From the SelectedWorks of Patrick Meyer

September 2011

2012 Law Firm Legal Research Requirement of New Attorneys (draft)

Contact Author

Start Your Own SelectedWorks

Notify Me of New Work

Available at: http://works.bepress.com/patrick_meyer/4

2012 Law Firm Legal Research Requirements for New Attorneys

By Patrick Meyer, Library Director and Assistant Professor, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law. The author would like to thank all those who took the time to submit the data that is the basis for this article.

I. Introduction and Purpose

This article summarizes results from the author's recent law firm legal research survey. The survey determined what research functions, and in what formats, law firms require new hires to be proficient. Such information effectively answers the question of what sources and types of research should be taught in an integrated fashion.

Recent conclusions by governing bodies and scholars that law schools should focus on preparing students for law practice[1] match perfectly with what law firm survey results indicate regarding legal research. Firms need schools to integrate the teaching of online and print-based research resources and to emphasize cost-effective research. Survey results show that the following federal and state specific print-based resources should be taught in an integrated manner: legislative codes, secondary source materials, reporters, administrative codes and digests. This is a challenge for legal writing and advanced legal research professors, where class time is already divided between a myriad of tasks. But such is a noble endeavor. As one author puts it, "[i]t may not be possible to prepare students fully for the practice of law in three years, but law schools can come much closer than they are doing."[2] Best practices for law schools should include changing from a test-centered outcome base to more of a hands-on input based means of instruction.[3]

II. My 2010 Law Firm Survey

A. About the E-Survey

This author conducted extensive research in May and June of 2010 in order to ascertain the research requirements of law firms (Results are on file with the author; see also the Appendices for some survey results and comments). Survey questions identified which research tasks are most important in the law firm setting and in what formats those tasks should usually be accomplished. See Appendix A for a copy of the 2010 and 2007 surveys.

The survey was administered to law firm librarians in the form of an electronic questionnaire that was posted to the Private Law Libraries Special Interest Section (PLL-SIS) of the American Association of Law Libraries. Of the 165 valid responses, the breakdown by firm size follows:

- 1-25 attorneys: 9 respondents
- 26-50 attorneys: 23 respondents

---

[1] *See, e.g.*, ROY STUCKEY, et al., BEST PRACTICES FOR LEGAL EDUCATION. A VISION AND A ROADMAP, 8 (2007).
[2] *Id*. at 7.
[3] *Id*. at 8.

- 51-100 attorneys: 46 respondents
- 101-200 attorneys: 47 respondents
- Over 200 attorneys: 40 respondents

As there were only nine respondents from the 1-25 attorney category, those results are not individually summarized in this article.

B. General Respondent Comments

Here are some representational entries when respondents were asked to share comments or concerns about legal research:

- Most summers and first years arrive at law firm woefully unprepared.
- The main problem I see with new attorneys is that they don't consult treatises or encyclopedias before resorting to case law. For example, Delaware law is crucial to corporate attorneys. It behooves them to be familiar with the law via a wealth of treatises before they dive into case law…. Another problem I see is that newer associates have problems with analyzing issues of law. They tend to do predominantly fact based search terms repeating what they have been told by partners or senior attorneys.
- There is very little support to train new lawyers on research even though they need it. Academic work highly differs from practice and they need practical training. There is a huge focus on research done by litigators but hardly any for transactional lawyers. Everyone seems to learn how to find a case but no one knows how to find where a company is incorporated or where to find a company's most recent prospectus. Case law research is emphasized but there is little attention given to statutes, codes and rules. Also, if they don't take administrative law in law school they are completely lost as to how the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Department of Justice or Office of the Comptroller works.
- Main concern: young lawyers are coming out of school with very little knowledge of research and sources; a shocking tendency to want to "Google" everything; a reflexive desire to jump right online for every research issue; simply not realizing how useful a book can be, to introduce you to a topic and to find answers without reinventing the wheel -- whatever your issue, someone else has probably already covered it, and if they haven't, that sets your expectations about the probable paucity of info you're going to find online as well.
- New associates are deficient in print research. They need to have an understanding of how the print resources work before they try to use them online. Also, they are lacking basic knowledge of what are statutes vs. regulations; digests and the Key number system … they don't know how to use tables of contents or indices in print resources.
- They rely too much on Google or other internet search engines these days. They do not have a plan in mind when researching. [They] [s]hould be taught how to judge a good reliable resource from a random website. In general they want to take the easy way out and do as little research as possible. I've been in law firms for 20 years and the research habits get worse every year.

For more law firm comments, see Appendix C.

C. Most Important Research Tasks (question 8)

When asked what the most important research tasks are that entry that level attorneys must know how to perform, these were the responses:

Table 1: Most Important Research Tasks (Regardless of Format)

Source	Firm Size: 26-50	Firm Size: 51-100	Firm Size: 101-200	Firm Size: Over 200	Totals:
Case law research	95.7%	87%	93.5%	83.8%	89.4%
Cost effective research	82.6%	91.3%	87%	91.9%	86.9%
Secondary source research	69.6%	76.1%	80.4%	89.2%	78.8%
Citator services	82.6%	71.7%	78.3%	83.8%	78.1%
Legislative code research	73.9%	73.9%	58.7%	59.5%	65%
Document retrieval by citation	69.6%	60.9%	50%	56.8%	58.1%
Administrative code research	47.8%	47.8%	45.7%	48.6%	46.3%
Digest research	34.8	52.2	32.6	51.4	41.3
Legislative history research	43.5%	23.9%	17.4%	21.6%	23.8%

1. Case Law Research (89.4 percent)
(Note: Prior surveys combined case law and digest research)

Of those groups who chose cases law research as one of the most important tasks, the middle three groups answered with similar regularity:

- 26-50 attorneys (95.7 percent);
- 51-100 attorneys (87 percent);
- 101-200 attorneys (93.5 percent)

2. Cost-Effective Research (86.9 percent)

When broken down by number of attorneys, the results for cost effective research show no clear pattern between attorney groups:

- 26 to 50 attorneys (82.6 percent);
- 51 to 100 attorneys (91.3 percent);
- 101 to 200 attorneys (87 percent);
- Over 200 attorneys (91.9 percent)

This was a typical quote from survey respondents regarding cost effective research:
"Inadequate preparation before logging into the database. Not checking print treatise resources that would have saved client time and money spent online. Not practicing efficient research practices. Not being aware of costs incurred by clicking on hyperlinks; Using a large (combined) file instead of a smaller (cheaper) one."[4]

Law firms indicated that only about 7 percent – 15 out of 215 -- of their so called "flat rate" contracts are actually unlimited in scope – or truly flat rate. Couple that with results from a spring 2011 annual survey of AmLaw 200 law firms, which noted that 42 percent of firms recover 60 percent or more of

[4] *See* Appendix D for comments on reasons for excessive research costs.

research costs from their clients.[5] The extent to which research costs are recovered is a source of friction between the firm and the client. The extent to which the firm eats the costs of online research is a source of friction between the firm and the researcher. These two factors – limited plans and cost recovery -- mean that it nearly always matters how you perform online research. And, as noted in the previous quote, the number and types of functions that you use on this year's plan will be taken into consideration when it is time to negotiate next year's contract. See Table 2 directly below for a breakdown of pricing plans.

Table 2: Types of Pricing Plans (Qs 12-15)

Westlaw

Firm Size	Flat Rate	Totally Unlimited	No Flat Rate Plan	Transactional Plan	Hourly Plan	Do Not Have WL
26-50	60.9%	0%	25%	30.4%	17.4%	17.4%
51-100	82.2%	2.3%	9.1%	17.8%	11.1%	2.2%
101-200	71.1%	9.8%	9.8%	20%	17.8%	4.4%
Over 200	68.4%	5.3%	15.8%	23.7%	26.3%	0%
Total	71.1%	4.6%	15.2%	22%	18.2%	6.3%

LexisNexis

Firm Size	Flat Rate	Totally Unlimited	No Flat Rate Plan	Transactional Plan	Hourly Plan	Do Not Have LN
26-50	56.5%	0%	11.1%	30.4%	8.7%	17.4%
51-100	62.2%	4.8%	28.6%	31.1%	11.1%	8.9%
101-200	65.2%	9.3%	20.9%	32.6%	15.2%	6.5%
Over 200	68.4%	5.3%	15.8%	28.9%	26.3%	5.3%
Total	63.8%	5.4%	22.1%	30%	15.6%	10%

Typical responses to the question of what the specific causes for entry level attorneys incurring excessive online research costs were as follows (See Appendix C for reasons for excessive research costs):

- Not understanding the firm's online research plans and their limits;
- Not being aware of low cost research alternatives to online researching;
- Lack of research training;
- Not realizing the value to using print resources or even that they're available;
- Poorly constructed search queries/failure to understand proper search techniques

Based on prior law firm responses, and buttressed by these survey results, cost-effective research should be stressed in nearly every class. There are various means to achieve this objective: Give a lecture on the basics of the pricing plans; include the estimated database search costs after students have completed research exercises; administer an online pricing plan quiz; have students fill out time sheets as part of their take home assignments.

[5] Alan Cohen, *Digital's Downside,* AM. LAW., July 1, 2011, http://www.law.com/jsp/tal/PubArticleTAL.jsp?id=1202497964484.

3. Secondary Source Research (78.8 percent)
The respondent groups were remarkably similar in their choice of secondary source research as being a most important research task, with the notable exception of the largest group whose percentage was more than 15 points lower than any other group. The percentages were:

- 26-50 attorneys (69.6 percent)
- 51-100 attorneys (76.1 percent)
- 101-200 attorneys (80.4 percent)
- Over 200 attorneys (89.2 percent)

As was my advice in the 2009 article, academics should stress the importance of secondary source research. Law firms still require new hires to be able to adequately research in a number of print based legal resources although reports indicate that they are generally deficient in this area.

