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Abstract

This study investigated and compared the vocational interests of private law firm attorneys and in-house attorneys using Holland's Vocational Preference Inventory (1985). Based on the reports of low job satisfaction of law firm attorneys (Daicoff, 2008), the ascending popularity of in-house counsel positions, and the fact that law firms are in direct competition with in-house law departments for law talent and clients (Hitt, Bierman, & Collins, 2007), it was deemed necessary to analyze and compare these two groups of attorneys. This study surveyed 172 attorneys on their vocational preferences, overall job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and the desirability to work within a billable hour billing system. Findings from this study determined attorneys employed in private law firms and in-house for corporate law departments were not significantly different from each other in terms of vocational preferences. Enterprising and Conventional preferences were positively associated with job satisfaction for private law firm attorneys. Artistic preferences were positively associated with turnover intentions and Realistic preferences were negatively associated with job satisfaction for in-house attorneys. Private law firm attorneys found the billable hourly billing system to be significantly more desirable than in-house attorneys. Additional analyses revealed negative relationships between Artistic and Investigative preferences and desirability to work within a billable hour system for private law firm attorneys. Based on these findings, it is recommended that attorneys explore their own vocational interests when considering employment within a private law firm or a corporation.
Chapter I

Review of Literature

Changes in the law industry in recent decades have had considerable impact on the practice of law. The law industry is in transition from a professional model, in which competition is subdued between lawyers and firms, into a traditional corporate business model, in which the goal is profit maximization (Hitt, Biernan, & Collins, 2007). Moreover, price competition for hiring lawyers has increased salaries, corporate clients are becoming more demanding, and the number of competitive law firms is increasing (Forstenlechner & Lettice, 2008; Hitt et al., 2007).

These changes in both business models and increased competition have resulted in increased pressure for billable hours, a decreased number of potential clients, and poor working conditions (Forstenlechner & Lettice, 2008). Firms highest in status and profits require the most hours of their employees and the best performing firms usually have the worst working conditions (Henderson & Zaring, 2007).

These long work weeks and tough work conditions may be partially responsible for employee turnover. The yearly turnover rate for all lawyers is 25 percent (Coates, DeStefano, Nanda, & Wilkins, 2011), and 37 percent of associates quit their jobs within the first three years (Levit & Linder, 2010). According to a recent meta-analysis, “psychological problems, substance abuse, depression, anxiety, and job dissatisfaction among attorneys appear to have increased in recent years” (Daicoff, 1996, p. 1414).
Because of difficulties that the law industry faces, including rising turnover, commentators have called for law students to explore different law practices and work contexts and self-evaluate their interests in the law field (Organ, 2011). It is inferred that if students reflect on their own experiences and interests, they will choose a career path more suited for their interests and also be aware of the challenges in a given practice area and work context (Organ, 2011). One way to identify the field best suited for law students may be through a better understanding of their vocational interests and exploring which law sector is best suited for their interests.

The first purpose of this study is to assess vocational interests of lawyers in private law firms and in-house corporate law departments using Holland’s Vocational Preference Inventory (VPI; Holland, 1985). Lawyers may be employed within a number of different sectors, such as private practice law firms, in-house for corporations, government agencies, and public interest groups (Munneke, 2002). Whereas there are different types of employing sectors for lawyers, this study focuses on in-house lawyers and private law firm attorneys, as these two sectors of law are in direct competition for clients and law talent (Hitt et al., 2007). Scant research exists in comparing vocational interests of lawyers in these two law sectors.

In addition to the VPI, lawyers were surveyed regarding their overall job satisfaction and turnover intentions. The purpose of these surveys is to determine if there is a relationship between vocational interest scores and these job-related outcomes. Finally, because lawyers have been critical of the billable hour system and the high number of minimum hour requirements, as well as the negative effects of long work
hours on work-family balance (Levit & Linder, 2010), this study surveyed lawyers on their desirability of working within a billable hour billing system.

The Billable Hour Dilemma

Most large law firms charge clients based on the billable hour, or dollar amount charged for each hour of their services (Hitt et al., 2007). The hourly billing system originally came from attorneys’ aspiration to be efficient and to maximize their earnings and also for clients’ preference for only paying for the actual time that their lawyers spent working (Fortney, 2006). Whereas billing hourly may be the dominant policy in law practice, there are alternative billing policies. For example, lawyers can arrange to charge incentive fees based on court outcomes, task-based fees for particular work assignments, or flat fees from completing a whole project (Jones & Glover, 1997). Lawyers could evade working under the billable hour systems by taking in-house positions (Dunn, 2012).

Law firms also use billable hours as measures of effort and productivity (Wallace & Kay, 2009). Law firms have stated or implied billing minimums per year, which is usually at least 2000 billable hours (Hitt et al., 2007). Since the 1960s, the hourly billing system has become the dominant billing method used by non-contingency fee attorneys (or earnings based on court settlements; Fortney, 2006). In 2005, the National Association for Law Placement (NALP) conducted a national survey of lawyers in government offices, corporate legal departments, and law firms of varying sizes and found that pressure to record billable hours emerged as a concern shared by numerous attorneys (Fortney, 2006). One reason organizations engage in a billable hour system may
be to generate funds for the high salaries of associates, which may be important in hiring top law talent (Hitt et al., 2007).

Attorneys, however, generally dislike the billable hour system. Firms risk creating an “oppressive work environment” when they raise hourly minimums (Fortney, 2000, p. 263). Lawyers may also have trouble finding work-life balance due to time commitments and work pressure (Fortney, 2000). The hourly billing system also may encourage unprofessional behavior in that it may encourage lawyers to add extra hours to their invoices and penalize lawyers who work efficiently and ethically (Fortney, 2006). Lawyers may also take part in other unethical work procedures to reach their hourly minimums. One of these is known as “double-billing,” or billing two clients concurrently, and “re-cycling work,” or billing clients for work already completed for another client at another point in time (Fortney, 2000). Rather than finding a quick and efficient solution to complete their work, lawyers may be tempted to maximize time spent on assignments with the intention of fulfilling their minimum requirements (Hitt et al., 2007). Lawyers may experience external pressure to record hours and, due to their long work hours, they may have limited free time (Hitt et al., 2007). In fact, 66% of lawyers believed that billable hour pressure had taken a toll on their personal lives (Fortney, 2000).

Lawyers also reported disliking the fact that their employers were quantifying worth and contributions based on billable hour production (Fortney, 2006). Both the billable hour system and long work hours were identified as essential concerns in work-life conflicts of the participants (Fortney, 2006). Yet, there may be discrepancies in opinions between law partners and associates. In an Australian survey of lawyers by Parker and Ruschen (2011), partners expressed higher optimism than associates in terms
of billing practices and firm culture discouraging unethical billing behavior. Partners may have higher optimism of the billable hour system due to their experience with the system, or perhaps because such a system is better suited to their personality. Some associates, on the other hand, may not necessarily be comfortable with such a system and may eventually decide to leave for an organization with alternative billing measures.

Private Law Firms

Whereas private law firms may have traditionally specialized in one area of law, most large firms have diverse legal specialties (Hitt et al., 2007). In addition to specialization diversification, firms are transitioning from single locations to opening new branch offices in various locations to better service the needs of clients (Hitt et al., 2007). Major firms are expanding to new regions to better compete with firms who reign in a particular region and to further recruit law talent (O’Briant, 1999). These trends are clear indications of law firms attempting to generate more business with aggressive strategic actions. Corporations, even with in-house legal departments, hire private law firms for litigation and when issues “are large, complex, or specialized” (Lipson, Engel, & Crespo, 2012, p. 243). Organizations will also contact private firms for services when necessary due to their presence in other regions (Lipson et al., 2012).

Perhaps due to these aggressive business practices, large law firms have a reputation for being tough places to work and have become increasingly difficult to work for due to the demanding and changing nature of the industry (Forstenlechner & Lettice, 2008; Hitt et al., 2007). Recent literature states that job security and promotions have dropped within private firms (Hitt et al., 2007).
Still, although positions in organizations other than law firms may be preferred for certain law students, literature suggests that recent graduate students choose large firms. Of all the law graduates of 2012, 39% chose a law firm position ("2012 Law graduate employment data," 2013). In 2005, 75% of lawyers were employed in private practice settings ("Lawyer demographics," 2012). The overall median entry-level salary for lawyers in private firms is $115,000 (NALP, 2010). Taking less desirable positions in large private firms with higher pay may be necessary because of the high cost of law school (Wallace & Kay, 2009). In addition to rising tuition, large firms may be more attractive to law graduates because they offer more benefits, promotions, and income (Hitt et al., 2007).

Another argument for lawyers to choose large law firms is the possibility of becoming a partner. Promotion into partnerships traditionally amounts to increased earnings and security at their position, even if production is lowered (Hitt et al., 2007). Lawyers who are “equity” partners are compensated by the profits the law firm makes after compensating its associate lawyers, whereas “non-equity” partners attain the status of partner but are compensated using a salary process (Richmond, 2009). However, major United States law firms are cutting pay and demoting partners based on low production (Hitt et al., 2007). Promotions are at all time low, which has been attributed to lateral hiring of partners (Forstenlechner & Lettice, 2008). Law firms do not want to hire inexperienced lawyers, which has resulted in less hiring of students directly out of law school and more lateral hires (O'Briant, 1999). Indeed, Hitt et al. found 40 percent of current partners in large US law firms came to the firm as lateral hires (2007). Partners
are hired laterally in order to create merger situations and gain access to new markets, which limits opportunities for internal promotions (Forstenlechner & Lettice, 2008).

In a 1991 study, the American Bar Association (ABA) found that 48% of lawyers in private practice who remain with their firms but are not happy would change jobs if they had a reasonable alternative (Daicoff, 2008). In a study by Fortney (2006), 37% of firm respondents reported they were interested in changing jobs in the next few years, with the largest percentage of firm respondents looking to change jobs indicating that they were most interested in a corporate counsel job. These articles suggest that lawyers may not be voluntarily quitting the law field but rather leaving law firms for positions in other sectors of law, possibly to avoid the billable hour system.

