

## 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

ROBERT L. BOWMAN	WILLARD F. LIBBY
MELVIN CALVIN	GORDON J. F. MACDONALD
JOSEPH W. CHAMBERLAIN	EVERETT I. MENDELSON
FARRINGTON DANIELS	NEAL E. MILLER
JOHN T. EDSALL	JOHN R. PIERCE
DAVID R. GODDARD	COLIN S. PITTENDRIGH
EMIL HAURY	KENNETH S. PITZER
ALEXANDER HOLLAENDER	ALEXANDER RICH
ROBERT JASTROW	DEWITT STETTEN, JR.
EDWIN M. LERNER, II	EDWARD L. TATUM
CLARENCE M. ZENER	

### Editorial Staff

#### Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

#### Publisher

DAEL WOLFFLE

#### 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:* DANIEL S. GREENBERG, JOHN WALSH, ELINOR LANGER, MARION ZEIGER, ROSEMARY GALLI

*Europe:* VICTOR K. MCELHENY, Flat 3, 18 Kensington Court Place, London, W.8, England (Western 5360)

*Book Reviews:* SARAH S. DEES

*Editorial Assistants:* JAMES BLESSING, ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, BEN CARLIN, SYLVIA EBERHART, GRAYCE FINGER, NANCY HAMILTON, OLIVER HEATWOLE, ANNE HOLDSWORTH, MARCIA JODLBAUER, RUTH KINGERLEE, KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, ELLEN SALTZ

### Advertising Staff

#### Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

#### Production Manager

RAYMONDE SALAMA

Sales: New York, N.Y., 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858): RICHARD L. CHARLES, ROBERT S. BUGBEE

Scotch Plains, N.J., 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873): C. RICHARD CALLIS

Chicago, Ill., 6 W. Ontario St. (312-DE-7-4973): HERBERT BURKLUND

Los Angeles 45, Calif., 8255 Beverly Blvd. (213-653-9817): WINN NANCE

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: 202-387-7171. Cable: Advancesci. Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Rm. 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE 6-1858.

## Of Time and the Doctorate

The idealized picture of a new Ph.D. in science is of a student who had his course well charted in advance and who was aided by assistantships and fellowships to earn the doctorate in approximately 4 years. As a matter of fact, only about one student in ten gets through that quickly. The typical one finished college without expecting to go on for the doctorate and without clear plans for any graduate work. In the B.A.—Ph.D. interval he spent 9 months in military service, worked a couple of years, usually as a college teacher or in other professional work, was enrolled in graduate school for more than 3 years on a full-time basis and for another year and a half part time, and finally got the doctorate nearly 8 years after the B.A.

These data are from a new study\* that adds considerable descriptive and interpretive detail to the information on B.A.—Ph.D. time lapse previously published by the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council and others. The study surveyed recipients of the doctorate between 1950 and 1958 in 16 fields, from 23 southern universities. Some factors may differ by geographic region, but in terms of B.A.—Ph.D. time lapse the sample was generally representative of the country as a whole.

Both the Ph.D. recipients and their mentors were asked whether the usual delay could or should be shortened. About a fourth thought not, but the large majority suggested ways of reducing the time lapse. Much emphasis was given to changes in organization and planning. Students and teachers both recommended that more and earlier counseling be given graduate students, that program planning be more systematic, that students be given a clearer understanding of their own responsibilities and of institutional and departmental expectations, and that faculty advisers provide more continuous monitoring of student progress.

Science departments already appear to do better on these points than do others. The graduate deans and professors explained the shorter average time lapse in the sciences (and particularly in chemistry, the "fastest" field of all) largely in terms of the tighter structuring of graduate work in science. But the respondents thought there was room for considerable improvement in most science departments.

These recommendations merit serious consideration. They would probably work, and shortening the average time for the next few years would be the equivalent of increasing the number of successful candidates. Yet caution is in order. Too much guidance, structuring, detailed program planning, and the like could change the character of the Ph.D. degree even if its level were not intentionally or appreciably changed. While some change in character may be appropriate for the nonresearch degree that is being considered in some quarters, the independent research characteristic of the Ph.D. surely should be preserved.

Graduate faculties seem therefore to be presented with a nice problem of balancing objectives and techniques. The task is one of identifying and encouraging good candidates earlier, and of imparting a clearer understanding of what is expected of them while still leaving them ample opportunity to stumble, to profit from their own errors and successes, and to develop scholarly independence.—DAEL WOLFFLE

\* *Of Time and the Doctorate*, by Kenneth M. Wilson. Atlanta, Georgia, Southern Regional Education Board, 1965, ix + 212 pp.