

## A Survey of Fee-Based Web Subscriptions in Academic Law Libraries\*\*

Laura Justiss\*\*

*The legal publishing marketplace is offering an increasing number of commercial subscriptions on Internet platforms. Using the results of a survey of academic law libraries, Mrs. Justiss analyzes the proliferation of fee-based Web subscriptions by ranking fifty-two titles based on the number of subscribers. She also considers the impact of law school ranking and size on Web subscriptions.*

¶1 In spring 2001 the reference librarians of the Underwood Law Library of Southern Methodist University Dedmon School of Law conducted a retreat that became the catalyst for a survey of fee-based Web subscriptions in academic law libraries. The stated purpose of the retreat was to discuss the impact of disintermediation on the library's collection development policy and its public service operations.

¶2 Like other academic law libraries, the Underwood Law Library has experienced a steady decline in the use of print sources, particularly by law students but also by faculty, as the quality, quantity, and usability of electronic sources have increased. In addition, as legal publishers have migrated to Web-based platforms not only from books, but also from CD-ROMs and proprietary software, the library has become as much (or more) a study hall from which to access the law school's wireless network as a center for pursuing traditional legal research. Therefore, a discussion of the impact of disintermediation on our operations was not a fusty, academic exercise, but rather a critical planning tool for evaluating our collection development policy, the design of our Web page, and our general approach to reference services for our primary patrons.

¶3 The term "disintermediation," while originally applied to banking and financial institutions,<sup>1</sup> has been appropriated into the technology vernacular to describe the use of the Internet to sell products directly to customers, thereby eliminating the

---

\* © Laura Justiss, 2003.

\*\* Reference Librarian, Underwood Law Library, Dedman School of Law, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas. I would like to thank and acknowledge Kenny Gutierrez, computer consultant at Underwood Law Library, for his invaluable assistance in formatting the survey instrument in Microsoft's FrontPage.

1. See THE NEW OXFORD AMERICAN DICTIONARY 490 (2001) ("reduction in the use or role of banks or savings institutions as intermediaries in the borrowing and investment of money, in favor of direct involvement in the securities market").

bricks and mortar retail intermediaries.<sup>2</sup> In the library literature, unfortunately, it has come to signify the decline of the librarian's role as a highly skilled intermediary between research materials and library patrons. As Nicholas P. Terry has written:

The good law school library is not just a place of storage, but one of highly professional research service. However, it is already severely marginalized by technology, and those having pure-play distance learning services will seek to marginalize it as an institution; librarians, professional information intermediaries, are simply the first established legal education professionals to be directly threatened by technological disintermediation.<sup>3</sup>

¶4 While the reference statistics at Underwood certainly do not suggest that the reference desk will become an anachronism any time soon, no one can deny that desktop electronic access to full-text research materials has had a profound impact on the way in which patrons both view and utilize the law library. Reams have been written and spoken regarding the impact of LexisNexis and Westlaw on the legal research skills of law students.<sup>4</sup> While personally I do not find anything particularly ennobling about using digests for case law research or print versions of *Shepard's* to check citations, the reality of disintermediation in law school libraries goes well beyond these concerns.

¶5 Prior to coming to a law school library environment, I spent much of my professional career in law firm libraries, first as a reference librarian and later as a library manager. In working with the highly intelligent, sophisticated patrons in these situations, I found that if the library did not meet the research needs of the attorneys, they would take the necessary steps to acquire the materials on their own—even if this was to the financial detriment of the firm or the quality of their research. In short, a law firm library manager either stays a step ahead of the attorneys or becomes virtually (no pun intended) irrelevant.

¶6 With these experiences in mind, I decided to prepare for the retreat by taking a look at the number and selection of fee-based Web subscriptions that were available on the Web sites of other law school libraries. I compiled a list of fifty-two fee-based subscriptions that I had observed on the sites of about a hundred law school libraries and recorded how many schools had subscriptions to each title or group of titles.

¶7 Despite the fact that the information was, at best, incomplete, it nevertheless provided us with a benchmark to determine how our electronic collection compared with about half of the American law schools in varying parts of the country. Because we found this information so helpful, I decided to design a more formal

---

2. WĒBOPĒDIA, at <http://www.webopedia.com/TERM/D/disintermediation.html> (last modified Feb. 12, 2003).

3. Nicholas P. Terry, *Bricks Plus Bytes: How "Click-and-Brick" Will Define Legal Education Space*, 46 VILL. L. REV. 95, 118 (2001).

4. See, e.g., Paul Douglas Callister, *Beyond Training: Law Librarianship's Quest for Pedagogy of Legal Research Education*, 95 LAW LIBR. J. 7, 10–11, 2003 LAW LIBR. J. 1, ¶ 7; Donald J. Dunn, *Why Legal Research Skills Declined, or When Two Rights Make a Wrong*, 85 LAW LIBR. J. 49, 52, 58–61 (1993).

survey to develop a more complete and accurate picture of the degree to which academic law libraries have come to rely on Web-based subscriptions. I also hoped to be able to make this information available to the academic law library community.

## **Method**

### *Goals and Objectives*

¶8 The purpose of the survey was to obtain quantitative, rather than evaluative, information regarding the prevalence of Web subscriptions in academic law libraries. The selection of subscriptions to include in the survey was not based on the perceived superiority (or inferiority) of any given product in the marketplace. The goal was to obtain a sufficient quantity of data to provide the academic law library community with some specific, quantitative information regarding the acquisitions decisions of their colleagues.

¶9 Within this goal, the objectives of the survey were twofold. First, I wanted to determine how many law schools were subscribing to each of the selected products and the correlation, if any, of certain variables, including the ranking and size of the school. Second, I wanted to determine how many of the law libraries made these subscriptions accessible on their Web sites, whether by a direct link or by a link to an online sources page available to the university campus at large.

### *Survey Instrument*

¶10 The survey, reproduced in appendix A, was formatted in Microsoft FrontPage to facilitate electronic submission via e-mail. It included the fifty-two titles (or groups of titles) that I had previously identified through my informal scanning of law school library Web sites, of which thirty-nine were legal or legal-related and thirteen were nonlegal. Seventeen of the legal titles were foreign or international law products.

