Science Ranked High in Faculty Survey

Science is the fourth most widely read periodical among all faculty members in the nation's colleges and universities. In a group of 25 general periodicals, *Science* is topped only by *Time*, *Newsweek*, and the *New York Times*. Among professors at major universities, only *Time* and the *New York Times* enjoy more regular readers than *Science*.

These conclusions are based on a recent survey conducted by Everett C. Ladd, Jr., of the University of Connecticut and Seymour M. Lipset of Stanford University, which was published in the 19 January 1976 issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. The authors also found that *Science* is the most widely read specialized journal, although its audience is understandably skewed sharply toward the natural sciences. The periodicals and their ratings are shown in the box below.

Some surprising results surfaced from the poll taken of faculty members' reading habits regarding general periodicals. For example, neither the prestige of a person's institution nor faculty members' intensiveness of publication had an effect on how regularly they read these publications. Likewise, there was no difference in the level of journal readership between professors primarily engaged in research and those heavily committed to teaching.

The most significant variable examined in the survey turned out to be political activism. Placing faculty members along a continuum of political involvement, the authors observed that 56 percent of the most active were in the highest readership group compared to 10 percent of the politically inactive faculty members.

Ladd and Lipset found that academics who viewed their professional work as being tightly bounded by the specific demands of their disciplines read the general periodicals included in the survey much less widely than did their colleagues. They pointed out that faculty members in all disciplines who described themselves as "scientists," and who thought of their scholarship as "pure," "basic," or "hard," read journals of social comment much less than did other professors. Although their data did not clearly show it, the authors assumed that "professors pursuing 'pure' science and scholarship are as much, perhaps more, devoted to the printed word as their colleagues, but they give primacy to the literature of the discipline."

Periodicals ranked by size of faculty readership*

	All faculty members	Faculty members at major universities
1.	*Time*	*New York Times*
2.	*Newsweek*	*Time*
3.	*New York Times*	*Science*
4.	*Science*	*Newsweek*
5.	*Saturday Review*	*New Yorker*
6.	*New Yorker*	*New York Review of Books*
7.	*U.S. News*	*Saturday Review*
8.	*Wall Street Journal*	*Wall Street Journal*
9.	*New York Review of Books*	*U.S. News*
10.	*Harper's*	*New Republic*
11.	*Business Week*	*Harper's*
12.	*Playboy*	*Washington Post*
13.	*Atlantic*	*Atlantic*
14.	*New Republic*	*Playboy*
15.	*Fortune*	*Business Week*
16.	*Nation*	*Daedalus*
17.	*Washington Post*	*Commentary*
18.	*Daedalus*	*Fortune*
19.	*American Scholar*	*Nation*
20.	*National Review*	*Foreign Affairs*
21.	*Foreign Affairs*	*American Scholar*
22.	*Commentary*	*Public Interest*
23.	*Encounter*	*National Review*
24.	*Foreign Policy*	*Encounter*
25.	*Public Interest*	*Foreign Policy*

*E. C. Ladd, Jr., and S. M. Lipset, "The General Periodicals Professors Read," © *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, vol. 11, p. 17, 19 January 1976.

Congress Praises Fellows Program

In a recent Senate concurrent resolution, AAAS and six other science and engineering societies were recognized for their efforts in initiating and developing the Congressional Science and Engineering Fellowship Program. The six other organizations were the American Physical Society, the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, the American Psychological Association, the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, the Optical Society of America, and the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology. The resolution took special note of the central role AAAS has played in coordinating and fostering this program.

This year there are 16 Congressional Science and Engineering Fellows serving with the House, Senate, and the Office of Technology Assessment. Six of these have fellowships awarded by AAAS (see *Science*, 6 June 1975, page 1005, and 9 January 1976, page 105) and the other ten by the participating affiliated societies. This is the third consecutive year of the multidisciplinary, cooperative public service program.

Senate Resolution 100, which was introduced 10 March by Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D–Mass.) and cosponsored by a bipartisan group of eight other senators, clearly highlighted the impact that the Congressional Science and Engineering Fellowship Program has had on the Congress during its 3 years of existence. Kennedy, in his cover statement, said, "There appears to be uniform enthusiasm for the program throughout the

Let SMC Do Your Reading

Frustrated at your inability to read and digest all those newsletters, magazines, press releases, and so forth, that reach your desk regularly?

Unable to keep abreast of the latest supply/demand situation, the latest salary data, what Congress is doing that will affect scientific, engineering, and technical personnel, what's going on in academe?

If the answer to these questions is yes, try subscribing to an invaluable digest of these materials pulled together and capsulized ten times a year. *Scientific, Engineering, Technical Manpower Comments* tells you enough to give you the gist of all the things you need to know about scientists and engineers and where to get more details.

