

University of Michigan Law School

## University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository

---

UMLS Alumni Survey Class Reports

University of Michigan Law School Alumni  
Survey Project

---

### The Recent Alumni of the University of Michigan Law School: A Report on a Survey of the Classes of 1966 and 1967 Fifteen Years After Graduation and the Classes of 1976 and 1977 Five Years After Graduation

Terry K. Adams

*University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, tkadams@umich.edu*

David L. Chambers

*University of Michigan Law School, dcham@umich.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://repository.law.umich.edu/alumni\\_survey\\_reports](https://repository.law.umich.edu/alumni_survey_reports)



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#), and the [Legal Profession Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

University of Michigan Law School, "The Recent Alumni of the University of Michigan Law School: A Report on a Survey of the Classes of 1966 and 1967 Fifteen Years After Graduation and the Classes of 1976 and 1977 Five Years After Graduation" (1984).

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Michigan Law School Alumni Survey Project at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in UMLS Alumni Survey Class Reports by an authorized administrator of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [mLaw.repository@umich.edu](mailto:mLaw.repository@umich.edu).

The Recent Alumni of the University of Michigan Law School:  
A Report on a Survey of the Classes of 1966 and 1967  
Fifteen Years After Graduation  
and  
the Classes of 1976 and 1977  
Five Years After Graduation

by

Terry K. Adams  
David L. Chambers

Ann Arbor, Michigan  
June 1984

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION..... 2

II. WHO RETURNS THE QUESTIONNAIRE?..... 2

III. BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT CLASS MEMBERS AND THEIR PRE-LAW SCHOOL BACKGROUNDS..... 3

IV. THE LAW SCHOOL EXPERIENCE..... 9

    A. Personal Factors..... 9

    B. Career Plans..... 9

    C. Duration of Law School.....11

    D. Law School Financing and Employment.....11

    E. Evaluation of Law School.....14

    F. Opinions on the Law School Curriculum.....16

V. NOW: CURRENT PERSONAL SITUATION.....20

    A. Residence.....20

    B. Family Life.....22

    C. Civic Activities.....24

VI. CAREER PATTERNS.....25

    A. Job Changing.....25

    B. Current Job.....26

VII. OPINIONS ON POLITICAL AND LEGAL PROFESSIONAL ISSUES.....49

## I. INTRODUCTION

For many years, the University of Michigan Law School has conducted a survey of its graduates in their fifth and fifteenth years after graduation. The fifteen-year surveys began in 1966 with the class of 1951; the five-year survey began in 1973 with the class of 1968. The survey questionnaire has asked graduates about their law school experience and their opinions on how the University of Michigan Law School curriculum should be changed; the nature of their law practice or other occupation and how they feel about it; and their opinion on a variety of professional issues. For the classes of 1966, 1967, 1976, and 1977, whose responses are the subject of this report, the survey questionnaire was substantially revised and expanded compared to those used in previous surveys.

In addition to the information in the questionnaire, some data is collected for each member of each class from the law school's student files—dates of beginning law school and graduating, LSAT score, undergraduate and law school grade-point averages.

## II. WHC RETURNS THE QUESTIONNAIRE?

The law school's graduates have been extraordinarily cooperative in completing and returning the questionnaires sent them. The return rates have averaged over 75%, very high for this type of survey. A listing of the returns for each surveyed class is presented in Table 1. As can be seen, however, the return rates for the classes of 1966 and 1977 are the lowest ever in the series.

Table 1: Responses to Alumni Survey Questionnaires

	<u>Year</u>	<u>Number in Class*</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>% Responding</u>
15-year survey	1951	282	229	81
	1952	291	221	76
	1953	257	192	75
	1954	218	161	74
	1955	199	155	78
	1956	218	173	79
	1957	253	183	72
	1958	252	198	77
	1959	261	199	76
	1960	243	179	74
	1961	256	201	79
	1962	247	198	80
	1963	339	254	75
	1964	303	227	75
	1965	295	220	75
	1966	354	233	66
	1967	355	263	73

\*Excludes persons known to be deceased and those for whom the law school had no address. No mailing was made to such persons, who typically make up about 2.5% of 15-year classes and 1% of 5-year classes.

5-year survey	1968	327	279	85
	1969	352	296	84
	1970	242	207	86
	1971	359	305	85
	1972	414	326	79
	1973	453	354	78
	1974	332	250	75
	1975	369	284	77
	1976	360	277	76
	1977	383	261	68

Using data from the law school student files we attempted to determine what characteristics of a graduate might determine whether the questionnaire is returned, and to what extent this might impair our ability to generalize from the information provided by questionnaire respondents. From comparing the responders and nonresponders in the classes of 1966, 1967, 1976, and 1977, we found little basis for predicting the likelihood that a questionnaire would be returned. Return rates were not related to a statistically significant degree to gender, length of time since graduation, undergraduate grade-point average, LSAT score, month of graduation, undergraduate school or major, or graduate school attendance and degrees. There are slight relationships to ethnicity (blacks return questionnaires 50% of the time, whites 73%, others 27%); to the region where respondents now live (the highest return rates, over 75%, were from persons living in Cook County, Illinois, Wayne County, Michigan, the Southwest, Indiana, and New England; the lowest rates, under 65% were for persons living outside the U.S., in outstate Illinois, New York, and Oakland County, Michigan); and to law school grade-point average (those with the highest GPAs were more likely to return the questionnaire than those with the lowest but there is no consistent pattern in the middle). These few slight relationships tell us very little about the factors that influence return of the questionnaires, but correspondingly increase our confidence that respondents are not significantly different from nonrespondents.

It does appear that there is a connection between financial contribution to the Law School Fund and return of the questionnaire, with return rates much higher among those who have ever contributed to the fund. Perhaps both contribution and returning the questionnaire are made more likely by generally positive feelings toward law school, and the results following may thus be biased by under-representation of those who were dissatisfied with their legal education.

### III. BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT CLASS MEMBERS AND THEIR PRE-LAW SCHOOL BACKGROUNDS

Overall, 12% of our respondents were female, but there were significant differences between the 5- and 15- year classes:

Table 2: Gender of Respondents

<u>Class year</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>
1966	2%	98%
1967	3	97
1976	24	76
<u>1977</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>82</u>
All	12%	88%

Similarly, the proportion of blacks and other minorities among respondents increased significantly over the years involved:

Table 3: Ethnicity of Respondents

<u>Class year</u>	<u>Blacks</u>	<u>Other Minorities</u>	<u>Whites</u>
1966	0%	1%	99%
1967	0	1	99
1976	4(7)*	1	95(92)*
1977	7(10)*	1(2)*	92(88)*

\*Figures in parentheses represent the proportions among the entire class where these differ from the proportions among respondents.

Our respondent's parents' residences, which probably indicates where the respondents grew up, were disproportionately in Michigan and the other Great Lakes states. The respondents tended to grow up in communities that were either much smaller or much larger than are typical for the national population as a whole. But as to region and community size, there was no significant difference between the four classes.

Table 4: Region of Parents' Residence

<u>SE Michigan</u>	<u>Other Michigan</u>	<u>OH, IN, IL</u>	<u>WestNorth Central</u>	<u>New England</u>	
17%	26%	21%	8%	4%	
<u>New York</u>	<u>Other Mid Atlantic</u>	<u>South</u>	<u>Southwest</u>	<u>Pacific</u>	<u>Foreign</u>
7%	10%	3%	1%	4%	1%

Table 5: Size of Community in Which Respondents Grew Up

<u>Less than 25,000-</u> <u>25,000</u>	<u>100,000-</u> <u>200,000</u>	<u>100,000-</u> <u>200,000</u>	<u>200,000-</u> <u>500,000</u>	<u>500,000-</u> <u>1 million</u>	<u>1 million+</u>
31%	22%	8%	8%	7%	24%

The educational level and occupational status of our respondents' parents was substantially higher than the national average, very slightly (but not statistically significantly) higher for the 5-year than the 15-year classes.

Table 6: Parents' Educational Levels

	<u>Less than</u> <u>High School</u> <u>Completion</u>	<u>High School</u> <u>Completion</u>	<u>Some Technical</u> <u>Vocational School</u>	<u>Some</u> <u>College</u>	<u>Bachelors</u> <u>Degree</u>
Mother	7%	31%	5%	19%	27%
Father	10	16	4	14	25
	<u>Masters</u> <u>Degree</u>	<u>Ph.D.</u>	<u>Professional</u> <u>Degree</u>		
Mother	10%	1%	1%		
Father	10	3	18		

Table 7: Parents' Occupations

	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Other Pro-</u> <u>fessional</u>	<u>Full-time</u> <u>Homemaker</u>	<u>Blue or</u> <u>Pink Collar</u>	<u>Clerical</u>
Mother	0%	16%	59%	3%	12%
Father	11	22	0	9	6
	<u>Owner-Operator</u> <u>of Business</u>		<u>Manager in Business</u> <u>Government</u>		<u>Other</u>
Mother	5%		2%		2%
Father	23		21		2

Prior to entering law school, all respondents but one had received a bachelor's degree (the one finished the BA in his first year of law school). The majority had gone to public college but the largest subgroup had attended private colleges other than Ivy League or Seven Sister schools. A majority had undergraduate majors in the humanities and social sciences.

Table 8: Undergraduate School Type

<u>University of Michigan</u>	<u>Other Michigan Public Colleges</u>	<u>Other State Public Colleges</u>	<u>Ivy League/ Seven Sisters</u>	<u>Other Private Colleges</u>	<u>Military Academy</u>
26%	12%	17%	15%	29%	1%

Table 9: Undergraduate Major

<u>Humanities</u>	<u>Social Sciences</u>	<u>Natural Sciences</u>	<u>Business, Economics</u>	<u>Engineering</u>	<u>Other</u>
34%	31%	5%	24%	4%	2%

The majority of our respondents, especially in the classes of 1966 and 1967, went directly to law school from undergraduate schools. But a significant minority had an interval of one or more years during which they were employed and or attended some other graduate school. The persons most likely to take time between the BA and law school were military academy grads (who obviously had mandatory service requirements); those married and with children prior to starting law school; members of the classes of 1976 and 1977; those whose fathers were deceased or retired; those with the lowest undergraduate grade-point averages; and whites. As Table 10 reveals, the proportion of students who took at least one year after college before starting law school nearly doubled between 1966-67 and 1976-77 (from about 23 percent of students up to 43 percent of students.)

