



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.*

CWAE

COMMITTEE ON WOMEN IN
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

NEWSLETTER

June 1988

Chairperson's Report

by Edna Loehman, Purdue U.

In my last column as chairperson for CWAE, I first want to recognize and thank those who contributed to CWAE during the last year. I also want to invite everyone interested in CWAE activities to join us at the AAEE Annual meetings (CWAE activities are highlighted below). Special thanks are given to:

Mary Ahearn and Joy Harwood--for a first-class newsletter;
Nancy Schwartz and her committee--for putting together an exemplary pre-conference workshop;
Joy Harwood--for the work in preparing the Working Rules for our group;
Marie Dougan and Charlene Carsrud--for their assistance in the AAEE Business Office;
Helen Jensen--for preparing the new membership directory which will include many new women;
Valerie Vantreese--for helping us move to a new budget system;
Tanya Roberts and her committee--for conducting the elections for new Board members;
Maureen Kilkenny--for providing new, interesting social events and a new CWAE logo;
Vickie McCracken--for developing a network for graduate students;
Fran Antonovitz--for preparing and disseminating our research brochure.

CWAE has grown in reputation and contributed to the professional growth of women. Many thanks!

All interested persons are invited to our business meeting to help us decide a number of issues. Agenda items will include the following (the person listed will lead the discussion):

Election procedures--Tanya Roberts
Membership/Women in Ag. Economics--Helen Jensen
Newsletter Finance and Distribution--Joy Harwood, Mary Ahearn
Budget and Planning--Valerie Vantreese
Working Rules--Joy Harwood
Graduate Student Issues--Vickie McCracken
Employment Opportunities--Jean Kinsey
Professional Activities--Nancy Schwartz
Women in the Profession--Joy Harwood, Joyce Allen, Mary Ahearn

Please let me know before the meeting if there are additional items that should be discussed by the Board during the meeting.

CWAE EVENTS Annual Meeting-1988

CWAE Communication Skills Workshop
Sunday, July 31
"Building Better Communication Skills to Advance Your Career"
Knoxville Hilton--8 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.

CWAE Business Meeting and Buffet
Sunday, July 31
Knoxville Hilton--5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.

CWAE Luncheon
Monday, August 1
"Our Past, Present, and Future as Women Agricultural Economists"
Ardelle Lundeen, Sylvia Lane, and Linda Lee
Knoxville Hilton--12 noon to 1:30 p.m.

Organized Symposium
Tuesday, August 2
"Professional Advancement in Agricultural Economics"
Linda Lee, Mary Ahearn, Joyce Allen, Joy Harwood, Craig Jagger, and Josef Broder
(an empirical analysis of CWAE survey results)
Tuesday afternoon, see program

A Switch from Academia to Agribusiness *by Sermin Hardesty, Rice Growers Association*

When I left my assistant professor position at Michigan State University (MSU) to become Senior Economist at the Rice Growers Association of California (RGA), I thought that I had a clear idea of the changes that I would be facing. Prior to returning to school to earn my Ph.D., I had worked in nonacademic positions. However, the differences have been greater than I had expected. Reflecting back after a year and a half in my current position, I can attribute these differences to two major reasons. The first reason is that my role as an economist is different in the two positions. Secondly, there are major differences between the functions of an academic institution and an agricultural marketing cooperative.

My switch from academia to agribusiness is associated with that ever-increasing phenomenon, the dual career marriage. When I was offered an assistant professorship at Michigan State University, my husband was well-established in his position in California and job prospects in Michigan in his area did not look promising. I accepted MSU's offer and we agreed that he would remain in California until he found a position in Michigan. Despite a lot of searching, nothing that was satisfactory surfaced. After maintaining separate households and commuting for two years, it became apparent that the arrangement was costly--in terms of both our finances and our relationship. I decided to resign from my academic position to return to California and accepted an offer from RGA, a rice marketing cooperative.

Economic analysis is heavily utilized at RGA. Although it is not a large company, there are four individuals with Ph.D.s in Agricultural Economics. This provides an intellectually stimulating environment which is not dissimilar from academia. Furthermore, management is supportive of my efforts to continue publishing.

The kind of economic analysis that I do at RGA is different from that at MSU. The level of analysis is different, as well as the specific topics. At MSU, I was concerned with methodology as well as theory. Although my current position is less demanding technically, I now face a

new challenge: the application of economic theory to the financial, marketing, and production issues affecting RGA. These issues are not neatly specified. Meaningful analysis requires a solid understanding of the economic principles, rather than methodological skill.

Some of the research projects which my friends in academia are working on now seem too esoteric to me. In some cases, they have assumed away the problems which form the challenges which I must face in my analyses. For example, they assume homogeneity among consumers while I evaluate the potential demand for new products which are differentiated for different groups of consumers.

As a researcher, I frequently act as a consultant to various departments at RGA. This provides me with a lot of people contact, both internal and external to RGA; there is a lot of teamwork. My interaction with other faculty was limited when I was at MSU; I usually worked alone. I sometimes found this situation to be lonely, although I am very comfortable burying myself in equations and data.

Most of the differences between my past and current positions are attributable to the differing functions of academia and agribusiness. My research topics are more restricted now than they were in academia. The work that I do now must be of direct benefit to RGA. Fortunately, this includes a broad range of marketing, finance, and production issues. This constraint has not been very binding. Occasionally, however, I have had to be very responsive in evaluating the issues and have been unable to do the research in as much depth as I would have liked.

However, there is a major benefit associated with this need to be responsive. More often than not, my analyses and recommendations will provide input for RGA's management decisions. It is very rewarding to me to associate a specific action or program with my analysis. Furthermore, there is not usually much time lag between the analysis and the decision. This is very different from academia where articles may take years to be published and there may be no further dissemination of the research findings.