¶11 The survey solicited “yes” or “no” responses to two questions for each of the fifty-two titles: (1) Do law school patrons have access to this source? and (2) Is the subscription accessible from the law school library’s Web page?

¶12 A “Comments” field was included for each title to permit respondents to include any additional information required to clarify their answers. The term “Web page” did not distinguish subscriptions that were IP-protected, and thus not accessible off-campus, from those that could be accessed via the Internet from any location by use of an authorized password.

¶13 At the end of the list I left blank “boxes” for the addition of up to fifteen additional titles so responding libraries could add any subscriptions that they felt should have been included in the original list.

### *Scope and Distribution of the Survey*

¶14 I transmitted the survey electronically to several law library discussion groups

but requested responses from U.S. law school libraries only. Discussion groups included lawlib and lawlibref, as well as some local and regional law library discussion group lists. The survey was first transmitted in August 2001 and again in October 2001 to obtain a better response rate. By mid-December the number of responding law libraries was still fewer than thirty. I then e-mailed the survey to individual academic law librarians at law schools that had not responded to the discussion group postings. By the end of January 2002, I had received a total of fifty-six usable responses.

¶15 Unfortunately, a number of responding law libraries did not identify their institution or library before submitting their survey answers. The first question on the survey requested the name of the law school and library, and while most respondents included this information, several libraries submitted unidentified responses. While the reported results do not identify any individual library or law school, the tables contain data compilations by law school ranking and number of JD students. Therefore, I felt it would be more confusing than edifying to attempt to integrate the unidentified data. Moreover, I received a number of responses from law firms and other nonacademic libraries (despite the subject field's stated "Survey of Fee-Based Web Subscriptions in U.S. Law School Libraries"), thereby underscoring the need for identification.

### Results and Analysis

¶16 The responses to survey question 1 were tabulated and ranked, using Excel, in three categories: (1) by the total number of law library respondents; (2) by law school ranking, pursuant to the 2001–02 law school rankings published in *U.S. News & World Report*,<sup>5</sup> and (3) by law school size, measured by total JD enrollment, pursuant to the 2001 statistics compiled by the American Bar Association.<sup>6</sup>

¶17 To assess the impact, if any, of these two variables—law school ranking and size—on the frequency with which respondents subscribed to the survey titles,

---

5. *Best Graduate Schools 2002; Law; Exclusive Rankings*, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REP., Apr. 9, 2001, at 78 [hereinafter *2002 Law School Rankings*].

6. In addition to the variables of ranking and enrollment size, I also attempted to consider the variable of geographic region. Fifty-five of the fifty-six responses came from thirty-two states within the continental United States. I distributed them among eight regions, as depicted in Appendix B *infra*. Unfortunately, as a probable result of the modest response rate, the regions varied significantly with respect to the number of states represented, as well as by the number of responding law libraries in each state. Five of the eight regions included three or fewer states and represented only 5% to 13% of the total number of respondents. On the other hand, with seven states the Southwestern region accounted for 21% of the total number of respondents, primarily because Texas provided a greater number of responses than any other single state. (This result could easily have been attributed more to my success in bullying librarians I know, that is my fellow members of the Southwestern Association of Law Libraries (SWALL), than to electronic subscription patterns in the Southwest.) Consequently, it was not possible to draw meaningful conclusions from these numbers.

I analyzed the data to answer the following questions:

- For each grouping within the two variables (i.e., law school ranking and size), how many titles had 50% or more subscribers?<sup>7</sup>
- For each grouping within the two variables (i.e., law school ranking and size), how many titles, if any, had no subscribers?
- Of the titles with no subscribers, were there common factors such as subject matter or type of research tool?
- For titles to which 50% or more of all respondents subscribed, was there any change in the subscription rates when the variables of law school ranking and size were considered?
- Were there titles ranked in the top 50% by the groupings within each variable that were not included in the top 50% for all respondents? If so, how did they compare?
- How did the three major tax service subscriptions included in the survey—CCH Tax Library, RIA CheckPoint, and Tax Analysts' TaxBase—compare with one another in the various rankings of results?<sup>8</sup>

¶18 With respect to question 2 of the survey, regarding accessibility from the law library Web site, the number of “yes” answers, not surprisingly, generally trailed the number of affirmative answers to question 1 in all categories. The reasons likely included password security issues, license restrictions, proxy server availability, and Web design issues, among others. Therefore, while the rankings listed in the complete survey results reported later in table 1 include Web page access as the secondary sorting factor, the discussion and analysis in this article focuses on the responses to question 1 inasmuch as the primary goal of the study was to determine the degree to which law school libraries have added fee-based Web subscriptions to their collections.

¶19 I anticipated that some responding libraries might interpret question 2 to mean that the subscription had to be directly accessible from the law library's site in order to merit a “yes” answer. As a consequence, some libraries may have been misrepresented in the results. However, as the titles were ranked by the number of affirmative responses to question 1, this variation, if it occurred, did not affect the positions of the subscriptions in the various rankings.

¶20 Because of space limitations, I did not include the remarks from the “Comments” field in the results reported in table 1. The most frequently occurring comments consisted of clarifications concerning Web site accessibility. For exam-

---

7. Because the sample sizes varied among the groupings within each variable, it was more meaningful to look at the top 50%, rather than a more narrow cross-section.

8. Many of Tax Analysts' and RIA's materials are available on LexisNexis, and Westlaw includes at least some of the RIA materials in the academic subscription. Neither service, however, includes CCH tax materials in the academic subscriptions. Thus I was curious to see whether this fact would result in a stronger showing for CCH Tax Library on the survey.

ple, in the case of the nonlegal subscriptions, many libraries noted that the law library Web site did not link directly to the title, but included a link to campuswide Web-based resources from which the subscription could be accessed. Because the survey asked only if the subscription was accessible from the law library's Web site, these responses were counted as affirmative for purposes of the survey. Appendix C, however, includes other comments that are specific to the titles listed in the survey.

¶21 Finally, a number of respondents took advantage of the opportunity provided at the end of the survey instrument to list titles in their collection that were not included on the survey. Appendix D includes all additional titles that met three criteria: (1) the subscription was, in fact, a fee-based Web subscription;<sup>9</sup> (2) the addition did not duplicate titles already in the survey;<sup>10</sup> and (3) the title was listed by two or more respondents.

