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ABSTRACT

Past research indicated that women do not have the same career patterns and experiences as their male colleagues, even when they have the same training and educational experiences.

This dissertation examines the similarities and differences of law school, employment and family experiences among women and men by drawing on the data from an alumni questionnaire, distributed in the summer of 1992, to the 1981 graduates of Case Western Reserve University School of Law, Cleveland, Ohio. This study compared law school experiences, measured by class rank, activity membership and participation, and CWRU career assistance. Employment histories were determined by employment position and reasons for job departure, among the first three jobs. Career commitment was measured by continued employment in the legal profession and the side bets (investments) made in maintaining career commitment.

A qualitative and quantitative analysis found that: (1) women and men had similar law school experiences, and class rank, not gender, influenced opportunities and experiences; (2) women were as committed as men to the legal profession as measured by job mobility, which was high and is increasing for both groups; (3) although the vast majority of graduates experienced stress in their work, the conflict
experienced between work and family relationships was
different among women and men; (4) in first jobs, both women
and men were motivated to change jobs for the same reasons;
advancement opportunities and financial considerations.
However, in second jobs, among the women, these reasons were
coupled with family considerations. In third jobs, the
women redefined their priorities, since they were motivated
by several different factors than in the past; (5) the women
accepted job discrimination by identifying it as something
else, such as personal conflict or job dissatisfaction; and,
(6) the women accepted restrictions on their careers if they
came from their husbands. Most women were not getting the
support they needed from their husbands or the workplace.
What they did get was not as relevant to their careers as
the type of spouse/partner career support received by their
male counterparts.
To Neil
"...words are a form of action, capable of influencing change. Their articulation represents a complete, lived experience."

-Ingrid Bengis
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Gender bias, gender stratification, pay inequities, the "mommy track," glass ceilings, and more recently, glass walls, have been issues of attention and concern for sociologists, law schools, the legal profession, and professions in general. Each issue has varied degrees of implications and consequences for both women and men in the workplace, as well as American society in general.

Research indicates that women do not have the same career patterns and experiences as their male colleagues (Kanter, 1977; Epstein, 1981; American Bar Association Commission on Women in the Professions, 1988; etc.). Since it is likely that career opportunities and experiences are dependent upon factors which go beyond knowledge and intellectual ability, these additional factors need to be recognized, acknowledged, and understood.

The underlying purpose of this study is to examine the similarities and differences of law school, employment and family experiences among the women and men 1981 graduates of Case Western Reserve University School of Law. The results of this study are significant not only for what will be
revealed about the differences in experiences among women and men, but also for what will be revealed about the similarities.

This study focuses on professional socialization, employment histories, and career commitment and side bets. Examining professional socialization at the law school level, facilitates a comparison of the law school experiences of women and men. Does socialization into the legal profession provided by the law school result in similar or different experiences and degree of career commitment among women and men law school graduates? Do the existing support systems and availability of role playing opportunities, role models and career assistance play a primary role in the graduates' degree of professional socialization, career commitment and pursuit of career goals?

The employment histories of the law school graduates allows me to examine the structural and individual dimensions of the careers of women and men. Are women and men motivated by the same factors when they change jobs? What differences in structural and organizational dimensions of the workplace differentiate the employment experiences and degree of mobility for women and men? Do women and men have different or similar types of jobs? Are women and men motivated by the same factors in the workplace, or do they have different likes and dislikes? In what ways do women
and men experience stress in their work? What factors are perceived as being the sources of stress? In what ways, if any, does discrimination affect the career experiences of women and men? Are there gender differences in career satisfaction and compensation? Are women and men just as likely to "drop out" of the legal profession? If so, what are their reasons?

This study also examines how women and men integrate career and personal/family obligations and commitments by examining career commitment and side bets (investments) of the graduates. Does this integration pose similar degrees of ease or difficulty for women and men? What problems, if any, arise because of the ways women's and men's lives are structured in American society? To what extent are personal, relational, and family lives meshed with professional lives? For example, many careers demand a great deal of time and energy of persons at entry level positions, such as that of law firm associates. Such requirements may impede the process of advancement for women because the associate years coincide with women's opportune years of childbearing. Hence, just at the time when women may want to work less, the demands of an associate position place a heavy burden on women trying to start families. This problem will also be of greater concern for men in the future as more individuals are involved in dual-career marriages/relationships (See Hertz, 1986; Hochschild, 1990).
Through these comparisons of professional socialization, employment histories, and career commitment and career investments (side bets), those factors which serve as barriers and facilitators to the "success" of women and men professionals are uncovered. Research has focused primarily on women lawyers and women law school graduates (Epstein, 1981; White, 1967), omitting the experiences of men. Other research has focused on tasks performed by lawyers in various professional settings (Spangler, 1986), or solely on career paths (Harvard, 1986; Liefland, 1986), and alumni studies have been conducted that focused on financial assistance, employment while in law school, law courses, judicial clerkships, and employment/family issues. The research conducted by the legal profession has been brief; often lacking detail and depth. This study aims to contribute to the body of knowledge of occupations and professions, professional socialization, marriage and the family, and gender similarities and differences by conducting an in-depth study which addresses the questions raised in the previous pages.

Throughout this study, references will be made to recent studies of law school graduates which will be referred to as: the New Mexico Study (Teitelbaum, Sedillo, Lopez, and Jenkins, 1991), University of Michigan Study (Chambers, 1987), the Minnesota Study (Mattessich and

Specifically, the New Mexico Study examined alumni of the University of New Mexico Law School, classes of 1975-1986. The University of Michigan Study examined the class of 1985 (five years out of law school at the time of the survey). The Minnesota Study was commissioned by the Minnesota Women Lawyers Task force on the Status of Women in the Profession. That study examined the careers of law school graduates of 1975, 1978, 1982 and 1985 from three Minnesota law schools: University of Minnesota (35 percent), William Mitchell (44 percent), and Hamline University (21 percent). The Stanford Project was an empirical study which examined gender, legal education and the legal profession with law school graduates and current students. The Harvard Project examined the classes of 1959, 1969, 1974 and 1981 from seven northeastern law schools: Boston College, Boston University, Columbia University, University of Connecticut, Harvard, Northeastern and Suffolk University. This study had a range of small, medium and large schools, representing schools with regional or national prestige. Finally, Liefland's study examined the career patterns of male and female lawyers of the classes of 1976, 1977, and 1978 from four prominent law schools: University of California at Berkeley, Columbia University, University of Pennsylvania, and New York University.
Theoretical Relevance & Concepts

The theoretical relevance of this study addresses: occupations and professions, sex and gender, gender stratification, and marriage and the family. This study is particularly interested in the differential relationships of women and men to professional opportunity structures, which include the available channels and prevailing constraints regarding access to occupational positions and opportunities, and career paths for groups and individuals with given characteristics and/or attributes. The primary components in this study are structural and individual dimensions; occasions to build both formal and informal networks; integration of work and family; and, issues of identity and the development of the professional self.

A Brief Historical Overview of the Professions and Professional Socialization

Before discussing the legal profession, it is beneficial to examine the history of the professions. Historically, professions have resisted invasion of their autonomy (Larson, 1977; Starr, 1983). In his work, "The Professions Profess," Everett Hughes (1963) discussed the accountability of professions and the legitimacy of the claims made by professions and professionals. He contended that the professions profess to know better than their clients what ails them or their affairs" (Hughes, 1963: 656). In other words, the professions claim the right to
autonomous action, based on their claim to expertise (i.e., esoteric knowledge), to a service orientation and to the internalization of high standards of performance.

Furthermore, professions assert their right to freedom from external control, contending that only their peers and colleagues are competent to evaluate their performance. The high standards of internalized training ensure self control on the part of the professionals, and that the structure of the profession includes mechanisms whereby colleagues maintain surveillance and control over each other's performance.

Generally, the training program is directly responsible for professional characteristics of graduates. According to Larson (1977), the power within a profession exists in controlling education and career facilities because in an organized profession, generally, the practitioners must pass through the educational centers and through the organizations in which the career unfolds and develops. From the point of view of socialization into the profession and professional "cohesion," control over members is therefore a matter of structure much more than a matter of obedience to an association's code of ethics (Larson, 1977: 72).

Professional socialization, Larson (1977) contended, aims at the internalization of special social controls. In other words, the standards are defined by the profession's
elites, thus making them part of each individual's subjectivity. Insofar as this socialization is successful, the elites will be in control not only of material rewards but also of the kind of esteem that counts—the esteem granted by a reference group of major importance for the individual (Larson, 1977: 228-230).

Socialization of recruits, therefore, consists of induction into the "common core." These are norms and codes which govern the behavior of the professional to insiders and outsiders: the sense of mission; work activities; methodology and techniques; clients; colleagues; interests and associations; spurious unity and public relations (Jack and Jack, 1989). Special skills, self-presentation, initiation into techniques, languages and jargons, ways of dressing, and mannerism identify the individual with her/his occupation for her/himself and for outsiders (See also works by Becker, Freidson, and Hughes).

Professional schooling occurs most conspicuously during the early stages of a career and is an essential part of getting people committed to careers and to fill positions (Becker and Strauss, 1972). Larson (1977) maintained that the particular strength of professional socialization is rooted in the length and the institutional character of the training—the incredible investment of time, energy, and money that most professions require ensures the stability of a recruitment within the field. This "stability" which is
distinctive in highly mobile societies, effects a particularly strong identification of the person with the role, both subjectively and for others outside of the profession.

The Legal Profession

In 1988, there were 723,189 lawyers in the United States, of which 83.9 percent were men and only 16.1 percent were women (Curran and Carson, 1991). Practicing lawyers are employed in several types of settings, including private practice, solo practice, in-house counsel and Legal Services. Private practice is the most common organization of employment for lawyers. Private practice may consist of firm sizes ranging anywhere from one lawyer to over one hundred. Generally, these firms may include lawyers, legal researchers and a support staff. Lawyers employed in private practice are salaried professionals with an opportunity for profit sharing if and when they get promoted from associate to partner status.

Also included in private practice is the solo practitioner, an independent lawyer who practices alone, which sharply contrasts those experiences of salaried attorneys. In her study of salaried professionals in the legal profession, Spangler (1986) found that whereas staff attorneys are constrained by their employer, independent practitioners need consult only their own preferences when
arranging their work life. However, their freedom is attained at a considerable cost: their income is precarious, and they must shoulder all of the administrative burdens of maintaining their own affairs. A sole practitioner may have more control over the allocation of their time, however, more of their time is often required because in addition to doing their own work, s/he must also market their practice. A higher proportion of women than men are still sole practitioners (Abel, 1989: 97; Curren and Carson, 1991).

In the late eighties and early nineties, the most significant employment increase in the legal profession was in-house counsel (Abel, 1989). In-house counsel lawyers are employed by an organization or corporation. These lawyers are constantly available to the corporation, and are informed on a day-to-day basis of the company's activities and direction. While outside counsel must respond to conflicting demands, those of their firm and their clients, in-house attorneys are only responsible to their employer.

Legal Services lawyers continuously engage in fierce battles to protect their mission of defending the interests of the poor. Their well-known militancy has a number of sources: in part it arises from the selective recruitment of activist lawyers; in part it results from the program's highly politicized history; and in part it is a response to present necessities (Spangler, 1986). Legal Services is the most common source of legal advice and representation for
poor people, with a goal to systematically change the balance of rights between the poor and the government and the poor and the private sector (Katz, 1982, via Spangler, 1986).

Internal structures of law firms generally consist of administrations ordered by a series of committees and a system of ranks, each with distinctive obligations and privileges. The single most significant distinction in a law firm is that of rank. "Partners" own the firm and therefore divide its considerable profits at the end of the year. "Associates," on the other hand, do not share in the profits of the firm; they are its employees, working for a generous but nevertheless fixed salary (Spangler, 1986; 35). The enormous differences between associate salaries and partnership salaries (sometimes more than 10:1) symbolizes both the subordination of the former and the rewards that follow from accepting it gracefully (Abel, 1989; 222).

Firms admit associates to partnership after seven to ten years of service to the firm. In all firms, the timetable for full partnership is similar: after a decade, attorneys expect to be full and permanent members of the partnership. Under the current system then, salaried employment (Associate status) is a temporary status designed to lead into either partnership (ownership) or exit from the firm. The possibility of a partnership secures the
associates’ loyalty, although the probability of being made partner is declining (Spangler, 1986: 36).

With regard to positions in private practice, women have always been distributed differently from men. Women may choose larger firms because they offer higher starting salaries and greater prestige, but also because women associates believe large firms will offer a better chance of advancement. However, the proportion of associates becoming partners seems to be higher among men than women (Able, 1989: 98).

So far, the women associates who work full-time have been less likely than men to be made partner (Abel, 1989). The National Law Journal found that women have been increasing their share of partnerships by only one percent a year. And experts say that, even allowing for women’s recent entry into the profession, as well as the increasingly long time it takes associates to become partners, the number of women partners is disproportionately low for the number of women associates (Fritz, 1988: 4).

Another position within a firm is that "of counsel." Traditionally this position title applied to those individuals who were retired partners of their law firm. However, in the last decade or so, this position has been redefined. Currently, the status "of counsel" implies more of a lateral category; a nonequity salaried employer of the firm. Individuals who occupy this position are not
considered associates because they are not on a partner-track.

Generally, working in the legal profession requires an involvement in cases, paperwork and community. Moreover, in most firm environments, earnings are to some extent dependent on initiative—ambition, drive and motivation. Hence, the time demands of the work dramatically increases. A full day at the office is not enough for an aspiring lawyer. The norms of the legal profession equate success and excellence with hard work, measured in part by long hours. Putting in extra hours at night and working on weekends are not only common, but generally expected. Furthermore, besides having the pressure to work hard, there is also the expectation of spending all extra time on legal affairs, such as taking classes (i.e., Continuing Legal Education), bar association projects and meetings, and community services such as Pro Bono work.

The legal profession, as well as most professions in general, are what Coser (1974) described as "greedy institutions." Not only do firms and corporations impose time demands on employees, the employees themselves seek other options to get access to more challenging and interesting work and/or seek to participate or increase participation in organizational problem solving. Thus, in these types of settings, women and men have projects with goals that require additional work and reflection beyond the
time permitted at the office (Kanter, 1989). Moreover, it is the organization's intention that time records and billing demands keep lawyers competitive and overproducing.

**Professional Socialization**

Chapter 3, Professional Socialization, examines the process of professional socialization prior to, and during, law school. Socialization before law school will be discussed in the section entitled Anticipatory Socialization. This section examines two facets of pre-professional socialization: (1) having access to immediate family members (parents and/or siblings) who practice law; and, (2) the decision to attend law school or be a lawyer at an early age (before entering college). I will examine whether these two factors influence parental encouragement in the decision to attend law school, class rank, activity membership, and CWRU career help and assistance. The guiding hypothesis is that those persons who had immediate family members who practiced law would have the potential of a greater degree of exposure to the profession, and of knowledge of law school experiences and expectations. They can be expected, therefore, to perform better in law school (i.e., class rank and law school activity membership), placing these women and men at an advantage over those graduates who did not have family members in law.
Chapter 3 will also examine the age that the graduates remember knowing they wanted to be lawyers or attend law school, using the hypothesis that early knowledge or awareness of long-term professional goals would allow women and men to alter their academic careers, both at the high school and college levels, with regard to specific courses and the awareness of the importance of grades with regard to law school admission. Therefore, graduates who decided to attend law school before graduating from high school would be more prepared and perform better in law school than those graduates who decided upon a career in law later in the life cycle. For the purpose of this study, age was divided into two categories: less than or equal to 18 years of age, and older than 18 years. These two categories were selected because I had conducted preliminary statistical tests which indicated little difference among women and men who decided on a career in law during college and those who made the decision later in the life cycle.

Anticipatory Socialization

Socialization refers to the process by which the values, beliefs, norms, roles, assumptions, and practices that make up a culture (or subculture) are learned. The process of professional socialization, when successful, produces conformity and predictability with regard to shared norms, values and norm expectations, as well as commitment
to the profession. In other words, socialization is "the process by which people selectively acquire the values and attitudes, the interests, skills and knowledge—in short, the culture—current in the groups to which they are, or seek to become, a member. It refers to the learning of social roles (Merton, 1957: 287)."

Anticipatory socialization refers to the acquisition of values and orientations found in roles and groups in which an individual is not yet a member, but desires to enter. Generally, anticipatory socialization is an informal process which prepares the individual for future roles in her/his role sequence. For example, the individual responds to cues in behavioral situations and unwittingly draws implications from these situations for future role behavior. Hence, s/he becomes oriented toward a role s/he does not yet occupy (Merton, 1968: 438-440).

The exposure and degree of anticipatory socialization has the potential to influence experiences which can ultimately influence career choices. Some degree of anticipatory socialization prior to attending law school may, in the long-run, result in a significant advantage over those students who did not have such opportunities. For instance, law school may not be as overwhelming an experience for those students who have some knowledge of law school demands and expectations prior to beginning their first year, and as a result, these women and men may perform
better--higher grades and activity memberships--than those students who entered law school with little or no prior knowledge.

It has been argued that the availability of role models such as parents, siblings, other relatives, or close friends in a desired occupation or profession can be an important potential source of information (Pavalko, 1988). For example, the individual who has grown up in a "law family" and decides at a young age to become a lawyer, has grown up in an environment with potentially useful knowledge, exposure to role models in law and access to information about legal work and the profession, which could ultimately produce a high level of anticipatory socialization. On the other hand, an individual with little exposure to the work world of lawyers and who decides late in college to enter law school, is likely to have undergone relatively little anticipatory socialization.

Education and Training

The second section of Chapter 3 will focus on the education and training aspect of professional socialization at the law school level. Bucher and Stelling’s (1977) work on the socialization process of medical students will be discussed with particular emphasis on what they defined as "situational" variables--variables within the social setting of the law school that are expected to be important in the
process of professional socialization. These situational variables are: (1) Role-playing; (2) Role Models; (3) Peer Groups; (4) Coaching and Criticism; (5) Conversion Experiences ("Career Enhancement Opportunities"); and, (6) Status Passages. Each of these variables is defined and modified to fit the law school environment.

Specifically, Role-Playing opportunities are examined by comparing: class rank, and law school activities (i.e., Law Review, Moot Court, judicial clerkship appointment, active and nonactive students), among those women and men who had participated in specific law school activities and those who did not. The availability of Role Models is analyzed by examining the gender composition of the CWRU law school faculty and the extent to which faculty may be viewed as role models.

The importance of Peer Groups is examined along with its significance to the perceptions that women and men had with their best and worst experiences of law school. The section on Coaching and Criticism examines the significance of grades and the law school experience. Law Review membership, Moot Court, judicial clerkship appointments, and CWRU career assistance, are compared between the top 10 percent of the class and the bottom 90 percent. Because of the great deal of prestige and opportunities that are associated with ranking in the top 10 percent of the class, and since a number of the CWRU women and men indicated that
the law school catered to the top 10 percent of the class, rank was first examined by top 10 percent and bottom 90 percent. However, for a more detailed analysis, comparisons among those persons in the top 50 percent and the bottom 50 percent of the class were also made.

Conversion Experiences, or what I have termed "Career Enhancement Opportunities" are also examined in terms of the law school socialization process. Specifically, I compare Law Review membership or judicial clerkship appointment, and CWRU career assistance between those graduates who were members of Law Review and/or had judicial clerkship appointments and those women and men who did not. I also discuss the formal Status Passages of the law school: first year (1L), second year (2L), third year (3L), and graduation. The formal and symbolic definitions of these status passages are defined and discussed.

**Structural and Situational Variables**

Based on their research on medical students' training in areas of specialty, Bucher and Stelling (1977) contended that during the education and training stage, to explicate the socialization process, two sets of social "variables" have to be taken into account. Structural variables are pertinent to the nature and organization of professions and to the social structure of the formal organizations which process succeeding generations of professionals. The second
set, "situational variables," refers to the consequences of specific social situations.

**Structural Variables**

When defining the concept of structural variables, Bucher and Stelling (1977) used the theoretical approach to professions which emphasized the concepts of process and segments (Bucher and Strauss, 1961; Bucher, 1962; Coe, 1970; Cafferata, 1974; Via Bucher and Stelling, 1977). Here they stated that professions are never fixed and must be viewed as continuously in flux, therefore changing various aspects of their internal and external relationships. The basic social units which are in movement within professions are segments, with a segment defined as a subgroup within a profession. The segment is composed of individuals who share some professional characteristics and beliefs which distinguish them from those members of other segments. Members of a segment share a specific professional identity; moreover, they have similar ideas about the nature of their discipline, the relative order of importance of the activities it includes, and its relationship to their fields (Bucher and Stelling, 1977).

Using this theoretical framework, Bucher and Stelling (1977) contended that the professional communities and larger formal organizations comprise the external structural variables, with the professional community being the host
institution, to determine: (1) the way the program is organized; (2) the view the students get of the field; (3) the kinds of experiences the students have as they move through the program; and, (4) the kinds of skills the students acquire. When the legal profession is used as the unit of analysis, the external structural variables are the job market and national, state, local, and specialized bar associations, and the top administrators of the law schools. The external variables are considered to be the larger formal organization to which the training program (law school) is linked.

The professional organization and the structure of the training program comprise the internal structural components. The internal structural variables determine the nature of the situational and interfactional variables present in the training situation. The structure of the training program is considered to be a function of the nature of the professional organization, at any particular location. Depending on their professional ideology, particular staff members (law school admissions) would select potential candidates (students applying for admission) they thought to be suitable for their goals (earning a law degree), and would attempt to set up a series of experiences for and with the potential students to attain these goals (law school).
Situational Variables

Situational variables are the second set of variables that refer to social situations (law school) which are a function of, or set up by, persons of the larger structural variables (i.e., the job market, committees of bar associations, law school administrators) included in the first set, structural variables. Bucher and Stelling (1977), found six situational variables that were central to the professional socialization process of medical students. These variables included: (1) Role Playing; (2) Role Models; (3) Peer Group; (4) Coaching and Criticism; (5) Conversion Experiences (from here on to be referred to as Career Enhancement Opportunities); and, (6) Status Passages. Because the variables were based on a medical school environment, some modifications are needed for a law school analysis. For the purpose of this study, Bucher and Stelling’s (1977) six situational variables argued to be crucial to the professional socialization process will be interpreted as: (1) Role Playing opportunities--Moot Court Competitions, Client Counseling Competitions, and Legal Clinic; (2) Availability of Role Models--gender composition and the role of CWRU Law School faculty; (3) Peer Group Relationships--camaraderie, competition and rivalry, and mastery of skills; (4) Coaching and Criticism--Socratic teaching method and the significance of grades; (5) Career Enhancement Opportunities --Law Review membership and
judicial clerkship appointments; and, (6) Status Passages of Law School--three year progression of law school (1L, 2L, and 3L), and graduation.

**Employment Patterns**

Chapter 4 examines the employment histories of the CWRU women and men, and will include employment positions, organizations of employment, job mobility, job departures, part-time, interruptions and parental leaves in employment, and non-law employment. Although research indicates that most lawyer's first jobs do not evolve into lifetime careers (Minnesota, 1992; Liefland, 1991; Stanford, 1988; Harvard, 1986), traditional perspectives have been that an attorney started her/his career, worked hard and became a partner, and later retired at the same firm/organization.

**Career Commitment and Side Bets**

Chapter 5 examines the similarities and differences of career commitment and career investments, or side bets, among the women and men graduates. In order to understand fully what is meant by career patterns, the concept of career must first be defined. In broad terms, Hughes (1958), defined the concept of career as "the more or less orderly and predictable course of one's work life (1958, 12)." According to Wilensky (1961), a career is "a succession of related jobs, arranged in a hierarchy of
prestige, through which persons move in an ordered (more or less predictable) sequence (1961, 523).

In Becker’s (1960) analysis, commitment to the organization and commitment to the occupation is the result of a series of conscious and unconscious side bets, or investments. In general, Becker asserted that the greater the number of side bets, the greater the degree of commitment of the individual to a course of action. So it follows that these investments strengthen one’s commitment to employment and career goals, both directly and indirectly, making it beneficial to continue such commitments.

Moreover, the work of one person is usually related to the work of another or a larger social unit. According to Lopata, Barnwaldt and Miller (1986), this means that one’s work is usually woven into social roles, defined as sets of interdependent social relations between a social person and a social circle involving duties and rights (Znaniecki, 1965; via Lopata, et.al, 1986). In other words, jobs are social roles containing work and other aspects of social relations with all members of a social circle, where the social circle consists of everyone with whom the person interacts in order to carry forth a role.

Throughout this discussion, Becker’s (1960) concepts of commitment and side bets are used along with those proposed side bets of Lopata’s (1992) study, (See pages 28-30).
Although Lopata presented ten side bets, only those side bets that are relevant to the occupational/professional commitment of law school graduates are examined and discussed. As Lopata did in her study, I broaden the concept of side bets to include relevant aspects of the total life space (professional and personal) which women and men graduates can bring into line because these can affect, with ease or with difficulty, the types of career choices made and the level of commitment desired and/or maintained.

When discussing the concept of commitment, Becker (1960), referred to two distinct types: (1) commitment to the organization, and; (2) commitment to the occupation. I examined the investments and commitments the women and men graduates have to the legal profession, as opposed to commitment to the organization of employment. Hence, for the purpose of this study, commitment to the profession will be measured by continued employment in the legal profession.

**Side Bet Theory**

Becker (1960) contended that commitment occurs through a process he called "placing side bets," or types of investments. Becker asserted that the greater the number of side bets, the greater the degree of commitment of the individual. In Becker’s analysis, commitment to the organization and commitment to the occupation is the result of a series of conscious and unconscious side bets, or
investments. A committed person has acted in such a way as to involve other interests of hers/his, originally unrelated to the action s/he is engaging in, to be directly related to that action (Stebbins, 1968; 527). For example, Stebbins (1970), in his study of job commitment, found that age, education, marriage, children and salary were all associated with a strong degree of commitment as well as a strong development of professional identity. So it follows that these investments strengthen one’s commitment to employment and career goals, both directly and indirectly, making it beneficial to continue such commitments.

A consistent line of activity will often be based on more than one kind of side bet; several kinds of "things" valuable to the person may be staked into a particular line of activity. For example, when a person contemplates leaving one employer for another, possible side bets keeping an individual in the original job could include: the loss of pension, stock options, benefits; the loss of seniority and "connections," new colleagues, new expectations, new tasks, and the loss of ease in domestic living( i.e., commuting, relocation). Ritzer and Trice (1969), asserted that there needs to be an analysis of values with which side bets can be made, by examining what kinds of things the individual desires and those types of losses feared. Hence, in order to understand commitment fully, one must discover the system of values, upon which side bets are made.
Lopata's (1992) *Career Commitments of American Women: The Issue of Side Bets*, examined the side bets in the form of: education, occupational preparation, employer selection, full-time involvement, role-conflict avoidance, incorporation of career into self-concept, and the building of a relatively congruent construction of reality. Following Becker (1960), Lopata contended that choosing an occupation or employing organization provides the individual with rewards which can be hard to give up, and leaving it may result either in penalties or in costs the person can increasingly be unwilling to face. Thus, the side bets tie the person to that line of action in many ways that s/he may not be aware of until s/he contemplates the decision to leave this occupation or organization. On the other hand, a person may consciously increase the ease of following the committed line of action by purposely building "side bets" into her/his life (Lopata, 1992: 4). The focus of this analysis is on the latter, that most of the women and men have purposely built side bets into their lives.

Lopata (1992) examined the literature and data from several major studies of the changing commitments of women to family and work roles, and identified some possible forms of side bets. For example, a person who may perceive her/himself as committed to an occupation or a career line which demands high commitment is thus recognized as such by her/himself and by the "generalized other," such as
colleagues, acquaintances and other members of the profession, and by the "significant other," such as spouse, family members, mentors, and friends. What then can be her/his major side-bets to support this commitment? Via the research of others, as well as the research of her own, Lopata presented the following possibilities of career side-bets that may be available to this person:

1. Preparation for involvement in the occupation through schooling and/or job training, at the initial go-around, or as a returnee (Chappel, 1978, via Lopata, 1992). Specialized schooling in job training has a major focus socialization into commitment to the occupation (Becker, 1960; Becker and Carper, 1956; Bucher and Stelling, 1977; Sewell, et al., 1980; via Lopata, 1992).

2. Selection of an organization which can be expected to support her/his commitment to her/his occupational goals (Angle and Perry, 1983; Gerson, 1985; Ritzer and Trice, 1969, 1970; Stebbins, 1970; via Lopata, 1992). People dedicated to a code of ethics prevalent in high status occupations (and actually in some lower ones, such as nurses aids) tend to avoid employers who are expected to demand loyalty to the organization above that to the occupation (Lenz and Myeroff, 1985; via Lopata, 1992).

3. Actual involvement in a job which best enables her/him to work in that occupation or pursue that career line and provides perceived job complexity (Lopata et al., 1985; Kohn and Schooler, 1983; via Lopata, 1992). Women, just as men, are more likely to take a job and be satisfied with it if they perceive it as having complexity than as being simple.

4. Positive evaluations of both instrumental and secondary benefits from such involvement, as in acceptable earnings and prerequisites (Hudis, 1976; Kohn and Schooler, 1983, via Lopata, 1992). The degree of importance assigned to a role and the rewards accrued from it are mutually and cumulatively interdependent.

point out, a student (and so a person in any other role) can get rid of friends who do not support a commitment.

