



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

CWAEA

NEWSLETTER OF THE COMMITTEE ON WOMEN IN AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

WINTER ISSUE 1988/89

IN THIS ISSUE:

- Chairperson's Report.....2
- A Special Note of Thanks for a Job Well Done.....2
- Our Past, Present, and Future as Women Agricultural Economists.... ..2
- Life in a Consulting Firm.....3
- Equal Opportunity at the University of Minnesota: An Update.....4
- Improving Communication in the Classroom.....5
- Work in the General Accounting Office.....6
- The Socio-Economic Trap of Single Parenthood.....7
- Gender Differences in the Workplace.....8
- Characteristics of Agricultural Economists and the Determinants of Salary Levels.....9
- The 1988 CWAE Preconference on Communication Skills: A Thank-You.....12
- The Joint Job-Hunting Problem.....12
- Newsnotes.....13
- News of Women in Agricultural Economics.....14
- Job Announcements.....15

Helen Jensen
CWAE Chairperson
Dept. of Economics
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011
(515) 294-1183

Joy Harwood
CWAE Newsletter Editor
USDA/ERS/Crops Branch
1301 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 786-1840

Chairperson's Report

*Helen Jensen
Iowa State University
Ames, IA*

The field of agricultural economics continues to evolve in response to developments in theory and methodology, and to new problems in agriculture, natural resources, and rural development. People and ideas seem to adapt more easily to these changes than do codes. The existing AAEA subject matter specialization codes, while diverse, do not permit identifying specialists in many emerging fields within the discipline of agricultural economics. The difficulties in communicating fields of specialization represent a particular difficulty for women, who are a higher proportion of new entrants in the field.

As example, health and safety in the production and processing of foods, buyer technology, the development of new food products, international marketing, and new models of household behavior are all emerging specializations within the field of agricultural economics. Identifying specialists in these areas is difficult under the current specialization codes.

One of the activities of the CWAE employment subcommittee over the past year has been the review of this coding system, in order to enhance the ability of those in new areas to match their interests with potential employers and recruiters. Chris Ranney and Jean Kinsey, among others, have been drafting a proposal for the AAEA Board's review. Please communicate with me, or with Chris Ranney at Cornell, if you have a specialization in the field in search of a code. We hope the effort will better represent the interests of all those in the profession.

A Special Note of Thanks For a Job Well Done

*Helen Jensen
Iowa State University
Ames, IA*

Many of us were fortunate enough to attend the CWAE-sponsored Communication Skills Workshop in Knoxville last summer. The participants came from all segments of the AAEA membership. For those participating, the workshop provided an opportunity to learn, interact, reflect, and test new skills. While the next summer's meetings and various outlook conferences may be the true test of whether we have better communicators, the reported success and enthusiasm expressed by those attending is a tribute to the well-conceived idea, good planning, and hard work of Nancy Schwartz, coordinator, and her committee. CWAE's reputation for active support of summer meetings and professional development derives from such projects. Thank you, Nancy, for the job well done.

Our Past, Present, and Future as Women Agricultural Economists

*Sylvia Lane
University of California/Berkeley
Berkeley, California*

(This article summarizes Sylvia Lane's part of the panel discussion presented at the CWAE Luncheon, held on August 1, in Knoxville, Tennessee. Ardelle Lundeen and Linda Lee also participated in the panel discussion.)

As a woman who is an agricultural economist, I, of course, have links to the past; I am here at present, but I am most interested in our future. Food and its consumption in the household have long been the province of women in almost all societies, and so it was that women were employed to deal with food consumption and contiguously all consumption-related and household-related subject areas both in departments of agricultural economics and in the Department of Agriculture in what is now the U.S. Economic Research Service--in the latter, as far back as the 1930's. (Home Economists had been employed in Universities since the beginning of the century.)

Stanford University employed women as professors in the Food Research Institute in the 1930's. Women who were economists were employed in women's colleges, by the United States government agencies, and occasionally by major universities during that period. Three notable examples were Lucy Stebbins who came to the University of California at Berkeley to teach social economics in 1910, achieving tenure in 1923 as Full Professor, and Jessica Piexotto and Emily Huntington who were Full Professors in the Economics Department of the University of California at Berkeley in the 1930's. Emily Huntington was my advisor. Margaret Reid was at Iowa but I did not know her until she was at Chicago.

In the 1940's, when men were involved in World War II, more women found employment as economists; but they were still relatively few and, outside of the government and Stanford, if I may count the Food Research Institute as a department of agricultural economics, there were none that I could find on record in university departments of agricultural economics.

It was not until the 1970's that the picture changed. The civil rights movement--and of particular interest to us, the women's movement--led to legislation and affirmative action programs and, by 1980, to an increase in opportunities in government employment, in academia, and in agribusiness. But there were other factors that helped as well. More women had discovered and had enrolled as undergraduate and graduate students, for the most part working toward master's degrees in agricultural economics. Enrollments of white males in departments of agricultural economics were declining. The profession itself had

changed, and there was a lessened emphasis on traditional farm management.

In 1970 Professor Roger Gray of Stanford, likening farmers to prairie dogs who were in the process of being eradicated, and agricultural economists to the black-footed ferret, a member of an endangered species for whom prairie dogs furnished food and shelter, noted that the eradication of the prairie dogs had caused black-footed ferrets to become extinct, but there were more ferrets than ever. The black-footed ferret had mutated. So have we. Agricultural economists were now demand theorists, environmental economists, resource economists, development economists, specialists in international trade, econometricians, et al.

We still have farm management specialists and agricultural economists who analyze agricultural commodity data, farm income data, and other data that provide the basis for agricultural policy, but women have largely entered the nontraditional areas (Offutt, 1984).

To conclude, the future for women as agricultural economists, despite the decline in farm numbers, is bright; but, for the most part, opportunities will be in the nontraditional expanding areas, i.e., development, international trade, etc., all of which require a strong grounding in econometrics and economic theory.

References:

Gray, Roger W. "Agricultural Economics: An Orientation for the 70's." Proceedings of the Western Economic Association. Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, 1971, pp. 22-26.

Offutt, Susan E. "Training Agricultural Economists: Are Women Different?" In Opportunities for Women in Agricultural Economics. Symposium presented at American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meetings, Logan, Utah, August 1-4, 1982.

Life in a Consulting Firm

*Joan Meyer
Putnam, Hayes, and Bartlett
Cambridge, Massachusetts*

Putnam, Hayes, and Bartlett (PHB) is a medium-sized firm with offices in Cambridge, Washington, D.C., New York, San Francisco, and London that specializes in economic and management consulting. PHB has three areas of concentration--litigation support, business strategy, and public policy. The litigation support practice assists law firms involved in litigation or regulatory proceedings. Cases involving antitrust or damage analyses are common in the litigation area while utility ratemaking cases represent the standard fare in regulation proceed-

ings. In its business strategy practice, PHB specializes in assisting clients evaluate large resource commitments, taking into account not only the short-term economic merits of a project, but also the relevant market, and economic and regulatory uncertainties which are likely to determine success or failure over the long term. The public policy practice supports clients in both the public and private sectors in formulating efficient legislation and regulations by assessing the likely economic consequences of various policy options.

