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## Update on the 2001-2002 U.S. Doctoral Recipients

## Introduction

The Annual Survey of the Mathematical Sciences collects information each year about departments, faculties, and students in the mathematical sciences at four-year colleges and universities in the United States. Definitions of the various groups surveyed in the Annual Survey can be found in the box on page 812 of this report. Departments in the former Group Vb (operations research and management science) are no longer being surveyed.

This Second Report includes data from two parts of the 2002 Annual Survey. First, we update information about new doctoral recipients reported earlier in the February 2003 issue. Second, we present the starting salaries of the new doctoral recipients who responded to a follow-up survey. Prior to 2000 this report contained a third part presenting information about the faculties and instructional programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels in these departments. Starting with the 2000 survey, we chose to present this data in a separate report that is now published in the September issue of the Notices of the AMS.

The names of the 2001-2002 doctoral recipients and their thesis titles were published in "Doctoral Degrees Conferred" (Notices of the AMS, February 2003, pages 264-80). This list has been supplemented by fourteen additional new doctorates, twelve of which have been reported since the original list was published. The supplemental listing appears at the end of this report on page 813.


#### Abstract

This Second Report of the 2002 Annual Survey gives an update of the 2001-2002 new doctoral recipients from the First Report, which appeared in the Notices of the AMS in February 2003, pages 238-53. Prior to 2000 this report included information about faculty size, departmental enrollments, majors, and graduate students for departments of mathematical sciences in four-year colleges and universities in the United States. This information is now published as a third report in the September Notices of the AMS. The First Report gave salary data for faculty members in these same departments. It also had a section on new doctoral recipients in statistics that is not updated here.

The 2002 Annual Survey represents the forty-sixth in an annual series begun in 1957 by the American Mathematical Society. The 2002 Survey is under the direction of the Data Committee, a joint committee of the American Mathematical Society, the American Statistical Association, the Institute of Mathematical Statistics, and the Mathematical Association of America. The current members of this committee are Amy Cohen-Corwin, Donald M. Davis, Lorraine Denby, Alexander J. Hahn, Naresh Jain, G. Samuel Jordan, Stephen F. Kennedy, Ellen E. Kirkman (chair), David J. Lutzer, and James W. Maxwell (ex officio). The committee is assisted by AMS survey analyst Kinda Remick Priestley and survey coordinator Colleen Rose. Comments or suggestions regarding this Survey Report may be directed to the committee.


Information about recipients of doctoral degrees awarded between July 1, 2001, and June 30, 2002, was collected from doctorate-granting departments beginning in late spring 2002 and from a follow-up census of individual degree recipients beginning in October. The "2002 Annual Survey First Report" (Notices of the AMS, February 2003, pages 238-53) presented survey results obtained about new doctoral
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## Highlights

- There were 960 doctoral recipients from U.S. institutions for 2001-2002, down 105 (10\%) from the previous year's number. This is the lowest annual number of new doctoral recipients reported since 1989-1990, when there were 950 . The annual number of new doctoral recipients has declined each year since the all-time high of 1,176 reported for 1997-1998.
- This year's drop of 105 in the number of doctoral recipients is almost entirely due to the drop of 104 in the number of recipients who are U.S. citizens (a decline of $20 \%$ over the previous year's number, 532). This year's count of 428 doctoral recipients who are U.S. citizens is the lowest annual figure reported since 1989-1990. The percentage of U.S. citizens among all doctoral recipients this year is 45\%, down from $50 \%$ last year. This percentage had been close to $50 \%$ for the past three years.
- The number of new doctoral recipients who are non-U.S. citizens, while down by only one from the previous year, has been declining every year for the past five years: from 639 in 1997-1998 to 532 in 2001-2002.
- Females totaled 296 (31\%) of all new doctoral recipients, down in number (and up in percentage) from 311 (29\%) last year. Of the 428 U.S. citizen new doctoral recipients, 130 are female (30\%, down from 31 \% last year). The highest percentage of females among the annual counts of U.S. doctoral recipients was 34\%, reported for 1998-1999.
- The final unemployment rate for 2001-2002 doctoral recipients was $2.9 \%$, the lowest reported since 1990, when it was 2.2\%.
- Of the 829 new doctoral recipients known to have employment in fall 2002, 732 (88\%) new doctoral recipients found employment in the U.S; last year this percentage was 90\%.
- The proportion of this year's total employed doctoral recipients who took U.S. academic positions in fall 2002 is $67 \%$, up over last year's figure of $63 \%$.
- The total number of new doctoral recipients taking positions in U.S. business and industry was 136 in fall 2002, a 30\% decrease from last year's number and down from 234 reported in fall 1998 (a 42 \% decrease).
- The number of new doctoral recipients hired by master's and bachelor's institutions was 148 this year. This number has been dropping each of the past five years, resulting in a $27 \%$ decrease in the annual number from fall 1998 to fall 2002. This decline may reflect more hiring at these institutions of individuals completing a postdoctoral appointment.
- There were 572 new doctoral recipients responding to the EENDR survey; of the 510 who found employment in the U.S., $52 \%$ reported obtaining a permanent position (last year this percentage was 56\%).
recipients from the departments. Here we update information for new doctoral recipients using data gathered with a questionnaire, Employment Experiences of New Doctoral Recipients (EENDR). The EENDR was sent in early October 2002 to all new
doctoral recipients whose address was known. When a new doctoral recipient did not respond or no address was known, information supplied by the department was used.


