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This project attempts to look at strengths and weaknesses in university press publishing from 1993 to 1998. University presses’ core business has been publishing the scholarly monograph. Concern has been expressed about the monograph’s future, because of reduced monograph sales to academic libraries, increased production costs, and changes in the scholarly cannon in some subject areas.

This study sent surveys to seventy-two university presses asking about their scholarly monograph, regional, and trade publishing programs. Among the thirty-one respondents, regional publishing was found to be strong, and serious nonfiction or trade books had increased on university press lists from 1993 to 1998. Presses reported publishing fewer scholarly monographs during the period 1993 to 1998. Nevertheless, they rated their commitment to publishing new knowledge and maintaining their reputations as publishers of excellence in scholarship very high.
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INTRODUCTION

The university press in the United States has existed to publish scholarship since the late 1800s, when the number of American scholars and universities began to increase. Traditionally, commercial publishers have not published scholarship because of its low sales and lack of profitability. Although many university presses began as printing plants, their functions and capabilities have changed a great deal since their beginnings. Today, the university press provides not only a product, in books, but also a service, added editorial value.

The publication process for a scholarly manuscript involves adding value to the manuscript, through the editorial peer review process. This process requires press editors to
know scholars in a manuscript’s subject who can evaluate its content. Not infrequently, a manuscript will be returned to its author with suggestions by reviewers for improving the manuscript. Publication by a university press says that a book’s contents have been evaluated and found to be a worthwhile contribution to knowledge. Competition exists among presses to acquire the best manuscripts in their subject areas. Competition also exists among scholars to get their manuscripts published by the most prestigious university presses.

Each university press has its specific subject areas and academic disciplines in which it publishes, and it seeks to maintain the highest intellectual standards for the scholarship in these areas of expertise. Thus, a press develops the reputation for scholarly excellence in certain subject areas. New authors and researchers, therefore, will want their manuscripts published by the presses with reputations for scholarly excellence in their subject areas.

The university press is not-for-profit. It generally requires subsidy from its parent university, and it may seek subvention or grants for individual publishing
projects. Presses have relied on grant money from federal government agencies, such as the National Endowment for the Humanities. This not-for-profit status allows the press to publish books, without concern for whether the book will earn a profit. A long standing difference between university presses and commercial presses is that the commercial presses have generally considered profitability before content of what they have published, whereas, the university presses have considered content before profitability. Economic strains, however, may be changing this picture. This paper explores this possibility.

The balance between publishing scholarship and needing to earn back some of their costs has become an issue among university presses during the 1990s. Various factors have been identified as causing the problem, and a panoply of solutions has been proposed. This paper has selected two main areas of university press publishing, scholarly monographic publishing and regional publishing, to investigate, in the hope that trends in these two staples of university press publishing can be found. Limited to the present and near future, an assessment and prediction about university presses’ continued viability will be made.
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LITERATURE REVIEW

This master’s project looks at scholarly monograph publishing and regional publishing by university presses from 1993 to 1998. Scholarly monograph publishing has long been university presses’ core business, but these books have been selling fewer copies and their production costs have risen in recent years. To complement and at times subsidize publication of scholarly but esoteric monographs, many university presses have published regional books since their founding. Regional publishing fits well into the missions of most presses at state-supported universities. Such presses have an obligation to the people of their states to supply publications to help meet their needs. Such publications may be travel books, cookbooks, natural history books, and books about well-known local people.

Sales of the Scholarly Monograph

During the past twenty-five years, monograph sales have steadily declined (Schwabsky, 1997; Schwartz, 1994).
Academic research libraries have purchased fewer monographs in the 1990s, as their own budgets shrunk (Brogdon, 1996). According to Okerson (Hoffert, 1991), Office of Scientific and Academic Publishing at the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), one-quarter to one-third of all university press sales are sales to libraries, but this figure is decreasing. The Association for Research Libraries’ (ARL) compilation of annual statistics shows that academic research libraries purchased 25% fewer monographs in 1998 than they purchased in 1986 (33,210 to 24,761), but monograph expenditures increased by 33% from 1986 to 1998 ($1,120,645 to $1,486,764), with the average per unit cost going from $28.65 to $47.59 (Kyrillidou, 1999). Both the ARL’s graph of this information (“Graph 1, Monograph and Serial Costs in ARL Libraries, 1986-1998”) and ARL’s table of this information (“Table 1, Monograph and Serial Costs in ARL Libraries, 1986 – 1998, Median Values for Time-Series Trends, Unadjusted Dollar Figures”) provide data on monograph unit costs, monograph expenditures, and number of monographs purchased by ARL member libraries from 1986-1998 (Kyrillidou, 1999). Because this author’s investigation covers 1993 to 1998, ARL statistics are reproduced below only for those years. It appears that the increase in per item cost has slowed in recent years, but still continues
to rise. The fact that this table uses dollar figures unadjusted for inflation, however, hides the entire scope of these annual increases.

Information taken from "Table 1, Monograph and Serial Costs in ARL Libraries, 1986-1998 Median Values for Time-Series Trends, Unadjusted Dollar Figures"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Monograph Unit Cost (No. of Libraries = 63)</th>
<th>Monograph Expenditures (No. of Libraries = 99)</th>
<th>Monographs Purchased (No. of Libraries = 63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$41.78</td>
<td>$1,295,807.00</td>
<td>25,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$44.51</td>
<td>$1,309,807.00</td>
<td>25,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$45.27</td>
<td>$1,365,575.00</td>
<td>25,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$46.73</td>
<td>$1,444,015.00</td>
<td>26,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$46.42</td>
<td>$1,460,234.00</td>
<td>28,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$47.59</td>
<td>$1,486,764.00</td>
<td>24,761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wasserman and Lippincott, both university press directors, report changes in sales patterns of their monographs to academic libraries (Schwabsky, 1997). Wasserman says that "20 years ago, libraries accounted for half the sales of a typical … publication [from our press], but now…it would be
closer to 5%.” Lippincott reports the number of books sold to research libraries is down from “800 or 900…to 300.” Holmes, who was associate executive director of the American Association of University Presses (AAUP) in 1997, said that academic libraries formerly would buy 1,000 copies of a scholarly monographic title, but that figure has declined (Dickinson, 1997). In 1997, Case (1997) said that sales were in the 400 to 500 range for a scholarly monograph and that said the decline in library purchasing had caused university presses to print fewer copies of each monograph title.

Decreases in assistance from presses’ parent universities and from government subventions have created further economic concern among presses (Case, 1997). University presses have responded by broadening the kinds of books they published. The question has been asked, therefore, “Will university presses maintain their traditional mission of publishing scholarship?” Scholars have a strong interest in presses’ continuing to publish scholarship, because, at present, published monographs are an important criterion by which they are evaluated for promotion. Furthermore, the fields of the humanities, social sciences, and some interdisciplinary fields, rely on monographs as
the main conveyor of knowledge and the vehicles by which
the fields retain their written records. The implied
threat, therefore, is not only that university presses may
be unable to remain economically viable, but also that the
many fields of scholarship they now help sustain may have
to find alternative vehicles for scholarly publication.

**Definition/Discussion of Scholarly Monograph**

A definition of specialized scholarly monograph has been
stated by Arnold: “relatively short, specialized books
emphasizing research method as much as or more than
content…… (Arnold, 1992). Arnold (1992) called the
monograph a dead form that is no longer viable. Arnold
(1992) said the university press’ commitment to publish
specialized scholarly monographs may change to a commitment
to publish scholarship, but not necessarily the monograph
in its present form. In a letter to the editor of *The
Chronicle of Higher Education* (1997), Arnold said the
viability of the monograph continued to be discussed among
university presses and researchers. Case (1997) said that
close concern about the monograph format exists, and she
expressed concern over the monograph’s battle for survival
against market forces.
Although new titles published by university presses per year increased "from 4,358 to 4,971," from 1990 to 1995, these were not all monographs (Thatcher, 1997). Thatcher observes that the proportion of monographs declined, as the proportion of other types of books on presses' lists increased between 1990 and 1995 (Thatcher, 1997; D'Arms, 1997). According to two university press directors, Thatcher and Day, the number of monographs published in the fields of literary criticism and in European history decreased from 1990 to 1995. They alluded to other subject areas that also may be "endangered" as measured by the number of monographs published in these subject areas ("University-Press group," 1999). The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation is financing a four-year study that will investigate the state of monograph publishing, and, in addition, it will investigate the state of scholarship in different fields ("University-Press group," 1999).

A conference, entitled, The Specialized Scholarly Monograph in Crisis, Or How can I Get Tenure If You Won't Publish My Book? was sponsored by the Association of American University Presses (AAUP), the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), and the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS). The conference, which took place in
September 1997, raised many issues about university press publishing. Issues included the definitions of the term "monograph," increased publishing of serious nonfiction by university presses, and questions about the future, such as the impact of electronic capabilities on the monograph.

The American Association of University Presses (AAUP) sponsors annual meetings, at which issues of concern to its membership are presented. Attendees number from 400 to 700 university press staff members. The 1990, 1991, and 1992 meetings presented worries about the continued viability of the monograph. New markets for monographs outside the United States were mentioned. For example, the Agency for International Development is sponsoring a program that would provide $2 million to Eastern European countries for development of libraries, training in publishing skills, purchasing of books (could be from United States university presses), and other book-related initiatives. Opportunities for university presses may exist within this program. Other foreign markets mentioned were Latin America, Mexico, and Japan (Feldman, Grannis & Maryles, 1990; Baker & Mutter, 1991; "University Presses Discuss," 1991).
Midlist books were also identified as candidates for university presses’ lists. Midlist books were defined as serious nonfiction, with sales not likely to be blockbusters, that large commercial conglomerates might not publish following takeover of independent publishing houses.

Recommendations to university presses at the AAUP annual meetings of 1990, 1991, and 1992 included underscoring their responsibilities to their regions with regional publishing, and the suggestion that course adoptions of university press books would provide an inexpensive and available new market. Presses were advised to specialize, and not to remain generalists, perhaps because university presses are in “fierce competition for both sales and manuscripts” (Phillips, E. H. & Holmes, 1991).

Barbara Hanrahan, from University of North Carolina Press said “the number of scholarly manuscripts demanding publication is overwhelming...” (Baker & Hilts, 1993). According to another participant, the scholarly monograph has become non-viable. Because of so many unknowns, such as the potential of electronic information transfer, the revenue problems experienced by university presses, and the
frequently stated lack of confidence in the scholarly monograph as a viable form of publishing scholarship, presses were urged to form closer and more active relationships with administrators at their parent universities. This relationship would reconnect presses with their responsibility to scholarship, and help to counter the pressures from the marketplace (Baker & Hilts, 1993). Additionally, alliances with other countries' scholarly and professional publishing enterprises was demonstrated by the presence of Eastern European academic and professional publishers at the 1993 AAUP annual meeting.

At the 1994 AAUP annual meeting, it was reported that university presses published "upward of 7000 titles per year, 'most of them serious nonfiction.'" The sales of scholarship reportedly had declined because libraries that would have bought scholarship have less and less money to work with. There was speculation about potential of electronic scholarship, and discussion about "fair use." Strengths of each individual university press was stressed (Baker, 1994).
At the 1995 AAUP annual conference, sales were reported to be $400 million, due to a blend of scholarly and trade publishing (Baker, 1995). Van Ierssel reiterated, “Library funding is, in fact, seen as a key element in university presses’ fortunes, and in the past five years, has had an adverse effect on their sales” (Baker, 1995). Denneny, senior editor at commercial Crown Publishers, said that serious nonfiction with expected sales of less than 10,000 copies, can benefit from university presses’ searching for quality books to publish (Baker, 1995).

At the 1997 AAUP annual meeting, it was reported that university presses produced 16% of all titles published in the United States (Baker, 1997). Presses reported money troubles, however, such as parent universities’ asking presses to be more self-reliant financially (Baker, 1997). Technology was not seen as the solution to financial woes for university presses and their specialized scholarly monographs. Fear of electronic communication’s ability to destroy the university press seemed to have receded. University presses reported publishing a wider variety of books, including serious nonfiction that trade houses do not publish (midlist). Presses reaffirmed their dedication to doing traditional scholarly publishing.
At the 1998 AAUP annual conference, university presses reported a good year, with higher sales and lower returns (Baker, 1998). Successes were reported from online sales by superstores, such as Barnes & Noble. Backlist sales by university presses were reported as steady and good (Baker, 1998). This may be due in part to the help from electronic advertising, and searchable title lists both frontlist and backlist of university presses. Distributor Ingram states, perhaps in anticipation, that on-demand publishing could make cost-effective publishing available for 2.5 million available titles (Baker, 1998).

