LAWYERS AND POLITICS

THESIS FOR THE DEGREE OF Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

BENJAMIN TAMER HOURANI

1966

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

Lawyers and Politics

presented by

Benjamin Tamir Hourani

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

PhD degree in Political Science

Joseph A. Schlesinger
Major professor

Date February 22, 1966

ABSTRACT

LAWYERS AND POLITICS

by Benjamin T. Hourani

The purpose of this study is to investigate how lawyers in different work situations relate themselves to politics. The major thesis tested may be specifically stated as follows: the work situation of lawyers and their position in the hierarchy of the legal profession affect their perception of the "expected utility" of political rewards, their political participation, degree and kinds of involvement, level of political interest and possibly their personal political styles. The data necessary for testing this proposition were gathered from a sample of 144 practicing lawyers in the County of Ingham, Michigan. The data were gathered by means of a structured and pretested interview schedule in the early summer of 1964. The majority of these lawyers reside and practice in the city of Lansing.

The results of this study do not directly point to any statistically significant differences in the overall degree of political involvement between lawyers in low-status work situations and those in high-status work situations.

The data point to significant differences in the kinds of activities in which lawyers in low-status work situations and those in high-status work situations engage. In other words, lawyers in low-status work situations tend to participate more in the politics of hierarchy, i.e., as active party workers and by holding office in the political party hierarchy and auxiliary organization. Lawyers in higher-status work situations, on the other hand, tend to be considerably more active in the politics of bargaining and discussion through money contributions to political candidates and the exercise of influence on legislators and public officials by direct contacts, letter-writing and personal word-of-mouth communications.

The data suggest further that lawyers' political participation in hierarchical politics decreases as they move upward in the professional hierarchy. The higher they climb, the more they seem to depend on the politics of bargaining, discussion and influence. The differences in the kinds of political activities in which different lawyers participate are due in part to differences in career or work stages, the value they attach to the expected rewards of holding office and the level of interest. Lawyers in low-status work situations, often in the initial stages of

their career, attach higher value to the expected rewards of political office than those in high-status work situations and who are in more stable stages of their career. Moreover, the former tend to consider seriously political offices at the local and state levels whereas the latter are willing to consider only offices on the national or federal level.

Lawyers tend to use politics and political office more often as vehicles for professional escalation in a legal career than for political advancement or a political career. This is suggested by the fact that 63 percent of those who are now in the upper echelons of the profession have held party or other local political offices at some time. The most frequently held public offices were the same as those which seem very attractive to lawyers who are now in low-status work situations. These are invariably elected law-enforcement offices at the city and county levels. Lawyers seem to have a virtual monopoly on these offices.

Other results indicate that lawyers with low social class background tend to perceive the utility of politics and political rewards in tangible-material terms more often than those coming from upper and middle classes. Also, there is evidence which suggests that lawyers in low-status work situations tend to hold Machiavelli-like beliefs more

frequently than those in higher-status work situations. Social background is found to be a contributive factor.

Finally, Ingham County lawyers tend to lean towards an ideology of political conservatism. Lawyers in low-status work situations are considerably more liberal than those in higher-status work situations. The influence of inherited and adopted political party affiliations is very clear. Lawyers who come from Democratic homes and belong to the Democratic party are considerably more liberal than those who come from Republican homes and belong to the Republican party.

LAWYERS AND POLITICS

By

Benjamin Tamer Hourani

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Political Science

1966

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to Professor Joseph A. Schlesinger for the diligent guidance and support he gave me through all the stages of this study. I am indebted also to Professors Frank Pinner and Charles Adrian for reading this work and for their invaluable suggestions.

I wish to thank Professor Jack Hunter of the Department of Psychology and his wife, Rhonda, for their assistance with research techniques, statistics and computer programming. Further, I wish to express my appreciation and thanks to all the lawyers in Ingham County who participated in this study and helped make it possible.

I owe especial thanks to my wife, who typed the first draft of this work and who detected and eliminated the intrusions of linguistic obscurities.

I would finally like to express my deep gratitude to my mother and family in Lebanon for their unfailing support, which enabled me to pursue my higher education in the United States. I would like also to thank my brother, Ramiz, of Lansing, for sharing my joys and tribulations, and for his constant encouragement and contagious good spirits.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

THE PROMINENCE OF LAWYERS

The prominent role played by members of the American bench and bar in the history of the American government and business has been a particular source of pride for the American Bar. Twenty-five of the fifty-two signers of the Declaration of Independence were lawyers, thirty-one of the fifty-five members of the Constitutional Convention were members of the Bar. Twenty-three of the thirty-six United States Presidents were lawyers.[1] During the period from 1877 to 1934, 70 percent of the Presidents, Vice Presidents and cabinet members were lawyers.[2] Professor J. A. Schlesinger reports that of 995 men elected governors all over the United States in the period from 1870 to 1950, 456 were

---

[1] Esther Lucile Brown, Lawyers, Law Schools and the Public Service (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1948), p. 17. See also Donald R. Matthews, The Social Background of Political Decision-Makers (New York: Random House, 1954), p. 30.

[2] H. Dewey Anderson, "The Educational and Occupational Attainments of Our National Rulers," Scientific Monthly, XL (June, 1935), 511-18.

practicing lawyers.[1]

A survey made in 1943 of both houses of Congress reported that 66 percent of the members of Congress were lawyers--74 percent of the House of Representatives.[2] Of the 175 members serving in the Senate of the United States in the period from 1947 to 1957, 54 percent were members of the bar.[3] The 88th Congress is no exception. Of its 535 members, 315 are lawyers: 66 percent of the Senators and 57 percent of the Representatives.[4] Of the 12,689 men serving in the lower houses of thirteen states and in the upper houses of twelve between 1925 and 1935, 28 percent (or 3,555) belonged to the legal profession.[5] The percentage of lawyers in the State legislatures varies or often fluctuates. A survey of the members of all State legislators showed that

---

[1] J. A. Schlesinger, "Lawyers and American Politics: A Clarified View," Midwest Journal of Political Science, I (May, 1957), 26-39.

[2] Brown, op. cit., p. 17.

[3] Donald R. Matthews, U.S. Senators and Their World (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960), pp. 33-36.

[4] Andrew Hacker, "Are There Too Many Lawyers in Congress?" The New York Times Magazine (January 5, 1954), pp. 14, 74-75.

[5] Charles S. Hyneman, "Who Makes Our Laws," Political Science Quarterly, LV (December, 1940), 557.

lawyers constituted about 22 percent.[1] A considerably higher percentage of lawyer-legislators were found in 1957 in the four state legislatures of New Jersey, Ohio, Tennessee and California: 52, 36, 30 and 30 percent respectively.[2]

Scores of lawyers are employed in government agencies at all levels. These lawyers are involved in litigation, prosecution and other governmental functions. At least 13,000 lawyers are working for the Federal government alone.[3]

In the world of business the lawyer is often in an envied position of prominence. Fowler Hamilton, a practicing lawyer, speaking of the close affinity between lawyers and business said:

> Every nook and cranny of modern business is permeated by the law and the lawyer. It is almost impossible to think of business without thinking of the lawyer's role. If the businessman finds it difficult to live with a lawyer, he finds it impossible to live without him . . . engineers, accountants, market analysts,

---

[1]Belle Zeller (ed.), American State Legislatures (New York: Thomas Crowell, 1954), p. 71.

[2]Heinz Eulau and John D. Sprague, "Lawyers in Politics: A Study in Professional Convergence" (Stanford University, 1962), p. 2 (mimeographed). The entire study is based on data drawn from John C. Wahlke, Heinz Eulau, et al. in The Legislative System (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1962).

[3]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1963 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963), p. 158.

> economists, advertising men, public relations men et al come and go at the business conference table as discussion moves in and out of their special fields, but legal problems and the lawyer are present at almost every stage. . . .[1]

Professors Lasswell and McDougal stress the lawyer's potential to influence the decision-making processes in business-corporate concerns and see him as "the one indispensable adviser of every responsible policy-maker . . . as such an adviser the lawyer, when informing his policy-maker of what he can or cannot legally do, is in an unassailable strategic position to influence, if not create policy. . . ."[2]

Lawyers in private practice play a similarly significant role in domestic relations and other problems of the citizenry and the law. They exercise a considerable influence by virtue of the legal counsel they give and the fiduciary relations they hold.

In spite of the important role lawyers play in politics, business and social relations, they are often viewed critically and with suspicion. The elements of this suspicion and other apprehensions are discussed in a later

---

[1] Fowler Hamilton, "The Lawyer and Business," Fortune, XXXVIII (October, 1948), 179.

[2] H. D. Lasswell and M. S. McDougal, "Legal Education and Public Policy," in H. D. Lasswell (ed.), The Analysis of Political Behavior (London: Routledge, Kegan, Paul, Ltd., 1948), p. 27.

chapter. The following paragraphs will concentrate on sketching, in brief, the developments in the legal profession with an emphasis on its stratification.

The Legal Profession: Developments

The growth of the American Bar, its proliferation and specialization were parallel and in response to changes in the structure of the capitalist system. The impact of industrialization on the profession has not been felt until the turn of the century. Before then the individual general practitioners were able to manage their business easily. But with progress of industrialization many changes were effected. Some of these changes were the emergence of large-scale business corporations and the enactment of a series of regulatory laws, the purpose of which was to control trade and business transactions. These factors, added to the complex nature of the federal structure of government, made lawyers extremely indispensable and, more important at this point, made specialization inevitable. Industrialization and expansion of business towards the West made the corporation a very useful legal measure of massing greater capital in business enterprises. The new "legal personality" worked closely through the lawyers. The lawyer had to advise the corporation on the legality of its actions, defend and

legitimize its actions in society and vis-à-vis the political system. Under the Democratic administration of Wilson, the anti-trust laws including the Clayton Act, the Federal Commission Act and the Income Tax laws were enacted. Businessmen became hard pressed for the lawyers' services, to solve the tangle of legal problems and face up to the government.[1] Lawyers were, in this manner, wedded to business and many of them became business executives. This manner of complexity which did not slacken except temporarily stimulated cooperation between individual lawyers and gave rise to the firm lawyer and what has been referred to as the "legal factories."

Firm and Solo Lawyers

These developments in the legal and industrial complexity of society made specialization of functions inevitable. Lawyers had to specialize to meet the specialized demands of this complex society and in order to be able to compete. The functions of the general practitioner came to be served by several specialized lawyers and by giant organizations. The general practitioner has found himself being stripped of his functions and soon became unable to compete for an honorable living as his predecessors were able to

---

[1] Hamilton, op. cit., p. 184.

achieve. Solo lawyers had to go into partnership or seek other employments as salaried lawyers in government service or private business.[1] The strain on the general practitioner came also from the increased supply of lawyers who had similar ambitions and similar images of their role as he had when he entered law school. As will be indicated below, the majority of lawyers are individual practitioners who fill the lower ranks of the legal profession.

Industrialization and the complexity of modern society have produced what Jack Ladinsky called the "bifurcated" bar; and it may even be referred to as the trifurcated bar.[2] The legal profession became a stratified hierarchy of large law firms on the top and solo lawyers at the base with smaller size firms in between.

The firm lawyers, the elite of the profession, are a class by themselves. In contrast to the traditional general practitioners, they rarely appear in courts, they handle business matters and give business counsel on highly

---

[1] Stuart T. Saunders, "Law and Business: Cornerstones of Our Economy," American Bar Association Journal, XLVIII (February, 1962), 154.

[2] Jack Ladinsky, "Career Development Among Lawyers: A Study of Social Factors in the Allocation of Professional Labor" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, 1963), p. 2.

specialized legal operations and spend most of their working time at the conference table or in the law library. This segment of the profession is relatively small and is to be found in large metropolitan centers.

Large law firms, from the early part of the century on, grew in size and power. Thus by 1948 there were 284 law firms with eight or more partners. There were 99 large-scale firms with over twelve partners and a large number of salaried lawyers and staff workers.[1] In New York, for instance, some such organizations are composed of 150 and a total staff of 250 to 300.[2]

The recruitment of firm lawyers is highly elaborate. Large law firms draw their recruits mostly from the Ivy League colleges and those with the highest quality of education. They prefer a "special kind" of lawyer over others. As put by Erwin O. Smigel, these firms "prefer the man with all three attributes: lineage, ability, and personality . . . [and] from the right" school and with the "right" social background.[3] The emphasis on recruitment in these

---

[1] James W. Hurst, The Growth of American Law (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1950), p. 307.

[2] Robert T. Swaine, "Impact of Big Business on the Profession: An Answer to Critics of the Modern Bar," American Bar Association Journal, XXXV (February, 1949), 89-92.

[3] Erwin O. Smigel, "The Impact of Recruitment on the Organization of the Large Law Firm," American Sociological Review, XXV (February, 1960), 57.

large firms is due to the fact that new lawyers who are admitted as "associates" will soon become partners.

Smaller law firms are scattered in the urban cities and towns all over the United States. These firms range from two partners to seven or eight plus several staff workers. A. A. Berle, Jr. speaks commendably of these smaller firms because the members are "lawyers rather than solicitors." From this group would emerge the scholars of the bar.[1] These lawyers are in close touch with the community; they engage in politics as well as practice law. The recruitment of lawyers to these firms is not as elaborate or formal.

At the bottom of the hierarchy are the two-partner family enterprises and the solo lawyers. These are to be found generally at the lower ranks of the legal profession. With the possible exception of those in prosperous towns, this group comprises the marching lawyers who work day and night to earn a living, chasing ambulances, litigating divorce cases and handling extremely routine work for various individual clients. In the lowest ranks of this stratum

---

[1] A. A. Berle, Jr., "Modern Legal Profession," Encyclopedia of Social Sciences (New York: Macmillan Co., 1938), IX, 340-346.

are those who lead a dangerous life at the brink of the underworld, especially in the big cities.[1]

Solo lawyers or the individual practitioners make up the masses of the legal profession (about two-thirds or more).[2] The low status of individual practitioners is generally attributable to the quality of their education, their social origin, type of legal work they engage in and other factors connected with their work situation and social relations. Often using income alone as an index is sufficient to show the discrepancy between individual practitioners and firm lawyers. The incomes increase according to the number of partners or size of the partnership (see Table I.1). Furthermore, it seems that opportunities for individual lawyers become limited especially when they are competing with laymen or men in the fields of real estate, insurance and the like in a large metropolitan center.

Some of the major sources of stratification of the legal profession are to be found at least in part in the

---

[1] C. Wright Mills, White Collar: The American Middle Classes (New York: Oxford University Press, 1951), p. 128.

[2] Albert P. Blaustein and Charles O. Porter, The American Lawyer: A Summary of the Survey of the Legal Profession (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 8; Tweed, Harrison reports that throughout the country 68 percent of the lawyers practice alone and that percentage is higher for big cities. See Table I.1.

popularity of the profession as a means for upward mobility. A career in law has often been viewed by young people as an occupation whereby a person can attain influence and wealth without a great deal of capital to start with. The success of prominent men with a legal training became a persistent example for ambitious young men. Further, this ambition to go into law has been greatly facilitated by the openness of the democratic system and the minimum requirements of legal training.

TABLE I.1.--Average net income in dollars (1954)

Lawyers	Mean	Median
Solo	7,315	5,485
2 Partners	11,169	9,022
3 Partners	14,830	12,407
4 Partners	19,824	14,812
5-8 Partners	23,849	20,571
9 or more	36,102	27,159

Source: Harrison Tweed, "The Changing Practice of Law: The Question of Specialization," American Bar Association Journal, XLVIII (May, 1962), 423-28. Data were arranged by the writer.

The night-school and the part-time legal education have contributed to the surplus of solo lawyers. These schools, Catholic and proprietary colleges, were graduating many lawyers every year. Often these schools were referred to as the "diploma mills." J. E. Carlin notes that: "During the twenties, the period of maximum growth . . . of the profession as a whole, the size of the bar in the largest cities increased by well over fifty percent."[1] Carlin goes on to say that "this marked expansion was effected largely by the influx into the ranks of the individual practitioners of the graduates from the rapidly expanding night schools."[2] The growth of the night law schools, Catholic colleges and part-time legal education was parallel with the flow of immigrants. These schools have certainly made it easier for immigrants and their sons, if they so desire, to enter the legal profession.

Thus another factor indirectly contributing to the stratification of the legal profession is the immigrants' avid desire for upward mobility. The appeal of the law as a profession was perfectly suitable to the desires of the

---

[1] Jerome E. Carlin, Lawyers on Their Own (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1962), p. 23.

[2] Ibid.

immigrants to climb.[1] In his Presidential Address to the Association of American Law Schools in 1915, Dean H. S. Richards of the University of Wisconsin commented:

> If you examine the class rolls of the night schools in our great cities, you will encounter a very large proportion of foreign names. Emigrants and sons of emigrants remembering the respectable standing of the advocate [supplied] in their old homes, covet the title as a badge of distinction. The result is a host of shrewd young men, imperfectly educated, crammed so they can pass the bar examinations, all deeply impressed with the philosophy of getting on, but viewing the Code of Ethics with uncomprehending eyes.[2]

Actually lawyers of ethnic origins (first and second generations) fill the ranks of the individual practitioners and constitute the majority of lawyers today. In a random sample of 207 solo and firm lawyers chosen from the Detroit area bar, there are indications that about 59 percent of the solo lawyers and only 10 percent of the firm lawyers are first and second generation Americans.[3] Ladinsky is tempted to refer to individual practitioners as the "ethnic bar"

---

[1] Samuel Lubell, The Future of American Politics (2nd ed.; Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1956), chap. 4, "The Frontier Reappears," pp. 81-85.

[2] As quoted by Joseph T. Tinnelly, Part-time Legal Education: A Study of the Problems of Evening Law Schools (Brooklyn: The Foundation Press, Inc., 1957), pp. 6-7.

[3] Jack Ladinsky, "Careers of Lawyers, Law Practice, and Legal Institutions," American Sociological Review, XXVIII (February, 1963), 48.

because of their station and peculiar origin.

Still another factor that has probably contributed to the increased surplus of the individual practitioners was the emergence of the common personal injury cases and the contingent fees that are often associated with these cases. Contingent fees were welcomed by the individual practitioners who found this type of case a lucrative business.

Finally, the Great Depression and the coming of the New Deal made the government enact more controlling legislation referred to earlier. These developments enhanced the position of the established firm lawyers in both government and business. The general practitioners had to struggle for survival and many of them had to turn to other salaried employments. In this manner the gulf between the upper-level firm lawyers and the lower-level solo lawyers was greatly widened.[1]

These developments, together with other stereotypes, contributed to an intensification of criticism of lawyers and the legal profession (see Chapter II). Some were indignant at the "decline" of law as a profession. Others directed their attack at the relations of lawyers to business. C. Wright Mills, for instance, contended that "the public has

---

[1] Carlin, op. cit., p. 22.

become what the public has been for the lawyer's chief client--an object of profit rather than obligation."[1] And still others lamented the erosion of "professional ethics" especially among the newcomers.

Many critics dwell on a fairly extensive list of apprehensions based mostly on special cases of practicing lawyers or others in public office. Observing "shysters" or others who make the headlines and who are not necessarily typical of the larger body of lawyers all over the country does not warrant the often-made generalizations. Other apprehensions are based on assumptions that are not necessarily true, e.g., the study of law and use of precedent lead to conservatism. Many other apprehensions are voiced with regard to the presence of a large number of lawyers in politics. The question remains, are political lawyers typical of the rest of the members of the Bar?

The Problem

The relation of lawyers to the political system is generally obscure. In spite of the fact that lawyers constitute a sizeable proportion of the membership of Federal and State hierarchies, and the role lawyers played and still

---

[1] Mills, op. cit., p. 122.

play in the American society, they have not received the attention they deserve from political scientists. The research that has been undertaken herein attempts to contribute to the understanding of the lawyer's relationship to politics. How do lawyers relate themselves to the political community? What type of lawyers are especially interested in politics? What particular incentives attract lawyers into seeking political office or into becoming active in politics? And finally, what is the nature of the personal backgrounds of lawyers that predispose them toward active participation in politics as a means of satisfying their ambitions?

That lawyers as a professional group are a sub-elite from which many of the members of the United States political elite often come can hardly be over-emphasized. The importance of lawyers in the American society attracted the attention of De Tocqueville. Writing in 1835, he pointed out that: "The special information which lawyers derive from their studies ensures them a separate station in society, and they constitute a sort of privileged body in scale of intelligence. . . ."[1] Another observation he made is related

---

[1] A. De Tocqueville, Democracy in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1945), I, 278-85.

to the prospects of lawyers in a particularly democratic milieu such as that of the United States. He wrote:

> The government of democracy is favorable to the political power of lawyers; for when the wealthy, the noble, and the princes are excluded from the government, the lawyers take possession of it, in their own right, as it were, since they are the only men of information and sagacity, beyond the sphere of the people, who can be the object of popular choice.[1]

This view, though perhaps biased, as Hurst indicates, by the contacts De Toqueville made in the Eastern states, lawyers remain in advantaged positions in American politics.[2] In a mass society such as that of the United States where a considerable degree of apathy is present among the plebeians, lawyers, by virtue of their education and position, may yet become the likely "opinion leaders" and natural recruits for political office. Together with advertising men they will tend to correspond to the "priesthood" of society.[3] Yet before any such generalization can be made seriously, some basic research must be done to understand the lawyers'

---

[1] Ibid., p. 285.

[2] James Willard Hurst, The Growth of American Law (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1950), p. 250.

[3] Harold L. Wilensky, "Work, Careers, and Social Integration," International Social Science Journal, XII (Fall, 1960), 543-560. The characterization of lawyers as the "priesthood" or "high priest" was used by Ferdinand Lundberg in his article "The Priesthood of the Law," Harper's Magazine, CLXXVIII (April, 1935), 515-26.

interest and involvement in politics.

The Purpose

Determined to take a fresh look at the relationship of lawyers to politics, this writer proceeded to investigate the behavior of lawyers in their everyday life and as they relate themselves to politics. Studying lawyers in public office alone may shed some light on the problem but does not necessarily clarify its various dimensions. Lawyers in public offices are not representative of the large body of lawyers in the country. In fact, one may hypothesize that lawyer-politicians may have different norms and perspectives than those dominant in the legal profession. A comparative study of lawyers in public offices and lawyers in practice is needed. The sample of lawyers in practice studied in this work is only a beginning. Here the researcher will focus on the behavior of lawyers at work and will take into account the differentiation in the position of lawyers in the hierarchy of the legal profession. The lawyers' work situation--work setting, type of practice, type of cases handled, income and years in practice--may be very helpful in explaining the lawyers' participation in politics. Studying the lawyers' involvement in politics while in practice may help explain how lawyers view politics, what kinds of

lawyers are likely to be interested and active in politics, and may possibly shed some light on the lawyers' career perspective and the points in their career where they may be most attracted to politics. Using the work situation approach for the understanding of the political participation of lawyers and with minimum commitment to a priori assumptions or residual explanations, this writer hopes to explore further the relation of lawyers to politics.

Thus the purpose of this study is to investigate, using mostly field research, the relation of lawyers to politics. It is essentially a study in political participation. In this case, it is the political participation of members of the legal profession. In more specific terms, this writer will investigate the following thesis: that the work situation of lawyers and their position in the hierarchy of the profession affect their perception of the "expected utility" of political rewards, their political participation, degree and kinds of involvement, level of political interest and possibly their personal political styles. It is often suggested that lawyers in the low work situations will tend to be more active in politics than lawyers in higher work situations. The writer will consider this hypothesis, accept or reject it, and try to offer an explanation based on empirical data.

Organization of the Study

This study consists of seven chapters. In addition to this chapter, which it is hoped gave some perspective to the important role lawyers play in politics, Chapter II will comprise a discussion of the major apprehensions concerning the role of lawyers in social life and politics. This study will attempt to answer and explain some of these apprehensions on the basis of the research findings. Chapter III contains a brief statement of the major hypotheses to be investigated, the nature of the universe of the lawyers studied and the tools used for collecting the necessary data. Chapters IV, V and VI will contain the research findings under the respective titles of: "Ingham Lawyers: Socio-Economic Background and Political Involvement," "Work Situation and Political Activity of Lawyers," "Work Situation and Personal Styles of Lawyers." Chapter VII will contain conclusions and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

LAWYERS: SAINTS OR SINNERS[1]

Several times in history the lawyers have come under the attack of social critics. The style of professional people, like the medicine men of the early past, has been viewed by the common man with respect mixed with a feeling of suspicion.[2] Medical doctors were supposed to know the secrets of life and death and lawyers of justice and injustice. Social critics, too, seem to have mixed feelings about these highly specialized professionals even today. Lawyers were in prominent positions in government circles, high legislative bodies, courts, business and other important phases of human living. Their closeness to objects of authority and the nature of their practice have stirred some speculation and aroused some apprehensions. In this chapter we shall point out some of these apprehensions and refer to some of the studies that dealt with them.

