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Arturo Flores**

* Volume count is a common method for measuring and comparing library collections. Yet both the accuracy of volume counts and their validity for comparative purposes are questioned regularly. Mr. Flores reports the results of a survey of law school deans and law library directors designed to elicit their perceptions and attitudes about the use of volume count in law library statistics.

I. Introduction

The young budding wildlife warden was flabbergasted on his first aerial survey by the ease with which his supervisor was flying the small craft over the African Savannah and calling out the size of huge herds. When he asked the senior warden how he could count so quickly and so easily, the warden replied, "There's really nothing to it. I just count the legs and divide by four."

Traditionally, legal educators have used volume count to measure the size of a law library collection. Volume count has taken on a greater significance than other library statistics because it is apparently easy to measure and can be used to compare or rank libraries. Consequently, size often has been mistakenly equated with quality. Volume count comparisons are unfortunate because they unduly emphasize size and do not consider other bases for comparison—most notably, service levels. Worse yet, volume count comparisons have, among some legal educators, resulted in a competitive mania which is discrediting to the entire profession.

Volume count also has been the source of continuous controversy. The controversy is a result of the misuse or imprecision of volume count, both in terms of its calculation and application. Dean Ernest Gellhorn of Case Western Reserve University declined to participate in the survey that served as the basis of this article, but stated, "I am persuaded that the statistics
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frequently utilized to evaluate libraries are, at best, misleading and generally meaningless.”

To better understand the problems surrounding the controversy, some basic definitions are in order. The American Library Association has defined a volume, for statistical purposes, as “a physical unit of any printed, typewritten, handwritten, mimeographed, or processed work contained in one binding or portfolio, hardbound or paperbound, which has been cataloged, classified, and/or made ready for use.”

The American Bar Association uses the same definition, but goes on to say, “For unbound periodicals, use the bibliographic or publisher’s volume count. Each linear foot of other materials not meeting the criteria or this definition equals five volumes.” This addition, although offered as a definition of a volume, is more accurately a definition of a count and serves to demonstrate the ambiguous nature of the standards.

The “count” part of the term “volume count” is problematic. At first glance, one might suppose counting volumes to be a straightforward, if tiresome, matter. Once a library collection had been counted physically for the first time, with adjustments made for volumes in circulation, at the bindery, lost, or being processed or cataloged, it would seem simple to adjust the count periodically, in accordance with acquisitions and deaccessions. The problem, however, is that the standards used to make the count allow for tremendous variation in their interpretation.

In response to a recent survey, Harry S. (Terry) Martin III of Harvard University Law Library said, “[S]ome if not most [law libraries] interpret the standards to maximize their numbers.” Nancy J. Kitchen of Pepperdine University Law Library remarked, “Everyone knows that volume count statistics do not reveal anything about the depth or quality of a collection, since even with hard copy materials the same standards are not used from library to library to determine what constitutes a volume.” Nancy Carol Carter of Golden Gate University Law Library stated that “there are no guidelines on what to count or how to count. Considering the lack of standards, it is surprising that we put so much store in comparing our volume counts.”


4. Unless otherwise indicated, quotations in this article were returned with survey responses. Some respondents preferred anonymity.
The existence of several standards, including those promulgated by the American Library Association, the American Bar Association, and the interpretation of ABA microform volume equivalent standards by the American Association of Law Libraries, has resulted in inconsistent application and, not surprisingly, some amount of mistrust. One dean responding to the survey volunteered that "there is cause for concern in some quarters regarding misrepresentation."

II. Methodology

To better understand volume count and its role in legal education, I sent surveys to library directors and to deans of 190 law schools in November 1985. Samples of those surveys are provided in Appendix I; tabulations are in Appendix II. The surveys sent to library directors were similar to those sent to deans. Each could be completed quickly and without reference to other individuals or sources, yet allowed participants to comment at greater length if they chose to do so. Some respondents complained that some of the survey questions were simplistic. In retrospect, it appears that some questions could have been stated with more precision, but probably at the cost of a lower response rate.