**In-House Counsel**

In-house or corporate counsel is defined as one or more attorneys employed by a company (Garner, 2009). In-house counsel positions, once perceived as negative positions for top law graduates, have increased in prominence as increases in salary and status have made these positions more popular than they have ever been (Classen, 1999; Hitt et al., 2007). These corporations with large in-house legal departments affect law firms because they are now in competition for both legal work and legal talent (Hitt et al., 2007). In comparison to law firms, in-house counsel earn more than attorneys in small firms, but less than attorneys in large firms (Munneke, 2002). Median salary for new law school graduates working in-house is $70,000 and median salaries for in-house attorneys with 5-10 years of experience range between $100,000 and $150,000 (“In-house salaries,” 2008).
The ABA reported that in 2005, 8% of attorneys were practicing within private industries ("Lawyer demographics," 2012). Of the law graduates of 2012, 15% chose employment within a business or industry ("2012 Law graduate employment data," 2013). Non-profit corporations may hire only one attorney or a few in-house lawyers, while for-profit corporations may hire between one and 500 attorneys (Classen, 1999). Consequently, there are more job opportunities in for-profit than non-profit corporations (Classen, 1999). In-house lawyers usually do not work within a billable-hour system (Hitt et al., 2007). However, work hours for in-house counsel are comparable to outside counsel and organizations are beginning to require attorneys to account for their hours in some way (Classen, 1999).

Corporations are beginning to facilitate lawyers to handle dual roles, namely to handle both legal issues and management responsibilities (Munneke, 2002). In-house lawyers are responsible for handling routine legal work within the organization and also responsible for delegating work to private firms (Lipson et al., 2012). Reserving more typical work responsibilities to in-house lawyers may be less costly than hiring a private firm to perform similar work (Lipson et al., 2012).

In addition to evading the billable hour, in-house counsel positions have numerous advantages over private law firms. Rather than representing a multitude of clients, in-house counsel work solely for their employer. In-house counsel has the ability to form relationships with business personnel of the organization (Classen, 1999). Corporations are more likely to provide family friendly policies for in-house attorneys (Hitt et al., 2007).
One of the criticisms of in-house lawyers (and advantages for employing organizations) is the obligation of lawyers to comply with their organization's strategy and operation, which can impair objectivity (Langevoort, 2011). Impaired objectivity could lead to unethical practice. In the wake of the Enron scandal, two in-house lawyers employed by the company were sued by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission for their roles in Enron's "violations of anti-fraud and periodic reporting provisions" (Ward, 2008). However, due to the rise in prominence of in-house legal departments and competition for clients, private firms are becoming more mindful of in-house practices, especially when it comes to relations with clients (Langevoort, 2011).

To summarize, the changing law field and an increase in prestige have led to a resurgence of in-house positions for lawyers. Private law firms, known for their demanding and competitive work environments, are competing with in-house law departments for both clients and law talent (Hitt et al., 2007). Whereas earnings for private lawyers are substantially higher than their corporate law counterparts (Hitt et al., 2007), in-house attorneys usually benefit from having a single client and a lack of an hourly billing system (Dunn, 2012). Based on studies demonstrating considerable dissatisfaction of attorneys within private firms and the resurgence of in-house counsel (Daicoff, 2008; Hitt et al., 2007), it is within reason to study the lawyers who make up these two distinct sectors of law. Vocational interest scales may be able to distinguish particular vocational traits between the two groups, and as a result, may be able to assist lawyers, law students, and advisors alike in career assistance.
Holland's Theory and the VPI

The present research utilizes Holland's VPI as an assessment of both lawyers employed in private law firms and in-house law departments. The VPI is a 160-question quantitative personality-interest exam developed by John L. Holland (1985). The VPI is based on Holland's (1959; 1997) theory of vocational choice as an expression of one's personality. The VPI contains six scales of vocational interest as hypothesized by Holland: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional (referred to by the abbreviation RIASEC; Holland, 1997).

The VPI also includes five additional scales: Infrequency, Acquiescence, Control, Masculinity, and Status. These scales were "developed using empirical methods of scale construction" (Goldstein & Hersen, 2000, p. 212) and, while they have some construct validity, have little convergent validity (Holland, 1985). Information regarding Holland's six interest codes is published on the website known as the Occupational Information Network, or O*NET, an online database of occupational information (Peterson et al., 2001). Occupational interest profiles are listed for each recorded occupation based on Holland's codes due to its prevalence in vocational research and counseling (Peterson et al., 2001). However, the five other scales are not included in O*NET.

Holland's theory has been utilized for a number of purposes, including occupation classification, interpersonal relationships, cross-cultural comparisons, education, career development, and for use within business organizations (Holland, 1997). In addition, the test has been used with various populations, including students, patients, prison inmates, and drug addicts (Holland, 1985). Holland describes his typology as "a tool for understanding work histories, vocational satisfaction, achievement, and vocational
interventions, as well as for organizing and interpreting personal and occupational data” (Holland, 1997, p. 14).

Holland’s theory (1997) operates under four main assumptions. The first is that people can be classified as one of six personality types. Each of the six types was developed in a theoretical model to create a list of occupations, attributes, interests, and other characteristics (Holland, 1997). The types as depicted by Holland are summarized in Table 1.

The second assumption is that environments can also be coded based on the RIASEC model, in which each environment is categorized based on the representation of a person’s personality type. The third assumption is that people will seek out environments based on their personality type. The fourth assumption is that a person’s behavior will be based on the interaction between personality type and environment type.

Holland added secondary assumptions to complement the four main assumptions of his theory. Included in the secondary assumptions are consistency, differentiation, identity, congruence, and calculus (Holland, 1997). Consistency concerns the commonalities of personality types. Pairs of types have more in common and are more predictable than other types for both personality and environment models. For example, the codes SE (Social & Enterprising) have more common attributes and characteristics compared to the codes SI (Social & Investigative). A person with more consistent interests will be more predictable in vocational choice. Differentiation is how clearly defined a person or environment is based on the six category model. A person or environment may be well differentiated if they resemble a single type more than others,
Table 1

Holland's Vocational Codes and Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational Code</th>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Aversion</th>
<th>Sample Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>Manual, mechanical, agricultural, electrical, and technical</td>
<td>Social and educational</td>
<td>Electrician or mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>Observational, symbolic, systematic, and creative investigation of physical, biological, and cultural phenomena</td>
<td>Persuasive, social, political, and business activities</td>
<td>Biologist, medical technologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Artistic competencies (language, art, music, drama, and writing)</td>
<td>Clerical or business systems</td>
<td>Writer, interior decorator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Human relations competencies</td>
<td>Manual &amp; technical competencies</td>
<td>Teacher, counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>Leadership, interpersonal, &amp; persuasive competencies</td>
<td>Scientific competencies</td>
<td>Sales person, manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>Manipulation of data</td>
<td>Exploratory and unsystematized activities</td>
<td>Bookkeeper, banker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

whereas an undifferentiated person or environment may resemble all six types equally. 

*Personal identity* is attained once a person realizes his/her skills and goals, and

*environmental identity* is attained when an organization has clear, long term goals.

*Congruency* is how well an individual’s personality type matches the environment they are working in. Congruence occurs when a person of a particular type works within an environment that provides interests and opportunities on par with their personality type. Incongruence occurs when a person of a particular type works in an environment that has opportunities foreign to his or her personality type.

The final secondary assumption is labeled *calculus* (Holland, 1997). Holland proposed that the personality types RIASEC can be arranged into a hexagon. He showed that the inter-relations of the personality types can be compared spatially, as types next to each other on the hexagon are more similar compared to types on opposite ends (see Figure 1). For example, a person whose most dominant type is Social will have more similar traits with the Enterprising and Artistic types, less in common with the Conventional and Investigative types, and least in common with the Realistic type. It is unreasonable to believe that each person is limited to one type. Therefore, a person is rank-ordered based on the six categories. A person’s type is determined by which of the six measures he or she scores highest on, whereas their personality pattern is their score and rank on all of the categories. This combination yields 720 possible personality patterns.

Holland created a classification system by administering the VPI to thousands of students and adults from multiple samples. Based on scale mean scores, an occupation is classified by the scores on the top three typologies, in which the first type in the order is the most dominant, followed by the two sub-types. In addition, Holland translated data
from other interest inventories into his own system in order to create a wide-ranging classification (Holland, 1997). Because of the hardships of administering thousands of inventories to analyze occupations, Holland and his colleagues utilized a large body of job analysis data to classify specific jobs (Gottfredson & Richards, 1999). Gottfredson and Holland published classification findings in the Dictionary of Holland’s Occupational Codes (DHOC; Holland, 1997). The DHOC can be a valuable resource for users to determine occupation prospects, necessary educational levels, and necessary experience for various positions.

Research has been mixed in supporting Holland’s theory in various studies. A study of accountants was successful with utilizing vocational fit in estimating work-related stress in its employees. Researchers found a positive relationship between vocational fit of different accounting positions and both job stressors and strains (Cluskey & Vaux, 2011). Employees who were poor fits for their position reported more negative experiences and greater turnover intentions (Cluskey & Vaux, 2011). Although the results were modest, they found that vocational fit was significantly and positively correlated with job satisfaction, work self-esteem, and negatively correlated with turnover (Cluskey & Vaux, 2011). Another study of accountants determined that employees who had the vocational profile combination of Conventional, Enterprising, and Social were generally more satisfied and committed to both their organization and profession (Aranya, Barak, & Amernic, 1981).

Another study found students who scored higher on a creativity test scored significantly higher on the Artistic scale in the VPI (Kelly & Kneipp, 2009). The authors of the study acknowledge that, although participants may not end up in an occupation
labeled as Artistic, they may attempt to find work in their positions to fulfill their Artistic interests. Similarly, in a study of counseling psychologist students, the researchers found that research interest was significantly related to scores on Holland’s Investigative scale, where participants with higher Investigative scores had greater interest in conducting research (Kahn & Scott, 1997).

