

Copyright (c) 1994 The Trustees of The University of Pennsylvania
University of Pennsylvania Law Review

NOVEMBER, 1994

143 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1

BECOMING GENTLEMEN: WOMEN'S EXPERIENCES AT ONE IVY
LEAGUE LAW SCHOOL.

Lani Guinier, Michelle Fine, and Jane Balin, with Ann Bartow, and Deborah Lee
Stachel

SUMMARY:

... In this Article we describe preliminary research by and about women law students at the University of Pennsylvania Law School -- a typical, if elite, law school stratified deeply along gender lines. Our database draws from students enrolled at the Law School between 1987 and 1992, and includes academic performance data from 981 students, self-reported survey data from 366 students, written narratives from 104 students, and group-level interview data of approximately eighty female and male students. ... Our three-part research design investigated gender-related differences in levels of academic performance, law student attitudes toward career goals, and general satisfaction with law school experiences. ... Our qualitative data include the 104 narrative responses to the open-ended question about student experiences of gender discrimination in the Bartow Survey, focus group data collected from twenty-seven students (including white students and students of color, both male and female), our observation of and participation with two classes of a critical perspectives seminar, a meeting with the Women's Law Group, and several meetings with Law School faculty. ... Across years, male students appear to be far more comfortable speaking with faculty of either gender than female students. ... Question 15: Do you think that the nature or content of classroom interactions between professors and students are affected by the sex of the professor? ...

HIGHLIGHT: *An I to be cursed forever with becoming somebody else on the way to myself?*

-- Audre Lorde ¹

TEXT:

[*2] INTRODUCTION

In this Article we describe preliminary research by and about women law students

at the University of Pennsylvania Law School -- a typical, if elite, law school stratified deeply along gender lines.² Our database draws from students enrolled at the Law School between 1987 and 1992, and includes academic performance data from 981 students, self-reported survey data from 366 students, written narratives from 104 students, and group-level interview data of approximately eighty female and male students.³ From these data we conclude that the law school experience of women in the aggregate differs markedly from that of their male peers.⁴

[*3] First, we find strong academic differences between graduating men and women. Despite identical entry-level credentials, this performance differential between men and women is created in the first year of law school and maintained over the next three years.⁵ By the end of their first year in law school, men are *three times more likely* than women to be in the top 10% of their law school class.⁶

Second, we find strong attitudinal differences between women and men in year one, and yet a striking homogenization by year three.⁷ The first-year women we studied are far more critical than their first-year male peers of the social status quo, of legal education, and of themselves as students.⁸ Third-year female students, however, are less critical than their third-year male colleagues, and far less critical than their first-year female counterparts.⁹ A disproportionate number of the women we studied enter law school with commitments to public interest law, ready to fight for social justice. But their third-year female counterparts leave law school with corporate ambitions and some indications of mental health distress.¹⁰

Third, many women are alienated by the way the Socratic method is used in large classroom instruction, which is the dominant pedagogy for almost *all* first-year instruction.¹¹ Women [*4] self-report much lower rates of class participation than do men for all three years of law school.¹² Our data suggest that many women do not "engage" pedagogically with a methodology that makes them feel strange, alienated, and "delegitimated."¹³ These women describe a dynamic in which they feel that their voices were "stolen" from them during the first year. Some complain that they can no longer recognize their former selves, which have become submerged inside what one author has called an alienated "social male."¹⁴

Law school is the most bizarre place I have ever been. . . . [First year] was like a frightening out-of-body experience. Lots of women agree with me. I have no words to say what I feel. My voice from that year is gone.¹⁵

Another young woman added, "[F]or me the damage is done; *it's in me*. I will never be the same. I feel so defeated."

Even those women who do well academically report a higher degree of alienation from the Law School than their male counterparts, based in part on complaints that "women's sexuality becomes [*5] a focus for keeping [women] in their place." For these women, learning to think like a lawyer means learning to think and act like a man. As one male professor told a first-year class, "to be a good lawyer,

behave like a gentleman." ¹⁶

Finally, we document substantial material consequences for those women who exit the Law School after sustaining what they describe as a crisis of identity. These women graduate with less competitive academic credentials, are not represented equally within the Law School's academic and social hierarchies, and are apparently less competitive in securing prestigious and/or desirable jobs after graduation. ¹⁷

We propose three related hypotheses to explain our primary empirical finding, which is that men outperform women at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. Our research suggests that (1) many women feel excluded from the formal educational structure of the Law School; (2) many women are excluded from the informal educational environment; and (3) some women are individually [*6] affected by the gendered stratification within the Law School, in terms of potentially adverse psychological consequences and more limited employment opportunities. We believe that our data documenting the differing experiences of male and female law students offer an opportunity to reconsider the educational project of law school. Although some have said in response to our data that perhaps women are not suited to law school or should simply learn to adapt better to its rigors, we are inclined to believe that it is law school -- not the women -- that should change. ¹⁸ Indeed, changes to the existing structure of the law school might improve the quality of legal education for all students.