## Updated Employment Status of 2001-2002

## U.S. Doctoral Recipients

Table 1A shows the fall and final counts of doctoral recipients in the mathematical sciences awarded by U.S. institutions in each year from 1993 through 2002. Final counts include those new doctoral recipients reported from departments who missed the deadline for inclusion in the First Report. Numbers

Table 1A: Annual U.S. Doctoral Recipients, Fall and Final Counts, 1993 to 2002

| Year | Fall | Final |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1992-1993$ | 1104 | 1116 |
| $1993-1994$ | 1025 | 1034 |
| $1994-1995$ | 1148 | 1157 |
| $1995-1996$ | 1098 | 1099 |
| $1996-1997$ | 1123 | 1130 |
| $1997-1998$ | 1163 | 1176 |
| $1998-1999$ | 1133 | 1135 |
| $1999-2000$ | 1119 | 1127 |
| $2000-2001$ | 1008 | 1065 |
| $2001-2002$ | 948 | 960 |

Table 1B: Citizenship of Annual U.S. Doctoral Recipients, 1998 to 2002

| Year | U.S. | Non-U.S. | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1997-1998$ | 537 | 639 | 1176 |
| $1998-1999$ | 560 | 575 | 1135 |
| $1999-2000$ | 566 | 561 | 1127 |
| $2000-2001$ | 532 | 533 | 1065 |
| $2001-2002$ | 428 | 532 | 960 |

in this table have been revised from reports prior to 1998-1999 to exclude new doctorates data from Group Vb departments, which are no longer surveyed.

Table 1C: 2001-2002 U.S. Doctoral Recipients by Type of Degree-Granting Department

|  | I (Pu) | I (Pr) | II | III | IV | Va |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 218 | 140 | 173 | 124 | 224 | 81 |
| $\%$ | 23 | 15 | 18 | 13 | 23 | 8 |

Table 1B shows trends in the number of new doctoral recipients for the past five years broken down by U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizens. There was a drop of 111 new doctorates from 1997-1998 to

Table 2A: 2001-2002 U.S. Doctoral Recipients: Field of Thesis by Fall 2002 Employment Status, Updated April 2003

| TYPE OF EMPLOYER |  | FIELD OF THESIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Algebra Number Theory | Real, Comp. Funct., \& Harmonic Analysis | Geometry/ Topology | Discr. Math./ Combin./ Logic/ Comp. Sci. | Probability | Statistics/ Biostat. | Applied Math. | Numerical Analysis/ Approximations |  | Differential, Integral, \& Difference Equations | Math. Educ. | Other/ Unknown |  |
| Group I (Public) |  | 16 | 9 | 15 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 73 |
| Group I (Private) |  | 12 | 8 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| Group II |  | 19 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 65 |
| Group III |  | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 22 |
| Group IV |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Group Va |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Master's |  | 6 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 43 |
| Bachelor's |  | 27 | 19 | 8 | 13 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 105 |
| Two-Year College |  | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 |
| Other Academic Dept. |  | 6 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 38 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 90 |
| Research Institute/ Other Nonprofit |  | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Government |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Business and Industry |  | 5 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 71 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 136 |
| Non-U.S. Academic Non-U.S. Nonacademic |  | 12 | 11 | 13 | 6 | 3 | 15 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 86 |
|  |  | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Not Seeking Employment Still Seeking Employment Unknown (U.S.) Unknown (non-U.S.) ${ }^{1}$ |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
|  |  | 6 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 21 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 62 |
|  |  | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 32 |
| TOTAL |  | 131 | 85 | 94 | 75 | 38 | 253 | 101 | 63 | 20 | 77 | 17 | 6 | 960 |
| Column <br> Subtotals | Male | 101 | 61 | 69 | 52 | 30 | 146 | 78 | 49 | 18 | 47 | 8 | 5 | 664 |
|  | Female | 30 | 24 | 25 | 23 | 8 | 107 | 23 | 14 | 2 | 30 | 9 | 1 | 296 |

${ }^{1}$ Includes those whose status is reported as "unknown" or "still seeking employment".

