need for massive worker re-skilling, from the need to monitor the performance of new products and processes, to refine the uses of new equipment and materials, and to integrate individual innovations into entirely new production systems which ultimately offer the greatest potential for increasing productivity. The entire sequence of steps required to fully assimilate fundamental production innovations throughout the economy may fairly be said to represent a collective national learning process, and the slow-but-steady growth of new productive enterprise should be seen as a national learning curve. Indeed, research has shown that the principal barriers to rapid innovation are the speed with which people can learn to master new realities, and the time required to re-design and redirect learning systems to incorporate those realities.

C. Industrial-style education, including college degrees, confers little long-term economic benefits to most people.

1. Most people now go to college, or intend to, mostly hoping for entry to higher paying jobs. The future vision of a polarized economy—one dynamic and with good jobs, the other stagnant with routine jobs—even if only partly valid and then for only a decade or so, troubles both policy makers and the general public with its inherent implications of increasing socio-economic inequities. This vision especially confounds educators who are being pressed to accept almost everybody interested in pursuing advanced education. Well over half of our young people now go to college, and many of those who haven’t yet or who have dropped out say that they intend to get a degree later; and a great many do go back—about half of college enrollment is made up of students who did not enter directly out of high school or have returned after dropping out.

As the numbers have gone up, the reasons for college have changed (particularly among women). Today, college is over-whelmingly
seen as preparation for career, wealth and power in a world that seems to have little reward for ideals. How are educators to prepare such large numbers of students looking for high paying or fast-track jobs, especially when those kinds of jobs require high-skill or high-tech employment that most graduates simply won’t find?

2. The surplus of college grads may accumulate for the next decade. Already, more than a third of our college graduates—and grad make up roughly the top 25 percent of the entrant work force—end up in jobs that only require a high school education; in fact, the pool of graduate applicants for positions in the professions (including engineering, accounting, law, and medicine) is about a sixth larger than needed. Ronald Kutscher, an official of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, estimates that we have about 15 million college grads in high school type jobs; this number may reach 25 million by the end of the ’90s. Without a greater mobilization of our country’s human resources, we may build a reservoir of discontent, and further discourage young people from pursuing their educations.

3. Employers seek able workers, not college degrees. Actually, the level of formal education appears not to be the issue. Most studies that look at the earnings of workers over the decades find that, after acquiring basic skills, the level of education seems mostly used to gain access to good initial jobs; after ten years, it is intrinsic ability, not education that more determines earnings and the quality of job held. The Commission on Skills of the American Work Force found that employers expect to teach work skills on the job, and that many use the presence of a college degree merely as an indicator of such qualities as punctuality, good work habits and the ability to learn. Many other employers hire after careful screening relatively uneducated recruits with high ability and character, who then turn out to be quickly trainable to master even the most sophisticated jobs. Of course, since both workers and employers use a college degree as a signal for good work attitudes, college grads as a statistical category do tend to make a lot more money and suffer less unemployment, but this is much more the result of what kind of people complete college (and why) than the result of how college changes the person.

We read in the papers and hear from friends a confusing set of trends—employers claim there are great shortages of workers, yet many friends tell us that they can’t find good jobs. What’s going on here? Well, more things are going on than before: there’s a greater divergence of jobs. Measures of income inequalities show a steady, almost straight-line increase starting in 1967. In fact, only the top 20 percent of workers have gained much purchasing power from an hour’s work over the last two decades, only the top 5 percent have really done well, and the lower 30 percent have lost significantly. Setting aside for a moment the shifts in job content and positioning (discussed above in I.B & C.4, and immediately below), there have been greater changes in who gets good jobs and how they are paid. More than 60 percent of the changes in income distribution are attributable to increasing inequality within groups of workers of the same age and same educational background (and generally, geographical region and work experience). It appears that employers are paying premium salaries to the very able (irrespective of credentials and experience), while the earnings of almost all other workers have stagnated.

4. Is producer services the new, high value sub-economy? Much of the reward for able workers has come in the producer services area—technical and professional workers who help design, debug, service, sell and adjust goods and services that are used by other producers of goods and services. This has been the major new growth area of the economy (not counting the growth in older sectors already mentioned—health, education,…). Producer services now account for over half of the value that is added in industry, and are providing an increasingly large part of the value added, often three to 10 times more than other kinds of labor. For example, assembly and fabrication. It’s understandable that those workers who provide
the most value will get the most pay. The wage structures for manufacturing, hourly wage workers\textsuperscript{55}, data-service (clerical workers and the like) have remained stable during this upheaval. Perhaps the vision (see C.1 above) of two economies with different income structures should better be seen as two technical systems representing society before and after adoption of the technological transition, with new and high growth area such as producer services attracting the more able workers and providing the higher rewards.

D. Volunteerism isn’t likely to help over the long term.

If business expansion and government programs are insufficient to handle our problems, perhaps America’s almost unique resource of voluntary associations and the non-profit sector in general can fill the void. A fundamental tenet of "Reaganomics" was that private sector initiatives and expanded voluntarism would make up for the reduction of the public social safety net. Moreover, many Reagonauts felt that generous public support programs had destroyed the effectiveness of small scale structure of family and local community that before the 1980s had carried the main responsibilities for social welfare. They thought that by cutting government programs and the supporting taxes they would shift the money back into the hands of local volunteers and private donors who would much more efficiently carry the load. Disappointingly, after the big tax cuts, neither the personal\textsuperscript{56,57} nor corporate\textsuperscript{58} sectors passed on their tax savings towards the public weal; in fact, their overall contributions as a portion of the economy has dropped over the past decade.

While increased voluntarism and private sector initiatives have achieved some notable successes, these efforts have not made a statistically significant impact on the steadily expanding range and number of unmet social support needs in America. The result has been a major growth in the numbers of poor, marginally educated people, and in the numbers of people with unattended health problems. Our investment in human capital has greatly fallen.

Similarly, voluntary investment in mobilizing advanced human capital—including higher education, research and development—has sliced off. (Especially after the Tax Reform Act of 1986 and the end of large tax expenditures for charitable donations.) Big institutions have a significant, but apparently limited role in providing the basis for bridging or shortening our current technical transition. Unless they help mobilize and work with smaller groups, such as families, with their intrinsic solidarities, they will not efficiently mobilize everyday behavior into more productive patterns.

III. Households as Personally Adaptive Social Technology

A. With less income per worker, more of the family must work.

Meanwhile, as the effects of the techno-economic revolution have swept through the U.S. workplace, Americans have adapted to their changing circumstances. In the face of declining entry-level pay, for example, millions of U.S. households have sought to sustain middle-class living standards by maintaining two wage-earners. Married women, even those with preschool kids, now predominantly hold down full-time jobs. In 1970, 40 percent of all U.S. married couples both worked full time; by 1985, over 50 percent of all married couples in America were both working full time, including 65 percent of all couples under the age of 55, and more than 70 percent of all couples employed in managerial, professional and technical jobs\textsuperscript{59}. By the mid-1990s, between two-thirds and three-fourths of all married couples are expected to be working full-time. As a consequence, by 1990, over half of all U.S. workers had at least one unattended minor child at home\textsuperscript{60,61}. Unlike the depression, when there were fewer jobs and people had to retreat to the old homestead for farm or domestic duties, now almost anyone who can goes out to work, even though very often at poorer jobs than they expected or were educated for. Household income has not increased anywhere near in proportion to the extra hands or hours at work.
B. With less money for housing, more share housing.

In addition to doubling-up on income, households have also begun doubling-up in generations. The numbers of families composed of multiple adult generations has been growing steadily since 197962. In 1980, 52 percent of all 18-to-24 year old’s lived with their parents; by 1983, it was 59 percent. During the same period, the number of 25-to-34 year olds living with their parents rose from 9.2 percent to 11.5 percent63. And, while only 6 percent of all Americans over 60 live with a younger relative today (up from about 3 percent in 1980), a recent survey shows that 25 percent of all U.S. workers are caring for an elderly relative either in or near their homes64. To accommodate additional family members—both young and old—America’s households have spent billions of dollars to expand or convert their homes65.

The rapid growth of multi-income, multi-generation households clearly reflects the economic rationality at the heart of our basic life-style choices, and is a good measure of the domestic sector’s capacity to adapt to economic change66. Other measures of recent domestic sector behavior provide clear evidence of society’s propensity not simply to adapt to changing economic realities, but to take steps intended to exploit those realities. Since 1980, for example, millions of U.S. adults have enrolled in college and technical schools67, committing huge amounts of money and time to their own re-skilling and career change. And, in an even more striking demonstration of purposeful social adaptation, Americans have invested billions of dollars and hours in improving their own health.

C. With more information on health, more people act healthily.

Faced with soaring medical costs68, and presented with a rapidly growing body of published research on the causes of disease, tens of millions of Americans have adopted more healthful life-styles, as reflected by reduced smoking, altered diets, exercise, and billions of dollars spent on fitness and home health equipment69 and on health-promoting publications, video tapes and software. The U.S. Surgeon General has further asserted that medical science and our institutional health care delivery system have made almost no contribution to increasing life-span during this same period70, in spite of the fact that the costs of medical care increased by more than 300 percent, faster than any other component of the consumer price index. Indeed, one recent survey strongly suggests that families, by actively initiating and supporting healthful life-style changes among their members, make a much greater contribution to our wellness and longevity than do the nation’s physicians71.

D. Family and familiar group support is ignored by public policy.

In short, over the past 15 years, America’s households, both as individuals and as families, have amply demonstrated their propensity to make substantial purposeful commitments and investments in response to changing economic realities. This propensity can be expected to manifest itself in future social adaptation, whether or not public policy encourages it. In a time of revolutionary change, during which job displacement and income reduction will be widespread and the funding for social service institutions will necessarily be constrained, it will clearly be in the common interest for the nation’s families to support and sustain their members to the greatest extent possible. In particular, at a time when sky-rocketing medical and housing costs are jeopardizing the well-being of the elderly72, it will clearly be in the public’s interest for families to undertake more inter-generational collaborations for housing and home healthcare, especially where it can be shown that domestic enterprise is more cost-effective than institutional social services. To this end, it would seem reasonable for public policy to encourage and reward such productive domestic collaborations as a fundamental strategy for sustaining general living standards during a period of diminished prosperity.

Unfortunately, in developing public sector economic plans and programs, policymakers
give little, if any, consideration to promoting domestic sector productivity, largely because modern economic theory treats households merely as consumers, rather than as productive enterprises. Eligibility for welfare and other public social support programs in America is essentially determined by the recipient's ability to consume. If you can demonstrate that your income is insufficient to enable you to purchase the bare necessities of life in the marketplace, you become eligible for public assistance. Similarly, the principal social objective of public sector economic development policy is to increase the level of average household consumption through improved employment opportunities, thereby reducing the numbers of people requiring public assistance while increasing the tax base. Indeed, other than as a source of tax revenue and business investment capital (through personal savings), public policy simply does not formally acknowledge the domestic sector as a producer of significant economic value.

E. The domestic sector, if accounted for by market norms, represents about three fifths of our gross domestic product.

Of course, the domestic sector is, in fact, enormously productive. Every day, in 75 million American households, meals are prepared, clothes are laundered, appliances are fixed, bushes are planted, children are helped with their homework and counseled on their careers. If all of the productive work done in the U.S. domestic sector were to be paid for a marketplace wage rates, the output of America's household would be worth 160 percent of the nation's measured GNP75 (and thus 62 percent of the combined gross product), and the average domestic manager (e.g. housewife) would earn $40,288.00 a year76. Moreover, in this age of venture capitalists and investment banks, relatives and friends remain the source of an estimated 70 percent of the start-up capital and 95 percent to 99 percent of all new businesses. In response to the entrepreneurial opportunities offered by information and service work, millions of Americans have gone into business for themselves since 1970, sustaining the first long-term growth in self-employment since the U.S. first became an industrial economy back at the turn of this century.

F. In addition, familiar groups perform the bulk of human support functions normally ascribed to government and professional organizations.

In addition to such directly measurable household contributions to our economy's performance, the social sciences give us powerful evidence of further substantial economic value produced by households.

1. Families and friends provide 2 1/2 times the health benefits as institutional medicine. As has already been discussed (see III.C and references, above), households have been shown to be major promoters of increased life-span and good health, with family members reflecting substantially higher levels of both physical and mental health than do single persons. In fact, half of observed variation personal health is attributable to the impacts of one's personal environment, five times greater impact than the 10 percent of the observed improvements accounted for by professional interventions77. Since health care represents 13 percent of the formal GNP, and assuming that families only realize half of their potential impact on personal life style, the contribution of families is equivalent to about 33 percent extra economic "product" at the institutional rates (or an extra trillion dollars of value a year!)

2. Families provide the bulk of the education and job placement function.

While the wide-spread adoption of merit-based policies and practices has significantly reduced the influence of family connections in key "gatekeeper" functions such as college admissions, hiring and promotions, family membership still remains the single most important factor in determining educational achievement and career success.

Social research has also shown that membership in a family is the principal
motivator of responsible personal behavior and of sustained individual commitments to productive activity throughout life. But, most important of all in this time of innovation and change, 75% to 85% of the average person's affective competency (i.e. problem-solving ability) and cognitive flexibility and fluency (i.e. capacity to learn and adapt) is derived from the family. Ten years out of school, these competencies are the principle determinant of the quality of job held. By comparison, formal training and education contribute almost nothing to an individual's ability to learn and change, factors which have already been described as the principal determinants of society's capacity to innovate rapidly and effectively (see the discussion in III.E. above). Families thereby undergird a major part of productivity growth and our long-term prosperity.

G. Families could provide the basis for an economic growth policy independent of industrial development and governmental intervention programs.

Because policymakers essentially ignore the domestic sector's substantial contributions to our economic performance, they not only fail to foster the enormous productive potential of domestic enterprise, but they also tend to pursue inefficient economic development strategies. Throughout the U.S., for example, state and local jurisdictions seeking to promote economic recovery from the decline of traditional core industries typically seek to attract new, "high-tech" industries. But experience has shown that such strategies are almost never successful, and further, that even when such schemes work, it takes at least a decade for transplanted enterprises to become self-sustaining generators of local economic growth.

By comparison, the most effective economic development programs build upon a community's existing human and physical resources—its current base of skills and capacities—and upon its established institutions. Moreover, conventional economic growth plans tend to focus on a limited number of large-scale projects, while successful growth plans foster a multitude of small-scale innovative initiatives which are monitored, modified, and ultimately scale-up or phased out based upon their marketplace performance. (In fact, the principal source of new job creation in the U.S. comes from the expansion of successful small entrepreneurs—10 to 100 employees—into intermediate size businesses—250 to 1000 employees). Conventional economic planning over-emphasizes infrastructure and capital formation, while successful plans involve the balanced, coordinated development of human, physical and capital resources.

H. Familiar groups could provide the basis for decentralized exploration from which new public programs might spring.

Two hundred years ago, when they designed our basic Constitutional framework, the founding fathers reserved substantial powers and responsibilities to state and local governments, so that they might serve, as Jefferson put it, "as civic laboratories" for exploring alternative solutions to the problems that would inevitably arise in the course of human progress. In 1787, even Jefferson probably could not have envisioned how homogenous America's policy-making culture has become after two centuries of professionalization, meritocratization and electronic communications. Throughout the nation today, there is a consensus policy position on every pressing public issue: for economic development, it's "high-tech;" for education, it's "back to basics;" for welfare, it's "work-fare;" etc. The downside risk potential for failure in the public arena has become so great that few leaders—or jurisdictions—will undertake actions or policies that are not already widely accepted as conventional wisdom.

IV. We Need a New and Vital Direction for Social and Economic Development

Surely, the time has come for the nation's political leaders and public policymakers to ask themselves, "After a quarter century of declining personal wages and a decade of a shrinking social safety net, can we provide our citizens with no more hopeful an approach to the future
than to mindlessly adopt a handful of popular policy nostrums whose very validity has already been unsubstantiated by rigorous research? In medicine the standard for ethical behavior (as enforced by malpractice suits) is that prescriptions first be proven by small scale experiments, and that the procedures be the best available given the resources at hand. What kind of ethics is it when our politicians continue to enforce policies that are proven to be harmful and inferior? How much power does the press really hold when it continually publishes the results of serious studies that show the failures of current policies as practiced by both political parties, only to be dismissed as "politically naive?" Well, one indication of what happens as a result of published scientific studies on policy evaluation is: starting in the early 1980s, government funding for gathering statistics was cut, along with the bulk of funding for policy research.

A. The old alternatives can't work any harder.

The underlying dynamics and limitations of current and traditional policies have already been discussed above. The human impact can be seen everyday in your newspaper and network news, and perhaps in the life of you or your friends. Some of the consequences of our current situation and policy dynamics include:

- The average real income of all families with children has already fallen nearly 10 percent.

- Half of the 15 million people who are unemployed for some extended time each year receive no public assistance whatsoever. In addition, there are various estimates of as many as 20 million "discouraged" workers who don't show up on the unemployment rolls, who would like to find a suitable job, but have given up; a high portion of these have no benefits, and a higher portion are at least partly disabled.

- Hundreds of thousands of psycho-sociologically dysfunctional people have been released to live on the streets with growing ranks of homeless, including families and their children. Over a million people a year have to spend at least some time "on the streets" without a home.

- Over 2/3 of the elderly poor and near-poor (more than 5 million people) are not covered by Medicaid. Worse, a fifth of all Americans are not covered by any form of health insurance. And, with a large and growing proportion of hospitals on the verge of bankruptcy, hospitals are increasingly turning away from their emergency care anybody who is uncovered.

- Millions of middle-income workers have suffered mid-career displacement with no expectations of re-employment at equivalent wages. On the average, workers who now must change industry (i.e., type of work) after ten years permanently lose a third of their income.

- No credible economic scenarios currently forecast either a significantly improved capacity to enlarge the social safety net or a significant increase in household income.

Is it enough for a state to hang up a "High-Tech Wanted" sign and say to its citizens "Don't worry, everybody; prosperity is just around the corner!"? That isn't leadership, but maybe it's "business as usual."