A recent meta-analysis supports the notion that congruency is positively related to satisfaction and, ultimately, lower turnover (Van Iddekinge, Roth, Putka, & Lanivich, 2011). The study also determined that interests are related to training performance more than both job performance and turnover, indicating that interests have a profound effect on motivation and gaining job-related skills (Van Iddekinge et al., 2011).

Another study, however, failed to provide support for using Holland’s codes for predicting job satisfaction. Ishitani (2010) found that other variables, such as personal characteristics and unique vocational conditions, may have a greater effect on job satisfaction than vocational interests. Moreover, in a study of medical students, researchers found that personality traits and vocational interests had a meaningful yet limited role in predicting work values, predicting between 2% and 14% of variance in the six work values (Duffy, Borges, & Hartung, 2009).

A criticism of Holland’s theory is that socialization is not accounted for in terms of personality matches and mismatches in an environment, particularly group and individual effects. In a study of personality-environment fit in college majors, congruent and incongruent students in the same major made “parallel gains in interests and abilities during their college years,” although absolute scores of incongruent students both at the
beginning and end of college were lower than congruent student in both categories (Feldman, Ethington, & Smart, 2001, p. 691).

Men and women have been researched separately on the VPI, as socialization differences affect career interests and choice between genders (Holland, 1997). In a study of various occupations, women were significantly more satisfied when jobs provided more social support, but congruence did not have a significant effect on satisfaction. Conversely, congruence was significantly related to satisfaction amongst men, but not job support (Harris, Mortizen, Robitschek, Imhoff, & Lynch, 2001).

Holland has suggested that his theory is suited for identifying general occupational fields as opposed to subspecialties (1997). Nonetheless, research has had success in differentiating subspecialties. The VPI was successful in distinguishing concentration areas of MBA students (Martin & Bartol, 1986). The VPI has also been successful in discriminating between doctoral psychology students in counseling and clinical programs (Zachar & Leong, 1997). Holland's theory was successful in predicting occupational profiles of soldiers; however, the theory was not successful in identifying congruence-satisfaction relationships for each Military Occupational Specialty (MOS) group (Upperman & Church, 1995). The authors do note that the soldiers did not have complete control over their choice of specialty and the sample size for each MOS group was low (Upperman & Church, 1995).

**Attorney Interest Codes**

There are inconsistent reports of three-letter Holland's codes for lawyers. It is unlikely that there will ever be a standard classification of Holland code assignments for each occupation (Gottfredson & Holland, 1996; Holland, 1997), and the lawyer
occupation is no exception. According to the most recent DHOC, lawyers are coded as ESI, with Enterprising being the dominant type and Social and Investigative as the main sub-types (Gottfredson & Holland). Lawyers who specialize in admiralty (or maritime), corporations, criminal, patent, probate, and real estate are coded as ESA, with Enterprising being the dominant type and Social and Artistic as the main subtypes (Gottfredson & Holland).

In addition to the DHOC, O*NET contains Occupational Interest Profiles for each job title, in which occupations are coded and compatible with Holland’s codes (Rounds et al., 1999). Contrary to the DHOC, lawyers in O*NET are coded as primarily Enterprising and Investigative. Based on O*NET, the interest profile for lawyers are: Enterprising (100), Investigative (61), Artistic (50), Conventional (45), Social (39), and Realistic (6) (O*NET Online, 2010). A study determined some agreement between the DHOC and O*NET occupational codings, with 83.3% agreement between first letter codes, 26.8% agreement between first and second letter codes, and 12.5% agreement between first, second, and third letter codes (Rounds et. al., 1999). This finding suggests good validity between sources of Holland’s codes only for the first letter of vocational profiles.

Because of the fact that Holland’s codes can be used as a guide for users to better understand their own interests, lawyers may be able to identify areas of law and assignments that may fit their interest profile. One particular source of literature that provides vocational guidance for lawyers is *Changing jobs: a handbook for lawyers in the new millennium* (Staudenmaier, 1999). This book is geared towards helping lawyers who are interested in new positions within the law field and acknowledges Holland’s codes as a way for lawyers to do so. In the chapter titled Career Self-Assessment (written
by Maureen P. Ryan), the author states that it is usual for lawyers to have held Artistic or Enterprising positions before entering the law field at some point (Ryan, 1999). Ryan makes several statements about lawyers and occupational codes: Artistic lawyers may want to find creative clients or change jobs to meet Artistic activities; Social lawyers may enjoy helping people and families in need of service or doing pro bono work; Investigative lawyers may prefer scientifically-based areas of law practice; Conventional lawyers may prefer detail oriented areas of law (such as finance and accounting); Realistic lawyers may prefer an area of law that requires work outside of a law office (such as construction or environmental law; 1999).

Due to their leadership skills and participation in business decision making, lawyers who have Enterprising as their dominant interest code may prefer in-house corporate counsel (Ryan, 1999). Ryan suggests lawyers who rate high in Enterprising will prefer working with clients who deal with business-related problems (1999).
Chapter II

Rationale and Hypotheses

Lawyers deciding between employment in private law firms and in-house corporate law departments should consider the tradeoffs of each sector of law. Private law firms offer high salaries, yet require lawyers to work longer hours, recruit clients, and charge clients for hours worked (Forstenlechner & Lettice, 2008; Hitt et al., 2007). Private law firms have been described as difficult places to work (Henderson & Zaring, 2007). In-house positions offer lawyers opportunities for work-life balance and to work with business personnel (Classen, 1999; Hitt et al., 2007). However, in-house counsel positions offer less monetary compensation (Munneke, 2002). Based on the differences between these two sectors of law, it may be possible to differentiate lawyers between the two sectors of law based on vocational interests.

Law students are advised to assess their interest in law specialties, their own experiences, and the sectors of law that interest them (Organ, 2011). Assessing vocational interests of lawyers in private firms and in-house law departments may reveal valuable information for understanding how vocational interest profiles differ between the two groups. Whereas lawyer vocational profiles have been identified in O*NET and the DHOC, the publications do not compare vocational interests between sectors of law. To the knowledge of this researcher, there is no study that investigates and compares the
vocational interests between private firm lawyers and in-house lawyers. Therefore, it is
proposed that:

*Hypothesis 1*: Vocational interest scores for private law firm attorneys will be
significantly different from in-house attorneys.

Holland’s theory states that people employed in work environments congruent
with their vocational interests will be more satisfied with their jobs (Holland, 1997).
Vocational profiles for private firm attorneys and in-house attorneys were determined by
the vocational codes with the three highest mean scores. The lawyers’ individual scores
on those three vocational codes were then analyzed and compared to the vocational
profiles based on the sector of law they are employed in. Consistent with Holland’s
theory, it is expected that:

*Hypothesis 2a*: Job satisfaction will be positively related to the law firm lawyers’
scores of the three vocational codes most related to their sector of law.

*Hypothesis 2b*: Job satisfaction will be positively related to the in-house lawyers’
scores of the three vocational codes most related to their sector of law.

Furthermore, Holland’s theory also states that individuals with vocational
interests incongruent with their work environment will be more likely to seek a congruent
environment (Holland, 1997). Based upon the vocational profile of the employing
organization, it is expected that:

*Hypothesis 3a*: Turnover intentions will be negatively related to the law firm
lawyers’ scores of the three vocational codes most related to their sector of law.

*Hypothesis 3b*: Turnover intentions will be negatively related to the in-house
lawyers’ scores of the three vocational codes most related to their sector of law.
Research suggests that lawyers generally do not like working under a billable hour system (Fortney, 2000). Private law firm lawyers are often required to work a minimum number of billable hours per year (Hitt et al., 2007). In contrast, in-house lawyers usually do not work within a billable hour system and work solely for the employing corporation (Dunn, 2012; Hitt et al., 2007). Based on past findings, the following hypothesis is proposed:

*Hypothesis 4:* Private law firm attorneys will find the billable hour system significantly more desirable than in-house attorneys.
Chapter III

Method

Participants

This study consisted of lawyers employed by either private law firms or corporate law departments throughout the United States. Participants consisted of professional contacts acquired from a law firm in a Midwestern state. This method was chosen because the firm has a diverse network of connections from across the United States. Lawyers were also contacted through referral sampling, in which participants were referred to the study from contacts of the law firm and from personal contacts of the researcher. Lawyers were contacted from both private law firms and corporations. Participation was voluntary and lawyers were encouraged to participate. Participant names were not collected and individual results were not shared with employers.

Participants surveyed were required to have a professional law degree and must have been employed full-time within either a law firm or within a corporation.

Participants must have held a position as an attorney, associate, in-house counsel, or any position synonymous with the job title as a lawyer.

The initial data set consisted of 195 completed participant surveys. Fifteen participants were discarded because they identified that their employment was not within a private law firm or a corporate law department. Six participants who identified themselves as in-house employees within an organization were discarded because they
(Holland, 1985). Coefficient alpha for the six VPI scales in this study were .82 for Realistic, .89 for Investigative, .87 for Artistic, .87 for Social, .80 for Enterprising, and .74 for Conventional. As noted in the VPI manual, multiple studies have demonstrated that the “concurrent or predictive validity of the VPI interest scales are equal to or exceed the concurrent or predictive validities of other interest scales” (Holland, p. 4).

**Turnover intentions.** Participants were surveyed on turnover intentions using a 1 to 5 response scale, with 1 being *strongly disagree* and 5 being *strongly agree*. This measure is a subjective assessment of an employee regarding the likelihood that he or she will leave an organization (Carmeli & Weisberg, 2006; Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978). As turnover intentions increase, actual turnover is likely to increase as well (Mobley et al., 1978). Although turnover intentions are not measuring turnover itself, there is evidence that suggests measures of turnover intentions are a good indicator of actual turnover (Griffeth et al., 2000). This study used the average score of the three questions. One of the three questions included in the measure is: “I think a lot about leaving the organization.” The Cronbach’s alpha for the items was found to be .90 (Carmeli & Weisberg, 2006). Coefficient alpha for this sample was .91.

