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The problem of this study was subsidy ("vanity") publishing among college and university faculty. The purpose of the study was to estimate the extent to which postsecondary faculty use subsidy presses for the publication of their scholarly writings and the professional reasons for which academicians choose these presses to publish their works, viz., tenure, promotion, or salary increase. An additional purpose was to compare the subsidy publication experiences of faculty according to the types of institutions which employ them.

The study involved 11 national subsidy publishers and 1,124 subsidy-published authors throughout the United States. Subsidy-published authors were identified occupationally as faculty by their appearance in the 1990 edition of *The National Faculty Directory*. The subjects in this study consisted of (a) faculty members listed in *The National Faculty Directory, 1990* who are (b) known to have used subsidy presses for publishing their writings. A major finding of the study was that the proportion of vanity-published authors who are college and university faculty was small.

Twenty-seven percent of the faculty whose books had been published by subsidy presses indicated that they had written and published in order to earn
salary increases. Another 23% indicated that they had their books published to obtain promotions. Seventeen percent had their books published for the purpose of gaining tenure. Finally, one-third of the faculty surveyed identified miscellaneous other reasons for publishing their books through subsidy presses.

More than two-thirds of the faculty who had used vanity presses (69%) claimed that their subsidy-published books had been effective in helping them achieve their purposes for publishing. Thirty percent judged their subsidy-produced books as ineffective. The majority of the subsidy-published faculty in the study were employed either by research universities or community/junior colleges. Only 26% of those surveyed indicated that they would choose a subsidy publisher if they had it to do again.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The increasing demand for scholars and faculty in higher education to publish is associated with an increase in questionable practices among certain publishers. Aspiring authors believe their literary works have the potential to be read and enjoyed by many if the academic community is adequately informed by their publications.

In recent years a number of publishing houses have arisen which publish books on a subsidy basis. These publishers, as they call themselves, state that they will share the expenses of publication with authors, that many copies of the published works will be sold, that royalties will be paid, and that the authors will make a profit. Goodman (1971) noted that competition has become so intense for subsidy publications that the companies are pursuing authors through the use of aggressive advertising and attractive catalogs.

According to Donald MacCampbell (1979), a veteran literary agent, "A vanity publisher will print almost everything you want to put on paper and for a price. The come-on advertisements that appear in newspapers and magazines offer false hopes to writers naive enough to believe a publisher has to go out looking for material" (p. 39).
Publishing today is a complex and precarious business. Manufacturing costs have risen to such a level that many publishers reject would-be authors who do not have established reputations in their fields. Today's trend is toward best-sellers and "big name" authors.

According to Corwen (1977), the publishing business is unique in many ways. It promotes education by providing the means of learning for present and future generations. The publishing business is an interesting industry which is subject to the economic vagaries that affect all major industries.

Publishers typically list their titles in widely distributed catalogs. Close examination of these catalogs can assist authors in selecting suitable publishers. Most publishers furnish copies of their catalogs upon request.

According to Reynolds (1970), "there is one group of firms who insist that the author finance the printing of his book. These firms are called vanity publishers" (p. 6). "Vanity" publishing is to legitimate publishing what loan sharking is to banking, with many claims and promises made to the authors. According to one report (National Writer's Club [NWC], 1989a), "vanity" publishers purport to be legitimate publishers, offer royalties, a promotional program, send books to reviewers, and imply to authors that they will recover their investments through the royalties they receive.

When it comes to "vanity" publishing, one fact remains, viz., authors pay twice to have their writings published, once at contract time and again when authors purchase copies of their own works. Once this fact is understood, the
goal of "vanity" publishing is comprehensible. According to Richardson (1977), "sales rarely occur, except for a few copies purchased by friends" (p. 45). According to another report (NWC, 1989b) "a vanity press has little or no incentive for seeing that a book sells, because the vanity house makes its money directly from the author often before the book is galleyed or even printed" (p. 46). This leads to the question: Why do some faculty choose subsidy presses to publish their books despite the poor reputations of vanity presses?

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study concerned "vanity" publishing among American college and university faculty.

Purposes of the Study

The primary purposes of this exploratory study were: (a) to estimate the extent to which postsecondary faculty use subsidy presses to publish their scholarly writings; (b) to ascertain the professional reasons for which academicians choose these presses to publish their works; and (c) to compare the subsidy publication practices of faculty according to the types of institutions which employ them.
Significance of the Study

This exploratory study is significant because it provides estimates on the extent to which college and university faculty make use of vanity presses for the publication of their literary works. The study also sheds light on their motives for allowing subsidy presses to publish their works.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for use in this study:

**Custom publisher.** A publisher, normally a typical trade publisher, who acquires, develops, and publishes materials primarily designed to serve the specialized needs of a local market. The costs of publishing books are not borne by the authors.

**Subsidy press.** A printer who masquerades as a publisher and who publishes books at the expense of authors.

**University press.** A university-based publisher who publishes refereed "thin-market" books at the expense of the publisher.

**Small press.** A minor, small-scale publisher who publishes books, fiction, non-fiction, scholarly, and/or non-scholarly, at the expense of the publisher.

**National Faculty Directory, 1990, 20th edition.** A publication which includes an alphabetical list, with addresses, of approximately 588,000 members.
of teaching faculties at colleges and universities in the United States and selected Canadian institutions.

**Self-publishing.** Publishing by the authors themselves. In effect, the authors enter the publishing business to produce and market their own books.

**Basic Assumptions of the Study**

It was assumed that faculty members who use vanity presses to publish their scholarly writings responded honestly to the instrument used in the study. It was further assumed that faculty who have used subsidy presses are listed in *The National Faculty Directory, 1990*.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were addressed with regard to the subjects in the study:

1. What proportion of authors who have had their works published by vanity presses are college and university faculty?

2. Of those faculty who have published their scholarly writings with vanity presses, how many used these publications to gain tenure?

3. Of those faculty who have published their scholarly writings with vanity presses, how many used these publications to obtain promotion?

4. Of those faculty who have published their scholarly writings with vanity presses, how many used these publications to obtain merit salary increases?
5. For what other possible reasons do postsecondary faculty choose "vanity" publishers?

6. Do faculty who publish with "vanity" presses differ according to the types of institutions employing them?

Summary

An increase in the demand for faculty members in colleges and universities to publish scholarly writings in recent years is associated with an increase in the number of publishing firms with questionable practices. Because of the absence of readily available information on this subject, a study to determine the extent to which such presses are used by postsecondary faculty in colleges and universities in the United States, the reasons for which academicians choose these presses, and a comparison of publication activities according to institutional classification, seemed warranted.

This chapter explains the need for such a study, defines terms used, states basic assumptions, and delineates the research questions which directed the study.
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CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Reynolds (1970) has identified three main reasons why academicians seek to have their works published. "The first is the need for ego gratification, the necessity to influence others and to establish a reputation. The second is the need for job security. The third is for financial return" (p. 94).

The faculty member who must publish to be promoted is essentially attempting to influence a small group of faculty such as a personnel affairs committee. If authors wish to contribute to their professions, they must locate publishers who best reach the desired audience. If they seek tenure and promotions, then the effort must be to identify academically acceptable publishers. If financial return is the primary goal, aspiring authors must determine the payment policies of various publishers and find the best way to get published.

The increasing number of academicians seeking publishers for their scholarly works, and the truth about "vanity" publishers and their works, make this study important. Although there have been some reports and articles
written about "vanity" publishers, exploratory research into scholarly writing and publishing has not been conducted among subsidy publishers.

Related Literature

Fuller (1976) stated, "we have wondered for some time about that strange group of printers known as vanity publishers. Their practices have brought them severe censorship in recent years, and their advertisements are barred from these and other literary columns" (p. 8).

In 1988 Pave reported that "for about $5,000 you get 500 copies of a 32-page book (standard for poetry). Spend upwards of $50,000 and you get 5,000 copies with color photos and fancy jacket" (p. 166).

Henderson (1973) stated that the idea of a publisher sharing the costs with an author is acceptable, but for a publisher to entice an author into a lucrative contract by using tactics which are unethical, if not illegal, is a questionable practice. Fuller (1976) added,

vanity publishers continue to separate unsuspecting authors from thousands of dollars each year. The writer ends up with a cellar full of worthless books, and a highly condensed bank account, and all of this is the result of a thoroughly slick and convincing con job on the part of "vanity" publishers . . . a job that builds the ego only of the writer to cloud seven as it pulls the wallet out of his pocket in one swift motion. (p. 9)

How to select a publisher is an important question for every faculty member. There seems to be no fool proof way of determining which is the "right" and "best" publisher for one's particular professional needs. According
to Henderson (1973), "one can only dodge the fly-by-night houses, those firms with limited capital to promote a book and insufficient know-how to sell it" (p. 17). These are usually small companies. The writer should, if possible, select a publisher who has the ability and resources to do an adequate job. Henderson warns that those who use "'vanity' presses to publish their works, ... [should] expect a microscopic return, ... usually less than 5% of the investment, because the books these sharks [print] are not sold, ... the 'vanity' publishers have little organization for selling books" (p. 19).

Some authors think that their only two options for publication are commercial houses (i.e., McGraw-Hill, Burgess, Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, or Harper and Row) and "vanity" publishers (such as Vantage, Carlton, Exposition, or Dorrance). However, the old traditions of self-publishing and author's "co-ops" have been ignored for a long time. "Vanity" publishers play a major role in ignoring these old traditions because they prefer that writers be exploited for their profit.

