



UNIVERSITY OF
DENVER
STURM COLLEGE OF LAW

University of Denver Sturm College of Law

Legal Research Paper Series

Working Paper No. 07-16

The Changing Social Role of Urban Law Schools

[JOYCE STERLING](#)

University of Denver - Sturm College of Law

[RONIT DINOVTZER](#)

University of Toronto

[BRYANT G. GARTH](#)

Southwestern Law School; American Bar Foundation

[*Southwestern University Law Review, Forthcoming*](#)

This paper can be downloaded without charge from the Social Science Research Network
Electronic Paper Collection

Original Abstract ID: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=948540>

THE CHANGING SOCIAL ROLE OF URBAN LAW SCHOOLS
(forthcoming in *Southwestern University Law Review*)

BY

Joyce Sterling
University of Denver
Sturm College of Law

Ronit Dinovitzer
University of Toronto
Department of Sociology

Bryant Garth
Dean, Southwestern Law School, and Director Emeritus, American Bar
Foundation

DRAFT

This research was supported by grants from the American Bar Foundation, National Science Foundation (Grant No. SES0115521), Access Group, Law School Admissions Council, National Association for Law Placement, National Conference of Bar Examiners, and Open Society Institute. The views and conclusions stated herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of individuals or organizations associated with the After the JD study.

Abstract:

This article, based on the first wave of the “After the J.D.” data, explores the history of urban law schools and asks whether they play the same role today as in the past. In

particular, it asks whether the “urban,” Catholic, and “independent” categories of law schools located in major urban centers play a distinctive role today or whether law school ratings are more important in allocating students to particular schools and determining what role they will play in the legal profession. The analysis shows some continuities but also some interesting changes – for examples, in terms of where immigrants are likely to attend law school and also the current significance of the social networking and location of urban schools today.

There has long been a major division between the “establishment” of university based law schools, often located on pristine campuses, and “urban” or “night” schools located in the centers of major cities. A rich literature on the historical development of these types of law schools reveals major differences in the social class, religious affiliations, and ethnic characteristics of the students found in each type of school, and in the careers that the graduates then pursue. The focus today, however, has shifted. Attention in the law school community today is much more concerned with distinctions based on rankings than it is on the historical differences between the urban schools and those identified more with the legal establishment.¹

The data collected to date as part of the “After the J.D. Project” provide the opportunity to begin to examine how the historical traditions play out in the 21st century legal world. This article will review the history of urban law schools, show that the very distinct lawyer career trajectories associated with the different types of schools, and then examine the relevance of “urban law schools” to today’s law school demographics and to careers in the legal profession today. It will examine several categories that can be included within the general grouping of urban law school, revealing some differences within urban law schools. It will show that the idea of access remains central to the urban law schools generally, but that the general pattern is made more complicated by changes

¹ An interesting exception is Jonakait, Randolph, “The Two Hemispheres of Legal Education and the Rise and Fall of Local Law Schools,” *New York Law School Law Review*, forthcoming 2007

in the legal profession, in the nature of immigration, and in the importance of the legal market in the place where law schools are located. As this article and the companion articles suggest, the concentration of law jobs in major urban markets is one advantage that many historically disadvantaged schools now enjoy.

The Historical Role of Urban Law Schools

Beginning in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, new law schools in major cities proliferated in order to provide access to the legal profession for individuals who otherwise could not have pursued legal careers – in particular, recent immigrants to the United States and their children. The new schools developed along with new waves of immigration and new initiatives by the American Bar Association, founded in 1878, to slow or stop admission to the bar through apprenticeship. According to Robert Stevens, the leading historian of U.S. legal education, in 1870 there were 1,200 law students in some 21 law schools, in 1890 some 61 law schools, and then the figure mushroomed to 140 law schools with over 21,000 students by 1916.² In his words, “legal education had become urbanized.”³

Alfred Reed, a pioneering student of legal education, stated in an article published in 1931 that, “the mission of an evening or part-time law school is to enable young men and women, who cannot afford to attend a better school, to prepare themselves for legal practice.”⁴ His reference was to the new generation of urban schools. One of the earliest such law schools was Columbian College (now George Washington University), which

²Robert Stevens, *Law School: Legal Education in America from the 1850s to the 1980s* 76 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press 1983).

³ Id.

⁴ See Alfred Z. Reed, “Social Desirability of Evening or Part-Time Law School, 7 Am. L. Sch. Rev. 198 (1931).) Dorothy E. Finnegan , Raising And Leveling The Bar: Standards, Access, And The YMCA Evening Law Schools, 1890-1940, 55 *Journal of Legal Education* 208, 217 (2005).

opened its doors in 1865. It was followed in 1870 in the District of Columbia by Georgetown (the first Jesuit law school) and National University. Both were evening and early-morning law schools designed to provide a legal education to government workers. The Iowa Law School, another very early example, opened its doors in Des Moines in 1866 as an independent evening law school granting a bachelor of law degree.⁵ It soon became part of the University of Iowa. The various access missions also include that of Howard University, which began as an evening law school in 1868 for African American men and women. By the 1880s, evening law programs had sprung up from coast to coast, including schools in Portland, Oregon (1884), New York City (Metropolitan School of Law, which was later taken over by NYU, 1888), Chicago (Chicago College of Law which became Chicago Kent) , Minneapolis, and Baltimore. The New York Law School was formed in 1891 by supporters of Theodore Dwight (founder of Columbia University Law School) after Dwight retired from Columbia. Unlike most of the other evening law schools, New York Law School was formed as a protest to Columbia's adoption of the case method approach to teaching.⁶ Instead, New York Law School adopted the lecture method favored by Dwight. Initially the school opened as a day law school, but three years after its inception, it added an evening division to provide opportunities for poor and wealthy alike.

Southwestern Law School, the site of this conference, was opened initially in 1911, and its first graduate was a woman. In contrast to New York Law School, however, Southwestern's founders sought to show that there was "a real field in the southwest for a

⁵Joseph T. Tinnelly, *Part-Time Legal Education: A Study of the Problems of Evening Law Schools* 4 (Brooklyn, Foundation Press 1957)4; Finnegan, *supra* note 23, at 213.

⁶James A. Wooten, "Law School Rights: The Establishment of New York Law School, 1891-1897," 36 *New York Law School Law Review* 337 (1991).

law school employing the case-book method of instruction.”⁷ University of Southern California, the other law school then in Los Angeles, did not adopt the case method until the 1920s.⁸ In addition to a law school, Southwestern also had a school of “commerce, accounts, and finance.”⁹

These law schools had different missions at the outset, and a number became part of larger universities soon after their creation. But access to law school was one of the goals shared by all the urban schools. The focus on providing access gained further momentum with the proliferation of Catholic and YMCA law schools designed with new immigrants specifically in mind. By the turn of the century, a number of Catholic colleges established evening law schools (most were operated by the Jesuit order) to provide legal education for those who were denied opportunities in the established schools. These Catholic schools included Marquette (1908), St. Xavier Law College in Cincinnati (1919), the Jesuit institution in San Francisco that was to become University of San Francisco (1912), and the Knights of Columbus school that opened in DC in 1922, joining with Georgetown, opened a half-century earlier to focus on government workers.

A significant number of the night law schools were formed and operated as part of urban YMCA’s. The mission of these schools was to enable “...many young and not-so-young adults to attain a higher socioeconomic status by entering a profession even though the path through the collegiate system was barred to them.”¹⁰ Researchers have identified

⁷Note and Comment, 1 *Southwestern Law Review* 40,43 (1916).

