



## Gender and Law Practice Income

—Richard L. Ender

*(The author wishes to thank Dr. Nancy E. Schafer for her assistance with this article.)*

Among the many factors which can contribute to the level of a lawyer's income - e.g., length of experience, type of practice and location of practice - one factor which is possibly associated with income level, but which is rarely discussed in the profession, is gender. Based on self-reported data taken from a mail survey, a substantial gap in income between male and female attorneys in Alaska, which may be related to several factors, appears to exist. This article looks at the role of gender and other conditions in relation to the income levels of Alaska Bar members.

The analysis contained in this article is based on a mail survey of the Alaska Bar membership conducted by Policy Analysts, Limited, for the Alaska Judicial Council in April and May, 1989. The 13-page questionnaire, distributed with one follow-up mailing, was completed by 1,083 respondents (55.5% of all Alaska resident bar members). The Council

released a report of the entire study, which was presented at the 1989 state bar meeting.

Among those responding, three-quarters (75.4%) were male and one-quarter were female. (The actual bar make-up is 24 per cent female and 76 per cent male.) The average respondent was male, came from the Third Judicial District, specifically Anchorage, and was a full-time partner in a large private firm with a civil law practice. He was approximately 40 years old, had lived in Alaska 16 years, and had practiced law about 11 years, primarily in Alaska. He spent approximately 45 hours a week working, earned an estimated \$78,300 in 1988 (though this average masks significant differences among types of practice), and received over three-quarters of his income from the practice of law.

This average profile, however, conceals significant differences within the heterogeneous legal community. According to the 1988 income figures, Anchorage practitioners earn an average of \$22,000 more than rural lawyers, and there is a \$35,000 difference between public and private practitioners. Firm partners average \$74,000 more than associates. Substantial income differences are associated with type of practice; partners/shareholders have the highest average income from law while public defenders have the lowest.

Male practitioners earned an average \$86,000, while female attorneys averaged \$53,000 (see Table 1). This large difference is not consistent throughout subgroups, although a gender gap does exist for a variety of subcategories within the

legal community. The gap is greatest in private practice, with an average \$40,000 difference between males and females. Even in public practice, females appear to average \$7,400 less in income. By selecting private practice rather than the public sector, men seem to increase their income almost \$40,000. However, women not only earn a lower average income in public practice but also average only \$7,000 more by being in the private sector.

A number of factors could explain this apparent gender gap in many of the career tracks. As noted in Table 1, in general female practitioners are significantly younger and have practiced fewer years. In addition, females are more than three times as likely to be working part-time (17.3% versus 5.5% for males). This difference is, in part, explained by personal considerations: almost one-half (43%) of all part-time female lawyers ascribed that status to maternity leave.

The primary reason behind the gender economic gap is the relationship between years of practice and type of practice. To a point, those practicing law longer are more likely to have higher incomes. While this trend reaches a plateau or even declines after 20 years, the effect of longevity is obvious. Nevertheless, if this were the only reason why females earn less, incomes would tend to equalize over time. In fact, the longer one's practice, the wider the gender gap on income. While males and females begin their careers on a fairly equal earnings basis, the income gap widens as experience increases.

*Please turn to GENDER, p. 6*

### HIGHLIGHTS INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- The Bureau of Justice Statistics analyzes justice expenditures in 1988 (page 2).
- Alaska UCR statistics show a slight drop in crime (page 5).