Table 2B: 2001-2002 U.S. Doctoral Recipients: Type of Degree-Granting Department by Fall 2002 Employment Status, Updated April 2003

| TYPE OF EMPLOYER |  | TYPE OF DOCTORAL DEGREE-GRANTING DEPARTMENT |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL | Row Subtotals |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Group (Public) Math. | Group (Private) Math. | Group II Math. | Group III Math. | Group IV Statistics | Group Va Applied Math. |  |  |  |
|  |  | 37 | 19 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 73 | 57 | 16 |
| Group I (Public) Group I (Private) |  | 18 | 32 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 62 | 44 | 18 |
| Group II |  | 27 | 11 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 65 | 46 | 19 |
| Group III |  | 6 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 12 | 10 |
| Group IV |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 40 |  | 45 | 29 | 16 |
| Group Va |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 1 |
| Master's |  | 7 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 43 | 25 | 18 |
| Bachelor's |  | 18 | 7 | 34 | 37 | 7 | 2 | 105 | 69 | 36 |
| Two-Year College |  | 2 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 11 | 3 |
| Other Academic Dept. |  | 12 | 6 | 13 | 13 | 36 | 10 | 90 | 52 | 38 |
| Research Institute/ Other Nonprofit |  | 5 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 24 | 15 | 9 |
| Government |  | 7 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 43 | 29 | 14 |
| Business and Industry |  | 18 | 12 | 19 | 7 | 65 | 15 | 136 | 97 | 39 |
| Non-U.S. Academic <br> Non-U.S. Nonacademic |  | 30 | 18 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 86 | 63 | 23 |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 9 | 2 |
| Not Seeking Employment Still Seeking Employment Unknown (U.S.) Unknown (non-U.S.)' |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 5 |
|  |  | 5 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 25 | 20 | 5 |
|  |  | 12 | 7 | 13 | 7 | 17 | 6 | 62 | 47 | 15 |
|  |  | 9 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 32 | 23 | 9 |
| TOTAL |  | 218 | 140 | 173 | 124 | 224 | 81 | 960 | 664 | 296 |
| Column <br> Subtotals | Male | 171 | 100 | 120 | 78 | 130 | 65 | 664 |  |  |
|  | Female | 47 | 40 | 53 | 46 | 94 | 16 | 296 |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Includes those whose status is reported as "unknown" or "still seeking employment".

Table 2C: 2001-2002 U.S. Doctoral Recipients: Field of Thesis by Type of Degree-Granting Department, Updated April 2003

| TYPE OF DOCTORAL DEGREE-GRANTING DEPARTMENT | FIELD OF THESIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Algebra <br> Number Theory | Real, Comp. Funct., \& Harmonic Analysis | Geometry/ Topology | Discr. Math./ Combin./ Logic/ Comp. Sci. | Probability | Statistics/ Biostat. | Applied Math. | Numerical Analysis/ Approximations | Linear Nonlinear Optim./ Control | Differential, Integral, \& Difference Equations | Math. Educ. | Other/ Unknown |  |
| Group I (Public) | 44 | 29 | 40 | 22 | 10 | 3 | 21 | 17 | 3 | 27 | 2 | 0 | 218 |
| Group I (Private) | 31 | 14 | 32 | 13 | 5 | 8 | 17 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 140 |
| Group II | 40 | 27 | 11 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 23 | 20 | 3 | 18 | 3 | 2 | 173 |
| Group III | 14 | 14 | 10 | 20 | 3 | 15 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 124 |
| Group IV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 215 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 224 |
| Group Va | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 22 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 81 |
| TOTAL | 131 | 85 | 94 | 75 | 38 | 253 | 101 | 63 | 20 | 77 | 17 | 6 | 960 |

Table 2D: Percentage of Total Employed New Doctoral Recipients by Type of Employer, Fall 1998 to Fall 2002

| $\%$ | U.S. Employed |  | Non-U.S. Employed |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Academic | Nonacademic | Academic | Nonacademic |  |
| Fall 1998 | 57 | 29 | 12 | 2 | 965 |
| Fall 1999 | 64 | 23 | 11 | 2 | 955 |
| Fall 2000 | 62 | 28 | 10 | 1 | 957 |
| Fall 2001 | 63 | 27 | 9 | 2 | 914 |
| Fall 2002 | 67 | 22 | 10 | 1 | $\mathbf{8 2 9}$ |

2000-2001, mostly explained by a drop of 106 nonU.S. citizen new doctoral recipients. This year the total number of new doctoral recipients was down from the previous year by 105 , with a drop of 104 in U.S. citizens. The count of 428 U.S. citizens is the
lowest figure reported since 1989-1990. The alltime high number of non-U.S. citizen new doctoral recipients was 679 in 1992-1993. These trends bear watching in the future.