6. Avoidance of the role of spouse/partner, which is regarded somewhat competitive to careers (especially for women), or marrying/bein involved with a person who supports such commitments, or, if changing commitments during marriage/relationship, socializing the spouse/partner into such changes (Houseknecht, et al., 1987; Poloma, 1972; Stein, 1976, 1977; via Lopata, 1992). Commitment to an occupation on the part of a spouse/partner precludes strong involvement in a two-person career, as the back-up, as many observers of the high status political leaders affirm. Her/his career, in fact, may require the spouse/partner's contribution in a two-person style (See also Finch, 1983).

7. Socialization of all circle members in her/his role of spouse/partner (e.g., spouse/partner's employer or work associates) to provide satisfactory supports for the employee role and not to make competing demands.

8. Avoidance of the role of parent, which is definitely documented as competing with careers of women (and as this study reveals, to some extent men), or socializing members of the social circle of that role into support of career/parent commitment. The same is true of other social roles (Veevers, 1980; Yoge and Vierra, 1983; via Lopata, 1992).

9. Incorporation of the occupation and the identity as a career person into the self concept, supported by both generalized and situational self-images (Lopata, 1987; Lopata et al., 1985).

10. Building a relatively congruent construction of reality out of the sociopsychological and behavioral aspects of commitment (Lopata and Barnewolt, 1981). The higher the level of occupational or career commitment, the more the person is likely to pull together a congruent image of the self, the job, and the environment, especially in the case of women who have traditionally not been socialized into such commitment. The very process of making conscious career commitment can push a person toward increased congruence (Burke and Reitzes, 1991; Lopata and Barnewolt, 1981; via Lopata, 1992: 8-11).

In reference to the above listed side bets, Lopata (1992) emphasized that it must be remembered that these
side-bets are expected for most men in modern America, due to the "vestige" of the two-sphere "world" in which a male's professional commitment to an occupation/employee role is taken for granted. This society was developed through a strong focus upon the economic institution, to be carried forth directly by men (Weber, 1904/1953; via Lopata, 1992). Lopata continued by explaining that until very recently, this half of its population has needed no justification for organizing life around occupations. Socialization throughout the life course provided men with a solid base of a congruent construction of reality. The occupational system continues for the most part with "greedy" commitment demands, making it difficult for women who also must meet the demands of an equally "greedy" family (Coser, 1974; Coser and Coser, 1974; via Lopata, 1992). Thus, career commitment by women and men of two career families requires investment in many side bets, both internally, in terms of the self-concept, or identities; and externally, from the environment, especially from people in the various role circles in which they are involved (Lopata; 1992: 11).
CHAPTER 2
STUDY DESIGN AND METHODS

Objectives of the Study

The objective of this study is to examine what patterns exist in the career development of the CWRU women and men graduates. It is the first study of its scale to explore the experiences and careers of all types of law school graduates: practicing lawyers, judges, political officers, teachers, accountants, business executives, entrepreneurs and those persons not currently employed in the paid labor force.

Studying women and men law school graduates enables me to compare women and men in a traditional male profession, where the demands of professional performance may relate differently to women's and men's professional, personal, and cultural identities. This study assesses the status of women and men law school graduates 11 years after graduating from law school and examines their experiences, expectations and differential opportunities to advance and develop professionally. In addition, barriers which prevent, and the facilitators that promote, women's and men's full participation in the profession are examined.
Specifically, this study aims to develop a realistic portrayal of the career experiences of women and men during and after law school; generate data to help the law school shape its curricula and programs for the present students, help students set more realistic career goals and expectations; help law teachers gain a better view of the possible career paths of the students they are educating; and, aid in helping the legal profession understand the experiences of the graduates during and after law school.

Case Western Reserve University and the Class of 1981

Case Western Reserve University School of Law was selected for several reasons, one of which was geographical location. I was looking for a law school in the vicinity of Cleveland, Ohio, since I was living there at the time. Although there were several law schools to choose from, CWRU has the most extensive program and is both a regionally and nationally respected law school and ranks in the top half of all law schools in the United States. It has a law program which attracts students from the United States and abroad and is one of only a few schools which offers a Canadian Law Program, therefore making it unique.

The class of 1981 was selected because it allowed for a longitudinal analysis, since at the time of the study the graduates had been out of law school for eleven years. What makes this class unique is that: it graduated at a time when
the public and the profession began to worry about "the lawyer glut;" major changes simultaneously occurred in the law firm economics and organizational structure, and; the members of the class of 1981 grew up in what some sociologists have called the "me generation" of the late 1970s and attended law school at a time when the mood of the country became more conservative politically, since liberal democrat President Jimmy Carter was defeated by conservative republican Governor Ronald Reagan in the 1980 elections (Vogt, 1986: 2-3).

**Questionnaire Construction**

The CWRU Alum Survey includes the following sections:


Section 1, Personal Background, includes the age, gender, race/ethnicity, of the women and men and type of high school and college/university attended, year bachelor degree was received, information on any additional degrees, if law school was attended immediately after undergraduate education was completed, and if they did not, what they were doing during those intervening years, and information on
family members employed in the legal profession or had attended law school.

Because law schools play a critical role in the professional development of their students and in shaping the profession, Section 2, Law School Experiences, focuses on law school experiences, remembered motivation for attending; likes and dislikes of experiences; satisfactions (intellectual, career training, social and overall); perceived career plans, career assistance, and law school performance.

Section 3, Employment Histories, focuses on employment histories in order to distinguish and understand employment patterns, and choices and opportunities inside and outside the legal profession. In particular, the areas of interest are: attainment of first job upon graduating from law school; histories of first, second and third jobs upon graduating from law school; reasons for job changes; part-time employment and stops in employment; maternity/paternity leaves; non-law employment, career priorities; career influences; and mentor relationships.

Section 4, Current Employment, focuses on current careers to gain an in-depth understanding of career choices, opportunities and direction. Some areas covered are: present job satisfaction; hours worked at the office and billable hours; hours worked at home and outside of the office; current organization of employment; current
position; firm size and firm position, career satisfaction; degree of stress experienced and perceived sources of stress. Also included in this section are questions for current practicing lawyers which include: likes and dislikes of their present job; time delegated to legal activities and tasks; clients; firm size and demographics; race, ethnicity, and gender; helps and hindrances with regard to the legal profession; and, professional association memberships and degree of involvement.

Section 5, Work Projections, examines professional goals five years from the time of the survey. This includes reasons for selection of such goals, and whether these goals are perceived as being realistic and why.

Section 6, Additional Background Information, pertains to demographics and personal background information, parental support of law school, parental educational attainment and occupational status; marital history, spouse/partner educational attainment, occupational status, and income; the graduates' parental status, personal interests; and income.

Lastly, Section 7, "Housework and Child Care Responsibilities, " examines household allocations regarding household tasks and parental responsibilities.

The questionnaire is 22 pages long and comprised mostly of multiple choice questions that required participants to circle a number which best described their answers, open-
ended, and rank-order questions. Prior to the actual mailing of the Alum Survey, a 26-page pre-test was conducted, with the help of the Steering Committee of the Joint Task Force on Gender Fairness of the Ohio Bar Association and the Ohio Supreme Court, of which I was a member. The persons selected from the Steering Committee were mailed two copies of the potential questionnaire, one for them to complete, and the other to be given to a colleague of the opposite gender. The feedback from the pretests provided invaluable comments, questions and criticisms which helped in developing the questionnaire which was used for the Alum Study. The pretests also gave the me an idea of how much time was required to adequately complete the questionnaire, as I was sensitive to the fact that the alums would be hard pressed for time and I wanted to give them an indication of how long it would take when I mailed out a cover letter.

A final questionnaire was mailed to the 1981 graduates of Case Western Reserve University School of Law in July, 1992, to the preferred address given by the graduates to the CWRU Law School Alum Office.

One week prior to the mailing, the Dean of the Law School, Peter M. Gerhart, sent out a letter of introduction and encouraged participation. The questionnaires were accompanied by a cover letter. In this letter, the graduates were informed that "This study aims, with your
assistance, to develop a realistic portrayal of experiences during and after law school. The information you provide will be used to improve programs for our present students, and aid us in helping our profession understand life after law school." The participants were assured of the confidentiality of their responses in the letter of introduction. Moreover, confidentiality was again addressed in the letter I enclosed with the questionnaires to the graduates:

You may be assured of complete confidentiality of your responses. I am the only person who will handle the questionnaires and envelopes and none of the information will be individually identified. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only—as the members of your class reside in 29 different states, provinces or countries. The identification number is used only to confirm when the questionnaire is returned. This also ensures that you will not receive unnecessary reminders if your questionnaire has already been returned.

Stamped envelopes addressed to me at the Law School were enclosed with the questionnaires.

Approximately three weeks after the first mailing, a second letter was mailed thanking those who had participated and encouraging others to do so. Approximately eight weeks after the first mailing, a second mailing of questionnaires and stamped envelopes were mailed to those graduates who questionnaires I had yet not received.

The last questionnaire was received from the alums in January, 1993. Of the 228 graduates who were located, 106
(approximately 47 percent of those located, 45 percent of the total class of 1981) returned their questionnaires. The quantitative responses were coded using Lotus 1-2-3 software. Later, SPSS-X and STATA were used to perform all statistical procedures and tests. The open-ended responses were transcribed using WordPerfect 5.1 and the responses were coded by gender.

Limitations of the Study

In using a questionnaire researchers rely totally on the honesty and accuracy of participants' responses. Because of this, it should be noted that individuals may answer the questions sincerely; however, some of their responses may be their own "theories." Moreover, individuals have "selected memories" about why they behaved this way or did one thing or another. They also may forget why they made the choices that they did, romanticize early pressures or influences and blockout or forget unpleasant circumstances or situations. Another perceived problem could be that individuals may recall their motivations, experiences, opportunities and/or choices in ways that conform to a currently popular theoretical model.

Open-Ended Responses--Qualitative Analysis

The open-ended responses were transcribed, word-for-word, using WordPerfect 5.1. Second, each response was
organized and categorized by type of response. Third, the responses were separated and categorized by gender.

Statistics--Quantitative Analysis

The data were analyzed using the F test, a standard statistical test. Results obtained with this test are reported as differences only if they are "statistically significant," that is, only if researchers can be sufficiently certain that the results reflect actual differences and were not obtained by chance. Researchers usually consider statistically significant those results that are significant at the .05 alpha level, that is, that the obtained result could occur by chance only five times in 100 (Babbie, 1986). However, the larger the number of statistical tests used by this study, the greater the possibility that some of the results might be judged significant using a .05 criterion. To control for this possibility, this study adopted a conservative alpha level of .005, so that the likelihood that any reported results were due to chance would be substantially reduced.

It should be noted, however, that tests of statistical differences explain nothing about the magnitude of a difference. In other words, the tests tell us only that a finding is a "real" one in the sense that it is probably not due to chance, not about whether the magnitude of the difference is large enough to be substantially meaningful (Babbie, 1986). For example, a difference between two
groups may be statistically significant but it may not be meaningful if the two groups differ by only two points on a scale of 100 points.

Case Western University School of Law

The Franklin Thomas Backus School of Law is located in Cleveland, Ohio. The greater Cleveland area has a population of more than two million people and includes many of the country's largest companies and law firms. Ranking "most favored" locations for corporate headquarters (20 of the Fortune 500 companies are headquartered in the greater Cleveland area), Forbes magazine put Cleveland fourth in the country (CWRU Law Bulletin, 1992).

The Law School was founded in 1892. In 1918 women were admitted. The Law school's total enrollment, in 1992, was around 675, nearly all full-time students, and about half are "from Ohio." In every entering class more than 130 undergraduate institutions are represented and no one college supplies a noticeable block of students. Nearly half the students are women, and about 10 percent are minorities. Moreover, law students and law school graduates with Master's degrees, Ph.D.'s and M.D.'s are not rarities.

In 1991-92 the full-time teaching faculty numbered 39, excluding the Dean and Library Director. Hence, the student-teacher ratio is about 17 to one. In addition to the Law School faculty, there is an adjunct faculty,
typically downtown attorneys who come to the Law School one or twice a week to teach a skills course (The Lawyering Process of Trial Tactics) or a substantive course in a specialized area (CWRU Law Bulletin, 1992-93).

Profiles of the Graduates

Similar to the actual 1981 class gender composition, 36 percent of the participants are women and 64 percent are men. The women graduates ranged in age from 35 to 59, with the mean age of 38 years. The men graduates ranged in age from 36 to 57 years, with the mean age of 38. The vast majority of the graduates were 36 and 37 years old. All but one of the participants are Caucasian, and one person is African-American.

The highest college degree attained by 29 percent of the mothers of CWRU graduates is a bachelor degree. One percent of the mothers have a law degree, and 16 percent have a professional degree or a graduate degree. The highest college degree attained by 30 percent of the fathers is a bachelor degree. Ten percent of the fathers have a law degree, and 23 percent have professional degrees or graduate degrees.

Twenty-nine percent of the mothers of CWRU graduates are employed professionals. Twenty-six of the mothers have other types of jobs in the paid labor force, 43 percent are homemakers, and three percent of the mothers are retired.
Fifty-three percent of the fathers are employed professionals, five percent are lawyers, 39 percent have some type of job in the paid laborforce, and three percent of the fathers are retired.

Prior to law school, 62 percent of the women and men attended private colleges or universities, 30 percent state universities, seven percent Case Western Reserve University and one percent (men only) had been in the military. Fourteen percent of the graduates have other advanced degrees (M.A., M.B.A., LL.M., M.D., Ph.D.) in addition to a law degree.

Upon graduating from law school 17 percent of the women and men ranked in the top 10 percent of the class; 31 percent in the top quarter; 30 percent in the top half, and; 22 percent in the lower half of their class. Women and men had similar class ranks.

Like the graduates in similar studies, the majority of women and men (81 percent) were married at the time of the study and had children (82 percent). The number of children in the CWRU study is higher than other studies that had studied parental status. However, this may be due to the fact that the CWRU women and men are older. For example, in the Michigan study (1987), the graduates were 31 years old, and 37 percent of the women had children and 41 percent of the men did. At that point in their careers, they were still in the process of becoming established. The Buffalo
study (Liefland, 1986), combined the classes of 1976, 1977, and 1978 for their results, and reported that 53.9 percent of the women had children and 48.3 percent of the men did. Minnesota (1990) was the other study that examined parental status of the 1975, 1978, 1982 and 1985 graduates of three law schools in the Minneapolis/St. Paul vicinity. Fifty percent of the women had children and 62 percent of the men did.

At the time of the survey 97 percent of the graduates resided in the United States. Fifty-nine percent were in the midwest, 19 percent the northeast, 11 percent the south, and eight percent in the west. In addition, one percent of the graduates were in each of the following: Puerto Rico, Belgium, and England.

Gender Similarities & Differences

Almost half of the women and men have family members who are employed in the legal profession or had attended law school. The majority of women and men have parents who encouraged their decision to attend law school. However, a significant number of women have parents who were neutral over their decision.

More than one-third of the mothers of the women have a bachelor degree. Eighteen percent have a professional or graduate degree. None of the mothers of the women have a law degree. Among the men, one-fourth of the mothers have a
bachelor degree. Thirteen percent have a professional or graduate degree, and one mother has a law degree.

Nearly two-thirds of the mothers of the women are employed in the paid work force; 41 percent are professionals, and 22 percent are employed in other occupations. Thirty-two percent of the mothers are homemakers and five percent are retired. Among the men, half have mothers who are employed in the paid work force, of which 15 percent are employed professionals, 28 percent are employed in other occupations. Forty-nine percent are homemakers, and none of the mothers of the men are lawyers.

Eighteen percent of the fathers of the women have a bachelor degree. Sixteen percent of the fathers have a law degree and 18 percent have a professional or graduate degree. Fifty-one percent of the fathers are professionals, 33 percent are employed in other occupations, 11 percent are lawyers and five percent of the fathers of the women are retired. Among the men, 37 percent of the fathers have a bachelor degree. Twenty-seven percent of the fathers have a professional or graduate degree and five percent have a law degree. Like the women, fifty-four percent of the fathers of the men are employed professionals, 42 percent are employed in other occupations, one father of the men is a lawyer and one is retired. There is a significant difference between the occupation of the fathers among the women and men graduates ($F=15.36; \text{Sig.}=.000$). This may be
indicative to the women having a higher parental socio-economic status (SES).

Few of the women and men were married upon entering law school, but the number of married persons increased slightly upon graduation. Few of the women and men had children at either points in their law school careers. At the time of the study, the overwhelming majority of women and men were married for an average of 10 years, and had children who were infants, preschool and early elementary school age.

The vast majority of the women are married to men with a bachelor degree. Almost one-third of the husbands have professional or graduate degrees and nearly one-fourth have a law degree. All of the husbands are employed full-time. More than three-fourths of the women have partners who are employed professionals. In her study of women lawyers, Epstein (1971) suggested that one way in which the difficulties faced by professional women may be reduced is by marriage to a husband in the same profession with similar professional goals and commitments. Epstein pointed out that these women would be in "a marital environment which tends to be sympathetic and supportive (Epstein, 1971: 551)."

Thirty-nine percent of the men have a spouse/partner with a bachelor degree. Thirty-seven percent have a professional or graduate degree and 35 percent have a law degree. Sixty-seven percent of the men have a
spouse/partner who is employed in the paid labor force, of which 31 percent are professionals, 21 percent in other occupations, and 15 percent are lawyers. Thirty-one percent of the wives are "homemakers," not employed in the paid labor force.

The husbands of the women have an average income of $85,140 and the average total household income (combining personal and spouse income) is $133,903, while the partners of the men have an average income of $28,100 and the average total household income (combining personal and spouse/partner income) is $119,203. The spouses of the women graduates earn substantially more than the spouses of the men (F=4.99; Sig.=.028), which strengthens the hypothesis that professional women marry or are involved with professional men.

Similar patterns of earned income were found in the Michigan study (1986), where the vast majority of men were linked with a spouse/partner who earned much less than they did or did not have a job in the paid work force. It was also found that even though the women earned somewhat less on average than the men, total family income for women with spouse/partners was substantially higher than it was for men with spouse/partners. These findings are not surprising, given that the norms of American culture expect men, and the men expect themselves, to be the primary breadwinners. Women, on the other hand, are expected to be the primary
caretaker of children, and are typically employed in "traditional female jobs" that pay poorly.

Forty-two percent of the women graduates and 16 percent of the men spent more than $8,000 a year on day care/child expenses. Moreover, 42 percent of the women and 16 percent of the men spent more than $8,000 a year on hired help (household). In total, 68 percent of the women and 67 percent of the men paid for some type of hired help in 1991.

At the time of the survey all but three of the graduates were employed in the paid work force, of which 79 percent of the women and 72 percent of the men of whom are employed in the legal profession. These proportions reflected the national trends for that time period (See Curran and Carson, 1991). The majority of the women and men employed in the legal profession practice law. The women are primarily employed in solo practice and small firms of four or less lawyers (47 percent) and in large firms of 100 or more lawyers (40 percent), which also is reflective of national trends where the highest proportion of women were employed in solo practice and in firms of 100 or more lawyers (Curran and Carson, 1991). Women were also employed in judicial positions, government, Legal Services, in-house counsel of corporations and businesses, Fortune 500 organizations, non-legal positions in business and industry and four women were not in the paid labor force due to parental responsibilities.
Unlike the women, the majority of the men employed in the legal profession are primarily in firms of five to 15 lawyers (35 percent). Twenty-three percent are in large firms of over 100 lawyers, 21 percent in firms of four or less and in solo practice, five percent in firms of 30 to 49 lawyers and two percent in firms of 16 to 29 lawyers. Approximately 25 percent of the employed men are not in the legal profession. Those men not employed in the legal profession are employed in a variety of occupations or professions which include medicine, non-law teaching, accounting, business, and real estate. The majority of the non-law employed men reported that they did not practice law because their personalities did not fit the profession.

**TABLE 1**

GENDER DIFFERENCES: PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hrs.Worked/Wk</td>
<td>Mean 44.03</td>
<td>Mean 51.63</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STDV 8.98</td>
<td>STDV 9.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 33</td>
<td>N 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>60,113</td>
<td>93,608</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,705</td>
<td>56,065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrs.Out/Wk</td>
<td>Mean 4.11</td>
<td>Mean 13.81</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STDV 5.48</td>
<td>STDV 20.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 18</td>
<td>N 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hrs.Worked/Wk is number of hours worked per week.
Hrs.Out/Wk is the number of hours spent on work-related tasks out of the office per week.

Since graduating from law school, both women and men have had an average of two different jobs, and have been at their current organization of employment for approximately six years. The women are at their jobs an average of 44 hours a week, while the men average 52. The nearly one-
fourth of women who are in a practice requiring billable hours average 34 hours a week, while the men average 38. In addition to the hours put in at work, the majority of both women and men are doing an average of five hours of job-related tasks at home. However, the women average four hours of job-related tasks outside of the office a week (excluding home), while the men average 14. The women are working an average of 48 weeks a year and have a mean income of $60,113, while the men work an average of 49 weeks a year, and have a mean income of $93,608.
CHAPTER 3
PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION

Introduction

How do persons become associated with the legal profession? In what ways does an individual alter her/his identity to accommodate the role of law student, and ultimately lawyer? Clearly, the process of identification with a profession does not happen over night; rather, the construction of professional identity and commitment is a lengthy and ongoing process, identified as professional socialization.

This chapter examines the process of professional socialization before, and during law school by examining law school experiences. Socialization before law school will be discussed in the first section, Anticipatory Socialization, this section examines two facets of pre-professional socialization: (1) having access to immediate family members (parents and/or siblings) who practice law; and (2) the decision to attend law school or be a lawyer at an early age (before attending college). I will examine whether these two factors influenced parental support (encouragement), class rank, activity membership, and CWRU career help and assistance. The guiding hypothesis is that those persons who have immediate family members practicing law would have
the potential of a greater degree of exposure to the profession, and of knowledge of experiences and expectations of law school. Therefore, they can be expected to perform better in law school than those persons who did not have family members in law. In addition, the remembered age of knowing one wanted to be a lawyer or attend law school will be examined using the hypothesis that early knowledge or awareness of long-term professional goals would allow those women and men to alter their academic careers—in both high school and college—with regard to specific courses and the awareness of the importance of grades with regard to law school admission. Therefore, students who decided they wanted to be a lawyer or attend law school before graduating from high school would be more prepared and thus perform better in law school than those students who decided upon a legal career later in their life cycle.

The second section of this chapter focuses on the education and training aspect of professional socialization at the law school level. As indicated in Chapter 1, Bucher and Stelling's (1977) work on the socialization process of medical students will be discussed with particular emphasis on what they define as "situational variables;" variables within the social setting of the law school that are expected to be important in the process of professional socialization and the development of the professional self. These situational variables are: (1) Role-playing; (2) Role
Models; (3) Peer Groups; (4) Coaching and Criticism; (5) Career Enhancement Opportunities; and, (6) Status Passages.

Specifically, the variables used in examining Role-Playing Opportunities are: class rank, and law school activities (Law Review, Moot Court, Judicial Clerkship, active/nonactive students). The availability of Role Models is analyzed by examining the gender composition of CWRU Law School faculty and the extent to which they may be viewed as role models.

The importance of Peer Groups is examined, along with how significant women and men perceive their peers to have been with regard to their best and worst experiences of law school. Coaching and Criticism variables are examined by the significance of grades and the law school experience. Specifically, I compare the similarities and differences of women and men who ranked in the top 10 percent of the class to those at the bottom 90 percent. Comparisons are also made of graduates in the top 50 percent and in the bottom 50 percent of class ranks. The variables used in these comparisons include; Law Review membership, Moot Court participation, judicial clerkships appointment, and CWRU career help and assistance.

Career Enhancement Opportunities are examined in terms of the law school socialization process. Specifically, I look at the similarities and differences of activity
membership between women and men who were members of the Law Review and/or Moot Court and those persons who were not. Finally, I discuss the formal Status Passages of law school: first year (1L), second year (2L), third year (3L) and graduation. The formal and symbolic definitions of these status passages are defined and discussed.

**Anticipatory Socialization**

As stated in Chapter 1, anticipatory socialization refers to the acquisition of values and orientations found in roles and groups in which an individual is not yet a member, but desires to enter. Generally, anticipatory socialization is an informal preparation which prepares the individual for future roles in her/his role sequence.

**Remembered Age Desired to be a Lawyer/Attend Law School**

A corollary of anticipatory socialization is the length of time one has been considering law school and/or a career in law. For example, if a person has been considering a career in a particular profession since high school, that person has had time to visualize her/himself in a particular role and to acquire some sort of identity with the profession. Forty-two percent of the women and 45 percent of the men graduates recalled they first decided they wanted to go to law school or be an attorney before or during high school (less than or equal to 18 years). Moreover, 34
percent of the women and 36 percent of the men had desired to attend law school at some point during college (older than 18 years). These findings refute earlier research which reveals that given current cultural norms, men would be more likely to choose a legal career earlier in life (See Teitelbaum, Lopez and Jenkins, 1992). As discussed in the next section, this difference may be a result of the fact that almost half of the women graduates had family members in law, which may have influenced their decision to attend law school and pursue a career in the legal profession.

When potential opportunities for anticipatory socialization are examined, more than three quarters of the women and men knew they wanted to enter law school during their high school and college years. These women and men, as opposed to those who decided to pursue a career in law after graduating from college, had the potential to begin to develop their professional identity and become aware of the demands and expectations of persons who pursue law school and/or a career in law. Also, having a career goal early in the educational process could result in being more focused on attaining that goal, and more aware of short-term and long-term expectations, even if that simply means knowing that a "respectable" grade point average and Law School Admission Test (LSAT) score are required to gain admission into a top-ranked law school.
Table 2
Consequences of Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 18 Years</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Over 18 years</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Review</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerked</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU Help</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank: 0=Upper 50%, 1=Lower 50%. Review, Clerked, CWRU Help: 0=No and 1=Yes.

Even though being aware and committed to career goals early in life affords the opportunity to have the potential for ample time to identify with work roles and work expectations, as illustrated in Table 2, there were no significant differences between women and men who decided to enter law school or become a lawyer at an earlier age than those who did not. In other words, the women and men who decided to attend law school before college did not rank higher, have higher Law Review membership, judicial clerkship appointments, or receive more career help or assistance from CWRU than those women and men who decided to attend law school later in their life cycles.

Among the women and men, it appears that regardless of the advantages anticipatory socialization has the potential to bring about, there were no significant benefits or advantages to law school performance in having the goal of being a lawyer or attending law school at an early age.
Family Members Employed in Law/Attended Law School

Those women and men with family members employed in the legal profession may have the potential opportunity to be more prepared for the experiences, demands, and expectations of law school. Moreover, law students themselves assume that those students with family members employed in the legal profession actually perform better than those who do not. This assumption is especially relevant among the students who do not have family members employed in law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSEQUENCES OF FAMILY EMPLOYED IN LAW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Law</th>
<th>Not in Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEANS</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support...</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank.......</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Review.</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerked ..</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU Help .</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support: 1=Strongly Discouraged; 2=Somewhat Discouraged; 3=Neutral; 4=Somewhat Encouraged; 5=Strongly Encouraged. Rank: 0=Upper 50%, 1=Lower 50%. Review, Clerked, CWRU Help: 0=No and 1=Yes.

However, as indicated in Table 3, there is little difference between graduates who had family members in law, and those who did not. When I examined the data of those graduates who did not have family members employed in law, the men had a slightly higher degree of having used CWRU for career help and assistance than the women did. Perhaps the men took a greater initiative to seek the help and assistance that was provided to them by the law school, or
received more encouragement to do so, as opposed to the women graduates. However, having a family member employed in the legal profession, with the opportunity for exposure and knowledge to the profession, did not significantly influence law school performance or experience.

Also, among both women and men, parental encouragement toward their decision to attend law school had no consequence on class rank, Law Review membership, judicial clerkship appointment, or CWRU career help and assistance.

**Education and Training**

To a great extent, the nature and outcomes of professional socialization--professional identity, commitment, and a sense of career--are determined by the nature of the socialization process. As discussed in Chapter 1, Bucher and Stelling (1977), contended would-be professionals enter a professional training program with varying degrees of clarity, specificity, and definitiveness in their views of their specific discipline, potential career opportunities within their profession, and their level of commitment to their profession. However, these would-be professionals usually emerge with a strong sense of professional commitment. As a result of the professional training program, individuals acquire not only needed skills in their course of training, but also a new set of
priorities, beliefs and values vis-a-vis their profession and professional lives.

The process of learning law is a demanding intellectual endeavor, particularly for first-year students, who must navigate through the difficult process of learning a new and often complex language. Generally, learning law involves assimilating a unique form of speech which is highly specialized and conceptually ambiguous. Moreover, embedded within legal discourse is a collection of competing and contradictory assumptions, world-views, and values from which students struggle to ascertain meaningfulness and, at least initially, certainty. In the course of their training, students become conversant in extremely technical concepts of the law (Granfield, 1992: 53).

