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INTRODUCTION

Writers and editors have many choices to make when creating their documents, including content, organization, style, and design. All of these choices depend on the rhetorical situation of the document. Let us take a look at one of these choices, design.

Take, for example, the writer who is creating a text on the history of the events leading up to the Civil War. The writer will spend months or years researching the information available and, presuming the document is of sufficient length, could turn this prose into a coffee table book complete with Mathew Brady photographs and four-color maps. Supposing, however, that the writer is researching one specific weapon used in the Civil War. Since the research this writer is doing yields only a portion of the information that comprises the Civil War, the work may be written as a professional paper, a research report, or an article. In both cases, the writer and reader will envision the book or article as a finished product.

Now let's turn to the author/editor who has a specialized goal: to produce a reference source that lists all the federal laws dealing with insurance, and then write accompanying text that will allow insurance companies to use the source as a manual for their lawyers, actuaries, and accountants. Even though this situation lends itself to a book or monograph design, the writer or editor should realize that if this type of design is chosen, there will be a problem. By the time the book is researched, written, published, released to the distributor, shipped to the client, and routed through the
office, it will be obsolete. Congress will have changed one or two of the laws, thereby making the information misleading or totally incorrect. A company that used this book would be in legal trouble before it had a chance to update its brochures to reflect the recent changes.

The answer is to find a way to publish these materials quickly. Publishing a book every time there is a change in a law is not the answer. Not only would environmentalists complain about every publisher that released a new edition of an 800-page book every month, but the client couldn't afford the cost. And the publisher would still have the same lag time problem as before. Fortunately, the publishing industry has solved the problem for many of the time-sensitive materials on the market today by creating the updating service, a subscription service providing a way to easily change information found in a source publication.

There are three main types of updating services: 1) looseleafs; 2) pocket parts; and 3) computerized online services. Each of these updating services has unique features. Looseleaf services provide quick updates that are filed in mechanical binders. Pocket parts, addenda placed in special pockets in hardcover books, are updated less frequently but use a more simplified, less labor intensive design. Online services are updated more quickly than looseleafs but require access to computer equipment which many people lack.

I have chosen to write this paper on the looseleaf format. At the present time, there are more looseleaf updating services than pocket part and online services
combined (though this ratio is changing rapidly with the introduction of new computer services). They offer updating more quickly than pocket part services and are more accessible to the audience than online services. Though looseleafs released by various publishers are similar in function, they differ greatly in design. Many looseleaf designs are simple in nature, requiring little expertise to maintain. A few designs are very difficult to maintain, requiring subject expertise that very few people who maintain these looseleafs possess. With thousands of looseleafs on the market, there is the potential for a unified design scheme that would make the job of maintaining looseleafs simpler.

For the past thirty months, due to the nature of my position in the Parks Library, I have developed an expertise in maintaining looseleafs. I supervise the maintenance of a 170-title looseleaf collection and have firsthand experience with designs that work and ones that do not.

This Study

This study will look at looseleaf services and discuss some of the guidelines the writer or editor should consider before designing and publishing a looseleaf. We will look especially at those design questions aimed at the secondary audience of looseleaf materials. The primary audience of a looseleaf is the reader or the librarian providing bibliographic interpretation. The author writes the looseleaf material for this audience. But the looseleaf publication has a strong secondary audience as well: those individuals who maintain the looseleafs, making certain that the publication is updated properly.
Organization

This study is organized into four parts. The first chapter will look at the three different types of updating services, the looseleaf, pocket part, and online service. Each has advantages and disadvantages from both the usability and design perspectives. This will be followed by an in-depth discussion of the looseleaf. The third chapter will look at the two audiences of looseleafs. I will examine audience analysis issues and usability testing of the document for the secondary audience.

The last chapter of this work will look at design issues. I have discovered little literature about the design of updating services. The final chapter of this paper will therefore look at looseleafs presently being published. I will construct some long-needed guidelines that editors may use for the design of looseleaf services, guidelines that are based both on the literature and on an examination of looseleafs themselves. This discussion will reinforce the need for guidelines or voluntary standards within the looseleaf services industry.
CHAPTER 1

UPDATING SERVICES

Updating services enjoy a long history, beginning around the turn of the century. In 1903, U.S. Steel asked the Corporation Trust Company to furnish it with a legislative reporting service. In 1907, the Corporation Trust Company provided its customers with the Congressional Service, which included copies of bills, acts, and documents emanating from each session of Congress. Subscriptions were offered by this service in any one of several subject areas. Full service included advice on the introduction of bills, copies of introduced bills, notices of legislative action taken in both bodies, copies of all amendments, and the amended or substitute bills, reports of the standing committees or conference committee, information on the President's action on the bill, and a copy of the enacted law. Looseleaf binders were provided for filing much of this information (Neal 153).

The three basic forms of updating services on the market today, the looseleaf, pocket part, and online services, are presently competing with each other for their share of the marketplace. All three are available in most academic, research, and special libraries.

Looseleaf Updating Services

The looseleaf updating service has two distinguishing features: it uses a ring, post, or spiral binder, or any of a number of other unique locking mechanisms to hold
individual pages in place, and the material contained in the binder will be updated at some point, either through the addition, subtraction, or exchange of pages. Updating usually takes place on a regular basis, either daily, weekly, monthly, or annually.

In December 1913, immediately after the enactment of the Federal Income Tax Law, the Commerce Clearing House invented the classic legal looseleaf format with the *Standard Federal Tax Reports*. At that time, the service was housed in one ring binder and contained 400 pages. Today the set contains more than 30,000 pages (Feldman 46), and the 1992 set of *Standard Federal Tax Reports* is contained in nineteen five-ring binders.

In law libraries, looseleaf services constitute a major portion of their collections. In 1981, the largest portion of the Harvard Law School collection development budget was spent on looseleaf publications (21%) and microforms (21%). This compares to only 14% for monographs and 7% for serials (Long et al. 257).

Industry wide, looseleafs are growing in number. In 1985 there were 250 publishers of legal looseleafs with a total of 2650 titles (Eis 1). In 1988 the list had grown to 300 publishers and 3200 titles (Feldman 46). This number does not reflect the growing number of looseleafs in the business, scientific and technical, or social sciences areas. In fact, popular literature entered the looseleaf arena in 1990 when DC Comics marketed a looseleaf comic book series. Additionally, looseleafs are popular on the international market. The number of looseleaf services has mushroomed in Australia (Fong 71) and Europe (Freytag 560-562).
Advantages

The advantage looseleaf updating services have is they are both comprehensive and yet up-to-date. Peyton Neal states that their greatest advantage is the gathering together of all the primary source material on a given topic (156-157). Thus, looseleafs are like monographs: they can be comprehensive. Unlike a journal, a looseleaf can be a one-stop reference tool because the reader can expect all the relevant information to be in the text.

Another advantage mentioned by Neal is the speed with which the information gets to the user. He states that regular supplementation is absolutely necessary if the busy researcher is to keep completely up-to-date in a particular subject area. Looseleafs, thus, share some of the same qualities that journals have. Updated pages can be published on a regular schedule so the customer can expect the information to be up-to-date. Unlike the information in a monograph, the information in a properly maintained looseleaf does not become outdated. Price (306-307) echoes Neal’s sentiments. Of the benefits gained by using a looseleaf updating service, the most important is the speed that the material is made available.

Disadvantages

Though there are advantages to a looseleaf service, there are disadvantages as well. Cost, format, and design are the three primary disadvantages to looseleafs.

Looseleaf services may have an enormous cost involved with their service. Not only is there the initial purchase price of a looseleaf, but also two continuing costs.
The first is the subscription cost for the updates. In 1968, the subscription cost for the *Standard Federal Tax Reports* was $355 (Neal 189). In 1992, this price had increased to $1313. The second disadvantage is the cost of maintenance. In the Iowa State University Library Reference Department, twenty to twenty-five student hours per week are spent on maintaining 170 looseleafs. Additionally, full-time employees spend from five to ten hours per week filing and checking the student work. Other costs include purchasing replacement binders as locking mechanisms wear out with age or break due to mishandling by patrons.

The design of the looseleaf may be either an advantage or disadvantage. Many of the companies publishing looseleaf products as their primary service (eg. BNA, CCH, Prentice Hall, and RIA) have created some very well-designed looseleafs. Unfortunately, as we will see later in this report, some of the publishers marketing looseleafs as a sideline have not put as much effort into design or quality control (the biggest culprit is probably the U.S. Government).

Another disadvantage to looseleafs is the simple fact that the pages are held in binders. Many looseleaf services use lightweight paper, which tends to tear easily at the binder rings; binders may open accidentally, allowing pages to fall out; patrons may remove pages for photocopies and not replace them properly. Each of these circumstances may result in missing pages or pages out of order, thus corrupting the integrity of the information contained in the looseleaf.
Pocket Part Services

An alternative to the looseleaf service is the pocket part service. Pages containing changes to the text of a hardcover book are stapled to a cardboard flap, and are slipped into a special pocket in the back of the book, where they will remain until the next year’s supplement is published. Since these supplements are cumulative, they are discarded as there is no need to retain the old ones. Some publishers of legal materials, such as Lawyers Cooperative Publishing and West Publishing, print their legal services in a hardcover book format. Titles such as the *Iowa Code Annotated* and *Corpus Juris Secundum* are updated annually by a pocket part updating service.

**Advantages**

The advantages of a pocket part service are their low cost and ease of maintenance. According to a discussion I had with a West Publishing representative, a pocket part subscription costs approximately ten percent of a subscription to a comparable looseleaf service due to reduced publishing frequency. Additionally, the cost of maintaining a set of pocket parts is less than the maintenance cost of looseleafs, as pocket parts are exchanged for many titles only once a year. This results in a maintenance cost of less than one hour of employee time annually per set as compared with 20-25 hours per year for a looseleaf set like *Standard Federal Tax Reports*.

Pocket parts are also easier to maintain than looseleafs. Updating a looseleaf service requires flipping through binders and locating the page needing to be replaced.
Replacing a pocket part simply requires opening up a hardcover book to the back, pulling out the old pocket part and inserting the new one.

**Disadvantages**

As with all books, the main disadvantage of a pocket part service is its initial cost. Hard cover books are expensive, and a set of law books may have 50-100 volumes. Eventually, enough changes to the text will create a pocket part too thick for the back of the bound book and then the book will need to be rewritten, incorporating these changes into its text. At that time, the customer will need to purchase a new hard cover volume.

A second disadvantage to pocket parts is that publishers who use them tend only to update them once a year. If a researcher needs more current information, he/she will need to go to a looseleaf service.

Finally, pocket parts often are inconvenient for the reader. The reader must turn to the back of the book to find any changes to the text that have occurred since the book was published. Looseleafs, on the other hand, replace the page that has changed, and the reader can be confident that all the information is correct as it is on the page.

**Online Services**

A new source for updating services is the online service. Companies such as BRS, Dialog, and Westlaw offer full-text computerized retrieval services. For up-to-the-minute information, these computer services offer much of the same text that BNA and West Publications offer on paper. Additionally, publishing companies are releasing
full-text CD-ROMs containing this type of information. Information may be updated within minutes on some of these online services.

Advantages

The main advantage to online services is the speed at which information becomes available. The searcher can go online and search databases containing information days before it may be available by looseleaf or months before it is available by pocket part.

Disadvantages

Unfortunately, the disadvantages of online searching may outweigh the advantages. The cost for online connect time is high—about $2.35 per minute for Westlaw—though this depends on the online service, how often the customer uses the service, and the type of searches done. In an academic library like Iowa State University’s, the cost of computer searches are passed on to the patron. Most students find themselves long on time and short on money. Even for the law office, performing only a few searches could cost as much as the subscription price for a looseleaf service. Additionally, not all researchers have the equipment or expertise to gain access to these services. Yet in 1974 it was pointed out that Mead Data Central, Inc. discovered researchers were willing to pay the $85 an hour computer retrieval price in order to retrieve tax documents in 3 minutes and 37 seconds that would have taken 75 minutes searching through the materials in a library ("Putting Law Libraries Into the Computer" 36).
Deciding on an Updating Service Format

In order to decide on a format, the author, editor, and publisher need to consider the advantages and disadvantages of each format. Of these, timeliness of the information, convenience of obtaining the material, and anticipated costs are paramount. In my opinion, looseleaf services provide the most timely material at the most reasonable cost for the library as well as the patron. They also provide a convenient method for locating information. Finally, their popularity in publishing makes this format an appropriate choice for an updating service. In the next chapter we will look more closely at the looseleaf format and how it functions as an updating service.
CHAPTER 2

LOOSELEAFS

What is a looseleaf? A survey of various publishing dictionaries gives many different answers:

A publication composed of individual leaves mechanically bound, thereby allowing individual leaves to be replaced at will; usually a publication containing timely material, kept up to date by removal of out-of-date and the insertion of up-to-date pages (Brownstone 169).

A book with loose pages which can be taken out and fixed back again on metal rings in a special binder (Collin 141).

Binding which uses steel rings passing through drilled holes in the paper to hold the sheets together (Peacock & Barnard 154).

A detachable leaf of paper, suitably punched, for use in a loose-leaf cover (Avis 176).
A form of mechanical binding which permits the ready withdrawal and insertion of leaves at any desired position. Common forms are ring binding and post binding (Young 136).