B. We haven’t tried a family empowerment policy, only a ideologically-based "family preservation" rhetoric.

At a time during which most households can be expected to experience fixed or declining economic well-being, public policy should at least enable and encourage households to make more productive use of the limited resources that they do have. This is particularly true where state government is pursuing economic development policies which, historically, have only produced improved economic performance over the long term. Families can—and do—care for dependent relatives; with appropriate public policy support, they could care for more. Families can—and do—engage in cooperative housing arrangements; with support, they could do more. Families can—and do—provide
interhousehold financial assistance to their relatives for education, business ventures and living expenses—and encouraged by economically rational social policy, they would do more.

By specifically acknowledging and rewarding productive domestic collaborations, policymakers would not only improve society’s ability to deal with diminished economic circumstances, but it would also permit a constructive renegotiation of the working relationship between society and its public servants. While families can be encouraged to expand their support of dependent members, America’s household clearly cannot provide air traffic control, or clean up toxic waste, or enforce health and safety laws, or regulate utilities, process sewage, pave streets and monitor pollution, or a host of other sophisticated services needed to sustain modern society. By encouraging households and extended families to be less dependent on public support systems, economically rational social policy will free up scarce public resources to be applied to essential functions that only government can perform.

V. Suggestions for a Family Empowerment Policy

Just as economically rational social policy will increase society’s ability to deal with the near-term, downside effects of the current technologic revolution, so too will socially rational economic policy increase society’s ability to exploit the long-term opportunities posed by that revolution. As has already been discussed, successful economic development programs involve a multiplicity of small-scale projects based largely upon existing resources, capacities and know-how. Since the domestic sector is the source of most new business starts and new venture capital, programs to better inform society’s entrepreneurial commitments and investments would clearly represent the most effective possible public sector economic development intervention. By identifying new marketplace needs, by supporting sound entrepreneurial education, by providing grassroots management assistance and research services, state policies and programs could substantially improve the success rates of the family-based enterprises that will constitute the vast majority of all future new businesses. Those initial successes, in turn would provide America with the broadest possible base of new enterprises from which an expanding array of regional, national and global markets may be served.

A. Home extension services to promote productive domestic enterprise.

1. Outreach education program for families—including adolescents, adults and the elderly—explaining the nature of the Trans-Industrial Revolution, to serve as a framework for an enhanced array of career counseling and guidance services, including additional training programs. (Such an orientation is essential for informing individual and household commitments and investments, especially in light of the general inadequacy of public school counseling efforts. A similar component should be added to home economics and domestic science curricula at all levels.)

2. Training for family members of all ages in computer competency, in view of the increasingly productive role that personal computers will play in all domestic sector activities, including continuing education and employment re-skilling, health promotion and healthcare, farming and other family-based businesses, domestic and financial management and inter-household cooperation.

3. Sponsorship of internship learning programs in support of adult education and employment retraining.

4. Training and support for home-based health care for convalescent and chronically ill family members.

5. Family Business Incubator Programs
   — Training and support for self-employment and family based entrepreneurship, including:
a. Media monitoring and research to identify new entrepreneurial markets and opportunities for family businesses;

b. Performance evaluation and research to identify common failures and keys to success to guide future family ventures;

c. Certification of qualified family ventures for financing.

B. Legislative measures to promote productive domestic enterprise.

1. Permit Individual Training Accounts (ITA's)—like IRA's—in which employees and employers contribute to a tax exempt fund to pay for the employee's eventual retraining.

2. Permit income tax deductibility of purchases of personal computers for either education or healthcare applications.

3. Permit individuals to deduct all adult educational expenditures associated with preparing for a new career or field of employment.

4. Permit individuals to deduct from their taxable income all financial contributions to the employment training of unemployed relatives.

5. Permit individuals to deduct from their taxable income all financial contributions to the education of all relatives whose immediate household incomes fall below the poverty, including contributions to K-12, remedial and other schooling for minors, as well as for adults.

6. Permit deductions from taxable income for individuals who make inter-household financial transfers within families that reduce public sector support payments, including for long-term, in-home healthcare, housing or rent subsidies, food stamps, AFDC or other similar social service support costs.

7. Permit a "Jobs Credit" tax reduction for taxpayers who intra-family contributions of venture capital to a family-based business create new jobs.

8. Permit tax deductibility of documented contributions of volunteer time to direct community service activities operated by either public sector or private/non-profit organizations. (In a time-short society, this will be essential in the order to realize any significant increase in capacity of the volunteer sector.)

9. Permit extended families to incorporate as producer-consumer cooperatives.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper has not sought to place any specific definition upon the term family, nor has it addressed the ethical and social functions of families. The purpose here is to examine the economic nature of families and households, and to draw attention to the failure of public policymakers to acknowledge the economic value produced by domestic enterprise. Policymakers clearly have no authority to involve themselves in the moral aspects of family life. But, just as clearly, policymakers must be concerned with the economic performance of families since the domestic sector represents far and away the largest component of our economy. Not only do families constitute our most productive institution, they also own most of our assets, control most of our cash flow, and pay the vast majority of all taxes. If the domestic sector does not perform well, our entire economy will not perform well.

With respect to the question of who—or what—constitutes a family for public policy purposes, we would be best served by permitting the members of families to define that for themselves. Once public policy establishes what its minimal interests are, then whoever is willing to undertake the rights and privileges (and responsibilities!) of being a family should be allowed to do so; any other approach will involve the state in matters which have mostly been the matters of religious or cultural determination.
Throughout human history, society—through the adaptive behavior of its individual members and familial groupings—has evolved purposefully and productively in response to changing economic and technological circumstances. Almost certainly, we would be ill-advised to discourage or unduly restrict this timeless adaptive process at this moment so crucial for our nation’s future.

In the turbulent transitional years between now and the end of the 20th Century, states that fail to legitimize and foster greater social productivity will, almost certainly, condemn the majority of their citizens to a decade or more of diminished public services and increased economic distress. At the same time, states which place all of their economic development "eggs" in one or two high-tech "baskets" will seriously jeopardize the long-term prosperity of the citizens as well.

Only by purposely tapping and promoting the productive capacities of the domestic sector—its households, extended families, and familiar groups with mutual hopes and obligations—will a state be able to sustain its citizens’ quality of life during the coming decade, and be able to fully tap the energy investment of families while laying the groundwork for long-term prosperity into the 21st century. Only by treating families as a real human resource, rather than a battleground for religious and partisan ideals, can the state and political leaders return the tools for forging vibrant futures back to their citizens in the form they can and will actually use—their families.
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EMPOWERING CHANGE: THE HUMAN DIMENSION

Jerold W. Apps, Coordinator
National Extension Leadership Development Program
University of Wisconsin-Extension

This is an exciting time to be a part of extension and a land-grant university. In the history of a country and in the history of an organization there are times when great and important changes can be made more readily. This is one of those times. We are at a crossroads where old ideas, old structures, old ways of thinking, and old approaches to leadership just don't work anymore.

Extension is in a position to seize the moment and make the most of it, to model a new approach for education. We are moving into what I call the "Next Age." Let me tell you something about it.

NATURE OF THE NEXT AGE

Over the last several decades we have experienced the agrarian age, the industrial age, and now are moving into what some refer to as the post-industrial age. I refer to the present time and the immediate future as the Next Age. I'll briefly mention just a few of the characteristics of the Next Age.

The Nature of Change is Changing

Charles Handy, in his delightful book, *The Age of Unreason*, (Harvard Business School, 1989) makes the strong argument that the past is no longer a strong predictor of the future. Handy, with the London Business School, argues that many of the changes we face as human beings living in a global community are changes that no one has predicted, changes for which there are no trends or data that give us clues that the change is coming. Examples of the most dramatic of these changes have been the coming apart of the Soviet Union, the coming down of the Berlin Wall, and the move from communism to capitalism in Eastern Europe.

Handy says that "the only prediction that will hold true is that no prediction will hold true..." (p. 5). He is telling us the comfortable days of examining trends, of looking at who did what last year and making predictions about what they will do next year is yesterday's way of thinking.

Handy recognizes that the rate of change is ever increasing, but his point is that change is not what it used to be. By that he means the very nature of change has changed. He calls this new change, "discontinuous change." Discontinuous change is not part of a pattern, not something we would ordinarily predict. Handy says "... discontinuous change requires discontinuous upside down thinking to deal with it, even if both thinker and thoughts appear absurd at first sight" (p. 5).

I use the metaphor of "stormy weather" to describe the changes we are now experiencing. Growing up on a farm in Central Wisconsin, storms were a part of my family's life as they were and are for all farmers. Summer storms blew up quickly. Some were violent with crashing thunder and sky splitting lightning. Other storms were more inconvenient than they were dangerous, stopping our planned work and causing us to make unplanned adjustments in our daily activities.

Like stormy weather much of today's change cannot be predicted very well, if at all. We have no blueprints or recipes that we can turn to which will tell us what to do if A or X occurs. Seldom can we anticipate the effects of a particular change, just as we cannot anticipate the effects of a storm.

Even during stormy weather, there are moments of calm, when the sun comes out and the wind quiets blowing and the ominous clouds disappear over the horizon. Sometimes, in these periods of calm, we are lulled into believing that severe storms are a part of history and that we
shouldn't be concerned. We go about our business and then are devastated when the next storm strikes. We lose our capacity for dealing with storms.

Just as some of us develop the capacity for surviving stormy weather, so we can develop the capacity to respond to discontinuous change. Much of this capacity is a mind set. It includes our ability to accept and perhaps even relish unpredicted change that sometimes borders on chaos, and to accept and work with ambiguity. Our planning efforts will also take new forms. We will often face situations when we will not have time to develop extensive plans before we begin doing something. Sometimes we must jump in the middle of something and then work toward the beginning, to plan what we do as we are doing it. Other times we will follow more traditional approaches of first planning and then doing.

In our society today, the periods of calm between storms are ever shorter, so we have little time to become complacent during the brief lulls. One storm after another occurs, some severe, some less so. Some storms include wicked lighting, others strong winds, still others leave the landscape swirling in snow as in winter in our part of the country.

After a storm, we try to assess the damages, pick ourselves up and move on. Too often we are so overcome by the negatives of a storm that we overlook the positives. It is possible that what at first might appear as a horrendous negative turns out to be a great positive—if we are open enough to recognize it.

So change, redefined and understood in a new light is a fundamental characteristic of the next age.

Multiple Realities

Walter Truett Anderson, in his book, *Reality Isn't What It Used To Be* (Harper & Row, 1990), helps us begin to understand the idea of multiple realities. Anderson argues that people around the world don't all subscribe to the same set of basic beliefs. I think most of us would agree with that. In fact, most of us know people, some we work with or even live with, who with the same information, come up with quite a different interpretation of it, or for other reasons seem to march to a different drummer.

Anderson describes basic reality systems (I've added one of my own) that increasingly are coming into conflict with each other, in this country, and around the world. One is called "Technology-Economic Development-Progress" view. It goes like this: create new technology (plants, animals, machines, chemicals). This new technology will lead to economic development—more efficient livestock, higher yielding crops. Economic development will lead to progress.

I think many of us would agree that this view of reality is and has been a prominent one in this country, and that it is indeed right, proper, and perhaps even absolutely correct that this is the view to guide what we do.

Yet an opposing view began emerging several years ago. This view could be called the "Environmental-Sustainable View." People who subscribe to this view question whether there is such a thing as progress, and seriously challenge whether many of the conditions we face in the world today are better than they were a few decades ago. They use groundwater pollution, destruction of the ozone layer, global warming and a host of other data to support their view.

This "Environmental-Sustainable" view is shared by many environmental groups in this country, and by many of the sustainable agriculture groups.

Another view, with a focus on education, is "Life Long Learning to Find Meaning in Life." People who subscribe to this view, and their numbers are growing, argue that not all learning must be for some economic or other purpose. They argue that finding meaning in one's life, through learning, is perhaps the most profound reason for participating in educational activities. People who subscribe to "Learning as a Way to Meaning in Life," say we must return to an old idea that not only is it important that learning help us make a living, but that learning also help us live. Proponents of this view argue that we humans are so busy doing that we have little time for being—we are too often "humans doing" rather than "human beings".

Which perspective is the correct one? Must one perspectives be the correct one?
there a middle ground? Where do educators, particularly extension educators, fit in these discussions?

Other Characteristics of the Next Age

I could of course list many additional dimensions of the next age such as technological change, effects of the so-called information age, world economic systems that are emerging such as the European Community and the North American Trade Agreements, and new political alignments that are emerging almost weekly.

I could also talk about some realities that we must face in this country. Higher education is no longer the queen of our society's institutions. Colleges and universities, certainly including the land-grant universities, are seen by many citizens as tax-hungry organizations who are constantly raising tuition and continually asking for more tax dollars.

We are at a time when state and federal governments are ever more critical of what universities do and how they do it. Sports scandals, misuse of federal research dollars, scandalous stories of university presidents who have, in the public eyes, misused university dollars for their own comforts have contributed to the distrust of colleges and universities.

Of course the competing demands for tax dollars have never been greater. No tax supported institution, including extension and the land-grant university, can get by with trying to tell tax payers how good it has been, and what great contributions it has made to the society. People want to know what extension and the land-grant university are doing for them right now, today.

IMPLICATIONS FOR EXTENSION AND LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITIES

What are we to make of all this, and how does this relate to extension and the land-grant university?

As educators, we are in the maelstrom. We are in a river where the currents are flowing in several directions at the same time. We struggle to keep afloat when one moment we are pushed rapidly in one direction, and the next moment we are jerked in the opposite. Few of us know how to cope with these changes. Many are not part of our experience, and others challenge to the very core what we have long believed and stood for. For instance, if technological change does not relate to economic development, which in turn does not contribute to progress and improvement of the human condition, what are we about? What are we to make of our role as educators? What are we to make of the purpose for an organization such as Cooperative Extension?

We are entering a time when less of what we need to know to succeed as educators will come from books and teachers, and more will come from our own ability to quickly adjust and learn from what we do.

Recently I heard discussed a project where those concepts and skills extension workers need to know would be identified and a curriculum developed. I would argue that this is an impossible task. I firmly believe that more than half of what an extension worker needs to know to be successful in the next five years no one has identified, and no one can identify, because we simply can't predict what is going to happen.

From the perspective of educators, we are moving into a time when many of our tried and true approaches to teaching and organizing meetings and conducting workshops may no longer be the approach that is appropriate or effective. Those of us who work in extension must wrestle with the idea of what teaching means, and explore new ideas about how people learn.

We surely will be using more technological media—satellite communication, computers, audio and video tapes and the like in our teaching. But what must we do differently to make these teaching approaches effective?

And what about the content of our teaching? We like to pride ourselves in saying that what we teach in Cooperative Extension is research based. But in the new world that I've been describing, is this too easy an answer?

A year ago I was part of a satellite educational program we did in Wisconsin on BST, sometimes known as Bovine Growth Hormone. BST represents a host of issues that are emerging from university biotechnical research. We had a panel made up of the
director of our Biotechnology Center and the
director of the Rural Development Center, a
private group that has been a strong advocate of
sustainable agriculture and a vocal critic of BST.
I served as moderator for the panel.

But why did it come to this, you might
ask? Why did we even put together such a
panel? Why didn't the College of Agricultural
and Life Sciences, using the research inform-
ation it has been developing about the effects
of BST, make these "facts" available and let it
go at that? Isn't that what researched-based
education is all about?

Perhaps it was at one time, but I'm not so
sure about that either. There is much more to
education than merely passing on research-based
information, and there are times when the
research-based information ought to be
questioned—and increasingly will be questioned
by a public that has become wary and
unfortunately distrustful of science.

Two circumstances seem to be going on at
the same time. We have a public that has
increasingly become science illiterate. Within
the past few years we have tried to emphasize
more science education in our schools, starting
in the early elementary years and continuing on
through secondary and higher education. But
we have a long way to go to create a level of
science literacy so that citizens can make policy
decisions intelligently.

And, on the other hand, with increasing
number of citizens wary of science, many
groups are ready and often highly capable of
challenging the research that our land-grant
universities do. The BST example I mentioned
above is but one of many examples that you
know more about than I do. I only have to
mention animals rights groups, environmental
groups, consumer groups and you know what I
mean.

So not only will we teach differently, and
people will likely learn differently, but the
content of our work must be examined as well.

As educators, we must learn to consider
content much more broadly than we have in the
past, and with more of an open mind. Surely
the findings of research are one source of
content. But I believe we also have a role in
discovering and making known the knowledge
that people already have. This is referred to as
indigenous knowledge—the knowledge of the
people. I believe we, at times, have a role in
helping people become aware of knowledge they
have and assist them in using and sharing this
knowledge.

I was working with a group of extension
middle managers from the Western states a few
weeks ago, in Monterey, California. We met in
a hotel right on the Pacific Ocean. If the
speaker became a little dull, people could watch
the breakers roll on the beach which was just
outside the meeting room.

I introduced the idea of multiple knowledge
sources, and that the university, increasingly is
seen as only one source of knowledge in society.
I saw a few skeptical looks from those who still
saw their land-grant universities as the most
credible and the most important research
provider, and extension as the major extender of
this research.

What got me into trouble with several
people in that room that day, and I suspect may
get me into trouble here today as well, is this.
If we accept the idea that there may be multiple
realities in the world, then we must also accept
the idea that the university's reality—what we
report in our research is but one reality in the
society. What is difficult to accept is the idea
of right and wrong reality. Increasingly, as
educators we will be faced with people, who
with essentially the same facts that we have, will
reach different conclusions. In many instances,
our reality—our interpretation of the facts—may
not necessarily be more right than another's
group's reality.

Our role as educators is one of dealing
with both internal knowledge, the knowledge
people already have, and external knowledge,
that which comes from research and other
sources external to the person, including from
other persons and organizations other than
universities.

DEVELOPING A PERSONAL APPROACH
TO LEADERSHIP

As we try to adjust to "stormy weather"
change and attempt to come to grips with mul-
tiple realities in our society and multiple sources of knowledge, what can we do personally?