The survey sent to deans included mainly general questions; those same questions also were asked of the library directors, for informational as well as comparative purposes. The library director survey also included questions of a more technical nature, as well as some questions that required a personal and professional opinion. Both deans and library directors were asked, for purposes of statistical integrity, to complete the surveys without consulting others. All those surveyed were offered anonymity.

III. Survey Responses

A. Who Responded and How

The survey responses, compiled in Appendix II, produced some interesting results. Of the 190 institutions surveyed, only 49 did not respond at all; 112 library directors (58 percent) and 84 deans (44 percent) responded. Fifty-three schools (27 percent) produced responses from both deans and library directors.

Broken down by size of student enrollment, the response rates from legal educators at small, medium, and large schools were about the same. Based on a volume count comparison, the response rates from all library directors were similar. The response rate from deans, however, grew signifi-
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5. Classifications were established on the basis of total student enrollments: small—less than 550; medium—550-799; large—800 and more.
6. Small—149,000 volumes or less; medium—150,000-200,000; large—201,000 and more.
cantly as library volume count increased (38 percent from small schools, 46 percent from medium schools, and 58 percent from large schools).

Where prestige ratings, based on The Gourman Report,7 are used, the response rate from all ranks of schools was even: Although questioned as a means to differentiate among schools, The Gourman Report can be used as a point of reference for general purposes relating to status or prestige.

Approximately half of the responses were fairly straightforward or slightly annotated. About one-quarter included more substantial, but not remarkable, responses. Most interesting of all were the remaining one-quarter, many of which contained lengthy, and somewhat spirited, responses. Comments in this latter group were frequently negative, if not hostile, toward current volume count practices. Many responses were quite supportive of the survey and expressed interest in the final results. One respondent, library director Jane G. Olm of Texas Tech University, proclaimed that her attitude toward volume count was “vehement and unequivocal,” and that “the obsession with such a meaningless standard is mainly a phenomenon peculiar to librarians and their professional associations.”

A number of respondents questioned some of the language in the survey. Eight deans changed the word “confront” in question 9C of the deans’ survey. In every case the change was to a more congenial form of interaction, such as “consult,” “talk with,” or “discuss.” Twenty-seven library directors had problems with the categories of what was counted (see question 6 of the directors’ survey). Indeed, the descriptions could have been more specific. Rather surprisingly, considering the strength of the language and the implications of the question, only two library directors questioned the use of the word “intentionally” in question 9 of the directors’ survey, which asked whether the respondent believed that any library intentionally misstated its volume count.

B. Survey Answers

Of the responding deans, 85 percent claimed to know their library’s current volume count; 64 percent indicated, in some terms, that they knew how it was calculated.

Questions 2 and 3 of the library director survey were worded erroneously in their implication that AALS has standards relating to volume count.8 With one exception, all responding library directors claimed familiarity with

8. Library director Jane Hammond of Cornell University Law School dispelled what she referred to as “one widely held misconception”: The questionnaire which “every school answers to produce the statistical reports is solely an American Bar Association product.” Letter from Jane Hammond to Arturo Flores (Dec. 9, 1985).
the "ABA/AALS" standards, while 95 percent claimed familiarity with the AALL's standards. Albert Brecht of the University of Southern California Law Library candidly said he was "not sure which [standards] we are using now; I think whichever one is most favorable to our collection."9

Of the responding deans, 68 percent considered volume count important; 63 percent of the responding library directors agreed. Of the deans, 94 percent thought that volume count was important to others; 97 percent of the library directors agreed. These respondents represented schools of all sizes and ranks. A few library directors claimed that volume count was primarily important to law school deans.

The notion of volume count importance stimulated some strong responses. Bob Berring of the University of California, Berkeley, volunteered:

The use of volume count for any purpose seems to me misplaced. The historical variations in counting criteria make them invalid measures, and the best libraries in the world of national on-line bibliographic systems are those with the best services. The most intelligent course would be to abandon the practice of listing comparative volume counts.