Table 10: Years Between Completing Bachelor's Degree and Starting Law School

<u>Class</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>2-5</u>	<u>6 or more</u>
1966	78%	8%	13%	1%
1967	76	10	11	3
1976	57	16	21	6
<u>1977</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>
All	67	13	16	4



Table 11: Post-Undergraduate, Pre-Law School Occupation

<u>Class</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Legal Assistant</u>	<u>Managerial/ Professional</u>	<u>Other White Collar</u>	<u>Full-Time Homemaker</u>	<u>Public Service</u>	<u>Other</u>
1966	84%	0%	1%	1%	0%	12%	2%
1967	81	0	1	4	1	8	5
1976	63	1	4	12	3	7	11
<u>1977</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>16</u>
All	74	1	2	6	2	7	9

Table 12: Pre-Law School Graduate School and Degrees

<u>Class</u>	<u>No Grad School</u>	<u>Some Grad School, No Degree</u>	<u>Masters</u>	<u>Doctorate</u>	<u>Other</u>
1966	93%	2%	4%	0%	1%
1967	92	3	4	0	1
1976	84	4	9	2	0
<u>1977</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
All	83	3	7	1	1

Given both grade inflation and intensified competition for places in law schools, we expected the 5-year classes to have significantly higher undergraduate grade-point averages and LSAT scores, and this was indeed the case.

Table 13: Undergraduate Grade-Point Average

<u>Class</u>	<u>0-2.85</u>	<u>2.86-3.30</u>	<u>3.31-3.65</u>	<u>3.66-4.50</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1966	48%	36%	12%	4%	2.8
1967	46	36	11	7	2.9
1976	6	18	40	36	3.4
1977	6	18	34	42	3.5
All	26	27	25	23	3.2

Table 14: LSAT Scores

<u>Class</u>	<u>0-585</u>	<u>586-650</u>	<u>651-700</u>	<u>701-800</u>
1966	50%	36%	11%	3%
1967	42	40	13	5
1976	9	16	37	37
<u>1977</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>42</u>
All	28	27	24	22

There were no significant differences among the four classes in marital status, cohabitation, or number of children at the time of entering law school—the overwhelming majority were never married and had no children at that time. The 5-year respondents were, however, slightly more likely to have been cohabiting with another person outside of marriage than were the 15-year respondents.

Table 15: Marital Status on Entering Law School

<u>Never Married</u>	<u>Married, First Time</u>	<u>Divorced</u>	<u>Remarried After Divorce</u>	<u>Widowed</u>
72%	27%	1%	0%	0%

Table 16: Number of Children on Entering Law School

<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Two</u>	<u>Three or More</u>
95%	4%	1%	0%

Table 17: Proportion Co-Habiting on Entering Law School

<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>
1%	1%	9%	6%

#### IV. THE LAW SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

##### A. Personal Factors

The great majority of our respondents--77%--retained the same marital status throughout law school as they had when they began, the figure being somewhat higher for the classes of 1976 and 1977 than those of 1966 and 1967. And those who changed marital status, 93% (about 20 percent of the whole class) went from being never married to their first marriage and nearly all the remaining 7% (about 2% of the whole class) went through a divorce or separation. Aside from changes in marital status, there was in all the class years a net increase during law school in the proportion of persons cohabiting with a lover outside of marriage.

Table 18: Marital Status on Leaving Law School

<u>Never Married</u>	<u>Married, First Time</u>	<u>Divorced</u>	<u>Remarried After Divorce</u>	<u>Widowed</u>	<u>Other</u>
50%	47%	3%	1%	0%	0%

Just as with marital status, the great majority of respondents had no additional children while in law school--92% had the same number when they left as when they entered, 8% had one additional child. Less than 1/2% had two additional children. Even if we restrict the analysis to that 48% of the respondents who had a status of "married" at some point in their law school careers, 85% had no change in the number of children, 15% added one child, and less than 1/2% added two or more.

##### B. Career Plans

Although a plurality (42%) of respondents remembered having the same broad career plans when they entered law school as when they left, there was substantial change. Of those who remembered having no specific career plans when they entered law school (44% of all respondents), 80% had such a plan in mind when they left, and 22% of respondents had changed from one specific career plan to another. Comparing the remembered career plans, the distributions are as follows:

Table 19: Remembered Career Plans at Entering and Leaving Law School

Plans	Proportion on Entering	Proportion on Leaving
None	44%	10%
Large Law Firm	13%	37%
Medium Law Firm	10%	18%
Small Law Firm	8%	10%
Solo Law Practice	2%	1%
House Counsel for Corporation	1%	4%
Politics, Government (Including Prosecution)	7%	7%
Legal Services, Public Defender, Public Interest	6%	6%
Teaching	1%	2%
Business	4%	4%
Other	3%	3%

As indicated in the table, the major net change was from those indicating "no plan" to those planning careers in large and medium law firms. But these net changes hide greater amounts of changed plans. In most categories, more than half of those who initially had a given career plan had altered it by the time they graduated. Of those who had a given plan on leaving, less than half had held it when they began. It appears that the greatest volatility was among those who came to law school with plans to become house counsel for corporations or teachers, and the greatest stability was among those who came to law school with plans to join large law firms.

There are only small differences between the 5- and 15-year respondents as to their career plans. On entering law school, members of the classes of 1966 and 1967 were somewhat more likely than those in the classes of 1976 and 1977 to have no career plans and somewhat less likely to plan to enter legal services for the poor or public interest practice. On leaving law school, the 1966 and 1967 classes were more likely to plan to enter small- and medium-sized firms and businesses and less likely to enter large firms and legal services/public interest practices. It seems likely that these differences in plans reflect more about changes over the 10-year period in the career options available than about changes in attitudes--law firms grew larger, and legal services for the poor and public interest law firms multiplied many times in number and size during this period.

### C. Duration of Law School

Most respondents (83%) in all four classes began law school in the fall term, the rest in the summer term. Among all the background characteristics noted above, only two—and these were closely related to each other—seemed associated with the term in which law school was begun—age, with older persons most likely to begin in the summer, and number of years since undergraduate school, with those out longest also more likely to start in the summer. Number of years since undergraduate school seemed to be the more powerful predictor among the two but still not very powerful. (About 5% of each graduating class consisted of students who had transferred from other law schools after the end of their first year, and are not included in the above computations; these persons were also somewhat longer out of undergraduate school than normal when they began at their first law school.)

The most significant predictor of a shorter than normal passage through law school was a summer start—summer starters were almost eight times as likely to finish in six or seven terms as fall starters. However, summer starters were also almost three times as likely to take nine or more terms. Perhaps the only generalization that can be drawn from this is that summer starters had a much more flexible timetable for completing their legal education than did fall starters. It seems likely that this need for flexibility was imposed by family pressures accelerated completion of law school was far more frequent among married students, especially those with children. It should be noted that other factors, such as the background characteristics discussed above, including actual age at law school entry, and the sources of financial support discussed below, did not have a significant effect on the time it took to graduate. Nor were any significant differences between the class years.

### D. Law School Financing and Employment

The predominant method of financing a law school education among the members of the classes of 1966, 1967, 1976, and 1977, was loans and gifts from family (including spouses). Table 20 summarizes the responses by indicating the proportions for which each most source contributed the most over all three years.

Table 20: Most Important Source of Financial Support Over All  
Three Years of Law School

Law-Related Employment	2%
Other Employment	16
UMLS Loans and Grants	14
Other Educational Loans and Grants	14
Commercial Loans	1
Family	52
Savings	8
Veterans Benefits	2
Other	<u>1</u>
	100%

Most people relied on more than one source of financial support during law school. The only source of support that increases significantly over students' three years of law school was, not surprisingly, income from law-related employment. By their third-year, 41 percent of students relied to some extent on income from law-related jobs. Fifty-three percent of law students relied on income from some sort of job, whether law-related or not, during at least one term of law school. Among those employed at any time, the average number of hours worked during the periods worked was about 15 hours per week.

There were substantial differences among individuals as to the extent they used various sources of support. Family financial support was more important among persons who were youngest when they entered law school (and had no graduate school or post-undergrad employment); whose fathers and mothers were professionals, managers, or business owners; and who had the lowest undergraduate grade-point averages and LSAT scores.

The second most important source of financial support, nonlaw-related employment, was more important to those in the classes of 1966 and 1967 compared to those of 1976 and 1977; those who were married or previously married when they began law school; those who attended UM or other Michigan undergraduate schools; those whose fathers and mothers were not professionals, managers or business owners; those who had served in the military prior to entering law school; and who were engineering majors.

Law school loans and grants were more important to blacks and other ethnic minorities; members of the classes of 1966 and 1967; those with the highest LSAT scores and undergraduate grade-point averages; whose parents were not professionals, managers, or business owners; who attended public colleges other than UM; and who were unmarried on entering law school.

Savings, not surprisingly, were more important to persons who were older and had some post-undergraduate employment (but no graduate school). Savings were also more important among those who attended UM and other Michigan undergraduate schools; and who had higher undergraduate grade-point averages but lower LSAT scores.

Most of the "law school grant" support noted above was received from the Law School Fund, which operates on a "moral obligation to repay" basis. The majority of members of all four classes had no obligations to the Fund when they completed law school, but the existence and number of such obligations was substantially lower for the 15-year than the 5-year classes--the proportions having such obligations were 26%, 29%, 38%, and 36% respectively for the classes of 1966, 1967, 1976, and 1977. The average obligation owed at graduation (in current dollars) was \$935, \$954, \$2659 and \$3344, and that in adjusted 1967 dollar was \$961, \$954, \$1560, and \$1843. These figures confirm therefore, that reliance on the Law School Fund grew over the period involved here, even after discounting for inflation.

Among the opinion items asked in the questionnaire was what graduates thought of as their most significant accomplishment during law school, and what in law school had contributed most to their abilities as a lawyer. The responses received did not vary substantially among class years, and are presented in Table 21.

Table 21: Law School: Most Significant Accomplishments and Greatest Contributions to Abilities as Lawyers

	<u>Most Significant Accomplishment</u>	<u>Greatest Contribution to Their Ability as a Lawyer</u>
Just Getting Through	15%	2%
Legal Research and Writing Skills	10	14
Doing Well in Practice Skills Courses	2	3
Doing Well in Substantive Law Courses	25	10
Learning to Think Like a Lawyer	31	56
Learning to Operate Under Pressure	4	4
Interaction With Faculty Outside Class	1	1
Interaction With Other Students	4	1
Clerking and Research Employment	3	5
Nothing	2	2
Other	2	1

It appears that the old saw about law school teaching people to "think like a lawyer" has some real meaning for most respondents, particularly in terms of what law school contributed to their abilities as lawyers.

The final law school grade-point averages of our respondents varied considerably by class year, with the later years having higher averages. It is, of course, not clear how much of this is due to better performance (as might be indicated by the increase in LSAT scores noted above) and how much to grade inflation.

