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Group Therapy

by Rosann Bazirjian (Assistant Dean for Technical & Access Services, University Libraries, The Pennsylvania State University; Ph: (814) 865-0404; Fax (814) 865-3665) <rvb9@psulias.psu.edu>

Grate: Submitted by Judy McConnell, Pennsylvania College of Technology

I would like to know if anyone has created a policy for maintaining current titles (both paper and/or microfilm) that are also in a full-text database?

We subscribe to Proquest Direct and have dropped a few of our current subscriptions for titles in full-text and have continued to purchase microfilm.

As our library is now experiencing space and budget constraints, we want to develop a policy for maintaining or discontinuing the purchase of duplicate (and sometimes triplicate) subscriptions for titles in full-text. I think that we are not quite comfortable yet in relinquishing our control and yet it may be time to “just do it.”

I would be interested in what others have done, and what problems or advantages or disadvantages they have experienced.

Response: (Submitted by Robert Alan, Pennsylvania State University)

Space and budgetary constraints are important factors in determining if the print version can be canceled when the same title is available in electronic format. Does the library really need multiple formats of the same title?

Collection development policies include useful guidelines for evaluation of print and electronic resources. Many of the guidelines used to evaluate print (e.g., relevancy of subject content to user needs) can also be applied to electronic resources. Additional guidelines (e.g., frequency of updates, intuitive user interface, etc.) need to be applied specifically to electronic resources.

The decision to either maintain or cancel print subscriptions when access is available in a full text database needs to be carefully considered. An important factor is the equivalency of the electronic full text version to the original print version. In the case of electronic journals, the original publisher may also produce both print and electronic formats, and the electronic journal can be considered a true equivalent. However, in the case of full text databases, the electronic version most often is not a true equivalent. The full text version may only deliver the text of articles and not include accompanying material, graphics, pictures, etc. The full text version may not include all issues or articles. Conversely, full text products offer expanded coverage and features not available in the original print version.

Decisions to maintain or cancel print subscriptions need to be made on a title-by-title basis. If the full text version meets the library’s user needs, maintenance of multiple subscriptions may not be in your library’s best interest as limited resources can be reallocated to purchase additional print titles or electronic resources.

The Times They Are A-Changin: Looking Back and Looking Ahead at the O.P. Market

by Jack Walsdorf (Library Relations-Alibris) <jackjuno@teleport.com>

Just over 30 years ago I was invited to speak to the American Library Association pre-conference on Rare Books being held in Kansas City. I opened that talk by taking a page from The World of Books and quoting from the author, Sir Basil Blackwell, who said: “Let me be frank at the outset and tell you that I have never contemplated an audience with less pleasure. For here am I, a jack-of-all trades in the Book World, about to speak of these many trades before those who are their several masters: and I cannot hope to conceal my shortcomings from many of you at any time, nor from any of you for long.”

For my part, I commented that “much the same feeling which came to Sir Basil as he contemplated his audience came to me” as I contemplated the task before me that day so long ago. There I was, at 27 years of age, coming before a representative group of American collectors, dealers and curators of rare books, talking on the topic of the antiquarian book trade.

Much has happened during the intervening 30 or more years since that talk was given, and I felt it would be interesting, educational and perhaps enjoyable to take a look back to those bookselling days of 30 years ago, to see what was then the norm, and to see how the world of technology and the Internet has changed the bookselling world of the rare, the used and the simply hard to find book.

My objective then, as it will be now, is to look at the background of the rare book trade, something of the current status as well as something of the future of the trade as I believe it will be practiced. To start off, I would like to quote from the English writer Michael Sadleir, who in his 1950 talk “Bookey and Auction Room” listed different classes of rare bookshops, among them: (1) the top-level rare book dealers; (2) the large-scale general rare booksellers; (3) the specialist booksellers; and (4) the junk shops.

Who were these people, and how did they operate some 50 years ago when Sadleir was writing, or some 30 years ago when I was first talking about them, and do they still operate today? The first group, the top-level rare books dealers, were then listed as Maggs and Quaritch. As I put it in my talk: “The top-level rare book dealers such as Maggs or Quaritch, have no nonsense about miscellaneous open shelves or two-shilling boxes. When they buy a library, they dispose of all the material which is either below their general standard of individual volumes or series value, or is irrelevant to their several subject specialties.”

continued on page 77