This paper describes a study done of the relationship between library-provided faculty research services and faculty productivity at American Bar Association accredited law schools. The study consisted of a survey of law school librarians of faculty usage of faculty research services and the gathering of publicly available information for lists of published law journal articles, *U.S. News & World Report* rankings, and faculty size. Ultimately, 54 law schools were included in the study. Faculty productivity, both unweighted and weighted by prestige, was compared with the frequency and percentage of faculty using faculty research services, *U.S. News & World Report* law school rankings, and faculty size. The top two correlations on faculty productivity were *U.S. News & World Report* rankings and faculty size, followed by either frequency of faculty use or percentage of faculty use depending on whether productivity was weighted or unweighted.
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Introduction

Legal scholarship has become more interdisciplinary in recent years. To serve faculty better, many academic law libraries have focused on providing research services to faculty, including empirical research and library-supervised student research assistants. While internal evaluations of these programs may be occurring, there does not appear to be any published writing about evaluations of the effectiveness of these programs in meeting institutional and individual faculty goals. Because legal scholarship is becoming more interdisciplinary, it has developed enough similarities with general academic scholarship that research from one field can be applied to the other. Faculty productivity in the general academy, including its relationship to libraries, has been studied. Using rank-order correlation methodology borrowed from studies of the relationship between general academic libraries and non-law faculty research productivity, this study tests the following hypothesis: The more a law school’s faculty request substantive research assistance from academic law librarians that provide it, the greater the law school’s faculty research productivity as measured by published law review articles and the prestige of the journals in which they are published. This study examines the effects of both the frequency of substantive research assistance requests made to an academic law library and the percentage of individual faculty members that make substantive research assistance requests on institutional publication. A positive correlation between requests for substantive research assistance and faculty research productivity and publication
prestige is expected, but the correlations will not be as strong as those between reputational rankings and faculty size. In addition to providing a foundation for further research, the research provides some evaluation of the effectiveness of faculty research services to determine their level of emphasis in the future. Some limitations of this study are that it does not examine all kinds of faculty research services and legal scholarship, it focuses on institutions rather than individuals, the measurements of law journal publications are not comprehensive, and the results are less than half of the total population and based off those willing to respond to the survey out of the whole population rather than a random sample of the population.

**Significance of the Work**

This work is significant for several groups of people: academic law librarians, law school faculty, and general academic librarians. Academic law librarians may benefit because, to the researcher’s knowledge, no one has studied the connection between law library service and law faculty productivity. This work, while very limited, can provide a model for law librarians to evaluate one dimension of the effectiveness of the services they provide to faculty. As law libraries face cuts and compete with other law school departments for funding, studies based on this one can be used to evaluate services that the law library provides for faculty and can also be used to potentially demonstrate the benefit that the law library provides to the faculty. Law school faculty may benefit from this work by learning of the connection between using law library faculty services and later publication. General academic librarians may benefit from a potential model to evaluate how the services they provide faculty help their faculty in some way.
Literature Review

Faculty services have been a recent focus of academic law libraries (Fitchett, Hambleton, Hazelton, Klinefelter, & Wright, 2011, p. 97). “Faculty services” is a broad term that incorporates many activities and approaches. Lewis suggests three tiers of law faculty service by law libraries (2002). The first tier is gathering information about the interests, projects, and specific library requests of the faculty; the second tier is providing services that react to a particular request by the faculty; the third tier is being proactive in providing resources and training related to faculty members’ known interests (Lewis, 2002). Lewis divides the second tier, reactive services, into two parts: administrative support and substantive research assistance (Lewis, 2002, p. 96). Administrative support includes “checking out and routing library materials, providing document delivery of photocopied materials or computer printouts, arranging for interlibrary loans, purchasing and routing new resources ordered for a faculty member, and routing certain resources or tables of contents to resources” for faculty (Lewis 2002, p. 96). Substantive research assistance may include responding to faculty requests involving “locating a specific document or resource, performing electronic searches in a particular database, compiling bibliographies on a topic or person, … doing research to support a theory[,]” providing training on how to use a resource, or providing training for faculty student assistants (Lewis 2002, p. 97). Using academic law librarian-supervised students can be another form of faculty research support (Richman & Windsor, 1999). Another type of research assistance is providing empirical research support. Duke and University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill law schools shared an empirical research assistant, who has a doctorate in Political Science and advanced training in statistics, is an example of this service (UNC Katherine R. Everett Law Library, 2013). These three general groupings
of faculty services were discussed in Butler’s survey of faculty services advertised by law school websites (2012). Out of 199 American Bar Association (ABA) accredited law schools at the time, 34.67% of law libraries had faculty liaison librarians, 14.82% of law libraries had a single faculty services librarian who could be a gateway to both librarian-provided and student-provided faculty services, 16.08% of law libraries had library student research assistants, 1.76% of law libraries had an empirical research librarian, and 7.04% had “research librarians” whose job description was not clearly defined (Butler, 2012, pp. 249-250). Despite all the services that can be provided to faculty, Lewis observes that faculty use of library services depends in part on the individual faculty member’s temperament and research style, and “legal scholarship is often a solitary endeavor” (2002, p. 90).

