
Documenting Illustrations; To Justify or Not to Justify ; Public Communication Campaigns; The Public Understanding of Science; Communicate!

Carol Sanders Reiner

Joyce Patterson

James W. King

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/jac>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Recommended Citation

Reiner, Carol Sanders; Patterson, Joyce; and King, James W. (1990) "Documenting Illustrations; To Justify or Not to Justify ; Public Communication Campaigns; The Public Understanding of Science; Communicate!," *Journal of Applied Communications*: Vol. 74: Iss. 1. <https://doi.org/10.4148/1051-0834.1513>

This Review is brought to you for free and open access by New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Applied Communications* by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. For more information, please contact cads@k-state.edu.

Documenting Illustrations; To Justify or Not to Justify ; Public Communication Campaigns; The Public Understanding of Science; Communicate!

Abstract

Review of "Documenting Illustrations," by Mary C. Hester, Jacquelyn L. Monday, and John I. Snead ; "To Justify or Not to Justify," by Allan Haley; *Public Communication Campaigns* (Second Edition), edited by Ronald E. Rice and Charles K. Atkin; "The Public Understanding of Science," by J.R. Durnat, G.A. Evans, and G.P. Thomas; *Communicate!*, by the Philippine Association of Communication Educators.

Reviews

"Documenting Illustrations," by Mary C. Hester, Jacquelyn L. Monday, and John I. Snead in *Technical Communication: Journal of the Society for Technical Communications*. Second Quarter 1989. Society for Technical Communication, 815 Fifteenth St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005, pp. 102-113.

Authors and editors frequently borrow illustrations or create them from the data of others. This article derives guidelines for deciding when permission is required and for crediting the borrowed material. It also introduces a documentation format to give appropriate credit.

The first five pages are devoted to a discussion of copyright law and the remainder to the documentation format, together with examples and illustrations.

When is permission necessary?

Permission is necessary to reproduce or create derivative works from illustrations protected by a valid U.S. copyright (except in fair use situations) or to use proprietary information on illustrations. The rights of the copyright holder include the right to:

1. reproduce the work in copies or authorize reproduction,
2. distribute copies of the work to the public,
3. prepare derivative works based on the copyrighted work,
4. display the work publicly.

The work need not be published or registered with the Copyright Office to be protected. If you want to use a copyrighted work, you are responsible for obtaining permission to use it or the proprietary information it contains. Do this in writing and specify precisely what will be copied, the source, and use you plan to make of the copies.

Permission is not necessary if an employer has commissioned the work from one of its employees or has contracted the job under "work for hire." Permission also is not necessary for illustrations in the public domain. "Public domain" includes works published without claim to copyright, publications of the federal government, and illustrations whose copyrights have expired.

The employer is considered the author of items created by employees, and the employer owns all rights of copyright unless the employer and employee have agreed otherwise in a written and signed document. If an illustration is "work for hire," the one who commissioned it has the initial ownership of the copyright. Works of the federal government are not subject to copyright protection. However, only the works created by federal employees as part of his/her official duties are exempt from copyright.

The copyright has expired on all works published in the United States before September 1906. Items published in 1978 or later have federal copyright for the lifetime of the author plus 50 years. Those for hire, anonymous, or pseudonymous have terms of either 75 or 100 years. Anything with a U.S. copyright of 1913 became part of the public domain in 1988 or sooner if the copyright was not renewed.

No permission is needed to borrow from a copyrighted publication if the use is *fair*. Fair use purposes, according to the copyright law, include criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship, or research. However, because the factors are subject to interpretation, caution is necessary.

Four factors determine fair use:

1. whether the use is for commercial or nonprofit educational purposes,
2. the nature of the copyrighted work,
3. the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the whole. As a general rule, the critic or reporter should not quote more than two or three paragraphs of a book, journal article, stanza of poem, a solitary chart or graph from technical treatise at any one time.
4. the effect of the use on the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work.

The absence of a copyright notice does not mean that the work is in the public domain.

Unpublished works do not need the notice to be protected. The notice is required on published work. The 1976 Copyright Act provides remedies for omission or incorrect notice that can prevent work from going into public domain. The copyright status of a registered work can be checked in the Copyright Office records which are open to the public. The Copyright Office will search them upon request for \$10 per hour.