Organized like a law firm, there are approximately 46 partners, 48 associates, and 42 research assistants. The partners and associates typically hold graduate degrees in economics (including agricultural economics), business, law, public policy, and engineering. Currently, 40 percent of the partners and associates hold PhD's in economics, 40 percent are MBA's, and the remaining 20 percent possess other types of degrees. The research assistants hold bachelor's degrees and generally work for several years at PHB before returning to graduate school.

The consultants at PHB clearly come with a wide variety of backgrounds. Some specialize in theoretical areas while others are skilled in hands-on, direct business decision-making. All possess the ability to work in an applied environment. The firm's practice is so varied that it's unusual for entry-level associates to be hired for their specific knowledge of an industry or topic. Instead, the firm looks for people with a good understanding of microeconomics, a demonstrated ability to work in a quantitative environment, and the desire to work in an applied field. It is additionally useful to have a background in finance, accounting, law, computer science, or applied math.

In the past, PHB has not specifically recruited agricultural economists probably due to ignorance of what a degree in agricultural economics represents. (I applied to the firm after learning of its reputation through an interview with one of its competitors.) As a result, pursuing a job with a consulting firm that lacks an agricultural focus takes a lot of determination and tenacity. It may be necessary to not only apply for positions but to also educate potential employers at the same time. When I originally investigated consulting firms in the Boston area, I found it helpful to devote a paragraph in my cover letter to a description of my PhD training at Cornell, as well as to list my specific coursework in my resume.

In my four years with PHB, I have worked on both litigation support and business strategy projects. One recent project involved determining the size of a trust fund to be created out of the assets of a bankrupt company. The company (A.H. Robbins) marketed the Dalkon Shield in the early 1970's. This IUD caused grave injury, including sterility and death, to a significant number of women who used the product. Although a large number of women successfully sued the company before it entered into bankruptcy, many thousands more remained uncompensated when it entered into Chapter 11. Using survey data available from the previous litigants, we calculated the average court award for the different types of injuries, cor-

rected for the strength of each individual's medical evidence and other health and demographic factors. We then applied this model to the survey data available for the uncompensated claimants in order to derive the total size of the trust fund needed. Another recent project involved computing the lost profits due to a coal company caused when an electric utility broke its long-term contract to purchase coal. Key tasks in this case included creating a cost model of the coal company and determining the appropriate discount rate to use.

I enjoy consulting because it involves a wonderful blend of theory and application. It is imperative to keep up with the current literature while searching for concrete solutions to your clients' problems. The breadth of work is wide and there is never an idle moment. The downside to consulting is the inability to predict when busy or slack times will come. Some weeks demand 60 to 70 hours of your time while other weeks are far more civilized. Some consulting firms, such as PHB, do offer part-time employment which may be of particular interest to women with small children. As with many employers, it is far easier to negotiate for a part-time position after one has worked full-time and proved one's worth.

Equal Opportunity at the University of Minnesota: An Update

*Jean Kinsey
University of Minnesota
St Paul, Minnesota*

One year ago, an article appeared in the CWAE Newsletter that outlined the events surrounding a 1978 Consent Decree at the University of Minnesota. Known as the Rajender decree, after the person who filed the initial sex discrimination suit, this decree set up an institution-wide structure and procedure to try to ensure that women had equal chances of being hired, promoted, and rewarded.

The Rajender decree was due to expire January 1, 1989, but it has been extended. The University's voluntary two-year extension of the Rajender Decree should provide enough time to determine which of its procedures should be preserved and which discontinued when it finally expires in 1991.

For example, the Office of Equal Employment and Affirmative Action (EEO-AA) has been very active in reviewing documents at the end of a search process where they do indeed have veto power over a department's choice of final candidates. They would like to take a more proactive approach, reviewing candidate pools and making suggestions earlier in the search process. It is the difference between eliminating discrimination and im-

plementing affirmative action. These two activities demand different kinds of monitoring and interaction.

Under the decree's explicit claim procedures, 325 women have been better able to pursue sexual discrimination grievances against the University by using a more efficient, less expensive, and less time-consuming method than full-blown formal litigation. The cost to the University in settlements and attorney's fees has been high (approximately \$7 million so far), but most claimants and petitioners would agree they have paid dearly too, in frustration and fatigue.

While the Rajender decree may have sensitized the University community to sexual discrimination practices and contributed to the growth of internal support groups, the decree's procedures have also created bitterness and backlash among some males. The final success of the Rajender decree has yet to be measured, especially in light of a troubling reminder that some of the old problems persist nearly a decade later. For example, attorneys are currently in the process of settling a major petition that accuses the University of gender-based salary discrimination.

Pat Mullen, the director of EEO-AA, offered some particularly useful insights into the limitations of the mandated procedures and activities that have become familiar at the University of Minnesota. For one, women themselves may become complacent, thinking that the institution is taking care of them. She was quoted in a newsletter of the University's Faculty Consultative Committee as saying, "I hope the affected constituents understand that part of their business--permanently, forever, until they die--is to ensure that sensitivity to discrimination doesn't disappear. If you are not in the power group, you need to take care of yourself--you will never be able to rely on any external thing to do that for you. Our challenge is to keep the subject of sexual discrimination in the foreground during the post-Rajender years."

As was pointed out in the article in the CWAE Newsletter last January, changing the rules may be necessary for equal opportunity, but it is never sufficient. Mullen agrees with the following comments. "A legal decree can resolve disputes, but it can't change the intellectual process leading to the kind of flawed judgments that result in discrimination. Laws tell people to do this, but they are free to continue to think about it however they like. We may not be able to change what people feel in their hearts, but we have to try to change their thinking process. In an institution dedicated to the discovery of truth, discrimination is a dangerous fraud that has to be eliminated--not only through the policing activity of this office, but by faculty members reminding their colleagues that hiring and promotion decisions tainted with prejudice subvert the entire intellectual enterprise."

In the last year, partly in preparation to live without the Consent Decree, a new all-University plan has been instituted and a new position was created to head up the plan. It is called Minnesota Plan II, deriving its name from its

1960 predecessor, the original Minnesota Plan. That was a Carnegie-funded effort to respond to women's changing educational needs and interests in that decade. The Minnesota II Plan is a response to:

- 1) The affirmative action recommendations in an Academic Priorities document;
- 2) A resolution from the faculty assembly asking for more progress on achieving gender and race diversity; and
- 3) Growing concerns among faculty women about sexual harassment.

