

2002

How Many Copies Are Enough? Using Citation Studies to Limit Journal Holdings

Kincaid C. Brown

University of Michigan Law School, kcb@umich.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.law.umich.edu/librarian>

 Part of the [Collection Development and Management Commons](#), and the [Legal Writing and Research Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Brown, Kincaid C. "How Many Copies Are Enough? Using Citation Studies to Limit Journal Holdings," *L. Library J.*, 94, no. 2 (2002): 301-314.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Other Publication Series at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Law Librarian Scholarship by an authorized administrator of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact mlaw.repository@umich.edu.

How Many Copies Are Enough? Using Citation Studies to Limit Journal Holdings*

Kincaid C. Brown**

Mr. Brown introduces the University of Michigan Law Library's use of citation study literature to develop a new policy regarding the number of duplicate copies of law review titles to be held in the library's collection. The specifics of the new policy are described.

¶1 Recently the University of Michigan Law Library utilized information from previously published citation studies to design a policy for limiting the number of duplicate copies of law review titles held in the collection. Although the law library had an existing policy that defined which journals should be added to the collection, this policy did not address how many copies of each journal were to be acquired and, ultimately, to be retained. Space pressures necessitated the development of such a policy. This article describes the rationale for using citation studies, how the data in the studies were used, and the details of the policy that resulted from their use.

¶2 Historically, the law library had a number of different areas in its building where journals were housed. In addition to the main journal collection, there also were separate journal holdings for a faculty library as well as for the staffs of *Michigan Law Review* and the *Michigan Journal of Law Reform*. The law library opened its new building in 1981 and, for the most part, gathered these various journal holdings into one area in the new building. However, at that time, no attempt was made to consider whether, for instance, the law library and its patrons really needed seven copies of the *Harvard Law Review* but only three copies of the *Michigan Law Review* and one copy of the *Stanford Law Review*. Both before and after the move, duplicate copies of individual journal titles were added when the existing sets were not enough to meet patron demand. Likewise, copies were cancelled (though not always withdrawn) when it was felt that more sets were held than were needed. The process was haphazard and there was no overriding policy to rationalize the decisions.

¶3 Needless to say, as time progressed, law library space became tight. To say there has been a large growth in legal publishing in the last generation would be to

* © Kincaid C. Brown, 2002.

** Senior Associate Librarian, University of Michigan Law Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan. I would like to thank Barb Garavaglia of the University of Michigan Law Library for her help and guidance in writing the number-of-copies policy, and Margaret Leary of the University of Michigan Law Library for her comments and guidance in writing this paper.

put it mildly.¹ One part of the collection where this growth can easily be seen—as the shelf space between titles disappears—is among the legal journals. To combat this continuing growth, the law library needed to create a policy that would limit unnecessary law journal holdings without jeopardizing the strength of this large and integral part of the collection. Recognizing the importance of journals for their inclusion of cutting-edge legal theories as well as their long-term historical research value, the law library needed to design a policy applicable to every law journal title that would conserve space without withdrawing so many volumes as to make important articles difficult to access.

¶4 The law library's solution was twofold. First, it created and defined categories for law journals that could be applied retrospectively to the titles already in the collection and prospectively to new titles added to the collection. Citation studies were the primary means used at this stage to categorize specific law journals by their importance to legal research. The studies measure actual use of law reviews by scholars and judges around the country and provide a clear comparison among the various law journals in the form of rankings.

¶5 Second, it defined parameters for the number of copies to be retained for the several categories of law reviews established earlier. The policy developed by the law library specifies the number of paper and microfiche copies to be held for each category of journal, without regard for the availability of the journal in any electronic format sources.² All in all, the law library wanted to move away from an ad hoc method of selecting, withdrawing, and retaining multiple duplicate copies of law reviews toward a systematic scheme that could be applied equally to titles already in the collection as well as future titles added to the collection. What follows is a discussion of the law review citation and ranking literature, an explanation of the law library's policy, and, finally, a brief discussion of the application of the policy to specific titles within the collection.