## A BJS Report

**Table 1. State and Local Justice System Total Expenditures (Direct and Intergovernmental),  
by Activity and State, Fiscal Year 1988**

Expenditures in thousands of dollars

	Total justice system	Police protection	Judicial (courts only)	Prosecution and legal services	Public defense	Corrections	Other justice
<b>Total</b>	\$53,516,609	\$24,401,411	\$6,459,821	\$3,276,822	\$1,012,832	\$17,982,275	\$383,451
Alabama	561,644	257,669	90,443	30,261	6,213	172,744	4,314
Alaska	283,241	116,722	35,418	42,905	6,535	81,661	0
Arizona	961,724	423,230	110,162	70,715	23,628	332,749	1,240
Arkansas	233,078	113,454	26,928	13,118	1,747	71,018	4,813
California	8,939,615	3,650,529	971,978	611,822	239,689	3,394,647	70,950
Colorado	701,061	335,977	76,242	58,049	16,739	212,580	1,474
Connecticut	692,068	373,023	90,371	49,400	10,251	166,094	2,929
Delaware	158,032	70,104	26,645	6,917	2,172	50,140	2,054
District of Columbia	529,894	193,883	60,756	12,942	19,976	240,097	2,240
Florida	2,810,272	1,348,733	324,537	157,298	69,726	871,671	38,307
Georgia	1,187,218	500,547	158,605	50,113	8,456	460,851	8,646
Hawaii	271,041	115,699	46,343	29,194	4,500	71,989	3,316
Idaho	132,715	62,330	22,262	10,985	2,754	33,929	455
Illinois	2,339,975	1,335,938	237,543	126,152	28,895	595,705	13,742
Indiana	688,290	337,307	83,633	38,359	6,285	220,324	2,382
Iowa	353,651	172,547	49,244	25,947	13,495	92,183	234
Kansas	404,076	191,630	50,121	27,685	3,825	129,492	1,323
Kentucky	496,329	202,512	69,693	31,851	5,947	182,456	3,870
Louisiana	747,619	337,171	114,180	38,354	2,958	252,422	2,534
Maine	169,464	84,827	19,339	10,004	1,420	53,004	870
Maryland	1,091,219	469,268	128,501	47,751	19,065	417,898	8,736
Massachusetts	1,448,933	712,570	197,040	91,118	37,603	402,372	8,230
Michigan	2,131,972	918,558	306,660	106,731	27,412	770,865	1,746
Minnesota	735,496	343,984	96,304	65,195	17,102	212,018	893
Mississippi	263,213	135,022	38,827	13,657	1,398	73,894	415
Missouri	829,103	423,875	109,635	39,876	8,764	245,584	1,369
Montana	104,456	50,020	12,613	8,093	1,750	28,991	2,989
Nebraska	216,231	109,974	28,741	15,294	2,929	58,255	1,037
Nevada	331,632	125,589	34,012	22,402	6,109	143,475	44
New Hampshire	170,275	91,150	24,267	10,970	4,742	39,097	49
New Jersey	2,117,567	1,038,246	225,212	168,609	44,954	638,597	1,949
New Mexico	290,359	130,458	28,026	21,026	5,511	104,263	1,075
New York	7,144,927	3,259,295	748,534	406,390	150,846	2,495,522	84,340
North Carolina	1,041,998	491,158	103,316	43,933	4,517	385,519	13,555
North Dakota	70,971	34,502	13,740	8,127	1,087	13,499	16
Ohio	1,809,484	792,299	248,363	106,712	24,761	633,424	3,925
Oklahoma	441,909	209,800	42,364	39,079	2,207	148,459	0
Oregon	592,774	233,302	97,228	52,146	26,379	174,810	8,909
Pennsylvania	1,918,774	903,117	311,888	99,018	27,934	569,787	7,030
Rhode Island	193,867	104,494	25,709	15,075	2,654	45,709	226
South Carolina	553,478	233,559	49,099	16,375	3,666	246,584	4,195
South Dakota	82,659	41,663	10,725	7,597	1,280	21,387	7
Tennessee	756,256	333,460	96,368	34,199	10,501	281,211	517
Texas	2,938,736	1,313,606	362,570	183,372	33,664	997,829	47,695
Utah	282,177	135,365	34,951	21,400	2,518	85,578	2,365
Vermont	83,907	38,643	10,678	6,617	2,943	24,472	554
Virginia	1,195,296	527,541	147,357	48,122	15,195	448,627	8,454
Washington	887,377	397,605	108,116	62,499	21,537	296,912	708
West Virginia	167,924	80,702	30,966	10,519	3,476	41,619	642
Wisconsin	864,212	451,254	108,413	53,990	23,529	224,434	2,592
Wyoming	98,430	47,505	13,155	6,858	1,588	25,826	3,496