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to an in-depth discussion of the six variables that Bucher and Stelling (1979) deemed to be critical to the successful professional socialization of medical students: (1) Role Playing Opportunities; (2) Availability of Role Models; (3) Significance of Peer Groups; (4) Methods of Coaching and Criticism; (5) Career Enhancement Opportunities; and, (6) Symbolic Meaning of Status Passages. These variables are examined to determine the extent of which their importance of professional socialization at the law school parallels those findings of Bucher and Stelling (1977) in their study of medical students.
Role Playing Opportunities

In most professions there are tremendous pressures for tight role identification. This is primarily due to the fact that conformance to a role helps define professional competence and integrity. Since the role establishes the rules of the game, close identification increases the likelihood of success in the profession and simplifies the spectrum of moral consideration.

Bucher and Stelling (1977) referred to Role Playing as the extent to which students have an opportunity to perform the roles, or do the work associated with the profession. In order for role-playing activities to result in a sense of mastery, the activities must involve some degree of autonomy and responsibility on the part of the student; the student must, at least, perceive that s/he is acting independently and has responsibility for those actions. Recognition of understanding, explanation, and the realization of having mastered something which outsiders do not know or cannot do, has been clearly linked to commitment and identity.

While attending law school, students have opportunities, or more frequently, compete for opportunities at role playing. Law school activities, such as Moot Court Competitions, Client Counseling Competitions, and Legal Clinic are the primary opportunities that offer some degree of role-playing. Each of these activities is discussed to
determine the significance of participation to the professional socialization process.

Moot Court Competition

Moot Court Competitions allow students to play the role of lawyer-as-advocate. Moot Court is really a simulation, since the students do not have "actual" responsibilities; they act and "play at" doing the work involved in an actual court hearing. Thirty-six percent of the women graduates and 27 percent of the men had participated in Moot Court Competitions.

At CWRU, the student Moot Court Board administers the Dean Dunmore Competition, which is a voluntary second-year program that emphasizes the further refinement of the advocacy and writing skills first developed in the first year Research and Writing course. The Dean Dunmore Competition in appellate advocacy attracts more than a hundred second-year students each year. They gain a substantial educational experience as they hone their brief-writing and oral advocacy skills, and those judged to be the best receive prizes and considerable honor as well, with sixteen finalists.

The format of this program consists of competitive rounds at the beginning of each semester of the second year. The students have four weeks in which to prepare their briefs and arguments; then they argue against each other in
round-robin competitions judged by faculty members, local judges, attorneys, and board members. From these advocates, the Board selects students who, in the fall of their third year, will represent CWRU in national competitions as members of the National Moot Court Team and the Jessup International Moot Court Team, and in the regional competition as members of the Niagar Moot Court Team, (Regional competition among teams from U.S. and Canadian schools. It annually argues a case on U.S.-Canadian international legal problems. Three third-year students represent CWRU and are picked from Dunmore participants).

Other students may participate in one of the specialized competitions such as the Wagner Labor Law Competition (National competition in the area of labor law), and the Alfred R. Mugel Tax Competition (National competition in the area of federal taxation). In addition, the best advocates and brief writers receive monetary awards and many of the participants are invited to Board membership for the following year.

### TABLE 4
CONSEQUENCES OF MOOT COURT PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANS</th>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>Did Not Participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank ......</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Review.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerked ...</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU Help</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rank: 0=Upper 50%, 1-Lower 50%. Review, Clerked, CWRU Help: 0=No and 1=Yes. N=9 for those who participated and were also members of Law Review.*
As illustrated in Table 4, the greatest difference between women and men who participated in law school activities and those who did not was with CWRU career help and assistance. For men, those persons who did not participate in Moot Court were more likely to have sought out the career help and assistance provided by the Law School. Perhaps the men took more of an initiative in pursuing the help and assistance that was available to them, and may have been encouraged to do so. It may be that the women were not encouraged to utilize the assistance that was available to them, or they may have already secured employment, and therefore did not need the assistance provided by the law school.

Client Counseling Competition

While Moot Court Competitions allow students to play the role of lawyer-as-advocate, the annual Client Counseling Competition has students playing the role of lawyer-as-advisor. This competition involves teams of two students who interview the same "client," typically played by a professional actor, and a panel that usually includes a psychologist or a social worker as well as lawyers, who evaluate their performances. Success in the competition depends less on substantive knowledge of law than on sensitivity and skills in one-to-one communication. Usually about a hundred students take part, including many
first-year. In a tournament involving several such interviews, a winning team is chosen. The members receive the Client Counseling Award and represent the Law School in regional competition sponsored by the American Bar Association. The winners of the twelve regional competitions go on to compete in the national finals.

None of the men and only two of the women had participated in the Client Counseling Competitions. Participation may have been so low because Client Counselling Competition is traditionally a first-year activity and is perceived by most students as "soft" and "touchy-feely," more of a psychological activity than a combative activity, like Trail Tactics of Litigation. Generally, winning this competition is based on ability to make the client feel comfortable, to deal with emotional components, letting the client do most of the talking, and getting the facts of the case (Jackson, 1994). There are no course credits for participation and it meets on weekends.

**CWRU School of Law Legal Clinic**

Aside from employment in law firms after the second year, it appears that the only law school activity which allows students to have actual responsibility is the Legal Clinic. At the Legal Clinic the students are supervised by practicing attorneys and actually meet and counsel clients. The attorneys supervise the students, as well as videotape
the students while interacting with the clients. Here, the students actually perform the roles and do the work that is associated with the profession.

The Legal Clinic at CWRU is only about 20 years old. Therefore, at the time that the graduates were in law school, the Legal Clinic had been in existence for just around seven years. The Law School's first clinic was a criminal clinic. There were fewer women involved because only a small number of women took courses in criminal law. Unlike medical school where students are exposed to different types of health problems and different types of patients, during the graduates' tenure at the Law School, clients of the Legal Clinic were mainly legal aid clients. Therefore, students were exposed to similar clients, mainly lower income people who could not afford to hire a lawyer on their own, with certain kinds of problems.

Unlike Client Counselling Competition, which occurs on weekends, Legal Clinic is a two to four credit course with a heavy time commitment. Also, where Client Counselling is traditionally a first-year student activity, Legal Clinic consists mainly of third-year students who must have two-thirds of their course work completed and certain clinical registration papers obtained by the court.

Despite the fact that participation in Legal Clinic offers the highest degree of role-playing opportunities, it should be questioned as to why none of the women graduates
and only four of the men were involved in Legal Clinic. According to Bucher and Stelling's (1977) theories, such hands-on experience would be significant to the professional socialization process.

One could speculate that time may have been an issue, since most third-year students are seeking employment and going through intense interviewing process, or that the limitations of the Legal Clinic with regard to types of clients and the law practiced would not be practical for their long-term career goals. Perhaps Journal participation may have been perceived as being more detrimental to a career in the legal profession since it provides life-long prestige.

What needs to be explored further is the fact that these role-playing activities were gendered. None of the men participated in Client Counselling, the "soft" and simulated role-playing activity, where some of the women did. And, none of the women participated in Legal Clinic, the only law school activity that offers "real" hand-on experience, dealing with actual clients with actual problems. Perhaps the Client counselling competition, because it is perceived as being "soft," is labeled as a "woman's activity," where the hands-on, Legal Clinic course is perceived as a "tough," and time-demanding activity; more of a "man's activity."
In addition to the law school activities already discussed, classes such as Lawyering Process, Trial Tactics/Practice and Mock Trial Competitions also use simulations. For example, the students get opportunities in interviewing, counseling and negotiation; however, the process is simulated by hired actors who play clients, or actual attorneys.

Law School Activity Participation/Nonparticipation

Overall, more men graduates were involved in law school activities, than women (F=5.03; Sig.=.027). More than twice as many men than women had participated in law school activities.

Although the questionnaire did not specifically address the reasons for lack of participation, some of the women and men qualified their nonparticipation with explanations. For a few of the women and men, nonparticipation was the result of employment, as indicated by this man, "I found it more productive to work part-time for firms in downtown Cleveland; this part-time work also enabled me to keep in touch with the outside world (540M)." A woman replied, "...I worked during law school (421F)." Another woman wrote, "...I had to work all three years of law school and did not have time [to participate in activities] (546F)." And another man reported, "...I worked part-time for an attorney (577M)." Therefore, it can be asserted that among
the graduates who had not participated in the Law School role-playing activities due to employment in law firms, were participating in an environment that offered hands-on-experience, while the Law School did not. In which case the men, and possibly the women, were actually involved in role-playing situations (I cannot comment on the women since they did not specify what type of employment they had).

Perhaps those women and men who had alternative opportunities of role-playing experiences wanted more responsibility than the law school was capable of offering. Moreover, some graduates displayed dissatisfaction with "real world" experiences offered at the Law School, when they commented on what they disliked about their law school experiences (to be discussed in detail later in this chapter). Such a perception is strengthened by Abel's (1989) study of American lawyers, where he pointed out that given the nonprofessional content of much legal education and the glamorous variation among legal careers, further socialization must occur within the first job and at the beginning of each subsequent job (See also Lortie, 1959).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
<th>CONSEQUENCES OF ACTIVITY PARTICIPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEANS</td>
<td>Participated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank.....</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU Help.</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank: O=Upper 50%, I=Lower 50%. CWRU Help: 0=No and 1=Yes. N=0 for top 10% ranking and did not participate in activities.
As indicated in Table 5, activity participation had no effect on class rank for both women and men. However, those women who had not participated in activities had a higher mean of having received help or career assistance from CWRU than men who had also not participated, but their mean was higher than those women and men who had participated in activities. Perhaps among the women, nonparticipation may have been due to their having to work in law offices, and therefore they focused more on their employment status and sought out any available career help and assistance.

Availability of Role Models

One agency of socialization is the presence of adequate role models; those persons who provide examples to aspiring professionals (For law, see Epstein, 1977, 1985; Jack and Jack, 1989). When Bucher and Stelling (1977) examined the availability of role models to medical students, they studied the types of models that were provided within the socializing situation, with whom the students actually identified and the nature of the identification.

Like the medical students in the Becker, Geer, Hughes and Strauss study (1961), most of the faculty at the law school do not serve as career models for the profession. A significantly low number of students enter law school with the ultimate desire to teach at the law school level. In
fact, none of the CWRU women and men graduates in this study had ever taught at a law school. However, a number of law school instructors enter the field of teaching with prior experience in the legal profession, and the law school has "special lecturers" who teach a course in addition to the work they do in the legal profession (i.e., attorneys, judges, physicians).

When the types of role models available within the socializing situation of the law school were further examined, the gender composition of the CWRU faculty proved to be an important and interesting factor. The women and men graduates began their law school career in the fall of the 1978-1979 academic year. Despite the fact that at this point, approximately forty percent of most entering classes consisted of women, the 32 full-time faculty positions at the Law School were comprised of 29 men and three women, while there were sixteen men and four women lecturers (See Table 6). In their second year, 1979-1980, the gender composition of the 33 full-time faculty positions had not changed much, with 29 men and four women (of which one woman was a visiting professor), while the positions of lecturer were occupied by 20 men and four women. In the graduates' last year of law school, 1980-1981, the 25 member faculty consisted of 23 men (of which two were visiting professors) and two women. The positions of lecturer were comprised of
20 men and five women. In addition, all of the special lecturers were men.

### TABLE 6
GENDER COMPOSITION OF CWRU LAW SCHOOL FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978 - 1979</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979 - 1980</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 - 1981</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992 - 1993</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 - 1994</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 - 1995</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To demonstrate what changes have been made with regard to faculty at the Law School in the past 14 years, with entering classes which consist of at least 40-50 percent women, the 1994-95 faculty consisted of 41 full-time members of which 28 were men and 13 were women. Of the adjunct instructors, 37 were men and nine were women. Therefore, the accessibility of role models, with regard to gender identification, would be more difficult for the women students, especially given the women/men faculty ratio at the Law School.

The lack of female role models to the women has the potential to make a difference in law school and professional experiences. Perhaps the lack of female professors/instructors contributed to the consistently low levels of law school satisfaction that women had, regardless of their class rank, or activity membership, while there
were virtually no differences in law school satisfaction among the men. This presumption is further supported by findings of the Michigan study (1986), where women and men were asked about gender differences in their law school experiences. When student/faculty relationships were discussed, it was revealed that the most frequent observation made by many women and men was that some male faculty members seemed uncomfortable, wary, or self-conscious in dealing with women. Because of this, the women of the Michigan study believed they were denied opportunities for "causal out-of-class contacts" which can greatly help a student adjust to the pressures of law school, and also were denied from establishing "the special mentor relationship" which can be so important to career development (Chambers, 1986: 40-41).

Furthermore, the opportunity to work closely with faculty members is potentially limited to those students who compete successfully in the law school activities. In essence, winning such opportunities is limited to a small portion of the class (approximately 10-15 percent). This leaves roughly 80 percent of the class to fend for themselves. In fact one man recalled what he disliked about his law school experience was "The lack of personal attention of the professors... (542M)."

The role models at law school, for most students, do not provide an extensive socializing situation. More
importantly, the lack of role model relationships could stagnate or limit the degree of identification the students have with the legal profession. For example, if a student has a faculty member as a role model, the student could benefit by getting knowledge of career choices, options, and advice as well as guidance and the opportunity to learn from the role model’s experiences.

More recently, CWRU and other law schools recognized the advantages of faculty role-models and have added more activities that allow students and faculty to work together (i.e, journals), with the realization that students do not have equal access to faculty members as role models--whether this is a result of gender, class ranking, or choice.

**Significance of Peer Groups**

Bucher and Stelling (1977) studied types of relationships characterized by the peer groups, whether peers learned from one-another, and if so, what they learned. The CWRU graduates were asked in an open-ended question what they recalled to be the best parts of their law school experience. The most common response among both women and men was the friendships they had formed while in law school.

Friendships and peers were significant to the experiences of both women and men. For example, one man wrote, "I have very positive memories of law school and
CWRU. The quality of the education in a supportive social environment is what I most fondly remember. My closest friends are those I made during law school (494M)." Another commented, "[One of my best experiences was] working with and competing against extremely bright people (495M)." One woman wrote, "[The best part of law school was] cementing several long-term friendships (502F)." Other women also indicated, "The friendships and camaraderie (517F)," and "The life-long friendships I formed (451F)" were the best parts of their law school experience.

Kahlenberg (1992), in his book Broken Contract: Memoirs of Harvard Law School, attributed a great degree of this closeness to the students all going through the same fears and doubts about themselves together. For instance, Kahlenberg reflected back to his humiliating first class of law school, and he wrote about entering his second class, "...I had found my seat and started pouring my heart out to the two women on either side of me, complete strangers, all of us now bound together by a common fear (Kahlenberg, 1992;14). Becker, Hughes, Geer and Strauss (1961) contended that this bond is due to the fact that the academic environment of the first year provides, in a rather extreme form, what makes it possible for a group to create the immediate, situational perspectives characteristic of an autonomous subculture. The students have pressing common problems which they face in realistic isolation (Becker,
Hughes, Geer and Strauss, 1961: 88). In other words, as a whole, the students are experiencing the stress that goes along with having to redefine their norms and culture for law school, mainly to do more work than they can manage easily.

Among the vast majority of both women and men the worst aspect of their law school experience was the competition and rivalry among their classmates. In his study of Harvard Law students, Granfield (1992) found that much of the censuring of commonplace positions takes place informally at the level of student culture. Severe sanctions often come from fellow students in the form of hissing, laughter, and general disdain. Students who violate the legalistic norms of objectivity and neutrality are often held in contempt by their classmates. In many cases students were criticized for being naive and immature (Granfield, 1992: 78).

The desire of attaining a law degree and attending CWRU School of Law is what brought the students together—a common goal and geography. The fact that they were so highly integrated under stressful circumstances contributed to the group cohesion and the formation of friendships. However, the environment of the law school, mainly its competitive nature, places another type of stress on the students. The stress on particular friendships with regard to classes, rank and activity memberships can further split and intensify the friendships (the haves and the have-nots,
the inside group and the outside group, specific areas of legal interest, the fast trackers...). Therefore, many friendships evolved out of circumstance and need, making it easy to understand why competition and rivalry of classmates was perceived by most of the women and men to have been one of the worst aspects of their law school experience.

Even 11 years after graduating from law school, most women and men continued to feel strongly about the high degree of competition and rivalry they experienced at Case Western. For example, one woman recalled, "[The] competition and pettiness of other students--it was like living in a small town where most of the people are paranoid (623F)," and one man wrote that "...The extremely competitive nature of the student body, encouraged by the law school, contributed to a negative academic environment (540M)."

The data suggest that relationships among classmates varied. The graduates recalled the wonderful friendships they had made while attending law school as well as the petty rivalries and inflated egos of their peers. What they all had learned from one another is difficult to assess. Clearly, the nature of the law school environment and the academic process taught the students how to compete at various levels--levels that were more stressful than those they were used to prior to entering law school. They had to compete for grades, activity membership, and employment
positions. Moreover, many were not only competing against their colleagues, but also they were competing against their friends. This type of environment is one that is commonplace in the world of law. Individuals may be pitted against a colleague in the court room and/or when competing for clients; however, that same colleague may be a close friend. Hence, one learned to put the friendships aside in the legal arena and focus only on the law. Although some students claimed that law school did not prepare them for the "real world," from this perspective, it most certainly did.

Moreover, as a result of the peer relationships and the law school environment, the students have the potential to learn how to survive in a hierarchy of prestige as insiders or as outsiders, and at the same time, they can learn the value of networking and contacts (Law Review, Moot Court, research assistantships, judicial clerkships). Study groups are generally considered to be a necessity and continue to be a significant source of knowledge and are pertinent to surviving law school. Study groups help to keep students informed of current issues and different, individual perspectives and interpretations of the law, and study groups also bring to light the structural aspect of the commitment to friends.

Nevertheless, some of the graduates remained bitter with regard to law school experiences and peers, as evident
in this response, "...I hated law school, nearly everyone there, and nearly everything about it (619F)" and "In general, it was not a particularly pleasing or rewarding experience. I was happy to have it over (474M)." This perception does not appear to be an isolated one. For example, Herma Hill Kay (1989) recalled the following brief but intense graduation address by a male student at Boalt Hall [University of California at Berkeley] in the 1960's: "I hated this place, I hated the faculty. I hated the courses. And, as for my classmates, I'll see you bastards in court (Kay; via Teitelbaum, Lopez and Jenkins, 1992)."

Regardless of personal feelings, law school peer groups are characterized by a number of different relationships, good or bad, and the graduates learned from each other, whether they realized this or not.

**Coaching and Criticism**

Bucher and Stelling (1977), defined the Coaching and Criticism variable as the ways in which the students knew how they were doing, what kind of cues they received and from whom, how they were communicated, and the ways in which the students were informed of their progress and performance.

Law schools continue to be criticized as being male creations. Despite the admittance of women, generally law schools are still dominated by males and male hierarchy.
The teaching style, specifically the Socratic method, continues to be criticized for promoting verbally and intellectually aggressive behavior. In its classical form, one student undergoes extensive questioning until s/he can no longer explain the position taken or falls into contradiction. The students see the outcome as inevitable, if not because legal reasoning is itself uncertain, then because the instructor is adept at "hiding the ball" (Teitelbaum, Lopez and Jenkins, 1992).

In addition, the Socratic method is often chided because of its power relationship between faculty members and students. Legal scholar Carrie Menkel-Meadow (1988) contended that:

[T]he law school form of Socratic dialogue occurs in so large a group that little reciprocity, genuine conversation, or exploration is possible. Students are often glad that someone else is "on the hook," and, while "out there," each student feels alone, unsupported, alienated, fearful, and grows increasingly apathetic. Thus, the messages of such classes are that teachers know it all, that students must guess at what is temporarily "right," and that learning is highly individualized (Menkel-Meadow, 1988: 71).

Generally, more CWRU men than women made reference to the Socratic method of teaching as one of the worst parts of their law school experience. One man replied, "The intellectual Socratic method does not prepare you for real life. If the goal of the law school is to make a person a good lawyer, they all fail miserably (552M)." Another man reported, " [I disliked] the insulting nature of the
Socratic method and the attitude of some professors who seemed to enjoy it too much (509M)." And still another man wrote, "[I didn't like] the unhealthy competition [and] the unnecessarily sadistic Socratic teaching methods (497M)."

When the Socratic method of teaching is examined from another perspective, it is interesting to find that the Young Law Teacher's Workshop, put on by the American Association of Law Schools, conducts its sessions on the premise that the Socratic teaching method provides a close analogue to the power relationships between lawyers and clients. The premise contends:

1. The professor has a great deal of information about which the student is at least initially ignorant;

2. The student needs something from the teacher (the student at least needs the grade), just as the client needs something from the lawyer;

3. The emotional dynamics that develop between lawyers and clients exist in the classroom between professors and students (i.e., feelings of dependence, with all their encircling defense mechanisms; concerns over narcissism, how do I look?; feelings of aggressiveness simulated by the challenges and tensions in the classroom with all of their surrounding conflicts);

4. The whole issue of uncertainty in legal questions and problems and how to cope with it is raised. Legal education requires that a student learn to act as if he knows something, even if he is ever aware that some things are not yet (or maybe never) knowable (Watson, 1988: 244).

Some of the CWRU women and men made no reference to the Socratic method of teaching as a negative experience, which
may account for the discrepancy in responses. For example, with regard to the law school environment, one man reported, "[I had] a great group of classmates, [the] small groups were conducive to making close friends; great camaraderie as a result of the first year experience. [There were some] great teachers who cared about me as an individual--who inspired me to love their courses and areas (503M)." One woman wrote, "[There were] excellent professors who taught me to think without degrading me or my fellows (550F)." and still another woman reported, "[I had] some excellent professors [and] a nurturing and warm environment (512F)."

Reading the different responses of the graduates, one could get the idea that they attended entirely different law schools! Yet, with the importance of class rank and the prestige and privileges that are associated with certain activity memberships and appointments, they probably did.

It could be argued that making grades was even more distressing to the students than the Socratic method of teaching. However, it appears that the legal profession, in general, is a highly stressful profession. Again, in a subtle yet powerful way, the law school is providing the students with tools, aside from esoteric knowledge, that are necessary for survival and success in the high powered, high stressed legal world. And, as indicated by some of the responses of the women and men, this goal was acknowledged.
Grades, also a source of criticism and stress for law students, are crucial in determining potential career options and choices. Law students experience the competition for grades as fiercer and more destructive than anything in their prior education; by contrast, entry to medical school is more competitive, and learning within it is less so (Abel, 1989: 224). A student’s success in law school is measured primarily or solely by high grades and the various law school positions held (i.e., Law Review, judicial clerkships). In law school, there is no consideration given in this "merit system" for any personal circumstances, such as their age, family responsibilities, illnesses, or their culture. Law school, critics argue, reflects the legal system, which focuses on the position of a hypothetical, featureless individual--an individual without family responsibilities--whose situation is measured only by a narrow range of circumstances (Teitelbaum, Lopez and Jenkins, 1991; 447).

The frustration and anxiety of grades were evident in common recollections of both CWRU women and men. One woman wrote, "[I went] from being a high achiever at a state university and public high school, to not having good grades in law school--and never knowing what I was doing wrong (465F)." A man recalled a similar thought, "I worked extremely hard in law school and put in very long hours; however, I graduated in the lower half of the class (608M)."
another woman recalled, "...one test each semester with no credit for classroom preparation and participation really stinks! It rewards those [students] who merely test well (451F)." Another woman reported, "[T]he system makes you feel like a failure from the start (448F)."

Understandably, the importance of grades appears to be somewhat of an overwhelming obsession. Grades are extremely important the first year because grades are significant in making Law Review. First and second year grades are crucial in getting summer jobs after the second year, judicial clerkships and Law Review memberships. All three years of grades determine what type of career options and choices are available to students upon graduation. Kahlenberg (1992), in his Harvard memoirs, recalled a professor making an obligatory speech to his first year class about how unimportant grades were; a speech which he believed was as convincing as a rich man telling a group of beggars that money wasn't important.

Grades received in law school will potentially open and shut a lot of doors for most students. Grades in law school are, by common acknowledgement, an important consideration in the hiring process for many employers. Academic performance strongly affects student career choices because those who do well can aspire to the extraordinary financial rewards of large-firm practice (Abel, 1989: 219). Most prestigious law firms will interview only those students who
rank in the top 10 percent of their class; high grades are generally needed to make Law Review, to obtain good jobs and to get awarded a judicial clerkship appointment.

The CWRU students are only too aware of this. Some of the graduates had recollections similar to this man, "The realization that subjective evaluations about students by faculty would determine who would excel...by the end of the first year, everyone had been type cast as to who would make Law Review (559M)," and a woman recalled "For those of us who were not in the top 10% of the class during the first year, we were basically ignored as far as career guidance was concerned (611F)," or "the faculty pondered to the top 10% (471F)."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7</th>
<th>CONSEQUENCES OF CLASS RANK: TOP 10% &amp; BOTTOM 90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEANS</td>
<td>Top 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerked</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU Help</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Law Review, Clerked and CWRU Help: 0=No, 1=Yes.

Because many of the CWRU graduates made reference to the advantages of being in the top 10 percent of the class, I categorized rank as the top 10 percent and bottom 90 percent and examined the consequences of rank by Law Review membership, judicial clerkship appointment, and CWRU career help and assistance. As illustrated in Table 7, when the
women and men in the top 10 percent of the class were examined, a significantly higher number of men than women were also members of Law Review. On the other hand, when women and men of the bottom 90 percent of the class were examined, a significantly higher number of women than men had been members of Law Review. Moreover, more men in the bottom 90 percent of the class used CWRU career help and assistance than did women.

**TABLE 8**

CONSEQUENCES OF CLASS RANK: TOP 50% & BOTTOM 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANS</th>
<th>Upper 50%</th>
<th>Lower 50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Review</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerked</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU Help</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Law Review, Clerked and CWRU Help: 0=No and 1=Yes.

To further study the consequences of class rank, the second comparison categorized class rank by the upper 50 percent and the lower 50 percent. In this analysis, more men in upper 50 percent of the class used CWRU career help and assistance than women. Consequences of class rank will be examined further throughout the remainder of this chapter and in Chapter 4.

Since CWRU Law School is highly respected and it is competitive to gain admission, generally the Law School is taking people who have received mostly A's in college and spreading them over a bell curve, so most students, by
definition, could not do nearly as well as they had in the past. Again, it could be argued that the importance of grades is likely to prepare students for the cutthroat world of law, where it doesn't matter why you aren't performing up to par on a particular day—what matters is merely that you are not performing up to par. Hence, what's humane and rational does not necessarily need to be central to the practice of law.

It is interesting to note that because grades and anxiety are so much of a given, the Law School currently offers a parents/partners orientation in which the school explains how the average grade point average prior to law school for the entering class may be, for example 3.4 or 3.6; however, the average grade point average for that class upon graduation will be a 3.1. The law school refers to this as the "pyramid effect."

There is little, if any, face-to-face interaction for reports of progress. The primary interaction is with that of which CWRU students have come to call the "Wailing Wall." This is the wall where the Law School posts the course grades at the end of each semester. All of the students wait for the posting and then gather around to find out what grades they made in their classes. It could be questioned as to why is it done this way, in front of everyone. Could this be one more chance for public humiliation? There are many other ways in which the distribution of grades could be
done--ways that are more individual and sensitive to what the students are going through, ways that are more humane than posting up grades on a wall. One could question the reasons why the Law School continues to use this procedure as the sole means of communicating progress. However, it could be that the public humiliation involved in getting grades is part of the self-fulfilling prophecy of first year ranking and, that this type of posting perpetuates competition and rivalry and the "need to succeed."

**Career Enhancement Opportunities**

Bucher and Stelling (1977) defined this variable as experiences which had an enormous emotional impact upon people. They examined what opportunities existed in a training program for such highlighted events and emotions, what form they took, how intense they were, and if students were aware of their impact at the time, or if this was something which took shape retrospectively or over time. Law Review membership and judicial clerkship appointments are the most significant career enhancement opportunities of professional socialization at the law school level.

**Law Review Membership**

Generally, the most significant law school experience which has an enormous emotional impact on the students is the competition to make Law Review. According to the CWRU
Law School Bulletin, the most important goal in making Law Review is to provide scholarly analysis of various legal problems and commentary on virtually any facet of the legal process. Ideally, the reader is given a powerful source for research and is simultaneously exposed to new ideas and approaches. The Law Review provides an unparalleled opportunity for students to improve their basic analytical and expressive skills.

Although The Law School Bulletin contended that the Law Review is published by a group of student editors selected on the basis of interest and ability; the selection appears to be made solely on demonstrated ability, as grades and a writing competition are the basis of making Law Review. Only 25-30 students are selected to be on Law Review. This is 10 to 15 percent of the class. Moreover, there was a significantly strong correlation between a high class rank and Law Review membership among the CWRU graduates (F=21.04; Sig.=.000).

Those students who "demonstrate the ability and interest" are invited to become associates of the Law Review at the beginning of their second year, and if their work is satisfactory they may be elected to serve as editors during their third year. Every member of the Law Review is given the chance to prepare a substantial work of legal scholarship and is expected to perform various technical tasks entailed in the production of a learned journal.
Participation on the Law Review involves a significant investment of time and energy, but generations of editors and associates have found that the intellectual and professional rewards are a more than generous return. Participation in the organization—as writer or editor—provides valuable experience for nearly any future endeavor that might interest a law student. Working on any of the journals helps a student to polish writing, editing, and in some cases administrative skills. Faculty advisors work with the student editors, who often receive academic credit for their work.

