

For a program like that of the Peace Corps, where returnees from the field are available for training their replacements, a ready source of potential educators exists. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that persons with practical experience are necessarily qualified by virtue of that experience to teach and communicate it. This is a particularly unjustified assumption when the proposed training is highly inductive. The "practical man" has most readily at his disposal a fund of experience, anecdotes and "war stories" which purport to illustrate to the trainee how to handle various relatively concrete and specific situations in the particular foreign culture in which the trainer obtained his own experience. The value of the experienced person is not in these concrete, and often undigested experiences, but in his potential to conceptualize the cross-cultural learning experience in terms which can be applied to the design and conduct of experience-based learning. For example, if a community developer can come, as have some of the returned Peace Corps volunteers I have worked with, to see working with trainees as "another kind of community development," then they are well on their way to translating their cross-cultural experience into training design. They will have begun to understand the learning process in which they participated overseas, and they will be beginning to consider how such experience might be simulated for trainees in process, if not in content.

This is not to imply that anyone who has had a cross-cultural experience can become an effective educator. Many cross-cultural experiences are so traumatic, and many cross-cultural workers are so practical and concrete in their thinking, that they learn only those situations and aspects of a culture which they directly encounter. They find it difficult to generalize beyond their own experiences to an understanding of the processes of communication, diagnosis and influence which are common to cross-cultural change agent assignments. They may have learned, but they have not learned how they learned. The learning may have taken place through trial and error and have succeeded by virtue of luck or dogged persistence, rather than by the building of a conceptual framework which was continually revised and modified as new data came in.

Among those who have taken part in cross-cultural experiences, however, there will be those who have learned how to learn and who can, with further training, begin to build experiences which will transmit these orientations and skills to others. To do this requires not only the personal skills, alluded to above, but a clear understanding of such principles of learning as those described in this paper. Such "theoretical" understanding is needed, because the conceptual framework for this sort of training is not implicit in our educational experiences as children, adolescents and young adults. The more traditional conceptual framework of higher education is implicit in all of our educational experiences from elementary school onward. We are indoctrinated in this system, often without really understanding how it operates. We can operate within it by rote, whether as pupils or teachers, but this does not necessarily mean that we understand the conditions which facilitate learning and the transfer of learning to an application situation.

When, therefore, an individual is asked to participate in the design and conduct of training of a radically different form from traditional models, he can no longer use his rote understanding to determine roles for himself and for the learner. He needs a basic education himself in the teaching and learning process. He needs supervised and assisted experience in designing training, conducting it and evaluating the results. He needs to work with others who are also struggling with the tasks of putting together and operating experience-based training designs.

I have tried realistically to indicate the difficulties in carrying out the proposed training, because it seems irresponsible to push for educational innovation without considering who is going to carry it out and what help they will need. The elementary and secondary school systems of the United States are full of the wreckage of excellent innovations which have failed through the lack of personnel with the training, motivation and will to make them work. The plans proposed in this paper have no fail-safe ingredients to protect them from such

failure. Just as being a community developer in a foreign country involves much more than a set of directions as to how to proceed, so also the launching of educational innovation requires more than a blueprint for success.

The advance of effective innovation in cross-cultural training will best be served by setting up training centers where the new methods can be intensively experimented with and which will serve as an eventual source of trained educators. It is by no means proposed that organizations which train huge numbers of personnel for overseas assignments, such as AID or the Peace Corps, attempt to convert their training programs in a wholesale manner. The cause of innovation is never served by confusion, ineptitude or failure. Nor is it harmed by the continuation of traditional, harmless but somewhat ineffectual programs. This paper proposes reform, not revolution, and to reform any educational system requires that the educators be re-educated to design and operate innovative systems. Such systems cannot be imposed upon personnel who have not the skills or the motivation to make them work without risking disaster.

Fortunately, there are some resources and forces towards innovation of the kind we have proposed. To begin with, our culture is highly pragmatic and application oriented. Americans are receptive to any ideas which demonstrably work. Supporting this pragmatism are the experiences of those who have lived in the cross-cultural situation, have been open to their experience and have been able to generalize from it. That the majority of overseas Americans are not reflective in this way does not detract from the insights of those who are.

In addition, there is a small body of experience-based pedagogy available as crude models as to what this sort of training might look like. Some experiments in the Peace Corps point in this direction. In the area of human relations and interpersonal communication, practitioners of sensitivity training have been using experience-based pedagogy for some time. The same is true in entirely different content areas for much industrial and military training. The models are available, but they must be refined and adapted to the purposes at hand.