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.  
Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics

## A BJS Report

Justice Expenditures,  
1988

According to a study recently released by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, federal, state, and local governments in the United States spent \$61 billion in fiscal year 1988 for civil and criminal justice, an increase of 34 per cent since 1985, the last year comparable data were collected. Justice spending increased more than total government spending for all activities, unlike in the early 1980s, when justice spending did not increase as fast as other government spending. All government spending grew by 21 per cent from 1985 to \$1.92 trillion in 1988.

The higher increases for justice spending during 1985-88 were seen at each level of government but were greatest for the federal and state governments.

Other findings of the study include:

- Three cents or 3.2 per cent of every government dollar spent throughout the nation in 1988 was for justice activities: 1.5 per cent for police protection, 1.0 per cent for corrections, and 0.7 per cent for judicial and legal services. The federal government spent less than one cent of every dollar for justice; state governments, six cents; and local governments, almost seven cents.
- The federal, state, and local governments spent six times as much on social insurance payments as on justice, five times as much on national defense and international relations, four times as much on education, three times as much on debt interest, two and a half times as much on housing and the environment, and almost twice as much on public welfare.
- State and local governments combined spent 88 per cent of all justice dollars; the federal government spent 12 per cent.
- Federal, state, and local governments spent \$248 per capita on criminal and civil justice in 1988.

- Expenditure for justice activities increased 21 per cent in the past decade in constant dollars per capita. Spending for corrections increased the most, 65 per cent, compared with 34 per cent for legal services and prosecution, 34 per cent for public defense, 17 per cent for courts, and 3 per cent for police.
- Federal government spending since 1971, when data first became available, increased 83 per cent in constant dollars per capita, twice as fast as state and local governments at 40 per cent.
- All levels of government are spending a greater proportion of their corrections dollars on institutions versus probation, parole, and pardon.
- Since 1979, state government expenditure for building prisons increased 593 per cent in actual dollars - 2.6 times faster than spending to operate correctional institutions.
- State governments spent 3.5 per cent of their total dollars for corrections - including building and operating institutions and running probation and parole programs.
- In October, 1988 the nation's civil and criminal justice system employed 1.6 million persons, with a total October payroll of almost \$3.7 billion.
- State and local per capita spending was highest in the Northeast (\$276) and West (\$274) and lowest in the South (\$179) and Midwest (\$176).
- Per capita spending ranged from less than \$100 in Arkansas and West Virginia to more than \$300 in four states, California, Nevada, New York, and Alaska.

*(This article was based on Bureau of Justice Statistics report, NCJ-124132, "Justice Expenditure and Employment, 1988." Copies of the report are available through the Alaska Statistical Analysis Unit, Justice Center.)*