This Article reports our empirical findings, assesses them in the context of studies of women at other law schools, and suggests several ways to place our findings within the ongoing debate about individual assimilation into hostile, elite, and previously all-male organizations. Further, this Article indicates directions for future research and identifies the potential for transforming legal education's principal pedagogy and assumptions about hierarchy in order to train and support the needs of *all* students.

I. THREE WINDOWS INTO THE LAW SCHOOL

A. *Methodologies*

In April 1990, a third-year law student at the University of Pennsylvania Law School surveyed the school's full population of 712 students about their views of gender and the law school experience. ¹⁹ Questionnaires were placed in the mail folders of every first-, second-, and third-year student. Of the 366 students who responded, 174, or 47.5%, identified themselves as female (compared to 41% then enrolled at the Law School), and the remaining 192, or 52.5%, identified themselves as male. The responses of female and male Penn Law students were compared across the first, second, and third years of law school and used to investigate anecdotal observations by several female law students about stigmatization, harassment, and general malaise related to their gender. ²⁰

[*7] The survey consisted of a multiple-choice questionnaire and one open-ended question designed to elicit narrative responses. One hundred four of the 366 respondents answered the open-ended question. The data, analyzed by gender and year in law school, revealed significant gendered attitudes and beliefs among the respondents, who constituted 51% of the men and women enrolled at the Law School in 1990.

Intrigued by the initial results, we set up a multiple-method research design to assess the comparative status of women and men when they enter, as they participate in, and when they leave law school. Our three-part research design investigated gender-related differences in levels of academic performance, law student attitudes toward career goals, and general satisfaction with law school experiences.

The Bartow cross-sectional survey of 366 law students formed the initial database, analyzed by gender and year in law school. This database was not longitudinal and was affected by a selectivity bias.²¹ The Bartow Survey represents the attitudes and experiences [*8] of a little over half (366 out of 712) of the men and women enrolled at the Law School in 1990. Discovering significantly gendered attitudes and beliefs, we sought to analyze student performance data.

Our second database comprised a quantitative cohort analysis of the academic performance of 981 students at the Law School.²² This database was longitudinal and was designed to determine the relationship, if any, along gender lines between incoming credentials and law student academic performance. The second database began in 1990 as an archival cohort study of the 712 students then enrolled in the Law School. With the full cooperation of Colin Diver, Dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, we subsequently analyzed performance data for all students enrolled at the Law School during the academic year ending June 1991, in order to confirm our initial findings. As a result, we collected and analyzed performance data for a total of 981 students, 712 of whom were enrolled at the time of the 1990 Bartow Survey, and 366 of whom submitted responses to her survey. We have the full academic performance data for the classes of 1990 and 1991, the first two years of law school for the class of 1992, and the first year of law school for the class of 1993.

The Law School furnished us with an anonymous listing for each of the 981 students, including gender, race, undergraduate grade point average (GPA), Law School Admission Test (LSAT) score, undergraduate institution, undergraduate rank, and law school GPA for each year in law school. We did not receive information about size of individual law classes, gender of the professor, or type of examination. We did not examine, therefore, possible correlations between these variables and student performance by gender. These [*9] areas of study may prove fruitful for future research.

Finally, in order to generate more detailed hypotheses regarding the gendered experiences of law school as suggested by the quantitative survey and academic performance data, we created a third, qualitative database. Qualitative data have become central to the work of social scientists, enabling them to produce more valid explanations of social life by checking their own assumptions and biases against the perspectives and understandings of the researched populations or subjects.²³ Our qualitative data include the 104 narrative responses to the open-ended question about student experiences of gender discrimination in the Bartow Survey,²⁴ focus group data collected from twenty-seven students (including white students and students of color, both male and female),²⁵ our observation [*10] of and participation with two classes of a critical perspectives seminar,²⁶ a meeting with the Women's Law Group,²⁷ and several meetings with Law School faculty.²⁸

Each of the three databases provides different windows into the students' gendered experience of law school. The academic performance data represent the entire population of students enrolled between 1990 and 1992. It is a definitive statement reflecting the [*11] disparity in grades between men and women during the period of our research. We used the additional two sets of data to help formulate hypotheses explaining the relatively weak academic performance of female law students.

