

## EXTENSION — 2000 A.D. — COMMENTS

by  
Robert C. Kramer, President  
California State Polytechnic University  
Pomona, California

---

Views future changes in Extension and lists suggestions for Extension marketing workers to improve their position.

---

California State Polytechnic University is a land grant university; it just does not have the opportunity to spend state and federal funds for its programs. But I think all the things that are done by land grant institutions are done here. Many of them are done very well by our competent faculty, and we have Mr. Lacy and many others who you have seen today and many, many more who are really carrying out programs similar to those in the land grant system. To go to the discussion, let me give a little background. After World War II, the Research and Marketing Act was passed and most of the states were given funds to employ extension and research workers to start out on this new marketing effort. I remember at Michigan State, the names of Love, Bodwell, Mott, and Higgins who were in Extension and were a part of that extension effort. They started their extension marketing programs. I was in their department and observed from the outside because at that time I was a staff member of the Michigan Experiment Station.

I think one of the things Jarvis Cain brought to the surface early was that there was the need for the sharing, the cooperation with the Experiment Station or with the research workers who were in the marketing efforts. There was also clearly demonstrated, the need to work with the staff in the USDA in Washington. And with that background, in 1953, we went to the legislature in Michigan and got a sum of money to expand our marketing work under what became the Michigan Marketing Program, and here again there was this demonstration of the need for Extension people to work with marketing people at the

state, the regional, and the national level. And particularly to work with those in industry who were involved in the marketing, processing and distribution segments.

As I listened to Jarvis and as I read the paper, it seems to me that one of the problems in Extension is a problem of definition. What is Adult Education? What is Continuing Education? What is Extension? What is Service? And, based upon Merry Bodwell being a consumer education specialist, from about 1947 until the mid 50's, when we reorganized the Michigan Marketing Program, we didn't call it consumer education. We called it consumer marketing information.

I'm president at the University and education is my business. It has been for 25 years and I don't want to be misunderstood. Our job is education, but I don't believe that many of us feel we want to be educated by others. We do want data. We do want to analyze. We do want information and I think we really undersell what we have to offer frequently by talking about education. When that is our business, but that's not the handle that we should put on.

I agree with Jarvis that a new structure is needed. One of my fears is that we will not jointly develop this new structure; the new structure will be imposed. It will be imposed by people who really do not fully understand what they're doing. Now this institutional structure deals with the organization at the federal level, the regional, the area, the state, the county, the community, and in fact the international. But my point is that we have to help develop the structure before someone tells us what it's going to be.

Now in speaking about marketing distribution efforts, I think it was only natural for Jarvis to omit the California State

Polytechnic University of Pomona, the University of Southern California, the Harvard Business School and many, many others because surely we and they are interested in the food industry, marketing, and in distribution. I thought Jarvis also failed to mention that the Super Market Institute, the trade associations, and many others including the commercial companies and some represented here in what would be a marketing education effort.

In my view, most of the impediments to change are not institutional, they are individual. Now he spoke some to the security issue and retirement. I would also add as faculty members, and many of you are, we could talk about tenure, we could talk about pleasure, and we could add other individual impediments to the new institutions that we need. As examples, he spoke about the open University or the University without walls. For about two years now, we have been attempting to try some new approaches at this University. To make the point again when we talk about external degrees; when we talk about students challenging by examination for the credit for the course; when we talk about giving advanced credit through entrance examinations we find that the professors and the individual faculty members are very much opposed to this. Yet we know that college students today are more sophisticated, have better vocabularies, are more travelled, and probably have more education as freshmen than we had when we first went to the University. So I would again repeat this, most of the major impediments to change are not institutional, they're individual.

