



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.*

12

CWAE

NEWSLETTER OF THE COMMITTEE ON WOMEN IN AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

FALL ISSUE 1989

IN THIS ISSUE:

Chairperson's Report.....	2
A Perspective on Women's Progress.....	2
Prairie Retreat for Women in Kansas.....	3
Roles of the Economist in the Policy Process.....	3
Working at a Futures Exchange.....	6
Views on Barriers to Equality.....	7
Women in Agriculture Conference.....	7
Profile of Women in Colleges of Agriculture.....	8
Newsnotes.....	9
News of Women in Agricultural Economics.....	10
CWAE Board Members and Subcommittees.....	11
Job Announcements.....	12
<u>Questionnaire</u> on Career Development Workshops.....	14

WAITE MEMORIAL BOOK COLLECTION
DEPT. OF AG. AND APPLIED ECONOMICS
1994 BUFORD AVE. - 232 COB
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
ST. PAUL, MN 55108 U.S.A.

Remember Your Subscription Notice.....15

Eileen van Ravenswaay
CWAE Chairperson
Dept. of Agricultural Economics
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824
(517) 353-8628

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

*Eileen van Ravenswaay
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan*

One of the benefits of being the Chairperson of CWAE is the opportunity to witness the contribution of women to each other's advancement and our profession. That contribution is evident in the work of last year's Chair, Helen Jensen, and by the chairs and members of the subcommittees. Thanks to all of you.

In recruiting new people for those important subcommittee posts, I have been impressed with what a bright and dedicated group our women are. Lots of good ideas for next year's AAEA annual meeting and future CWAE activities are developing. A list of the people carrying them out is on pages 11-12.

Many of the ideas for this year's activities came from the answers given to the questionnaire distributed during the CWAE luncheon at the AAEA annual meeting. The feedback was so useful that the planning subcommittee is distributing a follow-up questionnaire with this issue of the Newsletter (see p. 14). I urge you to complete it. We need your ideas. They will make a difference to our future.

Another good idea was a proposal submitted to the CWAE Board by Maureen Kilkenny (Pennsylvania State) exploring the possibility of establishing some type of scholarship fund for women. The Board decided to establish a scholarship subcommittee to develop a formal proposal. We hope that a draft proposal will be available for discussion at the CWAE luncheon at next year's annual AAEA meeting.

There are other new projects as well. Our professional activities subcommittee is exploring the possibility of another career workshop for the Vancouver meetings (another reason to fill out the questionnaire!). Our research subcommittee is looking at ideas for a research symposium. The employment and graduate student subcommittees are seeking new ways for improving employment opportunities and increased involvement of women graduate students in AAEA. The archives subcommittee has gathered the materials of all the past CWAE chairs and will organize them this year.

While our finance, membership, and elections subcommittees make sure that the nuts and bolts of CWAE are in place, our newsletter subcommittee provides a way of communicating with one another. We are very fortunate that Joy Harwood has volunteered to be editor of the CWAE Newsletter for the third year in a row. Joy is always on the look out for contributors, announcements, news, and reprints. Remember to call her when you are looking for someone to share good news or items of interest to women in our profession.

The development of the CWAE Newsletter, as well as many other CWAE activities, has been possible because of seed money provided by the Economic Research Service and the Farm Foundation. Now that the Newsletter has sprouted and grown, it is time to find out whether it can support itself. Consequently, this issue of the Newsletter has been mailed to all members of AAEA, along with a subscription notice (see p. 15). I hope you find the activities, ideas, and news of CWAE and its Newsletter as positive, stimulating, and useful as I do.

A Perspective on Women's Progress

*Sandra Batie
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, Virginia*

I was delighted when the editor of CWAE, Joy Harwood, asked me to prepare a CWAE Newsletter item. I have always taken pride in my association with CWAE. CWAE has been successful in addressing a diversity of views within the Association, it has provided leadership in career workshops, and, most importantly, it has elevated the status of women in the Association and profession.

All this success has come in less than a decade. CWAE had its first business meeting at the Clemson AAEA Summer meetings in 1981. Approximately 40 women attended that first meeting, some against the advice of well-meaning colleagues or major professors who feared attendance could result in a pejorative label of "radical feminist troublemaker." Much to the credit of our Association members, such fears proved groundless; CWAE has been exceptionally constructive to the Association on many issues of concern to men and women. CWAE has grown steadily to its present membership of over 400.

There are, of course, a diversity of opinions within CWAE--stretching from those who desire a more active role with respect to matters of gender and racial discrimination to those who favor concentrating solely on career development. All, however, believe in the fundamental mission of CWAE, which is to promote the welfare of women agricultural economists by representing their interests within the Association and by engaging in activities that will encourage the professional advancement of women agricultural economists. Like all organizations, strength has come from compromise.

Women's progress during the decade of the eighties is most heartening. It is possible for women to fill extension or farm management positions, to be department heads, and even to be AAEA Presidents. The salary gap between men and women professionals appears to be narrowing. More women are rising to senior positions in academic institutions, government, and industry. It is even possible for a woman to fail on her own merits without having indictments of inferiority leveled at all women professionals.

Nevertheless, the job of CWAE is not yet finished, and it should not yet disband as having fulfilled its goals. Women in academic positions tend to be clustered in a few schools and far too many departments of agricultural economics have no women at all. In government and industry, women still tend to be concentrated in junior positions of less influence and less pay. And, unforgivably, some women in our profession are still ignored in public sessions or are subjected to sexual harassment, unwelcome advances, or inappropriate humor or comments that are tolerated or condoned by colleagues. There are also issues that transcend the profession--dual careers, raising children while advancing in one's career, and maternity leave--all of which need the attention of professionals everywhere. However, from the progress of the last decade, CWAE members and their supporters (who are numerous within the profession) have reason to be most optimistic.

Prairie Retreat for Women in Kansas

(Editor's Note: The following paragraphs are summarized from an article entitled, "Flint Hills Ranch is Prairie Retreat for Women Guests," which appeared in the September 17, 1989 issue of the Salina Journal. Margaret Jagger of Minneapolis, Kansas brought the article to the attention of the CWAE Newsletter.)

Jane Koger, a well-known rancher in Chase County, Kansas, has been establishing a prairie retreat for women in the Flint Hills. Koger bought the 6,000 acre ranch near Matfield Green several years ago for its grasslands and buildings that she needed for her cattle operation. Although she needed only one house, another one came with the deal.