The woman chosen to head the plan (Janet Spector, an associate professor of anthropology) calls it a "...sweeping initiative for change that addresses the most challenging issues facing higher education today--how institutions are going to respond to their increasingly diverse populations." She also points out that "universities were established by, and pretty much for, privileged males, but that norm is obsolete. The image of faculty as white, male, middle-class scholars with no responsibilities outside the ivory tower and with a network of wives and secretaries to support them not only doesn't fit women, it no longer fits most of the male faculty members here. There is no doubt about increasing gender, class, and cultural diversity in higher education, the only question is whether the University responds to it or deteriorates into an institution filled with conflict and contention."

The Minnesota Plan II, although ambitious, does not have a long list of specific tasks; part of its force is its simplicity. Essentially, it contains four objectives and two recommendations. The objectives are:

- 1) To improve recruitment, retention, recognition, and career development of women;
- 2) To restructure the curriculum to reflect the new scholarship in women's, minority, and third-world studies;
- 3) To change institutional norms, attitudes, and values that negatively affect women's workplace; and
- 4) To improve institutional decision-making and administrative accountability through training and review.

The recommendations for action are two: 1) creation of an All-University Commission on Women, and 2) establishment of unit planning groups. The Commission was officially appointed and charged in mid-October; unit planning groups are being established now.

The Commission will function fairly independently, with its own staff and budget. Its job will be to coordinate and monitor the changes implied by the plan. For example, the Commission might develop All-University policy initiatives, consult with and advise central administration about women's concerns, and interview candidates for top administrative posts.

Administrative evaluations are key to the success of the Plan. They involve a process in which the department head or dean fills out a self-evaluation, the women supervised by that person complete parallel questionnaires, and all forms are reviewed by the Plan's office. In some parts of the University, women are frightened by that prospect. They fear retaliation if they respond to such questions truthfully, but these evaluations will provide baseline information. Future years' merit pay and/or sanctions for administrators will be based, in part, on progress in non-discriminatory treatment of women.

The All-University Commission on Women will serve as a visible and representative group that the president and other administrators can consult regularly on a full range of women's issues. How effective it will be in institutionalizing non-discrimination behavior and attitudes remains to be seen. It does appear though, the University of Minnesota is making an honest and all-out attempt to ensure that the benefits gained from the Rajender decree do not vanish due to inattention or a reversion to old habits and outmoded thinking. The emphasis under the Rajender decree was on hiring more women, and on promoting them. The emphasis now seems to be shifting to promoting a workplace atmosphere--an intellectual community--where women can concentrate on scholarly work and career development. This does not mean that much effort will not continue to be expended in order to ensure and protect women's entitlements and dignity but, hopefully, a balance will be struck.

Improving Communication in the Classroom

*Edna Loehman
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana*

(Editor's Note: The following article summarizes Dr. Kerry Litzenberg's seminar, "Teaching More Effectively," given at the Communication Skills Workshop in Knoxville, Tennessee on July 31, 1988. Dr. Litzenberg is an associate professor at Texas A&M University, and recipient of the AAEA Professional Excellence Award for Teaching.)

Dr. Litzenberg's seminar was presented to about thirty men and women from a variety of backgrounds, including teaching and extension. The discussion and audience interest made it a lively session.

Dr. Litzenberg emphasized that good teaching requires "good listening" on the part of students, and that the attention span of listeners may be only 6-8 minutes. Several techniques he uses to improve listening by students include:

- 1) encouraging feedback by students (e.g., asking a leading question every five minutes);
- 2) using worksheets;
- 3) using outlines or "road maps;" and
- 4) asking students to summarize what the lecturer said at the end of a lecture.

At the end of a lecture, or at the beginning of the next lecture, a three minute summary is helpful.

He also made the observation that people have different learning styles. He uses the Myers-Briggs personality test to help him understand the personality type of students (thinking/feeling, analytical, etc.). These tests are used to get a profile of the type of class he is teaching.

He also reviewed types of classroom communication: transmission mode (professor to student), transaction mode (between professor and student), and interaction mode (among professor, student, and another professional).

Work in the General Accounting Office

*Mary C. Kenney
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C.*

Supporting the Congress is the General Accounting Office's (GAO's) primary responsibility. The Agency does this by providing a variety of services--the most prominent of which are audits and evaluations (reviews) of federal programs and activities. Many GAO reviews are made in response to specific congressional requests. The Agency is required to do work requested by committee chairmen, and as a matter of policy, equal status is assigned to requests from ranking minority members. To the extent possible, GAO also responds to individual members' requests. Other reviews are initiated pursuant to standing commitments to congressional committees, and some reviews are specifically required by law. Finally, some reviews are independently undertaken in accordance with the Agency's basic legislative responsibilities. At the end of FY 1988, there were over 1,100 assignments under way.

GAO examines virtually every federal program, activity, and function, answering questions of the following type:

- 1) Are government programs being carried out in compliance with applicable laws and regulations, and are data furnished to the Congress on these programs accurate?
- 2) Do opportunities exist to eliminate waste and inefficient use of public funds?

3) Are funds being spent legally, and is accounting for them accurate?

4) Are programs achieving desired results, or are changes needed in government policies or management?

5) Are there better ways of accomplishing the programs' objectives at lower costs?

6) What emerging or key issues should the Congress consider?

Before starting a specific congressional request assignment, GAO staff generally meet with the requester to discuss the assignment's objectives; its feasibility given the availability of staff; the extent, or scope, of the work needed; the date when work results are desired; and the type of final product that is most appropriate, including:

Testimony. GAO testifies frequently before congressional committees and subcommittees, 227 times in FY 1988. Testimony on work already completed is often provided on short notice.

Oral Briefings. GAO encourages staff to keep requesters advised through periodic briefings during the course of a congressionally requested review.

Written Reports. Final written products vary in format, content, and complexity. They are addressed to the Congress, a requester, or an agency. Briefing reports and fact sheets can usually be prepared more quickly than detailed reports.

Briefing reports, which formalize information provided at a briefing, are used to provide the results of narrow-scoped reviews or when urgency will not permit the time necessary to prepare a detailed report. During FY 1988, GAO issued 167 briefing reports.

Fact sheets state facts that answer specific questions and are usually limited to specific information and facts without conclusions. GAO issued 103 fact sheets in FY 1988.

Detailed reports contain information on the background and operation of the program reviewed, as well as detailed data on the review results. Five hundred fifty-five detailed reports were issued in FY 1988, which were usually based on broad-scoped assignments with agency-wide applicability and, for the most part, contain conclusions and recommendations.

The ability to review practically any government function or program requires a multi-disciplined staff. GAO's staff have expertise in a variety of disciplines--accounting, law, public administration, the social and physical sciences, economics, and others. Nearly half of the staff have advanced degrees and about 10 percent of the staff have doctoral degrees.

Although the "Evaluator" job series is predominant in GAO, (3,132 individuals are classified as evaluators out of a total of 4,421 professionals), the Agency also employs 232 accountants, 133 attorneys and 71 economists. There were three agricultural economists as of September 1988.

All of the agricultural economists are employed in the Food and Agriculture area of the Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division. This Division provides products and services to congress on five key national issues in addition to food and agriculture: energy, environmental protection, housing and community development, natural resources management, and transportation.

