

Lucidity Letter Readers Survey Results¹

Forty-three of the 280 readers of the December 1989 issue of *Lucidity Letter* (LL) completed and returned a readers survey by June 17, 1990. There were five general types of questions beginning with the amount of the last two issues read and followed by three questions dealing with overall satisfaction. Six questions were then asked about specific content items for LL. Respondents were also asked how frequently they would like to see it come out under several conditions. Finally, general comments were solicited.

Of the 43 respondents, 31 said they had read from half to all of the last two issues, so the majority of responses are from individuals who are well read in this journal. A considerable majority (74%) said they saw the overall quality of LL as more than satisfactory to superior. Sixty-two percent said the same about the articles in general while not as many (37%) were happy with the layout. Although 44% said the layout was in the satisfactory range, it was clear that fewer were as happy with this aspect of LL than with the content.

As to the specific types of articles, about 50% favored more clinical, anecdotal, interview, and theoretical articles while only 31% wanted to see more scientific articles. A bit less than a quarter of the respondents wanted to see less science; only 12% on average said the same about the other types of articles. Types of articles suggested included:

- Mutual dreaming studies and lucid wakefulness
- Experiments in which readers can become involved
- Good illustrations
- Readers dreams and experiences
- Training/"how to"/induction methodology
- More book reviews
- Philosophical reviews
- Lucid dreaming and dream yoga (Tulku)
- More relationship between technical and anecdotal articles
- Background in disciplines that led to present professional positions

The majority of these well read respondents (64%) wanted to see LL come out more frequently while none wanted to see it come out less frequently. When asked several frequency questions as a function of type of content (more or less professional) an interesting mix occurred. For both types of questions (more frequent but less professional and more frequent but more professional) the majority response was no (49% and 47% respectively) with 37/39% saying yes to both contingencies.

All the less frequent questions were overwhelmingly answered no (2.33% to 4.65%). Clearly the LL readers agree that they want the publication more frequently but it appears that the lay and professional portions of the readership cancel each other out as to whether or not they would like to see it as more or less professional. This also shows when you look at the means of types of articles liked in LL. They were all around three out of five (about the same).

Twenty-one types of comments were identified by the reader of the surveys, Shelagh Robinson. The largest category was "love it now!" at 24%. The next largest category (20%) scored involved comments of a technical nature such as "the print is too small," "improve the layout," and "needs to be visually more stimulating." Otherwise the comments tended to be suggestions for future types of articles, for example, more about the OBE-lucid dream connection. Finally, to illustrate the apparent split in our readers, two said, "Don't become too Shirley McLaine-ish or anecdotal," while two said, "Don't fall into the trap of becoming too serious with statistics and technical jargon!"

As editor of LL, I appreciate the feedback from our readers. It appears that the major complaints are of a technical nature. In the last two issues of LL we have endeavored to correct these problems with a totally new layout (December 1989) and the addition of a copy editor (June 1990). As far as content is concerned I have and will continue to "walk the thin line" between science and anecdote.

Jayne Gackenbach, Ph.D.
Senior Editor, *Lucidity Letter*

¹ Thanks are due to Shelagh Robinson for entering the data for the readers survey and categorizing the comments.