¶22 No attempt was made with this survey to determine whether an electronic subscription was acquired to supplant the print version of the resource or whether it was simply an effort to increase access by offering another format. Moreover, the survey did not attempt to measure the perceived quality of the electronic search engines or interfaces. Any one or more of these factors could easily have influenced the results, regardless of a subscriber's opinion regarding the content or scope of the material itself.

### *Results from All Respondents*

¶23 Because the survey was transmitted electronically to law library discussion group lists, the number of potential respondents was greater than the number of law schools accredited by the American Bar Association (ABA). However, only one response was identified from an unaccredited law school. Therefore, based on approximately 184 ABA-accredited law schools in the United States,<sup>11</sup> the fifty-six responding law school libraries represented a 30% response rate. Consequently, it is important to emphasize that slightly less than one-third of the accredited American law school libraries are represented in these results.

¶24 Table 1 ranks the fifty-two titles in descending order by the responses of all fifty-six responding law libraries, first by number of subscribers (question 1), and secondly by number of libraries with Web access (question 2). There was no title to which all respondents subscribed; LexisNexis and Westlaw were the highest ranked products with 98% of the responding law libraries holding subscriptions to each.

---

9. Some respondents added CD-ROM, free Internet sites, and print titles to the list, but these were not included in Appendix D *infra*.

10. For example, WorldCat is part of the FirstSearch subscription from OCLC, which was already in the survey, and therefore it was not included in Appendix D *infra*.

11. AM. BAR ASS'N & LAW SCH. ADMISSION COUNCIL, THE OFFICIAL GUIDE TO ABA-APPROVED LAW SCHOOLS 74 (2002).

**Table 1***Survey Results of All Respondents Ranked by Number of Subscribers*

Rank	Title	Publisher	Question 1*		Question 2†	
			No.	%	No.	%
1	LexisNexis	LexisNexis	55	98	49	88
	WESTLAW	West Group	55	98	47	84
2	LegalTrac	Gale Group	53	95	49	88
3	Congressional Universe	LEXIS Publishing	50	89	43	77
4	Current Index to Legal Periodicals	Gale Group	49	88	24	43
5	FirstSearch	OCLC	45	80	26	46
6	Loislaw	Aspen Publishers	44	79	38	68
7	Hein-on-Line	William S. Hein & Co.	39	70	36	64
8	IndexMaster	IndexMaster	35	63	32	47
	United Nations Treaty Collection	Treaty Section of the Office of Legal Affairs of the United Nations	35	63	27	48
	JSTOR	JSTOR	35	63	22	39
	Legal Scholarship Network	Social Science Electronic Publishing	35	63	12	21
9	Books in Print	R. R. Bowker	31	55	13	23
10	CCH Tax Library	CCH	29	51	24	43
11	InfoTrac	Gale Group	28	50	15	27
12	STAT-USA	U.S. Dept. of Commerce	27	48	16	29
13	Access UN	NewsBank	26	46	23	41
14	Index to Foreign Legal Periodicals	Research Libraries Group	25	45	22	39
	CCH Internet Research Network (Business, Finance, Health, etc.)	CCH	25	45	21	38
15	UnCover Web	Ingenta	22	39	13	23
16	ProQuest Direct	UMI	21	38	12	21
17	Philosopher's Index	Silver Platter International	20	36	9	16
18	TIARA U.S. Treaties Researcher	Oceana Publications	18	32	15	27
19	U.S. Government Pubs (Marcive Webdocs)	Marcive	17	30	14	25
20	Bender.com Treatises	LEXIS Publishing	15	27	10	18
21	BNA Tax Portfolios	Bureau of National Affairs	14	25	8	14
	BNA Electronic Newsletters	Bureau of National Affairs	14	25	1	2
22	Internet Law & Regulation	Pike & Fischer	13	23	9	16
	Other BNA Treatises	Bureau of National Affairs	13	23	8	14
23	RIA CheckPoint	Research Institute of America	12	21	11	20
	InterAm	National Law Center for Inter-American Free Trade	12	21	10	18

*(Cont.)*

Table 1 (Cont.)

Rank	Title	Publisher	Question 1*		Question 2†	
			No.	%	No.	%
	Environmental Law Reporter	Environmental Law Institute	12	21	6	11
	Eureka	Research Libraries Group	12	21	6	11
24	BNA Labor Relations Reporter	Bureau of National Affairs	11	20	9	16
	Congressional Quarterly	Congressional Quarterly	11	20	7	13
	Dow Jones Interactive	Dow Jones Co.	11	20	7	13
	Columbia International Affairs Online	Columbia Univ. Press	11	20	5	9
25	QuickLaw America	QuickLaw America	10	18	6	11
26	Inter-American Trade Report	National Law Center for Inter-American Free Trade	8	14	6	11
	Poole's Plus	Paratext	8	14	5	9
27	TaxBase	Tax Analysts	6	11	5	9
	Yellow Book Directories	Leadership Directories	6	11	4	7
28	UN Optical Disk System	United Nations	5	9	4	7
	Index to Law School Theses & Dissertations	William S. Hein & Co.	5	9	2	4
	Celex	Office for Official Publications of the European Communities	5	9	1	2
29	LawTel UK	The Lawyer Group	3	5	3	5
	LawTel EU	The Lawyer Group	3	5	3	5
30	CaseTrac.com	Oxford Univ. Press	1	2	1	2
	China Legal Exchange	Helpful Information Technology Co.	1	2	0	0
31	International Business & Environmental Regulation	Center for International Legal Studies	0	0	0	0
	International Civil Procedure	Center for International Legal Studies	0	0	0	0
	Law Pro	Carswell	0	0	0	0

\* Respondents with Subscriptions to Title

† Title Accessible from Library Web Page

¶25 Of the fifty-two titles, there were only fifteen to which 50% or more of all fifty-six respondents subscribed. Seven of these were indexes or library catalogs (e.g., LegalTrac ranked second, with subscriptions by 95% of the respondents; IndexMaster, eighth, 63%). Interestingly, 70% of the respondents subscribed to Hein-on-Line, a relatively new product in fall 2001 when the survey was distributed. At the time of our retreat, we were trying to decide whether to subscribe to this product. Even the preliminary data I compiled for the library retreat were sufficient to make us comfortable with our decision to subscribe. We were gratified to see that this decision was supported by the survey results as well.