**Table 2. State and Local Justice System Per Capita Expenditures, by State, Fiscal Year 1988**

Rank	State	Expenditures per capita
1	Dist. of Columbia	\$858.82
2	Alaska	540.53
3	New York	398.96
4	California	315.73
5	Nevada	314.64
6	Arizona	275.64
7	New Jersey	274.26
8	Hawaii	246.85
9	Massachusetts	246.04
10	Delaware	239.44
11	Maryland	236.09
12	Michigan	230.73
13	Florida	227.83
	All state and local	217.72
14	Oregon	214.23
15	Connecticut	214.06
16	Colorado	212.38
17	Wyoming	205.49
18	Illinois	201.48
19	Virginia	198.72
20	Rhode Island	195.23
21	New Mexico	192.67
22	Washington	190.92
23	Georgia	187.20
24	Wisconsin	178.00
25	Texas	174.50
26	Minnesota	170.77
27	Louisiana	169.61
28	Utah	166.97
29	Ohio	166.70
30	Kansas	161.95
31	Missouri	161.27
32	North Carolina	160.58
33	Pennsylvania	159.88
34	South Carolina	159.50
35	New Hampshire	156.94
36	Tennessee	154.50
37	Vermont	150.64
38	Maine	140.63
39	Alabama	136.92
40	Oklahoma	136.31
41	Nebraska	134.98
42	Kentucky	133.17
43	Idaho	132.32
44	Montana	129.76
45	Iowa	124.79
46	Indiana	123.88
47	South Dakota	115.93
48	North Dakota	106.40
49	Mississippi	100.46
50	Arkansas	97.32
51	West Virginia	89.51

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics

Please see BJS, p. 4

## BJS

(continued from p. 3)

**Table 3. Per Cent of State Government Total Direct Expenditures for Justice Activities, by State, Fiscal Year 1988**

Rank	State	Total	Per cent for justice activities		
			Police protection	Judicial and legal services	Corrections
1	North Carolina	8.9%	1.9%	1.8%	4.9%
2	Florida	8.7	1.3	2.3	4.8
3	Arizona	8.1	2.1	.9	5.1
4	Nevada	8.1	1.2	.8	6.1
5	Delaware	7.9	2.1	2.2	3.5
6	California	7.5	1.6	.5	5.3
7	Maryland	7.4	1.3	1.6	4.4
8	New York	7.3	.8	2.4	4.0
9	Virginia	7.0	1.5	1.4	4.0
10	Georgia	6.9	1.6	.6	4.6
11	New Mexico	6.9	1.3	2.0	3.5
12	Oregon	6.8	1.2	3.2	2.3
13	South Carolina	6.7	1.6	.5	4.5
14	Massachusetts	6.7	1.3	2.5	2.9
15	Kansas	6.5	1.0	1.7	3.8
16	Missouri	6.4	1.3	1.5	3.6
17	Colorado	6.3	.9	2.0	3.3
18	Connecticut	6.3	1.4	2.2	2.7
All state governments		6.1	1.2	1.3	3.5
19	Michigan	6.1	1.1	.8	4.2
20	Alaska	6.1	1.5	2.3	2.4
21	Kentucky	5.9	1.3	1.8	2.7
22	New Jersey	5.9	1.5	1.3	3.1
23	Vermont	5.8	1.8	1.6	2.3
24	Utah	5.7	1.6	1.2	2.8
25	Tennessee	5.5	.9	.9	3.8
26	Illinois	5.4	1.2	1.0	3.1
27	Texas	5.4	1.1	.5	3.7
28	New Hampshire	5.4	1.2	2.4	1.8
29	Oklahoma	5.3	1.1	1.2	3.0
30	Alabama	5.2	1.1	1.6	2.4
31	Hawaii	5.1	.2	2.3	2.6
32	Iowa	5.0	1.2	1.8	2.1
33	Rhode Island	4.9	.9	1.8	2.2
34	Nebraska	4.8	1.4	1.0	2.4
35	Indiana	4.8	1.3	.6	2.9
36	Louisiana	4.7	1.1	.8	2.7
37	South Dakota	4.7	1.5	1.3	2.0
38	Wyoming	4.6	1.1	1.1	2.0
38	Maine	4.6	1.3	1.2	2.0
40	Wisconsin	4.4	.7	1.1	2.6
41	Ohio	4.4	.8	.5	3.1
42	Mississippi	4.1	1.3	.6	2.2
43	Idaho	4.1	1.2	1.0	1.8
44	Washington	4.1	1.0	.6	2.5
45	Pennsylvania	3.8	1.3	.7	1.8
46	Arkansas	3.8	1.0	.6	2.0
47	Montana	3.3	1.1	.5	1.5
48	Minnesota	3.2	.8	.8	1.6
49	West Virginia	2.9	1.0	.9	1.0
50	North Dakota	2.4	.6	1.0	0.8