Legal scholarship has traditionally consisted of “treatises, law reviews and peer reviewed journals, as well as casebooks, briefs and reports, book reviews, and op-ed pieces” (Novak & Pardo 2007, p. 209). Technology has allowed legal scholarship to migrate into blogs and podcasts as well. Legal scholarship serves several purposes, including facilitating the dissemination of ideas, helping the faculty member receive tenure, adding to the scholar’s professional reputation, and impacting the practice and development of law (Novak & Pardo 2007, p. 209). It is not clear whether blogs and podcasts contribute toward tenure (Novak & Pardo 2007, p. 209), but early indications are not positive (Schilt, 2007, p. 191). One reason cited for academic law librarians to provide faculty services is that the nature of legal scholarship has changed in the last several decades (Lewis 2002). Legal academics have been branching out beyond traditional doctrinal analysis and commentary on primary law into more interdisciplinary
research, which may require specialized research skills (Lewis, 2002; Schilt 2007). Some have argued that academic law librarians need to consider collecting and borrowing resources beyond traditional legal disciplines and learn how to research beyond traditional legal resources (Lewis, 2002; Schilt 2007).

While academic law libraries have focused on providing faculty research service programs in recent years, no one has conducted empirical evaluations of their effectiveness. Because of the increasingly interdisciplinary nature of law review articles which by necessity incorporate methodologies other than traditional legal analysis, research related to relationship between general academic libraries and the faculty they serve provides guidance on desired outcomes that can be measured. One outcome that can be measured is faculty research productivity. Several researchers have examined connections between various library characteristics and faculty research productivity, but many of the library characteristics studied were passive characteristics like the number of library holdings and library expenditures (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2010, p. 48). Wolff mentions the possibility of the number of reference requests by students and faculty being linked to research activity, but does so only in passing (1995, p. 80). Faculty research productivity itself can be measured in multiple ways. Some suggested measurements are publication output, grant proposals, funded grants, conference output, textbooks, national juried show exhibits, national or international awards, citation impact, patents, and consultancy/advisory work (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2010, p. 47-48). In a study of both research productivity and instructional productivity of general academic faculty, Fairweather defined research productivity as “the number of refereed publications during the previous two years,”
where publications include “articles in refereed journals; published reviews of books, articles, or creative works; books; textbooks; monographs; and chapters in edited volumes” (1999, p. 61).

Several studies of faculty research productivity in the legal academy have been done. One is Swegert and Gozanky’s 1985 study of the research productivity of senior law faculty who had already obtained tenure. Swegert and Gozanky chose to examine senior faculty because they already have tenure and experience less pressure to publish than law faculty still seeking tenure. Swegert and Gozanky found low publication rates among these senior tenured faculty, and a high percentage did not publish at all. The data on each senior faculty member was organized by school (Swegert & Gozanky, 1985). The correlation coefficient showed a relationship between faculty size and publications. Another study was published in 2000 by Brian Leiter (Leiter, 2000). Leiter used faculty scholarly productivity and the scholarly impact of top faculty at the top fifty law schools for 1998-1999 (as measured by various reputational measures) to see how scholarly output rankings would compare to the reputational rankings. In measuring faculty productivity, Leiter measured both journal publications and book publications. He counted articles in only twenty journals (ten student-edited journals and ten peer-edited journals) and assigned them scores based on article length in pages. Book publications from particular academic presses were counted and scored by type of book (treatise, casebook, etc.). Leiter did not measure what influenced faculty productivity but used faculty productivity as a measure of a law school’s academic quality. Leiter has updated his faculty productivity lists for 2000-2002 (Leiter, 2013, Scholarly Productivity section). Roger Williams University School of Law has conducted a similar study since 2007
regarding faculty at “non-elite” law schools ranked outside of the top fifty schools in U.S. News & World Report and New England law schools (for comparison with Roger Williams), using many of Leiter’s methods. (Harrison-Cox, Ortiz, & Yelnosky, 2013).