¶26 Although I had compiled the original subscription list from a review of

about a hundred law school library Web sites, there were three titles that received no affirmative responses whatsoever: International Business & Environmental Regulation and International Civil Procedure, both products of the Center for International Legal Studies, and Law Pro, a Carswell product. This “result” suggested that the libraries on whose sites I originally observed these subscriptions, either were not among the fifty-six survey respondents or their subscriptions had been discontinued after my initial review.

¶27 With respect to tax subscriptions, the CCH Tax Library clearly dominated both the RIA CheckPoint and Tax Analysts’ TaxBase products, with 51% of all respondents subscribing to it, versus only 21% and 11% for RIA and Tax Analysts, respectively. As our library subscribes to both CheckPoint and TaxBase on the Web, but to CCH only in print, we were interested in this result.

¶28 Another noteworthy observation was that no BNA products were subscribed to by more than 25% of the total responding libraries. The survey data was closed at the end of January 2002, well before the BNA proposal to limit LexisNexis and Westlaw access to their products by means of a new pricing structure for their print and electronic products. It would be interesting to see to what degree, if any, the position of BNA products has changed as a result of the new pricing.

### *Law School Rankings*

¶29 In looking more closely at the survey results, the first variable to be considered was that of law school ranking. Table 2 includes the number of law school library respondents in the first through fourth tiers, pursuant to the 2002 ratings published by *U.S. News & World Report* in spring 2001,<sup>12</sup> as well as respondents from unranked law schools.

**Table 2**

*Respondents by Law School Rank*

Law School Rank	No. of Respondents	% of Total Respondents
Tier 1	16	29
Tier 2	9	16
Tier 3	16	29
Tier 4	13	23
Unranked	2	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>

¶30 Unlike the uneven regional distribution of respondents,<sup>13</sup> the survey

---

12. 2002 *Law School Rankings*, *supra* note 5.

responses were somewhat more evenly spread among the four tiers in which law schools are ranked. As table 2 indicates, the first and third tiers included an equal number of respondents (each had sixteen or 29% of the total respondents). The fourth tier was the next largest (thirteen, 23%), and the second tier had the fewest respondents (nine, 16%).

¶31 The 2002 ratings included 174 schools, distributed among the four tiers. Subtracting the two responses from unranked schools, the fifty-four survey responses represented less than a third (31%) of the schools included in the law school rankings. In addition, it is important to stress that the respondents in each tier represent less than half of the law schools at any given ranking level. Table 3 reflects the survey response rate for each tier.

**Table 3**

*Response Rate by Law School Rank*

<b>Law School Rank</b>	<b>No. of Schools in Tier</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>	<b>% of Respondents</b>
Tier 1	54	16	30
Tier 2	34	9	26
Tier 3	45	16	36
Tier 4	41	13	32
<b>Total</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>31</b>

¶32 With that caveat in mind, considering the relatively uniform size of the classes, it was not unreasonable to compare the number of subscriptions to the fifty-two Web-based products by the responding schools in each of the four tiers. Because of space considerations, tables containing the complete title rankings for each of the four tiers are not included in this article but have been posted on the Underwood Law Library's Web site.<sup>14</sup> There were only two responding schools that were not represented in the *U.S. News & World Report* rankings, and consequently I did not include their responses in these tables.

¶33 As table 4 indicates, tier 1 schools had the greatest number of titles (twenty-four) to which 50% or more of the respondents subscribed, and the fewest number (four) with no subscribers. The comparably sized tier 3 group of respondents included only eleven titles to which 50% or more subscribed, and more than twice as many titles (ten) with no subscribers. Tiers 2 and 4 fell into the middle

13. See *supra* note 6.

14. LAURA JUSTISS, A SURVEY OF FEE-BASED WEB SUBSCRIPTIONS IN ACADEMIC LAW LIBRARIES, at <http://library.law.smu.edu/SurveyOfSubscriptions.htm> (last visited May 5, 2003) (includes tables reporting Survey Results by Law School Ranking, Tier 1; Survey Results by Law School Ranking, Tier 2; Survey Results by Law School Ranking, Tier 3; and Survey Results by Law School Ranking, Tier 4).

range with fourteen and eighteen titles in the top half, respectively, and nine titles with no subscribers. Table 4 does not include a separate category for nonlegal or general titles because most of the titles with no subscribers included foreign or international law products.

**Table 4**  
*Survey Results of Tiers 1–4 Respondents:  
Comparative Characteristics*

Title Category	All n=56*	Tier 1 n=16	Tier 2 n=9	Tier 3 n=16	Tier 4 n=13
Titles with 50% or more subscribers	15	24	14	11	18
Titles with no subscribers (all)	3	4	9	10	9
Titles with no subscribers (foreign or int'l law)	3	4	8	7	7
1st-ranked tax service	CCH	CCH	CCH	CCH, RIA	CCH, RIA
2d-ranked tax service	RIA	Tax Analysts	RIA	Tax Analysts	Tax Analysts
3d-ranked tax service	Tax Analysts	RIA	Tax Analysts	N/A	N/A

\* From table 1

¶34 With respect to the three tax services, their relative positions within the groupings established by law school ranking did not vary significantly from the results for all respondents reported in table 1. CCH maintained its dominant position in tiers 1 and 2, while RIA tied with CCH for first place in tiers 3 and 4. Tax Analysts ranked last in all tiers except the first. It may be that TaxBase achieved a better subscription rate among tier 1 libraries because of the strength of the materials budgets and specific endowments that highly ranked law school libraries frequently enjoy, enabling them to maintain multiple formats.

¶35 Table 5 compares the subscription rates of the fifteen titles to which 50% or more of all respondents subscribed (reported in table 1) with the analogous rates for these titles in each of the four tiers. With few exceptions, most of the top-ranked titles among all respondents also achieved rates close to or above 50% within each law school tier. Only one product in tier 2 (InfoTrac) and one in tier 4 (JSTOR) had a subscription rate that was substantially lower than the rate reflected for these titles in table 1 for all respondents.