As leaders, how do we come to grips with what is happening in the world, in our communities, in extension, and in land-grant universities. And as importantly, what can we do to influence the direction of what is happening, not merely be content with adjusting to the many changes that are swirling around us?

As leaders, it is important that you have the skills and capacity that you can apply in a variety of situations. It is also critical that you have a well-developed philosophy of leadership to provide a foundation for what you do.

A philosophy of leadership starts with you, and who you are and where you have been. A philosophy of leadership is built on your personal beliefs and values. One way to begin discovering your beliefs and values is to write a personal credo statement.

Most of us have a personal credo that guides us like a compass guides a traveler. Unfortunately for some of us, our personal credo is buried. We have not taken time to reflect on what we fundamentally believe and value, and allow expediency, pragmatism, politics, exhaustion, boredom, group think (others do it this way thus I must) and a host of other factors to influence what we do, and ultimately who we are.

Without a personal credo, we are like a hiker without a compass, following this trail and never quite sure where we are or where we are going, but exceedingly busy none-the-less. Without a compass, the hiker, upon encountering divergent paths, has no basis for deciding which path to take. Thus, the compass-less hiker is susceptible to all kinds of advice about which trail to take. Very often these days, the advice given is contradictory. Take the north trail, you’ll get there faster. Take the south trail, the view is better.

Soon the hiker knows not what trail to take, indeed if any trail should be taken. Some hikers, when confronted with divergent trails, turn around and hike on yesterday’s path, comforted with familiar surroundings. They have returned to their past.

Other hikers, upon encountering divergent trails, become exceedingly uncomfortable with the multiple opportunities, so set up a permanent base camp, fearful that no trail will be the "right" trail. They become paralyzed in the present.

Thus one’s personal credo becomes one’s foundation for action, a bright beacon in a foggy night. The extension leader, "hiker," with credo in mind, moves with confidence into an ever more confusing, changing, and challenging world. One’s personal credo becomes the core for one’s philosophy of leadership.

All of this is not to say that one’s credo becomes a fixed entity, that once discovered or rediscovered, is set for life. Indeed not. One’s credo, especially segments of it, come under regular inspection. Just as a hiker, at various times, is likely to check if his or her compass is working properly, so must we all, from time to time, examine our credos. Credos go out of date, at least parts of them do, in my judgment. Even though one’s credo is a foundation, and is more stable than most parts of our lives, it, too, we must point out, requires some examination and thinking about from time to time.

Writing a Credo Statement

What are the sorts of things one writes in a credo statement. First, credos are unique to the person writing them. There is neither one style of writing them, nor one set of credo statements that appear in all of them.

Examples of credo statements written by participants in my leadership workshops include:

— I will always strive to balance work time with family time and personal time.

— I will work hard, but will also never make excuses for taking vacations and days off to recreate.

— Solitude and personal reflection are an important part of my life. I will seek them daily.

— If I can’t do something well, I will not accept the task. I also recognize that a fetish for perfection can sometimes paralyze action.
I will try always to be open to new ideas and perspectives, recognizing how difficult that can be at times.

I will work hard to be open to people of diverse backgrounds and perspectives, realizing that something great and wonderful can result when people of diversity learn to pool the wonders of their differences to create something more than the sum of what and who they are.

I will constantly remind myself, when confronted with a new situation, that how I "read" the situation is largely influenced by who I am and where I have been in my life.

New ideas are important to me, from a wide array of sources, from the sciences and arts, from the humanities and the person on the street. I must learn to receive new ideas with all my senses, not merely from my eyes and ears.

I will regularly write my reflections on the meaning of what I am doing and why I am doing it.

Regularly, I will attempt to create something new, a new idea, a new relationship, a new structure.

I recognize the power of a being that is outside me, but which is tied to my spiritual self.

My spiritual self, although often mysterious and inaccessible, is one of the most important dimensions of my humanness and fundamental being. It helps me to be more of a human being, than merely a human doing.

My body is the only one I have, I must cherish it and care for it. I must learn to hear and heed its signals to slow down, to exercise more, to attend more carefully to what I eat.

NEXT AGE LEADERSHIP

What are some characteristics of leadership that will be necessary for extension and the land-

grant System as we move into increasingly more stormy weather times?

As leaders we will keep straight the difference between managing and leading. Steven Covy (1990) draws a clear distinction between managing and leading by using the example of a group cutting its way through a jungle. The producers in the group are those swinging the machetes and clearing out the undergrowth. The managers are right behind, sharpening machetes, developing machete cutting manuals, and receiving reports on how many yards of jungle were conquered in a particular day. The leader is up a tall tree and occasionally yells, "Wrong Jungle."

Managers are concerned with bottom lines. Leaders are concerned with top lines. Managers are concerned about trees; leaders are concerned about forests. Managers do things right; leaders do the right thing.

Leadership is shared. In next age leadership, at one time or another, everyone is a leader and everyone is a follower. In terms of power, I am talking about shared power and shifting power. A friend of mine at AT&T told me that in their organization they have moved from the old leadership idea of span of control (one way of defining power) to span of support (quite a different way of defining power). I've come to accept an interesting paradox in relation to power which goes like this: "The more power you give away, the more power you gain."

Some of you will recall the Carl Rogers book, Freedom to Learn. I suggest that those of us in administrative leadership positions must be willing to allow those with whom we work, the freedom to lead.

Sharing leadership will be a new idea for those who see leaders as those who always are in control. Sharing leadership means developing a shared control—a feeling on the part of many that they are realistically contributing to the direction the organization is taking.

Leadership includes a strong spiritual dimension. Leadership is a way for leaders to assist people in discovering a creative potential,
often crying to be released, that is buried deep within everyone. This creative spirit, when released, is the stuff of creative problem-solving and creative direction setting.

But there is more to the spiritual dimension of next age leadership. Next age leaders are guided by a spiritual core of beliefs and values that provides them with a compass for what they do, and how they do it. Gone is the mechanical, overly technical approach to leadership embodied in some of the recent leadership strategies. Next age leadership begins with leaders being well aware of what they believe and what they value, and what the sources of beliefs and values are—they know what are their personal credos. These new leaders also are open to examining their beliefs and values, and even changing some of them as the result of the examination.

— All leadership is guided by an ethical perspective. No longer can we hide behind the old saw, “the ends justify the means.” Ethically, leaders must be concerned with both means and ends, constantly. Ethics is part of all that we do, what we teach, how we teach, how we interact with people, and what advertising we wear on our caps. Ethics means avoiding conflict of interest situations; it means fairness; it means concern for the rights of people. Ethical decision making is seldom easy. It often involves thinking and discussing, but it must not be avoided.

— Collaboration rather than competition, is the cornerstone of leadership activity. As leaders, we must lead the way toward collaborating with other educational providers, both inside and outside the university. We must learn how to collaborate with other agencies, inside government and outside. For so long we have been taught to compete with one side winning; now we must learn how to collaborate with both sides winning.

— Quality must guide us, at every level, in everything that we do. Good enough is not good enough. Our standard must always be the very best that we can do. No excuses. Without quality, someone else, another educational provider with quality, will take our place. Leaders must set the pace for quality.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Extension is in a rare position in the land-grant university. You, as extension leaders, are in a position to help rediscover what it means to be a land-grant institution. In some instances I fear that some of our universities have strayed away from the roots of the land-grant concept of resident teaching, research, and outreach to the community, a concept that has made the land-grant university a unique institution in this country and around the world. Extension is the organization that has the savvy, and the ideas to help the land-grant university rediscover what it is and can be as we hurtle toward the twenty-first century.

As extension people, you can help colleges of agriculture and the rest of the land-Ggrant university move past the blocks to change, such as keeping all knowledge nicely boxed in departments and disciplines, and maintaining archaic systems of tenure and promotion that often prevent new ideas and structures from emerging.

Organizations, like individuals, are constantly learning and changing. No longer can we assume constancy in organizations with leaders prepared to fit into static situations. No longer can we assume that with the next reorganization everything will settle down. It won’t. Organizations will continue to learn and continue to change. Our role as leaders will be to help the process along.

Our histories and our traditions are often our worst enemies. We are often so intent on protecting what we have been, that we have no energy left to examine what we could be. What has been is important, we should be aware of it. What could be is essential, we must spend more time considering it. Each of us, from the top administrative officer to the newest hired person, must become a vision maker. Our future success depends on vision, and vision makers.

Leadership for the future is a personal activity, beginning with a careful examination on
what we believe and what we value. How we lead, the leadership style we use, will come out of our personal value and belief systems.

The world is changing around us. People are changing. Organizations are changing. You are a part of the process. You will be challenged to help people adjust to and make sense of the changes that are going on around them. At the same time, you will be in the forefront of many changes, showing the way, providing direction, and not waiting for the changes to occur before acting.

I've appreciated the opportunity to share these brief ideas with you. These are clearly exciting times. I wish you well as you provide the leadership for steering extension and land-grant universities into the next century.
Good Morning! It is my pleasure to be with you to discuss managing yourself and others during periods of massive change. In order for you to be aware of what is planned for this session, I would like to share with you the expectations of the planning committee. They have asked me to cover the following:

1. Help you understand your own reaction to change,
2. Provide you with strategies or tools that will enable you to become more effective leaders of change, and
3. Provide you with strategies or tools that will enable you to help people deal with and accept the changes that are here and coming.

In addition, I was asked to make the session somewhat interactive. Obviously, time will not permit as much interactive behavior as I would like nor will the information I present be as complete as I would like. However, should you decide to pursue the topic further, the proceedings of this conference will include a listing of resources/references that will be helpful to you in your state whatever your role.

I am very aware that every person in this room has had a tremendous amount of experience dealing with change, personally and professionally. I am also aware that some of your experiences have probably been positive and some negative or both. Some changes have probably turned out well and some not so well.

As we heard this morning and as you were well aware before you entered this room, change is a constant, and it is moving at a faster clip. Some of you may be able to identify with this quote from David L. Stein:

The past is gone; the present is full of confusion; and the future scares the hell out of me!

This quote deals with the personal—our personal reaction to what may be coming. On the table in front of you is an exercise titled, "Getting in Touch." I would like you as an individual to answer the questions on the form, then find a partner, preferably someone you don’t know or don’t know well, and share what you are willing to share of the information you record. We will take 12 minutes for this exercise. (Exercise attached)

If we had time we would discuss how easy or hard it was to identify those emotions or feelings and how easy or hard it was to share them with someone else.

The first step in being a leader of change is acknowledging how change is affecting you, identifying those emotions/feelings associated with it and owning them.

We all like to be in control but what often happens is the situation that "triggers" the change is often beyond our control and the control of those around us. It places us in the position of reacting to others’ agendas when in fact, most of us are more comfortable forming the agendas.

The central focus of change management is the impact of the change on the people. Developing strategies and plans are important but if the people aren’t "buying in," none of the strategies or plans will work or work well.

The most effective way to proceed is to manage yourself first and then work to influence others. Come to terms with your own thoughts and feelings, then work to create movement to a new and different way of doing things.

Our reaction to change is always personal, and it deals with loss, the letting go of what has been. There are a number of losses associated with change but the critical ones are probably these:

1. Security. You no longer feel in control, and you aren’t real sure what the future is
going to be for you or where your place in the organization may be or whether the organization will even continue to exist, at least in its present form.

2. Competence. No one likes to feel incompetent. Many changes today are calling for new skills, new ways of doing things. For people trained in a particular discipline as they are in extension, it can be hard to move into collaborative multidiscipline work which many of the issues of today require.

3. Relationships. People often lose their sense of belonging to a team, group or an organization. You don’t have to like people to be comfortable with them and how they like to do things and want things.

4. Sense of Direction. How many of you have a very strong sense of where the extension system as we know it is going, and how comfortable are you with the direction? There is often a loss of direction. Meaning and mission become muddy or dies.

5. Territory. There is a loss of psychological and personal space associated with work space, geographic areas and job assignments and responsibilities. We lose our turf, so to speak, and for many people, turf gives us our identity within a system.

As leaders you feel the same losses as the staff around you, but you may get to them first or become aware of them first. It is important to be aware of the dynamics within the organization and the effect of it on various layers of the organization.

I want to spend a moment on three layers—top management, middle management and the line employees. (see Figure 1). Top management often under-estimates the impact of change on people. Also, there is a tendency for top management to become isolated and get busy with such behaviors as strategic planning, doing surveys, team building and to stop communicating with the troops. There is a tendency to "expect employees to go along" and to blame middle managers if people resist or complain. Top management often feels betrayed if employees don’t respond positively.

Middle management feels the pressure "to make it work." They feel pulled/squeezed in different directions. On one hand, they are besieged with upset, withdrawn employees and on the other, they feel deserted, blamed or misunderstood by their employers.

Employees often feel betrayed by the changes. They may be caught off guard and don’t want to believe "my organization could do this to me." They respond with resistance, anger, frustration and confusion and become afraid to take risks, be innovative or try new things. Some withdraw and some retire in place.

I would like to share with you a transition grid developed by Flora/Elkind Associates in San Francisco that lays out the four phases of transition—denial, resistance, exploration and commitment (see Figures 2 and 3).

The left half, with phases of denial and resistance, represents a focus on the past—the attitude that things were fine the way they were, and there is no reason to change. The old "if we just told our story better, we will be okay" attitude.

The right half, with phases of exploration and commitment, is focused on the future. This is where the energy and creativity start to reappear as people make plans to adapt to the change.

The top half, with phases of denial and commitment, is focused on the external environment; the bottom half, with the phases of resistance and exploration, is focused on the reactions of self.

In order for you to recognize the phases you and your staff may be in, it is important to play attention to the behaviors the people are exhibiting.

During the phase of denial you will see signs of withdrawal, people ignoring new policies and doing business as usual, people focused toward the past and how wonderful it has been, people laying low and being hard to find, attitudes of "this too will pass."

When people are into resistance you will see anger, blame, anxiety, depression and even
people retiring on the job. The expression of "what’s the difference, this organization doesn’t care about me anymore," may be heard from people.

During the period of exploration, you will see the appearance of new energy and creativity. There may be lots of confusion and maybe even chaos as people try a variety of new ideas. There may be lots of activity, but it may lack focus and direction.

Commitment comes when people begin working together and the focus becomes how we can work through this—what do I have to do or should do to make this work. With a sense of direction, focus becomes clearer.

As you are well aware not all your staff will be at the same phase at the same time, and we need to be realistic and acknowledge that not everyone will make it through all four phases. We all move at different paces; and all of us know individuals who are still resisting something that happened years ago. The other complicating factor for a leader/manager is that you can have people at different phases of transition on a variety of changes at any one point in time.

At your table is another exercise (attached). It asks you to list members of your team or other key individuals and for you to think about their recent behaviors, thus identifying what phase they may be in. Then plot them on the transition grid. This helps you to identify who is out front, and who is having difficulty. You should also place yourself on the grid.

I hope this exercise provided you with some insight on the members of your team and how they are handling the change. I want to make one comment regarding your placement on the grid. If you placed yourself somewhere in the phases of denial and resistance, then you are going to find it exhausting and difficult to move others along in the direction that is expected. In managing yourself first, the first rule of change management, you need to work through those phases for yourself in order to lead and guide others effectively.

Now I would like to turn the attention to strategies or tools you can use to help people move through the stages of transition and to move the organization forward.

None of what I am about to say is new to you, it is things we instinctively know. The problem or issue is time and the need for lots of it. It may be time you don’t feel you have or in reality you really don’t have.

The issue is choice. You can either spend the energy and time at the front end and work to move as many people forward as possible, or you will spend the time at the end wondering why things aren’t going as well as expected, why people are angry, why your relationships with people inside and outside the system aren’t what you would like them to be and why the productivity level isn’t what you would like it to be.

There are five real measurable costs of not taking the time to manage the transition with a concern toward helping the staff, and it is GRASS (guilt, resentment, anxiety, self-absorption and stress). People experiencing these symptoms feel fatigued and demoralized at a time when you want their best, and they don’t have it to give.

The first and most important strategy is communications. Think back to a recent change within your university or extension system.

1. How did you first hear about the change? How were you informed?
2. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the way in which you were informed?
3. What was your emotional reaction?
4. How would you have preferred to be informed? How could the announcement have been improved?

We can learn a lot about how to do or not do things by the way they are done by others, particularly when we have a strong emotional reaction to either the message or the way in which it has been presented or announced.

Since I am aware that everyone in this room has participated in a variety of workshops and courses on communications, plus you have learned a variety of techniques through experience, I just want to highlight and reinforce some key points.
There needs to be an informational meeting, if possible. People want to hear it from the "horse's mouth," and they want to see him or her saying it. If everyone can't be brought to a central location or at several locations, it may be done by satellite or audio conference hook-ups, etc. It is the vehicle for saying "this is our situation, and this is what we think it means." It doesn't matter if you don't have all the information, give the information you do have. People often attempt to do this through written communication. Written communication doesn't allow people the opportunity to express their feelings directly and ask questions for clarification. Written communication has its place, but this isn't it unless there simply isn't time to do otherwise.

Informational meetings do need to be followed up with written communications. Be aware that people may not "hear" you, or that people will selectively hear. This is particularly true when people are under great stress and the change is massive and viewed as threatening their very security and place in your organization. For that reason it is important to use a political campaign technique and say it or write it seven times in a short time period so it has better chance of being heard and understood.

If you see signs of denial and resistance, it is important to hold one-to-one meetings with staff. Research indicates clearly that the single most effective technique for managing change is when a manager or supervisor sits down with his or her people individually and allows them to express their concerns, issues and ideas.

If people are into denial, confront them gently with the facts—yes, this is going to happen and this is why. Suggest strategies they can implement to begin adjusting to change. Give them time to let things sink in, then schedule a planning session to talk things over. If the person withdraws on you, you may have to work to draw them out. Often this is the person who tells you they are fine, and you know they are having great difficulty with the change.

If people are into resistance—listen and acknowledge what you are hearing them say. Don't try to talk people out of their feelings or tell them to pull themselves together. This will cause them to close up and move underground with their comments and feelings. One of the last things you want to move underground is anger because it can become "shadow energy" that can, when used subtly undermine what you are attempting to do. If you accept their reactions, they will continue to talk with you, and this will enable you to respond to some of their concerns.