One of the differences between academia and agribusiness which can require some adjustment concerns the hierarchy. There is clearly a hierarchy in academia. Even at the departmental level, there is a department chair and the ladder ranks. However, this hierarchy did not have much effect on me on a day-to-day basis at MSU; I felt that I was an equal to my colleagues when discussing research issues. In agribusiness, it may be necessary to be more cognizant of reporting relationships and the political implications of an analysis. However, this is not a particularly cumbersome requirement in a relatively small organization like RGA.

There is an obvious difference between academia and business regarding the teaching function. I am not currently teaching any classes, an activity which I found to be both rewarding and frustrating. Fortunately, we have student interns at RGA. I have continued my teaching activities in an informal way by working with these students on conducting economic analyses of the broad issues affecting RGA.

There is no question that there are differences between academia and agribusiness. For some individuals, these differences are substantial enough that it is not advisable for them to switch from one sector to another. In my case, the transition was not without difficulties. Working in agribusiness, however, has provided me with many rewarding experiences which I would have never had in academia.

Florida Women in Agriculture *by Christina Gladwin*

On May 4, 5, & 7th, the University of Florida's Women in Agriculture (WIA) statewide extension program held 3 regional conferences in Orlando, Tampa, and Alachua (in north Florida). County agents from the regions--seventeen in all--co-organized the seminars and workshops with me. Fifty women and one man attended the Orlando Workshop, 125 women (and five men) attended the Tampa seminar, and 15 women attended the Alachua Workshop. This entailed an increase over the 130 women who attended the first Florida WIA conference in October 1986.

The WIA conferences were successful because farm and agribusiness women were motivated

to further pursue careers in agriculture by speakers from the Small Business Administration who asked, "Why Put Your Agribusiness in the Woman's Name?" They also were captured by Sister Thomas More Bertels' message--to drop "love, sweet love" and go out and get agri-power. Power--as she defines it--is the ability to get things done. Political interests in agriculture, she says, are so separated that farmers and agribusinesses have no power to change and influence government commodity programs, to advertise in an effective way and thus market their products, and to encourage more people to pursue careers in agriculture. Currently, she says, people associate good nutritious food (red meat) with death (anorexic bodies). It's time to change this dismal situation, she says. It will take women, who are good lobbyists because they are aggressive and persistent, to end separation in U.S. agriculture.

Women farmers and agribusiness persons also were inspired by Jean Leising, an Indiana farmer and widow who has recently become a Republican candidate for the Indiana State senate. She told women "Your Can Make It on Your Own"--if you have to, if your husband dies. She recounted what happened to her when her husband died leaving her with 3 children, 600 acres, and 600 hogs at age 31. It was tough. She has been a speaker at the Chicago Board of Trade seminars for women, teaching them how to market, hedge, and use commodity coupons received as part of commodity programs receipts. They also listened to Mike Olexa, University of Florida and USDA, who talked about pesticide law, groundwater and endangered-species legislation, and how these can affect their farm and families' well-being.

Finally, women benefitted from learning from each other, by networking. They talked about integrated pest management, computer software, zoning ordinances, the future of the U.S. family farm, the demise of the mid-size farm, and their children and husbands.

Door prizes were given; lunches were gobbled up; women were enthusiastic about more WIA seminars. They also wanted information on WIFE and AAW (American Agri-Women). I was pleased. It's time CWAE ag economists realize that U.S. women are

farming--just like African women--and they need extension programs aimed especially at their needs and unique contributions to our food supply system.

Discrimination in the Labor Market

When Gary Becker completed the first work on the economics of discrimination in his dissertation in 1957, he might have reasonably expected that later decades would clarify empirical evidence as to the source and scope of discrimination against women and minorities in the marketplace. Instead, economists have provided alternative approaches, equally plausible, and thus upper and lower bounds for discrimination's impact on the salaries women receive.

Few dispute that a wage differential continues to arise between men and women in the labor market. Mean estimates of adjusted earnings ratios range from 0.62 to 0.81, and the mean unexplained portion of the gross differential ranges from 51% to 87%, depending on exactly how occupation is controlled for. In these studies, discrimination is usually defined as that portion of the earnings gap unexplained by individual characteristics, i.e., the residual. It is at this juncture that some economists diverge in their analysis.

The contrasts in their analytical approaches to the same basic problem have led to a variety of conclusions. Researchers using cross-sectional data dispute the conclusion of time-series data users that labor market discrimination plays an important role in determining wages for women. The former group has found that the earnings gap has been narrowing recently, which they attribute to a change in the relative human capital endowments of the relevant groups. Other studies, however, suggest that civil rights legislation has played a part in lessening discrimination. In fact, it is quite possible that past gender-based prejudice displayed in labor market transactions may have induced women to increase their investments in human capital, which may have led to the current apparent reduction in discrimination.

Another difference that has arisen has been the empirical strategy used. These analyses typically estimate the female earning and male earning equations to derive the usual

discrimination measure. Objections have been voiced as to the unbiasedness of this measure. Polachek and Becker in different articles suggest that such an estimate is usually biased upward due to the lack of consideration of intermittency of female participation in the labor force as a factor in the analysis. Kuhn studied the relationship between statistical discrimination as discussed above, and reported discrimination, and found it to be unexpectedly negative. This result could not be explained by selectivity bias nor by reducing the number of variables which are controlled for, which may be co-determinant with discrimination. Instead, Kuhn finds that in addition to measured wage discrimination, women have access to other sources of information about their wage position relative to a comparably qualified man, and that the possession of this non-statistical information may vary systematically with a woman's characteristics.

Madden explored the same question from a somewhat different perspective. This study involved the gap in wage losses for displaced workers between men and women, which permitted examination of exogenous wage changes due to characteristics of the labor market, rather than the personal attributes of the workers. It found, by analyzing cross-sectional data for 1983, that women suffered a greater wage loss than men after being involuntarily separated from their original job. Madden further proved that this inequality was not the result of disparate job-specific human capital, and proposed that it stemmed from discrimination in the labor market.

