

## When Nothing Matters Except Science

The main discrimination in the sciences I see is this idea that there is an ideal scientist. There's one particular type of person who does science. They like to work fourteen-hour days, and they think in a particular way, and their one and only passion is doing research. . . . I'm not that person, [and I] wonder if that means I'll never be a good scientist.

—Jennifer, physics graduate student<sup>1</sup>

Jennifer, a twenty-five-year-old physics student, fell in love with science while she was in high school, after she read *Cosmos* by the astronomer Carl Sagan. She has spent years pursuing her academic studies, and she is doing well in her graduate program. Yet she is questioning her future in academic science—how well she can fit in, her ability to succeed, whether she will be able to have a family and be a successful scientist, and whether she has what it takes to be good at the career she thought she wanted.

When we met her, Jennifer, one of the most professionally dressed and articulate scientists we interviewed for our study, wore jeans and a blue blazer, accessorized with a nice scarf. We were surprised to learn her young age and that—although it seems she is just starting—she is already questioning her future in science. Jennifer also exemplifies a sea change in academic science. She is troubled by her perception that there is an unspoken expectation to be “an ideal scientist,” and as a result, she questions her own ability to succeed in science even though she is doing well in her graduate program.

That is because, for quite some time and still today, science has promoted a strong and clear idea of the “ideal” scientist, and it doesn't match up to someone like Jennifer. An “ideal type,” according to sociologist Max Weber, is the central form of a group or an idea that we all treat as if it were true, whether or not it is.<sup>2</sup> The ideal type becomes

the expectation that insiders seek to live up to and that outsiders expect. From listening to scientists, we learn that the ideal scientist in the American university is a man, with a supportive wife who takes care of all his personal matters. If his wife is employed, her job takes a backseat to his; his scientific work is seen as a “calling”; her work is seen as “just a job.” This ideal scientist knew from a very young age that he wanted to do science and was always encouraged and inspired by his family. He never had any doubts about his desire to pursue this career. The ideal scientist often starts out as a lonely graduate student who spends most of his time on work, with few outside interests and little yearning to pursue other activities. As an established scientist, he has cultivated an ability to overcome any obstacles to getting work done. His work takes priority over family life. The ideal scientist can have children and often does, but his scientific work receives his full and undivided devotion. Work is his joy, his hobby—his whole life.

There are still some scientists who live up to this ideal, or are trying to. Most cannot. On these pages, we argue that they *should* not. The nature of science is changing, and, with it, so must the model of the ideal scientist and the structure of science itself.

### Who Is the Ideal Scientist?

Arthur is a professor in his early seventies who leads a bustling physics lab where he started as a postdoctoral fellow decades ago. Still bearing a felt-board office directory that looks straight out of the 1970s, Arthur’s lab building harkens back to a different time—and, in many ways, Arthur does too. He describes himself as “arrogantly confident.” When asked how he balanced work responsibilities with being a father to his two now-grown sons, he explained that, over the course of his fifty-year marriage, his wife “did everything . . . I did physics and she did the rest.” Echoing Arthur’s sentiments, another senior professor of physics, in his early sixties with two grown sons, admitted, “I like working, it’s basically my hobby. It’s wonderful that people would pay me to do what I’m doing . . . don’t tell anyone, but I would do it anyway if given the opportunity!”<sup>3</sup>

For these men, science is much more than a profession. It is their lifestyle, their passion, their ultimate pursuit, and the core of their identity.

These men represent the ideal scientist. They also represent a minority of the scientists we studied. Yet the ideal version of what it means to be a scientist remains fixed. This presents a problem.

Sociologists argue that “professional role confidence—individuals’ confidence in their ability to successfully fulfill the roles, competencies, and identity features of a profession”—is a central personality feature of those who persist in science.<sup>4</sup> So now we must answer a number of questions. Are scientists like Arthur the typical case? Not anymore. Are scientists still expected to live up to the ideal that Arthur embodies? We think they are. Is the university structure set up to prefer and facilitate the success of scientists like Arthur, men who have wives managing all spheres outside of their husbands’ scientific work? We believe it is. And this brings us to the crux of the problem: the “ideal” type is nearly impossible for the majority of today’s academic scientists to attain and maintain, and as a result, many are unable to achieve the all-important professional role confidence. This is true for *both* men and women. Young men in science today are more like Jennifer than Arthur. And Jennifer is more than just one individual. Jennifer will likely be a casualty of an academic science that is not just unappealing to young people but unmanageable and unsustainable for those already pursuing it. Here we provide the individual stories and reasons for those like Jennifer, whose experiences are deeply embedded in and birthed from an academic science structure that is at risk because it refuses to recognize that work and family life are now deeply interconnected for both men and women in science. As a result, many young scientists will choose to leave academia altogether, and as a result science will suffer.