All of this effort in the AAUP Annual Conferences from 1990 through 1998 does not speak of an industry that is fading out. University presses have identified changes that impinge on their ability to conduct business. They also are identifying new opportunities to grow.
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METHODOLOGY

This paper focuses on scholarly monograph publishing and regional publishing at university presses in the United States during the time period 1993-1998. Scholarly publishing is intrinsic to the purpose of university presses, and its robustness or lack thereof indicates changes taking place within these presses. Regional book publishing programs have existed at some presses since their founding, and these regional publishing programs are strong. Some presses may be considering embarking on regional publishing or expanding their existing program. Some presses do not do any regional publishing. A few general questions appear on the survey to broaden the picture of university press publishing.

The major ideas that helped shape this master’s paper were gathered by talking with people who work at university presses. Ms. Kathleen Ketterman, marketing manager and assistant director, University of North Carolina Press,
gave this researcher much insight into university press publishing. In a meeting with Ms. Ketterman of UNC Press, Ms. Reid, publicity manager for UNC Press, and this researcher, the idea of a survey format was discussed. The survey format seemed a promising method of data collection.

In a subsequent telephone conversation with Mr. Peter Givler, executive director emeritus of the Association of American University Presses (AAUP), Mr. Givler suggested that investigating the relationship between regional publishing and scholarly publishing, if there is one, might be an interesting project.

Research Population

Selecting Presses to Participate

Seventy-two university presses were selected from the 119 listed in the Association of American University Presses' Directory 1998-1999 to participate in this study. Each press was selected according to the following criteria. The press must have been a full member of the AAUP since 1993, as the time period under investigation in this research project is 1993 to 1998. The press had to be located in the United States, including Puerto Rico. The press also had to be associated with a university. This
last criterion did not specify the exact relationship between a university and its press. This varies from press to press.

When results of completed surveys were analyzed, the presses were grouped by size. Size of press was measured by total number of books in print as listed in the AAUP Directory 1998-1999. Size groupings were small, medium, or large, defined as follows. Small presses had 399 or fewer books in print; medium presses had between 400 and 999 books in print; and large presses had 1000 or more books in print. Whether each university press is publicly funded or privately funded was also recorded.

The Survey

The survey was created to try to get select information from university presses. The survey attempted to gain information about the two-part research question: (1) How strong are scholarly publishing programs? (2) How strong are regional publishing programs? Information about scholarly monograph publishing should have been readily available, since this is the primary mission of university presses. Information about regional publishing should also have been readily available, since many university presses
historically have published serious nonfiction that pertains to their geographic region. The survey was designed to take as little time as possible on the part of the respondents and to ask only for information that would be easy for respondents to supply.

Data was collected by e-mailing surveys to seventy-two university presses, addressed to senior editors or to press directors. The unit of analysis was the individual university press. Each unit was represented by a completed, returned questionnaire. Babbie (1995) distinguishes between the unit of analysis and the unit of observation. The person receiving and completing the questionnaire, either a senior editor or a press director, was the unit of observation.

An e-mailed survey accompanied by a letter of introduction and a consent form were sent in late June to each of the seventy-two selected university presses. Over the period June 22 through July 30, twenty-three presses returned completed and usable surveys. In addition, six other replies to the survey were received, by email or by telephone, which were not usable. Of these six, one declined to participate. Other reasons stated by presses
for nonparticipation were lack of time or difficulty downloading the survey. On August 1, another batch of forty-three surveys was sent by e-mail to presses that did not reply to the June mailing. Eight completed and usable surveys were received in response to this second mailing. In total, thirty-one usable questionnaires were returned.

The title of the person selected to receive the questionnaire at the presses varied with the size of the institution. Generally, at the smaller and medium sized presses, the addressee was the press director. At the large presses, a senior editor or acquisitions editor was chosen. Job titles were thought not to be consistent across the seventy-two presses. Some job titles did not exist at all presses, such as assistant director. This researcher received feedback by telephone and by email from some presses that the particular individual to whom the survey was addressed was not the appropriate one. In some cases, the survey, which had been addressed to a senior editor, was completed and returned by the press director. In one case, a respondent replied by e-mail to supply the name of the correct addressee. As a result of this feedback, this researcher decided to address all subsequent
correspondence, meaning follow-up surveys sent to non-respondents, to university press directors.

Various other feedback was received by email, telephone, and in writing from some recipients of this survey. This researcher found this population extremely rewarding to work with for this reason. The respondents were very willing to help with the survey’s success by pointing out some weak points in the survey design. In particular, several respondents said that the definition of scholarly monograph is not agreed upon. One press may define it differently from another press. For this reason, discussion about the scholarly monograph needs to be presented and interpreted carefully.

Respondents offered supplementary information that helped in the interpretation of the data. An example would be a question that asked whether publishing of regional titles had increased during 1993-1998. One respondent answered, "yes," but also added that their entire list of books increased during this time. Many respondents offered information in textual format that was not asked for on the survey, and this extra information helped data analysis and description of findings.
Questions on the Survey

The first section of the survey pertains to the specialized scholarly monograph. This section was intended to give a descriptive picture of scholarly monograph publishing at university presses. The scholarly monograph is the vehicle by which new knowledge is shared in the social sciences, the humanities, and in newer interdisciplinary fields. University presses have traditionally published these monographs.

The first section of the survey asks nine questions pertaining to scholarly monograph publishing. Question 1 asks presses to rate each of six considerations that may affect publication decisions. The considerations relate to university presses’ traditional commitment to publishing scholarship. Questions 3 and 4 also address publication decisions. Questions 3 and 4 address the idea that university presses need to balance their mission to publish scholarship with their financial needs. These questions ask whether a small projected readership deters presses from publishing a manuscript. Question 4 asks whether university presses have a pre-established figure, such that if the projected readership for a book is lower than this
figure, they will not publish the manuscript. Question 2 addresses acquisition strategy, asking whether presses wait for submissions of manuscripts or actively pursue them. Question 5 asks for the percentage of presses’ front lists that are scholarly monographs. Questions 6, 7, 8, and 9 address sales of the specialized scholarly monograph.

One area neglected by this survey is subject area of monographs accepted for publication. This variable may determine in part what gets published. Although the AAUP Directory 1998-99 contains a “subject grid” that lists subject areas on one axis and press names on the other axis, this grid could be subdivided more finely to be more informative. Changes may have occurred that are not reflected on the grid. Subsequent investigation of what subjects university presses are publishing, looking at subject areas as a variable, might be useful.

The second section of the survey asks nine questions about regional publishing at university presses. Questions 10 through 18 attempt to describe presses’ regional publishing programs. Regional publishing has been done by some university presses from their beginnings. Regional books, for example, are books about local sports figures, local
ecology, natural history, or cookbooks. Some regional books sell a lot of copies and provide needed income for university presses. Question 15 asks what percentage of a press’ front list is regional titles. Questions 16 and 17 ask for sales information. Question 18 asks whether presses are planning to expand their regional publishing programs.

The third and last section asks seven questions intended to broaden the picture of what university presses are publishing, and asks for publishing patterns over the time period 1993 to 1998. Question 19 asks whether presses have noticed an increase in interdisciplinary scholarship being submitted for publication. Although interdisciplinary scholarship has increased, the time period of 1993 to 1998 may not be particularly significant with respect to interdisciplinary books. This trend may have begun before 1993, and be continuing. Questions 20 and 21 ask about “midlist” or “cross-over” books. This question was included on the survey in order to test whether some midlist books are finding publishers at university presses. The concern has been raised that these midlist books are the most vulnerable books in the current marketplace. More research could be done into the well-being of these books.
Question 22 asks whether university presses intentionally have changed their acquisition policy during the period 1993 to 1998. Question 23 asks whether presses are considering publishing their books in electronic format. Question 24 is a sales related question.

Question 25 lists nine kinds of books and asks presses whether the number of books they have published in each of these categories has changed during the time period 1993 to 1998.

Overall, sections 1, 2, and 3 of this survey have attempted to describe university press publishing at present, to describe publishing patterns from 1993 to 1998, and to provide limited insight into what the near future of university press publishing in the United States will be like. Concerns have been raised that university press publishing may be suffering from lack of subsidy that it needs to survive. If there were pressure on presses to earn enough in sales to supply all of their operating costs, would the balance between scholarly and non-scholarly books shift? These issues motivate this investigation.
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RESULTS

General characteristics of presses who replied and general characteristics of presses who did not reply

Respondents tabulated according to whether press was associated with publicly or privately supported university

A total of seventy-two surveys were sent by email. Twenty-four of the recipients were presses associated with privately supported universities. Forty-eight of the recipients were presses associated with publicly supported universities. Ten of the twenty-four presses associated with private universities replied. Of these ten, however, one press declined to participate. Therefore, 9/24 or approximately 38% of the presses associated with private universities returned usable surveys. Twenty-two of the presses associated with publicly supported universities returned usable replies. Therefore, 22/48 or approximately 46% of presses affiliated with publicly supported universities returned usable replies. Overall, response
rate was 31/72 or 43% of the presses returned usable replies.

Non-respondents tabulated according to whether press was associated with publicly or privately supported university

Forty presses out of the original seventy-two presses (40/72 or ~56%) did not return the survey. Among these forty, twenty-six presses were associated with publicly supported universities, and fourteen presses were associated with privately supported universities. The original mailing was sent to twenty-four presses associated with privately supported universities and forty-eight presses associated with publicly supported universities. Therefore, the non-respondents comprise 14/24 or ~58% of presses associated with privately supported universities and 26/48 or ~54% of presses associated with publicly supported universities.
Table 1  Respondents and Non-respondents tabulated by whether press is associated with publicly supported university or privately supported university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PressAssociatedWith</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Non-Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicly Supported University</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately Supported University</td>
<td>10 (but 1 press declined to participate, therefore this category becomes 9)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents tabulated according to whether press is small, medium, or large

Of the seventy-two original presses, fourteen were defined as small (19%), with a total number of books in print being less than 400. Of the original seventy-two presses, thirty-three were defined as medium (46%), with a total number of books in print falling between 400 and 999. Of the total seventy-two presses, twenty-five were defined as large (35%), more than 1000 books in print. Of the thirty-one replies, six presses were defined as small, sixteen were medium, and nine were large. The rate of reply for each size category was 6/14 or 43% for the small presses; 16/33 or 48% for the medium presses; and 9/25 or 36% for the large presses.

Non-respondents tabulated according to whether press is small, medium, or large

Of the forty presses who did not reply to the survey, eight were small, seventeen presses were medium sized, and fifteen were large. Of the original seventy-two presses, fourteen were small, thirty-three were medium sized, and twenty-five were large. Therefore, the rate of non-respondents among small presses was 8/14 or ~57%. The rate of non-respondents among medium sized presses was 17/33 or
~52%. The rate of non-respondents among large presses was 15/25 or 60%.

Table 2  Respondents and Non-Respondents tabulated by size of press

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Non-respondents</th>
<th>Replied but is non-participant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1, Parts A through F

Question 1, parts A-F, collect data about university press attitudes toward publishing the specialized scholarly monograph. Question 1 reads, “When your university press decides to publish a book, how important is each of the following considerations?” Answer choices are as follows: 1=very unimportant; 2=unimportant; 3=neutral; 4=important; 5=very important.
Thirty-one out of thirty-one presses (100% of respondents) replied to all parts of this question, parts A-F.

Question 1, Part A

[When your university press decides to publish a book, how important is the following consideration] ‘supporting the academic tenure system by serving as the primary publishing outlet for the first-time author who needs to publish his/her scholarly monograph in order to be evaluated to received tenure or promotion?’

None of the thirty-one presses (0%) replied with a “5,” or “very important.” Four (~13%) of the presses replied “4,” “important.” Eight (~26%) presses replied “3” or “neutral” toward this consideration. Nine presses (29%) presses gave the reply of “2,” indicating an attitude of “unimportant.” Ten presses (~32%) gave a reply of “1,” indicating that they consider support of academic tenure to be a very unimportant role of university presses.

Grouping the replies of “1” and “2” shows that nineteen (61%) of the thirty-one presses view this consideration as “unimportant” or “very unimportant.” Compare this rating
with the four (approximately 13%) who rated this consideration “important.” Eight presses, or a little over one quarter of all respondents, rated their attitude as “neutral.” There does not seem to be a lot of enthusiasm for the role of academic presses in providing a publication venue for non-tenured faculty.

Question 1, Part B

[When your university press decides to publish a book, how important is the following consideration] ‘keeping the scholarly canons strong in the subject areas in which the press publishes?’