**Job satisfaction.** Participants were asked: “Overall, how satisfied are you with your job?” Participants were surveyed on their job satisfaction using a 1 to 5 response scale, with 1 being *very dissatisfied* and 5 being *very satisfied*. Research states that single-item measures for overall job satisfaction are satisfactory, with a correlation of .67 between single-item measures and scales of overall satisfaction (Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997).
A profile analysis was conducted for each group of lawyers based on their vocational interest responses. Based on the average responses for each separate group, this study determined a "standard interest profile" for both in-house lawyers and private firm lawyers. A comparison was made between each participant’s score on each of the profiles and the standard interest profile score. The difference between the participant’s profile score and the standard interest profile score served as the measurement signifying how much a participant differed from the standard interest profile. A smaller difference score represented a vocational profile more congruent with the standard interest profile, whereas a larger difference represented a vocational profile less congruent with the standard interest profile.

Desirability of Billable Hour System. Participants were surveyed on their desirability to work within a billable hour system. Participants were surveyed on a one item scale using a 1 to 5 response scale, with 1 being not desirable at all and 5 being very desirable.

Demographic variables. Participants were surveyed based on their demographic information, which included: age, race, gender, marital status, and if they were a parent or guardian. Additionally, participants were asked about their organization and work history. Participants were asked for their years of experience in the law industry, which sector of law they worked within, how long they had worked with their current organization, whether they were a partner or on partner-track, their principal method of billing clients, their primary method of compensation, if they had a yearly minimum billable hour expectation, and if they were either full-time or part-time employees.
Procedure

Approval for the study was granted by Xavier University’s Institutional Review Board (please see Appendix F). Contact information of the lawyers was acquired through the professional contacts of a Midwestern law firm. Participants were also acquired through referral sampling from the law firm’s contacts and from personal contacts. Lawyers were emailed and asked to participate in the study and were provided a link to the online survey created using the online survey software, SurveyGizmo.com. The email addresses were kept in a database that only the researcher could access. No data was tracked that could potentially link the data to the participant.

A link to the survey was sent directly to each lawyer’s email to ensure that the surveys were completed by the intended participants. Participants were emailed a pass code to access the survey. All participants received the same pass code to avoid linking participants to their passwords, which would link the participant to the data. Before beginning the survey, each participant received a briefing about the study, which emphasized the importance of honesty in their responses and informed the participants that their responses would be completely anonymous and would not be shared with their organization (please see Appendix G). Participants were required to answer all questions in the survey. Participants were presented with a debriefing form once their responses were submitted (please see Appendix H).
Chapter IV
Results

Correlations among scales on all of the VPI dimensions, turnover intentions, desire to work within the billable hour system, overall job satisfaction, as well as indices of internal consistency, are presented in Table 3. Prior to hypothesis testing, vocational profiles of lawyers in the sample were determined based on the three highest mean interest scores for each group. Table 4 lists the means and standard deviations for scores on all VPI codes for each group. The vocational codes with the three highest means scores for in-house corporate lawyers were Artistic (4.47), Enterprising (3.73), and Social (3.50), giving in-house lawyers in this sample a vocational profile of AES. For private law firm attorneys, the vocational codes with the three highest mean scores were Artistic (4.79), Enterprising (3.87), and Social (3.51), giving law firm lawyers in this sample a vocational profile of AES as well.

A MANOVA was conducted to evaluate the six VPI vocational interest scores of participants for the in-house attorneys and the private law firm attorneys. Hypothesis 1 proposed that these two groups would score significantly different on the six vocational interest scales. The analysis revealed a non-significant Wilk’s Λ (0.974), $F(6,165) = .729$, $p = .627$. There were no significant differences between vocational preferences of in-house lawyers compared to attorneys in law firms, failing to support hypothesis one.
Table 3

Correlations and Alpha Levels of Research Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Realistic</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Investigative</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Artistic</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td>.493**</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Social</td>
<td>.400**</td>
<td>.423**</td>
<td>.444**</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Enterprising</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td>.219**</td>
<td>.422**</td>
<td>.400**</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Conventional</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td>.183**</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>.427**</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Turnover intentions</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.154**</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.201**</td>
<td>.707**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Desire to work within a billable hour system</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.169*</td>
<td>-.160*</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in parentheses are Coefficient Alpha levels.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$
Table 4

*Means and Standard Deviations for VPI Responses by Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPI Code</th>
<th>Private Law Firm Attorneys</th>
<th>In-House Attorneys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-Letter Code</td>
<td>AES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The maximum score for each code is 14.
Based on the information from the VPI, it was determined that the standard interest profiles for both groups of lawyers were Artistic, Enterprising, and Social. From this information, it was possible to conduct a profile analysis to test hypotheses two and three, specifically to determine if there is a relationship between turnover intentions and job satisfaction to a lawyer’s vocational interest profile for each group of lawyers. For example, if participants have interest profiles comparable to the group standard, they may display higher levels of satisfaction and lower turnover intentions than participants with less comparable profiles to the standard score.

Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted to test the second hypothesis that scores on the Artistic, Enterprising, and Social scales would be positively correlated with job satisfaction for each group. Analyses for the law firm attorneys determined that there was a significant positive relationship between overall job satisfaction and scores on the Enterprising preferences ($r(108) = .195, p = .044$), but not between overall job satisfaction and Artistic preferences ($r(108) = -.006, p = .951$), or Social preferences ($r(108) = .100, p = .304$). These findings partially support hypothesis 2a. Analysis for the in-house lawyers determined that there was not a significant relationship between overall job satisfaction and scores on the Artistic preferences ($r(64) = -.185, p = .143$), Enterprising preferences ($r(64) = -.007, p = .947$), or Social preferences ($r(64) = -.010, p = .937$), failing to support Hypothesis 2b.

Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted to test the third hypothesis that scores on the Artistic, Enterprising, and Social scales would be negatively correlated with turnover intentions for both groups. Analysis for the law firm attorneys determined that there was not a significant relationship between turnover intentions and scores on the
Artistic preferences \((r(108) = .079, p = .418)\), Enterprising preferences \((r(108) = -.135, p = .165)\), or Social preferences \((r(108) = .006, p = .304)\). These results fail to support hypothesis 3a.

Analyses for the in-house lawyers determined that there was not a significant negative relationship between turnover intentions and scores on the Enterprising preferences \((r(64) = .012, p = .926)\), or Social preferences \((r(64) = -.085, p = .502)\). Unexpectedly, there was a significant positive correlation between turnover intentions and scores on the Artistic preference \((r(64) = .253, p = .044)\). These findings fail to support hypothesis 3b.

A between samples \(t\)-test was used to test the fourth hypothesis that private firm attorneys would find it more desirable to work within a billable hour system than in-house attorneys. Analysis shows that private law firm attorneys did find the billable hour system significantly more desirable than in-house lawyers \((t(170) = 5.226, p < .001)\), supporting hypothesis 4.

**Supplementary Analyses**

Supplementary analyses were conducted to analyze the six vocational preference scale scores in this study. This analysis was a comparison among the total sample to see which of the VPI scores were different between the 6 scales. A between-groups ANOVA revealed a significant difference between the six scales’ mean scores \(F(3, 1026) = 24.48, p < .001\). Post-hoc comparisons were made using Tukey’s Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) procedure. Participants scored significantly higher in the Artistic scale \((M = 4.67, SD = 3.69)\) than the Realistic scale \((M = 2.12, SD = 2.61)\), \(p < .001\), the Investigative scale \((M = 2.77, SD = 3.53)\), \(p < .001\), the Social scale \((M = 3.51, SD = 3.57)\) \(p = .001\), and the Conventional scale \((M = 1.45, SD = 1.89)\), \(p < .001\), but Artistic
scores were not significantly higher than the Enterprising scale \((M = 3.82, SD = 3.03), p = .118\). Participant scores for the Enterprising Scale \((M = 3.82, SD = 3.03)\) were not significantly higher than the Social scale \((M = 3.51, SD = 3.57), p = .938\). Participants scored significantly lower on the Investigative scale \((M = 2.77, SD = 3.53)\) than the Enterprising scale \((M = 3.82, SD = 3.03), p = .023\), but were not significantly lower for Social scale scores \((M = 3.51, SD = 3.57), p = .248\). Participant scores on the Conventional scale \((M = 1.45, SD = 1.89)\) were significantly lower than participant scores for the other five scales.

Supplementary analyses attempted to determine if there was a relationship between vocational interests and desirability to work within a billable hour system. Pearson product-moment correlation analysis revealed a significant negative correlation for private law firm lawyers between the desirability to work within a billable hour system and scores on the Artistic preference \((r(108) = -.239, p = .013)\).

A Pearson product-moment correlation revealed a significant negative relationship between turnover intentions and desirability to work within a billable hour system for private law firm attorneys \((r(108) = -.301, p = .002)\). Conversely, the analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between turnover intentions and desirability to work within a billable hour system for in-house attorneys \((r(64) = .260, p = .038)\).

Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted to determine if there was a correlation between the lower three vocational interests of each group of lawyers (Investigative, Realistic, and Conventional) and job satisfaction. For private law firm attorneys, there was a significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and scores on the Conventional scale \((r(108) = .253, p = .008)\). For in-house attorneys, there was a
significant negative correlation between job satisfaction and scores on the Realistic scale $(r(64) = -.309, p = .013)$.

Because the correlation between scores on the Realistic scale and overall job satisfaction was significant for in-house attorneys $(r = -.309)$ but was not significant for private law firm attorneys $(r = .103)$, it was deemed necessary to conduct an analysis to determine if these correlations were significantly different from each other. A Fisher's $r$ to $z$ transformation determined the correlation between Realistic scores and overall job satisfaction for in-house attorneys was indeed significantly higher than the correlation for private law firm attorneys ($z = 3.97$).