Table 22: Law School Grade-Point Averages

<u>Class</u>	<u>2.75 or less</u>	<u>2.76-2.99</u>	<u>3.00-3.39</u>	<u>3.40-4.50</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1966	55%	17%	20%	8%	2.7
1967	39	21	28	12	2.8
1976	15	19	39	27	3.1
1977	17	14	39	30	3.1

When an analysis of law school GPA is performed, the most significant factors by far are LSAT scores and undergraduate GPA, with the expected positive correlation. In addition, high law school GPAs were more likely among those who remember having planned, on entering law school, to work for large firms or to teach (and not to work for small firms, to have a solo practice, or to be house counsel for a corporation); and among those who had no employment during law school. It should be noted that all these factors taken together can explain only about one-third of the variation in law school grade-point averages.

#### E. Evaluation of Law School

What did respondents think of their law school education? In addition to the opportunity to make the free-form comments, each respondent was asked to evaluate their experience of law school on a scale ranging from 1 to 7 (very favorable to very unfavorable); there were in addition separate ratings for intellectual stimulation, career training, and overall. Table 23 shows the distribution by class year:



Table 23: Satisfaction With Law School

<u>Class</u>	<u>Very Satisfied</u>				<u>Very Unsatisfied</u>			<u>Mean</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>A. Intellectually</b>								
1966	41%	33%	13%	6%	4%	2%	1%	2.1
1967	40	31	14	8	4	3	1	2.2
1976	19	32	24	13	7	3	2	2.8
1977	18	34	27	7	7	4	2	2.7
<b>B. As Career Training</b>								
1966	27	29	21	14	6	2	0	2.5
1967	22	29	28	13	5	1	1	2.5
1976	8	24	34	19	12	3	1	3.2
1977	7	25	29	22	10	5	2	3.3
<b>C. Overall</b>								
1966	34	37	15	7	3	2	1	2.1
1967	31	35	19	11	3	1	0	2.3
1976	12	28	25	19	9	5	2	3.1
1977	9	31	26	17	11	4	2	3.1

In all years, for all three measures, far more respondents were satisfied than dissatisfied. Satisfaction was substantially greater for the intellectual than the career-training aspects of law school. And there were many more persons 15-years out of law school than 5-years out who expressed high satisfaction with their legal education. Why this should be so we cannot be certain. Will the 5-year groups look back with greater satisfaction ten years from now? Or will they continue to have fewer members who have strongly positive recollections of law school? As we will see later, the 5-year graduates are also substantially less likely to express high satisfaction with their careers, their incomes, or the balance of their professional and family lives.

In addition to class year, other factors associated with higher levels of satisfaction on these three measures were higher overall career satisfaction (discussed below); higher law school grade-point averages; pre-law school plans to enter medium-sized law firms, to be house counsel for corporations, or to teach; living in the South, Southwest, and Hawaii; Black ethnicity; working as a lawyer in a setting other than a law firm; nonmanaging partner or associate status in a law firm; political conservatism; and no employment during law school. (Note that all these relationships are those that exist after adjusting for the effects of other variables, and do not include the nonrespondents, who may be especially dissatisfied.) There was no consistent relationship to these satisfaction measures of current income, substantive legal specialties, gender, marital status or number of children during law school, or age at law school entry.

Overall satisfaction with law school was somewhat more highly correlated with satisfaction with the intellectual than the career training aspects. Together, the two aspects explain almost 75% of the variation in the overall satisfaction measure.

#### F. Opinions on the Law School Curriculum

One of the primary functions of the Alumni Survey is to gather information for the law school faculty and administration on graduates' opinions regarding the curriculum. The questionnaire asks not only about the relative importance of broad categories of courses (see Table 23 above), but also which specific courses were most valuable, intellectually and for career purposes, and which course areas should be expanded, made mandatory, or reduced. The course areas are relatively broadly defined to include both lecture and seminar courses and to group together distinct course titles with similar subjects. For example, we asked respondents to treat constitutional law and a variety of civil liberties seminars as one area, and to consider "commercial law" as a single area including such course titles as Contracts, Commercial Transactions, Corporations and Partnerships, Corporate Taxation, and International Trade.

One set of questions asked respondents to indicate which course areas they found especially valuable in their later careers and which they found

especially stimulating intellectually. The first three course areas mentioned by each respondent were coded, although three-quarters mentioned only two areas and half only one. As Table 24 indicates, there is sometimes a large gap between the intellectual and career values of a course area. The difference is especially striking for the constitutional and corporate areas.

Table 24: Proportion of Respondents Mentioning a Course Area as Valuable to Career or as Intellectually Stimulating

<u>Area</u>	<u>Proportion Mentioning as Valuable to Career</u>	<u>Proportion Mentioning as Intellectually Stimulating</u>
None	27%	27%
Clinical Law*	6	1
Legal Writing	5	0
Trial Techniques	5	1
Antitrust	3	5
Civil Procedure, Evidence	15	12
Constitutional, Civil Rights	1	24
Corporate, Commercial and Taxation	40	2
Criminal	4	11
Estate Planning, Probate	17	12
International	1	6
Labor	4	5
Real Property	9	9
Torts, Personal Injury	7	4

\*Not available to classes of 1966 and 1967. Proportions shown are for classes of 1976 and 1977.

The responses in Table 25 are necessarily limited to those courses the respondents actually took while they were in law school. Perhaps broader information, including courses they now wish they had had available and taken, is contained in the recommendations on course changes. (Each respondent was limited to three responses each as to increasing, making mandatory, and decreased course areas.)

Table 25: Proportion of Respondents Recommending Changes in Various Course Areas (circles indicate most frequent responses)

	Proportion Recommending:		
	<u>Increase</u>	<u>Mandatory</u>	<u>Decrease</u>
Clinical Law	(28%)	(16%)	(4%)
Discovery	14	6	1
Interviewing and Counselling	15	11	2
Law Office Administration	10	2	3
Legal Research	12	13	0
Legal Writing	(25)	(25)	0
Negotiation	(31)	13	1
Trial Techniques	(27)	15	1
Administrative Law	3	2	1
Antitrust	1	1	1
Banking	10	1	1
Bankruptcy, Debtor-Creditor	3	3	1
Civil Procedure, Evidence	7	7	1
Constitutional, Civil Liberties	4	2	3
Commercial	10	6	2
Communications	3	1	1
Criminal	1	2	3
Domestic Relations	2	2	1
Education	1	0	3

Table 25 (continued)

	Proportion Recommending:		
	Increase	Mandatory	Decrease
Employee Benefits	7	1	1
Energy	6	0	1
Environmental	3	1	2
Estate Planning, Probate, Personal Tax	4	4	2
Government Contracts, Municipal	2	0	1
Government Income Maintenance	1	0	2
Insurance	4	1	1
International	1	0	3
Jurisprudence, Legal History	5	3	⑤
Labor	2	0	0
Landlord Tenant	2	0	1
Patent, Trademark, Copyright	3	0	1
Professional Responsibility	6	⑮	1
Real Property	4	1	1
Securities	4	1	1
Torts, Personal Injury	1	0	0

The most obvious conclusion to be drawn from Table 25 is that graduates think there should be much more emphasis placed on "skills" courses, particularly negotiation, clinical law, and trial practice. The only "substantive" course areas that generate even 10% support for increases are commercial and banking law. Nonetheless, there is far less than majority support for increasing even negotiation courses as a top priority.

It is also obvious that there is far more support for adding courses, even for making courses mandatory, than there is for reducing course offerings; this is true overall and for nearly all course areas.

Are these curriculum recommendations based on an assessment of the overall needs of the legal profession, or are they responses that indicate "I personally do a lot of X, therefore the law school should provide more training in X"? Multivariate analysis of factors associated with each of the major recommendations suggests that respondents are mainly taking a broad view. Although it was often true that respondents who spent especially high proportions of their time on a particular skill or substantive area were more likely than others to recommend increases in courses in that area, these were seldom important predictors of the recommendation. Thus, it seems that the curriculum recommendations reflect an assessment of the inadequacies of training for the profession as a whole.

## V. NOW: CURRENT PERSONAL SITUATION

### A. Residence

A large proportion of the members of the classes of 1966, 1967, 1976, and 1977 have moved away from the communities and even the geographic regions where they grew up. Only 27% of respondents indicated they still live in the same communities where they grew up; leaving one's home community is less likely the larger that home community is in population—only 11% of those who grew up in a community of less than 25,000 people live there, now, as opposed to 48% of those who grew up in a community of over one million.

A majority of class members had moved out of the region (using the Law School Fund definitions of region listed in Table 26 below) in which we assume they grew up, the region in which their parents lived when they applied to law school. Only 45% still live in their home region, with the 5-year classes slightly less likely to live in their home region (43%) than the 15-year classes (48%). There is some migration into and out of every region, but the general trend seems similar to that in the national population as a whole—away from the Great Lakes and Northeast, toward the West and Southwest. The deviations from the general trend are due to increases for the Washington, DC and New York City areas, and only a slight increase in the South.

Table 26: Geographic Distribution

<u>Region</u>	<u>Pre-Law School</u>	<u>Time of Survey</u>	<u>Net Change</u>
New England States	4%	3%	-1%
New York State	6	7	+1
Other Mid-Atlantic States (Including D.C.)	9	13	+4
Southern States	3	3	0
Michigan Total	43	32	-11
Wayne County	[11]	[10]	[-1]
Oakland County	[6]	[5]	[-1]
Other Eastern Counties	[10]	[7]	[-3]
Rest of State	[16]	[10]	[-6]
Ohio	9	6	-3
Indiana	4	2	-2
Illinois Total	9	10	+1
Cook County	[2]	[9]	[+7]
Rest of State	[7]	[1]	[-6]

Table 26 (continued)

	Pre-Law School	Time of Survey	Net Change
Other North-Central States	8	7	-1
Northwest States	2	6	+4
California	2	9	+7
Southwest States	1	3	+2
Hawaii	0	1	+1
Foreign	1	0	-1

Another way of looking at migration patterns is to ask what proportion of people who now live in a region grew up there. The overall average for these classes was 45%, with the highest proportions being in Indiana (89%), western & northern Michigan (72%), and outstate Illinois (70%). Few non-natives now live in these areas. In contrast, few of the persons who now live in California or the Southwest (13%) or Hawaii and Cook County, Illinois (14%) grew up there.

The obverse of the above is to ask what proportion of people who grew up in a region returned there. In these classes, compared to an overall return rate of 45%, the highest return rates were to Cook County, Illinois (75%), the Northwest (61%), and California (60%), and the lowest were to outstate Illinois (10%), New England (32%), and Indiana (38%).

It should be noted that regional boundaries are necessarily arbitrary, and that some small amount of the above change could represent rather short moves, e.g., from Newark, New Jersey (part of the Mid-Atlantic region) to New York City (part of the New York State region). The great majority of moves, however (excepting those within Michigan and within Illinois) appear to be much more substantial than "just across the border".

Respondents now typically live and work in communities substantially larger than those in which they grew up. To some extent this is due simply to population growth in the country as a whole. However, it is primarily due to a real shift from smaller to larger communities.

