[The following article appeared in the *New York Times* of 19 May 1988, and is reprinted here with permission. It does an excellent job of exposing the thorny problems encountered by dual career couples and those who seek to employ them. Sylvia Fava and Kathy Deierlein's survey of 479 women physicists (see the August *Gazette*) revealed that 49% of women physics Ph.D.s are married to other physics Ph.D.s, or were at one time (widows and divorcees). This remarkable statistic indicates that the problems experienced by dual-career couples may be a major factor in the underrepresentation of women in the field. Historically, at least, it is more likely that the woman's career will suffer.]

PRACTICE NEPOTISM, BUT AFFIRMATIVELY
by Judith Martin and Gunther Stent*

Loved her, hated him.

That used to be only a social dilemma. But now employers are discovering how difficult it is to get one half of a couple when they don't particularly want the other. And so prospective employers in professions involving mobility—corporate business, the military and diplomatic services, higher education—end up spending a significant amount of time with other people's so-called significant other.

Suppose you run an academic department that has an opening for a solid-state physicist. For months, your search committee has been screening candidates. It has delicately refrained from inquiring into their private lives; that would have been improper, if not illegal.

Now it's down to three eminently qualified candidates, and serious negotiations begin. Over moo shu pork, there is no more talk about lab space. You are now going to hear about the physicists' love lives.

Candidate *A* is married to a specialist in the Romantic poets who refuses to

---

*Judith Martin, who writes the "Miss Manners" books, and Gunther Stent, chairman of the department of molecular and cell biology at the University of California at Berkeley, have separately dealt with the problems of dual careers in their work.

budge without an appropriate job offer. Candidate *B* lives with a "Big Bang" theorist who wants a position in your department—and it had better be tenured. Candidate *C* is engaged to a pilot. All are devoted to their respective partners' professional happiness. Now that they've heard what you are offering them, what are you going to do for the beloved?

You try to place candidate *A*'s spouse in the English department, where you don't know anyone, but the only need is for a deconstructionist Chaucerian. Then you try comparative literature, where you are reminded that you once scorned a nonequilibrium thermodynamicist who was married to a peerless comp lit candidate. Pleas that you will be more receptive next time go unheeded.

Candidate *B*'s "significant other" isn't all that good, and besides you don't have a second tenured position. Anyway, why should you make a permanent commitment to someone to whom even *B* won't? If you are lucky, your institution is near another school, and you could give this person a hearty recommendation—until your colleagues there learn that you are using them as a dumping ground.

Candidate *C*'s true love is professionally portable, and seems like a godsend. Never mind the snickers from your colleagues about the judgment of someone who would choose a sex object over a person who can debate faculty politics all night.

It seems only fair to consider the candidates on their merits alone. Naturally, you oppose nepotism. But you're not in favor of breaking up families, even incipient families (it's getting harder to make the distinction), like an antebellum slave dealer. You can only muse

---

In This Issue:

col contains a list of the most frequently used bulletin board commands. During a typical bulletin board session you would log in, open any conferences that are of interest to you, ask for a directory of the notes added since your last login, then close the conference and exit the system. Please feel free to add messages to the bulletin board, which will become more useful as it becomes more used.

Your editor has tested the procedure and recommends that you try the system only during off-peak hours, especially if you are making a long-distance call. The DB3 Vax was backed up for twenty to thirty minutes on a recent afternoon. Also, you should have a prior general familiarity with editors, electronic mail, and bulletin boards before a serious attempt.

The COPW bulletin board is still in its formative stages, and its manager, Dr. Patricia Donaldson, will appreciate having comments and making contact with other bulletin board services for women in physics and biophysics. Her Bitnet address is DONP@UORDBV and her mail address is Department of Physiology, School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14642.

