Providing an International Dimension To Curricula of Agricultural Students

Earl D. Kellogg

Universities in the U.S. function in a central role to preserve and transmit cultural heritage, teach skills and disseminate new ideas, and generate new knowledge and technology. As faculty, with substantial control of these universities, society has given us major responsibilities to define and implement educational programs and curricula to achieve these objectives. Accomplishing this will require an understanding of what our students will need in the future to function effectively in a society that will be considerably different from the one we now experience. In no area of study is this a greater challenge than in agriculture. Fundamental technological changes are occurring along with an internationalization in agriculture that affects producers, agribusiness people, policy-makers, scientists, and teachers. I am concerned that our present agriculture faculty may not fully understand this internationalization process and the related changes we need to address in curricula and educational programs for agricultural students. While there are substantial difficulties in providing a quality international dimension to agricultural educational programs, we must offer the kind of educational experience for agricultural students which will prepare agricultural students for the 1990's and the 2000's. To neglect the international dimension in our universities' educational programs in agriculture would be a failure to responsibly fulfill our mandates as teachers of a new generation.

The organization of this paper is as follows. First, a definition of an international dimension is given to develop a common basis for the use of the concept in this paper. Secondly, a classification of agricultural students is suggested to sharpen our notion of rationale and appropriate actions. Thirdly, methods of providing an international dimension to agricultural students' educational programs are suggested. Lastly, constraints to making progress and suggestions for collective action to alleviate some of these constraints are given.

Associate Director of International Agriculture and Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. **This paper was given at the annual conference of the National Association of Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture held at Washington State University, June 17-20, 1984.**

Definition of an International Dimension

An international dimension to educational programs is used here to refer to teaching and research conducted within American universities relative to states, societies, and cultures other than those of the United States. In addition to the study of specific world areas, the definition encompasses all teaching and research on topics explicitly treated in a multi-national, comparative, or international manner such as international trade, international relations, development studies, and comparative studies involving at least one "foreign" area (McCaughey). Using this definition, most colleges of agriculture offer some international dimension to their course programs, e.g., courses in international trade, economics of agricultural development, crop production in the tropics, world animal agriculture, etc. An international dimension may also be given by including comparative foreign area content in agricultural core curricula courses, e.g., crop production, soils, basic agricultural economics, and animal science.

Classification of Agricultural Students and Rationale for Providing an International Dimension to Their Academic Programs

Part of the difficulty in making major progress in developing meaningful international dimensions for agricultural students is that we fail to differentiate among potential students and their needs. Most colleges of agriculture serve a diverse set of students. While each student has different interests, objectives and backgrounds, there are commonalities of interests and objectives which might serve useful in delineating appropriate options for providing international dimensions to their curricula. I shall propose four groups.

Undergraduates interested in domestic agriculture - Group 1

One important group is composed of agricultural undergraduates who plan to farm or work in an agribusiness firm and do not plan to attend graduate school. Numerically, this is the largest group in colleges of agriculture. A large proportion of this group will remain in the U.S. and work relatively near the

university. They will comprise a relatively large proportion of the active agriculture alumni of the university who serve on department and college advisory committees and provide leadership to agricultural and political institutions within the state. A relatively small number of these students will take first jobs directly related to international agricultural concerns.

Graduate students interested in domestic agriculture - Group 2

Another group is comprised of graduate students within colleges of agriculture whose initial primary career objectives relate to domestic agriculture. These individuals will enter a national and international job market, but relatively few will take first jobs directly related to international issues. However, many of these individuals will become directly involved in international agriculture concerns sometime during their careers.

Students interested in international agriculture — Group 3

This group consists of agricultural graduate and undergraduate students whose initial career objectives are to be employed with some international institution or in a foreign country.[1]

Agriculturalists not enrolled in resident instruction programs - Group 4

This last group is composed of farmers, agribusiness persons, and leaders of agricultural institutions who are now faced with problems that have an international dimension. These individuals may work closely with various aspects of the college of agriculture but may not have much contact with the international dimensions of our colleges.