Table 27: Size of Communities

<u>Size</u>	<u>Grew Up</u>	<u>Now Live</u>	<u>Now Work</u>
Less than 25,000	31%	14%	6%
25,000-100,000	22	23	13
100,000-200,000	8	11	9
200,000-500,000	8	9	11
500,000-1,000,000	7	10	15
Over 1,000,000	25	32	47

Three quarters of respondents consider themselves to be living in the same community in which they work, and virtually all the rest live in smaller suburbs of the community in which they work.

### B. Family Life

A majority of respondents in the classes of 1966, 1967, 1976, and 1977, were married for the first time when they completed the survey questionnaire. Of the 15-year graduates, only a small number have never married. Around a fifth of the fifteen-year graduates have been divorced, though most of those divorcing have since remarried. A much higher proportion of the 5-year graduates have never married (24% of the class of '76 and 31% of the class of '77), but, of those who have married, the divorce rate has also been substantial.

Table 28: Current Marital Status

<u>Status</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>
Never Married	6%	7%	24%	31%
Married, First Time	72	72	61	60
Divorced, Now Single	8	7	8	6
Remarried After Divorce	13	13	7	3
Other	1	0	1	0

In all classes, the largest group of respondents (56%) had the same marital status as when they left law school, and in all the biggest change in status (29%) was going from never married to a first marriage. Table 29 gives a more detailed breakdown by class year.

Table 29: Changes in Marital Status Since Law School

<u>Change in Status</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>
None	43%	49%	63%	65%
Never Married to First Marriage	36	31	24	25
Never Married to Divorced	2	2	2	1
Never Married to Remarried After Divorce	4	3	0	0
First Marriage to Divorced	5	5	4	4
First Marriage to Remarried After Divorce	8	8	2	2
Divorced to Remarried After Divorce	1	1	4	1
Other	1	1	1	2



None of these patterns of change vary significantly between men and women graduates.

Distinct from the question of marital status was whether a respondent was cohabiting with someone outside of marriage. About 7% of respondents indicated they were currently cohabiting. The likelihood of cohabiting was significantly greater among 1976 and 1977 graduates (10%) than 1966 and 1977 graduates (3%), but this seems in large part due to the differences in marital status—about 20% of persons not currently married (never married, divorced, widowed) are cohabiting, while only 2% of persons currently married (first time or remarried) are cohabiting. Within any given marital status, however, 1976-1977 graduates are about twice as likely as 1966-1967 graduates to be cohabiting outside of marriage.

As would be expected due to their greater age and likelihood of being married, members of the 15-year classes have more minor children than members of the five-year classes.

Table 30: Number of Children

<u>Class Year</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4 or more</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1966	12%	12%	49%	20%	6%	1.99
1967	16	12	45	18	8	1.92
1976	51	31	13	4	0	0.73
1977	59	23	14	3	0	0.63

Only 37% of respondents had the same number of children (including none) they had when they graduated, the additional children having been born or adopted since law school; as expected, the 15-year class members were more likely to have had additional children since law school (84%) than the 5-year class members (41%). Persons remarried after divorce had more children (a mean of 1.79) than persons married for the first time (1.56), divorced persons (0.84), or never married persons (0.02).

The questionnaire asked respondents to indicate, on a 7-point scale, their degree of satisfaction with their family lives. Table 31 presents the results by class year.

Table 31: Satisfaction With Family Life

<u>Class</u>	<u>Very Satisfied</u>					<u>Very Un-satisfied</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
1966	51%	29%	8%	5%	4%	2%	0%	1.89
	80%		17%			2%		
1967	52	29	9	4	3	1	1	1.84
	81%		16%			2%		
1976	37	34	14	6	4	3	2	2.24
	71%		24%			5%		
1977	44	28	13	7	5	2	1	2.13
	72%		25%			3%		

In every class, at least 70% of respondents indicate that they regard their family life as quite satisfactory (responses 1-2), and in no class did more than 5% regard their family life as quite unsatisfactory (responses 6-7). There is thus not much variation in reported levels of satisfaction which might be associated with other factors, and in fact the factors with the highest degree of association explain less than 20% of the variance in levels of satisfaction. By far the most important factor seems to be marital status, with first-time married persons reporting the highest levels of satisfaction, then remarried persons, then never-married persons, with divorced persons showing the lowest levels (but still on average on the "satisfied" side of the scale). Among unmarried persons, those who are cohabiting are more satisfied than those who are not. Status on the job was the third factor of some import, with law firm managing partners and non-firm managers having the highest level of family satisfaction, and law firm associates and non-firm non-supervisory employees having the lowest levels. After these three factors are taken into account, we found no significant association of family satisfaction with class year, income, gender, ethnicity, or number of children. (There were strong correlations with the career satisfaction measures discussed below, but as is noted in that discussion, it is difficult to be certain of the fact or direction of causality.)

### C. Civic Activities

A final area of nonprofessional life about which the questionnaire asked was civic activities in which the respondents currently participated. For the four classes combined the proportions of respondents indicating such participation are reported in Table 32.

Table 32: Participation In Civic Activities

Electoral Politics	22%
Non-Electoral Public Policy Issue Politics	18
PTA, PTO, Other School Organization	12
College Alumni Association	19
Law School Alumni Association	9
Charitable Organizations	40
Religious Organizations, Churches	31
Other	12

The statistical association of participation in these civic activities with other personal characteristics are quite small. The persons most likely to participate in electoral politics were those who identified themselves as the strong supporters of the two major political parties, Democrats slightly more than Republicans; those who planned on leaving law school to establish a solo practice; and those who are not currently practicing law.

Nonelectoral political participation was higher among political liberals, 1980 Carter supporters, and persons who have never been married. Not surprisingly, PTA/PTO participation was highest among those with the largest number of children and those who have been married. College alumni participation was highest among graduates of Ivy League/Seven Sisters and other private schools, and persons who planned when they left law school to establish solo practices or go into business or teaching. Law school alumni activity participation was highest among those whose career plans on leaving law school included solo practice, teaching, or business; those who were most satisfied with their law school education; those who had never married when they entered law school; whites; those with the lowest law school grade-point averages; and those who work for law firms.

Working for charitable organizations was most frequent among those who were partners in a law firm or solo practitioners; those who had the highest incomes in 1982; and those most satisfied with the prestige aspects of their careers. Religious activities were most common among those with the largest number of children; those who went to private undergraduate schools; those who live in the South; those who voted for Carter or Anderson in 1980; and those who were least satisfied with the intellectual aspects of law school.

## VI. CAREER PATTERNS

### A. Job Changing

Following their graduation from law school, most respondents in the classes of 1966, 1967, 1976, and 1977 took a job. Most have changed jobs at least once since graduating.

Table 33: Number of Jobs Since Law School

<u>Type of Job</u>	<u>Class</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4+</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Work as a Lawyer	1966	1%	30%	27%	25%	18%	2.38
	1967	5	26	28	24	17	2.31
	1976	1	46	35	14	4	1.78
	1977	2	44	42	10	3	1.69
Work as Other Than Lawyer	1966	75	11	7	2	0	0.39
	1967	71	18	6	3	2	0.48
	1976	89	8	2	0	0	0.14
	1977	92	6	2	0	0	0.13
All	1966	1	23	23	30	22	2.67
	1967	2	23	25	26	25	2.69
	1976	0	42	34	19	6	1.92
	1977	1	33	31	21	14	1.79

Of course, 15-year graduates have had more opportunity to change jobs than 5-year graduates. Perhaps a better measure of job mobility is the ratio of jobs to years since graduation. From the pattern of responses of the earlier and more recent classes, it appears that most job changing occurs in the early years of practice. Roughly two-thirds of the 15-year graduates have been in their current job at least seven years.

About one-third of the respondents in each class have engaged in a non-private form of practice at some point in their career, and one-fifth of the 5-year classes have spent the majority of their careers in such non-private practice. For those who have spent some time since law school working in neither private nor nonprivate practice, the most common activity has been a period of military service. It appears that most of those who spent time in activities other than law practice were in military service.

#### B. Current Job

The overwhelming majority of each of the four classes are currently lawyers, in the sense of practicing law in a public or private setting. Table 34 gives the overall distribution.

Table 34 : Current Occupation

	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>
Lawyer	86%	77%	88%	90%
Judge	2	5	0	0
Legislator	0	0.4*	0	0
Government Executive	1	1	1	0
Business Owner-Operator	2	2	1	1
Business Top Manager	4	6	0	0
Supervisory Employee of Business	0	0	1	0
Non-supervisory Employee of Business	0	1	0	0
Teacher	2	3	4	1
Educational Administrator	0	1	0	0
Other	3	2	4	7

\*One member of the class of 1967 is a state legislator.

Of the 16 judges, 5 are administrative law judges (2 federal, 3 state), and 11 are trial judges (1 federal, 6 state, 4 local); none are appellate judges. Of the 9 state and local trial judges for which we have information, 6 initially took office by appointment (5 of those were later elected as incumbents) and 3 were initially elected.

The one legislator is a state legislator. Of the 10 government executives, 6 are in the federal government, 4 in state governments, none in local governments. None of the executives were elected to their offices—7 were appointed, 3 were civil servants. The average government executive works in an office with over 50 employees, and supervises almost 30 of them.

The 28 educators include one law school administrator, 20 law school teachers, and 7 college teachers. Five percent of the respondents work as nonlawyers in business. Most of this group (41 of 48 persons) are owner-operators and top managers. Their businesses average over 60 employees.

What factors are the best predictors of who is currently working as a lawyer? (For this purpose, we do not count judges as lawyers.) The persons least likely to currently be working as lawyers were those who planned when they left law school to enter business, teaching, legal services and public interest law, or to be house counsel for corporations; those who have spent the smallest proportions of the time since law school in their current jobs; those who live in New England, the Great Plains, and Ohio and Indiana; those who worked the greatest number of hours in law school on nonlegal jobs; those who earned the least in their first year after law school; and women. Of members of the classes of 76 and 77, 19% of women but only 9% of men are not working as lawyers. Among all the groupings we recorded, however, only one—those who planned a business career when they left law school—had fewer than 50% currently functioning as lawyers.

Among those who are currently working as lawyers, most work for law firms.

Table 35: Work Setting of Class Members Working as Lawyers Compared with United States as a Whole

	1966	1967	1976	1977	All Lawyers in U.S.-1980*
Law Firm (or solo practice)	81%	79%	72%	73%	70%
Business Enterprise	10	11	10	12	9
Financial Institution	1	1	1	1	1
Labor Union	0	0	0	0	1
Legal Services, Public Interest Public Defender	0	1	3	3	3
Government	7	7	12	9	9
Federal	4	3	6	5	
State	1	2	3	2	
County	1	2	1	1	
Municipal	1	0	2	1	
Other	2	2	1	0	7

\*From B. Curran, The Legal Profession in the 1980's, American Bar Foundation (draft April, 1984).