Few economists who have worked in this field in the last couple of decades deny that a substantial discrepancy exists between men's and women's salaries, though some maintain that most of it can be accounted for by differing human capital endowments. They then address, but fail to resolve, the issue as to whether this is also a result of discrimination, or the result of a factor from outside the labor market, such as education. There yet exists considerable scope for further research in this area, as many questions remain unanswered.

The references for this article are all from the American Economic Review. Volume

77, Number 2, May 1987 (M, G&P, B&F); and Volume 77, Number 4, September 1987 (K).

Janice Fanning Madden, "Gender Differences in the Cost of Displacement: An Empirical Test of Discrimination in the Labor Market." pp. 246-251.

Claudia Golden and Solomon Polachek. "Residual Differences by Sex: Perspectives on the Gender Gap in Earnings." pp. 143-151.

Francine D. Blau and Marianne A. Ferber. "Discrimination: Empirical Evidence from the United States." pp. 316-320.

Peter D. Kuhn. "Sex Discrimination in Labor Markets: The Role of Statistical Evidence." pp. 567-583.

--submitted by Stephanie Mercier, ERS

Choosing a Career in Government

(Last article in a series of reports on the Career Opportunities and Planning Conference, Michigan State University, August 2, 1987.)

The earlier articles in this series gave an overview of career planning issues and specifically addressed academic and private sector jobs. This article addresses jobs in state and federal government, including international jobs as well as some final words about the conference proceedings. The speakers included Cathy Jabara, Senior Economist, U.S. Dept. of Treasury, formerly of the Economic Research Service (ERS), USDA; Evelyn Spears, Director of Planning and Evaluation, Michigan Dept. of Agriculture, and Handy Williamson, Jr., Deputy Director, Office of Research and University Relations, Bureau of Science and Technology, USAID. Jim Hildreth, Director, Farm Foundation, provided the final overall commentary on the conference.

GOVERNMENT CAREERS

Dr. Jabara discussed issues related to federal government careers, and in particular, ERS. Under the current budget situation, overall growth in jobs is unlikely; however, certain specialties such as international and environmental economics are likely to grow. Masters level

candidates are likely to find positions at program agencies at USDA such as FAS and ASCS. In ERS, economists with masters are likely to be involved in monitoring commodity markets, situation and outlook, and staff analysis. Ph.D.s can engage in longer term research projects.

To look for a job at ERS, complete the standard form (SF-171) and get on the government register. Get to know people at ERS to see the skills needed. It's important to recognize that these change over time.

How you advance in government depends to a large extent on your long term career goals. Follow a career path which uses and develops your skills, but be open to new opportunities. You may be able to advance within the agency, but it is often helpful to move between agencies in government. This may be the most efficient way to get promotions (that is, change grades). It also helps you see what other agencies are doing, to see how they use research, and to develop contacts. The disadvantage of moving around is that you may not be able to narrowly specialize. Skills which increase your options to move around government include social cost-benefit analysis, and analysis of the budgetary and macroeconomic effects of program spending.

Ph.D.s usually start out in grade 12 at ERS. Advancement above grade 13 usually requires a move away from research and into managerial responsibilities. To advance, therefore, you need to take on supervisory tasks while you are still a 12 and 13, including supervising research assistants and cooperative agreements.

ERS often affords opportunities to move temporarily or permanently out of government. Commodity specialists can move into the private sector. Program expertise opens up opportunities to work on Capitol Hill. Your mobility is likely to increase by publishing situation and outlook articles and articles in other popular publications. This makes you known to the private sector as well as to program agencies such as ASCS and to Congressional staffers. Workers with at least three years of government service may be permitted to take up to a five-year leave of absence with reemployment rights. This allows excellent opportunities for

temporary employment in the private sector, including international assignments.

Dr. Spears noted that state governments do not usually hire many agricultural economists, but new opportunities are arising. Previously, state departments of agriculture were principally concerned with regulatory issues, but now international trade has become important. In particular, states are opening offices at home and abroad to promote and market their agricultural exports. Jobs in these offices often go to individuals with undergraduate degrees in marketing, communications, advertising, or related fields, including agricultural economics.

Most jobs for agricultural economists are either managerial or administrative. In addition to analytical and marketing skills, language, communication, and computer skills are needed. Research is not usually the principle objective in state level jobs. Publications may be possible in state government, but you may not find the time. Even if you don't find time to publish, you may be able to present papers at professional meetings.

To apply for a job, you need to get on a state's employment list. This often requires passing an exam. Entry level (BA) jobs in Michigan start at \$25,500. The highest ranking positions, such as director of the state department, pays about \$120,000 (\$80,000 plus perqs).

Dr. Williamson noted that international jobs (i.e., jobs that require living abroad or extensive foreign travel) for agricultural economists are available through State Department, AID, World Bank, FAO, USIA, OICD/USDA, and UNDP. His remarks, however, focused only on AID.

AID positions are either domestic (GS or GM) or foreign service (FS). Domestic positions focus on program development in education, nutrition, and agricultural policy design. The FS program is very competitive. There is a one-year intern program in Washington before interns are sent abroad. Entry into the intern program is based on a test, grade point average, prior experience such as Peace Corps, and language skills.

While AID job opportunities are shrinking under the federal budget constraints, jobs

for agricultural economists occasionally open up. The four specialty areas sought are agricultural marketing and pricing, farm management and production economics, international trade, and natural resource and rural development.

FINAL WORDS

In summing up the conference, Dr. Hildreth outlined the keys to career advancement. (His comments included a summary by Dr. Walter Armbruster, who was unable to make the conference.) The criteria for career success for agricultural economists vary across sectors. In academia, teaching, publishing and research are rewarded. In the private sector, analyses and projections of economic trends and profit opportunities are important, while in government, policy analysis and the generation and analysis of data on commodity prospects are rewarded. The overriding key to success in all three sectors is high quality performance, viz., the ability to identify important problems, then bring appropriate analytical tools to bear, and finally to communicate the results and their implications clearly. The other keys to success are flexibility and a willingness to learn.