It seems the common denominator in all of these definitions is that a looseleaf is held in some sort of mechanical binder. Therefore, let us begin our look at looseleaves by examining the mechanical binder.

The Mechanical Binder

Looseleaf updating services are maintained by orderly adding, deleting, or exchanging pages containing updated information. These pages are shipped to the subscriber in the mail and can be as few as a single page or as many as thousands of pages needing to be inserted or exchanged in looseleaf binders. Accompanying each shipment will be a set of instructions telling the filer how to update the looseleaf.

In order to facilitate this "filing," looseleaves are housed in mechanical binders. There are three basic types of binders typically used: ring, post, and spiral.

Ring binders

Ring binders are the most popular type of binder on the market. The first boost to this type of binder came at the turn of the century when National Blank Book Co. saw the looseleaf "fad" turn into a thriving business ("Happiness (and Success) is the Looseleaf 'Fad'" 6). Ring binders are convenient to use for looseleaves because the user only
has to turn to the page needing revision, open the binder, remove and/or insert pages, and lock the binder closed again. The most popular styles are the round-ring and the D-ring (see Figure 1). D-ring binders are used on larger binders as they allow for the inclusion of more pages without curling the sheets.

Figure 1. Types of ring binders (British Standards Institution BS5097 4)

The main drawback of ring binders is that pages tend to get torn as they move against the spot where the two halves of the ring meet. Users who regularly file in ring binders carry a supply of gummed reinforcing rings with them for quick repairs to loose pages. Additionally, the round metal rings tend to curl the pages, especially near the front and back of the binder. Page lifters (plastic flaps placed at the front and back of binders in order to align the stack of pages as the cover is closed) are necessary to help prevent this curl.

Post binders

Post binders use metal posts instead of rings to secure the pages (see Figure 2).
Posts can use many different locking mechanisms, including screws, clamps, or hooks. The benefits of a post binder are that posts can be of any length, allowing more pages than a ring binder. Also, posts do not tear the pages as easily as ring binders.

The drawback of post binders is that in order to replace a page, all the preceding pages need to be removed. If the pile of pages is not kept neat and orderly after the pages have been removed from the posts, it takes a bit of effort to replace them one by one to fit over the posts.

Figure 2. Post binder (Sloves 547)

**Spiral binders**

Spiral binders are much like spiral notebooks. The spines have a metal wire or plastic band that goes through the pages (see Figure 3). Few publishers use these types of binders for updating services, and for good reason. It is easy to remove pages from this style of binder, just grab and rip. To insert pages, however, it takes a special tool. It is also next to impossible to reinsert a page that has been accidentally removed, since the spine normally tears the sheets.
If our definition for a looseleaf publication only depended on it being housed in a binder, we would discover many different types of looseleafs ranging from laboratory notebooks and diaries to computer manuals and legal publications. In the following discussion, we will look at three types of looseleaf publications: monographs, serials, and looseleaf updating services. I will examine their similarities and differences and begin to look at the various designs these types use.
Monographic Looseleafs

Monographs can be thought of as materials that are complete in one part or several parts (Young 148). Books or book sets (such as encyclopedias), manuals, and reports are monographs because they survey the complete information within their scope at the time of their publication. Monographs do not necessarily depend on future updating, though there may be a new edition that may appear in the future. Normally new editions will then take on the same information as the previous edition and usually supersede it.

Many monographs take on a looseleaf format simply out of convenience or the desire for flexibility and durability (Peterson and Goldman 62). Take, for instance, computer manuals. Manuals have evolved from the two-page photocopied setup guide shipped with the first microcomputers to become multi-volume sets housed in three-ring or spiral bindings.

Lowel Thing suggests that looseleaf binders are the most convenient binding for the user of manuals. Looseleafs lie flat on desktops, allowing users to read the material without using their hands. This is especially convenient for computer manuals where the user may need to type with both hands while reading from a tutorial. Thing points out that looseleaf binders can be designed to fold over and stand up in a situation where this is desirable, such as at a computer workstation (10-11).

Looseleafs also allow the greatest degree of flexibility for the designer of the manual. Thing suggests that looseleaf binders have benefits over hardcover or paperback bindings. Looseleaf binders allow for future growth the text may require. For a
manual, this may mean that as a new revision of a computer software package is released, the binder may be reused and only the pages thrown away. Similarly, the user may want to add additional material to the binder, such as pages of notes, either interfiled within the text, or placed within special pockets inside the covers. A properly designed looseleaf binder, according to Thing, will be large enough for future growth.

Monographic looseleaves usually do not have an updating service associated with them. Some computer manuals, however, appearing in looseleaf format will have addenda released as a pamphlet or stapled spine booklet as part of a maintenance service. These addenda are usually slipped into pockets in the covers of the binders.

Serial Looseleaves

Just as monographs may use a looseleaf binder for convenience, so may serials. Serials are typically published on a regular schedule, perhaps daily, weekly, monthly, or yearly. Unlike monographs, serials are not totally inclusive (though their articles may be), but instead depend on the next issue to provide additional information about the topic they cover. Magazines and journals are examples of typical serials. Serials do not usually supersede the previous issue, and all issues are normally kept for the duration that the information is useful or valid.

Facts on File, Editorials on File, and many of the BNA (Bureau of National Affairs) and Moody’s publications are examples of serials filed as looseleaves for
convenience. When new issues of these publications are received, they simply are filed in the back or front of the looseleaf binder. There is little or no interfiling required.

The benefit of using a looseleaf format for serials is that it organizes the issues sitting on a shelf. Libraries commonly use "pam" boxes (cardboard or plastic boxes) to hold individual issues of serials. With regular use, individual issues will get out of order. Once issues are placed in a looseleaf binder, however, they tend to stay in order.

With large sets of serials, such as the Standard and Poor's or Moody’s financial services, binders make it easier to find the desired information. The material can be divided into a binder for each alphabetical or subject grouping.

It is common practice for many of these serial looseleaf publishers to periodically reprint the older information in a hardcover format. This practice allows the users to clean out the binders before they get too full. The cumulative volume may or may not be included as part of the subscription price.

Looseleaf Updating Service

We have now reached the type of looseleaf that this report will deal with, the looseleaf updating service. In this section I will look at the definitions of this type of looseleaf so we can limit our discussion of audience and design issues to this type of publication only.

The looseleaf updating service is a unique type of publication found in many academic, public, business, and other special libraries. This form of looseleaf is a
A combination of the two formats we have looked at above, monographs and serials. In fact, this similarity to both monographs and serials gives rise to controversy when trying to define this format.

Two definitions

Cole (75) suggests that two disparate methods of cataloging looseleaf publications (or looseleaf services) coexist today: one treats these publications as monographs, and the other as serials. In fact, there are two definitions for looseleafs suggested by the American Library Association.

According to the American Library Association (Anglo-American Cataloging Rules 65), looseleaf publications are described as monographs. This makes a certain amount of sense, since if we look at many treatise sets, we see that the material is treated as if the set were a monograph. Treatises comprise the totality of the information of a select subject. In order to do so, update pages are published weekly, monthly, or annually. By offering the totality of the information on the subject, the treatise is a monograph. By publishing revisions of this information on a regular schedule, the looseleaf updating service has a serial component. It is in fact a publication with a split personality.

On the other hand, the ALA Glossary of Library and Information Science defines the loose-leaf service as follows:

A serial publication which is revised, cumulated, or indexed by means of new or replacement pages inserted in a loose-leaf binder, and used where latest revisions of information are important, as with legal and scientific material (Young 136).
As we can see from this definition, the looseleaf service is considered a serial publication, yet the same organization that wrote this definition also considers the looseleaf not a serial, but a monograph when it comes to cataloging. Tallman, Scott, and Russell point out that looseleafs have traditionally been treated as serials, regardless of how they are cataloged (34). Bluh presents us with a working definition of a looseleaf:

*Looseleafs, whether full services or simply treatises, attempt to collect, organize, and digest the rapidly changing laws promptly and accurately... The common thread among all looseleafs is the need to remove and replace specific pages on an ongoing basis (63).*

Finally, Berring and Wedin give us a different definition:

*Looseleaf services can be viewed as any serial publication issued in a binder format that allows the subscriber to add and delete pages from the text (51).*

**Publishers’ definitions**

So how do publishers classify their looseleaf services? CCH gives many of their publications ISSN (International Standard Serial Number) numbers. *Mertens Law of Federal Income Taxation*, a treatise set, also has an ISSN number. In order to give a
publication an ISSN number, the publication must be a serial as defined by ANSI Z39.9-1979. This standard states, "a serial is defined as a publication in print or in nonprint form, issued in successive parts, usually having numerical or chronological designations, and intended to be continued indefinitely" (5). This definition certainly encompasses the looseleaf service if we allow the successive parts to be broken down into their component pages and interfiled within an existing entity.

A better definition

As we have seen, there doesn't seem to be one definition of the looseleaf updating service. At the beginning of this chapter we saw that publications found in binders were looseleafs. From Cole, we see that looseleafs are monographs posing as serials. From the publisher's definitions, we see that looseleafs are serials even though the type of material they contain may be monographic in nature. For the purpose of this report then, I propose a definition that will, I hope, encompass the looseleaf updating service. This definition should clarify what type of publication the design issues discussed later in this report pertain to.

1) A looseleaf updating service provides the reader with the totality of information on its intended topic within the scope of its intended purpose. 2) The information is updated on a regular basis to ensure that it is complete and comprehensive. 3) This updating takes the form of adding, subtracting, or exchanging pages from a mechanical binder.
To test this definition, let's look at two different publications, the CCH *Standard Federal Tax Reports* and the *ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Codes*.

There are three elements to the definition I have proposed; totality of information, updated material, and the user of mechanical binders. The CCH *Standard Federal Tax Reports* is a nineteen-volume set comprised of information on federal taxes. It is a standard reference for lawyers, businesses, and accountants dealing with tax laws.

In regard to the first element, totality of information, the *Standard Federal Tax Reports* within its nineteen volumes, is a wealth of information covering every aspect of federal taxes. Its stated purpose is to provide the information needed for handling federal income tax problems and planning for tax savings (10,001), and provides selective reporting of the federal income tax law (10,005). This set does not depend on additional information coming with the new shipment. Instead, the customer knows that the information is complete with the most recent update.

The second element, that the information be updated on a regular basis, is accomplished through the use of weekly shipments of packets containing sometimes hundreds of pages of updates.

Finally, the set is housed in nineteen-five ring binders, therefore fitting within the third element, the use of mechanical binders for updating the information.

To further test my definition of a looseleaf updating service, let's take a look at the *ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Codes*. The purpose of this set is to provide a reference source for scientists and engineers designing nuclear reactors, power plants,
and other similar structures. The first element is satisfied because the service contains all of the standards currently in effect by the ASME dealing with designing these structures. The second element is satisfied when these standards are updated on a regular basis, about twice a year. Additionally, the set is housed in twenty-four three-ring binders, thus satisfying the third element.

Choice of Looseleaf Format

Why would an editor choose one particular format—monograph, serial, or looseleaf updating service—over another? The choice is based on its intended function. Looseleafs that are monographic in nature have a limited life span. The information they contain will be outdated eventually and will then serve as a historical document. Looseleafs that are serial in design already have the historical design elements built in. Finally, looseleaf updating services serve only to provide the most up-to-date information. The editor/writer must decide before the looseleaf is even designed, what function the looseleaf will have.

As an example, there are many economic looseleafs, each reporting similar information. The Standard & Poor’s Stock Reports, published daily, is a looseleaf updating service. Once the information concerning a stock has changed, the obsolete information is discarded. Moody’s Industrial Manual is published semi-weekly as a serial. The information is cumulative and an annual hardbound edition is published. In
these two cases, the looseleaf updating service provides immediate up-to-date information for the user. The serial provides recent, as well as historical information for the user.

Now that we have taken a look at the looseleaf itself, let's turn our attention to the two audiences of looseleaf updating services.
CHAPTER 3

LOOSELEAF USERS AND THEIR RESPONSE

Socrates: Since the power of speech is in fact a leading of the soul, the man who is going to be an expert in rhetoric must know how many forms soul has. Their number is so and so, and they are of such and such kinds, which is why some people are like this, and other like that; and since these have been distinguished in this way, then again there are so many forms of speeches, each one of such and such a kind. So people of one kind are easily persuaded for this reason by one kind of speech to hold one kind of opinion, while people of another kind are for these reasons difficult to persuade. (Phaedrus, 271d, trans. C. J. Rowe)

A rhetorical approach to writing encompasses the three elements of communication: the writer, the audience, and the subject. Since the time of Socrates, audience analysis has been a concern of the orator and the writer. The audience is the motive for our energies in invention, organization, style, and delivery. The problems we face as we design our looseleafs are: who is our audience? and how do we make our design usable for our audience?

Determination of Audience

It is up to the editor, writer, and publisher to define the audience of a looseleaf. Many times this is determined by the material the looseleaf covers. For instance, a looseleaf based on laws will be aimed at the lawyer, law student, or interested layperson. Similarly, a looseleaf based on the types of microcomputers on the market will be aimed at the consumer who may want to compare these machines before purchasing. In both of these cases, the editor or writer probably has a clear idea of the individual who will...
read the material. This individual is a member of the group I will define as the *primary audience*.