### *The Nature of Academic Science*

In 1998, sociologist of science Joseph Hermanowicz described academic science this way:

Elite departments provide ample resources and rewards for excellence in research, the sole criterion for evaluating professional and personal worth. Elite scientists hold themselves and each other to uncompromising standards, severely sanctioning those who do not continually produce acclaimed research. Success only ratchets expectations higher, and one

derives status solely from one's most recent work. Thus, perhaps surprisingly, although they are most successful in terms of research, elites fear professional failure more than other scientists do. They also suffer more from this fear, because science looms large in their overall self-identities.<sup>5</sup>

Researchers find that men in professional occupations have strong devotions to the world of paid work.<sup>6</sup> Among middle-class men, such commitment demands long hours and a strong identification with career, which is often expressed as an all-consuming commitment to their employer.<sup>7</sup> The ideal academic scientist is devoted to his research, which affords him a type of “macho” masculinity that is linked to long hours spent at work.<sup>8</sup> Among elite professionals, long hours are even seen as a badge of courage, signaling a primary commitment to the workforce<sup>9</sup>—and academics average longer hours than most professionals.<sup>10</sup> For example, previous work on academic scientists at elite research universities (which our data confirm) reveals that both men and women work upwards of fifty-five hours a week.<sup>11</sup> These extremely high expectations for scientists are tied to the idea that science is concerned with ultimate truth, and thus obviously worthwhile, with long hours justified because they signal a meaningful pursuit of this truth.<sup>12</sup> Consequently, academic science is seen as a “greedy institution” that often claims a person's full temporal and cognitive attention.<sup>13</sup>

In recent years, academic science has become even more demanding of the total person. In times past, scientists—especially those at major research universities—needed less funding, so they did not experience the frenetic pace of grant writing, management, and fund-raising that we see today.<sup>14</sup> Their relationship with the public has changed as well. With easily accessible information that appears scientific, the public thinks it knows more about science than ever before, which means that scientists are pushed by the public and by the science infrastructure itself to do more science outreach. And federal agencies are now calling for more social application of science, meaning that even the most basic research (research done only to pursue scientific knowledge without any specific societal application in mind) must be rationalized to the public as “helping society.” In addition to doing cutting-edge research, scientists must now engage in outreach programs that show how their science serves society.<sup>15</sup> There is less affirmation of basic research for its own sake.

All these factors mean that successful scientists at major research universities now often manage multi-million-dollar-per-year research enterprises, which involve getting grants, being concerned about retaining full-time lab employees whose jobs are dependent on their grants, doing public outreach as a condition of getting and keeping grants, and serving on granting committees. All this is alongside teaching undergraduates, mentoring graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, serving on university committees, and remaining active members of professional networks and associations necessary for getting tenure. There are fewer university jobs, less affirmation of novel ideas, and greater pressures to get tenure-track jobs—and the even greater pressures of keeping these jobs after they are landed.

Another big change is the increasing number of women who are entering careers in academic science. This has led to new areas of work-family conflict. Because science is a time-demanding profession that allows for few responsibilities and commitments outside of work,<sup>16</sup> and because family responsibilities generally tend to fall on women more than men,<sup>17</sup> gender norms and disparities are directly linked to work-family conflict for women in academic science.<sup>18</sup>

What is interesting, however, is that we are also seeing greater work-family conflict for men in academic science. More and more, male scientists have wives and partners who are part of the paid labor force, and the expectations of the ideal scientist often conflict with the ideals of modern fatherhood. Today, men feel compelled to be their family's primary breadwinner while also being highly involved with their children—what psychologist Kerstin Aumann and colleagues, who study broader societal changes related to family life, call the “new male mystique.”<sup>19</sup> They claim that men are pressured to “do it all in order to have it all,” in a way that is similar to the pressures felt by women in the workforce.

