

Compilation of Data – CIP Survey for Publishers

The Publishers Survey consisted of 39 questions. (See Appendix A) The first set of questions (questions 1 to 25) was designed to obtain basic profile information about the nature and size of the respondent's publishing firm. The second set of questions (questions 26 to 39) focused on the use and value of CIP data, the current CIP product, and possible future enhancements.

The Publishers Survey, like the Library Survey, was an online survey hosted by Survey Monkey and accessible from the Electronic CIP homepage. This survey was opened May 31, 2006 and remained open until August 18, 2006. The marketing effort for the publisher survey was more focused than that of the Library Survey. Because CRG wanted particularly to obtain data from publishers currently participating in the CIP program, a promotional insert was included with CIP data mailed to publishers who submit applications by the U.S. Postal Service or a commercial carrier. Promotional text was also included in all CIP data emailed to publishers who submit applications electronically via the ECIP system. Access to the survey was also featured prominently on the ECIP homepage.

While the intent of the survey was to obtain feedback from publishers participating in the CIP program, a number of publishers who participate only in the EPCN program also completed the survey. These respondents often expressed unhappiness about not being able to participate in the CIP program.

CRG obtained a total of 655 responses. All of the data obtained from the survey responses with the exception of comments appears below. Respondents had the opportunity to provide comments in several areas of the survey.

Recurring themes and samples of these comments follow:

CIP lends credibility/validity to the book.

#97 *"Appearance of professionalism/industry recognition."*

#37 *"Lends dignity to our titles."*

#51 *"Establishes legitimacy among all purchasers."*

CIP is a valuable tool for marketing to libraries.

#77 *"Libraries require it and are 90% of our market."*

#110 *"We only do it for libraries."*

#82 *"Helps librarians who purchase our books."*

CIP program service to publishers is uneven.

#132 *"Anytime I have had a question and left a phone message or sent an email, I usually don't get an answer back and have to call again..."*

#182 *“My comment is that I can never get a response (via phone or e-mail) from anyone when I have a question...”*

#131 *“Our CIP liaison has not been helpful at all. Phone messages and email messages are not returned...”*

#107 *“We’ve never had a problem. The staff has been very helpful.”*

#93 *“I have always found CIP to be accommodating, helpful, and quick!”*

#57 *“Our CIP liaison is wonderful. She has helped us through many difficult situations when manuscripts were quarantined, etc.”*

Misconception that the CIP program does not include small presses when in fact the overwhelming majority of the publishers in the CIP program are small presses.

#29 *“I think it is really important to keep the small and independent press movement alive. Access to CIP is crucial for this. CIP should not be made available only to the biggest players. Free press and democracy itself relies on the small presses, the noncommercial presses, to keep alive the important discussions, art movements, and literary voices that we all rely on.”*

#35 *“The primary effect of the changes suggested in 38 would be to stifle dissent and create an information monopoly for main-stream opinions and big-business interests. Making it more difficult for small publishers to qualify for CIP services is a bad idea. Things are hard enough already for alternative presses that are just beginning.”*

#63 *“Any effort to narrow your services is just plain wrong, morally, ethically, and politically. You work for everyone out here, and in a democracy you should work especially hard for the small, independent presses, not just for the “traditional” publishing industry.”*

#17 *“The entire publishing industry is increasingly oriented toward mega publishers. Please do not change your program in any way that would act against small houses and independent presses. Smaller houses are doing some of the most exciting and important publishing in the country, helping new voices be heard. Please continue to support those efforts.”*

Misconception that the primary purpose of the CIP program is to market books.

#120 *“It seems that for Juvenile Fiction, CIP information is a must-have in order to sell to school librarians, and librarians in general. For fact-based fiction titles such as ours that are hard to classify, CIP has been an instrumental tool for educating our market and insuring that our titles end up in the proper sections of stores/libraries.”*

#171 *“It's bad enough that some publishers are excluded from LC CIP for reasons that are not tied to quality or market size. It's worse that most large publishers automatically reap the benefits of database inclusion which serves as free advertising, generating sales to the library community at taxpayer expense.”*

#41 *“We are a very small publisher that concentrates on the reference market and academia. We feel that CIP data and/or a PCN is essential to establishing*

credibility with the library market.”

