

We Need to Start with Where People Are At, Not Where We Want Them to Be



Paul McDonald

paul.mcdonald@sqlandscapes.org.au

Keywords: rural extension, rural policy, land managers

For around 30 years, different governments, industry groups and academic entities have worked to extend their knowledge and practice to landholders across the rangelands, with the view that this will result in their improvement in condition, trend and extent. These efforts have employed often ingenious approaches built on great logic and the understanding that preaching and teaching and showing sustainable practice will ultimately result in improved landscape outcomes. The evidence shows that this approach has not worked well, given that the limited monitoring and evaluation of the condition and trend of our natural assets demonstrate a continuing and, in places, accelerated decline across most landscapes (Department of Environment and Science, 2018).

Conventional wisdom says we should try harder, make more rules and policy, and be more creative and develop more targeted, better prioritised programs and approaches with more comprehensive modelling and monitoring so we can garner more money from governments. My experience teaches me that this approach has and will continue to fail us, and for one basic reason: we do not understand well enough the people we are wanting to influence.

Little research exists to help us understand who manages our landscapes; instead, the majority of assumptions are based on more workshops, more education, more data and more science to help these people do better. The limited research

done in the early 2000s by the University of Queensland around Central Queensland and Strachan on agriculture industry personality profiles indicates that up to 80% of our land managers have a personality and learning profile which indicates that the majority of our attempts at extension do not reach them or their learning networks (Shrapnel & Davie, 2001; Strachan, 2011). Trying harder to make these approaches better means little to these people.

Conclusion

As a result, we need to form a way forward based on:

1. Learning more about the people who look after our rangeland landscapes.
2. Discovering ways to help their learning and to practise improvement on the terms which make sense in their day-to-day lives (likely to be around business risk and working trials).
3. Finding ways to help them measure their improvement in ways that make sense to them, with the result that natural capital is improved at their pace.

This approach puts the people who impact rangeland landscapes at the centre of their own learning and improvement. While academia and practitioners can put labels on the resulting initiatives and discuss ecosystem services and

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International Licence. Individual articles may be copied or downloaded for private, scholarly and not-for-profit use. Quotations may be extracted provided that the author and The Royal Society of Queensland are acknowledged. Queries regarding republication of papers, or parts of papers such as figures and photographs, should be addressed to the Secretary of The Royal Society of Queensland (rsocqld@gmail.com).

other components for better landscape outcomes, the language and practice of improvement needs to focus back on what is meaningful to the person/entity actually causing the impacts. The 20% that do learn through extension approaches already know whatever is being offered. Some have told me that they have learned nothing from us (the NRM groups) over the past 10 years. Any policy or dialogue we have on our rangelands is unlikely to result in any real change on the ground unless we change our approaches to extension first.

Literature Cited

- Department of Environment and Science. (2018). *Queensland State of the Environment Report 2017*. Queensland Department of Environment and Science.
- Shrapnel, M., & Davie, J. (2001). The influence of personality in determining farmer responsiveness to risk. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*, 7(3), 167–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13892240108438818>
- Strachan, R. (2011). Myers Briggs Type Indicator Preferences by Industry and Implications for Extension. In J. Jennings, R. Packham, & D. Woodside (Eds.), *Shaping Change: Natural Resource Management, Agriculture and the Role of Extension*. Australasia Pacific Extension Network.

Author Profile

Paul McDonald is an Adjunct Associate Professor with the University of the Sunshine Coast, Chief Executive with Southern Queensland Landscapes, and has worked in natural resource management since 1996.