The rationale for providing an international dimension to the educational program is somewhat different for each group. However, there is, at least, one broad rationale which is relevant for all groups. Nations and people in all parts of the world are being affected in major ways by actions and occurences in foreign countries and international institutions. The world is rapidly becoming one ecosphere and our future thinking and understanding must accommodate this singular fact of survival (Bonham). Today, far more than at any time in our history, what we do affects other nations and what others do affects us. To secure our interests we must bargain, persuade, cajole — in short, draw upon all of the international knowledge, skills and competence at our disposal (American Council on Education).

This is certainly true in agriculture. College of agriculture students who now sit in the classrooms will be providing leadership to U.S. and other countries' agricultural and political institutions in the 1990's and the first three decades in the 2000's. The internationalization of agriculture which has so rapidly developed in the 1960's and 1970's will certainly continue during these decades.

The value of U.S. agricultural exports has increased about 800 percent since 1960. Not so well known is the fact that agricultural imports have increased over 400 percent since 1960 (see Table 1). While some of these imports are not competitive with U.S. agricultural products, about 66 percent of the total value of U.S. agricultural imports is commodities presently being produced in the U.S. It is good business to know not only your buyers but also your competition in your own home market.

Further evidence of the importance of international influences on U.S. agriculture is that exports have become increasingly large compared to the gross national product of the farm sector. In 1960, exports were about 22 percent of the total value of output of the farm sector. In 1983, exports were 49 percent of the farm sector gross national product (see Table 2). In terms of export value, American agriculture has rapidly internationalized in the past 10-20 years. Among individual commodities, the export share of total production varies substantially. Over 40 percent or our wheat, cotton, soybeans, and rice is exported. Substantial proportions of corn and soybean meal are also sold to other countries (see Table 3).

Our agricultural exports are increasingly being bought by less developed countries and nations with centrally planned economies as seen in Table 4. These countries buy about 46 percent of the total U.S. agricultural exports. Most of them have marketing systems, agricultural and trade policies, and consumer tastes not familiar to us. Fifty percent or more of exports of grains and feeds, wheat and products, rice, corn, soybean oil, and animal and animal products go to these types of countries.

In addition to international commodity trade, many other international influences are not affecting our nation's agriculture. Capital flows among nations much more freely than it did several years ago. The international debt problem affects many U.S. banks and financial institutions which also serve American agriculture. North-South dialogues and East-West negotiations involve agricultural issues. Other countries' agricultural and trade policies now affect us substantially. International institutions and agreements are becoming more important in agricultural trade. Non-tariff trade barriers are being increasingly utilized by many countries. To understand, accommodate, and negotiate these sometimes subtle barriers requires in-depth knowledge regarding these foreign countries and the pressures behind the enactment of various measures. Increased movement of commodities makes disease transfer more probable. In addition, agricultural research organizations in other countries are developing technology and answers which may be useful to U.S. agriculture.

[1] I have not chosen to classify students by country of origin. Foreign students fall into all groups. In some cases, foreign students are not interested in international issues in their studies.

Table 1. Value of U.S. Agricultural Exports and Imports 1960, 1970, 1983 Fiscal Years

Category	1960	1970	1983
	..... million dollars		
U.S. Agricultural Exports	4,628	6,958	34,771
U.S. Agricultural Imports	4,010	5,686	16,368

Source: ERS, USDA: **U.S. Foreign Agricultural Trade Statistical Report.** Various years.

As representatives of many of the best colleges of agriculture in the U.S. and world, we have a responsibility to present educational materials from a perspective which explicitly takes into account the international and foreign dimensions of agriculture. If we do this effectively, students will have a better understanding of and be able to function more effectively in international situations. Whether you start from a liberal education philosophy (every well-educated-person ought to know about other peoples' cultures, histories, and politics), or a more pragmatic basis (courses should improve students' performance in jobs), this rationale to develop knowledge regarding world issues can be developed into a strong case.

