

The following Employment Market Report for positions that began during the academic year 1980-81 was compiled and written by Kathryn M. Olesko, Clarkson College, for the History of Science Society's Committee on Women.

Of the 61 permanent and temporary positions that began during 1980, 57 were surveyed. Responses were received from 43 of these for a response rate of 75%, down 3% from last year. Statistical details are tabulated on pages 6 and 7.

Women accepted eight of twenty-four positions (33%), where they constituted up to 36% of the applicant pool. In temporary positions they took four out of twelve (33%) where they constituted up to 37% of the applicant pool. These figures represent a stabilization over previous years when a disproportionate share of temporary positions was offered to women. Women now seem to be offered permanent positions with the same frequency as temporary ones: one out of every three positions was offered to women, even though on the average they made up less than one-third of the applicant pool. Respondents complained of the lack of minority candidates for all positions, especially of the lack of female candidates in the history of technology.

The issues of professionalism and of outside reaction to candidates in history of science dominated the responses received. ABD candidates are still given more serious consideration for positions in history of science than for positions in general areas of history, although this consideration shows signs of being confined to temporary appointments, whereas for permanent positions an ABD is given serious consideration only in exceptional cases. While this attitude toward ABD's is a step toward increased professionalism, attitudes held by historians of science toward Ph.D.'s in other fields is not. Historians of science, along with historians of technology, administrators in scientific organizations, and museum curators, number among those most willing to hire Ph.D.s in fields other than history of science, e.g., in one of the sciences. One respondent remarked: "I would continue to prefer candidates with balanced interests between history and science rather than expertise in one field or the other."

Historians, in contrast, remarked that they were not willing to hire non-history Ph.D.s unless there was evidence of a firm grounding in historical methodologies and scholarship. In fact, it was just this issue of professional training that divided historians from historians of science among the respondents. A broad historical background in a prospective candidate was strongly emphasized by historians who considered this background the sine qua non of the appointment. According to one respondent, the lack of such training hurt some candidates: "History of science people should have a broad background in history and historical methodology. The narrowness of preparation prevented some applicants from receiving consideration." Historians of science, members of history of science or museum programs, and archivists considered this training less

important, a condition that points once again to the still strong separation between historians of science and historians.

This perceived absence of historical training among historians of science was only part of the problem, however. It was aggravated by the real lack of candidates who offered history of science as a minor or second field. Many institutions, unable to afford the luxury of a full-time historian of science, desired someone with dual competencies: either US or European history along with history of science. (Thirteen of the fifty-seven positions surveyed, or 23%, were of this type). Unfortunately, they found few candidates with balanced interests and training in both. More often than not the position went to a Europeanist or Americanist not well-trained in history of science (but who was considered the better qualified historian) who expressed a willingness to work up courses in history of science after a few years. So it appears that at medium and smaller sized institutions that require multiple competencies, history of science may not be represented by individuals professionally trained in the field.

Along with the perceived lack of historical training among historians of science, the need to make history of science popular as a minor field for historians points out the necessity of inaugurating fundamental changes in graduate education in the history of science. While this report is not the place to outline such changes, suggestions for doing so were cited in the responses received, among them: increased broadness and strength in historical training for those whose major field is history of science so that candidates can display the capabilities of a generalist and the skills of a specialist, and a closer cooperation between historians and historians of science in training graduate students to make history of science popular as a minor field. It was also pointed out that graduate students should be made aware of employment possibilities outside teaching, such as in museums and archives. Here, too, changes in graduate education need to be inaugurated, as these institutions often require "hands-on" experience prior to an appointment. At the same time, however, values and attitudes must be changed as well, as most students are trained to expect positions at academic institutions.

Serious faults in the hiring process still persist: some positions are never advertised, and less than honest and courteous interviewing and recruitment practices are not uncommon. A few openings for the future were projected by some institutions. The University of Alabama may advertise for the same Early Modern Europe & History of Science position again in a few years. An endowed chair in the history of agriculture is a possibility at Iowa State, and Harvard will be looking for a replacement for the position of assistant professor (non-tenure track) to begin fall, 1982. Finally, the Edison Papers at Rutgers University will continue to hire full and part-time people, and will begin internships.