While these studies were targeted toward legal faculty, they did not try to link faculty productivity with libraries. In a series of three studies starting in 1995, Budd examined the relationships between general academic library characteristics and institutional faculty research productivity. In 1995 Budd conducted a study of faculty research productivity that limited the definition of “publications” to articles as defined by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI), which does not include book reviews, editorials, letters, and notes (p. 549). Budd examined publication outputs of academic institutions who were members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) at the time for 1993-1995, using ISI’s Science Citation Index, Social Sciences Citation Index, and Arts & Humanities Citation Index as sources of raw publication output (1995, p. 548). Because he used the Corporate Index, Budd’s data usually included only the main campus of the institution. In order to control for institutional prestige, Budd also measured per capita publication by dividing the number of publications by the number of faculty at an institution in addition to gathering the raw number of publications per institution. Both total and per capita publications were compared with the “total number of volumes held by the institutions' libraries [sic], the libraries' total expenditures, materials expenditures, and the number of professional librarians on their staffs” in addition to the number of doctorates produced in 1992 and the institutions ranking in the latest Gourman Report, which rated graduate schools at the time (Budd, 1995, p. 549). Budd performed chi-square analyses on each pair of variables and did not find them
significant at a 0.05 level. Next, he ranked each institution by category and performed rank-order correlations between the variables. When he performed rank-order correlations for total publications per institution and per capital publications with the rest of the variables, Budd found higher positive correlations with total publications than per capita publications. He did not apply tests of significance to the rank-order correlations because significance tests require a random sample and Budd intentionally selected all 94 schools in the ARL at the time. Budd repeated this study for 1995-1997 and 2002-2004, except he added institutions that were members of the Association of College and Research Libraries, no longer performed the chi-square tests, and tested different variables, although he never added anything related to reference inquires (Budd 1999; Budd 2006). The focus was faculty productivity over time, and he found an increase from the 1995 study to the 1999 study, and a smaller increase from the 1999 study to the 2006 study. Budd studied the passive characteristics of general academic libraries and their relationship to non-law faculty, but his basic model is the foundation for this study which attempts to track the relationship between faculty research services and faculty research productivity. The next section discusses the basic methodology of this study.

**Method**

First, an electronic Qualtrics survey was prepared to be sent to the Academic Law Libraries-Special Interest Section (ALL-SIS) and law-lib listservs as an open link. ALL-SIS is a section of the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) which provides “a forum for the exchange of ideas and information on academic law libraries and to represent its members’[sic] interests and concerns within the [AALL]” (American Association of Law Libraries, 2013). The Law-lib listserv is a general listserv for law
librarians hosted by the University of California at Davis (Coe, September 14, 2012). Most academic law libraries have a member in ALL-SIS, but the law-lib listserv was used to reach academic law librarians that are not in ALL-SIS. The survey was intended for all fully ABA-accredited law libraries that offered a J.D. and could be answered by any law librarian who had the relevant knowledge of the ABA-accredited law library where they were employed. The survey asked the responder to provide the name of institution, name and job title (to be kept confidential and only used to weed out duplicates), and whether the library provided any of the following faculty services: Librarians who perform research or retrieve resources (other than through interlibrary loan) at a faculty member’s request; library-employed student research assistants who perform research or retrieve resources (other than interlibrary loan) at a faculty member’s request; and/or empirical research support other than training student research assistants employed by faculty. If the respondent indicated that the law library provided any of those three services, the respondent was asked two additional questions. These questions asked respondents to estimate what percentage of the faculty used these services (out of a choice of six percentage ranges) and how frequently faculty used these services (out of a choice of seven units of frequency per period of time, such as 2-3 times a month, suggested by the Qualtrics software). See Appendix B for more details. When analyzing the data, these scales were ranked 1-6 for faculty percentage and 1-7 for faculty frequency, with a value of “1” representing the highest faculty percentage range or frequency so as to not produce negative correlations when comparing with the other ranked variables.
A waiver by the Institutional Review Board was obtained on July 29th, 2013. The initial email was sent to the ALL-SIS and law-lib listservs on August 6, 2013 requesting that surveys be completed by August 19, 2013, and a follow-up/reminder email was sent on August 26, 2013. After about two weeks elapsed since the second email, the responses were examined. Incomplete responses, responses by representatives of law schools not accredited by the ABA or only provisionally accredited, and responses where it was ambiguous in which school the respondent was employed were discarded. In the case of duplicates from the same institution, the first complete response was used as the representative response regardless of the librarian’s position in the library.