---

[1]Title is borrowed from Beryl H. Levey's Corporation Lawyer . . . Saint or Sinner? The New Role of the Lawyer in Modern Society (Philadelphia: Chilton Co., 1961).

[2]Fred Rodell, Woe Unto You Lawyers (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1939). See chap. I entitled "Modern Medicine-men."

The Nature of Law Practice

The nature of the lawyer's profession often is too difficult to understand, especially by the common man. The custom of pleading for a defendant or plaintiff, without serious discrimination between what is right and what is wrong, somehow leaves much to be desired. Neither the defendant nor the plaintiff can escape the lawyer's fees no matter how the case is settled. In many cases, the defendant and the plaintiff come out of a case feeling that the lawyers on opposite sides of the case are much like the blades of shears; they cut whatever comes between them, but never each other. "I never," said Voltaire, "was ruined but twice--once when I gained a lawsuit, and once when I lost one." The lawyers, however, are always remunerated.

Again what goes on in the pleading of cases is found to exaggerate and distort evidence to an extent that justice loses some of its sanctity. The whole process often precipitates doubt in the process of justice and in the lawyer's profession. Justice suffers miscarriages and the lawyers remain as Sir Thomas More left them: "the sort of people whose profession it is to disguise matters. . . ."

Integrity and Independence of the Lawyer

Daniel Webster is quoted as saying,

> Our profession is good if practiced in the spirit of it; it is damnable fraud and inequity when its true spirit is supplied by a spirit of mischief-making and money-getting. . . . The love of fame [he continued] is extinguished; every ardent wish for knowledge repressed; conscience put in jeopardy, and the best feelings of the heart indurated by the mean, money-catching, abominable practices, which cover with disgrace some of the modern practitioners of law.[1]

Similarly, in the 1930's, when this nation was in the midst of a crisis, the attention of one writer was again directed to the lawyer and the legal profession. Lundberg, in a series of articles in Harper's Magazine, lamented the conditions of the American legal profession and attributed a good deal of the blame to the lawyers. Whatever social injustice was inflicted on the common man was said to be partly due to the inability of lawyers to detach themselves from the business interests of their big business clients.[2] Firm and corporation lawyers were especially blamed for their inability to stand by the side of the poor man. Low-level, inde-

---

[1] Quoted in Tryon Edwards, The New Dictionary of Thoughts (New York: Standard Book Company, 1952), pp. 329-30.

[2] Ferdinand Lundberg, "The Legal Profession: A Social Phenomenon," Harper's Magazine, CLXXVIII (December, 1938), 1-14; "The Law Factories: Brains of the Status Quo," Harper's Magazine, CLXXIX (July, 1939), 180-92; and "The Priesthood of the Law," Harper's Magazine, CLXXVIII (April, 1939), 515-26.

pendent lawyers, too, were found to have their sins. These lawyers were found unfit to carry on the traditions of the profession because of their "scant training" and lack of the noblesse oblige of the upper classes. They dealt with the shady side of the law and often followed unfair practices, often in violation of their professional Code of Ethics.[1] (Some of these charges are said to be equally true today and especially of big metropolitan centers.) In sum, the "priesthood of the law" was found wanting, causing a major reason for concern.

A more serious element of concern is the inability of the lawyer to detach himself of his client's business interests. In modern society it is not uncommon to find lawyers as partners in their client's business. They can be found often acting as public relations men, members of the boards of directors and sometimes active shareholders. The independence of the lawyer is essential to the independence of his judgment. Bias and possibly a conflict of interest may arise especially when these lawyers, "officers of the court," become parties in the lawsuits in which their moneyed clients are involved. Other than prejudicing the

---

[1] Lundberg, "The Legal Profession: A Social Phenomenon," pp. 1-14.

traditional concept of justice, this active attachment to business interests hampers the lawyer's ability to create or support innovation and progressive interpretation of laws and precedent. As noted earlier in the literature, lawyers serving business are commonly found in the upper echelons of the profession and are relatively few. The less privileged lawyers in whose ranks are to be found the "ambulance chaser" and shady operators cannot help the common man while struggling for existence. The integrity and independence of the lawyer, reminiscent of the past, seems more difficult to preserve than ever. The dilemmas resulting from the stresses and strains and sometimes the decline of the profession have led Harold Laski to suggest some measures to socialize this corps of men. His object, of course, was to make lawyers less "dependent on the hazards of the commercial market."[1] He even went on to cite favorably the experience of Soviet Russia in support of his suggestion!

"Bastions of Conservatism"

A third major source of concern has been over the fact that a high percentage of legislators at the national and state levels are lawyers by profession. Over a century

---

[1]Harold J. Laski, "The Decline of the Professions," Harper's Magazine, CLXXI (November, 1935), 682.

ago, De Tocqueville observed that a democratic society is especially favorable to the political power of lawyers partly because of the absence of established aristocratic groups and partly because, in a true democracy, the people will tend to recruit their politicians on the basis of individual merit rather than family or class. He further observed that, "By birth and interest, lawyers belong to the people; by habit and taste to the aristocracy; and they may be looked upon as the natural bond and connecting link of the two great classes of society." This "aristocratic" element, he believed, by its dedication to individual liberty and freedoms, will stand as a major barrier to tyranny of the majority. It is also implied in his writings that lawyers are progressive elements with a serious concern for the people. This image of the lawyer has been questioned several times almost a century later.

Modern writers spoke of lawyers in less complimentary terms. The "over-membership" of lawyers in national and state legislatures was viewed by some as a conspiracy of the legal profession. Others view legal education in itself as a handicap rather than advantage in the deliberation processes of the higher political assemblies of the nation today. There are still others who claim that lawyers are attached to the upper classes or business to the extent that

they tend to tread upon rather than defend the rights of the individuals in the lower classes. Most of the elements of the controversy are present in the common concern over the "conservatism" of the legal mind. In the following paragraphs we shall discuss some of the elements of the controversy.

The legal mentality, if at all it exists, is said to be characterized by "hair splitting" and narrowness. One ex-professor in Congress, describing his lawyer-colleagues, sums up this argument in the following: "Too often the lawyer, hanging on every word and finding many meanings in every phrase, sees only the details and not the full scope of a bill."[1] The over-concern of the lawyer with language and technicalities may go beyond exasperating the lay-legislator to undue delay, and to constrain "legislative imagination." Quibbling about the letter of the law, if motivated for a political advantage, could be used to "talk a bill to death." After all, aren't lawyers masters of the delaying action? Conservatism also is said to arise from the nature of legal training. The legal mind is said to be preoccupied with the search for precedent and hence this

---

[1]Hacker, op. cit., p. 74.

tradition would tend to constrain creativity, innovation and change. Lundberg, cited earlier, sharply answers those who say that lawyers, by virtue of their practice and the fact that they base their arguments on historical precedent, are conservative. He said:

> While this is true [that lawyers and jurists use historical precedent] it is generally overlooked that lawyers, if required to, are just as able to quote precedent in support of rapid social innovation. . . . The appeal to history is not necessarily conservative; Karl Marx proved that.[1]

Liberal legislators with legal background are not difficult to find on the American scene. It is yet to be proven that lawyers' professional education truly affects their politics. It probably is easier to prove that lawyers' ideologies are determined more by the social class they belong to rather than by their legal background. One may easily cite, as an example, the Southern delegation to the Congress in support of the latter argument. Of the 106 Southern Representatives, 74 are lawyers by training. Once intent on resisting innovation they often used their legal training and skills to a decided advantage. If it is not education or class, could it be the lawyers' clients that affect the

---

[1] Lundberg, "The Legal Profession: A Social Phenomenon," p. 10.

alleged conservatism of the lawyer?

Lawyers' connection with big business is often used strongly in explaining their conservatism. It is not that the conservatism of the businessman is contagious; rather the serving of business interests makes the lawyer behave more cautiously. The lawyer's independence presumably is restricted by the nature of the retainer relationship between himself and the businessman. Naturally, it is argued, lawyers serving businessmen do represent the latter's interests both in and out of legislative assemblies. There is very little to support this common apprehension, although it is often referred to and is sometimes taken for granted. The problem is a carry-over from the basic difficulty of maintaining the independence of the lawyer in cases involving the ordinary citizen. At the political level, the concern again is due to the possibility that the lawyer may become overly occupied with defending business to the detriment of the interests of the common man.

The accusation that lawyers are generally conservative is often drawn on the basis of their behavior in Congress. The charge of conservatism becomes credible and serious in cases concerning the scope of government and constitutional issues concerning the Supreme Court functions with regard to civil liberties. The Jenner-Butler Bill is a

case in point. The purpose of the bill was to severely limit the Appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court over cases arising from the subversive-control laws of the states. The bill passed the House by a vote of 241 to 155 but was defeated in the Senate by a margin of one vote only. An investigation of the votes showed that the majority of the lawyer-legislators in both houses supported the bill while the majority of the lay-legislators opposed it.[1] Andrew Hacker, the latest critic of the lawyers in Congress, pointed to the role of the lawyer-legislator in the House Committee on Un-American Activities and charged that they forgot the fundamental commitments they are supposed to hold with regard to civil liberties. He further accused them of succumbing to public opinion pressures--sometimes more quickly than their lay colleagues--and thus failed to be the kind of barrier against the tyranny of the majority that De Tocqueville had hoped. What follows illustrates Hacker's charges:

> Most members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities . . . have been lawyers, yet they have been almost uniformly insensitive to suggestions that witnesses be permitted to cross-examine their accusers, or that innocence should be presumed until guilt is

---

[1] Hacker, op. cit., p. 74.

> proven. On the contrary, hearings have been televised, and committee members have felt free to combine the roles of judge, prosecutor and jury.
>
> Legislative investigations may not be "trials" in the formal sense, but they have the consequences of judicial proceedings for many who run afoul of them. If safeguards for witnesses are needed, the demand has been studiously ignored by the Congress. The members of investigating panels who have legal backgrounds give every indication of having left their professional credentials at the door when they began exposing the presumed misdeeds of subversives, trade-union officials, corporation executives and government employees.[1]

The concern over the conservatism of the lawyer and its possible consequences in everyday life calls for some systematic search in this area. Robert Agger, alerted to the problem, expressed the need for research as follows:

> The phenomenon of conservatism among lawyers to the extent it exists is not disturbing per se, but when political mechanisms for social change are monopolized by lawyers and become mechanisms for personal power and reward--whether harnessed to social change or to status quo--the great number and influence of lawyers in politics deserves to be questioned.[2]

There are no indications that the trend to recruit lawyers into political positions of importance is slowing down; rather, it is rapidly increasing. Some of these charges are often accepted on their face value yet evidence may prove that they are not warranted.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 75.

[2] Robert E. Agger, "The Lawyers in Politics," Temple Law Quarterly, XXIX (Summer, 1956), 439.

There are other sources of concern with regard to the lawyers' participation in politics. Beside the concern over the qualification of the lawyers' education and the entry of the "ethnics" into the legal profession, there is concern over the "correctness" of holding political office while maintaining legal practice. Many of the lawyer-legislators maintain their law offices back home. These circumstances precipitate at least two questions. Local ties may over-commit the lawyer to local interests and probably local machines to the extent that it might hinder his role in legislative assemblies and other political decision-making bodies. The other question is about the political lawyer's business. Is all business that comes his or his partner's way inspired by purely "disinterested motives"? The uproar that arose in 1964 with regard to this question in Albany, New York, attests to the seriousness of the problem.

Some social scientists have already begun to show interest in investigating some of these apprehensions. Most of their efforts have so far been limited to lawyers in public office or conducting survey studies on law students. These efforts nevertheless represent a start. Charles Hyneman and David Derge addressed themselves to the concern

over the fact that most legislative assemblies all over the country are predominantly made of lawyers. Is it a "conspiracy" on the part of lawyers and the legal profession?

Hyneman, in his study of the Houses of thirteen states cited earlier, indicated rather clearly that the "over-membership" of lawyers in these legislatures cannot be construed as over-representation. He stressed that "over-membership" is quite different from over-representation.[1] Thus apprehension over "the conspiracy" of lawyers and the legal profession was not much warranted. David R. Derge, on the basis of data drawn from two state legislatures, Illinois and Missouri (1955 and 1957), reported that there was no substantial cohesion in the voting behavior of lawyer-legislators, nothing that compares with farmer-legislators.[2] Lawyer-legislators did not react to policy decisions on the basis of professional identification. In contrast to other groups in these legislatures, lawyer-legislators showed more initiative in sponsoring bills.[3] The fact that lawyers were found sponsors of bills more often than non-lawyer-

---

[1] Hyneman, op. cit., p. 569.

[2] David R. Derge, "The Lawyer as Decision-Maker in the American State Legislature," Journal of Politics, XXI (1959), 408-33.

[3] Ibid., p. 424.

legislators does not by itself necessarily indicate a decided leadership role.

Further, both Hyneman and Derge addressed themselves to the question of conservatism.[1] The assumption that the "legal mind" should tend toward conservatism is not accepted. Hyneman found no evidence "to support the supposition that law practitioners, when considering legislation, are bound up by a precedent-mongering habit."[2] However, Derge also reported similar conclusions drawn on the basis of the voting behavior of lawyers on a number of issues that came to a vote. The often-made inference that lawyers are the "bastions of conservatism" was again rejected by Derge. He found no necessary relationship between the attitude of the state legislator and his professional training. "On the contrary," Derge said, "a tentative conclusion is that the political attitudes and behavior of lawyers are quite similar to those of the non-lawyers, and that the most significant difference is between political parties."[3] The contention that lawyer-

---

[1] H. J. Laski indicated as early as 1925 that "It is almost an inevitable characteristic of the legal mind that it should tend to conservatism." In A Grammar of Politics (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925), p. 572.

[2] Hyneman, op. cit., p. 579.

[3] Derge, op. cit., p. 431.

legislators should be more conservative than non-lawyer-legislators was also rejected by Eulau and Sprague, at least for the four legislatures they studied in 1957.[1] This writer will address himself to some of these questions to the extent possible. The data collected, however, do not allow any serious comparison between practicing lawyers and lawyer-legislators or non-lawyers mostly because of the limited sample studied and the differences in the methods used in the gathering of data.

Lawyers and Politics

The apprehensions concerning the image and position of lawyers in society and in politics discussed in this chapter point to the need for more systematic research. Without this kind of research it will be very difficult to go beyond speculation and simple common sense generalizations. Students of politics interested in assessing the impact of lawyers on the political decision-making process and the political system as such cannot make any progress without understanding the relation of lawyers to politics. In this section it may be appropriate to discuss briefly a few more-or-less speculative materials concerned with the

---

[1]Eulau and Sprague, op. cit., p. 19.

relation of lawyers to politics.

Max Weber suggested that lawyers will play an increasingly important role in Western democracies because of the compatibility of their profession and that of the modern politician. The basic compatibility of the two professions, according to Weber, derives from the lawyer's skill as a pleader.[1] The skill of pleading, he predicted, will fit very well with the need to sway large groups of people. Further, lawyers as pleaders may be especially instrumental in the functioning competition of pressure groups in a democracy. Yet pleading in the courtroom and the skill of oratory are waning characteristics of the modern and successful lawyer in the United States. Pleading is a necessary skill only in certain types of cases--e.g., criminal cases--and is a function of trial lawyers. Weber speculated further that lawyers may be economically "dispensable."[2] Riesman, referring to this concept, indicated that lawyers are able to give up the practice of law for another

---

[1] Max Weber, Politics as a Vocation," From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, ed. and trans. Hans H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), pp. 94, 95.

[2] Ibid., p. 85.

political job without losing much in the process.[1] Thus lawyers may be more dispensable than, for example, medical doctors. Lawyers may be in a better position to afford an interruption in their legal career than medical doctors, especially when they view politics as an instrument for social and occupational mobility. The concept of dispensability, as a tool of interpretation, seems to be an improvement over the "legal skills" hypothesis because it takes into account the work situation of the lawyer and implicitly the rewards of political involvement. These rewards, of course, may be perceived and evaluated differently by members of the legal and medical professions.

Schlesinger, in a study reported earlier, concluded on the basis of substantial evidence that the compatibility of the professions of law and politics "operate to the advantage of lawyers primarily when they are career politicians."[2] A career politician has to be a highly involved political worker with an eye to holding political office or simply an office-holder with an ambition to a higher office.

---

[1] David Riesman, "Introduction" to Stimson Bullitt's What It Means to be a Politician (New York, Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1959), pp. 11-24. (Mr. Bullitt is a lawyer and a politician. He makes very insightful observations as to how law as a profession "shelters" a politician!)

[2] Schlesinger, op. cit., p. 26.

On the basis of the same data, Schlesinger drew another significant conclusion. The advantage that the lawyer has in politics, he said, "derives not so much from generalized political skills as from specific legal skills which give him a monopoly of offices related to the administration of law in the court system."[1] These particular offices are those of "officers of the court," judgeships or public attorney. In practice these positions are filled by lawyers. These positions have also served as strategic steppingstones to higher and more general political offices in American politics.

In this dissertation, the writer will investigate the relation of lawyers to politics by examining the ecology of lawyers in practice and specifically their work situation and position in the hierarchy of the legal profession. The hypotheses stated in Chapter III are derived for the most part from findings and observations reported in the literature on the sociology of work and the professions particularly.

Some of these observations were reported in the preceding chapter. They stress the stratified structure of

---

[1] Ibid., p. 27.

the profession and indicate considerable differences between its upper and lower ranks. Considerable differences were found in the amount of the lawyers' earnings, clients, social origins and prestige. The gulf between the upper ranks and lower ranks of the profession is also widening because of the development of group practice in the form of law firms, the elaborate and differential recruitment practices of these firms, emphasis on specialization, and the entry of greater numbers of immigrants' children into the profession mostly via the "diploma mills." Some of the general characteristics of those in upper and lower ranks have already been described.

These differences, while perhaps not as dramatic in less metropolitan areas, may still be relevant to the understanding of how lawyers in the upper and lower ranks of the profession relate themselves to politics. In the literature one finds scattered observations that suggest the importance of variables such as work conditions and status in the hierarchy of the profession in determining behavior. C. Wright Mills, for instance, suggested that large firm lawyers, because of their connection with big business, would tend to be interested in national politics. He added that the interest of these lawyers in politics would often be spurred by their business relations and tend to be only a "means of

realizing its [the firm's] economic interest."[1] Lawyers in smaller firms, he said, would tend to be interested in state and local politics and would aspire to hold positions on the bench or other locally elected offices. Lower-level lawyers would tend to be engaged in activities confined to legal practice and making a living. There are other observers who suggested that lawyers who come from lower classes and who have attended less known schools would tend to be more active in politics than those who come from more privileged classes and have attended better known schools.[2] Some have hypothesized more specifically that lawyers would be active in different political arenas to the extent to which these arenas are perceived as useful for career advancements.[3]

These various observations impress upon the writer the importance of investigating the lawyers' work situation, status in the hierarchy of the profession and other aspects connected with the lawyers' background and political per-

---

[1] Mills, op. cit., pp. 121-29.

[2] Matthews, U.S. Senators and Their World, p. 53; see also, David Gold, "Lawyers in Politics: An Empirical Exploration of Biographical Data on State Legislators," Pacific Sociological Review, IV (Fall, 1961), 84-86.

[3] Walter I. Wardell and Arthur L. Wood, "The Extra-Professional Role of the Lawyers," The American Journal of Sociology, LXI (January, 1956), 306.

spectives. How the work situation and differences in status affect the lawyers' political behavior will be investigated in the light of empirical findings.

The apprehensions concerning the role of lawyers in society indicated in this chapter will also be discussed to the extent possible. Lawyers have been depicted by critics as either saints or sinners. The critics' approach tends to contribute to the lawyers' distorted image. In this work an attempt is made to examine some aspects of the lawyers' orientations for possible clues to their present unflattering image. What kind of lawyer is in fact conservative? And what kind of lawyer is actually manipulative or Machiavellian? In each case, however, the special tools used to determine these characteristics are still in the experimental stage.

CHAPTER III

HYPOTHESES, SAMPLE AND METHODS

As stated in Chapter I, the major concern of this dissertation is to understand the relation of lawyers to politics. The study will consider the relation of lawyers to politics by investigating some major aspects of the ecology of lawyers in practice rather than in political office. Lawyers have been studied before, but almost every time in their capacity as office-holders. The latest study on lawyers is that of Heinz Eulau and John D. Sprague entitled Lawyers in Politics: A Study in Professional Convergence.[1] The study is a by-product of a study on legislative behavior in four state legislatures. Thus it is based on a select group of office-holders among whom a certain proportion are lawyers. Lawyer-legislators are not necessarily representative of the large body of lawyers in the country or in the four states that were studied. In fact, lawyer-legislators might have different backgrounds, norms and

---

[1]This is now published under the same title by Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., New York, 1964.

perspectives than those dominant in the profession at large. There are other students of political science attempting to study the relation of lawyers to politics by studying the perspectives of law school students. Here again, while the approach could be useful, it cannot tell very much about how lawyers in practice relate themselves to politics. The ecology of student life is very much different than that of practice and the realities of making a living.

In this work the writer will make use of what might be called the "situational approach." This approach emphasizes the significance of studying lawyers in practice and how they relate themselves to politics while still at work. Thus the factors that suggest themselves by the use of this approach pertain mostly to the lawyers' work conditions, type of practice, years in practice, the type of cases they handle, etc. Such factors, although difficult to assess completely, would serve to determine to a large extent the political behavior and perspectives of lawyers. This approach could certainly be manipulated fruitfully by political scientists studying lawyer-politicians provided they trace back their backgrounds and the antecedent career stages through which they passed.

Further, the approach used here seems very much suited for studying members of professional groups partly

because it enables the researcher to investigate variations in behavior and perspectives that parallel each career stage or position in the hierarchy of professions. An investigation of lawyers along these lines is attempted in this work. In the following paragraphs this writer will offer a brief description of the nature of professional and occupational work in an attempt to delineate the underlying career structures through which professional men pass. This discussion will help explain how the hypotheses in this chapter were derived.

The Framework of Careers

Occupations generally and professions particularly have a built-in framework determined more or less by the nature of the division of labor and the labor market demands. Even in the state of flux that society finds itself, there seems to be a substantial measure of organization in the world of occupations and professions. In professions there are what corresponds to hierarchies of positions. These positions are the result of specialized functions, opportunities and channels that widen and narrow and sometimes change. Becker and Strauss, in referring to the latter emphasis, indicate:

> The occupations and organizations within which careers are made change in structure and direction

> of activity, expand or contract, transform purposes. Old functions and positions disappear and new ones arise. . . . Such occupational and institutional changes . . . present opportunity for both success and failure.[1]

Positions on top have different work conditions, work settings, tasks, clientele, and pay-offs than positions in the lower ranks. People recruited to the top positions may even come from certain groups or classes, better schools, or have had different work histories than those in the lower positions. Mobility within the hierarchy of the profession is also subject to restrictions and standards imposed on its members by the labor market, not to mention others laid down by the profession's exercise of its own mandate over affairs pertaining to it.[2] Thus it seems that in professions "the career of a man is worked out in some organized system without reference to which it cannot be described, much less understood. . . ."[3] Such an organized system is found in the legal profession.

---

[1]Howard S. Becker and Anselm L. Strauss, "Careers Personality and Adult Socialization," The American Journal of Sociology, LXII (November, 1956), 262.

[2]C. E. Hughes, "License and Mandate" in his Men and Their Work (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958), pp. 78-87.

[3]Ibid., "Preface," p. 9.

Careers in law can be classified into two categories or work settings, institutional and independent work settings.[1] Institutional work settings include employment in government and quasi-government agencies, teaching and academic life, private business, industry and labor unions. Independent work settings is comprised of private group practice (law firm) and private individual practice. These categories and the avenues within each constitute the formal opportunities for students of law. Choices to enter any of these work settings depends on the lawyer's specializations, quality of education, ambitions, differential recruitment practices and a host of other personal circumstances. Initial work stages in any of these work settings may be a form of temporary employment in business, government or a law firm. Decisions at the initial stage may affect the rest of one's career in law. A lawyer may decide to stay where he is; for others, it is the time to try to shift from one work setting to another. The majority often will turn into independent practice. Ambitious lawyers often wish to join an established group of lawyers in a firm, others choose to practice alone. Here again the recruitment

---

[1]Ladinsky, "Career Development among Lawyers . . . ," p. 37.

process is selective and often restrictive. Lucky are the lawyers who enter a firm for they enter into an established concern. The others who choose to put up a shingle vow to sweat and toil until they make it.

Career mobility lines in independent private practice can be frustrating. Passage from the initial stage of work to a relatively more defined stable stage can be difficult for those seeking to practice on their own. It often involves a shift or a movement from salaried to independent self-employment, where initial capital and contacts are difficult to come by. Similar problems of mobility may be encountered in group or firm work settings. The passage from the initial stage to a more stable stage within a firm can be equally frustrating unless the junior associate proves to be a particular asset to the senior members. Once a junior associate in a firm is successfully initiated into the status of junior membership, he is assured of a relatively stable practice and particular rewards.