There appear to be four significant characteristics of Law Review: (1) the redundancy of grades; (2) the issue of time management; (3) the opportunity for publication and work with an author; and, (4) friendships. Law Review reinforces the significance of ranking in the top 10 to 15 percent of the class. There are two ways to make membership, "grade-on" and "write-on." A write-on is a student who makes membership by successfully winning the writing competition. However, grade-on is the norm. For example, for the 1994-95 academic year, of the 40 students who made Law Review, only six were write-ons.

The time management issue is an important facet of Law Review. Being a member of this major work activity while being a full-time law student enhances time management skills and reinforces research and writing skills. There is
the opportunity for public recognition of being published, working directly with an author, and using research and writing skills. Lastly, the students of the Law Review are a cohesive group. There is the formation of close friendships with everyone else at the top of the class, potential networking and collegiality once in the workplace and when seeking advice and future employment opportunities. Clearly, the benefits of the Law Review membership far outweigh the time commitment and work involved.

Being a member of the Law Review, like grades, can provide many career advantages and opportunities. Moreover, all of the students realize this sobering reality. When they begin their law school experiences, they begin as equals—equally scared of their new environment and new expectations. However, with the selection of Law Review, there is that understood knowledge that the members and the nonmembers have the potential to be on entirely different tracks throughout the remainder of their law school experiences well into their professional experiences.

| TABLE 9 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                | Law Review Member | Not a Member |
| MEANS          | Female | Male | F | Sig. | Female | Male | F | Sig. |
| Rank           | .143    | .727 | 7.69 | .014 | .167    | .054 | 2.89 | .092 |
| CWRU Help      | .2      | .73  | 4.49 | .053 | .27     | .43  | 3.49 | .065 |
| Clerked        | .28     | .1   | .91  | .354 | .03     | .05  | .19  | .666 |
| Income         | 58,286  | 132,273 | 7.83 | .013 | 60,646  | 85,731 | 4.91 | .029 |

Rank: O=Upper 50%, l=Lower 50%. Review, Clerked, CWRU Help: 0=No and 1=Yes.
Seven of the women graduates (23 percent) and 11 of the men (17 percent) had been members of the Law Review. As indicated in Table 9, a significant difference emerged among the men, where class rank had a significant influence on being a member of the Law Review; the higher the class rank, the greater the likelihood of being a member of the Law Review.

Eleven years after graduating from law school, one difference between the graduates who were members of Law Review and those who were not was earned income. For example, the men who were on Law Review had a mean income of $132,272, those men who were not on the Law Review had a much lower mean income of $85,731. On the other hand, women on Law Review had a lower mean income of $58,285, while those women who were not on Law Review had a higher mean income of $60,646. However, it is important to note that geographical location and area of law were not controlled variables, therefore these differences may be overstated, as the reported salaries were from different regions of the United States and also included other countries. Therefore there are geographic differences with regard to pay, cost of living, etc., that should be taken into account when interpreting these findings. Moreover, as revealed in Chapter 2, more women were employed in solo practice, where the earning potential is much lower than larger firm practice or corporate counsel. More of the men held the
position of partner in a law firm, which has a much higher earning potential than do solo, small firm, government and corporate counsel.

Abel (1989), in his study of American lawyers, pointed out that much of the income difference between male and female lawyers reflects career choices by women who may (reasonably) be anticipating employer discrimination as well as seeking positions they can combine more easily with childrearing. Furthermore, he contended that entry into the legal profession does not guarantee equality within it. One index of success is income, in a 1986 Boston Study, it was found that women made 85 percent of the income of men. Abel pointed out that part of the income disparity is attributed to difference in the age profile of women and men, but even within age cohorts, women have not attained equality. They still are expected to shoulder the burdens of childrearing, as almost all mothers do. Often women sacrifice career advancement to marital and childrearing responsibilities (Abel, 1989: 94-95).

The pay inequities among the women and men are devastating within themselves. But, the fact that participating on the Law Review had a negative consequence on women leaves a lot to be questioned. One plausible explanation could be that those women who were on Law Review took positions of lower pay than the men, or left the large law firms they were recruited into upon graduation for a
different firm setting, with lower pay (Jackson, 1993). Another explanation could be that regardless of the prestige of Law Review for the legal profession, it appears to be beneficial mainly to men, hence the inequity of pay and positions among women and men in the profession resurfaces.

In addition to the Law Review, Case Western also has the Journal of International Law. Although working on this journal affords students the opportunity to hone their writing skills and work with a faculty member, it does not carry the prestige that being a member of Law Review does.

**Judicial Clerkship Appointments**

The other law school career enhancement opportunity that appears to have an emotional impact upon the students is the competition for judicial clerkship appointments. Because most federal judges select their clerks one and a half to two years before the clerks have completed law school, this competition consists of second and third year students. Moreover, competition for clerkships is nationwide. Law students from all over the United States compete against one another for the approximately 3,500 available positions.

Like Law Review, competition for judicial clerkship appointments is based primarily on grades and letters of recommendation. Judicial clerkship appointments are one to two years following graduation, and pay substantially less
than most firms and corporations. However, there is tremendous prestige involved with the position of clerkship—especially clerkships with federal judges—for both the student and the law school. Furthermore, clerkships offer a one-on-one experience with judges, and allow the clerks to hone their writing skills. Generally, clerks are hired by judges to research, and often write judicial opinions involving complex and important issues. Top ranked students seek out judicial clerkships as one more credential in their educational process. Some students are appointed to two federal clerkships, one at a trial level with a District Court judge, and one with an appellate level judge. The normal career progression is from judicial clerkship to an associate position with a major firm. A judicial clerkship is also a typical credential for those women who want to be employed as law school teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 10</th>
<th>CONSEQUENCES OF JUDICIAL CLERKSHIP APPOINTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerkship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEANS</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU Help</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>37,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank: 0=Upper 50%, 1=Lower 50%. Review, Clerked, CWRU Help: 0=No and 1=Yes.

Three women and four men of the CWRU law graduates were appointed judicial clerkships. For both women and men,
there was no significant correlation between class rank and a clerkship appointment (See Table 10). Moreover, unlike the higher incomes that tend to be associated with graduates on Law Review, those graduates who held clerkship positions had lower current mean incomes than those who did not. This difference is interesting since those who have held judicial clerkship appointments are considered to be "fast-trackers" in the profession likely headed for the top prestige positions. However, prestige is not necessarily indicative to high pay.

As illustrated in Table 10, among those persons who had a judicial clerkship, the men were more likely to have used the career help and assistance available at CWRU, than the women. Moreover, like Law Review, among those persons who did not have a judicial clerkship, the men far exceeded the women with regard to earnings. Another gender difference was with dual-memberships, where significantly more women than men had been both members of Law Review, and received a judicial clerkship appointment.

**Status Passages**

The concept of status passage refers to transitional points in the passage of students through the system, and whether there are clearly marked points of transition which inform the students about where they are in their movement or development (Bucher and Stelling, 1977). The
transitional points through the system for the law students is the progression of their student status (Jackson, 1993; Kahlenberg, 1992).

First year is referred to as "1L." The first year is totally structured; the students do not have a choice in what classes they will take. Generally, the most significant transition while in law school is at the end of the first year. The perception is that they survived the dreaded first year, which is characterized as being a painful, humiliating, and humbling process and they survived it. Most students, particularly during first year, experience law school as an intellectually monolithic, emotionally overwhelming, and personally transformative. Numerous studies have found heightened symptoms of obsessive-compulsive, depression, and hostility, beginning in the first six months of law school and persisting throughout the entire three years, even influencing the first two years of practice (Abel, 1989: 213). During the second year, "2L," students are allowed to choose most of their classes, although the law school makes recommendations as to what classes would be beneficial to their legal careers. At this point in the process, the students are forming sub-groups according to areas of interest. This is also true of the third year. The third year, "3L," consists mostly of electives and a considerable amount of time is spent looking for potential jobs and interviewing. This
series of progression influenced the old adage of law school: First year they scare you to death, second year they work you to death, and third year they bore you to death.

Clearly, graduating from law school is the main status passage for the students. As some graduates in this study recalled, graduation was the best part of their law school experience. Graduation is the final status passage of their law school career.

Summary and Conclusions

Among the CWRU women and men, having the potential of anticipatory socialization—the goal of attending law school or being a lawyer at an early age in the career process and/or having an immediate family member who had gone to law school and/or who was in the legal profession—had little effect on law school performance or experiences. The data indicated that there were no differences among parental encouragement, class rank, activity participation, or career help and assistance from CWRU of those students who had the potential for anticipatory socialization and those who did not.

The early stages of professional socialization occur through schooling. Law school socialization is crucial to the professional socialization process because it plays an essential role in the development of professional identity and commitment. Clearly, the strength in this part of the
socialization process is rooted in the demands of the law school. Law school demands a three year commitment to one's time, energy and money in an intense, competitive and stressful environment in order to have the opportunity to gain the esoteric knowledge and the tools and skills necessary to aid in a successful career in the legal profession.

When I examined the six situational variables Bucher and Stelling (1977) regarded as critical to the successful socialization of medical students, I found several significant findings. Role-playing opportunities did not appear to be as significant to law students as it was to medical students. Moreover, very few graduates participated in these activities and two of the activities studied appeared to have had gendered participation. Only women participated in Client Counselling, generally considered by the students to be "soft," and only men had participated in the Legal Clinic, the only law school activity that provided "real" hands-on experience. It would be interesting to find out whether this pattern is present today, since the Legal Clinic no longer deals primarily with criminal law.

Activity participation did not have an effect on professional commitment, since even though men were twice as likely as women to have participated in an activity; at the time of the study, more women than men continued to be employed in the legal profession.
Grades and career enhancement opportunities were highly correlated with one another. Nearly identical proportions of women and men were in the top ten percent of their class, members of Law Review and/or appointed judicial clerkships. Among the men, class rank was highly correlated with Law Review. However, there was virtually no correlation between class rank and judicial clerkship for women or men.

The most significant finding appears to be that when going through the professional socialization process, gender was not nearly as influential in the individual experiences as were grades and career enhancement opportunities. Class rank tended to be the factor which caused students to have different law school experiences. Those women and men who were in the top ten percent of their class had a higher level of activity participation, and commitment to the profession than those students in the bottom 90 percent. Similar findings were made when further examinations were made among the top 50 percent and the bottom 50 percent.

Unlike the medical students, who learn procedures and techniques in clinical labs provided by the medical school, it appears that law students continue a significant part of their professional socialization process in their first places of employment and their employment histories, where they develop or further develop their areas of expertise, learn and employ techniques and strategies and find role models and develop mentor relationships.
It appears that class rank, not gender, influenced law school experiences. Hence, the data, thus far, give strength to the argument that the differences in careers among women and men are not due to their differences in law school experiences. For a better understanding of the similarities and differences of the women and men graduates, and to further investigate the professional socialization process, Chapter 4 examines the employment histories of the graduates, career mobility, and their reasons for mobility.
CHAPTER 4
EMPLOYMENT HISTORIES

Introduction

As discussed in Chapter 3, the main outcome of the education and training stage of professional socialization is to develop mastery, skill, professional identity and commitment. When employment histories of the graduates were examined, I found that women and men were similar with regard to first jobs out of law school and reasons for leaving first jobs. However, significant gender differences emerged when I examined second and third jobs, employment outside of the legal profession, part-time and interrupted employment, and parental leaves.

This chapter focuses on professional commitment and identity by tracing employment patterns of first jobs upon graduating from law school through third jobs, specifically, the frequency of mobility and reported reasons for job changes. As discussed in Chapter 2, commitment is measured by continued employment in the legal profession. Chapter 5 further enhances the discussion of professional socialization and career histories by examining current employment patterns and career commitment and side bets.
(investments) which could strengthen and/or further strengthen career commitment.

I begin with an examination of the employment histories of the graduates. This description includes the numbers and types of jobs moved in and out of, and the reasons for job mobility and dissatisfaction. The last part of this section focuses on the differences and similarities between women and men who have been or continue to be employed part-time, and/or who have stopped working in the paid labor force over a duration of time, and their reasons for doing so.

The second section of the chapter, non-law employment, details the career patterns of those women and men who were not employed in the legal profession at the time of the survey. This section examines the reasons the graduates had for pursuing employment outside of law, current employment, and whether these women and men perceive themselves as ever entering or re-entering the legal profession at some point in their careers. I examine the similarities and differences between women and men in law and non-law employment using the variables of class rank, Moot Court membership, Law Review membership, judicial clerkship appointment, and CWRU career assistance.

As noted in Chapter 1 careers are, "a succession of related jobs, arranged in a hierarchy of prestige, through which persons move in an ordered (more or less predictable) sequence (1961, 523). " Moreover, the work of one person is
usually related to the work of another or a larger social unit. In other words, a wo/man’s work is usually woven into social roles, defined as sets of interdependent social relations between a social person and a social circle involving duties and rights (Znaniecki, 1965; via Lopata, Barnwaldt and Miller, 1986). In this sense, jobs are social roles containing work and other aspects of social relations with all members of a social circle, where the social circle consists of everyone with whom the person interacts in order to carry forth a role.

First Employment Upon Graduating From Law School

To address directly the question of whether the CWRU women graduates changed jobs more frequently than the men or were leaving the practice of law at a greater rate, the graduates were asked a series of questions aimed at tracing employment patterns beginning with first jobs upon graduating from law school to present jobs. This analysis will reveal similarities and differences of women and men with regard to organization of employment, tenure at first employment, reasons for leaving first jobs and to begin to establish a pattern of career commitment to the legal profession.

The finding that the majority of CWRU graduates practiced law in their first jobs upon graduating from law school has also been reported in other studies of law school

TABLE 11
FIRST JOB AFTER LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family/Private Firm</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Corporation</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services/Defender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest Law</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F = .08; \text{Sig.} = .782$

As illustrated in Table 11, there are no significant statistical differences between the women and men of CWRU with areas of first employment. In other words, no single segment of the legal profession is over-represented by either women or men. The types of first jobs, on the whole, are evenly distributed among women and men. It could be speculated that the lack of differences among women and men could be attributed to CWRU curriculum, recruitment, job opportunities, the economy, geographical location and trends in employment patterns during that specific time period. Nevertheless, this finding conflicts with the findings of other researcher (Minnesota, 1992; Liefland, 1991; Stanford, 1988; and Harvard, 1986) where women were less likely than men to enter law firms and more likely to enter government in their first jobs after law school. It should be noted
that government jobs tend to be lower paying jobs than those positions in private practice and business/corporate organizations.

Most of the CWRU women and men did not uphold the traditional perspective that a lawyer's first job evolves into a lifetime career. Even as they began their first jobs, 76 percent of the women and 73 percent of the men expected to leave their first jobs or did not know how long they would be employed at that job. One explanation could be attributed to the early 1980s, when perhaps the legal profession was experiencing an increase in mobility, and accordingly, generated the idea that job mobility would become characteristic of career experiences. Also, it may have been a result of the economy in 1981, and the great influx of lawyers; jobs became more scarce, prompting graduates to accept the first offer that came along to satisfy their immediate needs—employment and income—with the perception that perhaps they would gain experience and move on to other employment opportunities later in their careers. At the time of the study, only 24 percent of the women and 20 percent of the men indicated that they were still employed at their first jobs.

Departure From First Job

Among both women and men, the most common factors that were considered to have been "very important" in the
decision to leave first jobs were an offer of better employment opportunities and dissatisfaction with current job. Among women, better employment opportunities included opportunities for advancement, financial considerations, firm environment, area of law, types of clients and geographical location. For example, one woman reported that she had left her first job because, "[I was] offered partnership in name only with no real control over the job or administration of the practice. I figured out that the clients who would go with me would result in higher income for me even after overhead (421F)." Another woman explained that her offer of better job opportunities included: "[A] politically, racially, diverse firm; salary 50% higher, larger firm, larger clients; broaden professional opportunities (more litigation opportunities) and located...in a larger city (512F)." One woman reported better job opportunities as, "[A] large firm, more money, more prestige, more economically sound city (471F)." Another woman reported "[The new job offered the] chance for variety and developing [my] own clients (499F)."

These themes prevailed in responses from the men as well, as evident by this man, "[There were] better cases, more interesting and complex cases, more money (greener pastures), a "move up" in all ways imaginable (523M)." Another man replied "Better salary, advancement, sole control over legal direction, much greater challenge in
taking on a turnaround situation (617M)." One man recalled, "[I received a] forty percent salary increase with more autonomy and prestige (501M)." Another man wrote "Slightly higher salary, better opportunity to do work I enjoy (407M).

Dissatisfaction with current job was the second most common reason of job departure among both women and men. The most common source of dissatisfaction related directly to certain aspects of their social role and/or social circle. For example, one woman reported, "[I was dissatisfied] more within this type of service-oriented liberal atmosphere. I wanted to help people, not just make money. I found firm life confining and limiting given its hierarchy and defending undefensible behavior (548F)."

Other women related their dissatisfaction to their social circle, as evident in these responses, "[I] lacked a "mentor" which all of the men in my department had (499F)."

Another woman reported "The attorney for whom I worked [with] wanted to be the 'boss,' he did not treat other attorneys well--[he] treated them more like secretaries (584F)."

Like the women, dissatisfaction with aspects of social role and/or social circle, was reflected in the responses of many of the men. One man wrote, "Firms pitted associates against each other for assignments (501M)."

Another recalled, "I was disappointed that there was little evidence of professional mentoring of junior lawyers (494M)."
As illustrated in Table 12, when the differences of departure between women and men were examined, there were significant statistical difference with the influence of spouse relocation. For 20 percent of the women and only two percent of the men this had been a very important factor in their decision to leave. This gender difference is reflective of American culture in that men generally continue to have higher earning power than women, and men's employment continues to be viewed as the primary household income and women's as secondary and/or supplemental in the household income equation.

Another gender difference was with discrimination by a supervisor. For 20 percent of the women and only two percent of the men this had been a very important factor in their decision to leave their first job. This difference may be attributed to the fact that there is a smaller percentage of women, as opposed to men, in high-powered positions, such as supervisor. Also the difference may be due to the notion that it may not be culturally acceptable...
for a man to report that he is being discriminated against by a woman. Lastly, this difference among women and men may be for the most part, that men are not socialized into being perceptive about the discrimination that exists, or may be desensitized to it altogether, behave in a certain manner, and still not perceive such behavior as inappropriate. Such behavior toward a woman/women may be offensive and lead to the perception of injustice in the workplace; something most of their male counterparts will never experience.

Discrimination of clients was also more of a factor in the departure of women than men. This may be attributed to the point in time that the graduates were employed at their first jobs (early 1980s). At this time, most members of the legal profession were still primarily men, and historically the practice of law had been a male bastion. In the mid to late 1970s women began entering the legal profession. Clients may have resented having a woman assigned to them, or were uncomfortable in having a women represent them. Therefore, women may have experienced more discrimination from clients.

The following differences between women and men among reasons for leaving first job were not statistically significant: job dissatisfaction, a better offer, advancement and financial considerations, child/family responsibilities, discrimination by co-workers, work environment, wanted a change in the area of law, geographic
considerations, long hours, budget cuts, conflict with politics, lack of control & challenge, and work was boring.

Second Job Upon Graduating From Law School

In order to analyze fully the mobility patterns and reasons for mobility, second jobs were examined in detail to consider various occupational/professional opportunities, or lack there of, as well as to follow the degree of commitment and professional identities the women and men had with regard to the field of law.

The data reveals that most graduates began their second jobs one to four years after graduating from law school. Among those who had a second job, all of the women continued to be employed in the legal profession, while only 70 percent of the men did (See Table 13). This finding would suggest that at this point, the women were more committed to the legal profession than their male counterparts. This finding may also suggest that perhaps more men than women used their first job as a stepping stone into a different area of employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female N</th>
<th>Male N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo practice</td>
<td>25% 6</td>
<td>12.5% 5</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private firm</td>
<td>50 12</td>
<td>30 12</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>12.5 3</td>
<td>7.5 3</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>12.5 3</td>
<td>20 8</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Law Employment</td>
<td>0 30 12</td>
<td>9.96 .003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=24) (N=40)
When second jobs are examined, both women and men have the highest proportion of employment in private firms. However, while 25 percent of the women are employed in solo practice, only 12.5 percent of the men are. This pattern also prevails in corporate organizations, where 20 percent of the men, and only 12.5 percent of the women are employed. Such gender differences may reflect American cultural expectations with regard to women and family responsibilities. Solo practice may be perceived as having a more manageable environment for balancing career and family obligations and commitments (See Pearson, 1988; 1990). Also, societal expectations could explain the increase in employment of the men in corporate organizations. As evident in Table 13, men may have more career choices and opportunities available to them within and outside of the profession, and would thus be more likely to have a greater number of alternative career paths.

Departure From Second Job

Unlike departures from first jobs where women and men had the same factors that influenced their decision to leave, gender differences emerged when reasons for departure from second jobs were examined. Among the women graduates, the most common factors that were "very important" included dissatisfaction with their current job, an offer of better employment opportunities, and child and/or family
considerations. On the other hand, among the men graduates, the most frequently listed factors are identical to those reported in the departure of first jobs: an offer of better employment opportunities, and current job dissatisfaction.

For a number of the women, job dissatisfaction was embedded in some sort of inequity in their work environment. The women made references to actual job responsibilities, opportunities, pay, recognition and respect. For example, one of the women wrote "[I was] hired as an in-house attorney. After change in control of [the] corporation, I was no longer considered an attorney. Also, very 'take all the credit' department head... (456F)." Another woman replied she had been dissatisfied because "As the economy slowed down and work slowed down, if you didn't fit into the business group profile you were not given better or more challenging work. The business group profile was essentially 'white, male, softball player' (482F)." One woman wrote, "I didn't feel I was being paid fairly or being treated with the respect I had earned (482F)." Still another woman recalled, "My employer (later partner), was not compensating me as agreed, and I found that he was not keeping correct books as to firm income in order to justify paying less. He was 'dumping' work on me, as well as expecting me to run the office (611F)."

Among many of the men, an offer of better employment opportunities is directly related to opportunities for
advancement and financial considerations. One man wrote of his new employment, "[I received] double salary and benefits (540M)." Another man recalled, "[I received a] twenty percent salary increase [and a] move to a better field (469M)." One man reported, "[I] became [a] partner in a firm which was small, [I] had related counseling practice with less hours and better pay (424M)." Another man recalled, "[I received the] opportunity to join a law firm I admired with a real shot at partnership and responsibility (503M)." One man wrote, "My prior employer asked me to return as a partner with a significantly better financial package (480M)." Still another man recalled, "[I received] a substantial increase in salary and elevated to a senior position in [the] corporation with an officer's title (581M)."

Like the men, for most of the women an offer of employment was better in terms of opportunities of advancement and financial considerations, as evident in this woman's response, "The benefits, money and opportunity for advancement was much better (402F)." Another woman recalled, "[I received a] regular salary, benefits and better hours (550)." Still another woman wrote, "[I received] fifty percent greater salary [and] much better projects (634F)."

Among the women, child and/or family considerations was also a common factor that had contributed to the decision to
leave their second job. However, most of the women did not make any specific reference to family responsibilities. The one exception was a woman in solo practice who replied, "I resumed full-time practice...long hours, but flexibility for [my] family since I am the boss...(502P)."

Another factor among the men that had been "very important" in their decision to leave their second job was job dissatisfaction, which was reported more in terms of a lack of opportunity for advancement. For the most part, dissatisfaction was defined in terms of social roles and social circles. For example, one man recalled, "I was frustrated in that I saw no evidence of upward mobility. My supervisor appeared to be belligerent in response to my concerns (494M)." Another wrote, "The firm was 'old fashioned' and resistant to modernization. Compensation of associates was poor and attitude of partners condescending. Long term career opportunity became distasteful (540M)." Another man replied, "[The] lead (only other) attorney’s manner of practice was problematic. [There was] too much emphasis on fees and win at all costs (588M)."

When differences in second job departure among women and men were further examined, family and child considerations were introduced for the first time as an important contributing factor for women. Among the men, the reasons for leaving their second job were the same reasons, in the same order, as those given as very important to
leaving their first jobs. This should be no surprise since societal expectations of men in America do not include primary responsibility of child/family obligations and commitments.

As highlighted in Table 14, one significant gender difference was discrimination by supervisors. Among 31 percent of the women, this factor was "very important" in the decision to leave second jobs, and among six percent of the women, it was "somewhat important." On the other hand, none of the men indicated supervisor discrimination had been "very important" in their decision to leave their second job; however, for three percent of the men it had been "somewhat important." Again, these differences may be the result of female/male socialization and expectations. Women may have been socialized to be more sensitive to what is actually going on in the workplace, or they may be more discriminated against. In addition, more women than men

---

**TABLE 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrim/Supervisor</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrim/Co-Workers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Challenge</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Was Boring</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Hours</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample size for the women was 15, except for Discrimination of Supervisor where the sample was 16. The sample size for the men was 29, except for No Challenge and Work Was Boring, where the samples were 28.
left second jobs because there was no challenge in their job, the work was boring, and the long hours. At the time of the survey, 25 percent of the women and 15 percent of the men were still at their second organization of employment.

The following differences among women and men among reasons for leaving second jobs were not statistically significant: job dissatisfaction, a better offer of employment, advancement and financial considerations, child/family responsibilities, spouse relocation, discrimination by clients, work environment, wanted a change in the area of law practiced, geographic considerations, budget cuts, conflict with politics, and lack of control.

Third Job Upon Graduating From Law School

Most of the CWRU graduates who left their second jobs did so approximately four to eight years after graduating from law school. Although the sample of graduates who had third jobs is relatively small, only 10 women and 24 men, it is significant since this represents 26 percent of the women and 35 percent of the men.

Among those graduates who had a third job, eight of the ten women, but only 17 of the 24 men, continued to be employed in the legal profession. The single highest number of employed women and men was in private practice. As indicated in Table 15, when employment patterns of third
jobs were examined, women were employed in the Legal services sector of the profession for the first time.

TABLE 15
THIRD JOB AFTER LAW SCHOOL OF THE 10 WOMEN & 24 MEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female N</th>
<th>Male N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo Practice</td>
<td>10% 1</td>
<td>13% 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Firm</td>
<td>30 3</td>
<td>29 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>10 1</td>
<td>4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>20 2</td>
<td>25 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>20 2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-law</td>
<td>10 1</td>
<td>29 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=10) (N=24)

\[ F = .91; \text{Sig.} = .348 \]

Again, it could be speculated that child and/or family responsibilities influenced the organizations of employment of the women graduates. The Legal Services sector offers more stability of hours and scheduling, when compared to other types of employment organizations in the legal profession. Also for the first time, a substantial number of men are employed in solo practice. This could also be the result of child/family commitments and/or the perception that such an environment would have the potential to allow for a greater degree of independence and flexibility as opposed to the larger private firms and corporate settings.

Departure From Third Job

Differences appear between the women and men graduates when departures from third jobs are examined. Among the
women the most important factors that influenced their decision to leave were dissatisfaction with current job (including a desire for a change in practice, lack of challenge and control over work and work was boring), and an offer of better employment opportunities. Among the men, like their reasons of departure in first and second jobs, better employment opportunities and job dissatisfaction also influenced their decision to leave third jobs.

When job dissatisfaction was defined by the women graduates, most attributed their dissatisfaction to their work environment and their social circle. For example, one woman wrote, "...[The] clientele did not seem to appreciate [the] services. Attorneys [were] forced to take large number of cases, often not in areas of expertise or preference (586F)." Another recalled, "The place was hell (435F)." And another women replied, "[The] Chairman of [the] real estate department very publicly made it clear that women were not advancing in the department...low projects, too competitive, tedious, definitely a 'boys club' (634F)." As evident in the responses of the women, it is easy to comprehend how both job dissatisfaction and the desire to change area of practice were entwined.

Among most men better employment opportunities included opportunities for advancement, financial considerations, area of law and geographic location. For example, one man wrote, "[I was offered a] forty percent higher salary,
Another man recalled, "I was offered partnership and a 25 percent raise (490M)." One man wrote, "I had long wanted to return to Boston...and such an opportunity occurred. The offer was also preferable in terms of salary, etc. (494M)."

Another man reported, "[I received] better cases, more interesting and complex cases...(523M)."

Among most women, an offer of better employment opportunities referred to a higher salary, better hours and the type of practice and/or area of law. For example, one woman wrote, "[it was better] monetarily, number of hours, as well as type of practice (586F)." Another woman recalled, "The salary was more than doubled, and the area of practice--corporate litigation--was what I wanted. Also, I had come to realize that I wanted to work in a large firm (568F)."

Another common factor of departure among the men was dissatisfaction with current job. They explained their dissatisfaction in terms of their work environment and social circle. For example, one man wrote "[A] partner and I had differing business philosophies and some personal disagreements (470M)." Another man recalled, "I was dissatisfied with the political system [within the firm] which was not addressing issues but was instead keeping incumbents and political careerists in power (577M)." Still another man replied "[I was] under paid, [there was] too
much 'dead wood' at firm, [there was a] waste of time through internal paperwork, bickering, petty disputes [and] poor work habits by too many attorneys (523M)."