4. Citator Services (78.1 percent)
Group responses ranged just over 12 percent between the attorney groups:

- 26-50 attorneys (82.6 percent);
- 51-100 attorneys (71.7 percent);
- 101-200 attorneys (78.3 percent);
- Over 200 attorneys (83.8 percent)

5. Legislative Code Research (65 percent)
The largest two groups chose this task about 15 percent less than did the smallest two groups:

- 26-50 attorneys (73.9 percent);
- 51-100 attorneys (73.9 percent);
- 101-200 attorneys (58.7 percent);
- Over 200 attorneys (59.5 percent)

6. Document Retrieval by Citation (58.1 percent)
The was nearly a 20 percent span between groups, with nearly 70 percent of the smallest group and only 50 percent of the 101-200 attorney group choosing this to be one of the most important research tasks:

- 26-50 attorneys (69.6 percent);
- 51-100 attorneys (60.9 percent);
- 101-200 attorneys (50 percent);
- Over 200 attorneys (56.8 percent)

7. Administrative Code Research (46.3 percent)
The scores were remarkably similar between groups, only varying by 2.9 percent:

- 26-50 attorneys (47.8 percent);
- 51-100 attorneys (47.8 percent);
- 101-200 attorneys (45.7 percent);
- Over 200 attorneys (48.6 percent)

8. Digest Research (41.3 percent) (Note: This task was combined with Case Law Research in the 2003 and 2007 administrations of this survey)
It is surprising that digest research still scores this high. The high percentages means that it is still a useful component to research courses. As noted in my prior article, it is often easier to teach students the concept of digest searching by first introducing them to the print digests.

- 26-50 attorneys (34.8 percent);
- 51-100 attorneys (52.2 percent);
- 101-200 attorneys (32.6 percent);
- Over 200 attorneys (51.4 percent)

D. Required Print-Based Research Tasks (question 7)

When asked what print resources entry level attorneys must know how to use, there were 10 research tasks chosen by at least 43 percent of respondents. Here are the full results:

Table 3: What Print-Based Sources Must New Attorneys Know How to Perform?

Source	Firm Size: 26-50	Firm Size: 51-100	Firm Size: 101-200	Firm Size: Over 200	Totals:
Your state's legislative code	57.1%	70.5%	80.5%	71%	70.1%
Federal secondary sources	76.2%	68.2%	75.6%	67.7%	68.8%
Your state's secondary sources	57.1%	61.4%	78%	67.7%	66%
Federal legislative codes	57.7%	65.9%	63.4%	67.7%	62.5%
Your state's administrative code	38.1%	50%	68.3%	58.1%	54.9%
Federal administrative code	38.1%	54.5%	46.3%	58.1%	49.3%
Your state's digest	38.1%	50%	46.3%	58.1%	47.2%
Federal reporters	57.1%	38.6%	39%	51.6%	43.8%
Your state's reporters	52.4%	38.6%	39%	54.8%	43.1%
Federal digests	28.6%	38.6%	39%	48.4%	38.2%
Your state's admin law decisions	14.3%	15.9%	19.5%	29%	19.4%
Regional reporters	19%	18.2%	7.3%	32.3%	17.4%
Federal Admin Law Decisions	14.3%	11.4%	9.8%	22.6%	14.6%

Overall, state legislative codes were the highest scoring must know print-based task, at 70.1 percent, with a high of 80.5 percent (101-200 group) to a low of 57.1 percent (26-50 group).

Federal secondary sources also scored very high, at 68.8 percent. The group percentages for were similar between attorney groups, from a high of 76.2 percent in the 26-50 group to a low of 67.7 percent in the over 200 group. The range between groups for the third highest scoring print-based task – state secondary sources – was from 57.1 percent (26-50 group) to 78 percent (101-200 group).

Although the overall percentages for federal and state administrative code research totaled 49.3 and 54.9 percent respectively, the 26-50 group had by far the lowest totals for both tasks, at barely over 38 percent.

When one compares the task percentages between availability and required knowledge, the range difference is as follows:

Table 4: Range Between Availability and Required Knowledge

(NOTE: A negative percentage means more firms required knowledge of a task than made the materials available at their local office.)

Source	Firm Size: 26-50	Firm Size: 51-100	Firm Size: 101-200	Firm Size: Over 200	Totals:
Federal secondary sources	-3.5%	20.9%	13.5%	11.2%	12.6%
Your state's secondary sources	11.1%	23.4%	15.5%	24.4%	19.1%
Federal legislative codes	19.6%	16.7%	23.6%	19.1%	18.2%
Your state's legislative code	33.8%	25.2%	19.5%	23.7%	22.4%
Your state's digest	25.5%	21.7%	25.4%	7.7%	18.6%
Your state's administrative code	21%	6.5%	14.3%	31.4%	15.3%
Federal administrative code	16.4%	10.7%	23.3%	15.6%	15.3%
Your state's reporters	15.8%	28.8%	32.7%	11%	21.5%
Federal digests	16.9%	17.9%	21.9%	6.9%	15.8%
Federal reporters	-11.6%	9.2%	11%	-1.6%	3.4%
Your state's admin law decisions	-5.2%	1.5%	15.3%	5.2%	4.8%
Federal admin law decisions	-.7%	-.5%	14.1%	-1.1%	3.4%
Regional reporters	-9.9%	-1.4%	3.6%	-11.2%	-2.5%

A lower percentage range suggests that the resource is a valuable part of the firm's print collection, in that nearly as many respondents feel the resource is a must know as make it available locally. A higher percentage difference may indicate a resource that should be considered for cancellation if that becomes necessary: the firm has the resource but it's not required to be mastered to the level as the other resources are.

Remarkable is that several tasks had higher percentages for required knowledge than availability when analyzing within attorney group percentages. Nearly all of these instances were for reporters and administrative law decisions. This could be because of cost tightening measures that resulted in cancelled subscriptions of important but unaffordable resources. It is possible that in some instances respondents are in the process of changing their perceptions on format (as evidenced by no longer having the materials in the firm), but have not yet completely done so (as evidenced by the high percentage for those materials being required). In other circumstances it could simply mean that the firm has the resource available near the office -- perhaps at a county law library or law school.

A final observation worth mentioning is that although the percentages for federal secondary sources are quite high in both the must know and availability categories, the range is only 12.6 percent. This difference further suggests the importance of knowing how to perform secondary source research.

E. Format Preference

1. Books vs. Online (question 9)

Respondents were asked what research tasks should usually be conducted in books vs. online, and 76.7 percent chose secondary source research. That is down by about nine percent from the 2007 survey. It also received one of the highest percentages for the most important research tasks question (78.8

percent). No other task scored higher than 50 percent for question 9, with digest research (41.3 percent), legislative code research (36 percent) and legislative history research (35.3 percent) being the next highest tasks. The totals in each task were lower than in the 2007 survey by a range of about 9 percent to 22 percent. The 2010 survey was the first time I divided digest research from case law research. What follows is the total breakdown for the 2010 survey. For my 2007 survey results, see Appendix E.

Table 5: What Research Tasks Should Usually Be Conducted in Books?

Source	Firm Size: 26-50	Firm Size: 51-100	Firm Size: 101-200	Firm Size: Over 200	Totals:
Secondary source research	63.6%	80%	78%	86.1%	76.7%
Digest research	50%	46.7%	36.6%	38.9%	41.3%
Legislative code research	22.7%	42.2%	31.7%	38.9%	36%
Legislative History research	50%	42.2%	34.1%	25%	35.3%
Administrative code research	13.6%	24.4%	7.3%	25%	18.7%
Case law research	9.1%	2.2%	2.4%	5.6%	4.7%

Each of the four groups chose secondary source research as the top percentage of tasks that should usually be conducted in books. The 26-50 attorney group had by far the lowest percentage for secondary source research, at 63.6 percent. The highest group total for secondary source research was 86.1 percent.

Digest research scored the second highest total for tasks that should usually be accomplished in print. Although the prior 2007 survey lumped case law and digest research together, the 2010 survey separated them. In this 2010 survey, 41.3 percent of respondents answered that digest research should usually be conducted in books, ranging from a high of 50 percent (26-50 attorney group) and a low of 36.6 percent (101-200 group). That compares to the exact same percentage of respondents who feel it is a most important research task.

The range among groups for legislative code research was from 42.2 percent (51-100 group) to 22.7 percent (26-50 group). Of major significance is the overall total of 36 percent was nearly 30 percent less than it was for the 2007 survey.

Although 89.4 percent of all respondents identified case law research as a most important task, only 4.7 percent of all respondents believe such research should usually be conducted using the books. In contrast, 79.4 percent of all respondents felt this type of research should usually be conducted online.

Of note is the seemingly paradoxical results between the 2007 and 2010 surveys when comparing tasks that should usually be conducted in print (Table 5/Appendix E) to ‘must know’ print resources (Table 3/Appendix G): There was a significant percentage decline from 2007 to 2010 for tasks that should usually be conducted in print, whereas there was an increase in the 2010 survey for nearly every print ‘must know’ task. So even though print research tasks are becoming increasingly necessary to master, the tasks should now more often be conducted online. Perhaps this merely indicates that respondents feel a mastery of these tasks in the print format is a prerequisite for moving to the online format. Or perhaps these figures indicate the start of an increased acceptance of the online format when performing such tasks.