GAO's work in the food and agriculture area focuses on the actual production of food and fiber products, particularly by grain, dairy and cotton farmers; the processing and marketing of food and fiber to the world market; the health of the farm, farm credit, and rural structures; and consumers who have difficulty meeting their nutritional needs.

In FY 1988, the food and agriculture area issued 42 reports on topics such as the creation of secondary agricultural financial markets, the continued financial problems of the Farmers Home Administration, the lack of farmer participation in the Federal Crop Insurance Programs, the impact of decreasing USDA food stocks on the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program, the Dairy Termination Program, proposals to tighten the \$50,000 payment limit on farm payments, the use and possible abuse of payment-in-kind certificates, opportunities to save funds and increase participation in the Women, Infants, and Childrens Program, the need to revise provisions relative to forest management, the use of the cattle futures market, the possibility of using alternative mechanisms for marketing farm products overseas, the need for more controls over imports of sugar-containing products, the need to change the federal milk marketing system, and the need to improve state food stamp automation efforts.

GAO reports, testimonies, and briefings enabled the Congress to enact the emergency loan and crop insurance provisions of the Disaster Assistance Act of 1988; assured that USDA and FDA took actions to improve food safety and labeling; and changed the Food Stamp Program to decrease the number of improper denials of food stamp clients.

The Socio-Economic Trap of Single Parenthood

*Stephanie Mercier
USDA/ERS
Washington, D.C.*

(Editor's Note: The following summarizes an article by Sarah McLanahan that appeared in the Fall, 1988 issue of *Focus*, a periodical published by the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin at Madison.)

The whole matter of the trap of poverty was first raised in a controversial study in 1965 by Daniel Patrick Moynihan (now U.S. Senator from New York), in which Moynihan suggested that the breakdown of the black family had the potential of deterring these black children from escaping poverty with the help of opportunities offered by President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society and War on Poverty programs. Moynihan's analysis created a hot public debate and other researchers responded by emphasizing the strengths of those black families. Their studies found only minimal negative impacts, contradicting Moynihan's results.

Since that time, single-parent families (headed mostly by mothers) have become more common in American society. Between 1960-83, the percentage of families headed by a single woman increased from 8 to 20 percent, a figure that has endured through the rest of the 1980's. The approach to the study of this problem has also become more refined methodologically and statistically since the mid-1960's. It appears that Moynihan was substantially correct, only now the problem embraces all racial and social groups.

Various studies over the last decade show that young women born and raised by single mothers are less likely to finish high school than their contemporaries living in two-parent households. Similar studies out of the same survey data sets also show that these same daughters are more likely to find themselves heading households and depending on AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) for survival. Exposure to single parenthood increases the probability of a repeat performance by about 150 percent for whites and about 90 percent for blacks.

One study examined four events that can be defined as disruptions of normal life patterns: 1) teen marriage, 2) teen birth, 3) premarital birth, and 4) marital disruptions. Everything else held equal, white respondents who lived in single-parent families were more likely to marry or give birth as teenagers and have babies out of wedlock. Finishing high school reduces the probability of a white teenager giving birth by about 40 percent. For black females living in a single-parent household, the situation is much the same. The only exception is the tendency to marry while a teenager, which is not statistically greater for single-parent women than two-parent women.

The article also probes potential causes for this clear relationship. Candidates offered by McLanahan include economic deprivation, parent-child relations, innate ability, and social and economic structure. Several studies have established that income or family economic status can account for between a quarter and a half of the difference in high school graduation rates and rate of occurrence of single-parent families between daughters of one- and two-parent households. The evidence suggests that family income plays an important but not complete role in explaining the intergenerational continuity of single-parent families.

The other explanations offered are not tested empirically, but to social theorists appear to be compelling reasons. Children growing up in single-parent environments do not have familiarity with the normal roles of both parents, and since such household heads are usually working full-time or more, these heads are often not able to exert sufficient parental control to instill appropriate behavior. Other analysts suggest an inherited pathological inability to participate in successful relationships tends to cause repetition of their parent's failures. Both of these sets of hypotheses would be difficult to test.

The final explanation proposed by McLanahan--social and economic structure--suggests that economic deprivation is present on a macro- as well as micro-level. Poor families generally live in poor neighborhoods where opportunities for adequate education and advancement are limited, and mother-headed households are often poor. Such a confined environment is not ideal for breaking out of the circle of poverty and unwed motherhood. It is likely that all of these explanations are valid, but none is a complete answer. The paper does show, however, that the trap of single-parenthood does exist, and offers a challenge to researchers to further explore the problem.

Gender Differences in the Workplace

Shirley L. Porterfield
USDA/ERS
Washington, D.C.

(Editor's Note: The following article summarizes Dr. Martha Miller's seminar on "Dealing with Cultural and Gender Problems in Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication," given at the Communication Skills Workshop in Knoxville, Tennessee on July 31, 1988.)

Are people's work habits shaped by the jobs they hold? "Yes," says Dr. Martha Miller, associate dean at UCLA's Anderson School of Management. Dr. Miller's seminar on gender differences in the workplace drew information from Rosabeth Kanter's book, Men and Women of the Corporation, as well as from her own research.

Work performance is usually thought of as a function of background, training, intelligence level, and other factors. However, research shows that situation (the type of job and its particular setting) is also an important determinant of job performance and, in fact, partly determines whether or not an employee is perceived as competent. This seminar was designed by Dr. Miller to counterbalance the general perception that each person shapes his or her own job.

Dr. Miller began by identifying two critical elements of each job--opportunity and power. Opportunity implies a chance to achieve growth, development, advancement, challenge, influence, and both monetary and nonmonetary rewards. Power is the ability to get work done or to gain access to resources. Power is often considered to be a function of who people know, but research shows that the structure and type of activities undertaken are equally important.

Opportunity. Most organizations, particularly those operating under a pyramid structure, consist of a mixture of "high opportunity" positions which lead to advancement and "low opportunity" positions which are dead end. Research shows that people know what type of position they are in and react accordingly. Thus, people in high opportunity positions are known as "movers" or "wonder boy/girl," while those in low opportunity positions are known as "stuck" or "dead wood."

Movers have high aspirations and are self-confident based on their perception of available opportunities. Their environment rewards success; just being a mover implies past successes. As might be expected, people stuck in low opportunity positions have lower aspirations and lower self-confidence. They tend to become disengaged from work activities, shifting their energy to activities outside of work, and are less likely to accept an opportunity if one becomes available.

While movers are rewarded for hard work, job structure blocks rewards to people who are stuck. For this reason, people who are stuck begin to focus much more on social or peer groups at work. Movers are more likely to take an active interest in the workplace, particularly in the existing power structure. When problems arise at work, movers step up and offer solutions while those who are stuck exhibit a passive and unconstructive attitude.