An anonymous dean observed that "given today's technology, volume count is not indicative of the information resources that a library can bring to bear on a particular research topic." Another dean warned of the danger when volume count is used to "look good or to cover up inadequacies."

Myron Jacobstein of Stanford University pointedly stated, "I think a volume count as we have traditionally done it is useless." Alfred J. Coco of the University of Denver was less critical of volume count importance: "Volume count is important as part of the total picture....[It is] significant when comparing like schools and circumstances."

Of the responding deans, 80 percent answered that they talk with their library directors about volume count. None of the deans volunteered any information about the substance of these conversations.

The response to question 7 on the deans' survey regarding independent reporting drew a mixed reaction: 33 percent of the respondents thought libraries should report volume count independently; 67 percent thought they should not. Of nineteen respondents who thought volume count should be reported independently, five thought that all libraries accurately state their volume count.

Question 10 of the deans' survey drew the opposite reaction. Sixty-nine
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9. Betty Taylor of the University of Florida explained an inconsistency in her library's volume count, depending on which standards were used (that library was at a milestone—400,000 volumes). She wrote James White of the ABA, "[W]e plan to continue to maintain our own statistics and publicize size and comparisons on the basis of our records and not those published by your office...or AALL." Letter from Betty Taylor to James White, Consultant on Legal Education, American Bar Association (Sept. 11, 1985).
percent of those favoring independent reporting opposed auditing. One dean claimed, “Libraries are more honest than other institutions but not extravagantly so.” The auditing question on the library directors’ survey (question 11) drew a stronger reaction: 24 percent of respondents favored auditing, while 76 percent opposed it. Many of those who answered negatively annotated their answers with remarks about cost, practicality, and feasibility.

Reporting without auditing raises credibility questions. James Francis Bailey III of Indiana University pointed out, however, that “those law libraries which do indeed inflate their statistics, either on purpose or accidentally, become known to others in the profession.” As a solution, Dean W. D. Hawkland of Louisiana State University thought that “libraries should adopt a standard method of reporting and then honestly implement it.”

Ninety-three percent of responding deans felt that not all libraries accurately state their volume count. A comparable percentage of responding library directors (92 percent) agreed. Indeed, nearly half (47 percent) of responding directors believe that some libraries intentionally misstate their volume count. As Albert Brecht put it, “Some libraries count ‘funny’.”

Librarian Edward Caparas of Antioch went further, saying that library reporting “is plain and simple misrepresentation and/or inflation of collection count.” Although disclaiming any personal knowledge of intentional misstatement, Roger Jacobs of Notre Dame University Law Library was able to “imagine scenarios where dissembling takes place.” He wrote that “close examination of the ABA-AALS annual survey shows sufficient internal inconsistencies for a given library to support the view that all libraries are not accurately reporting their volume count.”

When asked how they would react if they believed volume counts had been reported inaccurately in their own libraries, sixty-three out of eighty-four responding deans said that they would confront (or “talk with,” “discuss with”) their library directors. The next most popular response was to consult other librarians or the AALL, ABA, or AALS.

Should a newly appointed library director accept the current accuracy of a previously calculated volume count? The reaction from responding library directors was mixed: 31 percent favored acceptance; 68 percent opposed it. Many were concerned with practicality or questioned the value of an audit relative to cost. Nancy Carol Carter suspected that “most libraries do report erroneous numbers, just because it’s hard to make a meaningful correction and impolitic to reduce a volume count.”

The items listed in question 6 of the directors’ survey—slip opinions, advance sheets, supplements, unbound materials (cataloged), unbound materials (not individually cataloged)—were selected because they either represented areas of uncertainty or had the potential to skew volume counts. In general, the responses indicated that law libraries do not count those materials, with some notable exceptions.
The most common exception is unbound cataloged materials, which 65 percent of the responding libraries count. The next most common exception was supplements, which 16 percent of the libraries count. One library director responded that she counts all the questioned items, while three others admitted to counting advance sheets.