2. Access to Online Services (question 3) and Must Know Online Services (question 4)
Six services were available to at least 42.9 percent of all respondents. As one would expect given the general nature of smaller firms, the availability of specialty databases RIA Checkpoint, CourtLink and LivEdgar fell precipitously for the smallest two attorney groups. Here is the between-group database availability comparison:

Table 6: What Databases Do New Attorneys Have Access to In Your Office?

Database	Firm Size: 26-50	Firm Size: 51-100	Firm Size: 101-200	Firm Size: Over 200	Totals:
Westlaw	87%	97.8%	85.1%	94.9%	90.2%
LexisNexis	73.9%	80.4%	91.5%	97.4%	85.9%
Pacer	100%	89.1%	83%	79.5%	90.2%
CourtLink	30.4%	54.3%	66%	64.1%	58.3%
LivEdgar	21.7%	28.3%	57.4%	64.1%	42.9%
RIA CheckPoint	34.8%	65.2%	78.7%	82.1%	65.6%
Dun & Bradstreet	4.3%	8.7%	19.1%	25.6%	14.9%
LoisLaw	13%	10.9%	14.9%	12.8%	12.3%
ChoicePoint	13%	6.5%	17%	25.6%	14.7%

The difference in the availability of services between firm sizes for Westlaw was 97.8 percent (51-100 group) to 85.1 percent (101-200 group). For LexisNexis, the range fell as firm size decreased – from 97.4 percent in the over 200 group to 73.9 percent in the 26-50 attorney group. Every attorney group scored at least 83 percent for the availability of Pacer.

For 'must know' databases, Westlaw and LexisNexis have the highest percentages by far. However, two things are apparent. First, Westlaw held a 10.5 percent advantage over LexisNexis in this survey. This was in contrast to the 2007 survey, where LexisNexis had a slight advantage of 91.6 percent vs. 90.3 percent. Second, LexisNexis lost 12.7 percent from the 2007 to the 2010 survey. What follows is the table for must know databases.

Table 7: What Databases Must New Attorneys Know How To Use In Your Office?

Database	Firm Size: 26-50	Firm Size: 51-100	Firm Size: 101-200	Firm Size: Over 200	Totals:
LexisNexis	69.6%	76.1%	84.4%	84.6%	78.9%
Westlaw	87%	93.5%	84.4%	92.3%	89.4%
Pacer	39.1%	19.6%	35.6%	25.6%	28.6%
CourtLink	4.3%	4.3%	15.6%	17.9%	10.6%
RIA CheckPoint	17.4%	6.5%	20%	20.5%	14.9%
LivEdgar	8.7%	2.2%	15.6%	10.3%	8.7%
LoisLaw	4.3%	2.2%	8.9%	7.7%	5.6%
Dun & Bradstreet	0%	2.2%	0%	0%	.6%
ChoicePoint	0%	0%	2.2%	0%	.6%

LexisNexis percentages were significantly down for all but one firm size group, ranging from 6.5 percent (over 200 group) to 16.8 percent (26-50 group). The 26-50 attorney group also showed a fairly significant drop in the percentages for Westlaw, down 8.5 percent.

On the other hand, there were percentage increases between this 2010 survey and my 2007 survey in the largest two firm sizes for many of the databases other than Westlaw and LexisNexis, with the largest increases being for Pacer and RIA CheckPoint.

It is helpful to directly compare the database availability percentage to the database must know percentage. A wide difference between the percentages suggests that either it's a valuable resource but a small number of librarians in a firm are allowed to use it, or the resource is less of a priority than the others and may be the first to be cut if the budget requires it. What follows are these percentage differences by database:

Table 8: Database Availability vs. Must Know Databases:

Database	Have Access to	Must Know
Westlaw	90.2%	89.4%
Pacer	90.2%	28.6%
LexisNexis	85.9%	78.9%
RIA CheckPoint	65.6%	14.9%
CourtLink	58.3%	10.6%
LivEdgar	42.9%	8.7%
ChoicePoint	14.7%	.6%
Dun & Bradstreet	14.7%	.6%
LoisLaw	12.3%	5.6%

Pacer, CheckPoint, CourtLink and LivEdgar may well be considered to be valuable resources that only a few librarians are allowed to use (thus the low 'must know' percentages in spite of the high 'have access to' percentages): Pacer and CourtLink as prominent court docket databases, and CheckPoint and LivEdgar because they are seminal databases in securities law and tax law. The three databases on the bottom of Table 8 all have very low access percentages, and are likely the first ones to be cut.

3. Research Tasks That Should Usually Be Conducted Online (question 10)

All but one listed task showed a percentage increase as compared to the 2007 survey. But except for case law research (up 13.8 percent), all gains were minimal. Only document retrieval by citation showed a lower percentage on this survey, but it was only down 3.8 percent.

Over 90 percent of respondents felt that citator service research should be conducted online. As was suggested in my 2009 article, it makes sense not to teach print-based Shepardizing.

Nearly 80 percent of respondents indicated that case law research (excluding digest research) should usually be conducted online. Over 76 percent chose document retrieval by citation. By contrast, only 24.4 percent felt that digest research should usually be conducted online, compared to 41.3 percent who feel that digest research should usually be conducted in print. This indicates that 34.3 percent of respondents do not have a strong format preference for digest research. Here are all of the online-usually responses:

Table 9: What Research Tasks Should Usually Be Conducted Online?

Source	Firm Size: 26-50	Firm Size: 51-100	Firm Size: 101-200	Firm Size: Over 200	Totals:
Citator services	82.6%	91.3%	93.5%	92.1%	90.6%
Case law research	82.6%	84.8%	76.1%	76.3%	79.4%
Document retrieval by citation	73.9%	82.6%	71.7%	81.6%	76.3%
Administrative code research	21.7%	32.6%	21.7%	23.7%	25%
Digest research	13%	28.3%	21.7%	31.6%	24.4%
Legislative code research	34.8%	17.4%	19.6%	26.3%	21.9%
Legislative history research	21.7%	17.4%	8.7%	23.7%	17.5%
Secondary source research	17.4%	10.9%	6.5%	7.9%	10%

The percentages for citator service research were nearly identical for the largest three groups, between 91.3 and 93.5 percent. The 26-50 attorney group lagged at 82.6 percent.

The range for document retrieval by citation was 71.7 percent (101-200 group) to 82.6 percent (51-100). The smallest two of the four groups had significantly higher percentages for case law research at 84.8 percent (51-100 group) and 82.6 percent (26-50 group). The largest two groups chose this task just over 76 percent.

4. Availability of Print Materials (question 5)

As also shown in my 2007 survey,[6] most firm libraries still have a significant supply of legal research books. Leading the way are your state's legislative codes (92.5 percent), your state's secondary sources (85.1 percent), federal secondary resources (81.4 percent), and the U.S. Code (80.7 percent). These materials were followed by your state's administrative codes, your state's digests, the CFR, and your state's case law reporters, all of which ranged from 70.2 percent to 64.6 percent. Here are the totals by resource for my 2010 survey:

Table 10: Print Resources Available

Source	Firm Size: 26-50	Firm Size: 51-100	Firm Size: 101-200	Firm Size: Over 200	Totals:
Your state's legislative code	90.9%	95.7%	100%	94.7%	92.5%
Your state's secondary sources	68.2%	84.8%	93.5%	92.1%	85.1%
Federal secondary sources	72.7%	89.1%	89.1%	78.9%	81.4%
Federal legislative codes	77.3%	82.6%	87%	86.8%	80.7%
Your state's administrative code	59.1%	56.5%	82.6%	89.5%	70.2%
Your state's digest	63.6%	71.7%	71.7%	65.8%	65.8%
Federal administrative code	54.5%	65.2%	69.6%	73.7%	64.6%
Your state's reporters	68.2%	67.4%	71.7%	65.8%	64.6%
Federal digests	45.5%	56.5%	60.9%	55.3%	54%
Federal reporters	45.5%	47.8%	50%	50%	47.2%
Your state's admin law decisions	9.1%	17.4%	34.8%	34.2%	24.2%
Federal admin law decisions	13.6%	10.9%	23.9%	23.7%	18%
Regional reporters	9.1%	19.6%	10.9%	21.1%	14.9%

[6] Patrick Meyer, *Law Firm Legal Research Requirements For New Hires*, 101 L. LIBR. J. 297, 320.

A decline in the number of firms that have on-site access to the print based reporters is noted when comparing this survey's results with prior survey administrations in 2007 and 2004. The most notable decline was from the 2004 to 2007 surveys. Here is a comparison table of the overall reporter percentages for my three surveys:

Table 11: Comparison of firms who have case law reporters, by survey year

Title	2010 Survey	2007 Survey	2004 Survey
Your state's Reporter	64.6%	71%	89.7%
Federal Reporter	47.2%	59.3%	77.9%
Regional Reporter	14.9%	19.8%	39.7%

For a full comparison of source by survey year, see Appendix F.

There were some distinctions between groups for the 2010 survey. The larger the attorney group the higher the percentage of federal secondary source materials made available onsite in the print format. The percentages ranged from 72.7 for the 26-50 attorney group to 89.1 percent in the 51-100 and 101-200 groups. The 26-50 attorney group also had the least number of state secondary source materials in print format, at 68.2 percent. The other three groups ranged from between 84.8 percent and 93.5 percent.

The availability of print-based federal legislative codes, state legislative codes, federal digests, state digests, state administrative codes, the CFR, federal reporters and state reporters showed a similar pattern of nearly always increasing when firm size increased. Of particular note are the percentages for the regional reporters – which many libraries have been reportedly withdrawing over the past few years. The over 200 attorney group had by far the highest percentage of respondents reporting that they still have the regional reporters, at 37 percent. Contrast that percentage with the totals from the other three firm sizes: 26-50 (17.4 percent), 51-100 (15.3 percent), 101-200 (9.5 percent).