Richardson (1977) noted that,

Most writers have a low opinion of using subsidy or vanity publishing, and they rank it last among the six major types of publishing presses which are currently used. These six publishing presses are: trade press, university press, small press, author's co-op, self-publishing, and subsidy press. (p. 47)

Ghigna (cited by Richardson, 1977) is one of a number of authors who are disenchanted with subsidy presses. He stated that "subsidy houses are like rich churches where poorer members tithe in hopes of reserving a place in
heaven" (p. 45). In spite of all the pitfalls of using subsidy houses and their bad reputations, Kuo (cited by Richardson, 1977) stated, "in the last analysis, I'm more pleased with my subsidy publishing experience than with my small press experience" (p. 46). In the same issue of *Writer's Digest*, Ammons (cited by Richardson, 1977) stated that the production quality of his subsidy book pleased him and he is proud of the book. The question for those few satisfied authors is whether the books achieved for the authors the purposes they had in mind when writing them.

Although Richardson (1977) lists some advantages of using subsidy presses along with his previous criticisms, this does not mean that he encourages the use of this particular type of press. The possible advantages given by Richardson include the following:

1. "Vanity" press books are usually bigger and better produced than those of small presses and are most often hard cover. Also, the quality of the printing is excellent.

2. There is little chance of a manuscript being rejected, because subsidy publishers believe that the cost can not be estimated without it. While a trade publisher usually wants to see only a summary or sample, the subsidy publisher wants the whole manuscript at one time.

3. Subsidy publishers work fast. A trade publisher or small press editor may hold a manuscript in production for more than a year.
4. Bookkeeping, promotions, distribution, and royalty payments, though rarely used to the fullest, are nonetheless available. Advertisements can be purchased, and flyers can be mailed.

5. Royalties are an impressive 40% typically on the first printing of subsidy books, contrasted with a 12% or 15% royalty from a trade publisher's book or payment in free copies of the book.

6. Royalties are usually tax free until the original investment is regained. In some cases, losses may be deductible.

If these advantages actually exist with subsidy presses, why then are there so many complaints? Morris (1974) has a different point of view from Richardson concerning subsidy publishing. He lists no advantages for subsidy publishing. Morris stated, "it is here that 'vanity' or subsidy publishing cannot do your book much good. In fact, their reputation alone as printers of trash would probably kill it" (p. 421). He classifies subsidy publishing according to three distinct forms: classic "vanity" publishing, private presses, and university presses. Each genre has its own shortcomings.

Subsidy presses thrive on the same promises of sales as do other publishers, but at a much greater financial cost to the author. For beginners the fantasy of sales is stronger, and publisher advertisements can be irresistible.

Besides placing "tombstone" advertisements with newspapers such as the New York Times and other magazines, subsidy publishers do not market their
services in person through company salespersons. An announcement is published in a local paper stating that representatives of a large publishing firm will be available for interviews with prospective authors on a particular date at a particular location. Appointments are made by mail or telephone and prospective authors wait eagerly for their "big chance." Only clearly libelous manuscripts are rejected by subsidy publishers.

There seems to be a widespread feeling among writers that subsidy presses mislead authors. This feeling is due, in part, to the fact that their advertisements often have a positive sound and fail to specify the expense and risks of publishing or the bleak prospects for sales. This raises the question: Can the subsidy presses be faulted with anything more substantial?

Reasons for Subsidy Publishing

A January, 1975 article in Writer's Digest (Methieu) suggests the following reasons for paying to have a book published, provided the author can afford the investment:

1. An author wants to surprise his friends at Christmas time with a gift of his own book of verses.

2. An author has worked long and hard on a book and can not get anyone to take it seriously enough to publish.

3. A businessman by trade and a philosopher by yearning feels that publication will help him and his business.
4. An author, in a small town, has been looked down on and, in general, "pushed around" by local people. Everything in this author's thinking demands that he give them their comeuppance—which the publication of his book may accomplish.

These reasons for publishing, though not with vanity presses, differ somewhat from those cited by Lumsden (personal communication, October 1989), Professor of Higher Education at the University of North Texas. In his opinion, most scholars publish to disseminate knowledge, gain tenure, obtain promotion, or earn salary increases. An additional, excellent reason for not paying to have a book published is to profit monetarily.

Financially speaking, most books manufactured by subsidy publishers generally do not return the author's investment. This is due to the fact that a subsidy publisher issues a book only if the author pays in advance. The subsidy publisher makes a profit whether or not a single copy sells.

Commercial bookstores as a matter of course refuse to stock, much less display, books published by subsidy publishers. Neither do scholarly journals publish reviews of books published by "vanity" presses. Consequently, authors who want and need to develop national reputations as scholars and researchers will understandably avoid subsidy publishers.

According to Hughes (1979),

... if vanity should enter the writing process, it should not play any part in publication. In writing, your opinion of yourself matters a great deal. But in the acceptance of what you do, the opinions of others matters
more. In fact, it is the only opinion worth having. It is something that can only be given freely; it cannot be bought. Publishing, whether in newspapers, magazines, or books, is the only remaining republic of merit. I am here and have created such and so. The editor is out there and will judge my work with relentless objectivity. This is the professional way of things; this is the very integrity of letters.

What is chiefly wrong with vanity publishing (i.e., paying to appear in print) is that it means publication—of a sort—without benefit of objective judgment. You pay your money and you get—nothing. Vanity houses promise you a 40 percent royalty, as opposed to the usual 10 percent. But anyone can see the advantage of having 10 percent of someone else’s money over 40 percent of your own, because they are—with rare exceptions—not bought. They are not bought because they are not reviewed. No reviewer in his or her right mind would request them, so the publishers send review copies out completely at random—right into oblivion. For around four thousand dollars, one of these slim, amateurishly dust-jacketed, badly bound volumes of butcher’s paper can be yours—piled up in the darkness of your attic. (p. 24)

Differences Between Subsidy Press and Other Types of Book Publishers

Normal trade publishers, such as Ginn, Hemisphere, or Burgess, publish books and pay their authors royalties. The trade publisher assumes all the financial risks for production and distribution. Should the book sell few copies, the trade publisher loses money. Even with the greatest of precautions, the trade publisher may lose money on books released. Losses are often recovered on a few best-sellers plus motion picture options.

In order to assure a profit, subsidy publishers will not publish a book unless their profit is guaranteed in advance. Subsidy presses do not assume any risks, whether or not a book sells. If a profit is made, it will be by the subsidy press, not the authors. However, an important point to remember is
that with "vanity" publishers authors actually pay twice. They first pay to have their books published and they pay again for copies which they themselves want for their own purposes.

Comparisons Between Custom and Subsidy Publishing

According to a recent article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (Stange, 1981),

custom publishing executives would bristle at the comparison between custom and vanity publishing. In vanity publishing authors pay to put their work into print. In custom publishers no one pays to be published. In fact custom publishers pay royalties of anywhere from 5 to 15 percent on book sales. Just as any traditional publisher would. (p. 19)

Subsidy-produced books undergo no pre-publication editorial review. "Vanity" presses promise to pay their authors more than 15%; that is, if books are sold. According to the same author, many professors are turning to "custom-published" textbooks which are not author-subsidized.

Instead of "vanity" presses, some of those custom college textbook publishers (i.e., Burgess, Kendall-Hunt, and University Press of America) offer faculty the opportunity to design their own books for their courses. "Not all publishers deal exclusively in custom publishing; for example, only about 10% of the books published by University Press of America are custom texts" (Stange, 1981, p. 20).

Lyons (cited by Stange, 1981) said, "I wish I had a nickel for every author who has said to me I'm doing this because I can't find an appropriate
textbook" (p. 19). Stange added that "the textbooks being published today are
aimed at the widest possible market and are homogeneous enough to appeal to
as many users as possible, leaving teachers little room for innovation and
calls "the 'textbook crisis,' an increasing number of professors are finding they
have no choice but to compile their own" (p. 19). Stange (1981) added that in
a field where the caliber of textbooks is "pretty sad," custom publishing "allows
us to put some character into the course" (p. 19).

Stange (1981) concluded that textbook publishing as a whole is a small
industry, and custom publishing is a minute part of it. However, it is growing
each year. One development that is sure to affect custom publishing is the
new technology that will allow smaller and more specialized print runs. For
the time being, books are still on paper and publishers are still trying to find
ways to sell as many of them as possible. Custom publishing is what is known
in the trade as "niche publishing." "You find a niche," says one custom
publisher, "and then you fill it" (Stange, 1981, p. 20). According to Professor
Lumsden (personal communication, August 1990), "custom publishers and
'vanity' publishers are not identical twins, but they are first cousins."

Some Experiences with "Vanity" Publishers

A file of complaints against "vanity" publishers has been accumulated
over the past years (National Writer's Club [NWC], 1989b). The NWC stated
that "no happy experiences or any satisfaction [were] recounted in that file" (p. 2). The few writers and scholars who have used "vanity" presses and have seen their works sell enough to recover the cost have done so largely through their own promotional and distributional efforts.

NWC (1989b) reported that, "with approximately 500 titles under its imprint in 1988, Vantage Press was perhaps at the head of the "vanity pack" and NWC has more complaints on this house than any other" (p. 2). As an example,

A California member paid Vantage $6,046. The book's delay in publication was blamed on the author when Vantage requested she revise the galley proofs. The mistakes in the galleys were, according to the member, Vantage's and even the revised proofs had errors. After returning the proofs, along with another check for "extra charges," the author heard nothing for months. Inquiries went unanswered. (p. 3)

Another example was reported by NWC in 1989b. A North Dakota writer, misled by carefully worded advertising and a likewise carefully worded contract (concealing more than it revealed), paid Vantage $9,000, thinking that at least 4,000 copies of the book would be printed. His royalties amounted to less than $150 and he received only 50 books. When a friend ordered copies of the book from Vantage before the expiration of the contract, he got no response. The author lost 92% of his investment (p. 4).