It's been very difficult to try to react and respond to this paper for two reasons. One, I spent seven years as an Experiment Station worker and eleven years in Extension and as I read through and as I listened to your paper, Jarvis, memories of different involvements, different opportunities, kept coming into mind. That was one reason, but secondly, detachment. Actually for seven years I haven't had the time, nor the opportunity to really find out what Extension has done, yet I have had the interest and I have some information. But in my years as an Extension specialist and an administrator, I'll have to admit

that I had quite a bit of freedom, quite a bit of freedom to develop, quite a bit of freedom to travel. For three years I served as a marketing consultant to the old Marshall Plan over in Europe and I didn't have any trouble with my administrators getting the time off to go to Paris to give a paper or visiting 18 European countries to find out about their systems.

So again, I think it comes back to the individual, what he proposes, how he proposes, and how he sells his program and the benefits that he can contribute back on his home campus, in his state, in his region. What I really believe is needed, and we hear a lot about this in meetings, conferences, journals and in the press, is a marketing strategy. I think those of you in this organization who are in marketing need to develop a marketing strategy to sell those people who are involved with what you have to offer and how you could make your contributions. As you think ahead I would hope that you might give this some consideration as to the marketing strategy to market your own product with your own administrators, and with the politicians both at the local and the national level.

Now in my view, politicians do respond to the public. In fact, I think they're most responsive. There has been a reduction in the power base and the support for extension. Agriculture, Jarvis indicated, used to involve 70-80% of the working force, it's down below 10% in this nation now. So with this change which came about because of efficient production and because of the shifts and the development of the service industries, these politicians don't feel they need to respond to the agricultural leaders as they did in the past. I think this reduction in power base had lead to some of the changes that have been made back in Washington and in our states, and I think that more changes are coming. I think its natural that the agricultural leaders, the farmers, and the ranchers are going to put the pressure on to get money for agriculture production, farm management, pesticide management, and the other things that have been mentioned. And, I think the old leadership that was used for home economics, for 4-H, for marketing, just naturally has diminished. Personally, I'm concerned as an outsider now, about what re-

tirements and possible non re-election of a few people in Congress might mean to the support for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I'm also concerned about retirements and non election and what that might do to the support for Extension at the state level.

In my view, if Extension specialists and researchers feel that their marketing programs are important, they're going to have to do several things. They must work closely together and they must work closely with leaders in industry. They must communicate what they do much better with their superiors. They must organize and develop political understandings necessary at the national and state levels if they wish to continue receiving public monies. They must gain political support from the food industry and the businesses related to the food industry to help get continued public monies.

If the above list does not materialize, this is the way I see Extension in 2000 A.D. The USDA will be a small agency in some

larger federal department and that smaller agency will be concerned primarily with farm and ranch production and management. Marketing will be in another federal department, possibly the Department of Commerce. 4-H will be in health, education, and welfare; Home Economics will be in a new consumer department, and I do not think that we can play down the trends that are now becoming evident of the power of the consumer. You can talk about women's lib, the FDA, or many other things, but I believe after about 40 years now that we're coming close to the consumer department. In my experience, the larger businesses in the food distribution industry have really gone out and hired consultants for pay when they wanted some marketing information, data, analysis and it could very well be that marketing extension will be on a paid consultant basis in 2000 A.D.

Now lastly, I agree with Jarvis that a lot of hard work is needed to prepare for A.D. 2000.

\*\*\*\*\*

## EXTENSION — 2000 A.D. — COMMENTS

by  
William W. Wood, Jr.  
University of California  
Riverside, California

---

Presents an alternative view to the position paper.

---

Sample observations indicate that in 1950 there were 2.2 individuals per vehicle on Los Angeles freeways. By 1960 the number had dropped to 1.8 and by 1970 to 1.4 individuals per vehicle. The conclusion drawn by the trained observer studying transportation models was that by 1990, one out of every three vehicles on Los Angeles freeways would be empty.

The above illustration is by way of pointing out difficulties with trend projections in attempting to forecast what might be the situation at some future date. The reason for this is my disagreement with the basic assumption on which Professor Cain's paper is built, i.e., that food consumption and nutrient delivery systems in the year 2000 will be of a certain type predicted primarily upon the speed of preparation and convenience. Obviously, trends in the food purveying industry would indicate at this point in time a direction toward that end. However, I am not willing to accept