⁸ Stevens, *supra* note , at 191.

⁹ A description in the law review published in 1917 indicated that there were more than one hundred students, including “five Japanese students and one Filipino.” Notes and Comment, 1 *Southwestern Law Review* 108 (1917).

¹⁰ “Simultaneously the evening schools modernized the apprenticeship model by uniting a cadre of practicing lawyers with a continuous stream of aspirants in a classroom rather than in an office. Mentors and their ‘readers’ were now engaged in a focused and specialized conversation, an essential pedagogy for

19 original YMCA Law Schools. The three earliest YMCA law schools included Cooley Law Club formed in Detroit in 1891. This school was independent until 1915. Initially the school operated in the Detroit College of Medicine, but by 1913 the leaders decided to lease space from the downtown branch of the YMCA. The Cincinnati YMCA Night Law School also opened just prior to the turn of the century, and was incorporated by the Y in 1900. The third school was Northeastern University Law School. The doors of the school opened in 1898, and it was connected to the Boston YMCA. Tuition at Northeastern was \$30/year and it included membership into the YMCA. Eventually three branches of Northeastern opened under the administration of the YMCA. These branches were located in Springfield, Worcester, and Providence.

In addition to these initial YMCA Law Schools, historians have included the following YMCA schools: South Texas School of Law in Houston, Toledo YMCA Law School, St. Joseph (Missouri) Law School, Dayton YMCA Law School, Southeastern University Law School in D.C., Columbus YMCA Law School (which became Capital University Law School), Nashville Law School, Youngstown YMCA Law School, Golden Gate College's Law School, Minneapolis YMCA Law School (which was acquired by University of Minnesota), Southern Methodist University, and Salmon Chase Law School (which became part of Northern Kentucky University). While some of these schools became affiliated with the YMCA subsequent to their founding, at least seven of the schools were conceived and run by the YMCA.

In part, operating a law school was consistent with the mission of the YMCA.

According to the Detroit YMCA Annual Report in 1920, the YMCA provided

the more complicated legal world; the old method of capturing the breadth of common law under the tutelage of one master would no longer suffice." Finnegan, *supra* note , at 210.

educational programs “...to meet the practical everyday needs of men to whom the regular channels of education are closed, or are not immediately available. These schools offer to men who are already at work in trades, in business, or in professions, as well as to young men just planning their life work the opportunity to train for better positions and bigger salaries.”¹¹

While the YMCA Law Schools provided opportunities for young men from lower socio-economic origins, and those from minority religious groups (Catholic and Jewish), very few were open initially to women and blacks. However, by 1918-1920, scholars indicate that there were some women admitted to these schools. Southwestern’s first graduate, as noted before, was a woman. Some of the women graduates may have been unintended enrollees who were allowed to remain despite policies against women law students. Most schools expressly excluded black students and maintained the racial exclusion for a considerably longer period than the gender exclusion. Exceptions included the Detroit College of Law, which announced upon opening that “the college opens its doors to all classes, without regard to sex, color, or citizenship.”

A Divided Profession

The historical division between what were seen as the “establishment” university law schools and the “night” law schools has been the subject of considerable scrutiny.¹² The two kinds of schools had very different profiles, contained different students, and prepared lawyers for very different careers serving distinct clients. Graduates of the urban law schools were long excluded from certain practice settings, as above all the corporate

¹¹Finnegan, *supra* note, at 218.

¹² Jerold Auerbach, *Unequal Justice: Lawyers and Social Change in Modern America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1976)), See also Stevens, *supra* note .

law firms created to serve the major corporations that emerged in America's so-called "gilded age."¹³ Graduates of the urban law schools instead entered into fields that were open to them – e.g., litigation, family law, and some other specialty areas such as bankruptcy – and not dominated or even highly sought after by the lawyers in the corporate law firms. Partly because of their litigation emphasis and partly also because of their connections to the urban political machines, often also dominated by immigrant groups, these urban law graduates served in the local governments and in the state judiciaries in great numbers.¹⁴

Beginning in the 1960s, scholars examining the legal profession focused on the impact of ascriptive characteristics on career trajectories and legal practice.¹⁵ These pioneering sociological studies considered the impact of ethno-religious background, social origins, and educational opportunities. The findings suggested that Jews and Catholics, children of immigrants, and those from working class backgrounds were denied opportunities in the prestigious legal practices and specialties of law.¹⁶ Corporate law, as other studies suggested, was the preserve mainly of a Protestant elite.

Early studies by Jack Ladinsky and Jerome Carlin, for example, showed that religion and father's occupational status influenced the law school attended and

¹³ Marc Galanter and Thomas Palay, *Tournament of Lawyers: The Transformation of the Big Law Firm* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

¹⁴See Sara Parikh and Bryant Garth, "Philip Corboy and the Construction of the Plaintiffs' Personal Injury Bar," 30 *Law and Social Inquiry* 269 (2005).

¹⁵Ladinsky, Jack (1963) "Careers of Lawyers, Law Practice and Legal Institutions," 28 *American Sociological Rev.* 47-54; Jack Ladinsky, *The Impact of Social Backgrounds of Lawyers on Law Practice and the Law*, 16 *Journal of Legal Education* 127 (1963); Hugh F. Lena et al. "Professional Status at Midcareer: The Influence of Social and Academic Origins on Lawyers' Achievement," 8 *Sociological Forum* 365-82 (1993); Jerome Carlin, *Lawyers on Their Own* (Rutgers University Press 1962); Jerome Carlin, *Lawyers' Ethics: A Survey of the New York City Bar* (New York: Russell Sage, 1966) Arthur Wood, *Criminal Lawyer* (New College Press, 1967); Erwin Smigel, *The Wall Street Lawyer* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969).

¹⁶Lena et al., supra note 368.

subsequently the career path taken by these new entrants to the legal profession. Starting with samples of lawyers from Detroit and New York City, respectively, they found that Catholic and Jewish lawyers were more likely to have attended a part-time night law school, and also more likely to have come from family backgrounds where fathers were small business entrepreneurs rather than trained professionals. Once these individuals graduated from the part-time law schools, no matter how well they performed in law school, they did not find the doors of the elite law firms open to them. They overwhelmingly joined small firms or, even more likely, became solo practitioners.

These early studies set the stage for the landmark American Bar Foundation study of the Chicago Bar by Jack Heinz and Ed Laumann, published in 1982 and based on data collected in 1975.¹⁷ The same ethnic-religious minorities discussed by Ladinsky and Carlin were found to have attended the “local law schools” in Chicago (including DePaul, John Marshall, Loyola, and Chicago Kent) and to have encountered the same barriers to elite practice. In addition to validating the exclusionary practices of the elite bar in Chicago, Heinz and Laumann provided a framework that influenced all subsequent studies. They found that there were two distinct hemispheres of the bar separated according to the types of clients served: corporations or individual clients. The hemispheres coincided for the most part with the traditional distinctions between the establishment law schools and the urban schools.