Looking at these attributes, it is easy to see which people are more likely to be promoted. Women and minorities are often stereotyped as too talkative and less serious about their jobs than white males. This is not surprising since white males are generally placed in high opportunity positions while women and minorities are shuttled into low opportunity jobs. The observed differences in work behavior may be due to the opportunities inherent in each work position rather than actual gender/race differences.

Dr. Miller cited four ways in which people may be placed in low opportunity positions. These should be carefully considered when searching for employment. First, people often accept what they know is a low ceiling job.

While these jobs were potential entry routes to better positions in the past, the practice of internal hiring for higher level positions is declining in many industries. Second, it is possible for some people to move higher in the pyramid and then get stuck. For example, affirmative action may allow for entry into high opportunity positions, but the incentive for promotions beyond the entry level may not exist. Third, there may be no room ahead in the pyramid. This is known as being "squeezed out." Finally, in tough economic times it may be difficult to find a high opportunity position.

Power. Relationships with sponsors, peers, and subordinates are important factors in building and maintaining a position of power. All three provide valuable information. In addition, employees with sponsors receive support for their ideas.

Even if not in a position of power, it is possible for some people to create powerful positions for themselves. Three key features of activities allow these people to gain power. First, it is necessary to be seen as a decision-maker. The scope of problems with which people deal in their jobs must be broad enough to demonstrate good discretion. Second, some jobs provide more visibility than others. If a person's work is not visible, others will not see his or her talent. Third, every organization has key areas which significantly affect its survival. People desiring more power should know what these areas are and, if at all possible, be working in one of these areas.

Improving Your Position. In addition to discussing factors influencing job performance, Dr. Miller provided guidelines for improving one's position. When looking for a position, try to choose one which offers both opportunity and power. If already in a job, analyze its potential. Is it possible to gain opportunity and power in this position? Can accomplishments be made more visible? Is there room for additional decision-making activity? Dr. Miller found that pursuing work she was very interested in resulted in increased opportunity and power even though this was not her original goal. One solution to being stuck in a low opportunity position is to move out of the system by changing jobs.

Research shows that women are more collaborative than men and are less likely to do others ill to get ahead. This can be a detriment in an organization with a pyramid structure where higher levels are reached through aggressive behavior. Researchers used to think that women would eventually have to become indistinguishable from men to gain top positions. However, Dr. Miller found that men's behavior is changing instead, and that a wider range of behavior is now acceptable in the corporate setting.

In entry level positions women receive, on average, 83% of men's starting salaries. Unfortunately, the wage gap between men and women in middle management still hovers just above 60%. Dr. Miller attributed this continuing but lower gap to two offsetting effects. Women are beginning to value their work more appropriately, particularly at entry level positions where information concerning start-

ing wages is more readily obtainable. Nevertheless, women still continue to undervalue what they're worth in the marketplace. Women tend to attribute workplace successes to good luck rather than hard work. The market value of their labor is about 150% of the wage women state if asked what they expect to receive for a particular position. Dr. Miller suggested reading a book by Betty Lee Harrigan entitled Games Mother Never Taught You. Although the tone of the book is jarring, the section on salary negotiation reveals much about the mentality of women in the negotiation process.

Dr. Miller offered two additional suggestions particularly for women in the professional workplace. First, get involved in a women's network. These networks are invaluable for the dispersal of information concerning positions, salaries, benefits, grants, and other critical issues. Research shows that the flow of information is not as voluminous across gender lines and that women who are part of women's networks fare better than those who are not. Second, try to deal with "problem" people on a strictly professional level. For example, it may be helpful to bring a sponsor to initial meetings to provide a model of professional interaction.

Gender differences in the workplace provide a challenge to both employees and organizations. Organizations must determine how to structure jobs to give more individuals opportunity. The pyramid organizational structure only taps the intellectual potential of about 10% of its workforce. The idea of "workplace democracy" is catching on in production activities but requires the cooperation of all employees and the transfer of knowledge across lines of race and gender.

Suggested References:

Harrigan, Betty L. Games Mother Never Taught You: Corporate Gamesmanship For Women. New York: Warner Books, 1987.

Kanter, Rosabeth M. Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books, 1979.

Characteristics of Agricultural Economists and the Determinants of Salary Levels

Mary Ahearn
USDA/ERS
Washington, D.C.

One of CWAE's goals has been to measure the professional status and progress of women agricultural economists. Past analyses of opportunities among various groups of agricultural economists have been mixed. For example, Reichelderfer and Strauss and Tarr found that

gender was not a significant variable in explaining salary levels among groups of agricultural economists, while Lee found that gender was significant. Broder and Deprey found that, although a sample of women alumni had superior academic records, men were found to have higher salaries.

About the Survey

In 1987, it was decided that a survey of agricultural economists was needed in order to determine if women were experiencing job discrimination (based on salaries) or if women perceived they were experiencing discrimination based on the opportunities they were afforded. In addition, a special emphasis was placed on the problems of dual career couples. CWAE has had a continued interest in the subject of dual careers and has sponsored a discussion on the topic at a past AAEA meeting, but no quantitative information on the extent of the problem had yet been available. Finally, because of similar concerns and interests, members of the Committee on the Opportunities and Status of Black Agricultural Economists (COSBAE) were invited to participate in the project. Joyce Allen, who was then Chairperson of COSBAE, as well as a CWAE member, worked closely with me on survey design, using past surveys of economists as a guide. Many other CWAE members provided useful comments on the survey design.

Precisely identifying the population of interest is important because the composition of the group can significantly affect the results. Some agricultural economists are employed by nontraditional employers, that is, other than USDA and agricultural economics departments at universities. Because of the difficulty in identifying the whole population of agricultural economists, we limited the population of interest to those who were associated with the AAEA. I use the terms "associated with" because some CWAE and COSBAE members were not paid AAEA members at the time of the survey. However, we chose to include them because their participation in AAEA committees clearly indicated an interest in AAEA.

In May 1987, the mail survey was sent to all 201 CWAE members, all 95 members of the COSBAE, and a sample of 310 from the AAEA membership. Fifty percent of the surveys were completed and returned with equal coverage of all three groups. No attempt was made to have a second contact with the nonrespondents. It was assumed that those who did respond were representative of those who did not. Because we were interested in making statements about the whole population of AAEA members, and the AAEA contacts were a 1 in 13 sample of the membership, the responses from the AAEA sample were weighted accordingly. Responses were for 1986.

Dissemination of Survey Results

Survey results were presented at a symposium held at the 1988 AAEA summer meetings. Joyce Allen conducted

the analysis of the respondents' attitudes about their career opportunities. A summary of her findings was described in the last CWAE Newsletter. Joy Harwood and Craig Jagger, who conducted the analysis of the attitudes and characteristics of dual career couples, will provide a summary of their findings in the next CWAE Newsletter. The remainder of this article will focus on the survey findings regarding general characteristics of the population and the earnings of agricultural economists by gender and race. In addition, a report containing all three of the papers and the comments of Josef Broder, the discussant at the symposium, is being prepared.