Among lawyers, a work setting other than a law firm was most common among those lawyers who planned when they left law school to make a career as house counsel for a corporation, in legal services, public interest organizations, in politics, or had no plans; those who found no law school course of particular intellectual interest; those who have spent the smallest portion of their careers in their current jobs; and blacks.

The status of respondents working as lawyers within the setting of their legal jobs varied primarily by length of time since graduation, as might be expected given longevity requirements for promotion.

Table 36: Status Within Work Setting of Class Members Working as Lawyers

<u>Work Setting</u> <u>Status</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>
<b>Law Firm</b>				
Solo Practitioner	18%	14%	7%	6%
Managing/Senior Partner*	39	29	6	5
Non-Managing/Junior Partner*	40	52	24	15
	} 79%	} 81%	} 30%	} 20%
Associate	2	6	62	72
Other	1	0	0	2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<b>Business and Financial Organizations</b>				
Manager	57%	67%	22%	35%
Non-Managing Employee	<u>43</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>65</u>
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<b>Legal Services and Public Interest Organizations</b>				
Manager	N/A	0%	50%	43%
Non-Managing Employee	N/A	100	50	57
<b>Government</b>				
Manager-Supervisor	54%	58%	18%	20%
Non-Managing Employee	46	42	82	80

\* On the questionnaire, we provided separate boxes for "managing" and "nonmanaging" partners. We now believe that there is an ambiguity in those terms. Some respondents may have read "managing" partner to include all those partners with full voting rights within the partnership while others read the term to include only those voting partners who have substantial administrative responsibilities within the firm.

How large are the law firms and other offices in which lawyer respondents work? The questionnaire asked about the number of other attorneys in the office, and the number of legal assistants and nonlegal personnel. Table 39 reports the distributions. Note that because a few people worked in very large offices (47 out of 1034 respondents worked in offices with 200 or more other lawyers), the mean figures are greatly distorted. The median figures, which indicate what office size was "in the middle" (equal numbers above and below), are better measures of central tendency in this case.

As is apparent from the table, substantially more of the 5-year graduates than the 15-year graduates work in offices with more than 50 lawyers. On the other hand, the wide-spread belief that most of our recent graduates are working in very large firms is unfounded. Half the 5-year graduates work in offices with 25 or fewer other lawyers and over half the 15-year graduates work in offices with 10 or fewer other lawyers. On the other hand, it is true that our graduates are much more likely to be practicing in large offices than are the nation's lawyers as a whole. According to a recent national study by the American Bar Foundation, only 20 percent of lawyers in private practice practice in firms with 11 or more other lawyers, whereas 37% of our 15-year graduates and 60% of our 5-year graduates in practice work in such settings.

Table 37: Number of Other Persons in Lawyer's Offices

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Class Year</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1-5</u>	<u>6-10</u>	<u>11-50</u>	<u>51+</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>
<b>Other Attorneys</b>								
	1966	7%	31%	25%	17%	20%	52	8
	1967	8	27	18	21	26	81	14
	1976	5	23	12	27	34	65	25
	1977	4	16	22	23	35	75	25
<b>Legal Assistants</b>								
	1966	23%	53%	16%	8%	0%	5	2
	1967	17	47	20	14	3	9	2
	1976	18	36	30	15	1	10	5
	1977	13	43	25	17	2	11	5
<b>Non-Legal</b>								
	1966	1%	39%	25%	18%	17%	63	8
	1967	1	31	22	22	25	102	14
	1976	1	23	18	28	30	72	25
	1977	1	22	22	24	32	94	20

It appears that in most offices, legal assistants are still few, and that there are slightly more nonlawyers than lawyers in a typical office.

The best predictors of working for a large legal organization (those with the greatest number of other attorneys) are, other things being equal: career counsel for a corporation; living in New York, other mid-Atlantic states (including DC), Cook County, Illinois, or California; a high law school grade-point average; working nearly all of a career in one's current job; and working in government or a law firm. Once these factors are taken into account, the effect of time since graduation (graduation year) disappears.

Our respondents, particularly those in the fifteen year classes, are responsible for supervision of both other attorneys and nonlegal personnel, but very few persons supervise more than 10 other attorneys, indicating that, even in large organizations, most offices are comprised of quite small units.

Our typical lawyer respondent worked 2179 hours per year (both billable and nonbillable time, but not counting bar activities), the equivalent of a little less than 42 hours per week over 52 weeks. There were no significant differences between class years after controlling for other factors.

Table 38: Hours Worked Per Year

<u>1-1500</u>	<u>1501-1999</u>	<u>2000-2100</u>	<u>2101-2400</u>	<u>2400+</u>	<u>Mean</u>
4%	16%	31%	25%	25%	2179

Very little of the variance in the annual hours of work can be explained by the other factors known to us. Blacks and other minorities average slightly more hours than whites; men slightly more than women; and those who supervise some attorneys, legal assistants, or nonlegal personnel work somewhat more hours than those with no supervisory responsibilities. But there are no significant differences based on work setting, job status, time in law practice, or number of attorneys or others in the office.

The questionnaire asked those working as lawyers for a percentage distribution of the activities on which this time is spent. Table 39 reports that distribution for all four classes combined.



Table 39: Proportion of Time Spent by Individual Respondents on Various Activities

<u>Activity</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1-5%</u>	<u>6-10%</u>	<u>11-20%</u>	<u>21-100%</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Library Research	13%	41%	27%	13%	5%	.08
Client Interviewing	33	32	23	11	1	.06
Client Counselling	15	20	21	24	22	.15
Drafting Legal Documents Other Than Pleadings	13	17	16	22	32	.19
Drafting Pleadings	42	27	19	10	2	.05
Negotiation	21	28	27	19	5	.09
Discovery	50	21	13	10	7	.06
Factual Investigation and Witness Preparation Other Than Discovery	52	24	15	7	2	.04
Motion Practice	55	26	15	4	1	.03
Trial	49	26	15	6	3	.05
Appeals	65	26	6	2	1	.02
Office Administration	29	42	17	8	3	.06
Formal Legal Education	61	36	2	0	0	.01
Informal Legal Education, Reading to Keep Current	17	62	17	4	0	.05
Socializing With Clients	62	34	4	0	0	.01
Socializing With Co-Workers	53	41	5	0	0	.02
Other	82	7	5	3	3	.03

Practice activities seem widely varied, with large proportions of respondents spending none of their time on any one of the listed activities and only a small percentage spending more than 10% on any particular activity (drafting documents other than pleadings, and client counseling, are the most frequent activities). These averages are based on our respondents' rough estimates, usually rounded to the nearest 5% increment. One consequence of this rounding is the consistent underestimation of minor uses of time such as socializing with coworkers (note that over half respondents implicitly claimed to spend zero time socializing with coworkers, even though 1% is equivalent to only about 5 minutes per day).

Once it is seen how our graduates spend their days, the comparative dissatisfaction that many express with their legal education as preparation for practice becomes more understandable. Fewer of our graduates spend substantial amounts of time on library research or handling appeals, for which they may believe their legal education especially suits them, than spend their time on client interviewing and counselling (taken together) or negotiating, for which they may have found law school offering little training. What these lawyers actually spend their time doing also helps explain why skills related courses constituted such a high proportion of their recommendations for courses that should be increased or made mandatory.

Respondents were also asked to rate the most satisfying and least satisfying of the professional activities in which they do engage, and Table 40 gives the activities mentioned by at least 4% of respondents.

Table 40 : Respondent Reports of Most and Least Satisfying Activities

	<u>Proportion Listing Activity</u>
<b>A. Most Satisfying Activity</b>	
Client Counselling	36%
Trial	17
Drafting Documents Other Than Pleadings	13
Negotiation	12
Appeals	4
<b>B. Least Satisfying Activity</b>	
Office Administration	35%
Library Research	16
Discovery	9
Drafting Pleadings	8
Drafting Documents Other Than Pleadings	6

Analysis of which factors are correlated with expenditures of time on various activities indicates that, for most activities, mentioning an activity as the "most satisfying" activity is associated with an increased expenditure of time on it. In part, this is due to the fact that few people will mention as most satisfying an activity in which they do not engage at all. But mainly, this seems to result from a real association, suggesting either that respondents have been able to choose activities they enjoy or that they come to enjoy those activities to which they are assigned.

Also of great importance were the substantive specialties of our respondents, discussed in greater detail below. Table 41 presents the differences in activity time uses by the major substantive specialties. After other factors are taken into account, it appears that, compared to the average lawyer in these classes, specialists in administrative and commercial and corporate law spend more time at informal education such as reading on their own; specialists in banking, real property, and securities law spend more time drafting legal documents other than pleadings; antitrust specialists spend more time at discovery and other factual preparation; civil rights specialists spend more time at motion practice; criminal law specialists spend more time in trial and appeals; domestic relations specialists more time in client interviewing; employee benefits specialists more time at library research and informal education; estate planning and tax law specialists more time at office administration, informal education, and socializing with clients, and less at negotiation and trial; and torts and personal injury specialists more time in discovery, fact preparation, and motion practice documents other than pleadings.

Work setting was also importantly related to the time spent on various activities. Other things being equal, persons working in a law firm setting spent more time than those in other settings on discovery and appeals but less on library research and informal education. Persons working for nonfinancial businesses spent more time on client counseling, drafting legal documents other than pleadings, negotiating, and informal legal education; those working in financial institutions spent more time in interviewing and counseling clients, drafting legal documents other than pleadings, and negotiating. Government attorneys spent more time at drafting pleadings, fact preparation, motion practice, trial, and office administration. And legal services and public interest lawyers spent more time interviewing clients, drafting pleadings, appeals, office administration, and socializing with clients.

Status on the job was also an important factor. Solo practitioners spent more time than average on drafting pleadings but otherwise were quite similar to the other lawyers. Partners in law firms and manager-supervisors in other settings, spent more than average time on counseling clients, negotiation, and office administration. Associates in firms and nonsupervisors in other settings tended to spend more time at library research, drafting pleadings and other documents, discovery, and appeals.

After taking into account the above differences by activity preferences, substantive specialties, work setting, and job status, it was still the case that time since graduation made a difference as to a few activities—15-year grads spent more time on negotiation, trial, and socializing with clients, and 5-year grads more in library research and socializing with coworkers. Those working in

the largest offices (measured by number of attorneys) spent more time interviewing and counseling clients and socializing with coworkers, while those with the greatest proportion of individual (as opposed to organizational) clients spent greater amounts of time at interviewing, drafting pleadings and trial.

