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I. Executive Summary

A comprehensive membership survey was conducted during July and August 2012 on behalf of the ABA Section of Antitrust Law (SAL) by Lake Mountain Inc. (LMI), a private research and consulting firm. The survey was conducted completely electronically; 424 SAL members returned completed questionnaires. This represents a 66% increase in the number of responses over the previous survey (2007).

To determine the representativeness of the survey respondents, their characteristics were compared to the Section's demographic data. Age, gender, ethnicity, and legal practice setting were the variables used to establish how well the respondent pool represented the membership. Respondents to the survey closely track the membership demographics, to the extent that these are known.

Two demographic trends are highlighted. First, while the aging trend of the Section membership may have halted, the survey data show a demographic trough in 46-50 age range. Proportionately fewer members are currently in their late forties; this may pose a challenge for the Section's leadership transitions, since individuals often move into leadership positions at this life/career stage. Second, as the Section becomes more socially diverse, some differences in values appear. All members highly value the Section's publications, Spring Meeting and other programs; however, women and minorities place a greater value on the professional networking aspect of Section membership as well as the international scope and focus of the Section of Antitrust Law.

Members expressed a high degree of satisfaction with core section functions. A majority view SAL membership as more valuable than other professional associations and support the Section's public advocacy activities. Section publications and periodicals are the highest valued benefit of membership, with hard copies currently more popular than electronically delivered documents. Analysis of survey data shows an inverse relationship between age and support for new formats, including e-books and a proposed SAL smartphone/tablet app.

Continuing Legal Education and other Section programs are popular with the majority of members, with the topic and speaker being the strongest motivators for attendance. Beyond these two factors, the analysis shows that the networking facet of these programs is a stronger motivator for women and ethnic minorities than for dominant groups. The relationship between CLE attendance and committee service is also found to be highly statistically significant. Thus, participation in the Section's face-to-face programs makes it more likely that a member will join a committee.

The Section website is used occasionally by the majority and more intensively by members involved in committees and other leadership positions. Compared to other ABA sections, the SAL web pages get high marks. Only 3% of respondents noted they prefer not to use the website. Support for new technology for Section communications (e.g., the development of a Section smartphone/tablet app) is strong in the younger cohorts but unpopular with the 66 and older cohort. The only social media
site in which there is a strong interest by members is the LinkedIn ABA/SAL company page. Finally, the members anticipate the increasing importance of the European Union and China as foreign jurisdictions for antitrust practice in the next five years.

II. Introduction

From July 17 to August 15, 2012, the Section of Antitrust Law (SAL) conducted a membership survey, as it does every five years. The 2012 survey was conducted completely electronically for the first time. 4,502 SAL members were emailed invitations to take the survey on-line; 424 individuals responded (N=422). The response rate was 9.4%, which is an acceptable rate of return for electronic surveys (Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2004; James, Ziegenfuss, Tilburt, Harris, & Beebe, 2010). Compared to the last SAL survey in 2007 (N=254), we received an increase of 66% in the number of returned questionnaires.

Purpose of the Survey
The membership survey has five objectives: First, to assess the members’ satisfaction with Section services and benefits; second, to document the changing demographic composition of the membership; third, to evaluate the implications of demographic and professional changes for the stability and future growth of the Section; fourth, to use the survey-taking process as a vehicle to inform members about Section resources and benefits; and fifth, to solicit member input on future directions.

Report Overview
In this Report, we present key findings from the data analysis relevant to upcoming decision-making on Section initiatives and strategic planning. This Final Report is not an exhaustive review of all the collected data; the full data set contains information that may be valuable in the future but is not compelling at the moment. Accompanying this Report is a CD-ROM with all the raw data tables (in spreadsheet format) and a summary of response frequencies for all questions (in a pdf document). The Section leadership may wish to return to this resource when unanticipated issues arise for which members’ preferences need to be taken into account.

In Section III, the study authors establish demographic benchmarks to track SAL growth and development. We examine the age, gender, ethnic composition and legal practice settings of the respondent pool and compare these dimensions to those of the general membership. In so doing,

---

1 The survey was conducted by a private research firm, Lake Mountain Inc. (LMI). LMI’s research on behalf of the ABA Section of Antitrust Law was carried out in consultation with the Section’s officers and professional staff.
2 Although 424 individuals took the survey, two persons were excluded from the dataset because they were student members and thus ineligible for the survey. See Appendix for an explanation of the survey methodology.
3 This rate also compares favorably with the survey done by LMI for the ABA Section of Taxation in 2010 which received a 7% survey response from members (N=1,104).
we document these demographic measurements to evaluate the representativeness of the respondent sample and establish baselines for estimating future growth of the Section of Antitrust Law.

Section IV examines change in median age of the Section since 2002 and the effects of the current age distribution on the Section. We identify value divergence among different gender, ethnic, and geographic subgroups.

Section V details members' evaluation of the SAL's reputation and its public advocacy activities. Respondent preferences for the Section's benefits such as CLEs, publications, and other programs are analyzed. Feedback from respondents on their committee experiences is presented.

Section VI reviews Section initiatives regarding technology and international expansion. First, respondents' preferences for the enhanced technological options under consideration by the Section leadership are discussed. The relationship between age and technological preference is explored. Second, members' assessments of foreign jurisdictions which they anticipate will become more important for Antitrust/CP practice are presented.

Section VII summarizes the successful areas of Section functioning and activity, as established in the survey data. Upcoming challenges suggested by the foregoing data analysis are enumerated.

III. Members and Respondents ~ A Demographic Snapshot

To assess the representativeness of the survey, we compare the survey respondents to the Section membership on several key dimensions. We find that the demographic characteristics of respondents track closely what we know of the membership population. The exceptions to this trend are minor, and do not limit the extent to which we can generalize the survey results to the entire population.