Law Review Citation Studies and Rankings

¶6 The decision to use citation studies to categorize journals for a number-of-copies policy stemmed from the library's basic mission—meeting the information needs of its primary patrons, the faculty and students of the University of Michigan Law School. Citation studies show how often legal scholars and judges use a particular law review in comparison to others, and this was the critical factor that the law library needed to consider in developing the policy. The faculty of the University of Michigan Law School is among the most productive of law school

1. See, e.g., *Legal Publishing Market Poised to Record Double-Digit Growth in 1999*, PROF. PUB. REP., Sept. 24, 1999; Jennifer A. Kingson, *Legal Publications: A New Growth Industry*, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 19, 1988, at B5.

2. See *infra* ¶¶ 16–17 for discussion of the law library's decision not to rely solely on LexisNexis, Westlaw, Hein-On-Line, JSTOR, or other electronic media for law review access.

faculties,³ and the school's primary student-edited law journal, the *Michigan Law Review*, is among the most cited law reviews.⁴ If the law library was going to serve these two patron groups effectively, it needed to be sure to maintain a strong collection of law reviews, especially those that the faculty are citing and the students are using in their cite checking. The decision to base the law library's number-of-copies policy on citation study literature was an obvious one for Michigan, but the same hierarchical categorization that was logical in our case may not be appropriate for other libraries that have different patron groups, heavier reliance on electronic resources, or budgetary constraints.

¶7 Many studies have been written on law review usage and a large portion of these have used citations as the focus of their methodology. Rather than redo what so many had already done, we decided to use existing citation studies to review the law library's number-of-copies practices.⁵ The top five or ten titles on these lists are less important for our purposes than the next twenty or thirty. The law library is obviously going to hold multiple copies of the *Harvard Law Review* and *Yale Law Journal*, but it is the next group of titles where the question of how many copies are necessary that really needs to be addressed. The citation studies are useful toward this end because they show how frequently a particular journal or law review has been used, through citations to that journal, in comparison to other journals and law reviews. The thinking was that the law library would need to maintain multiple copies of the journals that rank highly in the citation studies in order to meet the demands of Michigan's primary clientele.

¶8 The studies used to develop Michigan's policy focused on how often law review articles were cited in either other law journals, court opinions, or both.⁶ Many of the authors counted citations in *Shepard's Law Review Citations*, the *Social Science Citation Index*, or both, but some of the authors focusing on citations to law review articles by the courts counted citations in the West National Reporter Series or the *United States Reports*.

-
3. See Brian Leiter, *Measuring the Academic Distinction of Law Faculties*, 29 J. LEGAL STUD. 451 (2000). The faculty of the University of Michigan Law School ranked fifth for publications in leading law reviews; fifth for overall productivity of law review articles; tenth for overall productivity of books and articles; tenth among the scholarly impact of writings; and tenth overall for productivity and impact.
 4. See *infra* appendix.
 5. For a list of the citation studies used to help review the law library's number of copies practices, see *infra* appendix B.
 6. The citation studies used at Michigan were limited to those discussing the sheer number of citations to particular general law review titles. We did not consider citation studies that looked at specialized law journals, e.g., Tracey E. George & Chris Guthrie, *An Empirical Evaluation of Specialized Law Reviews*, 26 FLA. ST. U. L. REV. 813 (1999); Gregory Scott Crespi, *Ranking the Environmental Law, Natural Resources Law, and Land Use Planning Journals: A Survey of Expert Opinion*, 23 WM. & MARY ENVTL. L. & POL'Y REV. 273 (1998); most-cited articles, e.g., Fred R. Shapiro, *The Most-Cited Law Review Articles*, 73 CAL. L. REV. 1538 (1985); William M. Landes & Richard A. Posner, *Heavily Cited Articles in Law*, 71 CHI.-KENT L. REV. 825 (1996); or other forms of law review rankings, e.g., Margaret A. Goldblatt, *Current Legal Periodicals: A Use Study*, 78 LAW LIBR. J. 55 (1986); Robert M. Jarvis & Phyllis G. Coleman, *Ranking Law Reviews: An Empirical Analysis Based on Author Prominence*, 39 ARIZ. L. REV. 15 (1997).