Table 41: Mean Percentage of Time Spent In Activity <sup>1/</sup>

"Specialists" (25%+ of Time Spent) in:	Library	Inter- viewing	Coun- selling	Draft- ing Non Pleadings	Draft- ing Pleadings	Negoti- ation	Disc- overy	Fact Prepa- ration
Administrative	10 %	5%	16%	14 %	6%	7 %	3%	5%
Antitrust	11	3	11	15	7	*5	*14	*11
Banking	7	5	17	*30	*4	11	3	*1
Bankruptcy	8	6	14	17	7	11	4	5
Civil Rights	9	5	9	11	*11	6	11	*8
Commercial, Corporate	9	5	*18	*24	*4	10	*4	*3
Criminal	8	7	*6	*7	4	6	3	5
Domestic Rela- tions	6	*12	14	*7	4	10	5	4
Employee Benefits	*13	6	21	26	4	6	2	2
Energy	7	5	15	21	5	12	4	3
Estate & Tax	9	*8	17	*26	4	*6	*1	*2
Insurance	7	3	7	*9	8	9	*15	6
Labor	10	5	16	*10	6	12	5	7
Real Property	7	6	17	*30	4	*12	*2	*1
Securities	6	4	*21	*30	*2	11	4	2
Torts/Person- al Injury	8	6	*7	*6	*7	8	*17	*7
All Respon- dents	8	6	15	19	5	9	6	4

1/ For all specialties on which at least 3% of class members spent 25% or more of their time.

\*Statistically significantly different from mean proportion of time spent by nonspecialists, i.e., difference would occur at random only one time in 100 or less. This computation is based not only on differences of means, but also on numbers of cases and the tightness of distributions around means.

T  
A  
B  
L  
E  
  
C  
O  
N  
T  
I  
N  
U  
E  
S  
  
O  
N  
N  
E  
X  
T  
  
P  
A  
G  
E

Table 41 (continued)

"Specialists" (25%+ of Time Spent) in:	Motion Pract- ice	Trial	Appeals	Office Admini- stration	Formal Educa- tion	In- formal Educa- tion	Social- izing With Clients	Socializi- With Co- Workers
Administrative	2%	5%	4%	7%	1%	*7%	2%	*3%
Antitrust	4	4	3	4	0	4	1	2
Banking	2	2	1	5	1	5	2	2
Bankruptcy	5	5	2	6	2	4	1	1
Civil Rights	*7	6	5	4	1	3	1	2
Commercial, Corporate	*3	*2	*1	6	1	*5	1	2
Criminal	6	*21	*10	7	1	5	1	2
Domestic Rela- tions	5	*9	2	*10	2	3	1	2
Employee Benefits	1	1	1	5	1	*7	1	1
Energy	2	3	2	6	1	6	2	1
Estate & Tax	*1	*2	1	9	*2	6	*2	2
Insurance	5	6	*7	9	1	3	3	1
Labor	3	7	3	4	1	4	1	2
Real Property	*2	*2	1	6	1	4	1	2
Securities	2	2	0	5	1	4	2	2
Torts/Person- al Injury	*7	*10	*4	4	1	*3	1	2
All Respon- dents	3	5	2	6	1	5	1	2

The substantive legal areas in which class members worked were quite diverse. There were 23 speciality areas on which at least one percent of respondents spend 25 percent or more of their time. Of these 23, in only three--corporate, personal injury, and real estate--did 10 percent or more of respondents spend 25 percent or more of their time. Almost exactly half of lawyer respondents spent over half their time on one substantive area.

Table 42 : Time Spent on Substantive Areas

<u>Area</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1-5%</u>	<u>6-15%</u>	<u>16-50%</u>	<u>51-100%</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>&gt;25%</u>
Administrative	71%	11%	9%	6%	3%	6	7
Antitrust	83	7	4	4	2	3	4
Banking	74	10	8	7	2	5	6
Bankruptcy, Debtor-Creditor	71	15	8	5	1	4	5
Civil Rights, Civil Liberties	85	6	4	4	1	3	3
Commercial, Corporate	36	7	14	33	11	21	36
Communications	95	2	1	1	1	1	1
Criminal	86	5	3	3	3	4	4
Domestic Relations	79	9	5	6	1	4	5
Education	96	2	1	1	0	1	1
Employee Benefits	83	8	4	3	1	3	3
Energy	92	4	1	2	1	2	3
Environmental	92	4	2	2	1	2	2
Estate Planning and Tax	71	11	7	8	3	6	8

Table 42 (continued)

	<u>None</u>	<u>1-5%</u>	<u>6-15%</u>	<u>16-50%</u>	<u>51-100%</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>&gt;25%</u>
Government Con- tracts, Muni- cipal	92	3	3	2	0	1	1
Government Income Maintenance	97	1	1	0	0	0	1
Insurance	84	7	6	3	1	2	3
International (Public)	97	1	1	0	0	0	0
Labor	89	3	2	3	3	3	5
Landlord, Tenant	84	12	3	1	0	1	1
Patent, Trade- mark, Copyright	90	6	1	1	2	2	2
Professional Re- sponsibility, Ethics	96	3	1	0	0	0	0
Real Property	62	12	11	11	4	8	11
Securities	78	7	6	7	2	4	6
Torts; Personal Injury	67	8	6	11	7	10	15
Other	85	2	4	5	4	5	8

Given a definition of a "specialty" as an area in which a lawyer spends 25% or more of her or his time, the average respondent had 1.4 specialties:

Table 43: Number of Specialties

<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Two</u>	<u>Three</u>	<u>Four</u>
5%	58%	33%	3%	0%

Only 5 percent of the respondents were generalists in the old-fashioned sense of having no area of law in which they spend a large portion of their time. The typical respondent had one or two areas in which she or he specialized (one of which was usually corporate law) but the majority of time is spent on a miscellany of areas. None of the factors in the survey seemed to be associated with the number of specialties.

The clientele of respondents is also diverse. The questionnaire asked lawyers for a percentage distribution both as to number of clients and time spent.

Table 44: Client Proportions

	<u>None</u>	<u>1-10%</u>	<u>11-25%</u>	<u>26-50%</u>	<u>51-100%</u>	<u>Mean</u>
<b>A. Client Numbers</b>						
Individuals	27%	22%	12%	14%	25%	30
Small Businesses	34	15	19	21	10	21
Larger Businesses	38	12	9	13	28	31
Labor Unions	97	2	0	0	1	1
Other Organizations	83	11	4	1	1	3
Other (Including Government)	82	4	1	2	12	13
<b>B. Client Time</b>						
Individuals	28	26	13	15	18	25
Small Businesses	33	17	18	23	9	20
Larger Businesses	36	6	7	17	34	37
Labor Unions	96	2	1	0	1	1
Other Organizations	83	10	3	2	1	3
Other (Including Government)	82	2	1	2	13	13



Over half of our respondents (59%) spent more than one-quarter of their time on matters for individuals and small businesses; 41% spent a majority of their time for such clients; and 27% spent at least three-quarters of their time for individuals and small businesses. This finding may be somewhat surprising to those who believe that most UM graduates spend their time serving large businesses.

The greatest amount of time spent for individual clients is by lawyers for legal services and public interest organizations and solo practitioners, particularly those in smaller offices and smaller cities. Time spent on behalf of smaller businesses is greatest in law firms, and those employed by business and financial institutions spend the greatest amount of time on large business clients.

Compared to respondents who spent less than half their time for individuals and small businesses, those who spent a majority of their time for such clients also spent more of their time in interviewing and trial work, less in discovery; and were more likely to specialize in Criminal, Domestic Relations, and Estate Planning and individual Tax law, but less likely to specialize in Administrative, Antitrust, Banking, Energy, Environmental, Insurance, and Securities law. There were no significant differences between the two groups as to time spent counselling clients or negotiating.

In contrast to the diversity of activities, substantive areas, and clientele, billing practices are dominated by hourly charges.

Table 45 : Fee and Billing Practices

<u>Type</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1-10%</u>	<u>11-50%</u>	<u>51-94%</u>	<u>95-100%</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Hourly Rate	17%	2%	12%	33%	35%	66%
Flat Fee	69	16	13	2	1	7
Contingent Percentage	66	18	13	2	1	7
Noncontingent Percentage	96	3	2	0	0	1
Pro Bono, No Fee	70	27	2	0	1	3
Salary, Retainer, Other	82	2	1	1	15	16

Less than a quarter of respondents were admitted to practice law in more than one state.

Table 46: States in Which Admitted to Practice

<u>Class Year</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Two</u>	<u>Three</u>	<u>Four</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1966	1%	77%	20%	3%	0%	1.24
1967	1	69	25	5	1	1.37
1976	0	72	26	1	0	1.29
1977	0	78	21	0	0	1.23

The questionnaire inquired about a number of credentials graduates might have earned after leaving law school, and Table 47 presents the responses.

Table 47: Proportion Earning Certificates Since Law School

<u>Certificate</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>
Military Discharge	28%	20%	3%	1%
Legal Specialty Certificate	2	3	1	0
Advanced Law Degree	10	5	1	3
Nonlaw Masters' Degree	5	2	2	3
Nonlaw Doctorate	0	0	0	0
CPA	2	0	1	1
CLU	1	0	0	0

Participation in bar activities was measured by questions asking about simple "membership" and "active participation." Not surprisingly, the former is much more common than the latter.

Table 48: Bar Activities

A. Membership	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>
Local Bar Association	85%	84%	77%	78%
State Bar Association	88	86	86	83
State Bar Section or Committee	53	48	42	39
National Bar Association	4	3	4	3
American Bar Association	69	69	71	74
ABA Section or Committee	45	47	42	49
National Lawyers Guild	1	1	3	2
Trial Lawyers Group	18	12	15	14
Other Legal Specialty Group	24	23	20	15
B. Active Participation				
Local Bar Association	35	30	22	25
State Bar Association	14	13	8	9
State Bar Section or Committee	18	19	10	8
National Bar Association	0	1	0	2
American Bar Association	7	8	3	4
ABA Section or Committee	14	13	5	8
National Lawyers Guild	1	0	1	1
Trial Lawyers Group	6	5	3	5
Other Legal Specialty Group	9	14	7	6

Among people who are members of a group, active participation is most likely in the National Lawyers' Guild, legal specialty groups, and local bar association, and least likely in the ABA and state bar associations. Active participation in any of the listed organization was not predictable by income or by gender, but was by ethnicity—blacks and other minorities are consistently more likely to be active participants.

Minority and women lawyer respondents felt they had been subject to some ethnic and gender discrimination from judges, lawyers and clients.