The Bartow Survey is representative of the experiences and attitudes of the 366 men and women who participated in the survey in 1990. The 104 narrative responses elicited from Bartow's open-ended survey question about student experiences of gender discrimination are also representative of the attitudes and experiences of these men and women. These responses were based on the same random sample as the rest of the Bartow Survey.

The narrative responses are part of our qualitative database. They offer qualitative data that are reliable, meaning that the instrument for collecting the data is likely to generate the same response over several observations taken in the same time period.²⁹ They are also valid, meaning that the categories of analysis used by the researchers are the same categories that the subjects employ.³⁰ The focus groups and responses to the presentation of our data were neither randomly selected nor necessarily representative. They are substantively valid, but not necessarily generalizable. We use these qualitative data to generate hypotheses explaining the more reliable quantitative data.³¹

By triangulating our databases, that is, moving back and forth among the three sets of data collected during our research, we have developed a number of observations regarding the divergent experiences of many men and women at the University of Pennsylvania [*12] Law School. Our multimethod design seeks to contextualize and explain our primary empirical finding: given traditional academic predictors, women at the University of Pennsylvania Law School underperform compared to their male counterparts.

B. *Related Research*

We designed our study to compensate for some of the untested assumptions in the literature. Although other studies found lower rates of classroom participation among women law students,³² no one had systematically documented the extent of gendered difference; nor had anyone researched the academic and emotional costs paid by women for their "different" or "dominated" experiences.³³ Our study is the first that attempts to weave a full analysis out of self-reported survey data, actual academic performance data, and open-ended narrative responses.

Early surveys of law students generally failed to examine the experience of legal education critically.³⁴ The original studies of women's experiences narrowly focused on women's entry into³⁵ and motivation for going to³⁶ law school, how women adapted to [*13] law school and professional success,³⁷ and what type of practice women pursued after graduation.³⁸ When women were novel in the field of law,³⁹ researchers were asking more simple questions: Were women too "feminine" to succeed in a "masculine" field? Could they adequately adapt to and incorporate the necessary attributes (that is, male styles) of professional conduct?⁴⁰ They wanted [*14] to know if women could "fit" into law school; the structure and practices of the school were not considered problematic. The only interesting question was could women "make it?"

The more recent studies have tended to contemplate "the gender question" as a feature of the law school process.⁴¹ More concerned with how male and female students experience law schools, these projects analyze gender by classroom performance and degree of social alienation. Many have been particularly intrigued, for instance, by women's silence in legal classrooms.⁴²

[*15] The more recent studies have been prompted predominantly by women law students and/or legal professionals, and have been influenced by the women's movement and feminist legal theory. The law school experience, especially that of being silenced in the classroom, provoked some women to search for broader understandings of what others termed "personal problems." This phenomenon originally motivated Bartow's 1990 study at Penn.⁴³ Carol Gilligan's early writings on women's "different voices"⁴⁴ were profoundly [*16] influential in these works,⁴⁵ as were the writings of Catharine MacKinnon on domination and identity formation,⁴⁶ and Mari Matsuda's theorizing about the multiple consciousness of outsiders.⁴⁷ Studies at both Berkeley and Yale Law Schools drew heavily from Professor Matsuda's suggestion that outsiders experience their presence within mainstream institutions as a forum for both assimilation and resistance.⁴⁸

Students at Stanford Law School were especially interested in testing Gilligan's proposition that men and women employ distinct types of moral reasoning when confronted with legal problems, as well as examining how female and male law students experience law school and think about the law and their lifestyles.⁴⁹ The study [*17] found only slight differences between men's and women's responses

to two of the three hypotheticals pertaining to moral reasoning.⁵⁰ Although the differences were "in the predicted direction," these disparities reached a statistically significant level inconsistently, and for only a few questions per hypothetical.⁵¹ The Stanford survey concluded that "few gender differences [are found] among [law] students" in their reactions to these hypotheticals, and that the students therefore displayed few differences in moral reasoning.⁵²

