

# RMS INSTA-POLL

## “How Big Is Your Collection?”

May—95 responding —85 males, 10 females  
75 RMS members—20 non-RMS members

Collection Size	Gender	Non-RMS Col. Size	Gender
1000000	1m		
400000	1m		
275000	1m		
250000	4m		
200000	2m		
150000	3m		
130000	1m		
125000	2m	125000	1m
110000	1m		
100000	6m		
85000	1m		
80000	1m		
75000	3m		
70000	1f		
60000	2m,1f		
55000	1m		
52000	1m		
50000	1 m		
40000	2m,1f		
39000	1m		
35000	3m		
30000	3m	30000	1m
25000	2m		
22500	1f		
20250	1f		
20000	1f	20000	1m
15000	2m,1f	15000	1f
		12000	2m
10000	3m	10000	2m
9000	1m		
8700	1m		
8500	1m		
8000	1f		
7000	1m	7000	1m
5000	3m		
4300	1m		
		3500	3m
3000	1m	3000	2m
2800	2m		
2500	3m		
2000	1m	2000	1m
		1300	1m
		1000	3m
		800	1m
500	1f		
350	2m		
245	1m		

[drum roll...] The average collection size was....  
**66,823 covers!**

At the top end, there were the 250,000+ collections, going all the up to 1,000,000, but more than balancing those out were the numbers of the new and very specialized collectors. [I should have included a question dealing with how many years the person has been collecting, now that I see the results]

I thought it was interesting that all the bigger collections were from males. The resulting generalization would be true, I think, but perhaps not as ironclad as the results seen here. I remember, for example, when I came into the hobby in the 1980s, and Evelyn Hovious, here in the San Francisco area, literally had millions of covers.

The larger collections were all from RMS members, and, as you can see here, the bulk of the non-RMS members reported substantially less than 30,000 covers. Not surprising, since I assume that *most* collectors who are going to be veterans and really serious collectors end up as RMS members, simply because that's the national organization, and the biggest, and the one with more to offer collectors. Many of the smaller collectors, on the other hand, tend to be local people who, for various reasons, either aren't interested or aren't able to pursue the hobby with as much time and vigor as other collectors...but there's certainly nothing wrong with the latter. We all tailor our collecting to meet our own particular personal needs and goals. And, of course, some of the smaller numbers were from collectors who simply haven't been collecting for any substantial time.

Also, the average here may well have increased since earlier polls, since many of the smaller collectors have disappeared from the hobby over the last decade or so.

Are these figures really indicative of the whole? I can't say for certain, but I would think they're at least in the ballpark...unless, for example, there's some sort of odd correlation between, say, large collections and collectors who have e-mail! Because, keep in mind with all these polls that I'm running...I'm only polling those collectors I can reach via e-mail.