

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Editorial Board

1983: FREDERICK R. BLATTNER, BERNARD F. BURKE, CHARLES L. DRAKE, ARTHUR F. FINDEIS, E. PETER GEIDUSCHEK, GYNN ISAAC, MILTON RUSSELL, WILLIAM P. SLICHTER, JOHN WOOD

1984: ARNOLD DEMAIN, NEAL E. MILLER, FREDERICK MOSTELLER, ALLEN NEWELL, RUTH PATRICK, BRYANT W. ROSSITER, VERA C. RUBIN, SOLOMON H. SNYDER, PAUL E. WAGGONER

Publisher: WILLIAM D. CAREY

Associate Publisher: ROBERT V. ORMES

Editor: PHILIP H. ABELSON

Editorial Staff

Assistant Managing Editor: JOHN E. RINGLE

Production Editor: ELLEN E. MURPHY

Business Manager: HANS NUSSBAUM

News Editor: BARBARA J. CULLITON

News and Comment: COLIN NORMAN (deputy editor), JEFFREY L. FOX, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, ELIOT MARSHALL, R. JEFFREY SMITH, MARJORIE SUN, JOHN WALSH

European Correspondent: DAVID DICKSON

Contributing Writer: LUTHER J. CARTER

Research News: ROGER LEWIN (deputy editor), RICHARD A. KERR, GINA KOLATA, JEAN L. MARX, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, ARTHUR L. ROBINSON, M. MITCHELL WALDROP

Administrative Assistant, News: SCHERRAINE MACK;
Editorial Assistant, News: FANNIE GROOM

Senior Editors: ELEANORE BUTZ, MARY DORFMAN, RUTH KULSTAD

Associate Editors: SYLVIA EBERHART, CAITILIN GORDON, LOIS SCHMITT

Assistant Editors: MARTHA COLLINS, STEPHEN KEPPLER, EDITH MEYERS

Book Reviews: KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, *Editor*; LINDA HEISERMAN, JANET KEGG

Letters: CHRISTINE GILBERT

Copy Editor: ISABELLA BOULDIN

Production: JOHN BAKER, SUSANNAH BORG, HOLLY BISHOP, ELEANOR WARNER; JEAN ROCKWOOD, SHARON RYAN, BEVERLY SHIELDS

Covers, Reprints, and Permissions: GRAYCE FINGER, *Editor*; GERALDINE CRUMP, CORRIE HARRIS

Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD G. SOMMER

Assistant to the Editor: SUSAN ELLIOTT

Assistant to the Associate Publisher: ROSE LOWERY

Assistant to the Managing Editor: NANCY HARTNAGEL

Membership Recruitment: GWENDOLYN HUDDLE

Member and Subscription Records: ANN RAGLAND
EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Area code 202. General Editorial Office, 467-4350; Book Reviews, 467-4367; Guide to Scientific Instruments, 467-4480; News and Comment, 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions, 467-4483; Research News, 467-4321. Cable: Advancements, Washington. For "Information for Contributors," write to the editorial office or see page xi, *Science*, 24 June 1983.

BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE: Area Code 202. Membership and Subscriptions: 467-4417.

Advertising Representatives

Director: EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager: GINA REILLY

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Marketing Manager: HERBERT L. BURKLUND

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Steve Hamburger, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-337-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772); DORSET, VT. 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581).

ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Tenth floor, 1515 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-730-1050.

Women in Science: Lack of Full Participation

Despite dramatically increased participation, women have not yet achieved full equality in the scientific research community. Compared to their male peers, they are still inadequately rewarded with salary, promotion, and tenure. Less visible, but no less real, are constraints on women's informal participation in science. Opportunities to form mentor and collaborative relationships with men and occasions to enhance professional reputations are limited. This may contribute to lower research productivity and slower professional advancement. Effective change requires a better understanding of why people choose science as a career, how science functions as a social system, and how science rewards participation.

These conclusions were reached by scientists, educators, and administrators at a two-day symposium on women in academic science.* After reviewing the current situation, participants discussed meaningful interventions and activities to increase career opportunities for women in science.

Women have made great advances in higher education and science since 1970. Over the decade, the percentage of women receiving undergraduate degrees increased by half in physical sciences, doubled in computer science, and tripled in engineering. Moreover, in most scientific fields women holding the bachelor's degree are now as likely as men to go on to the Ph.D. In the early 1970's, women received 14 percent of new Ph.D.'s, but by the end of the decade they received 26 percent. Between 1967 and 1972, women constituted 17 percent of newly hired faculty, compared to 25 percent between 1975 and 1980. At the top 50 universities, as ranked by R & D expenditures, women accounted for all net growth in science faculty at the assistant professor rank. Finally, men and women scientists with similar training tend to be in academic departments of equal prestige both 7 and 13 years after receiving the Ph.D.

But much remains unchanged. Similarities in training and first job experience do not result in comparable careers for men and women. Although men and women have similar affiliations, their positions within academic departments are vastly different. A 1981 survey of 1970-1974 doctoral recipients showed that 17.2 percent of the men versus 9.2 percent of the women were full professors, 50.8 versus 38.2 percent were associate professors, and 17.3 versus 31.7 percent were assistant professors. For this same group, 13.3 percent of the men under 35 compared to 9.4 percent of the women were tenured. For those aged 36 to 45, 80.8 percent of the men versus 62.7 percent of the women were tenured or on the tenure track.

Clearly, the tenure impasse and how men and women deal with career development and setbacks are not understood at present. Another finding is that women publish less than men. Many studies have shown a significant productivity gap, but there is little agreement about its causes.

Most of what is known about women in science is based on studies of Ph.D.'s. But studying only the survivors will not answer some key questions. More attention must be given to secondary and even primary education as well as to the effects of societal differentiations. We cannot expect to affect the choices of girls and women toward appropriate precollegiate studies or science careers if we do not understand how choices are made by most people, which factors are most influential, or whether men and women utilize the factors differently to reach career decisions. Methods of sociology, psychology, and history should be brought to bear on all these questions in order to provide appropriate guidance for both men and women in preparing for and managing careers in science.

The apparent discrepancy between the success rates of women and men in science is a tragedy for women and a loss of intellectual power for the nation. Effective remedies require better information and a commitment to act on that information to improve women's status in science.—JOHN T. BRUER, *Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation, 44 East 64 Street, New York 10021*

*Symposium on Women in Science, sponsored by the Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation and held at the Center for Research on Women, Stanford University, 26 and 27 January 1983.