General Population Characteristics

Nine percent of those associated with AAEA were women in 1986. Seven percent of those associated with the AAEA were nonwhite. Thirty percent of the women were students at the time of the survey, compared to 6 percent of the men. This finding regarding the large percent of women who were students is indicative of the increased enrollment of women in graduate programs. One-third of all students associated with the AAEA were women--CWAE has likely played a role in encouraging women to become involved in the Association.

Everyone in the sample had a B.S. or B.A. degree. Men were more likely to have had graduate training than women. Ninety-eight percent of the men had an M.S. or M.A. degree, compared to 92 percent of the women. At the Ph.D. level, 87 percent of the men earned the degree, compared to 74 percent of the women. Men were somewhat more likely than women to have earned their bachelor's degree in agricultural economics. Among only nonstudents, women and men were equally likely to have earned their bachelor's degree in agricultural economics, indicating today's women students are coming from more diversified undergraduate training. Women were more likely than men to have earned their master's and Ph.D. degrees in agricultural economics.

By race, whites were more likely to have graduate training, in all fields, than nonwhites. Ninety-nine percent of the whites had master's degrees compared to 88 percent of the nonwhites. Eighty-eight percent of the whites had Ph.D.'s compared to 77 percent of the nonwhites. If those who were students at the time of the survey are excluded, the gap in education by race narrows significantly. Whites were more likely to have earned their bachelor's and Ph.D. degrees in agricultural economics than nonwhites, and nonwhites were more likely to have earned the master's degree in agricultural economics.

The greater likelihood of women and nonwhites to come into the profession at the graduate level of training may indicate that agricultural economics programs interested in recruiting new students should concentrate on those subpopulations.

When considering four regions of the country (Northeast, South, Midwest, and West), most men lived in the

South (43%) and most women lived in the Midwest (41%). By race, both whites and nonwhites were more likely to live in the South. Almost half of all nonwhites were in the South, reflecting the presence of the 1890 schools. Nonwhites were very unlikely to live in the West. Only 1 percent of all nonwhites were in the West.

Women were more likely to be employed by the government or nonprofit organizations than were men. Most of the women at universities are students. Only 18 percent of the women at universities are tenured faculty, compared to 55 percent of the men at universities. Nine percent of the women reported having gaps of 6 months or more in their careers as a result of child-rearing or as a result of dual career conflicts. No men reported such gaps. This greater tendency of women to have career gaps is one of the explanations in the human capital literature for the observed salary gap by gender.

Regression Results

Both women and nonwhites are more likely to be students, to be younger, and to have less training and experience than men and whites, respectively. Therefore, it is not surprising that their average salaries are less. The average salary for men was \$46,748 in 1986, compared to \$30,807 for women. The average salary for whites was \$46,745, compared to \$26,523 for nonwhites. When students are eliminated from the group, the salary differential narrows.

In order to control for the effect of the differences in experience and training on salary levels, a simple wage function was estimated with OLS. The dependent variable was annual salary and the independent variables were: whether or not the individual had a Ph.D., whether or not the individual had administrative responsibilities, whether or not the individual had an academic position, the years of experience at their current position, total years experience, the number of career gaps, the number of refereed articles, the number of other articles, and the race and gender of the individual. Because students are voluntarily out of the job market and receiving no or a reduced income, the only valid results of a salary analysis are those based on the sample which excludes students.

The results indicated that gender was not a significant factor in explaining salary differentials among employed agricultural economists. Race was important at the 10% level of significance and indicated that nonwhites were earning a lower salary than whites after controlling for other variables. In the academic population alone, neither race nor gender were significant. All other independent variables were significant, except for having administrative responsibilities and the number of years at one's current job.

Implications

The result that gender is not a significant factor and race is at least not strongly significant in explaining salary levels should be reassuring to agricultural economists. Experience, having a Ph.D., and publishing are all very important determinants of salary level among individuals associated with AAEEA. However, there are still areas that are of concern to those interested in the status of women and Blacks in the profession. First, this analysis examined only employed agricultural economists. Are opportunities for employment equal by race and gender? We know there is a significant difference by type of employer. For example, universities are much less likely to hire women than are other research institutions, such as ERS. Secondly, as Joyce Allen's research has reported, women and nonwhites perceive that they are denied opportunities because of their gender and race, respectively. Perhaps there is discrimination in the availability of professional opportunities and support, aside from salary. Another explanation for the inconsistency between the determinants of salary levels and perceptions of those determinants is that there may be a lag in perceiving recent improvements in opportunities. Several other alternative explanations for this inconsistency exist. It will be of interest to watch how opportunities for advancement are distributed as the demographic composition continues to evolve in the agricultural economics profession.

References:

- Broder, J. and R. Deprey. "Selected Characteristics of Women in Agricultural Economics." Mimeo. January 14, 1983, University of Georgia.
- Lee, L. "A Comparison of the Rank and Salary of Male and Female Agricultural Economists." *AJAE* 63 (1981): 1013-18.
- Reichelderfer, K. "Rank and Salary of Federally Employed Agricultural Economists." *Agric. Econ. Research*. 35 (1983): 44-51.
- Strauss, R. and M. Tarr. "Salary Patterns of Agricultural Economists in the Early 1980's." *AJAE* Dec. (1982): 1053-61.

The 1988 CWAE Preconference on Communication Skills:

A Thank-You Note from Nancy Schwartz

From the feedback we've had, the CWAE Preconference on Communication Skills was a "great success" (to quote the last AAEA Newsletter). Not only was it well-attended, but we've received many compliments on the program. Several people suggested that we should do something like it every year. As last year's chair of the CWAE Subcommittee on Professional Activities, I want to take this opportunity to thank everyone who helped make the program possible, and mention certain individuals who deserve particular thanks for their assistance.

First and foremost, thanks to Dan Padberg and the AAEA Board for selecting our preconference proposal. There was tough competition for a preconference slot, and the communication skills program was a potentially risky endeavor. I certainly had sleepless nights wondering if enough people would attend our conference given the policy, modeling, and other fine preconference programs. My thanks also to John Miranowski, who is a strong supporter of CWAE's work, and who brought our proposal to the AAEA Board.

Equally, Leroy Rogers and the AAEA Foundation Board deserve special thanks. CWAE is the first group ever to receive AAEA Foundation Board funding for a conference. Their financial support allowed us to get Kathleen Barry as our main speaker. Jean Kinsey, who serves on the Foundation Board, is responsible for our proposal being voted on. The copy I mailed to Dr. Rogers was delayed in the mails--even Jean's plane was delayed--but she made it, literally in the nick of time to present our proposal.

The idea for the conference was sparked at our 1987 preconference on career planning and opportunities at the MSU meetings, where numerous speakers named communication skills as a key to career advancement. It was Ardelle Lundeen's idea to follow up with a communication skills conference and to seek AAEA Foundation Board support to make it feasible. Her suggestion prompted a lively and fruitful discussion at the CWAE Board meeting at MSU. My thanks to Jean, Ardelle, Liz Ericksen, and Sylvia Lane for their help and advice in shaping the conference and publicizing it.