Before the editor, writer, and publisher can accept this definition of audience, however, they will need to consider the other audience of looseleafs. There are other people using looseleafs for a very different reason from that of the primary audience. This group I allude to is the *secondary audience*, the individuals maintaining the looseleafs in the way the editor, writer, and publisher intend.

This secondary audience does not use the looseleaf to gain information from its text, but instead manipulates the text by inserting, removing, or exchanging pages. This audience generally has little interest in the subject matter of the text. Rarely, if ever, does the secondary audience have knowledge about the information it is maintaining.

In order to determine who the secondary audience of looseleafs is, I conducted an informal survey. Using electronic mail, I sent a request to people who subscribed to the LIB-REF electronic listserver. These subscribers are people interested in library reference services. I asked two questions in this request. The first was to characterize the person filing and maintaining looseleaf services in the respondent's library. The second was to give an indication of the subject expertise of the filer. (See Appendix 1 for my original request as well as the complete listing of the responses to my survey.)

From the responses returned to me, we can generalize that student and clerical staff in academic libraries and clerical staff in special libraries do most of the filing. Of the twenty-six respondents to this query, only two employed professional filers. These
filers are organizations that contract to file looseleafs for libraries, both academic and special. Undoubtedly these professional filers have become expert at their work and may have little problem maintaining looseleafs. However, these organizations are used by only two of the libraries responding.

The largest group of filers is student assistants. Many of the libraries responding use student assistants, supervised by clerical, paraprofessional, or non-degreed full time library employees. Also, most of the libraries depend on their full time clerical or paraprofessional employees to file at least some of the looseleafs. Only one of the libraries responding indicated that the professional librarians do any of the filing, this out of necessity, not out of choice. It is safe to generalize that the secondary audience has little or no knowledge of the information contained in the material. If they do, it is only incidental.

Because this audience has little or no background in or knowledge of the material it maintains, it depends a great deal on the design of the instructions and the binders. Visual rhetoric, therefore, plays a large part in how looseleafs are maintained by the secondary audience. Before we look at visual rhetoric, however, we will begin our discussion with a brief look at readability testing, starting with readability formulas and progressing through the Given/New contract and schema theory. We will see that readability testing leaves much to be desired when we try to design a usable looseleaf for the secondary audience. Readability tests present to the author/editor a reader profile that is good for writing text for the primary audience. In order to properly design a
looseleaf document for the secondary audience who is a user and not a reader, we must turn to usability testing.

Readability Testing

Though Socrates spoke of audience analysis nearly 2500 years ago, it wasn't until the twentieth century that linguists and rhetoricians began to analyze the specific design and syntactic relations affecting readability. In the 1950s, readability formulas became very popular as a descriptive test of the text. These formulas, though easy tools to use to evaluate text, are not adequate for authors to use during the invention process. Linguists have proceeded to find less prescriptive methods of audience analysis, including the given-new contract, schema theory, and visual rhetoric. In this section we will examine the history of readability and then proceed to the next level of audience analysis, usability testing.

Readability tests

Readability tests were among the first pragmatic efforts to assess stylistic efficiency. These tests were designed after World War I to help elementary school teachers estimate the difficulty of reading materials intended for their students. Many types of tests are currently in use to make sure the material the writer has put on paper is appropriate for the audience. Almost all of these involve counting words, sentences, and syllables, and placing these numbers into a mathematical formula. If the number coming back is satisfactory, then the text is supposedly appropriate for the reading level of the audience.
Readability tests come by the names of Dale-Chall; Farr, Jenkins, and Patterson; Flesch; Gunning Fog; Spache; and Spaulding (Giles 134). Each of these readability tests can be programmed into a word processor and can automatically analyze the text. The author or editor can edit the work down to the intended reading level.

Another form of readability test is the Cloze procedure. With this test, every fifth word is deleted and the reader's ability to fill in the blanks determines the readability score (Giles 134).

Both Selzer and Shelby point out many problems with readability tests. These problems include the prescriptive nature of the test, the factors that readability tests use, and the factors that readability tests ignore. Readability tests are inadequate for predicting how readable a text will be. They are only useful to test the text once it is written (Shelby 489).

Readability tests are based on the assumption that short sentences and short words alone will produce a more readable text. Studies in fact have shown that shortening a sentence does not automatically increase its comprehension (Selzer "What Constitutes..." 76). The problem is not the length, but the complexity of the sentences. Clause length, not sentence length is a culprit. Additionally, positive constructions are easier to comprehend than negatives, and nominalizations increase the difficulty of the prose.

Short words are also not the issue. Those who argue that short words are more readable are also quick to admit that short words are usually more familiar. The problem then is not one of selecting short words, but selecting words that are familiar to
the audience. Jargon, whether short or long, increase the complexity of the prose for
the uninitiated, but is appropriate where the audience is familiar with it.

**Cohesion**

Readability formulas also do not take into account the use of cohesion elements in
the prose. These cohesion elements include the Given/New Contract, the use of
pronouns, the use of topic sentences, and the use of synonyms and repetitions which are
important considerations the writer uses when tailoring the text for the audience.

In the 1970s, Clark and Haviland presented a new theory of audience based on an
implied contract between speakers/writers and their audiences. The Given/New Contract
is based on the speaker or writer tying all new information presented to older
information already presented in the text. If the speaker or writer fails to do this, the
contract is broken and the audience must make assumptions or jumps in logic that may
or may not be what the speaker or writer intended (Selzer "Certain..." 287).

The use of pronouns, according to Selzer, may increase the difficulty readers have
with the text even if the antecedents of the pronouns are simple and clear. This also
holds true for synonyms. Finally, the use of topic sentences has proven to help make
the prose easier to understand.

**Schema theory**

Another concept writers can use as they write for their audience is schema theory.
The audience has experiences or "schemata" that have been stored in long-term memory.
The power of these schemata is that as the audience discovers something new in the text,
it can relate this new information to something that has been experienced previously. If the writer and the reader share the same schemata, then the writer does not have to refer to all the details in the new information. The reader will simply supply the missing details by inference (Huckin 92-93).

**Visual rhetoric**

One last readability issue, and the most appropriate for looseleaf design, that can be raised is visual rhetoric. Kostelnick points out that visual design, and more importantly visual rhetoric, is the ability of the writer to achieve the purpose of the document through visual communication at any level. If the writer is able to design the document consistent with the purpose, then the visual rhetoric will enhance it. If, on the other hand, the writer creates a poorly designed document, the visual rhetoric will misdirect the reader (77).

Kostelnick identified four levels of visual design: the intra-textual, inter-textual, extra-textual, and supra-textual. Each of these levels plays some part in how the secondary audience is able to use the looseleaf.

**Intra-textual** The intra-textual level concerns the local design of the text (78). When the editor originally designs the looseleaf, he/she must consider such things as font size and weight. Although the majority of the text does not interest the secondary audience, the instruction page does. The editor should select a font for the page numbers in the instruction list large enough for the secondary audience to read clearly.
This way, the filer can more easily comprehend the numbers and insert or remove the correct pages.

**Inter-textual** The inter-textual level concerns the devices the writer uses to ensure that the reader understands the structures in the text (Kostelnick 79). The arrangement of the instruction sheet is an important inter-textual device for the secondary audience. Placing each step in a sequential order in a table instead of having the audience simply take out all the pages listed on the instructions and then insert all the pages in the packet, helps the filer to understand his/her task better. Also, if the table is laid out properly, with step one above step two or to the right of step two, the secondary audience will be able to complete the task more easily.

**Extra-textual** The extra-textual level concerns those images independent of the text (Kostelnick 79). From the standpoint of the primary audience, the instruction sheet may be an extra-textual element of the looseleaf. From the standpoint of the secondary audience, the pages of the looseleaf become extra-textual material the filer must code and eventually act upon.

**Supra-textual** The supra-textual level is the global organization of the looseleaf (80). Having a statement at the bottom of a page or a special blank page when page numbers are skipped fall within this realm of supra-textual. Doing this will increase the confidence in both the primary and secondary audience that all of the material is in the looseleaf. There are no missing pages sitting next to a copier or stuck in somebody’s briefcase.
Another element in the supra-textual level is the page number. In legal looseleafs, references in indexes often are to the serial numbers of paragraphs rather than to page numbers. Page references are almost always for the person filing insertion pages (Price et al. 310). If this is the case, then it is all the more important to settle on a standardized pagination scheme for all looseleafs so the secondary audience does not need to contend with many different filing schemes.

The inclusion of a shipment number or date on each replacement page allows the filer to replace pages of sets received out of order. If a shipment is skipped or arrives incomplete and replacement pages need to be ordered, a shipment number or date on the replacement page will indicate if the page being filed truly replaces the page in the binder, or if it has been superseded by the page now in the binder.

Tabs or colored sections make it easier for the filer to locate the place in the binder where the pages need to be filed. Finally, the style of binders and the information on their spines make replacing pages easier on large sets. Moore (218) points out that too many chapter tabs in a book with short chapters can hamper a reader's efforts to skim through it. On the other hand, well-spaced tabs can help the secondary audience greatly.

Moore adds, some publishers who provide drop-in supplements use colored paper instead of tabs for the sake of convenience. This helps the reader locate material that has been changed recently and helps the secondary audience locate the sections that receive drop-in supplements.
Although the Given/New Contract, Schema Theory, and Cohesion are good techniques for the writer and editor when writing for the primary audience, they are not adequate for the secondary audience. The secondary audience does not need to retain the information gained from a set of instructions for filing pages in a looseleaf. The secondary audience also does not need to read passages of prose. Rarely do instructions contain more than a sentence or two of prose, hardly enough for a readability test. Although visual rhetoric provides us with the backbone as far as "readability" for the secondary audience, we need to take audience analysis a step further.

Usability Testing

In order to test the looseleaf for the secondary audience, we must turn to usability testing. There are two forms of usability testing. Usability is the extent to which an item is useful in the intended way to its intended user (Simpson MPD-65). Instead of trying to determine the ease of reading the prose of looseleaf instructions or the retention the reader may have after reading it, the editor needs to look at how usable the instructions and the looseleaf format are.

The editor tries to find out with a closed test, before a product is marketed, whether it is usable; or in what ways, if any, it isn’t; and, what can be done to improve its usability (Simpson MPD-65). The usability test is a closed test involving test-subjects who use a set of instructions and then complete fill-in-the-blank worksheets after each test.
Another way to test the usability of the looseleaf instructions or the looseleaf itself is an open test based on a very simple idea: Find someone who knows nothing about the looseleaf and have him/her work with it, using only the filing instructions as a guide; his/her errors and hesitations should indicate the weak points (Atlas 28).

Unfortunately, neither method is used regularly. I contacted members of looseleaf publishing companies and discussed testing of looseleaf filing schemes. Those I talked with admitted that their designs are based more on tradition than actual testing though they were willing to listen to customer concerns.

To determine the needs of the secondary audience, I conducted a test made up of both types. This test was open but I modified it to test a control group who already had experience filing looseleafs. I chose four members of the secondary audience who had a minimum of 1-2 years experience and placed them in a round-table setting. This test was a closed test in that the users were interviewed about specific problems dealing with looseleafs. The purpose of this test was to discover their concerns about looseleaf design and how they felt these concerns could be addressed by editors of looseleafs. On the table in front of the subjects were many different looseleafs, representing several companies and several different subject areas. These four individuals were encouraged to discuss their feelings about any of the looseleafs with which they had had experience. Appendix 2 contains the transcript of this discussion. The following list contains a summary of the concerns these members of the secondary audience expressed.
Concern 1: Instructions
A. Some companies don’t use step-by-step instructions
B. Some companies use cryptic instructions

Concern 2: Location of Materials
A. It’s hard to locate material in binders without tabs

Concern 3: Binders
A. Spiral binders are difficult to file in
B. Some binders are not big enough for the pages
C. Transfer binders take too long to get through cataloging and marking (a local problem)

Concern 4: Paper
A. Old paper gets brittle
B. Paper tears in ring binders

Concern 5: Amount of material in shipment
A. Some packets come in boxes containing thousands of pages needing to be swapped.

Concern 6: Pagination
A. Some looseleafs have difficult-to-decipher pagination schemes
B. Some looseleafs don’t have any indication on the page that some page numbers are skipped.
C. Some page numbers are hidden on the page.
Concern 7: Filing System

A. Some looseleafs use a page number filing system, others use standard numbers or a geographic designation.

Concern 8: Errors in filing

A. Some looseleafs don’t have a way to make sure that all the pages are there.

B. Some looseleafs don’t have a way to tell which shipment a page came with.

In the final chapter we will use these eight concerns to create the basis for design considerations editors of looseleaf publications should use.
CHAPTER 4

DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS OF LOOSELEAFS

As I have pointed out, looseleaf updating services have both a monograph and serial component to them. They are monographic in terms of the information they present and they are serial in the way they are updated on a regular basis. The design of the looseleaf, therefore, should comprise both of these components.