Budget constraints, variable economic conditions, and a greater reliance on "soft" money for projects have all changed career outlooks. These trends underscore the need to be flexible. Only the top economists will benefit from narrow specialization. The increasing internationalization of markets means that economists should get international experience early in their careers. Identify your skills, emphasize them, and observe their use both in agricultural and nonagricultural markets. For example, if your specialty is agricultural marketing, consider general marketing also.

Dr. Hildreth noted two additional points to career success. First, find a mentor. Pick a role model who optimizes a utility function similar to your own and develop that relationship. Second, he encouraged AAEA members to broaden their definition of human capital development to include communication skills. From this acorn, the CWAE-sponsored preconference on communication skills listed in the AAEA preregistration packet you recently

received and also reported on in the last CWAE newsletter has grown. **Hope to see you there!**

--submitted by Nancy E. Schwartz, ERS

At USDA, A 5-Year Plan to Fight Discrimination

(The following is summarized from an article in the April 20, 1988 edition of the Washington Post, page A19.)

The Agriculture Department, embroiled in discrimination complaints since 1981, has drawn up a five-year affirmative-action plan that calls for upgrading and increasing the number of women and minority employees. The plan, sent by Secretary Lyng last week to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), concedes a wide range of shortcomings that contribute to USDA's low standing among federal agencies. The plan proposed these approaches:

- 0 The department would accelerate the promotion of more women to more responsible positions, increase the percentage of women in the department to the government-wide average by 1992, and increase women in professional and technical positions by 1 percent annually by 1992.
- 0 The department would increase the number of training programs designed to inform department managers of their legal responsibilities and to help prepare women and minorities for promotions. In addition, recruitment efforts would also be intensified.

Although the EEOC ranked the Agriculture Department 52nd among 58 federal agencies for minority employment in 1986, Lyng said that the percentages of women and minority workers had increased since 1985 as overall departmental employment declined by about 6,500 permanent positions. During that time, he said, the number of women employees increased from 32.9 to 35 percent and the number of minority employees increased from 13 to 14.6 percent. "Nevertheless, we have farther to go to attain fully equal representation by minority employees in several professional occupations and the USDA affirmative employment plan is designed to see that we achieve that goal," he said.

How to Write a Grant (Nitty-Gritty Guidelines for the Uninitiated) *by Everywoman, Ph.D.*

Writing your own grant proposal is ominous and, like many other things in "the real world," it is often ominous because there is no one around to teach you how to do it. This is being written with thanks to several people who helped me submit my first grant proposal. It is also written for two of my younger colleagues, whom I hope will go through the process of writing their own grant proposals long before I did, and with much less pain.

You might ask why anyone would need help in submitting a grant application. After all, it's your research and if you're really original, you're the only one who really understands what the problems are. It is my thesis that such an attitude does not help you get a grant proposal written and--the 0.001 percent of us who are brilliant, aside--that attitude doesn't help you succeed in getting funded, either.

After being in an applied statistics group for five years and participating in the writing of statistics sections for several grants on which others were the principal investigators, I submitted my own grant application last autumn. While I had a number of statistical problems I wanted to solve, I had no idea how to package a proposal. Statistics is different from science: in science it is not unusual to do preliminary experiments to demonstrate your ability to work in a problem area. In statistics, once you start thinking about your problem "preliminarily," you just might solve the problem altogether. (I was amazed to learn that some people do just that, but don't admit to it in the grant proposal.)

The Psychological State of the Grant Writer

Writing a grant proposal is a little like writing a thesis, very intense, with lots of pressure. You feel preoccupied, usually with technical details, a little removed from the rest of the world. Nobody else really understands what you're thinking about and perhaps that makes you short-tempered. You curse a lot, you forget to eat, and you don't sleep very much. You keep reminding yourself that the deadline is only XX days away, and then this will be

all over, and gosh, will you be glad! How can you protect yourself from abandoning collegiality and losing all your friends at a time like this?

Help From Your Institution. We'll assume you've got a problem area you want to work in (which everyone regards as the hardest part of grant writing). The first item required is a grant application form, which comes with instructions that you should not forget to read. The application form may be obtained from the Grants' Office of your institution, if there is one, or directly from the granting agency. (Sources for support of research in economics include most major federal agencies, the National Science Foundation, and many private foundations.) A Grants' Office will be very helpful in identifying potential sources of support. In my institution, a specific individual is responsible for assisting members of my department in obtaining grant support. While his training was in science and at our initial contact he knew only a little more about how to proceed than I did, he was willing to obtain information and supplied me with brochures of general advice which were prepared by his office. To my surprise, he also asked to see my Specific Aims to make sure they were in appropriate format and comprehensible. While I did not believe he really would help me improve upon them, I complied, figuring that at that point I could benefit from anybody's help. In due course, he read my whole grant. To this day, I am not sure how much of it he understood, but he was very supportive in telling me it looked the way it should, and his spelling and grammar were sometimes better than mine.

There were other functions that the Grants' Office served. I was applying for an N.I.H. grant and I was told to apply for another grant at the same time and shown how to reorganize my proposal into the format required by the other agency "through the miracle of modern word processing." The Grants' Office at my institution took responsibility for getting appropriate signatures on the face sheets of the proposal as well as responsibility for xeroxing and collating the required number of copies and being sure the proposal would reach its destination by the deadline. My grants' adviser urged me to have my original proposal ready-to-go one day early

so I had 24 extra hours to implement the reformatting.

Another area in which I was totally inexperienced was budget writing. My grants' adviser sent me to someone in the budget office. He had an algorithm for writing budgets: What percent of my time did I want to ask for? (Multiply by salary at starting date of the grant.) Supplies? Telephones? Secretarial assistance? Travel? Overhead was a fixed percent of the total, and the budget for years two and three were 6 percent increments over the budget for year one, except for the personal computer, which would be a one-shot expense. My first conversation fixed the budget structure, but the details still needed to be ironed out. I had to find someone in my field with experience in writing budgets.