Table 49: Proportion Reporting Ethnic Discrimination

	<u>Blacks</u> (N=20)	<u>Other Minorities</u> (N=5)	<u>Whites</u> (N=805)
<b>From Judges</b>			
None	40%	60%	95%
A Little	55	40	5
A Lot	5	0	0
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<b>From Other Lawyers</b>			
None	9%	60%	92%
A Little	86	40	8
A Lot	5	0	0
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<b>From Clients</b>			
None	27%	80%	89%
A Little	64	20	10
A Lot	9	0	0
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Table 50: Proportion Reporting Sex Discrimination

	<u>Females</u> (N=84)	<u>Males</u> (N=755)
<b>From Judges</b>		
None	42%	99%
A Little	54	1
A Lot	5	0
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Table 50 (continued)

From Other Lawyers

None	9%	98%
A Little	78	2
A Lot	<u>14</u>	<u>0</u>
	100%	100%

From Clients

None	22%	98%
A Little	68	2
A Lot	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>
	100%	100%

Minority and women lawyers find other lawyers to be more likely to discriminate against them on the basis of race or sex than either judges or clients. Few white males (despite their hostility to affirmative action as reported below) seem to have experienced race or sex discrimination against them.

There were too few minority graduates to be able to further analyze which were most likely to have felt discriminated against. Some analysis can be done to determine which women lawyer respondents were most likely to have felt discrimination, although here also the numbers are too small to permit much analysis. It does appear, however, that the women most likely to have felt discrimination from all three sources (judges, other lawyers, clients) are solo practitioners, associates in law firms, and (as to clients only) persons working as house counsel for business and financial institutions.

The questionnaire asked for the annual net pre-tax income from the respondent's principal occupation in the first, fifth, tenth, and 15th year after graduation. Table 51 reports the mean amounts reported, in nominal (current year) dollars, and in dollars adjusted to 1982 purchasing power (using the Consumer Price Index), for each class. From comparing parts A and B of the table, it can be seen that even though the classes of 1976 and 1977 earned much more in current dollars in their fifth years than the classes of 1966 and 1967 had earned a decade earlier in their fifth year, the purchasing power of the earnings of the classes of 1966 and 1967 were actually substantially higher once inflation is taken into account. Inflation also took a heavy toll on the effective earnings of the classes of 1966 and 1967 between their 10th and 15th years out of law school: although average earnings in dollars rose nearly sixty percent, the average person's purchasing power remained essentially unchanged.

Table 51: Mean Earnings From Principal Occupation

	<u>1st Year</u>	<u>5th Year</u>	<u>10th Year</u>	<u>15th Year</u>
A. Current Dollars				
1966	8,952	22,697	52,120	83,484
1967	8,453	23,013	51,908	84,358
1976	16,456	40,450	----	----
1977	18,411	41,319	----	----
B. 1982 Dollars (taking into account effects of inflation)				
1966	25,835	54,003	88,219	88,488
1967	23,417	53,010	82,537	84,358
1976	26,164	42,877	----	----
1977	27,059	41,319	----	----

Table 52 gives the ranges of incomes for each class, using 5th year incomes for the classes of 1976 and 1977, and 15th-year incomes for the classes of 1966 and 1967.

Table 52: Earnings Distributions (for year nearest to survey)

<u>Range</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>
Under \$20,000	3%	1%	7%	7%
\$20,001-30,000	5	2	15	10
\$30,001-40,000	4	6	33	33
\$40,001-50,000	9	10	26	25
\$50,001-60,000	16	12	10	18
\$60,001-75,000	12	17	9	6
\$75,001-100,000	16	15	1	1
\$100,001+	37	37	1	1

What factors are most closely associated with income? As a general matter graduates working as lawyers earned, on average, significantly more than graduates not working as lawyers. Lawyers in the classes of 1966 and 1967 averaged \$87,230; nonlawyers averaged \$69,813. Lawyers in the class of 1976 and 1977 averaged \$41,790; nonlawyers averaged \$33,173. (We did not ask respondents to fill in a blank with their earnings but rather to check off one of many boxes indicating ranges

of earnings. For computing average incomes, we imputed to people an income at the midpoint of the range they checked. We are comfortable with this approach except in one significant respect. Our top range was "\$100,000 or more." Unfortunately for our computations, 37% of the classes of 1966 and 1967 reported incomes above \$100,000. To members of this group, we have arbitrarily, and perhaps too conservatively, attributed a 15-year income of \$125,000. If this figure is too low for members of various subgroups, our analysis is seriously flawed.) Using the 5th-year incomes of the classes of 1976 and 1977, and the 15th-year incomes of the classes of 1966 and 1967, the following tables examine, separately for nonlawyers and lawyers, the factors associated with higher or lower income.

Table 53: Some Factors Associated with Earnings of Persons NOT Currently Working as Lawyers

	<u>Classes of</u> <u>1966 and 1967</u>		<u>Classes of</u> <u>1976 and 1977</u>	
	<u>N=</u>	<u>Mean</u> <u>Earnings</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Mean</u> <u>Earnings</u>
<u>Overall</u>	80	\$69,813	55	\$33,173
<u>Job Type</u>				
Judge	16	51,406	—	—
Government Executive	4	68,125	5	35,500
Business Owner or Manager	30	96,125	5	57,500
Teacher	12	51,875	14	35,535
Other	18	54,638	31	27,755
<u>Gender</u>				
Men	75	72,016	35	35,367
Women	5	36,750	20	29,313

Of persons not currently practicing as lawyers, only those who have become business owners or managers earn on average as much as classmates who are in practice. Among people not practicing as lawyers, women earn somewhat less than men. These differences between men and women persist even after adjusting for job type and other factors such as region of residence and population of city of work.

Table 54: Some Factors Associated with Earnings of Persons Working as Lawyers

	<u>Classes of</u> <u>1966 and 1967</u>		<u>Classes of</u> <u>1976 and 1977</u>	
	<u>N=</u>	<u>Average</u> <u>Earnings</u>	<u>N=</u>	<u>Average</u> <u>Earnings</u>
<u>Overall</u>	365	\$87,230	459	\$41,790

Table 54 (continued)

	Classes of 1966 and 1967		Classes of 1976 and 1977	
	N=	Average Earnings	N=	Average Earnings
<u>Work Setting</u>				
Solo Practitioner	45	74,694	20	39,037
Partner in Firm	237	97,163	85	47,322
Associate in Firm	9	55,468	228	42,699
Counsel for Business or Financial Concern	44	74,032	63	39,683
Government	24	49,167	50	35,650
Legal Services	--	--	13	22,115
Other	6	79,167	3	39,167
 <u>Population of City Where Working</u>				
Under 100,000	79	\$68,892	68	\$32,475
100,000-500,000	69	83,298	86	37,099
500,000-1,000,000	48	89,792	70	42,036
more than 1,000,000	166	96,619	224	46,953
 <u>Total Other Attorneys in Office</u>				
None*	25	\$63,100	18	\$34,583
1-5	95	73,434	87	36,109
6-15	77	81,915	76	41,118
16-50	72	96,389	112	40,536
Over 50	84	110,655	151	46,738
 <u>Gender</u>				
Male	358	\$87,238	372	\$42,780
Female	7	86,786	86	37,209

\*Many solo practitioners sharing space with other attorneys counted those other attorneys as working in the same office and thus are not listed under "none."



For members of the classes of 1966 and 1967 who were practicing law, the setting where they worked and the numbers of other lawyers working in their offices were the strongest factors associated with earnings. In the more recent classes, the setting where the class members worked and the population of the city where they worked were the strongest factors. In fact, in both sets of classes, the larger the city where the attorney worked and the larger the number of attorneys in the offices, the more the lawyers tended to earn. In all four classes, persons working in cities with a population over 1 million earned on average about 40 percent more than persons working in cities of under 100,000.

In the classes of 1976 and 1977, where women constituted a substantial portion of the class, men on average earned about 12 percent more than women. After taking into account the effects of other factors—setting of work, population of city where working, numbers of hours worked and a few others—some but not all of the difference disappears; even with adjustments, men still earn about 6 percent more than women. Moreover, some of the factors used for controls may disguise discrimination against women: for example, partners in firms tend to earn more than associates; if women have a harder time making partnership than men for reasons that relate to their gender, then the original figure of a 12 percent difference between men and women may be a more accurate reflection of disparities in income.

The questionnaire included a number of questions on the respondents' levels of satisfaction with various aspects of their careers, as well as an overall measure. As Table 55 indicates, nearly two thirds of respondents placed themselves at the "satisfied" end of the spectrum on all or nearly all the measures. It also appears, however, that members of the classes of 1966 and 1967 are more satisfied with their careers than members of the classes of 1976 and 1977. (Satisfaction was measured on a scale ranging from "1" or "very satisfied" to "7" or "very dissatisfied". The scale is collapsed in Table 55 into three groupings. The two 15 year classes and the two 5 year classes were so similar in distribution that they are treated together here).

Table 55: Career Satisfaction

<u>Aspect</u>	<u>Class</u>	<u>Very Satisfied</u> 1-2	3-5	<u>Very Dis-</u> <u>satisfied</u> 6-7
Balance of Family and Professional Life	1966-1967	55%	42%	3%
	1976-1977	41	53	7
Income	1966-1967	54	44	1
	1976-1977	49	47	4
Ability to Solve Problems for Specific Clients	1966-1967	82	17	1
	1976-1977	64	35	1
Intellectual Challenge	1966-1967	69	31	0
	1976-1977	59	39	2
Prestige in the Community	1966-1967	69	30	1
	1976-1977	53	46	1
Ability to Bring About Social Change	1966-1967	22	70	9
	1976-1977	13	72	14
Overall	1966-1967	69	30	1
	1976-1977	46	52	1

The six aspects taken together explain about two-thirds of the variance in the overall measure, with the following relative contributions:

Intellectual	24%
Prestige	21%
Family/Professional Balance	15%
Income	14%
Social change	14%
Individual problem-solving	<u>12%</u>
	100%

This analysis suggests that intellectual satisfaction and prestige of position are more important than other factors to respondents overall profession satisfaction. Using factors other than the six aspect satisfaction measures, it is possible to explain only about one-sixth of the variance in the overall satisfaction measure. In order of importance, after adjusting for the effects of other factors, the least satisfied respondents overall are those with the lowest incomes, law firm associates and nonsupervisory employees of business and financial institutions, unmarried persons, 5-year grads, and those who have had several nonlegal jobs. After adjusting for these factors, there are no significant differences by whether respondents are lawyers or nonlawyers, nor by race or gender.

As for five of the six aspects of career satisfaction, the other career and personal factors explain a similarly low proportion of variance, a slightly higher proportion for income satisfaction. The persons least satisfied with their family and professional balance are law firm associates and nonattorneys, 5-year graduates, those who are unmarried and males. As to income, the least satisfied are those with lower incomes, solo practitioners, 15-year graduates, those who are unmarried or have several children, and males. Dissatisfaction with the ability to solve problems for specific clients is best predicted by low income, nonsupervisory status on the job, more previous legal jobs, being a 5-year grad, and being unmarried. Intellectual dissatisfaction is most common among those with low income, males, and 5-year graduates. Dissatisfaction with prestige is associated with low income, nonsupervisory status, government employment, and being male. Finally, dissatisfaction with ability to bring about social change is most likely among nonsupervisory employees of financial and business institutions and law firms, and among 5-year grads. A fairly consistent pattern in the factors is less satisfaction among persons with low incomes, 5-year grads, and males.

