Electronic Journals and Skywriting: a Complementary Medium for Scientific Communication?

Number 45   November 11, 1991

Conventional scientific journals are considered to be as primitive as Neanderthals by some avant-garde computer enthusiasts. They even believe that printed journals will evolve into a new species—the "paperless" electronic journal. Some librarians, facing ever increasing costs and space constraints, would hope so. Indeed, there now exist six peer-reviewed electronic journals (Table 1). And a few organizations are poised to launch others—among them the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS).[1]

I have written recently elsewhere[2] that "besides the reluctance of scientists in general to give up things that are familiar and comfortable, present publishers, advertisers, printers, and editors have a vested interest in maintaining printed journals." I do, however, envision a future where electronic journals coexist with their printed, highly cited counterparts.

One of the first peer reviewed electronic journals grew out of the "Bitnet Psychology Newsletter," a bulletin board started in 1985 by Robert Morecock of the University of Houston, Texas. The newsletter was transformed into a journal called *Psycoloquy* in 1989. It is sponsored on an experimental basis by the American Psychological Association, which has a membership base of more than 100,000. In 1990, *Library Journal* selected *Psycoloquy* as among the best new magazines of 1990.

The journal has two coeditors—Stevan Harnad, visiting fellow in the Department of Psychology at Princeton University, and Perry London, dean of the Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology at Rutgers University. Harnad, founder and editor of *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* for the last 15 years, is responsible for scientific contributions, while London handles clinical, applied, and professional submissions.

The Concept of Scholarly Skywriting

Contributions to *Psycoloquy* are refereed by the journal's 50-member editorial board. However, the central idea is not just to replicate a conventional printed journal in electronic form, but to engage in "scholarly skywriting." This concept presumably represents a new form of scientific communication. Authors transmit over the network brief accounts of their current ideas and findings, as though they had written them in the sky for all to see simultaneously. The aim is to elicit quick worldwide feedback from colleagues with similar interests. The premise of skywriting is that the speed of scholarly communication can be brought much closer to that of thought. The electronic medium adds a global interactive dimension to this thought process.

We reprint below an article by Harnad, a Hungarian by birth who earned his undergraduate degree at McGill University and did his graduate work at Princeton. He explains the concept of scholarly skywriting. The article appeared in *Psychological Science*.[3]

Table 1. Peer-reviewed electronic journals.

1. **EJournal.** First published in April 1991. It discusses the problems and opportunities presented by electronic text.

The first issue was sent to about 400 subscribers, as well as to many other readers who have access to information on the networks. The editor is Edward M. Jennings, Department of English, State University of New York, Albany, NY 12222; (518)442-4091; EJOURNAL@ALBNYVMS.

2. **Electronic Journal of Communication/La Revue Electronique de Communication.** Covers communications studies in English and French. Started in 1991. Editing is shared by James Winter, an associate professor of communications studies at the University of Windsor, who speaks English, and Claude Martin, a professor in the communications department at the University of Montreal, who speaks French.

The journal has approximately 230 subscribers. Contact James Winter, Department of Communication Studies, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario N9B 3PA, Canada; (519)253-4232; WINTER@UCC.UWINDSOR.CA.

3. **Journal of the International Academy of Hospitality Research.** Began in November 1990. Covers research on tourism. Edited by Mahmood Khan, a professor in the Department of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Management at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, it is the only one of the six peer-reviewed scholarly journals that is not free. It charges $30 annually for institutions and $10 for individuals. Fifty-six libraries and 40 individuals have subscriptions.

Contact Scholarly Communications Project, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1700 Pratt Drive, Blacksburg, VA 24061-0506; (703)231-5515; JIAHRED@VTVM1 or JIAHRED@CC.VT.EDU.

4. **New Horizons in Adult Education.** Published since 1987 by graduate students at Syracuse University. It claims to be the first electronic, peer-reviewed scholarly journal.

The journal, which is supported by the Kellogg Project at Syracuse, is distributed to about 1,000 individuals.

Contact Adult Education Network, Syracuse University Kellogg Project, 310 Lyman Hall, 108 College Place, Syracuse, NY 13244-1270; (315)443-1095; HORIZONS@SUVM.

5. **Postmodern Culture.** Published since September 1990 at North Carolina State University. Includes essays and other materials on interdisciplinary studies.

The journal issues copies on floppy disks and microfiche. Its coeditors are John Unsworth and Eyal Amiran, both assistant professors of English.

About 1,150 of the journal's subscriptions are sent over the networks, while 50 copies are delivered in a less transient form.