As indicated in the literature, the legal profession is stratified. Those lawyers who are in firms and handling business cases tend to be in the upper echelons, whereas those in solo practice and handling domestic and personal injury cases comprise the majority of lower echelons. The differences between the upper and the lower echelons of the

profession may be specially dramatic in large metropolitan centers. In a smaller community these differences may not be as pronounced as one may expect from a review of the literature. Nevertheless, they do exist. In Ingham County, as will be indicated in Chapters IV and V, differences between solo and firm lawyers do exist in terms of income and type of cases they handle. Income and type of cases handled, however, are only two indicators of the variation in the positions of the hierarchy of the profession. There are other indicators that are equally important such as the size of the firm of partners, years in practice and whether lawyers are in full- or part-time practice. It is partly for this reason that this writer prefers to use "work situation" rather than solo or firm for describing the relative position of lawyers in the hierarchy of the Ingham Bar. In Chapter V the reader will find a more systematic discussion of this crucial variable. This brief description completed, the writer will restate the question to be investigated and the answers thereto in the form of testable hypotheses.

Hypotheses

The question to be investigated in this dissertation is this: Whether variations in the work situation of lawyers and their position in the hierarchy of the profession

affect their perception of the "expected utility" (i.e., value) of political rewards, degree of political activity and kinds of involvement, and possibly their personal political styles. The dependent variables contained herein will be discussed in greater detail in later chapters. It suffices at this point to indicate that political activity and kinds of political involvement will be measured by means of a modified version of Woodward and Roper's political activity index.[1] It will be discussed at length in Chapter IV.

Hypothesis I: The lawyers' degree of political activity is inversely related to their work situation and position in the hierarchy of the profession. In other words, lawyers in low-status work situations will tend to be more active in politics than those in higher-status work situations.[2] The underlying assumption is that lawyers in low-status work situations, who are expected to be often

---

[1]Julian L. Woodward and Elmo Roper, "Political Activity of American Citizens," American Political Science Review, XLIV (December, 1950), 872-76.

[2]Work situation refers to the work conditions in which a lawyer is "caught" or finds himself. The adjectives "low," "middle" or "high" describe the variations in the work conditions or the environment in which the lawyer operates. These work conditions determine also the relative status of the lawyer in the hierarchy of the profession. See Table V.2.

on-their-own, handling domestic and personal injury cases, in the initial or less stable stages of their careers, and with relatively low incomes, will perceive politics as an avenue for richer and steadier clients. Political activity could provide the publicity which a less established lawyer in the community may need badly. In addition to becoming known by prospective clients, politics offers the opportunity to meet the county and state officials and others interested in law enforcement.

Further, political involvement may be perceived as a vehicle for political advancement and holding office. Lawyers in low work situations may be particularly interested in holding local offices that might be used as a springboard for higher political offices. Needless to say that holding office at the local level would provide the lawyer considerable experience in the workings of the law in addition to access to community influentials and publicity--all of which are highly prized by less established lawyers.

Lawyers in high work situations often are men with long standing in the community, in more stable stages of their careers and hence would not be interested in attracting clients as much as maintaining their already going business in law and their more or less steady clients. If active in politics, these lawyers would be active through

channels different than those used by those in low work situations.

Hypothesis II: Lawyers in low-status work situations will be more active in political parties and groups that take a stand on public issues than lawyers in higher-status work situations. In party circles lawyers, in addition to becoming exposed to prospective clients, could meet party leaders face to face. Here less established lawyers seeking patronage would have the opportunity to assure the local party chiefs of their fidelity to the party. Lawyers in higher work situations may have already held a local office at one time or another and feel less compelled to join in relatively mundane hierarchical politics. They would rather contribute money and use other informal channels of influence to achieve their ambitions. The degree and kinds of political activities engaged in by lawyers in different work situations depend also on their evaluation of the rewards of public office.

Hypothesis III: Lawyers in low-status work situations will tend to attach higher value to the rewards of holding public office than do lawyers in high-status work situations. The rationale is the same as that offered to explain political activity (see Hypothesis I).

Hypothesis IV: Lawyers in low-status work situations will tend to perceive the utility of political rewards in tangible-material terms more often than lawyers in higher-status work situations. Lawyers in lower situations are expected to view politics and political rewards in tangible-material terms or personal gain (e.g., advancement of legal business, advertisement and business contacts to improve the quality of clients). Lawyers in high-status work situations are expected to perceive political rewards in intangible-symbolic terms (e.g., public and civic duty). It may further be hypothesized that those who view politics in tangible-material terms will tend to be more active in politics than those who perceive it in intangible-symbolic terms. It may be indicated at this point that both of these hypotheses could not be fully accepted. The manner in which lawyers perceive the utility of political rewards seems to be affected by the social class they come from rather than simply their work situation. Lawyers who come from upper or "status-stable" classes tend to perceive political rewards more in intangible-symbolic terms more often than those who come from the "newcomers." As will be indicated in Chapter VI, the data gathered does not permit investigating whether these differences in perception would reflect differences

in the motivation for political participation. In fact, the impression gained by this writer suggests that these lawyers are motivated to participate in politics more for practical reasons rather than ideological commitments.

Finally, an attempt will be made to investigate some aspects of the lawyers' orientations and "ideological" styles. This is an attempt to understand some of the apprehensions often voiced (see Chapter II) and to see whether concern is at all warranted. Are lawyers in lower-status work situations more Machiavellian and cynical than those in high-status work situations? Are lawyers in higher-status work situations and who service business clients more "conservative" than those who are in low-status work situations and who service poor clients? These questions will be investigated under Hypothesis V.

Hypothesis V: Lawyers' personal political styles are directly related to their work situation. That is, lawyers in low-status work situations are expected to be relatively more Machiavellian and cynical than those in high-status work situations. This may be due to the pressures that less established lawyers encounter in trying to pass to higher echelons in the profession. Those who are already in high positions may not be subject to such pressures any more.

The other aspects to be examined are whether lawyers in high-status work situations are, in fact, more conservative than those in low-status work situations and whether differences in the type of cases handled enter into this picture. Conservatism will be measured by an index developed by Michigan Survey Research Center specifically to test people's attitudes toward the scope of government and change. Lawyers in high-status work situations are expected to be more conservative than those in lower-status work situations partly because of the type of cases they handle (business-corporate-commercial) and partly because of the stable stage they have reached in their careers. This is often a stage when a lawyer is established and has an assured steady clientele. In this manner he might have a stake in maintaining the status quo.

Before concluding this section, the writer will indicate a final hypothesis that is incidental to this study, but which, nevertheless, lends support to the emphasis the writer puts on "work situation." The data collected for the purposes of this study permitted the testing of the following hypothesis: the political activity of lawyers is inversely related to their social class background. In other words, lawyers coming from lower social (or less privileged) class will tend to be more active in

politics than those coming from upper classes. As will be indicated in Chapter IV, this hypothesis was found unacceptable. It should be pointed out, nevertheless, that social background factors were found to conjoin other factors affecting certain perceptions held by Ingham lawyers. Thus social background factors cannot be totally discounted.

Research Sample and Methods

Most of the analysis in Chapters IV, V, and VI is based on data collected for the purpose of testing the above indicated hypotheses. These data were gathered from a sample of 144 practicing lawyers in Ingham County, Michigan, in the late spring and early summer of 1964. The sample comprised 89 percent of the total population of practicing lawyers of the county. A list of names of the lawyers was obtained mainly from the Lansing Area Telephone Directory and the 1964 Martindale-Hubble Law Directory.[1]

The decision to conduct this research in Ingham County rather than any other larger metropolitan area was due to the fact that the writer is more familiar with this

---

[1]This is a national directory of the legal profession. It tells whether the lawyer is in a firm or on his own. Further, it tells in code form the "rating" of the lawyer, year he entered the Bar, and sometimes gives an estimate of worth.

area than any other; and more important, financial limitations did not permit a more extensive survey in other remote areas.

The instrument of research was a structured interview schedule designed to elicit the responses to a variety of questions. The questionnaire was tested on a few lawyers in the city of Saginaw, about 70 miles northeast of Lansing. The testing stage was useful. The test lawyers were extremely helpful and suggested a rephrasing of some questions. Two firm lawyers, at the testing stage, gave their unsolicited contribution by timing the interviewer with the aid of stop watches they had fixed on their desks. This led to the elimination of a number of questions, thus cutting the interview time to a reasonable 55 minutes. Later, interviewing in Lansing was more pleasant and satisfactory partly due to this curtailment of the number of questions to be asked and partly because of an improved interviewing technique.

At the initial stage, that is, before going out into the field, the writer tried to enlist the support of the President of the Ingham County Bar Association. The latter refused to formally endorse the project but was made to appreciate and sympathize with the writer's

efforts.[1] The next step was to send to every lawyer a personal letter which had been signed by the Chairman of the Department of Political Science at Michigan State University.[2]

The letter explained the purpose of the research and introduced the writer to the individual lawyers. It also told them to expect a phone call from the interviewer to arrange an appointment to be held at their convenience. It further assured the lawyers of the privacy of the interview and that the contents would be strictly confidential. The letters were mailed in batches, a procedure intended to keep pace with the progress of the actual interviewing. It helped keep the letter and the purpose of the interview fresh in the minds of the lawyers. Judging by the response, the letter was very well received.

The actual interviewing went along satisfactorily and without serious delay. The organization of the interview consisted generally of the following sequence: the respondent was handed one or the other of two sets of

---

[1]The writer felt it was essential to get the confidence of this gentleman so that when lawyers called him for more information about the researcher he could allay their suspicions or fears. The writer insisted on interviewing him first, and did.

[2]See Appendix A.

colored, clipped sheets, on which were found the scale items (without any distinguishable order).[1] The respondent was asked to check the box that represented the degree of his agreement or disagreement with each statement. Next, he was asked a series of questions concerning his work situation, personal background, political activities and ambitions. Toward the end of the interview, the lawyer was handed the second set of colored sheets to complete. The last step was to hand him a white sheet with an income scale and ask if he would mind indicating his income. Only 6 percent of those interviewed refused to indicate the amount of their income. This system proved to be practical and efficient. The actual interviewing time ranged from half-an-hour to two hours. No stop watches were used. The interviewing itself had no boring moments. Most lawyers seemed to get a "big kick" from checking the two sets of colored sheets. It was interesting to the interviewer to watch these lawyers argue aloud with the scale items, "split hairs," and sometimes rip the items apart.

The total job of interviewing was finished in about two months (April 20, 1964, to June 20, 1964). In the first

---

[1]See Questionnaire in Appendix B.

month over 50 percent of the lawyers were interviewed by the writer. For the purpose of interviewing 162 lawyers in the county, the writer enlisted the services of a "veteran interviewer," a lady with considerable charm and experience.[1] After some coaching and supervision of the first two interviews, which she conducted on a trial basis, she was on her own. The two of us were able to complete the rest of the interviewing before June 20, 1964. Only 18 lawyers (11 percent) were not interviewed. Some of these lawyers were out of the state on business or on their summer vacations. Only one lawyer refused to permit an appointment to be interviewed.

The sample of lawyers interviewed consisted of 71 in solo practice, 15 employed (or serving as junior members of law firms) and 58 in group practice. Some differences in work situation between firm and solo lawyers were apparent. Offices of firm lawyers were more impressive, carpeted and well furnished. Solo lawyers, except for a few, were less impressive. It was common to find two and sometimes three lawyers in a suite with one secretary serving them.

In the following chapter the writer will discuss in greater detail the outstanding context in which Ingham lawyers operate, their social and political background and the degree to which they are active in politics.

---

[1]The Department of Political Science at Michigan State University helped pay for her employment.

CHAPTER IV

INGHAM LAWYERS: SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND AND POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT

In this chapter the writer will discuss the context in which lawyers in the sample operate, the general composition, and character of a legal career in Ingham County. In the later sections of this chapter the writer will discuss how the political activity of Ingham lawyers was measured and will also report some preliminary results concerned particularly with the lawyers' degree and kinds of political involvement.

Lawyers in this county seem to be fairly active in politics and especially at the local level. This general result, in the absence of comparative data, will be more understandable after the context in which the lawyers operate has been described. Thus the discussion below seems very necessary because it underscores the uniqueness of the political situation and the opportunities for a successful legal business in the area.

The Context: Ingham County

Almost all practicing lawyers in Ingham County reside in Lansing, the state capital, and East Lansing, which is a university town. Because it is the capital of Michigan, the city of Lansing is the center of considerable political activity. It is the seat of the state government administration, the legislature and higher courts. In addition to the city government, the city houses the offices of the Ingham County Prosecuting Attorney. It also serves as an alternate to Mason as the county seat. Both the Democratic and Republican parties have their headquarters in Lansing. The presence of all these political bodies generates unique political opportunities for involvement and political alertness. Thus it is possible that lawyers in this city do operate in a political situation that is not typical even for cities of the same size. A political situation of this kind offers Lansing lawyers considerable exposure to officeholders and administrative officials and perhaps opportunities to perform a linkage function between the people and their representatives and government bureaucracy. Via lawyers, interest groups, businessmen and individuals can operate to influence decision-makers in the vicinity. Needless to say, at the same time the lawyers themselves can benefit in the process. The benefits can be in the form

of increased legal business or political advantage.

Ingham County is predominantly Republican and the degree of competitiveness between the two parties is low at this level.[1] The Republican party is well intrenched in the county. In fact, Lansing has been a safe Republican stronghold in almost all national elections. In the 1962 national election, the Republicans captured 61.1 percent of the votes in the city and 63.1 percent of the county.[2] Moreover, all the elected offices at the county level are captured regularly by the Republican party. Further, the Republicans are considerably better organized than the Democrats. In the city there exists a very active and influential Young Republican Club and other Republican dominated civic groups. The Democrats, in contrast, have no continuously active extra-party organization. The Young Republican Club assumes special importance in this predominantly Republican county. In fact, many lawyers in the sample indicated some connection with this organization at present or in the past. At the city level elections are

---

[1]Leo F. Kennedy, "Attitudes of Precinct Chairmen Toward Party Organization" (unpublished Master's dissertation, Department of Political Science, Michigan State University, East Lansing), p. 31.

[2]*Ibid*., Table I.

officially "non-partisan"; nevertheless, there are indications that the Republican party organization in this city takes an interest in city candidates and lends a helping hand.[1] The political situation at the county and city levels, it appears, limits the opportunities of the Democrats and definitely enhances the position of the Republicans. The offices most desired at this level (e.g., City Attorney and the Assistant City Attorney, the County Prosecuting Attorney and about ten Assistant Prosecuting Attorneys, and Municipal and other local judgeships) have been captured by Republican lawyers. The Democratic lawyers in Lansing have better chances of getting patronage from office-holders at the state level. These may be in the form of "chores" to be done for Democratic legislators, business via the office of the Secretary of State and possibly appointments in the Attorney General's Office.[2] The latter two offices have been occupied by prominent Democrats.

The economic activity in the city is equally advantageous for a lucrative legal business. The City of

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 29 and 30.

[2] The writer came across two lawyers who were taking time off to help in the preparation of campaign material for an elected state officer.

Lansing is an expanding industrial and commercial center. It has a population of approximately 113,058 and a labor force of slightly more than 75,000.[1] In 1960, the government employees comprised 20 percent of the labor force of the city. Approximately as much as 27 percent were employed in automobile and metal manufacturing (Oldsmobile, Fisher Body, Motor Wheel, Reo and John Bean).[2] Except for forges and auto part plants, these large industries are absentee-owned. As a center of commerce and trade the city has, in addition, many business companies and numerous retail stores. It has a very active Chamber of Commerce. In the city are located the headquarters of various state, business, labor and professional associations, including the Michigan Bar Association.

The next largest city in the county is East Lansing with a population of approximately 30,000; Mason, the county seat, Williamston and Leslie follow with a population less than 5,000 each.[3]

---

[1]William H. Form and W. L. Sauer, Community Influentials in a Middle-Sized City: A Case Study, General Bulletin No. 5 (East Lansing: The Labor and Industrial Relations Center, Michigan State University, 1960), pp. 1 and 2.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Population statistics are from the 1964 Directory compiled and published by the Ingham County Clerk. See p. 27.

The city of Lansing may differ from some other middle-size cities in the east and midwest in that it has a relatively small minority of foreign-born and Negro workers. These groups constitute about 10 percent of the city population. As much as 66 percent of the native born are descendants of New England migrants and later German immigrants.[1] The community "influentials" are, for the most part, successful businessmen with wide contacts and are generally college-educated. Seven-tenths of the manual workers own their homes. Generally, the city is an attractive place because of its relatively small size and its community atmosphere. Similar views were expressed by others who did research in this city.[2] Many of the lawyers who have recently moved to the city and were interviewed in this study expressed concurring views.

Ingham County Lawyers:
A Profile

Lawyers practicing in Ingham County are not typical of others practicing in similar middle-size cities. While the career pattern may be generally similar to patterns in

---

[1]Form and Sauer, op. cit., pp. 2 and 3.

[2]Ibid.

other cities, the chances for success seem to be better here partly because of the size and the general political and economic situation described above. Lawyers in solo practice constituting 49.31 percent are the largest single group though not to the extent as is often the case in large metropolitan centers. Lawyers in partnership (firms) constitute as much as 40.28 percent and those employed or "associated" are only 10.42 percent. In the city there are as many as seventeen firms ranging in size from two to eight partners. Only two firms may be considered relatively large in the city of Lansing. Each of the large firms has 7-8 "members." The next two largest are firms with 5-6 members and as many as ten with 3-4 members and only three firms with less than 3 partners. The two firms consisting of 5-6 members had just recently become incorporated. Some firms, with the exception of the top four, practice as a partnership in certain law cases and not in others. This led the writer to take note that some lawyers in a group may operate under "assumed-name" giving the appearance of incorporation while in fact there is none. These "firms" are referred to, nevertheless, as incorporated firms partly because of the difficulty of checking the correctness of

their claims.[1] The majority of the employed or junior associates are employed by the larger firms and often are new graduates or in the initial stages of their careers; at least two are sons of senior members.

Lawyers in Ingham County may also be relatively more successful than lawyers practicing in similar size cities. At least in terms of income, lawyers on their own in this county seem to earn considerably more than $6,100, the national average income of lawyers in similar type of practice (1955).[2] In Ingham only as much as 18.18 percent of those in solo practice earned less than $10,000 (see Table IV.2 below). In the absence of income statistics that permit useful comparisons it may be appropriate to discuss the relative income of lawyers in the sample by

---

[1]In the last stages of the interviewing the writer realized variations in the responses to questions designed to determine the nature of those in group practice and the relation of lawyers in a firm to each other. The question asked was "Do you share fees?" In the same group or firm some answered "yes," others "no." After investigation it was found that some of these lawyers operate under what they call "assumed name." This is one reason why in Chapter V "work situation" becomes a more useful concept than work setting or type of practice as such.

[2]The figure for the national average is cited in Daniel J. Cantor, "An Economic Comparison of Lawyers in Private Practice," New York State Bar Journal, XXXIII (1961), 448.

relating it to the years in practice or what will be referred to hereafter as career "work stages." Lawyers who have been in practice 1-5 years are estimated by the writer to be in the "initial stage" of their legal career; those who have been in practice for more than 6 years and less than 15 are in their "transitory" or "transitional stage" and those who have been in practice for 16 or more years are considered to have entered the "stable stage." A cross correlation of income and years in practice shows that income is directly related to years in practice or work stage. The majority (54.55 percent) of those who are still in the initial stages of their career have relatively low income (less than $10,000) compared to those in the transitional (7.55 percent) and those in the stable stages (10.42 percent). It has been possible in Lansing for as much as 33.33 percent of those in the initial stage to earn middle-size incomes (between $10,000 and $19,000) and for as much as 12.12 percent to go beyond the $20,000 mark (see Table IV.1).[1]

---

[1]The fact that only 24.63 percent of the lawyers have been in practice less than five years and that the majority have been in practice for many more years indicates that the rate of turnover may be as low as 3-6 lawyers a year. This suggests that a career in law in this area can be quite steady.

TABLE IV.1.--Lawyers' income and career stages.*

	Initial Stage 3-5 yrs.	Trans. Stage 6-15 yrs.	Stable Stage 16 yrs. and over	Total
Low (less than $10,000)	54.55 (18)	7.55 (4)	10.42 (5)	20.15 (27)
Middle ($10,000-$19,000)	33.33 (11)	54.72 (29)	35.42 (17)	42.54 (57)
High ($20,000 or over)	12.12 (4)	37.74 (20)	54.17 (26)	37.31 (50)
	24.63 (33)	39.55 (53)	35.82 (48)	100.00 (134)

$r = .42$ $p < .001$

*Excluded from this table are 10 cases whose income was not ascertained. For tests of statistical significance see Appendix F.

The differences in income between those in solo practice and those in firms exist. Table IV.2 shows that as much as 59.26 percent of those who are members in law firms earn incomes beyond the $20,000 level, whereas only 27.27 percent of those in solo practice go beyond this mark. The differences are not as dramatic as the case may be in large metropolitan centers or other middle-sized cities. Lawyers who are associates or employed may hardly reach the high income bracket without becoming senior members or transfer into a different work setting.

TABLE IV.2.--Lawyers' income and work setting.*

Income	Solo	Associate	Firm	Total
Low (less than $10,000)	18.18 (12)	64.29 (9)	11.11 (6)	20.15 (27)
Middle ($10,000-$19,000)	54.55 (36)	35.71 (5)	29.63 (16)	42.54 (57)
High ($20,000 or over)	27.27 (18)	00.00 (0)	59.26 (32)	37.31 (50)
	49.25 (66)	10.45 (14)	40.30 (54)	100.00 (134)
$r = .23$	$p < .05$			

*Excluded from this table are 10 cases whose incomes were not ascertained: 5 are solo, 1 associate and 4 firm members.

The types of cases handled by lawyers in Lansing are fairly varied. It was possible, however, to classify the lawyers in the sample on the basis of the majority of cases they find themselves handling most of the time. Under "domestic" were classified lawyers who handle mostly personal injury cases, divorce, criminal, inheritance and labor cases. Under "business" were classified lawyers who handle will-probate-estate, real estate, business, insurance companies, industrial concerns and the like. The difference in income between lawyers handling mostly domestic cases

and those handling mostly business is present but again is not as dramatic as the case may be in large metropolitan centers. Table IV.3 shows that as much as 27.27 percent of those found handling mostly domestic cases earn less than $10,000 while only 10.53 percent handling mostly business cases earn similar incomes.

TABLE IV.3.--Lawyers' income and type of cases handled.

Income	Domestic	Business	Total
Low (less than $10,000)	27.27 (21)	10.53 (6)	20.15 (27)
Middle ($10,000-$19,000)	41.56 (32)	43.86 (25)	42.54 (57)
High ($20,000 or over)	31.17 (24)	45.61 (26)	37.31 (50)
	57.46 (77)	42.54 (57)	100.00 (134)

$r = .21$ $p < .05$

The size of the firm, as indicated in the literature, affects the amount of income earned by the members. This holds equally true in Lansing. The larger the firm, the higher the income of the partners (see Table IV.4).

TABLE IV.4.--Lawyers' income and size of law firm.*

Income	2 Members	3-4 Members	5-6 Members	7-8 Members	Total
Low (less than $10,000)	40.00 (2)	6.90 (2)	16.67 (1)	7.14 (1)	11.11 (6)
Middle ($10,000- $19,000)	60.00 (3)	31.03 (9)	50.00 (3)	7.14 (1)	29.63 (16)
High ($20,000 or over)	00.00 (0)	62.07 (18)	33.33 (2)	85.71 (12)	59.26 (32)
	9.26 (5)	53.70 (29)	11.11 (6)	25.93 (14)	100.00 (54)

$r = .30$ $p < .05$

*Excluded are 4 members whose income was not ascertained; 1 from a 2-member firm, 2 from 3-4, and 1 from 5-6 member firms.

The overall picture of the Ingham Bar thus far suggests a career in law in this county is a fairly lucrative business. The expanding economy of the area together with the fact that it is the center for considerable business and political activity does, in fact, provide the lawyer enviable opportunities for legal business and a steady career life. For a more complete profile of the Ingham Bar the writer will describe briefly the social and political composition of its members.

The majority of lawyers come from white Anglo-Saxon stock and belong to third- or old-generation Americans. Only 13 percent are only second-generation Americans (i.e., father was born in Canada, Greece or Lebanon). There are only 3 Negro lawyers and 4 Jewish lawyers in the area. In terms of religious affiliation, Protestants make 71 percent of the total sample, Catholics 22 percent and others 7 percent. As much as 34.03 percent of the lawyers come from traditionally upper classes (i.e., sons of lawyers, clergymen, engineers, physicians and other professionals); 30.56 percent come from a middle class background (i.e., sons of businessmen or executives, government officials and proprietors); and 35.42 percent come from lower middle and working classes (i.e., sons of clerical workers, sales persons, small farm owners, craftsmen, machine operators, laborers and service workers). In terms of age, lawyers in this area are generally young. As much as 23.61 percent are less than 35 years of age, 36.81 percent are between 35-44, 18.06 percent between 45-54, and 21.53 percent are over 55. Thus, as in most midwestern, middle-sized cities, the Ingham Bar does not have a great representation of ethnic groups and is not comprised mainly from the ranks of any one social class.