**Table 5***Subscription Rates of Titles in the Top 50% of Table 1 by Law School Ranking*

Title	% Subscribing				
	All n=56*	Tier 1 n=16	Tier 2 n=9	Tier 3 n=16	Tier 4 n=13
LexisNexis	98	94	100	81	100
Westlaw	98	100	100	94	100
LegalTrac	95	100	89	81	100
Congressional Universe	89	88	100	94	92
Current Index to Legal Periodicals	88	88	100	81	100
FirstSearch	80	88	78	88	77
Loislaw	79	75	67	75	92
Hein-on-Line	70	75	67	69	77
IndexMaster	63	63	67	63	70
United Nations Treaty Collection	63	81	67	56	54
JSTOR	63	88	78	69	23
Legal Scholarship Network	63	81	56	44	54
Books in Print	55	63	56	44	70
CCH Tax Library	51	50	78	44	54
InfoTrac	50	63	22	44	70

\* From table 1

¶36 Table 6 lists titles to which 50% or more of the respondents in a particular tier subscribed even though they were ranked in the bottom half of table 1 (i.e., titles to which less than 50% of all respondents subscribed). Not surprisingly, tier 1 respondents, which had an overall total of twenty-four titles to which 50% or more subscribed (see table 4), also subscribed to the greatest number of titles (nine) that did not garner 50% or more subscribers among all respondents. These nine additional titles with 50% or more tier 1 subscribers included three foreign or international law titles and four nonlegal subscriptions.

**Table 6***Titles with 50% or More Subscribers in Law School Tier That Ranked in the Lower Half of Table 1*

Title	% Subscribing				
	All n=56*	Tier 1 n=16	Tier 2 n=9	Tier 3 n=16	Tier 4 n=13
Access UN	46	75	–	50	–
Bender.com Treatises	27	–	–	–	54
CCH Internet Research					

(Cont.)

Library	45	50	–	–	70
Congressional Quarterly	20	50	–	–	–
Eureka	21	50	–	–	–
Index to Foreign Legal Periodicals	45	81	–	–	–
Philosopher's Index	36	63	–	–	–
RIA CheckPoint	21	–	–	–	54
STAT USA	48	69	–	–	54
TIARA U.S. Treaties Researcher	32	75	–	–	–
UnCover Web	39	50	–	–	–

\* From table 1

¶37 The remaining tiers trailed considerably behind tier 1. Tier 4 did include four titles with 50% or more subscribers that were not among the top-ranking subscriptions in table 1, but three of them were only four percentage points over the 50% threshold. Tier 3 included only one such title, and tier 2 had none.

¶38 If any conclusion can be drawn from these results, it is that, except for tier 1, law school ranking did not appear to have a significant impact on electronic subscription rates. Forty-eight of the fifty-two titles (92%) had at least one or more subscribers in tier 1 compared to a somewhat lower rate in the other tiers.

¶39 The most significant finding in the results by school ranking was the greater number of titles in tier 1 that enjoyed a subscription rate of 50% or better. It seems likely that tier 1 schools are in a better financial position not only to subscribe to more titles than schools in the lower tiers, but also to duplicate their print holdings with electronic alternatives. Tier 1 notwithstanding, however, the survey results fell short of demonstrating a direct relationship between law school ranking and the size of the library's electronic collection.

### *Law School Size*

¶40 The second variable considered in analyzing the survey results was that of law school size, based on the total number of JD students. The size groupings were determined from data included in the fall 2001 annual questionnaire provided by the ABA.<sup>15</sup> Table 7 depicts the number and percentage of survey respondents for each size grouping. As with the rankings of the fifty-two titles by law school tier, because of space considerations the tables containing the complete title rankings for the four size groupings have been posted on the Underwood Law Library's Web site.<sup>16</sup>

15. Only one responding school was not included in the ABA statistical data. I relied on THE PRINCETON REVIEW: COMPLETE BOOK OF LAW SCHOOLS (2001) to determine its size.

16. JUSTISS, *supra* note 14 (includes tables reporting Survey Results by Law School Size, 0–499 JD Students; Survey Results by Law School Size, 500–749 JD Students; Survey Results by Law School Size, 750–999 Students; and Survey Results by Law School Size, 1000+ JD Students).

**Table 7***Respondents by Number of JD Students*

School Size by JD Students	No. of Survey Respondents	% of Total Respondents
0–499	13	23
500–749	20	36
750–999	10	18
1000+	13	23
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>

¶41 The number of respondents in each grouping by size varied somewhat more than the law school tier groups. The smallest (0–499) and largest (1000+) groups were identical at thirteen respondents each. However, the second group (500–749) was twice the size of the third group (750–999), with twenty and ten respondents respectively. I did not attempt to determine the number of existing law schools within these size categories.

¶42 The survey results by law school size varied more with respect to the number of titles to which more than 50% of the respondents in a group subscribed than with regard to the relative positions of the titles within the rankings. Table 8 shows that the largest schools (in groupings 750–999 and 1000+) had the greatest number of titles with 50% or more subscribers. However, schools with smaller student bodies were not that far removed from the fifteen titles to which more than 50% or more of all respondents subscribed: the 0–499 group had twelve titles; 500–749, sixteen titles.

**Table 8***Survey Results of Law Schools by Class Size (Number of JDs): Comparative Characteristics*

Title or Category	All Respondents n=56*	0–499 JDs n=13	500–749 JDs n=20	750–999 JDs n=10	1000+ JDs n=13
Titles with 50% or more subscribers	15	12	16	20	19
Titles with no subscribers (all)	3	13	7	6	5
Titles with no subscribers (foreign or int'l law)	3	5	7	5	5
1st-ranked tax service	CCH	CCH	CCH	Tax Analysts	CCH
2d-ranked tax service	RIA	RIA	RIA	CCH, RIA	RIA, Tax Analysts
3d-ranked tax service	Tax Analysts	Tax Analysts	Tax Analysts	–	–

\* From table 1

¶43 Regarding the bottom-ranking subscriptions (i.e., titles to which no respondents subscribed), table 8 indicates that there was no more variation among the titles ranked by law school enrollment than there was by law school rank (see table 4). The schools in the 0–499 range had a greater number of titles in this category (thirteen) than the other schools, and the number of titles with no subscribers decreased for each progressively larger size category. However, the incremental decrease after the second group (500–749) was so small as to be insignificant.