After all the participating institutions were ascertained, the researcher proceeded to gather lists of journal articles published in calendar years 2011-2012 from the websites of the law schools. Unfortunately, many, if not all, of the websites did not provide comprehensive data, and some websites provided citation data from two different and slightly conflicting sources. Because of time constraints, the researcher used what in his judgment was the best available source from each law school website based on criteria such as accuracy (if not completeness) and ease of use. Depending on the school, these sources could be digital repositories, faculty bibliographies, faculty publication information under faculty profiles (not including Curriculum Vitae), or faculty publication updates/brochures. Social Science Research Network (SSRN) law school research paper series were not used because it was difficult to determine publication dates. Each source has its strengths and weaknesses. Digital repositories are usually maintained by libraries or the law schools themselves instead of individual faculty members, leading to more consistent updating, and preserve the scholarship of those who
have emigrated to other institutions, but the collections are often not comprehensive and limited by faculty cooperation and copyright ownership of the article. Faculty bibliographies have the advantages and drawbacks of digital repositories with the exception that copyright ownership is not as much of an issue since only the citation is reproduced, thus reducing a barrier to comprehensiveness. Publication information under faculty profiles is available at almost every law school and is not limited by copyright permission, but is highly dependent on faculty initiative, may be maintained or selected by faculty and therefore updated unevenly, and generally only reflects current faculty. Law school publication updates are often provided by the law school administration or law library and can provide publication information about faculty who have moved to other institutions, but potential drawbacks include having too much speculative publication information, sometimes being divided up into very small periods of time, and not going back far enough. If there was no best available source, the law school was eliminated from the study.

Once a best available source was selected, journal articles published in 2011-2012 were selected, counted, and scored. The accuracy of published journal article lists were generally taken at face value unless the source indicated that the article was forthcoming or otherwise indicated incomplete publication information, in which case the researcher investigated to see if the article was published during 2011-2012 using either HeinOnline or journal websites. If mistakes were found, such as publication in the wrong journal, the corrected citation was included. Even if aware of the incompleteness of a particular law school-provided source, the researcher did not add articles to the data where the law school source provided no notice that they existed.
When selecting 2011-2012 articles for counting purposes, the researcher used several criteria. The initial criteria required that the article had to be from a publication listed on Washington & Lee law library’s 2012 journal rankings, even if it was not ranked or a score was not assigned to it. Washington & Lee’s list contains a mixture of print law reviews, online counterparts to print law reviews, and international journals. This method has the drawback of excluding law faculty publications in prominent journals for other disciplines as well as some newer legal journals, but the articles were limited to Washington & Lee rankings because they provided something measurable and some degree of an assurance of quality in a world where faculty publish on numerous law-related websites and state bar journals. Once the appropriate list of journals was selected, additional criteria were applied in determining what articles to include. Book reviews; journal article bibliographies; articles that were debates; articles that were introductions, forewords, or afterwords to symposiums; and articles that were memorials or tributes to legal scholars were eliminated. For the latter two categories, occasional exceptions were made if it appeared from the title that the article was more than a simple introduction, foreword, afterword, memorial, or tribute i.e., an article focused on a deceased legal scholar’s legal thought rather than a short memorial. In addition to full-time, tenured or tenure track faculty, articles published by deans, clinical/writing faculty, and librarians were also included. Including articles by librarians poses some challenges since part of the purpose of this study is to examine the effect of librarian assistance to faculty, but many schools considered librarians as faculty and considered their publications worthy of listing. Thus, separating librarian publications would be too difficult, especially where the source was a digital depository. Moreover, limiting counted articles to ones
appearing in journals listed by Washington & Lee eliminated many of the library newsletters from the study, although publications like Law Library Journal were included. The researcher did attempt to not count adjunct publications as a matter of fairness, as many schools did not even have a profile for their adjuncts much less any information on their publications. The researcher attempted to not count articles by visiting professors for similar reasons as for adjuncts. If an article had multiple authors, it was only credited once per affiliated institution that responded to the survey. No attempt was made to determine whether the article was actually published while the author was affiliated with the institution. The final list of articles for each school were counted, regardless of whether they had a score given by Washington & Lee law library, which forms the value “faculty productivity.” The articles were then scored and totaled for each school, which forms the value “weighted faculty productivity.” The Washington & Lee scores used are from 2012 for convenience even for 2011 articles, the score is normalized (i.e. the top score is 100), and the scoring method that is used is the default combined score. The default combined score consists of one-third the journal’s impact factor and two-thirds total cites (Washington and Lee University School of Law Law Library, n.d.). In order to perform rank-order correlations, both the faculty productivity and weighted faculty productivity were converted into an ordinal scale with the highest number in each category being ranked “1” and ranked sequentially from that reference point.