In terms of their legal education, almost all of the lawyers in the area hold a Bachelor of Laws degree (LL.B.) in addition to at least three years of college or a college degree. Those practicing without a degree (4 percent) have been admitted to the Bar only after they studied under a competent preceptor. Unlike metropolitan centers, lawyers in the Lansing area have attended mostly local yet well-recognized law schools in the State of Michigan. As much as 63 percent are graduates of the University of Michigan, 23 percent from three Detroit law schools, 12 percent from local schools situated in other states, and only 2 percent come from Ivy League colleges.

Politically, 70 percent of the lawyers in Ingham belong to the Republican party and find in the Young Republican Club a place to meet and interact especially when no elections are near. The Democrats (30 percent) are not only in the minority but have no extra-party organization that unites them. In fact, the political climate is such that many lawyers can derive considerable advantage from being or becoming Republican. As noted earlier, the offices that lawyers would be especially interested in (law enforcement) at the city and county levels have been virtually monopolized by Republican lawyers. This political situation induces lawyers to shift their political affiliation toward the

Republican party because of the opportunities which might open. Actually as many as 18.75 percent of the lawyers interviewed recalled changing their political affiliation from Democratic to Republican somewhere along the line from the time of their graduation or upon entering practice. Only 5.56 percent reported a change in the opposite direction. The Republican climate leaves little doubt as to why some lawyers shifted from the Democratic to the Republican party. The change in the opposite direction is difficult to explain without more research.

The majority of lawyers in the county, it is important to note, have held a political job of one kind or another. In fact, as much as 64.58 percent reported having held a political job mostly in the office of the Prosecuting Attorney of the County, also as members of political committees or boards and positions in political party organizations. These positions, and particularly top county offices, seem to be perceived by lawyers as a springboard for an improved legal career or possibly for political advancement. This important finding will be further discussed in Chapter V.

It was indicated above that lawyers who recently moved into this area expressed satisfaction with the relatively small size of the city and its community atmosphere. Another source of satisfaction is the low degree of competition

among the lawyers themselves. The lawyers interviewed were asked if the bar were overcrowded. The majority of 82.64 percent of the total sample did not agree that the bar is overcrowded or becoming that way. This result indicates that lawyers in this area are possibly more satisfied than lawyers in large metropolitan centers where many lawyers were found to be dissatisfied with their work conditions and general work situation.[1]

The following section consists of a description of the instrument used to measure the political activity of lawyers. It also includes some preliminary results obtained by the instrument after certain adjustments were added to it.

Measurement of Political Activity

Political activity refers to the behavior of individuals and groups in their struggle for a favorable distribution of perceived rewards.[2] It involves participation in the decision-making processes of the political system at

---

[1]The question asked was in the form of statement to which lawyers were asked to express their degree of agreement or disagreement. It is this: "The bar is becoming overcrowded every day."

[2]Lewis A. Froman, Jr. People and Politics (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962), p. 15.

various levels and through various channels. Further, political activity may be expressed in various degrees of intensity ranging from simple "concern," "caring," and limited interest to a more intensive state of involvement and actual participation. It may also be expressed in limited spheres of action or in more extensive and varied arenas. Thus some persons may be satisfied to cast their ballot on the day of election of political candidates while others do more than simply vote. The latter may join political organizations, contribute money and labor, and seek election themselves. Nevertheless, the perceived rewards expected from political activity are varied and sometimes ambiguous; but they do exist. They are the motivating force no matter what their origins nor how expressed.

"Political activity" is a very common phrase in the literature yet it is one that is difficult to define conclusively. It certainly is difficult to operationalize. So far there is not one standardized list of items or set of indicators by means of which it can be measured satisfactorily.[1] For the purposes of this study the writer chose

---

[1]The failure of several such attempts are cited in William Buchanan's article, "An Inquiry Into Purposive Voting," The Journal of Politics, XVIII (1956), 281-96.

to use Woodward and Roper's Index of Political Activity, though not without some adjustments. It was chosen mainly because two features commend it. First, it was administered to a national cross-sectional sample of citizenry in an interview situation.[1] Thus it has a measure of reliability and offers some opportunity for comparison. The second and more important reason lies in its adaptability. The authors utilized a system of weighting that may be subject to modifications and adjustments.

Woodward and Roper's Index consists of seven questions that measure the citizen's use of five possible "channels" of influence on legislators and government officials. These channels are: (1) voting at the polls; (2) supporting possible pressure groups by being a member of them; (3) personally communicating directly with Congressmen; (4) aiding in the election of legislators and thus acquiring claims on them; (5) engaging in habitual dissemination of political opinions through word-of-mouth communication to other citizens.[2] The answers to the questions were

---

[1]The questions were first tested in a pilot study with a national sample of 500 and the final list was administered to a national sample of 8,000 respondents designed to be representative of the adult population.

[2]Woodward and Roper, op. cit., pp. 872-73.

assigned score points or weights that could be easily added up in a manner to determine the cumulative score. The score points range from zero to twelve (see Table IV.5).

A brief inspection of Woodward and Roper's instrument would suggest some comments that are important to remember regarding its nature and the interpretation of the information it elicits. The questions are too broad. They control for minimum activities done over a previous four-year period rather than the present. Further, consistent with their objectives, the authors over-emphasized "voting" over all others. Yet they have ignored or touched only tangentially on participation in political parties. Participation in party activities or hierarchy is political activity par excellence. It spells a clear channel of influence and constitutes possible training grounds for a political career. Finally, it may be necessary to remember that some data collected through this instrument, especially from a population such as lawyers, may carry meanings different than those collected from laymen in doorstep interviews. The following question asked is an example:

> Have you ever written or talked to your Congressman or Senator or other public officials to let them know what you would like them to do on a public issue you were interested in?

TABLE IV.5.--Scoring system for political activity index.

	Score Points Credited	Total Possible Score for Channel
Voting		
Once or more in last four years	1	
Three times or more	1	3
Five times or more	1	
Discussing Public Issues with Others		
Discusses frequently and takes an equal share in the conversation	1	
Discusses frequently and usually tries to convince others he is right	1	2
Belonging to Organizations That Take Stands on Public Issues		
Belongs to one or more such organization	1	
Belongs to two or more	1	2
Written or Talked to Congressman or Other Public Official to Give Own Opinion on a Public Issue		
One or more times in the past year	1	
Two or more times in past year	1	2
Worked for Election of a Political Candidate in Last Four Years	2	2
Contributed Money to a Party or Candidate in Last Four Years	1	1
Total Possible Score		12

Source: Julian L. Woodward and Elmo Roper, "Political Activity of American Citizens," American Political Science Review, XLIV (December, 1950), p. 876.

Positive answers from lawyers to this question indicate their personal interest and more. Lawyers often represent their clients' interest in addition to their own. Lawyers may often enter into a retainer relationship with some of their clients and speak to "public officials" about certain issues even when not so requested by their clients. Lawyers serving in such capacities are known and often are their business references. Further discussion of this point will be continued in the next chapter. In the following paragraphs the writer will explain how the Woodward and Roper instrument was adapted for the purposes of this study.

Woodward and Roper's Political Activity Index: Results

Before indicating the adjustments applied to Woodward and Roper's Index, the writer will present the results obtained by the instrument in its original form. Applying the same scoring methods and classification categories used by its authors, the Index points out a dramatic disparity between the political activity of Ingham lawyers and that of the national population. The "Very Active" comprise 86.11 percent of the lawyers and only 10.30 percent of the national population of 1950 (see Table IV.6). This wide disparity in itself is significant in that it directs attention to the need for further investigation of the

dynamics of political participation in general and of lawyers in particular.

TABLE IV.6.--Ingham lawyers and national sample of citizens.

Scoring	Percentage Lawyers (1964)		Percentage Nat'l. Sample (1950)	
12	8.33		0.10	
11	15.28		0.30	
10	17.36	Very Active (86.11%)	0.70	Very Active (10.30%)
9	15.28		1.20	
8	13.19		1.60	
7	9.03		2.40	
6	7.64		4.00	
5	6.25	Active (10.42%)	6.50	Active (16.80%)
4	4.17		10.30	
3	2.08		15.60	
2	0.69	Inactive (3.46%)	19.00	Inactive (72.90%)
1	0.69		19.10	
0	0.00		19.20	

Woodward and Roper's summary statistics permit further comparison between Ingham lawyers and other sub-groups in the national sample; e.g., the well-to-do (those belonging to Economic Level "A," "Executives," and "Professionals"). Here again, percentage differences are impressive. The percentage of the "Very Active" in the Economic Level "A" group is 36 percent, in the "Executives" it is 34 percent, and in the "Professionals" it is only 31 percent (see Table IV.7).

TABLE IV.7.--Ingham lawyers and selected sub-groups in national sample.

Woodward and Roper's Political Activity	Professionals	Executives	Economic Level A	Ingham Lawyers
Very Active	31%	34%	36%	86.11%
Active	32%	29%	33%	10.42%
Inactive	37%	37%	31%	3.46%

It would have been interesting if similar data were available on specific groups of professional men such as medical doctors, college professors, journalists, realtors or even insurance men. Further comparisons are necessary especially between lawyers practicing in small and medium-sized towns and those practicing in larger metropolitan centers.

Unfortunately, until such studies are available there is little data on which to base comparisons of Ingham lawyers. The study undertaken herein, it is hoped, is a step in the right direction.

Modified Version of Woodward and Roper's Index

For the purposes of this study, the writer found it necessary to introduce two changes to the above described instrument. The immediate purpose of these changes was to increase the discriminating power of the instrument. The first adjustment was to add a question of two parts. This question is: "Are you presently involved in any political activities?" and (if "yes"), "What activities?" Lawyers replying "yes" got one point bonus and those replying "no" got one point less. The point gained or lost was added or subtracted from the subject's original score, that obtained by Woodward and Roper's instrument. Thus, if Joe Doe's original score was 9 and if he answered "yes" to the first part of the above question, the final score for this subject would be 10. The operation, in other words, is that the original score ± 1 equals the final score. Beside the element of the time dimension there are at least two more advantages. First, this addition helps the researcher to know what the respondent understands by the phrase

"politically active" as it might mean something slightly different from that carried in the Index. In fact it did. Almost everyone asked understood it to mean some connection with a political party. There is also the advantage of adding to the Index a measure of the respondent's personal evaluation of his own relation to politics. The second advantage is in the attempt to counter-balance the over-emphasis given to "voting" in the instrument. The second part of the question, as will be noted later, offers the opportunity of developing an index of political participation in party activities and institutions as a counter-point to the overall Index.

The second adjustment involves moving the cutting points upward. Woodward and Roper classified as "Very Active" those who scored as little as 6 points out of a possible 12. This seems to be a generous classification.[1] It cannot be justifiably applied to lawyers and specially for the purpose of this study. The writer chose arbitrarily to classify lawyers scoring 10-13 points as "Very Active," 7-9 as "Moderately Active" and 6 or lower as

---

[1]Alfred DeGrazia suggests adjustment of the Index by raising the score from 6 to 9 points. For his comments see his Politics and Government, Vol. I: Political Behavior (New York: Collier Books, 1962), pp. 108-10.

"Relatively Inactive" (see Table IV.8). In the following pages the results obtained by the modified version of the Index will be described in simple summary statistics.

TABLE IV.8.--Ingham County lawyers distribution of political activity scores

Score Points	No. of Respondents	Percent of Total Sample	Cumulative Percent	
13	10	6.94	6.94	Very Active (38.19%)
12	17	11.81	18.75	
11	16	11.11	29.86	
10	12	8.33	38.19	
	55			
9	19	13.19	51.38	Moderately Active (36.11%)
8	19	13.19	64.57	
7	14	9.72	74.29	
	52			
6	9	6.25	80.54	Relatively Inactive (25.69%)
5	10	6.94	87.48	
4	9	6.25	93.73	
3	5	3.47	97.20	
2	3	2.08	99.38	
1	1	0.69	00.00	
	37			
	144			

Adjusted Political Activity Index: Results

In order to test the thesis that lawyers' political activity varies with variations in their work situation, the writer decided to use the Woodward and Roper Index with the modifications made above.

Using the adjusted version of the overall Index discussed, 38.19 percent of Ingham lawyers are found to be Very Active, 36.11 percent Moderately Active, and 25.69 percent Relatively Inactive. Tables IV.9-14 show the distribution of the kinds of activities undertaken by the "Very Active," "Moderately Active" and the "Relatively Inactive" groups. As generally expected, Very Active lawyers tend to vote more frequently than those that are either Moderately Active or the Inactive. The Very Active have contributed money and effort to aid candidates of their choice to be elected at least once over the past four-year period. They belong to more groups that take a stand on some public issues. It is true, however, that these groups are not necessarily political. They have written or talked to their Congressmen and other public officials about issues of interest to them more than once in the past year and certainly more often than those classified as inactive. The personal style of the Very Active seems to set them apart from their inactive colleagues. They have a contentious predisposition and often are not satisfied to be listeners only. Instead, they become involved in discussing political issues and frequently attempt to convince others of their points of view.

TABLE IV.9.--Overall political activity by voting (percentage across)

Degree of Political Activity	3 Times or Less	More Than 3 Times	Totals
Inactive	62.16 (23)	37.84 (14)	100% (37)
Active	19.23 (10)	80.77 (42)	100% (52)
Very Active	05.45 (3)	94.55 (52)	100% (55)
Total	36	108	144

TABLE IV.10.--Overall political activity by discussion of public issues.

Degree of Political Activity	Occasionally	Frequently & Equal	Frequently to Convince	Totals
Inactive	78.38 (29)	18.92 (7)	2.70 (1)	100% (37)
Active	34.62 (18)	38.46 (20)	26.92 (14)	100% (52)
Very Active	16.36 (9)	32.73 (18)	50.91 (28)	100% (55)
Total	56	45	43	144

TABLE IV.11.--Overall political activity by belonging to organizations.

Degree of Political Activity	None	One	2 or More	Totals
Inactive	78.38 (29)	16.22 (6)	5.41 (2)	100% (37)
Active	48.08 (25)	40.38 (21)	11.54 (6)	100% (52)
Very Active	7.27 (4)	36.36 (20)	56.36 (31)	100% (55)
Total	58	47	39	144

TABLE IV.12.--Overall political activity by times written or talked to legislator or other public officials.

Degree of Political Activity	None	Twice or More	Totals
Inactive	45.95 (17)	54.05 (20)	100% (37)
Active	9.62 (5)	90.38 (47)	100% (52)
Very Active	00.00 (0)	100.00 (55)	100% (55)
Total	22	122	144

TABLE IV.13.--Overall political activity and working for the election of candidates in past 4 years.

Degree of Political Activity	No	Yes	Totals
Inactive	45.95 (17)	54.05 (20)	100% (37)
Active	23.08 (12)	76.92 (40)	100% (52)
Very Active	3.64 (2)	96.36 (53)	100% (55)
Total	31	113	144

TABLE IV.14.--Overall political activity and money contributions to political candidates.

Degree of Political Activity	No	Yes	Totals
Inactive	37.84 (14)	62.16 (23)	100% (37)
Active	11.54 (6)	88.46 (46)	100% (52)
Very Active	3.64 (2)	96.36 (53)	100% (55)
Total	22	122	144

The relation of lawyers to political parties offers some interesting results.[1] In spite of the fact that there is a considerably significant correlation between political activity, as measured by the overall Index, and actual participation in political parties, there are some differences that are clearly suggested. An inspection of Table IV.15 shows that the overall Index picked up a substantial number of lawyers who admitted no participation in any serious party activities (73.08 percent of those classified as Moderately Active and 14.55 percent of the Very Active). These differences can be accounted for by the fact that the overall Index does not emphasize party action per se as it does other activities. Yet party participation is very much part of the dependent variable that is under examination, political behavior. The differences noted above suggest that a good many lawyers have not, of late, belonged

---

[1]The political activity of lawyers in political parties was determined on the basis of data gathered by the following question: "Are you involved in any political activities now?" "If 'yes,' what activities?" All those who claimed to be active were active in party politics. Of those classified as "active in party," 17.36 percent indicated that they are active in party clubs or presently passing petitions around to collect signatures, and as much as 27.08 percent indicated involvement in party hierarchy--precinct captains, ward chairmen and delegates, etc. The rest, 55.56 percent, admitted no connection with political parties. These were classified as inactive in party.

to party clubs or hierarchies and have scarcely participated in the circulation of petitions for judges or party candidates. Yet they seem to vote frequently, belong to both civic and political groups and have learned to use other channels of influence such as letter-writing, personally contacting public officials, and contributing to the political funds of candidates for office.

TABLE IV.15.--Overall political activity and participation in political party organization.

Degree of Political Activity	Inactive in Political Parties	Active in Political Parties	Totals
Inactive	91.89 (34)	8.11 (3)	100% (37)
Active	73.08 (38)	26.92 (14)	100% (52)
Very Active	14.55 (8)	85.45 (47)	100% (55)
Total	80	64	144

Political Activity and Personal Background

Political activity as measured above does not seem to be related to a number of socio-economic factors that often are expected to affect behavior. The writer hypothesized that lawyers coming from less privileged groups or classes

will tend to be more active in politics than those from privileged groups. The data on lawyers indicate that background factors such as father's political participation, occupational status, level of education and religion do not in fact affect political activity significantly. The null hypotheses concerning the independence of political activity from each of these socio-economic factors could not be rejected.[1] Similarly, the hypotheses that the correlation between political activity and each of these variables is zero could not be rejected. The writer expected a strong inverse relationship between the lawyer's political activity and the level of his family income. Here again no significant relationship was found. The one factor that was found significantly correlated to political activity was the lawyer's life cycle. As expected, the results show that political activity of the lawyer declines as he grows older (see Table IV.16). An inspection of the results indicate that the lawyer's political activity reaches its apex mostly between the ages of 35-44 and then begins to drop slowly. It is at this time when the lawyer begins what was termed the stable work stage in his career.

---

[1]Chi square (x^2) was not significant at .10 level. See Appendix F.

The lawyer's degree of activity declines the older he gets and the more established or stable his practice becomes.

TABLE IV.16.--Overall political activity and age.

Degree of Political Activity	Below 35	35-44	45-54	55-64	65 and over	Total
Inactive	38.24 (13)	13.21 (7)	11.54 (3)	64.44 (8)	46.15 (6)	25.69 (37)
Active	26.47 (9)	37.74 (20)	42.31 (11)	38.89 (7)	38.46 (5)	36.11 (52)
Very Active	35.29 (12)	49.06 (26)	46.15 (12)	16.67 (3)	15.38 (2)	38.19 (55)
	23.61 (34)	36.81 (53)	18.06 (26)	12.50 (18)	9.03 (13)	100.00 (144)

$r = -.15 \quad p < .05$

Two more aspects in the background of the lawyers in the sample are related to their "interest" in politics now and prior to graduation from law school and their political participation in politics over the past years. It seems that at work lawyers face the realities of life around them and learn what it takes to be successful in this profession. Whatever scruples they may have had are tested here at work and in the early stages of their career in law. At work their early attitudes and ambitions may be reinforced or

abandoned. There is evidence that "interest in politics," while it is to develop before graduation, it increases considerably after graduation. Approximately as many as 61 percent indicated "strong" or "some" interest in politics while they were students at law school.[1] When asked about their present interest in politics, this figure jumped to as high as 83 percent of the total sample. This increase is illustrated in terms of summary statistics in Table IV.17.

TABLE IV.17.--Degree of interest in politics before and after graduation.

Degree of Interest in Politics	Before Graduation	After Graduation
No Interest	38.89 (56)	16.67 (24)
Some Interest	29.86 (43)	29.17 (42)
Strong Interest	31.25 (45)	54.17 (78)
Total	100.00 (144)	100.00 (144)

[1]The degree of interest in politics was determined by two direct questions (28 and 28a) with the degrees of interest to be checked by the respondents.

The reasons for limited interest at school, as suggested by a few lawyers who volunteered to speak on this point, is due to the preoccupation of the respondents with studying for their degrees, allowing little or no time to be interested in politics. Further, it may be appropriate to indicate that the meaning of interest in politics at law school may be considerably different than interest in politics now. The difference in meaning may derive from the differences in ecology of a law student's life and that of practice and making a living. Interest in politics now seems closer to being "concretized" or real mostly because it is possible for respondents to relate "politics" to the making of a successful career in life. They are, as it were, in the midst of it whether they like it or not. Students' interest would remain less real at law school because "politics" is much more remote from him than it is when he is in practice. Thus the greater interest lawyers express now indicates that the "work situation" plays a considerable role in the politicization of lawyers.[1]

---

[1]A similar conclusion is reached by M. N. Goldstein in his Ph.D. dissertation, "Political Involvement Among American Law Students" (unpublished, Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C., 1964), p. 220.

The political activity implies, among other things, a measure of interest in politics and that political activity increases with increases in the degree of interest. This logic is found true in fact. There is a strong correlation between political activity as measured by the overall activity Index described above and the degree of "interest in politics now." Almost half (48.72 percent) of those indicating "strong" interest now are found actually very active in politics now and more than half (55 percent) active specifically in local party organization (see Tables IV.18 and IV.19).[1] There was no correlation between overall political activity and the degree of interest in politics at law school.

The majority (64.58 percent) of lawyers in the sample have had some political experience particularly at the state and local levels. The index used to measure political activity indicates that as much as 80 percent of those who were found very active have held a political office of one kind or another, including party offices (see Table IV.20). In Chapter V the writer will discuss the kinds of offices held and also the relationship of the lawyer's work situation to holding political office.

---

[1]These results may also indicate the need for a more adequate measure of political activity.

TABLE IV.18.--Overall political activity and "interest in politics now."

Degree of Political Activity	No Interest	Some Interest	Strong Interest	Total
Inactive	50.00 (12)	28.57 (12)	16.67 (13)	37
Active	37.50 (9)	38.10 (16)	34.62 (27)	52
Very Active	12.50 (3)	33.33 (14)	48.72 (38)	55
	16.67 (24)	29.17 (42)	54.17 (78)	144

$r = .31$ $p < .001$

TABLE IV.19.--Participation in party organization and "interest in politics now."

Party Participation	No Interest	Some Interest	Strong Interest	Total
Inactive	79.17 (19)	61.90 (26)	44.87 (35)	80
Active	20.83 (5)	38.10 (16)	55.13 (43)	64
	16.67 (24)	29.17 (42)	54.17 (78)	144

$r = .26$ $p < .001$

TABLE IV.20.--Overall political activity of lawyers and whether they held political office.

Degree of Political Activity	Have Not Held Political Office	Have Held Political Office	Total
Inactive	51.35 (19)	48.65 (18)	37
Active	40.38 (21)	59.62 (31)	52
Very Active	20.00 (11)	80.00 (44)	55
	35.42 (51)	64.58 (93)	144

$r = .24 \quad p < .001$

In this chapter the writer discussed the political and socio-economic context in which lawyers in the sample operate. Ingham County seems to be a unique place for a fairly successful legal practice in that it provides considerable opportunities. Members of the Ingham County bar come primarily from well-recognized law schools. They come from social backgrounds in which no particular class is predominant. Nevertheless, the majority come from white Anglo-Saxon Protestant stock.

The lawyers in the county have generally been active in local politics. Almost two-thirds of the lawyers in

the county have held some political office at one point or another in their careers. This fact in itself indicates that these lawyers and the context within which they practice is not typical of others practicing in cities of the same size.

A preliminary investigation of the hypothesis that there must be significant relationship between political activity and social background factors was rejected. The data show, nevertheless, that political activity is inversely correlated with age and directly related to interest in politics now. Further, with regard to interest in politics, the data indicate that it increases considerably after lawyers enter practice.

CHAPTER V

WORK SITUATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF LAWYERS

One conclusion reached in the preceding chapter was that the interest of lawyers in politics increases after graduation and upon entrance into practice and that the political activity of lawyers is generally independent of their social background. This finding makes the investigation of work situation the more important and necessary. The following pages are devoted to doing that.

The major hypothesis in this study is concerned with finding out whether variation in the political activity of lawyers is related to variation in their work situation and position in the hierarchy of the profession. In more specific terms, this hypothesis considered here may be stated as follows: the general political activity of lawyers is inversely related to their work situation and position in the hierarchy of the profession. Thus lawyers in low-status work situations will tend to be more active in politics than those who are in high-status work situations.

This hypothesis was formulated on the basis of the literature discussed in Chapters I, II and III. The research findings indicate that the hypothesis as formulated does not hold entirely true for the members of Ingham Bar. In the following pages this writer will discuss the reasons why it does not by examining both the degree and kinds of activities in which Ingham lawyers engage. Yet before going to any length, it is necessary to define what is meant by work situation and how this concept was actually operationalized.