Age Distribution

Figure 1 (below) compares the age distribution of our survey respondents to the Section’s membership age data collected by the ABA. Members in the 21 – 36 age group and members in the 66+ age group are almost equally represented in the respondent pool and the general Section membership: 14% for both groups in the 21 – 36 range; in the 66 + age group, the ABA demographics show a small (not statistically significant) difference between the Section membership (9%) and our sample (11%). In the subgroups of established (37 -50) attorneys as well as senior (51-65) lawyers, our respondent pool appears to skew older than the Section membership as a whole, as shown in the graph below. However, the study authors believe that this discrepancy is probably illusory and, in any case, minor. It is most likely an artifact of the missing data from the ABA demographics report. Note the final column on this chart: about a quarter (24%) of members declined to provide age information to the ABA when they registered for the Section. By contrast,
only 4% of survey respondents declined to identify their age category. Those who decline to give their age typically skew older. Finally, a significant number of attorneys are missing from the ABA demographic data set and it is likely that these missing data account for much of the difference between members and respondents in the middle two age categories.

**Figure 1. Age Distribution: Member Population and Survey Respondents**

![Age Distribution Chart]

**Gender Distribution**

Figure 2 shows the gender breakdown for the membership as a whole and for the respondent pool. There is no significant difference between the gender distribution for the general membership according to ABA/SAL demographic data (24% female, 76% male) and for our respondent pool (26% female, 74% male). For analytic purposes, the gender division of the surveyed population substantially reflects that of the membership.

**Figure 2. Gender Distribution: Member Population and Survey Respondents**

![Gender Distribution Chart]
**Ethnic Composition**

Members were more willing to provide data on ethnic heritage in the context of the survey than they were when applying for ABA and Section membership. 63% of SAL members did not provide race or ethnicity information when registering for ABA and SAL membership. In contrast, only 9% of survey respondents declined to provide this information. (See Figure 3 below.) Given the underreporting of ethnicity in ABA/SAL records and the close fit between the membership and respondent pool on other demographic dimensions, we believe the survey data provides a more reliable benchmark for race/ethnicity analyses.

![Figure 3. Ethnic/Racial Distribution: All Members and Survey Respondents](image)

**Legal Practice Settings**

The overwhelming majority of respondents and members work at private firms (69% respondents, 58% members) with pluralities employed by large firms (48% respondents, 45% members). (See Figure 4.) About one-tenth work as corporate attorneys (13% respondents, 10% members). Less than one-tenth are employed in government. The proportion of SAL respondents and members who are judges or academics is negligible (less than 2%). The international category (1% respondents, 0%
members) on this graph only includes associate members (non-US lawyers) who are primarily based overseas.\(^4\) Associate members who are foreign-accredited form about 12% of respondents but most are employed by US firms.

Figure 4 shows a higher proportion of respondents (21%) working for small firms, as compared to members (13%). This is a statistically significant difference.\(^5\) The respondent pool also over-represents the proportion of government lawyers (9% respondents, 5% members).\(^6\) In short, compared to the membership as a whole, respondents are somewhat more likely to work in smaller firms or for the government. Be advised: the survey is providing a slightly stronger voice for government lawyers and practitioners at smaller firms.

One final caveat: since 22% of members declined to indicate their practice setting when joining the ABA, there will inevitably be some discrepancies in comparing the respondent and member groups.

![Figure 4. Legal Practice Setting: All Members and Survey Respondents](image)

## Generalizability of Survey Results

As described above (Figures 1 – 3), the respondent pool accurately represents the population with respect to the key demographic variables: age, gender, and race/ethnicity. Although the respondents are drawn disproportionately from smaller firms and government, the skews in this direction are modest (Figure 4). In addition, we analyzed the overlap between the Section

---

\(^4\) ABA/SAL demographic data does not distinguish foreign-based versus foreign-accredited associate members; consequently, the percentage of SAL members in the “international” category is zero.

\(^5\) Pearson chi square 7.6, P < .01, df=1.

\(^6\) The difference is statistically significant. Pearson chi square 4.01, P < .05, df=1.
leadership and the survey respondents. We found that four-fifths of survey respondents were not represented in SAL leadership. Thus, while the views of individuals with leadership experience are well represented, the survey is a strong reflection of the attitudes and preferences of the general membership.

There are two limitations to bear in mind. First, the lack of complete age and ethnicity data in the membership records makes it difficult to establish an accurate profile of SAL demographics; hence, the demographic projections made in this Report are suggestive but not definitive. Second, about forty percent (2,939) of members’ email addresses were missing from the ABA and SAL master lists. These members were, therefore, unreachable for the survey. Although it was technically possible to send mailed questionnaires to a sample of these members, the study authors have found this endeavor to be of limited value. Despite the lack of feedback from these unreachable members, the demographic distribution of the respondent pool mirrors what we know of the Section population.

In short, the strengths of the survey are: 1) the social characteristics of the respondents reflect what is known of the SAL population as a whole; 2) the preferences of the general membership predominate in the survey data; and 3) the increase in the number of returned questionnaires yields a richer data set than in years past. The weakness derives from the missing membership data (demographic data and unreachable members) which limits our ability to definitively predict trends. Strengths and weaknesses of the data are taken into account in the analyses; any limitations are noted in the text.

**Recommendations:**

1) Review registration sign-up forms for ABA and the Section on Antitrust Law. Make “email address” a required field. Provide check-boxes so that the new member can control the types and the frequency of mailings they receive. 2) When requesting demographic information (e.g., age, sex, ethnicity), explain that these data are used in aggregate for statistical purposes only. The Section needs the information in order to accurately depict the social characteristics of the membership as a whole. These data are used for demographic trends analysis and have no influence on Section activities or decision-making.

---

7 Leadership lists were compared to the marked (completed) email addresses from the survey data auto collector. No individual questionnaire contained information regarding a respondent’s role in the Section.

8 When conducting a similar membership survey for the ABA Section of Taxation in 2010, LMI distributed paper questionnaires to a (systematic random) sample of 500 members (out of 5,740) whose email addresses were unavailable. In the 2010 survey, paper questionnaires had a lower response rate than electronic ones. The cost per response for the mailed questionnaires was over $100. SAL leadership did not consider this to be a cost-effective option, and we agree.
IV. Changing Demographics of the Section of Antitrust Law

In this section, we examine demographic changes affecting the Section of Antitrust Law. First, we analyze the age distribution of SAL membership and consider the implications of this pattern for leadership development and future growth. Second, we examine how increasing gender and ethnic diversity offers new considerations for adjusting Section benefits. Finally, we highlight geographic complexity; in particular, we consider how the combination of geographic density (of SAL members concentrated in the mid-Atlantic region) and geographic dispersion (the SAL members dispersed throughout the country) may complicate Section operations.