The first generation of law and society studies, it should be noted, including the Heinz and Laumann work, had to exclude women and racial minorities because of the small numbers in their samples. As a result, most of the first generation research on

¹⁷ John Heinz and Edward Laumann, *Chicago Lawyers: The Social Structure of an Urban Bar* (New York: Russell Sage, 1982)

stratification of the bar was made up only of white male respondents. As the numbers of women and minorities increased significantly in the 1980s, however, a second generation of research has gradually begun to understand how they fit into the picture of the “new legal profession.” Women are now admitted to law school in equal numbers to their male counterparts, and racial minorities have greatly diversified the previously all white law schools. This second generation work has included research on lawyers in Toronto,¹⁸ Chicago¹⁹ and the New York City suburban area.²⁰ Many of the early issues involving the urban law school graduates – “exclusion” from the elite positions of the corporate bar – have been seen to resurface in analyses of the careers of women and minorities.

The changes can be seen especially clearly in the new Chicago lawyers research, which revisits the Chicago bar twenty years after the first American Bar Foundation Study. The authors of the new study, involving Heinz and Laumann again along with Robert Nelson and Rebecca Sandefur, found that the graduates of the urban law schools in Chicago were no longer excluded per se from the corporate law firms.²¹ The corporate law firms were much larger than they had been in the past, and the expansion meant that many lawyers from the urban law schools had been included in that expansion. In addition, the law schools themselves were no longer as divided according to ethnicity and religious background.

¹⁸ John Hagan, et al. "Class Structure and Legal Practice: Inequality and Mobility among Toronto Lawyers," 22 *Law & Society Rev.* 9-55 (1988); John Hagan and Fiona Kay, *Gender in Practice: A Study of Lawyers' Lives* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1995).

¹⁹ John Heinz, Robert Nelson, Rebecca Sandefur and Edward Laumann, *Urban Lawyers: The New Social Structure of the Bar* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2005)

²⁰ Carroll Seron, *The Business of Practicing Law: The Work Lives of Solo and Small-Firm Attorneys* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press 1996)

²¹ Heinz, et al., supra note .

The new study of Chicago lawyers, however, maintains the emphasis of the first study on stratification within the legal profession. The stratification is no longer based simply on race and ethnicity, nor is it based on the new groups of gender and race. Yet the old categories still showed up to some extent in career results, such as income, and the new categories of women and minorities tended to thrive mainly in settings outside of the large corporate law firms. Women were found in particular to be disproportionately represented in government and in positions in corporate in-house departments. The new stratification, more generally, is seen more in statistical patterns than in specific exclusions. Our focus in this article is therefore on the particular role of urban law schools given the new patterns that have emerged in recent years. That role, furthermore, needs to be related to the stratification that comes from the law school rankings associated with U.S. News.

The After the JD Study

This paper relies on the first wave of data from the After the JD (AJD) study, a national longitudinal survey of law graduates. The study is based on a sample representative of the national population of lawyers who were admitted to the bar in 2000 and graduated from law school between June 1998 and July 2000. The sampling design used a two-stage process. In the first stage, the nation was divided into 18 strata by region and size of the new lawyer population. Within each stratum one primary sampling unit (PSU) — metropolitan area, portion of a state outside large metropolitan areas, or entire state — was chosen. The PSUs included all four “major” markets, those with more than 2,000 new lawyers (Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, and Washington, DC); five of the

nine “large” markets, those with between 750 and 2,000 new lawyers (Boston, Atlanta, Houston, Minneapolis, San Francisco); and nine of the remaining, smaller markets (CT, NJ remainder, FL remainder, TN, OK, IN, St. Louis, UT, OR). In the second stage, individuals were sampled from each of the PSUs at rates that would, combined, generalize to the national population. In addition, the study included an oversample of 1,465 new lawyers from minority groups (Black, Hispanic, and Asian American).²² For purposes of the present analysis, we examine data from the nationally representative sample of lawyers (and exclude the oversample of minority lawyers). These responses were weighted according to their appearance in the particular geographic region from which they were sampled.²³ The final sample included 9,192 lawyers in the 18 PSUs. Data collection was based on a mail questionnaire initially fielded in May 2002. Nonrespondents were followed up by mail and phone (with the telephone survey using a somewhat abridged version of the mail questionnaire).

About 20% of the individuals in the sample could not be located, and roughly 20% of those located proved to be lawyers moving from one state bar to another rather than lawyers entering a bar for the first time. These “movers” were included in the sample so long as they had graduated from law school no earlier than 1998. (Consequently, about 6% of the AJD sample began law practice in 1999, and 1.5% began practice in 1998.) Of the original sample members who were located and who met the criteria for inclusion in the study, 71% responded either to the mail questionnaire or to a telephone interview, for a total of 4,538 valid responses.

²²The sample also included respondents who self-identified as Native Americans, however the number of respondents in this category is too small for the analyses in this paper.

²³ The weighting used in this paper is preliminary and may be revised as part of an on-going process.

Comparisons with external data indicate that the AJD sample is representative of the general population from which the sample was selected. When compared with young lawyers in the 2000 Census, we find that the racial composition of the sample is almost identical,²⁴ and the sample also closely approximates the distribution of lawyers across firms, government, and business employers.²⁵ Finally, the gender composition in the sample closely matches data published by the American Bar Association.²⁶

Operationalization of Measures of Urban Legal Education

Urban law schools were operationalized first according to overall population of school location. The general category includes law schools defined as located in a SMSA population or PMSA population greater than one million. We next divided according to whether they offer a part-time legal education program or not. Those labeled as part-time offered a part-time program but we include both the full time and part-time students of the schools unless specifically distinguished. The next category is urban full-time law schools. These include schools located in geographic regions with more than one million in population, but the schools offer only full-time legal education. The third category of urban law school is the Catholic law school located in urban areas, whether or not it offered a part-time program. The fourth category is independent law schools, which includes schools that operate without affiliation to an undergraduate university and are also located in urban areas. As comparison groups to the four types of urban law schools,

²⁴U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) 2000, 5% sample, all lawyers and judges, ages 27-32.

²⁵ PUMS 2000, 5% sample, all lawyers and judges; Clara Carson, *Lawyers Statistical Survey* (Chicago: American Bar Foundation, 2004).

²⁶ American Bar Association 2005 (need cite)

we first defined two categories of elite schools, wherever they were located or whether they were Catholic or not. We simply refer here to the elite top 10 law schools as classified by the U.S. News, and to elite schools ranked by U.S. News from 11-31. The other comparison group is simply all the schools ranked 32 or lower and not included in the four urban law school categories.

For the present paper, we portray the AJD respondents who graduated from these urban law schools, and describe them demographically along with their initial jobs after graduating from law school. The discussion below will explore whether there is still stratification separating the graduates of urban law schools, and if so along what lines? We will also consider whether the graduates of urban law schools differ from graduates of the elite and establishment schools, and whether women and persons of color replaced the children of immigrants who were limited to attendance at the urban law schools historically.

Who are the new urban law graduates?

Gender and Age: The AJD respondents can be distinguished on many levels from the first generation research [Table 1]. For example, the national sample of new lawyers now has substantial proportions of women law graduates, with women representing 46% of AJD respondents. However, we do find that women are represented in slightly greater proportions among Catholic (51%) and independent law graduates (50%). The lowest proportions of women graduates were from non-urban law schools (43%) and Elite Top 10 and the 11-31 schools (45% and 44% respectively). Why the slightly higher representation of women in these particular urban law schools? We

expected that women who attend urban law schools may be older, more likely to be married, have children and be located closer to immediate family. And indeed, these schools do have slightly older students (particularly the independent schools, where 36% are over the age of 36).