Note: The percentages for the total justice system include expenditures for a residual "other" category not displayed separately.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics

## Angell Returns

John Angell has accepted appointment as Director of the Justice Center at the University of Alaska Anchorage. Dr. Angell has been on the faculty of the university since 1975. He previously served as head of the Center from 1979 to 1988. From 1988 through 1989 Angell was on sabbatical leave, serving as Director of Justice Services for Multnomah County, Oregon.

## Recent BJS Reports

In addition to the report summarized in the accompanying article, the following recent studies and reports from the Bureau of Justice Statistics are available from the Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit:

*"Prisoners in 1989," an examination of population data for state and federal corrections institutions, NCJ-122716.*

*"Jail Inmates 1989," an examination of results from a nationally-representative survey of local jails, NCJ-123264.*

*"Handgun Crime Victims," an analysis of handgun crimes reported in the National Crime Survey for 1979-87, NCJ 123559.*

*"Violent State Prisoners and Their Victims," an examination of the characteristics of victims of violent offenders now incarcerated in state prisons, NCJ 124133.*

*"Immigration Offenses," an examination of immigration law violations from 1980-1987, NCJ 124546.*

## Uniform Crime Reports

The total number of reported serious crimes in Alaska and the rate per 100,000 residents dropped slightly between 1988 and 1989, according to Uniform Crime Report figures released by the FBI in August. *Crime in the United States*, the annual FBI compilation of national reported crime statistics, indicates that total reported crimes for the state dropped from 25,248 in 1988 to 25,190 in 1989 - a decrease of .2 per cent. The rate per 100,000 inhabitants also decreased during the same period by 2.9 per cent. (Between 1988 and 1989 state population grew from 513,000 to 527,000.) Nationally, during the same period total reported crime rose 2.4 per cent, and the rate per 100,000 population grew 1.4 per cent.

The Uniform Crime Report program uses an index of selected offenses to measure changes in the level of crimes reported to law enforcement agencies across the country. In Alaska the number of reported murders increased from 29 in 1988 to 42 in 1989, an increase of 44.8 per cent. The murder rate per 100,000 population rose from 5.7 to 8.0, an increase of 40.4 per cent.

The number of burglaries also rose between 1988 and 1989, from 4,321 to 4,358 - an increase of .9 per cent. The rate of burglaries actually dropped, however, from 842.3 to 826.9, a decrease of 1.8 per cent.

Motor vehicle thefts increased 2.7 per cent, from 2,334 in 1988 to 2,398 in 1989. There was no change in the rate per 100,000 residents, which remained constant at 455.

All other categories reflected decreases in both total and rate. Forcible rapes declined from 296 in 1988 to 279 in 1989, a decrease of 5.7 per cent. The rate dropped 8.3 per cent, from 57.7 to 52.9.

Robberies dropped from 374 to 356, a decline of 4.8 per cent. The rate per 100,000 decreased from 72.9 to 67.6, a 7.3 per cent drop.

Aggravated assaults declined from 1983 in 1988 to 1946 in 1989, a drop of 1.9 per cent. The rate dropped 4.5 per cent from 386.5 to 369.3.

Larceny-thefts declined from 15,911 to 15,811, a .6 per cent drop, and the rate per 100,000 declined

## Alaska UCR Program

According to the Department of Public Safety, the following Alaska law enforcement agencies now regularly submit crime figures through the Uniform Crime Report program.

Alaska State Troopers	Kenai
Anchorage Police Department	Kodiak
Fairbanks Police Department	Kotzebue
Anchorage Airport Security	Nome
Bethel	North Pole
Bristol Bay	North Slope Borough
Cordova	Palmer
Craig	Petersburg
Fairbanks Airport Police	Seward
Haines	Skagway
Homer	Soldotna
Juneau	Wrangell

In addition, the following agencies are working with the Department of Public Safety to begin or resume reporting.