¶9 Aside from rankings of law reviews by number of citations, the most important part of these studies for our purposes, the citation studies also had some other relevant findings. Maru found that the top seven titles in his study accounted for 27.9% of all law journal citations,⁷ and that the journals in the defined “high impact group” (the twenty-three titles that account for approximately 50% of all citations) cite other journals in the high impact group almost six times as often as they cite all other titles.⁸ Leonard found that twenty-one journals accounted for more than 50% of all citations, and sixty-five journals accounted for 75%.⁹ Sirico and Margulies found that the same nine law reviews were cited the most frequently in both of the three-year periods that they studied (the October 1971 term through the October 1973 term and the October 1981 term through the October 1983 term),¹⁰ but that there were significant changes in the frequency with which certain journals were cited.¹¹

¶10 For the most part, perhaps unsurprisingly, analyzing the citation studies reveals that journals cited heavily in one study are the same journals that will be at the top of the list in another study.¹² As might be guessed, *Harvard Law Review*, *Yale Law Journal*, and *Columbia Law Review* rank first, second, and third, respectively, after all rankings are averaged out. The next four—*University of Chicago Law Review*, *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, *Virginia Law Review*, and *Michigan Law Review*—rank consistently in the top ten across the citation studies. After these top seven, the next twenty or so titles show greater variation in their rankings across studies but, with a few exceptions, consistently rank in the top thirty. As illustrated in appendix A, the citation rankings of each law review title were fairly consistent across all the reviewed studies, with the same titles cited more frequently, and therefore ranked higher, regardless of the methodology used to compile the citation data.

Michigan’s Number-of-Copies Policy

The Basic Policy

¶11 The approach used in the basic policy developed by the law library for determining the number of copies to be acquired and to be retained was to assign a value to each law review title based on its categorization. The number of copies to be retained for each category was assigned as follows, with the more important journals (as determined by the citation studies review) assigned to the lower number categories:

7. Maru, *supra* note 5, at 240.

8. *Id.* at 245.

9. Leonard, *supra* note 5, at 191.

10. Sirico & Margulies, *supra* note 5, at 132.

11. *Id.* at 136.

12. *See infra* appendix for a complete breakdown of the rankings of law reviews from study to study. All rankings are noted for any journal that ranked as highly as thirtieth in any of the citation studies considered.

- **Category 1 Journals:** The law library will hold three copies in paper, plus one copy in microfiche when available.
- **Category 2 Journals:** The law library will hold two copies in paper, plus one copy in microfiche when available.
- **Category 3 Journals:** The law library will hold one copy in paper, plus one copy in microfiche when available.
- **Category 4 Journals:** The law library will hold one copy in paper only.
- **Category 5 Journals:** The law library will hold one copy in microfiche when available.

¶12 In addition, for the last copy of Category 1 and 2 journals, only the most recent twenty years will be retained. Twenty years is enough to address the needs of most patrons,¹³ while the few who need older volumes will be able to access them in the remaining paper or microfiche copies.

¶13 The factors used to establish the number of copies to be retained for each category included the number of copies that the law library already held of the various titles, the usage of the volumes (were volumes always on the shelf or was there a continuous need for searches and recalls), recent decisions to add extra copies of specific law reviews, and the needs of the faculty document delivery service. Combining a consideration of these factors with the simple categorization of law reviews developed through the use of the citation study literature allowed us to establish a number of copies for each category that seemed reasonable for our particular circumstances.

¶14 There were two additional rationales for imposing such relatively strict limits on the number of duplicate copies of law reviews at the law library. First, with the exception of faculty offices, the law library does not circulate volumes outside the library. Thus, a volume usually can be quickly located for another patron who needs it. Second, the law library will make a copy of microfiche for the patron to keep. The patron can then use the library's microfiche readers at any time to view or print the portions that he or she needs.

¶15 All in all, the basic policy is really rather conservative. The law library wanted to be able to provide paper volumes to all of its patrons, relying on microfiche only for extra copies and long-term preservation purposes. The law library also did not want to rely on off-site storage because of the desire to get patrons the information they want when they need it. Although unwieldy at times, making a copy of a microfiche for a patron is much faster than waiting for an off-site volume to arrive at the library.