Eleven presses (~35 per cent) rated this consideration a “5,” or very important. Fourteen presses (45 per cent) gave this consideration a rating of “4,” or important. Only 3 presses (~10 per cent) rated this consideration as neutral. Only 3 presses (~10 per cent) rated this consideration “2,” meaning unimportant. None (0 per cent) of 31 presses replied to this consideration with a “1,” or very unimportant.

Grouping the replies of “1” and “2” shows that only 3 presses (~10 percent) hold this consideration to be
unimportant, while twenty-five presses (~80%) rated this consideration as important (4) or very important (5). Only three presses (~10%) felt this consideration was neutral. Maintaining the scholarly cannons appears to rank fairly high when presses decide whether they will publish a particular manuscript.

Question 1, Part C

[How important is the following consideration]
'serving as society’s primary gateway to new knowledge by disseminating scholarship?'

Fourteen presses (~45%) rated this consideration “5,” or very important. Thirteen presses (~42%) rated this consideration “4,” or important. Only 2 presses (~6%) rated this consideration a “3,” or neutral. Only 2 presses (~6%) out of thirty-one presses rated this consideration a “2,” or unimportant. None of the presses answered this part of Question 1 with a rating of “1,” or very unimportant.

Grouping the numbers of presses that consider dissemination of new knowledge to be very unimportant or unimportant shows only 2 presses (~6%). Twenty-seven presses (87%)
regard dissemination as important or very important with 2 presses (~6%) being neutral on this point. Clearly, dissemination of new knowledge ranks high when presses are deciding whether to publish a manuscript.

**Question 1, Part D**

*When your university press decides to publish a book, how important is] 'maintaining your reputation?'

Eighteen presses (~58%) gave this a "5," or very important. Ten presses (~32%) gave this consideration a rating of "4," or important. Only 1 press (~3%) gave this consideration a "3," or neutral rating. Only two presses (~6%) of the thirty-one saw reputation as being unimportant. No press found maintaining its reputation to be very unimportant.

Grouping of number of presses who gave Question D1 a rating of "1" (no presses) plus number of presses who gave Question D1 a rating of "2" (two presses) shows that only 6% of presses considered this unimportant. Only 3% of presses gave this consideration a neutral rating of "3". Grouping scores of "4" and "5" shows that twenty-eight presses (90%) of presses rated this consideration as important or very important. Self preservation and
perpetuation appear to be more important than even dissemination of scholarship or maintaining scholarly cannons.

Question 1, Part E

[When your university press decides to publish a book, how important is the following consideration] ‘remaining financially viable?’

Eighteen presses (~58%) rated remaining financially viable “5,” or very important. Six presses (~19%) gave E1 a “4,” important. Five presses (~16%) said they were neutral toward remaining financially viable. One press (~3%) rated remaining financially viable a “2,” or unimportant. No press gave E1 “1,” very unimportant.

Grouping shows that only one press, or 3% of all respondents, considered question 1, part E, remaining financially viable, to be unimportant or very unimportant when deciding whether to publish a manuscript. Five presses or 16% rated the consideration of remaining financially viable as neutral. Grouping scores of “4” and “5” shows that twenty-four presses (~77%) considered E1 to
be important or very important when deciding whether to publish a scholarly manuscript.

Question 1, Part F

[When your press decides to publish a book, how important is the following consideration] ‘ensuring that the specialized scholarly monographs continue to be published?’

One press (~3%) rated ensuring that the specialized scholarly monographs continue to be published a “5,” or very important. Thirteen presses (~42%) rated ensuring continued publication of scholarly monographs a “4,” or important. Eight presses (~26%) were neutral, rating F1 a “3”. Four presses (~13%) found ensuring publication of the scholarly monographs a “2,” or unimportant. Four presses (~13%) rated this consideration as “1,” or very unimportant.

Grouping shows that eight presses (~26%) rated this consideration as very unimportant or unimportant. Eight presses (~26%) were neutral toward this consideration. Fourteen presses (~45%) regarded this consideration as
important or very important. It looks like there is no overwhelming consensus in the responses to this question.

**Question 2**

*Does your press wait for submissions of manuscripts or do you actively pursue them?*

Thirty-one presses, or 100% of all respondents, replied to this question. This question asked for the answer of “actively pursue,” or “wait for submissions,” or “both.” The replies below are grouped according to the exact wording of the respondents’ replies – either “pursue” or “both.” No press answered this question with “wait for submissions.”

Nineteen presses (61%) of the thirty-one presses replied that they actively or aggressively pursue manuscripts. Of these nineteen, six presses were large, ten were medium sized, and three were small. A total of thirteen presses were associated with publicly supported universities, and six were associated with privately supported universities.
Twelve presses (39%) of the thirty-one presses replied that they both wait for submissions and actively pursue manuscripts. Of these twelve, three presses were large, six presses were medium-sized, and three presses were small. A total of three presses were associated with privately supported universities, and nine presses were associated with publicly supported universities.

Seven presses (23%) gave additional textual information explaining their choices. This researcher wonders whether, had this question been more open-ended or offered a wider choice of responses, more presses would have explained in more detail whether and to what extent they pursue manuscripts and in what circumstances they accept manuscripts unsolicited. With nearly two-thirds of all presses actively pursuing manuscripts, university presses appear to be investing time and effort in acquiring the best manuscripts. No presses chose the option of "wait for submissions only." Activity and effort by presses to acquire manuscripts they want to publish is clear from the replies.

Question 3
If a manuscript is very good, but it has a very small projected audience, would your press publish it nevertheless? The answer choices are "yes," "maybe," or "no."

All thirty-one presses replied to this question. Seven presses (~23%) of the thirty-one presses replied "yes" they would publish a manuscript if it were very good, but had a very small projected audience. Twenty-three presses (~74%) of the thirty-one presses replied "maybe." One press (~3%) of the thirty-one presses replied "no" to this question.

Of the seven presses who replied "yes," three were associated with privately funded universities, and four were associated with publicly funded universities. Of the seven, one was large, two were small, and four were medium sized.

Of the twenty-three presses who replied "maybe," six presses were associated with privately funded universities, and the remaining seventeen presses were associated with publicly funded universities. Of the twenty-three, eight were large, four were small, and eleven were medium sized.
The one press who replied “no” was a medium sized press affiliated with a public funded university.

The data show that quality of a manuscript is definitely among the factors that presses weigh when making their publishing decisions. The fact that only one press replied “no” to this question shows that quality is an important consideration. Because Question 3 did not ask presses what they meant by “maybe,” this question does not suggest what other factors presses consider.

Three presses who answered this question with “maybe” elaborated on their replies. Two of the presses mentioned financial concerns. The other press mentioned significance of author in his/her respective field.

There may be overlap between this question and the previous question. The method by which the manuscript was acquired may play a part in the decision to publish it. An editor might have actively pursued manuscripts that because of the manuscripts’ authors or contributions to their fields would enhance the press’ reputation. Enhanced press reputation could help other books on the press’ list to sell.
Question 4

Does your university press have a ‘cut off point,’ such as if a monograph is projected to sell fewer than 500 copies, at which your press will not accept it for publication? The choices were either “yes” or “no.” If the respondent answered “yes,” there was a follow-up question, “If yes, what is that number?”

All 31 presses (100%) replied to Question 4. Fifteen presses (48%) of the presses said “yes,” they do have a cut off point. Of these fifteen, five presses were large, eight presses were medium, and two presses were small. Of these fifteen, four presses were associated with privately supported universities, and eleven presses were associated with publicly supported universities. Sixteen presses (52%) of the presses said “no,” they do not have a cut off point. Of these sixteen, four presses were large, eight presses were medium, and four presses were small. Of these sixteen who said “no,” five of the presses were associated with private universities, and eleven presses were associated with publicly supported universities.
When asked, “What is that number?” twelve of the fifteen presses who responded “yes” to the first part of Question 4 provided figures. These figures ranged from 200 to 1250 in projected sales for their cut off points for accepting scholarly manuscripts for publication. Two more of these fifteen presses gave explanatory text. One press out of these fifteen presses did not supply a figure, nor did it provide any explanatory text. Explanatory text was not asked for nor expected in reply to Question 4. However, the verbal explanation provided by two presses mentioned some less clear-cut criteria that presses use when making the decision to publish a manuscript. One of these presses explained its “yes” reply by saying that while there is a number, the number varies. Reasons for this were not given. Whether the reasons have to do with availability of subsidy, discipline of manuscript, or ongoing relationship with or reputation of an author were not mentioned. The other press who gave explanatory material cited three considerations: costs (of publication), value to scholarship, and whether a subsidy for the manuscript exists or can be found.

Of the presses who gave an exact figure, they are reported in three groups: Presses who gave a figure of less than
presses who gave a figure falling between 500 and 999; and presses who reported a figure of 1000 or more. Three presses fell into the first group, five presses fell into the second group, and four presses fell into the third group.

Of the 16 presses who replied "no," five presses qualified their answers by providing explanatory material. One press said that although it does not have an absolute cut off point, if a manuscript does not fall into the middle group in the previous paragraph, it may fail to be published. (It was not included in that data, because its initial response was "no.") Another press expressed its concern with finances by saying that it wanted its books to contribute to overhead. A third press mentioned outside subsidy as a vehicle for enabling the publication of books that might not sell a minimum number of copies. A fourth press mentioned price of the book (retail). The fifth press said it will weigh potential sales when considering a manuscript for publication. It said that potential sales requirements vary with the discipline. These five presses provided a few other important considerations, either in addition to or other than, the number of copies the published book is projected to sell. Of these five
presses, two were large, and three were medium. Of these five, two were associated with privately supported universities, and three were associated with publicly supported universities.

**Question 5**

What percentage of your current list (front list) is scholarly monographs?

All thirty-one presses replied to Question 5. The replies are grouped into quartiles of 0% to 25%; 26% to 50%; 51% to 75%; and 76% to 100%. The group of 0% to 25% per cent included ten presses. Twelve presses were in the group of 26% to 50%. Six presses were in the group of 51% to 75%. And three presses were in the group of 76% to 100%.

Four presses added text to their replies. In each of these four cases, it was pointed out that the term “monograph” is defined in a different way by different publishers. It was mentioned that a book can be scholarly without being a monograph. A definition of the term “monograph” in the survey would have made the data for Question 5 more meaningful.
Question 6

On average, how many copies of a scholarly monograph does your press expect to sell?

Over how many years is a monograph projected to sell?

Thirty presses (~97%) out of thirty-one answered Question 6, part 1, giving either figures or ranges. One press replied with text only. Of seventeen presses who supplied figures, one press gave a figure less than 500; four presses answered with the number 500; nine presses reported figures greater than 501 and less than or equal to 1000; and three presses gave figures greater than 1000. Among the thirteen presses who supplied ranges, nine gave ranges between 500 and 1000, inclusive (a typical example might have been 500 to 700). The remaining four presses gave ranges with higher ends in the mid- to upper-teens.

Grouping the presses who answered with the number 500 (four), and the presses who answered with figures between 501 and 1000 (nine), and the nine presses who gave ranges beginning and ending with figures somewhere between 500 to 1000, inclusive, gives the total of twenty-two presses out
of thirty (~73%) who answered somewhere between 500 and 1000, inclusive.

Grouping the higher end replies shows two presses with ranges between 700 and 1300, inclusive; two presses with ranges between 1000 to mid- or upper-teens; and three presses who reported figures (not ranges) greater than 1000. This group totals seven presses (~23%) who expected sales of over 1000 copies of a specialized scholarly monograph (although two presses had a lower end of less than 1000 to their stated range).

Several presses said that the number of copies of a scholarly monograph their presses expect to sell depends on the subject area or discipline of the monograph.

Of the twenty-two presses whose reply was somewhere between 500 and 1000, inclusive, six were associated with private universities, and sixteen were associated with public universities. Six presses in this range were small, thirteen presses in this group were medium; and three were large. Of the seven presses in the higher end group, none was small, two presses were medium, and five presses were large. Of the seven, two presses were associated with
privately funded universities, and five were associated with publicly funded universities. The one press who reported expected sales of less than 500 was of medium size and associated with a publicly funded university.

All thirty-one presses responded to the second part of Question 6. The number of years a monograph is projected to sell was divided into three groups. One group replied less than three years. The second group said from three to five years, inclusive. Some presses in the second group reported a range, and others gave a figure. The third group of presses said greater than five years. A few presses in the third group reported a range of years with the lower number being five years, for example five to eight. By contrast, a few presses in the second group said their upper limit was five years.