Marriage and Child-Bearing: What are the patterns of marriage and childbearing among urban law school graduates? Among the AJD respondents, approximately 55% are married. It is not surprising to see that graduates of the Elite Top 10 schools are the least likely to report being married (43%), while the highest proportion of married respondents graduated from Urban FT and Urban PT law schools (60% and 59% respectively). At the remaining law schools, more than one-half of the AJD graduates reported that they are married.

How many respondents have at least one child? Across the sample, slightly more than 1/3 of our respondents have at least one child. Those most likely to have a child are graduates of the Independent law schools (37%), while the graduates least likely to have started a family are those graduating from the Elite Top 10 (13%). Both the Urban PT and Urban FT graduates are the next most likely to have at least one child (32% and 34% respectively).

Overall, we find that almost half of our respondents have not yet married, and the majority have not yet begun families. It is expected that these patterns will alter tremendously by the time of the second wave of data collection, in March 2007.

Racial makeup of urban law schools: Lawyers of color graduated in roughly equal proportion from the various law schools, representing about 14-23% of law school graduates in the AJD sample. Interestingly, the largest proportion of lawyers of color in

the AJD sample graduated from the Elite Top 10 Schools. [Table 1] These patterns suggest that while there has been a fairly equal opening up of opportunities for lawyers of color across all law schools, that the more elite law schools have opened their doors the widest to students of color. They also have the most resources in terms of financial aid.

Children of Immigrants: As the first generation of research established, the urban law schools tended to serve the first generation of immigrants to the United States who did not have easy access to the elite and established law schools. Do the urban law schools continue to serve this constituency? According to the data in Table 1, the highest proportion of respondents reporting that both parents were born outside the U.S. attended the elite top 10 law schools (23%) and the elite top 31 schools (17%). The urban/PT schools have the next highest proportion of parents born outside the U.S. (15%). The lowest reported proportion of parents born outside the U.S. is found among respondents who attended non-urban law schools (6%).²⁷ This signals a dramatic reversal of historical trends: all law schools are now open to children of immigrants. The new generation of immigrants also includes many more professionals and individuals able to put their children in the best secondary schools and colleges.

Ethno-Religious Background: Early research also highlighted the barriers faced by Jewish and Catholic students seeking entry into law schools. According to the AJD data, students of various religious affiliations are distributed across all the law schools. According to the data in Table 1, the largest proportion of Jewish law graduates attended the elite top 10 and schools ranked in the top 11-31 (14% and 10% respectively).

However, we find that an equivalent proportion of Jewish law graduates attended

²⁷ It is important to note that 90% of the parents of Asian students were born outside the U.S. In addition 53% of Hispanic students' parents were born outside the U.S. in comparison to 18% of parents of Black students and only 5% of white students.

independent law schools as the elite 11-31 schools (10-11%). The patterns of law school attendance for Roman Catholic students are less equally distributed: we find that a significantly larger proportion attended either Catholic law schools (49%) or the independent law schools (38%), with one third graduating from Urban /PT schools. These data suggest that barriers of the past have weakened and in some instances disappeared, allowing more of these historically excluded constituencies to enter the elite and establishment schools.

Social Class and the impact on law school attended: The data on socioeconomic origin reveal the impact of social class differences among AJD law graduates. Three quarters of the graduates of the top 10 schools and 60% of the Elite 11-31 have parents with more than a bachelors' degree. In contrast, the proportion of parents with more than a bachelors' degree drops to less than half (between 40-47%) for the graduates of other law schools.

This pattern of social stratification is equally apparent when we examined respondents' father's occupational status using the International Socio-Economic Index (ISEI) scale, which ranges from 16-90. [TABLE 1] As might be expected, elite law school graduates come from the most privileged backgrounds, with these respondents reporting the highest fathers' ISEI scores (66 and 64 for the two categories of elite law graduates); we should note that fathers of Catholic law school graduates had mean ISEI scores of 61. The lowest occupational status ISEI ratings are found among parents of urban part-time law graduates (57), independent law school graduates (58) and graduates of the other law schools (58).

Where Do They Work? A key measure for understanding key aspects of the legal profession – from salaries, to prestige, to type of clients served – derives from lawyers’ practice settings. The data in Table 2 outline the distribution of AJD respondents across the various practice setting, for each type of law school. We find that a substantial proportion of all urban graduates are working in solo or small firm practice (40% urban PT; 39% Urban FT; 39% Independent). Similarly, graduates of the non-urban, not ranked in the elite, not Catholic school or independent school graduates (hereafter referred to as “other schools”) are also more likely to begin their careers in solo or small practice settings (37%). In contrast, about 15% of all the graduates of these various law schools work in large firms of over 100 lawyers. For elite law graduates, large corporate practice continues to be the predominant work setting of the elite. Almost two thirds (62.2%) of top 10 graduates and almost half (44.6%) of top 31 graduates are working in firms of more than 100 lawyers. These results support previous research suggesting that graduates with elite credentials (including elite schools and top grades) are most likely to enter the legal profession in large corporate practice.

However, it is noteworthy that almost as many Catholic law school graduates start their legal careers in firms of more than 100 lawyers (27.5%) as start their careers in solo or small firm settings (29%). That graduates of Catholic law schools are more likely to enter large firm practice than either urban full-time or part-time law school graduates (or the graduates from the other non-urban schools) is an important finding. This pattern suggests Catholic law school graduates are able to mobilize a specific form of capital that enables their entry into these prestigious practice settings. While further research is necessary to better understand and isolate this mechanism, we speculate that the social

networks of Catholic law school alumni may be playing an important role in the continues presence of Catholic law graduates in the large corporate law firms.

Graduates most likely to begin their careers in government are graduates of non-urban schools (the “other” category), and of the urban FT schools. These jobs likely include positions in state and local government that can be found outside of the major metropolitan areas. While very few law graduates are found in non-government public law positions (usually public interest or educational in nature), graduates of the top 10 schools are most likely to begin their careers in these positions (10.4%). It is clear that these positions are rare and difficult to obtain, and that the elite credentials offers a unique advantage for those seeking to work in these organizations. Finally, lawyers most likely to begin their careers in business graduated from Independent law schools. It is possible that the graduates entering business are older, less likely to find opportunities in traditional law practice, and perhaps more likely to have connections already in the business world. In fact, the mean percentage of independent school graduates over the age of 36 is 36%.

What is the Effect of location in a Major Metropolitan Area? Urban law schools, by situating themselves within major urban areas may have easier access to the local job market (through connections or even sheer proximity) than higher ranked schools that are located outside of urban areas. In Table 3, we explore whether urban law schools indeed have this advantage, by comparing the distribution of AJD respondents in the various practice settings, based on whether or not they are located in a major city (defined as New York, LA, San Francisco, Chicago, D.C., and Boston). The data indicate that for all urban law graduates, location in a major city increases the likelihood that they

will obtain positions in large corporate law firms. For example, while overall, 15% of urban PT law graduates work in firms of 100 or more lawyers, 21% of these same graduates work in large corporate firms when they are located in large cities. Similarly, 28% of Catholic law graduates work in firms of over 200 lawyers, but when these graduates are located in one of the major cities, 32% work in these settings. Geography, then, is an important form of capital, with urban law schools graduates successfully mobilizing their locale into an advantage on the job market.

