



firms apparently inescapable logic. But too often survey data is used to confirm bias. I have never had much faith in surveys and I shudder when I think of the millions spent by governments to conduct surveys which produced the most obvious information.

There were, nevertheless some interesting and surprising variations from the expected in ISI's survey. It is not surprising that most *CC* readers are men. But the *CC* edition with the most female subscribers is not *CC/Behavioral, Social & Educational Sciences*, but *CC/Engineering & Technology!* On the other hand, there were no women at all among respondent subscribers to *CC/Agriculture, Food & Veterinary Sciences*.

Subscribers to *CC/BS&E* tend to be younger than subscribers to other editions, with *CC/Physical & Chemical Sciences* a very close second. Grant support is most frequently found among subscribers to *CC/Life* and *CC/BS&E*, and least often among subscribers to *CC/E&T*. That last fact may account for *CC/E&T* having by far the most pass-along readers per copy. The average *CC/E&T* subscriber has 10 friends and colleagues waiting for his issue of *CC* each week. *CC/Life* has the lowest pass-along readership, and these "facts" may reflect an atom of truth in the old saw that "research" scientists

write but don't read, while "applied" scientists read but don't write. One might also say that those who read a lot, write a lot, and those who write little read little! Not surprisingly, *CC/Physical & Chemical Sciences* has a high pass-along readership reflecting the budget problems of the chemical profession.

Interpreting survey results is an interesting game. One can be easily misled by preconceptions, with even the best designed of questionnaires. One sees too quickly what one wants to see ("... even this small sample confirms . . .") or too facilely dismisses what one doesn't ("... the sample is only a sample, after all . . ."). To adapt a famous pronouncement from Orwell, some average readers are much more average than others, and that is true of our *CC* reader. The most interesting thing about our readers is this. No matter how interesting other data may be, to me the 75% response in return of the questionnaires correlates well with the finding that an equal number find *CC* very helpful or indispensable. Perhaps this assurance is the greatest benefit derived from the survey. Lest you worry, however, about complacency on my part, I am still worrying about that other 25%.