One research study found that in 1965, fathers reported 42 hours of paid work per week, compared with 37 hours in 2011, while their hours spent on housework increased from 4 to 10. In 1965, men reported spending an average of 2.5 hours per week on child care, while in 2011 they reported spending 7 hours per week. (Child care hours for mothers also increased from 10 to 14 hours per week.)<sup>20</sup> Another study found that 95 percent of men would like to spend more time with their families.<sup>21</sup>

With more women entering science, and more men in science actively participating in housework and child care, the population of elite scientists is significantly different and more diverse than it used to be.<sup>22</sup> *We argue that these changes are good for the structure of science; more diversity among scientists means more diverse and better science.* Yet, while the demographic makeup of academic science is shifting dramatically, the institution of science is not. It is still suited to an earlier generation of scientist—a man with a stay-at-home wife.

Despite dramatic changes in the labor force and family structure over the past fifty years, society generally still sees separate spheres for husbands and wives: wives care for household activities, and husbands act as breadwinners for their families.<sup>23</sup> Child care is still believed to be more the responsibility of women than men.<sup>24</sup> Based on these traditional views, academic institutions still expect that male scientists will fully devote themselves to work without the burden of household chores or family obligations. In reality, however, many male scientists are now part of dual-career couples, and they must balance their work lives with their personal lives—managing their households, maintaining their relationships, and caring for their children. And academic scientists routinely face more limited job prospects when they are married to another scientist.<sup>25</sup>

What is unique about academic science is that perhaps more than some other professional fields the model of academic science is based on the ideal scientist. At the structural level science has not fully changed to accommodate family life at the same rate as other professional spheres. This means there are fewer male scientists who can pursue science all the time and anytime. In other words, there are fewer and fewer ideal scientists.

### *Why Does It Matter?*

Reaching the level of tenured faculty, the pinnacle of achievement in academia, is a more momentous task than it has ever been. Four years of undergraduate studies are followed by four to six (or more) years of PhD work. By the time a scientist earns her doctorate, she is likely to be in her late twenties, the time in the life course when most Americans are beginning to settle down. Scientists still must undertake at least one,

and increasingly multiple, postdoctoral appointments, which usually range from two to six years, and because many postdoctoral positions are dependent on grant funding, they do not offer the competitive pay, benefits, or stability of private sector jobs.

Next comes an appointment as an assistant professor, lasting five to seven years, and finally (if successful!) a tenured associate professor appointment. At this point, most scientists are in their late thirties or early forties, well past the time most Americans have started raising children. The time as a tenure-track professor is perhaps the most intense and stressful in an academic life, with no specific timeline for moving from associate to full professor. In this highly competitive and lengthy process, when is the right time to start a family? Scientists in academia often feel they have to wait until they are tenured, a perception that has led to a trend of later childbearing among scientists.

Even in the best-case scenario—once they manage to secure a job, earn tenure, and start a family—academic scientists still must deal with the heavy demands of their career, which often impinges on time set aside for family. The academic science workday has no strict boundaries, and academic scientists feel a constant pressure to produce more publications and earn more grants and awards. They also worry that prioritizing family obligations could have negative ramifications for their careers. Concerns over how to balance work and family are not eased at the most elite research universities, which supposedly provide the most resources to support their employees and are leaders in their organizational field.<sup>26</sup>

The inability to balance life as a scientist with life as a parent is more than a personal issue or a female issue. It is a structural failure resulting from the expectation that the ideal scientist will prioritize complete and utter devotion to career above all else.<sup>27</sup> While the fixed view of the ideal scientist has real consequences when it comes to gender equality—much research suggests that fully qualified women leave science at higher rates than do men—we find that the fixed view of the ideal scientist has a significant impact on the ability of *both* women and men to stay in and succeed in academic science.

Research shows that academic scientists who are mothers pay the highest price. A 2010 study found that married women with children are 27 percent less likely than married men with children to achieve

tenure in the sciences, and 13 percent less likely to earn tenure than are married women without children.<sup>28</sup> One likely explanation for this effect is an underlying assumption that being a mother distracts from or compromises a woman's devotion to her work.<sup>29</sup> What happens as a result? Numerous women we spoke with indicated that they actually felt it necessary to "hide" their children until after receiving tenure.