#53 “We feel that the current system is subsidizing CIP for large publishers who receive free inclusion in databases that libraries use for acquisitions, all at taxpayer expense. It is effectively restraint of trade for small publishers.”

#118 “CIP information is a mark of legitimacy and is a wholly necessary ingredient in some markets, so while it's understandable that eligibility requirements remain sufficiently stiff to weed out self-publishers, etc., independent publishers should have equal access.”

Regarding the data that appears below, please note that the total percentage of responses exceeds 100%. This results from respondents checking more than one option for questions with multiple options. Additionally, all numbers expressed as percentages were rounded to the nearest tenth of a percent, so that the total response for any given question could be slightly below or slightly above 100%.

Participation in CIP/PCN

- 77.4% of responding publishers participate in ECIP
- 44.7% participate in conventional (paper) CIP
- 18.6% participate in EPCN

New titles published last year

- 41.3% - less than five titles
- 23.8% - 5 to 14 titles
- 9.1% - 15 to 24 titles
- 8.8% - 25 to 49 titles
- 7.1% - 50 to 99 titles
- 5.4% - 100 to 249 titles
- 2.6% - 250 to 499 titles
- 1.1% - 500 to 1,000 titles
- 0.6% - more than 1,000 titles

Approximate percentage of titles received in machine-readable form from author or agent

- 14.9% - less than 5%
- 1.1% - 5% to 14%
- 1.9% - 15% to 29%
- 1.9% - 30% to 49%
- 7.0% - 50% to 74%
- 25.3% - 75% to 99%
- 47.7% - 100%

Print on demand

Do you print on demand?

- 30.5% responded yes
- 69.5% responded no

If yes, approximate percentage of total new production done as print on demand:

- 58.1% - less than 5%
- 11.0% - 5% to 14%
- 5.7% - 15% to 29%
- 4.8% - 30% to 49%
- 7.5% - 50% to 74%
- 3.5% - 75% to 99%
- 9.3% - 100%

E-books

Do you publish e-books?

- 21.1% responded yes
- 78.9% responded no

If yes, approximate percentage of total new production done as e-books:

- 53.1% - less than 5%
- 13.8% - 5% to 14%
- 3.8% - 15% to 29%
- 5.6% - 30% to 49%
- 8.1% - 50% to 74%
- 6.2% - 75% to 99%
- 9.4% - 100%

Of total e-books, approximate percentage also published in ink-print:

- 27.7% - less than 5%
- 0.6% - 5% to 14%
- 0.6% - 15% to 29%
- 1.9% - 30% to 49%
- 3.2% - 50% to 74%
- 5.8% - 75% to 99%
- 60.0% - 100%

If you do not publish e-books, do you plan to start within the next two years?

- 26.7% responded yes
- 73.3% responded no

Preparation for publication

What software application do you use to format content in final form?

- Adobe InDesign - 34.1%
- Adobe PageMaker - 10.5%
- Microsoft Word - 7.7%
- Corel WordPerfect - 1.4%
- Quark XPress - 35.5%
- Other - 10.8%

How long is a typical production lifecycle of a book, from contract to publication?

- 2.4% - less than 10 weeks
- 10.8% - 10 to 19 weeks
- 17.1% - 20 to 34 weeks
- 31.8% - 35 to 52 weeks
- 20.8% - 53 to 79 weeks
- 11.2% - 80 to 104 weeks
- 6.0% - more than 104 weeks

When does cover art become available?

- 25.4% - more than 10 weeks prior to printing
- 29.4% - 6 to 10 weeks prior
- 35.2% - 1 to 5 weeks prior
- 9.0% - at same time as printing
- 0.8% - 1 to 2 weeks after
- 0.2% - more than 2 weeks after

When during the production cycle is a request for LC CIP Data sent to LC?

- 1.1% - more than 52 weeks prior to printing
- 3.8% - 39 to 52 weeks prior
- 10.8% - 26 to 38 weeks prior
- 21.4% - 13 to 25 weeks prior
- 32.5% - 7 to 13 weeks prior
- 30.4% - less than 7 weeks prior

ONIX files

Do you create ONIX files?