Dillingham	Sitka
Sand Point	Unalaska
Seldovia	

The following agencies do not participate in the program at this time.

Angoon	Klawock
Fort Yukon	Metlakatla
Galena	Nenana
Gambell	Quinhagak
Hoonah	Tanana
Take	Valdez
Ketchikan	Whittier
Kianak	Yakutat
King Cove	

from 3,101.6 to 3,000.2, or 3.3 per cent.

Nationally, all of the above offense categories except for burglary show increases from 1988 to 1989 in both reported totals and rates.

These *Crime in the United States* figures reflect statewide figures reported to the FBI through the Alaska Department of Public Safety. Currently more than 25 of the 40 law enforcement agencies in the state are participating in the reporting program. (The Alaska Department of Public Safety uses UCR figures to compile its own annual statistics for reported criminal activity. *Crime Reported in Alaska: 1988* was recently released.)

## New Center Faculty

Two new faculty members have joined the Justice Center staff for the 1990-91 academic year. Lawrence Trostle has accepted a position as Visiting Associate Professor. Trostle has a doctorate in criminal justice from Claremont Graduate School and has a professional background in law enforcement.

Lisa Rieger has accepted a position as Assistant Professor. Rieger has a juris doctorate from Hastings and a masters in criminology from Cambridge University. She is a member of the California and Alaska bars.

## GENDER

*(continued from p. 1)*

The reason for this is suggested in Table 2. Almost three-quarters of all males enter the profession in the private sector, and that proportion remains relatively stable over time. Conversely, only 57.4 per cent of women with 0 to 6 years of experience were in private practice. This pattern remains stable for the first 12 or so years. Around that time, about one-half the female private practitioners leave the profession or move to the public sector. Table 3 demonstrates the effect of this pattern. By the time the length of experience has reached 13 or more years, the ratio of males to females in private practice is almost 23 to 1. This difference stands in stark contrast to the 2 or 3 to 1 ratios for those with less experience in the private sector, and the 1 or 3 to 1 ratios for the public sector. The overall result of these career patterns is that female attorneys are twice as populous in the public sector (39.4%) as in the private (18.3%).

To better illustrate this situation, Table 4 focuses on private sector career options. While both sexes enter the private sector as new attorneys primarily with associate status, it appears that males have some additional options. By the time the length of experience has reached 4 to 6 years, only one-half the males are associates, and at the level of ten years or more, less than 10 per cent remain at the associate level. Females, on the other hand, leave associate status more slowly, are almost two and one-half times more likely to be associates after ten years, make partner later in their careers, and always do so at a rate well below that of males. The 42.6 per cent rate for females attaining partner status after 10 years masks the fact that the attrition rate among females in the private sector is extremely high.

One interesting trend is the high proportion of females trying careers as sole practitioners. While the success rate apparently is not high, this pattern suggests that the option to move on to partner may not have been available in the same proportion as for male attorneys in private practice.