Work Situation Defined

In Chapter IV most of the elements that contribute to the definition of work situation were discussed. Here work situation is the major composite concept that requires definition and operationalization. Table V.1 shows the simple correlation matrix of the elements that define work situation. The internal correlations are not always significant, yet they help summarize the relationships of these elements to each other. These elements or factors include the lawyer's type of practice (whether on his own, employed, or a partner in a firm or group). If he operates in partnership, the number of members (size of firm) becomes a noteworthy factor. The stage of practice, i.e., whether the lawyer is in the initial or the transitional stage of his

TABLE V.1.--Simple correlation matrix--elements of work situation

	4	6	30	33	34	40
4	1.00	.133	.293	-.056	.143	-.175
6		1.000	.336	.068	.162	-.005
30			1.000	.247	-.035	-.095
33				1.000	-.055	-.121
34					1.000	.158
40						1.000

This Correlation Matrix shows the cross-correlations of: years in practice (4), size of firm (6), income (30), type of practice or work setting (33), type of cases mostly handled (34), and full-time or part-time practice (40).

career or in the more stable stage, is an important factor that enters into the definition of work situation. Income is also included. Two other indicators connected with the lawyers' work conditions are: whether he is in full-time or part-time and whether he handles mostly domestic or business-corporate-commercial cases. The former includes personal injury, divorce, criminal, inheritance and labor cases. The latter includes will-probate-estate, real estate and cases involving business, insurance companies, industrial concerns and the like. A system of weights was assigned, the sum of

which determined the general hierarchy (or the status) of the work situations of Ingham lawyers (see Table V.2). Using these indices in the manner indicated, this writer was able to classify Ingham lawyers into three categories that define their relative positions. Thus lawyers receiving a score of 8 points or less were classified in the "Low-status Work Situation" category (32.64 percent); 9-12 points in the "Middle-status work Situation" (34.03 percent); and those receiving 13-19 points in the "High-status Work Situation" (33.33 percent). In the following paragraphs an attempt is made to describe in a general manner the characteristics of members of these categories.

TABLE V.2.--Distribution of lawyers by work situation factors

	Score	Percentage	No.
A. Type of practice			
Solo	1	49.31	71
Associate (or employed by other lawyer)	1	10.42	15
Firm of 2 partners	2	4.17	6
Firm of 3-4	3	21.53	31
Firm of 5 or more	4	14.58	21
B. Years in practice			
5 years or less	1	23.61	34
6-10 years	2	20.83	30
11-15 years	3	20.14	29
16-20 years	4	5.56	8
21-25 years	5	7.64	11
26 and over	6	22.22	32

TABLE V.2--Continued

	Score	Percentage	No.
C. Income (thousands of dollars)			
NA	-	6.94	10
Less than 10	1	18.75	27
10-14	2	19.44	28
15-19	3	20.14	29
20-24	4	11.81	17
25-29	5	9.72	14
30-34	6	4.17	6
35 and over	7	9.03	13
D. Full-time practice			
Yes	1	88.19	127
No	0	11.81	17
E. Type of cases handled			
Domestic	1	57.64	83
Business	2	48.36	61
Final status categories			
Low work situation	4- 8	32.64	47
Middle work situation	9-12	34.03	49
High work situation	13-19	33.33	48
		100.00	144

Work Situation and Type of Practice

In large metropolitan centers the differences in work settings or type of practice alone tend to significantly determine the position of the lawyer in the hierarchy of the profession. There is evidence that this holds true in a

less metropolitan community such as Ingham, but not to the same extent. The impression received from the literature is that almost all or the majority of lawyers in solo practice are in the lower echelons of the profession. Assessing the status of lawyers' work situation in the manner described above indicates that 40.85 percent of those in solo practice and as much as 6.9 percent of those in firms are in low-status work situations (see Table V.3).[1] Considerable differences appear in the higher echelons. In the high-status work situation category there are only 21.13 percent of solo lawyers, whereas there are as much as 56.90 percent of those in firms. Almost all of those who are associates or employed are in low-status work situations. Further, Table V.4 shows in greater detail the distribution of members of firms of different sizes by the level of their work situation. It indicates rather clearly the function of the size of the partnership on the position of the member lawyers in the hierarchy of the profession.

---

[1] The members of firms who are in low-status work situation include two lawyers from two-member firms and two 3-4 member firms.

TABLE V.3.--Work situation by type of practice

Status of Work Situation	Solos	Associates	Firm Members	Totals
Low	40.85 (29)	93.33 (14)	6.90 (4)	32.64 (47)
Middle	38.03 (27)	6.67 (1)	36.21 (21)	34.03 (49)
High	21.13 (15)	0.00 (0)	56.90 (33)	33.33 (48)
	49.31 (71)	10.42 (15)	40.28 (58)	100.0 (144)

$r = .39 \quad p < .001$

TABLE V.4.--Work situation by size of firm

Status of Work Situation	2 Members	3-4 Members	5-6 Members	7-8 Members	Totals
Low	33.33 (2)	6.45 (2)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	6.90 (4)
Middle	33.33 (2)	48.39 (15)	28.57 (2)	14.29 (2)	36.21 (21)
High	33.33 (2)	45.42 (14)	71.43 (5)	85.71 (12)	56.90 (33)
	10.34 (6)	53.45 (31)	12.07 (7)	24.14 (14)	100.00 (58)

$r = .41 \quad p < .001$

Work Situation and Career Stages

The work stage in the lawyer's career is an essential factor used in determining the level of his work situation. In Chapter IV it was shown that the more stable lawyers become in their work situation, the higher income they will earn (see Table IV.1). Here, the writer is interested in showing the distribution of lawyers in different career stages by their work situation level. Table V.5 indicates that a lawyer's work situation will tend to improve rather continuously the longer he remains in practice. Table V.6 shows in a similar fashion how lawyers with different incomes are distributed by work situation status.

TABLE V.5.--Status of work situation by years in practice (or work stage)

Status of Work Situation	Initial Work Stage	Transitional Work Stage		Stable Work Stage			Total
	1-5 Years	6-10 Years	11-15 Years	16-20 Years	21-25 Years	25 or More	
Low	91.17 (31)	40.00 (12)	13.79 (4)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	47
Middle	8.83 (3)	43.33 (13)	57.72 (15)	62.50 (5)	27.27 (3)	31.25 (10)	49
High	0.00 (0)	16.67 (5)	38.48 (10)	37.50 (3)	72.73 (8)	68.75 (22)	48
	23.61 (34)	20.83 (30)	20.14 (29)	5.56 (8)	7.64 (11)	21.78 (32)	144

$r = .69$ $p < .001$

TABLE V.6.--Status of work situation by income (in thousands of dollars)

Status of Work Situation	N.A.	Low: Under 10	Middle: 10-14	Middle: 15-19	High: 20-24	High: 25-29	High: 30 $ over	Total
Low	20.00 (2)	81.48 (22)	46.43 (13)	27.59 (8)	11.76 (2)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	47
Middle	50.00 (5)	11.11 (3)	46.43 (13)	51.72 (15)	41.18 (7)	28.57 (4)	10.53 (2)	49
High	30.00 (3)	7.41 (2)	7.14 (2)	20.69 (6)	47.06 (8)	71.43 (10)	89.47 (13)	48
	6.94 (10)	18.75 (27)	19.44 (28)	20.14 (29)	11.81 (17)	9.72 (14)	13.20 (19)	

$r = .58 \quad p < .001$

Work Situation and Type of Cases Mostly Handled by Lawyers

The distribution of lawyers handling different types of cases by the level of their work situation shows that as much as 47 percent of those handling domestic cases are in low-status work situations, whereas only 13.11 percent of those handling business cases are in this same status (see Table V.7). In Chapter IV it was shown that the differences in income between those handling domestic and business cases, though existent, were not terribly large for the Ingham Bar. The differences in the position of those handling different

types of cases are present, but again not to the same extent as the case may be in a larger metropolitan center.

TABLE V.7.--Status of work situation by type of cases handled

Status of Work Situation	Domestic Relations	Business-Corporate	Totals
Low	46.99 (39)	13.11 (8)	32.64 (47)
Middle	36.14 (30)	31.15 (19)	34.03 (49)
High	9.72 (14)	55.74 (34)	33.33 (48)
	57.64 (83)	42.36 (61)	100.00 (144)

$r = .44 \quad p < .001$

In sum, it is possible to conclude that the determination of the position of lawyers in the hierarchy of the Ingham Bar by means of the classification scheme suggested in Table V.1 above is relatively adequate for the purpose of this study. It helps in pointing out differences between the three levels of work situation in a systematic manner. It takes into account several factors that affect the work situation of lawyers rather than only one or two. Furthermore, it is possible to reproduce easily.

It may be interesting to indicate that the majority of those lawyers classified in the high-status work situation category have received high "ratings" by the Martindale and Hubble legal directory. The editors of the latter documentary publication have assigned ratings of "A," "B," "C," and "No Mention" to lawyers all over the country. These ratings are given on the basis of vague criteria, the most important of which are "years in practice," "estimate of worth," and possibly community relations and competence.[1] Table V.8 shows the relationship between work situation and Martindale's ratings. The higher the work situation of the lawyer the greater the chances of receiving mention or a rating. Of those who are in low-status work situation as much as 87.23 percent received no mention, whereas only 35.42 percent of those in high-status work situation received this rating.

Finally, the differences in the social backgrounds between lawyers in low-status and high-status work situation often observed in large metropolitan centers are not significant in the Ingham Bar. No significant relationship was

---

[1] It is not very clear how these ratings were arrived at. It is possible that Martindale's editors ask the help of certain local community people for designating the competent and well-thought-of lawyers.

found between the level of lawyers' work situation and the social class they come from. As was indicated earlier in Chapter IV, a very small percentage of the lawyers are second-generation Americans and a much smaller percentage belong to ethnic groups. Further, there was no significant relationship between the lawyer's work situation and the quality of his education (law schools attended). Needless to say, the hypotheses concerning social background and education cannot be adequately tested except in large metropolitan centers where heterogeneous backgrounds are more available than in the Ingham area.

TABLE V.8.--Work situation by Martindale's rating (percent across)

Status of Work Situation	No Mention	"C"	"B"	"A"	Total
Low	87.23 (41)	10.64 (5)	0.00 (0)	2.13 (1)	100.00 (47)
Middle	44.90 (22)	36.73 (18)	14.29 (7)	4.08 (2)	100.00 (49)
High	35.42 (17)	10.42 (5)	29.17 (14)	25.00 (12)	100.00 (48)
	55.56 (80)	19.44 (28)	14.58 (21)	10.42 (15)	(144)

$r = .50 \quad p < .001$

The Work Situation of Lawyers and the Degree and Kinds of Political Participation

Variation in the degree of political activity of lawyers does not seem to be entirely related to variation in their work situation. Overall activity, as measured in this study, does not seem to be inversely related to work situation as was expected in an earlier chapter. The correlation is not significantly greater than zero and hence the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Summary statistics (Table V.9) show that over 77 percent of those in high-status work situation are either moderately active or very active compared to 74 percent of those in lower-status work situation. These differences in percentages, although very small, may suggest that the relationship between work situation and degree of political activity is really direct rather than inverse, as the writer hypothesized. Yet such a conclusion cannot be made on the basis of these data alone. In order to explain these results, it is necessary to investigate the modes or kinds of activities in which these lawyers participate. Differences in work situation were found to be significantly related to differences in the kinds of activities in which different lawyers engage. However, before proceeding further, it must be pointed out that Ingham lawyers have an impressive history of political involvement which in itself

is revealing of the nature of the relationship of lawyers to politics. The political experience of the majority of these lawyers may also help in explaining the differences in the degree and kinds of political activities in which lawyers in different work situations engage.

TABLE V.9.--Degree of overall political activity by status of work situation

Overall Activity	Low	Middle	High	Total
Inactive	25.53 (12)	28.57 (14)	22.92 (11)	25.69 (37)
Active	34.04 (16)	34.69 (17)	39.58 (19)	36.11 (52)
Very Active	40.43 (19)	36.73 (18)	37.50 (18)	38.19 (55)
	32.64 (47)	34.03 (49)	33.33 (48)	100.00 (144)

r = -.001

Ingham lawyers seem to have had political background and experiences that set them apart from other lawyers practicing elsewhere. It was indicated earlier that as much as 64.58 percent of Ingham lawyers have held a political office of some kind or another. It was also found that 80 percent of those who held office are presently very active in politics.

It is important to indicate at this point that as much as 62.50 percent of those who are now found in high-status work situations have held political offices. The summary statistics described in Table V.10 indicate that most of the offices that were held by these lawyers were law-enforcement offices at the city and county levels. Both the fact that a majority of the lawyers in high-status work situations have held political offices and that they have held local and law-enforcement offices suggest that both political experience and holding local offices are frequently perceived by lawyers as necessary for an improved work situation. This conclusion becomes more acceptable in the light of the fact that a majority (53 percent) of those who are now in low-status work situations strongly desire to hold offices mostly at the local level, i.e., city and county attorney and local judgeships. These offices are very much the same as the offices that were held by those who are now in high-status work situations. Obviously it is possible to infer that these offices have been instrumental in improving the work situation of those who are now in the upper echelons of the profession. These offices also serve as stepping-stones for higher political offices. Similar conclusions were arrived at by Professor J. Schlesinger on the basis of his study of governors. This political scientist suggested also

TABLE V.10.--Status of work situation by distribution of last political post held by Ingham lawyers

Status of Work Situation	Held None	Held Political Office: Party Office	City Atty.	Asst. Pros. Atty.	Pros. Atty.	Local Judge	Member County or State Boards	In State Atty. Office	State Legis.	Total
Low	34.03 (16)	12.77 (6)	8.51 (4)	19.15 (9)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	17.02 (8)	8.51 (4)	0.00 (0)	32.64 (47)
Middle	34.64 (17)	14.29 (7)	6.12 (3)	8.16 (4)	6.12 (3)	14.29 (7)	12.24 (6)	2.04 (1)	2.04 (1)	34.03 (49)
High	37.50 (18)	4.17 (2)	4.17 (2)	12.50 (6)	6.25 (3)	0.00 (0)	29.17 (14)	4.17 (2)	2.08 (1)	33.33 (48)
	35.42 (51)	10.42 (15)	4.17 (6)	13.19 (19)	4.17 (6)	4.86 (7)	19.44 (28)	4.86 (7)	1.39 (2)	100.00 (144)

that lawyers derive their advantage over non-lawyers in politics from legal skills that qualify them best to hold these law-enforcement offices at the local levels. He observed further that, in fact, lawyers are "becoming increasingly dependent on a law enforcement office as a means for political advancement."[1]

Thus the slight differences in the degree of political activity of lawyers in low-status and high-status work situations are partly due to the fact that the majority of those who are in high-status work situations have held offices at the local level and, as will be noted later, are less interested in offices at this level. Nevertheless, the political experience of those in high-status work situations--friendships and access--enables them to engage in politics of bargaining and influence more frequently than those in the lower echelons of Ingham Bar. The discussion below of the different channels used by lawyers at different levels is hoped to clarify this reasoning.

Politics of Hierarchy and Politics of Bargaining

The kinds of political activities in which lawyers engage and which were assessed by the overall adjusted index

---

[1] Schlesinger, op. cit., p. 33.

may be classified into two major categories or types. The first type, politics of hierarchy, includes a considerable measure of combativeness, contention and opportunities for exposure. Politics of hierarchy, as used here, includes mostly participation in political party organization and activities and participation in other civic and voluntary political organizations. The second type, politics of bargaining, includes the use of certain channels of influence such as voting, letter-writing and money contribution to political candidates. In politics of hierarchy the emphasis is on the search for channels of patronage, political advancement and establishing business contacts by increased exposure in specific publics or the community at large. In contrast, politics of bargaining emphasizes efforts toward making claims on public officials or legislators, claims, however, that do not necessarily lead to holding office as much as influencing the outcome of certain decisions regarding specific persons or issues.

As was hypothesized in Chapter III, lawyers in low-status work situations are actually more active in political party hierarchies and auxiliary activities than are lawyers in high-status work situations (see Table V.11). Furthermore, lawyers in low-status work situations tend to belong

to more organizations that take stands on public issues than those in high-status work situations (see Table V.12). It thus appears that when lawyers are in low-status work situations, they tend to perceive political party activities and membership in local organizations as possible vehicles for advancement more often than those in high-status work situations. This becomes even more clarified when participation in political parties is cross-correlated with work stages. Table V.13 indicates that as lawyers reach the more stable stage of their career they become less active in political parties as such.

TABLE V.11.--Participation in political parties and status of work situation

Degree of Political Activity	Low	Middle	High	Totals
Inactive	44.68 (21)	57.14 (28)	64.58 (31)	55.56 (80)
Active	55.32 (26)	42.86 (21)	35.42 (17)	44.44 (64)
	32.64 (47)	34.03 (49)	33.33 (48)	100.00 (144)

$r = -.16$ $p < .05$

TABLE V.12.--Status of work situation by number of organizations belonged to

Status of Work Situation	None	One	Two or More	Total
Low	22.41 (13)	44.68 (21)	33.33 (13)	33.33 (47)
Middle	32.76 (19)	31.91 (15)	38.46 (15)	34.03 (49)
High	44.83 (26)	23.40 (11)	28.21 (11)	32.64 (48)
	40.28 (58)	32.64 (47)	27.08 (39)	(144)

$r = -.16 \quad p < .05$

TABLE V.13.--Political party participation and work stages

Participation in Parties	Initial Stage	Transitional Stage	Stable Stage	Total
Not Active	44.12 (15)	49.24 (25)	78.43 (40)	55.56 (80)
Active	55.88 (19)	50.76 (34)	21.57 (11)	44.44 (64)
	23.51 (34)	40.97 (59)	35.42 (51)	100.00 (144)

$r = -.30 \quad p < .001$

Political parties and party activities seem to be the logical place in which lawyers could engage, especially for those who are in low-status work situations and who are determined to advance. If they were seeking a political career, it is important to prove their fidelity to the party as a first step toward political advancement. Similarly, if they were interested in increasing their legal business by establishing contacts and becoming known, participation in party activities offers considerable opportunities. In political party circles, these lawyers can get to know local political leaders, local judges, public officials and law enforcement people both formally and informally.

Community organizations, civic and business, provide excellent opportunities for lawyers to make contacts in the hope of improving the quality of their clientele and possibly for soliciting more business. In Lansing, the most important local community organization is the Young Republican Club. This club has been the major extra-party organization to which Republican lawyers belong. This club is well-recognized by other established lawyers in the area. Lawyers in the initial stages of their career and those who have newly arrived in the community soon learn about this club. One Democratic lawyer who has just recently moved to Lansing admitted considering joining this club. "In the

past I was a strong Democrat," he said, "but now I call myself an independent, but really I am not that at all. . . . In this Republican town I probably have to join the Young Republicans to get anywhere." It may be that in fact the club does not offer a great deal, but it certainly is perceived as the place to be "to get anywhere." Membership in other organizations as well as participation in political party organizations provide lawyers face-to-face contacts with people and exposure in lieu of advertising to which lawyers must not resort.

Lawyers in high-status work situations in the Lansing area seem to be more active in politics of bargaining, discussion and influence than lawyers in low-status work situations. This is indicated by the fact that they tend to make use of at least three channels of influence more frequently than those in low-status work situations. These channels are: (1) writing and talking to legislators and other public officials about matters of interest to them; (2) making money contributions to the funds of political candidates; and (3) voting (i.e., frequency of going to the polls). The latter "channel" of influence may also indicate the extent to which lawyers in high-status work situations take their "civic" responsibility seriously.

Table V.14 shows a direct relationship between work

situation and the extent to which lawyers write and talk to legislators and public officials. The higher the work situation level, the greater the tendency to use these channels of influence. Almost 94 percent of those who are presently in high-status work situations have written or talked to public officials twice or more in the past year as compared to 74.5 percent of those in low-status work situations. Similarly, lawyers in high-status work situations are found to lead others in lower-status work situations in making money contributions to the funds of political candidates (see Table V.15). Apparently lawyers in high-status work situations tend to perceive these kinds of participation as more suited to their purposes than participation in party organization as activists or office-holders.

TABLE V.14.--Times written or talked to legislators and public officials by status of work situation

Number of Times in Last Year	Low	Middle	High	Total
Less than once	25.53 (12)	14.29 (7)	6.25 (3)	15.28 (22)
Twice or more	74.47 (35)	85.71 (42)	93.75 (45)	84.72 (122)
	32.64 (47)	34.03 (49)	33.33 (48)	100.00 (144)

$r = .22 \quad p < .001$

TABLE V.15.--Money contribution and status of work situation

Contributed Money	Low	Middle	High	Total
No	17.02 (8)	24.49 (12)	4.17 (2)	15.28 (22)
Yes	82.98 (39)	75.51 (37)	95.83 (46)	84.72 (122)
	32.64 (47)	34.03 (49)	33.33 (48)	100.00 (144)

$r = .15 \quad p < .05$

Lawyers in high-status work situations, as indicated earlier, are often lawyers who have reached the stable stage in their legal career and have already had considerable political experience at least at the local level. Talking and writing to legislators and public officials is particularly facilitated by the numerous points of access provided by the fact that Lansing is the center for a considerable amount of political activity. Again, it would seem that the political experience of those who are now in high-status work situations is particularly helpful in facilitating informal communications between these lawyers and public officials. Further, it may be pointed out that in some cases the assistance of some of these lawyers is requested by

legislators and other public officials.[1] In one instance one of the largest firms (eight members) was "talking politics" to almost everyone and actually handling the organization of the local campaign for a presidential candidate. This is also a single example of how informal political contacts may result in a lucrative business deal.

It may be interesting to know the nature of the contents of communications between these lawyers and legislators and public officials. The writer assumes that these lawyers, by talking and writing to legislators and public officials, attempt to communicate their interest or the interest of their clients regarding the resolution of certain specific issues or the outcome of specific issues. One lawyer interviewed by the writer suggested that some lawyers perform a linkage function between the people and the government. Drawing on his experience, he indicated that many people come to him asking for help to contact and talk to public officials and sometimes legislators on their behalf.[2] Other researchers interested in this specific aspect may shed

---

[1] One lawyer indicated that his client (M.S.U.) asked him to help in the establishment of an M.S.U. mission to Saigon early in the rule of Diem. He boasted of his political contacts.

[2] This lawyer showed considerable sophistication when he spoke of the role of lawyers in the community.

further light on the function of lawyers as an intermediary agent between individuals and groups on one hand and political decision-makers on the other. Similarly, further investigation of the use of "money contributions" is required before anything can be said concerning this kind of participation in politics. The most that can be suggested here is that money contributions to political candidates are made by lawyers to obtain a measure of access and, more important perhaps, to assure party regulars of their fidelity to the party.

Lawyers in high-status work situations tend to vote more often than lawyers in low-status work situations. Table V.16 shows that as much as 38 percent of those who voted three times or more come from the ranks of those who are in high-status work situations. In addition, the tendency to vote increases with the level of work situation. Lawyers in high-status work situations seem to take their "civic" responsibility more seriously than those in lower-status situations. It is possible also that some of those in low-status work situations may not consider voting as a particularly effective channel of influence and hence do not take it seriously.

TABLE V.16.--Status of work situation by number of times voted in the last four years

Status of Work Situation	Less Than 3 Times	3 Times or More	Total
Low	41.66 (15)	29.63 (32)	32.64 (47)
Middle	38.88 (14)	32.41 (35)	34.03 (49)
High	19.46 (7)	37.96 (41)	33.33 (48)
	25.00 (36)	75.00 (108)	100.00 (144)

$r = .15 \quad p < .05$

Work Situation of Lawyers and the Value They Attach to Holding Political Office

It was hypothesized in Chapter III that lawyers in low-status work situations will tend to attach higher value to the rewards of holding public office than do lawyers in higher-status work situations. As it will be indicated below, this reasoning is substantiated by empirical evidence. It is, however, necessary at this point to explain how lawyers' evaluation of the utility of political rewards was determined. The utility of political rewards could be assessed by determining, roughly, the value lawyers attach to holding

different political offices. The lawyers were asked to evaluate a series of public offices (at the local, state, and national levels) in terms of their desire or interest in holding each of these offices. Each lawyer was asked to indicate the degree of his interest by putting a check-mark on a six-point continuum which ranged from "very much interested" at one end to "not interested at all" at the other (see Figure V.1).[1] A general overall score was obtained by adding the points in cumulative total. The resulting index is a rough estimate of the lawyers' personal evaluation and interest in holding political office. Lawyers with the lowest score points (36.81 percent) were considered to attach "high" value to the utility of holding office; those in the middle (31.94 percent) attach "moderate" value; and those with the highest score points (31.25 percent) attach "low" value.

Figure V.1.--Continuum of interest in holding office of U.S. Congressman

Very Much Interested					Not at All Interested
1	2	3	4	5	6

[1]See the detailed format of Question 30 in Appendix B. The lawyers were handed a yellow sheet on which the offices were enumerated each on six-point continuum. The question directly following was concerned with whether the Respondent would "consider or be seriously interested in" any of the enumerated political offices and if "yes" which one (see Table V.20).