A comparison of international emphases in educational systems in the U.S. and with Japan and the Soviet Union may be instructive.[2] These two countries are relatively large and could take the attitude held by some of us Americans that:

> We are a large country with little contact with others who speak foreign languages. So, we can't learn languages because we don't have to use them. In addition, technical competence and efficiency are the most important aspects of international trade and marketing and familiarity with other languages, cultures and economies doesn't matter very much at all.

It is clear that this attitude does not exist among the academic leaders in the Soviet Union and Japan. In the Soviet Union, it is reported that almost all students take at least one foreign language in high school. One foreign language is required in the university and a second or third foreign language is required in the graduate schools. According to some reports, there are four times as many teachers of English in the Soviet Union as there are total students studying Russian in the United States. In Japan, more than 80 percent of the students take a foreign language beginning at age 12 and two foreign languages are required for university graduation. It is reported that there are at least 10,000 Japanese businessmen in the United States who are competent in English and very knowledgeable about American politics, economy, business practices, and the general cultural content within which they function. The same report estimates that there are only 1,000 U.S. business representatives in Japan, and only a handful of that number speak Japanese. The Japanese have generally stressed the importance of their managers having a foreign language competency and a reasonably sophisticated understanding of the political, social, cultural, and economic contexts of the countries with which they do business. Not content with the current emphasis, however, Japanese corporate and government leaders concluded that even greater emphasis should be placed on these skills and 712 firms joined in funding a new university to train rising young executives in these skills. These young executives will spend a prolonged period of intensive study of the language and the political, social, economic and culture contexts of the various countries and regions of the world.

Table 2. Value of U.S. Agricultural Exports as Proportion of Farm Sector Gross National Production

Category	1960	1970	1983
	..... million dollars		
(1) U.S. Agricultural Export Value	4,628	6,958	34,771
(2) GNP of Farm Sector	21,400	28,600	70,800
	..... %		
(3) (1) as % of (2)	21.6	24.3	49

Source: ERS, USDA: **U.S. Foreign Agricultural Trade Statistical Report.** Various years.

U.S. Department of Commerce, **Statistical Abstract of United States 1982-83.**

Comparable data for the United States stands in sharp contrast to Japan and the Soviet Union. In 1915, 36 percent of American high school students studied a modern foreign language.[3] That figure has now declined by some estimates to as low as 10 percent, and as of 1980, one-fifth of the nation's high schools offered no foreign language instruction and the number continues to climb. In our colleges and universities, there has been a drop of 44 percent in college foreign language enrollments since 1963. In 1915, 85 percent of the nation's colleges and universities required students to pass a foreign language competency test as an entrance requirement. As of 1975, only 8 percent required entering students to show any record of foreign language work; 26 percent of this total decline took place in the brief nine-year period between 1966-75. The United States is the only major country which does not have a language requirement for entry into its foreign service, and of the foreign service positions designated as requiring professional language proficiency nearly one-third are not filled by persons with this qualification. Although relations with the Peoples Republic of China have taken on a new and expanded importance only twenty-seven positions in State Department/Foreign Service are designated as

requiring a professional proficiency in Chinese. I do not know what the comparative data for the Foreign Agricultural Service are.

The record in the non-language dimensions of international affairs is equally, if not more, discouraging. Recent surveys, for example, revealed that over 20 percent of high school seniors were unsure about the whereabouts of France or China. A 1977 Gallup Poll indicated that only half of the general public is aware that this country must import petroleum supplies and in 1980 a Roper Poll revealed that 49 percent of Americans surveyed believed that foreign trade was either irrelevant or harmful to the United States. The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies concludes that unless this very poor record is reversed, ours will be a country of internationally illiterate people, and this will place us in an increasingly vulnerable economic, political and strategic position vis-a-vis other nations.

