

StartwithXML Survey **Selected Results**

Mike Shatzkin

The Idea Logical Company, Inc.

For the BISAC meeting of BISG

14 November 2008



Survey available for about one month: Sept-Oct 08

- **About 165 people started the survey**
- **About 140 responded about “current digital practices”**
- **About 110 responded about “current digital production environment”**
- **About 100 responded about “current production practices**
- **About 100 completed the entire survey**

Respondents across publisher types

- **About 54% of respondents are with publishers all or partly trade**
- **About 36% of respondents are with publishers of professional, educational, scholarly, or religious books**
- **About 10% of respondents are not with book publishers (wholesalers, digital distributors, magazine publishers)**

More from big houses, more from top management

- **53% from companies with more than 100 employees**
- **28%: 10-99 employees; 19%: under 10 employees**
- **44% from senior management; 24% “director level”**
- **Only 32% from mid-level or entry-level**
- **77% were *not* IT professionals**

Light response from Editorial, Marketing, & Sales

- **31% of respondents in “overall management”**
- **23% production**
- **21% Information Technology**
- **13% editorial**
- **7% marketing**
- **5% sales**

Many publishers still trying to grasp importance of digital

- **Digital is “very important, informs everything we do” say 40% of non-trade publishers, only 18% of trade publishers**
- **“Trying to understand its importance” say 24% of non-trade publishers, 43% of trade publishers**

Trade sees downstream re-use as important, but they lag...

- Trade publishers twice as likely to ignore downstream use when acquiring (19% trade, 9% non-trade)
- Trade publishers twice as likely to edit focused on print edition (23% trade, 12% non-trade)
- Chunking and re-combining opportunities still too widely ignored (34% trade and 29% non-trade “don’t really do this”)
- But 2/3s say digital is “important” or “very important”

Expanded editions: an untapped opportunity?

- **Actively offering them: 8% trade, 15% non-trade**
- **Offering some and “they make money”: 10% trade, 15% non-trade**
- **We try, but find it hard to make it work: 22% for both**
- **Offering no expanded editions: 60% trade, 48% non-trade**
- **Will Kindle change this?**

“Repurposing” is squarely on the radar screen

- “Standard practice” to repurpose: 20% trade, 24% non-trade
- “For certain books or subjects”: 41% trade, 45% non-trade
- “Don’t do this, but we should”: 25% trade, 23% non-trade
- “Not appropriate for books we publish”: 15% trade, 9% non-trade
- So 85% or more think they *should*

Current use of XML

- **Common use for digital distribution: 43% trade and 59% non-trade**
- **Trade challenged on use for production: 26% trade, 53% non-trade**
- **Frequent use for archiving: 30% trade and 40% non-trade**
- **Beginnings of use for authoring: 13% trade, 28% non-trade**

And how are titles archived and stored?

- **About a third of publishers are in a DAM system (34% trade, 31% non-trade)**
- **Over 40% have an informal DAM (structured files on a central server) 44% trade, 41% non-trade**
- **About 1 in 4 have no central organization at all (22% trade, 28% non-trade)**

Re-using old content is still a big nuisance

- **Outsourcing conversion is pretty much standard (41% trade, 51% non-trade)**
- **But there's still a lot of scurrying around to printers or other suppliers to get final files back (49% trade, 39% non-trade)**
- **And more than 10% say “Forget it! Too hard to do this!” (11% trade, 10.5% non-trade)**

There will be an ROI in XML

- **93+% of all respondents: “house would benefit if costs were not an issue”**
- **46% of all respondents: “house would benefit by publishing more ebook formats”**
- **69% say “print to web” processes are “problematic” or “needs to be fixed soon”**

And thank you to our sponsors **(who make this all possible)**

- **Publishing Dimensions/Jouve**
- **Klopotek**
- **codeMantra**
- **Publishers Weekly (media sponsor)**
- **Book Industry Study Group**