That "other house" provides lodging for visitors to Prairie Women retreat. Women from all over the country visit the retreat to "get away." Although it is not required, visitors usually choose to be part of the ranch's working crew, which is composed almost exclusively of women. Experienced women ranch hands instruct visitors on the proper use of farm equipment and on handling cattle. Visitors help round up, work, feed and treat cattle, bale hay, tend the garden, feed chickens, and gather eggs.

All of the time at the ranch is not devoted to work. Visitors can spend the weekends reading, painting, fishing, or hiking.

Although Koger is not opposed to men working on the ranch, she finds that the work is calmer and cooperation is better among women-only crews. According to Koger, "If you work cattle with men and women together, the men take over. There is no hierarchy (with women-only crews)."

Koger initiated Prairie Women in 1986. She started the ranch in part because of one woman's question about hormones in cattle feed, which made her realize the need to

educate the public about beef production. She also wanted to give women an opportunity to enjoy the peacefulness of the Flint Hills and to gain experience at tasks normally done by men.

Roles of the Economist in the Policy Process

*Katherine Reichelderfer
Economic Research Service
Washington, D.C.*

(Editor's Note: The following article is adapted from the author's speech of the same title, presented at the CWAE Luncheon, held on July 31, 1989, in Baton Rouge.)

The agricultural economics profession appears to place high value on the policy relevance of its work. And, indeed, many individuals and groups of agricultural economists have conducted and published policy-related studies which, by our own professional criteria, can be called outstanding work. But I am willing to bet that fewer than 1-percent of the membership of the American Agricultural Economics Association have had any significant influence on Federal policy; maybe only twice that number of members have had a significant impact on policy decisions at any level.

This article explores the roles that economists can play in the policy process, with special emphasis on some of the problems we face, or that we create, as we attempt to participate in that process.

Political Decision Making and the Economist

Public choice theory and a lot of empirical evidence suggest that policy decisions by elected officials are motivated by a political preference function that places high weights on getting reelected or being qualified for higher office. Thus, political decision makers attempt to maximize votes by: (1) maximizing benefits to their own constituents; and (2) meeting the rent-seeking or broader desires of supportive interest groups (who may not represent constituents but can help pay for reelection), without: (1) decreasing the net wealth position of their political peers' constituents; or (2) creating strong opposition from other interest groups. They are further constrained by budget considerations.

Public or private sector economists can aim their policy analysis directly to the decision maker. But one has to ask: How does our standard analytical approach fit into the vote maximizing framework? The process just described attaches little relevance to comprehensive economic efficiency, the concept that we agricultural economists most often employ to measure the relative desirability of policy options. The political process is much more concerned with income redistributive effects of policy action. As history should make patently clear, policies that distort com-

petitive equilibria are politically preferred to economically efficient solutions if they reallocate income, wealth or utility to supportive interest groups. Furthermore, it has only been since the advent of the budget deficit crisis that cost-effectiveness, another of our own, personal, agricultural economic targets, has had much political relevance.

If the process is as described, and our standard welfare analytics and benefit-cost criteria fit so poorly into it, what, exactly, do we have to offer? Our advantage, from the perspective of policy decision makers, is that we are specialists who can provide useful input to (not necessarily the primary basis for) the complicated political calculus they use to make decisions. Specifically, our expertise in identifying who gains, who loses, and by how much from alternative policies is obviously important. However, we can only capitalize on that skill if we recognize that the political decision maker is most interested in how particular groups of geographically, culturally, or structurally defined and specially organized supporters and opposers gain or lose, and are aware that the decision maker likely places different weights on the importance of change in different groups' welfare. Furthermore, our indoctrination in the task of allocating scarce funds among competing means ought to have some bearing on how to allocate scarce votes among competing objectives.

Of course, rather than affecting the decision maker directly, economists often influence policy by helping interest groups articulate their position or by providing information of analytical results that purposefully or incidentally lend economic arguments that support interest group pressure.

In either case, we can end up in a confusing juxtaposition between our profession and the policy process. We see ourselves as value-free social scientists who use economic criteria to judge among policy options, and we let the politician spell out the values. However, if we don't understand and appreciate the ideological repercussions and political context of our work, we are likely to be totally irrelevant.

Too often, we are irrelevant. Much of our policy analytical work seems to have been prepared solely for our own enjoyment. Our focus is narrow. Our assumptions, while convenient for making an empirical point, can be obviously unrealistic. And, our results appear in scholarly journals where they are inaccessible if not incomprehensible to the political decision maker.

The truly policy-relevant analyst has a much, much harder job than the strict disciplinarian. She or he must: (1) be aware of and understand the motivations of political decision makers; (2) use broadly acceptable assumptions to underlie analyses; (3) translate findings into lay language (which is quite a bit more difficult than writing for one's peers); and (4) have perfect timing. (A relevant analysis offered after a vote has been taken is useless.) On top of all this, the policy relevant analyst must be as rigorous and as precise as his or her more narrowly focused peers. It is thus twice the job.

Bureaucratic Decision Making and the Economist

The job is no easier from within the government than from outside, although the opportunities to be relevant are more numerous within the bureaucratic decision making process. Once legislative decisions have been made, much of the impact of policies is actually determined via decisions about how they will be implemented. Bureaucratic decision makers often are economists or other technical experts. But their decisions, too, are heavily influenced by factors that do not fit easily into our economic theories and models.

For example, the Secretary of Agriculture must consider whether his decisions reflect the Administration's policies and philosophy and how his decisions will affect the discretion and appropriations granted to USDA by Congress, while at the same time being directly lobbied by special interest groups. Economists can and do play important roles at each node in this bureaucratic decision tree. At the present time, the Secretary of Agriculture is, himself, an agricultural economist. His immediate economic advisors and the many economists who work for USDA can directly provide information and analyses with potential utility to his decision making process. Economists working out of the Office of the President, such as those on the Council of Economic Advisors or with the Office of Management and Budget, have direct access and a mandate to involve themselves in Departmental policy decision making. And, output from the work of economists can influence the nature and persuasiveness of interest group and Congressional input to bureaucratic decision making.

It is no less important to be timely, concise, precise, clear, and relevant in providing economic input for bureaucratic than for political decision making. Whether or not the bureaucratic decision maker appreciates economic arguments, the relevance of economic analysis will be strongly dictated by the political context within which decisions must be made.

What's an Economist to Do?