Table 1. Gender Differences Among Law Practitioners

	Total	Practitioners Female	Male	Sig
<b>AVERAGE</b>				
Age	40.4	37.2	41.4	*
Years of practice	12.3	8.1	12.8	*
Years practice in Alaska	10.5	7.3	11.6	*
<b>AVERAGE INCOME OF</b>				
All practitioners	\$78,300	\$53,300	86,500	*
<b>Private Practice</b>				
Sole practitioners	89,700	57,000	97,000	*
Partners	71,500	39,300	77,400	*
Associates	127,700	104,900	129,900	*
Corporate	53,700	45,500	57,800	*
<b>Public Practice</b>				
Judges	76,800	74,200	77,800	*
Prosecutors	54,600	50,100	57,500	*
Public defenders	67,000	61,900	69,300	*
Other state	55,900	53,300	57,300	*
Other government/nonprof.	47,500	43,100	50,700	*
<b>Years of Practice</b>				
0 to 3 years	55,000	49,900	59,700	*
4 to 6	48,000	45,900	50,200	*
7 to 9	37,500	38,300	37,100	*
10 to 12	49,400	44,400	52,400	*
13 to 15	62,400	47,800	70,100	*
16 to 19	79,400	72,200	82,700	*
20 or more	106,100	62,400	114,900	*
<b>Work Status</b>				
Ful-time	114,700	70,600	118,900	*
Part-time	105,600	42,500	107,500	*
<b>Age</b>				
30 years or less	82,500	57,900	89,500	*
31 to 35	33,300	31,900	34,800	*
36 to 40	42,300	42,700	42,000	*
41 to 45	56,700	47,000	62,500	*
46 to 50	74,600	56,900	81,800	*
51 or older	98,900	66,500	104,900	*
<b>Location in State</b>				
Anchorage	99,800	45,000	105,800	*
Road-Ferry Served	93,300	58,600	96,000	*
Rural-Bush	83,100	56,300	92,100	*
	69,100	46,600	76,500	*
	61,200	47,500	65,200	*

\* statistically significant, &gt;.05

Note: average income is based on 1988 gross from a legal practice and mathematically derived from 14 intervals

The economic effect of these career paths is obvious. However, there is a second aspect. Whichever private bar career path a woman chooses, the average compensation level is still somewhat below that of her male counterparts. For example, private practitioners with 7 to 15 years of experience show a \$12,300 gender gap for partners, a \$16,900 gap for associates, and a huge \$41,400 gulf for sole practitioners.

To put the entire issue into perspective, a multi-variate analysis

of variance was used to explore the relative controlled effects of six measures - gender, age, type of practice, years of practice, work status and location - in predicting income. Individually, each is statistically significant. However, as shown in Table 5, gender is the only variable *not* contributing a significant amount to this explanatory model. The original \$33,200 gap is reduced to an adjusted \$4,500. In other words, the apparent \$33,200 male/female difference is, in fact, much closer to \$4,500 when one

Table 2. Private Versus Public Career Paths by Years of Practice

Years of Practice	Female Practitioner		Male Practitioner	
	Private	Public	Private	Public
0 to 6	57.4%	42.6%	74.6%	25.1%
7 to 12	56.1	43.9	75.0	25.0
13 or more	28.9	71.1	77.3	22.7

Table 3. Male/Female Ratio Within Career Paths and Years of Practice

Practice	Ratio of Males/Females		
	Total	Private	Public
0 to 6	1.7	2.3	1.0
7 to 12	2.1	2.8	1.2
13 or more	8.5	22.8	2.7

Table 4. Private Sector Career Paths by Years of Practice

Years of Practice	Sole Practitioner	Female Practitioner			Corporate
		Partner	Associate		
0 to 3	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	
4 to 6	13.5	10.8	70.3	5.4	
7 to 9	50.0	15.4	30.8	3.8	
10 or more	31.9	42.6	19.1	6.4	

  

Years of Practice	Male Practitioner			
	Sole Practitioner	Partner	Associate	Corporate
0 to 3	12.5%	3.1%	81.2%	3.1%
4 to 6	19.7	28.9	50.0	1.3
7 to 9	25.0	47.2	25.0	2.8
10 or more	32.7	55.7	8.6	3.0

Table 5. Role of Gender in Predicting Income in a Multiple Effects Model

	Largest Unadjusted Deviation	Largest Adjusted Deviation	F Ratio	Sig
Gender	\$33,200	\$4,500	1.5	*
Type of practice	80,200	65,100	34.0	*
Work Status	49,200	39,600	48.8	*
Location in state	21,900	11,800	6.7	*
Years of practice	Interval	Covariate	153.2	*
Age	Interval	Covariate	18.8	*

\* statistically significant, > .05

considers other influences on income. Gender is a *direct* cause of less than a \$5,000 difference in earning potential. The model suggests that type and years of practice, taken in unison, are the primary reason why gender alone is not significant.