And yet we found that male scientists also say that issues related to family can have a great impact on their academic careers. While many of the men we interviewed felt privileged to be more involved in their children's lives than were past generations of male scientists, many of those who are parents noted that their family commitments often negatively affect their opportunities for career advancement. Because they want to spend more time with their children, they are unable to devote as much time to their research as are their childless peers. They say senior male scientists subtly and overtly sanction them for devoting themselves too much to their families—for example, criticizing them for not being fully devoted to their work when they take time off after the birth of a child.

The tensions men feel between work and home are multiplied when their partner or spouse also works in a professional career, which is increasingly the case for male scientists today.<sup>30</sup> When faced with the same work-life challenges that women face (such as marriage to a spouse in a full-time profession or lack of adequate child care), some men curtail their careers as much as their female counterparts. Single and childless scientists also suffer under the expectations of the ideal scientist. They feel that their desire to take care of family matters and pursue any interests outside of work is often not validated.

The feeling that career progress has been hindered by the difficulty of balancing work and family has a negative effect on satisfaction as a faculty member (and it is safe to assume that faculty satisfaction is linked with retention and productivity). Our research also shows that even though there are pronounced differences between male and female scientists in their satisfaction with work, we find no gender difference in their happiness with life outside of work when controlling for other factors.<sup>31</sup> Once we add an intriguing variable—desired number of children—we find something fascinating: male faculty who have fewer children than they desired are less satisfied with their lives than are the women in our study, even though female scientists tend to have fewer

children than their male colleagues and are less likely to have children at all. Clearly, neither sex can be ignored in the push to expand the family-friendliness of academic science.

When surveyed, one in four graduate students and one in five post-doctoral fellows said they were considering a career outside science altogether, and those who said that they have fewer children than they want because of their science career are much more likely to desire a career outside science. In our interviews with scientists, they said over and over again that the difficulties they have with maintaining family commitments will play a particularly important role as they decide whether or not to stay in academic science.

Economist Albert O. Hirschman's organizational theory of exit, voice, and loyalty provides some insight into why many scientists struggling to balance work and family end up leaving academia.<sup>32</sup> He explains that members of an institution will remain loyal to an institution when they disagree with its policies *if* the organization provides them with the opportunity to bring change. Interviews with biologists and physicists reveal their perception that universities and departments are unwilling to change to support those who do not live up to their fixed notion of the scientific ideal.

This is a book about how women *and* men who are scientists at the top U.S. research universities negotiate their personal and family lives and how the strategies they use *and the identities they develop* have the potential to change the actual structure of academic science by moving it beyond the image of the ideal scientist—the scientist who pursues science as a calling at the cost of everything else. Elite academic science has changed and become much more accommodating to women, leading to an increase in the number of women in most disciplines in science, although women have still not reached parity with men. *Yet we argue that while women are hit harder by the pressures of elite academic science, the institution of science—and academic science, in particular—is not good for either women or men who want to have children or pursuits outside of their careers.* Our research reveals that women still experience difficulty “having it all,” and—perhaps most important—both young men and young women scientists struggle with balancing their work and family lives. This struggle may prevent these young scientists from pursuing positions at top research universities, a cost that is too great

for our national science infrastructure to bear.<sup>33</sup> We argue that science itself is better off if it can accommodate those in different life situations. We stand alongside theorists of organizational and institutional health who argue that when organizations that rely on creativity for success (as academic science does) are more diverse, this leads to better and more robust creative output. At its core, the image of the ideal scientist is an issue because it reproduces gender inequality, strains families and children, and makes academic science an unattractive career choice for the best and brightest (who often have families as well), all factors that are structurally hurting science itself. These findings ought to be of concern to scientists, university leaders, policy experts, and members of the broader public who want the United States to continue to be a leader in world science.

### How Did We Come to These Conclusions?

The data in this book are drawn from the Perceptions of Women in Academic Science (PWAS) study, which we led. When this research began, we planned to tell the story of how scientists perceive *women's* achievements in science and impediments to achievement for women in science. As research often does, ours uncovered something we were not expecting. While women definitely discussed discrimination in science, we were surprised to find that *both women and men* mostly talked with us about work-family dynamics in science. This is the story we present here, largely in their own words. Because certain voices seemed to capture the essence of what entire groups are thinking, the narrative is structured around a few scientists, like Jennifer, who embody the major findings and themes revealed by the larger study.