There is a range of activities in which we might see ourselves making positive contributions to the policy decision making process. In reality, some activities are more useful than others, and there may not be a perfect fit between those which are most useful to decision makers and those for which we get the greatest professional rewards at present. Let's review some of the activities economists provide for legislators, peers, and others.

Providing information. Information has tremendous value and power in and of itself. Our descriptions and economic explanations of past and current phenomena, whether relying on sound, theoretically-based logic or empirical analysis, are among the most useful products we have to offer. If we are successful in making those explanations wholly transparent, they can alter the way that decision makers assess the political or bureaucratic gains and losses from a particular policy action. Likewise, our

forecasts of economic conditions and the assumptions underlying our analyses are critical in that they can alter policy decision makers' perceptions of the world.

The possibility that economic information can change the way that things are viewed carries with it a great deal of responsibility. An unrealistic assumption that underlies an analysis, or a faulty forecast that is accepted, can have multiplier effects if policy decisions are made on its basis. This suggests that our work may be of particular value if we conduct parametric analysis which clearly illustrates the economic tradeoffs involved under various conditions or assumptions.

Design of policies. Designing policies is what many agricultural economists may believe they have been trained to do. But, in fact, we cannot design policies if we focus on economic criteria to the exclusion of ideology and political sociology. To do so invites frustration and confirms our irrelevance. On the other hand, directly incorporating the political calculus takes us out of the realm of standard economics, into areas where we are likely not well trained.

Ex-ante evaluation of policy options has great potential utility and impact, but to be relevant, such evaluation needs to be conducted with respect to relevant groups of policy gainers and losers. Our tendency to lump affected groups into highly aggregated categories, like "consumers" and "producers," while often dictated by data availability, ignores the focus of policy decision makers. We are much more likely to provide useful *ex-ante* information if our analyses employ a high degree of regional disaggregation and/or we disaggregate by type of group (eg: large farmers; specific commodity groups; low income consumers, etc.)

Optimization. Another area in which we receive a lot of training is optimization techniques. As long as we know a decision maker's objective function, we are pretty good at selecting optima. The problem with policy optimization is that it is highly unlikely we will know the nature or attributes of policy decision makers' objective functions. There is a high political cost to clear revelation of political preferences because, by necessity, some groups' welfare is weighted lower than others. Yet, without a clearly articulated objective function, including relative priorities among multiple policy objectives, the task of optimization is impossible. This may explain why so many of our attempts to "optimize" the use of policy instruments appear to fall on deaf ears.

Legitimation. It is with horror that many economists, seeing themselves as objective social scientists, view the task of providing economic justification for a policy decision already made. But to exclude the task of legitimation from the list of economic activities would be to ignore an activity that does have value to some policy decision makers. And, in fact, there are some agricultural economists who make a very good living by specializing in the task.

Ex-post evaluation of past policy decisions is something of which we probably do too little. Due to the need to decompose policy-related from unrelated factors affecting policy performance, it is a difficult task. However, it can be of great use to decision makers seeking a legitimate basis for extending successful programs or eliminating programs that have outlived their usefulness.

Keys to Successful Policy Relevance

In performing any of these tasks for any participant in the policy process, our value derives primarily from our expertise in agricultural economic theory, concepts, and methodology. Without special training in these areas, we have no unique contribution to make in understanding the systems affected and phenomena arising from policy decisions. While specialized training and rigorous analytical skills are necessary, they are not sufficient in and of themselves to produce policy relevant products.

Producing analysis with true utility for policy decision makers requires that the analyst thoroughly understand the complex policy environment, its history, folklore, and conventional wisdom, as well as its actors, their motivations, and biases. This does not mean that we should accept the conventional wisdom or adopt the biases. It is just that it is only with this investment in gaining awareness that our analysis can be focused appropriately and its results communicated effectively to the relevant audience.

When read from a textbook or heard in the classroom, descriptions of the policy process are wholly logical. However, when faced in the real world as a professional economist, the process can be discouraging. A common reaction by many agricultural economists facing the reality of political decision making seems to be cynicism. We are dismayed when our technical advice is ignored and may find it easy to claim government failure and the ignorance of decision makers as the basis for our failure. This conclusion not only may be totally false, but is also counterproductive. If we want to sustain the relevance of the agricultural economics profession, it would seem more important for us to strive to understand the policy process than to criticize it because it doesn't fit our preconceived notions about how government ought to work.

Further Reading

Few of the ideas extended in this article are original. Although not prevalent in the agricultural economics literature, issues of interaction between economic expertise and the political process are ably explored elsewhere. The following short list of selected readings provides detail on the conceptualization, conduct, and presentation of useful policy contributions by economists.

Aaron, Henry J. 1989. "Politics and the Professors Revisited," *Amer. Econ. Review*, vol. 79, no. 2 (May), pp.1-15.

Benveniste, Guy. 1977. The Politics of Expertise (second edition). San Francisco: Boyd and Fraser Publ. Co.

Leman, Christopher K., and Robert H. Nelson. 1984. "Ten Commandments for Policy Economists," J. Policy Analysis and Mgmt., vol. 3, pp. 97-117.

Verdier, James M. 1984. "Advising Congressional Decision Makers: Guidelines for Economists," J. Policy Analysis and Mgmt., vol. 3, pp. 421-438.

Wildavsky, Aaron. 1979. Speaking Truth to Power: The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis. Boston/Toronto: Little, Brown and Co.

Working at a Futures Exchange

*Kandice H. Kahl
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina*

The Chicago Board of Trade offers a dynamic environment for economists. Priority issues are constantly changing in response to changing market and regulatory conditions. As a result, projects are often short-term and varied. Some people enjoy the variety and the satisfaction of seeing their research being used relatively quickly by decisionmakers. Others dislike the uneasiness that comes from making hurried recommendations based on limited analysis.

I worked in the Economic Analysis and Planning Department of the Chicago Board of Trade (CBT) for four years. The economic analyses done in this department are used in the development of new futures contracts, in the continual review and updating of existing futures contracts, in lobbying efforts, and in general planning and decision making. The department is composed of 20 to 25 professionals, with about one-third having PhD's in economics (or agricultural economics) and the remainder generally having MBA's or master's degrees in economics. Most of the professionals are young and are hired as staff economists immediately after completing their degrees. The turnover among professional staff at the CBT has been high historically. Often, young professionals view these staff positions as stepping stones to floor trading or other work with member firms.