Contact *Postmodern Culture*, North Carolina State University, Box 8105, Raleigh, NC 27695; (919)737-2011; PMC@NCSUVM.NCSU.EDU.

6. **Psycoloquy.** Began in 1985 as an electronic "bulletin board" called Bitnet Psychology Newsletter. In 1989, coeditor Stevan Harnad, a visiting fellow at Princeton University, helped transform *Psycoloquy* into a journal, with the goal of implementing peer review on the networks for articles on psychology and related topics.

The journal is estimated to have thousands of "subscribers." An accurate count is not possible, because most people access it over the network without cost.

Contact *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 20 Nassau Street, No. 240, Princeton, NJ 08542; (609)258-4442; HARNAD@CLARITY.PRINCETON.EDU or HARNAD@PUCC.BITNET.

All the peer-reviewed electronic journals are available on Bitnet, an academic network, and Usenet, a global linkup of many networks. In addition to *Psycoloquy*, the other journals—all in the humanities and social sciences—are *EJournal, Electronic Journal of Communication/La Revue Electronique de Communication, Journal of the International Academy of Hospitality Research, New Horizons in Adult Education,* and *Postmodern Culture.* Incidentally, the Association of Research Libraries has recently issued a directory that includes electronic journals, newsletters, and academic discussion lists.

The present generation of electronic journals cannot display color or graphics. This is obviously a major limitation. However, developers of the next generation of electronic journals hope to be able to offer charts, graphs, tables, illustrations, and mathematical notation along with text. Other organizations reportedly considering publishing electronic journals include the American Mathematical Society, the American Chemical Society, and the American Physical Society.

The AAAS recently disclosed that the name of its new electronic journal would be *Current Clinical Trials.*[4] It is scheduled to be launched in April 1992 in collaboration

with the Online Computer Library Center of Dublin, Ohio. The editor will be Edward J. Huth, formerly chief editor of the prestigious, Philadelphia-based *Annals of Internal Medicine*.

The Issue of Peer Review

Joshua Lederberg, a Nobel laureate and president emeritus of Rockefeller University, is a long-time champion of electronic journals. He conducted a National Science Foundation workshop in 1989 that explored the architecture for what has been described as "nationwide collaboratories."[5]

New forms of scientific idea sharing, Lederberg believes, will emerge in this decade through digital collaborations[6] such as those involved in the electronic skywriting now practiced in *Psycoloquy*. This will force some major social readjustments within science. One of these readjustments contains the traditional notion of peer review, a process which Lederberg strongly advocates. "It is an essential part of the dialectic that also can assess and commend particular articles for readers."

The definition of peer review, however, undergoes a metamorphosis when what an author submits for network electronic publication is itself continuously changed during the process of more or less instantaneous critique between reader and author.

Most electronic journals now mimic their printed cousins. But Lederberg thinks the real potential for the electronic journal is to serve as a forum in the particular field, interacting, in his words, "dynamically and dialectically."

While some scientists, such as Lederberg, believe that the peer review process is the glue that holds the scientific establishment together, others are now questioning what would be lost by the disappearance of refereeing.[7] In the latter instance, readers would have to decide the merits of a paper for themselves, which, some argue, is already necessary because of ineffectual refereeing.

The Question of Reflective Time

A flaw in Harnad's argument, in my opinion, is that it ignores the value of the reflective thinking process that accompanies the traditional printed article. Good ideas, like good wine, improve with age. Electronic brainstorming will certainly have value in augmenting the content of an idea, as at a scientific meeting. But reflective time is usually also required for it to mature into a usable entity.

Also, while initial ideas can be improved on by skywriting, there is also a danger that they can be diminished by the process. We are all familiar with the adage that "too many cooks spoil the broth." An example might be the process of writing by committee, or consensus, which often tends to dilute the substance in a document, making it bland and uninteresting in comparison to the initial idea.

The strength of collective analytical thinking in relation to that of a single human being is demonstrated to some extent in the game of chess. A super computer has been built at MIT, called Deep Thought, that can defeat many players at the grand master level. However, it is wise to keep in mind that, because we have yet to learn how to program creativity, the computer to date has been unable to defeat the world champion in match play.

One area of science where the electronic journal makes a lot of sense is in the area of human gene mapping. At an international gathering of leading geneticists in London this past August, the Nobel laureate James Watson, who oversees the $200-million-a-year Human Genome Project, and Robert Sparkes, a geneticist at the University of California, Los Angeles, bemoaned the "explosion" of new information in the field.[8] The published paragraph-length abstracts of papers read at the meeting ran to 350 pages.

