



**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](mailto: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.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*

# In This Issue

---

Swamy, Conway, and LeBlanc return with the third and final article in their series on stochastic coefficients. Building on the critique of fixed coefficients in the first article, and the specification of stochastic coefficients models in the second, they now extend their stochastic coefficients arguments into the realm of forecasting. They examine the sources of forecast errors and, employing a stochastic coefficients model designed by Swamy and Tinsley, account for most of the sources of forecast errors inherent in the fixed coefficients models. A section called "applications" contains some tables comparing the performance of stochastic and fixed coefficients models. The authors conclude that forecasts can be improved by allowing all coefficients in economic relationships to vary over time. They also note that the predictive capability of a model is not necessarily improved by complexity.

Swamy, Conway, and LeBlanc cite Oakes in declaring that universal forecasting algorithms are doomed to failure because the future is not like the past. They anticipate our plans for an article in a forthcoming issue of the *Journal* to address the larger issue of nonlinear dynamics and prediction where systems of equations produce solutions so complex they appear to be random—in a word, chaos.

And what of the data we put into our models? Boxley examines the way we represent the structure of agriculture and the rural economy in our definitions and data management. He notes that the American Agricultural Economics Association has been struggling with definitions and concepts since at least 1972. Still, we overdescribe commercial agriculture and fail to provide adequate information on other aspects of rural life. Boxley concludes that information should be based on two distinct paradigms, one for production agriculture and another for rural resources.

Larson, in his brief article on intertemporal duality, reviews several types of problems for which this approach can be used, then states equations useful for planning problems with an important time dimension. In his comment on contemporaneous correlation, Babula shows that estimates of parameters pertaining to U.S./Canadian crops trade were sensitive to econometric procedure. Reining comments on another estimation problem, namely, measuring structural change in agriculture, and recommends an inexpensive, flexible regression procedure.

Several books receive sharp reviews in this issue. Schluter examines the collection on agricultural and food marketing edited by Kilmer and Armbruster and

finds it less than it might have been. Hauver disagrees with Doving's pessimism about multifactor productivity indexing by citing advances in duality theory and Tornqvist indexing.

Ribaudo, however, favorably reviews the Resources for the Future book on agricultural policy by supporting its argument that traditional commodity-based policy is inadequate to cope with today's agricultural and food problems. Tripaldi and Schor give qualified support to the Murdock-Leistritz book on the farm financial crisis.

Breimyer's appraisal of the anniversary tome from the American Agricultural Economics Association is mixed. Not surprising. A book with four editors and 57 authors is unlikely to be all good or all bad. Its chief deficiency, according to Breimyer, is that the subject of the book, the 21st century, was scarcely touched.

In this issue, we inaugurate a series of invited essays on professional issues in applied economics and related social sciences. It is fitting, I believe, that we begin with an essay on publishing in professional journals. Author of this thoughtful, upbeat essay is Peter Barry, editor of the *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. There is much in his essay with which I readily concur, yet I do not share all his views. For example, while I agree that journal publication does figure substantially in the reward structure of the profession, I am concerned that it may do so by neglecting other vital professional responsibilities such as teaching and learning. A professional literature is a public good. We need to attend to the needs of readers as well as authors. The size and variety of a literature and its access should be professional assets, not liabilities. An expanding and specializing literature is a mark of professional achievement, but it does have its downside also. Barry's essay, whether you agree or disagree, contains much to think about. I urge you to read it, and comment on it.

**Gene Wunderlich**

---

## Best Article Award

The ERS Administrator's Award for the best article in the *Journal* during fiscal year 1988 went to Fred Kuchler and Harry Vroomen for "Impacts of the PIK Program on the Farm Machinery Market," which appeared in the Summer 1987 issue.

---