

June 2006

# View From New Zealand -- Mixed Media in Libraries

Gita Gunatilleke

*Open Polytechnic of New Zealand*, [gina.gunatilleke@openpolytechnic.ac.nz](mailto:gina.gunatilleke@openpolytechnic.ac.nz)

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



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

---

### Recommended Citation

Gunatilleke, Gita (2006) "View From New Zealand -- Mixed Media in Libraries," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 18: Iss. 3, Article 39.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.4987>

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

The financial aspects of this model have yet to be fully worked out. As long as there is commercial interest among the publishers, articles are available on licence conditions. When demand declines for an article, it can be offered for free. Problems are foreseen, however, in the area of international electronic publications, which do not fall within the scope of a national library.

In a session on **Strategic Change**, **Mark Seeley** (Legal Counsel, **Elsevier Inc.**) illustrated how publishing functions are migrating far outside the traditional STM sector. Larger companies have invested in a variety of author support systems, but the offerings of new entrants — some of them companies that used to provide back-office services for publishers — make us aware of the changing roles of stakeholders. One central question is whether publishers should change their role. Some new services, like **PatientInform**, could easily be set up by publishers, but they will have to offer significant services to the community to stay competitive. On the other hand, it is not an easy task to develop easy-to-use systems.

In a **Closing Panel** discussion, chaired by **Herman P. Spruijt** (**Royal Brill Academic Publishers** and **IPA**), a general debate followed introductory statements by the three panelists. In his remarks, **Dr. Albrecht Hauff** (CEO of **Thieme Verlag**) expressed doubts as to whether a change from a competition-based publishing system to a state- or university-run system would be a change for the better; in his opinion the neutrality of publishers with regard to content is very important. Moreover, he stressed the importance of copyright protection and reminded the audience that lower levels of protection would discourage publishing activities, especially the scientific monograph. He thought it highly unlikely that OA publishing would lead to a reduction in costs, but reminded the audience that publishers must add value to the dissemination of science or they would become redundant. **Dr. Renn** of the **MPG** agreed with **Hauff** that added value and investment are necessary and that there is no reason why the future system should be less expensive. On the other hand, he felt that it would be beneficial for the publishing business to be guided by the most innovative and advanced scientists. He urged the publishing industry to shift their investments from conserving the old system to infrastructure and value-added services in innovative science activities.

**Dr. Klaus Saur** (**Walter de Gruyter GmbH**, Berlin) explained that publishers still play a very important role, but thinks this role is endangered by recent legislation and public funding policies. As a result of recent OA initiatives, he warned that many long-standing, established publications may have to be discontinued. Unlike **Renn** he thinks that


scientists do become competitors for publishers when they deliver all their content via OA channels. **Saur** thinks that these developments, combined with the budget reductions in libraries, will lead to a reduction in the quality of scientific information.

The ensuing general debate was largely driven by the issue of OA and a lively discussion revealed a wide spectrum of opinions. **Renn** reinforced his earlier championing of the OA model by stating that not only is information held in a closed system at the moment, but publishers are investing to keep it closed. This point was supported by **Mathew Cockerill** of **BioMed Central**, who stated that “OA is the only way to allow the full resources of academia to throw that creativity at finding the best ways to discover content and put that content in context.” **Stalmans** reiterates the point that if scientific societies were to adopt OA they would lose income that currently funds courses, congresses and fellowships, leaving European bioscientists homeless and impoverished. In the best scenario, some of these activities might be taken over by, for example, the **EU**, but then scientists would have to face consequences that were eloquently stated by the physicist **Sir Ernest Rutherford** as long ago as 1926: “It is

essential for men of science to take an interest in the administration of their own affairs, or else the professional civil servant will step in — and then Lord help you!”

In his closing statement, **Panel Chair Herman Spruijt** pointed out that OA business models should not be confused with the effects of digital distribution already achieved: scientists have at their fingertips more information immediately available than ever before and we have experience with more than one business model already. The question is now: Who in the information chain should pay the bill? There seems to be an agreement that more than one model can exist and that an abrupt change is not the best solution for the academic community.

Despite all the energy and investments publishers are devoting to changing their role, if they are not seen as adding enough value and are not seen as proactive enough, authors, libraries and funding agencies will vote with their feet; technology is not the prerogative of publishers only but available to all players.

A full report on **APE 2006**, including the full conference programme and further details of the presentations and discussion is available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1477/5.814>. 

---

## View From New Zealand — Mixed Media in Libraries

---

by **Gita Gunatilleke** (Collection Services Manager, Open Polytechnic of New Zealand; Phone: (04) 914 5218; Fax: (04) 913 5644)  
<[gita.gunatilleke@openpolytechnic.ac.nz](mailto:gita.gunatilleke@openpolytechnic.ac.nz)>

---

Just when we thought (or at least some of us did) that we got the wide and varied formats of library materials sorted, in comes something called “mixed media” which are more integrated than previously had been. We have been used to multi-media/formats, kits etc. where there was a main resource and other resources which were supplementary or complementary to it, book + video, book + charts + video. Even if they worked together in an integrated way several users could borrow them from libraries and use them individually one at a time, but with the mixed media it is not the same.

Titles listed in Bibliographic tools as “Mixed media (MIX)” consist of two, or more well integrated media that cannot be used without the

other and could be a Book + CD, or Book + Website. An increasing number of undergraduate titles in some subject areas such as commerce and science are published as mixed media. It makes study very interesting and exciting to the students especially in a highly pressurised world with too little time and too much to do. The problem is that access to the CD or Website is via a password which is restricted to one login only. The first user has to register the login. This is suitable for textbooks that individual students purchase but if it is not and the library purchases copies for use by several students the integrated resource cannot be used as intended as the 2nd, 3rd and 4th student cannot login. Are these titles not supposed to be bought by libraries? Are they only to be purchased individually by students?