Sparkes commented that "there is so much information now that it's becoming difficult to handle. I think just getting this data out to the scientific community will be one of our

biggest challenges in the future." This is the type of pressure that is likely to encourage genome researchers to use the electronic journal to foster rapid communication. However, reporting on new sequences of genome fragments will need increased attention by reviewers who can digest and interpret this information.

The Library View

Anne B. Piternick, a professor in the School of Library, Archival & Information Studies at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, has studied the question of whether electronic journals are a realistic way to control the rising costs of printed serials. Her conclusion is that migration to an electronic journal system "is likely to be slow and may never be complete" because of the human factors involved.

Some of the concerns she has identified, spelled out in a draft paper[9] sent to me for comment, include ready access to equipment in less developed countries; questions surrounding standardized formatting and citation; coverage by indexing and abstracting services; copyright and ownership of electronic material, and responsibility for preservation; risk of alteration of submissions, loss of files or intrusion by viruses; possible use of citation and usage logs to determine retention or deletion of individual contributions, and so on.

Clearly, the electronic journal is a long way from widespread acceptance by the scientific community. And though it may now make sense economically and technologically for rapid preliminary communications, it will not replace printed journals until a variety of human factors are integrated with software and hardware.

Some of the human factors I speak of were first discussed[10] in 1957 by Robert K. Merton, now a distinguished emeritus professor at Columbia University. They apply not only to science in general but to the newly emerging electronic journal of today. The history of science is replete with examples of disputes over the priority of discovery, an issue that could be considerably blurred in the electronic medium.

Linked to the priority of discovery is many scientists' need for recognition, which comes in many forms. The drive for recognition, of course, can, if not handled properly, foster misconduct, such as citation amnesia.[11,12] These are a few of the many human factors that electronic journals will have to confront as they progress on a parallel course with the printed journal.

* * * * *

My thanks to Paul R. Ryan for his help in the preparation of this introduction.

REFERENCES

1. **Wilson D L.** Testing time for electronic journals. *Chron. High. Educ.* 11 September 1991. (A22-4)
2. **Garfield E.** Don't hold your breath waiting for the 'paperless' journal. (Commentary.) *The Scientist* 5(18):12, 16 September 1991.
3. **Harnad S.** Scholarly skywriting and the prepublication continuum of scientific inquiry. *Psychol. Sci.* 1(6):342-4, November 1990.
4. **Palca J.** New journal will publish without paper. *Science* 253:1480, 27 September 1991.
5. **Schrage M.** Computer tools for thinking in tandem. *Science* 253:505-7, 2 August 1991.
6. **Lederberg J.** Digital communications and the conduct of science: the new literacy. *Proc. IEEE* 66(11):1314-9, 1978.
7. **Mermin N D.** Publishing in computopia. *Phys. Today* 44 (5):9-11, May 1991.
8. **Hooper L.** Gene mappers face 'explosion' of information. *Wall Street Journal* B1; B3, 26 August 1991.
9. **Piternick A B.** Electronic journals: realistic or unrealistic solution to the journal 'crisis'? *Serials Libr.* 21 (2/3). (Scheduled to appear in the spring of 1992.)
10. **Merton R K.** *Priorities in scientific discovery: 1957.* Speech presented to American Sociological Society, August 1957. First published in *American Sociological Review* 22(6):635-59, 1957. (Reprinted in: *The sociology of science.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1973. p. 286-324.

11. **Garfield E.** To cite or not to cite: a note of annoyance. *Current Contents* (35):5-8, 29 August 1977.
    (Reprinted in: *Essays of an information scientist.* Philadelphia: ISI Press, 1980. Vol. 3. p. 215-8.)
12. ---------. More on the ethics of scientific publication: abuses of authorship attribution and citation
    amnesia undermine the reward system of science. *Current Contents* (30):5-10, 26 July 1982.
    (Reprinted in: *Ibid.* Philadelphia: ISI Press, 1983. Vol. 5. p. 621-6.)