As an author, you must have permission to "derive" a new illustration from a copyrighted one unless your use comes under fair use. Derivative works are defined as those "based upon one or more preexisting works." Switching media is not sufficient to avoid infringement. Not protected by copyright are ideas, procedures, processes, systems, concepts, principles, or discoveries.

Once you have permission to use a borrowed illustration, the editor's job is then to use a clear, uniform format for credit lines.

What do you put in credit lines?

After a thorough discussion of copyright law — this review only hits the highlights — Hester, Monday, and Snead propose a format that identifies the source of the original illustration and tells the reader if it has been modified in the borrowing work. They say that the wording and placement of credit lines depend upon how the illustration is used, if it is copyrighted, and if its use has been freely donated. In any case, they say that professional courtesy demands that any work, other than the author's, always be credited, whether or not it is copyrighted.

Credit Line Placement — Place credits and permissions so that they are easily spotted and clearly refer to a particular work. On maps, published separately, place the credit line on the map under the title. Credits for illustrations within text may be set in small (perhaps italic), type and placed parallel to the lower edge of the illustration or on a vertical edge, without a terminal period. Or credit may be in parenthesis at the end of the figure's

Reiner et al.; Documenting Illustrations: To Justify or Not to Justify; Public legend or as part of the legend copy. If most of the art is from a single source and you have permission of the copyright holder, include the credit in the preface, acknowledgements, or on the copyright page. However, if all this additional text is unfeasible in the body of the work, group all the credits together in the front or back of the publication. This is called "box credit."

Content and Wording of Credit Lines — If the illustrations are from a previously published source, the credit line should provide the following information: name of authors, title, publisher or name of periodical, volume, page, figure number, year of the source, and name of copyright holder. It should also include the copyright information (e.g., Copyright 1982 by John Wiley).

The copyright holder can require the wording for the credit line and, if permission is contingent upon that wording, it has to be used whether or not it is consistent with other credit lines in the publication.

Documentation Categories

The authors found no comprehensive, consistent system of documentation which indicated both the source and what had been borrowed in any of the style manuals they searched. Therefore, they developed a system of seven categories for credit lines, providing more specific information about whether the data or the graphics or both have been changed.

Their categories, criteria, and examples follow:

1. **Reprinted from** — Direct photographic or photocopy reproduction of all or part of the source illustration; no changes except perhaps in size or scale, or color that is printed in black and white.

Example: (*Copyrighted source*): Reprinted, by permission, from figure 1, p.64, Ivonne Audirac and Lionel J. Beaulieu, "Microcomputers in Agriculture: A Proposed Model to Study Their Diffusion/Adoption," 1986. *Rural Sociology* 51 (1): 60-77. Copyright 1986 by the Rural Sociological Society.

(*Uncopyrighted source*): Reprinted from figure 2, p. 5, J.H. McGowen, Gum Hollow Fan Delta, Mueces Bay, Texas, Austin, Tex.: Bureau of Economic Geology, University of Texas at Austin, 1970.

2. **Adapted from** — Illustration photocopied and modified, either by additions or deletions from the graphics or data or both.

Example: Same as above except substitute "adapted from" for "reprinted from."

3. **Redrawn from** — Illustration redrawn not photocopied, but data have not been changed. Graphic revisions, such as changes in line thickness or patterns have been made.
4. **Redrawn and adapted from** — Illustration redrawn and modified either with additions or deletions. Changes made in both graphics and data presented.
5. **Data from** — Illustration based on statistical data from another source; illustration is original.
6. **Courtesy of** — Illustration donated without any restrictions or fee; illustration not published or copyrighted.
7. **No-or-abbreviated credit line** — Illustration is completely original

and has not been included in previous unpublished manuscripts; copyright has not been transferred. Illustrator may be credited in certain situations, but credit is not legally required.

The article provides a good discussion of copyright law and the documentation format is a useful one for authors and editors.

Carol Sanders Reiner
University of Arkansas-Little Rock

"To Justify or Not to Justify," by Allan Haley in *U&lc*, (Fall, 1989), International Typeface Corporation, New York, New York, pp. 14-15.

Ever lock horns with a fellow communicator, or with a client, about the merits of justified versus unjustified copy? Whichever side you took, you were right.