Does it matter if students attend school Part-Time? One of the hallmarks of the urban law school is the accommodation of students who choose to attend school part time, though as our data indicate, it is not a common option: only 13% of the total sample attended law school part-time. In Table 4, we examine whether the decision to attend law school on a part time basis is related to career outcomes by examining the practice settings of students comparing those who went to school part time and those who went full time. While the urban PT schools specifically target the part time students, other urban law schools also allow for part time students. The data indicate that for the urban law schools with part time programs, graduate who attended part time are less likely to be working in corporate law firms, and are more likely to work in business. A similar pattern emerges with the other urban law schools, where part time law graduates are also more likely to be working in business settings. In short the data indicate that attending law school on a part time basis translates into somewhat fewer job options after graduation – but at the same time, we must recall that for many students (and especially part time students), the law degree represents a substantial step in upward mobility, regardless of their initial practice settings.

The Effect of Social Class on Practice Settings: Fathers' occupational status is correlated not only to law school prestige, but to practice settings as well [Table 5a]. Having a father with an ISEI score greater than 68 increased the presence of law graduates in the large corporate settings, regardless of type of law school attended. The only exception to this boost is a small decline (less than 4%) in the proportion of elite top 10 graduates entering large corporate law firms. Of course, even with this decline, the elite top 10 graduates are still significantly more likely to enter large corporate practice. For urban law school graduates, having a father with a higher socioeconomic prestige score results in a greater likelihood of working in a large corporate firm, and a decline in the proportion of these graduates who start their careers in the business sector. There is a slight increase in the proportion of urban PT and FT, and Catholic law school graduates working in the government sector if their fathers have higher ISEI scores.

The impact of fathers' social class on early career placement is further elaborated when we consider father's education. [TABLE 5b] The analyses below compare the practice settings of respondents whose fathers have at most a first university degree compared to those whose fathers have a professional or graduate degree. The data in Table 5b suggest a number of patterns. First, there is a clear advantage for respondents whose father has a professional or graduate degree: these Urban PT and FT graduates, Elite 11-31 graduates, and non-urban graduates are more likely to enter large corporate firm practice. Similarly, for graduates of both Catholic law schools and Independent law schools, having a highly educated father is related to a decline of these graduates in business and small firm or solo practice. Here, we begin to see some of the urban advantage we mentioned earlier. It appears that the combination of going to law schools

in a major urban geographic area and having a father with professional or graduate degrees open doors for urban graduates previously excluded from many opportunities within the practice of law. Perhaps fathers with more education are able to open doors with connections they have acquired during their careers, or they may simply be able to provide additional financial resources for these young lawyers to be able to exercise more choice as they begin their legal careers. For graduates of the non-urban law schools we do not find a similar advantage: respondents are distributed across practice settings fairly similarly regardless of father's social class.

While there is evidence of stratification in early legal careers – based on type of law school attended and family social class – those graduating from urban law schools have the advantage of being close to potential employers and able to market themselves more effectively. Perhaps this proximity makes it easier to write unsolicited letters to potential employers, request and receive personal interviews with law firms, and to transform themselves from a name to a flesh and blood individual who presents a potential for success. During the course of the longitudinal study of AJD graduates, we will be able to better assess whether these early career advantages and strategies employed for securing positions are in fact predictive of career mobility.

How do these law graduates get their jobs? While the data above indicate some clear correlates of the distribution of law graduates into the various practice settings, the AJD data also allow us to assess the techniques law graduates relied on in order to obtain these jobs. Table 6 displays the ratings of importance attributed to thirteen different strategies used by respondents to obtain their current position. The results indicate that unlike the elite law graduates, urban law graduates are less likely to have

obtained their jobs through law school placement, on-campus interviews or summer positions. Clearly these traditional resources seem to benefit the elite law graduates. However, it is important to keep in mind that large corporate law firms tend to recruit only from particular law schools to select elite law graduates as other their constituents within legal education. Therefore the job search strategies of law school graduates are not doubt affected by these selection patterns.

Our data also indicate that urban part-time and full time graduates, as well as Independent law school graduates, tended to rely more on direct unsolicited contact with employers and on their friends in order to find their current jobs, with the Urban full-time graduates also relying relatively more on their summer positions as sources of jobs. Finally, the job search techniques of Catholic law school graduates are fairly similar to those of the urban FT school with two exceptions: Catholic rated their law school alumni as at least as helpful a resource as Elite top 10 graduates (while still fairly low rating, at a mean of 2.12), and compared to other urban law graduates, Catholic graduates gave their law school placement office a relatively higher rating (3.04). Finally the non-urban schools have used direct unsolicited contact more than any of their urban law school counterparts, perhaps reflecting the fact that they will have to move from the geographic location of their law school to find legal employment. We expect both law school classmates and law school alumni to rise in importance later in law careers for these graduates. It is important to remember that all these strategies used by the law school graduates were successful strategies – 94% were employed full-time when we contacted them in wave 1 of the survey.

II. NATURE OF THE WORK THEY DO:

Historically, the graduates of urban law schools, particularly evening law schools graduates, were more likely to practice personal injury plaintiffs litigation. This area of practice was considered a likely spot for a non-elite graduate, one who was likely to serve individual clients.²⁸ Table 7 shows the percent of respondents who spend any time working in these fields of law, and also the mean percent of time spent working in the field of personal injury plaintiff or defendant work for those who do any work in this field. We find a few important patterns. First, a substantial proportion of the urban PT and nonurban law school graduates are working in either of these fields (at least 17% and 31% respectively). In contrast elite graduates are very unlikely to be working in these fields, with between 2% and 11% of these graduates doing any personal injury plaintiff or defendant work.

These findings are consistent with historical research on the concentration of personal injury work among the urban and night law school graduates. Those spending the most *time* in personal injury defense are the Catholic law graduates (mean time spent = 38%), non-urban law graduates (36%) and Urban PT graduates (35%). The graduates spending the least amount of time likely to be practicing any personal injury work are graduates of the elite Top 10 graduates (26%); it is also noteworthy that the Urban FT law graduates spend relatively less time in personal injury practice compared to the other urban law school graduates. The patterns in these data therefore suggest some commonalities and contrasts to earlier research in Chicago: on the one hand, elite lawyers are very unlikely to work in personal injury law; on the other hand, graduates of

²⁸ See Heinz and Laumann, *supra* note.

urban law schools spend, on average, less than one third of their time in this field of practice.²⁹

The seminal work of Heinz and Laumann signaled the bifurcation of the bar into two hemispheres, with the line dividing the two spheres defined by the type of clients lawyers served. They found that lower tier law graduates were more likely to be working in smaller practice settings, and were more likely to serve individual clients; elite law graduates were more likely to serve corporate clients. Drawing on the AJD data, Table 8 shows the percentage of time spent representing individual clients. Here we see support for the two hemispheres findings of the Chicago Lawyer study. Elite law graduates are spending substantially less time representing individual clients than any other law school graduates. On average, these elite graduates spend 40% of their time serving individuals, while graduates of all other law schools are spending at least half of their time representing individual clients; graduates of Independent law schools report the most time serving individuals clients, with these clients representing almost two-thirds (64%) of their time.

III. SATISFACTION, COMPENSATION, AND CAPITAL.

Satisfaction and the distribution of financial compensation: Much scholarship on the legal profession has documented the unequal distribution of pecuniary and non-pecuniary rewards in the legal profession. The distribution of financial rewards among AJD respondents mirrors the findings of much other research: the highest levels of compensation are received by graduates of the top 10 law schools (Median = \$80,000)

²⁹ We should note that most of the AJD graduates are not yet specialists; indeed, it is too early in their career to be true specialists. The only exception to this are those graduates who have entered public law practice as public defenders or district attorneys.