Scholarly Skywriting and the Prepublication Continuum of Scientific Inquiry

by Stevan Harnad

Princeton University

William Gardner's proposal* (1990) is fine, as far as it goes (though he seems to have missed some of the relevant background literature, e.g. Engelbart 1975, 1984a, b; Schatz, 1985, 1987, 1990). The potential role of electronic networks in scientific publication, however goes far beyond providing searchable electronic archives for electronic journals. The whole process of scholarly communication currently is undergoing a revolution comparable to the one occasioned by the invention of printing. On the brink of intellectual perestroika is that vast prepublication phase of scientific inquiry in which ideas and findings are discussed informally with colleagues (in person, by phone, and by regular mail), presented more formally in seminars, conferences, and symposia, and distributed still more widely in the form of preprints and technical reports that have undergone various degrees of peer review. It has now become possible to do all of this in a remarkable new way that is not only incomparably more thorough and systematic in its distribution, potentially global in scale and almost instantaneous in speed, but so unprecedentedly interactive that it will substantially restructure the pursuit of knowledge.

The prepublication phase of scientific inquiry is, after all, the one in which most of

Stevan Harnad

the cognitive work is done. Some of this work is relatively noninteractive, to be sure (for example, actually executing experiments, running computer simulations, or proving theorems). But the rest—from the interplay of the prior ideas out of which the experiments were designed, and the theories were constructed to the analysis and interpretation of the findings and their fit to the theories—clearly consists of activities that profit from peer feedback. For most investigators the formal submission of a manuscript for refereeing is not the first stage at which it has been subjected to peer scrutiny; that is what all the prior discussions, sympo-

---

*Gardner, writing in *Psychological Science*, proposed an electronic journal publishing program for psychologists, called the electronic archive. He cited three critical principles: first, electronic publishing must retain the readability of a traditional printed journal. Second, it must be both accessible and attractive to all members of the discipline, whether they use computers or not. Most importantly, it must provide improved facilities for retrieving information, while continuing to serve as a permanent archive. He argued that the primary advantage of electronic publishing is not the inexpensive delivery of text, but the use of a centralized archive to concentrate resources for discovering and utilizing information.

sia, and preprints had been intended to elicit. And all the prepublication interaction clearly is continuous with the lapidary stage at which the manuscript—usually further revised in response to peer review—is accepted and archived in print. Nor does the process really end there, for of course the literature may respond to a contribution directly or indirectly for years to come, and there are even ways of soliciting post-publication feedback in the form of "open peer commentary" (as in this case).

Not just archiving itself, but all these other stages of scientific inquiry, which are on a continuum with the archival function, must be jointly re-examined in the light of the new technology. The picture that accordingly emerges turns out to be very different from what an exclusive spotlight on electronic archiving suggests.

There now exist numerous electronic networks such as Bitnet and Internet that link academic and research institutions globally. They not only make it possible to send electronic mail (e-mail) from individual to individual almost instantaneously, but they allow individuals to send multiple e-mail to groups of individuals reciprocally—anywhere from a few collaborating colleagues, to all the experts in a given subspecialty, to an entire discipline—all just as quickly as individual e-mail, but with the emergent benefits of the interactive feedback. I have called this new medium "scholarly skywriting." In principle, all the interactions at the "pilot" stage of inquiry—from informal brainstorming, to participating in research symposia, to circulating preprints for peer criticism before formal submission to an archival journal for peer review—can now be accomplished by skywriting, not only at a great saving in travel and talking time, but with a speed, geographic scope, and scale of multiple interactiveness that no prior means of communication could even come close to providing.

The potential effects of this rapid global interactiveness on scholarly inquiry are, in my opinion, nothing short of revolutionary.

But why has the revolution not begun, and why have the fabled effects so far failed to manifest themselves? There are obstacles. (1) Old ways of thinking about scientific communication and publication (partially evident in the limited scope and relatively conventional framework of Gardner's proposal) constrain our imaginations. (2) The computer is not yet quite friendly enough to have won over the majority of scholars; many still do not even use it for word-processing, much less electronic mail. It must also be admitted that (3) the current intellectual level of discussion on electronic networks is anything but inspiring. And many scholars are reluctant to entrust serious ideas, time, and attention to the net because of prima facie worries about (4) plagiarism, (5) copyright, (6) academic credit and advancement, (7) junk mail and (8) security. All these obstacles can be overcome, and all the objections have sensible answers.

———————

1. Old ways of thinking will not be corrected by futuristic proposals; only convincing demonstrations of the potential power, productivity, and scope of scholarly skywriting will capture the scientific community's allegiance and participation.

2. Computers are getting friendlier every day, and the proportion of scholars with e-mail is growing; but, again, the only thing that will really draw skeptics onto the net will be dramatic demonstrations of the unprecedented potential of scholarly skywriting. Then the medium will be seen to be as unique and indispensable to serious scholars as books and journals once were.