III. Conclusion

In an attempt to best prepare our graduates for their first law firm job, it is best to teach them in law school in the ways of the firms. Because of the law firm feedback that is represented in the 2010 survey, those who teach legal research courses should integrate several print research components into their courses. Components include state and federal material in the following task areas: legislative codes, secondary sources, administrative codes, digests, and reporters. In addition, instruction on cost effective research and online citator services should also be a major part of your teaching. Finally, the vast majority of firms expect new hires to be well versed in both Westlaw and LexisNexis.

It should come as no surprise that instruction on many of the following discrete tasks are still requested amongst the firms, as they were in 2007: the various types and uses of secondary sources; using indices and tables of contents; how and when to use free Web based resources and how to critically evaluate them; experience conducting research in an integrated manner; the necessity of developing a research plan before commencing the research process; and how to better research the online databases, to include instruction on cost effective research and search query formulation.

Law students must be taught cost-effective research strategies at all steps of the research process, regardless of format.

Appendix A

2010 Legal Research Questionnaire

Thank you for participating in this short anonymous survey, which should take about 15 minutes to complete.

1. What type of office do you work in?

- ○ Law Firm
- ○ Government
- ○ Academic
- ○ Business
- ○ Public Interest

2. About how many attorneys are in your local office?

- ○ 1-25
- ○ 26-50
- ○ 51-100
- ○ 101-200
- ○ Over 200

3. What online legal research services do entry level attorneys in your local office have access to?

- ☐ Westlaw
- ☐ LexisNexis (excluding Courtlink)
- ☐ LivEdgar
- ☐ CourtLink
- ☐ ChoicePoint
- ☐ Dun & Bradstreet
- ☐ VersusLaw
- ☐ PACER
- ☐ LoisLaw
- ☐ RIA Checkpoint
- ☐ Other (please specify)

4. What online legal research services must entry level attorneys in your local office know how to use?

- ☐ Westlaw
- ☐ LexisNexis (excluding Courtlink)
- ☐ LivEdgar
- ☐ CourtLink
- ☐ ChoicePoint
- ☐ Dun & Bradstreet
- ☐ VersusLaw
- ☐ PACER
- ☐ LoisLaw
- ☐ RIA Checkpoint
- ☐ Other (please specify)

5. What print materials are available to entry level attorneys at your local office?

In addition to up-to-date sources, you should count titles that were canceled but are being kept because they still have value (Example: A regional reporter set that was canceled four years ago but that is deemed important enough to keep for a few more years.).

- ☐ Federal case law reporters
- ☐ Federal legislative codes
- ☐ Federal administrative codes
- ☐ Federal administrative law decisions
- ☐ Federal digests
- ☐ Federal loose leaf treatises, practice guides or encyclopedias
- ☐ Your state's case law reporters
- ☐ Other (please specify)
- ☐ Your state's legislative code
- ☐ Your state's administrative code
- ☐ Your state's administrative law decisions
- ☐ Your state's digests
- ☐ Your state's loose leaf treatises, practice guides or encyclopedias
- ☐ Regional reporters

6. Please indicate the significant print titles that your local office has canceled within the past three years, along with the cancellation year. Ex: Pacific Reporter, 2008.

For brevity, if you canceled a number of significant state-specific or federal treatises, just give an approximate number of such titles without listing them. Ex: 8 to 10 major California treatises over the past two years.

Cancel Copy

7. What print materials must entry level attorneys in your local office know how to use?

- ☐ Federal case law reporters
- ☐ Federal legislative codes
- ☐ Federal administrative codes
- ☐ Federal administrative law decisions
- ☐ Federal digests
- ☐ Federal loose leaf treatises, practice guides or encyclopedias
- ☐ Your state's case law reporters
- ☐ Your state's legislative code
- ☐ Your state's administrative code
- ☐ Your state's administrative law decisions
- ☐ Your state's digests
- ☐ Your state's loose leaf treatises, practice guides or encyclopedias
- ☐ Regional reporters

☐ Other (please specify)

8. What are the most important research tasks (online or in print) that entry level attorneys in your local office must know how to perform?

☐ Case law research (excluding digests)
☐ Digest research
☐ Legislative code research
☐ Administrative code research
☐ Shepard's/KeyCite
☐ Other (please specify)
☐ Secondary source research
☐ Cost effective research
☐ Document retrieval by citation
☐ Legislative histories

9. Based on your experience, what research tasks should usually be conducted in books as opposed to online?

☐ Case law research (excluding digests)
☐ Digest research
☐ Legislative code research
☐ Administrative code research
☐ Other (please specify)
☐ Shepard's/KeyCite
☐ Secondary source research
☐ Document retrieval by citation
☐ Legislative histories

10. Based on your experience, what research tasks should usually be conducted online as opposed to in books?

☐ Case law research (excluding digests)
☐ Digest research
☐ Legislative code research
☐ Administrative code research
☐ Shepard's/KeyCite
☐ Secondary source research
☐ Document retrieval by citation
☐ Legislative histories

☐ Other (please specify)

11. Based on your experience, cost effective research is usually accomplished best under which circumstance?

- ○ Always or nearly always through online research
- ○ Always or nearly always through print research
- ○ With a relatively even combination of online & print research
- ○ By a combination of both, but mostly online
- ○ By a combination of both, but mostly in print

12. What Westlaw contract plan or plans do you have?

- ☐ We do not subscribe to Westlaw
- ☐ Flat-rate
- ☐ Transactional
- ☐ Hourly
- ☐ Other (please specify)

13. Is your Westlaw flat-rate plan unlimited in scope or is it limited so that any research beyond those limits results in extra costs?

- ○ We have no Westlaw flat-rate plan
- ○ It's totally unlimited
- ○ It's unlimited with a few exceptions (explain below)
- ○ It's an extremely limited flat-rate plan (explain below)
- ○ Other (please specify)

14. What LexisNexis contract plan or plans do you have?

- ☐ We do not subscribe to LexisNexis
- ☐ Flat-rate
- ☐ Transactional
- ☐ Hourly

☐ Other (please specify)

15. Is your LexisNexis flat-rate plan unlimited in scope or is it limited so that any research beyond those limits results in extra costs?

- ○ We have no LexisNexis flat-rate plan
- ○ It's totally unlimited
- ○ It's unlimited with a few exceptions (explain below)
- ○ It's an extremely limited flat-rate plan (explain below)
- ○ Other (please specify)

16. What are the specific causes for entry level attorneys in your local office incurring excessive online research costs?

17. What comments or concerns about legal research would you like to share?

Appendix B

2007 Research Questionnaire

Thank you for participating in this short survey, which should take between 10 and 15 minutes to complete. Your answers will be submitted via an anonymous e-mail address to assure confidentiality. Results will be summarized to this listserv and answers will be used to train our law students how best to serve the legal community. In addition, an article is planned to be written that will compare and contrast these results with results from prior administrations of this survey. This is your chance to tell academia how we should teach legal research. When finished, hit the SUBMIT button at the bottom of the page. If you completed this survey via the PLL-SIS listserv in December, 2004 then please do not fill it out.

1. **What type of office do you work in? Choose one:**

○ Law Firm ○ Government ○ Academic ○ Business ○ Public Interest

2. **About how many attorneys are in your local office? Choose one:**

○ 1-25 ○ 26-50 ○ 51-100 ○ 101-200 ○ Over 200

3. **What online legal research services do entry level attorneys in your local office have access to? Check all that apply:**

☐ Westlaw ☐ LivEdgar ☐ ChoicePoint ☐ VersusLaw ☐ LoisLaw ☐ RIA Checkpoint

☐ LexisNexis (excluding CourtLink) ☐ CourtLink ☐ Dun & Bradstreet ☐ PACER

Other (please specify):

4. What online legal research services *must* entry level attorneys in your local office know how to use? Check all that apply:

☐ Westlaw ☐ LivEdgar ☐ ChoicePoint ☐ VersusLaw ☐ LoisLaw ☐ RIA Checkpoint

☐ LexisNexis (excluding CourtLink) ☐ CourtLink ☐ Dun & Bradstreet ☐ PACER

Other (please specify):

5. What print materials do entry level attorneys in your local office have access to? Check all that apply:

☐ Federal case law reporters ☐ Federal legislative codes ☐ Federal administrative codes

☐ Federal administrative law decisions ☐ Federal digests ☐ Federal loose leaf treatises, practice guides or encyclopedias

☐ Your state's case law reporters ☐ Your state's legislative code ☐ Your state's administrative law code

☐ Your state's administrative law decisions ☐ Your state's digests ☐ Your state's loose leaf treatises, practice guides or encyclopedias

☐ Regional reporters **Other** (please specify):

6. What print materials *must* entry level attorneys in your local office know how to use? Check all that apply:

☐ Federal case law reporters ☐ Federal legislative codes ☐ Federal administrative codes

☐ Federal administrative law decisions ☐ Federal digests ☐ Federal loose leaf treatises, practice guides or encyclopedias

☐ Your state's case law reporters ☐ Your state's legislative code ☐ Your state's administrative law code

☐ Your state's administrative law decisions ☐ Your state's digests ☐ Your state's loose leaf treatises, practice guides or encyclopedias

☐ Regional reporters **Other** (please specify):

7. What are the most important research tasks (online or in print) that entry level attorneys in your local office must know how to perform? Check all that apply:

☐ Case law/digest research ☐ Legislative code research ☐ Administrative code research

☐ Shepard's/KeyCite ☐ Secondary source research ☐ Cost effective research

☐ Document retrieval by citation ☐ Legislative histories **Other** (please specify):