Many of the issues analyzed by CBT economists are topical issues of the day. For example, my first assignment at the CBT concerned the grain embargo of 1980. Futures trading in the grains and oilseeds had been suspended by the government in response to the announcement of the

embargo. As a result, I was asked to provide economic arguments protesting the suspension of futures trading to the government regulatory agency (the Commodity Futures Trading Commission).

During my tenure at the CBT, the exchange testified at several Congressional hearings concerning the 1979-80 price movement in silver futures (when the Hunt brothers were involved). As a member of the team preparing the testimony, I devoted several months to the analysis of silver futures prices and the resulting actions taken by the CBT.

Other issues analyzed by CBT economists are issues that will be newsworthy in the future. For example, stock index futures contracts and options on agricultural futures contracts were contemplated by economists for an extended period of time before being introduced for trading. Similarly, evening trading hours and other ways to encourage international trading were discussed long before actions were taken.

The Chicago Board of Trade, like other futures exchanges, is a small organization with few layers of management. As a result, economists have considerable interaction with people having different educational backgrounds and responsibilities. Economists focusing on lobbying efforts work closely with lobbyists and attorneys. Those focusing on new contract development work closely with exchange members, government personnel, and staff from other CBT departments such as marketing, education, and public relations. Economists are often asked to make presentations or meet with commodity groups, foreign delegations, or other visitors to the exchange. An ability to communicate the results of economic analyses to lay audiences is essential.

The Chicago Board of Trade does not particularly encourage or reward academic research. Thus, someone interested in pursuing an academic position later must devote extra time to publishing journal articles. Nevertheless, a stint at a futures exchange can be beneficial to later academic research. The continual focus on different issues and different commodities enables one to broaden his or her understanding of futures markets. The focus on topics of importance to an exchange (e.g., contract specifications relating to physical delivery) exposes one to important issues that are often ignored in the academic literature.

In looking back at my four years at the Chicago Board of Trade, I miss the interaction with such a diverse group of individuals, the teamwork involved in trying to solve an exchange crisis, and the excitement associated with being a part of the world's largest futures exchange. I also miss the Christmas bonus, which can represent 10 to 15 percent of one's annual salary. However, I do not miss the Chicago commute or the seemingly endless Chicago winters.

Views on Barriers to Equality

(Editor's Note: The following paragraphs summarize a front page article that appeared in the August 20, 1989 edition of the New York Times, entitled "Bars to Equality of Sexes Seen as Eroding, Slowly." The Times article was written by Lisa Belkin.)

According to a New York Times poll, women say the goals of the women's movement have not been fully realized, and many feel that the gains have come at too high a price. In contrast, men said there had been more changes than women saw, with less cost to women than women reported. The men suggested that they had overcome sexism more thoroughly than women acknowledged, and saw less need for further changes than women did.

Respondents between the ages of 30 and 44--those who came of age at the height of the women's movement--appeared particularly frustrated with women's progress. Sixty-two percent of the women in that age group agreed with the statement: "Most men are willing to let women get ahead, but only if women do all the housework at home."

Some of the other main findings of the poll, conducted in June and July of 1989 and sampling 1,025 women and 472 men, include:

- Thirty-three percent of the women, and 37% of the men, said children's needs are slighted the most when a woman combines a job with marriage and motherhood. Twenty-six percent of the women and 20 percent of the men said that the marriage was slighted the most.
- When asked whether women have "given up too much" in exchange for gains in the workplace, almost half of all women said yes, as did a third of the men. Most women said that they've given up too much time with their families.
- Women still do most of the work at home. The substantial majority of married women said they do most of the food shopping, cooking, house cleaning, bill paying, and child care, whether they work outside the home or not. Still, 61% of the women polled said that their husbands do their "fair share." In contrast, about half of the men conceded that women do "more than their fair share" of household chores.
- While three-fifths of the women respondents said men's attitudes toward women have improved in the past 20 years, the improvement perceived is limited. Fifty-three percent of the women said most of the men they know think they are better than women. Men are even more likely to say men's views of women have improved, but 48 percent of them said most men they know consider themselves better than women.

Even with these differences, there were some important areas of agreement between women and men. The big

majority of both men and women said that the women's movement had helped make all sorts of relationships between men and women more honest. In addition, 70% of the women with full-time jobs said that where they worked, women had an equal or better-than-equal chance of promotion than men. Fifty-nine percent of the men with full-time jobs said the same.

Sharp differences in responses occurred between different age groups. Only 34% of the men in the 45-to-64 age group said that men still run everything and exclude women from important decisions, but 59 percent of the women in that age group said so. When asked to name the most important problem faced by women today, the conflict between work and family or child care was named by 17% of the women between 18 and 29, but by just 9 percent of their male peers.

Women of different age groups also viewed situations quite differently. Women between the ages of 18 and 29 had the fewest complaints. However, those in this group were the least likely to have faced all the concerns of marriage, child care, and the work force, and most likely to have mothers who worked.

Differences among age groups can be seen in other ways. While about two-thirds of the women between 30 and 44 could name at least one obstacle to women's progress, only half of the women older or younger could name one. Asked to name the most important problems facing women today, 8% of the women between 18 and 30 named the difficulties in getting child care, while only 4% of the women 45 and older agreed.

Differences also appeared in the perceptions of black and white women. To the question of whether men are trying to take away the gains made by women over the past 20 years, less than 25% of the white women agreed--but more than half of the black women said yes. However, black women appeared more positive in some ways than white women. According to one black woman, "If you don't keep the pressure on, things will slip back the way they were, and that would be even worse."

Women in Agriculture Conference

*Damona Doye
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma*

The Oklahoma State University Cooperative Extension Service held its first management conference for women in agriculture on November 9-10, 1989. The conference was patterned after a successful program started by the Nebraska Extension Service. The conference featured keynote speakers in combination with small workshops. The focus was on practical ideas and learning from one another. The conference:

- Taught skills needed for improved farm and family management;
- Provided up-to-date information women need to work cooperatively with spouses in making sound management decisions; and
- Provided a forum in which women in agriculture could share their experiences and ideas.

Keynote speakers stimulated thinking about dealing with change and suggested positive means of responding to change. Rosemary Hartter, an Illinois farm wife who has helped teach Chicago Board of Trade educational programs targeted at women in agriculture, talked about how her role in marketing and managing the farm evolved. Chuck Lofy, a well-traveled Minnesota counselor and speaker, discussed the hero's journey in dealing with change successfully.