Vantage Press is not the only subsidy press about which authors have complained. All of the subsidy presses have been included in author complaints.
According to the same report of NWC (1989b), Pageant Poseidon Press was an old vanity publisher that seemingly disappeared, taking with it (as one member of the NWC from New Mexico said) a lot of money for which it never delivered the promised goods. Pageant Poseidon Press ended in bankruptcy. Other complaints against Pageant Poseidon Press are similar to those of Carlton, Exposition, Dorrance, Ashley, and the recently bankrupt Naylor.

Contracting with Publishers

While publication is a primary objective of members of the academic profession, the scholarly writer has curiously little information available to him about the terms on which publication can be arranged. Data on the terms provided in publishers’ contracts are not readily available. When scholars negotiate with representatives from subsidy presses, they have little information on which to judge, even in comparative terms, the contractual provisions offered.

Few authors seem to be aware that (particularly when a contract is signed before the manuscript has been completed) usually, and almost unavoidably, the publisher is not committed to produce the book in question. However, the author is committed to deliver his manuscript to the publisher with whom the contract is signed. Therefore, the contract binds the author without really committing the publisher.
Hogan and Cohen (1965) offer legal advice to authors before signing a contract. They raised some questions about the financial terms which seem to be of widespread interest—royalties, including the rather confusing and not readily comparable variety of bases on which they are calculated; advances; cost of corrections; discounts on copies of the book purchased by the author; sale-of-rights agreements; stock-option agreements; and the detailed subsidy publishing agreements.

The author of this study believes that not all problems of publication can be handled in terms of contractual provisions. Neither an information form nor a contract can guarantee that copy editing will be of satisfactory quality, that promotion will be vigorous, or that the printer's work will be of good quality and efficiently executed. Though it rarely causes much difficulty in practice because publishers are anxious to publish their authors' works, one of the most prevalent misunderstandings relating to contracts is the widespread failure to recognize that a publisher's contract often does not even constitute a commitment to publish. This is particularly true when the contract is signed before a manuscript has been completed. Taken at face value, such a contract is a one-sided affair which commits the author to deliver the manuscript to no other publisher but does not always bind the publisher to publish the author's work.
Misunderstandings of Contracted Terms

The publisher can hardly be blamed when a contract is misinterpreted or misunderstood because it has not been read carefully. It is inevitable that some misunderstandings will arise in this way. However, some provisions which cause problems and mistrust should be explained to the author by the publisher. There are also at least a few cases where the publisher may have abused the terms of the contract by stretching his interpretation in a manner that seems questionable at best. On such matters, the author will sometimes find it advisable to seek the help of legal counsel.

One case of abuse reported by Baumol and Heim (1967) was of a well-known mathematician at an ivy-league university who sent a letter to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) explaining the abuse of the contract provisions by a subsidy press. The issue arose out of a large sale of one of his books to an organization. The author wrote,

the publisher, according to their statement, was paid a flat fee in addition to their expenses; half of the small fee was turned over to the author. I reminded the publisher that according to the contract I should be entitled to a percentage stipulated for all sales even for those at a much reduced rate. But this argument was refused by the publisher under reference to a contract quotation. The statement, however, did not occur in my contract. When so informed, the publisher referred to the original contract with the statement that the case was covered by an "etc." in the clause concerning radio rights. No settlement was ever made. (p. 41)

This is only one of many examples of abuse concerning contracts with publishers. The fact that the contract is not an obligation to publish is a
prevalent misunderstanding among writers. This is particularly true when the contract is signed before the manuscript has been completed. Taken at face value, such a contract is a one-sided commitment which obligates the author to deliver the manuscript to no other publisher but does not bind the publisher to produce the author’s materials.

Another example, reported by Baumol and Heim (1967), was in reference to a contract signed in 1960 under the terms of which a manuscript was submitted in 1962. For three years, there was no progress toward publication. The editor who was working on the book informed the author that he would receive proofs in February of 1965. However, in November of 1964, the editor left the company at about the same time there was a change in the ownership of the publishing house. Shortly thereafter, the author received a letter from the publisher informing him that,

in the past two weeks our copy editor has encountered so many difficulties with the text of . . . that we have been forced to reappraise the whole project. I am sorry to say that we have now decided not to publish the book . . . and I honestly hope that you are able to sign a new contract with another publisher. (p. 40)

Other Contractual Provisions

If quality of writing and subsidy publishing ever make friends, part of the process will be through learning how to avoid treacherous contracts. Important points concerning contractual provisions such as warranty and indemnity are discussed in this study.
The provision of warranty requires the author to guarantee that he or she is the sole owner of the work and has full power and authority to copyright it and make an agreement, and that the work does not infringe any copyright, violate any proprietary rights, or constitute an invasion of privacy.

According to Baumol and Heim (1967), "the scholar is cautioned that he does not avoid liability if the contract omits the term indemnify and uses only the phrase 'hold the publisher harmless'" (p. 37). Some, but not all, contracts go one step further to protect the interests of the publisher. They specify the sums due the author may be withheld as security for his obligation.

The second provision is the copyright and its infringement, fees, and permission to use materials. According to the same report by Baumol and Heim (1967), contracts specifically provide for the securing of the copyright. The copyright is generally obtained by the publisher, sometimes in the name of the author himself, and sometimes in the name of the publisher (upon authorization). Except in the case of private publication, the cost is usually borne by the publisher.

To protect the publisher's interest, most contracts provide that the publisher shall have the right to bring action if he believes the copyright of the work has been infringed. Because financial arrangements vary among publishers, especially with subsidy publishers, authors must be aware. Understandably, subsidy presses are most explicit in imposing contractual requirements upon the author to obtain and furnish to the publisher written
permission to use any and all copyrighted material quoted in the work. In the
majority of contracts reviewed for the purposes of this study, permission fees, if
any, were borne by the author unless there was an exception or uncommon
arrangement stating that permission fees would be paid by the publisher. This
is never the case with "vanity" press contracts.

Another important provision is the form of the manuscript. It is a part
of the author’s responsibility to supply the publisher with final copy for
submission to the printer, complete with illustrations, charts, diagrams,
manuals, and index. The financial terms for publishing are negotiable issues
but usually paid by the author, especially when it is published by a subsidy
press.

In the editing-by-publisher provision, most contracts reserve to the
publisher the right to edit the work for the original printing, providing such
editing does not materially change the meaning or otherwise materially alter
the text. In a few cases, unpleasant conflicts have resulted over differences of
opinion on style and content between author and publisher which caused a
rejection from the publisher. Few contracts protect the author explicitly with a
provision to the effect that the author is given the opportunity to approve or
disapprove any changes suggested by the publisher.

Finally, there are other provisions which should be understood by
authors and publishers together before the contract is signed and finalized.
This kind of understanding will provide a strong relation between the authors and the publishers and will clear any doubts between them.

Summary

Publishers vary greatly in the amount of effort they devote to the quality of a book and to its sales. An author may often find it preferable to select a publisher whose record or reputation in these matters is good, even if its royalty rates are less than those offered elsewhere.

On all of the issues discussed, there seems to be no substitute for checking past performance. There is probably not a more reliable way than checking past performance to obtain information on the quality of a publisher's service. Concerns of great significance for authors, which are difficult, if not impossible, to cover explicitly by contractual provisions, were discussed previously in this chapter.

The many claims and promises in various literature, and the files of complaints accumulated against subsidy presses, have discouraged scholars from using this type of press. NWC (1989b) quoted Edward Uhlan (retired president and founder of Exposition Press) who said that, "contemporary subsidy publishing was conceived in sin and dedicated to fraud" (p. 3). And added "much of the censure that subsidy publishing has been subjected to has been justified . . . and is mainly due to the built-in larceny of the contract itself" (p. 3).
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CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES FOR OBTAINING AND COLLECTING DATA

Introduction

This chapter includes a discussion of the instrumentation and procedures for collection and treatment of data. The study was conducted during the spring of 1990. The questionnaire for this study was developed during the fall of 1989.

The Questionnaire

Borg and Gall (1983) have classified surveys into three categories: telephone interviews, personal interviews, and questionnaires. This exploratory study used a questionnaire which was mailed to college and university faculty members who have used "vanity" presses to publish their writings. As Clover and Balsly (1974) stated, "mailed questionnaires can be sent to students, administrators, or faculty members in widely scattered locations for a relatively low cost" (p. 285). This method was determined to be the most appropriate way to collect data for the study. In addition, the greater coverage offered by the mailed questionnaire yields greater external validity due to the fact that this method is free from interviewer bias.
Mailed questionnaires offer greatest reliability and more confidence than other methods because respondents can take time to think through their answers. The questionnaire used in this study was both brief and to the point. The content validity of the instrument developed was established by using a panel of experts consisting of published faculty/scholars at the University of North Texas. See Appendix D for a copy of the questionnaire developed and used in the study.

Procedures for Data Collection

The data were collected during the spring of 1990. Letters were sent to 11 major national subsidy presses listed in the National Writer’s Club Report (1989a) requesting their latest catalogs of publications. Table 1 contains a complete list of subsidy publishers included in the study.

The 1990 edition of The National Faculty Directory, an alphabetized directory containing the addresses and institutional affiliations of approximately 588,000 members of teaching faculties at 3,400 colleges and universities in the United States and Canada, was used to identify the occupations of authors who appeared in the catalogs of the subsidy publishers contacted.

The National Faculty Directory is compiled from current class schedules and academic catalogs and is maintained by CMG information Services of Winchester, Massachusetts. The leading supplier of college faculty mailing lists, CMG serves textbook, academic, technical book, and computer software
Table 1

**Subsidy Publishers Included in the Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Books, Incorporated</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Press, Incorporated</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Publications, Incorporated</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorrance and Company</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition Press</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Publishing Company</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossmont Press, Incorporated</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helios Publishing Company</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mojave Books</td>
<td>Reseda, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vantage Press</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Frederick Press</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

publishers and other marketers who seek to reach specific higher education faculty. The highly segmented information in the data base is verified and updated continuously throughout the calendar year through the use of class
schedules, course catalogs, and staff and faculty directories supplied by individual colleges and universities.