In addition to analyzing job satisfaction, Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted to analyze turnover intentions and desirability to work within a billable hour system to the lower three vocational interests of each group. No significant correlations were found between Investigative, Realistic, and Conventional scores and turnover intentions for both participants in private law firms and within corporations. Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted to analyze desirability to work within a billable hour system to the lower three vocational interests of each group. There was a significant negative correlation for private law firm lawyers between scores on the Investigative scale and desirability to work within a billable hour system $(r_{108} = -.191, p = .047)$. 
Chapter V

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to compare lawyers working for private law firms to attorneys working in-house for corporations in terms of vocational preferences. Results from this sample determined that lawyers working in-house and in private firms are not significantly different in terms of vocational preferences. This finding is consistent with Holland’s assertion that his typology is better utilized for differentiating between occupational fields as opposed to subspecialties (Holland, 1997). There did not seem to be a tendency for one sector of lawyers to prefer a particular vocational interest area more so than the other sector.

The participant responses from this sample support the coding combination of lawyers in the DHOC as mainly Enterprising, Social, and Artistic (Gottfredson & Holland, 1996). In contrast to the DHOC’s coding of Enterprising as the primary interest of lawyers with Social and Artistic being the secondary preferences, our sample of lawyers scored primarily as Artistic, with Enterprising and Social being the secondary preferences for both groups of lawyers. Analyses revealed that the Artistic vocational preference scores for all lawyers in this sample were significantly higher than the Social vocational preference scores, but were not significantly higher than the Enterprising scale. As suggested by Ryan, it is quite common for lawyers to have prior interests or
experiences in an Artistic field (1999) and it may be especially true for this particular sample of attorneys.

The findings from this survey may represent the vocational interests of attorneys employed within private law firms and in-house for corporations, but may not necessarily reflect the vocational interests of lawyers within other sectors of law, such as government and public interest organizations. Based on the distinct characteristics of the work environments and job responsibilities from different law sectors, these groups of lawyers may yield unique and potentially different vocational interest preferences than those found in this study. The different job requirements and functions of lawyers within public interest and government sector agencies may be notably different from lawyers working in private law firms and in-house for corporations. As a result, these public interest and government sector attorneys may have vocational interests which reflect these differences and may deviate from the vocational interest findings of attorneys in the present study. Research should be conducted to test these conjectures, although findings from this study seem to suggest lawyers are generally Artistic, Enterprising, and Social.

A possible reason for the Artistic preference score to be high in the present study may be due to the educational backgrounds of attorneys. Although students of all majors are considered for admittance into law school, the traditional undergraduate degrees for law students are history, English, philosophy, political science, economics, and business ("Preparing for law school," N.D.). Whereas majors in economics and business may reflect the lawyers’ preferences for Enterprising or Conventional occupations, undergraduate curriculums in history, English, philosophy, and political science require students to develop their writing skills, a competency which falls under the Artistic code.
It may be that lawyers who studied in these traditional academic fields are more likely to have preferences for Artistic-type occupations. Attorneys who studied in non-traditional undergraduate majors for law students may exhibit less Artistic preferences compared to attorneys who studied in traditional majors. Future studies may want to investigate the undergraduate majors of those who enter law school to determine if there is a relationship between undergraduate major and vocational preferences.

This sample also deviates from the general coding of lawyers in the DHOC and O*NET listing in terms of the Investigative preference. As stated earlier, lawyers in the DHOC are coded generally as ESA and ESI for certain specialties (Gottfredson & Holland, 1996). O*NET lists lawyers as primarily Enterprising and Investigative (O*NET, 2010). The vocational profiles in this sample ranked Investigative as the fourth code for each group of lawyers. Analyses in this study revealed scores on the Investigative scale to be significantly lower than scores on the Artistic and Enterprising scale in the present sample, but not significantly lower than the Social scale. Our findings may reflect a deficit of lawyers with Investigative-like specialties, backgrounds, or positions in this sample as opposed to the general population of lawyers. It is reasonable to believe that lawyers with scientific, mathematical, or analytical educational backgrounds would score higher in this vocational preference in accordance with Holland’s typology (1997). For example, a law firm or an agency which specializes in scientifically-based law (such as medical malpractice, environmental, and health-law) may employ attorneys with educational backgrounds and job responsibilities congruent with the Investigative preference (Ryan, 1999).
As stated earlier, a possible reason for the disparity of lawyers in this study with Investigative vocational preferences could be due in part to the surveying of lawyers strictly employed within private law firms and in-house within corporate law departments. Analyses of vocational preferences of all sectors of law may yield results which better reflect lawyers with Investigative preferences. For example, prosecutors working within the government sector are responsible for investigating illegal activity, thoroughly conducting legal research, and coordinating efforts with investigative agencies ("Prosecutor’s Function," N.D.). These responsibilities seem to fall under the Investigative occupational code. Attorneys working within this or a similar environment may then exhibit Investigative vocational preferences.

In addition to comparing vocational preferences between the two sectors of law, the second purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between vocational preferences and overall job satisfaction based on the vocational profile of the sample. For the private law firm sector, there was a significant positive correlation between scores on the Enterprising scale and overall job satisfaction. Lawyers are expected to have skills in speaking, listening, and persuasion (O*NET, 2010). These skills are congruent with Enterprising-type individuals, who possess "interpersonal and persuasive competencies" (Holland, 1997, p. 25). These skills may be especially important for attorneys in private law firms, who work directly with people and may be required to recruit clients for generating business. The other two interests of the vocational profile, Artistic and Social, did not seem to affect job satisfaction for private law firm lawyers.
For in-house lawyers, none of the top three vocational profile scores significantly correlated with job satisfaction. Overall, the findings from this sample suggest that scores on the Enterprising scale were significantly related to job satisfaction for attorneys in private law firms, whereas Artistic and Social preferences were not significant. For in-house attorneys, the Artistic, Enterprising, and Social vocational preferences were not a major factor in determining job satisfaction.

Supplemental analyses were conducted to determine if there was a relationship between the three other vocational interest scales (Investigative, Realistic, and Conventional) and overall job satisfaction. This study found a significant positive correlation between scores on the Conventional preference and overall job satisfaction for law firm attorneys. Individuals with Conventional preferences are organized, detail-oriented, prefer routine work schedules, and also prefer tasks involving the "systematic manipulation of data" (Holland, 1997, p. 27). Although scores on the Conventional scale were significantly lower than scores of the other five vocational preference scales, Conventional competencies may be important for lawyers, who may be required to possess knowledge of economics, accounting, or clerical procedures (O*NET, 2010). As a result, attorneys with Conventional preferences may find the law firm work environment satisfying. Even though the Conventional code for lawyers is ranked fourth on O*NET (2010) and is absent from the lawyer codes in the DHOC (Gottfredson & Holland, 1996), this finding suggests lawyers with Conventional preferences may want to pursue employment within a private law firm and such firms may want to consider recruiting lawyers who possess Conventional competencies.
For in-house attorneys, it was determined that Realistic scores had a significant negative relationship with overall job satisfaction. An additional analysis determined that the negative correlation between Realistic scores and job satisfaction was significantly higher for in-house attorneys than the correlation for private law firm attorneys. Individuals with Realistic preferences usually develop skills in “manual, mechanical, agricultural, electrical and technical” fields (Holland, 1997, p. 21) and prefer environments that require utilization and manipulation of tools, machinery, and animals (Holland, 1997). For this reason, they may dislike the tasks and responsibilities required for in-house roles, which may require knowledge in both business and legal fields (Munneke, 2002). In-house attorneys may not have the opportunity of working outside of the office, contrary to the suggested work environment for Realistic-type lawyers (Ryan, 1999). Lawyers in private law firms may have more accommodating work arrangements than in-house lawyers. This lack of workplace freedom may be especially discouraging for Realistic attorneys. According to an in-house attorney:

Life in a firm, while at times very cut throat, is very flexible. To a certain extent you are a free agent. As long as you are getting money in the door and keeping the clients happy you are free to structure your work life as you wish. Corporate is not like that.

Future research may want to investigate in-house attorneys to determine with certainty why Realistic-type attorneys in these positions are dissatisfied.

The third purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between vocational preferences and turnover intentions. For private law firm attorneys, the findings from the analysis determined that vocational interest scores in the Artistic,
Enterprising, and Social scales did not have a significant relationship with turnover intentions. For in-house attorneys, there were no significant relationships between turnover intentions and scores on the Enterprising or Social scales. Contrary to our hypothesis, there were no significant negative correlations between scores in the top three vocational preferences (Artistic, Enterprising, and Social) and turnover intentions. Supplemental analyses determined there were also no significant relationships between the three other vocational interest scales (Investigative, Realistic, and Conventional) and turnover intentions.

An unexpected finding in the analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between the Artistic scale and turnover intentions for in-house attorneys. Individuals with Artistic preferences value competencies in “language, art, music, drama, and writing” (Holland, 1997, p. 23). Individuals with Artistic vocational interests prefer working in unstructured work environments and have aversions to business settings (Holland, 1997). It is reasonable to believe that the aforementioned dual business/counsel roles required of in-house attorneys (Munneke, 2002) may be less desirable for Artistic lawyers. Hence, attorneys with Artistic preferences may want to consider employment in work environments that allow for atypical work structures or assignments.

Further research could be conducted to determine why Artistic preferences were significantly related to turnover intentions for in-house attorneys but not for private law firm attorneys. Much like Realistic-type lawyers, Artistic lawyers may prefer the work flexibility offered by private law firms. Private law firms may also provide more opportunities for attorneys to use their Artistic competencies. Because companies hire private law firms for litigation purposes (Lipson et al., 2012), in-house attorneys typically
do not represent clients in court. Artistic attorneys may find the courtroom as an
environment to satisfy their Artistic vocational needs. An attorney in a private law firm
described lawyers as “frustrated actors.” Indeed, courtroom trials are innately dramatic
and lawyers perform much like actors in order to emotionally and factually convince
audiences of their case (Havener, 2004).

Attorneys with Artistic preferences may not like the structure of in-house counsel
positions. According to an in-house attorney:

There is very little creativity in such [in-house] positions. For the most part, in-
house guys are handling routine things or acting as a project manager managing
outside counsel with very little freedom or input in how things proceed, other than
keeping the costs down and getting the result right.

In-house attorneys with Artistic preferences may want to consider leaving their
positions if they cannot engage in their Artistic needs. Future research may be necessary
to investigate these conjectures of Artistic attorneys in the law field.