This broad rationale applies to all groups previously defined. As agricultural faculty, we have the primary responsibility to provide an international dimension to agricultural students' educational programs which will make them better informed citizens of this country and world, more knowledgeable leaders of the agricultural sector, and more proficient workers in their subsequent employment.

The rationale for international studies in group 2 - graduate students in agriculture with primarily domestic agriculture interests - has to do with making them more effective agricultural scientists and educators within their disciplines. Being a true scholar within a discipline involves an international perspective of the subject matter. Agricultural social sciences must understand international social and economic forces, foreign country economic policy, international social and economic institutions, and bilateral negotiations because they strongly affect U.S. domestic agricultural issues. For the non-social science technical agricultural sciences, international concerns are extremely important, for example, in understanding potentials and problems of disease and pest control, germplasm exchange, and scientific collaboration. The U.S. is no longer the scientific leader in agriculture in all fields. To ensure steady and responsible progress in scientific agriculture, agricultural graduate students primarily interested in domestic agriculture concerns must have training which will assist them to better understand their discipline in an international context and encourage them to search out ideas and contributions from international and foreign institutions. Also, this group represents the bulk of future educators in our colleges of agriculture. They are the ones who will teach future generations and encourage or neglect instilling an international dimension into curricula.

The rationale for providing an international dimension for students primarily interested in work

Table 3. U.S. Export Share of Total U.S. Production of Selected Commodities, 1982.

Commodity (units)	Production	Export	Export Share
Wheat (thousand bushels)	2,808,737	1,525,000	55%
Corn (thousand bushels)	8,397,000	2,050,000	25%
Cotton (thousand bales)	11,962.6	6,263	53%
Soybeans (metric tons)	60,677,000	24,522,081	41%
Soybean Meal (metric tons)	24,235,000	6,448,873	27%
Soybean Oil (metric tons)	5,462,000	918,409	17%
Rice (100,000 lbs.)	154,216	67,500	44%

Source: USDA: **Agricultural Statistics, 1983** and American Soybean Association, **Soya Bluebook**, 1983.

with foreign or international institutions is thought to be straightforward (Wennegren and Whitaker). However, there are some aspects of this rationale which are not well-recognized. Much of the work in development assistance is now oriented to institution building, human resource development, equity issues, and policy concerns. While some of the earlier technical assistance activities, such as U.S. scientists working to develop improved varieties on experimental stations, could have been **improved** if scientists had a better understanding of the international and foreign context they were working in; activities oriented to policy, equity, human and institutional development **require** scientists who better understand foreign cultures, international forces, and political realities.

An international dimension in the educational programs of the fourth group - agriculturists not currently enrolled in resident instruction programs - is often not considered. Most of the contact with this group is through the extension services of our colleges. Leaders of agribusinesses, farm organizations, and public agricultural institutions need to have a better understanding of the international dimensions of agriculture and how these dimensions affect their respective institutions. Most of these leaders had almost no international dimension to their college education. Now they are providing leadership in a vastly different context than 20 years ago.

Table 4. Percent of U.S. Agricultural Exports by Commodity Categories Going to Less Developed Countries and Centrally Planned Economies 1982-1983 Year

Export Commodity Category	LDC	CPE	TOTAL
	..... Percent.		
Total Agricultural Exports	40	6	46
Grains and Feeds	53	11	64
Wheat and Products	70	14	84
Rice	74	-	74
Corn	37	13	50
Oilseeds and Products	25	4	29
Soybean Meal	22	5	27
Soybeans	17	4	21
Soybean Oil	86	13	99
Cotton	40	5	45
Animal & Animal Products	45	8	53

Source: ERS, USDA: **U.S. Foreign Agricultural Trade Statistical Report.** Fiscal Year 1983, March 1984.