8. Based on your experience, what research tasks should usually be conducted in books as opposed to online? Check all that apply:

☐ Case law/digest research ☐ Legislative code research ☐ Administrative code research

☐ Shepard's/KeyCite ☐ Secondary source research ☐ Cost effective research

☐ Document retrieval by citation ☐ Legislative histories **Other** (please specify):

9. Based on your experience, what research tasks should usually be conducted online as opposed to in books? Check all that apply:

☐ Case law/digest research ☐ Legislative code research ☐ Administrative code research

☐ Shepard's/KeyCite ☐ Secondary source research ☐ Cost effective research

☐ Document retrieval by citation ☐ Legislative histories **Other** (please specify):

10. If your office subscribes to Westlaw and/or LexisNexis, what contract plan or plans do you have? Check all that apply:

Westlaw:

- ☐ Flat-rate
- ☐ Transactional (pay-as you-go)
- ☐ Hourly

Other (please specify):

LexisNexis:

- ☐ Flat-rate
- ☐ Transactional (pay-as you-go)
- ☐ Hourly

Other (please specify):

11. If your office has a flat-rate plan from Westlaw and/or LexisNexis, is it unlimited in scope or is it confined to a certain jurisdiction, where any research beyond that jurisdiction would result in extra costs? If your office has more than one such plan, choose the service that's used the most and feel free to note the specifics of the other plan in the comment box. Choose one:

- ○ We have no flat-rate plan
- ○ Unlimited with a few exceptions
- ○ Totally unlimited
- ○ Confined by jurisdiction

Comments:

12. What are the specific causes for entry level attorneys in your local office incuring excessive online research costs?

What comments or concerns about legal research would you like to share?

Appendix C: Law Firm Comments -- 2010 Legal Research Survey

Comments are edited only for grammatical purposes. The substance of comments was not changed.

Overall, training works, and the more you can do, the better. Over time Lexis and Westlaw reps have begun to stress the cost-effective over other aspects of training, and this coordination has helped a lot.

We have comprehensive agreements with Westlaw/Lexis but never, ever use the term "flat rate" and neither do most other firms. It is a term used by vendors and law schools. It has no application for our clients and is very, very unhelpful to teach law school students to think that it applies to firms. You do them a grave disservice by using language that creates an unrealistic expectation of law firm access. Attorneys perform a search; each search incurs a charge; that charge, minus a discount, is billed to their client. That is what happens, that is what they need to know. Most summers and first years arrive at law firm woefully unprepared.

Attorneys are not taking the time to attend training classes.

I realize that the law schools have staffing constraints but I really think the sales vendors should NOT be teaching online research.

Most students have no idea what the digest are for and most have never heard of secondary titles.

The main problem I see with new attorneys is that they don't consult treatises or encyclopedias before resorting to case law. For example, Delaware law is crucial to corporate attorneys. It behooves them to be familiar with the law via a wealth of treatises before they dive into case law. These may be online or in print treatises for those who consider books "a 1950's technology," as one first year associate stated when I showed him a set of treatises on our shelves. Also, the common complaint of librarians: the new associates do not know the difference between laws and regulations. Pundits say this is because students are no longer taught civics in public high schools, but surely they should learn this in law school. Another problem I see is that newer associates have problems with analyzing issues of law. They tend to do predominantly fact based search terms repeating what they have been told by partners or senior attorneys.

Also - the new attorneys think all answers must be free on the web somewhere and often call us with "I've looked on the web for hours and found nothing....can you help?"

Google is not the answer! The students should be taught that there is nothing wrong with asking when you're not sure of the answer. Better to ask then to waste time floundering around trying to find something - when you're probably going around it the wrong way. Librarians are your friends - cultivate the friendship!

There is very little support to train new lawyers on research even though they need it. Academic work highly differs from practice and they need practical training. There is a huge focus on research done by litigators but hardly any for transactional lawyers. Everyone seems to learn how to find a case but no one knows how to find where a company is incorporated or where to find a company's most recent

prospectus. Case law research is emphasized but there is little attention given to statutes, codes and rules. Also, if they don't take administrative law in law school they are completely lost as to how the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Department of Justice or Office of the Comptroller works.

Main concern: young lawyers are coming out of school with very little knowledge of research and sources; a shocking tendency to want to "Google" everything; a reflexive desire to jump right online for every research issue; simply not realizing how useful a book can be, to introduce you to a topic and to find answers without reinventing the wheel -- whatever your issue, someone else has probably already covered it, and if they haven't, that sets your expectations about the probable paucity of info you're going to find online as well.

Things will be changing in law firms so quickly and profoundly over the next few years, that what's true today may not be true tomorrow. The death of the billable hour, alternate fee arrangements, lower costs for legal research, competition in sources of legal materials (i.e. Bloomberg Law), the rise of Generation Z (true online adepts) -- all will have a measurable effect on how we view what's considered "effective" legal research.

It should be more of a priority to teach in law school.

Consider librarian as an additional "free" resource in knowing best sources of information. Knowing when to use 'free' versus 'fee-based' options. More emphasis on value of digests & use of table of contents & indices instead of running searches through databases would be helpful. Ability to compare various sources in print versus looking online. Value & function of legal encyclopedias and hornbooks. Paying attention to source of material found on the Internet & possible inaccuracies or bias or no longer current information.

When they discover what value the Digest systems have they are flabbergasted that they never learned about this in school. The research becomes much easier after that.

I think Lexis/Westlaw access should not be free, but should carry a low cost charge by semester. Every time a law student signs on (like a phone card), they use some of the value behind the id or password. If their IDs run out of reserve or value before the semester ends, students should be able to purchase additional hours, but at a higher cost than the original value. Then, when the next semester starts, their IDs are re-charged for the semester again. These people need to know that Online Legal Research IS NOT FREE in the real world after law school.

Although we have a flat rate contract for some of our online services, that doesn't mean that searching is free. We still bill our clients for the research (passing along any discounts due to the flat rate), and our future contract is negotiated based on current usage. So the more we use the service, the higher our flat rate level will be the following year.

It’s important to remind attorneys that not everything is on Westlaw or Lexis. Remind them to take a moment before starting their research to consider what the best resource to use is, and to take into consideration not only the cost of the resource but the amount of time it takes to search.

New associates are deficient in print research. They need to have an understanding of how the print resources work before they try to use them online. Also, they are lacking basic knowledge of what are statutes vs. regulations; digests and the Key Number system; they think library staff should do Blue-booking for them (wrong); they don't know how to use tables of contents or indices in print resources.

Make legal research worth more credits, so students take it seriously; make students take advanced legal research; get the faculty on board with both ideas.

New associates need to make better use of print and/or online resources for which we have annual subscriptions (no charges to clients).

New researchers assume "everything of value" is online. They trust free online sources as much as trusted legal vendors - perhaps more. WESTLAW & LEXIS should provide an "approximate cost" when a student signs off Law School WESTLAW or LEXIS equipment. Students have no idea of the cost of their research or how to be cost effective. The success of our law firm has been to verify research using books. We catch mistakes in legal research arguments that give us an edge.

Books! They tend to waste time poking around online when they could have easily and efficiently found the answers if the used the state practice series. I tell them if they spend more than 20 minutes using any resource without result, they should consult with the librarian for guidance/suggestions.

Almost every new associate comes to the firm wanted to look for cases. But half the time cases aren't the answer and, even when they are, the best way to start looking for cases is usually using another resource -- treatises or articles especially. Also digests, annotated codes, etc.

Advanced Legal Research should be a required course. Law students need more in-depth instruction in how to use loose-leafs, in the legislative process and how to interpret a legislative history; more instruction in how to do regulatory research and regulatory history; more instruction in just how much is available from government or other resources in the internet that can keep costs down; how to use Library staff!; how to combine print and online research for more cost-effective and substantively effective results. It would be helpful if when doing research tasks in a course, that law students keep track of "billable" hours and get some kind of pro-forma estimate of what the online charges would have been, both retail and under a flat-rate contract, say at a 50% discount. In addition, you should teach them how to check in Westlaw and Lexis what database searches and document delivery fees will be before running a search. When WestlawNext becomes available, drill into them how the search and billing paradigms have changed, how WestlawNext will be charged at a premium, and document view fees will be different, and how to minimize them by, for example, looking at the cases first in Google Scholar to see if they are relevant and useful before viewing them. Emphasize that firms now want, not only cost recovery, but cost prevention and predictability, and that good research skills are very important to this.

New associates should be able to comfortably research both electronically and in print and be able to use both methods when appropriate.

It sometimes takes me a while to convince entry level attorneys that using secondary sources first will often save them time. Their inclination is definitely to jump into a case law database right away.

Students need to understand that there are still a lot of places to go. WEXIS should not even be the starting point for a lot of research; how to judge if they are good and use other services to verify data; It is not so much print versus digital, but how to look for both; They need to know how to establish validity, for example if they are doing state code research and they use the free state edition, that they need to confirm that citation has not changed by running it through a citation system; Legislative history is good example that people need to understand that some of it is digitally available up to a certain point and prior to that point needs to be done in print.

Law students must understand that all online research has costs, even if a firm has a flat rate unlimited plan in place. In addition, in the current environment, clients are increasingly refusing to allow firms to charge back for online research which means that much of it is written off.

They don't learn how to use the books. They automatically go online.

Just ask if you are not sure. I think they are sometimes nervous to let someone know they do not know how to do something. Don't worry--it is better to ask than get the bill from your supervisor. We still see what the charges are before the flat rate. If you are too nervous, call the Lexis or Westlaw reference attorneys for help. But don't be nervous, we field a lot of questions.

