

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

1970

GUSTAF O. ARRHENIUS	RICHARD C. LEWONTIN
FRED R. EGGAN	ALFRED O. C. NIER
HARRY F. HARLOW	FRANK W. PUTNAM
MILTON HARRIS	

1971

THOMAS EISNER	NEAL MILLER
AMITAI ETZIONI	BRUCE MURRAY
EMIL HAURY	JOHN R. PIERCE
DANIEL KOSHLAND, JR.	

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher

DAEL WOLFLE

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editors: ROBERT V. ORMES

Assistant Editors: ELLEN E. MURPHY, JOHN E. RINGLE

Assistants to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN, PAULA LECKY

News Editor: JOHN WALSH

Foreign Editor: DANIEL S. GREENBERG*

News and Comment: LUTHER J. CARTER, PHILIP M. BOFFEY, NANCY GRUCHOW, SCHERRAINE MACK

Research Topics: ROBERT W. HOLCOMB

Book Reviews: SYLVIA EBERHART, KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, CAROL BROWN

Editorial Assistants: JOANNE BELK, ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, GRAYCE FINGER, NANCY HAMILTON, CORRINE HARRIS, OLIVER HEATWOLE, ANNE HOLDSWORTH, MARSHALL KATHAN, MARGARET LLOYD, VIRGINIA NUESSELE, PATRICIA ROWE, LEAH RYAN, LOIS SCHMITT, BARBARA SHEFFER, RICHARD SOMMER, YA LI SWIGART, ALICE THEILE, MARIE WEBNER

*European Office: 22 Mulberry Walk, London, S.W.3, England (Telephone: 352-9749)

Advertising Staff

Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager

KAY GOLDSIEIN

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Robert S. Bugbee, 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); MEDFIELD, MASS. 02052: Richard M. Ezequelle, 4 Rolling Lane (617-444-1439); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Herbert L. Burklund, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-DE-7-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772)

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. See also page xviA, *Science*, 27 March 1970. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Room 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

The Changing Job Market

Recently, *Science* had an opening for a proofreader. Among the applicants was a Ph.D. in physics, who had been engaged in space research. Our interviewer, feeling that the applicant was overqualified, named a low salary. The physicist still wished to be considered; he said, "That would feed me." Further examples of an anecdotal kind are easily obtainable. They lead to the impression that scientists are experiencing unusual difficulty in finding positions commensurate with their training.

Detailed, up-to-date quantitative evidence on the job market for scientists is scarce. One of the best recent studies was conducted by Mrs. Susanne Ellis* for the American Institute of Physics (AIP). She examined the placement of new Ph.D. physicists during the past 3 years. The study confirmed that applicants are working harder to find jobs. In 1969, 52 percent of candidates sent applications to ten or more potential industrial employers. This figure was up from 29 percent in 1967. At the same time, the number of applicants whose efforts produced no offers rose sharply. The survey revealed that 2.5 percent of the recent doctorate holders are unemployed. But that percentage is deceptively low because, of the 1969 physics Ph.D. graduates, 46 percent have accepted temporary postdoctoral appointments. This figure is up from 6 percent in 1959 and 25 percent in 1967. Most of these temporary appointments were created by the chairmen of physics departments for their own Ph.D. graduates.

The dark picture for physicists has its origins mainly in changes on the academic scene. During the period of exponential growth of federal support, the number of positions available on university staffs increased in spite of a lack of growth in the number of physics undergraduates. This increase in faculties absorbed most of the new Ph.D.'s. When federal support leveled off, physics departments could not justify additional appointments to their staff. Industry and government, which together had been employing about 30 percent of the new Ph.D.'s, could not absorb the surplus. The kind of training that physicists have experienced is partly to blame. The AIP survey reported that nonuniversity employers found that physicists were overspecialized and less adaptable than engineers. Engineers have been obtaining an extensive physics education as part of their engineering training and are now taking positions that formerly went exclusively to physicists.

In part, the employment problems of physicists represent a crisis of expectations. The AIP survey asked recent doctorate holders to name their desired employer. As many as 57 percent named universities (where there are few job openings), whereas only 4 percent named government and almost none named 2-year colleges. The 2-year colleges employ only 1 percent of new Ph.D.'s and could use many more.

An article to be published in *Science*† sets forth results of a survey of many fields conducted by the National Research Council. The survey confirms the finding that most new Ph.D.'s must work harder to find jobs, but differs from the AIP study in its assessment of the extent of unemployment among new Ph.D.'s. The Council report is much more cheerful.

Faced with the possibility of an excess of scientists, the Nixon administration, in its 1971 budget, proposes to cut in half the number of new fellowships and traineeships (*Science*, 1 May). Earlier years have already seen severe pruning of such support. The proposed cuts will have repercussions extending to the high schools, and the full effects will endure for decades. Blinded by the prospects of short-term maladjustments, the administration seems about to stumble into long-term destruction.—PHILIP H. ABELSON

*Susanne D. Ellis, speech presented at the American Physical Society Meeting, Washington, D.C., 28 April 1970. †Office of Scientific Personnel, National Research Council, "Employment status of recent doctorate recipients," *Science*, in press.