Addressing the issue of what gets counted, Elizabeth Kelley of the University of Pennsylvania said, "Conflicting and changing instructions on what libraries should count, as well as lack of a consensus among those actually doing the counting, means that inconsistency is inevitable."¹⁰ Sarah K. Wiant of Washington and Lee University noted, "It is no secret that some libraries count each pamphlet as a volume while others are quite strict in their interpretation of a 'book'." Of the responding library directors, 20 percent indicated that they had a minimum page requirement for government documents.¹¹

Most respondents are less than enchanted with volume count. Yet, few offered any alternatives. The most common alternative proposed was counting titles. Albert Brecht wrote that "it would be an improvement if the ABA continued to have its list of minimum holdings but stopped collecting annual volume count and instead asked each year for how many titles, excluding duplicates, a library added and the total number of unique titles held." James Hoover of Columbia University Law Library stated:

As a qualitative indicator...volume count is much less meaningful than title count. Title is the first thing I look at to determine the depth of resources and therefore to some extent the depth to which a collection can support research. I would much prefer to do research at a small library with a high title count than in a large one with a low count. There are such institutions on both ends of the scale. Title count is not alone an indicator of quality but it sure beats volume.

A recurring theme from all respondents was the desire to shift emphasis from quantity to quality. Many emphasized service standards, such as hours of operation, ILL processing, and seating capacity. This was articulated by Dean David T. Link of Notre Dame University: "I believe any competition between law libraries with regard to volume count is not only misleading but is dangerous because of the tendency to discourage cooperative efforts. A library’s potential for scholarly research ought to be judged by access to titles within a 24-hour period." An anonymous library director concluded that "provision of service and access to legal information, whether in the collection or not, is a far more valid basis [than volume count] for evaluating a law school library." Another stated that volume counts "are perfectly meaningless. What does have meaning is service to patrons."

¹⁰. For an account of a volume count execution, see Carter & Benemann, supra note 3, at 266-78.
¹¹. This relates to the issue of converting microforms to "volume equivalents."
This theme was repeated by Kathleen M. Carrick of Case Western Reserve University Law Library. “We should be concentrating on quality service and the delivery of information....The end product of usable and complete information is the better gauge for most academic law libraries than volume count.” The question of volume count alternatives touched a sensitive nerve with one library director, who said, “Size? Size? Size indeed! Why don’t we just quit thinking about size and focus on service?”

Dean Gellhorn expressed serious concern “that the pressure to rank everything and substitute that for serious review of institutional needs and service has undermined our efforts to focus on the appropriate role of libraries and other elements of legal education.” He concludes, “We need to get back to the business of legal education. It may not be directly measurable but that is where I plan to put our efforts.”

Questions about microforms were omitted from the survey. Microform equivalency (the concept that some number of microforms can be said to “equal” a hard-copy volume) was an unsettled area at the time of the survey, and I felt that questions relating to microforms would detract from the main point of the survey. Volume count alone, without regard to microforms, was of enough substance and interest to justify the research project.

The survey also asked no questions about the extent to which volume count might affect acquisitions decisions. Asking a question such as, “Has your book selection criteria ever been affected by volume count?” might have tested credibility limits. Without prompting, however, one legal educator volunteered that “emphasis on volume count may already affect collection development.”

For the most part, both deans and library directors seemed to respect the request to complete the survey without consulting others. Seventy-four deans (88 percent) and 108 library directors (98 percent) indicated that they did so. When the survey was conceived, it was believed that as a matter of routine many deans would route the survey to their library directors for completion. From the answers given to the question and from an examination of the responses, it seems that the original request for separate responses was largely honored. Where the deans did consult with others, their responses were omitted from the tally to avoid duplicative totals.

Many responding deans (42 percent) and library directors (53 percent) preferred anonymity. In some cases, the reasons for this preference were clear

---

12. Letter from Ernest Gellhorn, supra note 1.
13. In August 1986, the ABA announced the adoption of a new microform volume equivalency formula to be used beginning with the 1987-88 reporting period. Under the formula, six pieces of microfiche equal one volume; one roll of microfilm equals five volumes. See Memorandum from Kathleen S. Grove to Deans and Head Law Librarians of ABA Approved Law Schools (August 19, 1981) (Memorandum D8687-10).
and usually were based on a rather sensitive statement or position. In many cases, however, the reasons for anonymity were not readily apparent from the responses. Where opinions have been quoted without disclosing identity, it was at the individual’s request.