Help from Colleagues. The year I was writing my proposal, my department had a visiting investigator who was an experienced grants writer, successful at obtaining funding. This is the kind of information one obtains by having lunch with colleagues. Looking back on it, this colleague almost adopted me. Although not in my field, he read my proposal several times as it was evolving. He criticized very promptly and unabashedly and had numerous concrete suggestions. At the same time, he kept encouraging me to get the thing done. "You can do it, of course you can!" Frankly, he intimidated me slightly. I figured that if I gave up, he'd tell everyone in the department I couldn't cut the mustard. He knew how to write budgets, and with the structure supplied by the budget office and his help with details, in due course I got that part done.

Help from the Granting Agency. One of my visiting colleague's suggestions was that I call the program director at the agency to which I was applying, just to discuss things. I should call a complete stranger to discuss my grant? Why bother her? Will she want to talk to me? "Yes," he said, "she'll be very helpful, you'll see. Ask her how large your overall budget can get and what percent of your time she would consider reasonable. Ask her if there's anything else you should know." Okay, so I did it.

The program officer was unbelievable patient and supportive. Not only did she answer my direct question, she told me how to target my proposal to her special study section and to make my title quite general, so that once funded, I could apply for renewals even with shifting research interests. She told me that, in her recent experience, someone with what seemed like a good idea did not get funded because they could not relate their theoretical proposals to "real world" problems, so I should be careful on that score. She told me to call her back with a definite title and to let her know that I would, indeed, make the deadline. My two conversations with the agency's program officer left me with the feeling that sisterhood is sometimes powerful in surprising ways.

Devising Your Own Support System. Another suggestion was that I include outside consultants in my proposal. What this required was some justification and a letter from the consultant stating that he or she would collaborate. Possibly there could be a fee for the consultant in the proposed budget. I included a scientific collaborator at my home institution (without budget) to ensure that my research was relevant. In truth, I discuss many of my ideas with him anyway. This "official" collaboration resulted in one more person who would read and criticize my proposal. By the way, I drafted the letter in which he agreed to collaborate and he was relieved merely to have to sign it.

Two others read my proposal critically, my husband and my department chairman. Both happen to have a lot of experience in writing and evaluating grant proposals. Both forced me to clarify and expand my ideas. Both were supportive, though in very different ways. My husband did all the grocery shopping and cooking for a couple of weeks (and swore he'd get even this spring when he was going to write a grant proposal). My chairman didn't mind not seeing me very often, as I preferred to do my writing at home. It would have been very difficult to get the application done without their cooperation.

The support of my other colleagues was very gratifying. They seemed to be quietly saying, "go ahead, do this, we're behind you." They didn't ask me to do anything extra while I was nearing the deadline,

they were just there with their fingers crossed. I hope I can reciprocate.

Conclusions

The best advice I have to offer if you are writing a grant proposal is to open yourself up to the review of your colleagues and not to feel devastated by their criticisms. It's much better to get criticism while you can still make revisions than to wait and get it back as part of the official grant review. We each have resources that we should take advantage of when undertaking a new intellectual challenge. Wouldn't you help a colleague in a similar situation?

--reprinted from the February 1988 newsletter of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession.

Some Tips on NSF Grantspersonship *by Daniel H. Newlon, National Science Foundation*

The National Science Foundation's Economics Program will spend about \$11 million this year supporting both basic and applied research in economics. The overwhelming majority of recipients of awards from the National Science Foundation's Economics Program are white males, in part because the overwhelming majority of applicants are white males. This is true despite special programs to provide assistance to women in planning grant applications, obtaining their first award, getting research support after a career change, and visiting another university. The purpose of this article is to encourage more women economists to take advantage of these opportunities by submitting proposals to NSF.

The Economics Program's Review Process

Proposals go through the following review process. First, the proposal usually is sent to different specialist reviewers. We use bibliographies, citations, conference proceedings, and our own knowledge of the field to determine who would provide the most informed evaluations. Second, members of an advisory panel present their independent written evaluations for each proposal and then discuss the outside reviews. The panel consists of fourteen

economists, typically serving two-year terms. Third, the program staff rereads each proposal, the outside reviews, and the panel's assessment and then recommends declining or funding the proposal. The final decision is usually made one to two months after the panel meeting. If declined, the applicant receives a letter with copies of the written reviews and a summary of the panel's recommendation. If funded, the applicant usually learns of the decision informally through a telephone call to discuss budgetary needs, data archiving, or substantive matters. Eventually an official award letter arrives with copies of the reviews and a summary of the panel's discussion.

Grants for Research and Education in Science and Engineering, NSF-83-57 provides forms and a detailed description of the formal procedures for submitting a proposal. Research Opportunities for Women OMB 3145-005B describes the special research grants available to women. These pamphlets are available free from "Forms and Publications" at the National Science Foundation or from most university research offices.

Tips About Preparing Proposals

#1: Concentrate on Substance. The key to success is time spent on substance to develop research ideas that your peers will find compelling. A proposal without "beef" will not be supported, no matter how much attention is paid to NSF grant personship.

#2: A Well-Written Proposal Is Necessary. The successful NSF proposal has to be as well-elaborated as the successful paper. It has to provide enough specifics--about relevant past research, data sources, the theoretical model, and statistical techniques--so that reviewers can evaluate the likely content of the research. You also have to have research plans; funds will not be provided for completed research.

#3: Call (don't write) the Economics Program Staff if You Have Any Questions. The Economics Panel staff prides itself on its accessibility, but it is easier and quicker to answer a telephone call or electronic mail than to write a reply to a letter.

Also, give us several weeks after the panel meets to make up our minds before asking for some preliminary news about your proposal. The staff consists of me; Lynn Pollnow, the co-director of the Economics program; Jim Slauch, the Assistant Economics Program Director and Datiya Gunter, the Economics Program secretary. We can all be reached at 202/357-9674 or by electronic mail at dnewlon@note.nsf.gov (INTERNET) or dnewlon@NSF (BITNET).