¶16 The policy could have placed greater reliance on microfiche or electronic media, thereby further reducing the number of paper volumes for even the most

13. One researcher did a study and discovered that more than 70% of law review articles cited in articles published in both 1996 and 1976 were originally published within the previous sixteen years. Richard A. Leiter, *Use of Law Reviews in Modern Legal Research: The Computer Didn't Make Me Do It!*, 90 LAW LIBR. J. 59 (1998).

widely used law reviews. For several reasons, however, the law library tried to stake out a middle ground where most patrons would be able to use print volumes, although occasionally needing to use microfiche. The first reason for conservatism was the reliance of the law library faculty document delivery service on the paper volumes of law reviews in order to be able to provide University of Michigan Law School faculty with copies of articles expeditiously. Using microform is much more time-consuming, and often electronic formats are not acceptable for research due to the demands of legal citation rules and faculty preference.

¶17 The second rationale for conservatism in the new policy was the law library's reluctance to rely on possibly ephemeral electronic formats for "additional copies" of important law reviews. In fact, the collection development policy for the University of Michigan Law Library forbids reliance on electronic format for any material that is intended to be held as a permanent part of the library collection. This is because there is no guarantee that material available today, even on LexisNexis or Westlaw, will be there tomorrow¹⁴ and, as a major research library, the law library wants to protect against the possibility that such important information will disappear in the future. Electronic format journals are obviously acceptable as copies in addition to those specified in the number-of-copies policy, but not as a copy needed for archival and patron access purposes. Other libraries may want to rely to a greater extent on LexisNexis, Westlaw, and other electronic journal sources like Hein-On-Line and JSTOR in their effort to conserve shelf space. This might make sense for libraries with limited shelf space and limited interest in, or funding for, microform versions of these important legal research titles.

Categories of Law Reviews

¶18 **Category 1 Journals.** The holdings of a Category 1 journal specified by the Michigan policy are two complete copies in paper, one copy of the latest twenty years in paper, plus a complete run of microfiche when available. Because of the large number of copies of these titles, Category 1 is limited to a handful of historically prominent law reviews that have stood the test of time and have served as models for the law reviews that have come later. Due to the strict definition, this category is closed for all intents and purposes and is limited to *Harvard Law Review*, *Yale Law Journal*, *Columbia Law Review*, *Michigan Law Review*, *Pennsylvania Law Review*, and the *American Journal of International Law*.

¶19 **Category 2 Journals.** The holdings for a Category 2 journal are one complete copy in paper, one copy of the latest twenty years in paper, plus a complete run of microfiche when available. This category is comprised of the journals (with the exception of the six Category 1 journals) that receive the most use in the law

14. For example, LexisNexis had a number of French legal databases that were eliminated in fall 2000. There was no warning that this information was going to disappear. What was most troubling was that LexisNexis could have chosen to cease adding new information to the database while still providing access to the information that was already there, but chose not to.

library and are held in the highest esteem by legal scholars. Category 2 is primarily comprised of the law reviews that consistently rank in the top twenty-five to thirty in law review citation studies.¹⁵

¶20 Prominent and high-use topical law reviews are also classified as Category 2 journals under the number-of-copies policy. The citation studies are not useful in the case of topical law reviews because they are often outside the focus of the studies. If topical journals consistently appear in the rankings at all, it is for good reason, and thus such journals are appropriate for Category 2. The only two journals that consistently fit into this category are *Law and Contemporary Problems*, published by Duke University School of Law, and the *Supreme Court Review*, published by the University of Chicago Law School. Even topical law reviews that do not consistently appear in the citation study rankings can also be included in this category, either because of their focus (e.g., *Journal of Legal Education*) or their high usage (e.g., *Journal of Legal Studies*). Although the criteria are a bit fuzzy, these journals are important enough that the extra copy of the latest twenty years is merited.

¶21 University of Michigan Law School topical journals are also placed in Category 2 for the obvious reason that they will receive extra use at the law library as compared to most other topical law reviews.

¶22 **Category 3 Journals.** The holdings for a Category 3 journal are one complete copy in paper, plus one complete run of microfiche when available. Category 3 is the default category for all primary and topical law reviews. Included in this category are scholarly journals published by organizations other than law schools, such as the American Bar Association and the Law and Policy in International Business Association.