Allan Haley, editorial director of *U&lc*, contends that justified and unjustified composition are equally readable. He says numerous studies show readers are oblivious. They don't know of care whether they are reading justified or unjustified text.

By recognizing potential problems with each, you can avoid pitfalls and base your decision to use one or the other on the particular job and on your personal preference.

Haley cites two problems with justified copy: It can create too much space between words, leaving "rivers" of white running through the copy. And it is boring.

The problems Haley sees with unjustified copy are these: Long lines followed by short ones can cause shapes that are not inviting to the eye. Also, short, indented paragraphs can make a piece look as if it were set both ragged left and ragged right. ACE readers may add a third, unjustified copy usually fills more space than justified.

The person setting unjustified copy must use an esthetic sense when making line-ending decisions. In contrast, in justified copy, the equipment automatically adjusts spacing to fit a predetermined line length.

U&lc is published quarterly by the International Typeface Corporation, 2 Hammarckjold Plaza, New York, NY 10017. Subscription price is \$20 per year. Complimentary subscriptions are available to professional communicators.

Joyce Patterson
Oregon State University

***Public Communication Campaigns (Second Edition)*. Edited by Ronald E. Rice and Charles K. Atkin. 1989. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.**

The second edition of *Public Communication Campaigns* is even more original than the first.

And that was a distinguished collection of articles covering the historical and theoretical foundations of communication campaigns, field experiences, and campaign issues -- formative and summative evaluation, campaign effectiveness and social marketing. It was a very needed and good

<https://newprairiepress.org/jac/vol74/iss1/8>

DOI: 10.4148/1051-0834.1513

Only four of the 16 chapters are repeated from the first book, and each of the four has been revised with new and original materials. In the "Theory and Design" section, Dervin presents the growth and advancement of her ideas about "information as construction," a cognitive processing approach to communication. McGuire refines and expands his "communication/persuasion model as an input/output matrix" into a very practical set of communication campaign guidelines.

The "Experiences" section summarizes varied communication campaigns. Its discussions cover television and safety belt use, venereal disease, McGruff crime prevention, Chinese campaigns, Smokey Bear, littering, rat control, cardiovascular disease, political efforts, AIDS, antismoking, and more. Agricultural campaigns are not discussed, but we can pick up lessons.

The editors endeavor to help the reader gain the most from the book. They include synopses and highlights of each of the four sections. Perhaps best of all, the editors include an outstanding annotated bibliography of over 15 campaign-related books.

All the authors use many examples—a helpful media planning calendar and model, a stimulating social marketing perceptual map, and a worthwhile six-page appendix on broadcast and print media audience research. You can see the development of systems thinking in communication by the inclusion of more pretesting and formative evaluation, more research reports, and more evaluation studies. Campaign reports also show that the quality of communication case studies has advanced and is now nearly fine-tuned to an art.

Topics like political campaigns of the future were especially interesting to me. So were AIDS campaigns using a new persuasion strategy based on "the power of illusion" that appeal to the individual's unreality.

This is an impressive book with an extraordinary collection of communication information. It's good for classes and for personal reading and reference. If you missed it the first time around, you get a second chance.

James H. King
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

"The Public Understanding of Science," by J.R. Durnat, G.A. Evans, and G.P. Thomas in *Nature*. Vol. 240. 6 July 1989, pp. 1-14.

You've heard it before, but...only 46 percent of Americans and 35 percent of Britons surveyed seem to know that the Earth goes around the sun once a year.

Obviously, a difference exists between being interested in science and understanding science. Three British researchers reviewed public perceptions of science and technology, including the surveys done by the U.S. National Science Foundation and the Science Indicators. They developed a survey to make some international comparisons and have issued a report in the respected British journal *Nature*. While their focus is on Britain, the authors note many parallels in the United States.

First, the writers surveyed Britons to determine their self-reported interest in and "informedness" about science. They asked respondents to

say how interested they were in six different issue areas in the news. People reported high interest in medical discoveries, new inventions and new technologies, and scientific discoveries. Over time and across cultures, not surprisingly, self-reported interest is high for science, technology and medicine. These results were checked for reliability by a series of questions on the likelihood of reading newspaper stories with different headlines. As selected by headline, science issues rated highest.