AAAS/APS/AAPT JOINT MEETING IN SAN FRANCISCO OFFERS SESSIONS ON WOMEN AND SCIENCE

The joint meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Physical Society, and the American Association of Physics Teachers in San Francisco on 14–19 January will offer a number of sessions that may be of particular interest to *Gazette* readers. A highly arbitrary list of highlights:

Reception, co-sponsored by the Association of Women in Science (AWIS), the CSWP, and the Committee on Women of the American Association of Physics Teachers. Tuesday evening, 6:30–8:30, in the Sausalito Room of the San Francisco Hilton. Evelyn Fox Keller, physics Ph.D. and noted gender and science scholar, will present a talk entitled, "Women Scientists and Feminist Critics of Science."

Women in Physics: Why So Few? (Thu/am) Organized by Janice Button-Shafer (Univ. of Massachusetts) and by the CSWP, this session will examine some of the factors contributing to the shortage of women in physics, and will address the history of women in the field as a group and as individuals. Speakers, their affiliations, and their paper titles are: Beverly F. Porter (Statistics Division, American Institute of Physics), Scientific Resources for the 1990s: Women, the Untapped Pool; Vera Kistiakowsky (MIT), Women in Physics; Jackie Eccles (University of Colorado), Social Influences on Girls' Interest in Math and Science; Mary Beth Ruskai (Univ. of Lowell), How Stereotypes about Science Affect the Participation of Women; Barbara Wilson (Jet Propulsion Laboratory), Choosing Physics as a Career: Experiments in Social Pressure.

Marriage, Family, and Scientific Careers: Institutional Policy Versus Research Findings (Mon/pm), Working couples and parents; industrial and academic responses. Organized by Rae Goodell (MIT) and Marsha Lakes Matyas (AAAS).

Uneasy Careers and Intimate Lives— Great Women in Science During the Late 1800s and the 1900s (Tue/pm), Characteristics and developmental factors of successful women scientists. Organized by Caroline L. Herzenberg (Argonne Nat. Lab.) and Pnina G. Abir-Am (Harvard).

Science Acculturation Among the Young (Sun/am–pm), Decay of interest; gender and minority differences; informal learning strategies. Organized by Valerie Crane (Research Communications, Ltd.) and Ray Hannapel (NSF).

Broadening Participation in Science and Engineering (Sun/am–pm). Organized by Sue Kemnitzer (Task Force on Women, Minorities, and the Handicapped in Science and Technology) and Sheila Widnall (MIT).

Multiple Strategies to Increase Female, Minority, and Disabled Students' Participation in Mathematics and Science (Thu/am), Precollege level programs and their impacts. Organized by Nancy Kreinberg (UC–Berkeley).

NEWS AND NOTES ON THE ROSTER OF WOMEN IN PHYSICS

The redesigned questionnaire for the Roster of Women in Physics, which was included as a loose sheet in the August *Gazette*, is the good work of CSWP member Ken Lyons, who will chair the Committee in 1989. The new questionnaire should improve the accuracy of Roster data. Because it is modeled more closely on the computer screens of the Roster database, the new questionnaire greatly facilitates data entry. Also, Ken reformatted some individual questions to avoid ambiguity, and made the questionnaire easier to fill out correctly and legibly. Quite an improvement!

To reflect developments in physics, new subfields will be added periodically in the research activity information section. Accelerator physics, superconductivity, and surface science were added to the latest questionnaire. If you specialize in any of these fields, fill out a new questionnaire so we can update your record. If your specialty isn't listed, you can enter it under "Physics/Other."

Ten searches of the Roster have been ordered so far this fall. In order to maintain confidentiality of the Roster, the labels are generated at APS headquarters, and affixed to envelopes supplied by the searcher. At its most recent meeting the CSWP voted to begin including a notice in each envelope to identify the mailing as resulting from a search of the Roster of Women in Physics. The notice will also ask women who apply or are hired for such positions to notify CSWP in confidence.

Most institutions ordering a search prefer to broadcast their position announcement, so that they reach as many potential applicants as possible. Since the search designs are not highly specific, you may occasionally receive position announcements that are not exactly appropriate for your level of accomplishment. Be not offended! Just pass these announcements on to a colleague who might be interested.

The *Gazette* is mailed to all physics department chairs, but not all of them get around to reading it. If you are employed in an academic institution, make