This survey is an official function of the History of Science Society Committee on Women and we would like to thank those who participated in it.

EMPLOYMENT MARKET REPORT FOR 1980-81

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Field</u>	<u>Level</u>	<u>#App.</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Ph.D.</u>	<u>ABD</u>	<u>Hired</u>
<u>Permanent positions</u>								
Univ. Alabama	Eur. Hist.& Hist. Sci.	Asst.	45	12	33	45	0	Male, Ph.D.
Auburn Univ.	Tech.	Asst.	17	1	16	14	3	Male, Ph.D.(2)
Univ. Calif., Berkeley	Sci.&Tech.	Asst. Dir.	5	1	4	3	2	Male, Ph.D.
Clarkson College	Eur. Hist.& Hist. Sci.	Asst.	85	21	64	60	25	Female, Ph.D.
Colorado College	Eur. Hist.& Hist. Sci.	Asst.	100	35	65	(3)	(3)	Female, Ph.D.
Colorado School of Mines	Tech.	Asst.	17	1	16	12	5	Female, ABD
IIT	Tech.	Asst.	23	4	19	15	8	Male, Ph.D.
IEEE	Sci.&Tech.	Director	30	0	30	20	10	Male, Ph.D.
Iowa State	Tech.	Asst.	11	0	11	11	0	Male, Ph.D.
Univ. Louisville	US Hist.& Hist. Sci.	Asst.	41	6	35	28	13	Female, Ph.D.
Univ. Miami	Eur. Hist.& Hist. Sci.	Asst.	150	20	130	100	50	Female, Ph.D.
NASM	Astronomy	Curator	16	5	11	9	7	Male, Ph.D.
Nat. Mus.Hist.&Tech.	Chemistry	Technician	5	0	5	4	1	(1)
Nat. Portrait Gal.	US Hist.& Tech.	Res. Hist.	55	20	35	20	20	Male, ABD
Univ. Notre Dame	(4)	Asst.	375	51	324	214	128	Female, ABD
Univ. Penn.	Tech.	Asst.	99	15	84	84	15	Female, Ph.D.
Univ. Pittsburgh	Hist.Phil.Sci.	Assoc./Full	30	4	26	29	1	Male, Ph.D.
RPI	US Hist.&Tech.	Asst.	18	2	16	(3)	(3)	Male, ABD
RII	Tech.	Asst.	30	8	22	(3)	(3)	Male, Ph.D.
Rutgers, Edison Papers	Tech.	Ed. Assoc.	15	5	10	7	3	Male, ABD
Rutgers, Edison Papers	General							(1)
SUNY Binghamton	General	Asst.	35	9	26	18	7	Male, Ph.D.
Trinity Univ.	Eur. Hist.& Hist. Sci.	Asst.	45	11	34	35	10	Male, Ph.D.
Union College	Medicine	Asst.	52	7	45	30	15	Male, ABD
VPI&SU	Sci.&Tech.	Asst.	106	13	93	(3)	(3)	Male, Ph.D.
VPI&SU	Biology	Asst.	24	5	19	17	5	Female, Ph.D.
West Virginia Univ.	Sci.&Tech.	Asst./Assoc.						(6)
Edison National Hist. Site	Tech.	Curator	9	3	6	2	2	Male, ABD(2)
<u>Temporary positions</u>								
Joan Bromberg	Tech.	Res. Asst.	1	0	1	0	1	Male, ABD
Univ. of Calif., Berkeley	Sci.&Tech.	Asst. Res. Historian	4	0	4	3	0	Male, Ph.D.
Univ. Calif., Berkeley	Sci.&Tech.	Asst.Res.Hist.	26	6	20	14	5	(1)
Carnegie Inst.	General	Adm. Asst.	5	3	2	2	3	Female, MA
Cent.Hist.Phys., AIP	Physics	Archivist						(3)
Univ. Conn.	General	Visit. Lec.	5	3	2	(3)	(3)	Female, Ph.D.
Univ. Conn.,Hartford	Sci.& Medicine	Asst.	35	11	24	33	2	(1)
Harvard Univ.	General	Asst.	39	14	25	14	25	Female, Ph.D.
Oakland Univ.	Eur. Hist.& Hist. Sci.	Asst.	40	15	25	30	10	Female, ABD
Pacific Lutheran Univ.	Eur. Hist.& Hist. Sci.	Asst.	16		(3)			Male, Ph.D.
Rutgers, Edison Papers	Sci.&Tech.	3 Ed. Assts.	11	2	9	1	0	3 Males (5)
SUNY Binghamton	General	Asst.	10	2	8	5	5	Male, Ph.D.
Texas Tech.	US Sci. & Tech.	Asst.	3	0	3	2	1	Male, Ph.D.
<u>No Response</u>								
Cornell	General	Asst.						Female, Ph.D.
Loyala Marymount	Eur.Hist. & Science	Asst.						
MIT	Comm. Policy	Asst./Assoc.						
Millikan Univ.	Sci.&Tech.	Asst.						