IV. Conclusion

Volume count is a controversial statistic used to measure library size and, often mistakenly, quality. Assigning major importance to volume count and using it as a comparative standard cuts against the reality that a small library may provide excellent service to its patrons. The volume count issue is primarily controversial because of the inconsistent way in which various libraries actually count or report volumes held.

Most deans and law library directors think volume count is important, although they are inclined to say that it is more important to others. Law school deans are informed about the volume counts of their libraries and know something about how they are calculated. Concern about volume count can affect collection management and development decisions.

Mistrust of volume count is common. Deans responding to the survey do not favor totally independent reporting and do favor auditing, but auditing is opposed by the responding library directors. This is peculiar; most other institutions that make claim to amounts of resources and that act on those claims are subject to audit. It is difficult to imagine banks or governments functioning without the credibility that independent auditing establishes.

More than nine out of ten deans and directors doubt the accuracy of volume counts, and almost one out of two library directors thinks that some libraries intentionally misstate their volume counts. Intentions aside, standards and guidelines are not clearly understood.

John M. Lindsey of Temple University Law Library stated, “The reality is that volume count is important. It ought not to be important, but it is.” As library director Igor I. Kavass of Vanderbilt University pointed out, “Innumerable public statements to the contrary, quantitative growth is still looked upon as the main factor in the assessment of a law library’s growth.” Kavass decried the fact that the value of collections, their research potential, and honest volume count reporting are of no use in the law school ranking competition.

W. Leslie Peat of Vermont Law School Library pointed out that any alternative to volume count is itself a problem because “[s]ize simply isn’t relevant—it’s the quality of information access that counts, and I have no idea how to measure that, other than subjectively.” He concluded, “I don’t suppose volume counts will go away, and as long as we’re going to have them, we should at least try for some sort of uniform standard.” Terry Martin volunteered that “what the profession needs is some clear, firm, liveable
alternative." Few would disagree with the need for an alternative. Unfortunately, few would agree on which alternative is clear, firm and "liveable." Still, if we are to continue counting volumes, an effort should be made to establish specific standards that are not subject to variation in their interpretation.

One alternative might be to move from a count of volumes to one of titles. Such a move would not eliminate all the problems related to volume count, but it would be a sound step. The use of a title count would cover multiple formats: it would bridge the gap between hard-copy volumes, microforms, and data bases. It also would serve to equalize libraries of different sizes since multiple copy holdings would not come into play. National on-line catalogs could serve to monitor reported counts.

The emphasis on volume count has resulted in too much time and energy being invested in discussions of volume equivalencies for microforms and other nonbook media. Such things should be counted separately from hard-copy volumes. In the words of James Hoover, "Even the magical powers of statisticians cannot make books, computers, microforms, audio and video cassettes, etc., fit the same measuring system."14

Better, but still problematic, would be a move from hard measures of quantity to "softer" measures reflecting quality. David A. Thomas of Brigham Young University, the AALL statistics coordinator, is among those who dislike quantitative criteria as the sole measurement of a law library's quality. His view is that

the total measure of a law library's quality should include both assessment of the collection and evaluation of the extent and quality of the services provided by the library. Assessment of the collection encompasses not only the size of the collection, but its richness. No adequate or comprehensive measures for collection quality have yet been devised. Likewise, no adequate measures have yet been devised to evaluate library services; however, that task promises to be easier than measuring collection quality. I believe such measures are possible, generally quantifiable, and are long overdue.15

Comparisons based on volume count favor larger and older institutions. A move to qualitative measurement would give smaller, well-managed libraries an equal opportunity to be recognized for their effectiveness. Under current practices, inconsistent application of conflicting standards is the rule, and few librarians and deans believe that law libraries accurately report their volume count. Legal education deserves better.