- 5.5% responded yes
- 94.5% responded no

If you create ONIX files, approximate number created last year:

- 46.7% - less than 5
- 13.3% - 5 to 14
- 6.7% - 15 to 24
- 4.4% - 25 to 49
- 6.7% - 50 to 99
- 2.2% - 100 to 249
- 8.9% - 250 to 499
- 2.2% - 500 to 1,000
- 8.9% - more than 1,000

If you create ONIX files, do you distribute them?

- 40.4% responded yes
- 59.6% responded no

If you do not create ONIX files, do you plan to create them within the next two years?

- 15.9% responded yes
- 84.1% responded no

Backlist titles in machine-readable form:

- 26.9% - less than 5%
- 5.6% - 5% to 14%
- 7.5% - 15% to 29%
- 9.9% - 30% to 49%
- 12.9% - 50% to 74%
- 15.2% - 75% to 99%
- 22.0% - 100%

LC CIP Data

Do you generally print LC CIP Data in the book?

- 64.7% responded always
- 23.3% responded usually

- 7.6% responded sometimes
- 4.3% responded never

If only sometimes or never, why not?

- 0% - Not enough space on verso of title page
- 26.4% - Data not requested in sufficient time
- 31.1% - Data not received in sufficient time
- 1.4% - Other CIP Data (e.g., British Library) printed instead
- 41.2% - Other

What benefits does LC CIP Data provide your organization?

- 12.7% - Inventory control
- 46.7% - Marketing
- 34.2% - Increased sales (general)
- 76.4% - Increased sales to libraries
- 20.5% - Other

Publisher satisfaction

	Not applicable	Not satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
Format of CIP Data	5%	3%	9%	53%	30%
Accuracy of subject analysis	4%	3%	19%	52%	22%
Typographical accuracy	4%	2%	8%	52%	33%
Publisher-supplied summaries in CIP Data	30%	4%	8%	41%	17%
Timeliness of CIP Data	4%	11%	18%	40%	28%
Timeliness of changes to CIP Data	21%	9%	15%	35%	21%
ECIP system	12%	8%	13%	35%	31%
Communication regarding upcoming changes in CIP program	15%	11%	22%	40%	14%
Courtesy of your CIP liaison	8%	8%	16%	32%	36%
Technical expertise of your CIP liaison	16%	5%	15%	36%	28%

Telephone availability of your CIP liaison	19%	19%	22%	26%	15%
Email availability of your CIP liaison	10%	13%	18%	33%	25%
Online CIP Publisher Manual	15%	3%	18%	47%	17%

Receiving CIP Data

In what format would you like to receive your LC CIP data?

- Printed card format - 17.6%
- Full MARC record - 10.6%
- XML - 10.9%
- PDF - 52.2%
- ONIX - 4.2%
- Other - 30.3%

Do you want the option to pull LC CIP data from an LC server?

- 74.1% responded yes
- 25.9% responded no

Do you use the LC/NACO Authority File?

- 2.4% responded yes
- 97.6% responded no

Audio/video files

Do you currently create or maintain audio or video files of authors for marketing purposes?

- 12.7% responded yes
- 87.3% responded no

If you create or maintain such files, approximately how many per year?

- 61.8% - less than 5
- 20.2% - 5 to 14
- 7.9% - 15 to 24
- 6.7% - 25 to 49
- 2.2% - 50 to 99

- 1.1% - 100 to 249
- 0% - more than 250

If you do not create or maintain such files, do you plan to within the next two years?

- 22.4% responded yes
- 77.6% responded no

PDF version of published book

In addition to a printed copy of the published book, would you be willing to send to LC a PDF version of the published book?

- 69.8% responded yes
- 30.2% responded no

Possible CIP Program changes - evaluate impact on your operations

<i>possible changes:</i>	Not applicable / No impact	Significant negative impact	Negative impact	Positive impact	Significant positive impact
Enlisting carefully screened and qualified cataloging partners from libraries to catalog CIPs in specific subjects and/or from specific publishers	30%	1%	3%	53%	13%
Changing eligibility requirements: require publishers to have at least 5 different authors published	49%	22%	18%	8%	3%
More thorough review process for publisher eligibility - may take 3-6 months from date of application	42%	24%	26%	6%	2%
Removing publishers who have no CIP activity for 24 months	46%	21%	24%	6%	3%