Oklahoma farm women were teamed with subject matter specialists to present ideas and lead workshop discussions. In small workshop settings, women were able to ask questions about unfamiliar terms--whether with respect to government programs, financial dealings, or marketing decisions--in a non-threatening environment, giving them the confidence to participate more fully in farm management after the conference.

Workshop topics included:

- Decision Making: Strategies When Tough Decisions Must Be Made;
- Understanding and Making Effective Use of Government Programs;
- Beginning Marketing;
- Starting a Home-Based Business;
- Children and Stress;
- Tax Planning;
- Family Budgeting When You Live on the Farm;
- Estate Planning;
- Speaking Your Lender's Language.

For more information on the conference, contact Damona Doye at: Department of Agricultural Economics; 513 Agricultural Hall; Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078. Phone: (405) 744-6081

Profile of Women in Colleges of Agriculture

(Editor's Note: The following paragraphs summarize an article entitled, "A Profile of Women Scientists in Colleges of Agriculture," by Barbara E. Cooper and Janet L. Henderson. The article appeared in the March 1988 issue of the National Association of Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture journal. It was brought to the attention of the CWAE Newsletter by Eileen van Ravenswaay.)

A national study indicates that women agricultural scientists in academia, although underrepresented, are young and dynamic. The typical woman scientist in agriculture in 1986 was white, married, in her thirties, and

earned between \$30,000-45,000 per year. She typically received tenure within six years. She was just as likely to teach courses as to not teach at all. She was typically conducting three research projects in 1986 and had directed three funded projects within the five preceding years. During those five years, the average woman agricultural scientist published seven refereed journal articles and presented seven papers at professional meetings. Overall, women accounted for 4.6% of the agricultural faculties at land grant universities.

These findings are based on questionnaires sent to 514 women faculty in agriculture at 70 land grant universities. For the study, women agricultural scientists were defined as faculty members with academic, tenure-track positions. The percent of all respondents accounted for by each department varied widely: crop and soil science (23%), animal science (15%), horticulture (14%), agricultural economics and rural sociology (12%), food science/animal nutrition (12%), biological sciences (12%), natural resources/forestry (8%), agricultural and extension education (3%), and agricultural engineering (1%).

This research effort was the first national study to focus on women agricultural scientists in academia. The study was designed to: investigate the academic background of women agricultural scientists and their current positions; describe their teaching, research, and service responsibilities; and provide demographic information. Findings of the survey include:

Academic Background--

- About 52% of the women faculty were assistant professors, 32% were associate professors, and 16% were full professors;
- Respondents indicated that there were an average of 3 women faculty per department;
- Thirty-five percent of the women reported that they were the only woman in their department;
- Respondents had been in their current positions an average of 5 years;
- About 46% of the women had tenure.

Teaching, Research, and Service Responsibilities--

- Forty-nine percent of the women did not teach courses;
- Those with teaching responsibilities taught an average of one undergraduate and one graduate course per year;
- They spent an average of 7 hours per week preparing for teaching;

- Respondents had an average of 7 undergraduate advisees and were the major adviser for one master's student and one doctoral candidate;
- Eighty-eight percent of the women had published refereed journal articles during the past 5 years;
- The women reported that they served on an average of three departmental, one college, and one university committee.

Personal Characteristics--

- The average age of respondents was 39 years;
- Sixty percent of the women were married and 42% had children;
- Twenty-seven percent of the women scientists had never married;
- Fifty-two percent of the women were raised in metropolitan areas; 16% spent their childhood on farms.

The study provides conflicting perspectives on the potential for women in agriculture. It cites a 1985 USDA study indicating that there is room for more women in agricultural fields because there are more employment positions for agricultural scientists than there are graduates available to fill those positions. On the other hand, the study cites Betty Vetter, writing in the National Science Foundation's Mosaic publication in 1987, who states that opportunities for women in the sciences may have reached their peak and will begin to drop significantly. The study concludes that the recruitment and retention of women in agriculture must become a high priority if women are to maintain the advancements they have achieved in the sciences.

References

Coulter, K.J., M. Stanton, and A.D. Goecker. Employment Opportunities in the Food and Agricultural Sciences. Washington, D.C.: Higher Education Programs, Office of Grants and Program Systems, U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1985.

Henderson, J.L. and B.E. Cooper. "The Representation of Women Scientists in Land-Grant Colleges of Agriculture." The National Association of Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture. 31 (2): 14-17.

Vetter, Betty M. "Women's Progress." Mosaic. 18 (1): 2-9. 1987.

Newsnotes

Mailing List of Women in Agricultural Economics

Do you need to do a special mailing to women in Agricultural Economics? You can purchase a mailing list and labels by contacting: AAEE Business Office; 80 Heady Hall; Iowa State University; Ames, Iowa 50011-1070. Phone: (515) 294-8700.

Distribution of Newsletter to Students

In order to make the CWAE Newsletter available to students in Agricultural Economics, we have mailed five extra copies of the Newsletter to a designated CWAE representative at each of the Universities. Please pass them along to your students who might be interested.

Career and Family Symposium

The Committee on Women in Agricultural Economics (CWAE) is organizing a symposium at the joint CAEFMS/AAEA Vancouver meetings in August 1990. The topic of the symposium is "Career and Family." The symposium will examine issues such as parental leave, part- and flex-time schedules, childcare, promotion access, sexual harassment, and other topics. CWAE encourages its members to participate in the planning of the Symposium. Suggestions for speakers and topics are welcome, and may be relayed through the chair of the organizing committee: Stephanie Mercier; USDA/ERS/Crops Branch; Room 1034; 1301 New York Avenue, N.W.; Washington, D.C. 20005-4788. Phone: 202-786-1840.

The Association for Women in Development

The Association for Women in Development (AWID) focuses on international development and gender issues. AWID is part of the global network of scholars and policymakers committed to increasing the awareness of the interdependence of nations, institutions, and individuals in development. It is committed to ensuring that women participate as full and active partners in a more equitable development process, and that they share in its benefits. AWID holds conferences; publishes a newsletter and directory; and holds special workshops and seminars. AWID welcomes both women and men as members. For more information, contact: AWID; Office of Women's Programs; 10 Sandy Hall; Virginia Tech; Blacksburg, VA 24061. Phone 703-231-7615.