Suggestions for Providing an International Dimension to Education Programs for Agricultural Students

An international dimension can be provided to agricultural students through courses taken outside the college of agriculture, core and elective agricultural courses, and other educational programs activities. It is important to consider carefully the kind of international content to emphasize in agricultural versus non-agricultural courses because of comparative strengths among different colleges within the university.

Most students in group 1 are required to take a certain number of credits in social sciences and humanities. These requirements usually can be fulfilled with courses which will help them understand the world in which they will be living and working. Courses such as comparative economic systems, major types of government and political organizations, comparative social and cultural systems, and the history of major world areas can provide important perspective and context for understanding and making decisions about international issues affecting agriculture. For example, I feel our future agricultural leadership needs to better understand **why** Europe and Japan have the agricultural policies that they do. Relative to ten years ago, there seems to be more understanding of what these policies **are** but I don't see much progress being made in an understanding of **why** these sets of countries do what they do. Nor do we understand countries which have vastly different ideological or religious perspectives although they are important customers. In general, we don't understand different value systems because we have assumed too readily that there is, or should be, a social psychological convergency among countries.

Language courses are usually included in international studies and are important for agricultural students. For many students in group 1, it may be difficult to predict which language, if any, would be "useful" to them in their careers. However, serious concentration in a language can develop opportunities in a career which would never be available otherwise. In many instances, well-developed foreign language courses can be organized to teach agriculture, economics, social behavior, and attitudes prevalent in other parts of the world which are important to U.S. agriculture. (See Brewer for an interesting point of view.) I don't think language **requirements** are needed but some incentives need to be developed so a greater number of agricultural students take language courses.

Graduate students in group 2 will need to concentrate on deepening their expertise in their disciplines. Our graduate faculty ought to provide instruction and other forms of learning for these students to better understand their chosen subject-matter in an international context as they strive to become mature scholars. Much of this can be done in regular and/or special study courses within agriculture. However, many graduate students have sub-discisciplinary emphases (e.g., maize breeding, soybean physiology, swine nutrition, agricultural credit) for which there are rather logical choices for complementary area study. For example, a soybean scientists may need to have some exposure to Brazil and China for making intelligent use of the substantial resources in those countries. Language study for this group can also be oriented to deepening disciplinary and/or world area knowledge. Courses such as those suggested for group 1 would also encourage these emerging scientists, educators, and administrators to better understand and interpret international issues and utilize international resources for the advancement of scientific agriculture.

Students interested in international agriculture - group 3 - may have definite ideas regarding world areas and/or language groups on which they wish to focus. Since the demands for competence within their chosen discipline will be no less than for others, students in group 3 may need to spend additional time in undergraduate or graduate school. If they want to concentrate in a certain world area, courses in economic systems and policies, social organization and change, government and political structures, and history will be important. To the extent possible, in-depth language learning will be important. For students in this group who may wish to concentrate on a particular subject-matter for a career in international or foreign institutions, the needed international studies content is not as clear. More directed special studies related to the particular subject-matter in a number of foreign country situations would be warranted. In addition, courses oriented to world scope and comparative courses across world areas might serve these students more effectively. In-depth language study will be useful in these cases, but the probability of choosing a language which will be utilized immediately may be low. These suggestions argue for the need to consider international studies minors, joint degrees or, at least, more flexibility in degree programs than is presently the situation in many colleges of agriculture.

There are a number of ways to provide an international perspective to resident undergraduate and graduate students. To ensure most students are presented with an international perspective will require integration of international content into core courses in agriculture curricula. For example, basic courses in plant sciences, animal sciences, agricultural economics, food science, and rural sociology, should include some material of an international comparative nature. This effort need not occupy weeks of time but would prove very usefull for introducing our students

to the rest of the world through a topic in which they are interested. Certain courses will need to be substantially international, e.g., international agriculture trade, tropical soils, world crop agriculture, and international agriculture development.