Two presses (~ 6%) were in the first group, with projected sales of less than three years. One of these presses was medium sized, and one was small. One was associated with a private university, and one was associated with a public university.
Twenty-two presses (~71%) fell into group two, with number of years from three to five years, inclusive. Of these twenty-two, three presses were small, thirteen were medium, and six were large. Of these twenty-two, six presses were associated with privately supported universities, and sixteen presses with publicly supported universities.

Seven presses (~23%) said they projected that their monographs would sell for more than five years, sometimes giving a range with five years as the lower number. Of these seven, two were small, two were medium, and three were large. Two of the presses were associated with privately supported universities, and five were associated with publicly supported universities.

Some presses supplied supplementary text. One point made was that most sales occur within the first few years of publication, or even in the first year or two. Another point was that presses expect monographs to continue to sell over many years, although at a greatly reduced rate, and for this reason presses keep a small number of copies in print in warehouse or storage.

Question 7
What factors determine whether a second print run is done?

All 31 presses answered this question. There was no limit on the number of factors presses could list. Most press listed several factors.

“Market,” “demand,” “sales,” “rate of sales,” “pattern of sales,” “sales history” were all grouped as one answer. Twenty presses said sales pattern/history of sales, market, or demand determined whether a second print run was done. A few stated a specific number of books that would need to be sold per year. Seven presses said that the time that it took for the first print run to sell out determined whether another print run was done. Four presses said that projected future sales was a factor. Costs and economic considerations were cited by eight presses. Five presses said course use potential was a factor. This might mean that the second print run would be in paperback. Other factors mentioned were importance of a monograph to its field; a monograph’s contents’ being current; author’s reputation; the possibility of new sales, publicity or review opportunities; and the types of audiences the book was finding—scholars, libraries, students, or other.
The replies show that presses are attuned to their market, and they want to be sure there is an audience for their monographs before reprinting a run of several hundred copies. Although a second print run is not the same as a second edition, which would be more costly, nevertheless, presses may be looking at patterns of sales to guide them in their decision to reprint a monograph. Every reply stated in the above paragraph can somehow reflect the marketplace for monographs.

Question 8

To whom do you sell the most scholarly monograph titles?

This question offered nine answers from which to choose. It was expected that respondents would select only one answer from among the nine. Eleven presses (~35%), however, selected multiple answers. All thirty-one presses replied to this question. Three presses gave replies that were not among the nine available choices. Two presses (~6%) said they did not know to whom they sell the most scholarly monograph titles. One press (~3%) said that a
definition of “monograph” would enable it to provide a meaningful answer.

Fifteen presses (~48%) out of thirty-one said that they sell the most scholarly monographs titles to research university libraries. Of these 15, six were associated with privately supported universities, and nine were associated with publicly supported universities. Four presses were large, eight presses were medium, and three were small. However, only five presses (5/31 or ~16%) said research university libraries were their only main customer. Of these five, three were small, one was medium, and one was large. Four of these five were associated with privately supported universities, and one was associated with a publicly supported university. The other ten selected more than one choice, indicating more than one category of customer. Among these ten, seven presses were medium sized, and three were large. Eight presses were associated with publicly supported universities, and two presses were associated with privately supported universities.

Six presses (~19%) out of thirty-one said that they sell the most to liberal arts college libraries. However, none
selected liberal arts college libraries as their only main customer. All of these six press are medium sized. All six are affiliated with publicly supported universities.

Fifteen presses (~48%) out of 31 said that individual scholars in the monograph’s subject area purchased the most scholarly monograph titles. Of these 15, seven presses listed other selections also. Of the eight presses (8/31 or ~26%) who selected individual scholars in the monograph’s subject area as their only main customer, all were associated with publicly supported universities. One was small, four were medium, and three were large. Among the seven presses who listed several main customers for the scholarly monograph, none was small, four were medium, and three were large. Five of the seven were associated with publicly supported universities, and two were associated with privately supported universities. Overall, looking at the fifteen as a group, thirteen were associated with publicly supported universities, and two were associated with privately supported universities. Six of the fifteen presses were large, eight were medium, and one was small.

Only two presses listed independent book store customers as the purchaser of the most scholarly monograph titles. One
press (1/31 or ~3%) chose this selection as its only one, and the other press chose independent book store customers as one among several main purchasers of monograph titles. Both presses are medium sized and associated with publicly supported universities.

The three presses (3/31 or ~10%) who selected large chain book store customers as their main customer selected other choices also. Two of these presses are medium sized, and one is large. Two are associated with publicly supported universities, and one is associated with a privately supported university.

Two presses (2/31 or ~6%) selected the choice of student (on-campus) book stores; however, both of these presses also made other selections. Both presses were medium sized, and both were associated with publicly supported universities.

Six presses (~19%) out of 31 said they sold the most scholarly monograph titles via orders placed at conferences. All six presses selected other answers as well in reply to Question 9. Four of these presses were medium sized, and two were large; none was small. One of
these six presses was associated with a privately supported university and the remaining five presses were associated with publicly supported universities.

Only one press (~3%) out of 31 said the public was among the customers who purchased the most scholarly monograph titles. This publisher also gave other categories of purchaser, in addition. This press was a medium sized publisher and was associated with a publicly supported university.

The category of “other” was also included, but not specified. Five presses (~16%) out of thirty-one replied with this category when specifying to whom they sell the most scholarly monograph titles. Three of these presses listed “other” as their only choice, and defined it as wholesalers. Of the two presses who selected more than one main customer, one of these presses specified that other meant wholesalers, and ranked wholesalers above the other customer it listed. The last press gave several choices, among which was “other.” Of these five presses, one was small, one was large, and three were medium sized. Two were associated with privately supported universities, and three with publicly supported universities. Four out of
five specified that wholesalers were their main customer for purchasing scholarly monograph titles.

Question 9

Has your main customer (above) purchased a (greater, smaller, the same) number of copies of monographs during the period 1993-1998?

Seventeen presses (~55%) out of thirty-one did not reply to Question 9. Three presses (~10%) said they did not know. Thus, twenty presses (~65%) out of the total of 31 presses either did not answer this question or responded that they did not know. Eight presses said that monographic sales are decreasing; three of those presses specified that sales to research university libraries and liberal arts college libraries are declining. Six of the eight presses are associated with publicly supported universities; two presses are associated with privately supported universities. Four of the eight presses were large sized, and four were medium sized. One press said sales have remained the same during the period 1993-1998. One press said it had seen an increase in sales to its main customer during the period 1993-1998, because its backlist has sold well over the internet to the individual scholars in the
monograph’s subject area. One press said it has seen an increase in sales, but most in its trade books, not monographs. With the response rate of 11/31 presses (~35%), few conclusions can be drawn.

REGIONAL PUBLISHING

Question 10

*Does your press do regional publishing?*

All thirty-one presses (100%) replied to Question 10. Twenty-seven presses (~87%) out of thirty-one replied in the affirmative, saying they do regional publishing. Of these twenty-seven, seven presses were large, sixteen were medium, and four were small. Of the twenty-seven, five presses were associated with privately supported universities, and twenty-two presses were associated with publicly supported universities. Of the five associated with privately supported universities, one press reported doing regional publishing occasionally.

Four presses (~13%) out of thirty-one replied in the negative, saying they do not do regional publishing. All four were associated with privately supported universities. Two presses were large, and two were small.
Question 11

What is your press' region?

Twelve presses out of twenty-seven gave the name of a state, and in most cases, specified a broader region, such as the South or the Midwest. Fourteen states gave a region of the country only. One press did not provide an answer.

Following is a list of all regions cited, whether or not state names had accompanied the regions: the West (two presses), the Southwest (four presses), the U.S.-Mexican Border area, the Gulf Coast, Asia and the Pacific, the Great Plains, Midwest (six presses), Great Lakes and surrounding states (two presses), Canada, Mid-Atlantic (two presses), Southeast, the South (three presses), New England (three presses), Northeastern USA, and the USA. Some presses said more than one area, if the areas were geographically near the press.

The only meaningful summary of this data is to say that these regions reflect the presses who replied to the survey. Nothing can be concluded about regional publishing in regions not listed here. Furthermore, it should be
kept in mind that all subsequent data and discussion about regional publishing reflects the regions listed above.

**Question 12**

*What is an average print run for a regional book?*

Seven presses gave figures in the 1,000s. All seven were associated with publicly supported universities. Two were small, four were medium, and one was large. Nine presses gave figures in the 2,000s. Eight of these were associated with publicly supported universities, and one with a privately supported university. One press was small, five were medium, and three were large. Three presses gave figures in the 3,000s. Two were associated with publicly supported universities, and one with a privately supported university. Two presses were medium, and one was large. One press, publicly supported and large, gave a figure in the 5000s. Three medium sized presses gave ranges of 5000 or less. One press, associated with a publicly supported university, said from the 1000s to 3000. Two presses, one associated with a publicly supported university and one, a privately supported university, gave ranges from the 2000s to 5000.
Therefore, counting all presses whose ranges or figures were in the 1000 to 5000 range, there were twenty-three presses (~85%) of the twenty-seven who do regional publishing. Five presses were large; three were small; and fifteen were medium. Three presses were associated with privately supported universities, and twenty were associated with publicly supported universities.

The higher end of average print runs is represented by three of the four remaining presses. One press reported a figure in the 10,000s. Another press reported a range with the upper figure in the 12,000s. One press reported a range from the 700s to the 7000s. In addition, one press who reported its average in the 2000s (and was included in a previous grouping), said that this figure can rise into the 7000s, depending on the type of book (specifically, for a coffee table book). Of the three presses, two were associated with publicly supported universities and one, with a privately supported university. Two were large, and one was medium.

Finally, several presses included text with their replies. One press replied only with text, saying that this number varies. Another press distinguished between regional
scholarly and regional trade, saying the former might average from the 800s to the 1000s, while the latter, from the 2000s up to the 12,000s. Two presses mentioned that the books are often or always in paperback. One press reported a figure in the 2000s, but added that the average print run could be higher.

**Question 13**

*What factors determine whether a second print run is done?*

Sales pattern, history of sales, whether the book sold out its first print run, how fast the book sold out, demand, and market were all grouped into one category. Twenty-four presses (~89%) out of twenty-seven who do regional publishing responded with one of these answers. Six presses were large, three were small, and fifteen were medium sized. Twenty presses were associated with publicly supported universities, and four with privately supported universities. Two other presses said anticipated sales. Both were associated with publicly supported universities and were medium sized.
Four presses said costs, economics, or financial considerations determined whether a second print run was done. Three presses were medium, and one was large. Two were associated with publicly supported universities, and two with privately supported universities.

Other varied responses to Question 13 follow: Availability of subsidy (one press); importance of book [to region] (two presses); whether the book was reviewed favorably (two presses); general interest (two presses); feedback about market from local booksellers (one press); whether the book has remained timely (one press); class room use or potential (two presses); special sales potential or new publishing opportunities (one press); limitations of storage facility create need for frequent reprinting (one press).

**Question 14**

*Are regional books published in paperback or cloth cover or both?*

Seventeen presses (~63%) out of the twenty-seven regional publishers responded by saying both, although the relationship of these two formats is unclear. It may mean
some books are in cloth, others in paper, and some in both. It may mean that a book is first published in cloth and then in paper if demand is sufficient. It may mean that a print run is done wherein some books have trade cloth covers, and a larger number are printed in paperback. Four of these presses were large, two were small, and eleven were medium. Three of the seventeen presses were associated with privately supported universities, and fourteen with publicly supported universities.

Two presses (~7%) of the twenty-seven said trade cloth. One of these presses was associated with a privately supported university and one with a publicly supported university. One press was large, and one was medium.

Eight presses answered Question 14 with text instead of choosing one of the three options: "Paperback," "cloth," or "both." These replies were the most useful. Five presses indicated that this format decision depended on type of book or project. One press said that this decision looks at the type of customer in the book's subject area and what that customer might be willing to pay. Two presses said sometimes only cloth, sometimes only paper, and sometimes a split run.
One press said the format of cloth or paper depends on whether the book is a picture book or not. It said the picture books will be published in trade cloth, whereas other types of regional books will be published in split runs of both cloth and paper. Another press also said it publishes some regional books in split runs but publishes others first in cloth, and then in paperback if there is demand. Cookbooks, gardening books, and natural history books were cited by presses as being published in split runs.