Mary Burfisher and Amy Sparks helped me with the necessary grunt work. Nicole Ballenger helped contact a potential speaker. And I relied on Tanya Roberts' and Mary Ahearn's valuable advice on speakers and organization. Cathy Jabara, Edna Loehman, Vicki McCracken, Tanya, Sylvia, and Ardelle also helped moderate and record the proceedings. Tanya, Vicki, and Helen Jensen had to lug tape recorders across the country for the event.

The conference was a major undertaking. Throughout the development of the conference, my "right arm" was

Charlene Carsrud of the AAEA Business Office. Thanks to Charlene's help, the conference went off without a hitch.

Finally, I want to thank those members of the AAEA who served as speakers at the conference--Richard Crowder, David Freshwater, Richard Just, Kerry Litzenberg, and Bob Thompson. They each put in the effort to make the conference workshops high quality, performing a valuable service for their colleagues. They all deserve the highest kudos.

After two years on the job, I am "retiring" as chair of the Professional Activities Subcommittee, and that honor now goes to Shida Henneberry. The conferences put on during my tenure were highly rewarding to me, and well worth the effort. I hope Shida feels the same sense of accomplishment during her term. I wish her good luck.

The Joint Job-Hunting Problem

(Editor's Note: The following paragraphs are based on an article by Katherine Lyall. The article appeared in the Fall 1988 issue of the newsletter of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession.)

Individuals involved in joint job searches often want advice as to how to approach the joint search process. The following observations are based on conversations with an unscientific sample of department chairs and individuals who have made joint job searches.

Look candidly at the market for your specialty and your spouse's--are you competing with each other in the same field or subfield? If you are, look specifically for schools and communities that have several sources of jobs. Searching among universities that have both a business program and an economics department, communities that have more than one college or university within reasonable commuting distance, and geographic areas that have other public or private employers who may hire economists will increase the probability of finding two jobs simultaneously.

Decide in advance whether you require two job offers in-hand simultaneously or whether you are willing to accept one while continuing a search for the other. It is likely that you will be faced with this tactical decision at some point in your search, and it will be less traumatic if you have thought through the risks and probabilities calmly in advance.

Be straightforward about your situation in the cover letters for applications and in interviews with potential employers. You might say: "My spouse, who has a Ph.D. in physics, will also be seeking employment in the Boston area (in the university)." Alternatively, if you are not prepared for a commuter marriage or other separate work-

ing situations, you might say: "My spouse has been offered a position at (campus/firm) and I am seeking a position that would enable us both to continue our careers in Cleveland;" or "My spouse, a professional engineer, is also seeking a position that would enable us both to come to Cleveland."

If you are silent about this issue, employers will assume that you are prepared to make a decision on the basis of your own position alone. They will not look kindly on side conditions and "complications" that emerge after an offer has been made. Conversely, employers who know that you're facing a joint job decision are more likely to be active in exploring opportunities for a spouse inside and outside their own organizations.

In universities, it is essential that the department chair or interviewing committee know if your spouse is also seeking an appointment in the university. It is not improper to ask directly in an interview whether the department or committee would be willing to discuss the possibility of an appointment for a spouse with other departments.

Be resourceful and persistent--do some research on other possible employers in the area, and at some suitable point ask your interviewers: "Do you know someone in the biology department at (campus/firm) that my spouse might contact for possible opportunities?;" or "Do you have contacts in the community that might help my spouse obtain an interview?"

Universities and other employers are encountering joint job searches with increasing frequency. Nationally, about one-third of current faculty at colleges and universities are going to retire and be replaced between now and the year 2000. This turnover will create a bull market in opportunities and an increasing willingness on the part of employers to find creative solutions for dual-career households. Joint job hunters need to be persistent, straightforward, and creative in helping employers help them.

Newsnotes

Organized Symposia:

Individuals or groups wishing to organize a symposium for the next AAEA annual meeting should submit three copies of a symposium plan to: Lester Manderscheid, Dept. of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, 204 Agriculture Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824-1039, by March 20, 1989. Acceptance or rejection of proposals will be announced by about May 1, 1989. Abstracts of the organized symposia results will be published in the December 1989 AJAE. Organized symposia are designed to

facilitate discussion of a single theme or problem. Audience participation is emphasized. Proposals involving the presentation of formal papers will not be accepted. For more information, contact Lester Manderscheid or refer to the AAEA Newsletter.

Selected Papers:

Selected papers for the next AAEA annual meeting are due to Catherine Kling and Richard Sexton, Co-chairs, Selected Papers Committee, Dept. of Agricultural Economics, University of California, Davis, CA 95616 by February 28, 1989 (postmark) or actual receipt by March 7, 1989. See the AAEA Newsletter for more details.

Poster Proposals:

Poster proposals for the next AAEA annual meeting are due to Tanya Roberts, Chair, Posters Committee, USDA/ERS, 1301 New York Avenue, N.W., Room 1137, Washington, D.C., 20005-4788, by February 28, 1989 (postmark) or actual receipt by March 7, 1989. More details can be found in the AAEA Newsletter.

Preconference Meeting on Data Issues:

The AAEA is sponsoring a premeeting conference on data generation, retrieval, and use at Louisiana State University on July 28-29, 1989. The conference is being organized by the AAEA Economic Statistics Committee and the AAEA Information Retrieval Committee. A "Technology Hall" is part of the conference. Posters will be displayed throughout the two-day program, with demonstrations scheduled for 10 a.m. - noon, July 29. Posters may represent new data generation techniques, data storage and retrieval methods and technologies, and innovative uses of data in teaching, extension, research, and business management. Due to space limitations, the number of posters will be limited. Submit posters and demonstration proposals by March 1, 1989, to: Marc A. Johnson, Head, Dept. of Agricultural Economics, Kansas State University, 342 Waters Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506. Submissions should include: title, objective, summary of poster content and size, summary of demonstration content, and facility requirements (space, electrical, etc.).

AAEA Foundation Governing Board News:

The AAEA Foundation Governing Board was established in 1985 to support economic analyses of real-world problems associated with food, agriculture, and natural resources. The Foundation recently discussed and adopted plans of action concerning future fund raising and project activities. As part of these plans, the Foundation adopted a statement of purpose which in part reads:

"... (The Board) solicits, collects, invests, and disperses funds other than AAEA membership dues. The funds collected are to be used to (a) enhance the quality and usefulness of the work done by agricultural economists, (b) expand the range of clientele for whom the economic intelligence produced may be useful, and (c) otherwise enhance the abilities and outreach of agricultural economists..."

The Foundation will fund projects to achieve professional excellence in teaching, economic education, research, and communication. For more information, contact Olan Forker, Dept. of Agricultural Economics, Warren Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853.

News of Women in Agricultural Economics

Sandra Archibald (assistant professor at Stanford) is a visiting professor at the University of California at Berkeley, September 1988-June 1989.