The PWAS study includes two parts: a quantitative survey of 3,455 scientists in biology and physics, which received a response rate of 72 percent (a very high rate in modern-day survey research),<sup>34</sup> and 150 interviews with biologists and physicists at the universities surveyed. In this way, we paint a full picture of the lives of academic scientists—combining the breadth that comes from surveying a large number of people with the depth that comes from follow-up face-to-face discussions. (More information about the details of our study can be found in appendix A at the end of the book.) Although we wrote this book

together, we conducted different aspects of the research, and so from here on out, we will sometimes refer to ourselves separately, as Elaine and Anne.

We surveyed biologists and physicists at the top twenty American universities in late 2008 and early 2009 and then followed up between 2009 and 2011 with in-depth interviews with a random sample of those who responded to the survey. Most of the interviews were conducted in person by Elaine. The list we put together of all scientists in five career stages (graduate student, postdoctoral fellow, and assistant, associate, and full professors) at these universities included more than 14,000 individuals at thirty-one universities and 100 departments. We then randomly selected scientists from among these twenty graduate programs to participate. Elite Research 1 universities, a rank given by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, were selected because these institutions largely shape what is seen as ideal in a given field. Scientists in the disciplines of biology and physics were selected for several reasons. First, the number of women in biology is increasing at all stages of the academic career path, while the number of women in physics remains very low.<sup>35</sup> At American colleges and universities, women constitute 46 percent of the life science faculty but only 14 percent of physics faculty. In the related discipline of astronomy, 19 percent of faculty members are female.<sup>36</sup> One possible reason for this, as some scholars have recently argued, is that physics is a discipline that people believe requires superior innate talent or brilliance, and such fields are likely to be dominated by men.<sup>37</sup> Second, we wanted to know whether biology, a discipline that now has as many women faculty as men, would be friendlier to family issues. We found that the cultures of these two disciplines are extraordinarily different.<sup>38</sup>

We also chose to survey and interview both senior and junior scientists. Senior scientists at top institutions most actively mold their disciplines, transmit scientific knowledge to the next generation, and broadly influence the practice and perception of science across sectors.<sup>39</sup> Junior scientists (graduate students and postdoctoral fellows) in the top graduate programs are on a path to becoming leaders in their fields and professors to the next generation of scientists.<sup>40</sup> Senior scientists are key informants on the structure of science, as well as potential agents of change. Junior scientists are the future. Only by surveying and in-

interviewing both groups could we truly and deeply understand the role professional and personal expectations play in scientists' lives throughout the career course, and how changing work-life dynamics are shaping academic science as a whole.

We spoke with graduate students and postdoctoral fellows about their professional and personal aspirations—their thoughts about entering academic science, as well as the struggles they face in trying to obtain an academic science position while starting a family. We spoke with those who have “made it” in science by obtaining positions as professors, asking them about the hardships they face as they try to balance devotion to work and family, and what kinds of strategies they use to overcome the difficulties. We also examined their potential to change the institutional infrastructure of science. Through our interviews, we were able to dig into some deeper issues. To what extent are the long hours academic scientists devote to work a matter of individual choice? How much are they determined by larger institutional structures? Just how gendered are the difficulties associated with being simultaneously a parent and a scientist? Do these difficulties affect women more than men? Is the structure of university science itself gendered, or is science neutral when it comes to how to raise a family and have a career as a leading scientist? What makes the university science environment unique when it comes to examining the family-work tensions faced by all those in professional careers?

This work is also personal. Elaine's husband is an academic scientist, and together they have encountered the difficulties that come with trying to balance their relationship and careers. They have also faced the difficulties that come with balancing an academic science career and raising a young child. Their daughter was born during the course of data collection for this book. As Elaine was interviewing scientists about their lives and how they manage personal and professional responsibilities and commitments, she often brought along her baby daughter and found she was navigating many of the same issues they shared with her. As the child of mathematics teachers, Anne became interested in science at an early age. Her acceptance to the North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics, a public residential high school that emphasizes those subjects, further cemented a lifelong love of science and exploration. After initially majoring in animal science in college, Anne turned

instead to the study of people, though her interest in science persisted. She studied the feminization of the veterinary medical profession for her dissertation and has studied science careers extensively with Elaine.

