


# CPN Reader Survey Results

By Donald Schnell

Our CPN reader survey was sent out with the September, 1987 issue which, unfortunately, was not received by subscribers until December. There were 777 questionnaires mailed and we received 259 replies by the last week in January when we began tabulation, a return rate of 33%. Having expected no more than 10-15% on this sort of survey, this was excellent.

You will recall that the survey consisted of ten questions which required written answers rather than a checkoff style of approach. This allowed greater freedom for the reader to express his or her opinion on many things. Indeed, many respondents wrote on the back of questionnaires and even included additional sheets of paper. By reading through each survey sheet, one can pick up on many ideas that the writer is trying to convey.

## Questionnaire Tabulation



This survey report will probably take two or more issues to be printed completely since we want to devote space to our regular topics as well. I will summarize results as best as possible question by question below. After the question number will be a brief phrase to help you recall the topic of the question, then the results, and then some comments. Some readers with their calculators handy will wonder why the figures do not add up in all cases. This is due to several reasons, primarily not every respondent answering all of the questions on their copy of the survey, or not answering all parts of the question, or providing multiple answers.

The survey sheets will not be destroyed at this point. I have gone through them and they will be provided for the other three co-editors to read. As I said above, reading the responses of any one person communicates some factors that cannot be quantified but are still important.

We thank those who did respond. Our job as co-editors is not to provide a salable item as is the case with most popular magazines. We see our task as providing the opportunity for each of you who has an interest in carnivorous plants to convey something you want to say to all of us, or read something someone has to say to you and all the other subscribers.

The summary will now follow.

# Question 1.

(Where you live)

Australia—9  
Austria—3  
Belgium—3  
Canada—12  
Czechoslovakia—1

## NON-USA

Denmark—1  
England—10  
France—1  
West Germany—12  
Ireland—1

Israel—1  
Netherlands—3  
New Zealand—3  
Rep. S. Africa—2  
Sweden—1  
Switzerland—7

## USA

AK—1  
AL—5  
AR—1  
AZ—3  
CA—37  
CT—4  
DC—1  
FL—6  
GA—3  
HI—2  
ID—1  
IN—1  
IL—5

KY—3  
LA—4  
MA—3  
MD—2  
ME—1  
MI—2  
MN—2  
MO—3  
NC—3  
ND—1  
NH—2  
NJ—4  
NM—1

NY—21  
OH—7  
OK—1  
OR—3  
PA—9  
SC—2  
TN—3  
TX—13  
UT—2  
VA—9  
WA—4  
WI—2  
WV—2  
NOS—9

## Comment—

As you can see, the 259 respondents are pretty well spread among all countries and States of CPN circulation. There were several “not otherwise specified” (NOS) in the US. However, the spread of respondent locations does not imply that bias is completely absent since those who did take the trouble to complete and return the survey were undoubtedly motivated for whatever reason. Anyway, throughout these comments I cannot help making a pitch for articles—I think most of us would be interested in knowing how CP growing is going in Alaska or North Dakota, for instance!


# Question 2.

(How long a subscriber)

## Comment—

You will note that 63% (163) of those responding have been subscribers for five years or less, but there are a good number who have been with us for some time, including six who often said, “Since the beginning...”, which I thought had a ring to it. Many responders of relatively few years did volunteer that they had purchased back issues, so they were familiar with CPN’s content through the years.

## QUESTION TWO



### Question 3.

(Lapses in subscriptions—why, and why resubscribed)

**Total responders who acknowledged subscription lapses—39 (15%)**

#### Why did they lapse?

Oversight—5

No/lost renewal notice—6

Lost interest—3

School—3

No time—2

Illness—2

Other preoccupation—9

Lack growing facilities—3

Expense—1

Moving/travel—5

#### Why resubscribe?

Corrected oversight/no renewal notice—10


Rekindled interest—25

Facilities/expense less of problem now—4

### Comment—

In the space for this question, several people complained about lateness of issues; several thought we had discontinued since they did not receive a renewal notice or last issue of year. Others complained about delays in answers to their queries about subscriptions. These are clearly problems for which there is no excuse, except possibly for what is out of our hands when issues are mailed. We recognize that we must endeavor to get the issues out on time in an expected time frame (“expected late” not allowed!), and we must have sufficient secretarial help to answer your questions about subscriptions. We notice that most of the lapses were short (three years or less), and we welcome all of you back.

### Question 3




### Question 4.

(Submitted material for CPN? Categories?)

Seventy-five (29%) of those who responded to the questionnaire had submitted material to CPN. Eighteen others said they had not yet but intended to do so.

### QUESTION 4



## Comment—

This is actually a pretty good percentage of reader submissions and tends to confirm CPN as a mutual communication. However, there are a good many of you who need to get busy with those intentions and share something with us.

## Question 5.

(Cost vs. quality—willing to accept less elaborate publication?)

This was one of those questions where a “no” answer meant that readers preferred the higher quality of CPN production rather than accept less. 93% of those responding indicated preference for the higher quality presentation. Some of the written-in comments concerned problems with overseas currency exchange, possible use of two grades of paper in an issue to cut costs (pictorial) on glossy, text on non-glossy), willingness to pay more to keep quality up, could not understand how we put out such a high quality publication for the money (comment included an editor of a similar publication), and willingness to accept more advertising.

## Comment—

The tone of some of the written-in comments seemed to be one of concern that we might be seriously considering a lesser production. At this time there are no plans to reduce the quality of CPN. We have been able to increase it over the years through seed bank sales and recent advertising which the readers do not appear to object to and in fact often seem to want as indicated by other comments in the questionnaires. We appreciate your vote of confidence and will try to hold the quality and the subscription price.

*To be continued*

## CP Around the World

*Cephalotus* and *Dionaea* in bud at the Paris Botanical Garden.  
Photo by Leo Song.

