

Washington Law Review

Volume 62 | Number 1

1-1-1987

Results of the Washington Survey Questionnaire

Scott Peterson

Bryan E. Lee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr>

Recommended Citation

Scott Peterson & Bryan E. Lee, Washington Survey, *Results of the Washington Survey Questionnaire*, 62 Wash. L. Rev. 229 (1987).

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr/vol62/iss1/10>

This Washington Survey is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews and Journals at UW Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington Law Review by an authorized editor of UW Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact cnyberg@uw.edu.

RESULTS OF THE WASHINGTON SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

In June of 1986, the Washington Law Review mailed a questionnaire to 1,200 law review alumni and subscribers. The purpose of this questionnaire was to determine the future format of the Washington Survey, the section of the Washington Law Review dedicated to Washington law. The results of this questionnaire are summarized below, along with our views on the future direction of the Washington Survey.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Questionnaires were returned from thirty-seven cities throughout Washington. The responses by city are as follows: Seattle, 48; Spokane, 8; Tacoma, Yakima, 5; Bellingham, Everett, Mount Vernon, 4; Bellevue, Centralia, Olympia, 3; Colfax, Odessa, Pasco, Port Angeles, Vancouver, Wenatchee, 2; other cities (from Aberdeen to Walla Walla), 21.

Most alumni and subscribers responding to the questionnaire were from private law firms. Responses by the type and size of practice are summarized below:

Private firm, fewer than 20 attorneys	75
Private firm, between 20 and 60 attorneys	14
Private firm, more than 60 attorneys	13
Public agency	7
Judge	6
Part private, part public	2
Clerk	1
Consulting Attorney	1
Journalist	<u>1</u>
Total responses	120

REPORT ON THE WASHINGTON SURVEY

The tables below summarize the responses to questions about the substance of pieces published in the Washington Survey:

How satisfied are you with—

	<i>Very Satisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Not Satisfied</i>	<i>Total Responses</i>
The topics covered by the Survey?	9	86	15	110
The quality of Survey pieces?	29	80	1	110
The practical utility of Survey pieces?	12	71	24	107

Which of the following possible Survey formats would you find most helpful? (rank in order of preference):

	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>Total Responses</i>
Brief case analysis of recent Washington Supreme Court decisions?	37	26	49	112
Comments dealing more thoroughly with problem areas of Washington Law?	60	44	11	115
Articles on Washington law solicited from faculty and practitioners?	17	50	43	110

WRITTEN COMMENTS

Many of those responding offered written comments. These comments included suggestions on issues that should be covered, recommendations on the format the Washington Survey should adopt, and insights into the nature of a law review. We thank those who took the time to make these comments and we welcome our readers to submit suggestions, insights, and criticisms to the Washington Survey in the future.

FUTURE DIRECTION OF THE WASHINGTON SURVEY

The responses show that subscribers are generally satisfied with the topic selection, quality, and utility of Survey pieces, but would like to see the review publish more comprehensive pieces focusing on problem areas of

Washington Survey Questionnaire

Washington law. Although the Survey will continue to publish brief case-notes on important or controversial Washington Supreme Court decisions and occasional articles written by faculty and practitioners, the Survey will focus on comments dealing more comprehensively with areas of Washington law that are either ambiguous, undeveloped, or just plain difficult.

We thank those who responded to our questionnaire, and we hope that all our readers will find the Washington Survey more interesting and helpful in the future.

Scott Peterson, Executive Editor
Bryan E. Lee, Editor
Washington Survey