Stopping the clock? A pause in the aging process

The Section of Antitrust Law, like other ABA sections, has been aging at a fairly rapid rate over the past few decades. In 1986, the median age of SAL members was 42; by 2002 this had increased to 51. The last survey (2007) reported a median age for respondents as 53. The 2012 survey marks a halt (at least temporarily) in this aging trend: respondents’ median age is now 51 (N=406). Additionally, our analysis of current ABA/SAL demographic data (all members) shows a median age of 50 and an average age of 44. Because of noise in these data sets, it is impossible to determine the exact median age of SAL members, but the available evidence puts the midpoint of the age distribution somewhere between 50 –52. Thus, the aging trend seems to have halted—and possibly reversed direction. This compares favorably to other ABA sections which have seen no abatement of the aging membership trend.

Figure 5 shows that about half of antitrust attorneys are above 51 years of age. Both ends of the distribution are balanced: attorneys in the 23 – 30 age range and those in the 66 – 70 age range account for 7% of membership respectively. The modal age category (highest proportion of members) comprises well-established practitioners between 56 – 60 years of age. 12.7% of respondents are in this category. But median and average ages are summary statistics that only tell part of the story. The other, more significant issue has to do with the distribution of members across the age categories.

---

9 Individual level data from the Section’s membership database (instead of categorical data from the 2012 Survey data) were used for Figure 5, to most accurately illustrate the age trend.
What is particularly notable in the age distribution presented in Figure 5 is a membership trough that appears in the 46 – 50 age range. This category includes the pool of mid-career attorneys from which SAL will draw members into leadership positions in the near future. The trough is preceded by a demographic bulge and followed by lower proportions of younger members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Segment</th>
<th>2012 (%)</th>
<th>2017* (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest third, as % of membership</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle third, as % of membership</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>12.7**</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.7**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest third, as % of membership</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Projection assumes zero population growth for five years.
**Modal age segment

Table 1. Age Distribution Projection, 2012 - 2017
IV. Changing Demographics of the Section of Antitrust Law

Currently, the distribution of members provides a pool of experienced attorneys who can be drawn into leadership roles, as the modal category (35.1%) comprises the middle third of the population. Since 41-55 year olds tend to be most active in (unpaid) leadership positions in professional associations, it is advantageous to have large numbers of members in this tranche. However, as we project these numbers forward, we can see that this advantage is lost by 2017. The demographic bulge moves the modal category to the oldest third of the membership in five years. Consequently, now is the time to consider ways to increase the numbers of young attorneys and to create pathways for younger members into leadership roles.

Recommendation: Develop incentives and leadership training opportunities for lawyers in their late thirties in order to have a larger pool from which to draw members into leadership positions. Making the opportunity structure for leadership roles more transparent will attract a more diverse set of individuals for these positions.

Gender Diversity

Although the Section is still predominantly male, the number of female antitrust and consumer protection lawyers is increasing. In 2007 (the first survey with SAL gender data), women were one-fifth of the membership; currently the proportion of female members is one-quarter.

The increasing proportion of women in the Section reflects the growing numbers of women obtaining the JD. Since 2002, near gender parity has been the trend in American Law Schools. We expect the proportion of women in the SAL to approach 30% within five years.

Figure 6 (below) compares men and women respondents’ evaluation of the various benefits of membership in the Section of Antitrust Law.

---

10 As legal careers can easily last forty to fifty years, it will take time before the total number of practicing female lawyers equals the total number of male lawyers. The proportion of women in the various legal subfields should be increasing for at least two decades. This trend is reflected both in our survey data and in the ABA membership data. See also, the American Bar Association’s compilation of statistics on legal education (http://www.abanet.org/legaled/statistics/charts/stats%20-%2006.pdf).
More women (64%) than men (59%) value professional networking; leadership opportunities (33% vs. 29%); and promoting public awareness of consumer protection (11% to 5%). Although all members highly value Section publications (both hard copy and on-line), women value them somewhat less while placing somewhat greater value on CLEs. These are not statistically significant differences. Overall, men and women are quite similar in how they evaluate various aspects of their section membership. However, these results show a slightly different preference order, with women stressing aspects of membership that are key to professional development, e.g., networking and access to leadership opportunities. This is not surprising, since a greater proportion of women members are in earlier career stages, compared to the men.

With growing gender diversity, the Section leadership may want to consider how to support women’s participation in Section activities. SAL women members tend to be newer to the Section\textsuperscript{11}, more than twice as likely as men to work in government\textsuperscript{12}, and less likely to receive employer subsidies for ABA dues and CLEs\textsuperscript{13}. While men and women exhibit similar levels of interest in

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{gender_difference_value_section_membership.png}
\caption{Gender Difference: Value of Section Membership}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{11} 40% of women respondents have been SAL members for five years or less (2012 Survey, P. 1, Q1).
\textsuperscript{12} 17% of female SAL members are in government; 6.5% of male SAL members list government as their practice setting (2012 Survey, P. 2, Q1).
\textsuperscript{13} 51% of women (compared to 37% of men) receive no reimbursement or only partial reimbursement from the employer for ABA dues (2012 Survey, P.1, Q10). 60% of women (compared to 49% of men) receive no reimbursement or only partial reimbursement from the employer for in-state CLEs (2012 Survey, P.1, Q9).
professional development, female participation in professional associations tends to be more contingent on external factors. For women, more so than men, the timing and location of meetings, availability of childcare, and the terms (e.g., length and scope) of committee membership are factors that may constrain members’ ability to participate and advance into leadership. Effective planning to take into account changing work-family patterns— that apply to both men and women— requires more detailed feedback from members, possibly through the use of occasional focus groups.