The 1987 Carnegie Classification of Higher Education (Boyer, 1987), prepared by the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, groups the nation's nearly 3,200 colleges and universities into 10 categories based on the level of degrees they award, the fields in which the degrees are conferred, and, in some categories, enrollment, federal support, and selectivity of admissions criteria. The classification system, which was created in 1970 and updated in 1976, is widely used by college administrators, education researchers, grant makers, and governmental officials. The Carnegie taxonomy was used in this study of subsidy-published faculty in order to classify faculty according to their employing colleges and universities. That is, the institutions which employ the faculty studied were classified according to the 1987 Carnegie Classification of Higher Education.

A packet including a cover letter explaining the purposes of the study was mailed to all faculty members listed in the subsidy catalogs obtained and The National Faculty Directory. Also included in each packet was a questionnaire and a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

A second letter was sent to the Better Business Bureau of New York City requesting a factual report of the operations of vanity publishers (see Appendix C). A third letter was sent to the Federal Trade Commission, in Washington, D.C. requesting a copy of the "complaint and decision" filed
against any vanity publisher (see Appendix B). This information is helpful in
two ways. First, it identifies for possible contact the names and addresses of
individuals who have used vanity presses. Second, it provides a clear picture
and full report of the operations and complaints filed against vanity presses.
According to Goodman (1971) "so many complaints were filed with various
Better Business Bureaus and government agencies, that the Federal Trade
Commission stepped in and issued cease and desist orders against many of the
‘vanity’ publishers" (p. 42).

While a 100% return of the questionnaires was sought, a 60% return
was expected. In order to proceed with the study, the return of completed
questionnaires by respondents was considered as their consent to use data for
research purposes. Follow-up postcards were mailed to non-respondents 4
weeks following the initial mailing of packets.

Limitations of the Study

This exploratory study was limited to faculty who are known to have
used subsidy presses for publishing their writings. It excluded those who might
have used "vanity" presses, but whose names did not appear in The National
Faculty Directory. The Directory made it possible to ascertain the faculty
appointments and addresses of the professors in the catalogs received from the
subsidy publishers included in the study. The names of 1,124 authors in the
catalogs of the subsidy publishers were checked for their inclusion in The
National Faculty Directory. A limitation in the study is the possibility that some authors in the catalogs researched were indeed faculty who, for whatever reasons, were not listed in the Directory. Because of the small number of "vanity" publishers who participated in the research, the generalizability of the findings of the research may be restricted.

The present research did not attempt to determine the hiring, tenure, and promotion practices of the colleges and universities employing the subsidy-published faculty in the study. Neither did the study attempt to evaluate first-hand the quality of the books identified as subsidy-published. These sorts of considerations are indeed important but were considered to be beyond the scope of the present exploratory investigation. What the study does contain, in its review of the literature, is an evaluation of the literary genre represented by the faculty-authored, "vanity" published books. Future researchers are encouraged to extend the present study by exploring these and other sorts of interesting issues which may influence faculty in their pursuits of publishers. The present study sought to answer these broad questions: Considering the widespread negative reputation of subsidy publishers and their books, do college and university faculty make use of them? And, are subsidy-published books authored by faculty effective when it comes to helping faculty achieve their goals for writing and publishing books?
Reporting of Data

The statistical procedures by which data were analyzed including chi-square tests of specified frequencies, percentage distributions, and frequency counts. Data collected and analyzed are presented in table form for ease of reporting and comprehension.


CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATION

This chapter includes a description of the "vanity" publishers included in the study, the respondents, and the results of the analysis of data collected.

In Table 2 is a list of the 11 subsidy publishers contacted along with the results of efforts to correspond with them.

Seven (63.6%) of the letters written and sent to the 11 subsidy publishers were returned marked "Undeliverable" by the United States Postal Service. One publisher, Mojave Books, did not send a catalog as requested, despite repeated efforts to secure one. Therefore, the remaining pool of subsidy publishers included in the study consisted of the three largest and major subsidy publishers in the United States: Carlton Press, Dorrance and Company, and Vantage Press.

The three catalogs received contained a total of 1,124 titles along with names of authors. These 1,124 authors were cross-referenced for listing in The National Faculty Directory. Table 3 contains data on the numbers of authors listed in both the Directory and the catalogs of the subsidy publishers included in the study.
Of the questionnaires mailed to the 37 faculty listed in both data sources, 23 (62%) were completed and returned. According to the data in Table 3, only 3% of the 1,124 subsidy-published authors in the catalogs of the three subsidy publishers examined were college and university faculty. This
provides an estimate to research question number one of the study, viz., what proportion of authors who have had their works published by vanity presses are college and university faculty?

Table 3

**Authors Listed in Subsidy Publishers' Catalogs and in The National Faculty Directory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Number of Authors Listed in Publishers' Catalogs</th>
<th>Number of Authors also Listed in The National Faculty Directory</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vantage</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorrance</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total     | 1,124                                            | 37                                                            | 3          |

Table 4 contains a list of the reasons faculty gave for publishing with subsidy presses.
Table 4

**Faculty Reasons for Publishing with Subsidy Presses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because efforts to secure other publishers had failed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain tenure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To obtain promotion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To earn a salary increase</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N=29 because some respondents identified more than one reason for which they had their works published.

The subsidy-published faculty in the study were asked to indicate other reasons for which they chose a vanity press for the publication of their books. In Table 5 are the open-ended and unedited reasons they provided on the questionnaires returned.
Table 5

Other Faculty Reasons for Publishing with Vanity Presses

"To bring into perspective the mismanagement of our colleges and universities through incompetence in an effort to help improve administrative skills and the better development of the human potential."

"I was in business at the time, not academia, I published the book with hope (were hope) that others would read it."

"Indirectly personal satisfaction."

"Altruistic investment in my own students’ development and hope for arousing general interest in original and new ideas about piano technique gained through my own technical development and teaching."

"Because of the published ‘cognitive rigidity’ involved regarding fears and/or phobias. . . . The ‘true’ case history/story needed to be presented with some of the ‘actual quotes’ involved regardless of society’s readiness. . . . Currently said book is being used as a supplementary text in abnormal psychology classes and Edward Waters College and FCCJ via several medics."

"To guarantee retention of copyright on an obscure, possibly esoteric, topic and my original research into it."

"I had thought of this for some time—like this kind of work when teaching loud is not too heavy (6 hours)."
"To experience and do the feasible ways of control figure."

"To get information into hands of elders and their families."

"I put together 6 years of my research on the human vocal tract. Since I made many discoveries, I wanted it in print in a more accessible form than my journal publications that only the specialist reads."

The faculty in the study were asked to comment on the effectiveness of their subsidy-published books in helping them achieve their purposes for having them published. In Table 6 are data that comment on the faculty-perceived effectiveness of their vanity-produced books.

The largest proportion of faculty surveyed judged their subsidy-published books to have been somewhat effective in helping them to achieve their purposes for publishing their books (43%). Another 26% considered their books to have been "very effective." A combined 69% of the faculty who had published with vanity presses perceived their books to have been anywhere from somewhat to very effective. Almost one-third (30%) of the faculty in the study perceived their subsidy-published books as having been either not at all effective or even ineffective.
Table 6

Faculty Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Their Vanity-Published Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat effective</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not effective at all</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to ascertain why some authors considered their books to have been less than effective, these writers were asked to indicate why they think their vanity-produced books were not successful. Their open-ended and unedited comments appear in Table 7.

The faculty in the study were asked if they would choose a "vanity" publisher if they had it to do over. The numbers and percentages of faculty who responded to this item on the questionnaire appear in Table 8.
Table 7

Reasons Faculty Cited for the Ineffectiveness of Their Vanity-Published Books

"The promise between me and the chairman of the department was only verbal."*

"Will become more effective as it becomes known through exposure and acceptance."

"Vantage Press, good in production, but poor in advertising."

"Publisher failed to promote the book."

*The author of this book had been promised a promotion, but after the publication of his book, the promise was not kept. He did not have the Ph.D. degree at the time his book was published; however, he believes a published professor is the equivalent of an unpublished professor with the Ph.D. degree.

In this study of subsidy-published college and university faculty, only 26% indicated that they would again choose a vanity publisher to produce their writings. Sixty-one percent said they probably would not, and 13% indicated they would not. Almost three-fourths of the faculty in the study (74%) stated that they were not likely to use again a subsidy press for the publication of their books.
Table 8

Faculty Thoughts on Choosing a Vanity Publisher Again

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those faculty who stated that they would not choose a vanity publisher in the future for the publication of their works were asked why they would not do so. In Table 9 are the open-ended, unedited responses of these subsidy-published faculty.

The faculty who participated in the study were classified according to the type of institution employing them. This was accomplished through use of the Carnegie Commission's Taxonomy for classifying American institutions of postsecondary education (Boyer, 1987). In Table 10 are institutional classifications of the subsidy-published faculty in the study.

According to the null hypothesis of no difference in the distribution of 23 faculty over 7 institutional categories, it was expected that each category
Table 9

Reasons for Not Choosing a Vanity Press for Future Publishing

"The management of such publishing company, Vantage, was fully inept and somewhat misleading. The administrative incompetence that the author described and discussed in his book applies in principle for all practical purposes to the way the management of Vantage mishandles business."

"No regular publisher would accept the book. I paid for it myself--a vanity publication. Today the book sells for $13.00 per copy."

"Only with planned 'PR' medics."

"Publication through the 'vanity' press carries a stigma which, while realized at the time, defeats equitable professional review no matter the contents or quality."

"The company Vantage Press is a fraud, a class action suit had been settled on April 6, 1990--alleged fraud and misconceptions."