The final purpose of this study was to determine if private law firm attorneys
found the billable hour billing system more desirable compared to in-house attorneys.
Results from this study determined that attorneys in private law firms did find the billable
hour billing system significantly more desirable than in-house lawyers. The mean scores
for both groups were exceptionally low (1.67 for in-house attorneys and 2.45 for law firm
attorneys on a 5 point scale). The low scores are consistent with assertions of general
opposition to the billable hour system in the law industry (Fortney, 2000; Levit & Linder,
2010). Because in-house lawyers find the billable hour billing system so undesirable, they
are likely to be less satisfied working in an environment which utilizes an hourly billing
system and should look for work environments that do not utilize an hourly billing system.

An indirect finding from the analysis revealed that the desire to work in a billable hour system and turnover intentions were negatively correlated for private law firm attorneys ($r = -0.301$) and positively correlated for in-house attorneys ($r = 0.200$). These findings suggest feelings towards the billable hour system may influence one’s outlook for remaining in each respective sector of law and indicate that lawyers should consider the type of billing system when choosing a position.

Supplemental analyses were conducted in order to determine if there was a relationship between the top vocational interests of the participants and desire to work within a billable hour system. The analyses showed a significant negative correlation between Artistic preferences and desire to work within a billable hour billing system for private law firm attorneys. Because Artistic-type individuals prefer unstructured work environments (Holland, 1997), they may dislike having to monitor and account for their productivity.

Supplemental analyses were conducted to determine if there was a relationship between the three other vocational interest scales (Investigative, Realistic, and Conventional) and the desire to work within a billable hour system. There was a significant negative correlation between scores on the Investigative scale and desirability toward the billable hour system for attorneys in law firms. According to Holland’s theory, Investigative-type individuals, who value scientific and mathematical competencies, are reluctant to work within environments requiring Enterprising competencies (Holland, 1997). Billing clients by the hour may be a task that falls under
the classification of an Enterprising competency, which could be the reason why attorneys in this study with higher Investigative scores have less desirability to work within a billable hour system. Hence, investigative-type lawyers may want to explore billing systems alternative to the billable hour system, such as contingency fees, task-based fees, flat fees, or possibly find positions which do not require billing clients.

One final point from this study should be discussed regarding findings relating to the Artistic scale. Because high Artistic preferences were associated with higher turnover intentions for in-house attorneys and lower desirability to work within a billable hour billing system for private firm attorneys, future research should investigate why individuals with high Artistic preferences choose law as a career, specifically within private law firms and in-house for corporations. Based on the work environment of in-house attorneys and the hourly billing system being the dominant billing practice for private law firms, the environments of these sectors of law do not seem to align well for individuals with Artistic preferences.

It has been documented that law students cite career uncertainty and career advancement as reasons for attending law school (Stevens, 1973). It may be that these individuals, although qualified for law school, are not vocationally fit for law positions and may ultimately find their positions unrewarding. Individuals with high Artistic preferences considering law school may want to consider exploring possible positions that can allow them to engage their Artistic competencies.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

The current study has some potential limitations. First, this study was limited to lawyers employed within corporations or private law firms. Given the number of career
options for lawyers, it may be worthwhile to extend vocational interest research to other sectors of law and samples of lawyers, such as the government sector, federal agencies, public interest organizations, law school professors, expatriates, and self-employed lawyers. As stated earlier in the discussion, characteristics of different groups of lawyers and work environments may yield unique vocational preference data, contrary to the findings in this study.

Another potential limitation is that the researcher had no control of the law firm’s recruitment and sampling strategy of participants. Since the participants were limited to network connections of a particular law firm and contacts of the researcher, they were not selected randomly but through professional connections. Hence, it is not known if this sample is representative of the population of lawyers, and caution should be taken before generalizing these results. Future studies may want to consider recruiting attorneys through alternative sampling methods.

A related limitation is that details regarding the organizations are also unknown. This study did not know the specific firm or corporation the participants worked within, the size of the law firm or the organization, the number of offices, or the products and services offered. This information may be important because the specific work environment the participants work within may account for as much or more of the variance in their vocational interests than the sector of law they work within. Future research may benefit from acquiring specific information about the employer. Future research may also consider comparing lawyers within a single corporate law department to lawyers within a single private law firm.
Similarly, certain information about the participants was unknown to this study. It was not known where the lawyers worked within the United States, or how many of the participants came from a particular region. Additionally, this study did not collect any information pertaining to the attorneys’ undergraduate education, specialty, or field of expertise. Specific VPI response scores of participants could reflect their job responsibilities and areas of expertise, or their position within their companies. It is possible that lawyers working within their desired specialty are more satisfied with their positions regardless of the sector of law in which they work. Future research may benefit from acquiring specific information about the attorney when comparing vocational interests of lawyers between different areas of law.

Because this study utilized the VPI (Holland, 1985), the results of this study can only be generalized to this specific inventory. The VPI inventory was last updated in 1985; future studies may want to utilize updated inventories, such as the Strong Interest Inventory (Harmon, Hansen, Borgen, & Hammer, 1994), or the Self-Directed Search (Holland, Powell, & Fritzsche, 1994). Both of these inventories assess vocational interests using the RIASEC taxonomy and both are more current compared to the VPI. However, the VPI was selected in this study because it is recommended as a quicker test to administer to participants compared to the SDS (Holland, 1997).

Due to the high number of analyses conducted, this study may suffer from alpha inflation, or experimentwise error. As a result, findings from this study must be taken with caution due to the increased chance of committing a Type 1 error.

Finally, the VPI and additional survey questions in this study amounted to 177 questions. It is reasonable that some participants may have experienced survey fatigue
based on the number of questions. The length of the survey also may have affected the responses from participants and may have possibly led to incomplete survey responses. However, an analysis of the coefficient alphas revealed that all six VPI scales had alphas above .73, so this concern is somewhat mitigated by that fact. Still, future researchers may want to consider using an abbreviated version of the VPI to avoid survey fatigue.

Conclusions

This study utilized Holland’s VPI in order to compare the vocational preferences of lawyers working within private law firms and in-house for corporations. In addition to comparing vocational interests, this study also analyzed each group of attorneys to determine if there was a relationship between vocational preferences and both job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Findings from this study determined that attorneys employed within private law firms and in-house for corporations are not terribly dissimilar from each other in terms of vocational interests. Enterprising and Conventional vocational interests were positively related to job satisfaction for lawyers working within private law firms. Artistic vocational interests were negatively related to turnover intentions and Realistic vocational interests were negatively related to job satisfaction for in-house attorneys. Private law firm attorneys found the billable hour billing system significantly more desirable than in-house attorneys, however a negative relationship was found between Artistic and Investigative vocational preferences and the desire to work within an hourly billing system for private firm attorneys.

Results from this study suggest lawyers with Enterprising and Conventional preferences find the private law firm environment favorable, whereas lawyers with Artistic and Realistic preferences dislike working in-house for organizations. Further
studies of lawyers with these preferences may reveal important information regarding why lawyers with certain preferences prefer a certain work environment. Further studies may also reveal characteristics of work environments of which lawyers of certain preferences may find unappealing. Finally, results suggest that lawyers with Investigative and Artistic preferences working within a private law firm dislike the hourly billing system. Further research into private firm lawyers with these preferences may also reveal important information regarding their affect towards the hourly billing system.

The moderate significant correlations in this study suggest there are meaningful relationships between vocational preferences and specific work environments. This study indicates law students, attorneys, and organizations hiring attorneys should pay attention to vocational preferences. Future research should extend vocational preference research to lawyers in other sectors of law.
Chapter VI

Summary

Changes in the law industry in recent decades have had considerable impact on the practice of law. The law industry is in transition from a professional model, in which competition is subdued between lawyers and firms, into a traditional corporate business model, in which the goal is profit maximization (Hitt, Bierman, & Collins, 2007). Moreover, price competition for hiring lawyers has increased salaries, corporate clients are becoming more demanding, and the number of competitive law firms is increasing (Forstenlechner & Lettice, 2008; Hitt et al., 2007).

The yearly turnover rate for all lawyers is 25 percent (Coates, DeStefano, Nanda, & Wilkins, 2011), and 37 percent of associates quit their jobs within the first three years (Levit & Linder, 2010). According to a recent meta-analysis, “psychological problems, substance abuse, depression, anxiety, and job dissatisfaction among attorneys appear to have increased in recent years” (Daicoff, 1996, p. 1414). Because of difficulties that the law industry faces, including rising turnover, commentators have called for law students to explore different law practices and work contexts and self-evaluate their interests in the law field (Organ, 2011). It is inferred that if students reflect on their own experiences and interests, they will choose a career path more suited for their interests and also be aware of the challenges in a given practice area and work context (Organ, 2011). One way to identify the field best suited for law students may be through a better
understanding of their vocational interests and exploring which law sector is best suited for their interests.

The present research utilizes Holland’s Vocational Preference Inventory (VPI; 1985) as an assessment of both lawyers employed in private law firms and in-house law departments. The VPI is a 160-question quantitative personality-interest exam developed by John L. Holland (1985). Assessing vocational interests of lawyers in private firms and in-house law departments may reveal valuable information for understanding how vocational interest profiles differ between the two groups. To the knowledge of this researcher, there is no study that investigates and compares the vocational interests between private firm lawyers and in-house lawyers. It is proposed that:

_Hypothesis 1:_ Vocational interest scores for private law firm attorneys will be significantly different from in-house attorneys.

Holland’s theory states that people employed in work environments congruent with their vocational interests will be more satisfied with their jobs (Holland, 1997). Vocational profiles for private firm attorneys and in-house attorneys were determined by the vocational codes with the three highest mean scores. The lawyers’ individual scores on those three vocational codes were then analyzed and compared to the vocational profiles based on the sector of law in which they are employed. Consistent with Holland’s theory, it is expected that:

_Hypothesis 2a:_ Job satisfaction will be positively related to the law firm lawyers’ scores of the three vocational codes most related to their sector of law.