**Ethnic Diversity**

A definitive assessment of the changing ethnic/racial composition of the Section of Antitrust Law is not possible using the currently available data. This section of the Report is a “soft” analysis of the data; it is suggestive—and not definitive— because of missing data and a dearth of comparable measures.\(^{14}\) We utilize ABA data as well as the 2012 membership survey to 1) establish a demographic benchmark for SAL, and 2) compare the ethnic composition of SAL currently to the national distribution of all lawyers.

In Table 2, we present data from the ABA and from the 2012 SAL membership survey. Individuals of Hispanic and Asian heritage, according to the 2010 US Census, form the fastest growing sub-populations within the country (US Census Bureau, 2011). Asian-American and Latino lawyers, although forming a very small proportion of the membership, are a growing segment within the ABA; the percentage of African American lawyers is also increasing in the profession. With minority enrollment in law school consistently above 20%, these trends will continue (American Bar Association, 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2000 All lawyers* (%)</th>
<th>2010 All lawyers* (%)</th>
<th>2012 SAL survey respondents** (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino/a</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Ethnic composition of the ABA and SAL, 2000 - 2012**

Source: *American Bar Association, 2011; **2012 SAL Membership survey

---

\(^{14}\) Ethnicity is included as a variable for the first time in the 2012 SAL Member Survey.
Table 2 (above) shows that whites predominate in the profession and in SAL, making up close to 90% of the membership. Looking at the change between 2000 and 2010, we can see that law is diversifying very gradually. Compared to the profession as a whole, the Section of Antitrust Law has slightly more Latino and Asian-Americans. However, the number of African American attorneys in the AT/CP subfield is very small.

As with gender, there is a great deal of consensus among ethnicities regarding the value of Section services and benefits. The key differences, however, are noteworthy and will be discussed fully in the next section.

**Intragroup Differences**

With respect to preference for member benefits, there are two key differences that distinguish between majority and minority groups within the Section. Professional networking and international programs are more valued by women and minorities than they are by men and whites. The strength of the support for both of these benefits is strongest on the part of minorities. (See Table 3.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Whites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued by</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td><strong>71%</strong></td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (out of 10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International scope/perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued by</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (out of 10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Intragroup Differences in Evaluating Member Benefits

* tied for 4th place
**statistically significant (Pearson chi square 14.6, P <.00001, df=1)

Similar intragroup differences are visible the way members express preference for future Section benefits and services. Men and women have similar preference orders for most future benefit enhancements with one notable exception. Women rank programs to promote participation of women and minorities second in their order of preference but men rate this choice last (seventh out of seven choices). (See Figure 7 below.) Specifically, 40% of women but only 4% of men see the need for SAL programs to promote greater participation by women and minorities. We ran a
statistical test\textsuperscript{15} on this finding and found it to be extremely statistically significant. Although women members may not actively call for such programs to be initiated, the survey finds strong support for diversity outreach among women. At the same time, the survey indicates weak support for such programs by men (who are the majority of SAL members).

\textbf{Figure 7. Preference for Benefit enhancements: Men and women}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure7.png}
\end{center}

When comparing preference orders for enhanced benefits of the different ethnic groups, we see a pattern similar to what we found in the gender analysis. There is overall consensus on highly valued benefits (e.g., availability of materials online). However, international programs are more supported by minorities (39%) than by whites (25%). Programs to support women and minorities are also highly valued by minorities (27%) but not by whites (12%). (See Figure 8 below.)

\textsuperscript{15} Pearson chi square 69.34, $P < .0001$, df=1.
Geographical Complexity

The majority of SAL members are located on the East Coast, and particularly in the financial and governmental centers of the United States. Fifty-seven percent of survey respondents live in either the New York or Washington DC metropolitan areas, a geographical concentration that mirrors the
Section as a whole. The remainder of the membership is spread throughout the US, with clusters of members in other major metropolitan regions like Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Houston. This sort of combination—high concentration in Washington and New York coupled with national dispersion—indicates a potential for coordination difficulties. Coordination problems can emerge in organizational communications or activities. The survey data allow us to address the latter issue. We investigated whether the uneven geographic distribution of members affects participation in SAL programs or committees. (See Figure 9 below.)

While those members not in the New York or DC area may prefer to have programs nearer to home, this preference does not seem to have had an appreciable effect on meeting attendance. More than three-quarters of respondents participated in a Section meeting or program within the past three years. There is no significant difference in levels of participation based on a member’s home location.

Figure 9. Geographic Concentration and Section Participation: Survey Participants in New York/Washington DC & Other Areas

---

16 See Appendix, “Qualitative Respondent Comments.”
V. Section Benefits

How members perceive the professional reputation and public presence of the Section of Antitrust Law is examined in this section. The survey asked respondents to assess their membership in the SAL as compared to other professional legal associations. This question formulation yields a "soft" measure of reputation (Heinz & Laumann, 1994; Rindova, Williamson, Petkova, & Sever, 2005). Members also expressed opinions regarding the extent and scope of the Section's public advocacy activities. Asking about the Section's involvement in policy-relevant issues is a way of measuring the respondent's perception of the association's public profile.

Section Reputation
The Section of Antitrust Law is considered very positively compared to other associations in which AT/CP attorneys are engaged. A majority (64%) view SAL membership as more valuable than other professional associations; and in fact, 27% of respondents consider SAL their most important membership. Only 7% view SAL as less valuable than others.

Figure 10. Comparative Assessment of SAL and Other Legal Associations
The comparative framework for assessing the value of the SAL is shown in Figure 11 (below). Antitrust and consumer protection attorneys (and non-attorney associates) belong to an array of domestic and foreign professional associations. A majority belong to their state bars, and 44% belong to their local bar association as well. Thirty-seven percent of SAL members also belong to other sections of the ABA. (A complete list of these other associations is in the Appendix.) Only 9% of the survey respondents have no other legal association memberships.