**Monographic design** Since looseleafs are monographs in the way they present their information, book design and style manuals should be a good source of design ideas that can be used for designing looseleafs. Unfortunately, these manuals tend to ignore the looseleaf updating service. In fact, a survey of book design sources offered little more than definitions in their glossaries (ANSI Z39.6-1983 6, Book Production Practice 73, and Rogers 145) or discussions of binder design (Blyden 76-77, Johnson 153-157, and Potter 176-180). Although these sources ignore the looseleaf updating service, many of their layout and design suggestions are applicable for the primary audience of looseleafs (Benson 35-39).

Another source for document design guidelines is suggested by the United States Government Printing Office Style Manual. This manual, in the section "Suggestions To Authors and Editors," suggests using ANSI Z39 standards for designing government documents, including looseleafs (2-7). ANSI standards in publishing are created by the ANSI Z39 Committee. This committee is comprised of members from a diverse group of professional and academic organizations, including the Society for Technical
Unfortunately, there has not been an ANSI standard adopted on the design of looseleafs. The British Standard BS5641: 1978 Recommendations for Loose-leaf Publications provides a design standard for looseleaf updating services, but this standard has not been adopted by ISO or ANSI to this point.

Serial design. As we have seen from my discussion earlier, looseleaf updating services have a serial component to them as well. Magazine or serial design concerns differ slightly from those of book design. Book or monograph designs are self contained, one-shot designs. If the editor makes a mistake and the design is a poor one, the book may sell poorly, but the mistake will be soon forgotten. With serials, design must be thought of as an ongoing process, and an ongoing problem. Serials are published continuously and a poor serial design must be contended with over time. A poor design cannot be changed overnight. Therefore, we need to make the right design choices at the beginning. If we do not, we may be trapped within a poor design for a long time to come. Even though the looseleaf is a monograph as far as its scope goes, it is a serial in nature. The editor cannot just change a design element whenever he/she feels like it. Antupit sums up serial design this way:
"Good [serial] design is a matter of organizing every conceivable detail into a structure that is flexible enough to allow for occasional modification. The emphasis is on the structure; the modifications are for special effects and must be used sparingly. The aim of the structure is to establish, from page to page and from issue to issue, a look that is unmistakably that of a particular [serial]. The secret, if there is one, is to use as few elements as possible but to use them with imagination" (60).

Since there are few guidelines for the writer or editor of a looseleaf, we must now turn to the looseleaf itself and see which design elements work and which ones do not. From this examination, I will develop a list of considerations the writer or editor may use when designing a looseleaf.

Looseleaf Design

In chapter three, the secondary audience expressed eight concerns during the round-table discussion. These included the instructions, locating the material, binders, paper, amount of material, pagination, variety of filing systems, and errors in filing. In the following discussion, I will look at ways of handling the first seven problems so that the secondary audience should not have to worry about the eighth concern, errors in filing.
Instructions

In the round-table discussion, the looseleaf filers agreed that instructions should be simple and step-by-step. This section will look at three different sets of instructions and the design elements we will find in each. The instructions we will examine have one thing in common: each uses a tabular form to provide instructions to the secondary user. Unfortunately, tabular instructions are not equal in clarity or usefulness.

Rude (72) suggests that information placed in tables is faster to use and results in fewer errors than information in a prose format. For this reason, most looseleafs have tabular instructions, yet this does not stop some publishers from using prose for looseleaf filing instructions. Perhaps the biggest culprit in this area is the U.S. Government Printing Office. Many of its looseleafs are difficult to file because the instructions are hidden in pages of prose or laid out illogically in a table.

Commerce Clearing House

In Figure 4, we see the instructions from a CCH publication, an example of a good looseleaf with two minor flaws.

**Good design elements** This instruction page offers all the information needed by the secondary audience for filing. At the top, we have the title of the publication in large letters. It is highlighted so there is no mistaking it with the competing Federal Tax Coordinator or any of a number of CCH products with a similar appearance.

Below the title is the issue number. It is larger than the surrounding information, giving the filer a good visual cue to what shipment he/she is filing. In this case, the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
<th>924 CCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pages Not Required</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pages in This Report</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondeductibles: Related Taxpayers: Evasive Transactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. § 1.267(b)-1 adopted and Reg. § 1.267(b)-1T amended.</td>
<td>29,079—29,080 29,083—29,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29,079—29,080 29,083—29,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment Expenses: Substantiation: Corporate Debt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991 Per Diem Rates.</td>
<td>30,693—30,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,693—30,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Benefits: Plans: Distributions: Employer Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised explanation at § 18,207.049.</td>
<td>36,045—36,046 36,045—36,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36,045—36,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controlled Foreign Corporation: DISC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53,565—53,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consolidated Returns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59,553—59,554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Layout of instructions aimed at secondary audience (Standard NP)
number "14" indicates that shipment number 13 should already be filed in the binder set. If number 13 has not been filed, it should be claimed from the publisher. A "filing record card" is sometimes placed in the front of the set with spaces to note the date a shipment has been filed.

Accompanying the issue number is the date, volume number, and part number. This information is of more use to the serials control personnel and the primary audience than it is to the secondary audience. The information is in a smaller font and does not intrude on the information necessary for the secondary audience. Working our way down the sheet, the next item we find is the word CONTENTS. Right away we know this is the table of contents to the shipment. This table acts both as a listing, in page number order, of the items in the packet, as well as an inventory of the items in the shipment.

From this point on down, we have three columns. The left most represents a description of the changes being made. The middle and right columns represent the most valuable information for the secondary audience. The middle column is titled, "Pages Not Required" and indicates the pages to remove from the binder and discard. The right column is titled, "Pages in This Report." This column indicates the pages that will replace the discarded pages, and new pages that have not been in the binder before.

There are two benefits this tabular format presents. The first is that the "Pages Not Required" column is to the left of the "Pages in This Report" column. English is read left to right. Similarly, tabular data is also read left to right. Applying this logic to
these instructions, we see that the secondary audience will remove the old page before inserting the new. There is no possibility of getting the old and new pages mixed up by being in the binder at the same time.

The second benefit is the horizontal information. The removed pages are listed on the same horizontal line as the pages to be inserted. English is not only read left to right, but is also read top to bottom. Only after the reader has read a complete line of text will he/she continue on to the beginning of the next line. The reader knows not to skip any prose on a line and start another, as there is more information yet to come. This principle also applies to tabular instructions. Information placed on the same horizontal line in a table carries the same weight. Therefore, the secondary audience knows that if there is information in both the "Pages Not Required" and "Pages in This Report" columns on the same horizontal line, he/she should not close the binder after removing the old pages, as the next step will be to insert new pages in the same spot. There is no wasted information.

**Flaws** One item, probably the most confusing, is the number 924 CCH located just below the word CONTENTS. This number is in fact the year (1992) followed by the binder volume number (4). This number seems cryptic to the uninitiated. Strangely enough, in this numbering scheme, two-digit volume numbers are enclosed in parentheses, e.g. 92(10). This is much easier to understand and if I were to make one correction to this set of instructions, it would be to change the 924 to 92(4).

Another problem with this set of instructions is the left column. This column is a
listing of the changes made to the text and is for the primary audience of the looseleaf. In this case, the information is unimportant to the secondary audience, but it is also unobtrusive and he/she will quickly tune it out. Unfortunately, this information gets lost, as the instruction page eventually will be filed in the back of the binder and then discarded once a new shipment is received. The primary audience might benefit if this information were on a different sheet, filed in a special section.

According to Burbank & Pett, instructional materials should include only that information appropriate to the audience. Related information that is interesting but irrelevant to performance should be included only if it has strong motivational value. Relevance is much more important than quantity of material presented in instructional materials (5).

When the editor designs the instructions for filing looseleafs, it is important that he/she include only the information the secondary audience needs to maintain the looseleaf. Extraneous information, such as descriptions about the change in the prose, though perhaps interesting to the primary audience, should not be included in the instructions, as they detract from how the filer maintains the looseleaf.

**ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Codes**

Let's contrast the CCH instructions to Figure 5. This set of instructions is from the *ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Codes*. This "Summary of Changes" offers less information to the secondary audience than the CCH instructions and therefore the design could be improved.
SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Replace or add the following pages. Unlisted index pages have not been changed; unlisted Case pages of revised Cases are only included to show the revised Case number.

**NUMERIC INDEX**
- Affected pages: vii-x

**SUBJECT INDEX**
- Affected pages: x-xi

**NEW AND REVISED CASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Affected Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1409-7</td>
<td>9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2055-1</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2080-1</td>
<td>304, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2098-1</td>
<td>320, 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2115-1</td>
<td>350, 369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117-1</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2118-1</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2119-1</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2120-1</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2121-1</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2122-1</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2123-1</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2128-1</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CASES WITH EARLY EXPIRATIONS**
(See Numeric Index for new expiration dates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1670-1</td>
<td>2020-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-1</td>
<td>2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-1</td>
<td>2036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1</td>
<td>2122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNULLED CASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Affected Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1872-1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-1</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-1</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-1</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048-1</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2065-1</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2078-1</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2085-1</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REAFIRMED CASES**
(See Numeric Index for new expiration dates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1177-9</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325-12</td>
<td>1988-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912-1</td>
<td>2034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>2047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-1</td>
<td>2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862-1</td>
<td>2053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1</td>
<td>2053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ERRATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Affected Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-1</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038-1</td>
<td>241, 242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Errata are identified on the above page by a margin note, E, placed next to the affected area.

---

Copyright American Society of Mechanical Engineers. Used by permission.

Figure 5. Layout of instructions aimed at primary audience (ASME NP)
The secondary audience first will look for the update number. In this case, the update number is Supp. 10, a number hidden in the bottom corner of the page. This information has been printed in bold type so it will stick out, but the placement is poor. One normally expects to find a page number, not a shipment number, in the bottom corner.

The title of the instructions is good. We know this is the "Summary of Changes." However, the secondary audience gets confused when they get to the instructions. The instructions indicate to "add or replace the following pages." The instructions go on to indicate in parentheses that there are unlisted index and case pages. What does this mean? The secondary audience can assume this means either 1) pages are included in the packet and not listed in the summary of changes, or 2) pages not listed in the summary of changes are not listed because there have been no changes and none are in the packet.

Next, we notice the instructions are arranged by the type of change in the status of the case. This information ideally is suited for the primary audience, but not the secondary audience, who only wants to change the pages. With this type of arrangement, the instructions do not reflect the order the pages are to come out of the package or go into the book. In order to file the pages, the secondary audience must take a set of pages from the packet and then go through the list to discover what to do with them. In instructions, steps should be in logical order and apparent to the reader.
Consistent organization from page to page and document to document helps learners find and act on information (Burbank & Pett 8).

This looseleaf also suffers from inconsistency. When the secondary audience files the "New and Revised Cases," the "Annulled Cases," and the "Errata," he/she is given page numbers to file by. However, only the case numbers are listed for the "Reaffirmed Cases" and "Cases with Early Expiration." Having two systems of filing is confusing for the filer. If only selected pages of some cases are to be changed, then all filing should be done by page number. If all pages of all cases are to be changed, filing can be done either by case number or page number. Ideally, to make sure that the pages needing to be changed actually get changed, only one filing method should be used.

Finally the method of listing case numbers leaves the secondary audience with little to use as an inventory list. If the page numbers were listed, the secondary audience would need only to check off the pages found in the packet. In using a list of case numbers, the secondary audience must become a primary audience in order to be certain that all the pages are in the packet.

Mertens Law of Federal Income Taxation

Another variation of filing instructions is shown in Figure 6. This treatise, *Mertens Law of Federal Income Taxation*, provides a four-page instruction booklet for updating its set. This set of instructions is well laid out, much like the first set we looked at.

The first thing we see on the page is the name of the treatise, in large, bold letters. This helps with name recognition. Below this, we see the information important to the
CAUTION—FILING VERIFICATION

You may check to see if the prior Release has been filed by going to Volume 1, Chapter 3, page 1. Check the copyright line at the bottom of the page. The publication date at the end should read "11/91."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Release Number</th>
<th>Check Page</th>
<th>Pub. Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rel 5–91</td>
<td>Ch 20B—Page 1</td>
<td>5/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel 6–91</td>
<td>Ch 54—Page 1</td>
<td>6/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel 7–91</td>
<td>Ch 5—Page 1</td>
<td>7/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel 8–91</td>
<td>Ch 45A—Page 1</td>
<td>8/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel 9–91</td>
<td>Ch 39—Page 1</td>
<td>9/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel 10–91</td>
<td>Ch 7—Page 1</td>
<td>10/91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Instructions with verification table (Mertens NP)
secondary audience. This is the December Chapter Revision Release 1991-12. The statement below this, "affects Chapter 26 & 42A," is useful for the primary audience. The secondary audience is more interested in the information that follows. "Affecting volumes 6 and 11, tables and index volumes" indicates which volumes the secondary audience needs to get from the stacks.

Below this, we are presented with a bonus we have not seen in the previous 2 looseleafs examined, a filing verification table. This table presents information for the previous 7 months so the secondary audience can verify that all previous shipments have been filed. The filer knows there hasn't been some mistake along the line and knows he/she will not need to claim a missing shipment.