#### VII. OPINIONS ON POLITICAL AND LEGAL PROFESSIONAL ISSUES

The questionnaire included a number of questions to elicit the respondent's opinions on some current political and professional issues. Perhaps the most striking aspect of the responses on most issues was how little variation there was among respondents.

The first questions attempted to ascertain the general self-reported political orientation of the respondents.

Table 56: Political Orientations

A. Liberalism-Conservatism

<u>Class</u>	<u>Very Liberal</u>				<u>Very Conservative</u>		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1966	2%	8%	26%	24%	29%	11%	1%
1967	2	11	26	20	32	10	1
1976	7	17	29	17	22	8	1
1977	6	19	23	21	26	6	0

B. Partisan Affiliation

	<u>Strongly Democratic</u>	<u>Not So Strongly Democratic</u>	<u>Independent/Lean to Democratic</u>	<u>Independent</u>	<u>Independent/Lean to Republican</u>	<u>Not So Strongly Republican</u>	<u>Strongly Republican</u>	<u>Other Party</u>	<u>Non Political</u>
1966	11%	14%	10%	8%	20%	16%	23%	0	1
1967	16	13	16	6	14	17	19	0	1
1976	14	15	23	13	13	6	12	1	3
1977	14	12	25	9	13	10	14	1	3

C. 1980 Presidential Vote

	<u>Anderson</u>	<u>Carter</u>	<u>Reagan</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>None</u>
1966	15%	27%	56%	1%	1%
1967	14	30	53	1	3
1976	20	43	31	3	3
1977	17	41	31	4	7

Members of the classes of 1966 and 1967 view themselves as somewhat more conservative as revealed by the three measures than members of the

classes of 1976 and 1977. Taken together, the four classes seem almost exactly balanced between people who regard themselves as liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats, and, except for a much lower proportion of non-voters and a higher proportion of Anderson voters, reflect quite well the nationwide Reagan-Carter vote distribution.

The best predictors of conservatism, excluding partisan preferences and other things being equal, were high incomes in the most recent year, a high proportion of time spent representing large businesses, residence in the Southwest or South, a low proportion of time spent on appeals work, a higher number of children, an engineering undergraduate major, and a current nonlawyer job. Strong Republican affiliation is best predicted by self-reported conservatism and residence in the Southwest or Great Lakes regions. A vote for Reagan in 1980 was best predicted by strong Republican affiliation and conservatism.

The second series of questions were on public policy questions with only an indirect effect on the legal profession. Respondents were asked to evaluate the policy involved along a seven-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. (The results in Table 57 combine contiguous class years because of closely similar distribution of responses within the pairs of years.)

Table 57: Opinions On General Public Policy Questions

- A. Affirmative Action. How do you feel about hiring policies that permit an applicant's race to be taken into account in order to increase the proportion of members of that race in an occupation?

Class	Strongly Favor (1-2)	(3-5)	Strongly Oppose (6-7)
1966-1967	7%	38%	55%
1976-1977	19%	42	39

- B. Environmental Policy. How do you feel about reducing the extent of federal regulation intended to improve environmental quality?

1966-1967	20%	49%	32%
1976-1977	8	41	52

- C. ERA. How do you feel about passage of the federal Equal Rights Amendments to prohibit government discrimination on the basis of sex?

1966-1967	36%	41%	23%
1976-1977	59	33	8

D. Welfare Policy. How do you feel about returning to the states the full responsibility for policy-making and funding of most welfare programs?

1966-1967	28%	46%	27%
1976-1977	17	39	44

E. Marijuana. How do you feel about removal of criminal penalties for possession and use of marijuana?

1966-1967	36%	44%	21%
1976-1977	56	36	8

In all but the affirmative action question, nearly twice as many respondents took a position that would conventionally be described as a "liberal" one than took a "conservative" position. On all four questions, the 5-year classes took a more "liberal" position than did the 15-year classes.

A favorable (or less unfavorable) attitude to affirmative action hiring policies was most closely associated, other things being equal, with political liberalism, lower income, nonwhite ethnicity, and Democratic partisan affiliation. Those persons most favorable to reducing government environmental regulation of businesses were conservatives, Republicans, employees of businesses, and those who had spent the smallest proportion of their careers at their current jobs. Opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment was most common, other things being equal, among conservatives, Republicans, males, persons employed in legal services and government, solo practitioners, and members of the 15-year classes. Support for defederalization of welfare programs was strongest among conservatives, Republicans, Reagan voters, and persons living in the Southwest and South. Opposition to the decriminalization of marijuana use was strongest among Republicans; conservatives; employees of government, business, and legal services; members of the 15-year classes, solo practitioners and firm partners, and persons in their first marriage.

The third set of questions involved public policy issues with a direct effect on the legal profession, to which respondents again expressed agreement or disagreement along a seven-point scale.

Table 58: Opinions On Legal-Professional Public Policy Issue

Class	Strongly Favor	(3-5)	Strongly Oppose
	(1-2)		(6-7)
<b>A. Continuing Legal Education. Mandatory attendance of continuing legal education courses each year as a condition of retaining the right to practice law?</b>			
1966-1967	32%	51%	17%
1976-1977	30	52	18
<b>B. Certification of Specialties. Certification of competence in legal specialty areas through written examinations as a condition of advertising a specialty?</b>			
1966-1967	40%	48%	12%
1976-1977	39	49	12
<b>C. Legal Services Corporation. Increased government funding for the Legal Services Corporation to provide legal services to the poor by salaried staff attorneys of local non-profit legal services programs?</b>			
1966-1967	29%	47%	25%
1976-1977	43	43	14
<b>D. Judicare. Increased government funding for "judicare" programs to pay private attorneys on a fee-for-services basis to provide legal services for the poor?</b>			
1966-1967	18%	58%	24%
1976-1977	22	59	19
<b>E. Mandatory Pro Bono Work. Mandatory requirements that attorneys devote a specified amount of time each year to <u>pro bono</u> legal services?</b>			
1966-1967	11%	42%	47%
1976-1977	17	40	43
<b>F. No Fault Auto Insurance. "No-fault" automobile insurance, in which the parties (and their insurers) are financially responsible for their own property damage and all but deaths and the most serious personal injuries?</b>			
1966-1967	40%	44%	16%
1976-1977	43	49	8

Overall, there are substantial majorities in favor (responses 1-3) of mandatory continuing legal education, specialty certification, funding of nonprofit legal services programs, and no-fault auto insurance, and against mandatory pro bono. There are slight pluralities in favor of *judicare*. There are fewer and much smaller differences among class years on this set of questions than as to broader political issues.

Mandatory continuing legal education was most likely to be opposed by those who currently spend none of their time in formal legal education, persons residing in the Northeastern region of the country, and employees of government and business. Specialty certification was most frequently opposed by persons residing in the Pacific Coast and Northeastern regions of the country. Increased funding for the Legal Services Corporation and local legal services programs was most unpopular among conservatives, Republicans, residents of the South and Southwest, whites, and those with the highest incomes. Increased funding for "*judicare*" programs was most often opposed by conservatives, Republicans, and whites. Mandatory pro bono was most likely to be supported by liberals, Democrats, employees of legal services, business, and government, and persons whose undergraduate major was social science or business.

Finally, a number of items on the questionnaire asked respondents to give their opinions on potential ethical problems in their own practice and the general ethical tenor of the profession. Generally, respondents claimed to have few potential ethical problem situations arising in their own practice, had a fairly high opinion of the ethical quality of the attorneys with whom they deal, but think ethical standards-enforcing agencies aren't sufficiently vigorous.

Table 59: Frequency of Encountering Potential Ethical Problems

- A. You are called upon to represent two or more persons who may have conflicting interests.

<u>Class</u>	<u>Very Frequently (1-2)</u>	<u>(3-5)</u>	<u>Never (6-7)</u>
1966-1967	18%	47%	36%
1976-1977	16	43	42

- B. Your client wants your assistance or complicity in plans you consider illegal or unethical.

1966-1967	1%	21%	78%
1976-1977	2	20	78



C. You have been lied to by your client, have unwittingly repeated that lie to a court or other parties, and then discover the lie.

1966-1967	1%	17%	81%
1976-1977	2	20	78

D. You discover that you have inadvertently missed a statute of limitations or other filing deadline.

1966-1967	0%	6%	93%
1976-1977	0	8	92

Table 60: Opinions of Legal Ethics

A. The lawyers with whom I deal (other than those in my own office) are highly ethical in their conduct

<u>Class</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u> (1-2)	(3-5)	<u>Strongly Disagree</u> (6-7)
1966-1967	40%	57%	3%
1976-1977	29	64	7

B. The normal pressures of practice, both from clients and from the economies of my practice, cause me to engage in practices that might seem unethical to an outsider.

1966-1967	2%	16%	82%
1976-1977	2	22	76

C. The use of delay as a tactic in litigation and negotiation in order to put pressure on the other side should not be regarded as unethical.

1966-1967	28%	41%	31%
1976-1977	24	54	22

D. Bar associations and ethical standards-enforcing agencies do not act forcefully enough to weed out unethical attorneys.

1966-1967	52%	40%	9%
1976-1977	50	46	4

The persons most likely to encounter potential conflicts of interest between clients are partners in law firms, whites, and those who have spent the greatest proportion of their careers in private practice. Clients seeking complicity in unethical activities are most common to lawyers who spent the greatest proportion of their time representing individuals and lawyers who are solo practitioners. Clients who lie to their attorneys seem to be most frequently encountered by solo practitioners and those in small offices, those who spend the highest proportion of their time in motion practice, employees of businesses, and specialists in criminal law. Filing deadlines are rarely problems but are most often a problem for specialists in torts and personal injury.

The highest opinions of the ethics of other attorneys are held by law firm associates and employees of businesses and financial institutions, members of the classes of 1966 and 1967, political conservatives, and those who spend no time in discovery and the least time in drafting pleadings.

Pressure to engage in unethical practices is most frequently felt by those who have the highest proportion of individual clients and those who specialize in government contracts and municipal government law.

The greatest agreement that delay should not be considered an unethical tactic came from employees of law firms and businesses, political conservatives, persons in the largest offices, residents of the Northeast and South, nonsupervisory employees, and those who do the most motion practice.

Dissatisfaction with a perceived weakness in enforcement of ethical rules was most common among legal services and public interest and government employees, and those who work in the largest offices.