With positive feedback from students about these interactive mixed media publications the number of such titles are steadily on the increase. An example of a recent purchase, *Economics* by **John Sloman**, 6th ed has us worried once again. At the time of order several editions were listed, including a book only edition and a mixed media edition that included Book + Website access and the former was ordered. What was received was the mixed media copy, and on inquiry was informed that the publishers received

*continued on page 71*






## View From New Zealand from page 70

such good feedback from the students about the mixed media publication that they decided to abandon the book only edition. This title, undoubtedly being a good one for students, was included in the reading lists as "Recommended reading." The library guarantees to supply to students the titles on the reading list and as there was a book only edition available at the time it was possible for the library to do so. With the book only edition abandoned by the publishers and restricted access to the mixed media edition the problem is how to loan multiple students copies of the latter. In the mixed media edition the Website ac-

cess is limited to one paper copy and the book can not be used independently.

One possibility is for libraries to note the first login details and make them accessible to other students so that they can use the same when they borrow the book but it is not as simple as that. Most new software now identifies logins with the specific computer and this could well be the student's own computer or a specific library computer in the library's study area. This will help on campus students who visit the library but what about distance learning students who have remote access and delivery of library materials? Electronic resources and remote online access is a boon to the delivery of distance learning. Why is it that mixed media are restricted by one book one login?

Particularly when the book has to be used along with the online material.

It is understandable that publishers want to maximize their profits by the sale of individual copies to students but why do they not think of marketing a library edition that includes multiple logins. At a time when electronic databases and eJournals have proved their worth, and when there is increased interest in eBooks particularly for remote delivery of learning materials it is surprising that multiple use of the mixed media publications have not been thought of. On the other hand if separate library editions are a serious impossibility, then publishers could work with the aggregators of eBooks to make these titles available via eBook collections. 

## Bet You Missed It

### Press Clippings — In the News — Carefully Selected by Your Crack Staff of News Sleuths

Column Editor: **Pamela M. Rose, M.L.S.** (Web Services & Library Promotion Coordinator, University at Buffalo; Phone: 716-829-2408 x129; Fax: 716-829-2211) <pmrose@acsu.buffalo.edu> [wings.buffalo.edu/~pmrose](http://wings.buffalo.edu/~pmrose)

**Column Editor's Note:** Hey, are you reading this? Your esteemed column editor would like to know what you think! Zip off a quick email to <pmrose@buffalo.edu>. Does BYMI fill your needs? Do you have any suggestions for changes? I'm listening! — PR

### NEW TECH FOR THE CLASSROOM by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel)

The iPod, Steve Jobs' new brainchild, is poised for a major impact on education delivery. Eighty percent of the students at the **Medical University of South Carolina** own one of these Apple gadgets. In South Carolina, MUSC, USC at Columbia and Clemson join Stanford, Brown, Duke, U-Wis Madison, the dental school at U-Michigan, and the journalism school at the U-Missouri, an elite group selected by Apple to receive free space on its iTunes Website. That will mean an explosion of podcasts delivering lectures and graphics.

See — **Diane Knich**, "Palm-sized digital device redefining the classroom," *The Post and Courier*, May 12, 2006, pA1.

### THERE'S BIG BUCKS IN CLAIRVOYANCE by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel)

Psychic author **Sylvia Brown** — *If You Could See What I See* — has fifteen books in print which adds to seven million hardcovers and paperbacks. She's so wildly successful, two rival publishers are content to share her — **Dutton** and **Hay House**. A claimed medium and clairvoyant, she talks to the dead, sees the future and solves crime.

While a slew of academics scoff at her claims, she appears on **Montel Williams** and charges \$700 for a telephone reading. She draws an estimated 75,000 listeners to her lectures annually at a charge of \$75 a head.

And if you don't have that \$700 for a phone call, her son will take you call for \$400.

See — **Jeffrey Trachtenberg**, "In Publishing, One Medium Looms Large," *The Wall Street Journal*, March 29, 2006, p.B1



### SO WHO NEEDS A CAMPUS? by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel)

Overall college enrollment is stagnant, but online is booming. **State U** is leading the charge. **UMass** has 9,200, mostly working adults. **Univ of MD University College**, the open-enrollment arm of **UMD**, has 51,000. Projections nationwide are for one in ten students to be online by 2008.

See — **Daniel Golden**, "Degrees@StateU.edu," *The Wall Street Journal*, May 9, 2006, p.B1.

### COPYCAT WEBSITES JAM THE WEB by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel)

"Original content" on the Web has exploded as owners try to get hits that will bring them ad revenue. But most is not so original; in fact cut-and-paste jobs with superficial changes. The *Journal's* investigative reporter was offered \$100 to modify a bird flu article lifted verbatim from the **WHO** Website. His conclusion was much legitimate information was being crowded out by junky, spammy imitations.

And imagine what professors and librarians are having to deal with from students.

See — **Lee Gomes**, "Our Columnist Creates Web 'Original Content' But Is in for a Surprise," *The Wall Street Journal*, March 1, 2006, p.B1.

### PRINT NEWS MEDIA TWISTS IN THE WIND. SLOWLY. by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel)

Fear, depression and denial reign as print news continues its slow death of cancellations and sliding ad revenue. But the **American Society of Newspaper Editors** is acting upbeat in their annual meeting. They claim it's a mere cyclical downturn despite more than half of the USA not reading the news. Any day now they'll find a new "diversified business model" which is to say they'll figure out a way to make readers pay for using the Web.

See — **Elizabeth Gillespie**, "Editors Seek Next Format for Newspaper Content," *The Post and Courier*, April 28, 2006, p.7B.