Inside the four-page booklet, we find a set of filing instructions similar to the CCH filing instructions. There are two columns, the left for the pages to be removed and the right for the new pages to be inserted. One difference, though, is the terminology used. This publisher uses several different terms to indicate the obsolete pages to be removed. These terms range from "destroy this page" to "remove, discard/recycle." The former term seems to indicate, in no uncertain terms, that the information is not only obsolete but it must be destroyed. This tone indicates that the secondary audience has no choice but to obey this command. On the other hand, "discard/recycle" gives the secondary audience the suggestion to remove the page and throw it in the garbage or perhaps be more environmentally conscious and recycle the paper. In the case of legal looseleafs, it is important to make sure old information
is removed to avoid legal repercussions. Therefore, the term "destroy" is appropriate. In other cases, however, the suggestion to "remove" is just as effective as the command "destroy" and may perhaps be more acceptable to the filer. Undoubtedly, the suggestion to recycle presents a more favorable ethos.

Other elements

Since the instruction page for a looseleaf shipment often serves as the title page of the shipment, there are various rules and federal regulations concerning the elements included on a title page. The following standards should be consulted for these additional elements, such as the ISSN number, the publishers address and telephone number, and the postal notice: ANSI Z39.1-1977 For Periodicals: Format and Arrangement; ANSI Z39.15-1980 For Title Leaves of a Book; and 16 CFR Ch.1 Part 256. From the standpoint of design, these elements should not interfere with the instructions.

Visual Aids

The secondary audience expressed another concern, the need for finding materials in the binders. From Kostelnick, we see the importance of visual cues (80). Visual cues, both on the spine of the binder as well as in the pages themselves, help in finding the proper place to file the pages. CCH uses volume numbers on the spines of their volumes. These volume numbers match the volume numbers in the instructions (See Figure 4). BNA (Figure 7) uses a system of stars to indicate the volume number. Both
Figure 7. Looseleaf with colored tabs and alternative binder numbers (Labor NP)
methods are equally effective as long as the number of volumes does not increase beyond three or four. After this point, the secondary audience would find counting the number of stars on a binder tedious when an arabic number would be more convenient. ANSI Z39.41-1979 For Book Spine Formats discusses the required information to be found on the spines of looseleafs published in the U.S.

A further problem is created when materials must be transferred or shifted once a binder gets too full. Though instructions from the editor (usually accompanied by a new binder or transfer binder) often initiate a transfer or shift, this is not always the case. Libraries may decide on their own to order a new binder when binders have become too full. Where there once were two binders, there may now be three. Editors must monitor the growth of new material in their binders. A simple remedy would be to use generic binders with pockets on the front, back, and spine that allow the filer to indicate somehow what materials are in each binder. Ideally, publishers would provide new binders, properly labeled, in advance of need.

Tab dividers or colored pages also should be utilized. Tab dividers including section names or standard numbers and page numbers allow the secondary audience to quickly find the place where the updating needs to take place. Figure 7 shows a looseleaf that uses colored tab dividers to help the secondary audience locate the correct place to file replacement pages. Tab dividers and index pages should be made of heavyweight paper or card stock as these pages are rarely changed and need to withstand heavy use (Sloves 548).
Some treatises use colored pages to indicate where material has been changed. This indication is more for the primary audience, but if supplements are added only as front matter or within a special supplement section, colored pages help the secondary audience to find the section quickly.

Binder Style

The style of the binder can mean more or less work for the secondary audience. Post binders offer the best protection for the pages if a binder is going to have approximately the same amount of material in it throughout its life. There is less wear and tear on the pages and consequently fewer repairs will need to be made. Many of the treatise sets use post binders successfully.

Ring binders are the appropriate choice if there is a great deal of page replacing, or if the amount of material in the binder may vary. In general, ring binders are easier to use than post binders and five- and six-ring binders keep the pages from slumping or ripping easily and put less stress on the paper than do three-ring binders. Sloves suggests using sheet lifters or holders to hold the front and back sheets away from the point where the rings bend under and enter the base piece. It is at this point where pages will tend to curl or get caught and tear (548).

Figure 8 shows a looseleaf using a spiral binding. This binder is unique in that each section has its own spiral binder. The benefits for this type of binder are for the primary audience. Many people can use the set at the same time, a benefit in a library
FILING INSTRUCTIONS

NOTE: The instructions below should be followed carefully. The numbers and titles on the left correspond to the numbers and titles of the Portfolios.

Obsolete pages in your service are listed in the column headed “Pages Out.” New and replacement pages in this issue are listed in the column headed “Pages In.” To expedite filing and use, all changes and analysis of new developments appear on white paper and should be filed numerically throughout the Portfolio. Existing pages will be replaced as changes and analysis of new developments are issued.

Customer Assistance: If you have any problems with missing pages or other questions regarding the filing of these Portfolios, call toll-free 800-372-1033 in the continental U.S.

IMPORTANT NOTICE: Route the accompanying Tax Management Memorandum to tax practitioners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGES OUT</th>
<th>PAGES IN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Estate Planning for Incompetency</td>
<td>B-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 B-801-812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-4th Aliens—Estate, Gift and Generation-Skipping Taxation</td>
<td>(v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234-2nd Estate Tax Deductions—Sections 2033, 2054 and 2057</td>
<td>C&amp;A 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)-(iv)</td>
<td>C&amp;A 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239-4th Estate Tax Marital Deduction</td>
<td>C&amp;A 1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)-(iv)</td>
<td>C&amp;A 1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-25-26</td>
<td>A-25-26(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-33-36</td>
<td>A-33-36(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-43-44</td>
<td>A-43-44(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;A 1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338-3rd Private Foundations—Sections 4940 and Section 4944</td>
<td>B-101-134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-101-138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442 Charitable Income Trusts</td>
<td>C&amp;A 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;A 1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd)

Figure 8. Looseleaf filed in a spiral binder (Tax NP)
or business where there are a large number of researchers sharing the same set. The secondary audience finds this type of binder a challenge. To place pages in a spiral binder, a special tool (shaped like a comb) must be used to press the tabs into the wire spine. A misplaced tool can keep the filer from maintaining the looseleaf until the tool is located or a replacement ordered. Also, pages accidentally removed are difficult to put back into the binder, as the special edge is likely to tear away as the pages are removed. Although these design issues concern the secondary audience, the benefits for the primary audience make this a good looseleaf style.

Paper Selection

The type of paper selected for a looseleaf has a great deal to do with the amount of maintenance required. A lightweight paper tends to tear easily, especially at the ring or post. CCH uses onionskin paper because its pages are expected to have a short life, since many pages may be exchanged several times during the life of the looseleaf. On the other hand, some scientific and technical standards may be current for many years. Lightweight paper in these circumstances would wear out over time. Repairs would need to be made, including photocopying of material onto better quality paper, claiming for replacement pages, and placing hole reinforcements on pages. All of these activities take time and money that can be put to better use. Archival bond or high quality copymachine paper are better for looseleafs that may be used for many years to come. Also, a heavyweight cellophane, paper, or fabric strip glued along the hole line will
reinforce the holes and keep them from tearing (Sloves 548). ANSI Z39.48-1984 Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials suggests minimum requirements for paper that is expected to last permanently in a library.

Page and Binder Size

Another concern expressed by the secondary audience was the amount of material crammed into binders. This becomes a problem when the amount of new information added to the looseleaf is greater than the amount removed. There are two ways to fight this problem. The first is page trim size and the second is binder size.

As with books and magazines, the decision of trim size for a looseleaf is important. A small page size will probably require a thicker binder than a larger page size. Therefore, the editor must be conscious of the amount of expected growth of the looseleaf when choosing a binder and page size.

Antupit states that the most important decision the editor must make is the trim size. For the primary audience, a large page needs to have a more inventive type style because a large page with plain, small type can be boring to the reader; but a small page size will increase the number of pages an article or chapter will run and make the article or chapter intimidating. Antupit also points out that page size and page number are functions of each other. If the page is small, the number of pages will be large to make up for it (60-61).
Pagination and Filing Systems

The secondary audience of looseleaves also is concerned about pagination and filing systems. If a poor pagination or filing system is used, the secondary audience finds it much more difficult to file the replacement pages. There are three basic ways to file looseleaves. One is by a page number or variation of a page number; the second is by standard number; the third is by some other sort of designation, such as alphabetic or geographic.

All methods provide a basic way of sequentially ordering the material in the looseleaf. Scientific and technical organizations seem to favor using standard numbers over page numbers. Most legal and business looseleaves use a page numbering scheme that may or may not coincide with how the pages are indexed. There really is no best overall filing system but as we will see next, there is a best depending on the rhetorical situation.

Figure 9 shows a standard that is filed by standard number. The standard number appears both in the title of the section and also in the lower right-hand corner of the page. A local page number appears at the bottom center of the page so the pages within the standard may remain in order.

Contrast this page with Figure 10, a similar standard published by the same company but filed by page number. In this case, the page number located at the bottom right of the page is a complex number (B-631.801). Complex numbers are difficult to file but become necessary when there is no other option but to try to insert several pages
GENERAL MOTORS ENGINEERING STANDARDS

SELECTION AND USE OF WROUGHT COPPER ALLOYS

1 GENERAL. When selecting copper and copper alloys for applications related to GM products, the most important factors to consider are electrical and thermal conductivity, tensile and fatigue strength, corrosion resistance, formability, machinability, joining characteristics, and the fact that these materials are nonmagnetic. Each of these factors is discussed briefly under a separate paragraph heading below.

1.1 Certain alloying elements in these materials are related to specific properties, and a knowledge of these relationships will assist the engineer in selecting the optimum material (or combination of alloying elements) for each application. The more commonly used alloying elements (and impurities) are listed below with information on their effect on the base metal. From this it is apparent that the addition of certain elements improves certain properties, but can have an adverse effect on some other property or properties; thus it is often necessary to make compromises.

1.2 Table 1 lists copper alloys commonly used in automotive and related industries by UNS (Unified Numbering System) designations with cross reference to SAE, ASTM and former SAE and GM numbers. Also included are alloy names and nominal chemical composition.

1.3 Tables 2 and 3 list typical physical properties, fabricating properties, uses and other characteristics for each alloy. Chemical composition limits, mechanical property limits, and dimensional tolerances for each material may be found in the specifications which follow this writing.

NOTE: This standard is scheduled for deletion from the book. Refer to SAE J461, published in the latest issue of the SAE Handbook, for similar information.

2 PHYSICAL, MECHANICAL AND FABRICATING CHARACTERISTICS.

2.1 Electrical Conductivity. The most common reason for using copper is its favorable electrical conductivity which is as high as 101% IACS (International Annealed Copper Standard) for the higher purity materials. The control of impurities in producing copper is important since relatively small percentages of some elements lowers the conductivity drastically. The presence of 0.04% phosphorus reduces the conductivity of copper to 75%. As a general rule, as the alloy content of copper is increased, the electrical conductivity decreases. Cold working copper also reduces the conductivity to 97%.

2.2 Thermal Conductivity. The same factors that govern electrical conductivity also apply to thermal conductivity. Those grades of copper and copper alloys that are good electrical conductors are also good thermal conductors.

2.3 Tensile Properties. Copper (unalloyed) can be cold worked to achieve a tensile strength of about 380 MPa but it is useless in this condition as it lacks sufficient ductility for further forming. To improve the tensile strength of copper and retain adequate formability it is necessary to alloy. Alloying improves the strength by virtue of the change in grain size, increasing the rate of work hardening during mill processing, forming a heat treatable alloy, or a combination of these factors. For example, tensile strength of about 1350 MPa is achieved by beryllium copper alloys suitably cold worked and heat treated.

2.3.1 The addition of zinc to copper in the amount of 30% forms one of the most commonly used alloys, C26000. This increases the strength from 350 MPa for copper to 620 MPa for the brass. Subsequent cold working improves the tensile strength from 620 MPa for spring temper copper to 1030 MPa for spring brass.

2.4 Fatigue Strength. While fatigue strength varies with surface condition, temper and corrosion conditions, the higher strength materials have the best fatigue strengths. Copper alloys having superior fatigue strength include the beryllium coppers and silicon bronzes.

2.5 Corrosion Resistance. Copper and copper alloys have been used for many years in a variety of corrosive environments. Copper is highly resistant to the effects of atmosphere, fresh and salt water, alkaline solutions (except those containing ammonia) and many organic chemicals.

2.6 Formability. All copper in the annealed condition is readily cold formed by drawing, stamping, bending, spinning, and swaging. The cold worked tempers are desirable for severe forming operations like cold heading. Cold working up to 97% must be used to form the hardest temper capable of forming the part. This assures optimum mechanical properties in the finished part.

2.6.1 Another factor influencing forming properties is grain size. Generally, the larger grain sizes (0.044 mm and up) are specified for severe forming operations like cold heading. However, excessively large grain size can be detrimental in the case of deep drawing. If the finished part is to receive decorative plating and buffing, the finest grain size capable of making the part is desirable to eliminate orange peel and minimize finishing costs.

2.6.2 When selecting a temper for cold headed parts such as screws, rivets and bolts, light drawn tempers are recommended to prevent buckling of the part during fabrication.

2.6.3 Bending is often the controlling factor in the selection of a temper. Every attempt should be made to select a temper that will bend across the rolling direction. When bends are to be made in

AUGUST 1991 PAGE 1 3906M

Copyright General Motors Inc. Used by permission.