#4 Participate in the Review Process.

Reviewing proposals is a good way to learn how to write them. Send us your vita or a note with a brief description of your research interests, and we'll add you to our database of reviewers. We'd also appreciate your help in improving the participation of women economists in the peer review process--please send us names and addresses of other potential reviewers, applicants, or members of the advisory panel. The roster of past and present panel members includes Beth Allen, Ann Friedlaender, Claudia Goldin, Anne Krueger, Marjorie McElroy, Nancy Stokey, and Janet Yellin.

#5 Submit Your Proposal for the Fall Cycle.

There are two target dates for submitting proposals to NSF--August 15 and January 15. Historically, only one-third of the proposals are submitted by August 15 for the "Fall cycle," but these applicants have two chances of obtaining NSF support for the following summer, not just one, because they can resubmit if declined. In addition, the "Spring cycle" is not over for some proposals until late June or early July, making it difficult to plan for a project that starts July 1.

#6 Take Advantage of Research Opportunities for Women (ROW).

In the early 1980's, the ROW programs were primarily symbolic because there was little money for special initiatives, but in the last two years, significant amounts of funds were set aside for them.

--reprinted from the February 1988 newsletter of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession.

Self-Confidence and Success

(The following is summarized from "Women and Their Power Base," an article in the May 10, 1988 edition of the Washington Post, page E5).

Cristina Goggio Banks, director of undergraduate programs in the School of Business Administration at the University of California, Berkeley, speaks frequently on her findings from a study of 100 top women leaders in Texas. According to Banks, self-confidence is the No. 1 attribute women leaders say underlie their success. It enables them to:

- 0 Establish credibility in a new position by effectively enlisting the support and respect of others.
- 0 Argue an unpopular opinion by knowing when and how to stage the battle and when to align with the ranks to maintain a degree of trust.
- 0 Resolve a conflict through negotiation.
- 0 Enlist the cooperation of peers, clients, and bosses by putting an argument in terms other people can understand and agreeing on goals before solutions.
- 0 Allow a person who launches a personal attack against you to save face--so you gain trust and credibility--by using humor, acknowledgement, or deflection ("We can all get in a mud-slinging fight because we care so much about this matter, but it's probably not in our best interests so let's get back to the point").

Banks says that self-confidence enables leaders to aggressively seize opportunities and "to do everything else that you need to do to be a leader."

News of Members

Susan Offutt has accepted a position as a Budget Examiner in the Agricultural Branch, Natural Resources Division, Office of

Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President.

Amy Sparks has accepted a position as Agricultural Economist with the Fruits, Vegetable, Sweeteners, and Tobacco Branch, CED, ERS. Amy will be analyzing the impact of the U.S.-Canadian Free Trade Act on fresh vegetable production and markets.

Mary Ahearn has accepted a position as Section Leader, Farm Costs and Returns Section, Farm Sector Financial Analysis Branch, ARED, ERS. This section is responsible for cost of production analysis, farm financial and policy analysis, and economies of size work.

Maureen Kilkenny has accepted a position as Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, the Pennsylvania State University. In addition to her teaching responsibilities, Maureen will be continuing her work analyzing trade issues using computable general equilibrium models.

Congratulations to Sandra Batie and Margo Rich Ogus who were selected as candidates on the AAEA ballot this year.

Newsnotes

The CWAE Research Subcommittee has compiled the results of the survey of research interests which was mailed to CWAE members last spring and fall. There were approximately 110 respondents. Information listed includes: name, address, present position, degrees and dates, research specializations, current research, and selected publications. In addition, those listed are categorized by specialty groupings. The listing will be distributed to Agricultural Economics Department Chairs and Heads, journal editors (where the journal is widely used by agricultural economists), and appropriate individuals in government agencies. Distribution should be completed by the summer meetings.

The Association for Women in Science Educational Foundation awards grants to women in Ph.D. programs, including social science programs. Four awards of \$500 each and a number of honorable mentions of \$100 each are given. Applications are available

from the AWSEF, 2401 Virginia Ave., NW, Suite 303, Washington, DC 20037.

The American Association of University Women Educational Foundation awards fellowships for those who intend to pursue a professional career in the U.S. and are U.S. citizens or hold permanent resident status. Fellowships are for dissertation and for postdoctoral research. Applications are available from AAUWEF, 2401 Virginia Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20037.

More information on the above announcements for financial aid and many others are available in "Financial Aid: A Partial List of Resources for Women", Project on the Status and Education of Women, 1818 R St., NW, Washington, DC 20009, for \$3.50.

New CWAE Board Members

Congratulations to the new CWAE Board Members for 1988-90. Eileen van Ravenswaay was elected Vice-Chair and Joyce Allen and Vicki McCracken were elected as members at large. Helen Jensen will begin serving her term as CWAE Chair at the annual meetings.

Jobs

University of Puerto Rico. Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology. Assistant professor. Tenure track. The Department is seeking a candidate to expand teaching, research, and departmental expertise in agricultural economics. A Ph.D in Agricultural Economics, Economics, or closely related field is required by date of appointment. Good written and oral communications skills both in Spanish and English are required, as is experience with computers. Interested individuals should submit: a detailed resume; undergraduate and graduate official transcripts; three letters of recommendation; and a letter detailing principal teaching and research areas, qualifications, and interests. For further information, contact: Dr. Gladys M. Gonzales, Chairperson, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, College of Agricultural Sciences, Mayaguez Campus, Mayaguez, Puerto Rico 00708.

Office of Management and Budget. Commerce and Lands Branch of the Office of

Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA). Desk Officer. OIRA is responsible for reforming the Federal regulatory structure, reducing the burden of Federal regulations, and developing policy for the use of information within the Federal government. The successful candidate will review regulation and information collections from agencies within the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and (perhaps) Justice. Candidate should have a strong background in economics and regulation, and a strong interest in government and policy. Knowledge of farm finance or food stamp programs helpful. For further information, contact Lisa Grove, Desk Officer, Commerce and Lands Branch, (202) 395-7340. Closing date is May 2, 1988, or until position is filled. Salary: \$22,907 - \$33,218.