**Question 15**

*What percentage of your current list (front list) is regional titles?*

Twenty-six of the twenty-seven presses who do regional publishing answered Question 15 with a percentage. One press stated that their regional publishing program was new, and figures were not available. Responses were divided into quartiles: 0% to 25%; 26% to 50%; 51% to 75%; and 76% to 100%. Sixteen presses fell into the first quartile of 0% to 25%. Of these, five were large, nine were medium, and two were small. Thirteen were associated
with publicly supported universities, and three with privately supported universities. Nine presses fell into the second quartile of 26% to 50%. Of these, one was large, six were medium, and two were small. Seven were associated with publicly supported universities and two with privately supported universities. One press was in the third quartile of 51% to 75%. It was medium sized and associated with a publicly supported university. None of the presses was in the fourth quartile.

Because these quartiles contained so many presses, the twenty-six presses were further divided as follows: 0% to 15%; 16% to 30%; 31% to 45%; 46% to 60%; 61% to 75%; 76% to 90%; and 91% to 100%. Nine presses were in the first group of 0% to 15%. Three were large, five were medium, and one was small. Three were associated with private universities and six with public universities. Seven presses were in the second group of 16% to 30%. Two were large, four were medium, and one was small. All seven presses were associated with publicly supported universities. Five presses were in the third group of 31% to 45%. Four were medium, and one was small. Three were associated with publicly supported universities and two with privately supported universities. Four presses were
in the group 46% to 60%. One was large, two were medium, and one was small. All four were associated with publicly supported universities. One press was in the group of 61% to 75%. It was medium sized and associated with a public university. No presses were in the categories of 76% to 90% or 91% to 100%.

**Question 16**

*What percentage of sales comes from regional books?*

Among the twenty-seven presses who do regional publishing, two presses did not answer Question 16. One was associated with a privately supported university, and one was associated with a publicly supported university. Both were large presses. Five presses said they did not know what percentage of sales comes from regional books. Of these five, one press was large, three were medium, and one, small. All five were associated with publicly supported universities.

Among the twenty presses who answered question 16, one press answered only in text, saying that the percentage was "a lot." Of the nineteen presses who supplied percentages, 4/19 of the presses were large, 12/19 of the presses were
medium, and 3/19 were small. Four were associated with privately supported universities, and fifteen with publicly supported universities. These 19 presses were divided into the following groups: 0% to 15%; 16% to 30%; 31% to 45%; 46% to 60%; 61% to 75%; 76% to 90%; and 90% to 100%.

Six presses said the percentage of sales from regional books was between 0% to 15%. One press was large, four were medium, and one was small. Two were associated with privately supported universities, and four with publicly supported universities.

Two presses said between 16% and 30% per cent of their sales came from regional books. One press was large, and one was medium. Both were associated with publicly supported universities.

Two presses said the percentage of sales from regional titles was between 31% and 45%. One press was large, and one was small. One was associated with a privately supported university, and the other, with a publicly supported university.

Seven presses fell into the group 46% to 60%. One was large, five were medium, and one was small. One of the
medium sized presses was associated with a privately supported university. Six presses were associated with publicly supported universities.

The higher percentages were reported by two medium sized presses, both associated with publicly supported universities. One said its percentage of sales from regional books was between 61% and 75%; the other press reported its sales were between 76% and 90.

Another way to look at the breakdown is to see the number of presses who reported sales in the 0% to 50% range and the number who reported sales of 51% to 100%. Thirteen presses said sales from regional books were between 0% and 50%. Three were large, eight were medium, and two were small. Four were associated with privately supported universities, and nine with publicly supported universities. Six presses said sales were between 51% and 100%. One press was large, four were medium, and one was small. All of these presses were associated with publicly supported universities. It might be possible to include the press who responded with “a lot” to question 16 in the 51% to 100% grouping. If that were done, there would be seven presses in the 51% to 100% group. All presses would
be associated with publicly supported universities. Five would be medium, one large, and one small.

Thus, four of the five presses from privately supported universities, who said they do regional publishing, reported sales in the 0% to 50% group. (The fifth press from a privately supported university that does regional publishing did not answer this question.) In the 51% to 100% group, all six presses (or seven, if the press who said, "a lot," is included) were associated with publicly supported universities.

Question 17

Has the percentage of sales from regional books increased, decreased, or remained the same during the period 1993-1998?

Of the twenty-seven presses who do regional publishing, three presses (3/27 or ~11%) did not answer this question. Four presses (4/27 or ~15%), all associated with publicly supported universities, said that they did not know. One was large, two were medium, and one, small.
Of the twenty remaining presses, thirteen presses (13/27, or ~48%) said the percentage of sales from regional titles has increased during the time period 1993-1998. Two were large, eight were medium, and three, small; ten were associated with publicly supported universities, and three with privately supported universities. Four presses (4/27 or ~15%) said sales of regional books have remained the same. One press was large, and three were medium, and none was small. One was associated with a privately supported university, and three, with publicly supported universities. Three presses (3/27 or ~11%) said that sales decreased during the time period 1993-1998. These three were all associated with publicly supported universities; two were medium sized, and one was large.

A different perspective on the data shows that four of the five presses associated with privately supported universities who publish regional titles answered Question 17. Three of the four presses said sales have increased and one press said sales have remained the same during the time period 1993-1998. The four presses out of thirty-one total presses who do not publish regional titles all are associated with privately supported universities.
Of the twenty-two presses associated with publicly supported universities who publish regional titles, ten said sales increased, three said sales remained the same, three said sales decreased, four said they do not know, and two did not answer Question 17.
Question 18

*Is your press planning to expand its regional publishing program?*

All twenty-seven presses who said they do regional publishing answered Question 18. Two presses said they do not know whether their press is planning to expand its regional publishing program. Of these, one is large, and one is medium, and both were associated with publicly supported universities. Fifteen presses (15/27 or ~56%) said they were planning to expand their regional publishing programs. Four were large, nine were medium, and two were small; twelve were associated with publicly supported universities and three with privately supported universities. Ten presses (10/27 or ~37%) said they were not planning to expand their regional publishing programs. Two were large, six were medium, and two were small; two presses were associated with privately supported universities and eight with publicly supported universities.

A different perspective shows that three of the five presses (60%) associated with privately supported universities (who publish regional titles) were planning to
expand their regional publishing program, and twelve of the
twenty-two presses (~55%) associated with publicly
supported universities (who publish regional titles) were
planning to expand their regional publishing programs.

Combining Question 17 and Question 18 shows that nine
presses said both that the percentage of sales from
regional books has increased during the years 1993-1998 and
they were planning to expand their regional publishing
programs. One press was large, seven were medium, and one
was small; two were associated with privately supported
universities and seven with publicly supported
universities. Of the other six presses who said they were
planning to expand their regional publishing programs, one
reported sales had decreased during 1993-1998, two said
they did not know whether sales had changed, one said sales
remain the same, and two did not answer Question 17.

Of the ten presses who are not planning to expand their
regional publishing programs, one said its percentage of
sales from regional books decreased during 1993-1998
(Question 17), four presses said the percentage of sales
increased, three said it remained the same, one did not
know, and one did not answer Question 17.
GENERAL QUESTIONS

Question 19

Has your press noticed an increase in interdisciplinary books submitted for publication?

All thirty-one presses answered Question 19. Twenty-two presses (~71%) said yes, they have noticed an increase in interdisciplinary books submitted for publication. Eight presses were large, twelve were medium, and two were small; seventeen presses were associated with publicly supported universities, and five with privately supported universities.

Nine presses (~29%) said no, they have not noticed an increase in interdisciplinary books. One press was large, four were medium, and four were small; five presses were associated with publicly supported universities and four were associated with privately supported universities.

Some presses gave text in support of their answers. One comment was that interdisciplinary books have been published by presses for years, and their appearance on publishers’ lists is not new. Another comment addressed
the quality of the interdisciplinary books that presses are publishing.
**Question 20**

*Does your university press publish the midlist books that are no longer published by independent commercial publishers?*

All thirty-one presses replied to Question 20. Twenty-six presses (26/31 or ~84%) said that they do publish midlist books that are no longer published by independent commercial publishers. Six of these presses were small, twelve were medium, and eight were large; nine presses were associated with privately supported universities, and seventeen, with publicly supported universities.

Five presses (5/31 or ~16%) replied no, they do not publish the midlist books that are no longer published by independent commercial publishers. One press was large, four were medium; all five were associated with publicly supported universities.

One clear finding showed up. All nine presses in this study that are associated with privately supported universities said they published the midlist books. Another finding is that 84% of all presses replied in the affirmative to Question 20.
These midlist books are trade books that formed the midlist of independent trade publishers. Many independent trade publishers have been bought by large conglomerates who have a financial motive in selecting books for publication. These midlist books are not considered profitable enough by large companies. In some cases, university presses find these books fit well with their existing lists. Thus, a new pool of manuscripts is available to university presses, and these are projected to sell as trade books, with stronger sales than monographs.

**Question 21**

*On average, how many copies of a midlist book does your press expect to sell?*

All thirty-one presses replied to Question 21. Estimates ranged from 5000 on the high end to 700 on the low end. Because all estimates were within this range, no further analysis was performed.
Has your university press intentionally changed the composition of its list (its acquisition policy) during the years 1993-1998?

All thirty-one presses answered Question 22. Twenty-five presses (~81%) replied yes to Question 22. Six were large, thirteen were medium, and six were small. Seven presses were associated with privately supported universities, and eighteen were associated with publicly supported universities. Six presses (~19%) replied no. Three were large, and three were medium, and none was small; two were associated with privately supported universities, and four with publicly supported universities.

Question 23

Is your press considering putting select books into electronic (or e-book) format?

If yes, what types of books?

All thirty-one presses answered Question 23. Eleven presses (~35%) said yes, they are considering putting select books into electronic format. Six were large, three were medium, and two were small. Three presses were associated with privately supported universities, and eight
with publicly funded universities. Twenty presses (~65%) replied no to Question 23. Of these, three were large, thirteen were medium, and four were small. Six presses were associated with privately supported universities, and fourteen with publicly funded universities.

Four publishers are considering putting reference works into electronic format, because they have searchable components. Three presses said they are considering putting monographs into electronic book format. Other presses said backlist books, regional trade, classics, and regional classics were candidates for electronic format. One press said that all types of books will be considered for electronic format.

**Question 24**

*Approximately what percentage of your overall budget is supplied by your book and journal sales?*

Twenty-nine out of thirty-one presses answered question 24. Five presses said that 100% of their overall budget is supplied by their book and journal sales. Three were large, one was medium, and one, small. Three were associated with privately supported universities and two
with publicly supported universities. Thirteen presses gave a percentage from 90% to 99%. Of these, six were large, six were medium, and one was small. Four were associated with privately supported universities, and nine with publicly supported universities. Five presses reported percentages from 80% to 89% of their overall budget that is supplied by book and journal sales. Of these, two were medium, and three were small. Three were associated with publicly supported universities and two with privately supported universities. Two presses said that between 70% and 79% of their overall budget is supplied by their books and journals sales. Both were medium sized and affiliated with publicly supported universities. Two presses gave percentages in the 60% to 69% range. Both were medium sized and associated with publicly supported universities. Two presses said they did not know.

Among the nine presses from privately supported universities, three said their book and journal sales accounts for 100% of their budget; four said between 90% and 99%; and two said their sales accounts for 80% to 89% of their overall budget. All nine presses from privately
supported universities answered this question, and all reported percentages of between 80% and 100%.

Combining the total number of presses who reported 100% and the total number who said between 90% and 99% gives eighteen presses (18/31 or ~58%) whose sales of books and journals supplies between 90% and 100% of their overall budget. Combining the remaining respondents to question 24, nine presses (9/31 or ~29%) said that sales from their books and journals supplies between 60% and 89% of their overall budget. Two presses did not know, and two presses did not reply.
Question 25

Please indicate whether the number of new titles your press has published in each of the following categories has changed during the time period (1993-1998).

Question 25 has nine kinds of books that university presses publish: Regional titles; non-regional trade nonfiction; scholarly monograph; reference books; translations into English (fiction); translations into English (nonfiction); textbooks; journals; fiction and poetry. Presses are asked to record changes in the number of new titles published in each category during the time period 1993-1998. Six answer choices are available: 5=increased substantially; 4=increased; 3=stayed the same; 2=decreased; 1=decreased substantially; 0=not published. The last part of question 25 asks for changes in total number of new titles published during 1993-1998.

Of the thirty-one presses, two presses responded with text, and one press’ replies were not able to be interpreted, because of formatting problems. Twenty-eight presses supplied answers that could be tabulated and percentages calculated.
Question 25, Part A

Please indicate whether the number of new [regional titles] titles your press has published has changed during the time period (1993-1998).