People into the exploration phase are ready to be focused on the priorities. This is the time to provide training. This is the time to set short-term goals. This is the time to draw on the energy and creativity that is starting to appear by providing opportunities for staff and clientele to participate in brainstorming, visioning and planning activities.

When you see there is a commitment to the new way, the new organization, it is time to set long-term goals and concentrate on building teams. It is also the time to reward in a very public way, those that are responding to the change.

Tell people the truth regardless of how painful. Give as much information as possible. If you don't, two things may happen. One, it will affect your trust level with staff, and second, staff will make up their own answers. You need to remember people have their own contacts, and it won't take them long to get answers if they work at it long enough. Be willing and able to admit you don't know when you don't know. Share the process, the timelines and other information you are able to share.

Nothing works as well as the grapevine during times of great change. Hook into it, and correct misinformation as it first appears.

Express your feelings. Let the staff know you are human, that you may be feeling some of the same things they are. They will feel acknowledged and understood and possibly be more open with you. Self-disclosure is a very powerful strategy because you often reflect what they are thinking. If they know that you are having problems sleeping, it helps them to understand that concerns and pains are shared. It is not going to change how they feel about the change, but it may soften their view of you.
Work to get your message across. Behavior + feelings + effect + what you want = clear communications.

1. Behavior/situation. What has happened? What is the change that needs to be responded to?

"We heard from the Governor's office our budget is being cut 10 percent, beginning January 1, in order to accommodate a deficit in state revenues. We need to plan how the system will accommodate the request."

2. Feelings. What are your feelings about the change? Are you confused, hopeful, upset?

"I am obviously upset about the request and concerned about what this will mean for our system and programs."

3. Effect. What effect will the change have on you? The system? The programs?

"We will have to make cuts in operating, take a look at programs and our level of staffing and decide where the cuts will take place. This level of cut may require layoffs and shutting down some programs."

4. What you want to happen. What outcome you would like to see? What do you want others to do?

"We are going to have to make decisions in a relatively short period of time. If you are asked for information, please make it a priority and provide it as soon as possible. If you are asked to serve on one of the subcommittees, please say yes. If you have ideas please share them within the next five days."

It is important to check to see what people are hearing from you and others on your team. If it is obvious they are not hearing, then you need to find other ways of saying it so it will be heard; that may mean having others do it for you. If the issue is they don't believe you, then you need to develop strategies to get the facts out. There may also be the issue of lack of trust, and that is something that is not dealt with easily in the short-term it will take long-term strategies to correct.

Become comfortable with resistance and the emotions that go along with it. Expect it; plan for it for it is normal and to be expected. Remember, people resist for very normal reasons:

- Their security is threatened.
- The change threatens their sense of competence, and they fear they will fail at new tasks and assignments; and
- They are comfortable with the status quo.

It is important to remember there is an upside to resistance. It means people have moved out of denial. Resistance is also the phase where it is important to use rituals to bring people together, so they can celebrate and mourn the past in order to move on to the future.

In closing, we need to acknowledge there are a lot of fantasies and myths about change. We tend to think change should be:

1. Not so disruptive,
2. Not cost much and be quick to implement, and
3. Solve previous organizational problems.

The key is in involving people in the process and treating them as members of the team. People who are involved are less likely to get stuck in the phases of denial and resistance. The other key is to acknowledge and reward people for their efforts, not only at the end but all along the way. Also provide training for new jobs and responsibilities. Acknowledging the struggles and the sacrifices people are making to move the system along is important. Establish symbols of change and celebrate the past. Provide opportunities for people to mourn what is gone.
Change and transition are disruptive; it does cost a great deal in terms of resources, good will and people. Change isn't easy to implement; and often, it just creates more organizational problems. As a friend of mine says quite often, if it ever does get fixed, nothing stays fixed for long. This is our new reality. If there is any consolation, I hope you will find this quote of interest from the Florida Speaker's Advisory Committee on the Future:

Strangely enough, in the midst of change, the present course may often be the most risky one. It may only serve to perpetuate irrelevancy.
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Scott, Cynthia and Dennis Jaffe, Managing Organizational Change.

What do You see in your Workgroup?

During a recent change in your organization check any behavior you observed within your work unit:

**Denial**
- it will be over soon
- apathy
- numbness
- this too will pass

**Commitment**
- teamwork
- satisfaction
- clear focus and plan

**Resistance**
- can't sleep at night
- angerfights
- gave my all and now look what I get
- withdrawal from the team
- dysfunctional behaviors

**Exploration**
- overpreparation
- frustration
- too many new ideas
- have too much to do
- can't focus

Scott, Cynthia B. and Dennis Jaffe, Managing Organizational Change.
Getting in Touch Exercise

1. Of all the information you have heard this morning pick the one item/issue you believe is going to have the biggest impact on you and your system within the next year or so.

   Name it: ____________________________

2. Identify the feelings/emotions you are experiencing relative to the above. (fear, anxiety, anger, energy surge, sadness, joy, worry, happiness, weariness, withdrawal, depression, sense of being confused and overwhelmed, etc.)

   The feelings/emotions:

3. What is your greatest fear? Why?

4. Find a partner, preferably someone you don’t know or don’t know well and share what you are willing to share of the above. (Don’t share anything that makes you uncomfortable.)

5. Listen to your partner’s responses to the same questions.
2. Identify some key people by initials. They may be on your team or within the system. Identify the behaviors that lead you to believe which phase (denial, resistance, exploration or commitment) they are in and the phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Next graph the members on the change grid below. Place their initials approximately where they fall on the curve. Make sure you have plotted yourself on the grid.

![Change Curve Diagram]

4. Who are the ones out front, who can help bring others along? Are you one of them?

5. Who are the ones focused on the past in your group who need special attention?

- modified from Managing Organizational Change
LEADING NATIONAL CHANGE IN EXTENSION

Myron D. Johnsrud, Administrator
Extension Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Thank you for inviting me to speak with you today. The topic you’ve asked me to discuss is very important and very timely. It’s a pleasure for me to bring you views from Extension Service, USDA. I plan to leave a few minutes at the end for questions and discussion.

Karl Wallenda, a high wire artist, said in 1968, "Being on the tightrope is living; everything else is waiting." Real leaders walk the tightrope everyday and enjoy it. They take risks—dare new solutions, never think of falling.

As I told a magazine reporter recently, "If you don’t like change, Extension is a poor place to be in this country right now. If you love change, we ought to be smiling ear to ear, because it’s a fantastic time to be in the Extension System.

1. At the Federal level we’ve coped reasonably well with change and the challenges of the mid 1980s. We’re currently enjoying the support of the Administration and Congress. Our 1992 budget was the best we’ve had in a very long time. Our FY 93 budget is basically level, but we should consider that good in the face of a stringent Federal fiscal situation.

As we have improved our ability to plan strategically and communicate at the national level about our programs, we have gained support. We must continue to listen to a broad array of input and focus our attention and resources on critical issues.

While retaining good working relationships with traditional clientele, we’ve expanded the network of strategic alliances. For example, in rural health and safety, our strategic alliance is 30 public and private organizations. We have a common agreed-upon agenda, are building an electronic data base, and we formally meet twice a year to conduct business. This is resulting in a richer mix of ideas, expanded potential for efficiencies and less duplication, and the ability to combine financial and human resources to target on a priority issue.

2. If we took a snapshot of state Extension Services right now, we’d see a varied assortment of pictures. Some have adjusted programs and processes and are holding their own or enjoying budgetary increases. A majority are faring about the same as the total university community with some manageable cut-backs.

We do have a small number of state Extension Services facing very serious state budget problems and as a System we must all be concerned. There is truth in the statement about the "weakest link." However, the very worst reaction to these unsettling events is to hang your head and become resigned.

Trying times, more than any other, require optimists. Without hope and optimism, negative prophecies can become self-fulfilling.

3. Within the Cooperative Extension System, we’ve been handed some fairly specific challenges to meet if we are to be a viable and vibrant educational organization in the future. We must pay attention to increasing environmental concerns and issues. Educational programs focusing on the environment, food safety and sustainable agriculture will be even higher on our agenda.

4. I am very pleased with the way we have enhanced our historically strong youth programs. We have made it clear to Congress and concerned private, non-profit and public entities that CES will do everything it can to assure a better future for our young people. The youth-at-risk program is one of those efforts to enhance our youth program.

Yes, we have changed, but we must continue to change. We must continue to move
rapidly just to stay even. This means we will make some mistakes. Real leaders accept failures as learning opportunities.

There's a story told about Tom Watson, Sr., founder of IBM. He had promising junior executive involved in a risky venture for the company. The young man managed to lose over $10 million in the gamble. It was a disaster. When Watson called the nervous executive into his office, he blurted out, "I guess you want my resignation?" Watson said, "You can't be serious, we just spent $10 million educating you!"

Since you asked me to talk about leading National change in Extension—let me say right up front that we are all responsible for this. Certainly we in ES-USDA must do our part, but increasingly we should view our organization not as a hierarchy...but as a network. We all Share the responsibility for leading national change.

Successful leadership comes from a fusion of positive self-regard and optimism about a desired outcome. It isn't too difficult these days to travel throughout our system and identify the real leaders. They're energized by change—the chance to create new strategies, structures and programs.

Peter Drucker has just published an excellent new book titled Managing for the Future. Let me peak your interest first with what he says about Leadership.

He says the foundation of effective leadership is thinking through the organization's mission, defining it and establishing it clearly and visibly. According to Drucker, the leader's first task is "to be the trumpet that sounds a clear sound."

Second, leaders see leadership as responsibility rather than as rank and privilege. Effective leaders are rarely permissive, but when things go wrong, as they always do, they don't blame others. Since effective leaders know they are ultimately responsible, they seek strength in their associates, they encourage, push and glory in their associates.

Finally, Drucker says an effective leader must earn trust—otherwise there won't be any followers. Trust isn't about liking someone or agreeing with someone. Trust is the conviction that the leader means what he says. Effective leadership is not based on being clever; it is based primarily on being consistent.

In short, if any of us are to lead we must:

1. be very clear about our mission and goals;
2. take full responsibility, and
3. be consistent to develop trust.

Easy to say—difficult to achieve!

Drucker's final chapter focuses on the way it will be during the rest of the 1990s and beyond. He says every organization must change in the following ways:

* become more entrepreneurial
  recognizing the global economy,
* flatten the structure and eliminate unnecessary hierarchy, and
* build flexible networks using new telecommunications potential.

"The model for the new organization is the symphony orchestra."

Drucker says this new type of organizational structure will be organized around clearly stated goals. Self-discipline and systematic feedback will be critical. Organizations will have to learn to build their communications system on information-up rather than information-down.

What does this mean for CES? I believe that we are already positioning ourselves to become more like the symphony orchestra. We have the infrastructure in place today, through the National Science Foundation Network and Ag*SAT. We have a National Standards Management Committee at work to give us greater interoperability, and we recently named a Distance Education Committee.

But we have more to do...

General H. Norman Schwarzkopf in a recent talk spelled out the problem he faced in Desert Storm:

"The problem with interoperability is organization, not technology. Organization feels threatened by interoperability. You need to overcome the perceived threat."
I think the biggest changes we must make now are in mind-sets and organization. Becoming an interoperable, flat, network organization challenges all of our old assumptions. We must have the courage to do this.

Drucker closes his book with four key observations:

1. THE NEW GLOBAL ECONOMY AND FREE FLOWING INFORMATION REQUIRE A NEW TYPE OF MANAGEMENT

Information is moving everywhere and its effects are everywhere. Drucker notes that the businesses trying to organize around information have rapidly reduced the number of management levels from 50-60 percent. He uses Massey Ferguson as an example. After going virtually bankrupt, they organized around information and reduced management layers from 14 to six and are still coming down.

Drucker defines information as data endowed with relevance and purpose. And while no organization has found the perfect model, many are moving to information based structures.

2. THE LEARNING SOCIETY IS TAKING OVER

Drucker challenges the "knowledge people" to assume their responsibilities. He says most education does not deliver knowledge. "We know how people learn, and that learning is not at all the same thing as teaching. We know that no two human beings learn in the same way."

He says that for the first time in human history it really matters whether or not people learn. He says to be literate today means not just reading, writing and arithmetic, but also in basic computer skills, and potential, social and historical systems.

He uses the analogy of the orchestra conductor saying conductors and leaders, build a first rate orchestra by:

a. Getting individual performers to improve...the players must be craftsman first.

b. Individuals must take pride in their common enterprise..."I play for the Cleveland Symphony, and it is one of the best in the world."

c. Finally the great conductor gets the orchestra to hear and play that Haydn symphony in exactly the way he or she hears it. In other words, there must be clear vision at the top.

3. THE MOST CRUCIAL ISSUES FOR LEADERS IN THE KNOWLEDGE SOCIETY ARE INNOVATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP—IF EXISTING INSTITUTES CANNOT LEARN TO INNOVATE, THE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES WILL BE SEVERE

Drucker focuses a number of his remarks in this section on government institutions and universities. He says, and it might make us mad, but I quote:

"There is nothing more reactionary than a liberal faculty in a university. It is the ultimate in reaction. It is the motto of the U.S. universities that when a subject becomes totally obsolete, then a required course should be built around it. To survive and be useful, they must learn how to innovate."

The following are his must-dos for innovation:

a. Abandon the old. This takes hard work and organization abandonment—creative destruction.

b. Sit down every three years and systematically put every aspect of the organization on trial for its life; every product, process, procedure, service, technology, market, and distribution channel. He says the distribution channels are the fastest changing elements today.

c. Look on change as an opportunity.

d. Remember innovations are work above all. Drucker's first law is that everything degenerates into work, and if it does not degenerate into work, nothing gets done.
4. Drucker ends his book with a listing of skills and abilities that the leader/executive will need to be personally effective in the next years

a. Manage by going outside...go to the front lines and work there...don't visit.

b. Find out the information you need to do your job. People have to take responsibility for their own information needs. They have to identify what they need from whom, when and in what form and ask what information others require from them. People will have to control themselves.

c. Focus for effectiveness. Leaders and managers today try to do too many things. There is too much delegation up. Keep priorities clear and communicate them.

d. Build learning into the system.

Drucker says the greatest danger to the big organization is the belief that there is a right way and a wrong way and our way. In-house training tends to emphasize and strengthen this view. For skills, yes; teach them in-house. But for purposes of broadening the horizons, questioning established beliefs and for organized abandonment, it is better to be confronted with diversity and challenges from outside.

His last paragraph is I think a fitting summary for all of us to keep in mind while Leading National Change in Extension.

"There are enormous opportunities, because change is opportunity. But there is no predictability. Turbulence is characterized by having no predictability. It is certain that the unexpected will happen, but it is impossible to predict where, when or how. We live in a very turbulent time. Not because there is so much change, but because it moves in so many different directions. In this situation, the effective executive has to be able to recognize and run with opportunity, to learn, and constantly to refresh the knowledge base."

Thank you, and now I'd like to take questions and comments.
LEADING CHANGE—THE MINNESOTA CASE STUDY

Pat Borich, Director
Minnesota Cooperative Extension Service

I am pleased to be here because I know a lot of the directors of extension in the Southern Region. I have worked with them in ECOP and a number of other ways, and respect them. I respect the Cooperative Extension Services in the Southern United States, not only because they are the largest Extension Services, but also because I think they have shown the country a lot about working with people, serving people and having very good contacts in the Legislature and Congress.

I'm a little concerned Dick Sauers is here. Dick was the individual who hired me as Director of Extension. He was Vice President at the university at the time. He still comes to listen to what I have to say and validates whether, in fact, I'm telling the truth or not. So he's going to have to tell you afterwards how close I came.

Ogden Nash wrote something that, I think, fits what I'm going to try to do today. He said, "Progress might have been alright once, but it's gone on too long." I think everybody in this room can relate to the fact that maybe progress has gone on too long and too fast.

Some of the toughest things I've had to understand in my extension career are (1) you can't stop progress, (2) you'd best understand that changes that occur in many cases are out of your control, and (3) dealing with change and taking leadership in change is the major responsibility that an extension administrator has. Instead of fighting change and griping about it, we have to take a look at how we organize it, and how we respond to it, not how to survive it, but succeed during it.

What I'm going to do today is give you a case study of Minnesota. I'm going to tell you up front, nobody in this room should model what you're doing in your state after our case study because I think the environment in the state dictates how you function. So, it is not a recipe, it's an example. Maybe among all the things I share with you in a hurry, you will find some things that might fit your environment, your administration, your goals as an Extension Service in your state. I'm not here to sell; I'm here to tell. I would hope that the story I tell will be understandable. I'll go back to my office, you'll go back to work, and hopefully, we will have survived the better for it.

Ogden Nash said another thing, "There is one fault that I find with the 20th Century, and I'll put it in a couple of words, too adventury. What I'd like would be some nice monotony, if anyone's got any." There is no monotony.

Let me start out by telling you a little bit about some positive response we've had. We have a class in the Humphrey Institute at the University of Minnesota that studies innovation in public institutions. None of our faculty and none of our extension workers are a part of that class, but somehow they heard we've made significant changes in the Minnesota Extension Service. So they assigned a group of four graduate students to study our organization, as well as some other public organizations, to look at what has changed and what kind of innovation occurred and whether, in fact, the organization promotes innovation.

They came—four, bright, Ph.D. students—and interviewed people, drove around the state, talked to county commissioners (which always scares you a little in Minnesota), talked to extension staff, and pulled together a report. I didn't see the report, haven't heard anything about it, but I got a call from the instructor one day saying he was asking the chief executive officers of all these organizations to come to a luncheon where he would talk about innovation and innovation in public organizations. So I wandered over as a typical Extension Director—20 minutes late because I had another appointment—and sat down in the middle of a discussion. I looked up at the board and there was a continuum across the board with initials or
a name of an organization and under it culture, structure or whatever it was. Way off to the right was MES (Minnesota Extension Service). I didn’t know what that meant. They had already discussed it. It was done, so I sat. We discussed innovation for a while and talked a little bit about some other things, and it was over. As I was going out the door, the instructor came running after me and said, "Thanks for coming. You’re really appreciated." I asked him what that continuum on board mean? He said, "We put all of the innovations in the organizations that we studied on a continuum. Our decision was that no other organization that we studied has ever made as many significant changes to focus on innovation as MES. It’s really an amazing story. You’ve really got to tell that story."