3. The currently low intellectual level of the net is purely the result of incidental initial conditions. The medium was created by engineers and computer scientists, and they (along with students, reared on video games, with little knowledge, and a lot of time on their hands) are the ones who have been setting people's expectations and standards so far, giving the impression that the net is just a global graffiti board for trivial pursuit. But this initial con-

dition which is rather as though Guttenberg and a legion of linotype operators, instead of Shakespeare and Newton, had provided our model of what the printed page was to be used for—is surely destined to rectify itself as the net's demography changes and the serious demonstrations of its scholarly potential start to appear.

4. The best protection against plagiarism would be to set up a vertical peer hierarchy like the one described later in this commentary. That way the relevant specialists will see new ideas first and know where they originated. A soft archive for all skywriting could be used to authenticate priority where necessary. And because scientists write for their peers rather than the publication-list-padding multitudes, it is not even clear how much they are, or ought to be, worried about ideas being purloined by contributors to the unrefereed vanity press.

5. The copyright laws will no doubt have to be enlarged to take the electronic media into account, but, in principle, skywriting represents no greater or lesser threat to auctorial proprietorship than printing or photocopying.

6. Once the intellectual potential of scholarly skywriting is demonstrated, it is a foregone conclusion that contributions to the medium will be given much greater weight. Just as citation statistics have become relevant to tenure/promotion committees, so will airtime—weighted, of course, by the altitude in the peer hierarchy where it takes place. Moreover, as there is no real hermetic seal along the horizontal (archiving) continuum either, skywriting contributions will come to be cited in the "hard" archival publications with which Gardner is concerned, just as "personal communications" are now, except that, having already been jointly witnessed in the sky by the relevant peer community when they originally appeared, these "soft" citations will be increasingly seen as the locus classicus, or at least the site of origin, of new contributions.

7. The concern about being overwhelmed by junk electronic mail in an age when there is already an information glut looks reason-able on the face of it, but actually is quite wrong-headed. It is, in fact, easier to filter electronic mail than it is to filter paper mail and phone calls (yet we never considered turning our back on the latter because of potential overload). Simple computer programs can restrict one's e-mail to the individuals, groups or topics one chooses. Moreover, even unfiltered e-mail, unlike paper mail and phone calls, can be discarded with one keystroke after scanning a one-line topic header. In fact, e-mail should soon take over much of the load of regular mail and telephoning, at a much lower cost in time and resources. So the net will turn out to be the best means of rationally managing the information glut, rather than being just another polluter.

8. In this era of computer viruses and vandalism, there are still unsolved security problems, but these need not be deterrents to scholarly skywriting. Though they are not 100% secure, the currently available password and encryption systems are safe enough for scientists, if not for military analysts. Paper mail, phone calls, and even face-to-face conversations are never altogether immune from snooping. There is no reason to see this as a greater threat on the net.

Once we recognize that the archiving of scientific ideas and findings is *already* on a continuum, with varying degrees of formality, reliability, and even of peer validation (as in the prestige hierarchy among journals, from the most rigorously reviewed ones at the top to what is virtually a vanity press at the bottom), it is natural to transpose all of this into the electronic dimension as well. I have proposed that two dimensions should be implemented in the archival continuum that begins with an inchoate thought and ends in a lapidary entry in the literature:

> The idea is to have a vertical (peer expertise) and a horizontal (temporal-archival) dimension of quality control. The vertical di-

mension would be a pyramidal hierarchy of email groups, the height of each depending on degree of expertise, whether in a subspecialty, an entire discipline, or even an interdisciplinary field. An accredited group of peers at level i would have read/write access at level i; those at level i-1 would have read-write access at level i-1 and read-only access at level i, but with the right to post to a read-write peer at level i who could in turn post their contribution for them, if it was judged good enough. An individual with an established record of valuable mediated postings could eventually be voted up a level. A single editor or an editorial board are simply special cases of this very same mechanism, where one person or only a few mediate all writing privileges through peer review.

This vertical hierarchy would be based on the contributors' degree of expertise, specialization, and their record of contributions in a given field. In principle, the hierarchy could trickle down all the way to general access groups for nonspecialists and students at the lowest read/write levels. (Such unrefereed groups would carry the equivalent of what is called "flaming" on the network today; unfortunately, this anarchic level is the only one that exists among the net's current "unmoderated" groups; in the so-called "moderated" groups all contributions are filtered through a single person, but usually one with no special qualifications or answerability. There is not yet any real peer review on the net.)

