

March 1989

Charleston Conference Peer Questionnaire

Corrie Marsh

George Washington University

Bill Raggio

SKP Associates

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Marsh, Corrie and Raggio, Bill (1989) "Charleston Conference Peer Questionnaire," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 1: Iss. 1, Article 8.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.1007>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

The Charleston Conference Peer Questionnaire

compiled by **Corrie Marsh** (George Washington University) and **Bill Raggio** (SKP Associates)
This summary was prepared by **Katina Strauch**•all percentages have been rounded.

Library Peer Data

The **Library Peer Data** questionnaires at the Charleston Conference 1988 were returned by 86% of the recipients.

a) The large majority of the responding libraries had materials budgets over one million dollars, though other significant categories had budgets between \$50,000 and \$999,999.

b) For 1989/90, 72% predicted an increase in the materials budget with 27% predicting a static budget.

c) Regarding percentage of the (1988/89) materials budget spent on various categories of materials (monographs, periodicals, memberships, database services, audiovisual, binding), the most significant number of libraries spent the majority of their materials budgets on periodicals and magazines (50-74%).

d) Apparently, the percentage differential between serials and books can keep growing since 70% of the respondents stated that they do not have a cap on their materials budget.

e) Eighty-six percent of the respondents have cancelled serials in the last three years and 55% plan to continue (or start) cancelling serials. Total number of serials cancelled was largely between zero and fifty.

f) Few (especially large) libraries seemed to be able to rank journals from most expensive to least expensive because of the time required to do so.

Vendor Peer Data

The **Vendor Peer Data Questionnaires** were returned by 59% of the recipients. Seventy percent of the respondents were book wholesaler/jobbers.

a) Fifty percent of the vendors do not maintain statistics on publisher error rates, but forty percent do.

b) A trend by publishers toward requiring or encouraging direct orders from libraries was noted by 64% of the vendors.

c) Ninety percent of the vendors said that shipping and freight costs had increased over the last three years. Seventy-eight percent of the vendors admit that they have passed on this publishers'

cost increase to libraries.

d) To the question "do you believe that publishers' discounts are changing?" 100% of the respondents replied "yes," and 78% state that there is a "downward trend."

e) Interestingly enough, especially for us librarians who have always heard about the "ideal order mix," there was very little unity as to what vendors as a group perceived as this mix.

Publisher Peer Data

The **Publisher Peer Data** questions were returned by 80% of the recipients.

a) The majority of the responding publishers work through library wholesalers, though percentages vary.

b) The primary method for promoting library sales was "direct mail."

c) Seventy percent of the publishers responding have experienced increased subscription cancellations from library customers.

d) Eighty-nine percent of the publishers state that they have refereed publications.

e) An even number replied yes and no (36%) to the question of whether or not they compensate editorial board members financially.

f) To the question "how closely do you monitor the citation rates of your journals," sixty-seven percent responded "somewhat" and 22% responded "very closely."

g) Interestingly, the number of items published did not seem to have dropped off significantly from 1986-1988.

The report above was also issued to Marcia Tuttle for distribution on her electronic pathway as part of the RTSD's Publisher/Vendor/Library Relations Committee Subcommittee on Serials Pricing Issues. If anyone failed to get a copy of the results (distributed at the 1988 Charleston Conference), please write me (Katina) for a copy.

Y'all: This is a very brief summary. Responses could be collated many ways which they have yet to be. I need some input. Did you like the peer data questionnaires? Would you like to see this continued at future conferences with a growing compilation base? If so, how would you like to see the results discussed, disseminated, etc.???? Help!!!