There are lots of free and valid online research sources. Law schools should also teach about these.

All primary sources of law should be easily and cheaply accessible online (and most of them are). But for some things, like codes and court rules, books just work better because we often need to see the structure of the code at various levels. Lexis would work better for codes if its table-of-contents interface weren't so kludgy and dated (I have complained about that to them). My only other major gripe with online legal publishers is that they can't seem to figure out how to devise a search system that is as effective as, say, Google.

Firms should test applicants to determine their level of competence in using online databases.

I have seen two extreme approaches: they expect to find a treatise on a very narrow topic and they look at you like you don't know your stuff if you don't have an answer; (2) they just don't see how they can contextualize a research assignment by using books or dictionaries, or digests. We just want to know what electronic sources the academic libraries have and what the students are taught.

Pricing of Lexis and Westlaw for law firms, especially as measured against the costs for law schools, remains inexplicable.

New lawyers should think about research as though the money is coming out of their pockets.

We have found that the West WILR program integrating print and online research is valuable to summers and first years. We librarians teach on an as needed basis.

My experience so far this summer is that the clerks are having difficulty realizing that they may have to spend hours on one research project - it's not a Google-it-to-the-top process. Don't discount the value of paper indexes just because you're used to electronics. Put as many arrows in your quiver as you can

I believe law students should at least be introduced to online research costs while in school, and [should be taught] a course on how to conduct a search. I see way too many instances of kids fresh out of law school taking what I call the 'shotgun approach' to legal research where they just fire away (run searches) until they hit something. Part of that may be attributable to my first statement - they have no concept of online costs until a partner or client comes yelling about the bill.

Entry level attorneys don't seem to be as familiar with the utility of table of contents and indices found in print publications.

Don't know basics -- how a bill becomes a law; how the regulatory systems work at both the federal and state level; lack of experience with secondary sources; lack of experience with print

More schools need to offer programs/workshops/assignments on cost effective research. They need to be aware that there is a growing trend among clients to refuse to pay for electronic research. While books are becoming rarer, they should at least be given an overview of using digests, reporters, and possibly treatises (though those are going to be practice specific). I've had summer associates and first year associates tell me that they were terrified about hearing how a transactional plan works. This could be ameliorated with more preparation in law school. And the vendors should be responsible for also sharing the costs of these searches. They need to show them how to find the cost of searches in both Westlaw and Lexis and give them some basic idea of the costs of the most basic types of searches. For too long, Westlaw and Lexis have hooked attorneys on unlimited research like crack, with no care as to how effective they are at researching. As long as they're hooked that's all that matters to them.

Entry level attorneys develop bad online legal research habits before they come to work at a law firm. After they get to a firm they think they know everything, actually they know nothing or next to nothing. They do not even know what Wright & Miller is or Moore's, they act like you are speaking a foreign language, if you say Manual for Complex Litigation or MDL (Multi District Litigation) their faces turn white. They look at the books like they are foreign objects not to be touched unless they can put earphones in them. They cannot even find things using an index, table of contents or finding aids.

not taught nearly enough in law school - I teach an advanced legal research class at Georgetown, and even the most prepared students coming into the class are horrified at how ill-prepared they would have been if they had left school without our course

Sometimes a firm is not able to give a lot of guidance re: how online should be billed. Really need to ask specific attorney for whom you are doing research what they expect -some use what you need and will write off rest; some bill office not client; if bill client be very circumspect.

The use of books for searches that are not appropriate for online searching in the current technological environment. There has to be additional strides in computer software before there can be an elimination of books.

They don't understand the civics 101 aspect of the research, namely how laws are made; difference between statutes and regs; how to use an index; what annotated statutes are.

Librarian is best research resource in the entire collection. Always best starting point. We can save the 5 hours research time when assoc. has DC opinion from 1971 citing DC Code section that he cannot find in the current code book, on LX or WL. The Customer Service at both LX and WL cannot find it either and conclude it must be a mistake in the citation in the opinion. When librarian is finally consulted, Librarian knows the code was revised in 2001 and refers to a disposition table. Librarian produces the language in 5 minutes. Can't find that experience in books or online or Google. Five minutes or five hours: what would you want to pay for if you were the client?

The law clerks always surprise me in how little print research they do know how to do, they are entirely dependent on online databases and sources. Whereas new associates spend time with state treatises, and practice specific books.

The fact is many legal questions will be answered with something other than case law and schools really don't teach students to search or even think of where to start their search except for in case law.

Assuming that we the materials in both paper and electric we let attorneys decide which format they prefer. In some cases, due to space restrictions, we only have materials online.

Law schools should focus on training beginning with print resources - the old fashioned way. Electronic research is fantastic and can be a real time saver, but I find that most young associates have no idea what they're actually doing. They do not understand the elements of the law they are researching because they just throw together some search terms and look for the matching terms, instead of the relevant law. Mixing both print and electronic research is the only way to appropriately research. Start with the secondary resources to gain a greater understanding for the topic, then switch over the electronic research for case law and Sheperdizing/KeyCiting.

Summer associates come to us knowing nothing about the practical aspects of doing research. For us is it not a scholarly pursuit; it is business and it needs to be done in the most efficient and time sensitive way possible. Law schools don't teach students about secondary sources and it does them a huge disservice when they get to a law firm. Law schools need to acknowledge that they are preparing people to work in a BUSINESS.

THEY ARE STILL ARRIVING WITH LITTLE CONCEPTION OF ANY SORT OF LAW EXCEPT CASE LAW. THEY DO NOT UNDERSTAND HOW LAWS OR REGS ARE MADE AND HOW LAWS AND REGS FIT IN TO THE SCHEME OF LAW MAKING.

Vendors need to stop the unlimited online research given in law school and really train students in effective online research. Until an associate gets a client of their own, they could care less about online charges or billing in general. It isn't until they have to charge a client for services does money start to matter.

1. In general, law students are not taught the cost of doing business as a lawyer. Even some seasoned lawyers don't want to be bothered with understanding overhead costs. Law schools would do well to teach students basic business and financial management. 2. Law students should be taught that every legal research resource may not be available where they work. They should be taught how to use a library and how to build relationships with law librarians.

Think about what you are really looking for and make a plan before going online.

I wonder if creating law school WL/Lexis research assignments replicating real-world constraints would be useful. i.e., letting them use only cases they find in 3 transactional searches to write their memos. Or going over their research trails with them. I do that with our new hires all the time.

Associates do not seem to understand that if something is not billed to a client then the cost becomes an overhead cost. That overhead cost then reduces the profitability and affects their bonuses, operations capabilities, etc.

Entry level attorneys should be aware that they don't know everything and that there are many people to be used as resources, not just other attorneys.

Unless there is a familiarity with the subject matter, ELA's should be well versed in both online and electronic research so that they can completely understand their question. Reliance on one or other does not necessarily mean they are competent and have completely covered their commitment to client representation.

Future legal research training courses should provide a mix of online and print demonstrating the value of both formats. Legal research courses in law schools should be required in year one but carry as much credit power as any other legal course work in law school. In years two and three, perhaps students should be required to complete a legal research exam (searching for answers in the library and online) to demonstrate that their research skills are improving as they complete each year of law school.

Questions posed to lawyers requiring research generally do not have pat answers. Such questions require research and analysis skills to analogize and synthesize material. Attorneys in law firms giving assignments do not tell junior associates what sources to look in. Thus, exercises in law school with easy to find answers in the source identified as the subject of the exercise are useless in terms of demonstrating to students what researching and analyzing will be like when they are practicing law.

I have seen more attention to choice of format and learning about various options within the firm before going online or starting a project but there is a long way to go. Students must finally understand that Lexis and Westlaw are not always starting points; costs are paramount; efficient and effective searchers are winners. They have an information tool belt and use it thoughtfully.

Need to be well grounded in fundamentals of how to do research, and be aware that there are quite a few resources available in the specialized areas of law. be willing to look for advice on the best resources to use.

There is an increasing view that all information is accurate, easily available, and free on the web. Needless to say, while there's a lot of good info out there for free, sometimes 15 minutes in a database is more cost effective than 3 hours looking for reputable free sources.

New associates think that all their answers will be answered online. Not all treatises are available online. They might also want to consult with the librarian if there are other services available that would help them that might not incur additional charges (e.g. CCH, BNA,...)

Students need to be made comfortable to use both print and online. Those familiar with the content of treatises or other material in print will be more likely to understand the best ways to approach some of those when online is the only option available to them. And, remember - encyclopedias are not wikipedias - AmJur and CJS are still relevant in print!

too much Googling not enough understanding of the results.

Westlaw and Lexis need to wake up and smell the coffee. Cut pricing, stop gouging, and look out - here comes Bloomberg Law - poised to replace each firm's second place online service.

They don't know what they don't know. There's practically NO need to conduct actual meaningful legal research in law school, so it's really not a skill they've managed to hone during their legal education.

When asked about research skill level, a common response is I can Google. In a lot of small-midsized law firms, books are a thing of the past. Sad but true. This is the Google generation and vendors take advantage by describing their products as "comprehensive." One stop here--that's all.

Cost factors.

Lexis or Westlaw should not be the place to begin research

We are extremely aggressive in trying to make attorneys aware of pricing and alternative databases

They rely too much on GOOGLE or other internet search engines these days. They do not have a plan in mind when researching. Should be taught how to judge a good reliable resource from a random

website. In general they want to take the easy way out and do as little research as possible. I've been in law firms for 20 years and the research habits get worse every year.

Any instruction that stresses the importance of planning a research activity and the importance of considering all research resources before starting a research activity should produce positive results for anyone attempting to perform cost effective legal research. Thanks for asking!