Research Opportunities for Women

The National Science Foundation's mandate is to ensure the vitality of the Nation's scientific enterprise, including concern for the quality, distribution, and effectiveness of the human resource base in science and engineering. Because women are underrepresented in all disciplines, a number of activities are directed at increasing their numbers as full participants in the mainstream of the nation's research enterprise. These activities include: Standard

Research Grants; Research Initiation Awards; Research Planning Grants; Career Advancement Awards; and Visiting Professorships for Women. To obtain a brochure describing all research program activities available to women scientists at the National Science Foundation, entitled, "Research Opportunities for Women," contact: Forms and Publications Unit; Room 232; National Science Foundation; Washington, D.C. 20550

News of Women in Agricultural Economics

Sandra Archibald received an AAEA Quality of Communication Award.

Nicole Ballenger of ERS is on leave as a resident fellow at the National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy, Resources for the Future (RFF), 1989/90.

Amy Barnes has accepted a position with Texas Instruments. She recently received the MS degree from Texas Tech University.

Patricia Boyland has accepted a position as adjunct lecturer, California State University at Bakersfield. She recently received the PhD degree from the University of California, Davis.

Karen Burke of the University of California, Berkeley, received an AAEA Quality of Communication Award.

Ann Boyda, University of Alberta, received the CAEFMS Outstanding MS Thesis Award, and honorable mention, WAEA Master's Thesis Award.

Karen Brooks, University of Minnesota, is on leave in Moscow, USSR, for the fall quarter.

Susan Capalbo of Montana State University is on leave as a resident fellow at the National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy (RFF), 1989/90.

Bonnie Colby, University of Arizona, has been promoted to associate professor with tenure. She is doing research on water and environmental quality issues, serves on the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Western Water Management, and now has a third son, born in 1989.

Patricia Driscoll has accepted a position at Johnson State College. She recently received the MS degree from the University of Vermont.

Barbara Elliott, formerly at the National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy (RFF), entered graduate school at the University of California at Davis.

Barbara El-Osta has accepted a position with the General Accounting Office in Washington, D.C. She recently received the PhD degree from the University of Nebraska at Lincoln.

Elizabeth Frazao has accepted a position at USDA's Economic Research Service. She received the PhD degree from North Carolina State University.

Lilyan Fulginiti has accepted a position as assistant professor, Iowa State University. She recently received the PhD degree from North Carolina State University.

Joyce Hall has accepted a position as assistant professor at Colorado State University. She recently received the PhD degree from Purdue University.

Marge Hubbert, Cornell University, received the Teacher of Merit Award.

Sally Kane of ERS and others received a USDA Superior Service Group Award.

Jean Kinsey, University of Minnesota, was elected vice president-projects, AAEA Foundation Governing Board.

Donna Lee has accepted a position as assistant professor, University of Hawaii at Manoa. She recently received the PhD degree from the University of California at Davis.

Diane Lowe of the University of Guelph received third place, SS-AAEA Outstanding Student Paper Award.

Elizabeth Mack, formerly at USDC/Bureau of Economic Analysis, has accepted a position as economist at USDA's Economic Research Service.

Sara Mazie of ERS and others received an honorable mention, AAEA Quality of Communication Award.

Tammy Meyer, formerly at the North Dakota Association of Cooperatives, has accepted a position at USDA's Agricultural Cooperative Service in Washington, D.C.

Barbara Miller has accepted a position as lecturer for the fall semester at Cornell University. She received the PhD degree from Syracuse University.

Pamela Miller, of the University of Manitoba, received the Canadian Transportation Research Forum Best Master's Thesis Award.

Mary McKnight has accepted a position as assistant professor, University of Wisconsin at Platteville. She recently received the PhD degree from Texas A&M.

Catherine Murphy, of the University of Maryland, received the Woodrow Wilson Rural Policy Fellowship.

Rosamond Naylor has accepted a position as postdoctoral fellow, Stanford University. She recently received the PhD degree from Stanford.

Carole Nuckton and others at the University of California at Davis received an AAEA Quality of Communication Award.

Kathleen Painter, (research assistant, Washington State University), is a visiting scholar at North Carolina State University, August 1989-July 1990.

Diane Parent (MS, Universite Laval) accepted a position as lecturer, Universite Laval.

Christine Ranney, Cornell University, has been promoted to associate professor. She is on leave as a western rural development associate at Oregon State University, July 1989-July 1990.

Katherine Reichelderfer, ERS, has accepted a position as senior fellow at Resources for the Future, effective January 1, 1990. She will be responsible for developing a program in agriculture and the environment.

Claudia Sersland, University of California at Fresno, has been promoted to associate professor.

Lynda Shoalmire and others of Louisiana State University received second place, SS-AAEA Academic Bowl Award.

Theresa Spencer has accepted a position at Meredith College. She recently received the PhD degree from North Carolina State University.

Barbara Stucker is on leave from ERS to the Council of Economic Advisors, September 1989-August 1990.

Mary Templeton of West Virginia University received a NAREA Distinguished Member Award.

Karen Thierfelder, has accepted a position as economist at USDA's Economic Research Service. She recently received the MS degree from the University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Michele Veeman, University of Alberta, was elected CAEFMS president, 1990/91. She has also been appointed to the Agriculture, Food, and Beverage Sectoral Advisory Group on International Trade, Dept. of External Affairs.

Cathy Wessels, formerly at the University of California, Davis, has accepted a position as assistant professor, University of Rhode Island.

Paula Wheeler and others of the University of Illinois received an AAEA Quality of Communication Award.

Christine Winterkamp accepted a position with Frito-Lay in Lubbock, Texas. She recently received the MS degree from Texas Tech University.

CWAE Board Members for 1989/90

Chair: Eileen van Ravenswaay (Michigan State U.)
Vice Chair: Deborah Brown (Purdue U.)
Past Chair: Helen Jensen (Iowa State U.)

1988-90 Members:
Joyce Allen (Joint Ctr. for Pol. Studies)
Vicki McCracken (Washington State U.)

1989-91 Members:
Sermin Hardesty (Rice Growers Assn.)
Joy Harwood (ERS)

AAEA Board Rep.: Gene Futrell (ERS)

CWAE Subcommittees for 1989/1990

The Finance subcommittee proposes the budget, prepares financial statements, and addresses fundraising issues.

Chair: Valerie Vantreese (U. of Kentucky)

The Membership subcommittee provides membership services, keeps a roster of members, and addresses the recruitment of new members.

Chair: Helen Jensen (Iowa State U.)
Member: Carole Nuckton (U. of California, Davis)

The Newsletter subcommittee prepares the CWAE Newsletter.

Chair: Joy Harwood (ERS)
Members: Deb Brown (Purdue U.)
Coletta Moser (Michigan State U.)