![Figure 11. Other Legal Association Memberships](image)

Public Advocacy
To assess support for the Section's public advocacy activities, the survey asked respondents whether they supported the issuing of public comments. A vast majority of respondents (two-thirds or more) support all the areas in which the Section of Antitrust Law issues public comments: legislative, governmental agencies, foreign jurisdictions, amicus briefs\(^\text{17}\). Fifty percent think the Section engages in the right amount of public advocacy, with an additional 12% supporting an increase in

---

\(^{17}\) 2012 Member Survey, P22, Q1: “One way in which the Section engages in public service is by submitting Comments on regulatory, competitive, and other legal matters within its area of expertise. Which of the following activities to do you endorse?”
such activity. Only 12% think that SAL is too active or should refrain from public comment and 26% “do not feel strongly, either way.” 18

It is notable that a quarter of the membership expresses ambivalence regarding the Section's public advocacy efforts. To search for clues on why so many members would refrain from weighing in on this aspect of membership, we examined the open field ("other") comments.19 There are two clusters of responses: some individuals feel that they don’t have enough information to take a position, others are concerned about inherent conflicts of interest.

Books and Periodicals
Section publications are the highest valued benefit of membership with hard copies currently more popular than electronic (84% vs. 68%).20 About half of the membership is open to having increased electronic options for accessing SAL publications. In this section we analyze members’ preferences regarding SAL books and periodicals and factors that support or deter purchases.

Books. Sixty-seven percent of respondents have purchased a SAL book in the past five years.

Figure 12. SAL Book Purchases and Future Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antitrust Law Devel 6/e</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann. Rev. of Antitrust</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Devel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Antitrust</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prac &amp; Statutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition Laws</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside US</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP Law Devel</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 2012 Member Survey, P22, Q2: “Compared to the present level of engagement, please indicate your preference regarding the level of policy advocacy to be undertaken by the Section in the future.”
19 See Appendix, “Qualitative Respondent Comments.”
20 2012 Member Survey P.1, Q.3.
About half (48.6%) of the survey respondents are interested in purchasing Section e-books. Nevertheless, some concerns were identified by members in the open comments. Thus, as the Section considers a transition from print to e-book format, the following issues should be addressed:

- the terms of the e-book license
- how e-books will be shared or circulated within law libraries
- cataloguing and search functions for the e-book
- whether copy/paste of book selections will be permitted
- how to communicate the technological advances of e-books to the membership and possibly train some members in the use of the application

The better members understand the specific features of the e-book technology and its benefits—accessibility, portability, lower cost—the more likely that this technology will become widely accepted. Currently, there remains some resistance. This is because multiple technological standards create uncertainty, longstanding members are comfortable with the current print publications, and the cost advantage and other benefits are not clear.

Some resistance will melt away with the passage of time. In Figure 13, we can see that there is stronger support for e-books among younger cohorts and the strongest resistance to e-books is in the 66 and older cohort.

**Figure 13. E-book Interest by Age**

![E-book Interest by Age](image)

Demographic change will automatically increase the base of support for e-books. Since these changes occur gradually, the Section will have time to consider the issues identified above and formulate a plan for expanding e-book titles.

---

21 See Appendix, “Qualitative Respondent Comments.”
Besides analyzing the preferences of those members who are committed book purchasers, we investigated why one-third of respondents did not purchase any Section books in the last five years. The factor most often cited as a deterrent was price, with availability of materials from the law library being the next most frequently cited reason. (See Figure 14.) Additional explanations were proffered in the open fields. They included the sufficiency of books already purchased, the availability of relevant materials on the internet, and the need to tailor research to specific cases.

---

**Figure 14. Factors Deterring Book Purchases by Respondents**

---

Periodicals. The membership is overwhelmingly satisfied with the frequency of periodical distribution.\(^{22}\) *The Antitrust Magazine* is used most intensively by members, with 48% using it regularly and 44% occasionally. *The Antitrust Law Journal* is an important journal for members, 38% use it regularly and 56% occasionally. Thus, these publications are key resources for more than 90% of members. *The Antitrust Source* is also a valuable resource for 77% of members, 33% of whom use it regularly. (See Figure 15.) The difference in usage among these periodicals is likely due to the varying needs of the membership and the mix of cases that they are working on.

---

\(^{22}\) 99.1% of respondents agree that the frequency of publication of Section periodicals do not need to change. 2012 Survey, P.12, Q2.
The Committee Newsletters have a targeted distribution; these periodicals are directed towards the various subspecialties within the SAL. About half the members read these newsletters occasionally.

**Figure 15. Periodical Usage**

A majority of respondents would use all formats for periodicals except for a smartphone/tablet app. (See Figure 16.) However, a plurality was in not favor of the smartphone/tablet app.

**Figure 16. Preferred Formats for Periodicals**
The two formats that received the least support, dedicated wiki and smartphone app, also had the highest proportion of “no opinion.” This is likely due to the less technologically-attuned members’ lack of familiarity with this relatively new technology. Although only 37% of respondents said they would use a mobile app for Section publications, more people responded positively when we rephrased the question. We revisited the issue of a possible smartphone/tablet app later in the survey with this query: “The Section is considering developing applications for use on smartphones and tablets. If a free version of these apps for Section-related activities were available, would you be likely to use it?” Here a majority (57%) expressed interest in using such an app. This result indicates that when bringing up the issue with the membership, it would be advantageous to communicate that the proposed application is 1) a specialized program designed to facilitate Section-related communications and activities, and 2) it is a free, easily installed, download.

Continuing Legal Education

Continuing legal education requirements vary by state but there seems to be a trend toward increasing mandatory CLE requirements. For example, the New Jersey bar added a MCLE in 2010 and Virginia strengthened requirements in 2011. Only five states (Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, and South Dakota) and the District of Columbia do not have mandatory requirements. At present, most state bars do not accept on-line courses for full CLE credit.

The Section of Antitrust Law’s continuing legal education courses are experiencing strong enrollments. Seventy-seven percent of survey respondents have taken an SAL sponsored CLE course in the past three years. Survey results indicate that in-person methods are more preferred for CLEs. (See Figure 17 below.) This is probably due to the difficulty of getting full credit for on-line courses. However, electronically-mediated methods are preferred for Committee Programs (Brown Bags). The survey also indicates the popularity of internet/streaming video for both CLE (72%) and Committee Programs (73%). This latter result is confusing in light of the need to document course credit with on-line courses. It may be attributed to the diversity in state requirements and varying rules for accepting CLEs. More research would be necessary to fully explain this result.