This finding of few differences may reflect the influence of legal education on the moral reasoning of both men and women.⁵³ It may also be attributable to the design of the survey⁵⁴ and the anomalous [*18] environment of Stanford.⁵⁵ Other studies of gender in law school conclude that women's experience as "outsiders" differs from the experience of men,⁵⁶ causing them to formulate a larger critique of the educational enterprise.⁵⁷

[*19] More typical is a study of Berkeley law students that began with the presumption that men and women experience law school differently, and that these differences disadvantage women.⁵⁸ The authors of the study assumed that some women do not feel good about themselves, despite performing as well as men.⁵⁹ Thus, the primary objective of the survey questions was to test self-esteem.⁶⁰ Many women students expressed intense feelings of pain, frustration, and isolation.⁶¹ The vast majority of survey responses split along gender lines,⁶² most noticeably regarding participation in class.⁶³

[*20] In our view, each of the prior studies contained important methodological flaws. For example, unlike the Berkeley study, which had not been published when we began our work, we did not begin our research assuming that men and women experience law school differently. Indeed, we initiated the Bartow self-reported survey to investigate this very claim. Unlike the Stanford study, we did not assume that gendered differences could be captured in answers to hypotheticals about moral reasoning. Our survey did not ask about hypothetical situations. We developed instead a number of focus groups in which women and men were invited to reflect informally on their perceptions of their actual law school experiences.⁶⁴ In contrast to the Stanford survey, we also included in the written survey an open-ended question for narrative responses.

[*21] From Banks's pioneering attempt to document women's silence in the classroom to the more full-bodied examination of the law school experience of outsiders at Berkeley, all studies of female law students have been based primarily on self-reported data.⁶⁵ Unlike these studies, we did not limit ourselves to self-reported data, nor did we assume that men and women achieve similar levels of academic performance. With the support of the Dean, we received unlimited access to four cohorts of academic performance data and designed a study to assess actual performance by following three separate classes of law students throughout much of their law school careers.⁶⁶ Our research thus builds on the methodologies and findings of prior studies.

II. ON GENDER

A. Quantitative Data on Academic Performance

We investigated academic performance to determine whether a gendered relationship exists, and, if so, whether differences in the accumulated grades and credentials earned by men and women up to the point that they leave law school are explained by differences in entry-level credentials.⁶⁷ From these analyses, detailed below, we conclude that there is indeed a gendered academic experience. But the differences we identify are not predicted by those entry-level credentials on which the Law School bases admission decisions. In fact, women and men begin Penn Law School with equally stellar credentials. Holding incoming statistics constant, however, women graduate from the Law School with significantly less distinguished professional credentials.

Both men and women come to the Law School with very impressive, and quite comparable, records based on undergraduate GPA [*22] and rank in class, LSAT, Lonsdorf Index,⁶⁸ and undergraduate institution. On two of the admission criteria, the women actually present incrementally stronger records. The men, on average, achieve a 3.49 undergraduate GPA, whereas women attain a 3.52. Men, on average, enter with an undergraduate class rank of 78.44, and women with 80.13. On a scale from one to forty-eight, the men's mean LSAT is 40.98, and the women's is 40.87. Finally, the men's average Lonsdorf Index is 4.73; the average for the women is 4.74. None of these differences is significant at the .05 level.

TABLE II

MEAN STATISTICS FOR INCOMING STUDENTS

	College GPA			Rank in College		
	N	Mean	o	N	Mean	o
Men	542	3.49	.31	544	78.44	20.35
Women	408	3.52	.28	409	80.13	18.45
		p=.143			p=.188	
	LSAT			Lonsdorf Index		
	N	Mean	o	N	Mean	o
Men	544	40.98	4.16	543	4.73	.370
Women	413	40.87	4.09	408	4.74	.367
		p=.677			p=.685	

Tracking law school GPAs for men and women across years one, two, and three, Table III reveals a solid and stable gender difference in performance.