Figure 9. Looseleaf filed by standard number (Engineering 3906M)
ULTRA HIGH STRENGTH HIGH CARBON STEEL STRIP
GM 6115-M

1. SCOPE. This specification describes the requirements of a precision cold reduced steel spring strip of a thin gauge which provides ultra high strength. This material is to be used for parts like cold formed springs which cannot be readily heat treated without warpage after forming.

2. CHEMICAL COMPOSITION. The steel furnished to this specification shall conform to the following heat analysis (mass percent):
   - Carbon: 0.70-0.90
   - Manganese: 0.25-0.60
   - Silicon: 0.10-0.30
   - Phosphorus: 0.03 max
   - Sulfur: 0.03 max

3. MECHANICAL PROPERTIES.
   3.1 The tensile properties of the strip shall be as shown unless otherwise specified on the purchase order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thickness</th>
<th>Tensile Strength (Longitudinal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 0.20</td>
<td>2100-2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 0.25</td>
<td>2100-2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 0.30</td>
<td>(See Note)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. QUALITY AND FINISH.
   4.1 Steel furnished to this specification shall not be wavy or crooked. The surface shall be free from scale and rust. There shall be no objectionable surface defects such as seams, deep scratches, rolled in scale, laps, pits or transverse openings.

5. FORMABILITY.
   5.1 As received material must withstand a 180° bend around an arbor with a diameter equal to 12 times the stock thickness.

6. METALLURGICAL REQUIREMENTS.
   6.1 Properly mounted, polished and etched samples shall show a textures fine lenticular prismatic structure or a homogenous tempered martensitic structure with no carbide segregation.

7. NOTES:
   7.1 Prior to shipment of any material from a new source, samples shall be submitted for examination and approval by the Purchaser before the material can be accepted.

Copyright General Motors Inc. Used by permission.

Figure 10. Looseleaf filed by complex page number (Engineering B-631.801)
between two other numbers. The publisher of the pages in figures 9 and 10 is slowly converting this looseleaf from a page number filing scheme to a standard number filing scheme. In this case it is much easier for the secondary user to file by standard number than to try to file with a complex pagination scheme.

Another example of complex page numbering schemes is shown in Figure 11. Each grouping of numbers within the complex page number (eg. CM11-300UD-101) has some meaning for the writer or editor, but very little for the secondary audience of the looseleaf. Filing by complex numbering schemes such as this usually requires a great deal of time. Tinker (40-41) states that roman numerals are much more difficult to read than arabic. Complex page numbers are just as difficult to read and even harder to file.

In order to avoid complex pagination, CCH uses large page numbers. Each section in the Standard Federal Tax Reports begins several thousand pages after the previous one ended. This allows additional pages to be added to the end of the previous section. When a page must be inserted between two pages, this publisher uses the page numbering scheme XXXX-1, XXXX-2, etc. Figure 12 shows us two features about CCH pagination. The first feature is that the page numbers are prominent, in bold font, larger than the surrounding text, and in a corner by themselves. This feature makes the pages easy to file because the page numbers are easy to locate. The second feature is, before a page is skipped, the statement, "The next page is XXXX," appears at the bottom of the page. This small feature assures the filer, as well as the reader, that the material is all there.
## FILING INSTRUCTIONS
March 1992

### datapro reports on MICROCOMPUTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAB</th>
<th>REMOVE PAGES</th>
<th>INSERT PAGES</th>
<th>TITLE AND DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOLUME 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index (CM01)</td>
<td>CM01-050-101 to -103</td>
<td>CM01-050-101 to -106</td>
<td>Systems Benchmark: 18MHz and 20MHz 386SX Notebook Microcomputers (new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems (CM11)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>CM11-010-101 to -106</td>
<td>Systems Benchmark: 18MHz and 20MHz 386SX Notebook Microcomputers (new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers (CM15)</td>
<td>CM15-300UD-101 to -113</td>
<td>CM15-300UD-101 to -118</td>
<td>Dell Microcomputers (revised)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM15-010-051 to -057</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laser Printers: Market Overview (revised &amp; retitled; replaced by Report CM15-010-051)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM15-010-081 to -086</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laser Printers: Technology Overview (revised &amp; retitled; replaced by Report CM15-010-051)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM15-010-101 to -145</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laser Printers: Comparison Columns (revised &amp; retitled; replaced by Report CM15-010-051)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM15-010-051 to -092</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laser Printers: Overview (revised &amp; retitled; replaces Reports CM15-010-051 through CM15-010-101)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOLUME 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frontspiece</th>
<th>Frontspiece</th>
<th>Frontspice (revised)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expansion Cards (CM17)</td>
<td>CM17-010-051 to -054</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM17-010-081 to -084</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM17-010-101 to -109</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM17-010-051 to -063</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Processing (CM43)</td>
<td>CM43-987MU-301 to -212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM43-995FM-101 to -104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Looseleaf filed by complex page number (Datapro NP)
(ii) Property rented to others. Except as provided in the second sentence of subdivision (i) of this subparagraph, property or a portion thereof rented by the association to others does not constitute property used in the association's business. However, if the fair rental value of the rented portion of a single piece of real property (including appurtenant parcels) used as the principal or branch office of the association constitutes less than 20 percent of the fair rental value of such piece of property, or if such property has an adjusted basis of not more than $150,000, the entire property shall be considered used in such business. If such rented portion constitutes 50 percent or more of the fair rental value of such piece of property, and such property has an adjusted basis of more than $150,000, an allocation of its adjusted basis is required. The portion of the total adjusted basis of such piece of property which is deemed to be property used in the association's business shall be equal to an amount which bears the same ratio to such total adjusted basis as the amount of the fair rental value of the property used as the principal or branch office of the association bears to the total fair rental value of such property. In the case of all property other than real property used or to be used as the principal or branch office of the association, if the fair rental value of the rented portion thereof constitutes less than 15 percent of the fair rental value of such property, the entire property shall be considered used in the association's business. If such rented portion constitutes 15 percent or more of the fair rental value of such property, an allocation of its adjusted basis (in the same manner as required for real property used as the principal or branch office) is required.

(f) Special rules. (Reserved) [Reg. § 301.7701-13A.]

.10 Historical Comment: Proposed 1/10/78. Adopted 5/15/79 by T.D. 7622.

Proposed Amendments

Caution: See List of Proposed Amendments at ¶ 43,909A.

[Proposed Amendment]

Prop. 10. Section 301.7701-13A is amended by adding a new paragraph (a)(12) to read as set forth below:

(a) (12) Regular or residual interest in a REMIC—(i) In general. If for any calendar quarter at least 95 percent of a REMIC's assets (as determined in accordance with § 1.860G-1(e)(11) or § 1.609-7(f)(3)) are assets described in paragraphs (e)(1) through (e)(11) of this section, and for that calendar quarter, all the regular and residual interests in that REMIC are treated as assets described in paragraphs (e)(1) through (e)(11) of this section. If less than 95 percent of a REMIC's assets are assets described in paragraphs (e)(1) through (e)(11) of this section, then for that calendar quarter, the percentage of each REMIC regular or residual interest in the REMIC's assets is determined in accordance with § 1.860G-1(e)(12) or § 1.609-7(f)(3). For purposes of paragraphs (e)(12)(i) and (ii) or this section, a loan secured by manufactured housing that qualifies as a single family residence under section 25(e)(10) is an asset described in paragraphs (e)(1) through (e)(11) of this section.

(ii) Manufactured housing treated as asset described in paragraphs (e)(1) through (e)(11). For purposes of paragraphs (e)(12)(i) and (ii) or this section, a loan secured by manufactured housing that qualifies as a single family residence under section 25(e)(10) is an asset described in paragraphs (e)(1) through (e)(11) of this section.

THE NEXT PAGE IS 72,427-1A]
Summary of Recommendations

The design considerations already discussed can be summarized as follows.

Instructions should

1. be step-by-step and preferably in a table format
2. include the title and shipment number
3. provide an inventory of the shipment
4. include a way to verify that previous shipments have been filed.

Aids for locating materials include

1. tab dividers
2. colored pages
3. volume numbers on spines
4. a visual cue indicating skipped or removed pages.

Binder considerations include

1. binder size vs. the amount of material
2. ring or post binder

Paper

1. paper should be heavy enough for its expected life

Page and binder size

1. a small page size means a thicker binder or more binders
Filing Systems may be by

1. page number
2. standard number
3. subject designation

Pagination should

1. use whole numbers when possible
2. be simple
3. use a font that makes them stand out
4. be in a consistent place

Implementation of Design Recommendations

Although it is easy to come up with a list of design considerations, it is difficult to gain compliance. The adoption of looseleaf editing as a part of college level editing classes would be one way to gain appreciation of the difficulties of designing such a unique product. Such a class should include placing the student in the role of the secondary audience. It is hoped that these students would then go on to work in the industry with an understanding of the problems that the secondary audience faces.

Although education is a beginning, this may not be enough. According to Lehr, there are three nontraditional roles for the technical editor, that of resource person, instructor, and standards bearer (WE65). As a resource person, the editor is responsible for knowing the topic and being aware of where the author may go for more
information. As an instructor, the editor is responsible for continuing the education of the author. Finally, it is up to the technical editor to maintain publication standards - both written and graphic. Another possible method for industry to implement good design would be to adapt industry-wide standards like those created by the British Standards Institute or the American National Standards Institute. The British Standard BS5641: 1978 has not been adapted by the ISO. Perhaps by creating an ANSI standard covering looseleaf design, publishers who do not publish looseleafs as a regular part of their business would voluntarily adopt more uniform design practices, making work easier for the secondary audience.

Kinder points out "standardized format produces rumblings of disgruntlement among writers and editors. On this point, the librarian (or primary audience) is probably more deeply concerned with the reader (or in this case secondary audience), for the chief advantages relate to efficient handling. We can, however, find justification for uniformity when documents appear in series or are published periodically. The reader (or again, secondary audience) has a recognition factor in his favor. He also profits by being able to find like information in the same place in each publication. Use is made easier" (24). Freytag presents additional support for standardization of binders, formats, and paper quality (562). He points out that Germans suffer the same problems with filing looseleafs as Americans and standardization is needed to improve the design of looseleaf services.
CONCLUSION

Audience

As this report has shown, there are two different audiences for looseleaves. The first is the audience perceived by the writer. It is the researcher who will be using the looseleaf as a reference guide, the lawyer who is looking for changes in a law, and the biologist who is trying to identify some new species of butterfly. Looseleafs have been written successfully for these individuals.

Looseleaf services have not been successful in serving the secondary audience, the student assistant, secretary, or clerk who has to maintain the service, to file the pages correctly, and see they stay that way. For this audience it would be wise for the looseleaf publisher to heed the axiom: "Write for the Reader, Design for the Filer." In so doing, the publisher would indirectly aid the primary audience as well.

Design

There are seven areas of looseleaf design that concern the secondary audience. These include the instructions, the finding aids, the binder type, the paper choice, the page and binder size, the filing system, and the pagination scheme. Each of these areas impact on how well the secondary audience maintains the looseleaf. Therefore, the editor should be aware of how the secondary audience depends on the design and be willing to make changes to improve the usability of the looseleaf.
Implementation of Looseleaf Design

Although looseleafs are a specialized form of written discourse, it is important that the design of looseleafs be a part of the editor's education. Both the undergraduate and graduate English program should include a discussion of the secondary audience and looseleaf design as a part of a larger discussion of book design.

This report has looked at the industry standards and how they may be applied to looseleaf writing. Writers as well as editors feel that creativity and freedom of expression are cherished rights. On the other hand, a voluntary standard such as the British Standard mentioned above would not impinge on any of these rights but would give the secondary audience the right to file looseleafs and maintain them in a way consistent with the wishes of the editors and publishers. A poorly designed looseleaf, one that is difficult or impossible to maintain, is a black eye for everybody involved.
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APPENDIX 1

RESPONSES TO A QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT SECONDARY AUDIENCE

The original letter: I am a graduate student in the English program at Iowa State University. I am presently working on my masters thesis, on a topic I hope many of you can relate to. I am looking at the design of looseleafs, both the good and the bad. The primary question that I am trying to answer is how the looseleaf design affects its filing and upkeep. In order to determine if the design of select looseleafs is appropriate for those who maintain them, I would like to know who files looseleafs in your library? Do librarians, paraprofessionals, or students do most of the filing? Are the filers primarily laypeople or do they have some expertise in the topic covered by the looseleaf? If you could write me just a short description of those whose responsibility it is to maintain these services, I would appreciate it. Thank you for your assistance.

Richard Adix
Library Assistant II
Parks Library, Iowa State University

The responses: 1. I’m a reference librarian in a small public library with five fte professional staff. Our reference dept. has one assistant, and three pages (high school students or retirees). We all file loose leafs, with the primary duties falling on the paraprofessional library assistant.
2. We are a community college library servicing a campus with 16,000 students (about 10,000 FTE's). Our library is not large; we don't subscribe to a huge number of looseleaf services. For those we do have, the updating is done mainly by student aides, under the supervision of a library paraprofessional. There are a few looseleaf services that our student aids just seem to find too complicated to deal with, where they always get the pages in the wrong place or can't quite figure out what to discard. Those are handled by our paraprofessional. Most of our student helpers are foreign students on college work-study grants, and it may be the fact that English isn't their first language that causes the problems.