Four presses replied that regional titles have increased substantially (5) during the time period 1993-1998. Three presses were medium, and one was small. Three were associated with publicly supported universities and one was associated with a privately supported university.

Fifteen presses replied that regional titles have increased (4) over this time period (1993-1998). Five presses were large, seven were medium, and three were small. Three presses were associated with privately supported universities and twelve, with publicly supported universities.

Four presses said the number of regional titles on their list remained the same (3) from 1993-1998. Two of these presses were large, and two were medium. Two were associated with privately supported universities, and two, with publicly supported universities.
Two presses said regional titles decreased (2) on their list from 1993-1998. Both were medium sized presses, and both were associated with publicly supported universities.

None of the presses reported that regional titles had decreased substantially (1) over this time period (1993-1998).

Three presses reported that they do not publish regional titles (0). All three were associated with privately supported universities; two presses were small, and one was large.

Discussion

Grouping replies of "increased substantially" and "increased" gives nineteen presses (~68%) out of twenty-eight presses that responded to question 25, part A, saying that regional titles increased from 1993 to 1998. Four presses (~14%) out of twenty-eight said the number of new regional titles "remained the same" from 1993 to 1998. Two presses (~7%) said the number of new regional titles on their list decreased between 1993 and 1998. Three presses (~11%) reported that they do not do regional publishing.
A different perspective contrasts the presses associated with publicly supported universities and those associated with privately supported universities. Fifteen presses (15/22 or ~68%) out of twenty-two presses associated with publicly supported universities said that the number of new regional titles they published had increased or increased substantially. Two presses (2/22 or ~9%) replied that the number of new regional titles they published has remained the same. Two presses (2/22 or ~9%) replied that the number of new regional titles they published had declined during 1993 to 1998. Three presses' responses could not be coded to fit into this analysis.

Among the nine presses associated with privately supported universities, three presses (3/9 or 33%) responded that they do not do regional publishing. Among the six presses that do regional publishing, four (4/9 or ~44%) said the number of new regional titles has increased or increased substantially from 1993 to 1998. Two (2/9 or ~22%) presses said the number of new titles of regional books has remained the same from 1993 to 1998.

Question 25, Part B
Please indicate whether the number of new [trade/serious nonfiction (excluding regional titles)] titles your press has published has changed during the time period (1993-1998).

One press who did not reply to some parts of Question 25, replied to Part B. Therefore, the total number of respondents to question 25, part B, is 29.

Seven presses said that their trade/serious nonfiction (excluding regional titles) has increased substantially (5) during the time period (1993-1998). One press was large, four were medium, and two were small. Three were associated with publicly supported universities, and four were associated with privately supported universities.

Sixteen presses said the number of new titles that were trade/serious nonfiction (excluding regional trade) had increased (4) during this time period. Six were large, six were medium, and four were small. Four were associated with privately supported universities, and twelve with publicly supported universities.
Two presses said there had been no change (3) in the number of new titles in trade/serious nonfiction (excluding regional trade). One press was associated with a publicly supported university and the other, with a privately supported university. One press was large, and one was medium. One press said the number of new titles had decreased (2). It was associated with a publicly supported university and was medium sized. One press said the number of new titles had decreased substantially (1). It was medium sized and associated with a publicly supported university. Two presses reported that they do not publish the serious nonfiction (excluding regional nonfiction). These presses were both medium sized, and both were associated with publicly supported universities.

Discussion

Grouping responses of "increased substantially" and "increased" gives twenty-three (23/29 or 79%) presses who responded to question 25, part B saying that the number of new titles of trade/serious nonfiction, (excluding regional titles), that their presses published had increased from 1993 to 1998. Two presses (~7%) said there had been no change in the number of new trade/serious nonfiction (excluding regional titles) they published from 1993 to
1998. Combining the number of presses who answered question 25, part B with “decreased” or “decreased substantially” gives two presses (~7%) who reported that the percentage of new trade/serious nonfiction (excluding regional titles) had decreased from 1993 to 1998. And two presses (~7%) said they do not publish trade/serious nonfiction (excluding regional titles).

Among the twenty-two presses associated with publicly supported universities, fifteen presses (15/22 or ~68%) said that the number of new titles of trade/serious nonfiction (excluding regional titles) has increased or increased substantially. One press (1/22 or ~5%) said the number of new titles in this category has remained the same from 1993 to 1998. Two presses (2/22 or ~9%) said that the number of new titles has decreased or decreased substantially in the category of trade/serious nonfiction (excluding regional titles). Two presses (2/22 or ~9%) reported that they do not publish trade/serious nonfiction (excluding regional titles).

Among the nine presses associated with privately supported universities, eight presses (8/9 or ~89%) reported that the number of new trade/serious nonfiction (excluding regional
titles) has increased or increased substantially. One press reported that new titles it had published in the category of trade/serious nonfiction (excluding regional titles) remained the same from 1993 to 1998. None of the presses said that the number of new titles in this category decreased. None of the presses in this category said that they do not publish these books.

**Question 25, Part C**

*Please indicate whether the number of new [scholarly monograph] titles your press has published during the time period (1993-1998) has changed.*

None of the presses said that the number of new scholarly monograph titles published during this time period had increased substantially (5).

Four presses said that their number of new monograph titles increased (4) from 1993 to 1998. Two presses were associated with privately supported universities and two with publicly supported universities. One press was large, two were medium, and one was small.
Seven presses reported that the number of new scholarly monograph titles their press published from 1993-1998 had remained the same (3). Three presses were large, two were medium, and two, small. Two presses were associated with privately supported universities and five were associated with publicly supported universities.

Fourteen presses said that the number of new monograph titles had decreased (2) during the time period 1993 to 1998. Four presses were large, eight presses were medium, and two were small. Four presses were associated with privately supported universities, and ten, with publicly supported universities.

Three presses said the number of new monograph titles had decreased substantially (1) between the years 1993-1998. One press was from a privately supported university, and two, from publicly supported universities. Two were medium, and one was small.

None of the presses said that they do not publish the scholarly monograph.

Discussion
Combining the number of presses that responded to question 25, part C, with "increased substantially" or "increased" gives four presses (~14%) out of twenty-eight that said the number of new monograph titles their presses published had increased during the time period 1993 to 1998. Seven presses (25%) said the number of new scholarly monograph titles they published had remained the same from 1993 to 1998. Combining the number of responses that selected "decreased" and "decreased substantially" gives seventeen presses (~61%) that said the number of new scholarly monograph titles that they published from 1993 to 1998 had decreased. None of the presses said that they do not publish the scholarly monograph.

Among the twenty-two presses associated with publicly supported universities, three presses' replies were not tabulated here (3/22 or ~14%), because either they replied with text, or format difficulties interfered with reading the reply. Two presses (2/22 or ~9%) said that the number of new titles of scholarly monographs had increased during the time period 1993 to 1998. Five presses (5/22 or ~23%) said that the number of new titles has remained the same from 1993 to 1998. Twelve presses (12/22 or ~55%) said
that the number of new scholarly monograph titles they published had decreased or decreased substantially.

Among the nine presses associated with privately supported universities, two presses (2/9 or ~22%) said that the number of new scholarly monograph titles published from 1993 to 1998 had increased. Two presses (2/9 or ~22%) said that the number of new scholarly monograph titles has remained the same over this time period. Five presses (5/9 or ~56%) said that the number of new scholarly monograph titles published over the time period 1993 to 1998 had declined.

**Question 25, Part D**

Please indicate whether the number of new [reference book] titles your press has published has changed during the time period 1993-1998.

None of the presses said that the number of new reference book titles increased substantially (5) during 1993-1998.

Six presses said the number of new reference book titles increased (4) during 1993-1998. Two of the presses were large, three were medium sized, and one was small. Four
presses were associated with privately supported universities and two, with publicly supported universities.

Nine presses said that the number of new reference titles remained the same (3) during this time period. Three presses were large, five were medium, and one was small. Three presses were associated with privately supported universities, and six, with publicly supported universities.

Two presses said that new reference titles decreased (2) during 1993-1998. One was large, and one was medium. Both were associated with a publicly supported university.

Two presses said new reference titles decreased substantially (1) from 1993-1998. One press was medium, and one was small; and both were associated with publicly supported universities.

Nine presses said they do not publish reference books. Two large presses, four medium sized, and three small presses fall into this group. Two presses were associated with privately supported universities, and the remaining seven, with publicly supported universities.
Discussion

Combining the two groups of replies “increased substantially” and “increased” shows six presses (~21%) out of twenty-eight presses that reported that the number of new reference work titles they published between 1993 and 1998 had increased. Nine presses (~32%) said the number of new reference titles remained the same from 1993 to 1998. Grouping the presses who replied either “decreased” or “decreased substantially” gives four presses (~14%) who said that the number of new reference work titles declined from 1993 to 1998. Of the twenty-eight presses who gave an answer to question 25, part D, nine presses (~32%) said they do not publish reference works.

Among the twenty-two presses associated with publicly supported universities, two (2/22 or ~9%) presses said that the number of new reference book titles increased from 1993 to 1998. Six presses (6/22 or ~27%) reported that new reference book titles they published had remained the same between 1993 and 1998. Four presses (4/22 or ~18%) said that the number of new reference titles published between 1993 and 1998 had declined. Seven presses (7/22 or ~32%) said that they did not publish reference titles.
Among the nine presses associated with privately supported universities, four (4/9 or ~44%) presses said that the number of new reference titles published had increased over the time period 1993 to 1998. Three presses (3/9 or ~33%) said that the number of new reference titles published had remained the same from 1993 to 1998. Two presses (2/9 or ~22%) said that they did not publish reference titles. No press reported that the number of new reference titles declined.

Question 25, Part E

Please indicate whether the number of new titles [that are translations into English (fiction)] on your list has changed during 1993-1998.

Among the twenty-eight presses that have replied to previous parts of question 25, one press did not supply an answer to question 25, part E. Furthermore, one press that did not supply answers for previous parts of question 25 did answer question 25, part E. Therefore, the total number of presses who replied to question 25, part E, is twenty-eight.
Seventeen presses said they do not publish (0) translations into English of fiction. Four presses were large, ten presses were medium, and three presses were large. Five presses were associated with privately supported universities, and twelve were associated with publicly supported universities.

One press reported that translations into English (fiction) have increased substantially during 1993-1998. This press was medium sized and associated with a publicly supported university. One of the presses said translations of fiction into English had increased (4).

Five presses said that translations of fiction into English had remained the same (3) from 1993-1998. One press was large, two were medium, and two were small. Three presses were associated with privately supported universities, and two, with publicly supported universities.

One press said translations of fiction into English had decreased (2) during the time period 1993-1998. This press was large and associated with a publicly supported university. Three presses said the translations had decreased substantially (1). One press was large, one
press was medium, and one, small. All three were associated with publicly supported universities.

Discussion

Grouping the presses who replied “increased substantially” or “increased” showed two presses (2/28 or ~7%) out of twenty-eight who said publication of translations into English of fiction increased during the time period 1993 to 1998. Five presses (~19%) said the number of new titles of translations into English of fiction had stayed the same from 1993 to 1998. Combining the responses of “decreased” and “decreased substantially” shows four presses (~15%) who said that the number of new titles of translations into English of fiction had declined during the period from 1993 to 1998. The remaining seventeen presses (~63%) reported that they do not publish translations into English of fiction.

Among the presses associated with publicly supported universities, twelve (12/22 or ~43%) said that they do not publish translations into English of fiction. Two presses (2/22 or ~9%) said that the number of new titles of translations into English of fiction had increased from 1993 to 1998. Two presses (2/22 or ~10%) said the number
of new titles of translations into English of fiction had remained the same. Four presses (4/22 or ~18%) said that the number of translations had declined from 1993 to 1998. Two presses provided responses to question 25, part E, that could not be coded.

Among the nine presses associated with privately supported universities, five presses (5/9 or ~55%) said that they do not publish translations of fiction into English. Three presses (3/9 or ~33%) said that the number of new titles of translations into English had remained the same from 1993 to 1998. One press did not reply to question 25, part E.
Question 25, Part F

Please indicate whether the number of new titles your press has published [of translations into English (nonfiction)] has changed during the time period 1993-1998.

Six presses of the twenty-eight said they do not publish (0) translations of nonfiction into English. Five presses were medium, and one was small. Five presses were associated with publicly supported universities, and one, with a privately supported university.

None of the twenty-eight presses said that translations into English (nonfiction) had increased substantially (5). One press said translations into English of nonfiction had increased (4). It was a medium sized press associated with a publicly supported university.

Sixteen presses out of twenty-eight said that translation into English of nonfiction had remained the same (3) during the time period 1993-1998. Six presses were large, six were medium, and four were small. Eight presses were associated with privately supported universities, and seven
presses were associated with publicly supported universities.