Table 1C gives a breakdown of the 960 doctoral degrees awarded in the mathematical sciences between July 1, 2001, and June 30, 2002, by type of degree-granting department.

Tables 2A, 2B, and 2C display updates of employment data, found in these same tables in the First Report, for the fall count of 2001-2002 doctoral recipients plus twelve additional doctoral recipients reported late. These tables are partitioned by field of thesis research, by the survey group of their degree department, and by type of employer. At the time of this Second Report, the fall 2002 employment status of 866 of the 960 doctoral recipients was known.

Figure 1: Percentage of New Doctoral Recipients Unemployed, As Reported in the Respective Annual Survey Second Reports, 1978 to 2002


The fall 2002 unemployment rate for new doctoral recipients, based on information gathered by the time of the Second Report, was $2.9 \%$. The unemployment rate rose steadily in the early 1990s and reached its all-time high of $10.7 \%$ in both 1994 and 1995. Since then the rate has fluctuated between $3.3 \%$ and $4.9 \%$, until this year's figure of $2.9 \%$, the lowest rate reported since 1990. Figure 1 presents the fall 1978 through fall 2002 trend in the final unemployment rate of new doctoral recipients. The counts on which these rates are determined do not include those new doctoral recipients whose fall employment status was unknown at the time of the Second Report. Note that prior to 1999 the new doctoral recipients from Group Vb are included in the total unemployment rate for each year.

Of the 866 new doctoral recipients whose employment is known, 732 were employed in the U.S., 97 were employed outside the U.S., 25 were still seeking employment, and 12 were not seeking employment.

Table 2D presents the trend in the percentage of employed new doctoral recipients by type of employer for the last five years. Academic employment includes those employed by research institutes and other nonprofits. The percentage of the total employed new doctoral recipients that are in U.S. academic positions is at a five-year high, while the percentage of the total employed in U.S. nonacademic positions is at a five-year low.

Among new doctoral recipients who are employed, the percentage taking nonacademic employment (U.S. government, U.S. business and industry, and non-U.S. nonacademic) varied significantly by field of thesis. For those whose field of thesis is in the first three columns in Table 2A, this percentage is the lowest at $9 \%$, while the percentage for those with theses in probability or statistics is the highest at 39\%.

Table 3A: Number of New Doctoral Recipients Taking Positions in Business and Industry in the U.S. by Type of Degree-Granting Department, Fall 1998 to Fall 2002

| Group | I (Pu) | I (Pr) | II | III | IV | Va | TOTAL |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fall 1998 | 37 | 27 | 44 | 25 | 75 | 26 | $\mathbf{2 3 4}$ |
| Fall 1999 | 32 | 24 | 28 | 21 | 66 | 14 | $\mathbf{1 8 5}$ |
| Fall 2000 | 33 | 28 | 37 | 24 | 83 | 18 | 223 |
| Fall 2001 | 28 | 15 | 27 | 26 | 75 | 23 | 194 |
| Fall 2002 | 18 | 12 | 19 | 7 | 65 | 15 | 136 |

Tables 3A through 3D first appeared in the First Report for 2000-2001, although they do not have the same table numbers in that report. They have all been updated with information obtained from the individual new doctoral recipients who responded to a follow-up questionnaire. The next few paragraphs
discuss some of the information presented in these tables.

The fall 2002 numbers in Table 3A are down from last year in each category, and over five years the total shows a $42 \%$ decrease. The trend

Table 3B: Number of New Doctoral Recipients Taking U.S. Academic Positions by Type of Degree-Granting Department, Fall 1998 to Fall 2002

| Group | $\mathrm{I}(\mathrm{Pu})$ | $\mathrm{I}(\mathrm{Pr})$ | II | III | IV | Va | TOTAL |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fall 1998 | 133 | 100 | 138 | 61 | 85 | 30 | 547 |
| Fall 1999 | 166 | 91 | 146 | 82 | 86 | 39 | $\mathbf{6 1 0}$ |
| Fall 2000 | 144 | 82 | 126 | 79 | 131 | 28 | 590 |
| Fall 2001 | 159 | 71 | 126 | 80 | 108 | 30 | 574 |
| Fall 2002 | 133 | 86 | 107 | 91 | 102 | 34 | 553 |

away from jobs in business and industry most likely reflects problems in the economy.

