http://www.aaas.org

Published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues re 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

The American Association for the Advancement of Science was founded in 1848 and incorporated in 1874. Its objectives are to further the work of scientists, to facilitate cooperation among them. to foster scientific freedom and responsibility, to improve the effectiveness of science in the promotion of human welfare, to advance education in science, and to increase public understanding and appreciation of the importance and promise of the methods of science in human progress.

Membership/Circulation

Director: Michael Spinella Deputy Director: Marlene Zendell

Member Services: Rebecca Dickerson, Manager; Mary Curry, Supervisor, Pat Butler, Helen Williams, Laurie Baker,

Marketing: Dee Valencia, Manager; Jane Pennington, Europe Manager; Hilary Baar, Associate; Angela Mumeka,

Coordinator Research: Renuka Chander, Manage Business and Finance: Robert Smariga, Manager; Kevin Bullock, Nina Araujo de Kobes, Coordinators Science Member Services

Danbury, CT: 800-731-4939 Washington, DC: 202-326-6417 Other AAAS Programs: 202-326-6400

Advertising and Finance

Associate Publisher: Beth Rosner Advertising Sales Manager: Susan A. Meredith Recruitment Advertising Manager: Janis Crowley Business Manager: Deborah Rivera-Wienhold Finance: Randy Yi, Senior Analyst; Shawn Williams, Analyst Marketing: John Meyers, Manager; Allison Pritchard,

Traffic: Carol Maddox, Manager; Christine Pierpoint,

Recruitment: Terri Seiter Azie, Assistant Manager; Pamela Sams, Production Associate: Celeste Miller, Bethany Ritchey, Nancy Hicks, Sales; Debbie Cummings, European Sales Reprints: Ordering/Billing, 800-407-9191; Corrections, 202-

Permissions: Lincoln Richman Exhibits Coordinator: Arlene Ennis Administrative Assistant: Caroline Althuis PRODUCT ADVERTISING SALES: East Coast/E. Canada: Richard Teeling, 201-904-9774, FAX 201-904-9701 • Midwest/ Southeast: Elizabeth Mosko, 312-665-1150, FAX 312-665-2129 • West Coast/W. Canada: Neil Boylan, 415-673-9265, FAX 415-673-9267 • UK, Scandinavia, France, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands: Andrew Davies, (44) 1-457-838-519. FAX (44) 1-457-838-898 • Germany/Switzerland/Austria: Tracey Peers, (44) 1-270-760-108, FAX (44) 1-270-759-597 • Japan: Mashy Yoshikawa, (3) 3235-5961, FAX (3) 3235-5852 RECRUITMENT ADVERTISING SALES: US: 202-326-6532, FAX 202-289-6742 • Europe: Debbie Cummings, +44 (0) 1223-302067, FAX +44 (0) 1223-576208 • Australia/New Zealand: Keith Sandell, (61) 02-9222-2977, FAX (61) 02-922-

Send materials to Science Advertising, 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

Information for Contributors appears on pages 93-94 of the 5 January 1996 issue. Editorial correspondence, including requests for permission to reprint and reprint orders, should be sent to 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005

Science World Wide Web address: http://www.aaas.org Other Internet addresses: science_editors@aaas.org (for general editorial queries); science_letters@aaas.org (for letters to the editor); science_reviews@aaas.org (for returning manuscript reviews); membership@aaas.org (for member services); science_classifieds@aaas.org (for submitting classified advertisements); science_advertising@aaas.org (for product

LETTERS

Sound policy

Several of this week's letters discuss professional and policy concerns of the working scientist. "One in four whistleblowers reported severe consequences" to their jobs, according to a survey study. Comparing the quality of research done at national laboratories to that at universities (to determine allocation of funding) is not a simple exercise, two writers say. Another gives an example of a successful fellowship program that "strengthens ties" between universities, industry, and government. A question about equity for people who "live far away from the information highway" is raised. The ethics of using previously collected tissue samples for genetic research is discussed. And the achievement of the amateur scientist is trumpeted.

Whistleblowing Consequences

As the project officer for the study of the consequences of whistleblowing, I was pleased to see the Random Samples item about the study (5 Jan., p. 35). Readers should also be made aware of the following important findings of the study.

Although 69% of whistleblowers in scientific misconduct cases experienced one or more negative consequences as a result of their whistleblowing, 62% perceived the consequences of whistleblowing to have had a neutral impact on their careers, professional activities, and personal lives; 28% perceived a negative impact; and 10% perceived a mixed (positive and negative) impact.

Whistleblowers attributed the negative consequences they experienced to institutional officials, the accused, colleagues, and professional societies. The most serious negative consequences were most frequently attributed to institutional officials and secondarily to the accused. One in four whistleblowers reported severe consequences, including loss of position or denial of tenure, promotion, or salary increases.

Negative consequences for whistleblowing were most likely to begin while the institution was responding to the allegation and continue after the inquiry and investigation were completed. Negative consequences were experienced whether or not the allegation was substantiated.

Negative consequences reduced the willingness of whistleblowers to blow the whistle again but did not extinguish it. More than half of the whistleblowers who experienced severe negative consequences reported that they would blow the whistle again.

Although positive consequences of whistleblowing were seldom cited, one in

four whistleblowers reported a positive impact on their self-esteem.

Readers may access the whistleblower study report on the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) Home Page at http:// phs.os.dhhs.gov/phs/ori/ori_home.html> or obtain it in hard copy or diskette from the ORI.

Lawrence J. Rhoades

Director, Division of Policy and Education, Office of Research Integrity, Department of Health and Human Services. 5515 Security Lane, Suite 700, Rockville, MD 20852, USA

Academia vs. National Labs

The observation in ScienceScope of 2 February (p. 585) that "a recent National Academy of Sciences panel recommended [that] federal agencies should 'favor' universities over national labs and other research institutions because the quality of the science is generally higher on campus" does not reflect what the panel's report said. In fact, the report states that the "committee does not presume that academic research is always of higher quality than that conducted in industry, federal laboratories, or other nonacademic institutions" (1). The committee did urge that federal funding for science and technology should generally favor universities because of the greater flexibility of their programs, inherent quality control, and linkage of research to education. It also recommended that excellent, well-evaluated federal laboratories supporting the missions of their sponsoring agencies should not be diminished.

Norman Metzger

Study Director, Committee on Criteria for