So far, even at the highest levels, this would still be just brainstorming, at the pilot stage of inquiry. The horizontal dimension would then take the surviving products of all this skywriting, referee them the usual way (by having them read, criticized and revised under peer scrutiny) and then archive them (electronically) according to the level of rigor of the referring system they have gone through (corresponding, more or less, to the current "prestige hierarchy" and levels of specialization among print journals). Again, an unrefereed "vanity press" could be the bottom of the archiving hierarchy. (Harnad, 1990).

It would be at the late horizontal stages of such a two-dimensional system that Gardner's proposal for an interactive, searchable archive would come in, although there seems to be no reason to assume that the process should end there. It may be just as important to skywrite in response to an archived contribution as to one at a softer stage of the process. Thus, the continuum would swallow its own tail.

Scholarly inquiry in this new medium will proceed much more quickly, interactively, and globally; and it is likely to become a lot more participatory, though perhaps also more depersonalized, with ideas propagating and permuting on the net in directions over which their originators would be unable (and indeed perhaps unwilling) to claim proprietorship. An individual's compensation for the diminished proprietorship, however, would be the possibility of much greater intellectual productivity in one lifetime, and this is perhaps scholarly skywriting's greatest reward.

In accordance with the Ziegarnik effect, our memory for tasks we have not yet completed is better than for tasks we are already done with. Because of the slow turnaround time of conventional publication, by the time the literature takes up a theme that we had in mind when we published something, we may no longer be actively thinking about it. Intellectual communication has its own natural pace; perhaps real-time verbal conversation is its most natural tempo. Writing, though slower, has the advantage of being more disciplined and reflective, and of preserving an archival record of what we said. Yet we all know that we can think faster than we can write; and we can certainly think faster than the time it takes for a letter to reach someone and be answered. So consider how much faster still we are able to think than the time it takes for an article to be accepted, published, read by others, and responded to? How many are the stillborn thoughts that might have survived and flourished if only they had been stimulated by peer feedback at the right time, while they were still active in one's mind?

Skywriting offers the possibility of accelerating scholarly communication to something closer to the speed of thought while

adding a globally interactive dimension that makes the medium radically different from any other. To be truly forward-looking, Gardner's proposed searchable electronic archive should be embedded in a continuous stream of electronic communication among scholars.[1]

REFERENCES

Engelbart, D.C. (1975). NLS teleconferencing features: The journal, and shared-screen telephoning. *IEEE Catalog* (pp. 173-176). No. 75CH0988-6C.
Engelbart, D.C. (1984a). Collaboration support provisions in AUGMENT. *Proceedings of the 1984, AFIPS Office Automation Conference*, (pp. 51-58).
Engelbart, D.C. (1984b). Authorship provisions in AUGMENT. *Proceedings of the 1984 COMPCON Conference*, (pp. 465-472).
Gardner, W. (1990). The electronic archive: Scientific publishing for the 1990s. *Psychological Science, 1*, 333-341.
Harnad, S. (1990). On the scholarly and educational potential of multiple email networks. In N.R. Coombs (moderator), COMMED (electronic discussion group on electronic communication and education) (commed@rpiecs.bitnet commed@vm.ecs.rpi.edu.nrcgsh@ultb.isc.rit.edu).
Schatz, B. (1985). *Telesophy*. Bellcore Technical Memo, TM-ARH-002487.
Schatz, B. (1987). Telesophy: A system for manipulating the knowledge of a community. *Proceedings of the IEEE Globecom '87*, (pp. 1181-1186).
Schatz, B. (1990). *Building on electronic scientific community: A national collaboratory testbed.* HICSS-24 Hawaii International Conference on Systems Sciences.

1. An experimental skywriting group conceived along these lines, PSYCOLOQUY, has recently been formed. The vertical hierarchy has not yet been implemented, but there is an editorial board with specialists from all fields of psychology, and all contributions are refereed. To sign on, send the one-line message Sub Psyc your Firstname Lastname to listserv@pucc.bitnet. Postings are then sent to psych@tcsvm.bitnet. PSYCOLOQUY can also be accessed from Usenet as the moderated newgroup sci.psychology.digest. For further information, send email to harnad@clarity.princeton.edu or harnad@pucc.bitnet.

Editorial Schedule Change

With the first issue of 1991, ISI ® implemented a schedule change in the front matter for *Current Contents*. ® *Citation Classics* ® and the *ISI* ® *Press Digest*, including *Hot Topics*, now appear every other week. They alternate with either an essay by Eugene Garfield, a reprint with an appropriate introduction, or an essay by an invited guest.