Table 3C shows that the number of new doctoral recipients hired by Groups M and B has been dropping each of the past five years, and there has been a $27 \%$ decrease in the number of new doctoral recipients hired by master's and bachelor's depart-

Table 3C: Number of New Doctoral Recipients Taking U.S. Academic Positions by Type of Hiring Department, Fall 1998 to Fall 2002

| Group | I-III | IV | Va | M\&B | Other | TOTAL |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fall 1998 | 187 | 36 | 5 | 203 | 116 | 547 |
| Fall 1999 | 233 | 47 | 19 | 193 | 118 | 610 |
| Fall 2000 | 216 | 51 | 11 | 180 | 132 | 590 |
| Fall 2001 | 214 | 49 | 11 | 178 | 122 | 574 |
| Fall 2002 | 222 | 45 | 10 | 148 | 128 | 553 |

ments from fall 1998 to fall 2002. This decline may reflect more hiring at these institutions of individuals completing a postdoctoral appointment.

Table 3D gives information about the production and hiring of female new doctoral recipients in the doctoral-granting departments of this survey. From Table 2B we see that $42 \%$ of the new doctoral re-

Table 3D: Females as a Percentage of 2001-2002 U.S. Doctoral Recipients Produced by and Hired by Doctoral-Granting Groups, Fall 2002

| $\%$ | I (Pu) | I (Pr) | II | III | IV | Va | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Produced | 22 | 29 | 31 | 37 | 42 | 20 | 31 |
| Hired | 22 | 29 | 29 | 45 | 36 | 10 | 29 |

cipients hired by Group M departments were female, while $34 \%$ of those hired by Group B departments were female.

Table 3E: 2001-2002 Male U.S. Doctoral Recipients: Type of Citizenship by Fall 2002 Employment Status

| TYPE OF EMPLOYER | CITIZENSHIP |  |  |  | TOTAL MALE DOCTORAL RECIPIENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U.S. CITIZENS | NON-U.S. CITIZENS |  |  |  |
|  |  | Permanent Visa | Temporary Visa | Unknown Visa |  |
| U.S. Employer | 245 | 20 | 228 | 2 | 495 |
| U.S. Academic | 184 | 12 | 172 | 1 | 369 |
| Groups I, II, III, and Va | 77 | 6 | 85 | 0 | 168 |
| Group IV | 10 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 29 |
| Non-Ph.D. Department | 92 | 5 | 60 | 0 | 157 |
| Research Institute/Other Nonprofit | 5 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 15 |
| U.S. Nonacademic | 61 | 8 | 56 | 1 | 126 |
| Non-U.S. Employer | 13 | 1 | 58 | 0 | 72 |
| Non-U.S. Academic | 13 | 1 | 49 | 0 | 63 |
| Non-U.S. Nonacademic | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| Not Seeking Employment | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 |
| Still Seeking Employment | 10 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 20 |
| Subtotal | 270 | 23 | 299 | 2 | 594 |
| Unknown (U.S.) | 28 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 47 |
| Unknown (non-U.S.)1 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3 | 23 |
| TOTAL | 298 | 25 | 335 | 6 | 664 |

1 Includes those whose status is reported as "unknown"

Table 3F: 2001-2002 Female U.S. Doctoral Recipients: Type of Citizenship by Fall 2002 Employment Status

| TYPE OF EMPLOYER | CITIZENSHIP |  |  |  | TOTAL FEMALE DOCTORAL RECIPIENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U.S. CITIZENS | NON-U.S. CITIZENS |  |  |  |
|  |  | Permanent Visa | Temporary Visa | Unknown Visa |  |
| U.S. Employer | 117 | 15 | 101 | 4 | 237 |
| U.S. Academic | 95 | 8 | 77 | 4 | 184 |
| Groups I, II, III, and Va | 30 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 64 |
| Group IV | 4 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 16 |
| Non-Ph.D. Department | 58 | 7 | 27 | 3 | 95 |
| Research Institute/Other Nonprofit | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 9 |
| U.S. Nonacademic | 22 | 7 | 24 | 0 | 53 |
| Non-U.S. Employer | 1 | 1 | 22 | 1 | 25 |
| Non-U.S. Academic | 1 | 1 | 20 | 1 | 23 |
| Non-U.S. Nonacademic | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Not Seeking Employment | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 |
| Still Seeking Employment | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| Subtotal | 121 | 17 | 129 | 5 | 272 |
| Unknown (U.S.) | 9 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 15 |
| Unknown (non-U.S.)1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 9 |
| TOTAL | 130 | 19 | 140 | 7 | 296 |

${ }^{1}$ Includes those whose status is reported as "unknown" or "still seeking employment".