3. I saw your message on the list and decided to respond. I am Head of Reference at Florida International University. We have dozens of looseleaf services. We have a very strong business/legal ref section. The looseleaf services are all filed by PROFESSIONAL FILERS. We have a contract that has gone out to bid. We contract at an hourly rate up to a certain amount of money and giving a specific list of titles that we expect to have done. It's a godsend. The filers come at least once a week and they are very accurate. I know that some law libraries also contract for their service. I've worked in several other libraries and have never heard of professional filers. Looseleaf services have always been a problem maintaining. My personal opinion--looseleaf services are crucial for up-to-date information in certain areas. The problem with them has been with maintenance. If you can get that under control, it solves most of your problems.
4. At the University of Missouri-Kansas City, most of the filing of loose leaf services is done by student employees with other support staff filling in from time to time if students are not available. They are trained to file the different titles but generally have no subject expertise in the field.

5. Generally, clerical staff file items received for looseleaf subscriptions. They have no subject expertise related to the items.

6. We are a small liberal arts college--1,000 students, three professional librarian, three support staff. The students have been filing now for six years. I filed for a year until "I learned the ropes", then passed it on to my assistant, who has trained ONE specific, sharp student how to file. We found that there were problems if more than one person files--never quite knew who was goofing up what.

7. At SUNY Cortland, the head of Reference trains a few students and supervises their work effort. One of the tasks assigned to students is the replacement effort for looseleaf.

8. I have worked in a number of special libraries that had looseleaf services. Obviously the law firm libraries that I have worked for were the heaviest users of looseleafs, but even the more general libraries have some looseleaf services. Every library that I have worked in personally has hired a filing service to come in and do the job. Generally, these have been minimum wage employees, in some cases developmentally handicapped. I know of a few libraries that have looseleafs filed by the library staff. In those cases, they are filed by the lowest person on the totem pole.
Nobody likes doing it and I am sure that most library workers consider it to be the lowest level of library work around. Nobody with any expertise in anything would touch them if someone else was available to do it. Now, I think that it would be good if Senior Partners occasionally did the filing. When I practiced law myself, I did my own filing because I did not have anybody to do it for me. I discovered that more than one third of the pages that I was filing for one service as "updates" were mere reprints of what I already had. Frequently, these were printed in a different type size so that they would look different. Another third would have legally insignificant changes in wording (such as changing "the party of the first part" to "the first party"). Often, these were changed back in a later update. I have one set that I have not updated since 1984. When I do legal work now, I use that set as the basis for my work then use a current set from a local library to verify the work. I have never had to change anything from a contract or set of pleadings because of this comparison. I have saved more than $10,000 by not updating.

9. In this library the filing of looseleaf supplements is the responsibility of a library assistant. She generally delegates it to a student who may or may not have any knowledge of the subject area (but generally doesn’t).

10. Our looseleaf services number 200 and they are filed by paraprofessionals and students who have no knowledge of the subject they file. It is technique to filing, very routine work. Learning how to file is important and until one learns it causes many
problems when the filing service is done incorrectly (which it usually is). At that point the professional subject specialist librarian takes over to try to correct the problems.

11. We have several large multi-volume sets of looseleaf binders in the chemistry reference collection. They are complex collections and we have found that relying on student assistants for interfiling updates and new sheets is only successful with very careful training. We generally choose one of our chemistry seniors as the designated person to deal with new packets of pages. Depending on the subject matter and adequate training, student assistants (as least in my experience) are competent filers. The other large group of looseleaf binders we have are the documentation for our various online search services (Dialog, STN, OCLC). I have all of the student assistants file the Dialog bluesheets and file chapters, but have to, again, be careful to explain carefully about the difference between revised documentation and new material. As for the type of binder that I think is best suited for this type of reference material -- although not necessarily the easiest for new student assistants to readily understand -- the binders used with the Thermodynamics Research Center for spectral and thermodynamic data sheets are very good. There are hinges that unfold to release the rings that hold the papers; when folded and locked into place, the papers are all pressed tightly together and it is nearly impossible with normal use for any pages to become torn out (unless, of course, there are inscrutable users but that is not a problem so much for us).

12. Our looseleafs are filed by Library Assistants -- full-time clerical staff. They have no special training in the subject matter of the looseleaf services they file.
13. I'm a reference librarian at Georgia Tech. The paraprofessional in our office files our looseleaf items. Wanted to mention one problem that you may not have thought of. Certain looseleaf binders we have to keep behind the reference desk, because parts of them keep getting stolen. Don't know how to solve this problem while keeping something updatable, but it really is a problem, because until someone asks for those pages we don't know they are missing, and it is quite hard to get replacement pages.

14. In my library, an academic law library, looseleaf filing is done by support staff. There are basically two full-time positions whose primary responsibility is filing. They report to a paraprofessional who reports to a librarian (head of collection management). This is a parallel reporting structure to the shelvers (although there are also student shelvers.) No subject expertise is required or expected. With as many looseleaf subscriptions as we have, it would really be impossible to hire someone with subject expertise in all of them, even if the had a JD! And, as far as I can see, there's not much need for any knowledge regarding the content. The looseleaf publishers provide pretty explicit instructions as to what goes and what stays, so the major skill required is to follow directions meticulously. Of course, when it comes to actually using looseleafs, it's a whole different story: subject expertise can be very helpful. At three law firm libraries (a mid-sized, and two large firms) at which I have formerly held positions, the looseleaf filing was contracted out to a service which came in a few hours a day to file. I am not sure about this, but I believe that in the "regular" medium-sized
academic library I was at, our few looseleaf services were filed by a paraprofessional (probably took less than an hour a week).

15. Here at the Martin P. Catherwood Library at Cornell University, our Reference Assistant (a paraprofessional) is in charge of maintaining our looseleaf services. She has a student assistant who files the updates to most of the services from BNA and CCH which are well designed and straightforward and have very good instructions for filing. The reference assistant maintains the more complex services which are either not well designed or not frequently updated, or too much work for a student to manage in the short shifts she works (1-2 hrs long). The student has some expertise in the field, but that is not a factor in whether she is a good filer. More importantly is her ability to follow the filing directions and notice any inconsistencies in pagination etc. It is important for supervisors to have experience in filing so that they can appreciate the problems that may arise that are unique to looseleaf services, but librarians do not usually file on a regular basis.

16. At St. Norbert College Todd Wehr Library, paraprofessionals do the filing of looseleafs. They have no expertise in the particular fields. Our looseleaf services deal with business news and statistics and various addenda to our state’s laws.

17. Paraprofessional staff file our looseleaf services most of the time, occasionally student workers do it. They do not have any subject expertise in the topic covered by the looseleaf service. We have a surprisingly stable paraprofessional staff so that those who do our filing have been here for a number of years and have been doing the filing
for a long time. It is a very labor intensive job. As the Coordinator of Reference, I have been considering replacing some of the services with the CD-ROM version (not available for all but maybe that will come) -- as long as the CD-ROM version is updated frequently (monthly or quarterly). My personal opinion is that a lot of the looseleaf services are a real pain to file and if someone is inexperienced and doesn’t understand the procedure, they can get way out of order very quickly. The other problem is that no two services are done the same way so that you must learn each one separately and that makes it hard to train people.

18. I am glad that someone is examining this topic. Looseleafs have their origin, I believe, in legal bibliography where they were traditionally filed by outside services retained by contract. Serial publishers realized that it was a great way to update information and the newsletter and general looseleaf business proliferated while maintaining a significant subscription base. In most academic libraries that I have been associated with the filing is done by support staff and occasionally by students in either Serials or Reference Departments. Most assignments are made so that staff has an ongoing relationship with a particular title and develop a familiarity with the product. Not necessary in my opinion to have subject expertise because those people do not usually assist users in manipulating the product. Looseleafs serve a purpose but have expensive maintenance costs besides subscription fees. I have grown to dislike this publication format now that electronic publishing has become so available.
19. At the University of Nebraska at Omaha, looseleafs are filed by students who need to know how to read and follow directions. They are monitored by a Library Assistant II (me) whose job description requires a high school education, but who, in reality, is a paraprofessional. If the students have questions, they ask me. If I have questions, I ask the appropriate librarian.

20. In our library, undergraduate student workers file pages in our looseleaf services. Our looseleaf services cover primarily tax law and accounting. The students do not usually have any background in these fields. In order to minimize confusion, we have begun to assign particular looseleaf services to a single individual. The criteria seems to be not so much whether the students are knowledgeable about the field covered by the service, but their attention to detail and a conscientious, positive attitude. I tell students not to rush when filing, and not to file more than an hour without a break or change of task.

21. In our library we have reference assistants who are students and they are the ones who file the looseleaf services. Besides reshelving and shelfreading of indexes, etc. this is part of their job. They are obviously not expert in the subject areas, but they are competent in the task.

22. I don’t know if you were only concerned with academic libraries or not, but some years ago I worked for the largest private law firm library in Houston, Texas and all of the filing was done by non-degreed library personnel. While these workers gained experience once employed, they had no previous knowledge of library science or law.
These were almost exclusively high school graduates with no college hours at all. There was some concern over accuracy in filing, due to the variety of styles presented by publishers. Those that were very easy to understand were done first, even if there was a backlog of filing from the prior week.

23. At the University of Regina Library, the looseleaf filing is done by paraprofessionals. We are definitely laypersons. The looseleafs which I take care of are all within the Canadian Legal areas.

24. Radford University is a 9,000 student university, masters granting. The library is small and understaffed. One of the many jobs students do is file looseleafs. In the Reference Dept. we usually pick the student who we hope is the sharpest. Student assistants are assigned to us, we do not interview or hire whom we would like. They seldom have expertise, only sometimes do they interest. We have a list of about 75 -- half may be looseleaf, half may be supplementary pamphlet, etc. -- which the student takes care of. We do try to get them to ask questions, but in general they seem to have used the lists to find the materials and then do a pretty good job of replacing pages, etc.

25. After 25 years of dealing with looseleaf publications, I have considerable, but at 11 pm, alas random thoughts concerning them. 1. They are troublesome but if well done and necessary, they can be wonderful up to date resources. 2. Surely electronic formats will make them obsolete. 3. If they are not timely, they are worthless. 4. No publication should involve screws and/or pick-up-stick type metal rods or any other insane mechanical gimmick. 5. Binders should not be too small to accommodate all the
pieces intended to be placed therein. 6. If annual looseleaf collections are to be replaced by bound volumes, the bound volumes should arrive quickly, and/or extra looseleaf binders should be provided. 7. Spines should have a slip in pocket for changing yearly designation if this has to be done. 8. Cover sheets should come with stacks of pages to be inserted with columns, pull these old pages, insert these new pages. 9. Every sheet should bear a date. 10. All such clumps of inserts should arrive in chronological sequence. 11. Numbering should be immediately obvious. 12. Sections should be distinctly titled so there can be no confusion. 13. Any page or pages skipped or left blank should have a sheet so stating. 14. Size or format should not be switched in mid-year or mid-volume. 15. Color coding special sections can be helpful ie. yellow indexes. 16. Annual indexes should boldly state that they belong in earlier volumes. Students always shelve them with the current material. 17. One of the best looseleaf publications around is the Congressional Index. It’s tedious, but very well done and an invaluable resource. However, it’s possible a good online system could replace it. Maybe not for the same cost. 18. Students file looseleafs here. 19. Librarians correct what the students have or have not done. 20 No expertise at all. Pure rote, it’s a job.

26. We have both students and paraprofessionals do the filing. Librarians have to know how to use them, but do not do the filing. Exceptions would be if we get way behind in filing, then librarians could help out.
Text of a round table discussion held on March 25, 1992. The participants were:

Eugene Hibbs -- 1 year looseleaf filing experience
Matt Markland -- 2 years looseleaf filing experience
Tony Neyens -- 2 years looseleaf filing experience
Angela Stickels -- 2 years looseleaf filing experience

Richard: Let me begin by asking what looseleaves do you find easy to file and why?

Angela: CCH.

Richard: Why CCH?

Angela: The instructions are step-by-step. They don’t just drop a pile of pages on you. You are told to put in this page and this page and take out this page and this page. It tells you to start in this section and do that.

Eugene: The instructions are pretty self explanatory. When I first started filing I found CCH pretty easy because they told you at the beginning of their report letter how to file them. I believe the report letter says "Pages not required" and "Pages in this report." It's very simple.

Tony: The simpler the instructions...the more step-by-step. It's the most important thing when filing a looseleaf.
Matt: Step-by-step instructions with absolute page numbers so you cannot mistake (the page numbers) with other numbers. Like in the Iowa Administrative Code where there are chapter numbers and page numbers but there are also titles to parts that you have to worry about. The page numbers need to be more...

Richard: The page numbers should be more simplistic.

Tony: The easier the page numbers, like 1 through 141 would be better. Basically, the easier the better. The simpler the better.

Richard: So something like CCH which uses whole numbers is much better than something that files by chapter number and page number and paragraph number.