TABLE 16
GENDER DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EIGHT WOMEN & 14 MEN:
REASONS FOR LEAVING THIRD JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th></th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Male</td>
<td>Female Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Hours</td>
<td>13% 0</td>
<td>38% 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacked Control</td>
<td>25% 0</td>
<td>38% 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrim/Supervisor</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>25% 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As highlighted in Table 16, a statistically significant difference with third job departure between the women and men were long hours, a lack of control over their work, and discrimination by a supervisor. Among 13 percent of the women, the long hours were "very important" in their decision to leave that job and for 38 percent, long hours were "somewhat important" to their decision of departure. On the other hand, long hours were neither very important or somewhat important to the men in their decision to leave their third job. These gender differences may be attributed to women attempting to balance career and family, and therefore redefining their priorities.

Moreover, for 25 percent of the women, lack of control over their work was "very important," and for 38 percent it was "somewhat important," in their decision to leave third
jobs. None of the men graduates attributed the lack of control over their work as having been very important, however, 14 percent indicated that this was somewhat important to their decision of departure. It would have been interesting to know how lack of control was defined (i.e., lack of independence, no opportunity for advancement, no flexibility, hours...). Perhaps if this factor was further probed, this study could have discovered the underlying reasons for feeling a lack of control and why this was a very important factor for one quarter of the women and none of the men in departure from third jobs.

Discrimination by a supervisor also influenced factor of job departure among women, although only "somewhat," while it was not a factor at all among the men. These differences are consistent with those factors found to be important in second job departures. At the time of the survey, only two of ten women and eight of 24 men were still employed at their third jobs.

The following differences between women and men among reasons for leaving third jobs were not statistically significant: job dissatisfaction, a better offer, advancement opportunities and financial considerations, child and/or family considerations, spouse relocation, discrimination by co-workers, discrimination by clients, work environment, wanted a change in area of practice,
geographic considerations, budget cuts, conflict with politics, lack of challenge and work was boring.

Job Mobility

Job mobility was the norm among the CWRU women and men graduates. Most have held at least two jobs since graduating from law school (excluding judicial clerkships). Moreover, 47 percent of the women and 50 percent of the men have held three or more jobs. Twenty-one percent of the women and 24 percent of the men had yet another job after job three.

This data confirms that women are not dropping out of the legal profession. Although they are highly mobile, women continue to be employed in the profession of law in even higher numbers than their male counterparts. However, the types of organizations in which women were employed differ from those organizations of the men, primarily that the women had steady employment in the private firms. Solo firm employment increased dramatically as in second jobs and a dramatic increase of employment in corporations and Legal Services occurred in third jobs. Solo firms, corporations, and Legal Services may give the perception that such employment choices have the potential to be more compatible with work and family obligations and commitments (Pearson, 1990). Also, employment in these areas of law is not as
competitive as employment in larger sized firms (Spangler, 1986).

Job Mobility and Law School Activity Participation

To find out whether there was any relationship between job mobility and Law School activity participation, I compared those graduates who had participated in activities and those who did not. For this comparison, I used those variables that were introduced in Chapter 3: Moot Court, Law Review membership, judicial clerkship appointments and the variable that represented any activity participation, "law school activities." I wanted to find out if activity participation had contributed or had any influence over the number of jobs the women and men had been employed in at the time of the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANS</th>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>Did Not Participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moot Court</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Review</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Clerkship</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.S. Activities</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Table 17, when the data were further examined, there were no significant differences between women and men who had participated in activities and those who had not. However, it is interesting to note that the
women and men who had been appointed judicial clerkships had the highest number of jobs. This difference may be associated with the wide variety of job opportunities available to judicial clerkship appointees. For instance, there may have been more vertical mobility (movement in different jobs with similar levels of pay and prestige) for upward mobility. The various career experiences may be needed for long-term goals (running for political office).

When job mobility was further examined by class rank, those persons in the lower 50 percentile had a higher mean number of jobs (3.25 among women and 4.0 among men), than those graduates in the top 10 percent and the top 50 percent of the class. As discussed in Chapter 3, prestigious law firms cater primarily to those students in the top 10 percent of their class, while students of lower ranking generally do not get such opportunities. Moreover, lower ranked students may be accepting any available job, and entering areas of law where employment is easier to obtain since grades and class rank may not be associated with such employment opportunities.

Part-Time Employment/Interrupted Employment

As illustrated in Table 18, thirty-three percent of the graduates have experienced part-time and/or an interruption in employment during their careers. Differences among the women and men were revealed when the reasons for such
employment patterns were examined. For example, 42 percent of the women who had slowed or postponed their careers for three to six months for parental responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 18</th>
<th>GRADUATES WHO WERE EMPLOYED PART-TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Part-time</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Stopped Employment</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time and Stopped</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=38) (N=63) 

In contrast, among the men, unemployment of three to six months was due to being unable to find employment (14 percent) or for volunteer work; generally defined as working on political campaigns, community projects, etc., (14 percent). Participating in volunteer projects, for the most part, may further enhance legal careers and career-related experiences, while parenting does not. These findings support traditional research which indicates that despite the incredible advancements women have made in the realm of paid labor, women continue to bear the brunt of the household and child care responsibilities inside and outside of the home (See Hochschild, 1991; Hertz, 1986).

Among those graduates who were unemployed for more than six months, 31 percent of the women and only 17 percent of men were unemployed due to parental responsibilities.
Thirty-one percent of the women and 33 percent of the men could not find employment, and for 33 percent of the men, unemployment of more than six months was due to taking a sabbatical.

These findings suggest that despite the incredible gains that women have made and continue to make in the paid labor force, the continuing societal expectation of American women taking primary responsibility for family and/or child obligations and commitments places these women on a slower or deferred traditional career path. Not only does the esoteric knowledge of the day-to-day legal matters change and get updated at a rapid rate, but the competitive nature of the profession gives these women limited, if any, options for handling family responsibilities in conjunction with their careers.

It appears that the legal profession, as a whole, is generally not receptive to alternative employment options and offers little, if any, support which would allow women, and men, the opportunity to share or be a significant contributor to both types of responsibilities and commitments; home and professional. Such alternative employment includes: job-sharing, part-time schedules, flex-time, working out of their homes, and paid leaves and days off for extenuating circumstances. Desai and Waite (1991), in their study of women’s employment patterns during pregnancy and after birth, pointed out that occupations may
encourage labor force participation of women surrounding a birth in two ways: by making it relatively easy to combine work with motherhood; or by making it difficult to stay away from work. Desai and Waite (1991) found that women in occupations that offered part-time or part-year work were more likely to return to work following a first birth than women in occupations that offered primarily full-time and full-year schedules (Desai and Waite, 1991: 553). Hence, without such opportunities, many women may pursue nontraditional career paths or leave the profession altogether for a duration of time and then, for some, attempt to re-enter.

**Parental Leaves**

Sixteen of the women graduates (42 percent) and one man had taken a parental leave ($F=31.60; \text{Sig.}= .000$). Moreover, half of the women and the one man took their leaves for a duration of six months or more. The remaining eight women took four to six month parental leaves.

Among those graduates who had taken parental leaves, 14 of the women and only one man were given the same hours and responsibilities that they had prior to taking leaves upon their return to employment. However, the remaining two women reported that upon their return, they did not continue to have the same hours that they had prior to taking their maternity leave. It is both interesting and troubling that one woman wrote that her "maternity leave was considered a
"Moreover, a change in hours may have been by choice, as evident in the response of this woman, "[I had] decreased hours. Two maternity leaves, [one] of 6 months and [the other] five months; [I] returned [to work] three days after each, then [I worked] full-time before my second child. I am now [working] four days a week permanently (548F)." And another woman wrote, "I have been allowed to work part-time, but my responsibilities have not been reduced proportionately (560F)."

Upon returning to work, ten women and the one man had the same responsibilities and authority that they had before they took their leaves. However, upon returning to their employment, four of the women did not have the same responsibilities and authority that they had before they had left. One women wrote, "[I had] less responsibility [and] quality of cases was less challenging (560F)." Another recalled, "[My] first leave was at a different employer. In exchange for part-time, [I] relinquished a more prestigious position (586F)." Still another woman wrote "Some partners refused to work with me (471F)."

More than half of the women experienced minimal difficulties as a consequence of their maternity leave, but there were women who, upon taking their leaves and returning to work, experienced blatant inequities in their places of employment. Surprisingly, despite the reported difficulties, among 11 of the women and the one man, the
maternity/paternity programs of their organization of employment met their needs. Perhaps these women were socialized to appreciate what little they received from their employer, or maybe they did not expect anything, so that they were grateful for the treatment and benefits they had received (See Pearson, 1990).

**Non-Law Employment**

In order to examine why some of the graduates had taken alternative career paths after graduating from law school, or at some point during their careers, a series of questions were asked pertaining to why these women and men were not currently employed in the field of law and whether they would enter or re-enter the legal profession in the future.

At the time of the survey, 16 percent of the women and 19 percent of the men were not practicing law. Moreover, one of the six women and seven of the seventeen men had never practiced law. The remaining five women and six men dropped out of the legal profession at some point during their careers.

The most significant difference between women and men and their reasons for non-law employment was having wanted more time with family (F= 23.82; Sig.= .002). Again, when examining career patterns, this is one difference that has been apparent throughout this study. Women are more likely than their male counterparts to have taken alternative
careers or to remain outside of the paid labor force for family and/or child concerns.

Six women were not employed in law because they wanted more time with their family. In fact among all of the women, this had contributed, to some degree, to their decision not to practice law. One woman wrote, "children and family matters are taking far more time than I ever realized... (549F)." Among the women, other contributing factors to their decision to drop out were wanting less pressure and more time for themselves, and they felt that their personality did not fit the legal profession. One woman wrote "...Once I realized how happy I was out of practice, I don't think I would select to practice again (634F)." Another woman reported "I enjoy my business too much [to go back into law] (435F)."

Among the women who are not employed in law, four are "homemakers" (not in the paid labor force) and the remaining two women are employed in business/industry. Three of the men graduates are employed in government; three in accounting; two in the teaching profession; two in business/industry; and two in self-employment. Also, one man is employed in each of the following: medical profession; real estate; tax department; investments/finance and one was unemployed.

Ten of the men are not practicing law because they felt their personality did not fit the legal profession. One man
wrote "[I] enjoy what I am doing. [I] don't want the stress and the long hours required to practice law (407M.)" Other reasons for not practicing law were wanting more time for themselves, and a lack of skills and qualifications for another position.

In order to examine whether or not the law school socialization process had some sort of impact on types of employment, statistical tests were conducted to compare the similarities and differences of law school experiences: class rank, Moot Court participation, Law Review membership, judicial clerkship appointment, and lastly, law school satisfaction, between those women and men of non-law employment and those who were employed in the legal profession.

Law school satisfaction and class rank are the two factors that are different among graduates in non-law and law employment. The strongest difference is with law school satisfaction. Those persons not employed in law have a much lower score of law school satisfaction than those graduates in law (F=6.23, Sig.=.038). Moreover, when law school satisfaction is broken down into four separate areas--intellectual, career training, social and overall experience--the non-law employed women and men are the most dissatisfied with the career training aspect of law school (F=9.56; Sig.=.003).
The other difference among those graduates employed in law and those in non-law employment is with class rank. Those women and men who are employed in the legal profession had a higher class rank than those women and men in non-law employment (F=4.42; Sig.=.038). This finding suggests that the lower ranked graduates, as opposed to their higher ranked counterparts, for some reason or another did not enter, experienced barriers to entrance, or dropped out of the legal profession.

With regard to future career plans and the possibility of ever practicing law, three of the women do not expect to practice law. One woman simply stated "I do not want to practice law (571F)." However, one woman will be practicing law in the future. This woman wrote, "When [the] children are all in school I will work part-time (512F)." Two of the women did not know what their future plans would be with regard to practicing law.

Among the men graduates, ten will not be practicing law in the future. One man wrote "...I did not follow the traditional career path for a law school graduate, but I value my legal training and am grateful for the light it shone on the legal system...(577M)." Another man replied, "[I] took a job as a legal editor for a company thinking it would be temporary, that I’d eventually practice law...[I] had an opportunity to purchase the company...[There is] too much potential to stop now. [I] still think about
practicing law sometime, but after working for myself, there's no way I'll start with rookie drudgery... (559M)."

Another man wrote, "I am very happy as a partner in a CPA firm's tax department. I don't plan to move (518M)." One man will be practicing law in the future, while two of the men do not know what their future career plans would be with regard to practicing law.

**Summary and Conclusions**

Upon graduating from law school the CWRU women and men were generally employed in similar jobs with similar organizations, with no one type of job being over-represented. However, with second jobs, even though women continued to be employed primarily in private practice, one-fourth had entered solo practice. The men, on the other hand, had a strong representation of employment in private practice and corporate organizations. An examination of third positions of employment revealed that women continued to be employed primarily in private practice. However, for the first time, there was a strong representation of women in corporate organizations and Legal Services. Once again, the men continued to be employed primarily in private practice and corporate organizations.

When employment patterns were further examined by gender, the positions and organizations of employment among women may have been influenced or motivated, to some extent,
by parental responsibilities. Generally, employment in solo
practice, Legal Services, government and in-house counsel
have regular hours. Such environments may be more
compatible with family responsibilities than private firm
practice. Moreover, there is less competition for
employment in these areas, as opposed to positions in
private practice.

Job mobility was the norm for both CWRU women and men.
At the time of the study, the majority of the graduates had
at least two different jobs since graduating from law school
(excluding judicial clerkships). Moreover, nearly half of
the women and men have had three jobs, and nearly one-third
of the women and half of the men have had four or more jobs
since graduating from law school. Therefore, these findings
indicate that the legal profession has become a high-
mobility profession, with a lower number of women and men
making life-time career commitments to their first employer.

When job mobility was examined, on the surface, it
appeared that the women and men had similar motivating
factors--an offer of better employment opportunities and job
dissatisfaction. However, closer examination of the
explanations of job dissatisfaction shows gender
differences. When women explained their dissatisfaction,
more often than not, they described an experience they had
with inequity in the workplace. Moreover, among the women
there was a lack of identification of job inequities as discrimination.

This is troubling for several reasons. First, one could assume that these graduates from law school would be knowledgeable as to what discrimination is and what the repercussions are. Second, either the women truly do not realize what is going on, which is also troubling, or that they choose to ignore it for some reason; rather than describing their experiences as discrimination, they simply defined the situation as dissatisfaction with their jobs. The latter explanation needs to be further explored because this suggests that the women may have ignored their experiences or redefined them to "fit in" and not "cause trouble;" or they were socialized into not defining this type of behavior as discrimination, for the sake of maintaining a stable subculture by not upsetting the social circle.

Whatever the reasoning, this is an important observation because, despite the tremendous gains women have been making in law school enrollment and in the legal profession, the top positions continue to be dominated by men. Therefore, the inequities experienced by these women need to be further explored in order to understand such situations as barriers; barriers that need to be identified, acknowledged, understood, and dealt with.
This study also revealed that women graduates were almost three times as likely than their male counterparts to have interrupted or slowed their career paths. Moreover, the women graduates were three times as likely to have stopped paid employment outside of the home. In both instances, parental responsibilities were the main reason in having worked part-time, interrupted, or stopped paid employment. On the other hand, among men, employment interruptions were mainly due to participation in volunteer work, sabbatical or unemployment. Hence, although women are entering the legal profession at a drastic rate, they continue to have their career paths influenced or dictated by their parental responsibilities, something the vast majority of their male counterparts will never experience.

Among women graduates parenting was the most important reason for not practicing law. In addition, more than half of the non-law employed women were not in the paid labor force because they wanted to spend more time with their families. Among the men graduates, however, the main reason for non-law employment was because they believed that their personality didn’t fit the field. Hence, these men were employed in several different types of organizations and types of employment. Perhaps such differences prevailed because most of the men made their employment choices based on their own professional wants and needs, whereas the
majority of the women may have been motivated by the wants and needs of others.

In conclusion, the findings indicate that both the women and men graduates of CWRU had a high rate of job mobility. However, this study revealed differences in career patterns among women and men when interrupting their careers, or choosing to have a career outside of law. The primary motivations of women graduates were family responsibilities and commitments— Influences quite different from those of their male counterparts.

To obtain a deeper understanding of the similarities and differences of the CWRU women and men and to further investigate the motivational and influential factors of their career choices, Chapter 5 examines the career commitment and side bets of the graduates.
CHAPTER 5
CAREER COMMITMENT AND SIDE BETS

Introduction

Traditional research indicates that the greater the complexity of the occupation, as well as its status in the structure, the higher the commitment of the persons in it (Kohn and Schooler, 1973, 1983; Lopata et al., 1985a, 1985b; via Lopata, 1992). In order to understand fully the occupational commitments of the women and men graduates, this chapter focuses on a series of side bets--career investments--that could maintain or strengthen professional commitment.

As indicated in Chapter 1, commitment to the profession will be measured by employment in the legal profession. Throughout this chapter, Becker's (1960) concepts of commitment and side bets will be used along with those proposed side bets of Lopata's (1992) study. In Becker's (1960) analysis, commitment to the organization and commitment to the occupation are the result of a series of conscious and unconscious side bets, or investments. In general, he asserted that the greater the number of side bets, the greater the degree of commitment of the individual to a course of action. So it follows that these investments strengthen one's commitment to employment and career goals,
both directly and indirectly, making it beneficial to continue such commitments.

Like Becker (1960), Lopata contended that choosing an occupation or employing organization provides the individual with rewards which can be hard to give up, and leaving it may result either in penalties or in costs the person can increasingly be unwilling to face. Therefore the side bets tie the person to that line of action in many ways s/he may not be aware of until a decision to leave this occupation or organization is contemplated. On the other hand, a person may consciously increase the ease of following the committed line of action by purposely building side bets into her/his life (Lopata, 1992). The focus of this discussion is on the latter--that most of the women and men have purposely built these side bets into their lives.

This chapter is devoted to eight of Lopata’s hypothesized ten side bets. As mentioned in Chapter 1, because of insufficient data from this study, two side bets have been omitted. The eight side bets to be discussed in detail are: (1) Preparation in the occupation/profession through schooling; (2) Selection of an organization which can be expected to support commitment to occupational goals; (3) Involvement in a job which enables one to work in that occupation and/or pursue their career-line and provide job complexity; (4) Positive evaluation from above involvement; (5) Association with people of similar commitments,
colleagues, and friends; (6) Integration of the role of spouse/partner; (7) Integration of the role of parent; and, (8) Building a relatively congruent construction of reality at the sociopsychological and behavioral aspects of commitment. These side bets are examined to identify similarities and differences in side bets among women and men and what effect, if any, these differences and/or similarities have on their degree of commitment to the legal profession.

**Side Bet 1: Preparation For Involvement in the Profession through Schooling**

According to Becker and Strauss (1956), "Schooling occurs most conspicuously during the early stages of the career and is an essential part of getting people committed to careers, and prepared to fill positions (Becker and Strauss, 1956; 256). Almost all potential law school students have received their bachelor’s degrees prior to their acceptance into a law program. In fact, in this study, 50 percent of the men and 57 percent of the women entered law school immediately after receiving their bachelor degree. Moreover, the vast majority of the remaining women and men (61 percent) entered law school six months to two years upon graduating from college.

In order to gain admission to most high-ranked law schools, most potential students must rank in the top 25 percent of their class. However, this is only part of the
requirements. Potential students must also earn acceptable scores on the Law School Admissions Test (LSAT), in addition to submitting letters of recommendations--academic and character--from professors, employers, etc., to the law school. At this point, it could be argued that the potential students are already integrated into being committed to their goal of lawyer and becoming a member of the legal profession.

Once enrolled in law school, a student’s experiences can be lived out with difficulty or ease depending on a number of factors. As discussed in Chapter 3, law school experiences are important to the socialization process of professional commitment. For instance, parental encouragement over the decision to pursue a law degree and ultimately choose a career in the legal profession may allow some students the opportunities and availability of choices, while other students may have little, if any, parental support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 19</th>
<th>PARENT’S REACTION TOWARD LAW SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Discouraged</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Discouraged</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Encouraged</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Encouraged</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=37) (N=65)
In this study 62 percent of the women and 86 percent of the men graduates have parents who encouraged their decision to go to law school (See Table 19). Hence, the men received a higher level of encouragement than the women did. This difference may be attributed to the fact that, in 1978, when the CWRU women entered law school, law schools and the legal profession were traditionally male bastions. During this time, American society was first experiencing a significant number of women entering professional schools and traditionally male professions. This may have fostered some type of resentment on the behalf of the profession and a degree of uncertainty on behalf of the women. There was still, to a great extent, the cultural belief of the separate sphere ideology—men at work; women at home. As a result, some women may have encountered a lesser degree of encouragement from their parents with their decision to go to law school than their male counterparts did.

As discussed in Chapter 3, parental encouragement has the potential to be an important factor in the law school experience, especially since it is common knowledge that law school performance has a detrimental effect on career choices and opportunities. In other words, different levels of parental encouragement may result in different law school experiences. For example, if a wo/man’s parents encourage career schooling and decision, there is the possibility of receiving financial contributions. This could influence the
decision of whether s/he would have to work in order to support her/himself and pay tuition. Financial assistance may allow more time to study and concentrate on making good grades and devote more time to law school activities. Hence, this additional time to study could result to higher grades, which in turn could result in a position on the Law Review and/or a judicial clerkship appointment. Both of these factors not only strengthen professional commitment, and as evident in Chapter 3, but will ultimately influence career choices, opportunities, and goals.

Moreover, another type of parental encouragement could be moral/emotional support; having someone believe in you and your abilities. This factor alone, regardless of financial support, may strengthen professional goals and commitments. One can only wonder what consequences these factors actually had on the experiences of the CWRU women and men graduates, especially since the men had overall higher scores of parental support than the women did.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 20</th>
<th>SATISFACTION OF LAW SCHOOL EXPERIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Training</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social ........</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall ........</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction scale: 1=Very Unsatisfied; 2=Somewhat Unsatisfied; 3=Somewhat Satisfied; 4=Very Satisfied.
To further understand the effect law school experiences have on professional commitment, the graduates rated their level of satisfaction with four specific aspects of their law school experience: (1) intellectually; (2) career training; (3) social; and, (4) overall satisfaction. As illustrated in Table 20, the women and men have similar levels of being somewhat unsatisfied with the social aspect of law school. This pattern also prevails with overall law school experiences, where both women and men have been somewhat satisfied. Although the women and men may have had different academic expectations of law school, they may have had similar expectations as to what type of social life they would have while attempting to maintain and strengthen their law school, and professional goals and commitments.

Gender differences are revealed with the levels of satisfaction graduates have with the career training and intellectual aspects of law school. The men have higher levels of satisfaction with the career training they had received during law school than the women did. This finding is also supported in Chapter 3, with the discussion of the graduates' likes and dislikes of law school. Among several of the women, law school did not provide adequate preparation for their careers, and their "real world" professional experiences. For example, one woman wrote, "The worst part of law school was the lack of clinical practical exposure to what practicing law is really about."
Combining courses with practice opportunities would have made many concepts easier to understand [and] easier to remember (512F)." Another woman wrote "[There was] no training on [the] realities of practice...(471F)." And another replied "The information taught [in law school] was not very practical (623F)." And yet another woman wrote, "Law school did not prepare me for the regions of law firm life. I do not think law school really taught me how to practice law as opposed to studying law (402F)." Comments such as these were not nearly as common among the men graduates.

As revealed in Chapter 3, among the women, their law school experience lacked intellectual challenges and intellectual stimulation. Their dissatisfaction could be associated with the disappointment among the women with having received "very little practical experience" while in law school. Overall, the women graduates tended to expect more training and intellectual challenge from law school than their male counterparts did.

Side Bet 2: Selection of an Organization Expected to Support Commitment to Occupational Goals

As indicated in Chapter 4, employment patterns suggest that the women and men graduates of Case Western School of Law do not hesitate to switch employment organizations when their "core" priorities (i.e., salary, opportunities for
advancement, area of practice...) are not being met or are perceived as being compromised. However, as indicated in Table 21, regardless of the high rate of job mobility, the vast majority of the graduates, even after being out of law school for more than 11 years, continue to be highly committed to the legal profession.

### TABLE 21
CURRENT ORGANIZATION OF EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Firm/Solo</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Local Government</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-Government (World Bank)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services/Public Defender</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune 500 Industry/Service</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Industry/Business</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking/Finance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Firm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Service</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = .07; Sig = .796

Most of the women are employed in private/solo firms, state/local government, and Fortune 500 industry/service. Most of the men are employed in private/solo firms (55 percent), other services (nine percent) and Fortune 500 industry/service (eight percent). It is interesting to note the diversity of current organizations of employment among the graduates. Many women and men are employed in private and solo firm practice. However, when examining the second most common organizations of employment, gender
differences emerged. While the women have a higher rate of employment in federal government and Fortune 500 industry/service, the men graduates have a higher rate of employment in "other services."

The strong representation of women who practice law contributes to their continued commitment to the legal profession. The high rate of women employed in the government and business sectors suggests that they may find it is easier to gain employment in those areas (Spangler, 1986) since there is a lesser degree of competition for employment in such positions and these organizations may be perceived as offering a greater consistency of at-work hours and more flexibility and control over their time than do those positions in private practice firms which require a specific number of billable hours a year (Pearson, 1990).

At the time of the survey, the women graduates were highly committed to the legal profession, since 94 percent of the women practice law (See Table 22).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 22</th>
<th>CURRENT POSITION OF EMPLOYMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Law .................</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial/Appellate Judge .......</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Legal Position .......</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-law Employment .........</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F= .43; Sig.=.513
Three-fourths of the men practice law, and two men are employed in other types of legal positions. Hence, 75 percent of the men are employed in what tend to be traditional legal jobs. One would think that since law is a traditionally male-dominated profession and with all of the media hype proclaiming that women have "left the profession" (Faludi; 1992) that the men would have had a higher representation in the legal field. However, 19 percent more women than men are employed in the legal profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Size</th>
<th>Female N</th>
<th>Male N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 or Less</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 100</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( F = .03; \; \text{Sig.} = .852 \)

Similar to the women in Coontz’s (1993) study, the majority of the women are employed in either the very large firms, of 100 or more lawyers, or in the very small firms of four or less, while the men have a more diverse representation of firm sizes (See Table 23).

One explanation for women being disproportionally employed in large law firms could be that the larger firms have the most prestige and conduct the heaviest and most
visible recruiting of the top-ranked students, therefore the women may have entered the large firm environment directly out of law school.

On the other hand, as mentioned earlier, few women and men begin solo practice right after law school. Employment in a solo practice is usually something entered into after several years of experience in a firm and is usually motivated by a desire for independence and control over one's practice. Therefore, the small firm could be desirable because of a perceived greater degree of flexibility and independence, and more control over handling cases, as compared to other sized firms. As one woman solo practitioner wrote, "I control what cases I take, what hours I work, and what techniques I employ...I went solo nine years ago for the sole purpose of being a parent. Because of this decision, I can avoid most [work/children] conflicts (508F)."

| TABLE 24 |
| CURRENT LAW FIRM STATUS |
|-------------|------|------|
|             | Female | N    | Male | N    |
| Solo .............. | 40%   | 6    | 13%  | 5    |
| Partner .......... | 33    | 5    | 69   | 27   |
| Associate ......... | 13    | 2    | 8    | 3    |
| Of Counsel ......... | 7     | 1    | 3    | 1    |
| Other .............. | 7     | 1    | 8    | 3    |
| (N=15)      | (N=39) |

F= .26; Sig.=.610
As indicated in Table 24, when current firm positions of the graduates are examined, we find the highest proportion of the women are employed in solo practice, while the majority of men are partners in private law firms. Thirty-three percent of the women have partner status, while 69 percent of the men do. This inequity of firm status is reflected in several other studies (Spire, 1990; Fritz, 1986).

The high number of women employed in solo practice may be attributed to several factors. Women's high rate of employment as solo practitioners may be that they were unable to get employment in medium or large sized firms, and/or the women perceived more control and ability to juggle professional and personal lives within the environment of the solo firm as opposed to the larger sized firms (See Pearson, 1990). Also, women may have been employed in larger firm settings, disliked the environment and sought employment and a firm size they believed to be more personally suitable (Jackson, 1993). This reason could also be directly or indirectly related to the perceived flexibility and balance of work and family demands. Moreover, they may have received an offer of better employment opportunities elsewhere.

Furthermore, as indicated in Table 24, more women than men are at the associate level status. This may be due to the fact that, as revealed in Chapter 4, women worked part-
time or stopped their careers at a much higher rate than the men did. In her study of women lawyers, Fritz (1990) found that many law firms provide maternity leave and offer flexible arrangements to those associates, virtually all of whom are women, who wish to work part-time or take extended leaves to care for their children. But those women who accept part-time arrangements (at a law firm this can mean working 30 hours a week), generally forfeit the opportunity to become partners (Fritz, 1990). The Law Society’s Working Party on Women’s Careers found that with women’s career advancements, "the principal difficulty that women have to face is the reconciliation of their social responsibilities for children with the needs of a career (Women in the Profession, 1988: 11)."

The traditional male career model of success would suggest that a person occupy an associate status for five to seven years and then be promoted to partner status. However, the timing of associate status coincides with women’s peak fertility, while men’s fertility lasts much longer. The demands of the firm tend to be the highest at the associate status; a time when women may prefer to work less. The CWRU women who were at the associate level status may have "slowed" or stopped their career path for family/spouse obligations or commitments (Pearson, 1990; Spencer and Podomore, 1987; White, 1984). Therefore, those women who took "nontraditional" career paths would be more
likely to achieve partner status much later in their careers than those persons who followed the traditional male career model of the legal profession.