Three presses replied that translations of nonfiction into English had decreased (2). All three were associated with publicly supported universities. Two presses were large, and one was medium.

Two presses said the number of new titles of translations of nonfiction into English had decreased substantially (1). One was medium, and one was small. Both were associated with publicly supported universities.

Discussion
Grouping replies of “increased substantially” and “increased” shows one press (~4%) out of twenty-eight that said the number of new titles of translations of nonfiction into English has increased. Sixteen presses (~57%) reported that the number of new titles of nonfiction translated into English had remained the same over the time period 1993 to 1998. Grouping the presses who said “decreased” and “decreased substantially” shows five presses (~18%) that said the number of new titles of translations into English of nonfiction had declined during
the time period 1993 to 1998. Six presses (~21%) reported that they do not publish translations into English of nonfiction.

Among the twenty-two presses associated with publicly supported universities, five presses (5/22 or ~23%) said they do not publish nonfiction translations into English. One press (1/22 or ~5%) said that the number of new titles of translations into English of nonfiction had increased from 1993 to 1998. Eight presses (8/22 or ~36%) said that the number of new titles of nonfiction translation into English had remained the same from 1993 to 1998. Five presses said that the number of new titles of nonfiction translated into English has declined from 1993 to 1998. Two presses responded with text, and one press’ answers to all parts of question 25 were not usable because of difficulty with format when the survey was returned.

Among the nine presses associated with privately supported universities, one press (1/9 or ~11%) said it does not publish translations into English of nonfiction. The remaining eight presses (8/9 or ~89%) all said that the number of new titles of translations into English of nonfiction had remained the same from 1993 to 1998.
Question 25, Part G

Please indicate whether the number of new [textbook] titles your press has published has changed during the time period 1993-1998.

One press that did not reply to question 25, parts A-F, did reply to part G. Therefore, the total number of presses who replied to question 25, part G, is twenty-nine.

Four presses out of twenty-eight said they do not publish (0) textbooks. One press was large, two, medium, and one, small. One press was associated with a privately supported university and three, with publicly supported universities.

Two presses said new textbook titles had increased substantially (5) from 1993-1998. One press was medium, and one was small. One press was associated with a publicly supported university, and one, with a privately supported university.

Six presses out of twenty-eight said that the new titles they had published in the textbook category had increased (4). Of these six, two presses were large, three were
medium, and one, small. Four presses were associated with privately supported universities, and two presses were associated with publicly supported universities.

Fifteen presses out of twenty-eight said that the number of new titles they had published in the textbook category had remained the same (3) during the period 1993-1998. Twelve of these presses were associated with publicly supported universities, and three with privately supported universities. Five presses were large, seven presses were medium, and three presses were small.

None of the presses said that the number of new titles their press had published in the textbook category has decreased (2) during the time period 1993-1998.

Two presses said the number of new titles in the textbook category they had published during 1993-1998 had decreased substantially (1). One press was large, and one was medium. Both presses were associated with publicly supported universities.

Discussion
Grouping those presses who replied with “increased” or “increased substantially” shows eight presses (~28%) of twenty-nine presses that said that the number of new textbook titles they had published from 1993 to 1998 had increased. Fifteen presses (~52%) reported that the number of new textbook titles they published from 1993 to 1998 had remained the same. Combining the replies of “decreased” and “decreased substantially” shows two presses (~7%) that reported that the number of new textbook titles they published had declined between 1993 and 1998. Four presses (~14%) reported that they do not publish textbooks.

Among the twenty-two presses associated with publicly supported universities, three presses (3/22 or ~14%) said they do not publish textbooks. Three presses (3/22 or ~14%) said the number of new textbook titles has increased from 1993 to 1998. Twelve presses (12/22 or ~55%) said the number of new titles of textbooks had remained the same over the period 1993 to 1998. Two presses (2/22 or ~9%) said the number of new textbook titles decreased over this time period. Two presses gave replies that could not be coded for this analysis.
Among the nine presses associated with privately supported universities, five presses (5/9 or ~56%) said that the number of new textbook titles they published from 1993 to 1998 had increased. Three presses (3/9 or ~33%) said that the number of new textbook titles they published had remained the same from 1993 to 1998. One press said it does not publish textbooks.

Question 25, Part H

Please indicate whether the number of new titles your press has published in the category of [journals] has changed during the time period 1993-1998.

Thirteen presses out of twenty-eight said that they do not publish (0) journals. Three presses were large, seven were medium, and three were small. Three were associated with privately supported universities, and ten, with publicly supported universities.

None of the twenty-eight presses said the number of new journals their press has published has increased substantially (5) during 1993-1998. Six presses said the number of new journals titles their press has published during 1993-1998 has increased (4). Three presses were
large, one was medium, and two were small. Three presses were associated with privately supported universities, and three were associated with publicly supported universities.

Six presses said the number of new journal titles they published during 1993-1998 had remained the same (3). One press was large, four were medium, and one was small. Two presses were associated with privately supported universities, and four were associated with publicly supported universities.

Two presses said the number of new titles in the category of journal decreased (4). One press was large, and one was medium. Both presses were associated with publicly supported universities. One press said the number of new titles in the category of journals decreased substantially (1). It was a medium sized press associated with a publicly supported university.

Discussion
Grouping replies of “increased substantially” and “increased” shows six presses (~21%) out of twenty-eight that said the number of new journal titles they published from 1993 to 1998 had increased. Six presses (~21%) said
the number of new journal titles they published stayed the same from 1993 to 1998. Grouping the replies of "decreased" and "decreased substantially" shows three presses (~11%) that said that the number of new journal titles they published from 1993 to 1998 had declined. Thirteen presses (~46%) said they do not publish journals.

Among the nine presses associated with privately supported universities, three presses (3/9 or ~33%) said that the number of new journal titles increased from 1993 to 1998. Two presses (2/9 or ~22) said this number remained the same, and one press (1/9 or ~11%) said the number of new journal titles declined from 1993 to 1998. Three presses said they do not publish journals.

Among the twenty-two presses associated with publicly supported universities, ten presses (10/22 or ~45%) said they do not publish journals. Three presses (3/22 or ~14%) reported that the number of new journal titles increased from 1993 to 1998. Four presses (4/22 or ~18%) said the number has remained the same from 1993 to 1998. Two presses (2/22 or ~9%) said that the number of new journal titles declined from 1993 to 1998. Three presses’ replies could not be coded for use in this comparison.
Question 25, Part I

Please indicate whether the number of new titles your press has published in the category of fiction and poetry has changed during 1993-1998.

One additional press replied to question 25, part I, raising the total number of responses to question 25, part I, to 29. One press did not supply an answer to question 25, part I. Ten presses out of twenty-nine said they do not publish fiction and poetry. Two presses were large, five were medium, and three were small. Four of the ten presses were associated with privately supported universities, and the remaining six, with publicly supported universities.

None of the presses said the number of new titles they published had increased substantially (5) during 1993-1998. Eight presses said the number of new titles they published had increased (4). Four presses were large, and four were medium. Six presses were associated with publicly supported universities, and two, with privately supported universities.
Nine presses said the number of new titles they had published in fiction and poetry had remained the same (3) during the time period 1993 to 1998. One press was large, five were medium, and three were small. Seven presses were associated with publicly supported universities, and two with privately supported universities. None of the presses said publishing of new poetry and fiction has decreased (2) during 1993 to 1998. One press said that publication of new titles in fiction and poetry during 1993 to 1998 decreased substantially (1). It was medium sized and was associated with a publicly supported university.

Discussion

Grouping the replies of “increased substantially” and “increased” gives eight presses (~28%) out of twenty-nine presses that reported that the number of new fiction and poetry titles they published from 1993 to 1998 had increased. Nine presses (~31%) said the number of new fiction and poetry titles published during the time period 1993 to 1998 had remained the same. Grouping the replies of “decreased” and “decreased substantially” shows that one press (~3%) said that publication of new titles of fiction and poetry had declined. Ten presses (~34%) said they do
not publish fiction and poetry, and one press did not answer question 25, part I.

Of the twenty-two presses associated with publicly supported universities, six presses (6/22 or ~27%) said they do not publish fiction and poetry. Six presses (6/22 or ~27%) said that the number of new fiction and poetry titles had increased from 1993 to 1998. Seven presses (7/22 or ~32%) reported that the number of new titles had remained the same in fiction and poetry from 1993 to 1998. One press (1/22 or ~5%) said the number of new titles decreased from 1993 to 1998 among fiction and poetry.

Of the nine presses associated with privately supported universities, four presses (4/9 or ~44%) said they do not publish fiction and poetry. Two presses (2/9 or ~22%) said the number of new titles of fiction and poetry increased from 1993 to 1998. Two presses (2/9 or ~22%) said the number of new titles remained the same for fiction and poetry from 1993 to 1998. One press among the nine did not reply to question 25, part I.

Question 25, Part J
Please indicate whether the [total number of new titles published] has changed between 1993 and 1998.

Sixteen presses responded to question 25, part J. Fourteen presses gave responses that could not be coded, such as the number of new titles published per year, or number of new titles published from 1993 to 1998. One press did not supply an answer for question 25, part J.

Four presses of the sixteen said that total number of new titles published had increased substantially (5) from 1993 to 1998. One press was large, two were medium, and one was small. Two presses were associated with privately supported universities, and two, with publicly supported universities.

Nine presses reported that the total number of new titles they published from 1993 to 1998 increased (4). Two were large, six were medium, and one was small. Two presses were associated with privately supported universities, and seven, with publicly supported universities.

Three presses said the total number of new titles they published remained the same (3) between 1993 and 1998. One
press was large, one was medium, and one was small. Two presses were associated with publicly supported universities, and one was associated with a privately supported university. None of the presses said the total number of new titles published from 1993 to 1998 decreased (2). None of the presses said the total number of new titles published from 1993 to 1998 decreased substantially (1).

Discussion
Combining the answers of "increased substantially" and "increased" gives thirteen presses that said that the total number of new titles they published had increased from 1993 to 1998. Three presses said the total number of new titles they published remained the same. One of the three presses that said the number remained the same indicated that the total number of new titles published might have declined slightly. None of the presses said that the total number of new titles decreased.

Two presses replied with text to Question 25. One reply indicated that changes in subject areas, rather than in types of book, are occurring on publishers' lists. And, one press observed the increasing popularity of publishing
of books that will be used in college courses, reinforcing replies to question 7 on this survey.
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION / CONCLUSIONS

The original research questions that began this inquiry were, “How are university presses coping with reduced demand for scholarly monographs, fewer sales to the academic research libraries (their major customers), reduced financial support from their parent universities, and difficulties obtaining subventions for titles and special projects? Are presses publishing fewer monographic titles, are they doing shorter print runs of monographic titles, or are they publishing a broader variety of types of books, hoping to bring in needed revenue?” An implied concern was, “Will university presses’ commitment to publishing scholarship weaken, if they expand the types of books they publish in order to remain financially viable?” This research instrument, the survey, attempted to measure attitudes and trends in publishing of scholarship by university presses. It hoped to find associations between some of replies and size of press; also between whether a press was associated with a privately or publicly supported
university. Another research question was, “Is regional publishing increasing at university presses?” Many presses, in particular those associated with publicly supported universities, have traditionally published regional works. Presses associated with publicly supported universities have a mandate to the people of their region to publish books that will improve the quality of life in their region. Thus, some presses have developed particular strengths in regional publishing. This survey attempts to investigate whether presses might be publishing more regional titles, because regional titles sell reliably.

Justification for investigating monographic and regional publishing trends is supported by examining the percentage of presses’ front lists that comprise both monographic and regional books. Twenty-four presses (24/31 or ~77%) said monographs plus regional titles comprised between 50% and 100% of their front lists. Seven presses (7/31 or ~23%) out of 31 said monographic plus regional titles were less than 50%. This data show that these two types of titles make up the majority of books on presses’ front lists.

This project also attempted to report whether and in what ways presses’ changed their acquisition strategies over the
time period 1993 to 1998. Twenty-five presses said that they did change their acquisition strategy from 1993 to 1998. All of the small presses in this survey (6) said they had changed their acquisition policy; 13 of the 16 medium sized presses replied they had changed their acquisition policy; and 6 of the 9 large presses in this survey said they had changed their policy. Only 6 presses said they have not changed their acquisition strategy (in response to question 22).