---

23 Age is also a confounding factor. See the discussion on p. 34 for a breakdown of support for mobile app by age group.
24 2012 Member survey, P. 7, Q3.
25 2012 Member survey, P. 7, Q2.
Figure 18 (below) shows that the majority of respondents identified two factors that motivate their CLE attendance: an interesting topic and a speaker with a strong reputation. Topic and speaker are the top two factors for all subgroups. However, there are some interesting divergences when we consider the relative weights of the other motivating factors.
In Figure 19, we compared the responses of men and women to see if there is a gender difference in motivating factors for CLE attendance. While both men and women primarily seek out interesting topics and speakers, the secondary factors influencing CLE attendance diverge according to gender. (See Figure 19 below.) In particular, women place a higher value on the networking opportunities that accompany participation in CLE (55% women, 39% men). More women than men will attend CLE if the program is close to home (49% women, 37% men). Finally, employer encouragement is a factor for twice as many women as men (25% women, 13% men). These findings are consistent with the results from earlier questions of membership value. Women consistently report network opportunities to be a significant motivator of Section involvement. This is not as important for the males in our study.
We find a similar pattern when breaking down CLE attendance by ethnic subgroups. (See Figure 20 below.) Responses by ethnic minorities show a motivational profile closer to women than to men. Networking opportunities are more important (48% minorities, 41% whites) as is the employer’s encouragement (33% minorities, 15% whites). One surprising finding is that minimizing time away from work is important for almost twice as many minorities as whites (38% of minorities, 21% whites). Finally, the issue of speaker diversity is more important for minorities and women (23% minorities, 18% women) than for whites and men (13% whites, 13% men), but it is not one of the more important factors overall.
Committees

Fifty-seven percent of survey respondents have served on an SAL committee at some point in the past three years. Overall, they rate their committee experience very positively; pluralities report that their experience with committee communications, leadership quality, and relevance to their practice were excellent. (See Figure 21 below.) More than 75% of respondents felt that members’ contributions were sufficiently recognized, with 38% stating that recognition was satisfactory and 37% saying it was excellent. Pluralities view meeting agendas and efficiency as only satisfactory, but a quarter of respondents had no opinion. This high rate of “don’t know” answers indicates that meeting agendas and efficiency are not considered to be particularly salient issues. Also impressive is the very low rate (1.6% - to 5.6%) of unsatisfactory evaluations. Finally, the data analysis shows no evident gender or ethnic disparities in respondents’ evaluations of committee service.
Our analysis does show that there is one factor that affects the propensity of a member to get involved in committee work. That factor is CLE attendance. There is a highly statistically significant relationship between CLE attendance and committee service.\footnote{ Pearson chi square 19.16, P <.0001, df=1.} With the current data and methods we cannot say whether this is because more committed members attend the CLE courses and so are more likely to participate in committees, or whether information sharing and networking that takes place during the CLEs bring more members into deeper involvement with the Section. However, this is clearly an issue that warrants further discussion and examination.

**Recommendation.** Use CLE events as opportunities to recruit committee members and make known upcoming openings for leadership positions. The simple availability of sign-up sheets for interested members may provide an impetus for increased participation.
VI. Section Initiatives

The Section of Antitrust law is committed to using technological advancements to better serve its membership. Towards that end, we queried members on their usage of various information technologies as well as their preferences for future enhancements. Additionally, the Section is growing internationally both by adding international members and by the expansion of AT/CP law to foreign jurisdictions. We surveyed members regarding their expectations for future internationally-relevant practice.

Technology

The SAL website is used occasionally by the majority of respondents (65%), with an addition 21% using it often. Only 3% prefer not use to SAL’s website and 11% state they are unaware of the Section website. While this shows an overall high level of satisfaction with the SAL website, we have identified three areas for improvement. First, Section leaders may want to discuss how to reach members who were unaware of SAL’s website. Second, open field commenters indicated confusion regarding the navigation through the SAL pages, for example, how to access Task Force reports. Third, some commenters felt the search functions in the Searchable Antitrust Library were inadequate.

It might be worthwhile for a staff member to provide a live demonstration of the SAL web pages, perhaps at a booth during the Spring Meeting. Some members may need a “hands-on” experience to help them utilize the functionality of the SAL website.

The survey shows that the most popular features of the website are the availability of full text PDF documents, program information, and the Searchable Antitrust Library. (See Figure 22 below.) The least well known or well understood features are the podcast downloads and the Task Force reports. More than 40% of the respondents are unfamiliar with these features. The most problematic seems to be the podcast download, with 42% of respondents in the “no opinion/don’t know” category and an additional 18% saying that podcasts are not useful.

27 See 2012 Member Survey P Q. These numbers compare favorably to other ABA sections. For example, another ABA section for which LMI conducted a survey had 12% of members preferring not to use the website and another 12% who said the section web pages were not useful at all.

28 See Appendix, “Qualitative Respondent Comments.”
Since mobile devices and tablets are becoming a more popular alternative to laptops, the utility of a customized Section app is being considered. The survey sought to determine the strength of support for this technological initiative. We found that when members are asked if they would like to receive Section publications via a smartphone or tablet app, this proposal received minority support (37%). However, queried about their interest in "a free application for download" for Section communications, the initiative received majority support (57%). Clearly, how this issue is framed affects the strength of member support. Additionally, support is inversely related to age, with 21-50 age group mostly supporting the initiative and 51- and older mostly not interested. (See Figure 23 below.)

---

29 This finding was reported above on p. 25 of this report. Also see Fig. 16, “Preferred Formats for Periodicals.”
30 2012 Member survey, P. 20, Q1.
Of the respondents who support the development of a dedicated Section app for their tablets or smartphones, 84% would be interested in receiving Antitrust/competition news via the app. In addition, the other proposed features (Spring Meeting materials, calendar, and publications) all receive majority support.