Oregon State University. Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics. Extension Agricultural Marketing Specialist at the rank of Assistant/Associate Professor. The successful candidate is expected to develop and conduct Extension programs in agricultural marketing. About two-thirds of the individual's time will be devoted to Extension in marketing, management, international trade, and policy relating to the major field crops produced in Oregon. The remaining time will be spent coordinating the joint OSU-USDA Market News Project. Applicants must have a Ph.D. in agricultural economics or closely related field. Formal experience or coursework in agricultural marketing is necessary. Candidate must be familiar with data collection, database management, and computer programming. For more information contact: Dr. A. Gene Nelson, Head, Agricultural and Resource Economics, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331-3601.

University of Florida. Agricultural Extension Agent. Broward County. The successful candidate will work with two other horticulture agents to develop an educational program addressing turfgrass production and turfgrass service issues, and develop programs for landscape management professionals. The individual may be assigned other responsibilities supporting the Extension program. Applicant must have a Bachelor's Degree (Master's Degree is preferred). Familiarity with computers desirable. For more information, contact: Dr. R.C.

Andrew, Director, Personnel Affairs, IFAS. G027 McCarty Hall, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611. Applications must be received no later than ten (10) calendar days past June 10. (Other Florida extension positions may also be available).

University of Florida, Citrus Research and Education Center. Assistant or Associate in Food Science. Non-tenure track. The successful candidate will cooperate as a team member conducting research on fruit juice beverages. This person will work with the hydrocolloids, polymers, emulsions, and stabilizers used in beverages, and collaborate with other investigators in developing research goals. The applicant must have a Master's or Ph.D. in Food Science or closely related field. Preference will be given to candidates with research experience and analytical knowledge relating to fruit juices or beverage ingredients and a strong publication record. Applicants should furnish vita, copies of any publications, copies of transcripts and a list of three references. Return inquiries to: Dr. Phillip G. Crandall, University of Florida, Citrus Research and Education Center, 700 Experiment Station Road, Lake Alfred, FL 33850.

New Mexico State University. Extension Associate. County Development Coordinator. Non-faculty, non-tenure track. Successful candidate will be responsible for providing extension leadership and guidance in livestock production and marketing, Christmas tree farming, and the marketing of Christmas products. Bachelor's degree in agriculture or related field is required. Successful candidate must reside in Mora County, NM. Closing date is May 20, 1988. Reply to: Robert F. Howell, Personnel Office, New Mexico State University, Box 5273, Las Cruces, NM 88003. Telephone: (505) 646-2805. Salary: \$18,000 per year.

University of Missouri at Columbia. Department of Agricultural Economics. Department Chair. The department chair is responsible for administering and promoting the teaching, research, extension, and international programs of the department and reports directly to the dean of the College of Agriculture. Candidates should possess a Ph.D. in agricultural economics or closely related field. Candidate should have an outstanding professional record; demonstrated leadership and administrative

ability; a perspective which takes into account the department's state, national, and international dimensions; and an understanding of the teaching, research, and extension functions of a land grant university. Applications should include: a complete resume (including list of publications and accomplishments) and the names and addresses of five references. Send applications to: Jon A. Brandt, Chair, Search Committee, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Missouri-Columbia, 200 Mumford Hall, Columbia MO 65211. Applications will be received through September 1, 1988 or until the position is filled. Salary will be commensurate with experience and qualifications.

University of Florida, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS). Vice President. The vice president is the administrative head of the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences which encompasses five major units: the College of Agriculture, the Agricultural Experiment Station, the Cooperative Extension Service, the School of Forest Resources and Conservation, and elements of the College of Veterinary Medicine. Candidate must have Ph.D. in an appropriate area of specialization with at least ten years experience. Candidate should have a strong record of achievement with demonstrated competence as an administrator and effective leader; the ability to work effectively within the framework of a large university; and a strong commitment to excellence in instruction and in basic and applied research. Applications should include a current resume and names of at least three references. Applications should be submitted no later than August 1, 1988 to: Dr. E.T. York, Jr., Chairman, Vice President Search Committee, Building 106, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611.

Iowa State University. Assistant Professor of Economics. Two 12-month, tenure track positions in agricultural trade and international marketing, 85% research, 15% teaching. One position involves conducting a research program in agricultural trade, tariff and non-tariff trade barriers, and trade negotiations, for the Center for Agricultural and Rural Development--the other involves research relating to international marketing of livestock and

meat, analyses of trade opportunities, and alternative marketing strategies for the Meat Export Research Center and the International Trade Development Center. Opportunities exist for teaching in agricultural trade, marketing, policy, and/or price analysis. Ph.D. in Econ., Ag. Econ., or related field with emphasis on econ. is required. Familiarity with international trade theory and marketing, or international marketing of livestock and meat are preferred, respectively, for the two positions. Application deadline is August 15, 1988. Provide an up-to-date vita and transcripts, and have 3 references send letters to: Marvin Hayenga, Dept. of Econ. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

Iowa State University. Assistant Professor of Economics. 12-month, tenure track position. Responsibilities involve conducting an effective extension and applied research program integrating farm management, marketing, finance, and production economics. Assist in planning, coordinating, and implementing extension education programs. Initiate and conduct applied research complementing extension programming. Ph.D. in Econ. or Ag. Econ. is required along with familiarity with U.S. agriculture, and background in farm management and marketing. Application deadline is July 15, 1988. Send vita and graduate transcripts, and have three references send letters to: Marvin L. Hayenga, Dept. of Economics, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering

The National Science Foundation issued a fact and information report in January 1988, titled "Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering." Women and members of minority groups have had historically low rates of participation in science and engineering. This report highlights academic degrees, employment, and salary differences from 1975/76 through 1985/86.