(cell) would contain 3.3 faculty. The calculated $\chi^2$ of 8.92 was not significant at $p = 0.05$, indicating that the actual distribution of faculty did not depart significantly from the expected distribution. The actual, observed distribution of faculty over the 7 institutional categories was what was to be expected under the condition of the null hypothesis of no difference.
Table 10

Subsidy Published Faculty According to Institutional Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number of Observed Subsidy-Published Authors</th>
<th>Number of Subsidy-Published Authors Expected (According to the Null-Hypothesis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research universities I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research universities II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate-granting universities I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate-granting universities II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive universities and colleges I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive universities and colleges II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal-arts colleges I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal-arts colleges II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year institutions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 = 8.92$; ns at $p = .05$
The faculty included in the study were further stratified according to the specific institutions employing them, their academic disciplines, their vanity publishers, and the titles of their books. This information is reported in Table 11.

An examination of the information in Table 11 shows that 20 of the subsidy-published faculty (88%) had used Vantage Press for the publication of their books. Two (8%) had used Dorrance and Company, and only 1 (4%) of the faculty studied had made use of Carlton Press.

The single largest discipline represented by the subsidy-published faculty was medicine (N = 4 = 17%). Education was second with 3 (12%) vanity-published faculty. The remaining 16 faculty appear to be equally distributed across the various disciplines represented.

Table 12 contains data on the institutional classifications of faculty who published with vanity presses in order to obtain tenure. According to these data, a total of 5 of the 23 faculty studied wrote vanity-published books to obtain tenure. This represents 22% of the total number of faculty in the study. Two of the 5 (40%) had used their books to obtain tenure; these faculty were from research universities I. Another 40% (N = 2) from specialized institutions had used vanity presses for the publication of their books in order to obtain tenure. Only 1 faculty member (20%) from a doctorate-granting university had used a subsidy press to publish a book for this purpose.
Table 11

Characteristics of Subsidy-Published Faculty According to Institution, Institutional Classification, Academic Discipline, Publisher, and Title of Book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Academic Discipline of Author</th>
<th>Title of Book</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Comprehensive I university</td>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>Mismanagement in Higher Education</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>Doctorate I granting college</td>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>A Century of Separate but Equal Education</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Research universities I</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Omnateum</td>
<td>Dorrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Community College</td>
<td>2-year college</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>A New Type of Phobia Isolated</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia College</td>
<td>2-year college</td>
<td>English speech</td>
<td>LeGende Doree Ou Legenda Aureu</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew College</td>
<td>Specialized institution</td>
<td>Judaic studies</td>
<td>One Thousand One-Minute Lessons</td>
<td>Dorrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan School of Music</td>
<td>Specialized institution</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>A New Approach to Piano Technique for Serious Musician</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebury College</td>
<td>Liberal arts I</td>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>Endgame</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>Research II</td>
<td>Aerospace engineering</td>
<td>The Colone Wars</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State University</td>
<td>Comprehensive I</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>A Documented History of Black Consciousness</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Specialized institution</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>The Land Down Under</td>
<td>Carlton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Medical College</td>
<td>Specialized institution</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>The Last President</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Academic Discipline of Author</td>
<td>Title of Book</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>Research I</td>
<td>Liberal arts</td>
<td>Israel in the Year 2025</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa Junior Community Metro College</td>
<td>2-year college</td>
<td>Arts &amp; science</td>
<td>Broadcasting &amp; Cable</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Research I</td>
<td>Language/literature</td>
<td>A Reader's Guide to Language</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>Research I</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>In Search of Academic Excellence</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
<td>Doctorate I</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>A Pretty Thin Salami: A History of the President's Salary</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Manitoba Canada</td>
<td>Doctorate I</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Humor is No Laughing Matter: Psychology and Wit</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>Research I</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Figure and Fitness</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>Research I</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>The Second Mid-Life Crises Relating to Aging Parents</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura College</td>
<td>2-year college</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Caty and Me</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchee Valley College</td>
<td>2-year college</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>The American Hunting Myth</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>Research I</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>The Human Vocal Treat Anatomy Function</td>
<td>Vantage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

Institutional Classifications of Faculty Who Published with "Vanity" Presses to Gain Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Research Universities I</th>
<th>Research Universities II</th>
<th>Doctorate-Granting Universities I</th>
<th>Doctorate-Granting Universities II</th>
<th>Comprehensive Universities I</th>
<th>Comprehensive Universities II</th>
<th>Liberal-Arts Colleges I</th>
<th>Liberal-Arts Colleges II</th>
<th>Two-Year Colleges I</th>
<th>Two-Year Colleges II</th>
<th>Specialized Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Medical College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Los Angeles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In Table 13 are data showing that 7 (30%) of the subsidy-published faculty in the study had published their books in order to obtain promotions.

Within this select group of 7, 3 (43%) of those who had published with a vanity press to earn promotions were on faculty at research universities I. The remaining 4 faculty (57%) were equally distributed among 2-year colleges, specialized institutions, liberal arts I colleges, and research universities II.

Eight (35%) of the faculty in the study had published their books for the purpose of earning salary increases. In Table 14 are data regarding these faculty classified according to institutional type.

Within this group of 8 faculty persons, 3 (38%) of those who had published books with vanity presses were employed at 2-year colleges. Another 2 (25%) of the faculty in the study who were subsidy-published were on faculty at research universities I. The remaining 3 faculty (37%) were equally distributed among specialized institutions, research universities II, and doctorate-granting I institutions.

Nine (39%) of the subsidy-published faculty in the study had written and published their books for reasons other than salary increases, obtaining tenure, or gaining promotions. Data describing these faculty are in Table 15.

The majority of vanity-published faculty who published for miscellaneous reasons were employed at research universities I (N = 4 = 44%). Two (22%) were on faculty at community/junior colleges. The remaining 3 (33%) of the
Table 13

Institutional Classifications of Faculty Who Published with Subsidy Presses to Earn Promotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Research Universities I</th>
<th>Research Universities II</th>
<th>Doctorate-Granting Universities I</th>
<th>Doctorate-Granting Universities II</th>
<th>Comprehensive Universities I and Colleges I</th>
<th>Comprehensive Universities II and Colleges II</th>
<th>Liberal-Arts Colleges I</th>
<th>Liberal-Arts Colleges II</th>
<th>Two-Year Institutions</th>
<th>Specialized Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gesigla College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebury College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 14

**Institutional Classifications of Faculty Who Published with "Vanity" Presses to Earn Salary Increases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Research Universities I</th>
<th>Research Universities II</th>
<th>Doctorate-Granting Universities I</th>
<th>Doctorate-Granting Universities II</th>
<th>Comprehensive Universities I</th>
<th>Comprehensive Universities II</th>
<th>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I</th>
<th>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II</th>
<th>Liberal-Arts Colleges I</th>
<th>Liberal-Arts Colleges II</th>
<th>Two-Year Institutions</th>
<th>Specialized Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geagea College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa Junior College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 15

Institutional Classifications of Faculty Who Published with Vanity Presses for Miscellaneous Reasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Research Universities I</th>
<th>Research Universities II</th>
<th>Doctorate-Granting Universities I</th>
<th>Doctorate-Granting Universities II</th>
<th>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I</th>
<th>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II</th>
<th>Liberal-Arts Colleges I</th>
<th>Liberal-Arts Colleges II</th>
<th>Two-Year Institutions</th>
<th>Specialized Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama A&amp;M University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Community College at Jacksonville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan School of Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchee Valley College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subsidy-published faculty in the study who had published for miscellaneous reasons were equally distributed among comprehensive universities I, specialized institutions, and doctorate-granting I institutions.

In Table 16 are data on 15 faculty whose vanity publications were considered by their authors to be effective, according to institutional classifications.

Of the 15 vanity-published faculty in the study who considered their books to have been effective at helping them achieve their purposes, 5 (33%) were employed at research universities I. Four (27%) were on faculty at 2-year community/junior colleges. Two faculty (13%) whose vanity-published books had been effective were employed at comprehensive universities I. Another 2 professors (13%) were at specialized institutions. The remaining 2 vanity-published faculty were from a liberal arts I college and a doctorate-granting I university.

Not all faculty in this study judged their vanity-published books to have been effective in helping them attain their purposes. Seven (30%) of the faculty included in the survey considered their books to have been ineffective. In Table 17 are data on the authors classified according to institutional type.

Of the 7 faculty who considered their subsidy-published books to have been ineffective, 3 (43%) were on faculty at specialized institutions. Two (29%) were employed by research universities I. The remaining 2 (29%) who
Table 16
Institutional Classifications of Faculty Whose Publications Were Effective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Research Universities I</th>
<th>Research Universities II</th>
<th>Doctorate-Granting Universities I</th>
<th>Doctorate-Granting Universities II</th>
<th>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I</th>
<th>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II</th>
<th>Liberal-Arts Colleges I</th>
<th>Liberal-Arts Colleges II</th>
<th>Two-Year Institutions</th>
<th>Specialized Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama A&amp;M University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Community College at Jacksonville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebury College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa Junior College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchee Valley College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

Institutional Classifications of Authors Whose Subsidy-Published Books Were Ineffective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Research Universities I</th>
<th>Research Universities II</th>
<th>Doctorate-Granting Universities I</th>
<th>Doctorate-Granting Universities II</th>
<th>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I</th>
<th>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II</th>
<th>Liberal-Arts Colleges I</th>
<th>Liberal-Arts Colleges II</th>
<th>Two-Year Institutions</th>
<th>Specialized Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geaiga College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan School of Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Medical College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
considered their books to have been ineffective were equally distributed among
doctrate I granting colleges and research universities II.