Appendix I-A

Survey to Law School Deans

1. Do you know what your library’s current volume count is? Yes  No
2. If so, what is it? ____________________________
3. Do you know how it is calculated? Yes  No
4. Do you think volume count is important? Yes  No
5. Do you think volume count is important to others? Yes  No
6. Do you talk with your library director about it? Yes  No
7. Do you think libraries should be totally independent with regard to reporting volume count? Yes  No
8. Do you think all libraries accurately state their volume count? Yes  No
9. If you were to learn or suspect that your volume count was not accurate would you:
   a. do nothing?
   b. confront the library director?
   c. consult other librarians?
   d. consult AALL/ABA/AALS?
   e. make a public announcement?
10. Should libraries be subject to audit, so as to insure accurate volume counts? Yes  No
11. Before completing this survey, I
    a. did
    b. did not consult with others.
12. a. You may attribute my answers to me in your publication.
    b. Do not associate my answers with me publicly. I prefer anonymity.
Appendix I-B

Survey to Law School Library Directors

1. What is your current volume count? ________
2. Are you familiar with the volume count standards promulgated by:
   a. ABA/AALS       Yes   No
   b. AALL            Yes   No
3. Which standards do you use? ABA/AALS AALL
4. Do you think volume count is important? Yes No
5. Do you think volume count is important to others? Yes No
6. Do you count:
   a. slip opinions   Yes   No
   b. advance sheets  Yes   No
   c. supplements     Yes   No
   d. unbound materials (cataloged) Yes No
   e. unbound materials (not individually cataloged) Yes No
7. With regard to government documents, do you have a minimum page requirement for volume count purposes? Yes No

(Questions 8-11 are intended to elicit a personal, professional opinion.)

8. Do you think all law libraries accurately report their volume count? Yes No
9. Do you think any law libraries intentionally misstate their volume count? Yes No
10. Should a newly appointed library director assume the previously stated volume count to be accurate as to present holdings? Yes No
11. Should libraries be subject to audit, so as to insure accurate volume counts? Yes No
12. Can you offer alternatives to volume counts to measure library size? If so, please do so on an attached sheet.
13. Before completing this survey, I
    a. did
    b. did not consult with other library directors or law school administrators.
14. a. You may attribute my answers to me in your publication.
    b. Do not associate my answers with me publicly. I prefer anonymity.

Note: If you care to make a lengthier response than this form allows, please do so. I would appreciate such interest.
Appendix II-A

Dean Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Other*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knew current library volume count.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stated a volume count.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Knew how volume count is calculated.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Thought volume count important.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Thought volume count important to others.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Talked with library director about volume count.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Thought libraries should be totally independent with regard to reporting volume count.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Thought all libraries accurately state their volume count.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If learned or suspected that their volume count was not accurate would:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Do nothing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Confront library director</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Consult other librarians</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Consult AALL/ABA/AALS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Make a public statement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Thought libraries should be subject to audit.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Completed survey without consulting others.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Preferred anonymity.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes answers which were not plainly yes or no, e.g., “yes and no,” “maybe,” “both,” “?,” etc. Percentages were calculated with regard to “yes” and “no” answers only.
### Appendix II-B

#### Library Director Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Other*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stated a volume count.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A. Were familiar with ABA volume count standards.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Were familiar with AALL volume count standards</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Volume count standards used:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. ABA 76 82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. AALL 16 18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Thought volume count important.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Thought volume count important to others.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Included in volume count:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Slip opinions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Advance sheets</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Supplements</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Unbound materials (cataloged)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Unbound materials (not individually cataloged)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Have a minimum page requirement for a government document to be included in volume count.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Thought all law libraries accurately reported volume count.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Thought some law libraries intentionally misstated volume count.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Thought a newly appointed library director should assume a previously stated volume count to be accurate.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Thought libraries should be subject to audit.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Offered alternatives to volume count to measure library size.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Consulted with other library directors or law school administrators.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Preferred anonymity.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes answers which were not plainly yes or no, e.g., "yes and no," "maybe," "both," "?," etc. Percentages were calculated with regard to "yes" and "no" answers only.