As hypothesized, lawyers in low-status work situations tended to attach higher value to holding political office than did lawyers in higher-status work situations. Table V.17 shows that 51.11 percent of those who attach "high" value to holding political office come from the ranks of those who are in the lower echelons of the profession versus only 13.13 percent from those in the top.

TABLE V.17.--Status of work situation and value attached to holding office

Status of Work Situation	Low Value	Moderate Value	High Value	Total
Low	20.75 (11)	28.26 (13)	51.11 (23)	32.64 (47)
Middle	37.74 (20)	28.26 (13)	35.56 (16)	34.03 (49)
High	41.50 (22)	43.48 (20)	13.13 (6)	33.33 (48)
	36.81 (53)	31.94 (46)	31.25 (45)	100.00 (144)

$r = -.29 \quad p < .001$

One might reasonably expect lawyers who attach high value to holding political office (in this case 51.11 percent of those in low-status work situations) to be very active in politics. It does in fact hold true. Almost 58

percent of those who attach high value to holding political office are found to be very active in politics (see Table V.18). On the basis of these facts it is possible to conclude that the lawyer's work situation and position in the hierarchy of the profession seem to cause to a considerable extent both a high evaluation of the rewards of holding political office and active participation in politics. That is, in spite of the absence of any significant statistical relationship between overall political activity and work situation.

TABLE V.18.--Overall political activity and the value lawyers attach to political rewards

Degree of Political Activity	Low Value	Moderate Value	High Value	Total
Inactive	32.08 (17)	23.91 (11)	20.00 (9)	37
Active	39.62 (21)	45.65 (21)	22.22 (10)	52
Very Active	28.30 (15)	30.43 (14)	57.78 (26)	55
	36.81 (53)	31.94 (46)	31.25 (45)	144

$r = .21 \quad p < .05$

Lawyers' Work Situation and the Kinds of Offices That Will Be Seriously Considered

The rewards of holding public office seem to be particularly attractive to members of the Bar perhaps more than members of any other profession. This explains in part the relation of lawyers to politics. Especially at the state and local levels, lawyers can hold political office and at the same time maintain their legal practice. The data gathered here indicate that more than 72 percent of the lawyers in Ingham County would seriously consider holding certain political offices, especially at the local and state levels. Further investigation indicates there is a significant relationship between the lawyers' work situation and the level of the offices that would be considered. Table V.19 shows that 80 percent of lawyers in low-status work situations are willing to consider offices at the state and local levels in contrast to 25.81 percent of those in high-status work situations. Lawyers in high-status work situations are willing to consider mostly offices at the federal level.[1]

---

[1]It probably should be pointed out that many of those in high-status work situations hesitated very much when asked to indicate which political office they would consider seriously. Many said that they will consider a given office when it is offered.

TABLE V.19.--Level of offices which would be considered by Status of work situation

Level of Office	Low	Middle	High	Total
Local and State	80.00 (32)	60.00 (21)	25.81 (8)	57.55 (61)
Federal	20.00 (8)	40.00 (14)	74.19 (23)	42.45 (45)
	37.74 (40)	33.02 (35)	29.25 (31)	100.00 (106)

$r = .44$ $p < .001$

It was indicated earlier that over 60 percent of those in high-status work situations have already held a political office sometime in the past and subsequently went back to legal practice. This would seem to limit their ambitions at the local and state levels. These offices seem to be desired by lawyers who find themselves in low-status work situations and who may be desiring to walk in the paths already trod by a majority of those who are now in high-status work situations. These offices may also serve as stepping-stones for higher political offices and especially for those who are interested in political advancement or a political career. Table V.20 shows in greater detail the

TABLE V.20:--Distribution of offices considered seriously by status of work situation

Status of Work Situation	Would not Consider	Would Consider: City & County Atty.	State Atty.	Local & State Judge	State Legis.	State & Fed. Admin.	U.S. Cong.	Fed. Judge	Total
Low	14.89 (7)	36.17 (17)	2.13 (1)	17.02 (8)	12.77 (6)	4.26 (2)	4.26 (2)	8.51 (4)	32.64 (47)
Middle	28.57 (14)	2.04 (1)	8.16 (4)	30.77 (15)	11.11 (1)	18.37 (2)	6.12 (3)	18.37 (9)	34.03 (49)
High	35.42 (17)	4.17 (2)	2.08 (1)	6.25 (3)	6.25 (2)	10.42 (5)	27.08 (13)	10.42 (5)	33.33 (48)
	26.39 (38)	13.89 (20)	4.17 (6)	18.06 (26)	6.25 (6)	6.25 (9)	12.50 (18)	12.50 (18)	100.00 (144)

kinds of offices that would be considered by lawyers in different work situations. The offices desired by those in low-status work situations are mostly law-enforcement offices at the city and county levels, whereas lawyers in high-status work situations would consider mostly positions such as Congressman.

In Chapter VI the writer will discuss how different lawyers perceive the utility of political reward, i.e,, in what terms.

Other Aspects of Lawyers' Work Situation and Political Activity

Before concluding this chapter, an attempt will be made to investigate the relationships between two specific aspects of work situation and political participation. These selected aspects are work-history and the type of cases handled. These aspects of the lawyer's work situation should be examined more thoroughly than is possible in this study.

Work History and Political Activity

In Chapter III the possible relation between work history and political participation was referred to briefly. As defined earlier, work history refers to conditions surrounding the lawyer's passage from one stage to another in

his career. Smooth and orderly passage from one stage to another, it was hypothesized, leads to easy entry into high positions in the lawyer's career. There is evidence to this effect in the data collected in this study (see Table V.21). Lawyers who went "directly into practice" and had a relatively easy entry into practice are found, for the most part, in relatively higher work situations than those who had to go into other employments partly because of the difficulty of hanging out their own "shingle."

TABLE V.21.--Status of Work situation by work history

Status of Work Situation	Assumed Other Employment	Directly to Practice	Total
Low	41.10 (30)	23.94 (17)	32.64 (47)
Middle	30.14 (22)	38.03 (27)	34.03 (49)
High	28.77 (21)	38.03 (27)	33.33 (48)
	50.69 (73)	49.31 (71)	100.00 (144)

$r = .16$ $p < .05$

More important at this point is the assumption that difficulties encountered after graduation might produce the kind of person who learns to appreciate politics as a possible means for advancement and hence political participation. Table V.22 indicates the validity of this reasoning. Lawyers who assumed other employment before going into practice are found in fact to be more active than those who had relatively easy or direct entry into practice.

TABLE V.22.--Work history by overall political activity

Work History	Inactive	Moderately Active	Very Active	Total
Directly to Practice	56.76 (21)	57.69 (30)	36.36 (20)	49.31 (71)
Assumed Other Employment	43.24 (16)	42.31 (22)	63.64 (35)	50.69 (73)
	(37)	(52)	(55)	(144)

$r = .17 \quad p < .05$

Type of Cases Handled and Political Activity

A very important aspect of work situation and a considerable factor in determining the position of the lawyer in the hierarchy of the profession is the type of cases he handles most (see Table V.7 above). The amount of "legal specialization" could not be studied in Ingham County because those who are specialized are extremely few. The nearest thing to specialization was determined by the "type of cases handled most" by the lawyer. The type of cases handled most proved to be adequate for the purpose of this study. This variable helps clarify the kind and quality of clients with whom the lawyer deals. Lawyers handling mostly domestic and personal injury cases deal with generally poor clients and people with special problems arising from divorces, assaults, crime, labor and some wills. Lawyers handling mostly business cases deal generally with rich and steady clients. They represent mostly defendants rather than plaintiffs and therefore handle mostly cases involving business, industrial corporations and utilities in the area. They also handle a mixture of cases arising from wills and estates and real estate. The data collected in this study indicate a close relationship between the type of cases mostly handled by the lawyer and his political activity.

As expected, lawyers handling mostly domestic cases tend to be more active in local party organizations and auxiliaries than do those handling mostly business cases (see Table V.23).

TABLE V.23.--Type of cases handled by participation in political parties

Type of Cases	Inactive in Party	Active in Party	Total
Domestic	48.75 (39)	68.75 (44)	57.64 (83)
Business	51.25 (41)	31.25 (20)	42.36 (61)
	(80)	(64)	100.00 (144)

$r = -.20 \quad p < .05$

The difference in the party activity of those handling domestic and business cases may, as explained earlier, be due to the differences in their work situation. One may speculate also that those handling mostly business cases may tend to avoid partisan activity. These inferences, however, must be supported with more data than is available at the moment.

The data available here, however, are connected with certain behavioral sets performed by lawyers handling differ-

ent types of cases. These behavioral sets are not imputed but actually enacted roles derived for the most part from the specific mechanics involved in the cases handled and partially from the personality of the lawyer. The information was obtained by the following question: "Which of the following activities do you find yourself performing more frequently than others? And which do you like best?" (pleading, negotiating, advising and giving counsel, writing briefs, etc.). Further cross-tabulation made it evident that there is a relatively strong relationship between participation in parties, types of cases handled and specific role of lawyer. In the absence of an index of "combativeness," these roles were used as rough measure of such an attribute.[1] "Pleading" involves strong combativeness and "negotiating" and "advising and writing briefs" lesser degrees of the same attribute. This manipulation of the data allows the writer to explain the differences in the party activity of those handling mostly domestic cases and those handling business cases in terms of combativeness. Domestic cases involve pleading more than negotiating or advising.

---

[1] "Combativeness" as an analytical concept was suggested by Professor F. Pinner, to whom the writer is indebted.

The latter roles are performed mostly by those handling business and commercial cases. Evidence for these conclusions is illustrated in Table V.24. "Combativeness" may operate, therefore, as one intervening variable out of many uncontrollable factors that make lawyers handling domestic cases more active in party organization than those handling business cases. Similar useful experiments could be performed if more data were gathered on specific aspects of the lawyers' work situation and activities they perform.

TABLE V.24.--Type of Cases handled by role performed

Type of Cases	Pleading	Negotiating	Advising and Writing Briefs	Total
Domestic	70.42 (50)	50.00 (10)	43.40 (23)	57.64 (83)
Business	29.58 (21)	50.00 (10)	56.60 (30)	42.36 (61)
	49.31	13.89	36.81	100.00

$r = .25 \quad p < .001$

Other aspects of interest that should be investigated are the lawyer's degree of involvement in professional activities, i.e., relationship to the American Bar Association and professional conferences, subscription to legal

journals or contributions thereto. How much time does a lawyer spend in the courts and generally what kind of work schedule does he have. In a metropolitan setting it will be important to know more about his ethnic background and that of his clients. All these are factors that are tied to the lawyer's work situation and possibly affect his political participation.

The data reported in this chapter do not point out any significant differences in the overall political activity between lawyers in low-status work situations and those in higher-status work situations. There is evidence, however, that work situation affects the kinds of political activities in which lawyers participate. Lawyers in lower-status work situations were found to be active in political parties and their auxiliary activities, while those in high-status work situations were very inactive in these arenas of political contention. Lawyers' political party activity was found to be inversely correlated to their level of work situation. Lawyers in high-status work situations, on the other hand, seem to take their civic duties more seriously than those in low-status work situations. This is indicated partially in their voting record. They seem to vote much more often than lawyers in lower-status work situations. Further, more lawyers in higher-status work situations seem to utilize the

channels of "letter-writing and talking to legislators and public officials" and contribute money to the funds of political candidates more frequently than those in low-status work situations. Apparently they would prefer to use these channels of influence rather than become involved in the overt hierarchical activities that characterize participation in political parties.

Lawyers in low-status work situations are found to evaluate the rewards of holding public office higher than those in high-status work situations. There is conclusive evidence which indicates that the higher the work situation of the lawyers, the lesser value they would tend to attach to the rewards of holding public offices, or what was termed, in Chapter III, the "expected utility" of politics.

Further, there is evidence that differences in level of political ambitions (level of offices that would be "seriously considered") are directly related to level of lawyers' work situations. Lawyers in low-status work situations are generally inclined to consider seriously offices that are within reasonable reach (e.g., law-enforcement offices at the local and county level, municipal judgeships and sometimes state legislators). In contrast, those in high-status work situations are inclined to consider seats in the national

Congress or the Federal bench.

There is evidence, also, that suggests that lawyers' participation in hierarchical activities (party echelons and auxiliaries) precedes activities of bargaining and influence. Sixty-three percent of those in high-status work situations were office-holders at one time or another. Most of the offices that were held by these lawyers seem to be much the same offices desired by those who are now in low-status work situations. Thus it seems that the participation of those in high-status work situations in activities of bargaining and influence become facilitated considerably by their previous political experience and connections. Further, it seems that lawyers tend to be particularly active in hierarchical politics so long as they are still in low-status work situations. Participation in political party activity seems to decrease as they reach the higher echelons of the profession.

The terms in which lawyers in high-status and low-status work situations perceive the utility of politics is discussed in the next chapter, as are certain orientations.

CHAPTER VI

STATUS OF WORK SITUATION AND THE PERSONAL STYLES OF LAWYERS

In the preceding chapter, the data indicated fairly clearly that, first, lawyers in low-status work situations attach a higher value to the political rewards of holding office than those in higher-status work situations and, second, that lawyers attaching high value to political rewards tend to be very active in politics. One question to be answered at this point is whether lawyers in lower-status work situations perceive the utility of political rewards in any different terms than those in high-status work situations and whether such a difference in perceptions exists between those who are politically active and those not so active. In later paragraphs attention will be directed to a discussion of whether work situation, in fact, affects certain aspects of the lawyer's outlook, such as belief in Machiavelli-like principles and conservatism.

Status of Work Situation and Perception of the Utility of Political Rewards

In the course of preparing the research design for this study, the writer tried to avoid explaining motives because of their complexity. Further, they are difficult to arrive at by means of the available instruments. Motives, as C. Wright Mills points out, are often "imputed or avowed as answers to questions. . . ."[1] Moreover, motives are not easily articulated by the respondent himself. In the light of these difficulties, it was decided to ask two projective questions which could indicate in what terms lawyers perceive the utility of engaging in political activities.[2] Instead of classifying the answers obtained into numerous categories, the writer chose to summarize them into two broad headings "tangible-material" versus "intangible-symbolic" terms.[3] Tangible-material

---

[1]C. Wright Mills, "Situated Actions and Vocabularies of Motive," Power, Politics and People (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 441.

[2]The first question asked: "What would you say lawyers in politics (or those who go into politics) expect to obtain from politics or political positions?" The second was a follow-up: "What would you say is the most important incentive or reward (of those you mentioned) for attracting a lawyer into politics?" (See questions 43 and 43A in Appendix B.)

[3]These two categories would correspond to Eulau's "selfish-exploitative" and "altruistic-contributive" in

included answers such as:

Political advancement--anticipating political position

Advance legal business

Make contacts and learn the ropes

Advertise and gain recognition

Personal gain--make money

and intangible-symbolic included:

Personal challenge--personally qualified

Serve the public or to contribute to the community

Fulfill an obligation to the community

Fame and recognition

Leadership

The majority of the lawyers (57.64 percent) seem to perceive the utility of politics in tangible-material terms. It is safe to say that very often political rewards were perceived as connected with the legal career rather than a political career. Further inspection of the responses obtained here indicate that Ingham lawyers do not articulate their expectations in ideological terms. They tend to view politics as a vehicle for improved work situation rather than a means to reform the world around them.

---

his The Legislative System (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1962), pp. 113-20.

Differences in the perception of the utility of political rewards, it was hypothesized, are directly related to the work situation of lawyers. The data do not support this assumption. Instead, the data show that it is related to the social class from which the lawyer comes (see Table VI.1). This relationship was not totally unexpected and was, in fact, anticipated in the course of preparing the research design for this work. Lawyers from lower classes tend to view politics in tangible-material terms more often than those who are "status-stable" or in upper classes. Lawyers from less privileged backgrounds would tend to see in political office the things they have wanted all along--material benefit. Whereas lawyers coming from upper classes, who presumably have already been satisfied materially, would tend to see in politics symbolic benefits.

TABLE VI.1.--Types of perceived utility of politics by social class of father.

Types of Perception	Upper Class	Middle Class	Lower Class	Total
Tangible-material	44.90 (22)	61.36 (27)	66.67 (34)	57.64 (83)
Intangible-symbolic	55.10 (27)	38.64 (17)	33.33 (17)	42.36 (61)
	34.03 (49)	30.56 (44)	35.42 (51)	100.00 (144)

$r = -.18$ $p < .05$

An interesting result which is by no means new to political scientists is the relation between political activity and the subjects' type of perceived utility of political rewards. The data show a relatively strong relation between how the rewards are perceived and political activity. Yet it is the opposite of what was expected. The data indicate that lawyers who are very active and attach high value to the rewards of holding office view the perceived utility of political rewards more in intangible-symbolic rather than tangible-material terms, as was initially expected (see Table VI.2).

TABLE VI.2.--Types of perceived utility of politics by overall political activity.

Types of Perception	Inactive	Active	Very Active	Totals
Tangible-material	67.57 (25)	65.38 (34)	43.64 (24)	57.64 (83)
Intangible-symbolic	32.43 (12)	34.62 (18)	56.36 (31)	42.36 (61)
	25.69 (37)	36.11 (52)	38.19 (55)	100.00 (144)

$r = .20 \quad p < .05$

It seems that the more active in politics a lawyer becomes, the sharper is his skill to project the image of a public spirited citizen. This skill is not something that has to be mastered in school but it might develop and become a part of the behavioral sets that are internalized in the person in various phases and kinds of involvement. Those who are inactive have difficulty in developing such behavioral sets. In the following paragraphs the writer will pursue two more aspects of the lawyer's orientation.

Status of Work Situation and Machiavellianism

In Chapter II the writer discussed some of the apprehensions connected with the role of lawyers in society. The lawyer's image as that of "shyster" is not uncommon today. In these paragraphs an attempt will be made to test whether lawyers in low-status work situations are in fact "manipulators" or believe in so-called Machiavellian "principles of conduct." These principles were interpreted by Christie and Merton to mean "cunning, duplicity and bad faith."[1] For the purpose of testing this attribute, six items formulated by Christie on the basis of a review of

---

[1]Richard Christie and Robert K. Merton, "Procedures for the Sociological Study of the Values Climate of Medical Schools," Journal of Medical Education, XXXIII (October, 1958), 125-53.

Machiavelli were used.[1] Christie and Merton describe the items as follows:

> The items in the scale express a conception of human nature as fallible and weak, a lack of affect (i.e., the value of detachment in dealing with other people), and the use of expedient procedures in social relations. Those making a high score on the (Mach.) scale endorse such items and reject items of opposed kind, such as those portraying human nature idealistically, emphasizing the need of warmth and affective involvement with other people, and holding that social relations should always be governed by strict adherence to ethical norms.[2]

The scale items were generally met by rejection by those to whom it was administered--however, not completely. Differences in agreement with the items are interesting. Medical students were found more Machiavelli-like than four other groups including Business Executives and Lobbyists. On these and similar data the authors concluded that a "philosophy of manipulation has substantial currency among medical students."[3] How is it with Ingham lawyers?

Ingham lawyers rejected the items for the most part with varying degrees of disagreement. Scores from 1-6 were assigned to varying degrees of agreement or disagreement for each item (see Figure VI).

---

[1]The items are reported in Appendix C.

[2]Christie and Merton, op. cit., p. 134.

[3]Ibid., p. 136.

FIGURE VI.1

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Slightly	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	6

The total scores add up to 36 points for the combined items. Lawyers disagreeing "strongly" were classified as "Not Machiavellian" and those agreeing or disagreeing less strongly were considered simply as "Machiavellian." Lawyers are sophisticated readers of the printed word and hardly can be ambivalent to what they read. The connotations cannot very well escape them. So that if they did not reject the items strongly, they might as well be considered Machiavellian. Further, this writer thinks that lawyers may have "manipulated" the items and hence tended to "Agree Slightly" and "Disagree Slightly" and "Somewhat" rather than taking stronger positions. Medical students may, in fact, have a Machiavellian <u>intent</u> and actually lack the manipulative <u>skill</u> that may (in fact) be common among Lobbyists, Business Executives or lawyers. Further, lawyers may be particularly sensitive to such fallible connotations as implied in certain items.

In Chapter III the writer hypothesized that lawyers in low-status work situations will tend to be more

manipulative than lawyers in higher-status work situations. The assumption here, of course, is that lawyers in low positions would want to rise and that the struggle for better clients and improved work situation may make them expedient and believe "it is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there." This hypothesis does hold true. Lawyers in low-status work situations are, in fact, more Machiavellian than lawyers in higher-status work situations (see Table VI.3). These results should not be interpreted as conclusive because the instruments used are still in the stage of experimentation. It is, nevertheless, interesting to indicate some further attributes of Machiavellian lawyers.

TABLE VI.3.--Machiavellianism by status of work situation.

Degree of Machiavellianism	Low	Middle	High	Total
Machiavellian	72.34 (34)	59.18 (29)	45.83 (22)	59.03 (85)
Not Machiavellian	27.66 (13)	40.82 (20)	54.17 (26)	40.97 (59)
	32.64 (47)	34.03 (49)	33.33 (48)	100.00 (144)

$r = .22 \quad p < .05$

One of the factors that seems to produce what is termed Machiavellianism in this study and that was anticipated early in the research design is the social class from which lawyers come. The lawyers' social class, together with the stage of their careers, the type of cases they handle and the role they assume in these cases, seem to determine their Machiavellianism. It is true, however, that social class may have preceded all other factors, yet it is not necessarily the strongest influence. The strongest influence may be due to the pressures that are associated with the initial and transitional stages of their careers.

Table VI.4 shows that Machiavellianism is not independent of social class and that, in fact, it is inversely correlated with it.

TABLE VI.4.--Degree of Machiavellianism by social class.

Degree of Machiavellianism	Upper Class	Middle Class	Lower Class	Total
Machiavellian	53.06 (26)	50.50 (22)	72.55 (37)	59.03 (85)
Not Machiavellian	46.94 (23)	50.00 (22)	27.45 (14)	40.97 (59)
	34.03 (49)	30.56 (44)	35.42 (51)	100.00 (144)

$r = -.17 \quad p < .05$

Further, Machiavellianism is not independent of the pressures that accompany the stages of the lawyer's career. These pressures may be similar to those encountered by medical students in their struggle to be physicians. Table VI.5 shows the nature of the relationship that exists between the two factors. Lawyers in their initial and transitional stages are far more manipulative than those in more stable stages.

TABLE VI.5.--Degree of Machiavellianism by career stages.

Degree of Machiavellianism	Initial Stage	Transitional Stage	Stable Stage	Total
Machiavellian	73.53 (25)	59.32 (35)	49.02 (25)	59.03 (85)
Not Machiavellian	26.47 (9)	40.68 (24)	50.98 (26)	40.97 (59)
	23.61 (34)	49.97 (59)	35.42 (51)	100.00 (144)

$r = .18 \quad p < .05$

Two other factors that are correlated with each other and seem to have an influencing effect are: type of cases handled and the role lawyers assume in handling these cases. Type of cases is an important element of the lawyer's work situation and tells about the clients he deals with in his

practice. Lawyers handling mostly domestic cases are found, as expected, to be comparatively more Machiavellian than those dealing mostly in business-corporate-commercial cases (see Table VI.6).

TABLE VI.6.--Degree of Machiavellianism by type of cases handled.

Degree of Machiavellianism	Domestic	Business	Total
Machiavellian	66.27 (55)	49.18 (30)	59.03 (85)
Not Machiavellian	33.73 (28)	50.82 (31)	40.97 (59)
	57.64 (83)	42.36 (61)	100.00 (144)

$r = .17 \quad p < .05$

Similar relation is found between the roles they perform in transacting the type of cases they handle and Machiavellianism. Pleading, as noted earlier, is the most common role performed by those who handle domestic cases. Negotiating, advising and writing briefs are much more common in the practice of lawyers in higher-status work situations and who handle mostly business cases. Those who perform pleading and like it most are found more Machiavellian than others

who perform roles that are less combative in nature (see Table VI.7).

TABLE VI.7.--Degree of Machiavellianism by lawyers' legal role.

Degree of Machiavellianism	Pleading	Negotiating	Advising & Writing	Total
Machiavellian	69.01 (49)	55.00 (11)	47.17 (25)	59.03 (85)
Not Machiavellian	30.99 (22)	45.00 (9)	52.83 (28)	40.97 (59)
	49.31 (71)	13.89 (20)	36.81 (53)	100.00 (144)

$r = .20 \quad p < .05$

Finally, it may be interesting to report one more attribute of Machiavellianism and that is "Political Cynicism." Cynicism refers to a belief that "human conduct is motivated wholly by self-interest."[1] Robert E. Agger developed a scale for measuring political cynicism.[2]

---

[1] Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Webster defines it further as an attitude of "fault-finding, captious, critic; a misanthrope." Cynical implies "a sneering disbelief in sincerity and rectitude."