Updated Information about 2001-2002 U.S. Doctoral Recipients by Sex and Citizenship Tables 3 E and 3 F show the sex and citizenship of the 960 new doctoral recipients and the fact that 732 new doctoral recipients found jobs in the U.S. this year. This is $88 \%$ of the 829 new doctoral recipients known to have jobs in fall 2002. Last year this percentage was $89 \%$.

Sex and citizenship is known for all of the 960 new doctoral recipients. The final count of new doctoral recipients who are U.S. citizens is 428 $(45 \%)$. For the previous three years, this figure remained very close to $50 \%$, the largest percentages reported by the Annual Survey since the mid-1980s.

Pages 243-6 of the First Report present further information related to the citizenship of the 2001-2002 new doctoral recipients.

Of the 428 U.S. citizen new doctoral recipients, 130 are female and 298 are male. The 130 female new doctoral recipients comprise $30 \%$ of the U.S. citizen total for 2001-2002, a decrease from last year's count of 166 (down 22\%); last year female new doctoral recipients were $31 \%$ of the U.S. citizen new doctoral recipients. The number of U.S. citizen males, 298, is down 68 (19\%) from 366 last year.

Table 3G shows that while U.S. academic doctoral departments, Groups I through Va, hired $44 \%$ U.S.

Table 3G: Number of 2001-2002 New Doctoral Recipients Employed in the U.S. by Citizenship and Type of Employer

| U.S. EMPLOYER | CITIZENSHIP |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U.S. | Non-U.S. | TOTAL |
| Academic, Groups I-Va | 121 | 156 | 277 |
| Academic, Other | 158 | 118 | 276 |
| Nonacademic | 83 | 96 | 179 |
| TOTAL | 362 | 370 | 732 |

citizens, U.S. academic positions other than in the doctoral departments hired 57\% U.S. citizens. Those hired for nonacademic positions in the U.S. who are U.S. citizens was $46 \%$ Among those 732 2001-2002 doctoral recipients taking employment in the U.S., $24 \%$ took nonacademic employment (government or business and industry). This is down from 30\% in 2000-2001 and from 31\% in 1999-2000.

## New Information from the EENDR Survey

Of the 948 new doctoral recipients reported in the First Report, the 890 whose addresses were known were sent the Employment Experiences of New Doctoral Recipients (EENDR) survey in October 2002, and 572 (64\%) responded. The response rates varied considerably among the various subgroups of new doctoral recipients defined by their employment status as reported by departments. Among those who were employed, the highest response rate, $75 \%$, was from those in academia in the U.S., while the lowest, $10 \%$, was from those in foreign nonacademia.

The EENDR gathered details on employment experiences not available through departments. The rest of this section presents additional information available on this subset of the 2001-2002 doctoral recipients
Table 4A provides the trend in EENDR respondents taking permanent and temporary positions in the U.S for fall 1998 through fall 2002. This year we see that among the 510 employed in the U.S., 264 reported obtaining a permanent position and 245 a temporary position (one individual did not answer this question). Of the 245 in temporary positions, 110 (45\%) reported taking temporary employment because a suitable permanent position was not available and 234 (96\%) classified their position as postdoctoral. Furthermore,

Table 4A: Number (and Percentage) of Annual EENDR Respondents Taking U.S. Positions by Job Status, Fall 1998 to Fall 2002

| U.S. Employed | Fall 1998 | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| TOTAL | 539 | 512 | 536 | 473 | 510 |
| Permanent | $313(58)$ | $273(53)$ | $317(59)$ | $266(56)$ | $264(52)$ |
| Temporary | $225(42)$ | $237(46)$ | $218(41)$ | $205(43)$ | $245(48)$ |
| Perm not avail. | $127(56)$ | $101(43)$ | $92(42)$ | $93(45)$ | $110(45)$ |
| Postdoctorate | $129(57)$ | $155(65)$ | $157(72)$ | $163(80)$ | $234(96)$ |
| Perm not avail. | $56(43)$ | $58(37)$ | $55(35)$ | $50(31)$ | $86(37)$ |
| Unknown | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |

Table 4B: Percentage of Annual EENDR Respondents Taking U.S. Positions by Employment Sector within Job Status, Fall 1998 to Fall 2002

| U.S. Employed | Fall 1998 | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Permanent |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Academia | 55 | 59 | 59 | 62 | 70 |
| Government | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 |
| Business/Ind. | 41 | 37 | 36 | 32 | 23 |
| Temporary |  |  |  |  |  |
| Academia | 90 | 94 | 95 | 95 | 93 |
| Government | 7 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Business/Ind. | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |

among those in postdoctoral positions, $37 \%$ responded that they took the position because a suitable permanent position was not available. Of particular note in Table 4A is the steady increase in the percentage of temporarily employed respondents who reported taking a postdoctoral position.

Table 4B shows the employment trends of permanent and temporary positions broken down by sector for the last five years. There has been a

Figure 2: Age Distribution of 2001-2002 EENDR Respondents

continuing increase in the proportion of EENDR respondents taking permanent employment in academia and an offsetting decline in the proportion taking permanent positions in business and industry.

Among the 264 who reported obtaining a permanent position in the U.S. in fall $2002,70 \%$ were employed in academia (including $3 \%$ in research institutes and other nonprofits), $6 \%$ in government, and $23 \%$ in business or industry. Women held $36 \%$ of the permanent positions.

Among the 245 individuals with temporary employment in the U.S. this year, $93 \%$ were employed in academia (including $5 \%$ in research institutes and other nonprofits), $6 \%$ in government, and $1 \%$ in business or industry.

Figure 2 gives the age distribution of the 556 new doctoral recipients who responded to this question. The median age of new doctoral recipients was 30 years, while the mean age was 32 years. The first and third quartiles were 28 and 34 years, respectively. These figures are very similar to those reported in previous years.

## Previous Annual Survey Reports

The 2002 First Annual Survey Report was published in the Notices of the AMS in the February 2003 issue. For the last full year of reports, the 2001 First, Second, and Third Annual Survey Reports were published in the Notices of the AMS in the February, August, and September 2002 issues respectively. These reports and earlier reports, as well as a wealth of other information from these surveys, are available on the AMS website at www.ams.org/ employment/surveyreports.htm1.

## Starting Salary Survey of the 2001-2002 U.S. Doctoral Recipients

The starting salary figures for 2002 were compiled from information gathered on the EENDR questionnaires sent to individuals who received doctoral degrees in the mathematical sciences during the 2001-2002 academic year from universities in the United States (see previous section for more details).

The questionnaires were distributed to 890 recipients of degrees using addresses provided by the departments granting the degrees; 572 individuals responded between late October and April. Responses with insufficient data or from individuals who indicated they had part-time or
non-U.S. employment were considered unusable. Numbers of usable responses for each salary category are reported in the following tables.

Readers should be warned that the data in this report are obtained from a self-selected sample, and inferences from them may not be representative of the population.

Key to Tables. Salaries are listed in hundreds of dollars. Nine-month salaries are based on 9-10 months' teaching and/or research, not adding extra stipends for summer grants or summer teaching or the equivalent. Years listed are the academic year in which the doctorate was received. M and F are male and female respectively. Some persons receiving a doctoral degree had been employed in their present position for several years, so those who had "one year or less experience" were analyzed separately from the total. Male and female figures are not provided when the number of salaries available for analysis in a particular category was five or fewer. Also, quartile figures are not available for 1965 through 1980. All categories of "Teaching/Teaching and Research" and "Research Only" contain those recipients employed at academic institutions only. The "Academic Research Only, 9-10-Month Salaries" category was dropped from the published analyses in 1998 because so few recipients respond in this category that the data were not considered meaningful. Starting salaries for those reporting a 9-10-month salary postdoctoral position are available for a sixth year. These salaries are also included within the "Academic Teaching/Teaching and Research, 9-10-Month Salaries" table and boxplot on page 809.

Graphs. The graphs show standard boxplots summarizing salary distribution information for the years 1994 through 2002. Values plotted for 1994 through 2001 are converted to 2002 dollars using the implicit price deflator prepared annually by the Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce.

For each boxplot the box shows the first quartile (Q1), the median (M), and the third quartile (Q3). The interquartile range (IQR) is defined as Q3- Q1. Think of constructing invisible fences 1.5 xIQR below Q1 and 1.5 xIQR above Q3. Whiskers are drawn from Q3 to the largest observation that falls below the upper invisible fence and from Q1 to the smallest observation that falls above the lower invisible fence. Think of constructing two more invisible fences, each falling 1.5 xIQR above or below the existing invisible fences. Any observation that falls between the fences on each end of the boxplots is called an outlier and is plotted as o in the boxplots. Any observation that falls outside of both fences either above or below the box in the boxplot is called an extreme outlier and is marked as * in the boxplot.