Summary of Major Findings

Data from the questionnaire were analyzed in this chapter using
frequency counts, percentage distributions, and a chi-square test of specified
frequencies. Because of the small number of "vanity" publishers who
participated in the research, the generalizability of the findings of the research
may be restricted. Major findings from the investigation are these:

1. In this study of 11 national vanity publishers, 8 (73%) could not be
contacted because mail sent to them was returned by the United Postal Service
marked "Undeliverable";

2. In this study, only 3% of the 1,124 vanity-published authors studied
were college or university faculty.

3. The majority of faculty who had turned to vanity presses for the
publication of their books (69%) did so for professional reasons, viz., to gain
tenure, to obtain promotions, or to earn salary increases;

4. Sixty-nine percent of the faculty surveyed reported that their
vanity-published books had been anywhere from somewhat to very effective in
helping them achieve their professional objectives;
5. The majority of the faculty studied whose books had been published by vanity presses indicated that they would not choose a vanity publisher if they had it to do again;

6. Faculty who had used vanity presses for the publication of their books did not differ when their employing institutions were stratified according to the Carnegie system of institutional classification;

7. The single largest discipline represented by the subsidy-published faculty in the study was medicine (17%). Education faculty constituted the second largest group of vanity-published faculty (12%);

8. The majority of faculty (80%) who had used vanity-published books to obtain tenure were employed by research universities I and specialized institutions;

9. The majority of faculty (57%) who had used vanity-published books to gain promotions were equally distributed among 2-year colleges, specialized institutions, liberal arts I colleges, and research universities I;

10. The majority of faculty (63%) who had used vanity-published books in order to obtain salary increases were employed either by 2-year colleges or research universities I;

11. The majority of faculty who had published with vanity presses (66%) were from research universities (44%) or 2-year colleges (22%);
12. Sixty percent of the faculty in the study who considered their vanity-published books to have been effective at helping them achieve their purposes were employed by research universities (33%) and 2-year community or junior colleges (27%);

13. Among the faculty who considered their vanity-published books to have been ineffective at helping them achieve their purposes, 43% were on faculty at specialized institutions and 29% were employed by research universities.
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CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter consists of a summary of the study, discussion of the major findings and conclusions, and a listing of recommendations for future research.

Summary of the Study

This exploratory study was an investigation of the extent and reasons for which college and university faculty use subsidy presses for publishing their books. It was assumed that faculty members who used subsidy presses in order to publish their scholarly writings and who were listed in The National Faculty Directory, 1990 would respond honestly to the instrument that was sent to them. The purposes of the study were (a) to determine the extent to which postsecondary faculty use subsidy presses to publish their scholarly writings, (b) to determine the main professional reasons for which academicians chose this type of press for the purpose of publishing their works, and (c) to compare the subsidy publication practices of faculty according to the types of institutions that employ them.
The survey of related literature revealed dissatisfaction among writers who have used subsidy presses for publishing their works. Unsatisfactory results and many complaints were found throughout the literature.

Authors who selected subsidy presses to publish their scholarly writings face serious problems. Not only must they produce good ideas for books, but they must also persuade publishers that they write well and can research and organize their material. Many new writers and scholars complete manuscripts before approaching publishers. Manuscripts then speak for themselves--either they are well-written, well-researched, and well-organized, or they are not. However, it was found in this study that regardless of the quality of book manuscripts, subsidy presses accept them. They accept virtually any materials authors want to have published.

Discussion of Major Findings

Thirteen major findings are listed in Chapter 4. These major findings provide the answers to the research questions raised in Chapter 1 of the study. A discussion of the 13 major findings follows.

1. Letters were sent to 11 major national subsidy presses listed in the National Writer's Club Report (1989a) requesting their latest catalogs of publications. Only 3 (27%) responded and sent their catalogs, and 8 (73%) could not be contacted because the letters sent to them were returned by the United States Postal Service marked "Undeliverable." Another attempt was
made, and 8 more letters were sent to those returned "Undeliverable" with the same results. The author of the study assumed that they are no longer in business or they moved to different locations without leaving a forwarding address. This normally happens for credit protection or for legal reasons.

2. In this exploratory study, 3 major national subsidy presses‘ catalogs were received. Vantage, with 835, had the largest number of published authors; Dorrance, with 185, was second; and Carlton, with 104 published authors, was third. A total of 1,124 "vanity"-published authors were listed in these catalogs, but only 3% of them were college or university faculty. This means very few college and university faculty use subsidy presses for their scholarly publishing. Instead, they use different publishers such as custom or commercial publishers.

3. The majority of scholars and faculty members strive to publish for a variety of professional reasons, namely, to gain tenure, to obtain promotions, to earn salary increases, to gain recognition, or for other professional reasons. In this study it was found that 69% of the faculty members published for the above reasons. The study disclosed that 17% of those faculty members who published with subsidy presses did so in order to gain tenure, 24% to obtain promotion, and 28% to earn a salary increase. But it revealed that 31% of those scholars who published with subsidy presses did so for other reasons.
4. Of those scholars who desired to achieve professional objectives, the study showed that the majority judged their subsidy-published books to have been effective. Only a minority of faculty who use subsidy publishers considers their subsidy-published books to be ineffective.

5. Most faculty whose books have been published by "vanity" presses would not choose a "vanity" publisher if they had it to do again. Only 26% indicated that they would again choose a "vanity" publisher for their scholarly writings, and those faculty who said yes to "vanity" publishers may have had no other choice.

6. Faculty who use "vanity" presses for the publication of their books do not differ when their employing institutions are stratified according to institutional classification.

7. Whether the subsidy-published faculty's field was medicine, education, law, or business, the single largest discipline represented by the subsidy-published faculty is medicine. The second largest group of "vanity"-published faculty are in education. The remaining subsidy-published faculty are equally distributed across the various disciplines.

8. The majority of faculty (80%) who have used "vanity"-published books to obtain tenure are employed by research universities I and specialized institutions. The requirements for tenure include publication of books with reputable scholarly presses. It is possible that the pressure at these institutions
for faculty to publish is so great that they will turn to any publisher, including "vanity" presses, to ensure that their writings get published.

9. Almost half of the faculty who use "vanity"-published books to gain promotions are employed by research universities II, and 57% of the faculty who use "vanity"-published books to gain promotions are equally distributed among 2-year colleges, specialized institutions, liberal arts I colleges, and research universities I. In spite of the relation among the purposes for publishing, faculty members who use "vanity" presses have individual reasons for doing so regardless of the faculty member's college or university affiliation. A large proportion of faculty who use "vanity"-published books to gain promotions come from prestigious institutions classified as research universities II.

10. Many authors are not interested in prestige, fame, tenure, or promotion, although these benefits are related to each other. Most of those who use "vanity"-published books to obtain salary increases are employed either by 2-year colleges or research universities I.

Finale

According to MacCampbell (1979), a veteran literary agent, "Over a thousand books a year are put out at the author's expense, many of these being the work of college professors who must, as the saying goes, publish or perish" (p. 41).
Although experience is the best teacher, it is often costly, especially for those who used subsidy presses for their scholarly publications and who found themselves with worthless books and reduced bank accounts. Those scholars who used subsidy presses in order to publish their books were somehow dissatisfied because these presses failed to promote their books effectively. According to Henson (1990), dean of the College of Education at Eastern Kentucky University:

"Authors on campuses around the country are joyfully signing book contracts with commercial publishers. But by this time next year, the joy of some of these authors will have faded when they realize that they have signed away many of the advantages that attracted them to writing in the first place." (p. B2)

Additional complaints put forth by the authors against subsidy presses deals with inadequate information and communication. This is an indication that some subsidy presses do not provide an adequate information for authors. Whereas some go to considerable lengths to assure that their authors are well informed, others erect barriers between themselves and those who write for them. The study revealed few satisfactory experiences among these authors and the subsidy presses because of lack of communication between scholars and their publishers. This lack of communication led to many complaints against subsidy presses from dissatisfied authors who had decided not to use subsidy presses again for the publication of their books.
College and university faculty do not normally resort to subsidy presses for the publication of their books. The study concluded that less than 3% of 1,124 scholars were faculty members. This study has shown that relationships between authors and subsidy presses are often not straightforward and, therefore, are often unsatisfactory. It should not be necessary for new authors to feel that they are engaged in a venture in which publishers such as subsidy presses will take advantage of them. Some of the difficulties that occasionally beset relationships between authors and publishers include delays in publication, failure to supply adequate information to the author, and abuses of option clauses. Above all, there is the danger that the author will be inadequately informed about the range of terms currently offered by subsidy presses.

This study sought to supply substantial information about some of the items that concern authors and publishers, thereby helping authors make better decisions in choosing a legitimate, reputable press for their future publishing. In addition to providing information for authors who are seeking publishers, this study should serve as a foundation for future studies on this subject. It was the sincere hope of the author of this study to give readers a general preview of the tactics practiced by these subsidy presses and to provide information that can aid authors in future publishing decisions. In all fairness, it must be pointed out that there is a natural connection between good books
and good publishers, and between good marketing strategy and good books which is considered to be a fact. In this study a conclusion can be drawn that some dissatisfaction did exist among subsidy presses and scholarly faculty members who were employed by prestigious institutions in using subsidy presses for their publications.