[2] Robert E. Agger et al., "Political Cynicism: Measurement and Meaning," Journal of Politics, XXIII (August, 1961), 477-506.

The scale items were reported to be reliable and could be used for the purposes of this study. The six items used test to what extent people view politics and politicians in a cynical manner. For example, one item tests whether the respondent believes that "people are very frequently manipulated by politicians."[1]

The scale items were used as an index of political cynicism and were dealt with in the same manner as the items on Machiavellianism. The results show that cynicism is an attribute that is associated with Machiavellianism. Table VI.8 shows that the predominant majority of those who are "Very Cynical" are also Machiavellian.

TABLE VI.8.--Machiavellianism by political cynicism.

Degree of Machiavellianism	Very Cynical	Not So Cynical	Trusting	Total
Machiavellian	73.81 (31)	54.90 (28)	50.98 (26)	59.03 (85)
Not Machiavellian	26.19 (11)	45.10 (23)	49.02 (25)	40.97 (59)
	29.17 (42)	35.42 (51)	35.42 (51)	100.00 (144)

$r = .18 \quad p < .05$

[1]For all items in the Index see Appendix D.

This evidence permitted the writer to use the word "cynical" more confidently. Cynicism was not correlated appreciably with other factors to warrant further independent treatment.

Lawyers' Conservatism and Work Situations

One major controversy connected with lawyers in the United States is the issue of conservatism. Are lawyers in fact conservative? This question obviously cannot be answered on the basis of data collected in this study. In the absence of an outside criterion group it is difficult to generalize. The design of this study permits the writer to describe some facts that produce such a phenomenon as conservatism in lawyers. But before going any further, conservatism must be defined.

Conservatism as used here is an aspect of political ideology that refers to the respondents' specific attitudes toward the scope of government. Those who are sympathetic toward the idea of having an active and expanding role for government to bring about further equity and social justice are liberal in orientation. In contrast, conservatives tend to be suspicious of the role of government or of any change in the status quo. Further, they would tend to believe that the government that is best is that which governs least. The operational definition is contained in the form of

statements formulated by the Michigan Survey Research Center, which tested them and ascertained their reliability. Using these statements as an index of conservatism, the writer was able to determine four continuous shades of liberalism-conservatism: "Very Liberal," "Moderately Liberal," "Moderately Conservative," and "Very Conservative."[1]

The hypothesis that the attitude of lawyers toward the scope of government (political ideology) is directly related to their work situation was adequately verified by the data (see Table VI.9).

TABLE VI.9.--Status of work situation by political ideology.

Status of Work Situation	Very Liberal	Moderately Liberal	Moderately Conservative	Very Conservative	Total
Low	43.33 (13)	45.45 (15)	24.44 (11)	22.22 (8)	32.64 (47)
Middle	23.33 (7)	42.42 (14)	37.78 (17)	30.56 (11)	34.02 (49)
High	33.33 (10)	12.12 (4)	37.78 (17)	47.22 (17)	33.33 (48)
	20.83 (30)	22.92 (33)	31.25 (45)	25.00 (36)	100.00 (144)

$r = .21$ $p < .05$

[1]For the items of the index see Appendix E.

Work situation and the position of the lawyer in the hierarchy of the profession do in fact affect the lawyer's attitude toward the scope of government. Yet the origin of these attitudes seems to antedate their present work situation and position. The strongest correlations are found between the lawyer's political ideology and both father and son's political affiliation. This suggests that both inherited and adopted party ideology is an enduring factor that operates in conjunction with the elements of work situation to produce the lawyer's present political ideology. Tables VI.10, VI.11, and VI.12 show these relationships in statistical terms. Other social background factors, except age, were not appreciably related to political ideology.

TABLE VI.10.--Father's party affiliation by political ideology of lawyer.

Political Party	Very Liberal	Moderately Liberal	Moderately Conservative	Very Conservative	Total
Republican	40.00 (12)	69.70 (23)	82.22 (37)	86.11 (31)	71.53 (103)
Democratic	60.00 (18)	30.30 (10)	17.78 (8)	13.89 (5)	28.47 (41)
	20.83 (30)	22.92 (33)	31.25 (45)	25.00 (36)	100.00 (144)

$r = -.55$ $p < .001$

TABLE VI.11.--Lawyer's party affiliation by political ideology

Political Party	Very Liberal	Moderately Liberal	Moderately Conserva-tive	Very Conserva-tive	Total
Republican	30.00 (9)	54.55 (18)	86.67 (39)	97.22 (35)	70.14 (101)
Democratic	70.00 (21)	45.45 (15)	13.33 (6)	2.78 (1)	29.86 (43)
	20.83 (30)	22.92 (33)	31.25 (45)	25.00 (36)	100.00 (144)

$r = -.55$ $p < .001$

TABLE VI.12.--Lawyer's party affiliation by status of work situation.

Political Party	Low	Middle	High	Total
Republican	57.45 (27)	77.55 (38)	75.00 (36)	70.14 (101)
Democratic	42.55 (20)	22.45 (11)	25.00 (12)	29.86 (43)
	32.64 (47)	34.03 (49)	33.33 (48)	100.00 (144)

$r = .15$ $p < .05$

Finally, it may be interesting to report that liberal lawyers are found to be far more "Machiavellian" and politically cynical than conservative lawyers (see Table VI.13).

TABLE VI.13.--Political ideology by Machiavellianism.

Degree of Machiavel-lianism	Very Liberal	Moderately Liberal	Moderately Conserva-tive	Very Conserva-tive	Total
Machiavellian	76.67 (23)	63.64 (21)	53.33 (24)	47.22 (17)	59.03 (85)
Not Machiavel-lian	23.33 (7)	36.36 (12)	46.67 (21)	52.78 (19)	40.97 (59)
	20.83 (30)	22.92 (33)	31.25 (45)	25.00 (36)	100.00 (144)

$r = .21 \quad p < .05$

It certainly is difficult to speculate why this is the case except to say that lawyers in low-status work situations generally are still in the struggling stage of their careers, a stage that might call for expediency. They are often younger men with a considerable zest for living under some changed conditions. Further, as younger lawyers they have probably been affected by the "Realist" school of thought with its emphasis on the sociology rather than the letter of the law.

The quality of the lawyer's clients is another important factor to consider. Lawyers in low-status work situations serve poorer clients than those served by those in higher-status work situations. The latter are often

serving far richer and steadier clients. Those who are already serving better-off clients (e.g., business) see that change in the status quo may not be in their interest. Those in low positions would certainly view change in the order of things sympathetically and perhaps optimistically.[1] The connection indicated above between liberalism and Machiavellianism must be interpreted cautiously partly because of the experimental nature of such exercises and partly because of the nature of the connotation.

In this chapter the relation between work situations and certain perceptions held by the lawyers were examined. Lawyers in low-status work situations were found to attach a higher value to the rewards of holding a public office than those in higher-status work situations. Differences in the perceived utility of politics (i.e., tangible-material or intangible-symbolic) were not found related to work situation as was initially hypothesized. How (in what

---

[1]The reader may be interested to know that most lawyers do <u>not</u> think that the lawyer's education and his use of precedent have anything to do with conservatism (58.33 percent). Most of those disagreeing indicated that political ideology is affected by the lawyer's clients rather than by the lawyer's education and use of precedent. Agreement or disagreement on this issue varied with variations in the respondents' work situations. The higher the work situation the greater the agreement and vice versa.

terms) political rewards are perceived seems to depend more on the social class of the lawyer rather than his work situation. Politically active lawyers were found to perceive political rewards more in intangible-symbolic rather than tangible-material terms.

Ingham lawyers have generally disagreed with most of the items on Machiavellianism; however, the majority did not reject them totally or definitively. The findings indicate, nevertheless, that Machiavellianism is inversely related to work situation. In addition to other factors directly connected with work situation, there is evidence that social class is a major element that contributes to the Machiavelli-like beliefs held by a segment of the lawyers. There was evidence to warrant reporting a close connection between Machiavellianism and political cynicism.

Finally, it appears from the data that Ingham County lawyers on the whole tend to lean toward a political ideology of conservatism (Conservatives 56.25 percent vs. Liberals 43.75 percent). Work situation is certainly a factor that contributes to the conservatism of lawyers. Stronger influence seem to come from home and their political affiliation. Lawyers coming from Democratic homes and belonging to the Democratic party are considerably more

liberal than those who come from a Republican home and belong to the Republican party.

Moreover, there was evidence indicating that liberalism is associated with both Machiavellianism and political cynicism. Liberal lawyers apparently believe in expedient means and often are sophisticated critics of the world around them, more so than conservative lawyers who seem to have a stake in the status quo.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

The data reported in this study do not directly point to any statistically significant differences in the overall degree of political activity between lawyers in low-status work situations and those in higher-status work situations. Lawyers in Ingham County, however, manifest a considerable degree of political activity. Compared with other "professionals" from a national sample surveyed in 1950 and who responded to the same set of questions (measuring political activity), Ingham lawyers are found almost three times as active. It is possible that Ingham lawyers are more active than lawyers practicing in other middle-sized cities. This could be partly due to the unusual context in which they operate. Lansing is the capital of the State of Michigan and therefore the center of considerable political activity generated by the fact that it houses the state legislature and government administration. In this city are the headquarters of the two major parties and the offices of the major professional, business

and civic associations. The city is also the center for considerable industrial and business activity. Almost 27 percent of the labor force are employed in the automobile and other metal manufacturing concerns. The city is, for these reasons, an excellent place for a prosperous career in law. Ambitious lawyers could build a lucrative business in this city and many of the lawyers interviewed have done so. While the political situation might account for the considerable political activity of these lawyers, the economic situation accounts, in large measure, for their relative success. It seems that the chances for success in this city are still better than fair for those who are still in the initial stages of their careers or those in solo practice. This is so partly because law firms in the city are not numerous or large and specialized to the extent that they might siphon all business and threaten those in solo practice as perhaps happens in large metropolitan centers. Hence the differences in the work situations of those on top and those at the bottom in the Ingham Bar correspond only slightly to the dramatic differences among lawyers practicing in large metropolitan centers.

The data nevertheless indicate that there are significant differences in the <u>kinds</u> of activities in which lawyers in low-status work situations and lawyers in

higher-status work situations engage. Lawyers in low-status work situations tend to participate more actively in the politics of hierarchy and contention, whereas lawyers in higher-status work situations tend to be considerably more active in the politics of bargaining and discussion. In other words, lawyers in low-status work situations tend to be active party workers and to hold office in political party hierarchy and auxiliary organizations and other community organizations. Lawyers in higher-status work situations, on the other hand, tend to contribute money to political candidates and tend to exercise influence on legislators and public officials through direct contacts, letter-writing and personal word-of-mouth communications. Further, lawyers in high-status work situations seem to take voting or participation at the polls more seriously than those in low-status work situations.

The differences in the kinds of political activities in which lawyers in lower-status work situations and those in higher-status work situations engage are due in part to differences in career work stages and differences in the value they attach to the expected rewards of holding office. Lawyers who are still in the initial and transitional stages of their careers are more active in

hierarchical politics than those who are in the more stable stages. Lawyers in low-status work situations tend to evaluate the "expected utility" of public office higher than those in high-status work situations. Moreover, lawyers in low-status work situations tend to "consider seriously" political offices at the local and state levels most often, whereas lawyers in high-status work situations are willing to consider seriously only offices on the national or federal level. The fact that lawyers in high-status work situations are willing to consider only offices at the federal level is no surprise partly because as much as 63 percent of these lawyers have previously held offices at the local level. These offices are locally elected law-enforcement offices, e.g., city and county prosecuting attorney or municipal and local judgeships. Capturing these offices demands the support of the political party organization and possibly other community organizations. Thus it seems necessary for lawyers in low-status work situations to be active in political party organizations, especially when they desire to hold any of these offices. Further, participation in political parties and other community organizations helps the less established lawyers to gain a considerable degree of visibility and exposure. Lawyers in high-status work situations apparently have already held

party or other political offices at the local level. This limits their local ambitions; nevertheless, it facilitates their participation in the politics of bargaining and discussion. Their political experience, contacts, and friendships made at the time help them to use personal communications to advantage. The purpose of these communications is not so much for patronage in the form of local political offices as much as to influence the outcome of political or non-political decisions in which they (or their clients) are interested. It may also be that these lawyers have generally wealthier and steadier clients and therefore the advantages of overt active partisan politics must be carefully and cautiously weighed.

It was indicated above that 63 percent of those lawyers who are now in the upper echelons of the profession have held political office at the local level. An inspection of the offices last held by these lawyers reveals that those held most frequently are the same as the offices which seem very attractive to lawyers who are now in low-status work situations. These offices are invariably elected law-enforcement offices. These offices are perceived as especially rewarding to ambitious lawyers desiring professional or political advancement. Holding such offices provides the lawyer valuable experience and a

considerable degree of access to political decision-makers at the local level in addition to visibility and publicity. All of these rewards seem to be very important for the passage from a low to a higher and improved work situation. A lawyer with this kind of experience becomes attractive to wealthier and steadier business clients and might be easily invited to join a law partnership in an already established law firm. Further, if he is interested in a political career, these local offices can be excellent stepping-stones to higher political office. Lawyers are in an enviable position, especially when running for these law-enforcement offices. In fact, members of the Bar have a virtually complete monopoly of these offices.

Thus it seems rather clear that the predominance of lawyers in American politics is in large part due to the advantage that lawyers have over non-lawyers when trying to capture the law-enforcement offices at the city and county levels. These offices are perceived as vehicles for professional escalation more often than for political advancement. The decision to go farther into a political career would seem to depend on other factors, not least of which is the desire to do so and the loyalty to the party organization. The local offices in Ingham County seem to have been used by lawyers as a means for an improved

legal career. This was clearly suggested by the political experience of lawyers in high-status work situations.

The manner in which lawyers perceive the utility of political rewards was found to be correlated with the social class lawyers come from, and not so much their work situation and position in the hierarchy of the profession. Lawyers with low social class background tend to perceive the utility of politics and political rewards in tangible-material terms more often than those coming from upper and middle classes. Further, political activity of lawyers was found to be inversely related to the way they perceive the utility of political rewards. Politically active lawyers tend to perceive the utility of political rewards in intangible-symbolic terms more often than those who were found less active.

There is some evidence which suggests that lawyers in low-status work situations tend to hold Machiavelli-like beliefs more frequently than those in higher-status work situations. Machiavelli-like beliefs seem to be particularly common among those in the initial stages of their careers, who handle mostly domestic cases, personal injury cases, and those who do more pleading than negotiating and advising. Social class background is found to be a contributive factor

also. The Machiavelli-like beliefs held by lawyers in low-status work situations may be partly responsible for the often-exaggerated image of the lawyer as a "slick operator" or even a "shyster."

Ingham County lawyers tend to lean towards an ideology of political conservatism. Lawyers in low-status work situations are considerably more liberal than those in higher-status work situations. The influence of inherited and adopted political party affiliations is very clear. Lawyers who come from Democratic homes and belong to the Democratic party are considerably more liberal than those who come from Republican homes and belong to the Republican party.

In retrospect, it seems that the work situation approach offers an important tool for studying the political behavior of lawyers and possibly other professional people. Politicization of lawyers takes place and assumes full expression primarily at work. The realities of the lawyer's work situation and desire for career mobility and the good life shape a good deal of his behavior and relation to politics. Observing lawyers at different stages in their careers and at different points in the hierarchy of the profession and their respective work conditions is, in fact,

a developmental approach. Using this approach, the researcher could define the lawyer's relation to politics at several points in his career progress.

The work situation of lawyers seems to determine the kinds of political activity in which they engage. Both the value lawyers attach to holding political office and their level of political ambitions seem to be affected by their work situation and position in the hierarchy of the profession.

Lawyers' political participation in hierarchical politics decreases as they move upward in the professional hierarchy. The higher they climb, the more they depend on politics of bargaining, discussion and influence. Data on the Ingham Bar suggest further that lawyers perceive local politics as an especially convenient vehicle for escalation in the profession rather than in the political system as such.

Finally, the writer recommends similar, nevertheless more intensive, efforts be made to study lawyers in larger metropolitan centers. Studies made on a larger scale may allow the researcher to understand more fully the implications of the influx of lawyers into decision-making positions in the political system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Berelson, Bernard R., Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and McPhee, William N. Voting. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Blaustein, Albert P., and Porter, Charles O. The American Lawyer: A Survey of the Legal Profession. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Brown, Esther Lucile. Lawyers, Law Schools and the Public Service. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1948.

Bullitt, Stimson. To Be a Politician. Introduction by David Riesman. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1959.

Campbell, Angus, Gurin, G., and Miller, W. E. The Voter Decides. Evanston: Row Peterson & Co., 1954.

Carlin, J. E. Lawyers on Their Own. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1962.

Comfort, George O. Professional Politicians: A Study of British Party Agents. Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1959.

Dahl, Robert A. Modern Political Analysis. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

De Tocqueville, A. Democracy in America. Vol. I. New York: Oxford University Press, 1945.

Downs, Anthony. An Economic Theory of Democracy. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

Epstein, Leon D. Politics in Wisconsin. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958.

Froman, Lewis A., Jr. People and Politics. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.

Grossman, Joel B. Lawyers & Judges. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Harno, Albert J. Legal Education in the United States. San Francisco: Bancroft-Whitney Co., 1953.

Herble, Rudolf. Social Movements: An Introduction to Political Sociology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951.

Horsky, C. A. The Washington Lawyer. Boston: Little, Brown, 1953.

Hughes, E. C. Men and Their Work. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.

Hurst, James William. The Growth of American Law. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1950.

Hyman, Herbert. Political Socialization. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.

Jacob, Herbert. Justice in America. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1965.

Janowitz, Morris. The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.

Kramer, Judith R., and Leventman, Seymour. Children of the Gilded Ghetto: Conflict Resolution of Three Generations of American Jews. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1961.

Lane, Robert E. Political Life. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959.

Lasswell, H. D. Politics: Who Gets What, When, How. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1936.

Levy, Beryl H. Corporation Lawyer--Saint or Sinner? The New Role of the Lawyer in Modern Society. Philadelphia: Chilton Co., 1961.

Lipset, S. M., and Bendix, R. Social Mobility in Industrial Society. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953.

Lubell, Samuel. The Future of American Politics. 2nd ed. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1956.

March, James G., and Simon, Herbert. Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.

Marvick, Dwaine (ed.). Political Decision-Makers: Recruitment and Performance. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.

Matthews, Donald R. The Social Background of Political Decision-Makers. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1954.

_____. U. S. Senators and Their World. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1960.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Rev. ed. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Mills, C. Wright. Power, Politics and People. Edited by L. Horowitz. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.

_____. White Collar: The American Middle Classes. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.

Moley, Raymond. Our Criminal Courts. New York: Minton, Balch & Co., 1930.

Nosow, Sigmund, and Form, William H. (eds.). Man, Work & Society. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1962.

Passos, John R. Dos. The American Lawyer--As He Was--As He Is--As He Can Be. New York: The Banks Law Publishing Co., 1907.

Pegues, Franklin J. The Lawyers of the Last Capetians. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Pound, Roscoe. The Lawyer from Antiquity and Modern Times. St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1953.

Rosenberg, Morris. Occupations and Values. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Schlesinger, Joseph A. How They Became Governor. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1958.

Simon, H. H., Smithburg, D. W., and Thompson, V. A. Public Administration. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959.

Smith, Talbot. Lawyer: Opportunities for Careers in the Legal Profession. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961.

Steude, William L. The Lawyer in Michigan State Government. Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan, 1959.

Tinnelly, Joseph T. Part-Time Legal Education: A Study of Evening Law Schools. Brooklyn: The Foundation Press, 1957.

Von Neumann, J., and Morgenstern, O. Theory of Games and Economic Behavior. 1st ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944.

Wahlke, John C., Eulau, Heinz, Buchanan, William, and Ferguson, LeRoy C. The Legislative System. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

Weyrauch, Walter O. The Personality of Lawyers. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

Wilson, James Q. The Amateur Democrat. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Zeller, Belle (ed.). American State Legislatures. New York: Thomas Crowell, 1954.

Articles

Agger, Robert E. "Lawyers in Politics," Temple Law Quarterly, XXIX (Summer, 1956), 434-452.

_____. "Political Aspirations of Law Students," Political Research: Organization and Design, I (March, 1958), 7-8.

Agger, Robert E., and Goldrich, Daniel. "Community Power Structure and Partisanship," American Sociological Review, XXIII (August, 1958), 383-392.

Agger, Robert E., Goldstein, M. N., and Pearl, S. A. "Political Cynicism: Measurement and Meaning," Journal of Politics, XXIII (August, 1961), 477-506.

Allport, G. W. "The Psychology of Participation," Psychological Review, LIII (May, 1945), 117-132.

Anderson, H. Dewey. "The Educational and Occupational Attainments of Our National Rulers," Scientific Monthly, XL (June, 1935), 511-518.

Austin, Edwin C. "Some Comments on Large Law Firms," The Practical Lawyer, III (April, 1957), 8-16.

Becker, Howard S., and Strauss, Anselm L. "Careers, Personality, and Adult Socialization," American Journal of Sociology, LXII (November, 1956), 253-263.

Beckett, P., and Sunderland, Celeste. "Washington State's Lawmakers: Some Personal Factors in the Washington Legislature," Western Political Quarterly, X (March, 1957), 180-202.

Berle, A. A., Jr. "Modern Legal Profession," Encyclopedia of Social Sciences. Edited by R. A. Seligman. New York: Macmillan Co., 1938. I, 340-345.

Buchanan, William. "An Inquiry into Purpose Voting," The Journal of Politics, XVIII (May, 1956), 281-296.

Chaffee, Zecharia, Jr. "Changes in the Law During Forty Years," Boston University Law Review, XXXII (January, 1952), 46-53.

Child, I. L. "Socialization," Handbook of Social Psychology. Edited by G. Lindzey. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954. II, 655-692.

Christie, Richard, and Merton, Robert K. "Procedures for the Sociological Study of the Value Climate of Medical Schools," Journal of Medical Education, XXXIII (October, 1958), 125-153.

Clark, Peter B., and Wilson, James Q. "Incentive Systems: A Theory of Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, VI (September, 1961), 129-66.

Dahl, Robert A. "Hierarchy, Democracy, and Bargaining," Research Frontiers in Politics and Government. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution, 1955. 47-66.

Davies, James C. "A Note on Political Motivation," Western Political Quarterly, XII (June, 1959), 410-416.

Derge, David R. "The Lawyer as Decision-Maker in the American State Legislature," Journal of Politics, XXI (August, 1959), 408-433.

Dion, Leon. "Political Ideology as a Tool of Functional Analysis in Socio-Political Dynamics," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXV (February, 1959), 47-59.

Dogan, Mattei. "Political Ascent in a Class Society: French Deputies 1870-1958," Political Decision-Makers, Recruitment and Performance. Edited by D. Marvick. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961. 57-90.

Easton, David, and Hess, Robert D. "The Child's Political World," Midwest Journal of Political Science, IV (August, 1962), 229-46.

Edwards, Ward. "The Theory of Decision Making," Psychological Bulletin, LI (1954), 380-417.

Eldersveld, S. J., Heard, A., et al. "Research in Political Behavior," The American Political Science Review, XLVI (December, 1952), 1003-1032.

Eulau, Heinz. "H. D. Lasswell's Developmental Analysis," The Western Political Quarterly, XI (June, 1958), 229-242.

_____. "Identification with Class and Political Perspective," The Journal of Politics, XVIII (May, 1956), 232-253.

Eulau, Heinz, and Koff, David. "Occupational Mobility and Political Career," The Western Political Quarterly, XV (September, 1962), 507-521.

Eulau, Heinz, and Schneider, Peter. "Dimensions of Political Involvement," Public Opinion Quarterly, XX (Spring, 1956), 128-142.

Form, William H., and Miller, Delbert C. "Occupational Career Pattern as a Sociological Instrument," American Journal of Sociology, LIV (January, 1949), 317-329.

Friedman, M., and Savage, L. J. "The Expected-Utility Hypothesis and the Measurability of Utility," Journal of Political Economy, LX (December, 1952), 463-475.

Froman, Lewis A., Jr. "Learning Political Attitudes," Western Political Quarterly, XV (June, 1962), 304-314.

_____. "Personality and Political Socialization," Journal of Politics, XXIII (May, 1961), 341-352.

Frost, T. Richard. "Stability and Change in Local Party Politics," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXV (Summer, 1961), 221-235.

Glazer, William A. "Doctors in Politics," The American Journal of Sociology, LXVI (November, 1960), 230-245.

Gold, David. "Lawyers in Politics: An Empirical Exploration of Biographical Data on State Legislators," Pacific Sociological Review, IV (Fall, 1961), 84-88.

Hall, Oswald. "The Stages of a Medical Career," The American Journal of Sociology, LIII (March, 1948), 327-336.

Hamilton, Fowler. "The Lawyer and Business," Fortune, XXXVIII (October, 1948), 179-188.