The effect of years of practice on income can be overcome by time. However, some evidence suggests

that females leave the profession at a rate higher than males. Type of practice reflects personal choice. Why female attorneys disproportionately choose career paths which are less financially rewarding is probably due to a number of reasons, including lifestyle and interests. However, to some extent, evidence exists that recruitment and retention for the

private bar are not as successful with women as with men. The kinds of barriers that exist, from a lack of problem recognition and career option flexibility to sexism in the workplace, all contribute to the fact that the private bar is perhaps not making full use of law graduates seeking employment in Alaska. These conclusions, however, contain questions and directions for future research rather than definitive answers.

(Richard Ender is Professor of Business and Computer Information Systems at the University of Alaska Anchorage.)



## Alaska Justice Forum

Editor: Antonia Moras  
 Editorial Board: John Angell, Allan Barnes, David Parry, Emily Read, Lisa Rieger, Nancy Schafer, Lawrence Trostle  
 Typesetting and Layout: Phyl Booth

Justice Center, N.E. Schafer, Director

Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit,  
 Allan Barnes, Director

Published quarterly by the Justice Center, and the Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit, at the University of Alaska Anchorage, 3211 Providence Drive, Anchorage, AK 99508. (907) 786-1810; fax, 786-7777.

© 1990, Justice Center, University of Alaska Anchorage.

ISSN 0893-8903.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, provides approximately thirty-five per cent of the funding for this publication.

The opinions expressed are those of individual authors and may not be those of the Justice Center or the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

The University of Alaska provides equal education and employment opportunities for all, regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, disability, or status as a Vietnam-era or disabled veteran.

## Reference Guides Available

The Statistical Analysis Unit of the Justice Center at the University of Alaska Anchorage has recently completed three reference works designed for researchers in the justice area.

The *Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit Research Catalog* contains a complete annotated listing of all reports and data holdings of the Statistical Analysis Unit and the Justice Center.

The *Alaska Criminal Statute Cross-Reference Guide* correlates Alaska criminal statutes with the differing codes utilized by the National Crime Information Center (NCIC), the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR), the Alaska Offender Based Transaction Statistics (OBTS) and the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The volume includes a brief annotation for each statute. A separate volume presents conversion tables alone.

Each of the three reference works is available on the Center computer network and in hard copy. The works were prepared under the supervision of Allan Barnes, Director of the Statistical Analysis Unit.

*Alaska Justice Forum*  
Justice Center  
University of Alaska Anchorage  
3211 Providence Drive  
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

Address correction requested

## Library Resources

The Justice Center at the University of Alaska maintains a library of books, reports and other documents related to the justice system. Library holdings are now catalogued on the Center computer network. The library is open to the public on a non-circulating basis. In each issue the *Forum* will include a list of recent acquisitions. Further information concerning the use of library resources may be obtained by calling 786-1810.

*Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Control Task Forces 1988: Critical Components of State Drug Control Strategies.* Washington, D.C.: Criminal Justice Statistics Association, 1990.

*Crime in South Dakota 1988.* Pierre, South Dakota: Office of Attorney General, Statistical Analysis Center.

*Wisconsin Crime and Arrests 1989.* Madison, WI: Wisconsin Office of Justice Assistance, Statistical Analysis Center, 1990.

*Alaska Corrections in Review - Fiscal Year 1989 Report.* Alaska Department of Corrections, 1990.

*Crime in the United States (Uniform Crime Reports - 1989).* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1990.

*Crime Reported in Alaska: 1988.* Anchorage, AK: Department of Public Safety, 1990.

Non-Profit Organization  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Anchorage, Alaska  
Permit No. 107