[TABLE 9]. Surprisingly, graduates of Catholic Law Schools have the same median salary as the top 10 elites. The next highest compensation levels reported are found among Independent law graduates (median = \$75,000), and the lowest reported incomes are found among Urban FT and Non-Urban graduates (median = \$60,000).

Despite the discrepancies in median salary levels, we do not find much relation between compensation and satisfaction [TABLE 10]. The data in Table 10 indicate that the only exception is that the elite Top 10 law graduates are more satisfied with their compensation than any other respondents, simply reflecting the reality of the distribution of financial rewards. There are a few measures of satisfaction where graduates indicate similar levels of satisfaction, regardless of the type of schools they attended. While Table 10 displays the minor fluctuations in satisfaction based on type of school attended, we find that most law graduates are fairly satisfied with the level of responsibility in their current position,³⁰ the control over how they work, the intellectual challenge of their work, and their relationships with colleagues; on the other hand, most graduates are fairly unsatisfied with the performance evaluation process. Across all measures, graduates of the urban FT law graduates and the non-urban graduates report the highest levels of satisfaction.

It is also interesting to note that the elite law graduates were not the most satisfied with the intellectual challenge of their work; instead we find that non-urban graduates and urban FT graduates express the greatest levels of satisfaction with this aspect of their jobs. Certainly, it appears to be the case that those working in smaller practice settings are given more autonomy immediately than those who are employed in the large corporate

³⁰ Satisfaction was measured on a scale from 1 (most dissatisfied) to 7 (highly satisfied).

law firms. Perhaps these differences lead the urban law graduates to feel that their jobs are what they expected to do after completing law school.

Networking Activities in their current positions: It is expected that networking activities in initial jobs may lead to connections that will result in mobility both within firms and laterally across firms and sectors moving from one job to another. What networking activities do law graduates participate in during their early careers? Do we find differences in networking activities based on the type of law school attended by the graduates? [Table 11] Those attending elite Top 10 law schools are most likely to indicate that they participated in their firm recruitment committee. Of course, this is not surprising, since the largest corporate law firms have the most extensive recruitment activities to hire summer associates and new associates for firms. We also asked respondents to report whether they socialized with partners in the firm. While a large proportion of AJD graduates indicated that they engage in this activity, we find that the non-urban law graduates do so most often (62%). Those reporting less frequent interaction with partners included Independent law school graduates (47%) and graduates of the Top 10 schools (48%). Consistent with this finding is that lawyers from elite schools (both Top 10 and 11-31) were the least likely to report that they spend recreational time with partners from their firm. Instead, we find that Catholic law graduates (38%) and non-urban graduates (37%) were the most likely to engage in this networking activity.

Graduates of all law schools were likely to spend recreational time with other associates, though elite graduates appear to be investing the most time networking with their peers (78%). Overall, the pattern of networking activities for elite graduates may

either suggest that elite students do not feel the need to network with partners in the firm, or on the other hand, the pattern may suggest a more rigid stratification between partners and associates in the large corporate firms.

We also considered other forms of networking activities, such as writing for publications or participating in bar association activities. These measures again signal some important patterns. First, graduates of the Independent law schools are most likely to write articles for publication, followed by those graduating from the Elite 11-31 and Urban PT schools. Second, those most likely to engage in bar association activities are the graduates of Independent law schools graduates, followed by Urban FT, and non-urban graduates. As lawyers build their careers, they are clearly investing in different strategies: those in the large firms appears to investing in their peers, while those working in predominantly smaller settings are investing both with those ahead of them (ie. partners), and in building profiles and connections outside of their workplaces. As the careers of AJD respondents progress, we will continue to track their networking activities, in order to identify which strategies pay off, and in what ways.

Law School Activities: Since we hypothesize that networking activities may result in the accumulation of capital, we asked respondents what activities they participated in during their legal education. We hypothesize that those graduates who actively accumulate various forms of capital throughout law school and in their early careers may be more likely to find opportunities for mobility. [Table 12] First, it is clear that during law school very few of the AJD graduates, regardless of type of law school attended, were active in either political advocacy groups or political party activities. The most frequent student activity for graduates of all urban law schools (including Catholic

and Independent schools) was participation in the student division of the ABA; this appears to be the first step in their professionalization, and is an activity that continues into their early careers. Again, we find that Elite law graduates (especially Top 10 graduates) do not engage in ABA activities, either in law school or as young lawyers. We also find divergences in the patterns of law review activities. While across the board, 19-23% of the law graduates were on the general law review, only the elite Top 10 were most active in other law review activities. And again, while about one third of all law graduates spent time on pro bono activities, half of Elite Top 10 graduates engaged in these activities.

Discussion and Conclusions

The urban law school was created largely as a place to provide legal education to immigrant groups who could not gain a place in the establishment law schools. They served a particular clientele and the graduates went into particular careers in government, litigation, and the judiciary. Catholics and Jews were especially well represented among the early urban law schools. Corporate lawyers from the establishment schools tended to dominate the leadership of professional organizations.

The pattern has changed in some striking ways. There are more children of immigrants in the most elite of the law schools than in the various kinds of urban schools we discuss. The more elite schools, with more resources for financial aid to go with their high prestige, also have more diverse student bodies than other law schools. Where they are less diverse, however, is in the age of the students, the percentage of women who attend the schools, the number of women with children, and more generally the social class background of the students. Jews and Catholics are well-represented in the most

elite law schools as well. Interestingly, however, Jews remain less likely to attend the Catholic schools and Catholics are more likely to do so. Clearly the identity of law schools still matters to some extent.

There is still some identification in the graduates of urban law schools with personal injury practice and more generally with service to individuals and not merely businesses, but litigation is now common among the graduates of all the law schools. And the urban law school graduates, as with respect to their predecessors, do not rely simply on their grades and the prestige of the school they attended. We see evidence that already in law school they are actively accumulating social networks and building other forms of capital. Where the ties are most easily established, as may be likely in the Catholic schools, we especially see the prominence of social networking.

Finally, we find that the students who attend law schools do gain today from the location. This is especially true with respect to the students who come from relatively advantaged backgrounds. There is a correlation between parents' status and the likelihood of non-elite students to land in corporate law firms. But the general point is an interesting reversal of the early history. The high demand for legal services in the largest metropolitan areas means that students who graduate in those areas have some advantages in building their careers.

It is still early in the life of the graduates followed by the AJD study. The role of the forms of capital other than grades and law school attended will be more evident as lawyers mature. The categories that once divided the urban law graduates from the graduates of the so-called establishment schools are much more porous than in the past – but clear statistical differences are quite evident at this stage of legal careers.