_Hypothesis 2b:_ Job satisfaction will be positively related to the in-house lawyers’ scores of the three vocational codes most related to their sector of law.
Furthermore, Holland’s theory also states that individuals with vocational interests incongruent with their work environment will be more likely to seek a congruent environment (Holland, 1997). Based upon the vocational profile of the employing organization, it is expected that:

**Hypothesis 3a:** Turnover intentions will be negatively related to the law firm lawyers’ scores of the three vocational codes most related to their sector of law.

**Hypothesis 3b:** Turnover intentions will be negatively related to the in-house lawyers’ scores of the three vocational codes most related to their sector of law.

Research suggests that lawyers generally do not like working under a billable hour system (Fortney, 2000). Private law firm lawyers are often required to work a minimum number of billable hours per year (Hitt et al., 2007). In contrast, in-house lawyers usually do not work within a billable hour system and work solely for the employing corporation (Dunn, 2012; Hitt et al., 2007). Consistent with past findings, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**Hypothesis 4:** Private law firm attorneys will find the billable hour system significantly more desirable than in-house attorneys.

**Method**

**Participants**

This study consisted of lawyers employed by either private law firms or corporate law departments throughout the United States. Participants consisted of professional contacts acquired from a law firm in a Midwestern state. Lawyers were also contacted through referral sampling, in which participants were referred to the study from contacts of the law firm and from personal contacts of the researcher. Participation was voluntary
and lawyers were encouraged to participate. Participant names were not collected and individual results were not shared with employers.

Participants surveyed were required to have a professional law degree and must have been employed full-time within either a law firm or within a corporation. Participants must have held a position as an attorney, associate, in-house counsel, or any position synonymous with the job title as a lawyer. This study consisted of 172 participants. Of the participant pool, 108 of the participants were employed by private law firms, whereas 64 were employed within corporations.

**Measures**

Lawyers were measured on their vocational preferences using Holland’s VPI (1985). The eighth revision of the VPI was used for this study. The VPI contains 160 occupational titles. Participants were asked to answer whether a specific occupation is interesting by answering *Yes, No, or Undecided.* Coefficient alpha for the six VPI scales in this study were .82 for Realistic, .89 for Investigative, .87 for Artistic, .87 for Social, .80 for Enterprising, and .74 for Conventional.

Participants were surveyed on turnover intentions using a 1 to 5 response scale, with 1 being *strongly disagree* and 5 being *strongly agree.* This measure is a subjective assessment of an employee regarding the likelihood that he or she will leave an organization (Carmeli & Weisberg, 2006; Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978). As turnover intentions increase, actual turnover is likely to increase as well (Mobley et al., 1978). This study used the average score of the three questions. One of the three questions included in the measure is: “I think a lot about leaving the organization.” Coefficient alpha for this sample was .91.
For job satisfaction, participants were asked: “Overall, how satisfied are you with your job?” Participants were surveyed on their job satisfaction using a 1 to 5 response scale, with 1 being very dissatisfied and 5 being very satisfied.

Participants were surveyed on their desirability to work within a billable hour system. Participants were surveyed on a one item scale using a 1 to 5 response scale, with 1 being not desirable at all and 5 being very desirable.

Participants were surveyed based on their demographic information, which included: age, race, gender, marital status, and if they were a parent or guardian. Additionally, participants were asked about their organization and work history. Participants were asked for their years of experience in the law industry, which sector of law they worked within, how long they had worked with their current organization, whether they were a partner or on partner-track, their principal method of billing clients, their primary method of compensation, if they had a yearly minimum billable hour expectation, and if they were either full-time or part-time employees.

Procedure

Approval for the study was granted by Xavier University’s Institutional Review Board (please see Appendix F). Contact information of the lawyers was acquired through the professional contacts of a Midwestern law firm. Participants were also acquired through referral sampling from the law firm’s contacts and from personal contacts. Lawyers were emailed and asked to participate in the study and were provided a link to the online survey created using the online survey software, SurveyGizmo.com. Before beginning the survey, each participant received a briefing about the study, which emphasized the importance of honesty in their responses and informed the participants
that their responses would be completely anonymous and would not be shared with their organization (please see Appendix G). Participants were presented with a debriefing form once their responses were submitted (please see Appendix H).

Results

The vocational codes with the three highest means scores for in-house corporate lawyers were Artistic (4.47), Enterprising (3.73), and Social (3.50), giving in-house lawyers in this sample a vocational profile of AES. For private law firm attorneys, the vocational codes with the three highest mean scores were Artistic (4.79), Enterprising (3.87), and Social (3.51), giving law firm lawyers in this sample a vocational profile of AES as well.

A MANOVA was conducted to evaluate the six VPI vocational interest scores of participants for the in-house attorneys and the private law firm attorneys. Hypothesis 1 proposed that these two groups would score significantly different on the six vocational interest scales. The analysis revealed a non-significant Wilk’s Λ (.974), $F(6,165) = .729$, $p = .627$. There were no significant differences between vocational preferences of in-house lawyers compared to attorneys in law firms, failing to support hypothesis one.

Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted to test the second hypothesis that scores on the Artistic, Enterprising, and Social scales would be positively correlated with job satisfaction for each group. Both groups had the same vocational preferences with Artistic being the primary code and Enterprising and Social being the secondary codes. Analysis for the law firm attorneys determined that there was a significant positive relationship between overall job satisfaction and scores on the Enterprising preferences ($r(108) = .195$, $p = .044$), but not between overall job
satisfaction and Artistic preferences \((r(108) = -.006, p = .951)\), or Social preferences \((r(108) = .100, p = .304)\). These findings partially support hypothesis 2a. Analysis for the in-house lawyers determined that there was not a significant relationship between overall job satisfaction and scores on the Artistic preferences \((r(64) = -.185, p = .143)\), Enterprising preferences \((r(64) = -.007, p = .947)\), or Social preferences \((r(64) = -.010, p = .937)\), failing to support Hypothesis 2b.

Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted to test the third hypothesis that scores on the Artistic, Enterprising, and Social scales would be negatively correlated with turnover intentions for both groups. Analysis for the law firm attorneys determined that there was not a significant relationship between turnover intentions and scores on the Artistic preferences \((r(108) = .079, p = .418)\), Enterprising preferences \((r(108) = -.135, p = .165)\), or Social preferences \((r(108) = .006, p = .304)\). These results fail to support hypothesis 3a.

Analyses for the in-house lawyers determined that there was not a significant negative relationship between turnover intentions and scores on the Enterprising preferences \((r(64) = .012, p = .926)\), or Social preferences \((r(64) = -.085, p = .502)\). Unexpectedly, there was a significant positive correlation between turnover intentions and scores on the Artistic preference \((r(64) = .253, p = .044)\). These findings fail to support hypothesis 3b.

A between samples \(t\)-test analysis shows that private law firm attorneys did find the billable hour system significantly more desirable than in-house lawyers \((t(170) = 5.226, p < .001)\), supporting hypothesis 4.
Supplementary analyses attempted to determine if there was a relationship between vocational interests and desirability to work within a billable hour system. Pearson product-moment correlation analysis revealed a significant negative correlation for private law firm lawyers between the desirability to work within a billable hour system and scores on the Artistic preference ($r(108) = -0.239, p = 0.013$).

A Pearson product-moment correlation revealed a significant negative relationship between turnover intentions and desirability to work within a billable hour system for private law firm attorneys ($r(108) = -0.301, p = 0.002$). Conversely, the analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between turnover intentions and desirability to work within a billable hour system for in-house attorneys ($r(64) = 0.260, p = 0.038$).

Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted to determine if there was a correlation between the lower three vocational interests of each group of lawyers (Investigative, Realistic, and Conventional) and job satisfaction. For private law firm attorneys, there was a significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and scores on the Conventional scale ($r(108) = 0.253, p = 0.008$). For in-house attorneys, there was a significant negative correlation between job satisfaction and scores on the Realistic scale ($r(64) = -0.309, p = 0.013$).

Because the correlation between scores on the Realistic scale and overall job satisfaction was significant for in-house attorneys ($r = -0.309$) but was not significant for private law firm attorneys ($r = 0.103$), it was deemed necessary to conduct an analysis to determine if these correlations were significantly different from each other. A Fisher's $r$ to $z$ transformation determined the correlation between Realistic scores and overall job.
satisfaction for in-house attorneys was indeed significantly higher than the correlation for private law firm attorneys ($z = 3.97$).

Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted to analyze turnover intentions and desirability to work within a billable hour system to the lower three vocational interests of each group. No significant correlations were found between Investigative, Realistic, and Conventional scores and turnover intentions for both participants in private law firms and in-house attorneys. Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted to analyze desirability to work within a billable hour system to the lower three vocational interests of each group. There was a significant negative correlation for law firm lawyers between scores on the Investigative scale and desirability to work within a billable hour system ($r_{108} = -.191, p = .047$).

**Discussion**

Results from this sample determined that lawyers working in-house and in private firms are not significantly different in terms of vocational preferences. This finding is consistent with Holland's assertion that his typology is better utilized for differentiating between occupational fields as opposed to subspecialties (Holland, 1997).

The second purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between vocational preferences and overall job satisfaction based on the vocational profile of the sample. For the private law firm sector, there was a significant positive correlation between scores on the Enterprising scale and overall job satisfaction. Lawyers are expected to have skills in speaking, listening, and persuasion (O*NET, 2010). These skills are congruent with individuals who have Enterprising preferences, who possess "interpersonal and persuasive competencies" (Holland, 1997, p. 25). These skills may be
especially important for attorneys in private law firms, who work directly with people and may be required to recruit clients for generating business. The other two interests of the vocational profile, Artistic and Social, did not seem to affect job satisfaction for private law firm lawyers. For in-house lawyers, none of the top three vocational profile scores significantly correlated with job satisfaction.

A supplemental analysis of the three other vocational interest scales (Investigative, Realistic, and Conventional) found a significant positive correlation between scores on the Conventional preference and overall job satisfaction for law firm attorneys. Individuals with Conventional preferences are organized, detail-oriented, prefer routine work schedules, and also prefer tasks involving the “systematic manipulation of data” (Holland, 1997, p. 27).

