

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

1976

ALFRED E. BROWN	FRANK PRESS
JAMES F. CROW	FRANK W. PUTNAM
HANS LANDSBERG	MAXINE SINGER
EDWARD NEY	ARTHUR M. SQUIRES

1977

WARD GOODENOUGH	DONALD KENNEDY
CLIFFORD GROBSTEIN	NEAL E. MILLER
H. S. GUTOWSKY	RAYMOND H. THOMPSON
N. BRUCE HANNAY	

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher

WILLIAM D. CAREY

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

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

Assistant to the Editors: RICHARD SEMIKLOSE

News and Comment: JOHN WALSH, Editor; PHILIP M. BOFFEY, LUTHER J. CARTER, BARBARA J. CULLITON, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, DEBORAH SHAPLEY, NICHOLAS WADE. Editorial Assistant, SCHERRAINE MACK

Research News: ALLEN L. HAMMOND, WILLIAM D. METZ, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, JEAN L. MARX, ARTHUR L. ROBINSON, GINA BARI KOLATA, FANNIE GROOM

Book Reviews: KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, LYNN MANFIELD, JANET KEGG

Cover Editor: GRAYCE FINGER

Editorial Assistants: JOHN BAKER, ISABELLA BOLDIN, MARGARET BURESCH, ELEANORE BUTZ, MARY DORFMAN, SYLVIA EBERHART, JUDITH GIVELBER, CAITILIN GORDON, CORRINE HARRIS, NANCY HARTNAGEL, OLIVER HEATWOLE, CHRISTINE KARLIK, RUTH KULSTAD, MARGARET LLOYD, JEAN ROCKWOOD, LEAH RYAN, LOIS SCHMITT, YA LI SWIGART, ELEANOR WARNER

Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD SOMMER

Membership Recruitment: GWENDOLYN HUDDLE;
Subscription Records and Member Records: ANN RAGLAND

Advertising Staff

Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager

MARGARET STERLING

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Herbert L. Burklund, 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-DE-7-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 11 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772); DORSET VT. 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581)

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phones: (Area Code 202) Central Office: 467-4350; Book Reviews: 467-4367; Business Office: 467-4411; Circulation: 467-4417; Guide to Scientific Instruments: 467-4480; News and Comment: 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions: 467-4483; Research News: 467-4321; Reviewing: 467-4443. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. See also page xi, *Science*, 26 March 1976. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Room 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

Scientists' Meetings: Collegial versus Positional

From Airline House to Asilomar, from Arden House to Aspen, scientists are participating in workshops, conferences, and meetings. Yet often, as these gatherings draw to a close, one has the impression that many in attendance question whether the time taken away from their principal pursuits was really worth it. If scientists are "convoking more but enjoying it less" the reasons may run deeper than the oft-cited "distractions" of out-of-town conferences (jet lag, touristic lures, free and freely flowing libations, too much socializing). One such deeper problem may be the all-too-frequent mismatch between a meeting's intended function and its format.

Most scientific meetings are intended to serve one of two functions: either exchange of research findings and techniques or formulation of a collective position on matters regarding public policy (for example, the safety of nuclear reactors), ethical guidelines (should certain lines of experiments in genetics be voluntarily suspended?), or the interests of the scientific community (should there be a separate office for a scientific adviser to the President?). Thus, meetings are essentially either *collegial* (in the tradition of the Royal Society and the annual conventions of the AAAS) or *positional* (that is, attempting to evolve a position those assembled, or those they represent, can come to share).

Trouble arises where sociological formats developed for and suited to collegial meetings are carried over to positional ones. Thus, a collegial meeting can thrive on scores of presentations, delivered in numerous simultaneous sessions of which scientists attend some or none, with relatively little time set aside for group dialogue. To reach a group position and evolve the consensus to back it up, however, a quite different structure is needed, one entailing relatively few presentations and much room for dialogue, few or no simultaneous sessions (or only in the first part of the gathering), and as full participation as possible.

Collegial meetings can do quite well with what social psychologists call *laissez-faire* leadership (which actually means no leader at all but a passive chairperson). In contrast, positional meetings tend to require one or more active chairpersons, whose role it is to keep the dialogue on the track by cutting off excessive side trips, summarize whatever consensus emerges, clarify remaining points of difference, and urge progress toward a resolution.

In the selection of participants, a collegial meeting can be relatively non-selective, allowing scientists spanning a wide range in outlook, status, and temperament all to have their day in the free-for-all of findings and hypotheses. In contrast, positional meetings work best if participants are invited who represent at least the main relevant alternative viewpoints but are also willing and able to have a true dialogue with each other and make an effort to join in the collective enterprise of reaching a group or community position.

There is no room for concern if many, even most, scientific meetings are of the collegial type. But when the intent is positional and the format collegial, the result is likely to be a frustration of purpose that will tend to generate disappointed participants and more heat than light.—AMITAI ETZIONI, *Columbia University, New York 10027, and Center for Policy Research, Inc., 475 Riverside Drive, New York 10027*