



SUGGESTED READING

A Study on the Status of Women Faculty in Science at MIT. (1999). *The MIT Faculty Newsletter*, Vol. XI, No. 4.

This is the original MIT report that has spurred so many other studies.

Bensimon, E.M., Ward, K., & Sanders, K. (2000). "Creating Mentoring Relationships and Fostering Collegiality." *Department chair's role in developing new faculty into teachers and scholars*, 113-137. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

The authors describe the ideal mentoring relationship, and offer suggestions to department chairs in encouraging mentoring and establishing formal mentoring programs. Strategies are offered for fostering collegiality for newcomers to a department, including a letter from Professor Anna Neumann. Sections are devoted especially to collegiality for women in predominantly male environments and minorities in predominantly white environments.

Etzkowitz, H., C. Kemelgor, and B. Uzzi. (2000). "The 'Kula Ring' of Scientific Success." *Athena unbound: The advancement of women in science and technology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Explores the ways in which the lack of critical mass for women in science disadvantages them when it comes to the kinds of networking that promotes collaboration and general flow of information needed to foster the best possible research.

Georgi, Howard. (2000). "Is There an Unconscious Discrimination Against Women in Science?" *APS News Online*. College Park, Maryland: American Physical Society.

An examination of the ways in which norms about what good scientists should be like are not neutral but masculine and work to disadvantage women.

Hopkins, Nancy, Lotte Bailyn, Lorna Gibson, and Evelyn Hammonds. (2002). *An Overview of Reports from the Schools of Architecture and Planning; Engineering; Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences; and the Sloan School of Management*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The overview of MIT's more recent study of all of its schools.

Long, J. Scott, ed. (2001). "Executive Summary." *From Scarcity to Visibility: Gender Differences in the Careers of Doctoral Scientists and Engineers*. 1-8. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

This excerpt provides an overview of differences in the science careers of men and women.

McNeil, L., and M. Sher. (1999). "The Dual-Career-Couple Problem." *Physics Today*. College Park, MD: American Institute of Physics.

Women in science tend to have partners who are also scientists. The same is not true for men. Thus many more women confront the "two-body problem" when searching for jobs. McNeil and Sher give a data overview for women in physics and suggest remedies to help institutions place dual-career couples.

Mickelson, R. A. and M. L. Oliver (1991). Making the Short List: Black Faculty Candidates and the Recruitment Process. *The Racial Crisis in American Higher Education*. C. Kerr, State University of New York Press.

Sagaria, M. A. D. (2002). "An Exploratory Model of Filtering In Administrative Searches: Toward Counter-Hegemonic Discourses." *The Journal of Higher Education* 73(6): 677-710.

Smith, D. (2000). "How to Diversify the Faculty." *Academe*, 86, no. 5. Washington, D.C.: AAUP.

Steinpreis, R.E., Anders, K.A. & Ritzke, D. (1999). The impact of gender on the review of the curricula vitae of job applicants and tenure candidates: A national empirical study. *Sex Roles*, 41, 7/8, 509-528.

Trix, F. and C. Psenka (2003). "Exploring the color of glass: letters of recommendation for female and male medical faculty." *Discourse & Society* 14(2): 191-220.

Letters of recommendation for successful female and male medical faculty showed differences in terms used to describe them and in the length of letters. Letters for females were shorter than those for males; included more phrases expressing doubts; were more likely to include only minimal information; mentioned their personal life more often. Letters for males included more repetition of standout words like "outstanding", and included more references to research, skills and abilities and career.

Valian, V. (1998). "Evaluating Women and Men." (Chapter 7.) *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

In this chapter, Valian presents research that demonstrates that men and women who do the same things are evaluated differently, with both men and women rating women's performances lower than men's, even when they are objectively identical.

Wenneras, C. & Wold, A. (1997). "Nepotism and sexism in peer-review." *Nature*, 387, 341-343.

This Swedish study found that female applicants for postdoctoral fellowships from the Swedish Medical Research Council had to be 2.5 times more productive than their male counterparts in order to receive the same "competence" ratings from reviewers.

Wolf Wendel, L. E., S. B. Twombly, et al. (2000). "Dual-career couples: keeping them together." *The Journal of Higher Education* 71(3): 291-321.

Yoder, J. (2002). "2001 Division 35 Presidential Address: Context Matters: Understanding Tokenism Processes and Their Impact on Women's Work." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26.