The Elections subcommittee compiles the list of nominees for the Board; tabulates the ballot; notifies the Board, the candidates, and Newsletter editor of the election outcome; and addresses election procedures.

Chair: Edna Loehman (Purdue U.)
Members: Catharine Halbrendt (U. of Delaware)
Jean Kinsey (U. of Minnesota)
Vicki McCracken (U. of Washington)

The Arrangements subcommittee arranges meetings, luncheons, and social gatherings at the AAEA annual meeting.

Chair: Eileen van Ravenswaay (Michigan State U.)

The Employment subcommittee works to improve employment opportunities for women agricultural economists by identifying such opportunities and disseminating information.

Chair: Linda Calvin (ERS)
Members: Kristen Allen (Resources for the Future)
Cheryl Danley (Ford Foundation)
Jill Findeis (Penn. State U.)
Sermin Hardesty (Rice Growers Assn.)
Emily McClain (ERS)

The Graduate Student subcommittee identifies and addresses the particular needs of graduate student members and strives to increase graduate student involvement in the AAEA.

Chair: Hui Shung Chang (Auburn U.)
Members: Mary Marchant (U. of Kentucky)
Lydia Zepeda (U. of Wisconsin)

The Planning subcommittee helps identify and evaluate emerging issues relevant to the activities and purposes of CWAE.

Chair: Joyce Allen (Joint Ctr. for Pol. Studies)
Members: Margaret Andrews
Tanya Roberts (ERS)

The Professional Activities subcommittee plans, encourages, and coordinates professional activities such as career workshops and preconferences at the AAEA annual meeting.

Chair: Stephanie Mercier (ERS)
Members: Kate Buckley (ERS)
Christina Gladwin (U. of Florida)
Rebecca Lent (Laval)
Ann Vandeman (Washington)

The Research subcommittee promotes the role of women in the research community by organizing sessions at the AAEA annual meeting and by carrying out other relevant activities.

Chair: Catharine Lemieux (Indiana State U.)
Members: Sandra Archibald (Stanford U.)
Patricia Duffy (Auburn U.)

The Archives subcommittee maintains and compiles the history of CWAE.

Chair: Ardelle Lundeen (S. Dakota State U.)
Member: Sylvia Lane (U. of California, Berkeley)

The Scholarship subcommittee is developing a proposal for establishing a scholarship fund.

Chair: Maureen Kilkenny (Penn. State U.)
Member: Sermin Hardesty (Rice Growers Assn.)
Vicki McCracken (Washington State U.)
Tanya Roberts (ERS)
Jean Sussman (Quaker Oats Co.)
Eileen van Ravenswaay (Michigan State U.)

The CSWEP Liaison informs the Board of activities of the American Economic Association's Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession and sends potential Newsletter information to the Newsletter Subcommittee.

Liaison: Kathleen Segerson (U. of Connecticut)

The CAEFMS Liaison informs the Board of pertinent activities and needs of the Canadian Agricultural Economics and Farm Management Society in planning the AAEA annual meeting.

Liaison: Rebecca Lent (Laval)

Job Announcements

Auburn University
Butler/Cunningham Eminent Scholar Chair in Agricultural Resources and the Environment. The Eminent Scholar position is an endowed chair in the College of Agriculture. Primary responsibilities of the Eminent Scholar will be to develop strong research, teaching, and balanced public advocacy programs that integrate agricultural and environmental issues for improving the quality of life in rural and urban communities. Targeted program areas include: enhancement of parks, forests, roadways, and communities; or impacts of agricultural technologies on water quality, food safety, biological diversity, and other environmental issues. Applicants should have a PhD and extensive experience in research, teaching, extension, or public or private service. Salary commensurate with qualifications. Application deadline is December 15, 1989. To apply, send a statement of interest, resume, copies of a few major publications, and names of at least five references to: C. Robert Taylor, Search Committee Chair; Department of Agricultural Economics; 208 Comer Hall; Auburn University; Auburn, Alabama 36849-5406. Phone: 205-844-5606.

Economic Research Service (USDA, Washington, DC)
Agricultural Economists. Applications are being accepted for grades 12 and 13 agricultural economist positions in USDA's Economic Research Service. Responsibilities range from long-term research projects to quick turnaround analyses on issues related to national commodity, trade, resource, and rural development policies and programs. Excellent analytical and com-

munication skills are required as well as an MS in agricultural economics (or equivalent education and/or experience) for grades 9 and 11, and a PhD or equivalent for grades 12 and 13. Salary range is \$23,846-\$53,460, plus an attractive benefits package and reimbursement of the costs of moving to Washington, DC (if appointed at grade 12 or 13). US citizenship required. To apply, obtain a copy of announcement WA-AG-9-50 (grades 9/11) or WA-AG-7-01 (grades 12/13) from department heads or the Examining Unit; USDA/EMS; Room 1443-South Building; Washington, D.C. 20250-3500. Phone: 202-447-3660.

Iowa State University

Research Director, Utilization Center for Agricultural Products. This is a full-time, 9-month (plus 2 summer months), tenure-track position with teaching and research responsibilities. The successive candidate will provide leadership in developing innovative research projects in food technology and agricultural product development with emphasis on further processing of animal and plant products. Candidates must have a PhD, a strong research record, and demonstrated competence in working with industry on cooperative research projects. Candidates should provide a summary of accomplishments and professional activities, a list of publications, and the names of three references. Application deadline is December 1 or until position is filled. Application materials should be sent to: Dr. Thomas A. Fretz; Associate Dean; College of Agriculture; 104 Curtiss Hall; Iowa State University; Ames, Iowa 50011.

Kansas State University

Extension Economist-Southwest (Location: Garden City). The successful candidate will organize an economics program that responds to cooperators' needs, working with all county extension agents in the area assigned. Primary emphasis will be to conduct an educational program which will teach farm management and marketing principles and provide educational input to assist crop and livestock producers in maximizing their incomes. Salary commensurate with education and experience. Candidates must have an MS degree in agricultural economics; PhD in agricultural economics and experience in extension education desirable. Applications will be accepted until December 15, 1989. To apply, send a resume, transcripts, and three letters of reference to: Marc A. Johnson, Head; Department of Agricultural Economics; 342 Waters Hall; Kansas State University; Manhattan, Kansas 66506. Phone: 913-532-6708.