¶44 Of course, a comparatively higher subscription rate among schools with the largest student enrollments does not seem surprising, considering that such schools likely support broader, more diverse curricula and possibly have practical incentives to offer multiple formats to serve a larger user base. Interestingly, except for the 0–499 group, foreign and international law titles accounted for an even higher proportion of the titles with no subscribers by law school size than by law school ranking.

¶45 With respect to the tax services, CCH was again the leading title with better than a 50% subscription rate for all size groupings except schools with 750–999 students (Tax Analysts led with a slim 10% margin<sup>17</sup>). RIA ranked second in the first two size groupings and tied for second in the two larger ones.

¶46 Table 9 lists the fifteen titles that had 50% or more subscribers among all respondents (from table 1), along with their analogous percentages of subscribing schools among the groups based on law school size. Interestingly, similar to the results in table 5 for the groups by law school rank, five of the fifteen titles dropped below the 50% subscription level, and four of these were common to both the variables of law school rank and size: Legal Scholarship Network, Books in Print, CCH Tax Library, and InfoTrac. For the most part, however, table 9 shows that the top-ranking titles in table 1 fared well, with few exceptions, when the factor of law school size was applied.

---

17. However, none of the tax services in the 750–999 size group scored above 30%, possibly suggesting less about the schools' preferences in online tax services than about their use of electronic tax services in general.

**Table 9***Subscription Rates of the Top 50% of Titles in Table 1 by Law School Size*

Title	% Subscribing				
	All Respondents n=56*	0-499 JDs n=13	500-749 JDs n=20	750-999 JDs n=10	1000+ JDs n=13
LexisNexis	98	100	100	80	100
Westlaw	98	100	100	100	92
LegalTrac	95	92	90	100	100
Congressional Universe	89	92	85	100	85
Current Index to Legal Periodicals	88	92	80	90	92
FirstSearch	80	77	75	90	85
Loislaw	79	85	75	60	92
Hein-on-Line	70	62	65	80	77
IndexMaster	63	54	65	60	69
United Nations Treaty Collection	63	38	70	40	92
JSTOR	63	54	70	70	54
Legal Scholarship Network	63	46	55	60	92
Books in Print	55	54	55	80	38
CCH Tax Library	51	62	55	20	62
InfoTrac	50	38	45	70	54

\*From table 1

¶47 Table 10 lists the titles to which 50% or more of the respondents in a particular law school size group subscribed even though they were ranked in the bottom half in table 1 (i.e., titles to which less than 50% of all respondents subscribed). The results varied considerably. The smallest schools (0-499 group) had no such titles, while the second largest size group (750-999) had the most at seven, and the largest schools (1000+) had five.

**Table 10***Titles with 50% or More Subscribers by Law School Size Groupings That Ranked in the Lower Half of Table 1*

Title	% Subscribing				
	All Respondents n=56*	0-499 JDs n=13	500-749 JDs n=20	750-999 JDs n=10	1000+ JDs n=13
Access UN	46	-	0	50	62
CCH Internet Research Library	45	-	-	-	69
Index to Foreign Legal Periodicals	45	-	-	80	69
Philosopher's Index	36	-	-	50	54
STAT USA	48	-	60	50	54
TIARA U.S. Treaties Researcher	32	-	-	50	-

(Cont.)

Title	% Subscribing				
	All Respondents n=56*	0-499 JDs n=13	500-749 JDs n=20	750-999 JDs n=10	1000+ JDs n=13
UnCover Web	39	-	-	50	-
U.S. Government Pubs.	30	-	-	50	-

\*From table 1

¶48 As noted earlier in the discussion of subscriptions to bottom-ranking titles by tier 1 schools,<sup>18</sup> these results may reflect the existence of broader, more diverse curricula in larger schools. In addition, they may also indicate that schools with larger enrollments may have evening school programs that consequently lead to a greater student reliance on remote access to research materials. Finally, larger schools are likely to have more generous technology budgets and thus are able to afford more subscriptions to electronic products.

### Conclusions

¶49 The survey described in this article sought to assess the proliferation of fee-based Web subscriptions in U.S. law school libraries and the impact, if any, of the variables of law school ranking and law school size on such subscriptions. The results clearly indicated that Web subscriptions, if not ubiquitous, are now an integral part of many law school library collections. At least half of the schools responding to the survey subscribed to fifteen of the fifty-two titles, and only three titles on the list had no subscribers whatsoever.

¶50 As to law school ranking and size, the results suggested only very limited relationships. With regard to subscriptions for the most popular fifteen titles (i.e., those to which 50% or more of all respondents subscribed), the variables of rank and size did not appear to have a consistent or clearly defined impact. On the other hand, some patterns did emerge when the numbers of titles with 50% or more subscribers within a particular group were considered. For example, this number did appear to be affected by law school rank, at least at the high end. Among the four tiers, tier 1 respondents had the greatest number of titles with 50% or more subscribers, although the reverse was not true, as the number did not decrease progressively for schools in the lower tiers. In addition, the variable of law school size showed only that the 750-999 group had the largest number of titles with 50% or more subscribers, but not at rates significantly higher in most cases than their rates for all respondents. Schools in the largest group (1000+ students) had fewer titles in this category than the next largest group (750-999), but more than the smaller-sized groups. Thus it appeared that law school size made some difference, but only at the higher end.

---

18. See *supra* ¶ 39.

¶51 For titles at the bottom of the rankings with no subscribers, no consistently definitive pattern emerged. With respect to law school ranking, tier 1 was clearly the strongest class with the fewest 0% titles. However, because the results for tiers two through four were not progressively weaker, it could not be concluded that the higher the school ranking, the more electronic subscriptions in its collection.

¶52 Moreover, with respect to law school size measured by JD enrollment, the smallest group (0–499 students) had about twice the number of 0% titles as the other groups. Again, however, the numbers did not decrease with each successively larger class. Thus there did not appear to be a correlation between law school size and the number of titles with no subscribers other than that the smallest schools had the greatest number.

¶53 One clear result did emerge. In almost every case, law libraries eschewed subscriptions to electronic foreign or international law products in favor of domestic legal or nonlegal titles. While the numbers and proportions were not identical among the groups within each variable, they nevertheless demonstrated an unwavering pattern, regardless of school rank or size. It appeared that law libraries were more interested in using their budgets for finding tools, such as periodical indexes and catalogs, than for foreign or international law sources. Of the seventeen foreign or international titles, only the United Nations Treaty Collection appeared in the top half of the results for all respondents.