All the above conclusions are tentative because of the small numbers of faculty who were found to have used vanity publishers and because of the fact that not all subsidy-published authors appeared in The National Faculty Directory of 1990. Another conclusion that should be stressed is that a subsidy press has little or no incentive for seeing that a book sells. The study showed only claims or promises in "vanity: literature with attention that the book will be reviewed, promoted, etc. NWC (1989b) reported:

Reviewers, as a rule, will not look at a vanity title, librarians refuse to take them seriously and book store buyers, upon seeing vanity imprints, will tell you they want nothing to do with them. What little promotion or reviewing is done, if it can be called that, comes usually from the vanity publisher's staff and is done in the most cursory fashion, just enough to stay "legally" within the ad promises and contractual guarantees. (p. 2)

NWC (1989b) added that after an Oklahoma member paid Vantage $5,000.00, they had his manuscript for more than a year before it was published; no publicity or promotion was done and the illustrations were poor quality black and white. The member sold less than 50 copies; Vantage press declared the book a "poor mover" and suggested canceling the contract. (p. 2)
In 1990 a New York jury awarded $3.5 million in a 13-year-old lawsuit charging Vantage Press with fraud and deception. The class-action suit represented thousands of authors who had paid up to $8,000 each to have their books published by Vantage Press. The civil suit claimed the publisher had made no effort to sell or promote its books (Florida Space Coast Writer's Conference, Inc., 1990).

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, it is recommended that comparative research be made of subsidy presses and self-publishing. While publication by "vanity" presses invites disrepute, self-publishing suffers no such stigma. Self-publishing is in no way to be confused with "vanity" publishing. In self-publishing the author takes on the entire task himself, and it is a task requiring faith and energy. Final preparation and all other activities must be carried out with the author acting, more or less, as his own managing editor. High quality will be realized and better results will be achieved.

Additional studies should focus on the wrongdoings of subsidy presses to the authors. More studies are needed relating to legal matters and the abuses of contractual provisions that are used between subsidy presses and authors. Another recommendation is for authors to investigate a number of reputable scholarly presses, such as university presses, Burgess, and Prentice Hall. Also, faculty considering the use of "vanity" presses are urged to investigate these
presses and their reputation in the publishing business. Before choosing a publisher, authors should also speak to others who have had books published with the various "vanity" publishers. An important recommendation for authors is to seek the help of legal counsel before signing with any of the subsidy presses and to contact personal affairs committees whose job it is to evaluate the scholarly writings of faculty. There is also this recommendation: The simplest, quickest, and least expensive method of getting a book into print is to deal with a reliable, experienced, reputable printer. Many fine book printers will print a limited number of copies for a fixed, reasonable cost. Also, they make no promises for a book's sales possibilities. The books will be expertly printed and bound, and the rest is up to the author, who may wish either to sell his copies, give them away, or donate them to libraries. The printer's sole interest is printing a high-quality product in the fastest possible time and at the lowest possible cost. Another recommendation for scholarly authors is to contact the Association of American Publishers, Inc. to seek their recommendations regarding any situation related to the present publishing field.

A recent statement of principles for college publishing was released by the Association of American Publishers, Inc. (1990), "Higher Education Division":

The Higher Education Division believes that the criteria for textbook selection properly concern only the quality of the textbook itself and its
immediate ancillary materials. The Higher Education Division recommends that college publishers follow the guidelines set forth below to ensure that their individual competitive practices do not lead away from this focus on educational material because of payment of money or other consideration, directly or indirectly, to the benefit of individuals or academic departments. These guidelines are: (1) Individual publisher's policies for textbook adoption should be universally applied and openly stated. (2) College publishers should avoid making any improper inducement to any actual or potential adopter, directly or indirectly, which may be described as a bribe, kickback or excessive commission or fee which is contingent on the adoption of their textbooks or their ancillary materials. (3) Unacceptable activities include, but are not limited to, the following: providing cash grants, allowances or "rebates" to individuals other than students, booksellers or other direct publishers or to academic institutions. Making direct payment to individuals other than for actual services rendered. Making cash payment, to third party suppliers of equipment or materials to institutions where the equipment or materials are not part of a textbook. (p. A13)

It is recommended that scholars and faculty members contact the Federal Trade Commission and the local Better Business Bureau to obtain facts concerning operations of "vanity" publishers in general or of any specific "vanity" publisher.

Henson (1990) recommended scholars to read the fine print when signing book contracts and not to be afraid to negotiate and to ask for a non-refundable advance, because commercial publishers can and often do cancel contracts at any point during the publishing process. "To guard against this disappointment, scholars may wish to ask that the advance become a 'kill fee' if the publisher decides to cancel" (p. B2). And he recommended scholars to watch for hidden expenses that may be deducted from royalties.
It was not the intent of this study to slander subsidy presses. Instead, this study was directed to those subsidy publishers to whom this may apply. If any publishers may be in doubt—try the shoe for size and let their consciences be their guides.

One final point should be made concerning the use of self-publishing. In effect, the author goes into the publishing business to produce and market his or her own book. Depending upon skill, time, and areas of expertise, the author may perform the production, distribution, and marketing functions, or the author may seek professional assistance for some of the work required. In either case, the author controls the book's production, pays all production, distribution, promotion, sales costs, and receives the total income from book sales.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER TO SUBSIDY PUBLISHERS REQUESTING CATALOGS
To Whom It May Concern:

This is to request a copy of your catalog of publications. Thank you for your prompt attention given this request for information.

Sincerely,

D. Barry Lumsden
Professor of Higher Education
APPENDIX B

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, D.C.
To Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C.

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to you requesting a copy of "Complaint" and "Decision" which has been filed against Vantage Press, Dorrance Press, and Carlton Press.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely Yours,

D. Barry Lumsden
Professor of Higher Education
Copy of complaint filed against "X", a "vanity" publisher
before the Federal Trade Commission, August 5, 1938

PARRAGRAPHTWO: Respondents are now and for more than two years last past have been engaged in the solicitation of contracts for the publication of books for authors and prospective authors and in the promotion, sale and distribution of books of authors, contracting with respondents. Said solicitations are made through advertisements placed in magazines, periodicals and newspapers, and otherwise, all of which are circulated to authors and prospective authors located in various states of the United States and in the District of Columbia.

PARRAGRAPHFOUR: In the course and conduct of their said business in commerce, by means of brochures and other letters, postal cards, circulars and through advertisements, as aforesaid, respondents invite authors to send their manuscripts to respondents for an appraisal of their literary merit and sales potential.

Upon receipt, the manuscript is assigned to a reader to read, after which a letter is composed to the submitting author. Except in rare instances, this letter gives a praiseworthy appraisal of the manuscript and recommends it for publication; said letter also contains various statements relating to the sales promotion and publicity respondents propose to place behind the book. A contract is generally enclosed for execution and provides for payment of a specific sum in one or more installments, all of which must be paid before the manuscript in book form is released for sale.

PARRAGRAPHFIVE: In the course and conduct of their business as aforesaid, respondents have made many statements and representations, directly or indirectly, concerning the nature, size and operation of their said business, the sales, promotion and publicity afforded their author customers and the effectiveness of same and results obtained thereby. Typical, but not all-inclusive of said statements and representations, are the following:

1. That theirs is a cooperative publishing plan in which respondents share with the author in the expense of the editing, printing, binding, publication, promotion and sale of the book and that respondents are partners with the author;

2. The respondents publish on a partial subsidy basis;

3. That under respondents' plan of publication, the author recovers his entire investment in the publication of his or her book very soon after its publication and well before a sell-out of the first edition;

4. That respondents bind all the copies of the first edition of the book listed in the contract with the author;

5. That respondents have a large organization with numerous employees and departments, including an art department;

6. That respondents only accept for publication those manuscripts having merit and sales appeal and that manuscripts accepted by them have been determined to have such merit and sales appeal before respondents will risk their own money in publishing said manuscript;

7. That respondents have a board of editors who examine each author's work carefully and report impartially, fully and frankly on its literary merit and sales potential;
8. That respondents have publicity and promotion departments which conduct intelligent and effective promotion and sales campaigns of their authors' books, and that the same reach some 6,400 book trade outlets in North America;

9. That respondents reinforce their sales promotion of their authors' books with extensive national-direct mail drives;

10. The respondents' sales department is in constant touch with retail bookstores, libraries, universities, wholesalers and department stores, all of which repeatedly buy the books published by respondents;

11. That respondents sell and have sold reprint rights in their authors' books to pocket book reprint companies; that respondents' authors' books published through respondents have been selected by book clubs for sale to the book club members; and that respondents sell and have sold their authors' books published through respondents to book clubs and to book club members;

12. That respondents sell, and have sold, subsidiary rights to their authors' books published through respondents, to foreign publishers, television producers, motion picture studios, digest and serialized periodicals;

13. That respondents pay their authors a 40% royalty;

14. That respondents arrange for reviews of their authors' books in key periodicals;

15. That respondents offer an exclusive book service;

16. That respondents have never sold any selected poetry, Christian or fiction books at reduced prices for lack of continuing sales;

17. That respondents are accredited with all large book wholesalers, jobbers and retail outlets.

PARAGRAPH SIX: The aforesaid statements and representations are false, misleading and deceptive. In truth and in fact:

1. Respondents do not operate a cooperative publishing plan in that they do not share with the author in the expense of editing, printing, binding, publication, promotion and sale of the book, nor are they partners with the author; in truth and in fact, the sum charged an author by respondents, except in rare instances, covers the entire expense of editing, printing, binding, publishing, promotion, distributing and selling the finished book, plus a profit to respondents;

2. Respondents do not publish on a partial subsidy basis but require a complete subsidy covering the entire cost of publishing and promotion of the author's book;

3. The author seldom recovers more than a small amount of the money paid respondents at any time, let alone the entire investment. In truth and in fact, only in rare and exceptional cases do any of said books sell-out the entire first edition;

4. Respondents do not bind all of the copies of an author's first edition of the book respondents contract to publish and often bind less than half the number of copies called for in the contract;

5. Respondents do not have a large organization with numerous employees and departments, nor do they have an art department;
6. Respondents accept, and have accepted for publication, manuscripts which do not have merit or sales appeal possibilities and their experience has been such that they knew or should have known that many of the manuscripts they accept have neither merit nor sales appeal possibilities. In truth and in fact, respondents do not “risk” their own money in publishing an author’s manuscript as the sum paid by the author to respondents covers all cost plus a profit thereon to respondents;

7. Respondents do not have a board of editors. Respondents employ readers to read the manuscripts and report on same; such reports are neither impartial, full nor frank disclosures of the merit or sales potential of the submitted manuscript; said report is written in glowing and laudatory terms for the purpose of convincing the author that the manuscript has literary merit and sales potential and should be published.

