evidence and not on the 'authority' of authors."

Inasmuch as "few emendations" were made by the physicians, they must concede that the writer wrote the major portion of the paper. The writer need only demonstrate that the presentation format constitutes a primary contribution for which he or she is willing to take public responsibility in exchange for public credit.

Bethany Thivierge
Biomedical Technical Writer/Editor
Technicallity Resources
Rockland, Maine

New Question: A Question of Motivation
Your organization's medical-editing department has lost several positions in a general corporate layoff; as manager, you are responsible for training the remaining editors in unfamiliar tasks. The remaining editors, stressed by the fear of losing their jobs, increasingly display either unproductive or inappropriately competitive behavior. You know that any editor who leaves cannot be replaced.

Whereas you have previously informally passed on and responded to authors' compliments or complaints to motivate your editors to achieve goals, you now recognize that you must quickly provide a focused training effort by establishing quantitative methods for measuring production and rewarding quality. What expectations of timely and excellent manuscript editing can you outline to motivate the manuscript editors to train in new skills while remaining efficient in their current roles? That is, what specific experience with your authors and manuscript products can you use to establish baseline measures of quantity and quality that you can incorporate into the new training program? What behavioral measures can you include to improve these editors' satisfaction with the job and with coworkers?

Send your responses to the new questionnaire by 19 October 1997 to Delia Mundy, Kaiser Foundation Research Institute, Department of Medical Editing, 1800 Harrison Street, 16th Floor, Oakland, CA 94612-3425. Delia.Mundy@ocs.kaiserperman.org; telephone: 510-987-3573; fax: 510-873-5133

NET RESULTS

To Sum Up Our Position to Date

Since my 1st column about the Net 2 years ago, a number of sites have been listed and discussed. I find my bookmarks are becoming a daunting list to review and that many sites no longer exist or are not in the same format. So this column hopes to organize information for life-science communicators and create a format for adding new sites this coming year. I have included here the sites I find most informative for 1 reason or another.

Thanks to all of you who contributed to this list. I hope all readers will let me know about other sites to add. Let's chat! sedwards@ulna.bwh.harvard.edu

Science Editing and Writing Societies
American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS): http://www.aaas.org
American Medical Writers Association (AMWA): http://www.cais.com/amwa
Council of Biology Editors (CBE): http://www.cbe.org/CBE

European Society of Science Editors (EASE): http://www.compulink.co.uk/~case-editors
International Federation of Science Editors (IFSE): http://www.cmns.mnepri.ru/ifse
Society for Technical Communications (STC): http://www.stc.org

Commercial Newsletters
Copy Editor: http://www.copyeditor.com
Editorial Eye: http://www.eeicom.com

References
EurekAlert! (sponsored by the AAAS): http://www.eurekalert.org
The Why? Files (sponsored by the NSF): http://www.whyfiles.news.wisc.edu
WWWWebster Search Screen: http://www.m-w.com/netdict.htm

Government Resources
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: http://www.cdc.gov
Statistical Abstract: http://www.census.gov/statabstract

Web Page Evaluations
Health on the Net Foundation (WWW code of conduct): http://www.hon.ch/Conduct.html
Physicians' Choice: http://www.mdchoice.com
Staines GM. "Evaluating information found on the Internet." Mankato State University. http://www.lme.mankato.msus.edu/class/629/Cred.HTML
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