¶54 Regarding the tax service comparisons, CCH dominated the other two competitors in most instances, regardless of which variable was applied. As noted previously, the absence of the CCH Tax Library from the LexisNexis and Westlaw academic subscriptions was a likely factor in the strength of this title in the survey. Conversely, RIA consistently trailed CCH, and Tax Analysts was top-ranked only in the group of law schools with 750–999 JD students. These results suggest that the inclusion of RIA and Tax Analysts materials in the academic subscription by LexisNexis, and to a much lesser degree by Westlaw, may have given law schools sufficient access to these materials.

¶55 If the results of this survey yielded any single supportable conclusion, it was that the data suggested many more questions than answers. In retrospect, I wish that I had formulated question 2 to ask whether the library subscribed to the title in print, either instead of, or in addition to, the Web version. Answers to that question might well have been more informative than determining whether the subscription was accessible from the library's Web site.

¶56 The larger question, of course, is what impact the increasing digitalization of our collections will have on our professional role as intermediaries between both “bricks and clicks” and our primary patrons, especially when law students, and even some faculty, clearly prefer clicks to bricks. Our concerns about disintermediation notwithstanding, it is apparent that Web-based subscriptions are, at the very least, here to stay and are likely to comprise an increasing portion of our collections as the technology continues to advance. Moreover, as indicated in the

responses to question 2 of the survey, law school libraries are attempting to increase access by adding these titles, where feasible, to their Web sites.

¶57 The trick, of course, will be to make ourselves, as well as our URLs, highly visible to our primary patrons, and not just as a kind of human meta-site or on-ramp to the Internet. As educators and information specialists, we will need to continue to do what we have always done best—before the Internet, during its evolution in the legal publishing marketplace, and after it gives way to whatever comes next.

## Appendix A Survey Instrument

### *Survey of Fee-Based Internet Subscriptions in U.S. Law School Libraries*

#### *Part 1 of 2: Legal and Legal Related Titles*

**Instructions:** Type in the name of your law school and library name in the box provided. (Example: University of Oz School of Law; Wizard Law Library) For each title or product name, click on “yes” or “no” to question 1 (“Do Law School patrons have access to this source?”). If “yes,” please answer question 2. If “no,” go on to the next title. Feel free to enter any explanatory comments you feel would be helpful. At the bottom of the list, you may add additional subscriptions, not on this list, to which your patrons have access.

When you have completed both parts of the survey, click “Submit” at the bottom of the page.

Law School and Library Names: \_\_\_\_\_

Title or Produce Name	Description, Vendor, or Publisher Info	Question 1: Do Law School patrons have access to this source? If “yes” answer question 2. If “no,” go on to next title.	Question 2: Access from Law Library Web page?	Comments
Access UN	United Nations Document Index & selected full text. NewsBank, Inc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Bender.com Treatises	Including any Web-based treatise title (Example: Nimmer on Copyright); or Bender “Library” (Example: Intellectual Property Library) in your collection. LEXIS Publishing.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
BNA Labor Relations Reporter (BNA)	Bureau of National Affairs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
BNA Tax Portfolios (BNA)	Bureau of National Affairs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Other BNA Treatises	Bureau of National Affairs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
BNA Electronic Newsletters	Examples: Daily Tax Report, Labor Report, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Casetrac.com	Full text United Kingdom cases. Smith Bernal.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

(Cont.)

Title or Produce Name	Description, Vendor, or Publisher Info	Question 1: Do Law School patrons have access to this source? If "yes" answer question 2. If "no," go on to next title.	Question 2: Access from Law Library Web page?	Comments
CCH Internet Research Network (Business, Finance, Health, etc.)	Including any Web-based CCH treatise except tax. (See below.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
CCH Tax Library	Any or all of the CCH Web-based full text tax publications	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Celex	European Union Commission Databases	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
China Legal Change	Helpful Information Technology Co. English-language summaries of recent Chinese laws	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
CILP (Current Index to Legal Periodicals)	Gale Group, Inc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
CIS Congressional Universe	LEXIS Publishing, Inc. U.S. Federal legislative information	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Congressional Quarterly	Congressional Quarterly, Inc. Current congressional news	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Environmental Law Reporter	Environmental Law Institute State, Federal & International Environmental Law sources.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Hein Online	William S. Hein & Co., Inc. Full text legal periodical database	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
IndexMaster	Searchable database of tables of contents and indices of legal treatises	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Index to Foreign Legal Periodicals	Research Libraries Group	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Index to Law School Theses and Dissertations	William S. Hein & Co., Inc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
InterAm	National Center for Inter-American Free Trade. Primary & secondary law materials from Latin American countries and Canada.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

(Cont.)

## Appendix A (Cont.)

Title or Produce Name	Description, Vendor, or Publisher Info	Question 1: Do Law School patrons have access to this source? If "yes" answer question 2. If "no," go on to next title.	Question 2: Access from Law Library Web page?	Comments
Inter-American Trade Report	National Law Center for Inter-American Free Trade. Monthly periodical.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
International Business and Environmental Regulation	Center of International Legal Studies	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
International Civil Procedure	Center of International Legal Studies	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Law Pro	Carswell. Canadian Legal Sources.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
LawTel UK	The Lawyer Group. Database of British Law	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
LawTel EU	The Lawyer Group. Database of European Union Law	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Legal Scholarship Network	Social Science Electronic Publishing. Abstracts of scholarly articles and papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
LegalTrac	Gale Group, Inc. Index to English language legal journals, reviews, bar journals, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
LEXIS-NEXIS	LEXIS Publishing.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
LOIS Law	Aspen Publishers. Full text primary source state and federal materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Internet Law Regulation	Pike & Fischer, Inc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
QuickLaw America	QuickLaw America, Inc. Database of U.S., Canadian, U.K., Australia and other common law countries.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
RIA CheckPoint	Research Institute of America. Full text primary & secondary tax law sources.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
TaxBase	Tax Analyst.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

(Cont.)

