

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

1972

ALFRED BROWN	FRANK PRESS
JAMES F. CROW	FRANK W. PUTNAM
THOMAS KUHN	WALTER O. ROBERTS
ELLIOTT W. MONTROLL	

1973

H. S. GUTOWSKY	GARDNER LINDZEY
ARTHUR D. HASLER	RAYMOND H. THOMPSON
RUDOLF KOMPFFNER	EDWARD O. WILSON
DANIEL E. KOSHLAND, JR.	

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher

WILLIAM BEVAN

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

Assistant Editors: ELLEN E. MURPHY, JOHN E. RINGLE

Assistant to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN

News and Comment: JOHN WALSH, DEBORAH SHAPLEY, ROBERT GILLETTE, NICHOLAS WADE, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, BARBARA J. CULLITON, SCHERRAINE MACK

Research News: ALLEN L. HAMMOND, WILLIAM D. METZ, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, JEAN L. MARX

Book Reviews: SYLVIA EBERHART, KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, KATHRYN MOUTON

Cover Editor: GRAYCE FINGER

Editorial Assistants: MARGARET ALLEN, ISABELLA BOULDIN, BLAIR BURNS, ELEANORE BUTZ, ANNETTE DIAMANTE, MARY DORFMAN, JUDITH GIVELBER, CORINE HARRIS, OLIVER HEATWOLE, CHRISTINE KARLIK, MARSHALL KATHAN, MARGARET LLOYD, DANIEL RABOVSKY, JEAN ROCKWOOD, PATRICIA ROWE, LEAH RYAN, JOHN SCHAUER, LOIS SCHMITT, YA LI SWIGART

Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD SOMMER

Membership Recruitment: LEONARD WRAY; Subscriptions: BETTE SEEMUND; Addressing: THOMAS BAZAN

Advertising Staff

Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager

PATTY WELLS

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Sales: New York, N.Y. 10036: Herbert L. Burklund, 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858); Scotch Plains, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); Chicago, Ill. 60611: John P. Cahill, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-DE-7-4973); Beverly Hills, Calif. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772)

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phones: (Area code 202) Central Office: 467-4350; Book Reviews: 467-4367; Business Office: 467-4411; Circulation: 467-4417; Guide to Scientific Instruments: 467-4480; News and Comment: 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions: 467-4483; Research News: 467-4321, Reviewing: 467-4440. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. See also page xv, *Science*, 29 September 1972. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Room 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

More Women for Higher Education

The slowness of many colleges and universities in supplementing their predominantly white, male professional staffs with proportionate numbers of women and members of minority groups is a major force behind the issuance of new, detailed guidelines from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Office of Civil Rights for recruiting, hiring, and promoting qualified persons. In some instances, the delay has been rooted in the inability of frustrated administrators to determine appropriate proportions or to locate qualified applicants. These stumbling blocks do exist in recruiting from minority groups, but they should not be a problem in finding qualified women.

The first step is to understand and eliminate past discriminatory practices. In addition to stricter requirements for admission and less government support for women in graduate study, many who attained advanced degrees were restricted by reverse nepotism. Once hired, women faculty received less research support, lower salaries across all ranks, and slower promotions than their male cohorts. Few schools have accommodated to the needs of women with families.

The second step, affirmative action, begins with a statement of reasonable numerical or percentage goals. The proportion of all research doctorates conferred on women (perhaps the best measure now available in determining realistic goals) has averaged 12.2 percent since 1920 and has risen substantially in the past 5 years. However, there is wide variation within fields. Since about 91 percent of women doctorates are now in the labor force, persons earning Ph.D.'s since 1939 provide a base for a present pool. Sex proportions are available by subfield in the doctorate record file maintained by the National Research Council, and some general breakdowns by field may be useful. In the physical sciences, 4.6 percent of the Ph.D.'s granted since 1939 were conferred on women. The proportion in the life sciences is 11.4 percent; in the social sciences, 14 percent; in the arts and humanities, 15.5 percent; in engineering, 0.5 percent; in education, 20 percent; in professional fields, 11.4 percent; and in all fields combined, 11.9 percent. Since within the doctorate population a higher proportion of women than men seek academic employment, somewhat higher proportions of women may be realistic goals.

The final step is to locate available, qualified women. Every recent survey of involuntary unemployment among professionals has found unemployment rates to be two to three times as high among women as among men. While married women are less mobile than men, eliminating reverse nepotism will allow many women to accept local opportunities.

More than 35 professional societies have internal groups concerned with the status of women, and many have rosters that may be used to find qualified applicants. An extensive listing of women seeking employment in higher education is available through the Cooperative College Registry in Washington, D.C.

Upgrading the rank and salary of women already employed to match their male cohorts requires no outside assistance.

Present law makes inevitable the ultimate acceptance of qualified and capable women on an equal basis with men in institutions of higher education. Only the time lag remains uncertain. While a reluctant few individuals may have to be forced to comply with regulations, most thoughtful administrators will welcome the infusion of talent and dedication from this underutilized resource pool.—BETTY M. VETTER, *Executive Director, Scientific Manpower Commission, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20418*