It is important for the firm partners to support the Library. New associates pick up on that support, and bring their research projects to us for assistance. We answer more than 3,500 research requests annually, as a result. Partners and Associates should be aware of the cost savings achieved when they use the Library.

The idea that everything is available without cost concerns and online. It simply isn't the case in many firms. My concern then becomes that the research is not performed thoroughly because of the fear and/or lack of knowledge. My goal is to provide assistance without judgment but it is sometimes difficult to get that thought into their heads.

The use of secondary resources in print are where our new associates are weak. Many expect to find answers to complicated banking transactions online.

Thorough, fast, cheap - pick two.

I wish there was some consistency about what was taught at all law schools//I wish there was a requirement for an advanced legal research class//I wish it was taught to use a mix of online & print resources//I wish they didn't think everything was "online" & it was all free.

LEXIS and West Law are both good products but you MUST simplify your pricing schemes. Tiered pricing is ludicrous - I much prefer the Bloomberg Law approach - very clear and very concise. Bloomberg is going to ultimately give both LEXIS and West Law a run for their money, I think.

Law Schools MUST teach students in an accountable way how to effectively use CALR. This is more important than ever, because I have Summer Associates who have never opened a book in a Law Library. Their world is online, and they must be taught distinctions between internet research and CALR and must learn how to use CALR well BEFORE working in the real world. That must be part of their new reality.

I'm at the point of wanting to PAY associates to come to training ... they won't come, and it shows. The whole hubris of 'I know what I need to know and can't think of anything else I can learn' is just ridiculous and frustrating

I am finding that law students believe that a case-law or statutory search (conducted online) is the very first thing to do: they do not look for a secondary source to explain the entire context and help them get a head start on their case law/statutory research. They spend so much time looking online (and

sometimes not even knowing what they're looking at -- a primary or secondary source) that they sometimes miss the fact that they may not truly be comprehending the issue they're asked to research.

PLEASE teach them to be cost-aware. Please teach them to ask questions, and not just dive into expensive research as if it were Google!

Our partners are concerned that new lawyers don't know about the seminal treatises in particular areas of law. This lack of knowledge makes the partners question the quality of research. If you are unfamiliar with an area of law, start with treatises.

Students should have a government documents class like librarians, so they understand the workings of the U.S. government. That way, they would know where to start in doing legislative and administrative research.

Most new attorneys do not understand/use secondary sources enough. Many do not understand that primary law includes statutes and regulations.

Thank you for surveying us law firm librarians!

They come in to the firms not knowing anything but Google and how to search case law. Their search capabilities are Google based so not time or cost efficient.

Most newly graduated attorneys have never heard of Hein Online, New graduates need much more experience using and understanding KeyCite. They also need more practice doing statute and case research online.

It seems many law students don't know how to do research,

Re: Question 11- the best cost effective research is done by starting with print treatises, pulling and updating and getting to understand the relationships between the legal materials online, and then reading and processing information with print materials or print-outs. Familiarizing stage = print. Mental mapping of the area of law and updating = online. In depth understanding of specific materials = in print.

If you cannot effectively search manually you cannot effectively search online.

Appendix D: Respondent comments regarding excessive research costs

These are some of the many comments to the question of "What are the reasons for excessive online research costs?" Comments are edited only for grammatical purposes. The substance of comments was not changed.

I wish I really knew. Sometimes they just don't know how to use it cost-effectively (in spite of all the training we do), maybe they are in a big hurry (wouldn't be surprising). A partner said to me that he wondered why two people in the same practice group given roughly the same kind of assignments could have such different amounts of Westlaw/Lexis usage. Maybe it's research preferences; there are those who will give their research to the Library and those who want to do it themselves.

Probably forgetting about focus & locate.

Failure to understand Boolean search basics, to select appropriate files, to ask for research assistance, to understand file pricing, and to understand how research is billed to clients. Usually all of these at once.

Ignorance and not understanding bill backs to clients.

They think everything is free! They treat the online research databases like Google. They don't think about their research before they start.

Failure to plan, confusions in switching between hourly and transactional searching; not understanding the costs of printing

Not knowing when to search broadly and then using the narrowing features of the online system -- such as Focus in Lexis. Secondly, they choose ALL database when they should only be searching with a particular state.

Not knowing how to start research in an area which is new to them.

They don't really understand the difference between transactional search and hourly search. They don't have any idea what's available as secondary sources in print -.e.g. - searching ALLCASES for basic contract law materials or searching TP-ALL for anything on their topic. - Also, forgetting they are using the database hourly and doing other tasks.

Do not know how to effectively strategize a search before touching the computer. The idea that if they can't find it, it isn't there. Not knowing when to use the reference/help desk of the vendor

Being unaware of low cost research alternatives and lack of training are the main cause for excessive research costs.

Lack of good online research habits.

Lack of attendance at law firm Westlaw and Lexis training where the contract and pricing is discussed as well as databases outside of the contract.

1. not realizing the cost of particular searches 2. inefficient search methods -- searching larger files than required; duplicative searching.

Ignorance of how the contracts work and how much W/L costs, not knowing the best cost-effective strategies, more training needed in basic searching,.

ignorance

Combining sources that overlap. Running multiple searches when one or two searches are necessary. Printing/downloading hundreds of results instead of reviewing online to limit to a dozen relevant results.

Inadequate preparation before logging into the database Not checking print treatise resources that would have saved client time & money spent online Not practicing efficient research practices Not being aware of costs incurred by clicking on hyperlinks Using a large (combined) file instead of a smaller (cheaper) one

Poorly constructed searches repeatedly run in a transactional database.

Not understanding how research costs are incurred. I show them their bills and they are shocked.

(1) Not realizing the difference between transactional/hourly pricing; (2) Not being familiar with the scope materials available online; (3) Using West and Lexis before considering other online sources like CCH, RIA, etc.

Law schools over-encourage students to do online research rather than a composite or mix of books and electronic services. They also do not pay attention to the distinction between files that are included in the contract versus the "excluded files", the use of which is billed to us at retail costs OVER AND ABOVE our monthly flat rate.

Performing multiple searches on the same idea rather than using Boolean search logic to combine a variety of keywords into a single search string. Lack of understanding

Doing multiple searches and not realizing that they should do a broad search first and then focus.

Searching incorrectly with hourly or transactional pricing. Using databases outside of our contract.

Using resources outside of our plan, signing on with the transactional plan then running multiple searches in a large database instead of a single, broad search then using Focus or Locate. Using a database that is larger than their needs (such as Allcases when they just need NY cases). Also, not attending Lexis or WL training to learn about the firm's contract.

using files not in our plan, without first consulting the librarians or the vendor themselves; not using research tips, i.e. not using focus to narrow a broad search, not truncating, etc...

Not understanding how Lexis/Westlaw charge for searching; not understanding that having a contract does not mean that there's no charge; thinking that Lexis/Westlaw charge to print documents but not to download or email them Not understanding the assignment Not starting with a free source, either in print or online, to get a better understanding of the subject matter, to learn what terms will work best when searching online, and to identify the most important cases and other primary source materials.

Free access in law school without knowing the consequences in the real world; attorneys that are more senior (therefore more "knowledgeable") telling them to "just go online"; not enough legal research training in school.

Their searches may be too broad or too specific, and they may run new searches instead of refining their original ones.

ignorance and arrogance ; free online access spoil them to use online sources without thinking

Lack of understanding of digest headnotes; key numbers; indices; no knowledge of primary sources and how they are organized

Using content outside the flat rate contract (even though they get a prompt telling them it is outside), forgetting to log-off, using the hourly option but stay on too long looking at results.

1. They should look in print treatises, digests, annotated codes and (to the extent available) case reporters first. 2. They should do preliminary online research on Fastcase (or another service that does not bill back, such as the BNA or CCH services, even Google). 3. Only once they know the legal background and what they are looking for should they go onto Lexis or Westlaw. 4. They should take the time to learn the basic elements of cost-effective online search (e.g., doing a general search and then using Focus or Locate if they are being charged by the transaction). This information is available in brochures from both Lexis and Westlaw - and the librarians are glad to teach it at any time.

Using too broad a database at first, not doing preliminary research first in print or in Google, not using a broad enough search at first, and then filtering by locate or focus with no extra charges, jumping into online case law research first without first scoping out the area of law; not using free resources first (such as at government websites); doing law review research or Federal Register or other research in Westlaw or Lexis instead of in HeinOnline of the CCH database; not asking for help from either Library staff or vendor reference attorneys or asking Library staff if there is a less costly source for getting the same material.

Not understanding cost effective searching or the difference between Westlaw/Lexis and Google.

It often takes some time for entry level attorneys to be able to estimate how much searching or printing, for example, will cost to the client. After years of not worrying about that, it is a tricky transition to make.

This happens less than it used to as incoming attorneys are aware of importance of keeping costs down. West and Lexis do a good job of alerting users of what is outside of our flat rate plans and thus there are fewer surprises.

They need to ask questions, these contracts are very complex and often something will be in WL or Lexis but won't be in the contract because it separately purchased. For example we had an issue with USPQ being pulled through West when they should have used the BNA database.

Failure to think through the research task before beginning or failure to consult print sources.

Lack of forethought.

They have no concept how expensive it is regardless of whether it's hourly or transactional billing. Nor do they realize every little click can cost more money. They also start out too broad i.e. searching all state & federal cases when only need state level cases

They either sign on hourly and forget to log out, select the largest databases (ALLFEDS, STATE Cases) for citation look up, or they go outside the contract without checking other sources where we may have the material.