Although career opportunities within the legal profession are diverse, especially for the men graduates, the overall core priorities continued to hold true despite organization of employment or position. The most common career priority among both the women and men is intellectual challenge and stimulation, thus supporting Lopata’s (1992) hypothesis that women, just as men, are more likely to take a job and be satisfied with it if they perceive the job as having complexity rather than being simple.

It could be argued that when professional priorities are not being met, the graduates seek employment opportunities in organizations they believe will be more conducive to their career goals. This is evident by the finding discussed in Chapter 4, that the vast majority of the graduates had been employed at their third or fourth job since graduating from law school. This supports the assumption that most graduates who were unhappy with their current predicaments, or who may have been asked to leave because of inadequate performance, will continue to seek employment at those organizations which they expect will support or further strengthen their commitment to their occupational/professional goals. Nevertheless, regardless of the organizations of employment, as evident by the large
number of graduates who practice law, the overwhelming majority of the CWRU women and men are strongly committed to their professional goals, and to the legal profession.

Side Bet 3: Involvement in a Job Which Enables Pursuit of Career Line & Provides Perceived Job Complexity

Those side bets which are of relative importance to the career commitment of the CWRU women and men can be further understood using a cost and benefit analysis of those career aspects that the graduates like and dislike the most. This analysis allows for a deeper understanding of job involvement, complexity, and ultimately professional commitment.

The CWRU women and men have similar likes and dislikes with their careers. Intellectual challenge and stimulation are the career aspects liked the most by both women and men. Other career factors liked the most are problem solving, personal independence and financial rewards. Again, this data supports Lopata's (1992) hypothesis of the career providing job complexity. For example, one woman recounted, "[My current position is] intellectually a challenge, constantly stimulating and [I have] very interesting work (412F)." Of the men graduates, responses such as this were common, "[I have] intellectual stimulation, [the] opportunity to be creative [and] innovative (454M)." Such similarities among the women and men may be a result of the intense professional
socialization which occurred at the law school level. Therefore, it can be speculated that this "conformity" may be a consequence of their law school socialization process.

TABLE 25
AMOUNT OF WORK-RELATED STRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Little</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Lot</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Great Deal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=35) (N=66)

F= .29; Sig.=.594

The degree of stress experienced among the graduates, and the perceived sources may be indicative to what is valued the most in current occupations and careers, and what is valued the least. Stress is the career aspect disliked the most by the majority of both women and men. As illustrated in Table 25, two-thirds of the graduates experience "a lot" or "a great deal" of stress.

Among both women and men, work demands and deadlines are the most common sources of stress. Among the women the second most common source of stress is juggling work, family and household responsibilities, while for the men it is client demands. The third most common source of stress for the women is problems with superiors, while the men couple
problems with superiors with juggling work, family, and household responsibilities.

The most common source of stress among both the women and the men is linked to the demands and constraints on their time at work; the deadlines and immediate output, making quality work difficult. For instance one woman attributes her stress as the result of "keeping [the] cases moving quickly with minimum delay [while] striving to be fair (451F)." And another wrote, "[The] unpredictability, constant deadlines, billable hours, [and] fights for clients (604F)." Similar themes prevail among the men, as evident by one man who wrote his stress is the result of "[Having a] number of different activities undertaken at once [and the] call for immediate performance (603M)." And another man wrote he has "too little time to do everything I would like to do...[and an] unending number of deadlines...(444M)."

Juggling work, family and household responsibilities is the second most common source of work-related stress among the women. One woman summed things up with this response:

[I get] very little sleep. [I'm] juggling a full caseload at work, arranging sufficient family time, fulfilling church and multitudinous charitable board position obligations, [and] maintaining the household ...[I get] frequent colds [and] tiredness, due to little sleep and stress (even though 'positive' stress!). Occasionally the constant juggling has me yearning for a precious commodity--time (502F).
As indicated in Chapter 2, at the time of the survey, most of the graduates have children who were quite young. However, in their study of women lawyers, Spencer and Podomore (1987), found that child care concerns and responsibilities are not just indicative to the early years. A senior barrister in their study pointed out that her teenage children made a lot of emotional demands "that you can't delegate (Spencer and Podomore, 1987: 55)."

Among the men, client demands is the second most common source of stress, as stated by this man, "[There are] demanding clients...[and there is the] internal stress of performing sufficiently to justify fees paid by clients and my own income... (408M)." For other men, client stress is also the result of [clients’] unrealistic expectations [of them].

Problems with superiors is the third most common source of stress among both the women and men. For example, one woman wrote, "[I work] with a supervisor who is arrogant, disrespectful and degrading (550F)." Another women reported, "[I have] a bitch of a supervisor [and] irresponsible management (468F). Similar to the women, one man wrote, "[I have] a weird supervisor who doesn't talk to me anymore about law work or firm business... (523M)." Other men wrote about conflicting instructions from supervisors and poor relationships. Like the women, when discussing the stress created by work and family obligations, most of the
men, to some extent, responded in terms of time demands and allocation of time for family and careers.

Clearly, the most common underlying source of stress for the CWRU graduates is time demands. Lack of time, time pressures and time demands are mentioned over and over again. Both women and men write of the lack of time for work related responsibilities and tasks, and lack of time for their family and themselves. As discussed in Chapter 1, one plausible explanation for the lack of time appears to be characteristic of the legal profession.

However, the degree of underlying pressures are somewhat different for the CWRU women and men. While the primary sources of stress tend to be rooted most often in the work environment, the women experience stress and tension in their work environment and in their family environment. It could be argued that those women who aspire to achieve higher positions, or who occupy higher positions within their organization, have the potential to shoulder heavier "out of work" demands, particularly family responsibilities. Research suggests that women, despite their full-time employment status, continue to do the bulk of the family and household work (Hertz, 1986; Hochschild, 1989; Kanter, 1989). Hence, like the women lawyers in Epstein's study (1981), the CWRU women graduates appear to have additional time demands created by their multiple roles.
Side Bet 4: Positive Evaluations of Instrumental & Secondary Benefits From Job Involvement

One way that positive evaluations and secondary benefits from job involvement can best be measured is by perceived career satisfaction. Not only can career satisfaction be instrumental in job involvement, it can also contribute to various degrees of professional commitment and loyalty. Using a scale of one (very unsatisfied) to four (very satisfied), graduates rated their level of satisfaction with 18 distinct career factors. Among the women, the most common factors which have the highest level of influence on their career satisfaction include: solving problems, intellectual challenges and stimulation, and degree of independence. Among the men, the factors include: intellectual challenge, prestige of position, independence, intellectual stimulation, and solving problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 26</th>
<th>GENDER DIFFERENCES: CAREER SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of Position</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige in Community</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement Opportunity</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample size of the women was 33, except Prestige of Position, which was 34. The sample size of the men was 63, except Advancement Opportunity, the sample was 61.

The majority of the women and men have some degree of satisfaction with most aspects of their careers; however, there are significant gender differences pertaining to some
of those aspects. For instance, among the men, the prestige of their position is the highest ranked aspect of career satisfaction, while it is not a high ranked career aspect among the women. This difference could be indicative to a number of factors. As discussed in Chapters 2, 3, and 4, the CWRU men are generally employed in higher-level professional positions, in terms of pay and status, than are the women. Moreover, there is also a significant difference of earned income between the women and men, with the men having profoundly higher incomes. One explanation may be that higher positions and higher salaries of employment are indicative to a higher degree of power in the organization. This would explain why the men had higher levels of job satisfaction with regard to the prestige of their positions than did the women.

Prestige in the community is another gender difference of career satisfaction among women and men. High-status positions generally tend to be associated with high salaries and power. Therefore, it may be presumed that prestige in the community would be higher for those persons with high-level positions, salaries and power; since generally these aspects tend to be admired in American society and are often directly correlated with each other, and this may also lead to higher job satisfaction.

Another gender difference in career satisfaction is the opportunity for advancement. Again, it is likely that this
aspect is related to current position, and career histories of advancement. More women may be employed in positions without much opportunity for advancement. The opportunity for advancement can also be minimal or nonexistent among those women employed in solo practice.

The following differences among specific factors of career satisfaction between women and men are not statistically significant: intellectual stimulation, problem solving, intellectual challenges, degree of independence, work with a mentor, income, community service, value of work to society, treatment from colleagues, treatment from clients, relationship with superiors, relationship with co-workers, the hours, balance of career and family obligations, and overall satisfaction.

Side Bet 5: Association With People of Similar Commitments, Colleagues, and Friends

The American Bar Association (ABA) is the national professional organization of the legal profession. There are additional bar associations at the state, county, and city levels and also in different areas of specialty (special bars). Hence, there are many professional organizations available to persons in the area of law. Memberships in professional organizations allow persons to seek recognition from outside groups and professional groups. Therefore, membership affiliations are one
indication of professional commitment and loyalty to the profession.

Gouldner (1957, 1958), studied the professional commitment and organizational loyalty of faculty members of a small liberal arts college. He distinguished between two types of members: "the cosmopolitan" and "the local." The cosmopolitan member has little loyalty to the local organization, a strong commitment to specialized skills, and a strong identification with reference groups representing a professional specialty. The local member, on the other hand, displays a strong loyalty to the local organization and of the profession, a weak commitment to specialized skills, and a strong identification with reference groups located within that organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 27</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIP AFFILIATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Bar Association</td>
<td>42% 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Bar</td>
<td>74 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Bar</td>
<td>44 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Bar</td>
<td>46 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Bar</td>
<td>42 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Bars</td>
<td>15 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When using Gouldner's "cosmopolitan" and "local" role orientation analogy to the membership affiliations of the women and men graduates, more men are "cosmopolitan," while more of the women tend to display "local" role orientation.
For example, when membership affiliations are further examined, three-fourths of the men are members of the American Bar Association, while only two-fifths of the women are. Another gender difference which further supports Gouldner's hypothesis, is among special bar memberships (with the focus on specific areas of the law, i.e., criminal law, tax law), where more men, than women participate in special bars. To some extent, these differences can be understood when the CWRU women and men graduates identify some of the advantages and disadvantages of professional membership affiliations.

Many of the women and men identified networking and connections, legal information and education, as well as camaraderie to be advantages of membership affiliations. Responses such as this woman's were quite common, "[The] State Bar [advantages are] weekly law updates and malpractice and other insurance [and the] Local Bar [advantages are] educational opportunities and it provides opportunities to work with other attorneys on noncase projects (508F)." One man wrote that memberships afford "Broader exposure to lawyers in comparable practice areas provides tremendous learning opportunity; network of lawyers is helpful, both in terms of professional support and business development (554M)." And another man replied, "Some say [you join] for contacts--for me it's a matter of
professional expectations. Also, I put it on resumes in proposal opportunities (408M)."

What, then, could account for the gender differences in membership affiliation? Why do some people opt not to join a professional organization when there are numerous professional advantages? According to those women and men who are not members of professional organizations, it is due to financial and time constraints. Again, as indicated in Chapter 4, the issue of time demands emerged. According to one woman, "[Membership] dues are not covered by [the] firm. [The] firm pays only basic required burdens. [I have] too little time to devote to activities, so I do not pay the extra dues (601F)." And one man wrote, "[There are] other uses of my time and money, both of which are finite, [and] are more valuable (493M)." The issue of time as a constraint was an important issue.

It is interesting to note that women could not join the American Bar Association until 1910 and today women are underrepresented in the governance of professional associations. In 1987, only one of the 32 members of the American Bar Association Board of Governors was a woman, although the ABA had just appointed a woman as executive officer (Abel, 1989: 212).

In a study of her cohort of the class of 1975 Harvard Law School, Swanson (1990), pointed out that professionally women are far behind, that the American Bar Association
statistics demonstrate the inescapable conclusion: our male colleagues of the classes of 1974 and 1975 are outstripping us professionally in all categories, particularly partners in major law firms. Like racism, Swanson contended, sexism has not disappeared, it's just gone underground. The American Bar Association is trying to get more women involved (visible) in the bar association, however, she asserted that, what these men forget is that women were excluded for so long they have gotten used to getting along without men. For the most part, the male bar association centered around the needs of the medium-to-large size male firms. Furthermore, if a woman lawyer is not in financial control of her law firm, she must have the expenses and time commitments of bar involvement approved by the male lawyer-partners and sometimes it is just not worth the trouble. Even if she wanted to, a woman lawyer does not have the economic power in her law firm to declare that bar "involvement" is a rightful and professional priority. On the other hand, Swanson pointed out, many of her male colleagues do have that economic power in their firm (Swanson, 1990: 47).

Side Bet 6: Integration of the Role of Spouse/Partner

Upon entering law school, 78 percent of the women and 86 percent of the men had never been married. However, upon graduating from law school, 54 percent of the women and 68
percent of the men had never been married, a decrease from their first year marital status. Therefore, despite the assumption that marriage competes with careers, especially for women, almost half of the women and only one-third of the men were married by the time they graduated from law school; a time when they were first starting their careers.

However, at the time of the survey, approximately 11 years after law school, only 11 percent of the women and 15 percent of the men had never been married. Furthermore, 32 percent of the women and 50 percent of the men had been married for six to ten years and 42 percent of the women and 21 percent of the men had been married for 11 to 15 years. What appears pertinent and needs to be further examined is not the avoidance of the role of spouse, but Lopata’s (1992) hypothesis, that a person with a high level of professional commitment would marry/be involved with a person who supports her/his professional commitments, or, if changing commitments during marriage, socializing the spouse/partner into such changes.

Among those CWRU graduates who remain unmarried, the women tend to view their decision of marriage as being linked to the type of career they have. For example, one woman responded, "My being a lawyer destroyed marriage plans while in law school... (456F)." Another wrote, "I work for divorce court. I know the pitfalls of marriage (623F)." And
still another woman indicated, "Many men are threatened by
professional women (471F)."

The men, on the other hand, tend to be more inclined to
view their single status as the result of the time demands
and the internal factors of their career as a lawyer. One
man wrote, "I put myself so freely into my job for so long
that it distracted me from marriage (525M)." Another wrote,
"[I have] little time to socialize [and experience] frequent
geographic moves (490M)." While another man simply stated,
"[I have] time constraints (413M)."

For the majority of women and men, their careers as
lawyers did not influence their decision to marry. What,
then, are the factors that allow these women and men to
integrate or make a successful integration, of their work
role and their role of spouse/partner? Furthermore, does
this integration affect the professional and personal lives
of the women and men in similar or different ways?

Research suggests that at the professional level, most
women and men will marry persons of similar goals and
commitments or persons who will support their own
professional goals and commitments. Moreover, Epstein’s
(1981) study of women lawyers, contended that male
professionals dated women of all occupational ranks, but
women lawyers usually wanted to date only professional men.
In order to find out if this hypothesis holds true at the
marital level, I will examine the educational attainment and current spouse/partner occupational status.

### TABLE 28
**SPOUSE/PARTNER EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Female N</th>
<th>Male N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Degree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Graduate Degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=31) (N=57)

F = .05; Sig. = .815

As illustrated in Table 28, the vast majority of the spouses/partners have at least a college degree. Among the women, only 55 percent of the spouse/partners have degrees beyond a bachelor, while 77 percent of the spouse/partners of the men do. Hence, the women are more likely to have married men less educated than themselves. It could be argued that for the most part, the graduates, especially the men, tend to be involved with persons of similar goals and commitments, or are involved with persons who could generally accept and/or understand their professional goals and commitments.

Clearly, education alone is not enough to explain fully or predict what degree of difficulty or ease the women and men experience when they attempt to integrate their professional and personal roles. However, it could be
argued that those women and men who have a spouse/partner with similar professional interests and goals, may receive a greater degree of encouragement and understanding with their own work responsibilities and commitments. Obviously, those persons involved in dual-career marriages/relationships or one career/two income marriages/relationships would tend to encounter different types of strains and tensions than those graduates who are the primary career person in the marriage, with a spouse who has little, if any, employment in the paid labor force.

**TABLE 29**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional.........</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer ................</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Employment.....</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student ..............</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker ............</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=31) (N=54)

\( F = 2.92; \text{Sig.} = .091 \)

Regardless of the fact that 72 percent of the men have a spouse with a law, professional, or graduate degree; only 46 percent of the men have a spouse/partner who is employed in the paid labor force, of which 15 percent are lawyers (See Table 29). Moreover, 31 percent of the men have wives who are "homemakers." On the other hand, of the 100 percent of the women with an employed spouse/partner, 87 percent of
the spouses are employed professionals, of which 32 percent are lawyers, and the remaining 12 percent have "other employment." Furthermore, as revealed in Chapter 4, only seven percent of the women are not in the paid labor force. Hence, at the time of the survey, 93 percent of the women were in dual-career or one career/dual paycheck marriages, while only 31 percent of the men were in such marriages.

These findings offer an explanation to the differences in time demands (as discussed earlier) and the degree of ease or difficulty one may encounter when attempting to balance professional and personal roles. To get an in-depth understanding of the significance that this aspect contributes to professional and personal roles and lives, I examine the degree of career encouragement graduates receive from their spouse/partner and the ways in which they perceive their spouse/partner supports and hinders their career.

There are two possibilities of partner support: (1) the majority of women are married to professionals who are likely to be in "greedy" organizations and thus with their own competitive career goals, and (2) since less than half of the men are married to professionals, and close to one-third are married to "homemakers," more of the men are likely to have spouses who support their own competitiveness, professional goals and commitments.
As indicated in Table 30, seventy-four percent of the women and 87 percent of the men reported positive encouragement from their spouse/partner. However, 26 percent of the women, while only two percent of the men reported "neutral" career encouragement. The neutrality of spouse/partner encouragement could be indicative of a number of factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPOUSE/PARTNER REACTION TOWARD CAREER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female N</th>
<th>Male N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Discouraged</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Discouraged</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Encouraged</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Encouraged</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=31) (N=56)

\(F = .29; \ Sig. = .594\)

One speculation is that their husbands have financial security and independence, which may generate a passive involvement with the careers of their wives. For instance, the husbands may have already achieved their desired income and professional success, and thus are comfortable with their wives having a professional career, or their wife's noninvolvement in the paid labor force. Hence, the husband may have an increased acceptance of his wife's career choices as his own career dominates the relationship/household.
The most common type of spouse/partner career support among the women include: (1) a general "support of their career;" (2) career consulting; and, (3) sharing household/child responsibilities. Among the men, spouse/partner support include: (1) a tolerance of work-related time demands; (2) taking sole responsibility of household/child responsibility; and (3) a tolerance of frequent and extensive work-related travelling. Among the women, general career support is defined in a number of ways. For example, one woman wrote, "[My husband] encourages me to pursue [my] career interests--not just pursue a paycheck (570F)."

The second most common type of spouse/partner career support among the women is career consulting. One woman replied, "[My husband] listens, helps with the children, [is] very supportive during rough times, [and has] social skills with co-workers (471F)." Third, their husbands helped/shared with child care and/or household responsibilities. Most of the women may have developed somewhat of a give-take type of a relationship with their spouses. For instance, one woman wrote, "When he is not travelling we try to split child care responsibilities. He often picks the kids up so I can work late, [he] makes dinner, shops, [and we] moved here for my job (548F)." Another wrote, "[My husband] watches [the] baby while I travel [and] evenings when I work late. [He] shares my
enthusiasm [and] commiserates with my disappointments (456F). Yet another woman wrote, "He is a partner in household labor and child care. He doesn’t "help," he takes responsibility (619F)." Still another woman wrote:

My spouse is very supportive by shouldering innumerable household tasks. He is also a lawyer and we have a give and take relationship that whomever has the time performs the task. This often results in him performing more household tasks that I do because of my work and charitable/community commitments. His doing this also allows me to spend more time with my son than on domestic tasks (502F).

The most common type of spousal career support reported among the men is that their spouse/partner tolerates their time demands. One man wrote, "She [my wife] has understood the time and travel demands and worked with or around these with little annoyance shown as possible (524M)." Another man wrote, "...She [my wife] understands the need to work beyond customary hours when emergency situations demand the extra effort (540M)."

The second most common spouse/partner career support among the men is that their wives take sole responsibility of child care and household burdens, and the third most frequent support is a tolerance of frequent and extensive travel. For example, one man wrote, "[My wife] does most of the child care, manages my wardrobe, [and] consults on matters in her field (605M)." Another indicated, "[My wife] puts up with long hours [and] lots of travel...She does a
great job with our kids--reducing the stress on me (503M)."
Still another man reported, "She stays home with the kids,
which makes my work priorities easier to handle. She's also
excellent with social matters (534M)." Another wrote, "[My
wife] bore the burden of spending extra time with the
children (454M)."

These findings suggest that the women and men
experience different types of career support provided from
their spouse/partner. For example, among the women, the
husbands pose a major problem since the women's careers are
not getting the support they need and also, the support
provided by the husbands is not as relevant to their career
commitment and goals as what the men graduates receive from
their wives.

Furthermore, the women tend to define spouse career
support more in terms of their own professional goals and
help with child care and/or household responsibilities. The
men, on the other hand, orient their spouse/partner support
in terms of their own professional responsibilities and
commitments. This finding supports the "second shift"
ideology (Hochschild, 1989), that working women, in addition
to their professional obligations and commitments, continue
to be responsible for the lion's share of both children and
household obligations and commitments. This is supported by
the fact that among many of the women, having a husband who
helped with family and household responsibilities was
perceived as a display of career support. Whereas among the men, career support was spouse/partner tolerance of their job responsibilities. However, some of the men recognize the fact that their wives take sole responsibility of child care and household obligations, therefore giving them the opportunity to be more deeply involved with their professional obligations, commitments and goals--something most of their female counterparts will not likely ever experience.

It is no surprise that spouse/partner career hindrances differ among women and men. Among the women, the most common types of hinderance include: (1) that simply having a family life generally limits choices; and, (2) not having a spouse take any, or enough responsibilities for child/household obligations.

Like Hochschild (1989), who found in her study that family responsibilities were a major theme in the problems of the women, this theme also prevailed in my study. For example, among the women of CWRU, responses such as these were all too common, "He does nothing to ease the responsibilities at home and with our child. By leaving those responsibilities to me, my career goals have had to be deferred (592F)." Another woman reported, "He does not do his share to run the household or child care responsibility (508F)." Yet another wrote, "Too many household chores fall on my shoulders (560F)."
Among the men, spousal/partner career hindrances include: (1) the complaining of long hours; and, (2) the tension experienced by having "both themselves" and their spouse/partner employed in the paid labor force. For instance, one man wrote, "[My wife] has, on occasion, been less than enthusiastic about...[my] long hours (624M)." Another wrote, "[My wife has] inflexible hours with her job (591M)." And yet another man indicated, "She has a full-time career also, so we have to juggle kids, household chores, etc. (511M)."

These findings would lead one to question whether work often conflicts with the ability of the CWRU women and men to devote enough attention to their spouse/partner relationship. The data indicates that the majority of both women and men experience some degree of conflict between their work commitments and their marital relationships. Twenty-nine percent of the women and 24 percent of the men reported they experience conflict "often" and only three percent of the women and ten percent of the men experienced this type of conflict "very often."

It was no surprise that the reported source of conflict among both women and men is "time." One woman wrote, "Our respective careers and our child rearing responsibilities leave very little time for our relationship (508F)." Another woman responded, "[There is] not enough time [and I'm] too tired at the end of the day to spend quality time
Similar replies prevailed among the men graduates, as indicated by this response, "[I am] out early in [the] morning without spending time with [my] spouse, [I'm] home right at dinner, then the kids have to be addressed--then we crash. Work does not provide 'free time' to spend with [my] spouse (617M)." Another man wrote, "[Work] reduces [my] available time and energy (493M).

Regardless of the conflict and time demands experienced from work roles and the role of spouse/partner, the majority of graduates report that their marriage makes a positive contribution to their work. Among both women and men, marriage gives support, helps keep their careers in perspective, and gives them stability. What is interesting to note, however, are those graduates for whom marriage has a negative impact on their career. Some women tend to perceive marriage as discrediting their abilities. One woman wrote, "[I'm] not currently married. I believe being married doesn't impact one's career, but married women with children are taken less seriously by management (631F)."

Another woman wrote, "When women marry, they are discounted. No one thinks they give as much as before. Everyone waits for you to get pregnant and quit (619F)."

On the other hand, some of the men CWRU graduates tend to perceive marriage as limiting their time and opportunities. One man reported, "[Marriage] makes me feel the conflict of time demands that as a single person I
ignored (554M)," and another wrote, "[Marriage] has narrowed my ability to consider some options (577M)."

Side Bet 7: Integration of the Role of Parent

Even though it has been documented that parental roles most often compete with career roles, especially for women, 80 percent of the women and 83 percent of the men have children. Moreover, of those with children, 56 percent of the women and 63 percent of men have two or three children.

As discussed earlier, child care and household responsibilities tend to place many women, and those men who juggle these responsibilities with wives who also have employment commitments, in role overload. This section examines the extent of which professional responsibilities of the women and men conflicts with their ability to devote enough attention to children, and what the sources of this conflict are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 31</th>
<th>CONFLICT EXPERIENCED BETWEEN WORK &amp; CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>15% 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>42 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>23 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>19 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=26)</td>
<td>(N=49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F= 2.23; \text{Sig.}=.139$
As indicated in Table 31, eighty-three percent of the graduates experience some degree of conflict between their work obligations and their relationship with their children. Specifically, 42 percent of the women, but only 24 percent of the men, experience this conflict "often" or "very often."

Interestingly, the most significant gender difference is between the respondents who experience work/children conflict "very often" and "often," and those who do not. Despite the finding that many of the men experience some work life conflict with their ability to devote enough attention to their children, the women are almost twice as likely to experience this conflict "often" or "very often." This difference may be associated with the stress that the women graduates report to have experienced over and over again with their time demands of work competing with their time demands at home.

It is no surprise that "lack of time" is the most frequent source of conflict among both women and men. For example, one woman wrote, "[The conflict is] time demands--sometimes when I travel, I won’t see my kids for three days. I have missed parent/teacher conferences. Sometimes I feel I’ve not spent enough time with my children (471F)."

Another woman reported, "[I’m] away from home for weeks at a time (including weekends). I’ve missed one full month of my
baby's so far 6 month life (456F)." And another woman wrote:

I work all day, so the important times--lunch, right after school--for good communication, are missed. It's hard to be involved in school. And evenings are only three hours long, including dinner time. If I devote any time to me or my husband, to get emotionally prepared to go to work the next day, there is little time left for a child (619F).

Therefore, if a woman professional decides to have children, she is faced with the dilemma of how much time should she devote to her children and her spouse/partner, and how much to her career. This dilemma involves more than simply the allocation of time, as Coser and Rokoff (1971) pointed out. The issue of "family" and "career" imply conflict between deeply held social values too: "Professional women are expected to be committed to their work 'just like a man,' at the same time they are normatively required to give priority to their family (Coser and Rokoff, 1971: 535). Moreover, research suggests that the conflict experienced by many women in the paid labor force, as indicated in the responses of the CWRU women, is often associated with guilt (See Pearson, 1990). And along with the guilt, some of the women appear to project a sense of sadness.

Among most of the CWRU men, to some extent their work also conflicts with their ability to devote enough attention to their children. However, the underlying tone of regret
does not appear to be displayed with the same undertone of guilt and sadness that the women experience. One man wrote, "I am not able to spend as much time with [my children] as I would like, or attend doctor appointments, or games or programs. I am never home for dinner unless we eat out on a weekend (524M)." Another man reported, "I am not able to devote as much time to my daughter as I would like. Often I don't get home until after her bedtime (624M)." Still another man wrote, "It is extremely important for a parent to spend time (not just 'quality time,' but absolute quantitative time also) with children, and my work inhibits that occasionally (523M)." However, their conflict should not be discounted. The responses made by the men may not be entirely reflective of the guilt and sadness they experience. Generally, men in America have been socialized not to express their feelings as openly as women, hence their responses may not mirror the depth of what the men graduates actually felt or experienced.

Regardless of work and family conflicts, nearly half of both the women and men are "very satisfied" with their family life today. An additional 37 percent of the women and 28 percent of the men are "somewhat satisfied" with their family life today. Hence, although the graduates cope daily with the stress and conflict of meshing their professional and personal lives, overall, they are satisfied with the results, and continue to be committed to their
professional goals, evidenced by the fact that they generally do spend their time mainly on the job.

**Side Bet 8: Building a Relatively Congruent Construction of Reality Out of Sociopsychological & Behavioral Aspects of Commitment**

Lopata (1992), hypothesized the higher the level of occupational/professional commitment, the more the person is likely to pull together a congruent image of the self, the job, and the environment. She contended that the very process of making conscious career commitments can push a person toward increased congruence. Therefore, projected career goals and the perceived possibility of their goal attainment could be reflective of the degree of occupational commitment and congruency.

When five-year career projections of the graduates are examined, nearly three-fourths of the women and men predicted they will be working at the same organization of employment at which they were currently located. Furthermore, 80 percent of the women and 92 percent of the men, predicted it is very likely that they will achieve their desired professional goals.

Most women believe they will achieve their projected professional goals because of their demonstrated ability to perform, satisfaction from position, or because they are self-employed. Responses such as the one made by this woman were common, 
"[I will achieve my goal] because I set
realistic goals and I work hard to achieve them (508F)."
Another woman indicated that her achievement would be because "I am very determined and [I am] an excellent lawyer (550F)."