Other input variables that were used include *U.S. News & World Report* law school rankings and faculty size. For convenience and because the recent rankings publish more ranks for schools than older rankings, the 2014 *U.S. News & World Report*
rankings were used which use data from Fall semester 2012 and early 2013 (Flanagan & Morse, 2013). If an ABA-accredited school’s ranking was not published, it was ranked 145. For faculty size, data from ABA and Law School Admission Council’s (LSAC) 2013 law school guide was used because most of the data came from late 2011, the ending of the measuring period for faculty substantive research requests (Law School Admission Council, Inc. & American Bar Association, 2012). Among other statistics, the guide provides faculty size per school divided into Fall and Spring semesters, and further divided into four, mutually exclusive categories: Full-time; other full-time; deans, librarians, & others who teach; and part-time (Law School Admission Council, Inc. & American Bar Association, 2012, p. 64). “Full-time” refers to tenure and tenured track faculty, “other full-time” refers to full-time nontenured professional skills and legal writing faculty, “deans, etc.” refers to administrators who also teach and are counted for both semesters even when not teaching in one semester, and “part-time” refers to adjuncts, part-time professional skills instructors, faculty from another unit, permanent part-time faculty, and part-time emeriti. It is not clear which category contains visiting professors. The actual faculty size was computed by taking the Fall and Spring total figures for each school, removing the part-time faculty from each, and averaging the remaining faculty for Fall and Spring in order to get that institution’s faculty size. This method retains not only the full time faculty, but the other full time and deans, librarians, and others who teach categories as well, but excludes part-time emeriti and some part time professors in addition to adjuncts. In order to perform rank-order correlations, the faculty size variable was converted into an ordinal scale with the highest number in each category being ranked “1” and ranked sequentially from that reference point.
Limitations

This study has several important limitations. First and foremost, the study only counts articles in journals listed on Washington & Lee law library’s website. Thus, it does not include most journals outside the field of law and any kind of book. This exclusion may result in lessening the impact of some professors who frequently publish articles in non-law journals and all kinds of legal book publications. For example, one faculty member’s bibliography at a prominent law school listed the author’s output as mostly casebooks. Also, some recently created journals are excluded from the list, yet some journal articles for 2011-2012 were published in these recently created journals, thus possibly affecting the accuracy of the faculty productivity results. Another limitation is that the results are on based on who responded to the survey as opposed to a random sample of the population, making the responses subject to self-selection bias and not necessarily representative of the whole population of academic law libraries. A significant limitation is that many, if not all, of the information provided by law school websites is incomplete, affecting the accuracy of faculty productivity and weighted faculty productivity. This issue may be mitigated by measuring the relative rankings rather than absolute numbers, where one or two articles or points can make a difference. Another limitation is while this methodology measures estimates of both the percentage and frequency of faculty usage of faculty research services, the study does not measure which particular faculty made substantive research requests and then subsequently had something published. In addition, if a library offered multiple types of faculty research services, this study does not indicate which services were used. Also, because some of the law school websites only provide information about current faculty publications, there is no guarantee that they were not published at a previous institution or when a professor
visited at another institution and used its library’s resources. The percentage and frequency of faculty making substantive research requests are based on estimates rather than actual data, which is another limitation. In addition, some otherwise complete responses were discarded because not all law schools had a good public source for lists of published journal articles. A further limitation is that the Washington & Lee journal rankings do not take into account how difficult it is to be published in a particular journal. Leiter, in his study, made a distinction between student-edited (which includes many well-known law reviews) and peer-edited law journals, in part because of concerns that “student-edited law reviews simply reinforce the existing hierarchies because their publication decisions are pedigree sensitive” (Leiter, 2000, p. 462). The Washington & Lee list makes no such overt distinction. Another limitation is that except for excluding some article categories, such as book reviews, no attempt was made to gauge the quality of the journal articles counted. Also, in order to save time, only one year’s worth of data was used for the U.S. News rankings, Washington & Lee scores, and faculty size instead of trying to match each journal citation with the correct year (Washington & Lee scores) or averaging the scores over several years (U.S. News ranking and faculty size rankings). Finally, in gathering data and making decisions, the researcher may have committed human error, resulting in less accurate results.