Hennessy, Bernard. "Politicals and Apoliticals: Some Measurements of Personality Traits," The Midwest Journal of Political Science, III (November, 1959), 336-355.

Hill, Evan. "The American Doctor: End of a Legend in an Era of Miracles," The Saturday Evening Post, CCXXXVI (June 15, 1963), 30-37.

Hughes, Everett C. "The Making of a Physician," Human Organization, XIV (Winter, 1956), 21-25.

_____. "The Professions in Society," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXVI (February, 1960), 54-61.

Hyneman, Charles S. "Who Makes Our Laws," Political Science Quarterly, LV (December, 1940), 556-581.

Janowitz, Morris. "Some Consequences of Social Mobility in the United States," Transactions of the Third World Congress of Sociology. London: International Sociological Association, 1956), III, 191-201.

Janowitz, M., and Wright, D. "The Prestige of Public Employment," Public Administration Review, XXVI (Winter, 1956), 15-21.

Katz, Daniel. "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIV (Summer, 1960), 163-205.

Krastin, K. "The Lawyer in Society: A Value Analysis," Western Reserve Law Review, VIII (1957), 409-455.

Ladinsky, Jack. "Careers of Lawyers, Law Practice and Legal Institutions," American Sociological Review, XXVIII (February, 1963), 47-54.

_____. "The Social Profile of a Metropolitan Bar: A Statistical Survey in Detroit," Michigan State Bar Journal, XLIII (February, 1964), 12-24.

Lane, Robert E. "Political Character and Political Analysis," Psychiatry, XVI (November, 1953), 387-398.

Laski, Harold J. "The Decline of the Professions," Harper's Magazine, CLXXI (November, 1935), 676-685.

Lasswell, H. D., and McDougal, M. S. "Legal Education and Public Policy," The Analysis of Political Behavior. Edited by H. Lasswell. London: Routledge, Kegan, Paul, Ltd., 1948.

Lipset, Seymour M., Lazarsfeld, P. F., Barton, A. H., and Linz, J. "The Psychology of Voting: An Analysis of Political Behavior," Handbook of Social Psychology. Edited by G. Lindzey. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954. II, 1124-1175.

Lipset, Seymour M., and Zetterberg, Hans L. "A Theory of Social Mobility," Transactions of the Third World Congress of Sociology. London: International Sociological Association, 1956), II, 155-177.

Litt, Edgar. "Political Cynicism and Political Futility," The Journal of Politics, XXV (May, 1963), 312-323.

Llewellyn, Karl N. "The Bar Specializes--With What Results?" Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CLXVIII (May, 1933), 177-197.

Lortie, Dan C. "Laymen to Lawmen: Law School Careers and Professional Socialization," Harvard Educational Review, XXIX (Fall, 1959), 352-369.

Lundberg, Ferdinand. "The Law Factories: Brains of the Status Quo," Harper's Magazine, CLXXIX (July, 1939), 180-192.

_____. "The Legal Profession: A Social Phenomenon," Harper's Magazine, CLXXVIII (December, 1938), 1-14.

_____. "The Priesthood of the Law," Harper's Magazine, CLXXVIII (April, 1939), 515-526.

Mason, J. B. "The Trend: Lawyers in the Seventy-First and Seventy-Fifth Congress," Rocky Mountain Law Review, X (1937), 45-52.

McClosky, Herbert. "Conservatism and Personality," The American Political Science Review, LII (March, 1958), 27-45.

Milbrath, Lester W. "Predispositions Toward Political Contention," The Western Political Science Quarterly, XIII (March, 1960), 5-18.

Miller, William. "American Lawyers in Business, and in Politics," The Yale Law Review, LX (January, 1951), 66-76.

Mills, C. Wright. "The Competitive Personality," Partisan Review, XIII (September-October, 1946), reprinted in Power, Politics and People. Edited by C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963, 263-273.

_____. "Situated Actions and Vocabularies of Motive," American Sociological Review, V (December, 1940), reprinted in Power, Politics and People. Edited by C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963, 439-452.

Mitchell, William C. "The Ambivalent Social Status of the American Politician," Western Political Quarterly, XII (September, 1959), 683-698.

Mussen, Paul H., and Wysznski, Anne B. "Personality and Political Participation," Human Relations, V (February, 1952), 65-82.

Parsons, Burke A. "The Economics of Law Practice," Michigan State Bar Journal, XLIII (January, 1964), 11-29.

Parsons, Talcott. "A Sociologist Looks at the Legal Profession," Essays in Sociological Theory. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954. 370-385.

Riesman, David. "Equality and Social Structure," Journal of Legal and Political Sociology, I (October, 1942), 72-95.

_____. "Law and Sociology: Recruitment, Training and Colleagueship," Stanford Law Review, IX (1957), 643-673.

_____. "Toward an Anthropological Science of Law and the Legal Profession," American Journal of Sociology, LVII (1951), 121-135.

Rosenberg, Morris. "Some Determinants of Political Apathy," Public Opinion Quarterly, XVIII (Winter, 1954-55), 349-366.

Rosenzweig, Robert M. "The Politician and the Career in Politics," Midwest Journal of Political Science, I (August, 1957), 163-172.

Saenger, Gerhart H. "Social Status and Political Behavior," The American Journal of Sociology, LI (September, 1945), 103-113.

Saunders, Stuart T. "Law and Business: Cornerstones of our Economy," American Bar Association Journal, XLVIII (February, 1962), 152-155.

Schlesinger, J. A. "Lawyers and American Politics: A Clarified View," Midwest Journal of Political Science, I (May, 1957), 26-39.

Schmidhauser, John R. "The Political Behavior of Older Persons: A Discussion of Some Frontiers in Research," Western Political Quarterly, XI (March, 1958), 113-124.

Shils, Edward A. "The Legislator and His Environment," University of Chicago Law Review, XVIII (Spring, 1951), 671-684.

Smigel, Erwin O. "Interviewing a Legal Elite: The Wall Street Lawyer," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (September, 1958), 159-164.

_____. "The Impact of Recruitment on the Organization of the Large Law Firm," American Sociological Review, XXV (February, 1960), 56-66.

Stone, Harlan F. "The Public Influence of the Bar," Harvard Law Review, XLVIII (November, 1934), 1-14.

Swaine, Robert T. "Impact of Big Business on the Profession: An Answer to Critics of the Modern Bar," American Bar Association Journal, XXXV (February, 1949), 89-92.

Tweed, Harrison. "The Changing Practice of Law: The Question of Specialization," American Bar Association Journal, XLVIII (May, 1962), 423-428.

Wardwell, Walter I. "Social Integration, Bureaucratization, and the Professions," Social Forces, XXXIII (May, 1955), 356-359.

Weber, Max. "Politics as a Vocation," From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Translated and edited by Hans H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958. 77-128.

Wells, Richard S. "The Legal Profession and Politics," Midwest Journal of Political Science, VIII (May, 1964), 166-189.

Wilensky, Harold L. "Orderly Careers and Social Participation: The Impact of Working History on Social Integration in the Middle Mass," American Sociological Review, XXXVI (August, 1961), 521-539.

_____. "Work, Careers, and Social Integration," International Social Science Journal, XII (February, 1960), 543-560.

Wood, Arthur L. "Informal Relation in the Practice of Criminal Law," American Journal of Sociology, LXII (July, 1956), 48-55.

_____. "Professional Ethics Among Criminal Lawyers," Social Problems, VII (Summer, 1959), 70-83.

Woodward, Julian L., and Roper, Elmo. "Research on Political Parties and Leadership: Political Activity of American Citizens," American Political Science Review, XLIV (December, 1950), 872-885.

Unpublished Material

Eulau, Heinz, and Sprague, John D. "Lawyers in Politics: A Study in Professional Convergence." Unpublished project, Stanford University, 1962.

Goldstein, Marshall N. "Political Involvement Among American Law Students." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina, 1964.

Hale, William H. "The Career Development of the Negro Lawyer." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, 1949.

Kuroda, Yasumasu. "Political Socialization: Personal and Political Orientation of Law Students in Japan." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1962.

Ladinsky, Jack. "Career Development Among Lawyers: A Study of Social Factors in the Allocation of Professional Labor." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, 1963.

Lortie, Dan C. "The Striving Young Lawyer: A Study of Early Career Differentiation in the Chicago Bar." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, 1958.

MacKinnon, Frederick B. "Study of Ethical Problems of Lawyers in Private Practice." Harvard Law School project in progress.

Thielens, Wagner P., Jr. "Socialization Processes Among Law Students." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in progress, Columbia University.

APPENDIX A

LETTER PRELIMINARY TO SURVEY

Michigan State University
East Lansing
College of Social Science
Department of Political Science

April 15-June, 1964

Dear Mr. _____,

As part of its program, the Department of Political Science at Michigan State University is interested in promoting grassroots research whereby its graduate students will have the opportunity to study public affairs and political phenomena in a systematic manner.

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of a study that is currently in progress and in which we hope you will participate. Mr. Ben T. Hourani, a graduate student in Political Science, is conducting this research. His main concern is to learn how LAWYERS relate themselves to public affairs. He is interested in how the work situation of lawyers affects their personal perception and participation in public affairs. In addition we hope to learn how lawyers feel about some vital public issues.

The research will be carried out by means of personal interviews. To minimize inconvenience to you the interviewer will phone you within the next few days to arrange an appointment.

These interviews and information obtained thereby will be strictly confidential. Names of persons and organizations will under no circumstances be used in any publications or reports. Our interest is in the general patterns

of behavior and not in the individual cases. The success of this study and the significance of the results depend very much on your cooperation.

If you have any questions concerning this study, please feel free to call me at 355-6592 or Professor Joseph Schlesinger, the Graduate Student Advisor, at 355-4709. I am sure you will find the interview interesting and enjoyable.

Sincerely,

Charles R. Adrian
Chairman

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE*

INGHAM COUNTY AREA STUDY

Lawyers and Public Affairs

Contact History

	Date of Appointment	Interview Taken	Not Available	Refused	Other
1st Call					
2nd Call					
3rd Call					

Comments: (Length of Interview, other): _____

_____

_____

* Please note that during the process of pre-testing the questionnaire, this researcher deemed it necessary to eliminate certain items from the whole. However, the numbering of the items was not changed, which explains the discrepancies found herein.

Michigan State University
Ingham County Area Study
Lawyers and Public Affairs

The following questions are part of an effort to study the opinions and attitudes of lawyers in private practice. We are trying to learn how lawyers feel about public affairs in general.

Please express your opinions and how you feel about things very freely. All questionnaires will be held in strictest confidence.

1. Where were you born?_____
   name of town or city state or country

2. What is the original nationality of your family on your father's side? (If "American," what country did his family come from?)

   Orig. Nationality_____(American?)_____

a. Was your father born in the U.S.? ____yes ____no

   (If "no," where?):_____

3. Generally speaking, when you were growing up, did your mother think of herself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?

   _____ Strong Republican
   _____ Republican
   _____ Independent closer to Republican
   _____ Independent
   _____ Independent closer to Democrat
   _____ Democrat
   _____ Strong Democrat
   _____ Other: _____
   _____ DK

4. Generally speaking, when you were growing up, did your father think of himself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?

   _____ Strong Republican
   _____ Republican

_____ Independent closer to Republican
_____ Independent
_____ Independent closer to Democrat
_____ Democrat
_____ Strong Democrat
_____ Other: _____
_____ DK

6. How active was your father in politics? Would you say:

____very active ____slightly active ____not too active

____not active at all

Now I would like to talk to you about going into law and law practice:

7. When did you definitely decide to go into law?

____Before high school
____During the high school years
____Between high school and college
____During the early years of college (Freshman and Sophomore)
____During the later years of college (Junior and Senior)
____After college
____Other (When?):_____

8. Did you earn your way through school? ____yes ____no ____in part (If "yes" and "in part"), what kind of a job did you do?

a. During law school:_____
b. Post-law school:_____

9. Would you say it was financially easy going through law school?

____quite easy ____not so easy ____ quite tough

10. What ambition would you say was particularly important in your decision to go into law?

_____

11. How long have you been in your present practice? Has this been in the Lansing area?

Number of years in present practice:_____
Years in Lansing office:_____
Years in other places:_____
Name of Place:_____
(town, city and state)

12. Are you in law practice full time or part time?

____full time ____part time ____Other:_____
(If "part-time," what other jobs do you hold or do?)

Name of job:_____
Functions:_____

13. Are you in law practice on your own, in association with others, in a partnership, or in a firm?

____individual practice ____in association with others
____in partnership _____in a firm
Other_____

14. (If Respondent is associated or in partnership), how many lawyers are there in with you?

Number of lawyers:_____

a. Do you work together on cases and share in the fees (or returns), or do you each have your own practice and share only overhead expenses?

____share fees ____own practice but share overhead

b. Is there any particular division of labor? Who does what?

_____

15. (If Respondent is in a firm), are you an "associate" or a "member"?

____Associate ____Member ____Other (specify):_____

16. What types of cases do you usually handle? (rank)

____Personal injury cases
____Divorce, adoption, etc.
____Criminal
____Collections
____Will-probate-estate
____Patent, trade-mark
____Unfair competition
____Income tax
____Federal Estate Tax
____Inheritance tax
____Tax foreclosure
____Labor
____Real Estate
____Business-corporate-commercial
____Other (specify):_____

b. What other work to you do?_____

19. A lawyer performs many functions in his daily work; which of the following functions do you find yourself performing more frequently than others?

____Pleading ____Advising and giving counsel
____Negotiating ____Contactman-linking function
____Mediating ____Writing briefs
____Arbitrating ____Other:_____

a. Which of these functions do you like best?:_____
_____

20. Would you say many of your clients are members of nationality groups (I mean people belonging to groups such as the Greeks, Negroes, Polish, Italians, etc.?)

_____none _____some _____a good many

a. What group(s)? Name of groups:_____

b. How would you characterize your clients' problems, occupational category they belong to: are they business people, professionals, white collar, blue collar, other? Remarks in detail:_____

_____

c. Whom do you find yourself representing more often, defendants or plaintiffs?_____

21. Would you say it has been easy for you to get established in the profession?

____quite easy ____not so easy ____quite tough

a. How is that?_____

23. If you had a son, would you wish him to be a lawyer? Or what?

____Lawyer ____Other:_____

(If "lawyer"), what kind of lawyer:_____

Would you want your son to be active in politics?_____

_____

Now I would like to talk to you about political parties and learn how you feel about them, about government political offices and your interest in local, national and international issues:

24. Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, an Independent, or what?

____Rep. ____Dem. ____Ind. ____Other:_____

Would you call yourself a strong Rep./Dem. or not very strong?
____Strong Rep. ____Strong Dem. ____Not strong

Was there ever a time when you thought of yourself as a Rep./Dem. rather than a Dem./Rep.? ____yes ____no
(If Yes,) when did you change:_____

25. Suppose there was an election where your party was running a candidate that you did not like or you didn't agree with; which of the following things comes closest to what you think you would do?

____I probably would vote for him anyway because a person should be loyal to his party.

____I probably would not vote for either candidate in that election.
____I probably would vote for the other party's candidate.

(If Respondent is Independent or Other):

a. Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic Party?

____closer to Republican ____closer to Democratic

b. Was there ever a time when you thought of yourself as a Republican or Democrat? ____yes ____no
(If yes) which party was that?_____

c. When did you change or become independent?_____

26. Did you hold any political or government position in the last ten years? ____yes ____no
(If "yes,") What position(s)? Name of position(s) and duration:_____

a. Did you ever seek the nomination or enter any primary elections? When? ____yes ____no
(If yes, further detail):_____

b. Were you at all approached by members of either party or someone else in this regard? Comments:

_____

27. Are you involved in any political activities? ___yes___no
(If yes) what activities? Enumerate and describe:

_____

28. While at law school, how interested would you say you were in politics?
____very much interested ____not so interested
____pretty interested ____not at all interested

a. How about now; how interested are you in politics?
____very much interested ____not so interested
____pretty interested ____not at all interested

29. How much interested would you say you are in local, national, and international affairs?

	Very much	Fairly	Not much interested
Local affairs	____	____	____
National matters	____	____	____
International matters	____	____	____

30. How interested would you be in the following positions? Please make a check mark in the space that corresponds most closely to the intensify of your interest or lack of interest.

Not interested at all	City or county attorney : : : : :	Very much interested
Not interested at all	City or County Judge : : : : :	Very much interested
Not interested at all	County Party Chairman : : : : :	Very much interested
Not interested at all	State Judge : : : : :	Very much interested
Not interested at all	Federal Judge : : : : :	Very much interested
Not interested at all	State Legislator _____	Very much interested
Not interested at all	Party State Central Committee : : : : :	Very much interested
Not interested at all	U.S. Congressman : : : : :	Very much interested
Not interested at all	State and Federal Official : : : : :	Very much interested
Not interested at all	State Attorney General : : : : :	Very much interested

31. Would you say that you have given some thought to any of these positions listed previously?

____good deal of thought ____a little ____not at all

a. What about in the (near) future; will you consider or be seriously interested in any of the previously listed positions? ____yes ____no ____DK

b. Which position is this?_____

32. What would you say is particularly attractive about this position?
Comments:_____

33. When you get together with your friends, would you say that you discuss public issues like government regulation of business, labor unions, taxes, and farm programs "frequently," "occasionally," or "never"?

____frequently ____occasionally ____never (almost)

34. (If "frequently" or "occasionally") which of the statements listed here best describes the part you yourself take in these discussions with your friends?

____Even though I have my opinions, I usually just listen.
____Mostly I listen, but once in a while I express my opinions.
____I take an equal share in the conversation.
____I do more than just hold up my end of the conversation; usually I try to convince others that I am right.

35. Have you ever written or talked to your Congressman or Senator or other public official to let them know what you would like them to do on a public issue you weren't interested in? ____yes ____no

a. In the last four years, have you worked for the election of any political candidate by doing things like distributing circulars or leaflets, making speeches, or calling on voters? ____yes ____no

b. Have you attended any meetings in the last four years at which political speeches were made?
____yes ____no

c. In the last four years, have you contributed money to a political party or to a candidate for a political office? ____yes ____no

d. Probably you can't remember exactly, but about how many times do you think you have gone to the polls and voted during the last four years?_____

36. Do you happen to belong to any organizations that sometimes take a stand on housing, better government, school problems, or other public issues? ____yes ____no
(If "yes,") what organizations?_____

37. What other clubs and organizations such as social, business, or political, do you belong to?

About how often do you attend their meetings; would you say "usually," only "occasionally," or almost "never."

Are you, or were you ever, an officer or committee member of any of these groups?

Meeting Attendance

Organization	Usually	Occasionally	Almost Never	Officer or Comm. mem.

43. What would you say lawyers in politics (or those who go into politics) expect to obtain from politics or political positions?

_____

a. What would you say is the most important incentive or reward (of those you mentioned) for attracting a lawyer into politics?_____

44. Often the conclusion is made that lawyers, by virtue of their education and work (use of precedent) tend to be conservative in politics. Do you agree or disagree?

How is that? Comments:_____

45. It is often said that lawyers have a unique position in the American democratic system. What is so unique about the position of the lawyer as you see it?

Comments:_____

46. If a lawyer wanted to do most good in his community, what is the most important thing he could do?

____Devote his spare time to politics.
____Devote his spare time to civic affairs.
____Give legal aid to people who can't afford legal services.
____Pay taxes and vote.
____Make enough income to contribute to worthy community causes.
____Other (specify):_____

47. What kind of work did your father (or step father) do? That is, what was his occupation?_____

a. In his work, did your father work for himself or for someone else?
____self ____someone else ____DK

48. How many years of school did your father complete:

4 or less	5-8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16
___	___	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _

Graduate Training

49. What is (was) your father's usual religious (denominational) affiliation?
Father's denomination:_____
Mother's denomination:_____

53. What degrees do you have? Degrees: _____ _____ _____

a. What law school did you attend?_____

b. Did you attend day or night law school? ____day
____night

c. Were you a full-time or part-time student? ____full
____part-time

d. What was your legal specialization in?_____

e. What year did you graduate from law school?_____

f. What was the highest grade of college you completed?

____no college completed
____Freshman
____Sophomore
____Junior
____Senior (but no degree)
____Graduate (but no degree)

g. (If a college degree is mentioned), what was your major?_____

54. What was your total family income before taxes in 1963?

____Under $3,000
____$3,000-3,999
____$4,000-4,999
____$5,000-5,999
____$6,000-6,999
____$7,000-7,999
____$8,000-8,999
____$9,000-9,999
____$10,000-14,999
____$15,000-$19,999
____$20,000-24,999
____$25,000-29,999
____$30,000-34,999
____$35,000- or over

Here I have a number of statements that I would like you to read: These statements refer to basic personal opinions and attitudes toward certain social issues. Please read each statement. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by placing a check mark in the appropriate column:

Confidential

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Slightly	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
In order to get nominated most candidates for political office have to make basic compromises and undesirable commitments.						
A large number of city and county politicians are political hacks.						
We have to teach children that all men are created equal, but almost everyone knows that some are better than others.						
Duties are more important than rights.						
People are getting soft and weak from so much coddling and babying.						
Politicians represent the general interest more frequently than they represent special interests.						

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Slightly	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
Politicians spend most of their time getting re-elected or re-appointed.						
People are very frequently manipulated by politicians.						
Money is the most important factor influencing public policies.						
The heart is as good a guide as the head.						
No matter what people think, a few people will always run things anyway.						
You can't change human nature.						
The world is too complicated to be understood by anyone but experts.						
If a person doesn't care how an election comes out he shouldn't vote in it.						
In order to get ahead you have to be able to make people do what you want.						

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Slightly	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
If cities and towns around the country need help to build more schools, the government in Washington ought to give them the money they need.						
The government in Washington ought to see to it that everybody who wants to work can find a job.						
If Negroes are not getting fair treatment in jobs and housing, the government in Washington should see to it that they do.						
The government should leave things like electric power and housing for private businessmen to handle						
The government ought to help people get doctor and hospital care at low cost.						

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Slightly	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
Most people make friends because friends are likely to be useful to them.						
I don't think public officials care much what people like me think.						
So many other people vote in the national elections that it doesn't matter much whether I vote or not.						
The government ought to see to it that labor unions don't have much to say about how the government is run.						
Most politicians in the community are probably more interested in getting known than in serving the needs of their constituents.						
Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.						

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Slightly	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
If one has the opportunity he should go out of his way to help another person even at the cost of some self-sacrifice.						
The way people vote is the main thing that decides how things are run in this country.						
The bar is becoming overcrowded every day.						
Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.						
Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.						
The government ought to see to it that big business corporations don't have much say about how the government is run.						
The best way to handle people often is to tell them what they want to hear.						

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Slightly	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
It isn't so important to vote when you know your party doesn't have a chance to win.						
Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the government runs things.						
A good many local elections aren't important enough to bother with.						
It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.						
People like me don't have any say about what the government does.						
It is wise to flatter important people.						

APPENDIX C

MACHIAVELLIANISM INDEX ITEMS

The best way to handle people often is to tell them what they want to hear.

Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.

It is wise to flatter important people.

It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.

Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.

Most people make friends because friends are likely to be useful to them.

APPENDIX D

POLITICAL CYNICISM INDEX ITEMS

In order to get nominated most candidates for political office have to make basic compromises and undesirable commitments.

Politicians spend most of their time getting re-elected or re-appointed.

Money is the most important factor influencing public politics.

A large number of city and county politicians are political hacks.

People are very frequently manipulated by politicians.

Politicians represent the general interest more frequently than they represent special interests.

APPENDIX E

LIBERALISM-CONSERVATISM INDEX ITEMS

If cities and towns around the country need help to build more schools, the government in Washington ought to give them the money they need.

If Negroes <u>are</u> <u>not</u> getting fair treatment in jobs and housing, the government in Washington should see to it that they do.

The government in Washington ought to see to it that everybody who wants to work can find a job.

The government ought to help people get doctor and hospital care at low cost.

The government should leave things like electric power and housing for private businessmen to handle.

APPENDIX F

SIGNIFICANCE TEST FOR PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION

The product-moment correlation was used in this work because it is better suited to our purpose than other tests. The chi square test measures the association or independence of two variables. The product-moment correlation tells us if an increase in one variable will be accompanied by a constant rate of increase (or decrease) in another. Further, it is a fairly powerful test. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, represented in this study by the letter (r), provides a descriptive measure of the magnitude of linear relationship in the sample. Significance tests are rarely performed directly with (r). Fisher's transformation to the normally distributed z-statistic is used instead. The formula is:

$$z = \log_e \sqrt{(1+r)/(1-r)}$$

The value of z corresponding to any obtained (r) can be easily found in a book of statistical tables. Then a critical ratio is constructed:

$$CR = \frac{z - \hat{z}}{\sqrt{1/(n-3)}}$$

The significance to the result yielded (α) can be checked in specially prepared tables that tell probability (p) of obtaining a CR of a given size or greater.[1]

All tables in the text have a level of significance at the .05 level or less.

---

[1] See William A. Scott and Michael Wertheimer, Introduction to Psychological Research (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962), pp. 358-359.