Most of the men graduates indicated they were likely to achieve their projected professional goals because of being well-established, are able to control their destiny, and their demonstrated ability to perform. For example, one man wrote he would reach his goal "Because I’m capable and I’ve done it before (480M). Another wrote, "I’ve always achieved my goals (621M)."

Among those graduates for whom it was "very" or "somewhat" unlikely that they will achieve their five year projected professional goals, 20 percent are women, while only eight percent are men. Among most of the women, goal unattainment will be due primarily because of family considerations, the economy, or lack of desired position. Among the men graduates, unattainment of goals will be due to the economy, the lack of a desired position, or their limited opportunities.

It appears that the vast majority of the CWRU women and men graduates have pulled together a congruent image of the job. However, does this congruency of their professional goals and commitments come at a cost to their personal selves? According to the graduates, it most certainly does. When the extent that their work conflicts with their
personal interests, 45 percent of the women and 34 percent of the men experience conflict "often" or "very often" and 33 percent of the women and 53 percent of the men "sometimes" experience conflict.

As discussed throughout the chapter, "time demands" are the primary source of conflict. One woman, in response to her work conflicting with personal interests wrote, "Are you kidding! I work, I raise two kids and I maintain our household--how much time can be left? (508F)." Another women reported, "When there is simply not enough time, personal interests get sacrificed before family interests (502F)." And, one of the few women in this study who was not employed in the paid labor force wrote, "My 'work' is primarily raising the kids, with the exception of volunteer work on political campaigns or as director on a board. However, I've found that kids will eat up every available minute, often to the detriment of the parent's personal interests (549F)." Keeping this in mind, one could only imagine how those women with full-time careers and employment married to men with similar working commitments, experience time demands.

Time demands are also experienced by the men, as evident in this response, "There is just very little time to relax enough and do the personal things I like, and not take time from [my] wife and children (524M)." Another man indicated, "I can't read or play as much as I would like.
I've had no time to learn golf and little time to travel (523M)."

Perhaps the legal profession, and professions in general, with incredible time demands and pressures, and the socialization process at both the law school level and the professional level, drive and maintain the image of congruency. And, as a result, such congruency, as Lopata also asserted, creates a strong commitment to the profession. Perhaps this is the only way to maintain the self, job, and the environment in order to maintain professional goals and commitments.

**Summary and Conclusions**

Many significant gender differences were rooted in child care/household responsibilities. This is an important issue, directly or indirectly, for most of the CWRU women and men graduates, especially since the vast majority have young children (infant, preschool and early grade school age). Primary responsibility of family obligations and commitments has career consequences. However, most men tend to construct their lives around their jobs, while most women tend to construct their jobs around their personal lives.

Regardless of how strong the women and men have been socialized into the traditional paths of the legal profession, the stress, tension and frustration of having to meet both professional and family demands influences the
professional choices and opportunities of many women, and those men who have wives employed in full-time jobs in the paid laborforce, thus resulting in their taking on partial child care/household responsibilities. This is evident in the responses that the women and some of the men made when they explained their likes and dislikes of their jobs, sources of stress involved with their jobs, spouse/partner support and hindrances, and work and family conflicts.

Nevertheless, regardless of the greater degree of difficulty many of the women and some men experience with maintaining these side bets in their lives, even 11 years after graduating from law school more women (20 percent more than men) continue to be employed in the legal profession. Therefore, despite the obstacles and difficulties, the CWRU women exhibit a strong commitment to the profession.

The majority of the men, on the other hand, do not experience the demands of child care/household responsibilities as being detrimental to their career opportunities and choices as do most women. This could be because almost one-third of the men have wives/partners who are "homemakers," not currently employed in the paid labor force. As a result, most CWRU men are the sole career person and sole or primary source of income for their families. This puts less constraints on their time for professional responsibilities and obligations, which could put them at a professional advantage over most of their
female counterparts in attaining positions of employment and salary. Also, this puts men at an advantage in maintaining the eight side bets.

In conclusion, as Lopata (1992) contended, most men in modern America are expected to develop and maintain professional side bets. It has only been in recent years that men have needed to justify organizing their lives around their occupations. As evidenced in the literature, and as further indicated in the experiences the CWRU women and men law school graduates, the occupational system continues to be a "greedy institution" with "greedy" commitments, demands, and expectations. Moreover, to most of the women, and those men involved in dual-career or one career/dual-paycheck marriages, the family is an equally "greedy institution" with equally "greedy" demands, commitments and expectations of its own (Coser and Coser, 1974). Therefore, the degree of career commitment for most of the CWRU women and men is dependent upon the investment each makes in side bets in terms of self-concept and identities, and external contributions from the environment, to help maintain their continued involvement in their professional goals, which in turn, dictates their professional commitment.
CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS, THEORETICAL RELEVANCE & RESEARCH PROJECTIONS

Professional Socialization and Law School Experiences

A frequent assumption in professional socialization literature is that those women and men who have the opportunity for anticipatory socialization may have the potential to perform better in law school than those persons who do not. However, this study found no significant differences in class rank, activity participation (specific and general), and CWRU career help and assistance between women and men with family members in the legal profession and those without. Furthermore, the age a wo/man decided upon a career in law or attend law school had no consequence on law school experiences or achievements. There were no significant differences between those graduates who had these goals upon finishing high school and those who decided later in their life cycle upon a career in law or to attend law school.

The men graduates were nearly three times as likely as the women to have participated in a law school activity. However, there were similar proportions of women and men who participated in activities carrying the most prestige: Law Review and judicial clerkship appointments. When the
consequences of activity membership were further examined by comparing class rank, and CWRU career help or assistance, there were no significant statistical differences between the women and men who had participated and those who had not. Overall, there was no direct correlation between the level of activity membership and commitment to the legal profession. Even though more men than women had participated in law school activities, at the time of the survey, more women than men were employed in the legal profession.

As true of the medical profession, professional socialization at the education and training level in law is crucial to the development of professional identity and commitment. When Bucher and Stelling's (1977) theoretical framework of professional socialization of medical students was applied to the CWRU Law School graduates, I found that Peer Groups, Coaching and Criticism, Career Enhancement Opportunities (referred to by Bucher and Stelling as Conversion Experiences), and Status Passages also play an important role in the law school socialization process. However, two of Bucher and Stelling's (1977) six situational variables found to be crucial to the professional socialization of medical students, Role Playing and Role Models, were not significant factors in successful law school socialization.
The CWRU Legal Clinic is the only law school activity which allows students the opportunity to participate in role-playing. At the Legal Clinic students develop their professional identity by actually having responsibility for cases and clients. However, very few graduates, and only men, participated in the Legal Clinic. Nonetheless, at the time of the survey the majority of both women and men were employed in the legal profession. Therefore, employment in the legal profession may not be the result of law school role playing opportunities. Perhaps the CWRU women and men had their role playing activities by working part-time in law firms while going to school, or through their work in law firms during the summers of their first and second years. This needs to be explored in greater detail, since it suggests that the training aspect of professional socialization takes place outside of the law school environment. If this is the case for the vast majority of law students, then the legal profession itself provides the role-playing opportunities of the professional socialization process, not the law school.

An additional factor which needs further investigation is that when these women and men were in law school, the Legal Clinic was primarily criminal law, an area of law that was dominated by men. However, today the Legal Clinic no longer focuses primarily on criminal law, which may allow
for a greater opportunity of student participation from more diverse areas of the law.

Another important finding of this study was that class rank, not gender, accounted for the primary difference in law school socialization experiences and professional commitment. Among both women and men there was a strong correlation between class rank, and Law Review membership, judicial clerkship appointment, and commitment to the legal profession. These findings suggest that Law Review membership has the potential to provide students advantages in law school, some of which include: prestige, honing writing and research skills, the potential for publication, working closely with faculty, and an overall visibility with peers and faculty. The prestige attached to both Law Review membership and judicial clerkship appointments provides these students different law school experiences than their non-member counterparts. In some respect, these students were "fast tracking" in law school, and as evident from Law Review member characteristics, they were primarily top-ranked students.

Most prestigious law firms interview only those students in the top 10 percent of their class, with the vast majority having been on the Law Review. In fact, those graduates who were no longer employed in law had an overall lower class rank than those women and men who were. Moreover, Law Review membership is a career-long prestige
source since it influences employment potential and affords career opportunities and choices that non-members are not ever likely to receive.

Unlike medical school, in which students learn the esoteric knowledge of the profession in addition to hands-on training and experience, law school is primarily responsible for esoteric knowledge. A law student has the potential to graduate from law school without ever playing the role of a lawyer, or practicing law; something unheard of in the field of medicine, where training is required before entering the profession. Therefore, hands-on training and experience, although helpful, is not needed in order to seek employment in the legal profession.

In medical school, where students train and work with doctors in areas in which they hope to specialize, there is the potential of developing career-long mentoring relationships. Most law students do not aspire to teach law school, although for the most part, law school teachers are the role models to whom they are exposed. However, special lecturers teach classes while maintaining a full time position in the legal profession. Also, many faculty members were employed in the legal profession at some point in their careers.

Another finding was that the gender composition of the CWRU faculty, consisting of primarily men, has the potential to place women, as well as minority students, at a
disadvantage. This is an important issue, since most law school faculties in the United States are dominated by middle and upper-middle class white men. Women law students may be excluded from student/faculty relationships which are not only important in making the adjustment to law school, but also have the potential to develop into mentoring relationships which are beneficial to career development.

An area for further research would be the socialization process of other professions, perhaps accounting and engineering, to determine if Bucher and Stelling’s (1979) situational variables are common to all at the education and training level. Are the six variables unique only to the medical profession? Or is it only the law school that does not provide students with the training aspect of their socialization process? Do the students in these professions receive a great deal of their professional socialization from their first jobs, and each subsequent employment? The answers to these questions are important in understanding the contribution of the school and actual involvement in the profession to the professional socialization of students.

Employment Histories

CWRU Women and men had similar first jobs upon graduating from law school. The vast majority of the graduates were employed in private firms. None of the women were employed in government or Legal Services organizations
at that time (See also Stanford Project, 1988). This finding is unlike the results of other studies where women graduates were less likely than men to enter law firms and more likely to enter government in first jobs (Minnesota Study, 1990; Harvard Project, 1986; Liefland, 1986).

The majority of women and men were employed at their first jobs for an average of one to four years. Perhaps there may be a trend toward leaving first jobs at an increasingly earlier rate. The most common factors that attributed to first job departure among both women and men included an offer of better employment opportunities (opportunities for advancement, financial considerations, area of law, firm environment and geographical location) and job dissatisfaction (lack of advancement opportunities, inequities in the workplace, area of law).

When the patterns of departure among the graduates were examined, I found that one outcome of law school was that the women and men were tightly socialized. The intense degree of socialization was evident in their reasons for departure, and continued high level of commitment to the legal profession. In job one, women and men had similar reasons for departure. In job two, for some women, family and child considerations were an influential factor; however, as the third most frequent response. In job three, the women gave similar reasons to those they had given in job one, along with some new factors, such as long hours, a
lack of control and boredom. Among the men, however, the most common reason for leaving all three jobs tended to be opportunities of advancement, financial considerations, and job dissatisfaction.

When the patterns of departure were further examined, family considerations prevailed more among women than men. For nearly one-third of the women, spouse relocation was an influential factor in departure from job one, and family and child considerations and long hours were influential in their decision to leave job two. Among the men, most were motivated by opportunities of advancement and financial considerations when changing jobs. With second and third jobs, more of the women were motivated by job dissatisfaction, better offers, and child and family considerations. These findings suggest career development for the men was the primary motivating factor for job changes, while the women were motivated primarily by job dissatisfaction, personal and/or family reasons. Therefore the motivation of the men tended to be career tied, to a large extent, to better job opportunities.

Moreover, between jobs one and two, for some women, discrimination by superiors had some degree of influence in their decision to change jobs, while it was unimportant to the men (See also Minnesota Study, 1990). This needs to be further investigated in order to understand the influence of discrimination since so few women and men indicated that
they had ever experienced discrimination, yet many women defined their job dissatisfaction as inequities they had experienced in their place of employment.

Both women and men of CWRU left their places of employment after similar durations of time, which conflicts with the perception that women leave law firms faster or in greater numbers than men. Women and men also had similar number of jobs, and most graduates have held at least two jobs, with some having had as many as six. This rate of mobility refutes the notion that lawyers have "career-long" employment with their first employers. Moreover, although both the women and men graduates were highly mobile, the CWRU women were not changing jobs any more frequently than men (See also, the Minnesota Study; 1990, and the Stanford Project; 1988).

When job mobility and law school experiences were examined, although no gender differences were revealed, one significant finding was that those women and men who had been appointed to judicial clerkships had a significantly higher number of jobs than those who had not had that experience. However, because of the wide variety of job opportunities available to those women and men who had judicial clerkships, frequent mobility may be an appropriate characteristic of their career patterns.

Another significant gender difference revealed in the employment patterns was that the majority of the women
graduates have been employed part-time, and/or have
interrupted or stopped employment at some point in their
careers (See also Minnesota Study, 1988). In fact, the CWRU
women were three times as likely than the men to have slowed
or stopped their careers. The majority of the women who
have worked part-time, interrupted, or stopped employment
for three to six months did so because of parental
responsibilities. Among those women who have worked part-
time or stopped employment for six months or more, again,
the majority of women did so because of parental
responsibilities. In contrast, most men were not in the
workforce because they took leaves for volunteer work,
sabbatical, and seeking employment. Only one man had
interrupted his employment for a parental leave.

Non-Law Employment

At the time of the survey, six women and 17 men were
not employed in the legal profession. Four of the women
were at home with their children, while the remaining two
women were employed in business or industry outside of the
legal profession. One of the men graduates was unemployed,
while the other men were employed in various occupations and
professions. One of the women and seven of the men had
never practiced law since graduating from law school.

Similar to the findings in the Minnesota study (1990),
reasons for not practicing law lend support to the
perspective that perhaps the legal profession is losing some women who find their employers either unable or unwilling to accommodate or integrate their family related responsibilities. Two of the six women (both at home with their children) would like to practice law in the future, and one would like to teach at a law school.

The majority of the men were not practicing law because they believed that their personality did not fit the legal profession. These findings are similar to those of the Minnesota study (1990), where 50 percent of the men were not in law because they perceived that their personality did not fit the field.

When several variables were examined between those graduates employed in legal profession and those who were not, those who were not had a lower level of law school satisfaction, specifically with the career training aspect of law school. Moreover, the non-law employed graduates had a lower class rank than their law practicing counterparts. Both of these findings need to be further examined. The high level of dissatisfaction with the career training aspect of law school needs to be addressed as well as the fact that the non-law graduates had a lower class rank. Perhaps the Law School could offer supplemental role-playing/training outside of the school. Also, the Law School could examine ways to promote lower ranked students to be more involved and committed to the profession, or
offer career assistance to those students who have no desire to practice law, but would like to use their legal knowledge in the workplace.

**Career Commitment & Side Bets**

The findings of this study suggest that most CWRU graduates have maintained a high level of commitment to the profession, as evidenced by the high number who continue to practice law. When eight of Lopata's (1992) proposed side-bets were examined, many similarities and differences among the women and men graduates were revealed.

Side Bet 1, examined commitment to professional goals by means of education. Clearly, all of the women and men made an investment in their career commitment through attaining a law degree. They invested their time, energy and money in obtaining an undergraduate degree, prior to their three year commitment to earn a law degree.

Side Bet 2, was the selection of an organization which can be expected to support commitment to professional goals. This investment was made by the majority of both women and men, reflected in the high rate of job mobility among the graduates. This finding suggests that when professional goals are not being met or are perceived as being compromised in a job or an organization, most CWRU women and men will seek alternative employment perceived as more
conducive to the achievement of professional goals and commitments.

At the time of the survey, the majority of women and men practiced law in private firms. Women were also employed in solo firms, local, state and federal government positions, Fortune 500 industry/service, other business and industry positions, banks and financial institutions, Legal Services, and other service positions. The men were also employed in non-law organizations, solo firms, other services, Fortune 500 industry/service, local, state, federal and quasi (world-bank) government, Legal Services/public defender, and public interest. These findings were similar to several other studies, with the exception of first job after law school, where gender differences were found among organizations and positions of employment (Minnesota Study, 1990; Liefland, 1986; Harvard, 1986; Curran, 1985; White, 1965).

At the time of the CWRU survey the majority of women employed in the legal profession practiced law, two were judges and two women were in other types of legal work. The majority of women who practiced law were employed in solo/small firms of four or less (47 percent), and large firms of 100 or more (40 percent). Similar to the women, the majority of men practiced law, and one man did other legal work. However, the majority of men who practiced law were employed in firms of five to 15 lawyers (36 percent),
one-fourth were in large firms of 100 or more, and 21 percent were in small firms of four or less. Hence, the men graduates had greater employment diversity among firm sizes, while the women were concentrated in the very small or the large firms. These findings and differences must be explored further to determine the underlying factors prevalent in organizations of employment. For example, are these choices made by the women and men? Are they the result of unsuccessful employment in a difference firm size and/or organization? Or are they the only alternative options available for personal responsibilities? Are women making their employment decision based on their own needs, or are they based on the needs of others?

Among those women who were in firms with status-level positions, 33 percent were partners, 12 percent associates, seven percent of counsel, and seven percent were employed in other firm positions. The majority of men were partners in their firms (69 percent), eight percent associates, three percent of counsel, and eight percent were employed in other firm positions. As mentioned throughout Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 5, the differences among the firm positions of the women and men may be attributed to the fact that a high proportion of women were employed in solo practice.

Side Bet 3, revealed that the majority of both women and men were involved in a job which enabled her/him to work in that profession and/or pursue their career-line and
provide job complexity. Again, the investment of career commitment was reflected in the high rate of mobility among both women and men graduates. Moreover, the factors liked the most among both women and men about their current careers include intellectual stimulation, challenges and problem solving; characteristic of job complexity. Work-related stress was the aspect they liked the least.

The majority of both women and men attribute their work-related stress to deadlines, which require immediate output, making quality work difficult. In addition, many women attribute their work related stress to their attempt to balance work and family demands, and problems with superiors. The men attribute their stress to client demands, problems with superiors and balancing work and family demands. Even though family was more frequently a source of stress for the women, among the men family demands was the fourth most common source of stress. Perhaps the acknowledgement and identification of stress due to family demands may be influenced by the fact that 62 percent of the men have spouses who are also employed. These men, as opposed to their male counterparts whose wives are homemakers, have the potential to experience, to some extent, the time demands most women in the paid labor force experience in their attempt to juggle both work and family responsibilities and commitments.
Side Bet 4, a positive evaluation of both instrumental and secondary involvement, was evident in the graduates' evaluation of their career satisfaction. Regardless of the high level of stress experienced by the graduates, the vast majority of both women and men had overall high levels of career satisfaction (See also the Michigan Study, 1990; Minnesota Study, 1990; and the Stanford Project, 1988).

The majority of the women had the highest level of career satisfaction with solving problems, intellectual challenges, and intellectual stimulation and degree of independence. The majority of men had high levels of career satisfaction with: intellectual challenges, prestige of position, degree of independence, and intellectual stimulation and solving problems.

The significant statistical gender difference among career satisfaction was prestige of position. The men had a much higher degree of career satisfaction with the prestige of their position than did the women. This difference needs to be further investigated in order to discover whether the dissatisfaction is related to job position, salary, organization of employment, or public perception of the significance of their job positions.

Side Bet 5, association with persons of similar commitments, also revealed differences among women and men. When professional membership affiliations were examined using Gouldner's (1957, 1958) concepts of "local" and
"cosmopolitan" professional role orientation, the findings of this study suggest that the women graduates took more of a "local" role orientation, while the men were more "cosmopolitan." The majority of the women were not members of the American Bar Association, while the majority of the men were.

Those women and men who did not participate in professional organizations identified time and/or financial constraints as the primary reasons for nonmembership. They did not have enough time to devote to being members, and/or the membership rate was too expensive, forcing them to not join if their firm did not pay for it, or to pick and choose those organizations they believed to be the most beneficial to join. However, it was noted that women were not allowed to join the American Bar Association until 1910, and currently there is a significant underrepresentation of women in the governance of the American Bar Association coupled with the commonly held perception that the American Bar Association caters to middle and larger sized male firms. Moreover, the low rate of membership among the women may be attributed to the expenses and time commitments of bar involvement which must be approved by firm partners, a position that, as revealed in this study and several others, is more often occupied by men than women.

Side Bet 6, addressed the integration of the role of spouse/partner. Although it has been documented that the
role of spouse/partner is regarded as being somewhat competitive to careers (especially for women), like most other studies, the majority of both women and men were married at the time of the CWRU survey (Michigan, 1990; Minnesota Study, 1990). Moreover, 93 percent of the women and 67 percent of the men were involved in marriages where both spouses had careers, or one had a career and the other works full-time. Eighty-seven percent of the women had a spouse/partner who was an employed professional, of which 32 percent were lawyers. The remaining 13 percent of the husbands were also employed full-time. Among the men, however, only 42 percent had a spouse/partner who was an employed professional (of which 15 percent were lawyers). Moreover, 31 percent of the men had wives who were homemakers, and 20 percent had wives who were employed full-time. These findings were similar to the Michigan study, where the women were typically linked with someone who earned about as much as they did, or earned more than they did. By contrast, the great majority of men with partners were linked to someone who earned much less than they did or did not have a job in the paid workforce.

The ways in which a spouse/partner gave career support differed among women and men. The majority of women received "general career support," followed by consulting with work and career, and helping with child care and household responsibilities. On the other hand, the majority
of men received spouse/partner career support in terms of a
tolerance of their time demands of work, taking sole
responsibility for child care and household
responsibilities, and a tolerance of their frequent and
extensive travel.

When spouse/partner career hindrances were examined,
many of the women claimed that simply choosing to have a
family limits their choices, as did receiving little if any
help with child care and household responsibilities. For
most of the men, a spouse/partner hindered their career by
complaining of the long hours they have to work, and in the
tension they experience as the result of having a spouse who
was also employed full-time.

For the majority of both women and men, work conflicted
with their marital relationships. Moreover, most women and
men attributed this conflict to a lack of time.
Nevertheless, most women and men defined their
marriage/relationship as making a positive contribution to
their work/careers in that it gives them support, helps keep
career in perspective, and gives them stability.

Side Bet 7, examined the integration of the role of
parent. Although it has definitely been documented that the
role of parent competes with careers of women (and as this
study reveals, to some extent, men), the majority of both
women and men graduates had two to three infant, preschool
and grade school age children. Most women and men found
that their work conflicted with their ability to devote enough attention to their children. However, the women were twice as likely than the men to experience this conflict "often" or "very often."

Side Bet 8, examined the development of a relatively congruent construction of reality around career identity. Clearly, the findings of side bets one through seven indicate that the overwhelming majority of the CWRU women and men have developed a congruent construction of reality around their professional identities. Among the majority of the women, work conflicted with their personal interests "very often," while most men tended to experience this conflict "sometimes." Again, the source of conflict for the majority of women and men was lack of time. Nevertheless, despite the conflict the graduates experience, whether it was with job changes, stress, conflict with spouse or parental roles, most of the graduates had high levels career satisfaction and continue to be employed in the legal profession. This holds true even when the vast majority of women and men experienced a high level of conflict with work and personal interests. Regardless, nearly half of the women and men were "very satisfied" with their family life today, and nearly one-third of both women and men were simply "satisfied" (See also Michigan, 1987; Minnesota, 1990).
Another factor that needs to be examined is the gender discrepancy in earned income, as revealed in Chapter 2. While it is beyond the scope of this study to explain the differences observed, men were much more likely than women to have high incomes and positions. This conclusion was drawn in the most recent studies that examined law school graduates (Minnesota, 1990; Stanford, 1988; Michigan, 1987; Harvard, 1986; Liefland, 1986; Curran, 1985; White, 1965). To date, no study has effectively explained the gender discrepancy in salary; however, some researchers have suggested a combination of factors that may contribute to such inequities. These factors include the exclusion of women from high powered positions of authority in the profession, the exclusion of women from traditionally male networking and mentor relationships. Other researchers have more directly advanced sexual discrimination as the most plausible explanation to pay differences among women and men in the legal profession (White, 1965).

Conclusions

Whatever my conclusions about the women and men graduates from CWRU, caution must be taken about offering any guesses about the probable situation for women and men graduates of other law schools. This study made conclusions from 47 percent of the class of 1981 and there were disproportionately fewer graduates from the lower half of the
class. Moreover, I used a measurement of only 11 years since graduating from law school. The findings from this study provide a basis for assessing gender similarities and differences of professional socialization and law school experiences, employment histories and career commitment and side bets. They also raise questions which merit further attention and discussion.

The results suggest numerous similarities between the law school experiences of women and men. Both women and men have high levels of law school satisfaction, similar likes and dislikes of law school experiences, class rank and participation in Law Review and judicial clerkship appointments. Class rank, not gender, influenced the similarities among women and men in their law school experiences and satisfaction.

Other similarities were found in employment histories and patterns. The findings revealed that women were as committed as men to the legal profession. Women have not "abandoned" the profession, nor are they changing jobs more frequently than are men. Rates of mobility for both groups are nonetheless high, and appear to be increasing. Only one-fifth of the graduates continue to be employed at their first jobs.

Women and men also experienced similar conflicts between their personal and professional lives. The vast majority of the graduates experience stress in their work,
and their work often conflicts with their desire to spend time with their families. However, both women and men continue to be highly committed to the legal profession.

While overall the graduates are relatively satisfied with their jobs, it is necessary to ask whether or not they will continue to be satisfied, as they appear to want to have both their family lives and their professional lives, if the profession continues to follow the traditional male career model of success—basing success for a man with little, if any responsibilities. This model appears to dissatisfy not only women, but men are also experiencing dissatisfaction as well. Perhaps women and men may become increasingly dissatisfied if the legal profession fails to confront the concept of both women and men lawyers to be able to lead satisfying personal lives, and participate in their communities, in addition to practicing law and remain committed to their professional goals.

The differences in employment histories and mobility also have important implications for the law school and the future of the legal profession. Although women were employed at the same number of jobs as the men and are as likely as men to practice law, the CWRU women and men were influenced by different factors in their career decision-making. For the CWRU men graduates, advancement opportunities and financial considerations were significant in all three jobs changes. The Minnesota study (1990)
referred to these factors as "positive" career development related reasons for changing jobs. For the women, on the other hand, personal and family reasons were motivating factors in changing jobs, although they were not the sole reasons for job changes.

Another important finding was that the women accepted discrimination by identifying it as something else, such as job dissatisfaction. Moreover, the women also accepted restrictions on their careers if they came from their husbands. Not only are they not receiving support from their spouses, but they accept this. And for those women who receive career support, the vast majority are not getting the support they need, and what they get is not as relevant as the spousal career support received by their male counterparts. Therefore, this study suggests that career differences among women and men are not attributed to their law school experiences, per se, as they are to the lack of cooperation they receive from their spouses, and the workplace, for their family responsibilities and obligations.

However, it should not be overlooked that CWRU women and men have similar high levels of career satisfaction. Perhaps women are, in their own ways, attempting to redefine the traditional male career model of success, making it more conducive to fit their unique needs. Moreover, with the increase of men in solo firms, one can not help but wonder,
if they too, are attempting to redefine the traditional male career model of success; defining success more on an individual level, as opposed to the expected American societal level. Women were also more likely than men to seek part-time or other alternative and more flexible arrangements in their attempt to achieve a balance between their personal/family lives and professional lives. At least some women have left practicing law to accommodate their desire to spend more time with family; perhaps because their employers were unable to meet their needs.

The over-representation of women in solo and large law firms and the disparities among incomes reported by CWRU women and men deserve further attention. The findings of other research confirm that women in the legal profession earn less than men (Michigan, 1987; White, 1965). These differences suggest that while larger numbers of women have entered the practice of law and will continue to be employed in legal positions, the goal of fully assimilating women into the profession has not yet been met.

Moreover, it should be questioned as to whether the legal profession’s goal of assimilation is a worthy one to begin with. The findings of this study suggest that a goal more conducive to full participation and maximum productivity of both women and men may be to integrate the unique needs identified in this study. After all, only 12 percent of all families in America are "traditional;" with
the father working and the mother staying at home to raise the children. For many families, a mother in the paid labor force is not an option; it is necessary for economic survival. As revealed in this study, problems that have fallen solely on the shoulders of most women are now being experienced by many men who, as a result of needing both spouses in the paid labor force, are experiencing some degree of the struggle of attempting to be responsible for both work and family responsibilities.