A majority of respondents who support the development of the new software indicate a preference for accessing the information on Apple devices. Sixty-six percent of these respondents own iPhones and 82% own iPads. Thus, the Apple operating system (iOS) is dominant for both platforms. Blackberry is in second place for smartphones (18% of respondents) and Android for tablets (7%). These results indicate that should the Section move forward with this initiative, initial development should be for the Apple iOS. This would also ease distribution, which would be via a free download from iTunes.

Social media is another technology area examined in the survey. Here the results were straightforward. The survey found that a majority (66%) of respondents do not use social media for professional and antitrust matters. Currently, 34% are using the Section’s social media offerings.

Social media usage is inversely related to age. In the 21-36 age range 48% of respondent are social media users, in the 37-50 age group 45% use social media, and in the 51-65 group, social media use drops to 26%. These are not surprising results. Since it takes a few years to develop and beta test a new app, the demographic data suggest that interest in this initiative will be higher by the time the app is introduced.
The survey also queried respondents regarding specific social media sites they used in connection with their legal practice. LinkedIn has the strongest support among those members who use social media for professional matters. Seventy-eight percent either have used or are interested in using SAL’s LinkedIn company pages. By contrast, majorities express disinterest in using SAL’s Facebook page (67%), Twitter feed (65%), and Antitrust Forum (52%).

**International Expansion**

Increasing globalization has influenced the international expansion of SAL in two ways. First, more foreign lawyers have joined the Section as associate members in order to network with American legal talent and to increase their knowledge of AT/CP practices in the United States. Second, more American lawyers are working in foreign offices or collaborating with overseas colleagues due to the expansion of international market relations.

Foreign associate members, more than US-based members, value networking opportunities as a Section membership benefit (76% to 58%). Foreign members also place a higher value on the international scope and perspective of the Section (62% to 19%) and are in favor of more international programs as a future benefit enhancement (78% to 15%). In other respects, they are very similar to US-based members: they are just as likely to participate in CLEs, serve on committees, and purchase books.

The survey queried all respondents regarding their assessments of which foreign jurisdictions were likely to become more important for antitrust in the next five years. Table 4 shows the countries in ranked order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EU (indiv. member states)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. International Jurisdictions in Importance to Antitrust*
The European Union is clearly the most significant arena (ranked first and third for the individual states). China is in ascendance with Japan, Korea, and India following closely. (See Table 4 above.) The expanding Asian economies and the attempts of the US government to negotiate market relations with China, in particular, are developments likely to impact antitrust in the near future. Given this trend, it is not surprising that the Asian American subgroup is growing faster than other minority subpopulations within the SAL membership.

### VII. Successes and Upcoming Challenges

#### Successes

The vast majority of members highly regard Section performance in the core areas of operation. The Spring Meeting, ALJ, Antitrust Magazine, CLEs, SAL website and the Searchable Antitrust Library are all positively evaluated by most of the survey participants. Committee leadership and performance similarly are assessed positively by the majority. In addition, the SAL’s reputation and its international focus are highly valued. Relatively few participants used survey participation as an avenue for registering complaints.

#### Challenges

Analysis of the survey data allows us to identify a number of potential challenges that may face the Section of Antitrust Law in the next five years. Being aware of these possible bumps in the road will allow the leadership to proactively devise a strategy to maintain the current high level of performance and member satisfaction. These challenges lie in three areas: demographic change, professional tensions, and technological change.

First, the demographic composition of the SAL is changing due to the social transformation of the American bar. Younger lawyers joining the section are more likely to be female or Asian-American while attorneys who are retiring are more likely to be white and male. One challenge for the Section will be to gather more accurate data on the social composition of the membership so that demographic change can be correctly documented. Better quality data are needed for benchmarks, so future surveys can provide the Section with more robust analysis and accurate predictions. The other challenge posed by demographic change concerns diverging values and expectations among a more diverse membership.

Second, from the open-ended comments, it is clear that a central tension within the SAL is associated with the opposing perspectives and interests between plaintiff and defense attorneys.31

Third, rapidly changing information technology makes available new methods of connecting with members, but these advances come with their own challenges. SAL members include many individuals who embrace new technology and others, particularly older members, who are quite satisfied with the status quo.

---

31 See Appendix, “Qualitative Respondent Comments.”
Appendix

Qualitative Respondent Comments
From the 2012 Member Survey

This is a compilation of members’ comments collected in the open fields (“other” category) from the SAL 2012 Membership Survey. These comments are impressionistic and are not necessarily representative of the membership as a whole. They provide descriptive detail and should be treated as supplemental to the quantitative analysis.

Section Benefits

- (I value) Spring Antitrust Conference. I’m an MBA, so I don’t need CLE, but I appreciate the broad overview.
- The regular in-house counsel updates are an excellent service, as well as an opportunity to get a professional impression of practitioners.
- Speaking and writing opportunities for scholarship have added needed reputational capital.
- My apologies for not taking advantage more frequently of your web page.

Cost Concerns

- Reduce price of CLE programs; include some antitrust programs in free CLE for solo practitioners.
- More opportunities for Govt attorneys to participate when their offices are unable to pay for transportation, etc.
- ABA membership is very pricey and as a government antitrust enforcer, the services do not match the cost.
- (I would like) free telephone fora. Just informational about developing issues as opposed to CLE for a fee.
- (I would like) more in-person panels and CLE. I’m not going to pay $75 for an on-line seminar at lunchtime.
- Make it easier for employees of state agencies to participate (further reduce membership fees).
- Since many states do not have CLE requirements, it would be nice to have some substantive programming via brown bags (no fees).
- Those of us who are state enforcers appreciate the decision of the ABA to offer a membership deal through NAAG. Though section membership dues are not reduced (I have no problem with that) the overall decrease in cost makes it much easier to participate.

Enhanced Section Benefits

- Need programs for less specialized/advanced practitioners.
- Collect jury instructions and make them available online.
- Mentorship opportunities; both as a mentor perhaps to law school students/young lawyers and a mentee.
• More informal opportunities for interaction with antitrust bar.
• More training and materials to non-US lawyers. More access to your conferences and workshops.
• More training on how to access services or benefits.
• Events in areas other than Washington DC.
• Events someplace other than Washington D.C. and NY. You ignore most of the country.
• More networking opportunities, particularly in the east.
• More materials to assist plaintiff’s bar and regulators.
• More content on antitrust issues that impact finance companies (not banks or insurance companies).
• Please provide recordings of the Privacy Monthly Updates, or a podcast.