¶23 **Category 4 Journals.** The holdings for a Category 4 journal are one complete or partial copy in paper. Under the law library number-of-copies policy, Category 4 journals are practice-oriented, current awareness, or nonlaw journals.¹⁶

¶24 **Category 5 Journals.** The holdings for a Category 5 journal are a complete run in microfiche, when available. When microfiche is not available, the paper copy is kept until microfiche becomes available. Category 5 journals are law reviews that have ceased publication.

Additional Considerations

¶25 The law library number-of-copies policy also allows for additional limited retention copies of heavily used law reviews when the need arises. These copies

15. These journals are *University of Chicago Law Review*, *Virginia Law Review*, *Stanford Law Review*, *California Law Review*, *New York University Law Review*, *Texas Law Review*, *Georgetown Law Journal*, *Cornell Law Review/Quarterly*, *Minnesota Law Review*, *Duke Law Journal*, *Vanderbilt Law Review*, *Northwestern/Illinois Law Review*, *UCLA Law Review*, *Iowa Law Review*, *Wisconsin Law Review*, *Hastings Law Journal*, *Southern California Law Review*, and *George Washington Law Review*.

16. These titles include *Internet Tax Advisor*, *Medical Ethics Advisor*, *Practical Tax Strategies*, *Psychology Today*, *Signs*, and *Time*.

are unbound and retention is limited to the most recent three years. Most of these additional copies are housed in the law library's reserve collection. These additional copies on reserve are used to deflect some usage of the recent law reviews in the main stacks as well as to provide an extra copy for patron use when one of the stacks' copies is at the bindery. This reserve collection is separate from the rest of the journal collection and is noncirculating, thereby guaranteeing the availability of a source from which to photocopy a new article from a leading law review. The titles held on reserve are limited to those that are either the most used or that the library's clientele has shown a particular interest in. Less-used titles that merit an additional copy have extra copies housed in the journals collection in the stacks.

¶26 A certain amount of ambiguity is built into this policy so that different law reviews can be treated in different ways without constantly having to reassign journals to different categories. With primary law reviews there is a hard and fast basic categorization because there is enough citation literature available to make these decisions—the five historical law reviews are Category 1 journals; the eighteen primary law reviews that consistently rank higher than thirty are Category 2 journals; Category 3 is the default; and, Category 5 are dead journals. Additional limited retention copies can be added and withdrawn as the need arises and eventually there probably will need to be a slight reorganization in which a few titles may change categories. With the topical law reviews, there is more ambiguity because data from the citation studies is not sufficient to allow for easy categorization. When the citation studies include topical law reviews, they tend to rank low on the list, and, logically, the large majority of topical law reviews are going to default as Category 3 titles. Outside the handful of major topical law reviews, determining which topical journals merit an extra complete or partial copy will depend on the journal's usage or its subject.¹⁷

Application of the Policy

¶27 Through the adoption of this policy, the law library freed up approximately 800 feet in shelf space. Once the policy was in place, the law library needed to make the necessary withdrawals, selections, retention period changes, and microfiche purchases. Here are a few examples to demonstrate how the policy actually works in practice.

¶28 The *University of Chicago Law Review* is a Category 2 journal where the law library also holds a copy on reserve. Prior to the adoption of the number-of-copies policy, the law library held three complete runs, a fourth copy of volumes 29–48, and a reserve copy. In applying the policy, the law library withdrew copies 3 and 4 in their entirety, changed the retention of copy 2 to the most recent twenty

17. Topical law reviews that merited an additional limited retention copy at the law library include *American Criminal Law Review*, *Antitrust Law Journal*, *Business Lawyer*, *Hastings Constitutional Law Quarterly*, and *Journal of Law and Economics*.

years and withdrew earlier volumes, and purchased microfiche from Hein. These actions achieved a gain of about twenty-eight feet in shelf space.

¶29 As a journal that ceased publication after six volumes, the *Hofstra Property Law Journal* is a Category 5 journal. Prior to the adoption of the policy, the law library held one complete run. In applying the policy, the law library withdrew the paper holdings and purchased microfiche from Hein as a substitute copy. These actions achieved a gain of about one foot in shelf space.