The data in this study pertaining to employment patterns, experiences and mobility of the CWRU Law School graduates should contribute not only to an understanding of the experiences of women and men in law school and in the legal profession, but also to the consideration of changes in the workplace and law school which would benefit all those who choose to practice law and be employed in the legal profession.
I. PERSONAL BACKGROUND
1. In what year were you born?  19_____
2. What is your gender? (circle number)
   1. female  2. male
3. What is your race/ethnic group (circle letter)
   b. Hispanic/Latino  e. White/Caucasian
   c. Native American/Indian  f. Other
4. What best describes the type of high school you graduated from?
   a. public school  
   b. private school--co-ed  
   c. private school--female  
   d. private school--male
5. In what city and state is the high school from which you received your diploma located?  
   city state
6. What best describes the type of college from which you received your bachelor's degree?
   a. Case Western Reserve University  
   b. state college or university  
   c. private college or university  
   d. military  
   e. foreign college or university
7. In what state or country was that college or university located?  
   state/country
8. What year did you receive your bachelor's degree?  19_____
9. Do you have any other degrees?  
   1. No  
   2. Yes--please indicate degrees and year received
      a. M.A.  19_____
      b. M.S.  19_____
      c. LL.M.  19_____
      d. Ph.D.  19_____
      e. M.B.A.  19_____
      f. Other  19_____
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10. Did you attend law school immediately after receiving your college degree?
   1. Yes (SKIP TO QUESTION 13)
   2. No

11. If no, how many years later did you start law school? ______

12. During the intervening years, did you ever do any of the following:

   a. raise children? ______________ 1 2
   b. work full-time in an employed position? ______________ 1 2
   c. work part-time in an employed position? ______________ 1 2
   d. spend more than six months unemployed, but looking for a job? ______________ 1 2
   e. serve in the military? ______________ 1 2
   f. pursue higher education? ______________ 1 2
   g. other ____________________________ 1 2
   h. other ____________________________ 1 2

13. Have there been other persons in your family who went to law school?
   1. No 2. Yes

14. If there are other lawyers in your family, what is their relationship to you? (circle all that apply)
   1. mother 5. aunt 9. grandmother
   2. father 6. uncle 10. other: __________
   3. brother 7. cousins
   4. sister 8. grandfather

II. LAW SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

1. In retrospect, approximately how old were you when you first decided that you wanted to go to law school (or decided that you wanted to be a lawyer)? ______

2. The following is a list of reasons that motivate people to attend law school. For each reason, please indicate if it was a major reason, a minor reason, or of no importance to you. In retrospect: (please circle one in each row)

   Did You Attend Law School Because: A Major A Minor Of No
   Reason Reason Importance
   a. family influenced you. ______________ 3 2 1
   b. teacher/friend influenced you. ______________ 3 2 1
   c. prestige of legal profession. ______________ 3 2 1
   d. to serve people in need. ______________ 3 2 1
   e. direct your career. ______________ 3 2 1
   f. go into politics. ______________ 3 2 1
   g. work in business/industry. ______________ 3 2 1
   h. teach law. ______________ 3 2 1
   i. government service. ______________ 3 2 1
   j. high income. ______________ 3 2 1
   k. wanted an advanced degree. ______________ 3 2 1
   l. needed education to get job. ______________ 3 2 1
   m. nothing better to do. ______________ 3 2 1
   n. other: ____________________________ 3 2 1
3. What were your significant long-term career plans:
(circle one in each column)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>upon entering</th>
<th>upon leaving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>law school</td>
<td>law school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. didn’t have any..............</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. large private law practice (50+)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. medium private law practice (11-50)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. small private law practice (2-10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. solo private law practice</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. private law practice</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. house counsel for corporation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. prosecutor</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. politics/government--not prosecutor</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. legal services, public defender</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. teaching</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. business</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. After you were a law student for a while, did you feel that pursuing a career outside of law was something you: (circle one)

1. definitely planned to do
2. would consider, but not favor over the practice of law
3. would not do
4. just didn’t think about at the time

5. In what sort of setting did you work the summer after your second year of law school?

1. a private law firm that had approximately ___ other lawyers (fill in approximate number of lawyers)
2. a business corporation or financial organization
3. government
4. legal services, public defender
5. "public interest" group
6. summer school
7. other

6. During law school, did the faculty or placement office staff of CWRU provide you assistance or direction in finding a job or choosing a focus for your career?

1. No  2. Yes

7. If Yes, did they help with: (circle where appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. job placement.................</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. support for goals.............</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. outside contacts.............</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. interviewing skills...........</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. career direction.............</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. other:______________________</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Did you want any career help or direction that you did not receive?

1. No  2. Yes
9. If you never received assistance, would you have liked assistance in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. job placement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. support for goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. outside contacts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. interviewing skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. career direction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. other (specify:_________)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. What law school courses do you regard as having been especially valuable to you in your later career, and why?

Why?

1
2
3

11. In what substantive areas or areas of skills training would you recommend that the Law School add more courses, and why?

Why?

1
2
3

12. In retrospect, how did you find your law school experience:

(circle one in each row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very unsatisfied</th>
<th>somewhat unsatisfied</th>
<th>somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. intellectually</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. career training</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. socially</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. overall</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. As you look back on law school, what do you consider the best parts of your experiences there?

14. As you look back on law school, what do you consider the worst parts of your experiences there?

15. In which Law School activities or journals did you participate?
16. What was the total amount of your law school loans:
1. none
2. one to 25% of your first year's salary
3. twenty-five to 50% of your first year's salary
4. fifty to 75% of your first year's salary
5. seventy-five to 100% of your first year's salary
6. more than your first year's salary

17. If you had a loan, how much difficulty have you experienced paying off your loan?
1. no difficulty
2. some difficulty
3. adequate amount of difficulty
4. a lot of difficulty
5. a great deal of difficulty

18. What was your approximate rank at the time you graduated from CWRU?
1. upper 5%
2. upper 10%
3. upper 25%
4. upper 50%
5. lower 50%

19. After graduating from law school, did you hold a judicial clerkship?
1. No
2. Yes -- in what courts did you clerk? __________________

III. WORK HISTORY
1. Since leaving law school, how many: (write number in blank)
   a. years practiced law (all settings) __________
   b. years in private law firms __________
   c. years in solo practice __________
   d. years in government (excluding judicial clerkships) __________
   e. years in a public defender/legal service organization __________
   f. years in a "public interest" law firm or group __________
   g. years have you been in your current job __________
   h. different bars have you been admitted to (List state and year) __________
   i. different jobs have you had __________

2. How did you get your first job after law school/clerkship?
   1. on-campus interview (including on-campus interview for summer job that led to permanent offer)
   2. family or other connection
   3. sent out resumes
   4. faculty recommendations
   5. other __________________

3. Excluding clerkships, what was your first employer after law school?
   1. (your) family law firm—_________ other lawyers (fill in firm size)
   2. private law firm—_________ other lawyers (fill in firm size)
   3. business corporation/financial organization
   4. government
   5. legal services/public defender
   6. public interest group
   7. other __________________
4. Did you work for this employer in the summer after your second
year of law school?  1.Yes  2.No

5. In approximately what month and what year did you take your first job
after law school/clerkship?  ___________  ___________
month  year

6. In what city and state was your first job located
__________________________,  ____________
city  state

7. When you began this job, did you intend to remain there for most
or all of your career, or did you expect to leave?
1.intended to remain
2.expected to leave
3.didn’t know

8. How long did you expect to stay in that job? ________________

9. Are you still employed at this job?  1.Yes (SKIP TO QUESTION 37, PAGE 10)
2.No

10. If "no," in what month and year did you leave?  ___________  ___________
month  year

11. How important were each of the following to your leaving
your first job? not
very  somewhat at all
a.dissatisfied with job..................  3  2  1
b.got better offer......................  3  2  1
c.advancement/salary considerations....  3  2  1
d.child/family considerations..........  3  2  1
e.spouse/partner relocation.............  3  2  1
f.discrimination of supervisors........  3  2  1
g.discrimination of co-workers.........  3  2  1
h.discrimination of clients...............  3  2  1
i.disliked work environment/people....  3  2  1
j.desired change in area of practice...  3  2  1
k.geographical considerations..........  3  2  1
l.long hours............................  3  2  1
m.employer’s decision/budget cuts......  3  2  1
n.conflict with political/moral beliefs  3  2  1
o.lacked control over your work........  3  2  1
p.work wasn’t challenging................  3  2  1
q.work was boring.....................  3  2  1
r.other: ____________________________  3  2  1

12. If dissatisfied, please explain your dissatisfaction:

13. If you circled better offer, explain how better:
14. If you circled discrimination was it based on...
(circle one in each row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. sex/gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. national origin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. marital status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. parental status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. other:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. If you circled discrimination, how do you feel it was manifested?
(circle one in each row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. uncomfortable environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. work assignments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. salary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. clients/potential clients</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. harassment by co-workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. harassment by supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. sexual harassment by co-workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. sexual harassment by supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. exclusion from social life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of firm/organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. other:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Did you have another job before taking your current position?
1. Yes
2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 37, PAGE 10)
3. Unemployed (for how long? , why?)

SECOND JOB POSITION

17. In what month and year did you take your next job? ____________ month   ____________ year

18. In this second position, did you practice law or not practice law?
1. Practiced law:
   Was this job in: (circle letter)
   a. solo practice
   b. a law firm/partnership
   c. government
   d. the judiciary
   e. a law school/or other academic organization
   f. in-house legal counsel of corporation
   g. in-house legal counsel of university/foundation
   h. legal services
   i. public interest/nonprofit organization
   j. other (please specify)__________________________

2. Other than law, what type of job was it?________________________

19. Are you still employed at this job?
1. Yes (SKIP TO QUESTION 37, PAGE 10)
2. No
20. If you answered "no", when did you leave?  

21. Which of the following factors contributed to your leaving your second job: (circle one in each row) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. dissatisfied with job</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. got better offer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. advancement/salary considerations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. child/family considerations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. spouse/partner relocation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. discrimination of supervisors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. discrimination of co-workers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. discrimination of clients</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. disliked work environment/people</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. desired change in area of practice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. geographical considerations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. long hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. employer's decision/budget cuts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. conflict with political/moral beliefs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. lacked control over your work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. work wasn't challenging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. work was boring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. other:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. If dissatisfied, please explain all aspects of your dissatisfaction:

23. If you circled better offer, explain how better:

24. If you circled discrimination was it based on... 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. sex/gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. national origin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. marital status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. parental status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. other:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. If you circled discrimination, how do you feel it was manifested? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. uncomfortable environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. work assignments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. salary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. clients/potential clients</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. harassment by co-workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. harassment by supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. sexual harassment by co-workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. sexual harassment by supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. exclusion from social life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of firm/organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. other:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. Did you have another job before taking your current position?

1. Yes
2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 37, PAGE 10)
3. unemployed (for how long? __________, why?)

THIRD JOB POSITION

27. In what month and year did you take your next job? __________ __________

28. In this third position, did you practice law or not practice law?

1. practiced law: Was this job in: (circle letter)
   a. solo practice
   b. a law firm/partnership
   c. government
   d. the judiciary
   e. a law school/or other academic organization
   f. in-house legal counsel of corporation
   g. in-house legal counsel of university/foundation
   h. legal services
   i. public interest/nonprofit organization
   j. other (please specify) ______________________________

2. other than law, what type of job was it? ______________________________

29. Are you still employed at this job?

1. Yes (SKIP TO QUESTION 37, PAGE 10)
2. No

30. If "no," In what month and year did you leave? __________ __________

31. Which of the following factors contributed to your leaving your third job: (circle one in each row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>At all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. dissatisfied with job</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. got better offer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. advancement/salary considerations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. child/family considerations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. spouse/partner relocation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. discrimination of supervisors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. discrimination of co-workers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. discrimination of clients</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. disliked work environment/people</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. desired change in area of practice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. geographical considerations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. long hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. employer's decision/budget cuts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. conflict with political/moral beliefs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. lacked control over your work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. work wasn't challenging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. work was boring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. other: _______________</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. If dissatisfied, please explain all aspects of your dissatisfaction:

33. If better offer, explain how better:

34. If you circled discrimination was it based on...
   (circle one in each row)
   never  sometimes  frequently
   a. race ......................... 1  2  3
   b. sex/gender ........................ 1  2  3
   c. religion .......................... 1  2  3
   d. national origin ..................... 1  2  3
   e. marital status ..................... 1  2  3
   f. parental status .................... 1  2  3
   g. other:___________________________

35. If you circled discrimination, how do you feel it was manifested?
   (circle one in each row)
   never  sometimes  frequently
   a. uncomfortable environment ......... 1  2  3
   b. work assignments ........................ 1  2  3
   c. opportunity for advancement .......... 1  2  3
   d. salary .................................. 1  2  3
   e. clients/potential clients ............. 1  2  3
   f. harassment by co-workers .......... 1  2  3
   g. harassment by supervisors .......... 1  2  3
   h. sexual harassment by co-workers .... 1  2  3
   i. sexual harassment by supervisors .... 1  2  3
   j. exclusion from social life of firm/organization............ 1  2  3
   k. other:___________________________ 1  2  3

36. Did you have another job before taking your current position?
   1. No  2. Yes  3. unemployed (for how long?_______. why?

37. Since law school, have you ever worked part-time only or not worked outside the home at all for some period of time (not counting the time studying for the bar?) (circle as many as apply)
   1. No, always worked full-time (SKIP TO QUESTION 40, PAGE 11)
   2. Yes, worked part-time for a total of months
   3. Yes, stopped working for a total of months
   4. Yes, other________________________

38. Since you graduated from law school, have you ever taken a maternity/paternity leave from your employer and then returned for that same employer?  1. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 39)
   2. Yes
   A. How many leaves have you taken?
   B. How many months was the longest leave?
   C. When you returned did you continue to have the same hours as when you left?  1. Yes
   2. No, decreased hours
   3. No, increased hours
D. When you returned, did you continue to have the same responsibilities and authority as when you left?
   1. Yes
   2. No: what were the changes?

E. Did the program meet your needs?
   1. Yes
   2. No: why not:

39. If you have gone three months or more without working in the paid labor force, have never worked, or have worked part-time, was it because:
   (circle all that apply)
   a. sabbatical/leave/break ................... 3-6 months 6+ months
   b. parental responsibilities ................ 1 2
   c. caretaking responsibilities .............. 1 2
   d. didn't need the money .................... 1 2
   e. health ................................... 1 2
   f. spouse/partner didn't support type of work 1 2
   g. couldn't find the job I wanted .......... 1 2
   h. wanted to vacation/travel ............... 1 2
   i. not intellectual stimulating ............ 1 2
   j. too much pressure ....................... 1 2
   k. no future in job ........................ 1 2
   l. wanted to return to school ............. 1 2
   m. pursue hobbies/interests ............... 1 2
   n. volunteer/public service work .......... 1 2
   o. other: _____________________________ 1 2

40. Looking at your career since law school, what do you think have been your most important priorities in looking for and selecting a job. Are these the same priorities you had at graduation?
   Yes, same  No, different
   1. ________________________________ ...... 1 2
   2. ________________________________ ...... 1 2
   3. ________________________________ ...... 1 2
   4. ________________________________ ...... 1 2
   5. ________________________________ ...... 1 2

41. If you answered "no, different," what are the reasons for these changes?

42. Looking at your career, what factors have influenced its direction?
43. What factors have influenced your areas of expertise?

44. In hiring, do you feel you have experienced any personal discrimination in the workplace based on your: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. sex/gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. marital status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. nationality/religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. political beliefs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. parental status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. other commitments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. work history</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. How was the discrimination manifested?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. discrimination from employer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. uncomfortable environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. work assignments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. salary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. coverage and benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. clients/potential clients</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. harassment by co-workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. harassment by supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. exclusion from social life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. other:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. In your career since law school, has there been anyone who served as an especially helpful mentor to you? 1. No 2. Yes

47. If "yes," indicate in what setting (circle as many as apply)

1. law firm
2. business or corporate counsel's office
3. government agency
4. legal services/defender/public interest organization
5. judicial clerkship
6. other (specify) ________________________________

48. If "yes," have your mentors been:

1. a woman/women 2. a man/men 3. women and men

49. If "no," would you have liked/like someone to serve as a mentor to you? 1. No 2. Yes

50. If "yes," why would you have liked/like a mentor?
**IF IN PRACTICE OF LAW SKIP TO QUESTION 1, BELOW**

IF NOT IN PRACTICE OF LAW (INCLUDING UNEMPLOYED), CONTINUE

51. You do not practice law. Did any of the following reasons influence you at all in your decision not to practice law at this time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. no jobs were available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. wanted to make more money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. wanted more intellectual challenge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. wanted less pressure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. wanted more time with family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. wanted more time for yourself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. lacked skills/qualifications for other position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. law school was not respected by law firms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. discrimination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. didn't fit field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. Do you expect that you will probably not practice law in the future, or that you probably will move into practice?

1. will not practice
2. will practice, ___0-5 years ___6-10 years ___don’t know
3. Don’t know

53. Why do you expect this?

IV. WORK--CURRENT

1. With regard to your present job, how satisfied are you with:

(circle one in each row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. solving problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. intellectual challenges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. prestige of position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. prestige in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. degree of independence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. work with a mentor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. community service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. value of work to society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. treatment from colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. treatment from clients</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. relationships with superiors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. relationships with co-workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. the hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. balance of career and family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. overall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. On average, how many hours per week did you work in 1991?

If you report time for billing purposes, approximately how many hours a week were billable?

4. On average, how many hours of job related work did you do per week at home in 1991? __________, or out of the office, in 1991? __________

5. How many weeks did you work during 1991? __________
6. In your primary job now, where do you work and what do you do?
(circle one in column A and one in column B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Organization</th>
<th>b. Type of Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. private law firm or solo practice</td>
<td>1. practice law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. federal government</td>
<td>2. trial/appellate judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. state or local government</td>
<td>3. law teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. quasi-government (such as World Bank)</td>
<td>4. other legal position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. legal services, public defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. educational institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. public interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fortune 500 industry/service</td>
<td>Law-related position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. other industry/business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. banking/finance</td>
<td>Non-legal position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. accounting firm</td>
<td>5. elected/appointed official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. insurance</td>
<td>6. non-legal teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. other service</td>
<td>7. executive director, manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. other:</td>
<td>8. staff member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. If "worked in a law firm," what are the number of lawyers in the firm?

a. over 100
b. 50 - 100
c. 30-49
d. 16 - 29
e. 5 - 15
f. 4 and under

8. If you are presently working at a law firm, are you...

1. solo practitioner
2. a partner, shareholder
3. an associate
4. of counsel
5. other: ________________________________

9. With regard to your career, how satisfied are you with:
(circle one in each row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very satisfied</th>
<th>somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>somewhat unsatisfied</th>
<th>very unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. intellectual stimulation........ 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. solving problems ............... 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. intellectual challenges........ 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. prestige of position........... 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. prestige in the community...... 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. degree of independence......... 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. work with a mentor............. 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. opportunity for advancement.... 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. income.......................... 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. community service.............. 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. value of work to society...... 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. treatment from colleagues ..... 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. treatment from clients......... 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. relationships with superiors... 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. relationships with co-workers.. 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. the hours...................... 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. balance of career and family... 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. overall....................... 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. How much stress do you experience in your work today? (circle one)

None at all  a little  adequate  a lot  a great deal
1      2      3      4      5

11. What do you perceive to be the sources of your stress?

**NONPRACTITIONERS--SKIP TO QUESTION 1, PAGE 18**
FOR PRACTICING LAWYERS ONLY--FIRMS, GOVERNMENT, BUSINESS, LEGAL SERVICES...

12. What aspects of your job do you like the most?

13. What aspects of your job do you like the least?

14. How would you define career success?

15. Of your total time, approximately what percent is spent in the following activities? (fill in blanks, with percentages totaling 100)

a. library research ................................ a. _____
b. client interviewing or counseling ................. b. _____
c. litigation-related activities (discovery, factual investigation/motion practice/negotiation/trial, etc.) c. _____
d. negotiation (outside of litigation) .................. d. _____
e. drafting legal documents/agreements/opinion letters. e. _____
f. appeals ................................................. f. _____
g. lobbying legislation and rule-making bodies .... g. _____
h. office administration ................................ h. _____
i. reading to keep current, informal or formal legal education ............................................. i. _____
j. socializing with clients or co-workers .............. j. _____
k. recruiting new attorneys ............................ k. _____
l. other (specify) ........................................ l. _____

TOTAL 100%
16. (For all practitioners) Of the attorneys in the office in which you work, including yourself, roughly how many are:
   a. men ______
   b. women ______
   c. minority group members ______

17. Roughly how many hours a year do you spend:
   a. representing individual or organized clients on a pro bono basis (count explicit initial agreements only) ______
   b. doing other law-related work on a pro bono basis (e.g., serving on a legal services board, bar committee)? ______

18. Of your total work involving specific clients, approximately what percentage of your time is spent representing:
   (fill in blanks, with percentages totaling 100)
   a. high-income individuals _______________________ a. ______
   b. middle-income individuals ______________________ b. ______
   c. low-income individuals _________________________ c. ______
   d. Fortune 500 businesses/services __________________ d. ______
   e. other large or middle-sized businesses ___________ e. ______
   f. small businesses ______________________________ f. ______
   g. governments, government agencies _______________ g. ______
   h. non-profit organizations _________________________ h. ______
   i. other _____________________________ i. ______
   TOTAL 100% ______

19. Of the total time you spend working on legal matters, approximately what percentage do you spend in the following substantive areas?
   (fill in blanks, with percentages totaling 100)
   a. administrative law (not otherwise listed below) ... a. ______
   b. antitrust _______________________________ b. ______
   c. banking and finance ______________________ c. ______
   d. bankruptcy, debtor-creditor, consumer credit ... d. ______
   e. civil rights, civil liberties, discrimination ... e. ______
   f. communications, broadcasting __________________ f. ______
   g. corporate and commercial—including commercial litigation/business planning/business organization g. ______
   h. criminal _____________________________ h. ______
   i. domestic relations, family law _____________ i. ______
   j. employee benefits, ERISA ___________________ j. ______
   k. energy (gas, oil, minerals, nuclear, solar) ... k. ______
   l. environment, land use, water use _____________ l. ______
   m. estate planning/inheritance/gift tax/probate ... m. ______
   n. government contracts, municipal _____________ n. ______
   o. immigration _____________________________ o. ______
   p. income taxation (personal, corporate) ______ p. ______
   q. insurance _____________________________ q. ______
   r. international trade _______________________ r. ______
   s. labor relations, labor law ________________ s. ______
   t. patent, trademark, copyright ______________ t. ______
   u. real property (other than energy) __________ u. ______
   v. securities _____________________________ v. ______
   w. torts/personal injury/products liability/malpractice w. ______
   x. other ____________________________ x. ______
   TOTAL 100% ______
20. Consider the area of law of which you say you spend the greatest proportion of your time. What best describes your expectations with regard to this form of work while you were still in law school:

1. I planned that this would be my principal area of work.
2. This was one of several areas I was interested in.
3. I had little/no idea that this would become an area of my work.

21. Overall, how do you feel that your race/ethnicity affect your relationships with: (circle one in each row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very positive</th>
<th>somewhat positive</th>
<th>somewhat negative</th>
<th>very negative</th>
<th>know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a. other lawyers working with you in your current place of work........... 1 2 3 4
b. your support staff.......................... 1 2 3 4
c. other lawyers who are not co-workers at your current place of work........ 1 2 3 4
d. clients/potential clients..................... 1 2 3 4
e. judges........................................... 1 2 3 4
f. court administrators............................ 1 2 3 4
g. other:______________________________ 1 2 3 4

22. How do you feel your gender affects your relationships with: (circle one in each row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very positive</th>
<th>somewhat positive</th>
<th>somewhat negative</th>
<th>very negative</th>
<th>know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a. other lawyers working with you in your current place of work........... 1 2 3 4
b. your support staff.......................... 1 2 3 4
c. other lawyers who are not co-workers at your current place of work........ 1 2 3 4
d. clients/potential clients..................... 1 2 3 4
e. judges........................................... 1 2 3 4
f. court administrators............................ 1 2 3 4
g. other:______________________________ 1 2 3 4

23. In which professional associations are you a member? If no, why not?

1. American Bar Association 1. ________________________________
2. state bar association 2. ________________________________
3. county bar association 3. ________________________________
4. city bar association 4. ________________________________
5. specialized bar groups 5. ________________________________
6. other:______________________________ 6. ________________________________

24. If you are not a member because of time or money, please explain:

25. Have you served on any committees in these associations? 1. No 2. Yes

26. What are the advantages of being a member of an association?
V. WORK--PROJECTIONS

1. Look ahead five years. Do you expect to be working five years from now in the same setting (same government agency, same firm, etc.) in which you are currently working?

1. no
2. probably not
3. yes, probably (SKIP TO QUESTION 6)
4. yes (SKIP TO QUESTION 6)

2. If you answered "probably not" or "no" what will be the most important reason you will have left?

   a. job you want won't be available ............... 1
   b. want to make more money ...................... 1
   c. want more intellectual challenge ............. 1
   d. want less pressure ........................... 1
   e. want more time with your family ............. 1
   f. want more time for yourself ................ 1
   g. lack skills/qualifications to get desired job 1
   h. want a position with more prestige ........... 1
   i. feel personality won't fit the field of law you are in currently explain: ______________ 1

3. In what type of setting would you ultimately like to work?

1. practice law
2. outside of law

4. If practice law, Which of the following would you like most?

1. solo practice
2. a law firm/partnership (size: __________)
3. government
4. judiciary
5. a law school or other academic organization
6. in-house legal counsel of a corporation
7. in-house legal counsel of a university or foundation
8. legal services
9. public interest/nonprofit association
10. other: ________________________________

5. If Outside of law, what would you like to do?

6. Thinking about that long term goal, how likely do you feel it is that you will achieve this goal?

1. very unlikely
2. somewhat unlikely
3. somewhat likely
4. very likely

why?
VII. ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. How did your parents react about your decision to go to law school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly discouraged</th>
<th>somewhat discouraged</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>somewhat encouraged</th>
<th>strongly encouraged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>your decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. When you entered law school, what were your parents occupations? (if a parent was retired or deceased, list his/her previous occupation)

   a. mother

   b. father

3. What is the highest level of education that your parents attained?

   a. MOTHER
   1. less than 9th grade
   2. some high school
   3. high school diploma
   4. some college
   5. legal degree (J.D./LL.B.)
   6. bachelor's degree
   7. other professional degrees
   8. other graduate degrees

   b. FATHER
   1. less than 9th grade
   2. some high school
   3. high school diploma
   4. some college
   5. legal degree (J.D./LL.B.)
   6. bachelor's degree
   7. other professional degrees
   8. other graduate degrees

4. What was/is your marital status (circle one in each column)

   a. upon entering
   b. upon leaving
   c. now

   a. never married
   b. married, first time
   c. divorced or separated
   d. widowed
   e. remarried after divorce or being widowed
   f. other

5. How long have you been married? 

6. How many children altogether did/do you have? (including step children)

   a. upon entering
   b. upon leaving
   c. now

   a. law school
   b. law school
   c. now

7. What were/are their ages

   a. 1.
   b. 1.
   c. 1.

8. How many children live with you at the current time? (including step children)

9. How does your spouse/partner react about your career today?

   a. strongly discouraged
   b. somewhat discouraged
   c. neutral
   d. somewhat encouraged
   e. strongly encouraged

   a. 1
   b. 2
   c. 3
   d. 4
   e. 5
10. In what ways has your spouse/partner been supportive with your career?

11. In what ways has your spouse/partner hindered your career?

12. If you are married or have a partner with whom you share a home, what is your spouse's/partner's occupation? __________________________

13. What is the highest level of education that your spouse/partner attained
   1. some high school
   2. high school diploma
   3. some college
   4. bachelor’s degree
   5. legal degree (J.D., LL.B)
   6. other professional degrees
   7. other graduate degrees

14. Do you feel that your work as a lawyer at all influenced your decision about marriage or opportunities to marry?
   1. No
   2. Yes

15. If yes, how?

16. Do you feel your current work life conflicts with your ability to devote enough attention to your relationship with your spouse/partner?
   rarely sometimes often very often
   1      2      3      4

17. In what ways does your work conflict with your relationship?
18. If you have ever been previously married and then divorced, do you feel that the demands placed on you by your work life contributed to your divorce?  1. No  2. Yes

19. If yes, how?

20. In what ways do you think your marriage has influenced your career?

21. If you have children, do you feel that your current work life conflicts with your ability to devote enough attention to your children?
   rarely  sometimes  often  very often
   1       2       3       4

22. How does your work conflict with your children?

23. Do you feel that your current work life conflicts with your ability to devote enough attention to your personal interests?
   rarely  sometimes  often  very often
   1       2       3       4

24. How does your work conflict with your personal interests?

25. Overall, how satisfied are you with your family life today?
   very  somewhat  neutral  somewhat  very
   unsatisfied  unsatisfied  neutral  satisfied  satisfied
   1       2       3       4       5
### HOUSEWORK AND CHILD CARE

1. Who mainly takes care of the following household tasks and childcare in your family? (circle the appropriate letter--FOR O-V, DO NOT CIRCLE X)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Mainly Spouse</th>
<th>Help</th>
<th>Equally Spouse</th>
<th>Help</th>
<th>Mainly Kids</th>
<th>Help</th>
<th>Doesn't Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. cutting grass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. gardening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. taking out garbage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. making breakfast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. making dinner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. minor house repairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. grocery shopping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. dry cleaning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. pay bills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. make appointments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. cleaning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. clean up after meals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. laundry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. pet care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. discuss problems with children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. help children with homework/projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. playing, doing sports with children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. discipline children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. school activities, parent/teacher mtgs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. caring for sick children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. watching children on breaks/in-service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. taking children to doctor, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. During 1991, what was:
   a. Your approximate income from your employer? $__________
   b. The approximate earned income for your spouse/partner? $__________
   c. The approximate total cost of child care? $__________
   d. The approximate total cost of hired help (cleaning, lawn care...) in your household? $__________

28. Approximately how long did it take to complete this survey? ________
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