We were so busy in the middle of it that until somebody came to analyze it, we didn’t realize that we’d made so many of those changes. But over a 10-year period or actually 12 years now, we have focused on a lot of different changes. I did get the report from the graduate students. One of the things they talked about was the achievements in the Extension Service over a 10-year period. Here’s what they said we did: "They articulated the vision of the Minnesota Extension Service as future-oriented, thus establishing a norm of on-going development. They laid out an implementation plan. They set bounds for change, then encouraged and trusted the creative process of staff to use the process and seek results within those limits. They modeled risk-taking and tolerated mistakes. They established and used a constant and open system of communication and feedback within the system. They developed administrative processes that embody the values of the new vision that established a culture for change." Now if we really did that, maybe change has occurred.

Let me very quickly go through the things we did. There was a lot of luck in timing, in trying to affect change in an organization. One of the lucky things I did was follow a fellow by the name of Norm Brown, who was selected in 1980 as the director of the Minnesota Extension Service and is currently the president of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Norm Brown came into the organization with the instruction to make changes—to change what the administration considered to be a lethargic Extension Service and to bring it up to date. He spent four years listening, making very autonomous decisions in many cases, asking for a lot of retirements, generally creating what I consider a real stir within the organization. He came in not concerned about a long career but concerned about waking up this lethargic giant—it was and is a giant among public organizations in Minnesota—and getting it to focus more on current problems and less on history, tradition, and an awful forever-planning process. His concern was that we spent all our time planning and little time doing. We even reported the plans better than what we had done. Do I need to tell you that he shook up everybody? He shook up everybody so that when he moved on he left behind a group of very disgruntled staff who realized that change had to occur. I was lucky to be hired into that environment with a staff that believed they had no alternative but to make changes if they were to survive. I didn’t have to start there. I did have to start, as director, trying to build up morale and trying to set a vision for what the future of the Extension Service would be.

Another thing happened about that time, the Farm Crisis. All of a sudden rural Minnesota was in deep trouble. People with farms that had been in their families five and six generations were being foreclosed. Families were disintegrating. Communities were falling apart. Loan officers were being shot at. There was a revolution going on in rural Minnesota. The day Dr. Dick Sauer appointed me at our annual conference, I got up and said, "Throw away your plans of work, we are going to reorganize. Within the next three months, we are going to develop a program to serve these people who are crying for help across this state."

We put together what we call Project Support and by December had trained our entire staff. We were out on a program which involved—and this is the key—the agricultural people, the home economics people, the youth people, and community people as resource people—all those who had a part of what was
saving Minnesota. All of a sudden our ag agents were saying there is a use for home economists. All of a sudden 4-H wasn’t just something you had to do at county fair time. Helping youth in crisis was a significant part of helping a family. All of a sudden, tough agricultural agents had to buy Kleenex for their office, to wipe away the tears both from the families that came in and from the county agents.

We went through a process in which we learned two things: (1) we were the only organization that responded quickly in the state, and (2) we responded with class and quality. What that did to us, our morale and our self-esteem is key to the changes we have been able to make. It was a rallying factor that said we are a system of value. It didn’t say it only to us, it said it to the Senate Majority Leader and to the Legislature who was looking around for some system that was helping people at a time when there was very little help available. It said it to the House Majority Leader who got me in a room and asked, "How much money do you need?" I had never had that opportunity before. I didn’t know how to handle it. I pray that one more time before I retire I get that opportunity again, and I will never make the mistake I made that time. I told him a minimum amount and by the next day it was wrong. All this because we were in a place where they recognized that we were needed. We have tried to continue that recognition since that time.

One of the things we did immediately was change our name. We changed the name to the Minnesota Extension Service. I know that’s not much in some of your states, but Vice President Sauer and I moved that through in the middle of the Farm Crisis. Again, timing. The reason we did it in the middle of the Farm Crisis is because the agricultural block was too busy. If they didn’t have anything to do, they’d have objected, and it would have probably been our scalp. But survival was on their mind at that time. They said the name of the Extension Service was not something that was going to be too important to them in the future. They have mumbled about it since. We made the change and tried to describe an organization that supports a geographic area in Minnesota.

One of the things we did immediately, also, was to develop our strategic plan. We did it with the help of 600 lay and advisory people and with the help of all our staff. It was an elongated process. What we really had to do was create a vision, a parameter, a description. It will be nine years this fall that I’ve been director, and the major job I’ve had in those years is redescribing the vision and mission in many different ways. I suddenly realized it takes a long time. Leadership in changing times is allowing individuals to see the vision of where we’re going, describing it in many different ways and then implementing it consistently.

I get tired of explaining to our staff, clients and legislators who we are and where we’re going. But really that's my major job. That's what I need to be doing, to let our staff feel assured there is a place to go.

There were three messages I tried to communicate publicly: 1) we focus on people not animals. That was hard to get through. Our animal science department head got really upset, "I don’t care what you say, Borich, we’re gonna focus on animals." I said, "Well, that’s what you’re gonna do research on. When we go out, strangely enough, it’s not the beef cattle that we talk to; it’s the people who raise them." He looked at me strangely, and I think it was like a light bulb came on in his head. I bet there were some students in his department that were pretty happy he had that light go on because he was focusing on animals.

2) We will focus on central issues, issues that people are concerned about. Perhaps not uniformly, but we won’t stand by and watch issues go by. We will be helping people face difficult decisions—collectively, individually—with research-based education.

And finally, 3) we will focus on relevance. Not our definition of relevance, because we always define ourselves as relevant, but the relevance as defined by the people we serve. That isn’t a big message, but it is important.

We began by identifying some central issues, much to the chagrin of all our program areas. We said that as an organization these are the major things we are going to be looking at and the major things we are going to focus on: economic development, environment and natural
to think more broadly. Some of our agents aren’t around anymore simply because they didn’t want to work outside of their county.

So, those are the three items in the strategic plan—issues programming, clustering, and agent specialization. Those three items affected every one of our staff members. We painted a picture of an Extension Service that we were going to try to move toward. We laughed a lot along the way. We had to rely on that. I still consider luck as an important ingredient, too, because sometimes we didn’t know exactly where we were going. That’s hard for some of you Myers-Briggs SJs. That’s hard for some of you long-time programmers. That’s especially hard for someone who still love the four-year plan of work and that kind of an organized structure.

I happen to believe we need to set direction. We have to focus on what we’re trying to become. We also have to be able to move when the opportunities occurs, and some of it is blind luck. Garrison Keeler made a statement that I quote, "Some luck lies in not getting what you thought you wanted but getting what you have, which once you have got it, you might be smart enough to see is what you would have wanted had you known." He’s a writer, too, makes a lot of money.

One of the things we did after strategic planning, that I still feel is important, was giving ourselves a visual identity. We have a visual identity system manual. The visual identity is three streaks with Minnesota Extension Service, University of Minnesota. We have pins. We have cups. We have sweatshirts. We have office signs. Previously, every office was labeled differently. There were even some county offices that didn’t want anything to do with the university. Some had the sign, but they had it hidden. Every letterhead was an adventure. There was nothing to hold this group together. We couldn’t use the University of Minnesota logo because that wasn’t exciting as a logo describing what we do. So we went through a process of identifying a visual identity. I know it sounds like an insignificant thing, but it’s not. We put this visual identity system standards manual together that even shows where to put the sign on your cars or your cups or your letterhead. It was aimed at the people who
staff. Every time new secretaries in the county or in the state offices are hired, they get to review this and understand that I hold all our program areas accountable, even 4-H. Now, in addition to the clover, there’s got to be Minnesota Extension Service, University of Minnesota. They’re coming around pretty well. When I get examples from my staff, that’s one of the first things I look for. I often have to say it would have been nice to have a visual identity in the right-hand corner. The truth is that it has given us some collective pride. Nobody holds it up and says, "Am I ever proud of that!" But it’s an identifying factor, and what we’re trying to do in Minnesota as a part of our vision, is to say that this represents quality. This visual identity only goes on quality, and it goes on everything we do. That message means a lot.

Let’s talk a little bit about our mission and vision. I decided after our cuts that we needed to rethink them. We have a revised mission. It’s simple. In fact, some of our staff says it sounds like what we are right now. We aren’t, but I like to have them believe we are. Because they act that way, then. We again went through a collective process across the state. We’ve got extension committees in great debates over what is the right mission. We keep getting letters that our mission doesn’t say 4-H, or agriculture, or family, or such. What it does say is that this is going to be an organization that is the outreach arm of the University of Minnesota. That is the vision we are trying to paint and to put into effect.

Another thing to look at is the staffing initiatives for the 90s. Following our strategic plan, we developed a couple of items. One was a staffing plan in which we asked all our clusters and all our departments to look at the future with the vision in mind and determine what is going to be priority staffing areas in the future. Then, when we have an open position, we won’t have to start from scratch every time. If we need certain things in the cluster, that is the kind of specialization need that will begin the discussion.

We also developed a strategic budget plan which helps us identify some things to do should budgets not work the way we would like. And of course, they didn’t work the way we would have liked them to. Last year, we were faced with a 10 percent cut in positions. Let me further mention that 10 percent because I have a hard time explaining this even in Minnesota. Four percent of it was simply shortfall in dollars that we hadn’t been able to maintain because of Federal dollars. I think every state has found itself in that position. Six percent was a salary increase given to all our faculty on July 1. Our university president decided this was going to be done through internal reallocation not additional funding. I decided that the Minnesota Extension Service was a part of the University of Minnesota. In the past, I’ve made our cuts. This time I turned it around and said, "You tell me. Talk about program priorities for the future. Revisit those plans. Then decide and recommend to me the cuts that need or should be made." We made some really tough decisions. Some of our stars, some young staff members and some of our old reliables were in those cuts simply because they were in position. Now I had a big running battle about performance evaluation being the key criteria. Some of our programs were low priority because of poor performance, but we didn’t use performance evaluation. We tried to focus on program priorities. That was very confusing to a lot of people because it wasn’t as simple as saying years of service counts or saying performance evaluation counts. It said that we need to find which programs will not be high priority.

We made those announcements and at the same time did some things I think will be interesting to you. We established a transition center. A group of colleagues, including field staff and specialists under the leadership of the assistant to the director got together and looked at ways to assist those people in transition—those leaving extension and those people remaining in extension. They met a number of times via phone conference. They made contacts individually with the people who got the termination letters, and helped them through a process. In a minute, I’ll show you a tape we developed in the transition center that will show you some of the ways we tried to assist those people.
A brochure, "Responding to Change," was developed as a result of the recent cut; realizing that unless we change the work we do and the way we do this work, the people who make decisions, including our staff, will believe this cut was not as serious as we let on. There had to be visible proof of difference in programming. So we had all our clusters represented in a meeting in which we identified the concept of second order change. What is second order change? Well, the lady who describes it says the first order of change is like when you’re going up a hill and the car’s pulling hard, and you step on the gas and you work harder and harder and try to get more out of it. You chug up the hill and pretty soon the car breaks. The second order of change is when you shift gears and make some hard decisions. You are not getting up the hill as fast as you’d like, so you change the way you operate. A social scientist said we must undertake second order change in our system. The staff agreed but is sick of the term now.

Our goal as administrators—through this process, through the cuts, through the transition, through the second order change, through the re-examination of the mission and the vision—has been to paint a picture of a future that is different than what it is now. You’ve got to change the picture.

If there’s a message I can give you today, it’s how important you are. That’s important at every level of the system. The key actors in this whole process have been our district directors, our program leaders. Our program leaders are the ones who have taken the lead in developing this concept and are currently the ones going out cluster by cluster, helping individuals through a process of second order change.

Here’s how you can make some changes. Here’s the process to eliminate programs. You eliminate programs locally through the decisions of the local partners and staff. I firmly believe if you’ve got a process that allows them to do that, and if you have reasons for eliminating programs, such as: Reason 1 - shortage of staff, Reason 2 - a better program that replaces it, then most local people will support you all the way. It’s when you do it arbitrarily, quietly, send out the secret message, that they have a tough time trying to determine the difference between poor performance and priority setting.

Let me talk about some of the items that the planning committee asked about. Staff morale: throughout this process, staff morale had peaks and valleys. First of all I’m not sure what staff morale is. I believe morale is an enthusiasm for achieving the goals of the organization. That enthusiasm has peaks and valleys. Folks, I have peaks and valleys. There are days when I want to go to my cabin in the north woods and forget about Minnesota and extension. When those days get too regular, I will retire.

Enthusiasm, I am convinced, is based on a couple of things: 1) Seeing the picture for what we’re trying to build, and 2) Knowing there’s going to be support regardless of the hurdles you have to go over. One of the problems we have had in some of our departments is specialists that haven’t seen the true picture. Now that they’re starting to see the picture, we’re trying to change the focus again with our current restructuring. We decided to restructure when it was obvious that morale in our organization as of July 1 showed we were over the hurt and on the up way. There was a window of opportunity. People already thought we were going to make changes because of cuts. I put a small task force together, my secret task force. I asked them what did we need to change to get out of the way of quality programming in this state? What was preventing us? The task force came up with recommendations of which a third is restructuring. We are updating now. On October 1, I will come out with a change in structure. It’s timing. Restructuring says we haven’t died. We’ve got less chairs filled, but we’re needed worse than ever. We’re just streamlined now.

The transition team was a morale booster. Our transition team had a hotline where individuals could call in and get help. We communicated through a weekly update on the computer, "Transition Times." We gave our staff a chance to get direct counseling from the University Counseling Center without being identified. Throughout this transition process, many of our staff members have gone to counselors, some for diagnostic help and some
for psychological help beyond that. They had someone they could talk to and it would not get back to the director of extension and not be shared with their colleagues.

I did a satellite conference on restructuring. We had 200 questions called in. We've been answering those questions on a regular basis. We tried to communicate with people through this process on a regular basis. Extension work is lonely work. Whether you're in a county office, in a department or an administrative office, it's basically a lonely job. We don't have the opportunity to get together on a regular basis and talk about the system and the organization.

Another thing we have developed is "MES Focus." This is a quarterly video that is shared with all of our extension committees and county boards of commissioners across the state. Programs are focused with the idea to help people see what extension is. It's been received quite well. It is shown all over just to make sure nobody gets slighted. I believe the major response has been in the morale of our staff. When they look at these focus videos and see the diversity and variety of our programs, they are more proud of what our system can do and what all parts of it are doing.

We have focused a lot on communication. I've come to the conclusion that you can't communicate too much, too well, too clearly, or repeat it too often. No matter how many times you say it, there is still somebody in the group who says, "I didn't know that." I'm always surprised at that because I think I explain things so well.

We had a faculty member from Public Health at the University of Minnesota who worked with our family life specialist to develop a tape to focus on the help and support that people leaving extension can get from their colleagues in the organization. We made copies of the tape, sent it to every office where a staff member was being released, and asked that the whole group sit, view this tape, and talk about it. It was support for individuals in transition beyond their control.

It isn't changes that do you in, it's transitions. Change and transition are different. Change is situational: loss of a job, a new boss, new team roles. Transition is the psychological process people go through to come to terms with the new situation. Change is external; transition is internal.

I think you can see that internal support was a very useful tool to help people through this process. It gave assistance to people as they moved on. It helped our remaining staff feel better about the organization. I think it helped internally as much as externally.

Let me quickly conclude with some points I have tried to weave throughout this talk. Leadership through change. Point one: we are going to change. Let me use a metaphor of taking a journey, of transportation. You're the chief engineer. It is absolutely important for the leader to go about the process of deciding where we're going, of helping our people decide where we're going. Most importantly, decide how we will look when we get there. That's vision, that's mission. It's not just words on a piece of paper. Not, "we've got the mission statement down, so let's go back to doing what we did". It's integrating the idea. So you've got to decide where you're going on this journey. When we don't do that, people set the journey for us. I see that happening in some Extension Services.

Second point, make sure all your procedures and policies help get you to where you're going. After we determined our vision, it was amazing how many procedures and policies, set several years before, really interfered with taking steps in the direction toward the vision. You know what that communicates? It communicates that the engineer really isn't so sure he's going in the right direction or doesn't have the complexity of it understood. But when you start to put those procedures and policies in line, all of a sudden people see that at least somebody knows where we're going.

Third point. Let creative others decide how to travel on this journey. They know more about transportation methods than you do. I don't care what position you have, if you're in management or administration, chances are there are people who know more about what to do in any given situation. You've just got to say where we need to go. Just say, "We'd like to
get to Nashville." Coming here, I didn’t go up to tell the pilot how to get here, he knew more about that than I did. Describe where you’re going and then how you’ll look when you get there. It’s common sense. Just admit, I don’t know enough about this, you’ve got to do it for me. When I’m really sincere, it’s not a test, I always get more than I expected. That’s kind of a warm fuzzy for me.

Fourth point. Don’t be surprised or disappointed in how long you are enroute or how many detours it takes. You should not expect a smooth ride and should expect the detours. A detour simply says it’s going to take a little longer than we thought. That’s really what we focused on during downsizing: it’s going to take a little longer than we thought. Actually, it may not. Downsizing may be the trigger that makes us change toward the picture and vision we had painted six years ago, to do some things we wanted to do anyway.

Fifth point. Open communication. We’ve talked enough about that. There can never be enough. I have a philosophy that says, when in doubt, share; listen and share again in a different way. Continually along this trip describe the beautiful scenery. I think it’s important that people know where we are, where we’re changing. It’s important that communication be constant. It’s important that as administrators we decide we’re going to have to say things five times before one-third of the people understand it. Sometimes we think that’s a monotonous job, having to repeat, repeat, repeat until you wake up in the morning thinking you’re the only one who understands.