## Definitions of the Groups

As has been the case for a number of years, much of the data in these reports is presented for departments divided into groups according to several characteristics, the principal one being the highest degree offered in the mathematical sciences. Doctoral-granting departments of mathematics are further subdivided according to their ranking of "scholarly quality of program faculty" as reported in the 1995 publication Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Continuity and Change. ${ }^{1}$ These rankings update those reported in a previous study published in 1982.2 Consequently, the departments which now comprise Groups I, II, and III differ significantly from those used prior to the 1996 survey.

The subdivision of the Group I institutions into Group I Public and Group I Private was new for the 1996 survey. With the increase in number of the Group I departments from 39 to 48, the Data Committee judged that a further subdivision of public and private would provide more meaningful reporting of the data for these departments.

Brief descriptions of the groupings are as follows:
Group I is composed of 48 departments with scores in the $3.00-5.00$ range. Group I Public and Group I Private are Group I departments at public institutions and private institutions respectively.
Group II is composed of 56 departments with scores in the 2.00-2.99 range.

Group III contains the remaining U.S. departments reporting a doctoral program, including a number of departments not included in the 1995 ranking of program faculty.
Group IV contains U.S. departments (or programs) of statistics, biostatistics, and biometrics reporting a doctoral program.
Group V contains U.S. departments (or programs) in applied mathematics/applied science, operations research, and management science which report a doctoral program.
Group Va is applied mathematics/applied science; Group Vb, which is no longer surveyed as of 1998-99, was operations research and management science.
Group M contains U.S. departments granting a master's degree as the highest graduate degree.
Group B contains U.S. departments granting a baccalaureate degree only.
Listings of the actual departments which comprise these groups are available on the AMS Website at www.ams.org/employment/surveyreports.htm7.
${ }^{1}$ Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Continuity and Change, edited by Marvin L. Goldberger, Brendan A. Maher, and Pamela Ebert Flattau, National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1995.
${ }^{2}$ These findings were published in An Assessment of ResearchDoctorate Programs in the United States: Mathematical and Physical Sciences, edited by Lyle V. Jones, Gardner Lindzey, and Porter E. Coggeshall, National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1982. The information on mathematics, statistics, and computer science was presented in digest form in the April 1983 issue of the Notices, pages 257-67, and an analysis of the classifications was given in the June 1983 Notices, pages 392-3.
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## Doctoral Degrees Conferred 2001-2002

## Supplementary List

The following list supplements the list of thesis titles published in the February 2003 Notices, pages 264-80.

## ARIZONA

## Arizona State University (6)

## Mathematics

Archibald, Richard, Boundary detection and reconstruction in magnetic resonance imaging.
Dunn, Charles, Extensions of a simple competitive graph coloring algorithm.
Kuo, Yu-Ju, Interior point algorithms for second order cone problems with applications.
Loladze, Irakli, The importance of being stoichiometric: Population dynamics from the perspective of chemical elements.
Marthaler, Daniel, Two problems from nonlinear dynamical systems.
Zela, Dritan, A continuum spine model for the horizontal cell-to-cone feedback in cat outer retina.

## COLORADO

## University of Colorado (3)

## Mathematics

Caravone, Curtis, On the convergence of model-free policy iteration algorithms for reinforcement learning: Stochastic approximation under discontinuous mean dynamics.
Caulk, Suzanne, Explicit action of Hecke operators on Hilbert-Siegel modular forms.
Kornelson, Keri, Local solvability of Laplacian difference operators arising from the discrete Heisenberg group.

## GEORGIA

## University of Georgia (2)

## Mathematics

Bindner, Donald, On the space spanned by the powers of an operator and its adjoint.
Liu, Ruihua, Hierarchial control and filtering of stochastic markovian system.

## NORTH CAROLINA

## Duke University (1)

## Mathematics

Collins, Anne D., Configuration spaces in robotic manipulation and motion planning.

## PENNSYLVANIA

## Carnegie Mellon University (2)

## Statistics

Ghiuvea, Cristian, Pricing of generalized American options with applications to energy derivatives.
Ianus, Iuliana, Approximate robust Bayesian inference with applications to sample size calculation.


[^0]:    Ellen E. Kirkman is professor of mathematics, Wake Forest University. James W. Maxwell is AMS associate executive director for Membership and Programs. Kinda Remick Priestley is AMS survey analyst.

