November 1994

Group Therapy / Reprints

Rosann Bazirjian
Syracuse University

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

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

Recommended Citation

Bazirjian, Rosann (1994) "Group Therapy / Reprints," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 6: Iss. 5, Article 26.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.1810>

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.

Group Therapy

Column Editor: **Rosann Bazirjian** (Syracuse University)
Hey y'all out there! Do you have any gripes? Come to your therapist! Try rvbazirj@hawk.syr.edu or FAX (315) 443-9510.

GRIBE:

(Submitted by **Kate Herzog**,
State University of New York at Buffalo)

The title sounds great. The book deals with treatment of soils contaminated by hazardous waste. The book is a second edition. The price is acceptable, \$65. There is no hint in the CIP or the publisher's blurb that "the information in this book is from the following documents", which is a direct quote from the forward. The "following documents" happen to be EPA reports we've already received on deposit from SUDOCs under slightly variant titles. One of these reports is two years old and the other, seven years old. And, after you get past the nicely printed contents and subject index, you find the text itself is only a photo-duplication of the original documents. The contents of this particular monograph are in two parts, each a different technical report. In this particular

case, part II (which comprises 70% of the book's contents) is a report from 1984 which we've already purchased from this same publisher yet another similar (but different) title back in 1986.

Publishers, why don't you admit something is essentially a reprint in your blurbs and CIP? Approval vendors, why don't you catch this information when your staff review the books and add this vital information to your forms? Selectors, why do we continue to support such repackaging of government information?

Title of book: **In Situ Treatment of Hazardous Waste-Contaminated Soils** by Catherine Chambers et al. (Pollution Technology Review, no. 199), 1991. It

purports to be a 2nd edition of **Contaminated Surface Soils In-Place Treatment Techniques** by Ronald Sims (Pollution Technology Review, no. 132), 1986.

The 1990 EPA report is entitled **Handbook on In Situ Treatment of Hazardous Waste-Contaminated Soils** (EP 1.8:Su 7/8) (PB90-155607) and the earlier was **Review of In-Place Treatment Techniques for Contaminated Surface Soils** (PB85-124881 and PB85-124899).

PUBLISHER RESPONSE: (Submitted by **Robert Noyes**, Publisher, Noyes Data Corporation)

I would like to make the following comments:

- 1) The reprinting of government-sponsored research (either a single document, or a combination of related reports under a different title), is only a small part of our publishing program, but it has been very successful in keeping industrial firms up-to-date on difficult-to-locate research. This is a unique service provided to industry, and we have never had a complaint. We obtain the documents directly from the contractor in very legible form. These same documents available from NTIS are, in most cases, difficult to read.
- 2) Ms. Herzog mentions that a recent book of ours contained 70% of its information from 1984, that we had

previously published. This is very unlikely. It is important that you do not print her statement until I have a chance to investigate. Please advise the name of this title. [Editor's Note: subsequently did that — RB].

- 3) Any of our books that are derived from government-sponsored research, state that fact in the front matter of the book. Also, we have a generous returns policy.
- 4) However, there could be a legitimate bibliographical complaint here. I, as a chemical engineer, started this publishing company directly from industry 35 years ago, without ever having been in the publishing business. Because of this, our emphasis has been on creating books for industry, and possibly we have not been paying

enough attention to the bibliographical needs of the librarian.

- 5) Upon investigation, I have found that we have been using the "CIP Data Sheet for Books" for all of our books, including those based on government-sponsored research. It appears that we possibly should be using "CIP Data Sheet for Reprint Editions" (at least for those books based on one document). If so, we will use the correct CIP form where appropriate, which hopefully should solve the problem.

[The following is Mr. Noyes' response after I gave him the title of the publication in question — RB]

Thank you for sending us the specific details of the book in question, as per the

"gripe" from Ms. Kate Herzog. This book does state specifically the source of the information. I cannot check any further, as the editor involved is no longer with us. However, it is truly a "second edition." In a second edition, the background stays the same, and the technical details are brought up to date. In the 1991 second edition, we retained the background

information from the 1986 edition, and brought the technical information up to date.

Even though we concentrate our efforts on the industrial market, we wish to cooperate fully with the bibliographic needs of the libraries. Therefore, beginning with our Fall 1994 schedule, we will use the "CIP Data Sheet for Reprint

Editions" for those books based upon government-sponsored research. I regret that we did not use this form in the past, but we did not know that such a form existed, until we investigated Ms. Herzog's complaint.

I hope this will solve all future problems.

VENDOR RESPONSE: (Submitted by **Matt Nauman**, Marketing Manager and **Celia Wagner**, Approval Systems Manager, Blackwell North America, Inc.)

Kate Herzog raises a very good point. We agree that information about the history of this title should be added to the announcement slip. In fact, our longstanding policy has been to identify titles which are reprints of government documents, or even reprints of books pub-

lished but never distributed through the trade as "First Trade Edition." We also classify titles which are obvious photocopies as such.

We do feel that making this information about a title known is the most we can do. To restrict the availability of a

title would penalize libraries who need it regardless of its non-trade printing history. It is not for us to say why publishers sometimes follow this practice. From our standpoint, we try to convey the accurate information to our customers while providing the best service possible. ☛

Chaos

BISAC At 20: Where Are the Librarians?

by **Sandra K. Paul** (President, SKP Associates)

Although I'm reluctant to admit it to EVERYONE, my "child is all growned up." As the person often referred to as the "mother of BISAC," I will confess to just a few of you reading this, that the meeting of folks in the world of the book that kicked off the creation of the Book Industry Systems Advisory Committee was held on October 4, 1974 — TWENTY YEARS ago. In thinking about BISAC and its sister organization, SISAC (the Serials Industry ...), I realized how differently the library community has made its needs heard and how differently it has had a role in establishing the direction for each of these organizations.

At the October 26, 1994 SISAC meeting, publisher **Susan Malawski** (from **John Wiley**) turned the Chair over to librarian **Joan Griffith** (University of New Mexico). Past SISAC Chairs include librarians **Tina Feick** and **Betty Landesman**. There has never been a librarian Chair of BISAC. This column looks at some of the history behind librarian participation in these Committees and its implications for the future.

Books vs. Serials

One of the reasons that the role of librarians is so much greater in SISAC

relates to some significant differences between publishers' perceptions of the book vs. the serial acquisitions of the library community. Publishers of scientific, technical, medical and professional journals KNOW that the library community IS their market. They send journals directly to libraries; they feel the effects of library funding cuts directly; they understand that subscription agents would not be placing orders for journals were they not ordered and renewed by libraries. Book publishers, on the other hand, don't know where the books they sell to wholesalers are then shipped — to bookstores or to libraries. AND, since they DO see their own relatively significant direct sales to bookstores vs. relatively small to

nonexistent direct sales to libraries, they start BELIEVING that they are selling to a class of customer known as "wholesaler," rather than to library and bookstore customer. It is no wonder that **Carol Nemeyer** (with her MLS and later to become President of ALA), when she worked for the **Association of Ameri-**