¶30 The *Southern California Law Review* is a Category 2 journal where the law library also holds a copy on Reserve. Prior to the adoption of the policy, the law library held one complete copy of this title and a limited retention copy on reserve. In applying the policy, the law library purchased microfiche from Hein and purchased a second paper copy of this journal, limiting retention to the most recent twenty years. With the addition of twenty years of the second copy in paper, the result is a loss of about nine feet in shelf space.

Conclusion

¶31 Many law libraries eventually have to deal with the unfortunate fact that there is not enough physical space in the library stacks to house all of the paper titles and copies necessary to maintain a strong legal research collection. Accordingly, choices have to be made to deal with this situation, and one such choice is in the number of duplicate copies of law journal sets that the library must retain to meet the needs of its patrons. To help make this decision in the case of individual journal titles, the University of Michigan Law Library developed a policy based on published citation studies that categorizes law journals according to the frequency of their use by legal scholars and judges across the country.

¶32 For the University of Michigan Law Library, the decision came down to choosing between the expense of purchasing microfiche and the need to preserve space in the library stacks; ultimately, the need for space outweighed the cost of purchasing and processing hundreds of titles of microfiche. When the process of applying this policy is complete, the law library will have gained nearly 800 linear feet of shelf space that can be used to house other parts of the law library collection. This gain justified the expense and work involved in applying the policy for the University of Michigan Law Library, but other libraries might see it differently. Each should balance the costs and benefits according to its own collections and patron needs. Electronic journal resources and off-site storage are two alternatives that might interest other libraries, though the University of Michigan Law Library rejected them based on the perceived needs of its patrons. Another library might also decide that the paper to microfiche ratio adopted at Michigan may be skewed too much to one side or the other. Even though every library is different, each library will need to address these issues in making decisions about retention of duplicate copies of law journals because of the importance of these titles to legal scholarship as well as to the integrity of a law library collection.

Appendix A: Combined Rankings of All Journals

Rank	Title	Maggs 1930	Newland 1959	Maru 1976	Daniels 1983	Sir.&Mar. 1986(#1)	Sir.&Mar. 1986(#2)	Mann 1986(#1)	Mann 1986(#2)
1	Harvard L. Rev.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5
2	Yale L. J.	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	1
3	Columbia L. Rev.	4	3	3	6	3	2	2	2
4	U. Chicago L. Rev.			7	3	6	4	9	8
5	U. Penn. L. Rev.	3	9	4	4	4	6	4	14
6	Virginia L. Rev.	12	8	8	7	5	8	13	7
7	Michigan L. Rev.	5	4	5	5	7	5	19	18
8	Stanford L. Rev.			11	13	11	9	16	24
9	California L. Rev.	20	12	6	7	7	7	38	9
10	New York U. L. Rev.	20		12	9	9	9	8	52
11	Texas L. Rev.	14		13	25	24	19	12	38
12	Georgetown L. J.		12	17	17	11	11	7	3
13	Cornell L.(Q.) Rev.	12	6	18	13	27	16	17	70
14	Minnesota L. Rev.	14	9	16	9	17	11	25	27
15	Duke L. J.			24	25	22	19	10	18
16	Vanderbilt L. Rev.			20	25	18	16	22	46
17	Northwest'n (Ill.) L. Rev.	9	5	10	19	22	13	45	32
18	UCLA L. Rev.			21	17	85	25	31	52
19	Iowa L. Rev.	14		22	19	18		21	38
20	Wisconsin L. Rev.	14		26	19	42	33	35	36
21	Law & Contemp. Probs.		6	15	9	18	13	24	46
22	Hastings L. J.			27	42	24	22	5	4
23	Southern Cal. L. Rev.			25	42	18	30	29	128
24	J. Law & Economics			50	25	42			
25	Energy L. J.								
25	Business Lawyer				42		40	6	32
27	George Wash. L. Rev.		14	23	19	15	19	65	87
28	Supreme Court Rev.			33	42	15	25		
29	Hofstra L. Rev.							15	18
30	Boston U. L. Rev.			37	19	85	33	37	80
31	North Car. L. Rev.			39	42	29	36	41	32
32	Harv. Civ. Rights- Civ. Lib. L. Rev.			34	42	42	36		
33	Ohio State L. J.			36	25	66	40	50	63
34	Fordham L. Rev.			38	13	29	40	87	52
35	L & Human Behavior				42				
36	Notre Dame L. Rev.			32	42	29	79	29	63
37	Indiana L. J.	14		48	25	42	25	49	70
38	Tulane L. Rev.			30		54	79	32	38
39	Emory L. J.			105	25			20	46
40	Villanova L. Rev.			41		24		56	27
41	Wayne L. Rev.			45	42	54	79	38	15
42	J. Crim. L. & Crim'y			28		54	13		
43	Boston College L. Rev.			29	25	38	79	65	26
44	Arizona L. Rev.			62		14	55	44	63
45	U. Pittsburgh L. Rev.			47		54	40	50	105
46	U. Cincinnati L. Rev.			51		27	33	74	70
47	Georgia L. Rev.			90		54	55	28	70
48	Louisiana L. Rev.			43	42		79	32	11
49	Washington L. Rev.			59	42	42	40	83	63
50	U. Miami L. Rev.			73		85		14	38
51	SMU L. Rev.			40		66		22	10
52	J. Taxation			35	25	54	55		
53	Law Quarterly Rev.	7			42		79		