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Field</u>	<u>Level</u>	<u>#App.</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Ph.D.</u>	<u>ABD</u>	<u>Hired</u>
<u>No Response (cont.)</u>								
Montana State Univ	Eur.Hist. & Science	Asst.						
NSF	Sci. Ed.	Program Officer						
NSF	Ethics & Values	Program Manager						
Univ. Penn.	Hist. Soc. Sci.	Asst.						Female, Ph.D.
Rose-Hulman Inst.	Hist. Tech.	Asst.						
Nat. Mus. Hist. Tech.	Elec. Tech.	Historian						
Nat. Mus. Hist. Tech.	Sci.&Tech.	Asst. to Chair						(1)
NASM	Soc. Hist.	Curator						2 Males, Ph.D.
NASM	Space Science	Curator						
VPI&SU	General	Director						

Not Surveyed

Univ. Aleppo	General	Asst.						
Isis/Univ. Penn.	General	Ed. Asst.						
Princeton	General	Visit. Prof.						Male, Ph.D. (7)
Wellcome Trust	General	Director						

- Notes: (1) Final offer not yet made
(2) Females among finalists
(3) No statistics reported
(4) To teach in the "Great Books" program
(5) Offered first to female, who declined
(6) Position unfunded
(7) Position filled after this survey was completed

PLEASE POST

HISTORY OF SCIENCE SOCIETY PRIZES TO BE AWARDED AT THE 1981 ANNUAL MEETING, LOS ANGELES, DECEMBER 27-30.

1981 PFIZER AWARD

The Pfizer Award, consisting of a medal and a cash prize of \$1,500, was established in 1958 through the generosity of Charles Pfizer and Company, Inc. to recognize and reward the best published work related to the history of science written by an American or Canadian citizen and published in the preceding year.

The words "history of science" are to be interpreted in the broadest sense possible, covering the impact of science as well as its origins and development. Biographies whose subject touches on science are also construed to fit in the category. We have excluded from consideration reprints of previously published works, new editions, collected articles or symposia. Translations and editions of classics of science will be considered if the scholarly apparatus and introductions are substantial.

Closing date for entries is May 1. The Chairperson of the 1981 Pfizer Award Committee is Dr. Betty Jo Dobbs, Department of History, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60201.

1981 SCHUMAN AWARD

The Schuman Prize of \$500, established in 1955 by Ida and Henry Schuman of New York City for an original prize essay in the history of science and its cultural influences, is open to graduate and undergraduate students in any American or Canadian college, university, or institute of technology.

History of science and its cultural influences should be interpreted very broadly. Papers may deal with the ideas and accomplishments of scientists in the past, the evolution of particular scientific concepts, or the historical influences of one branch of science upon another.

Three copies of each essay should be sent before July 15 to Dr. Lorraine Daston, Chairperson of the Schuman Prize Committee, Dept. of History of Science, Harvard University, Science Center 235, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Names and institutions of the contributors should be placed on a separate title page so they may be removed before being read by members of the Committee. Past recipients of the Schuman Prize are not eligible to compete again.