### Book at a Glance

In *Failing Families, Failing Science*, we look at how gender, choice, and institutional structure shape science careers, and how science careers, in turn, shape family life. Our research reveals that *both* female and male scientists find structural barriers in the university setting that restrict their ability to raise a family and have a life outside of work, and this drives significant numbers of academic scientists to the corporate world or into other careers outside of science, where they believe a balance between work and family is more feasible.<sup>41</sup>

In the next chapter, “Family Matters to Science,” we look at the degree to which elite scientists today feel they are living up to their image of the ideal scientist and the ways in which they try to integrate family life with their scientific work. We also explore the various ways that family life is important to science and the U.S. science infrastructure. In chapter 3, “Will I Make It? Family Life for Young Scientists,” we hear from graduate students and postdoctoral fellows who tell us that finding a faculty position in science is not necessarily their goal, even though they have devoted many years to training for such a post. For many of these scientists, a strong desire to be near family or have a family takes precedence over an academic career, and they feel jobs in industry may provide more flexibility and be better able to meet their needs and wants, especially if they are in a relationship with another professional or academic.<sup>42</sup> “I want to read to my kids every night, and I don’t want to quit my job, I would go crazy,” says Christine, a biology postdoctoral fellow in her early thirties.<sup>43</sup> “I could never be a stay-at-home mom all the time, but I want to be able to be there for soccer games and reading and homework.” Concerned that an academic lifestyle would “just be too hectic,” she is considering a career outside of academic science— notwithstanding the almost ten years of postgraduate study she has devoted to biology.

In chapter 4, “Managing the Controlled Crash,” we show that although graduate students and postdoctoral fellows may believe that

their careers will stabilize and accommodate their families once they earn tenure, the experiences of senior scientists suggest that work-family struggles continue long after the tenure clock stops ticking. Carolyn, a full professor of biology who is married to another scientist at a major research university, is by all accounts a success story, but we quickly learn just how much she had to sacrifice to get there.<sup>44</sup>

Often, male scientists see their female colleagues as not fully belonging in the academy, though we found this sentiment to be stronger in physics than in biology. We also found that when these women have children, it seems to confirm male beliefs about their lack of professional dedication. As a result, the women we talked with disproportionately discussed the impact their science careers had on family planning, such as deciding when to have children, how many children to have, or whether to have children at all. In chapter 5, “When the Ideal Scientist Meets the Ideal Mother,” we show that female scientists, as a whole, hold different beliefs than male scientists do about the contributions women *ought* to make to family life. In addition, men and women frame their contributions to family life differently. Men describe their family contributions as sacrifices, whereas women emphasize how “lucky” they are if their partner contributes equally to child-rearing tasks. Even though men are responding to new pressures to be involved parents, adopting strategies for work-family balance that have previously been used by women, the self-descriptions illustrate that the mental and emotional pressures are greater for scientist mothers, who are trying to simultaneously fulfill the obligations of two full-time roles.

Finally, in chapter 6, “A Way Forward for Universities, Science, and Scientists,” we argue that universities must restructure their science departments to better meet the needs of the modern academic scientist, or they risk losing both women and men (though the failure of academic departments to account for and address gender differences and responsibilities outside the workplace could keep them from attracting more women specifically). We challenge universities and departments to implement structural changes that better accommodate the personal lives of modern scientists, and we encourage them to take a more active role in teaching young male and female scientists how best to balance their careers with family responsibilities through mentoring, classes, and workshops. After hearing the stories of those we have interviewed, we

also encourage today's young scientists to develop personal strategies that allow them to succeed in academic science while having the kind of family life they want.

When it comes to balancing work and family, scientists deal with the same kind of struggles as everyone else. Yet they also deal with a professional ideal that is nearly impossible for them to live up to if they have a working spouse or any interests or commitments outside of work. The "greedy institution" of academic science is uniquely challenging and demanding. The perception that academic science is an especially inhospitable place for those desiring children and involvement in family life should be important to us all. We trust our top universities to generate the best and brightest scientists, to keep our country at the forefront of scientific knowledge and research, and to address the most pressing problems of our time. It is a national problem if the family-unfriendliness of academic science is a turnoff for the most talented men and women. We want the best scientists in the best universities doing the best research.

Ultimately, this is a book about change—the changing nature of academic science, the changing priorities of academic scientists, and the institutional changes that U.S. research universities can and need to make to retain scientists like Jennifer. As we have begun to see, the struggle to balance academic science and family life is not just a woman's problem. The large majority of scientists today—both male and female—are not willing to pursue science at the cost of everything else. The ideal scientist is a thing of the past, and it is time to leave this faulty image behind. The future, as they say, is now.