Replies to question 25 provide evidence that university presses published a different mix of titles in 1998 than they did in 1993. The change was not due solely to increases in the overall number of titles published, but was likely the result of new acquisition policies, adopted since 1993. New acquisition policies may have been seen as advantageous because of changes in the economy, such as the recent availability of serious nonfiction, formerly published by small, independent publishing houses; changes in the world’s markets and communications structures, bringing overseas publishing and selling opportunities for presses; the changing ethnic mix of the population of the United States, providing locally-based writers of languages other than English; the increasing prominence of Latin and
South American literature; and opportunities newly available through electronic commerce. Unfortunately, the survey instrument does not ask presses why they changed their acquisition practices. Information from such an open ended question could complement the data reported herein. The assumption has been made throughout this research project that revenue has decreased because monograph sales have decreased, motivating presses to change their acquisition policies. This assumption has not been challenged in this report. Neither has it been confirmed. Some economic problems for presses are not caused by decline in monographic sales. Adapting to new economic conditions may be a frequent situation for businesses, even not-for-profit organizations, such as university presses.

When asked to identify their major customer(s), presses reported an awareness of the purchasers of the scholarly monograph (Question 8). Seventeen presses, however, did not respond to the follow-up Question 9, "Has your main customer (above) purchased a (greater, smaller, the same) number of copies of monographs during the period 1993 to 1998?" Such a large group of non-respondents may indicate that presses do not know the necessary information to answer this question. Presses may rely on distributors to
undertake many of their sales-related activities, such as order fulfillment, distribution, and collection of payment. Presses may be able to use sales information, however, if it were available to them. Increasingly, presses have implemented aggressive marketing strategies. Electronic information systems could help presses to gather and analyze information about their markets, giving presses more demographic information about who buys their monographs. This information could benefit the marketing and publicity functions increasingly used by university presses to reach their intended audiences.

Almost three-quarters of the presses said they expect monograph sales to continue for three to five years. An investigation into whether the time span has decreased in recent years, or whether the number of years is related to subject area or discipline, could be investigated. The more information that is sales-related, the more effectively university presses can anticipate revenue. The majority of sales may occur within three to five years, but the monograph may continue to sell at a greatly reduced rate for many years. Backlist sales, a strong component of any publishers’ revenues, is a major component of university presses’ revenues.
One clear finding was that twenty-seven out of thirty-one presses do regional publishing. Twenty-two were associated with publicly supported universities, not unexpectedly, because state supported universities have a long-standing tradition of publishing regional works. The four presses out of thirty-one who do not do regional publishing were all associated with privately supported universities.

Sales of a regional book, or of a monograph, vary with cultural circumstances. A book published in the past may acquire new relevance in light of contemporary political events. Timing plays a part in how well books sell, and editors consider seasons and political events in their decisions of when to publish a book. Trade books, such as books about sports, gardening, hobbies, politics, or any other topic that has a strong seasonal association, will be published at a time that will maximize its sales.

According to over half of all survey respondents, the percentage of sales from regional books has either increased or remained the same. When asked whether their press planned to expand its regional publishing program, over half of respondents said “yes.”
Nearly three-quarters of presses said they had noticed an increase in interdisciplinary books submitted for publication. Most presses (~84%) said they publish the midlist books that are no longer published by independent commercial publishers.

Finally, over half of the respondents said that sales from their book and journal programs are expected to supply all, or nearly all, of their overall budget. One-third of respondents said sales made up at least three-quarters of their budget.

This research project attempted to describe university press publishing by identifying strengths, such as regional programs; asking about unknowns, such as the possibility of putting books into electronic format; and by assessing the strength of the scholarly monograph publishing programs. All university presses publish scholarly monographs. Presses seem knowledgeable about their market. As partial explanation for university presses’ situation, changes may be happening too fast for university presses to keep track of, and in that respect, they are not so different from other segments of society. The presses seem to be rallying
to maintain their niche as scholarly publishers of the highest quality.
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SURVEY

SPECIALIZED SCHOLARLY MONOGRAPH

1. When your university press decides to publish a book, how important is each of the following considerations? (1=very unimportant  2=unimportant  3=neutral  4=important  5=very important)

_______ supporting the academic tenure system by serving as the primary publishing outlet for the first-time author who needs to publish his/her scholarly monograph in order to be evaluated to receive tenure or promotion.

_______ keeping the scholarly canons strong in the subject areas in which the press publishes.

_______ serving as society's primary gateway to new knowledge by disseminating scholarship.

_______ maintaining your reputation.

_______ remaining financially viable.

_______ ensuring that the specialized scholarly monographs continue to be published.

2. Does your press wait for submissions of manuscripts or do you actively pursue them?

3. If a manuscript is very good, but it has a very small projected audience, would your press publish it nevertheless?  

________YES  ________MAYBE  ________NO

4. Does your university press have a "cut off point", such as if a monograph is projected to sell fewer than 500 copies, at which your press will not accept it for publication?

________ YES  ________ NO
If yes, what is that number? ________

5. What percentage of your current list (front list) is scholarly monographs? ________

6. On average, how many copies of a scholarly monograph does your press expect to sell? _______

Over how many years is a monograph projected to sell? ________

7. What factors determine whether a second print run is done?

8. To whom do you sell the most scholarly monograph titles?

    _______ Research university libraries
    _______ Liberal arts college libraries
    _______ Individual scholars in the monograph’s subject area
    _______ Independent book store customers
    _______ Large chain book store customers
    _______ Student (on-campus) book stores
    _______ Orders placed at conferences
    _______ Public
    _______ Other

9. Has your main customer (above) purchased a (greater, smaller, the same) number of copies of monographs during the period 1993-1998?

REGIONAL PUBLISHING

10. Does your press do regional publishing? ____YES
    ____NO

11. What is your press’ region?
12. What is an average print run for a regional book?

    ________________

13. What factors determine whether a second print run is done?

14. Are regional books published in paperback or cloth cover or both?  __________

15. What percentage of your current list (front list) is regional titles? __________

16. What percentage of sales comes from regional books?__________

17. Has the percentage of sales from regional books (increased, decreased, or remained the same) during the period 1993-1998?

18. Is your press planning to expand its regional publishing program?  ____YES  ____NO

GENERAL QUESTIONS

19. Has your press noticed an increase in interdisciplinary books submitted for publication?

    _______ YES  _______ NO

20. Does your university press publish the midlist books that are no longer published by independent commercial publishers?  _______ YES  _______ NO

21. On average, how many copies of a midlist book does your press expect to sell? __________

22. Has your university press intentionally changed the composition of its list (its acquisition policy) during the years 1993-1998?  _______ YES  _______ NO

23. Is your press considering putting select books into electronic (or e-book) format?
______YES______ NO  If yes, what types of books?

24. Approximately what percentage of your overall budget is supplied by your book and journal sales? ________

25. Please indicate whether the number of new titles your press has published in each of the following categories has changed during the time period (1993-1998).
   (5=increased substantially  4=increased   3=stayed the same   2=decreased   1=decreased substantially   0=not published).

   Regional titles ________
   Trade/serious nonfiction (excluding regional titles) ________
   Scholarly monograph ________
   Reference books ________
   Translations into English (fiction) ________
   Translations into English (nonfiction) ________
   Textbooks__________
   Journals ________
   Fiction and poetry ________
   Total number of new titles published ________

Thank you very much.
Appendix B

Consent Form
Relating to the research questionnaire conducted by
Lisa Greenbaum
A candidate for the Master of Science in Library Science degree
School of Information and Library Science
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
For her Master’s Paper that carries the working title
Scholarly monographs, regional books and non-scholarly books

As a respondent to the questionnaire, you should understand that:

The results of Ms. Greenbaum’s survey will be used in the Master’s Paper that she proposes to write, which will be based on the research that she is conducting on university press publishing during the time period 1993-1998;

In gathering data for her paper, Ms. Greenbaum will rely on the cooperation of 73 university presses in the United States, including Puerto Rico;

The results of Ms. Greenbaum’s findings will be compiled in the form of a Master’s Paper, which will contain a review of library literature on the subject of university press publishing in the United States, as well as a discussion of findings (which may take the form of patterns) that are reflected in the survey responses;

There will be no costs whatsoever to those being interviewed;

Participation in the survey is strictly voluntary, and the findings resulting from the survey will be reported in the Master’s Paper in such a way that the participating institutions’ identities and the individuals being interviewed will remain anonymous. The data collected will remain confidential, but Ms. Greenbaum’s completed work will be available to anyone who wishes to borrow the Master’s Paper from the School of Information and Library Science of the University Library;

The faculty advisor for this project is Dr. Helen Tibbo, who may be reached at her office (919-962-8063) if there are any questions that you might have about this project. Ms. Greenbaum may be reached at (919) 419-1712.

If necessary, The UNC Academic Affairs-Institutional Review Board may be contacted, if you feel your rights have been violated. The contact is: Academic Affairs Institutional
Review Board, David A. Eckerman, (Chair), CB#4100, 201 Bynum Hall, UNC-Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC  27599-4100 (919-962-7761), aa-irb@unc.edu.

I have read the text above and understand the conditions outlined therein.
June 21, 1999

Theresa May
Assistant Director & Executive Editor
University of Texas Press
P.O. Box 7819
Austin, TX

Dear Ms. May,

I am a graduate student in the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. I am writing my master’s paper on university press publishing during the time period 1993-1998. In particular, I am gathering information about changes in scholarly and regional publishing, because I believe this information will interest prospective authors, publishers and librarians.

For this research project and paper I am hoping to collect data from 73 university presses, and I would like to include your press. My criteria for inclusion of a press in the survey group follow. The university press must be a full member of the American Association of University Presses (AAUP), the press must have been a full member of AAUP since 1993, the press is located in the United States of America, including Puerto Rico, and the press is affiliated with a university.

In order to gather relevant data, I have designed a survey that has 25 questions. The survey accompanies this letter. The survey should take no more than 20 minutes of your time. I would be very grateful if you would take the time to complete the survey and return it to me in the enclosed envelope. You are free to skip over any question that is not applicable to your press, or that you would rather not answer for any reason. Responses to the survey will be kept confidential and anonymous; at no time will individual university presses be specifically tied to individual responses, and only my advisor and I will have access to the “raw” survey information. Demographic information will be examined only in an aggregate way. If you would like further information or clarification, please feel free to contact me or my advisor, Helen Tibbo (919-962-8063), at any time. This study has been approved by the
UNC Academic Affairs-Institutional Review Board, which may be contacted at (919) 962-7761. The chair of the Board is David A. Eckerman.

In compliance with guidelines mandated by UNC’s Office of Research Services, I must ask that you read the enclosed consent form. This form makes clear the intentions of my research and verifies subjects’ willingness to participate in a study such as this one. Your completion and return of the survey indicates your willingness to participate.

I look forward to receiving the completed survey from your press. I will be glad to share the results of my research with you.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and support of my research.

Sincerely,

Lisa Greenbaum

Enclosures (2)

2219 Alpine Road  
Durham, North Carolina USA  27707  
Telephone:  (919) 419-1712
LIST OF PRESSES TO WHOM SURVEY WAS SENT

University of Alabama Press
University of Arizona Press
University of Arkansas Press
University of California Press
Catholic University of America Press
University of Chicago Press
Columbia University Press
Cornell University Press
Duke University Press
University Press of Florida
Fordham University Press
Georgetown University Press
University of Georgia Press
Harvard University Press
University of Hawai'i Press
Howard University Press
University of Idaho Press
University of Illinois Press
Indiana University Press
University of Iowa Press
The Iowa State University Press
Johns Hopkins University Press
University Press of Kansas
Kent State University Press
University Press of Kentucky
Louisiana State University Press
University of Massachusetts Press
The MIT Press
University of Michigan Press
Michigan State University Press
University of Minnesota Press
University Press of Mississippi
University of Missouri Press
Naval Institute Press
University of Nebraska Press
University of Nevada Press
University Press of New England
University of New Mexico Press
New York University Press
University of North Carolina Press
Northeastern University Press
Northern Illinois University Press
Northwestern University Press
University of Notre Dame Press
Ohio University Press
Ohio State University Press
University of Oklahoma Press
University of Pennsylvania Press
Pennsylvania State University Press
University of Pittsburgh Press
Princeton University Press
University of Puerto Rico Press
Purdue University Press
Rutgers University Press
University of South Carolina Press
Southern Illinois University Press
Stanford University Press
State University of New York Press
Syracuse University Press
Teachers College Press
Temple University Press
University of Tennessee Press
University of Texas Press
Texas A & M Press
Texas Tech University Press
Texas Western Press
University of Utah Press
University Press of Virginia
University of Washington Press
Wayne State University Press
University of Wisconsin Press
Yale University Press