For in-house attorneys, it was determined that Realistic scores have a significant negative relationship with overall job satisfaction. Individuals with Realistic preferences usually develop skills in “manual, mechanical, agricultural, electrical and technical” fields (Holland, 1997, p. 21) and prefer environments that require utilization and manipulation of tools, machinery, and animals (Holland, 1997).

The third purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between vocational preferences and turnover intentions. For private law firm attorneys, the findings from this analysis determined that vocational interest scores in the Artistic, Enterprising, and Social scales did not have a significant relationship with turnover intentions. For in-house attorneys, there were no significant relationships between turnover intentions and scores on the Enterprising or Social scales. An unexpected finding in the analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between the Artistic
and desire to work within a billable hour system. This finding suggests the top three preferences have little bearing on the attorneys' desirability to work within a billable hour billing system. A second analysis was conducted to determine if there was a relationship between the three other vocational interest scales (Investigative, Realistic, and Conventional) and the desire to work within a billable hour system. There was a significant negative correlation between scores on the Investigative scale and desirability toward the billable hour system for attorneys in law firms.

**Limitations and Future Research Directions**

The current study has some potential limitations. This study was limited to lawyers employed within corporations or private law firms. Given the number of career options for lawyers, it may be worthwhile to extend vocational interest research to other sectors of law and samples of lawyers. These groups of lawyers may yield unique and potentially different vocational interest preferences than those found in this study.

Certain information about the participants was unknown to this study. It was not known where the lawyers worked within the United States, or how many of the participants came from a particular region. Additionally, this study did not collect any information pertaining to the attorneys' undergraduate education, specialty, or field of expertise. Specific VPI response scores of participants could reflect their job responsibilities and areas of expertise, or their position within their companies. It is possible that lawyers working within their desired specialty are more satisfied with their positions regardless of the sector of law they work within. Future research may benefit from acquiring specific information about the attorney when comparing vocational interests of lawyers between different areas of law.
scale and turnover intentions for in-house attorneys. Individuals with Artistic preferences value competencies in “language, art, music, drama, and writing” (Holland, 1997, p. 23). Individuals with Artistic vocational interests prefer working in unstructured work environments and have aversions for business settings (Holland, 1997). Contrary to our hypothesis, there were no significant negative correlations between scores in the top three vocational preferences (Artistic, Enterprising, and Social) and turnover intentions. A supplemental analysis determined there were also no significant relationships between the three other vocational interest scales (Investigative, Realistic, and Conventional) and turnover intentions.

Results from this study determined that attorneys in private law firms did find the billable hour billing system significantly more desirable than in-house lawyers. The mean scores for both groups were exceptionally low (1.67 for in-house attorneys and 2.45 for law firm attorneys on a 5 point scale). The low scores are consistent with assertions of general opposition of the billable hour system in the law industry (Fortney, 2000; Levit & Linder, 2010).

An indirect finding from the analysis revealed that the desire to work in a billable hour system and turnover intentions were negatively correlated for private law firm attorneys (-.301) and positively correlated for in-house attorneys (.200). These findings suggest feelings towards the billable hour system may influence one’s outlook for remaining in each respective sector of law and indicate that lawyers should seriously consider the compensation system when practicing law.

A supplemental analysis determined there was not a significant relationship between the top vocational interests of the participants (Artistic, Enterprising, and Social)
Conclusions

This study utilized Holland’s VPI in order to compare the vocational preferences of lawyers working within private law firms and in-house for corporations. In addition to comparing vocational interests, this study also analyzed each group of attorneys to determine if there was a relationship between vocational preferences and both job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Findings from this study determined that attorneys employed within private law firms and in-house for corporations are not terribly dissimilar from each other in terms of vocational interests. Enterprising and Conventional vocational interests were positively related to job satisfaction for lawyers working within private law firms. Artistic vocational interests were negatively related to turnover intentions and Realistic vocational interests were negatively related to job satisfaction for in-house attorneys. Private law firm attorneys found the billable hour billing system significantly more desirable than in-house attorneys, however a negative relationship was found between Artistic and Investigative vocational preferences and the desire to work within an hourly billing system for private firm attorneys.

Results from this study suggest lawyers with Enterprising and Conventional preferences find the private law firm environment favorable, whereas lawyers with Artistic and Realistic preferences dislike working in-house for organizations. Further studies of lawyers with these preferences may reveal important information regarding why lawyers with certain preferences prefer one work environment. Further studies may also reveal characteristics of work environments which lawyers of certain preferences may find unappealing. Finally, results suggest that lawyers with Investigative and Artistic preferences working within a private law firm dislike the hourly billing system. Further
research into private firm lawyers with these preferences may also reveal important information regarding their affect towards the hourly billing system.

The moderate significant correlations in this study suggest there are meaningful relationships between vocational preferences and specific work environments. This study indicates law students, attorneys, and organizations hiring attorneys should pay attention to vocational preferences. Future research should extend vocational preference research to lawyers in other sectors of law.
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Appendix A

Vocational Preference Inventory

The Vocational Preference Inventory (VPI) is protected by copyright so it is not reproduced in this document. This measure is available through Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc. at www.parinc.com
Appendix B

Turnover Intentions

Appendix C

Job Satisfaction

Instructions: Complete the questionnaire by selecting the most appropriate choice.

Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, how satisfied are you with your current position?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Satisfied at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Billable Hour System Desirability

Instructions: Complete the questionnaire by selecting the most appropriate choice.

Billable Hour Desirability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How desirable is it for you to work in a billable hour billing system?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Desirable At All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Participant Demographics

Instructions: Complete the questionnaire by either filling in the blank or by selecting the most appropriate choice.

What is your age?

a. 24 and under
b. Between 25 and 29
c. Between 30 and 34
d. Between 35 and 39
e. Between 40 and 44
f. Between 45 and 49
g. Between 50 and 54
h. Between 55 and 59
i. 60 and over

What is your race/ethnicity?

a. Caucasian/Anglo
b. African American/Black
c. Hispanic/Latino
d. Asian/Pacific Islander
e. Native American Indian
f. Other (Please Specify):
    g. Multi-racial
    h. Choose not to reply

What is your gender?

a. Male
b. Female

c. Choose to not reply

What is your marital status?

a. Married, no children
b. Married with children
c. Divorced or separated
d. Single
e. Widowed

Are you currently employed as a full-time attorney?

a. Yes
b. No

How many years have you practiced law?

a. Less than a year
b. More than 1 year but less than 3 years
c. More than 3 years but less than 6 years
d. More than 6 years but less than 9 years
e. More than 9 years but less than 12 years
f. More than 12 years but less than 15 years
g. More than 15 years

Which sector of law do you work within?

a. Private Law Firm
b. In-house or for a Corporation’s Law Department
c. Other (Please Specify):

What is the principal method of billing clients in your practice?

a. Hourly billing
b. Contingent fee
c. Flat fee

d. I do not bill clients

e. Other (Please Describe):

Does your employer have a minimum annual billable hours expectation of associates?

a. Yes

b. No

What is your primary method of compensation (not including yearly bonus)?

a. Salary

b. Contingency

c. Flat fee

d. Other (please describe)

How long have you worked within your current organization?

a. Less than a year

b. More than 1 year but less than 3 years

c. More than 3 years but less than 6 years

d. More than 6 years but less than 9 years

e. More than 9 years but less than 12 years

f. More than 12 years but less than 15 years

g. More than 15 years

Are you a partner or on a partner-track?

a. Yes

b. No
Appendix F

IRB Approval Letter

June 24, 2013

David O’Connell
3822 Regent Ave.
Cincinnati, OH 45207

Re: Protocol #1299-S, Corporate vs Private: A Vocational Interest Comparison Between Private Law Firm and In-house Attorneys
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Please contact our office if you have any questions. We wish you success with your project!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Morrell E. Mullins, Jr., Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board
Xavier University

MEM/AB

C. Mark Nagy, Advisor
Appendix G

Informed Consent

You are being given the opportunity to volunteer to participate in a project conducted by David O’Connell through Xavier University. The purpose of this study is to investigate vocational interests of lawyers. You were chosen because of your position as an attorney.

In this study, you will answer a short survey and fill out a demographic questionnaire. Your participation will take around 40 minutes to complete.

There are no known risks associated with this study. Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time. Your participation will benefit research in vocational interests and career counseling. Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from Xavier University.

Your responses will remain confidential. Moreover, only the researcher conducting this study will have access to your responses. You will never be connected to any of your responses in any way.

If you have any questions at any time during the study, you may contact the principal investigator, David O’Connell, at oconnelld@xavier.edu, or the faculty advisor, Dr. Mark Nagy, at nagyms@xavier.edu. Questions about your rights as a research subject should be directed to Xavier University’s Institutional Review Board at 513-745-2870.

My completion of this survey indicates my consent to participate in the study:

I have been given information about this research study and its risks and benefits and have had the opportunity to ask questions and to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I freely give my consent to participate in this research project.
Appendix H

Debriefing Form

Thank you for participating in our research project. The purpose of this study is to research vocational interests of lawyers. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact David O’Connell (the principal researcher) at oconnelld@xavier.edu or Dr. Mark Nagy (the research supervisor) at nagyms@xavier.edu. Questions about your rights as a research subject should be directed to Xavier University’s Institutional Review Board at (513) 745-2870.
Appendix I

Email to Participants

To: (Participant Emails)

Subject: Masters Thesis Survey

My Name is David O'Connell. I am currently completing my Masters Degree in Industrial and Organizational Psychology at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio. As a part of my Masters thesis, I am researching the vocational interests of attorneys. You were chosen to participate in this study because of your position as an attorney.

This research study will benefit organizations that hire lawyers. The goal is to submit the findings of this study for publication by a Law Journal and the Journal of Vocational Behavior. The survey will take about 15 minutes to complete. All survey responses will remain anonymous and confidential.

If you would like to participate in the research, please access the survey through the link below. The pass code for the survey is xavier.

http://edu.surveygizmo.com/s3/1271222/Lawyer-Vocational-Interest-Survey

Pass Code = xavier

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

David O'Connell