Sixth point. Be sure to stop for food and potty breaks along the way. If it’s anything we’ve discovered in extension across the country it’s commitment of the staff. It’s a fact they will work themselves to death on a project they believe in. That’s also true of administration, contrary to what some field staff and specialists believe. You must take care of yourself personally. There are times when you really have to watch out for yourself, particularly when the pressure is on.

Seventh point. Celebrate progress whenever it occurs. Reinforce those people who helped the progress occur and encourage those that didn’t. (In some cases, you may have to encourage some to take another vehicle.) That is a humanistic approach. We have some individuals who just are not going to fit in the new Extension Service, but they would fit into a number of other vocations and be very good and very happy. Do it as humanely as possible. Anyway, celebration of progress is important.

Finally, this is the toughest one especially for the S/Js and administration, you’ll never stop the trip or complete the journey. Just when you get to the point you think you’ve finally arrived, somebody will throw a new destination at you and ask you to make the trip. I know you’ve heard that a million times, but it’s true.

In this never-ending journey, you’re only at the throttle for a short time. It may seem like a long time, but it is really a short time. Therefore, it is extremely important that you take advantage of that short time to describe and develop a system that is better when you leave than when you began. I have more faith in the potential of the Cooperative Extension System than I ever had before because I see it changing. I see a lot of people, like yourselves, at the throttle painting a picture of an organization that is not the same as in 1914, not the same as any other in this world. They’re leading an organization that will contribute into the next century. We’re not all going to make it. Some of our systems, states and universities are in terrible shape. That will make our journey just a little longer. I have a feeling that the potential we have as administrators and program leaders to make a difference has never been greater, and the responsibility we have has never been more important.

I can’t retire, this is too exciting of a trip.
Ladies and gentlemen, these reports have been tremendous and reflect well on each of you. I want to once again thank the Program Leadership Committee who worked very hard to represent each of you during this last year. I especially would like to acknowledge Bonnie Teater and the Southern Rural Development Center who worked extremely hard to make this conference happen. We also appreciate the hard work of Jacque Tisdale. The success of this conference has been a result of all their collective ideas and hard work. Three of our members will be leaving the committee at the conclusion of this meeting, and we will be joined by two new members who will serve three year terms. The exiting members are:

Ned Browning, Communications
Mississippi State University
 replaced by

Joe Courson, University of Georgia

I want each of you to know that I have enjoyed being your chairman for the year. As you may or may not know, my responsibilities have changed since we last met. The time that I can give to program leadership will be somewhat diminished. I am, of course, replaced by an excellent representative from ANR, Billy Caldwell, who will serve out my last year in this assignment.

Finally, I would like to recognize my colleague, Sue Fisher, from the Florida 4-H Program. She will be next year’s chairperson and has been an extremely important member of this year’s committee. I wish her the very best and assure you that you are in good hands.
SETTING THE 1992-1993 PROGRAM LEADERSHIP COMMITTEE AGENDA

Sue Fisher, Chair
University of Florida

We thank Bill Allen, Ned Browning and Jimmy Richardson for their service on the Southern Region Program Leadership Committee. I look forward to working with new and continuing committee members.

The Program Leadership Committee has given the responsibility to guide/encourage and support multi-program area planning by the SR Directors. Our program committees continue to provide a base from which to launch multi-program area initiatives as you have just learned from the program committee sessions as well as opportunities for all program leaders to tackle some organizational issues cooperatively.

This year’s conference addressed the theme, "Changing Environment for the Cooperative Extension Service." Your planning committee tried to focus on you, the program leader, and strategies for you to used in better understanding the factors that are managing the impact of change on the human dimension of our organization...including ourselves.

Our evaluation form asks you to assess the degree to which our conference objectives have been achieved. In addition, we seek your guidance in identifying our conference theme for 1992-93. I assure you that your input is valued and will be used when the PLC meets this fall and lays the groundwork for the 1993 conference.

Task forces also document the Southern Region's agenda. You heard task force reports yesterday from 1991-92 groups. I’m pleased to report that the following task forces have completed their work:

1) Water Quality and Waste Management, Mike Levi, North Carolina State University, Chair

2) Literacy, Chris Sieverdes, Clemson, Chair (PLC accepted recommendation that the issue not be addressed on a regional basis.)

Task forces continuing in 1992-93 include:

1) Cultural Diversity, Meatra Harrison, Texas A&M, Chair (We anticipate work of this group will be completed this fall 1992.)

2) The Working Poor, Jennie Kitching, Texas A&M, Chair

3) Extension Programs in Urban Areas, George Hadley, University of Georgia, Chair

4) Issues Based 4-H Health Curriculum, Sharon Rowland, North Carolina State University, Chair

The PLC has encouraged development of proposals to create new task forces. At the present time, new proposals are being prepared in three areas:

1) rural health
2) coalition building in rural areas, and
3) communities in economic transition.

Action will be taken by the PLC this fall on these proposals.

Individuals are encouraged to assess their Extension program environments on a regular basis. They are also asked to share their observations with the PLC regarding need for specific regional multi-program area activities to enhance our capacity to provide the highest quality Extension programs. Your suggestions are welcome.

We look forward to serving and working with you in the year ahead.
TASK FORCE REPORTS
EXTENSION WORK IN URBAN COUNTIES

George Hadley, Chair, University of Georgia
Sue Fisher, Advisor, University of Florida

We thank the Extension Directors for identifying this issue and bringing it to the attention of the Program Leadership Committee. We also thank Wayne Jordan, director, University of Georgia, for agreeing to support appointment of the task force’s leader, George Hadley.

The task force’s first step was to identify a needs assessment tool to answer two questions:

1) What are the needs within our states regarding extension work in urban counties?

2) Of these needs, which can use work on productivity through a regional strategy?

Extension directors have been asked to identify "urban contacts" to conduct and summarize the needs assessment within their states. State and county faculty as well as administrations are among those to be surveyed.

The survey has been distributed to the states, and results are due September 15. George Hadley should receive the information. He will work with his task force to analyze state responses and prepare recommendations regarding future actions. It is expected that the task force’s action strategy will be outlined and ready for review and approval by the PLC this fall.

Presented by Sue Fisher
September 1, 1992
The Southern Region 4-H Issues-Based Health Committee has worked diligently by telephone conference call and in each of the representative states to perform the tasks delegated to it. Work performed by the group has been organized into five categories:

1. Needs Assessment from Curriculum Contracts,
2. Development of a Survey for Use with Focus-Groups,
3. Recommendations from Survey Results,
4. Health Materials Collection, and
5. Funding Efforts.

Needs Assessment from Curriculum Contacts

In addition to having input on the current issues that should be included in the Southern Region 4-H Health Project from committee members, each state’s 4-H curriculum contact was given an opportunity to provide feedback. Twelve of the states submitted a response. These responses were reviewed by the Southern Region 4-H Educational Materials Committee and the Health Committee, and a tentative listings of topics were generated.

Focus Groups

In addition, to give 4-H members and parents/volunteers an opportunity to provide input, the focus-group method was selected. Instruments were developed by the committee to collect data from 4-H members in the 13-19 age group and from the parents and volunteers of 4-H members in the 5-12 year old group.

Each committee member agreed to survey 4-H members and parents in his or her state. In addition to surveying 4-H members and adults who were attending camps and congresses, a special effort was made to survey EFNEP youth and adults, teens who participated in a local health department group, and church youth and adults. Focus-groups were conducted in Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina and Texas with a total of 1,198 participants.

Survey Results

Participants ranked pre-determined topics within seven broad categories to indicate their interest and were asked to add additional topics in an open ended question. The categories were: Personal Health, Family/Community Health, Nutrition, Diet and Health, Human Sexuality, Substance Abuse, Consumer Health, and Health Careers. Although each category was valued, those receiving the most support were (listed in priority order): Human Sexuality, Substance Abuse, Personal Health and Family/Community Health. Although individual topics within the Nutrition, Diet and Health category were valued, the overall grouping was less popular than those topics already mentioned. Consumer Health and Careers were valued more by teens than by parents of younger 4-H’ers.

When asked how they liked to learn, the overwhelming response was through video and television or by participating in small group discussion with friends. The acceptable print medium was magazine format. Although different responses were given to the questions regarding comfort level in discussing controversial health issues, the overriding concern was that the volunteer(s) be comfortable in the role of facilitation, and that each member be made to feel safe in opening themselves up to discussion of "embarrassing topics."
One conference call was devoted to discussing the results from the surveys and the implications for the Issues-Based Health Project. In general, the committee suggested that the curricula be divided into six modules and that each module include age-appropriate information for each of the following age groups: 5-8 years old; 9-11 years old; 12-14 years old; and 15-19 years old. The six modules listed in order of importance to those surveyed were:

1. Human Sexuality
2. Substance Abuse
3. Personal Health
4. Family/Community Health
5. Consumer Health and Careers
6. Nutrition, Diet and Health

The committee recommends that modules be developed in each area, preferably in the order listed. Further, the committee recommends that each module include a magazine format rather than traditional projects—with volunteer materials to include technical subject matter as well as support group facilitation. Where funding will allow, the committee suggests the development of a video that could be used individually or in small group settings.

**Funding Efforts**

After conducting research on the current health status of young people in the Southern Region, a health proposal template has been developed for ease in submitting proposals and letters of inquiry.

**Committee Membership**

Sarah Anderson, Texas  
Sheila Forbes, Oklahoma  
Sara Seals, Louisiana  
Douglas Steele, Texas  
Jimmy Tart, North Carolina  
Sharon Runion Rowland, North Carolina (Chair)  
Sue Fisher, Florida (Advisor)
The conference "Water Quality and Waste Management: Roles and Opportunities for Extension Initiatives Programming" was sponsored by the Southern Region Extension Water Quality Committee, SERA-TF2-Solid Waste Management, ES-USDA and the Southern Rural Development Center. Financial support was also provided by the Farm Foundation.

Attendance at the conference was 294 (including speakers) from 23 states and territories. Most of the attendees were Extension faculty including 126 state and 121 county and area personnel.

The objectives of the conference were:

- To update participants on technical and regulatory developments
- To highlight successful extension programs
- To familiarize participants with resource materials available to support programs
- To encourage the implementation of interdisciplinary programs and networking, and
- To develop a prioritized list of research needs to support extension programs.

The conference was structured to include a general overview session on Tuesday morning; concurrent sessions on water quality, animal waste and municipal solid waste on Tuesday afternoon, and an information and resource fair with over 30 exhibits on Tuesday evening. Wednesday focused on in-depth half-day sessions in implementing successful educational programs on various aspects of water quality and waste management. A discussion of water quality accountability and reporting was held Wednesday night. The final day focused on six research round-tables designed to identify high priority research needed to support extension programming. Each attendee was provided with a reference notebook which included speaker descriptions, abstracts of presentations, research reviews for each round-table, and a directory of extension program materials (publications, fact sheets, slide sets, videotapes, and computer programs) and an inventory of research projects on waste management in the South.

Sixty-nine participants returned an evaluation form designed to determine how well the conference met its objectives. The attached figures summarize responses. The first column includes all responses; the second, county extension responses; and the third, state extension responses. Numbers in parentheses are the number of responses for each category.

Overall, evaluations were very positive. In response to the question should this type of conference be held again, 64 of the 65 respondents said yes; 30 said the conference should be repeated in two years, and 20 said it should be held annually.

For several of the questions there were clear differences between county and state responses, and between those given for the water quality and waste management tracks. For example, for question one, 61 percent of the county respondents but only 23 percent of the state respondents said that the conference increased their knowledge of technical developments in waste management to a great extent. For water quality comparable figures were 20 percent for county and 15 percent for state respondents. These figures probably reflect the differences in levels of knowledge and training of the participants at the conference.

Similar differences in responses for water quality and waste management occurred for questions four (to what extent did the conference
help you better understand the implementation of interdisciplinary programs) and five (to what extent did the conference help you to better understand the role of networking). Again, the more limited training which has been offered in waste management may explain more positive responses than for water quality.

Both county and state faculty were very positive about the value of the resource materials (question 3c, 71 percent of county respondents and 68% of state respondents said very helpful) and the information fair (question 3b, 57 percent of county respondents and 44 percent of state respondents said very helpful).

A small number of respondents attended the Wednesday night session on accountability and reporting (question six). Attitudes varied greatly, with responses split almost equally between very beneficial, beneficial and little benefit.

The Thursday morning session to prioritize research needs was included in the program primarily to try to establish a closer linkage between research and extension activities in water quality and waste management. Responses to question seven indicate a generally positive response to the sessions. The comments reflected a concern for how the results would be used.

Finally, responses to question nine (what was most useful to you in the conference) have been included as they reflect the overall success of the conference and the wide variation in what participants found of value.

Workshop Planning Committee

Frank Humenik, North Carolina State University, co-chair
Mike Levi, North Carolina State University, co-chair
James App, University of Florida
Bill Branch, Louisiana State University
Marie Hamner, University of Florida
Horace Hudson, University of Georgia
Waldon Kerns, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Albert Myles, Mississippi State University
Bill Segars, University of Georgia
John Sweeten, Texas A&M University
Jacque Tisdale, Southern Rural Development Center
Bill Waters, Louisiana State University
Dick White, Clemson University, South Carolina
QUESTION - 1 To what extent did the conference increase your knowledge of technical developments in
a) water quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Great Extent</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Great Extent</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) waste management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Great Extent</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Great Extent</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION - 2 To what extent did the conference increase your knowledge of regulatory developments in

a) water quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Great Extent</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Great Extent</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Great Extent</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) waste management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Great Extent</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Great Extent</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Great Extent</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION - 3  How helpful were the following in providing you with ways to improve the water quality/waste management programs in your state/county

a) Wednesday program presentations

- Little Help 9
  - Helpful 41
  - Very Helpful 49
  - All(50)

- Little Help 4
  - Helpful 32
  - Very Helpful 64
  - County(22)

- Little Help 7
  - Helpful 50
  - Very Helpful 40
  - State(42)

b) Sharing at information fair

- Little Help 9
  - Helpful 42
  - Very Helpful 51
  - All(65)

- Little Help 5
  - Helpful 38
  - Very Helpful 57
  - County(21)

- Little Help 10
  - Helpful 46
  - Very Helpful 44
  - State(39)

c) Resource materials

- Little Help 6
  - Helpful 24
  - Very Helpful 70
  - All(57)

- Little Help 29
  - Helpful 39
  - Very Helpful 71
  - County(21)

- Little Help 10
  - Helpful 22
  - Very Helpful 68
  - State(40)

QUESTION - 4  To what extent did the topics of the conference help you to better understand the implementation of interdisciplinary programs in

a) water quality

- None 1
  - Little 9
  - Great Extent 26
  - Somewhat 64
  - All(58)

- Great Extent 39
  - Somewhat 61
  - County(18)

- Little 11
  - Great Extent 17
  - Somewhat 69
  - State(36)
QUESTION - 5  To what extent did the topics of the conference help you to better understand the role of networking in
a) water quality

b) waste management

QUESTION - 6  How beneficial to you was the Wednesday night session on accountability and reporting
Depends on the actual results of the listing. Do something with the priorities
Helped to get ideas from around the country and see where we could fill knowledge gaps with concentration of efforts & funds
A difficult but necessary exercise
We need to develop conferences based on these priorities-next
Researchers & university personnel who are non-extension need a lesson on nominal group process
Each commodity group has some problems in common but site specific research is still needed
Strict nominal group technique as I understand it was not adhered to-lessened effectiveness
Primarily the discussion of specific ideas not the agglomeration of interesting individual topics into broad “thrusts”
But what will be done with info?
Opinions tended to be dominated by research people, “specialists”, rather than county-oriented participants.
We’ll see.
What will be done with lists? Too many people & ideas for the technique to work. Domination by basic researchers from soil science wanting research without linking it to education and/or regulation development & implementation.
Thanks the effort paid off
Would like a copy of results to be sent to all participants
Good interaction-probable needed more time and the opportunity to present a broader view of the identified need. The small group interaction was the best part of the conference.

QUESTION - 9 What was most useful to you in this conference

Research prioritization
The notebook
Programs developed in other states; their problems and successes
Resource fair
Hearing about other state’s programs
Session on source reduction
Networking with other professionals
Sessions on recycling pesticide containers and handling canceled or old pesticides & residue
Environmental policy
Networking Enviroshopping
Reports on Abstracts
Ground and Surface waters
Agent ideas & programs done in other counties
Sharing & networking
Info fair
General info on water & waste, especially papers
Resources for 4-H age groups
Sharing ideas, successes & problems in formal sessions, informally & at resource fair-EPA involvement
Being here increased my awareness. Farm*A*Syst and solid waste was most helpful
Networking; technical info from other agencies/states
Other contacts
County Presentations
Idea fair. Talking to folks from other parts of country
Priorities, handouts, composting info, contacts made
Sharing ideas
Networking, exhibits and sharing
Solid waste session, roundtables, composting session (Wed. pm)
Wed session
Meeting people working in this area
Composting session
Information fair, concurrent sessions, legislative update
Wed session
Session on policy
Networking
Understanding that problems face all states and areas
Agency interaction/familiarization of priority concerns or various areas/agencies
Talking with others about successful programs
Wed sessions-wish source reduction & composting was at separate times
Networking
Solid waste source reduction-I gained many ideas from this session that will be put to work immediately
Source reduction session
Increased understanding of the problems surrounding the two issues
Info fair & roundtable discussions. Visiting & questions in break out sessions
Introduction with peers
Summary
Interstate interface on similar issues
Billy Durham's presentation on "Recycling" session
Waste management
Contacts and the information received
Making contacts with others working in the subject matter area
Meeting with co-workers throughout the southern region
Breakout sessions on Wed: 1) am session C on Farm*A*Syst 2)pm session H on communications
Talking with others
Networking, sharing of info
Session on communicating environmental issues
Networking and teaching session
To discover again we are all in the same boat, quality lifeboat struggling with the oars
Farm*A*Syst & sharing fair
CULTURAL DIVERSITY

Meatra Harrison, Chair
Texas A&M University

At the 1990 meeting, program committees were asked to address the following with regard to diversity.