Katherine Acuna has accepted a position as an agricultural economist with USDA/FAS. She received the M.S. degree from the University of Arizona.

Irma Adelman (University of California, Berkeley) is on leave in Washington, D.C., Massachusetts, and France, for the spring semester 1989.

Maria Belliveau has accepted a position as research analyst at the Vermont Legislative Joint Fiscal Office, Montpelier. She received the M.S. degree from the University of Vermont.

Joanne Blair has accepted a position as research assistant at Kansas State University. She received the M.S. degree from the University of Arkansas.

Barbara Chattin is on detail from ERS to the Office of the Special Trade Representative (USTR). Her new phone is: (202) 395-3077.

Cheryl Christensen has accepted a position as research coordinator, Abt Associates, Washington, D.C.

Sheila Cleveland has accepted a position as economist, Haliburton Oil Co., Duncan, Oklahoma. She received the M.S. degree from Oklahoma State University.

Dorothy Comer (University of Florida) has been elected AAEA Student Section adviser, 1988/89-1990/91.

Constance Falk has accepted a position as assistant professor at New Mexico State University. She received the Ph.D. degree from Oklahoma State University.

Nina Glasgow (formerly at USDA/ERS) has accepted a joint appointment as senior research associate, Depts. of Rural Sociology and Consumer Economics and Housing, Cornell University.

Kim Hjort has accepted a position as agricultural economist at USDA/ERS. She received the Ph.D. degree from Purdue University.

Cathy Jabara has accepted a position as a senior project associate for Cornell University's Food and Nutrition Policy Program in Washington, D.C. She was formerly with the Dept. of the Treasury.

Kandice Kahl has achieved the rank of professor at Clemson University.

Patricia Lindsey has accepted a position as assistant professor at Oregon State University.

Deborah Markley (formerly at the University of Tennessee) has accepted a position as assistant professor at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Katherine Reichelderfer is on leave as resident fellow at the National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy, Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C., October 1988-April 1989.

Margo Rich Ogus has just formed a new consulting firm, Spectrum Economics, Inc., with many of her former colleagues. Spectrum offers consulting services in the areas of energy, public utility, regional, resource, agricultural, and environmental economics. The firm's address is 2100 Geng Road, Suite 205, Palo Alto, CA 94303. Phone: (415) 424-1415.

Sonya Salamon (professor, University of Illinois) is on leave at ERS for the 1988/89 academic year.

Nancy Schwartz is on detail from ERS to the Office of Management and Budget, National Security and International Affairs Special Studies Division. She is working on a variety of topics including the GATT, telecommunications and steel. She can be reached at NSIA/SSD, OMB, Room 10007 New Executive Office Bldg., Washington, DC 20503. Phone: (202) 395-3720.

Linda Swanson has accepted the position of Leader, Population Section, ERS.

Job Announcements

Economic Research Service (USDA). Agricultural Economists. Applications are being accepted for Grades 12 and 13 agricultural economists at ERS. Salary range for grade 12 (minimum requirement: Ph.D. or equivalent experience) is \$33,218-\$43,181; for grade 13 (minimum requirements: Ph.D. or equivalent experience and at least one additional year of professional experience at a level of difficulty and responsibility comparable to grade 12), \$39,501-\$51,354; plus an attractive benefits package and reimbursement of the costs of moving to Washington, D.C. U.S. citizenship is required. To apply, obtain a copy of announcement WA-AG-7-01 from department heads, federal job information centers, state employment services, or the Examining Unit, USDA/EMS, Room 1443-South Building, Washington, D.C. 20250-3500 (202-447-3660).

Georgia Southern College. Assistant Professor of Finance. Department of Finance and Economics. Applicants should have an earned doctorate, and the potential to establish a successful record of research and publication. Preference will be given to a person with a field in business finance. The position is anticipated to be available September, 1989. The appointment is a 9-month, tenure-track position. Send resume and credentials to: Lon M. Carnes, Jr., Search Committee, Department of Finance and Economics, Georgia Southern College, L.B. 8151, Statesboro, GA 30460-8151. Application deadline: January 31, 1989.

Georgia Southern College. Department Head. Department of Finance and Economics. Applicants should have an earned doctorate, a successful record of research and publication, and administrative experience in an academic setting. Preference will be given to a person with a finance field of commercial banking or financial institutions. Appointment may be at either Associate or Professor rank. The position will be available September, 1989. The appointment is a 12-month, tenure-track position. Send resume and credentials to: Dr. Herbert A. O'Keefe, Search Committee, Department of Accounting, Georgia Southern College, L.B. 8141, Statesboro, GA 30460-8141.

University of Wisconsin. Assistant Professor, Economics of Southeast Asia. The Dept. of Agricultural Economics seeks an economist at the assistant professor level (tenure-track) who has demonstrated research interest and competence in the economics and/or agricultural economics of Southeast Asia. A Ph.D. in economics or agricultural economics with strong theoretical training is required. The teaching load is two courses per year, and the individual filling the position is expected to have major involvement with graduate student research. The graduate program in the Department is integrated with that in the Dept. of Economics, and this position offers the prospect of collaboration and joint work. The individual would be expected to participate in the programs of the University's Center for Southeast Asian Studies. Salary is competitive

with major research universities. Position is available April 1, 1989. To apply, send letter of application, resume, transcripts, and the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of four references to: Edward V. Jessee, Chair, Dept. of Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin, 433 Taylor Hall, Madison, WI 53706. Applications received after February 1, 1989 cannot be assured of consideration. This appointment is pending acceptance of a grant proposal.

University of Wisconsin. Assistant Professor, Dept. of Agricultural Industries. This is a tenure-track, nine-month position for an agribusiness management teaching position. Research and extension activities may be added with up to a 12-month contract possible. Salary will be commensurate with qualifications. A Ph.D. in agricultural economics and industry experience are preferred, with emphasis in agribusiness management. Send a letter of application, resume, official undergraduate and graduate transcripts, and have three letters of reference sent by February 1, 1989, to: Dr. John Ambrosius, Chairman, Dept. of Agricultural Industries, University of Wisconsin, One University Plaza, Platteville, WI 53818-3099.

CWAE NEWSLETTER

The Committee on Women in Agricultural Economics is a committee of the American Agricultural Economics Association. The current Chairperson of CWAE is Helen Jensen, Department of Economics, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011 (515) 294-1183. The Newsletter editor is Joy Harwood, USDA/ERS, 1301 New York Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005-4788 (202) 786-1840.

For those of you receiving the newsletter for the first time, welcome. The Newsletter is distributed to AAEA members who wish to receive it. We have been making an effort to identify AAEA members who are women, and have added a number of names to the CWAE mailing list. If you know of others who would like to receive the Newsletter, contact Helen Jensen or Joy Harwood.

Technical support for the Newsletter is provided by Lona Christoffers, Sandy Suddendorf, and Kathy Augustine.

American Agricultural Economics Association
Business Office
80 Heady Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011-1070