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND AND DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 1. Demographic characteristics by type of law school

	Urban Law School with PT program	Urban Law School with FT program	Catholic Law School (excluding non urban)	Independent Law School (excluding non urban)	Elite top 10	Elite top 31	Ranked 32 or lower, Non urban, Not Catholic, Not Independent
Race							
Black	5%	6%	4%	4%	8%	6%	6%
Hispanic	5%	4%	5%	4%	3%	3%	4%
Native	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%
Asian	7%	3%	6%	6%	12%	9%	3%
White	79%	82%	83%	83%	74%	78%	83%
Other	4%	4%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%
Distribution of minorities by law school							
Minority Students at Law School	19	18	23	21	26	23	16
Gender, Age, and Family Status							
Female	48%	45%	51%	50%	45%	44%	43%
Male	53%	56%	49%	50%	56%	57%	57%
Over 36 years old	29%	17%	24%	36%	8%	11%	18%
Not Married	41%	40%	44%	44%	57%	47%	45%
Married	59%	60%	56%	56%	43%	53%	56%
Has no Kids	68%	66%	75%	63%	87%	74%	75%
Have Kids	32%	34%	25%	37%	13%	26%	25%
Social Background							
Both parents born outside of USA	12%	10%	12%	11%	23%	17%	6%
Jewish	7%	8%	5%	11%	14%	10%	2%
Roman Catholic	33%	21%	49%	38%	12%	21%	23%
Parent has more than a BA	44%	48%	47%	43%	75%	60%	41%
DAD ISEI occupation status code	57.31	60.2	61.49	58.04	66.42	63.83	58.5

SECTION 2: Practice Settings
Table 2. Practice settings and job changes by law school type

	Urban Law School with PT program	Urban Law School with FT program	Catholic Law School (excluding non urban)	Independent Law School (excluding non urban)	Elite top 10	Elite top 31	Ranked 32 or lower, Non urban, Not Catholic, Not Independent
Practice Setting							
Solo	7%	5%	4%	8%	0%	3%	7%
Private firm - 2-20	34%	34%	26%	31%	3%	16%	30%
Private firm - 21-100	12%	14%	14%	9%	8%	13%	14%
Private firm - 101-250	5%	5%	8%	6%	12%	12%	6%
Private firm - 251+	11%	9%	20%	8%	51%	33%	8%
Govt	17%	20%	17%	17%	10%	11%	22%
Non govt public	5%	6%	4%	6%	10%	6%	6%
Business	11%	7%	9%	14%	6%	6%	6%
Job Changes							
No job changes	65%	62%	63%	63%	67%	67%	64%
At least one job change	35%	38%	37%	37%	33%	33%	36%

Table 3. Practice Settings by law school type, restricted to respondents working in a major metro area

	Urban Law School with PT program	Urban Law School with FT program	Catholic Law School (excluding non urban)	Independent Law School (excluding non urban)	Elite top 10	Elite top 31	Ranked 32 or lower, Non urban, Not Catholic, Not Independent
Solo	4%	3%	4%	7%	0%	3%	9%
Private firm (2-20)	27%	35%	20%	29%	2%	8%	26%
Private firm (21-100)	13%	5%	11%	9%	6%	9%	11%
Private firm (101-250)	6%	1%	7%	7%	10%	9%	4%
Private firm (251+)	15%	18%	25%	12%	56%	49%	16%
Govt	21%	16%	16%	18%	12%	11%	22%
Non govt public	6%	8%	4%	7%	9%	5%	9%
Business	8%	14%	13%	12%	6%	7%	4%

Table 4. Practice Setting by law school type, for full or part time students

	Went Part Time		Went Full Time	
	Urban Law School with PT program	Other urban law schools	Urban Law School with PT program	Other urban law schools
Solo/Small <20	37.10%	29.01%	44.90%	37.77%
Mid Firm 21-100	11.40%	13.74%	13.20%	14.39%
Large Firm 101-251+	4.90%	9.16%	9.10%	8.45%
Public Settings	18.30%	23.66%	25.50%	29.14%
Business	28.30%	24.43%	7.40%	10.25%

Table 5a. Practice Setting by father's educational attainment

	Urban Law School with PT program	Urban Law School with FT program	Catholic Law School (excluding non urban)	Independent Law School (excluding non urban)	Elite top 10	Elite top 31	Ranked 32 or lower, Non urban, Not Catholic, Not Independent
Dad Isei <68							
Solo	6.80%	6.80%	5.60%	10.80%	0.00%	2.80%	7.00%
Private firm - firm 2-20	34.70%	33.70%	22.90%	30.00%	5.00%	16.10%	31.00%
Private firm - firm 21-100	13.00%	17.00%	16.50%	8.20%	5.80%	12.70%	14.40%
Private firm - firm 101-250	3.90%	3.20%	8.70%	5.00%	15.40%	11.60%	5.50%
Private firm - firm 251+	10.40%	8.10%	19.20%	6.50%	50.80%	29.60%	6.00%
Govt	16.20%	19.10%	13.80%	18.90%	10.40%	13.70%	22.80%
Non govt public	4.50%	6.40%	4.00%	7.70%	8.90%	7.00%	7.70%
Business	10.40%	5.90%	9.30%	12.80%	3.80%	6.60%	5.60%
Dad Isei >=68							
Solo	5.50%	2.80%	0.90%	5.90%	0.00%	3.80%	6.00%
Private firm - firm 2-20	29.60%	33.20%	28.50%	39.70%	3.20%	15.50%	31.90%
Private firm - firm 21-100	10.90%	12.60%	11.80%	8.10%	9.10%	14.20%	13.90%
Private firm - firm 101-250	6.10%	6.30%	9.50%	5.20%	10.40%	11.30%	8.80%
Private firm - firm 251+	13.70%	13.10%	21.00%	10.20%	52.00%	33.20%	13.20%
Govt	18.70%	20.50%	17.20%	15.50%	11.00%	10.90%	15.10%
Non govt public	6.50%	5.50%	3.70%	4.00%	11.40%	5.70%	4.70%
Business	9.10%	5.90%	7.30%	11.40%	2.90%	5.40%	6.30%

Table 5b. Practice Setting by father's educational attainment

	Urban Law School with PT program	Urban Law School with FT program	Catholic Law School (excluding non urban)	Independant Law School (excluding non urban)	Elite top 10	Elite top 31	Ranked 32 or lower, Non urban, Not Catholic, Not Independant
<u>Father had university or less</u>							
Solo & Private firm - firm 2-20	41.60%	34.50%	32.90%	38.60%	1.00%	21.70%	37.50%
Private firm - firm 21-100	11.00%	13.30%	12.00%	7.20%	7.80%	16.40%	12.50%
Private firm - firm 101-250	4.90%	1.50%	9.40%	6.30%	11.80%	10.50%	3.30%
Private firm - firm 251+	5.30%	8.80%	12.80%	6.60%	52.10%	23.60%	6.70%
Govt	15.20%	24.20%	18.50%	12.80%	11.10%	15.50%	26.70%
Non govt public	7.20%	10.70%	4.00%	6.80%	11.00%	8.10%	6.30%
Business	14.90%	7.00%	10.40%	21.70%	5.20%	4.20%	6.90%
<u>Father had professiona/graduate degree</u>							
Solo & Private firm - firm 2-20	36.40%	34.30%	27.40%	48.10%	3.10%	17.40%	32.60%
Private firm - firm 21-100	12.10%	12.00%	7.50%	2.40%	6.40%	9.00%	11.10%
Private firm - firm 101-250	5.10%	5.70%	7.00%	2.60%	12.00%	10.50%	5.50%
Private firm - firm 251+	13.00%	12.80%	14.20%	5.60%	49.80%	34.70%	9.30%
Govt	20.30%	22.00%	26.60%	28.20%	11.90%	15.30%	26.70%
Non govt public	3.10%	5.70%	8.90%	2.50%	11.40%	6.70%	8.70%
Business	9.80%	7.50%	8.50%	10.60%	5.30%	6.60%	6.20%