The number of employed economists doubled from 1976 to 1984 and grew an additional 30 percent in 1986 (table 1). Women continue to constitute a smaller ratio of the science and engineering work force than they do of either total U.S. employment (44 percent)

or total employment in professional occupations (49 percent). Women were only 13 percent of the total number of employed economists in 1976, increasing their percentage slightly to 19 percent in 1986. Minorities lost ground during this ten year period, from 13 percent in 1976 to only 9 percent of all employed economists in 1986.

Women economists employed with doctoral degrees remained a small percentage, only 9 percent of the total employed in 1983 and 1985 (table 2). Women, blacks, and Hispanics remained underrepresented in all science and engineering employment fields in 1986 based on their representation in the overall work force. Asians represented the largest share of all minorities employed as doctorate economists, with 1,500 employed in 1986.

The percentage of women as degree recipients increased at all levels from 1975 to 1985 (table 3). Women received 17 percent of the total bachelor's degrees in economics in 1975, increasing to 34 percent in 1985. The number of men receiving master's and doctorate degrees declined from 1975 to 1985, while women recipients increased slightly. Because of this, women increased their percentage of the total degrees received to 24 percent of all master's degrees and 16 percent of all doctorate degrees in economics in 1985.

The salary information listed in this report was for all social scientists, of which economists were only 28 percent (table 4). All social scientists earned an average salary of \$31,000 in 1986. Asian and native Americans earned higher average salaries than white social scientists. Looking at the salary differentials between men and women, men generally earned an average of \$10,000 more in 1986.

The data in this report suggest less favorable job market conditions encountered by women and minorities who have earned science and engineering degrees. Given the facts and information presented in this report, the National Science Foundation is concerned with the overall vitality of U.S. science and engineering and the furtherance of equal opportunities and equal treatment for women and minorities in these fields.

--submitted by Annette Clauson, ERS

Table 1--Number of employed economists by year

	1976	1984	1986
Total	62,500	125,600	163,600
Men	54,500	106,900	131,700
Women	8,000	18,700	31,900
White	54,500	113,000	149,000
Black	800	4,400	5,200
Asian	6,700	5,600	6,100
Native American	NA	700	1,000
Hispanic	NA	2,500	3,400

NA: Not available.

Numbers may not add to total due to rounding.

Table 2--Number of employed doctoral economists by year

	1975	1983	1985
Total	11,800	17,000	17,900
Men	11,200	15,500	16,200
Women	600	1,500	1,700
White	10,800	15,100	15,800
Black	100	300	300
Asian	500	1,300	1,500
Native American	NA	100	100
Hispanic	100	300	400

NA: Not available.

Numbers may not add to total due to rounding.

Table 3--Number of degree recipients in economics by year

	1975	1983	1985
Total Bachelor's	14,118	20,556	20,769
Men	11,679	13,718	13,606
Women	2,439	6,838	7,163
Total Master's	2,133	1,975	1,994
Men	1,808	1,506	1,509
Women	325	469	485
Total Doctorate's	868	792	786
Men	784	663	664
Women	84	129	122

Table 4--Average 1986 annual salary for all social scientists

	All	Men	Women
Total	\$31,800	\$34,700	\$25,000
White	\$32,200	\$35,100	\$25,200
Black	\$22,800	\$23,800	\$21,400
Asian	\$38,700	\$41,900	\$31,700
Native American	\$34,300	\$39,100	\$21,500
Hispanic	\$25,600	\$28,500	\$18,700

Remember to Sign Up for the Communications Skills Conference in Knoxville (see AAEA registration packet for details)

Remember to sign up early for the communications skills conference to be held on July 31st at the Knoxville Hilton in conjunction with the AAEA annual meeting. Communications skills are critical to our profession and to professional advancement. Dan Padberg, President of the AAEA, wrote the following about the program:

"The quality of the 'Build Communication Skills' preconference workshop is impressive. You have chosen an important subject and brought together an exciting group of resource persons...The list of topics and speakers is really first class...This workshop offers a unique opportunity for our members to improve their communication skills and to share that experience with others at their home institution...Clearly this program will be a powerful benefit to professionals of all age groups."

Departments and agencies can extend the benefits of the program by asking participants to present synopses upon their return--giving participants an opportunity to share what they learned with others. Participants will be able to attend only two of the afternoon sessions. Therefore, the greater the attendance from your department or agency, the more information to be shared after the meetings. And by staying in Knoxville on Saturday night, most participants will benefit from reduced air fares that will cover the registration and hotel costs.

CWAE Newsletter

June 1988

Editors:

Mary Ahearn and Joy Harwood

CWAE Subcommittee Appointments

Much of the work that CWAE accomplishes during the year comes from the work of subcommittees. These include nominations, finance, membership, newsletter, employment, graduate students, and planning, among others. If you are interested in becoming involved in CWAE activities by working on a subcommittee, please contact Helen Jensen, Dept. of Economics, 578 Heady Hall, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011.

The Committee on Women in Agricultural Economics is a committee of the American Agricultural Economics Association. The current Chairperson of CWAE is Edna Loehman, Dept. of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University, W. Lafayette, IN 47906, (312) 494-4303.

The CWAE Newsletter is published quarterly and distributed free to AAEEA members who wish to join CWAE. CWAE membership requests and address changes should be addressed to the AAEEA Business Office, 80 Heady Hall, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011, (515) 294-8703. Contributions of news, announcements, and job vacancies for the newsletter should be sent to Mary Ahearn, USDA-ERS, 1301 New York Ave., NW, rm. 940, Washington, D.C. 20005-4788, (202) 786-1807 or Joy Harwood, USDA-ERS, 1301 New York Ave., NW, rm. 1034, Washington, D.C. 20005-4788, (202) 786-1840.

AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION
BUSINESS OFFICE, 80 HEADY HALL
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY, AMES, IA 50011-1070

Non-Profit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Permit No. 187 Ames, IA 50011
--

Moving? Please send your new address plus the above label to the Business Office, address above left.