— Key issues in the South relative to cultural diversity in extension programming and staffing.

— Actions currently being taken in the states to deal with cultural diversity issues.

— Additional actions that should be taken so cultural diversity truly becomes a resource versus a problem in programs.

— Regional activities that would be useful to states as they continue their efforts in this area.

Reports from program groups indicate that states have conducted a variety of activities in several program areas. These include:

— Held staff awareness programs,

— Held Southern Region seminar for middle managers,

— Held conferences to address the significance of cultural diversity,

— Participated in the greater university through a university provost’s advisory committee,

— Developed a paper on cultural diversity,

— Inventoried controversial climate in extension programming,

— Established a state diversity task force with membership from all levels of staff in both 1890 & 1862,

— Held training at the 1993 Southern Region 4-H Planning Conference in March,

— Continued cooperation between 1890 and 1862 personnel,

— Began development of clip-art, graphics, computer graphics files, and media materials that are more visually responsive to culturally diverse audiences,

— Explored the possibility of a survey of available literature about media sensitivity to culturally diverse audiences,

— Provided Spanish-written newsletter to target Hispanic audiences,

— Used 3-D small farms money to reach and support small part-time farmers,

— Encouraged diversity on county advisory committees, and

— Formed a diversity committee.

Indications are that more in-depth work will be conducted in this vital area of emphasis.
The study group surveyed the states in the Southern region to determine the extent of CES's involvement in dealing with the issue of literacy. The task force was asked to make a determination of how much staff and program time was allocated to serving the illiteracy needs of youth and adult populations.

Findings
The level of support for illiteracy programs was uneven throughout the region. The Extension Services in some states had no involvement. Other states provided short term support through grant funds. Some of these states targeted a small sub-set of the population. Other states had published a few brochures. It is not a focus area.

The illiteracy programming effort is done more effectively by other state agencies and by voluntary groups in some instances.

Conclusion
Extension considers this issue a low priority item. No further action is anticipated in terms of programming.
PROGRAM COMMITTEE REPORTS
Reports were received from Vivian Jennings and John Vance on the activities at the National level important to ANR programs. Of special interest is the development of Certified Crop Advisory program. Also of interest was new initiatives and current funding of special projects.

Steve Halbrook provided the group with an up-date of Farm Foundation activities and a summary of the Foundation’s strategic plan.

At the request of the leaders, Denver Loupe, substituting for Bud Webb, reviewed the SERA structure and up-dated the group on the status of SERAs in progress and new ones proposed. The group discussed linkage and coordination of ANR task forces and committees.

Doss Brodax shared the proposal from TVA on coordination of Rural Development Activities in the Southern Region. The group appointed John Wilson to participate in this activity and attend the planning meeting.

The ANR leaders support the proposal to the Extension Directors to re-establish the regional forester’s position.

The activity of each committee or task force was discussed, schedules and leadership up-dated. Each advisor will continue their efforts in getting the objectives and mission of each group defined. Several were targeted for combining, linking to SERA and other regional committees’. A diversity report prepared by Ray Hummer was read and discussed.

Significant time was allocated to discuss sustainable agriculture, specifically to develop a planning strategy for a conference to be held March 1993 in Atlanta. Joe Waldrum is providing leadership to this activity. Other regional activities of SARE and other groups and organizations were reviewed. The status of the national "Competitiveness and Profitability in Agriculture Initiatives" was summarized by Absher. The goal of the group is to become aware of the diverse activities underway under the banner of sustainable agriculture and where possible, begin to build coalitions.

We were pleased to have an 1890 representative participate in our discussion.

New Officers: John Beverly, Chair, Texas Ray Hummer, Vice Chair, Tennessee John Wilson, Secretary, Mississippi Billy Caldwell, PLC (1 year) North Carolina Curtis Absher, National PLC member, Kentucky
COMMUNICATIONS

Ned Browning, Chair
Mississippi State University

Cultural Diversity

Communicators have set a goal of developing clip-art, graphics, computer graphics files, and media materials that are more visually responsive to culturally diverse audiences.

The group also is exploring the possibility of a survey of available literature about media sensitivity to culturally diverse audiences.

 Interstate Sharing of Media Materials

Communications department heads’ longstanding concerns with economies in media production have led to greater efforts to share materials among states.

Video: Most notably, the Southern Region Extension Video Producers Group will hold its fourth annual meeting in October. This group has developed a catalog of educational videos available for exchange across the region. It is producing significant production savings through the exchange of file video footage. And, it provides an effective idea forum.

Print news. Modeling on the success of the video exchange program, the communications department heads are developing a print news network for swapping stories and ideas. Since news doesn’t know state boundaries, several states are exchanging stories for local modification. The full-fledged adoption of electronic mail is hastening the process.

Philip Breeze of Virginia Tech reported that current literature indicates the media are more attracted to multi-source news releases. For the extension system this suggests that news releases quoting specialists in more than one state will get greater coverage.

Graphics. Graphic presentation of information always has been crucial, but is more so now with the advent of computer graphics and electronic publishing. The communications department heads agreed to an objective of a closer network of graphics producers. Pete Pepinsky of Clemson and Kevin Hayes of Oklahoma State agreed to poll graphic designers in the region to determine their interest in forming an information exchange group.

Publications. There has always been great attention to sharing publications across the region. An objective was set to establish an online catalog of publications available across the region. Additionally, it was noted that several states are working on standardized digital formats for text files for compatibility across state lines.

Communications departments are interested in exchanges, but need endorsement and reinforcement from administration. A significant element that was noted is the ever-increasing concern with the effect of promotion and tenure on the publishing agenda of authors. Clear policy statements delineating P&T concerns and educational goals for clientele are needed.

Developing Communications Technologies

Keeping with its tradition of cooperating in solutions to challenges across state lines, the communications group sees, in compact disk interactive (CDI), an opportunity to make a reasoned approach to a developing technology. The group is exploring a joint regional effort to seek extramural funding for a CDI pilot project.

At the Joint Committee meeting, Communications worked with ANR to arrange a CDI demonstration. A representative of Philips Corporation briefed the groups on the technology’s potential and showed how the system works.
The recent joint meeting of ECOP and ESCOP to develop strategies for enhancing the land-grant system image was noted. Communications department heads are looking forward to seeing a report. Communication department heads are in support of any plan that will improve strategic communication planning at our institutions. We likewise would encourage the use of expertise already existent within the land-grant system.

Videoconferencing

**Training.** In response to last year's interest in videoconferencing, Barry Jones, Texas A&M, and Kevin Hayes, Oklahoma State, reported a joint effort to teach faculty about videoconferencing. The concept was to use the medium to teach about the medium as specialists from OSU explained their videoconferencing activities to their TAMU colleagues via satellite.

**Southern Region Communicators Conference.** The communicators are practicing what they preach in videoconferencing. Due to travel constraints, the triennial meeting was cancelled. In response, the Texas A&M staff has scrambled and arranged a two-day distance education workshop. To be held in March, the videoconference will bring practical professional updates to communicators. Many topics will be of interest to other professionals within the system, so they are urged to contact their communications departments for details.

**Training Needs**

An involved discussion of training needs focused on the increasing necessity to equip faculty with communications skills. This need was contrasted with the fact that it clashes with steadily constricting production resources. The group resolved to seek better training methods for communications staffers.
COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Greg Taylor, Chair
Texas A&M University

The Southern CRD Leaders had an extremely busy, yet highly productive meeting. Principal focus was interaction with, and response to emerging challenges. This overall focus certainly adhered to the theme of the overall meeting.

Southern CRD Leaders met in joint sessions with Southern Directors for a presentation by Mr. Scott Ingham, aide to Congressman English (Oklahoma). Congressman English was sponsor for much of the rural development legislation eventually incorporated in the current Farm Bill. Consequently, Mr. Ingham has a good perspective of the overall Federal action surrounding rural development—of which there is quite a bit. Within the past year, the Rural Development Administration has been established; Rural Development Councils funded and expanded, RC&D (SCS) received additional funding; and the Forest Service allocated substantial funding for rural development efforts. Mr. Ingham outlined the legislative perspective of these efforts with an emphasis on extension’s perceived and desired role in this arena. Mr. Ingham also commended extension for its recent adoption of the new national initiative Communities in Economic Transition.

A significant portion of the CRD committee’s time was devoted to discussions of implementation of this initiative in the Southern Region. This discussion was supplemented by presentations by Randy Williams, National Program Leader, Economic Development, ES-USDA. Included in these presentations was a draft agenda for a national meeting to develop implementation strategies to be held October 1992. A conclusion emerging from this discussion is that implementation must cut across program lines and include field/county staff as well as specialists. One specific result is a recommendation to the PLC that, following the October national implementation meeting, a multidisciplinary/programmatic task force be established to address implementation of the Communities in Economic Transition Initiative in the Southern Region.

In tune with Mr. Ingham’s presentations, Southern CRD Leaders also heard a presentation from the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) regarding their interest in rural development and multiagency cooperative efforts. TVA made a proposal to cosponsor a workshop with Southern CRD Leaders and the Southern Rural Development Center on multiagency, cooperative rural development programming. Discussion by the committee reinforced the concept that rural development is a sufficiently acute and widespread issue that one agency alone, even extension, cannot hope to impact significantly. However, appropriate structured responses involving several agencies can have a positive effect on rural areas. Therefore, Southern CRD Leaders will request PLC endorsement of the TVA proposal. The committee named tentative representatives to a planning committee for the purpose of developing such a workshop.

The committee heard reports of various other activities on the Federal Level from ES-USDA staff. These included, besides those discussed already, technology Extension, training for local government officials and a rural health initiative. It was recognized the rural health is a very visible and critical issue across the country and the South. Further, that a truly interdisciplinary approach will be required to successfully address it. The committee is recommending to the PLC, in anticipation of a national rural health initiative, that a multidisciplinary task force be appointed to assess implementation in the South.

Other issues and concerns addressed by the committee were related to these main thrusts. These included extension intra-system interaction with other agencies—specifically the Rural
interaction implementation programming addressing broad issues of community/rural/economic development and universal involvement/input of all Southern states in formulation of regional response within the committee. Pertinent concerns were passed to the administrative advisor for consideration by Southern Directors. Continued efforts will be made by working with the ANR/CRD membership to assess interactional issues.

Reports also were received from traditional cooperators: Farm Foundation and Southern Rural Development Center. The (by now usual)

Conclusion is that these entities continue to play a critical role in the effectiveness of extension programming throughout the South. The committee also note the addition of 1890 representatives to these meetings and looks forward to developing this relationship to further enhance extension programming.

Committee officers for 1992-1993 are:

Larry Graves, Mississippi, chair
Mike Levi, North Carolina, chair-elect
Mike Hedges, Arkansas, secretary
1. Attendance. For the first time in several years, the state 4-H program leader position in each state is filled and all attended this meeting. We were pleased to have Dr. Richard Sauer, president, National 4-H Council and Dr. Alma Hobbs, Assistant Deputy Administrator, 4-H, ES-USDA meet with us to share national program concerns and plans.

2. Dr. Myron Johnsrud met with us on Tuesday. Among the items discussed was the plan for filling the currently vacant USDA/ES 4-H Deputy Administrator position. He invited us to share our expectations for the position with him. A position paper representing the thoughts of all present has been developed and presented to him.

3. Dr. Hobbs shared information concerning Ghostwriters, a new TV workshop for 4-H members about improving writing skills, Making the Grade, Youth at Risk, International Year of the Family, International 4-H Youth Exchange and a report from the National 4-H Recognition Event Design Team.

4. Dr. Sauer shared information regarding National 4-H Councils vision, image and organizational plan. He responded to questions concerning National 4-H Council operations.

5. Plans were finalized for the 1993 Southern Region Triennial Extension 4-H professional development conference to be held in Charleston, South Carolina, March 9-12, 1993. All states plan to participate in the conference.

6. The first week of October, the 25th annual Southern Region 4-H Leader Forum will be held at Rock Eagle 4-H Center in Georgia. South Carolina is the host state.

7. The National 4-H Event Design Team’s report and recommendations were analyzed regarding its effect on the Southern states. Agreement was reached on certain modifications which will be recommended.

8. The Southern Region 4-H Educational Materials Committee reported on the regional multi-disciplinary curriculum being developed for the 4-H Issue-Based Health task force. It was reported the 4-H Communications project curriculum will be ready this fall. This is a cooperative effort between nine states and is coordinated by the Southern Region Educational Materials Committee. Training for state staff will be conducted in Knoxville, Tennessee, and Baton Rouge, Louisiana, this fall.

9. It was announced that Arkansas is hosting a workshop for Southern Region 4-H Foundation Trustees to be held in Little Rock in October.

10. Dalton Proctor, North Carolina, was elected chair of Southern Region Executive Committee.

Other members:
Glenn Krohn, South Carolina
Lynn Thibodeaux, Texas
Norma Roberts, Louisiana
Jim Rutledge, Oklahoma
HOME ECONOMICS

Martha Johnson, Chair
Auburn University

* Initiated a proposal for a National Professional Development Activity in Financial Management.
* Worked on strategies and management issues for extension programs with a family focus.
* Had an update from Deputy Administrator of Home Economics and Human nutrition, Shirley Baugher.
* Discussed pending legislation and funding sources related to nutrition.
* Discussed alternatives related to regional cooperation among specialists faculty.
* Next officers will be:
  Jennie Kitching - chair, Texas
  Pat Ganter - chair-elect, Tennessee
The mid-management group had representation from all states in the region and 1890. The program was developed to address two objectives:

To provide an opportunity for participants to interact regarding:

- reduced funding,
- changing staffing patterns resulting from reduced funding,
- techniques for interpreting Extension educational programs to our publics, and
- changes in middle-management functions resulting from reduced staff.

To develop a procedure for communications between mid-managers in the Southern Region for:

- idea sharing
- support system
- regional planning and program development

Committee members shared opportunities, challenges and experiences resulting from budget shortfalls. Techniques that are being used in states to remain viable after restructuring and adjustment of staff and resources were discussed. Dr. Chester Fehlis, assistant director for county programs, Texas, led a discussion on Building Effective Support for Extension in the '90s and interpreting Extension Educational Programs to our Publics.

Numerous ideas were shared that mid-managers felt would be helpful. This type of exchange also allowed others to feel better about their present situations.

The officers for the next year remain the same:

Jan Montgomery, Oklahoma, chair
Mason Morrison, Kentucky, secretary
Dr. Walter J. Walla, advisor to the group
PROGRAM & STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Howard Ladewig, Chair
Texas Agricultural Extension Service

ADMINISTRATION
New officers elected for 1992-1993 include:
Roy Lessly (Tennessee), chair
Cliff Taylor (Florida), vice chair
Angela Neilan (Virginia), secretary

Our representative to the Program Leadership Committee is Bill Shimel (South Carolina).
Stanley Lamendola (Louisiana) has replaced Randy Barnett (Kentucky) as our liaison to the Southern Directors.
Connie McKenna, our counterpart on ES, USDA staff, participated in our meeting and briefed us on national events and activities.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS
The 1991-1992 Program Leadership Committee requested that we address two major concerns: Cultural Diversity and Programming in a Controversial Climate.

Concerning Cultural Diversity, Roy Lessly and Angela Neilan are in the process of identifying Southern Region state contact people and materials. They also will work with the National Center of Cultural Diversity and Paratism at Kentucky State when that center gets established.

In support of Programming in a Controversial Climate, Satish Verma (Louisiana) provided leadership in working with communications to produce a video using examples from nine states and Puerto Rico. Dr. Verma also will develop a guide for use of the video with Module 6 of Working with our Publics. Each state has been given a copy of the video. Stanley Lamendola will present the video to Southern Directors. Also Jerry Whiteside (Georgia) will show the video to the Southern Region Video Association.

A third accomplishment of our committee is the development of a fact sheet on networking prepared by Martha Nall and Paul Warner (Kentucky).

PROSPECTS
Recognizing that at least one-half of the cost of change relates to training and development, we will be working toward helping control those costs through several projects. The project titles and committee leadership are listed below:

1. Preparation of a video on building support bases—Cliff Taylor.
2. Review materials useful for on-site program reviews for management of programs—Connie McKenna.
3. Work with Communications Committee on Distance Learning with emphasis on Educational design—Howard Ladewig.
4. Recommendations for annual reporting—Satish Verma.

We also will be developing fact sheets on the following topics:

* Distance Learning—Howard Ladewig
* Accountability—Cliff Taylor
* Collaboration & Teamwork—Paul Warner
* Working with advisory councils—Satish Verma
* How to make better use of internet for communications and resources—Angela Neilan
We will begin the process of developing a Strategic Plan for information technology—Paul Warner

Recommendation to Program Committee on having available information, equipment on information technology in support of distance learning—Bill Shimei

A position paper on the role of staff development in these changing times will be developed. The paper will be used in development of strategic plan for staff development—Jimmy Richardson (Mississippi).

THANKS
Finally, our committee thanks the leadership of the Southern Region for the opportunity to both meet as a Southern Region Committee and to interact with the other Program Committees.
Networking

Essential to Effective Programming

by Martha A. Nall and Paul D. Warner

A network is an informal exchange system for obtaining resources. It is a mechanism for acquiring information by developing linkages with persons outside our immediate circle of contacts. In trying to answer questions or solve problems we start by drawing on our own expertise, then we turn to our co-workers and close friends for help. If we still do not have the answer, we reach out for assistance to those outside our work group.

What is Networking?

Networking is how we get things done. It is a card file or address book filled with names, addresses, phone and Fax numbers accumulated through the years. It is becoming a part of someone else’s list. It is our personal database of acquaintances that we call on for information or resources.

Definitions abound for networking. Webster’s Dictionary defines it as making “connections among people or groups of a like kind.” It is an informal, purposeful process of acquiring and/or sharing resources (Wells, 1988). It can take place between individuals, groups, organizations or any combination of the three. Simply, networks represent a collection of acquaintances who can be counted on for support or help (Morrison, 1981).

Characteristics of Networks

1. Networks involve people. Networking’s very nature implies that people are involved and that human relations skills are essential. The skills used in networking are the same social skills we use in establishing friendships.