[*23] TABLE III

MEAN LAW SCHOOL GPAs⁶⁹

	First-Year GPA (GPA1)			Second-Year GPA (GPA2)			Third-Year GPA (GPA3)		
	N	Mean	o	N	Mean	o	N	Mean	o
Men	532	0.932	.524	397	1.005	.456	382	1.047	.425
Women	397	0.771	.475	303	0.853	.429	294	0.923	.416
		p=.000			p=.000			p=.000	

Although men and women enter with virtually equal statistics, men receive, on average, significantly better grades by the end of year one. Further, they maintain this advantage through graduation.⁷⁰

[*24] Figure I shows that the gender difference for mean GPA is stable across the three years in the Law School.

FIGURE I

MEAN GPAs FOR LAW STUDENTS

[SEE FIGURE IN ORIGINAL]

In terms of rank and GPA, first- and second-year men are 1.6 times more likely to be in the top fiftieth percentile of the class than are women. Third-year men are 1.5 times more likely to be in the top fiftieth percentile.⁷¹ Figure II shows that 53.8% of the first-year [*25] male law students are in the top fiftieth percentile of their class, compared to 42.8% of the first-year women.

FIGURE II⁷²

PERCENT OF STUDENTS IN TOP FIFTIETH PERCENTILE OF CLASS

[SEE FIGURE IN ORIGINAL]

[*26] If we rely upon an even more stringent measure -- the top 10% of the class - - we find that in the first year men are almost three times more likely than women to reach the top 10%; in the second and third years, men are two times more likely to do so. . Figure III illustrates this differential.

FIGURE III

PERCENT OF STUDENTS IN TOP TENTH PERCENTILE OF CLASS

[SEE FIGURE IN ORIGINAL]

The data document that women and men enter the Law School with comparable credentials.⁷³ In a pattern established firmly in the first year and maintained thereafter, however, women receive relatively lower grades, achieve lower class ranks, and earn fewer [*27] honors.⁷⁴

As a consequence of these disproportionately low class ranks, women law students are underrepresented in the Law School's prestigious positions and extracurricular activities. Over the three years of our study -- from 1990 to 1992 -- women were underrepresented in the Order of the Coif,⁷⁵ the graduation awards given by the faculty, the *Law Review* membership and board, and the moot court competitions and board.

[*28] TABLE VI

MEN AND WOMEN SELECTED FOR VARIOUS HONORS, BY CLASS⁷⁶

	Class of 1990		Class of 1991		Class of 1992	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Order of the Coif	19	5	16	7	21	7
Law Review Member (Non-Board)	25	3	16	12	21	11
Law Review Board	13	2	11	4	11	4
Moot Court Finalist	7	0	4	2	7	1
Moot Court Board	12	4	11	1	10	2
Faculty-Chosen Graduation Awards ⁷⁷	12	8	11	8	15	6

Part of this disparity is due to the grade differential just described. Many honors are distributed, in whole or in part, on the basis of academic performance. For example, selection for membership on the *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* is based partially on first-year grades, and thus women, despite applying at rates proportionate to their numbers in the Law School, are less likely to be selected than men.⁷⁸ Graduating as a member of the [*30] Order of the Coif requires a student to be ranked in the top decile. In 1991 and 1992, men were almost twice as likely to be selected for the Order of the Coif as were women, and in 1990, men were more than twice as likely to be selected.⁷⁹

Underrepresentation in other areas may be related to the fact that some honors are awarded on the basis of subjective judgments made by faculty and, at times, student peers who have internalized the academic hierarchy established during the first year.⁸⁰ For example, in 1990, each of the three student-run publications (*Law Review*, *Comparative Labor Law Journal*, and *Journal of International Business Law*) was headed by a male editor-in-chief.⁸¹ Women also serve less frequently than men as editorial board members on the *Law Review*.⁸² Additionally, women are rarely selected as finalists [*31] in the moot court competitions or members of the Moot Court Board.⁸³

When Ann Bartow first approached Professor Guinier in January 1990 about doing a video documentary of the experience of women law students, she related a story that resonates with these data. Bartow, then a student at the Law School, reported that some of her male colleagues chose their upper-level law school classes based on the number of women enrolled in each class. Women were perceived as "Q-absorbing" buffers, with Q ("Qualified") being the lowest passing grade on formal and informal grading curves. [*32] These men assumed that their own chances of receiving a grade higher than Qualified increased as the number of women enrolled in the class increased because the women would absorb a disproportionate number of the Qualified grades. They sarcastically referred to large groups of women in a class as the "Q quotient." At the time Bartow related this story, she was using it as an example of male stereotyping. What she did not articulate, but her male colleagues perhaps intuitively realized, was that our findings about women's performance were already known on some level within the Law School community.