Leadership Opportunities
• The leadership is insulated and self-perpetuating and maintains geographic bias (favoring east coast lawyers).
• It’s hard to know how to get involved in the section and really advance into leadership positions.
• Opportunities for committee member involvement and to be an active member are not adequately communicated to committee members.

Communications issues
• Fewer e-mails, please.
• Wish I knew more about the databases, probably would use them.
• More education regarding online resources available.
• More training on how to access services or benefits.
• I didn't know there was an online magazine.
• Is ALJ available electronically?
• Wasn’t aware that Task Force reports were available online - where are they located?

CLEs & Meetings
• Webinars with CLE and Committee updates monthly are very good.
• (I value) Phone-in brown baggers.
• Discursive formats tend to wander or do not provide speakers with enough time to discuss details of topics.
• Downloadable conference materials rather than CD ROM.
• All methods are valuable but only if handouts are provided that actually relate to the verbal discussions. A panel on a teleconference is very hard to follow if there is nothing visual to help the audience.
• Given time zone difficulties of attending brown bags, ability to access MP3s and hard copy materials is important.
• I don't like panel discussions. They have become boring and repetitive. Participants are often not well prepared and don't seem to take it as seriously as they could.
I appreciate the Committee Programs in all of their forms, though I am not located in the geographic area in which most live programs are based. They are extremely helpful and accessible (and it is a shame that other Sections do not have similar programs).

Archive brown bag materials along with the recordings, please.

Committees
- (I value) reports on new developments from some subcommittees; more should do this
- It would facilitate international participation if some regard could be had to time zones in scheduling discussions and committee meetings.
- I find the Committee Programs to be particularly valuable.
- Committee leadership has been mixed, with some doing an excellent job and others contributing considerably less.

Website & Technology
- ABA should put the Spring Meeting on podcast and permit attendees to download it to their mobile devices. That would be a fantastic upgrade. I would like to have electronic access to ABA publications.
- Make the database more searchable...key words.
- The Searchable Antitrust Library needs better search functions.
- The office's computer network filter does not always permit access to internet streaming.
- (Prefer) availability of the [conference & meeting] materials on a flash drive or via the cloud. CD-Rom seems out of date.
- Docs or files that arrive at a time when I do not need them must then be organized or archived in a way that lets me retrieve when I do. I don't want to have to maintain files and indexing for this - either put it on a website where I can look and find it when it is relevant, or send hard copy that my assistant can easily access to search for relevant material.
- I tend to read all of the hard copy materials because I can throw them in my bag and read them when I have time. When electronic comes in, and I am busy, I am less likely to go back to read the material.
- What the Source does (closest on list to dedicated web site with files to download) is fine; I would probably be OK with that for Antitrust Law Journal if the articles had abstracts and if I got an email every time an issue came out with article titles, abstracts and links. Need: (1) push distribution of the issue contents and abstracts (2) availability of back issues on a web site (3) ability to download hard copies of all articles.
- At this time my office blocks these [social media] sites so I can only use on my own media devices.

Section Initiatives & Outreach Priorities
- Support foreign antitrust lawyers to harmonize the legal enforcement.
- More genuine research into the economics of competition, in order better to influence public policy decisions of the antitrust law agencies.
I would like to see greater interaction between the business school academics and antitrust academics. It's importantly for these communities to understand each other.

I think there has been a near-complete failure of enforcement. Where are the indictments for bid-rigging by banks of bonds issued by local governments or for price-fixing by banks of LIBOR? There are almost no indictments for routine price-fixing throughout the economy, and I cannot believe that business is so clean. This has become a travesty.

I'd like to see more outreach to US government agencies beyond FTC and DOJ (e.g., FCC, FERC, and the Federal Reserve Board), that review major mergers.

Expressions of Frustration or Disappointment
- To be candid, in the last year the ABA Antitrust Law Section has displayed an obvious bias in favor of defendants and against plaintiffs in antitrust litigation. The prime example is the "Thanksgiving" letter from the Chair in late 2011. If the Section is going to maintain such a bias, I will not renew my membership.
- The Section needs to return to its core mission, namely, refining and improving the quality of antitrust law analysis, with emphasis on the economics of competition, including behavioral economics. It spends too much time being a trade association.
- I focus exclusively on privacy and consumer protection issues in my practice. Although the survey did address many C/P issues, it was focused heavily on antitrust.
- The Antitrust Law section sometimes comes across as a "club" of the largest law firms.
- I do fear that the Spring Meeting has gotten to a scale that makes it unmanageable. It is, perhaps, too successful. I think the Section should look into the possibility of reducing the number of programs and shortening the number of hours/days devoted to the Meeting.

Expressions of Satisfaction
- Have also made some good friends through participation in the Section.
- Great programming -- Spring Meeting and free standing, cutting edge programs.
- Well satisfied.
- Works for me, the way it is.
- Completely satisfied with services/benefits.
- Nearly all of my current needs are specific to health care providers, other than pharma, and health insurers. The AHLA focuses on my areas. The ABA Section is still valuable for broader perspective and when there is a "hot" health care development. Please keep up the excellent work.
- I am proud to be a member of this section. I have only missed one annual meeting in the last 5 years.
- I congratulate you for taking the time to hear our opinions. I would like to be closer to the Section since I am currently heading the equivalent section at the Mexican Bar Association. Any interaction would help to foster activities together.
- Good survey. Hope it helps with Section decisions.
- Thank you for asking.
• This survey is much better designed than some previous ones but the responses still allow a lot of ambiguities.

• I enjoy participating in the Section. Have made many great friends. I also greatly appreciate the FJE program, which allows government attorneys the opportunity to attend events that we otherwise could not afford to attend. I also highly compliment the entire Section Staff for all their terrific work, especially Margaret Stafford who works tirelessly in her efforts to make this a first-rate section.