Title or Produce Name	Description, Vendor, or Publisher Info	Question 1: Do Law School patrons have access to this source? If "yes" answer question 2. If "no," go on to next title.	Question 2: Access from Law Library Web page?	Comments
TIARA U.S. Treaties Researcher	Oceana, Inc. Treaties in force from 1783–present.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
UN Optical Disk System	United Nations. Full text UN documents, resolutions & decisions	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
United Nations Treaty Collection	Treaty Section of the Office of Legal Affairs of the United Nations. Full text bilateral and multilateral treaties.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
WESTLAW	West Group, Inc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

*Part 2 of 2: Nonlegal Titles*

**Instructions:** Same as part 1. When you have completed both parts of the survey, click "Submit" at the bottom of the page.

Title or Produce Name	Description, Vendor, or Publisher Info	Question 1: Do Law School patrons have access to this source? If "yes" answer question 2. If "no," go on to next title.	Question 2: Access from Law Library Web page?	Comments
CIAO (Columbia International Affairs Online)	Columbia University Press. Full text scholarly contributions in the area of international affairs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Books in Print	R. R. Bowker	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Dow Jones Interactive	Dow Jones Co. Full text newspapers, financial market reports, SEC filings, etc. Factiva.com	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Eureka	RLG (Research Librarians Group). User interface for RLIN bibliographic records database	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
First Search (includes WorldCat, etc.)	OCLC bibliographic records database	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

(Cont.)

### Appendix A (Cont.)

Title or Produce Name	Description, Vendor, or Publisher Info	Question 1: Do Law School patrons have access to this source? If "yes" answer question 2. If "no," go on to next title.	Question 2: Access from Law Library Web page?	Comments
InfoTrac	Gale Group, Inc. Index to academic (nonlegal) and business periodicals. Gale Group.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
JSTOR	Full text academic journals	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Philosopher's Index	Silver Platter International. Index to philosophy journals & books, 1940–present.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Poole's	Plus Paratext, Inc. Poole's Index to Periodical Literature (1802-1906)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
ProQuest Direct	UMI. Abstracts & full text articles from academic journals in science, education, business & other areas; dissertation abstracts, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
STAT-USA	U.S. Dept. of Commerce. Economic, business, and international trade information produced by U.S. government.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
UnCover Web	Ingenta. Article summaries from more than 4,500 journals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
U.S. Government Pubs	Marcive Webdocs. Listing of documents published by U.S. Government Printing Office. Includes links to selected full text documents. Marcive.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Yellow Book Directories	Leadership Directories, Inc. Congressional, Judicial, Federal, State, Municipal, Foreign Representatives, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

Add any additional titles to which your patrons have access and that you would like included in the survey results (limit: 15). Or, if finished, scroll down to the bottom of this page and click on "Submit."

**Appendix B**  
**Regions and States Represented by Survey Respondents**

Region or State	No. of Respondents	Region's % of Total
<b>Outside Continental U.S.</b>		
Puerto Rico	1	
<b>Total</b>	1	2
<b>Great Lakes</b>		
Minnesota	1	
Wisconsin	2	
<b>Total</b>	3	5
<b>Mid-Atlantic</b>		
Delaware	1	
District of Columbia	1	
Maryland	2	
<b>Total</b>	4	7
<b>Northwest</b>		
California	2	
Oregon	1	
Washington	1	
<b>Total</b>	4	7
<b>New England</b>		
Massachusetts	6	
Vermont	1	
<b>Total</b>	7	13
<b>Northeast</b>		
Connecticut	1	
New York	4	
Pennsylvania	2	
<b>Total</b>	7	13
<b>Midwest</b>		
Illinois	1	
Iowa	1	
Kansas	2	
Missouri	2	
Nebraska	1	
Ohio	2	
<b>Total</b>	9	16
<b>Southeast</b>		
Florida	3	
Georgia	1	
Louisiana	1	
Mississippi	1	
North Carolina	1	

(Cont.)

Region or State	No. of Respondents	Region's % of Total
Virginia	1	
West Virginia	1	
<b>Total</b>	9	16
<b>Southwest</b>		
Arizona	1	
Arkansas	1	
Colorado	2	
New Mexico	1	
Oklahoma	1	
Texas	6	
<b>Total</b>	12	21
<b>Total, All</b>	56	100

### Appendix C Comments Added to Survey by Respondents

Product Title	Comment
Access UN	Web access to info from 1998. Remainder on CD.
Bender.com Treatises	Still using Authority CDs.
BNA Treatises—Other	School investigated a number of the BNA Web-based treatises, both individually and as a "core" set of titles. In both cases, subscriptions were prohibitively expensive. I actually believe BNA is pricing itself out of the market. Big problem: no IP access.
Environmental Law Reporter	1 password for single interested faculty member.
LawPro	Wanted it, but could not negotiate acceptable license, agreement, after much negotiation.
Legal Scholarship Network	"Just fighting over this now. Too damn expensive."
LOIS	We had it, but frustrations about coverage and 2001 free student site not being same as main "Professional" site.
TIARA U.S. Treatise Researcher	"Had to give it up because school could not agree to conditions in their license agreement."
STAT-USA	Available thru depository program.
TaxBase	Password for librarians only.
U.N. Optical Disk System	Password for librarians only.
	Librarian assistance required for access.

**Appendix D**  
**Titles Added to Survey by Respondents**

Title	No. of Respondents
ABI Inform	2
Britannica Online	7
Business Search Premier	2
Chronicle of Higher Education	2
Foreign Law Guide	2
Greenwire Environment & Energy Daily	2
Isinolaw: Chinese Law in English and Chinese	3
Lexis Shepard's Citations (public access subscription)	2
LOIS MCLE Library	2
Massachusetts Administrative Law: Library, Codes, Regulations and Administrative Agency	2
Massachusetts Lawyer	2
National Bureau of Economic Research	2
National Poverty Law Center	2
Oceana New York Ethics Opinions, Code Opinions, Commentary & Case Law	2
Oxford English Dictionary	5
Public Affairs Information Service (PAIS)	2
Social Law Library Online	2
State House News Service: News & Activity of Massachusetts State House	2
Tax & Commercial Laws of the World (Foreign Tax Law, Inc.)	2
VersusLaw	2
Worldtradelaw.net	2
Your Nation's Courts (Want Publishing)	2