Subscriptions, at $15 a year, may be ordered from the Scientific Manpower Commission, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. A sample issue will be sent on request.

Congress. Many more members have requested science and engineering fellows than could be accommodated by the limited number of individuals available."

Additional statements introducing or supporting the resolution were submitted by Senators Bob Packwood (R–Ore.), John Glenn (D–Ohio), Warren G. Magnuson (D–Wash.), and John V. Tunney (D–Calif.). They all strongly encouraged the continuance and expansion of these "very valuable programs." As Magnuson attested, "The Congressional Science and Engineering Fellowship Program represents an important step in ensuring that the Congress has the technical expertise to help make science and technology more responsive to human needs."

In a letter to AAAS president William D. McElroy, Kennedy went on to say, "The Congress is increasingly involved in public policy issues of a scientific and technical nature, and recognizes the need to develop additional in-house expertise in the areas of science and engineering. In addition, it becomes increasingly more important that the scientific and engineering communities become aware of the workings of government in these areas, and that better liaison be developed in the public interest. The Congressional Science and Engineering Fellowship Programs are well designed to accomplish these purposes, to the mutual benefit of all concerned."

The resolution generally credits the fellows for facilitating more enlightened congressional decision-making on issues with scientific and technological components; maintaining a valuable liaison and exchange with the scientific and engineering communities; and providing a valuable pool of talent for permanent staff positions.

A similar concurrent resolution (594) has been introduced in the House by Representative Melvin Price (D–Ill.), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. It is cosponsored by a bipartisan group consisting of Representatives Olin E. Teague (D–Tex.), Mike McCormack (D–Wash.), Charles A. Mosher (R–Ohio), and George E. Brown, Jr. (D–Calif.). The House resolution is in committee and is expected to be reported out shortly.

Copies of the resolution and supporting statements are available upon request from the AAAS Office of Special Programs.

MARY C. DOLAN
Special Programs

AAAS-AAS Workshop at Annual Meeting

The AAAS Office of Science Education and the Association of Academies of Science (AAS) held an all-day workshop at the AAAS Annual Meeting in Boston on 23 February 1976. Half of the 46 academies affiliated with AAS were represented, plus one nonaffiliated academy of science. Also, several junior academy members participated. Discussions at the workshop were aimed at developing a 3-year plan of action for AAAS-AAS cooperation.

After reviewing the problems of the various academies of science and current AAAS programs, four working groups outlined some 50 recommendations. Few of them are entirely new. Some are intended for the immediate future; others are clearly long-range. Some appear low-cost; others will require more money and time for development. For many, the details must yet be worked out. The recommendations are directed not only to the AAAS, but also to the executive officers of the academies.

One basic recommendation was to continue existing cooperative activities—AAAS Council membership, AAAS research funds for students, annual meeting sessions and exhibits, mutual publicity, travel expense fund, and so forth—and to give them more publicity. Other recommendations included:

1. *Academy Programs*
   - Develop a file of resource people (AAAS members) for the academies—speakers, guidance consultants, and research project consultants.
   - AAAS sponsor symposia at the annual meetings of the state academies, perhaps "repeating" exceptional AAAS annual meeting symposia.
   - AAAS and the academies cosponsor public lectures, workshops, minicourses, and serial-type programs.
   - Develop more programs via mass media.
   - Conduct more interaction-type programs for junior academy members like the successful dialogues between high school students and Margaret Mead, Linus Pauling, and Carl Sagan at the Boston Annual Meeting.
   - Provide leadership workshops on science career guidance for academy members interested in working with young people.
   - Assist state academies in advising state governments and becoming more involved in public education.
2. *Junior Academy Programs*
   - Publicize the availability of research funds for students.
   - Involve junior academies of science that are not at present affiliated with the AAAS.
   - Make the number of honorary AAAS subscriptions to *Science* for junior academy members proportional to the number of AAAS members in the senior academy.
   - AAAS help academies develop workshops on possible methods of operation of junior academies—budgeting, publication, and others.
   - AAAS help prepare a handbook of activities, ideas, and procedures for junior academies.
   - Initiate regional meetings for junior academies.
3. *Communications*
   - Assist academies in *disseminating* information about academy activities as well as AAAS programs and services.
   - AAAS survey the state academies for information about advising state governments, the needs of the academies, and the desirability of AAAS regionalization.
   - For 1 year the AAAS should assign a staff member to visit the individual academies to inform them of AAAS programs and determine academies' needs.
4. *Finances*
   - AAAS should assist the AAS and the Junior Academy of Sciences in applying for grants.
   - A need for matching-fund programs continues, such as the discontinued visiting scientists program, AAAS lecture programs, and others.

(Continued on page 576)