There are several ways of providing an international dimension other than through course work. Agricultural students should have more opportunity to participate in study abroad programs. There are many excellent colleges of agriculture throughout the world which can provide students with not only solid technical academic training but also an educational experience in living in another country with different languages, cultures, and agricultural policies and organizations. The Japanese regularly send agricultural students to the U.S. to learn how we think, what our values and goals are, and how our society and economy operate. Some of these Japanese students are not even encouraged to obtain a formal degree - they are to learn as much about American agriculture as possible in and out of the classroom.

To a limited extent, international internships may be arranged in U.S. multinational firms, foreign firms collaborating with U.S. businesses, or government institutions dealing with international issues. These internships can also be arranged in international institutions working in agriculture like the EEC, FAO, and USAID. Another useful international learning experience is a study tour to other countries. To be high quality educational experiences these tours will require solid preparation and faculty participation. Because these trips may be expensive, ways to provide some financial support should be explored. Trips between fall and spring semesters can reduce the economic burden of a student not being able to work during the summer months.

Most agricultural students belong to some club or organization related to agriculture, e.g., agronomy clubs, collegiate 4-H, agricultural economics clubs. Faculty and visitors experienced in international agricultural affairs should be encouraged to give seminars to these clubs. In general, professors who have significant international experiences should be **required** to interact with agricultural students about these experiences. Many of the foreign students studying in our colleges are excellent sources of international expertise. Most often they are delighted to provide some instruction in regular courses or speak to agricultural clubs. Most colleges of agriculture have alumni who have significant international agricultural experience who are pleased to share that with students in a variety of ways.

Lastly, universities can encourage living arrangements where domestic and foreign students interact daily and gain a deeper understanding of each others' perspectives, problems, and agriculture sectors.

Professional agriculturalists who are presently leaders of agricultural businesses, farm organizations and other institutions - Group 4 - can profitably utilize an international dimension in the continuing educational processes which are directed to them. The current problems with respect to U.S. agricultural trade with Europe, Japan, China, and the Soviet Union are very important to U.S. agriculture. To deal more effectively with these problems will require us to better understand why these countries do what they do. Seminars to understand these nations' economic problems, political pressures, and agricultural problems can be effectively organized. Most countries have articulate agricultural representatives in the U.S. who are interested in talking with American agricultural leaders. In many universities, economists, political scientists, and historians have in-depth expertise related to many of these nations. These faculty can provide important insights to our agricultural leadership about many of our current problems in international agricultural relations. The Foreign Agricultural Service is another source of important expertise for these seminars.

Constraints and Suggestions for Collective Action

There are many problems with trying to develop and integrate an international dimension into the education of agricultural undergraduates, graduate students, and post-degree persons in agriculture (Bonham). First, the traditional university organization is not well-suited to deal with global issues that cross many areas of knowledge. While opportunities for gaining an adequate world view may seem better for agricultural students attending research universities and highly selective colleges, these institutions serve only a small percentage of agriculture students. Even though such opportunities may be greater at these institutions, strong disciplinary orientations and traditional academic conservatism create departmental walls that can preclude global learning (Bonham).

Secondly, much of what is defined as international studies outside of agriculture which can serve our agriculture students is dependent on federal monies. Much of this support has a roller coaster quality for specific universities and this tenuous character of international studies does little to serve the nation's interest in providing the young with a more professional view of agriculture in an international context.

Third, the role and content of foreign language instruction for agriculturalists is not clear. Some would argue for an applied conversational/reading skills course with substantial agricultural, social, and cultural examples being utilized. These courses do not seem to elicit enthusiastic response from language faculty (Brewer). Others argue that only those who are

serious in using a language should take language instruction and that should be rather rigorous, conventional language teaching. Others feel the university should not try to develop language classes for short, intensive, learning experiences. The private sector already does it and can continue to do it better for more people. I would argue that foreign language instruction provides a richness to an educational program and a basic skill that can be useful if any other language skills eventually become needed. We do not give many of our undergraduates an in-depth knowledge of statistics but we do give them a basis for specialization when that is needed. I think the same logic applies to language training. I would opt for applied conversational/reading skill courses with agriculturally related content taught by language faculty. I also feel language requirements are not needed as much as provision of incentives, opportunities, and encouragement by faculty advisors.