North Carolina State University

Assistant Professor, Quantitative Natural Resource Economics. The Department of Forestry is seeking a dynamic individual for a 12-month, tenure-track teaching and research position. Applicants must have a PhD with emphasis in econometrics, natural resource modeling or management science, and a demonstrated interest in natural resources. Salary commensurate with qualifications. Application deadline: December 31, 1989. Applicants should send a resume; statement of research, educational, and professional interests; and names and addresses of three references to: Dr. Joseph Roise; Depart-

ment of Forestry; Box 8002; North Carolina State University; Raleigh, NC 27695. Phone: 919-737-7783.

Ohio State University

Assistant/Associate Professor. This position, specialist in the study of Latin American women, begins in September 1990 and is a tenure-track joint appointment in the Center for Women's Studies and an academic department appropriate to the candidate's discipline, including agricultural economics. Teaching responsibilities are divided between the Center for Women's Studies and an appropriate department, and include graduate and undergraduate courses. Qualifications: PhD by September 1990; ability to teach interdisciplinary women's studies courses; and evidence of promise or significant scholarly achievement. To apply, send credentials and a list of three references by December 31 to: Susan M. Hartmann, Director; Center for Women's Studies; Ohio State U.; 207 Dulles Hall; 230 West 17th Ave.; Columbus, Ohio 43210.

Oregon State University

Two Center Associate positions are available at the Western Rural Development Center for the 1990/91 academic year. Positions are designed for professionals in a position to take leave from regular employment. The Center Associate will participate in activities of the National Rural Studies Committee and investigate a significant rural area problem of interest to the applicant. Applicants are expected to have the equivalent of a PhD and some research experience. Salary is amount equivalent to one-half of regular salary, not to exceed \$25,000 for 12 months. Application deadline is December 15, 1989. Minorities and women are encouraged to apply. For application materials, contact: Dr. Emery Castle; Western Rural Development Center; Oregon State University; Corvallis, Oregon 97331. Phone: 503-737-3621.

Stanford University

Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor, Food Research Institute. This is a tenured or tenure-track position for an economist or agricultural economist with interests in agricultural development and a regional focus on China. The successful candidate should have excellent teaching skills, broad quantitative training, and demonstrated commitment to applied economic research. To apply, send a resume and two letters of reference by December 1, to: Walter P. Falcon, Director; Food Research Institute; Stanford University; Stanford, California 94305-6084.

University of Minnesota

Temporary Research and Teaching Positions. The Department of Agricultural Economics receives and evaluates applications from candidates for temporary part-time and full-time research and teaching positions on a continuous basis. Positions as Research Fellow require an MS degree, and Research Associate/Lecturer, a PhD degree in agricultural economics or closely related field and applicable research training and/or experience. Salary is competitive. Send letter of application to: Laura Bipes; Department of Agricultural Economics; University of Minnesota; St. Paul, Minnesota 55108.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON CAREER DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP AND OTHER ISSUES

CWAE is considering continuing to offer workshops for AAEA members at the annual meeting. Your response to the following questions will be helpful in planning.

1. Would you attend a workshop on any of the following career development topics? ____ yes, ____ no. If yes, rank topics by preference: (1 = highest)

- ____ Employment opportunities in Ag Econ/interviewing skills
- ____ Career planning
- ____ How to get a research grant
- ____ Research collaboration issues
- ____ How to get tenure
- ____ Writing/publishing tips
- ____ Public speaking
- ____ Development of negotiating skills
- ____ Development of leadership skills
- ____ Opportunities for advancing into administration and management
- ____ Sharpening econometrics/computer skills
- ____ Priority setting/time management
- ____ Other topic, please specify _____
- ____ Some of all the above topics

2. There has been discussion at CWAE meetings concerning what organization ought to be responsible for fulfilling this perceived need for career development. Please rank:

- ____ CWAE
- ____ Other AAEA committee, please specify _____
- ____ Other professional organization, please specify _____
- ____ Joint sponsorship, please specify groups _____

3. What is your preference for the length of a career development workshop?

____ 1/2 day, ____ 1 day, ____ 1 1/2 days, ____ 2 days

4. One idea being considered for the workshop for the next AAEA meeting is "Career and Family Issues". Which topics would be of interest to you? Please rank:

(1 = highest)

- ____ Job finding issues for 2 career couples
- ____ Policies on part-time or flexible hour opportunities in business, government, and academia
- ____ Policies on leave after childbirth in business, government, and academia
- ____ Policies on leave for care of family members (elderly & young)
- ____ Policies on day care or provision of day care facilities
- ____ Other, please specify _____
- ____ Some of all the above topics

If on the agenda, would you attend? (perhaps offered during the regularly scheduled time of the AAEA meeting)

____ yes, ____ no.

5. Some CWAE members have expressed interest in discussion of discrimination within the profession. Do you think it is important to address this issue at this time? ____ yes, ____ no. If yes, how do you think this discussion could best be arranged?

- ____ Workshop format targeted for women on dealing with discrimination
- ____ Symposium for men and women on identifying and dealing with discrimination
- ____ Informal discussion
- ____ Formation of AAEA committee to identify the issues
- ____ Broad-based workshop to address different forms of discrimination (gender, race, age, professional)
- ____ Other, please specify _____

Additional comments:

PLEASE RETURN QUESTIONNAIRE TO:

CWAE Questionnaire, 234 G Street S.W., Washington, DC 20024.

Committee on Women in Agricultural Economics

Subscription Notice

The Committee on Women in Agricultural Economics Newsletter, as well as many other CWAE activities, has been funded by the Economic Research Service and the Farm Foundation. Response to the Newsletter has been most supportive. Now that the Newsletter has sprouted and grown, it is time to find out whether it can support itself.

CWAE will now be charging for its future issues of the Newsletter.

All members of the AAEA are encouraged to subscribe.

The subscription fee for 1 year (January-December) is \$5.00.

Three issues are published each year.

Some members of the AAEA have received the CWAE Newsletter at no charge. This will no longer be the situation. Students can obtain the Newsletter from the designated CWAE representative in their department who has been selected to receive 5 free copies for distribution (see Newsnotes, p. 9) or from their Department Head. These are the only free copies available!

Make sure you receive the next issue of the CWAE Newsletter!

Return the subscription notice below by February 1, 1990.

Yes, I want to Subscribe.

To receive the Newsletter, send this application, with a check for \$5 made payable to AAEA, to:

CWAE Newsletter Subscription
c/o Lona Christoffers
AAEA Business Office
80 Heady Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011-1070

NAME: _____

MAILING ADDRESS: _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP: _____

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

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

139