Table 6. Rating of factors in obtaining current job

	Urban Law School with PT program	Urban Law School with FT program	Catholic Law School (excluding non urban)	Independent Law School (excluding non urban)	Elite top 10	Elite top 31	Ranked 32 or lower, Non urban, Not Catholic, Not Independent
	MEAN						
Family members	2.4	2.44	2.47	2.64	1.73	2.07	2.72
Law school classmates	1.87	1.84	2	2	2.08	2.04	1.97
Other friends	3.01	3.08	2.99	3.27	2.29	2.68	3.12
Law schools alumni	1.87	1.99	2.12	2	2.12	2.1	1.97
Direct unsolicited	3.35	3.4	3.39	3.48	3.18	3.33	3.52
Response to an ad	2.62	2.55	2.66	2.58	1.47	2.05	2.68
Law schools placement	2.72	2.78	3.04	2.63	4.58	3.96	2.85
On-campus interview	2.23	2.27	2.55	2.25	4.94	3.77	2.42
Summer Position	2.66	3.27	3.26	2.67	5.24	4.34	3.09
Part-time Position	2.42	2.8	2.61	2.36	1.64	2.16	2.14
Unpaid internship	1.44	1.41	1.62	1.62	1.35	1.37	1.63
Recommendation	1.78	1.96	2.04	1.88	1.9	1.84	2.06
Experience	1.84	1.88	1.98	1.92	1.94	1.66	1.78

SECTION 3: Nature of work

Table 7. Percent time working in Personal Injury by type of law school attended

	Percent time working in...		Mean percent time working in field, for those doing any work	
	Personal Injury Plaintiff	Personal Injury Defense	Personal Injury Plaintiff Mean	Personal Injury Defense Mean
Urban Law School with PT program	20.40%	17.30%	27.13	35.43
Urban Law School with FT program	14.50%	16.00%	21.73	28.88
Catholic Law School (excluding non urban)	10.60%	13.50%	28.04	37.7
Independent Law School (excluding non urban)	11.90%	9.20%	29.48	34.03
Elite top 10	1.50%	2.50%	20.03	25.58
Elite top 31	9.40%	11.00%	20.91	30.06
Ranked 32 or lower, Non urban, Not Catholic, Not Independent	31.70%	30.50%	20.95	35.74

Table 8. Percent time representing personal clients by type of law school attended

Urban Law School with PT program	59
Urban Law School with FT program	55
Catholic Law School (excluding non urban)	54
Independent Law School (excluding non urban)	64
Elite top 10	40
Elite top 31	40
Ranked 32 or lower, Non urban, Not Catholic, Not Independent	54

SECTION 4: Satisfaction, compensation and capital

Table 9. Median Salary by law school type

	salary (median)
Urban Law School with PT program	63000
Urban Law School with FT program	60000
Catholic Law School (excluding non urban)	75000
Independent Law School (excluding non urban)	62500
Elite top 10	130000
Elite top 31	90000
Ranked 32 or lower, Non urban, Not Catholic, Not Independent	55000

Table 10. Satisfaction with aspects of current job, by type of law school

	Urban Law School with PT program	Urban Law School with FT program	Catholic Law School (excluding non urban)	Independent Law School (excluding non urban)	Elite top 10	Elite top 31	Ranked 32 or lower, Non urban, Not Catholic, Not Independent
	MEAN						
Level of Responsibility	5.63	5.7	5.62	5.62	5.46	5.49	5.73
Recognition for your work	4.92	5.02	4.93	4.96	4.94	4.93	4.95
Substantive area of work	5.32	5.45	5.3	5.3	5.28	5.35	5.38
Tasks you perform	5.13	5.22	5.17	5.11	4.85	4.98	5.25
Opportunities for advancement	4.63	4.76	4.62	4.68	4.63	4.78	4.74
Compensation	4.31	4.35	4.39	4.23	4.95	4.85	4.23
Control over amount work	4.7	4.72	4.41	4.73	4.14	4.34	4.76
Control how you work	5.47	5.48	5.27	5.53	5.2	5.2	5.59
Relationships with colleagues	5.75	5.88	5.67	5.74	5.47	5.54	5.75
Opportunities for pro bono	4.31	4.35	4.02	4.31	4.62	4.38	4.29
Intellectual challenge	5.4	5.55	5.28	5.36	5.2	5.34	5.61
Opportunities to build skills	5.32	5.52	5.33	5.3	5.13	5.19	5.52
Amount of Travel	4.83	5.16	4.89	4.88	4.9	5.03	5.03
Diversity	4.49	4.63	4.51	4.71	4.06	4.26	4.49
Performance evaluation process	4.02	4.1	3.91	3.97	3.87	3.93	4.03
Value of work to society	4.9	4.98	4.72	4.82	4.23	4.36	5.01
Job security	5.29	5.24	5.24	5.34	5.02	5.02	5.44
	4.965882353	5.065294118	4.898823529	4.975882353	4.820588	4.8805882	5.047058824

Table 11. Percent of respondents engaging in the following networking activities, by type of law school

	q17_1 SUR Participate on the office/firm recruitme . . .	q17_2 SUR Join partners (if you are in a law firm) . . .	q17_3 SUR Spend recreational time with partners . . .	q17_4 SUR Spend recreational time with associates	q17_5 SUR Write for publications presentations	q17_6 SUR Participate at least monthly in either
Urban Law School with PT program	15.3%	55.1%	32.2%	54.7%	20.8%	46.8%
Urban Law School with FT program	23.1%	53.8%	34.8%	66.6%	16.3%	49.2%
Catholic Law School (excluding non urban)	19.8%	52.7%	38.2%	67.5%	14.2%	35.7%
Independent Law School (excluding non urban)	17.6%	47.0%	37.7%	54.9%	25.0%	54.2%
Elite top 10	34.2%	48.5%	23.3%	77.5%	17.6%	28.0%
Elite top 31	26.8%	57.1%	28.1%	76.1%	20.6%	36.8%
Ranked 32 or lower, Non urban, Not Catholic, Not Independent	21.5%	61.5%	36.8%	62.6%	17.0%	48.2%

Table 12. Percent of respondents engaging in the following law school activities, by type of law school

	Urban Law School with PT program	Urban Law School with FT program	Catholic Law School (excluding non urban)	Independent Law School (excluding non urban)	Elite top 10	Elite top 31	Ranked 32 or lower, Non urban, Not Catholic, Not Independent
General Law Review	20%	20%	22%	24%	19%	23%	20%
Other law review	16%	14%	22%	12%	56%	33%	17%
Moot court	36%	46%	34%	34%	32%	41%	32%
School government	17%	18%	11%	15%	11%	9%	18%
Political advocacy group	10%	14%	10%	10%	19%	12%	12%
College alumni	22%	20%	16%	19%	22%	25%	20%
American Bar Assn	42%	52%	48%	44%	13%	36%	52%
Public Interest	16%	19%	19%	13%	32%	22%	19%
Pro bono work	29%	30%	33%	23%	51%	32%	35%
Political party	17%	20%	11%	19%	15%	15%	17%
Gender-based organization	15%	18%	17%	11%	15%	14%	17%
Race ethnicity	13%	17%	16%	14%	24%	18%	13%
Other	34%	29%	27%	38%	41%	37%	34%