Fourth, there is, at least, a lack of incentives and, at most, penalties for students and other professional agriculturalists to be involved in international studies. Most of our curricula are heavily loaded with requirements and prerequisities. If interested in international studies, students and working agriculturalists must add it to busy schedules or prolong the process of graduation or certification. In addition, as knowledge accumulates and new technical skills appear crucial (such as computer skills), time demands on students will increase. Even students with international interests may decide to concentrate on disciplinary courses and assume international studies can be self-learned later. This problem is reduced if international content is integrated into disciplinary courses.

Fifth, professional agriculturalists' careers in international agriculture often do not encourage area and/or language specialization. Many of our international institutions move personnel after they live 2-3 years in a particular area. The possibility and motivation for developing in-depth expertise in a particular world region is not great under these circumstances.

Sixth, agricultural faculty may not take seriously student advisement with regard to non-agricultural courses. There is a tendancy to respond to students' wants even though many of our agricultural students are ill-prepared for making course decisions in non-agricultural areas. We, as faculty, should become leaders in the development of non-agricultural courses and requirements which are needed rather than just asking students what they want and responding only to this information.

Seventh, many of us in international agriculture offices are so busy trying to obtain grants and contracts that we have forgotten the needs of students and other professional agriculturalists. To improve the international dimension of our programs requires a long-term view based on upcoming student generations' needs as well as consistent leadership from international agriculture faculty in cooperation with students, administrators, and other faculty.

Collective action suggestions for improving the situation involve a number of possibilities. Most of the ideas I have suggested will have to be implemented on individual campuses. However, I see benefits to developing some collective action in helping universities provide opportunities for agricultural students and professional agriculturalists to gain a world-view regarding agricultural problems.

While much has been said about international aspects of education for agriculturalists, I know of no systematic analysis of needs, opportunities and recommended options. Isn't it time we concentrated somewhat more specifically on asking professional agriculturalists (representing the four groups defined) about their perceptions of needs for an international dimension to their education programs? Wouldn't it be useful to have a way to share curriculum and program ideas with each other consistently? I suggest that NACTA investigate appropriate mechanisms within the association to: (1) complete a study on needs of various types of students for an international dimension to educational programs which are dictated by logic and articulated by experienced agricultural professionals; (2) compile a document outlining several programs of instruction related to the international dimension of agriculture oriented to various types of agricultural students; and (3) in cooperation with other relevant organizations like AUSUDIAP, BIFAD, and the Extension Service recommend ways to address the needs of professional agriculturalists who are interested in international dimensions of agriculture after their formal education has been completed.

University representatives should come together regularly on a regional basis to discuss and help resolve questions of providing international dimensions for their undergraduates and graduate students. Regional committees working on domestic agricultural problems have been useful in making scientific progress, obtaining resources, matching interests, and developing colleagueship with persons of the same interest. Several issues in international agriculture could benefit from these kinds of discussions. As a by-product, we might be able to develop more leverage with federal agencies for support of international educational initiatives as contrasted to the single university-federal agency negotiations that now take place.

With regards to developing plans within each university, a major assignment to a person in the international agriculture or resident instruction office with a faculty advisory committee from agriculture and non-agricultural units might work best. Faculty committees are extremely important legitimizers and

advisors to someone working on a project. However, to better define how international studies might best be developed will require concentrated attention of a few people working with units across colleges.

The development of sound options for providing agricultural students and professionals with improved learning experiences related to the international dimensions of agriculture is extremely important. I can think of few other opportunities for faculty leadership that would be more productive for U.S. and world agriculture in the long run.