Rarely happens, but when it does it is a lack of understanding of the contract limits and poor skills with respect to cost effective use of resources.

We avoid additional costs beyond our flat-rate plan.

Attorneys do not know what is available to them in print in the firm's library, which is easily accessible. They do not know the limitations of the plan.

Research beyond the flaw rate, typically investigative research on individuals or companies.

Not knowing how to use Westlaw. Westlaw does not offer in-person training to our firm. All they have is online tutorials or the toll-free help line.

We constantly hold seminars on using transaction vs. hourly, and that is where most of the errors take place. Also, reading for hours at a time online.

Lack of capability of organizing a search

Not a problem for us.

Bad research habits; ignoring warning signals; ignorance of cost effective research techniques; failure to ask the librarian or to call Westlaw when needed

Going out of contract, running too many searches on Lexis

Use after an extremely long period of disuse following training; we do not mandate refresher training yet

the think it is free like law school. they don't understand flat rate. they misjudge hourly versus transactional searching

They are used to having free online research as law students and as clerks and have never learned to search cost effectively.

Not understanding how pricing works; forgetting that they aren't one the open web; forgetting that they're using transactional ID; not formulating a precise search before logging on

Lack of understanding of Locate and Focus features, poor spelling, not knowing what databases to search.

Assuming everything they need from the first step on is available online.

Don't understand the research topic

Lack of research skills and not understanding how online research costs are charged.

Going outside of the contract Not realizing they hadn't logged off Not understanding the difference between hourly and transactional

Too used to flat rate access from law school; they search Westlaw and Lexis like they're running a search in Google - trial & error. They don't know how to be specific as to what databases they actually need to use. Don't understand to search with broader search strings, then focus down to save on costs.

Poor research skills.

They do not know what they are doing and they do not ask for help from the law firm librarian, the Westlaw Reference Attorneys or Lexis search assistance.

lack of understanding of how online charges are accrued, failure to use ref. attorneys or secondary sources before starting fee-based research

they tend to be pretty careful in how they search, as large online bills are frowned upon suspect that inefficient searching is responsible for most big bills - diving into online sources, rather than searching in the books first to find some good cases

Using transactional rather than hourly.

Doing 'new searches' instead of managing the search effectively. Needing information in out of contract sources.

Not understanding transactional v hourly; too much printing

Failure to seek advice before starting a project.

In general we do not have this issue arise. They are all trained when they start and given the speech in which Westlaw is compared to the drug-dealer, they are not in the schoolyard now, Westlaw is not giving stuff away for free anymore.

Multiple transactional searches. Not clearly defining the search query before going online. Scorched earth research.

Searching hourly when they should not and run too many searches rather than creating broader queries.

Thinking everything will be found in case law and not using other sources. Also searching the same concept repeatedly instead of using focus or find in results of intial search

Using databases outside the contract, and inefficient searches.

Lack of familiarity with other existing totally flat-fee firm contracts. Lack of preparation before going on-line. Lack of knowledge of cost-effective searching techniques, or even when to use transactional v. hourly IDs.

They have no idea what they are doing because legal research training in law school is practically non-existent.

Ignoring the warnings

Not reading the memo about how online research is charged.

Research outside of our flat-rate subscription.

THEY DO NOT DO USE FREE PRINT SOURCES TO FIND OUT ABOUT THE TASK BEFORE THEY LOG ON. THEY DO NOT UTILIZE SOURCES LIKE HEINONLINE EFFECTIVELY.

THEY ARE TOO LAZY TO READ -- THEY WANT TO SCAN THROUGH ELECTRONIC VERSIONS OF DOCUMENTS ONLY.

Using Westlaw/Lexis when free (GPO), non-pay-per-use (CCH, Hein), or print sources will do. Flailing during online research and not asking for help soon enough.

They have no concept of how to set up a search strategy before going online. They do not understand hourly vs. transactional. They use out of contract materials. They do excessive code section printing and charge by document rather than by line.

using transactional when they should use hourly, and vice-versa. Using many small searched when they could use one broad search and focus. Using expensive resources when the info is available at much lower cost, or at no cost. Starting with keyword searches when they should start with the table of contents. Not calling the online reps first.

They click through warning screens without reading that they will incur additional charges. They don't save their research so they retrieve the same documents repeatedly. They don't refine their searches to get targeted results. They use delivery methods that incur additional charges when they could use their browser's print function.

Basically repeating the same search over and over and over in hopes of getting a different result.

1) Failing to master WL/Lexis skills because those resources are free to them in law school. They don't know search syntax, fields, operators, and especially they don't use the WL topic/key number system. Most know only pure keyword searching, and don't even know enough to omit stop words like prepositions and articles. 2) Failure to understand that they need some background understanding of the area they are to research, typically from secondary sources, to craft an appropriate search string. Without that background, they don't know the concepts they need to cover or the synonyms/alternate phrasing that courts use to discuss the concepts.

Not using the print in advance of the online, not initially focusing and planning their research, not having a clear idea of what they need as an end product, selecting too broad a file, using out-of-plan resources, refusing to go to training,

Some new attorneys forget to check the scope notes for the online database they want to search to make sure the information they are seeking will even be included in the database.

Unclear about pricing - when to use hourly or transactional access - and more sophisticated search techniques, for ex. rather than starting with a broad search and focusing down, they'll just run additional searches.

Staying online too long using hourly rates or too many "new searches" using transactional rates. Not realizing that some research should be started with print resources (or at least online 2ndary resources)

not knowing cost efficient research, assumption of Google to be an authoritative resource, don't know what a paper book is.

1.Lack of understanding in the area or topic being researched. Eagerness to please

They do not know how to formulate proper searches and end up running many searches.

Unfettered access in law school settings which encourage attorneys to use the service without understanding the real costs.

Spending too much time, running too many searches, not understanding the scope/content of databases, believing everything is accessible online (and searching fruitlessly in multiple databases to find what is not there)

Understand hourly and transactional billing methods and when it's appropriate to use each; larger the file = larger cost; no need to "buy" all the search results; be familiar with both services even if there is a personal preference

Limited knowledge of the resources available in the database. Not willing to take the time to call Westlaw/Lexis for help

Lack of experience in searching; not thinking through the research process; not understanding what they are trying to accomplish

Re. Answer to #13 (WL): Certain DBs are outside the flat-rate contract and are charged at retail minus a percentage discount. Some DBs are charged at retail. Re. Answer to #15 (LN): Some databases are outside the flat-rate contract and are charged at retail rate.

Re. WL Flat Rate contracts (q. 13 comments): Most primary materials are included; treatises, company data, public records and news are extra. Re. LN Flat Rate contracts (q. 15 comments): Primary materials and some news are included; treatises, pub records, court docs are not included.

Re. #13: There are ancillary items outside of the contract, but constitutes a small percentage of our usage. Re. #15: Unfortunately the Matthew Bender litigation library and CCH and BNA materials are outside of the contract. Courtlink is outside of the contract.

Appendix E: 2007 Survey Results for What Research Tasks Should Usually Be Conducted in Books

Source	Firm Size: 26-50	Firm Size: 51-100	Firm Size: 101-200	Firm Size: Over 200	Totals:
Secondary source research	81.8%	83.7%	97.3%	81.4%	85.8%
Legislative code research	50%	62.8%	64.9%	51.2%	58.1%
Legislative History research	40.9%	39.5%	43.2%	55.8%	45.9%
Administrative code research	22.7%	41.9%	37.8%	30.2%	34.5%
Case law/digest research	13.6%	25.6%	10.8%	16.3%	16.9%

Appendix F: Comparison Chart of Print Resources Available By Survey Year

Source	2010	2007	2004
Your state's legislative code	92.5%	87%	85.3%
Your state's secondary sources	85.1%	89.5%	92.6%
Federal secondary sources	81.4%	90.1%	89.7%
Federal legislative codes	80.7%	88.3%	82.4%
Your state's administrative code	70.2%	79%	70.6%
Your state's digest	65.8%	n/a	n/a
Federal administrative code	64.6%	75.3%	61.8%
Your state's reporters	64.6%	71%	89.7%
Federal digests	54%	n/a	n/a
Federal reporters	47.2%	59.3%	77.9%
Your state's admin law decisions	24.2%	36.4%	33.8%
Federal admin law decisions	18%	26.5%	19.1%
Regional reporters	14.9%	19.8%	39.7%

NOTE: n/a indicates that the survey did not track that source.

Appendix G. 2007 Survey Results: What Print-Based Sources Must New Attorneys Know How to Perform?

Source	Firm Size: 26-50	Firm Size: 51-100	Firm Size: 101-200	Firm Size: Over 200	Totals:
Your state's legislative code	69.6%	69.8%	80%	54.8%	67.8%
Federal secondary sources	52.2%	53.5%	52.5%	50%	52.6%
Your state's secondary sources	43.5%	58.1%	55%	45.2%	51.3%
Federal legislative codes	56.5%	65.1%	77.5%	57.1%	65.1%
Your state's administrative code	48.8%	46.5%	47.5%	42.9%	46.1%
Federal administrative code	34.8%	51.2%	50%	45.2%	47.4%
Your state's digest	52.2%	55.8%	55%	31%	47.4%
Federal reporters	56.5%	53.5%	62.5%	45.2%	53.9%
Your state's reporters	65.2%	51.2%	50%	38.1%	49.3%
Federal digests	43.5%	43.5%	50%	34.8%	44.7%
Your state’s admin law decisions	13%	21.7%	16.7%	15.2%	18.4%
Regional reporters	17.4%	10.9%	9.5%	13%	12.5%
Federal Admin Law Decisions	13%	19.6%	11.9%	10.9%	15.1%