Results

Two weeks after the second email solicitation was sent, the survey had received 102 responses. However, only 77 responses were complete. Of the 77 that were complete, 4 surveys were eliminated because they were from law schools that were either not ABA-accredited or only provisionally accredited; 8 were eliminated because they
were responses from the same institution (2 of which were responses from the same institution, for a total of 3 responses from one institution); 1 response was eliminated because the librarian respondent worked for one campus of a law school that operated two campuses across two states, the two campuses shared the same website and the same U.S. News ranking, and when collecting the data the researcher had difficulty determining which articles and faculty to attribute to a particular campus; and 1 survey response was eliminated because the name of the institution could refer to one of two different law schools in different geographical areas and there was no clear information indicating which one it was (one of these schools was clearly identified and included in the survey); 1 survey response was eliminated because the librarian responder indicated a desire for confidentiality for the name of the school; and 7 responses were eliminated because they were from law schools that did not have a good public source for published journal article lists. Thus, 54 responses from librarians at 54 different law schools remained. The data was recorded in the survey. All the librarians that responded with completed surveys indicated that their library provided at least the service of librarians performing research or retrieving resources (other than through interlibrary loan) at a faculty member’s request, if not more. This information is summarized in the following two tables:
In reporting on a 2005 ALL-SIS survey regarding faculty services, Schilt notes that 92 out of 137 responding law libraries have faculty liaisons, and 71 out of 108 responding law schools have student library research assistants who assist with faculty

### Table 1a: Number of Responding Law Libraries who Provide Particular Services to Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Service Provided to Faculty</th>
<th># of Law Libraries who Provide Service (overlapping results)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarians who perform research or retrieve resources (other than through interlibrary loan) at a faculty member’s request</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library-employed student research assistants who perform research or retrieve resources (other than interlibrary loan) at a faculty member’s request</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical research support other than training student research assistants employed by faculty</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1b: Number of Faculty Services Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Services Provided</th>
<th># of Law Libraries Providing # of Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only one service (always librarians who perform research or retrieve resources at a faculty member’s request)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only two services (librarians who perform research or retrieve resources at a faculty member’s request &amp; library-employed student research assistants who perform research or retrieve resources at a faculty member’s request)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only two services (librarians who perform research or retrieve resources at a faculty member’s request &amp; empirical research support other than training student research assistants employed by faculty)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All three services</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
research requests but work for librarians, not faculty (2007, pp. 195-196). These results are similar to the results of the current study’s smaller sample listed above in Table 1a in that slightly more libraries offer faculty services directly through a librarian than through student assistants employed by the library (although the numbers are overlapping). The amount of law libraries providing empirical research support in the current study seems higher than the three law libraries that had empirical research staff at the time of Butler’s recent study, although the amount of these librarians were growing as of the time of her article (2012, p. 250). However, that portion of Butler’s study counted job titles (2012, p. 259), whereas the current study’s survey questionnaire asks whether a library provides empirical research support. Moreover, as mentioned in the literature review, some libraries share an empirical research assistant. The difference between providing an empirical research assistance function and having a particular position for empirical research may explain the discrepancy between this study and Butler’s study.

Regarding the percentage and frequency of faculty using librarian-provided faculty services, of the included responses every choice for faculty percentage and faculty frequency was marked at least once except for “0%” and “Never,” respectively. For faculty frequency, the results clustered around the higher frequencies, whereas for percentage of faculty, the results clustered round the middle percentage ranges. The following tables show these results:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th># of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% to less than 40%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% to 60%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60% to less than 90%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% or more</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2a: Percentage of Faculty Who Made Substantive Research Requests from Calendar Years 2010-2011
Table 2b: Frequency of Faculty-Made Substantive Research Requests from Calendar Years 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th># of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Once a Month</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a Month</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 Times a Month</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a Week</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 Times a Week*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One of the respondents who gave this response emailed the researcher and indicated that in actuality faculty make requests more than 2-3 times a week but less than daily, sometimes with multiple requests in one day. The researcher notes this information and keeps the respondent’s more conservative survey response.