B. *Quantitative Data from the Bartow Survey*

The 1990 Bartow Survey tracks the academic performance differential between male and female law students to reveal attitudinal and experiential differences by gender. Female law students are significantly more likely than male law students to report that they "never" or "only occasionally" ask questions or volunteer answers in class.⁸⁵ Women, more than men, report that [*33] men ask more questions, volunteer more often, enjoy greater peer tolerance of their remarks, receive more

attention from faculty during classes, get called on more frequently, and receive more post-class "follow up" than women.⁸⁶

[*34] Perhaps because of their differing rates of participation, women and men also seek distinct qualities in law professors.⁸⁷ Students were asked to name the three qualities they admired most in a law school professor. The men and women both chose "knowledge of subject matter" and "enthusiasm for teaching" as their top two qualities. Ninety-three percent of the women, however, selected [*35] "treats students with respect" as their third most admired quality,⁸⁸ whereas 82% of men selected "expresses ideas clearly."⁸⁹ We also observed sex-based responses that differed significantly with respect to qualities such as a professor's "openness to questions outside class," (valued by 69% of women, 55% of men) and "friendly with students" (valued by 65% of women, 56% of men).⁹⁰

Across years, male students appear to be far more comfortable speaking with faculty of either gender than female students.⁹¹ When asked, "How comfortable are you in interactions occurring outside of class with professors of the same or opposite sex?" 60% of the men, compared to 40% of the women, reported that they felt "very comfortable."⁹² Men, in group interviews, confirmed their substantially greater degree of comfort with faculty.⁹³ In contrast, many women indicated their inability either to approach faculty or, once engaged in conversation, to sustain a useful interaction. Several women in follow-up interviews expressed frustration at what they perceived to be aloofness on the part of the faculty.⁹⁴ [*36] The rates of participation reported by women as first-year students and as third-year students differ only to the extent that they reflect a transition from women never asking questions to asking questions infrequently. Women's level of satisfaction with this relatively stable rate of nonparticipation, however, increased over time. To the question, "Are you comfortable with your level of voluntary participation in class?" we see dramatic gender differences for year one (28% of the women responded "yes" versus 68% of the men).⁹⁵ By year three, however, 64% of the women respond that they are now comfortable with their essentially unchanged level of participation, as do 72% of the men.⁹⁶

[*37] In sum, women and men report significantly different assessments of their own classroom performance and perceptions of gender bias in the classroom. Also interesting, however, are the highly significant differences between the responses of the first-year women and all other categories of students. First-year female students, more than all other groups, report that men are called on more often than women⁹⁷ and receive more time and more follow-up in class,⁹⁸ that the sex of students affects class experience,⁹⁹ and [*38] that sexist comments are permitted under the informal "house rules" of the Law School.¹⁰⁰ The concerns expressed by first-year women with male dominance in the classroom and failure to use gender-neutral language, as well as their perception that sexist comments are permitted, are not identified as problems by third-year female respondents.¹⁰¹ After three years at the Law School, either women seem to tolerate displays of what they, as first-year students, interpreted as offensive incidents of sexism, or, in fact, the frequency of

such incidents diminishes.¹⁰²

[*39] A dramatic difference between the positions of first- and third-year women is also reflected in responses to questions about career aspirations. Many more women than men come to the Law School expressing a commitment to public interest law. A quarter of the first-year women, compared to 7% of the first-year men, indicated that they expected a job in public interest law.¹⁰³ In response to a similar item, "What kind of law do you expect to practice?" we found the following distributions:

[*40] TABLE XII

EXPECTED AREA OF PRACTICE

(percentage of group)

(columns may exceed 100% because multiple selections permitted)

	1L Women	3L Women	1L Men	3L Men
Corporation	33	28	56	41
Labor	28	6	10	10
Litigation	28	38	46	44
Public Interest	33	10	8	5
Estate	23	18	23	18
Bankruptcy	11	18	10	17

First- and third-year men consistently expressed minimal interest in public interest work. In contrast, the first-year women were at least three times more likely than men to express interest in public interest law. Third-year women's level of interest, however, was nearly as low as that of first- and third-year men. Whereas 25% to 33% of the first-year women planned to practice some form of public interest law, only 8% to 10% of the third-year women expressed such intentions.¹⁰⁴ This suggests that, over three years [*41]