2007

Adventures in Librarianship -- Haiku

Ned Kraft

U.S. Department of State, kraftno@state.gov
Adventures in Librarianship — Haiku

by Ned Kraft (Ralph J. Bunche Library, U.S. Department of State) <kraftno@state.gov>

Who would have imagined that the 2nd Triennial ATG Haiku Contest would bring such genius to the fore? The breadth of talent in our profession is truly staggering.

This year’s judges included, along with myself, LeMoyne Leeper, winner of the 1971 Buddy Hackett Prize for Poetry, and Sherman Strep, Poet Laureate of Arlington County, Virginia. We had a difficult time, I can tell you, choosing from so many beautiful works.

Katy Bluff, Assistant Director for the Hareless County Library System, submitted what the judges considered the “Most Poignant” poem. Here is her Exasperate.

Committee, task force,
In whose name we bash large rocks
On our willing heads.
The Most practical haiku was sent in by Noam Brusky, a front-desk assistant at the Bourbon College Library. It is entitled Get Away from the Front Desk.

It won’t circulate
Without a barcode, stupid.
Why did we hire you?
The judges especially liked Mr. Brusky’s use of the question ending, leaving readers with a sort-of-puzzle; and leading the second two lines with W while the first leads with a seemingly contradictory I.

For “Most Sentimental,” the judges went with Little Bird, by Bertha Schwnk, a volunteer at the Somerset High School Library. I think you’ll agree that Ms. Schwnk captures the essential sentiment in any lost-book tragedy.

Little bird, come here.
Lost or missing or withdrawn,
Time to check you out.

Finally, our winning haiku for 2007, comes from Dusty Beets, a cataloger with Darkmound University. It is called simply Where?

If I could come back
As a book or a journal
Where would you class me?
The judges agreed that Dusty’s use of imagery was superb. One could almost picture the book and the journal. It is moving yet sublimely still, grandiose yet self-effacing. We hope to see more of Ms. Beets work in the future. Perhaps another submission in 2010?

And They Were There
from page 64

• OA articles are generally considered reliable.
• Opinions are split about the future of OA vs. published materials.

Survey respondents to the study were divided by professional positions:

- Acquisitions ..............................................................9%
- Senior management .............................................35%
- Collection development .......................................11%
- Reference ....................................................................
- System or technology .............................................2%
- Electronic resource management .........................13%
- Other roles ...................................................................

Only about 60% of the respondents to the survey gave regional information to the study. Responses by known region are:

North America ............................................................41%
Europe ........................................................................40%
Australasia .................................................................6%
Asia .............................................................................6%
Rest of world .............................................................7%

Overall, the study shows that librarians are likely to choose OA materials when they are assured of reliability, peer review, and currency of the articles. However, the study also showed that other factors have an important part in influencing the selection of OA articles over journal articles.

— Presented by Anthony Watkinson (University College London and Blackwell Publishing), Mark Patterson (Public Library of Science), Scott Plutchak (University of Alabama at Birmingham), Astrid Wissenberg (UK Economic & Social Research Council)

Report by Charlie Rappe (Head of Marketing, Ingenta) <charlie.rappe@ingenta.com>

Mark Patterson attempted to focus on OA benefits by separating them from OA funding. However, given that his cited examples (linkage between papers; power of text mining; interactivity of content) are all achievable with “traditionally” published literature, the only distinct advantage of OA is that content is free at the point of use. And since free-at-the-point-of-use has to mean paid-for-at-the-point-of-publishing, the funding model cannot be disengaged. That increased access to the literature empowers each of these processes was nonetheless well demonstrated.

Astrid Wissenburg raised the unavoidable issue of corporate revenues, which currently comprise 20.3% of the STM market and which

continued on page 66
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