Matt: Even though there’s not much that can probably be done about the Iowa Code. That’s the way that it has been done for a long time. And if they are going to separate things by subject like the Iowa Code, then we need tab dividers for each subject. Tabs make things a lot easier to file because you know that this subject goes in this section.

Eugene: I’ve noticed that some looseleafs have tabs that list page numbers just to make things easier to find.

Matt: That’s true.

Eugene: I’ve noticed that BNA on their volumes often uses stars. I’ve found that over time they may list that the material goes in volume double star when we’ve had to shift it to volume triple star in order to get everything in. Then you have
to look through all the volumes to see where we have moved it and it makes things confusing.

Tony: Yeah, there have been a lot of times that we have gotten new binders and we’ve had to transfer some of the pages. If they keep them up to date it’s not so bad. But if they have gotten sloppy...

Eugene: I don’t know if people arbitrarily shift things in the binders to keep them from getting too full, but we now get things that say a section is supposed to be one volume and then we find it in the next volume. I don’t think that some of the companies have planned accordingly. They need to put the proper amount of sections...chapters in a binder. The instructions need to reflect that.

Matt: One thing that I think that a company that produces a looseleaf should make the instructions as basic as possible. And every time they send out instructions they should send them out that way. I’m sure that the federal government looseleafs have good instructions on how to originally set up their looseleafs, but over time... If you don’t know how the looseleaf was originally set up, its hard to file if the updating instructions are bad. The federal job descriptions for example.

Richard: So we need more continuity. Perhaps different editors or authors don’t continue the instructions or filing methods.

Matt: Say a looseleaf started back decades ago. It may have been set up fine, but now I’ve been given the task to file it. I have no idea how it was originally set up. If I
can’t figure it out the way it was originally laid out in the book. People may have misfiled it or patrons taken pages out to copy.

Richard: OK

Matt: I don’t know. I think that it would be fine if everything came in standard binders.

Richard: OK. What about binders? What makes a binder more easier or more difficult to use.

Matt: If its a spring loaded binder that pops open like a standard notebook.

Richard: A ring binder.

Matt: A ring style with more than three rings is more easier to take apart.

Richard: So a post binder is more difficult.

Eugene: It’s easier to break a post binder. And the post binders are really difficult to open. I don’t know if they are rusted or what.

Tony: The BNA binders, when they get too full, you can’t push the button in to open it. You have to use pliers. And some of the buttons get stuck in so they won’t stay locked.

Eugene: These binders...ring binders that have the rings come together. You have to carefully hold the front and back pages of a full binder together because the rings aren’t long enough. You have to make sure that the pages get aligned because if they aren’t, the ring will miss the holes and maybe tear the pages.

Matt: That’s a problem with most binders. I think that companies aren’t aware of
how much we try to stuff into one of their binders. Some of these binders end up so full that the pages can’t be moved around without taking all the pages out or they end up with a permanent curl.

Richard: Have you noticed that when you have to repair pages. Do pages get more easily torn in a post binder or a ring binder?

Matt: I don’t know. I think that ring binders are harder on pages.

Tony: Yes. Some of those binders get a lot of use and the pages get torn more easily.

Matt: I think that some of that has to do with the amount of movement. With a post binder, the pages can’t move latterly like this. It’s this movement that makes spines…the pages weak and tears them easier.

Angela: Those full ring binders. When you try to close them and that one little piece of paper slides and gets off just a little bit. The ring snaps closed and tears it.

Eugene: When the binder gets too full its much easier to tear pages than when the binder isn’t so full. Binders like these post ones where you just add a supplement…they rarely if ever tear. Almost never. You get a lot more wear out of the pages too.

Matt: I also think that some of these places, like these standards, they should reprint some of their older stuff to replace the really old pages or tell us to get rid of the pages if they are not being used anymore. There’s no way that people can be referred to these old brittle pages. They’ve been in here too long.
Richard: So if the material is going to be used for a long time, then they should use a different format than looseleaf.

Matt: A different format or a different paper. It may be more expensive to use a heavier style of paper but it's going to hold up a lot longer.

Eugene: Where CCH updates more often, they can use this thin paper. But like Matt is saying, some of these looseleaf pages have been around ten years at least.

Matt: Also, if these looseleafs have 20-25 volumes to update at a time it's a pain to update. If they could possible send them out more often so we don't have so much at once.

Tony: I understand what you are saying. Some of these military standards, you get a big stack of paper and it takes so long to update.

Richard: O.K. What about transfer binders?

Angela: It takes so long to get the binders through cataloging. I had to wait 6 weeks for the binder to come through. Then I had a lot of shipments that had to be filed once it came through.

Richard: Have you ever noticed problems... where previous ones have been misfiled, for instance? Or making sure that everything has been done before transferring? or filing?

Tony: Fortunately most of these transfer binders have good instructions. We have decided to keep all the instructions we now receive somewhere in the binder set in a sequential order. It's easy to check and make sure that the previous set was received
and all the steps were completed. We know that if the previous issue hasn’t been received we hold off and claim the missing issue.

Richard: So what makes things hard to file? We’ve talked about CCH and why it’s easy to file.

Matt: Cryptic instructions. Like the Aerospace Standards. They have a little grid that tells you what everything means. But most of us can’t figure it out. It takes two or three times filing them before you can get the hang of it.

Tony: Yeah. Usually they are replaced pages. But they also include notices. This can get really sloppy. Sometimes we get a notice that says that this is discontinued but not to remove. The real problem is what to do if something is validated. Sometimes they send a new sheet but sometimes they don’t. People think that if there is a new sheet with the same number as an old one they are to replace it. If they see something on the instructions that is in the binder but not in the packet they throw it out instead of realizing that it is really supposed to stay in there.

Eugene: I think tabs is important. If every binder had tabs like this and clear definitions of every volume with the title on it, things would be a lot easier. It would really cut down on the time involved in finding what we are supposed to change.

Matt: Either that or colored pages.

Eugene: Yeah. Colored pages would also help. It would help to find where we’re supposed to be.

Matt: I think that if companies would every couple of years send out a master
index, then we could go through sets like Alloy Digest and find out what pages are supposed to be there. We could check which pages we are missing. Only not set up like an index but like a sequence of page numbers we could check off.

Richard: Some sort of an inventory...table of contents.

Matt: I think that that should be done, if not every year, at least every five years to keep things updated.

Richard: Something like what we get for Tax Management. We get a list every once in a while that tells us what binders we should have.

Matt: I think that they should also ban that style of binder. They could file the same material in a few ring binders.

Eugene: I don’t think this is any cheaper than binders.

Matt: Even in ring binders they could put several volumes together and tabs for the sections. It would save space and we wouldn’t have to keep our eyes on hundreds of spiral notebooks.

Richard: Do you ever have troubles not knowing what is supposed to be pulled and what is to go in? Do the instructions ever say to remove such and such a page? Then you go to insert such and such a page and the pages don’t match up? Is that a problem?

Matt: I haven’t seen a problem with CCH or BNA. But sometimes the standards aren’t clear and you don’t know what to do.

Richard: About the standards. You filed the GM standards as they decided to
totally reorganize their filing system. They went from one page numbering system to a standard numbering system. The changeover started more than a year ago and they still aren’t half finished. We have two filing systems in one binder. How is that going?

Matt: It would have been nice if they had been more explicit on how to do it. We had to figure out a system on our own.

Richard: Would it have been better if they had done it all at once? Is it a problem that it is being done over time?

Matt: If the instructions were better written then I don’t think that there would have been a problem. I was never really confident about what I was doing, if it was something new or if I was replacing something under the old system.

Tony: What I think is the problem is the page numbers used. When companies use too complex of a page numbering scheme, some people can misread the number. They take out the wrong pages. You may not get another set for a long time. Then when you get around to filing it, you find a gap that shouldn’t be there. Maybe companies should reprint entire sections periodically to catch these problems.

Angela: Sometimes they will ask you to remove a page from the middle of a chapter but not have you replace it. If the text on the previous page is in the middle of a sentence and then it jumps to the middle of some other text after you remove the page, you aren’t sure that you should remove the page without something else going in. I mean, people will get confused.
Matt: If they aren’t going to use consecutive page numbering, if there is a gap in pages, they should have a note that says that the text is continued on page so and so...

Tony: Like CCH.

Matt: Then you know that there isn’t something missing.

Eugene: Something that BNA does that annoys me is that they will have a line that says take out page 451-452. Then on the next line it says new material 451-452. Most of the other looseleafs tell you what to take out and what to put in on the same line. Then I know that I’m to stop. The step isn’t complete. This way it breaks it into two steps. Then they also label it as new material, obsolete material, and revised material. I don’t know what the difference is.

Matt: With the Iowa Court Rules, they are updated a section at a time. It would be nice if the instructions let you know what should have been replaced with the previous shipment so you can check and see if you received and filed it or not.

Tony: With Mertens, they have a table of what was supposed to be changed with the last several shipments. I usually check those to make sure just in case the instructions may have been destroyed instead of filed.

Richard: Some looseleafs include in one of the corners of each page what shipment they come with. Is this helpful?

Angela: Yes. If I get my discard and my new page pile mixed up, I can check and see where it belongs.
Richard: What about if shipments come out of order and one accidentally gets filed. Do these numbers help?

Eugene: They help when you discover an error in your or someone else’s filing. The filing system I find easiest is filing by page number. It’s very obvious when a page number is out of order. Then you can go by the date or shipment number and look at the instructions to see what mistake was made in the past. When it really gets difficult is when the date or shipment number is printed the same size as the page number. It’s always easier if the page number or however you file it is the biggest and the darkest thing on the page. I think that there are a few out there that don’t do that and it makes things difficult.

Richard: O.K. Here is a looseleaf that I haven’t had any of you file before. The main reason is that it is such a problem. One of its problems is that they started out with a whole number sequential page numbering system. Then they decided on major revisions of each section. They discovered that the revisions of each section took up more space than the original. Then they went to a whole number followed by a period followed by a whole number. Though the number looks like a decimal, its not. Do you find this confusing?

Eugene: It’s probably better than having it actually a decimal number.

Matt: It depends on the instructions. If the instructions make it clear, then it would be O.K.

Richard: One of the problems with these instructions is that the instructions only
indicated which page numbers actually had changes on them. The instructions did not indicate which pages were in the shipment. One page may be changed on the instructions but a whole section may be swapped. On the other hand, you had to watch and make sure that everything has been included in the section or you may be leaving in pages and hand writing revised page numbers on the pages.

Matt: I'm sure that all of us are experts on Boiler Pressure Vessel Design. I don't think that the page numbering is all that bad. I mean, they could have used a number-letter combination but you will run out of combinations too quickly. I think that the instructions could be better, they could tell you more.

Richard: Do you find this filing better than Alloy Digest? Would you rather file by standard number or page number?

Matt: For me, I find filing by standard number easier. I don’t even have to look at the instructions if I know that the standard is completely revised. I can just turn to the standard and swap it. Of course, the standards have to be filed in some sort of order first.

Tony: Alloy Digest doesn’t need instructions. You just swap or add standards.

Angela: The problem I have is that some looseleafs use page numbers that are a number, a letter, then another number.

Eugene: Some aren't too bad. They use letters when they run out of numbers. They go A-B-C-D.
Tony: There was one where they had page number 24.00.13.35. You don’t know where to file it.

Eugene: If ultimately everyone would start using a standard page numbering system and tried to keep really close to that, it would make things a lot easier. They need a standard page number form and a standard deviating form when page number combinations run out in a certain area. And if they did that, and if it was a standard form, it would make things really easy to file. Now there is no standard and when they go off in this dash dot A B, it gets really confusing.

Matt: If they were to explain on the instructions what the page numbers mean. I know that on the Datapro stuff you don’t know what these complex numbers mean.

Richard: Something similar is on the Tax Management. They have the C&A page numbers that come before the A page numbers, but the instructions don’t tell you that.

Eugene: You were talking about Datapro. Their page numbers are complex but they make some sense. You file by the first set of numbers, then by the middle set, then by the third. But the middle set starts with 005 then 010 then 016 then 504MK.

Matt: You don’t understand if there is something missing. You don’t understand if something is supposed to be there. You don’t know how they classify this information.

Eugene: Right. If you really look into it. If you really start to read what’s on the page...in the articles they use. You realize that the letters they use describe either the company or the topic. But it doesn’t seem necessary. Why don’t they just stick to a
numerical filing order? I don't think it's necessary to put MM for Macintosh Microcomputer. There isn’t anything close. In one section it jumps from 60MM to 171VM. It isn’t necessary. It’s more confusing.

Richard: Is there anything you can think of that we missed?

Matt: It would be nice if companies sent out transfer binders more often. We could sure use more Alloy Digest binders. I think it should be the company’s responsibility to send out more binders as they fill up. We shouldn’t have to keep requesting new ones.

Richard: Or at least they could send out a survey or questionnaire every year or so to see how our binders are.

Eugene: And then we could tell BNA that we had to move some of the sections in the 1 star binder over to the 2 star binder.

Richard: Is there anything else?

Matt: Never, ever leave a looseleaf binder open where somebody can knock it off the table. It’ll take you hours to clean it up. I’ll vouch for that.

Richard: Well, I would like to thank everybody for coming and participating in this discussion.