8. Respondents do not have publicity and promotion departments; respondents’ publicity promotion campaigns do not reach any significant number of book trade outlets in North America;

9. Respondents do not reinforce the sales promotion of their authors’ books with national direct mail drives;

10. Respondents do not have a sales department. Their dealings with retail book stores, libraries, universities, wholesalers or department stores are limited. Such outlets buy few of the books published by respondents.

11. None of the books published through respondents have been selected by book clubs for sale to, nor have same been sold to, a book club or a book club’s membership, nor have they sold the reprint rights of any book to pocket book reprint companies;

12. Respondents do not sell, nor have they sold, subsidiary rights to their authors’ books published through respondents to foreign publishers, television producers, motion picture studios, digest or periodicals;

13. Respondents do not pay their authors a 40% royalty or any kind of royalty. Respondents’ plan of publication is one whereby the author subsidizes the publication of his or her book with the author paying for the entire cost of same, plus a profit to respondents in practically all cases. Respondents agree to pay the author 40% on the sales price of all the author’s books sold and paid for, but only in rare cases are the sales ever sufficient for the author to recoup his or her investment made with respondents for the publication, promotion and sale of the author’s book;

14. Respondents do not arrange for reviews of their authors’ books in key periodicals;

15. Respondents do not offer an author an exclusive book service, and in truth and in fact, the respondents’ service does not differ from that of other subsidy publishers;

16. Respondents have sold poetry, Christian and fiction books at reduced prices for lack of continued sales;

17. Respondents are accredited with few, if any, large book wholesalers, jobbers or retail outlets.
APPENDIX C

BETTER BUSINESS BUREAU OF
NEW YORK CITY, INC.
To Better Business Bureau of New York City, Inc.

To whom it may concern:

We would like to receive a factual report of the operations of the following publishers: (A) Dorrance (B) Carlton, and (C) Vantage.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely Yours,

D. Barry Lumsden
Professor of Higher Education
SUBJECT REPORT

VANITY PUBLISHING* AND ADVICE TO AMATEUR AUTHORS

What is vanity or subsidy book publishing?

This type of enterprise has been termed the "Vanity Press"; although vanity, as such, may not be the reason or motivation for utilizing the services of a vanity publisher.

The Council of Better Business Bureaus advises a careful reading of the contract for specific details of services to be performed. Questions concerning provisions contained in the contract should be answered by an attorney. Although such firms may fulfill the terms of their contracts, their efforts on behalf of authors to produce a commercially profitable product are not necessarily successful. Conventional book publishers make no such promises. Of the thousands of new books published each year, only a small percentage make any real profit for their publishers or provide an income for their authors.

How does vanity book publishing differ from conventional publishing?

The conventional publishing company accepts manuscripts and reviews them. If, in the company's judgment, a book has commercial potential, the publisher will decide to risk its own money to have the book published and promoted.

The vanity book publisher requires the author to underwrite either a partial or total amount of cost of publishing and promoting the book. Thus, the risk to the publisher is relatively nominal, enabling them to accept many manuscripts which the conventional book publisher would reject as being a poor investment.

What are the chances of success for the author using a vanity book publisher?

Rarely does a subsidy publisher put out a commercially successful book. The few exceptional success stories are often repeated to potential authors. Vanity book publishers and their operating practices are well-known to those who buy books for resale to the public. Books published by the so-called vanity press are recognized as such. News releases and other publicity or advertising are accepted and the books are reviewed in this light.

Persons who deal with vanity book publishers should recognize that their books may have little or no commercial possibilities, especially if their manuscripts have already been rejected by a number of the better-known publishing houses. Such authors should realistically expect no more than the self-satisfaction that any author would derive from seeing his book in print. (The success of getting one's ideas before the reading public would depend on whether or not the advertising or publicity resulted in a significant volume of sales.)

Will a conventional book publisher consider works by an unpublished author?

Conventional publishing companies are usually pleased to receive well-written manuscripts from unknown authors. It is advisable to make more than one copy of the manuscript before submission since it may take considerable time before such publishers are in a position to review and advise the authors of unsolicited manuscripts whether or not they are interested in publishing their books. NOTE: The author normally is required to pay the return postage for rejected manuscripts.

What assurance is there that a vanity publisher will effectively promote the published book?

Authors contemplating the use of a vanity book publisher should bear in mind that the typical contract offered does not spell out what percentage of the monies paid by the author will be for promotional purposes, nor does it vest any control of such promotion in the author. (Generally, 10% of the total money paid by the author is the maximum which would be allocated for promotion of the published book.) In addition, the publisher normally is not obligated to bind more than a nominal number of books in the absence of demand in the form of orders.

Finally, the author contemplating a vanity publishing venture should realize that the publisher can very well make its money from printing a book submitted by authors at the author’s expense without the necessity of expert or aggressive promotion on the part of the publishing firm.

Are song promoters similar in operation to vanity publishers?

By and large, the answer is yes.

For a fee, so-called “song sharks” offer to write music or lyrics to go with poems or melodies solicited from amateurs.

They also offer to promote the song with a vocal and musical audition tape or phonograph record, or for fees to be paid by the author.

The offer may be to “polish” a song submitted, the work claimed to be done by expert arrangers or professional musicians also for a fee.

As in the case of the vanity publisher, there is no guarantee that the song will be bought by a publisher or record company or be otherwise commercially successful.

The chance of publishing a successful popular song is very remote, as even well-known song-writers have composed hundreds of songs which have never been published or successful.

What about solicitations for biographical directories?

Patterned after the “Who’s Who” publications, various publishers solicit the biographies of persons for inclusion in directories, which may bear prestigious-sounding titles.

The solicitation is typically accompanied by the request for a “membership” fee, or for an order of one or more copies of the projected directory.
There is no guarantee that the advertised biographical directories will be or are widely distributed outside of the libraries of those purchasing copies for themselves. The appeal may be based strictly on personal vanity.

How can one distinguish a reputable biographical directory from those of little or no value?

The public library will stock well-known and useful general biographical directories and can advise you if the questioned volume is known to it.

Professional and business directories may be checked with trade associations for their opinions.

A reputable publisher will be willing to tell who subscribes to its publication and the number of volumes published in past years.

If the subscribers to the directory are mainly limited to those whose names appear in it, one can logically infer that it is in fact a "vanity" publication for the self-aggrandizement of those listed.

ADVICE TO AMATEUR AUTHORS

Better Business Bureaus throughout the country continually receive inquiries from individuals regarding the reliability of certain subsidy publishers, sometimes known as "vanity" publishers. While the Bureau does not attempt to judge the merit of the verse or prose written by the individuals making the inquiries, we do suggest they check with a competent person, such as a librarian, English teacher or clergyman, in whose judgment they have confidence, before approaching a subsidy publisher.

Vanity publishing has flourished, because it is fed by the dreams, gullibility and money of would-be-authors who believe the promises of certain "publishing houses" which appear to offer fame, fortune and possible immortality, for a fee in advance.

Misrepresentations employed by some vanity publishers in their sale tactics are exploitative and without basis in fact is evidenced by the Federal Trade Commission's issuance of restraining orders against several publishers, a few years ago. Those orders required the publishers to refrain from misrepresenting the nature of their services performed for would-be authors.

Some of the claims to which the Federal Trade Commission took exception were:

1. That none of the books which have been published has resulted in failure;
2. That sales will warrant more than one edition of the book;
3. That the publisher recommends for publication only those manuscripts which have literary merit and sales appeal;
4. That the publisher supplies authors with the same promotional services that the largest book publishers give to their big name, best-selling authors;
5. That the publisher has salaried traveling salesmen who spend all their time selling only their books;
6. That leading libraries generally purchase large numbers of books from the vanity publishers, as a common practice.
7. That the promotion of a book always results in the placement of a book in book stores which are in the vicinity of the author's home;

9. That in contracting author's book will be nationally advertised or mis-representing in any manner, the kind, manner or extent of the advertising, publicizing or promoting accorded said books or other printed matter;

9. That they print or bind all or a portion of the copies listed in the contract of the first edition of an author's book, provided, however, that it shall be a defense in any enforcement proceeding instituted hereunder for respondents to establish that said books are printed or bound as represented.

10. That their advertising, publicity, or sales promotion campaign assures success of the sale or distribution of books or other printed matter published by them.

It is to be pointed out that vanity publishers always insist on payment in advance, of the fee for the "cooperative publishing" venture. Therefore, it is imperative that the author of any literary work exercise extreme caution with regard to his business dealings preceding the "publication" of a book. INVESTIGATE BEFORE YOU INVEST!!!
APPENDIX D

REQUEST TO ANSWER QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear ________________:

Here at the University of North Texas we are conducting a national study of faculty who have recently been successful at having their books published. You have been selected to participate anonymously in our study. We assure you that whatever information you provide us will be treated confidentially.

In 19__ a book of yours titled _____________________ was published by ______________________ Press. Did you write and publish this book to:

- gain tenure?
- obtain a promotion?
- earn a salary increase?
- because efforts to secure other publishers had failed
- others (please explain)?

How effective was the publication of the book in helping you achieve your purpose?

- very effective
- somewhat effective
- not effective at all
- ineffective
If the book was not effective (or was ineffective), will you tell us why?

If you had to do it over again, would you choose the same publisher?

______ probably not

______ yes

______ no (if no, why not?)

Thank you for your cooperation. The information you provide us will be treated with complete confidentiality.

Sincerely,

D. Barry Lumsden
Professor of Higher Education
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