Respondents also were asked how well informed they were about the issue areas. Results showed an inconsistency between self-reported interest and how well informed people felt themselves to be. Even though people were interested in science, they did not rate themselves as very well informed. Durnat, et al. conclude that "people perceive a gap between themselves and a world of learning," and that "they would like to know more."

Scientific understanding was the second area studied. The authors measured two dimensions: understanding of the processes of scientific inquiry (process) and knowledge of the elementary (sic) findings of science (knowledge).

While less than 14 percent of respondents mentioned theory, testing, or experimental methods, over half had a tacit understanding of the processes of scientific inquiry when given a choice between alternative methods of investigating a problem. The researchers concluded that the public has some understanding of the process of science.

Then the British researchers inquired about respondents' scientific knowledge. Some results: 31% (43% U.S.) knew that electrons are smaller than atoms; 74% (65% U.S.) knew some radioactivity occurs naturally; 46% (37% U.S.) knew that the earliest human being did not live at the same time as the dinosaurs. Over 25% of British respondents could give a "minimal account of the difference between computer hardware and software." The British researchers "doubt whether these figures give much cause for celebration on either side of the Atlantic."

What individuals tend to have greater understanding of science?

In Britain the authors found younger rather than older people, males rather than females, and middle-class rather than working-class know more about science as measured by the tests. Not surprisingly strong correlations exist between scientific understanding and educational level, socio-demographic variables and scientific interest.

Even in this brief article, the authors discuss methodological problems and issues in definitions and constructs. For example, this study to measure scientific understanding rests on an assumption that process and knowledge constitute meaningful components of the *construct* of scientific understanding.

In an abbreviated way, the scholars concluded by discussing several questions, among them, these two are key: 1) What are the expectations for knowledgeable public discussion and decision-making about scientifically based issues (water quality, waste disposal, nitrate and pesticide concerns) in a democratic society when a large proportion of the public is confused about most of the relevant scientific facts? 2) What about the relationship between public comprehension and public support for science?

While not directly answering these questions, Durnat and associates

Reiner et al.: Documenting Illustrations: To Justify or Not to Justify; Public warned that "it is unwise to generalize to any particular conclusions concerning public attitudes towards specific scientific or science-related public policy questions." Some optimism is possible because the public reports an interest in science, although they are "largely" uninformed.

For agricultural communicators, the public information role continues to be a necessary one. And the scope of the communication task to improve public understanding remains a continuing challenge. This survey would be an interesting one for research and experiment stations to replicate in each state. It would certainly underpin the recent national communication planning efforts for experiment stations.

Who's willing to take the lead?

James W. King
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

***Communicate!* Published twice a year (December, June) by the Philippine Association of Communication Educators, Institute of Development Communication, University of the Philippines, Los Banos, College, Laguna, Philippines. (\$20/year for individuals; \$30/year for institutions).**

Communicate!, a new journal from the Philippines, takes the place of *DEVCOM Quarterly*. While the latter focused on development communication, this new publication is broader. Crispin Maslog, editor and professor at the Institute of Development Communication, University of the Philippines-Los Banos, will follow a "special bias for communication education."

The first issue contributes a valuable overview of the current educational programming in communication. Articles include a course analysis of the undergraduate curricula and proposed core communication courses. Maslog writes, "There is a strong and urgent need to instill values to help the communication students and graduates become 'men and women of conscience, of courage, and of commitment'" — pertinent words for all educators confronting the year 2000.

Maslog has also pulled together a wonderful annotated bibliography on "Philippine Instructional Materials in Communication." Briefly, it shows sustained, internal growth in communication skills, vision, and commitment in Philippine communication over the past ten years.

Those who teach communications in the U.S. may find a spirit of camaraderie from like-minded colleagues on the Pacific rim. Besides a bibliography of instructional materials, *Communicate!* contains three revealing articles on opportunities for Filipino communication graduates in broadcasting, metro Manila, and the provinces.

The first issue carries a challenge to communicators, reflecting on years of authoritarian rule by Marcos and the emergence of Filipino hero, Ninoy Aquino, and his ideas.

Naturally, those in the ACE International Special Interest Group may gain the most from the pages of *Communicate!*

James W. King
University of Nebraska-Lincoln