2. There is an exchange. Networking affords access to needed resources. However, the idea of exchange means giving, as well as getting. The underlying assumption is that persons are willing to freely share information and resources with others. There must be the realization that through reciprocity both parties benefit. If I give you something, then you will respond to me in a like manner when I have a need. And in the long run, we will both be better off. Because of this exchange relationship, each person is willing to continue to support the needs of the other. A willingness to serve as a resource for others is essential in maintaining networking relationships.

3. The “stuff” being exchanged varies. The tangible resources are physical exchanges. For example, money, buildings, people, land and equipment can all be acquired through networking relationships. We can see and touch these items. Intangible resources such as information, ideas, or legitimization can also be a part of the exchange. Support, encouragement or advice are important psychological and emotional resources.
estimates, any two people in the United States can be connected by a series of only six contacts. Networks allow us to reach beyond our personal circle of acquaintances to a much larger group that includes contacts of contacts.

How does this work? Let's say, for example, that a T-H agent in Alabama went to school with an attorney who graduated from the Harvard Law School. The attorney now works in New York City in entertainment and has a client who lives next door to a musician who is actively involved in charities which raise money or youth development projects. The agent connects with the attorney who facilitates the contact with the musician who agrees to give a benefit concert in Alabama to raise money for a counseling program for troubled youth.

1. Networks are informal yet purposeful. They are informal in that there are no formal rules or guidelines or network involvement. Often the idea of informality is equated with lateral or horizontal contacts. However, networks that include superiors, bosses or administrators within an organization can also be informal in their structure. It means that you call the Vice President and ask for assistance because you are aware of his or her knowledge or expertise in this area, or because of the organizational position the person olds.

Although networks are informal in nature, this does not imply that they operate by happenstance. The most effective networking is the result of careful identification of needed resources and the determination of the persons most likely to be of assistance.

Types of Networks


Similarity Networks: These are made up of persons with something in common. In Extension, we people we meet through our involvement in professional associations such as the National Association of Extension Home Economists or the Community Development Society are a part of our similarity network. We interact and make contacts because of what we have in common. Similarities are always related to careers. It may be age, religion, geographic location, political party, civic organization

Common interests produce a powerful bond and an effective channel for expanding networks.

Transaction Networks: In transaction networks people come together because of their ability to exchange different resources. In Extension, we form transaction networks when we contact a leader to teach a skill not possessed by the agent. If the saying, "opposites attract" has any validity, it is exemplified in transaction networks. Transaction networks are based on identifying those who complement us by contributing strengths we are lacking. One person compensates for the weakness of the other.

Networking in Management

In Re-inventing the Corporation, Naisbitt and Aburdene say that "Networking is the baby boom's management style of choice" (p. 30). Extensive study (Naisbitt and Aburdene, 1985; Kotter, 1988; Kanter, 1989) of corporate America has concluded that the hierarchical structure of organizations will not work in today's rapidly changing environment. An information society requires that management functions be organized into small work groups where communication is quicker and more effective.

The team approach to organization is becoming the norm in practice, if not in structure, in American corporations. Bill Gore, of W.L. Gore & Associates, calls what's happening in many companies, lattice organization. Gore says, "Every [successful] organization has a lattice organization that underlies the facade of authoritarian hierarchy" (Naisbitt and Aburdene, p. 36). The traditional authoritarian structure may remain, but networking is how they get things done.

One of the ten considerations to keep in mind in the process of re-inventing the corporation, suggest Naisbitt and Aburdene (1985), is that "top-down authoritarian management style is yielding to a networking style of management, where people learn from one another horizontally, where everyone is a resource for everyone else, and where each person gets support and assistance from many different directions" (p. 62).

Studies of leadership styles of effective corporate managers (Kotter, 1982; Kotter, 1985; Kotter, 1988; Gardner, 1990) identify several skills related to networking:
and institutions,
- the ability to understand the systems within and outside their organizations, and
- the ability to build a strong implementation network of people.

Effective leaders have implementation networks which include key bosses, peers, subordinates and outsiders. "It is a leadership that can build support networks not only with subordinates and customers, but also with superiors and peers" (Kotter, 1988). It is a leadership style that knows how to cooperate and develops a sense of teamwork. It is broad in its vision and found in a world that tends to create the narrow and specialized.

Kotter also found that networking involves a wide range of interpersonal tactics. General managers use humor and non-work discussions to develop personal relationships that later serve to facilitate completion of work-related tasks.

**Why Networking is Essential in Extension**

The Cooperative Extension System needs to have a structure and mechanisms that enable and encourage the formation of networks, both of a formal and informal nature. As the issues that Extension addresses become more complex, we must:
- rely on the expertise of others,
- understand the issues to the extent that we identify all the related and relevant parties, and
- bring together the different perspectives of these groups and explore those differences.

A single discipline or individual cannot have all of the answers. As John Gardner put it, "Many a group bent on achieving one or another goal in the larger society has failed because it could not bring itself to enlist allies outside its own field" (p. 103). Therefore, we must seek assistance from Extension organizations located in other states and regions, from professionals conducting educational programs in other agencies, and from lay leaders and the clientele we serve.

Furthermore, with constrained budgets, many state systems cannot afford to have resource people with expertise in every subject area needed. We as a system

In times of limited resources there is a temptation to pull back and try to take care of immediate needs. But doing so diminishes our capacity to respond to critical issues. Actually we should be further encouraging the formation of networks, work groups, subject matter teams, and coalitions. That may mean increased out-of-state travel, but it definitely suggests more audio and video conferencing, more sharing of educational materials, and the increased use of electronic communication systems. We must encourage the formation of mechanisms that provide crosscutting access to persons in other systems who have expertise and information we need, and to whom we can also be of assistance.

Perhaps the place to start is in assessing our own networking skills. This publication includes a checklist (on the last page) which may be used for discussion purposes and to help you identify your own strengths and areas which need improvement.

**References**


Networking Skills

In the box preceding each statement, place a check (✓) if the statement applies to you.

☐ 1. I probe for underlying issues in a conversation.
☐ 2. My work is perceived as competent by others.
☐ 3. I am genuinely interested in other people.
☐ 4. I remember relevant information about people's expertise.
☐ 5. I'm aware of how my work relates to that of others.
☐ 6. I value the opportunity to work with individuals with different points of view.
☐ 7. I seek information from others concerning their goals and needs.
☐ 8. I seek creative options and alternatives to problems or issues.
☐ 9. I continue to expand my circle of contacts by becoming acquainted with new people in the organization and/or community.
☐ 10. I ask probing questions that expand the range of conversation.
☐ 11. I let people know I appreciate them when they help me.
☐ 12. I am aware of the current "culture" of the organization (the issues, the "in" topics).
☐ 13. I seek information from others before I proceed with a task.
☐ 14. I have a systematic approach to remembering who people are, what they do, and their interests.
☐ 15. I strive to maintain a positive reputation in my work.
☐ 16. I encourage others to talk and share information. (e.g., activities, responsibilities, interests).
☐ 17. I plan for the time needed to access my networks.
☐ 18. I make people aware of my goals and needs.
☐ 19. I have a reputation for being a strong team player.
☐ 20. I am known for returning a favor when one is done for me.

Score one point for each checkmark:

16-20—Actively engaged in networking. Keep up the good work!
10-15—Moderately involved. There’s room for improvement.
Less than 10—Networking is neither a skill nor a priority. Pay special attention to developing your networking skills.

*Adapted from "Networking Skills Inventory," developed by Beverly Byrum-Robinson and J. David Womeldorff.
FEELING GOOD ABOUT CHANGE

Judy Burner, Organization Development Specialist
Virginia Cooperative Extension Service

On Tuesday in the work session on Change — Managing Yourself and Others, the focus was primarily on the organization with a minor emphasis on you and your reactions to change.

In closing this conference I want to place the focus directly on you and your relationship with change because as we all knew before we arrived and now have had reinforced through a number of speakers, the opportunities are massive.

I would like for everyone to pick up a pen or pencil and write down a number that would place you on a scale of between one and ten, ten being high, to this statement.

How satisfied I feel with myself as a person and my place in this world.

Chances are those of you that ranked yourself at a high number feel a bit more comfortable with change than those of you that ranked yourself at the lower level. I do need to acknowledge that the number you choose on the scale today may be different than the number you might have chosen yesterday or will choose tomorrow.

Many of you have seen these statements before:

I am where I am today because of the choices I made or didn’t make yesterday.

I am who I am today because of the choices I made or didn’t make yesterday.

Where you are today and who you are today was brought about by your ability to react to, welcome and adapt yourself to all the opportunities that have presented themselves to you over the years.

Whether we consider change a good thing or a bad thing often depends on how we feel about ourselves, our abilities and our place in the world. And, it doesn’t really matter whether the change was perceived as positive, negative, whether it was triggered by others, or whether it was a change we triggered. In the end, most changes have turned out okay.

Change always represents a leap of faith — even when the change is perceived to be a positive one. I would like to share with you a change response scale some of you may have seen before. It comes from Harry Woodward’s and Steve Buchholz’s book, After-Shock.

The Change Response Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moving Away From Change</td>
<td>Moving Toward Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss</td>
<td>Gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity (Form)</td>
<td>Resilience (Purpose)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Woodward, Harry & Steve Buchholz, After-Shock

Primarily in the beginning of a change experience, it is helpful for people to assess themselves on three pairs of variables: victim/owner, loss/gain, rigidity/resilience. I would like to spend some time on these because the way we perceive ourselves on these variables is going to affect how we react to the change, how fast we move through the phases of change, and whether we perceive the change to be a good one or not.
I will deal with the victim/owner pair first. People who see themselves as victims are often people who feel the change was done to them. They feel victimized and that events are beyond their control. The key word here is "they" — "they did it to us," "why didn’t they tell us?" "if only they had." People who perceive themselves as victims are often resisters and detractors.

Owners, on the other hand, are active participants. They may or may not like the change or agree it is necessary, but regardless of their feelings, they are willing to work on implementing it and to work with others to make it happen. It is important to point out that you don’t have to like something to be an owner.

The person who falls in the middle of the scale on the variables of victim/owner may not be an owner or victim but a "wait and see" person.

The change may represent a loss or gain for individuals. Some individuals will probably see it as both and would rank themselves in the middle of the scale. People that see the experience as a loss and loss of what has been important to them will back away from the change if possible; those that see it as a gain will move toward it. Whether an individual comes down on the side of loss or gain, they still need to be able to articulate for themselves what those losses and gains will be. Seeing possible gains helps people deal with losses.

Whether a person is rigid or resilient in their behavior will determine whether a person is more likely to move toward change than away from it. Rigidity represents an attachment to form and the way we have always done it or the attitude there is only one way to do it. Resilience signifies a focus on purpose, mission and vision—the end result and the fact there may be many ways to do it. Individuals who are tied to the "way we have always done it" will more likely resist. The person who comes down on the resiliency side will see change as a challenge to be worked on and through.

I think many of us would like to be people who are resilient, owners of our experiences, who can always see the positive from the standpoint that any experience will bring us more gains than losses. However, it is more likely that some of us can identify with this quote from John Kenneth Galbreath, the economist:

Faced with the choice between changing one’s mind and proving that there is no need to do so, almost everybody gets busy on the proof.

I would like to share with you dialogue from the book, _Hope for the Flowers:_

"How does one become a butterfly?"
"You must want to fly so much you are willing to give up being a caterpillar."
"You mean to die?"
"Yes and no. What it looks like is you will die, but what’s real is you will still live. Life is changed, not taken away. Isn’t that different from those who die without ever becoming butterflies?"

My perception is that extension is once more in its proud history between the stages of being a caterpillar and a butterfly, and it has got to decide whether it wants to fly. To do so means we need to move toward change and embrace some of the new opportunities that are out there. It also means we may need to redesign the system to be able to embrace those opportunities.

Whether extension flies again depends on whether you and I want it to fly, because we represent the leadership, the people "in charge" if there is such a thing in extension.

The issue is what are we "holding on to" and why. When we hold on to the way we have always done business and, in some cases, with whom we have done business, we can’t reach for those new opportunities. In fact, we often can’t even see them, or we see them but don’t think they fall into "our business."

Change is a growth experience. I am not the same person I was five, 10, or 15 years ago,
and neither are you. I hope we are better. We need to realize the Extension System isn’t the same organization it was 10, 20 or 30 years ago, and it never will be, nor should it be. That does not mean it can’t be the most relevant organization in the world today.

Each of us has to deal with change as an individual and in our own way for change is always personal. In the end we are all alone. We can support each other, but we each have to walk our own journey. And, that journey is walked in our heads.

We each have choices as to how we will relate to others, our world and to the effects of change. We can be owners, or we can be victims. Each of us has to acknowledge the losses for us and work through them to get to new gains. Others can be supportive, but in the end it is our journey.

Your choices are critical—for you are the leaders of the Extension System in the Southern Region. You can choose to focus on the inside of our organization, or you can focus outside. My sense is there are a lot of people in our system playing the "circling our tree" game. We are so busy keeping things the way they are, ignoring all those golden opportunities outside, that we can’t see we may be running the risk of becoming irrelevant in our society.

We have missed them in the past because we were hanging on to the past, to what we felt comfortable with, to what our clientele felt comfortable with, to the way we had always done it, to what we have always done. Yet most of us have found “hanging on” to be exhausting and demoralizing. The energy, the time and the resources it takes to hang on saps morale and resources.

At the same time some of our people are having difficulty changing to address some of the critical issues in society today, the extension model is being replicated by other state agencies and organizations all around us in order to address some of the same issues we are choosing not to address.

I am the staff person assigned to work with the State Extension Advisory Committee, and they had a meeting last week. After the administration and committee had discussed plans to get $3.4 million restored during the 1993 General Assembly session, one committee member asked if the system had totaled the costs of resources, including personnel time, that had gone into the restoration of funds over a two year period and will go on before January. I thought, what a good question, and silently said to myself, “While the financial resources have been great, the energy and effort on morale-type resources have been even greater.” The sad part is that those resources, financial and otherwise, were not spent on programming.

A friend of mine does a lot of work with groups and organizations on resolving conflicts. She has three rules for escalating conflict, not de-escalating conflict:

1. Personalize it. Take it personally.
2. Expand it, exaggerate it, and add on baggage from the past.
3. Form an army of people who agree with you, and hang in there.

Doing this doesn’t feel good. It is based on fear and lack of trust and causes feelings of alienation and isolation. Change involves lots of conflict, and this is often the way we react.

I would like to share with you four rules for making it. This comes out of Bill Bridges’s work on change and transition.

Rule One: Show Up.

We often miss opportunities by taking ourselves out of them. All dire predictions of success or failure are simply our own imaginings for we never have a true picture of all the factors in a situation. There is no way to guess how many failures are traceable to simply not giving something a try—to not “showing up” for the opportunity.
Rule Two: Be Present.

Some people show up but don't give it their best shot. They don't bring their energies and talents to the table. You can be physically in this room and not be present. Some people go through the motions, put in their time, leave their energies and talents unused.

Rule Three: Tell the Truth.

Saying what you think you are expected to say has several drawbacks. First, you may get the expectations wrong; second, the expectations may change; and third, it is difficult to keep up with what has been said. In addition, it destroys your mind and spirit. Telling the truth is the most powerful action you can take. If you can't tell the truth and others can't accept it, your system has an issue it needs to address.

Rule Four: Let Go of the Outcomes.

This is the hardest rule for people to do because a lot of people are into control. We need to stop manipulating the process for a desired outcome. When we try to do so, we either alienate others, or drive ourselves crazy, or both. Instead, all we should do is deliver the best possible programs addressing the critical issues of society, and let go. What is going to happen is going to happen. We cannot control the outcome.

Feeling good about change—what does that mean to you? Are you there now, or do you have a way to go? If you have a way to go in feeling good about change, what is getting in your way? Is it something on the outside, or is it you and your head?

You are the master of your universe. If you don't believe that, you need to acknowledge why you don't feel that way. It is not an issue of control, it is an issue of choice. Remember no choice is a choice.

The other piece we need to be aware of is other people. We all walk our own journeys, but there are others around us walking their journey at the same time. It is critical that we "connect." There are all kinds of connections that are appropriate with a variety of people, but it is important that we connect emotionally and psychologically for the connections to be real.

Trust people enough to connect. Be open, be real, be honest with people. This includes staff as well as clientele. Take the walls down, move the focus from inside the organization to the outside. What is it we (extension) can and should be doing throughout our region to make things better for others—not how can we save the system. The system will save itself if we do the right things.

There are tremendous opportunities right now, and everybody in this room knows what they are. There are many choices to be made. We need to involve others in those choices and be satisfied with the results.

Nothing feels as good as success and everyone pulling together for that success. Nothing feels better than people working together using their collective power to make a fiery mission and vision real.

Remember the caterpillar and the butterfly. Out of the death of a caterpillar comes a butterfly—a thing of beauty, with wings to fly.

The extension concept is as relevant today as it ever was, maybe even more so. Whether we allow it to soar again as a butterfly or to stay as a caterpillar focused on the ground is up to us. You are the leaders of the Southern Region—a major part of the national Extension System.

And if the system is to turn into colorful butterflies, you as leaders need to take care of yourself. Take time out and do things that give you pleasure. Eat right, get enough rest and exercise. Find distractions that take your mind off your job. They may be hobbies, activities, volunteering within the community, spending time with children, family and friends. Make
plans to turn losses into gains. Take stock of your life. Is this really where you want to be at this point in your life? Does it matter?

Think back to times in your life when you went through massive change. How did you manage it? What resources and skills did you draw on? Those same experiences and skills will get you through any new changes.

You and I are responsible for the quality of our life and the quality of our relationships—no one else.

As you leave this conference to return to your office where your desk is awaiting you, piled high, take a few moments in your car or on the plane to reflect on what is going to be different because of what you heard and experienced this week. What are you carrying with you that can be shared? What new insights, both about yourself and the environment in which your system operates, do people need to know about? The ability to share and communicate your insights is important. The choice to do so is up to you. Feeling good about change is also up to you.

I wish you the best with your journeys.
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