Letters to the Editor

February 28, 2005
In the January issue of LRTS, Janet Swan Hill repeats the oft-heard assertion that there are not enough new catalogers entering the profession. This state of affairs is not apparent to the newly graduated job seeker. When nearly every job description (by which search committees are often bound) requires a minimum of two years of experience, the implication is that there are plenty of catalogers already working who can simply be shifted around from library to library as openings occur.

I suggest that people may not be entering the cataloging profession because they cannot get hired. After more than a year of being told, “We like you but you don’t have enough experience,” I am strongly considering seeking employment in another area of librarianship. How can the ranks of catalogers grow if libraries won’t hire people who want to be catalogers?—Steven Knowlton, M.L.I.S., Ypsilanti, Mich. www.angelfire.com/mi4/hiresteve, knowstev@med.umich.edu

(Update on findings reported in “The Ethics of Republishing: A Case Study of Emerald/MCB University Press Journals,” by Philip M. Davis [49, no. 2].)

January 7, 2005
Article duplication within Emerald/MB publication is more extensive than first reported. It has now been identified in seventy-three journals spanning a period from 1975 to 2003. This letter will address updates to the initial findings and react to Emerald’s response. It will investigate the relationships between Emerald, MCB, and Barmarick Publications, and shed light on possible conflicts of interest in management functioning simultaneously as owners, editors, and authors. Is this a case where commercial interests have outweighed editorial independence?

Duration of Duplication and Emerald’s Response

In my previous article published in the April 2005 issue of LRTS, I initially reported that covert article duplication could be detected as early as 1989. Earlier examples were not possible due to the limitations of the publisher’s database. Further investigation of MCB/Emerald print journals has identified article duplication going back to 1975 (see below for an example), indicating that this practice of covert article duplication took place over a period of almost thirty years.


Contrary to the publisher’s response that “[article duplication] was done with journals that had a nil or negligible overlap of subscribers,” searches