[2]This section draws heavily on the 1980 Annuals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

[3]This section draws heavily on the report "Strength through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capabilities" from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies.

Bibliography

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. **Without a Nickle — The Challenge of Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus,** AASCU Studies 1983/2, November, 1983. Washington, D.C. 55 pages.

American Council on Education. "What We Don't Know Can Hurt Us: The Shortfall in International Competence," Washington, D.C. undated, 15 pages.

Anderson Carrel M. "Will Schools Educate People for Global Understanding]" **Phi Delta Kappan** 61:660-110. October 1979.

AUSUDIAP. **Proceedings of the 17th Annual Conference of the Association of U.S. University Directors of International Agriculture Programs.** Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas. June 9-11, 1981.

Bonham, George. "Global Imperatives," **Change** 13:14-15. July/August 1981.

Brewer, William D. "The Truisms, Cliches, and Shibboleths of Foreign-Language Requirements." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 72. January 1983.

Kellogg, Earl D. "International Studies and the Professional Agriculturalist" in Teamwork and International Agricultural Development Proceedings of the Annual Conference — AUSUDIAP, 1983. pp. 36-42. Human Resources Development Center, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama, 1983.

Klitgaard, Robert E. "Why International Studies? A prologue," **Change** 13:28-34. January/February 1981.

Lambert, Richard D., ed. "New Directions in International Education," **The Annuals of the American Academy of Policical and Social Science,** Philadelphia, PA., 1980.

McCaughey, Robert A. "The Current State of International Studies in American Universities: Special Consideration Reconsidered," **Journal of Higher Education** 51(4):381-399. 1980

McCreight, Donald E. "Assessment of your Potential for International Employment," **The Agricultural Education magazine** 52:134-135. December 1979.

Posvar, Wesley W. "Toward an Academic Response: Expanding International Dimensions," **Change** 13:23-26. January/February 1981.

Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability. A Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. November, 1979, Vol. II, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Wennengren, E. Boyd and Morris D. Whitaker. "U.S. University Education and Technical Assistance to Third World Agriculture," **Journal of General Education 30(2):97-105. 1978/79.**

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Re: "Evaluations and Comments from NACTA Conference Participants"

During the 29th NACTA conference at Kansas State University, the attendees were presented with an evaluation sheet, both to evaluate the 1983 conference and to assist and benefit planning of the 1984 conference at Washington State University. The three questions were purposefully kept very general and asked the participants what they liked about the 1983 program, what they did not like about the 1983 program and what suggestions or recommended changes they had for the 1984 conference.

A summary of the 65 evaluations returned assisted us in the development of the program for the 1984 NACTA Conference program.

In the following discussion we will review the six major components of the 1983 NACTA Conference and discuss what the participants expressed. Obviously, not all of the specific comments can be listed or discussed, but a general consensus is presented for your consideration and review. We have taken the liberty to generalize statements on the evaluations to more clearly present participant perspectives.

There were nine **major speakers** during the 1983 NACTA Conference sessions. Most participants commented that the speakers were excellent, informative, appropriate and motivational. Participants observed that community colleges and universities were represented, and that the speakers were, for the most part, dynamic and enthusiastic. Positive comments endorsed continuation of selecting a conference theme promoting the teaching of Agricultural courses. Time constraints involving the number of major speakers, sessions, displays, luncheons and business meetings resulted in suggestion that we prioritize conference activities and program fewer speakers or sessions, allowing more time for looking around the book and computer displays.

Not all of the speakers were accepted as well as others. Participants indicated that some of the material presented was too elementary or out-dated, with no new information included. It was suggested that we avoid speakers who "preach" or "joke" to the point of entertaining, thwarting educational and knowledgeable discussions of agricultural teaching topics. Some speakers were repetitious and others presented new and different ideas. Several participants suggested we look for teaching methods or techniques outside of agriculture, rather than for teaching ideas specific to agriculture.