Chic-Kent 1989	Finet 1989	Leonard 1990	Gumm 1990	Sir.&Drew 1991	Cul.&Kal. 1995(#1)	Cul.&Kal. 1995(#2)	Shapiro 2000	Sirico 2000(#1)	Sirico 2000(#2)	Avg.
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1.28
2	2	2	3	5	2	3	1	2	3	2.33
4	3	3	4	2	4	5	5	3	2	3.33
6	9	9	6	3	8	6	6	5	4	6.19
13	4	5	7	12	7	7	8	11	12	7.44
7	8	8	9	5	5	8	7	6	8	7.72
14	5	10	15	9	3	4	3	4	7	7.89
3	21	4	2	23	6	2	4	7	8	10.25
5	6	7	5	12	9	11	10	13	5	10.50
9	10	13	10	12	22	14	18	11	6	14.35
11	11	6	8	4	11	9	11	27	23	15.39
19		32	21	40	14	19	14	13	13	16.44
8	14	13	11	17	13	16	12	7	17	17.06
20	12	15	20	17	24	20	20	27	17	17.78
29	34	16	25	9	10	12	9	9	17	18.00
10	13	17	12	9	18	24	16	9	23	18.63
16	16	22	13		21	22	17	20	21	19.00
15	20	12	14	17	16	17	15	13	10	23.75
24	19	25	17	40	40	34	25	20	23	24.94
22	23	18	19	17	17	26	20	38	44	26.41
		15	52			32			66	26.91
30	24	63	33		34	34	19		21	27.29
18	22	28	16		12	13	13	13	10	27.80
		18				15			29	29.83
				23				38		30.50
					15	27		38	44	30.50
	29	44	31	17		34	24	27	15	30.87
		63							13	31.83
26		22	29	40	36			38	66	32.22
17	42	32	22	12	29	24	23	20	29	33.81
27	27	28	28	23	23			38	66	34.21
		28				17		38	37	34.25
12	28	36	24	17	19				44	35.38
46	35	44	36	12			22	27	15	35.43
						29				35.50
28	37	52	27	40	26		27	27	23	37.40
37	38	25	45			28	26		66	38.43
50	26	28	48	23	28					39.64
31		52	39	23				20	44	40.50
34		77	32					38	44	41.44
	40	20								41.63
		52				39			66	42.00
43		39						13	66	42.30
33		39	38					38		42.89
		20	35	23	39	33	28		44	43.17
		52		23	33		30	38	44	43.18
21		52	23	23	37			38	37	44.00
	18	77		40				38	66	44.60
35	33	44	44	40				13		44.83
41	41	39	46	40				38		45.50
	30	106								45.67
				40					66	45.83
				40					66	46.80

(cont.)