There was a wide variety in the *U.S. News* rankings in the results, from single-digit schools to several schools whose rank was not published resulting in a given rank of 145. This group of schools whose rank was not published was a large enough to result in an artificial cluster of 145 rankings. Before it was converted into rankings in order to perform rank-order correlations, the raw data for faculty size was fairly evenly distributed, whereas the raw data for faculty productivity and weighted faculty productivity tended to skew toward lower results. The following tables show the relevant metrics:
Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Raw Data Before Conversion into Rankings (Rounded to Two Decimal Places)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>75% Quartile</th>
<th>25% Quartile</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Std. Err. Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Size</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>72.88</td>
<td>41.63</td>
<td>57.35</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Productivity</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>74.75</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>55.93</td>
<td>38.99</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Faculty Productivity</td>
<td>4840</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>810.6</td>
<td>1654.55</td>
<td>387.8</td>
<td>1250.95</td>
<td>1232.68</td>
<td>167.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When running the rank-order correlations, as expected U.S. News rankings and faculty size rankings, respectively, were the top two most strongly correlated with faculty productivity and weighted faculty productivity. Raw faculty productivity was more highly correlated with the percentage of faculty using library faculty services than the frequency of use, whereas with weighted faculty productivity the results were reversed. Budd, in his 1995 survey, did not believe that significance tests were applicable to his intentionally chosen set of universities, but all correlations here were significant at the 0.05 level. The correlations are listed in the below tables.

Table 4a: Rank-Order Correlations for Faculty Productivity

| Input Variable                        | Spearman’s rho | Prob>|lpl |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|-------|
| US News Ranking                       | 0.7990         | <.0001|
| Faculty Size Rank                     | 0.7323         | <.0001|
| % of Faculty Using Library Faculty Assistance | 0.4459         | 0.0007|
| Frequency of Faculty Usage of Library Faculty Assistance | 0.4309         | 0.0011|
Table 4b: Rank-Order Correlations for Weighted Faculty Productivity

| Input Variable                              | Spearman’s rho | Prob>|lpl |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------|------|
| US News Ranking                             | 0.8910         | <.0001 |
| Faculty Size Rank                           | 0.7586         | <.0001 |
| Frequency of Faculty Usage of Library Faculty Assistance | 0.5289 | <.0001 |
| % of Faculty Using Library Faculty Assistance | 0.4813 | 0.0002 |

Discussion

As shown above, every law library included in the survey responses provides at least one the three services that are being studied in this paper. Thus, the effectiveness of these services is an important topic. Because representatives from less than half of the ABA-accredited law schools did not respond to the survey, it is unknown if most law libraries offer this service.

As for the main results, the U.S. News & World Report law school rankings had the highest correlation with faculty productivity rankings and weighted faculty productivity, followed by the faculty size rankings. These correlations potentially indicate that reputational prestige and the amount of faculty are major factors in faculty getting journal articles published often and in journals of higher prestige. Again, less than half of all fully accredited ABA schools were included, which limits the applicability of the results. What is interesting is that the percentage of faculty users is more correlated with faculty productivity, but frequency of faculty users is more correlated with weighted faculty productivity. There could be any number of reasons why the results came out this way, but to speculate, it could be the higher percentage of an institution’s faculty that attempt to publish, the more they use library research.
services, and faculty that try to publish in prominent journals use library research services more frequently. It also could be the other way around, where the higher percentage a law school’s faculty use library research services, the better their articles are and the more articles they get published, and the more frequently faculty use library research services, the more they get published in more prestigious journals because the quality of the articles are better. Again, the foregoing is just speculation and needs to be confirmed through further research.

**Conclusion**

In consideration of all its limitations, this study indicates some relationship between library-provides substantive research services and the subsequent faculty productivity in law journal publications, although other factors such as reputational rankings and faculty size have stronger relationships to faculty productivity. This study provides a starting point for future research that can remove some of the limitations of this study, particularly by having the time and personnel to retrieve more precise journal citation figures and faculty counts. In addition, academic law libraries could internally study the relationship between substantive research assistance and productivity of their own faculty. General academic librarians could also modify the methodology of this study for their context.
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Appendix A

Email Recruitment Message Posted on ALL-SIS listserv
Dear Librarian,

I am a master of library science student at UNC Chapel Hill, and I am conducting research in the process of writing my master’s paper. As part of this research, I have prepared a short survey for academic law librarians. The study examines the relationship between academic law libraries providing faculty research support services and the quantity and quality of faculty publications in law reviews. This survey is intended for the law library’s academic law librarian who knows the most about faculty research support services, so please forward this survey to the most knowledgeable librarian on staff at your institution.

If you wish to participate, please click the link below and answer the survey questions in the order they are asked. The survey is 3-5 questions and should take only 5 to 10 minutes. If you are participating, please try to complete and return the survey by **August 19, 2013**. The only benefit to participating in this study is contributing to knowledge about the efficacy of faculty support services.

The survey asks for information on the name of the respondent’s institution, respondent’s name, and respondent’s job title. Respondent’s name and job title will be kept confidential and are only requested in order to eliminate duplicate answers from the same institution. After the surveys are collected and counted, they will be removed before any data analysis is conducted, and they will not be part of the final publication of the research. In addition, electronic data will be protected by the UNC Institutional Research Board’s Level II data security protocols. For more information, contact the Office of Human Research Ethics using the contact information below.

Participation in this survey is voluntary, there is no penalty or loss of benefits for refusing to participate, and you may discontinue participation at any time.

By completing the online survey and returning it, you agree to participate in this study.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact me, the principal investigator by email at jrountre@live.unc.edu or by phone at (919) 363-8267. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject you can contact UNC’s Office of Human Research Ethics by email at IRB_Subjects@unc.edu or by phone at (919) 966-3113.

If you wish to take the survey, please follow the following link: [Survey Link]

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Jonathan V. Rountree
MSLS Candidate December 2013, UNC Chapel Hill
Follow-up Message:

Dear Librarian,

I am a master of library science student at UNC Chapel Hill who is conducting research in the process of writing my master’s paper. Several weeks ago, a message was sent out to law librarians at all fully ABA-accredited law schools that offer a J.D. containing information about how to participate in this research by taking a survey. My records show that I do not have a survey response from your institution. Taking the survey is completely voluntary, but in case you or another law librarian at your institution wanted to complete the survey but were unable to do so within the past several weeks, the link is here: [insert survey link]. If you want to review the original message describing the research in more detail or never received the original message initially, it is reproduced below my signature. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Jonathan V. Rountree
MSLS Candidate December 2013, UNC Chapel Hill

[Reproduction of original message here]
Appendix B

Survey Instrument
Survey

[What follows is an accurate representation of the survey content. The real survey is located on Qualtrics. Format may vary. Notes and comments are in brackets.]

Intro. The following survey is voluntary. By completing and submitting the survey, you have provided consent for your responses to be used in research and data analysis. The survey questions change depending on your responses to other questions, so please complete each page before moving on to the next.

Q1. Name of law school with which law library is affiliated.

Q2. Name and job title of person filing out survey (for researcher’s use only, name and title will be kept confidential and not published).

Q3. Which, if any, of the following services does your library supply to the law faculty? Check all that apply.
   □ Librarians who perform research or retrieve resources (other than through interlibrary loan) at a faculty member’s request.
   □ Library-employed student research assistants who perform research or retrieve resources (other than interlibrary loan) at a faculty member’s request.
   □ Empirical research support other than training student research assistants employed by faculty.

[See next page below]
Q4. In your estimation, for the calendar years 2010-2011, approximately what percentage of the law school’s faculty used any of the services listed on the previous page that your library provides? [This question only appears if the respondent checked at least one of the boxes in Q3.]
○ 0%
○ Less than 10%
○ 10% to less than 40%
○ 40% to 60%
○ Over 60% to less than 90%
○ 90% or more

Q5. In your estimation, for the calendar years 2010-2011, approximately how often has your library received requests from faculty for the services listed on the previous page that your library provides? [This question only appears if the respondent checked at least one of the boxes in Q3.]
○ Never
○ Less than Once a Month
○ Once a Month
○ 2-3 Times a Month
○ Once a Week
○ 2-3 Times a Week
○ Daily

Warning. You have reached the end of the survey. If you wish to make any changes to your responses, please go back and take the opportunity to do so now. By clicking "Next" you will be submitting the survey and consenting to the use of this data for research purposes.