Chic-Kent 1989	Finet 1989	Leonard 1990	Gumm 1990	Sir.&Drew 1991	Cul.&Kal. 1995(#1)	Cul.&Kal. 1995(#2)	Shapiro 2000	Sirico 2000(#1)	Sirico 2000(#2)	Avg.
		91		40				38		47.25
39	25	52	40					38		47.60
47		35				37			66	47.70
		36				30				48.00
		49	41					38	37	48.89
				23						50.33
	43	91	37		40			38	66	50.82
32	31	106	30				29			50.82
36		52	43						44	50.89
48	48	36							66	51.10
23		25	18	40	26			27	23	51.27
		52	49					38		54.25
		106		40					17	54.33
25		39	26	23	35			38	66	54.92
		106							29	55.13
	47			40						56.71
		106		40					66	57.63
	49					23		27	37	57.78
		91								59.00
		22						27		59.40
		49	50							60.25
42		106			30			38	35	64.30
38		39								65.57
		106						27		66.50
		77								66.67
		132							29	67.67
		11		40		10			44	68.17
		132						20	66	68.67
45		106							37	70.17
		220		40		30		38	66	70.89
		157						38	23	72.67
				5					44	58.20
				23					66	75.50
		106				20			66	76.00
		52			25				66	77.33
		77		40				20		78.63
		63		23						81.00
		106		40				20		81.14
		77							66	81.80
		106						27	44	82.17
		106		23						87.75
		77			20				66	89.50
		91								91.67
		184						38		95.25
		132								98.20
44		132		23						104.67
									29	107.00
		132		5					66	108.13
		220						13		116.50
		157								116.60
		220		23						121.50
		220						27		123.50

Appendix B:
Citation Studies Used in Creating Michigan Policy

- “The Chicago-Kent Review Faculty Scholarship Survey,” *Chicago-Kent Law Review* 65 (1989): 195–218.
- Cullen, Colleen M., and S. Randall Kalberg, “Chicago-Kent Law Review Faculty Scholarship Survey,” *Chicago-Kent Law Review* 70 (1995): 1445–1460.
- Daniels, Wes, “‘Far Beyond the Law Reports’: Secondary Source Citations in United States Supreme Court Opinions, October Terms 1900, 1940, 1978,” *Law Library Journal* 76 (1983): 1–47.
- Finet, Scott, “The Most Frequently Cited Law Reviews and Legal Periodicals,” *Legal Reference Services Quarterly* 9, no. 3–4 (1989): 227–240.
- Gumm, Janet M., “Chicago-Kent Law Review Faculty Scholarship Survey,” *Chicago-Kent Law Review* 66 (1990): 509–528
- Leonard, James, “Seein’ the Cities: A Guided Tour of Citation Patterns in Recent American Law Review Articles,” *St. Louis University Law Journal* 34 (1990): 181–239.
- Maggs, Douglas B., “Concerning the Extent to Which the Law Review Contributes to the Development of the Law,” *Southern California Law Review* 3 (1930): 181–207.
- Mann, Richard A., “The Use of Legal Periodicals by Courts and Journals,” *Jurimetrics Journal* 26 (1986): 400–420.
- Maru, Olavi, “Measuring the Impact of Legal Periodicals,” *American Bar Foundation Research Journal*, 1976, no. 1: 227–252.
- Newland, Chester A., “Legal Periodicals and the United States Supreme Court,” *Kansas Law Review* 7 (1959): 477–
- Shapiro, Fred R., “The Most-Cited Law Reviews,” *Journal of Legal Studies* 29 (2000): 389–396.
- Sirico, Louis J., Jr., and Beth A. Drew, “The Citing of Law Reviews by the United States Courts of Appeals: An Empirical Analysis,” *University of Miami Law Review* 45 (1991): 1051–1060.
- Sirico, Louis J., Jr., “The Citing of Law Reviews by the Supreme Court: 1971–1999,” *Indiana Law Journal* 75 (2000): 1009–1039.
- Sirico, Louis J., Jr., and Jeffrey B. Margulies, “The Citing of Law Reviews by the Supreme Court: An Empirical Study,” *UCLA Law Review* 34 (1986): 131–147.