

Michigan Law Review

Volume 65 | Issue 8

1967

Supplement--The Class of 1951

Michigan Law Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr>



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#), and the [Legal Profession Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Michigan Law Review, *Supplement--The Class of 1951*, 65 MICH. L. REV. 1685 (1967).

Available at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr/vol65/iss8/10>

This Recent Important Decisions is brought to you for free and open access by the Michigan Law Review at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Michigan Law Review by an authorized editor of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact mlaw.repository@umich.edu.

SUPPLEMENT

THE CLASS OF 1951*

PREFACE

Communications between the faculty of the University of Michigan Law School and alumni have improved rather dramatically in recent years. The appearance of *Law Quadrangle Notes* in 1957 was followed in 1960–1961 by the organization of the Law School Fund and in 1962 by the first meeting of the Committee of Visitors. As a result of these and other activities, the faculty and the alumni are better acquainted. But, as is so often true, a little information seems only to generate the need for more.

In order to test the utility of comprehensive information about graduates, former Dean A. F. Smith approved a proposal of Professor Richard V. Wellman, Faculty Placement Counsellor, to gather data concerning a particular class. The Class of 1951, which observed its fifteenth reunion in 1966, was chosen since it was felt that fifteen years was long enough for careers to be well settled, and yet not so long as to make its members unresponsive to school inquiries. The response was excellent: 229 of 282, or 81%, returned a completed, seven-page questionnaire. This story of the Class of 1951 reflects much of what was learned about this group as a result of the experiment.

I. THE FRESHMAN CLASS

Most of the 287 persons who graduated at one of the three commencements of 1951 entered the law school in September of 1948, although 24 started the previous June, and 37 started in June of 1949. The group came from 32 states including the District of Columbia. 129, or 41%, were Michigan residents. Other states highly represented were Ohio (33), Illinois (22), New York (17), and Pennsylvania (16).

The average age of the graduating class when they started in law school was 23.8 years; the youngest was 19, and the oldest, 34. About 27% were married. 231, or 82%, were veterans—a circumstance that explains why their average age was about two years older than that of today's entering classes. Approximately 73% had college degrees

* This supplement comprises excerpts from a study made by the University of Michigan Law School under the direction of Professor Richard V. Wellman who is solely responsible for the conclusions expressed.

when they entered law school. 16% were admitted on combined curriculum arrangements between the law school and some of the undergraduate schools here and elsewhere in Michigan. Several of these persons received baccalaureate degrees at the end of their first year of law study. The remaining 11% were admitted as veterans. Evidently, three years of college work was expected of veterans, for all admitted on the basis of prior military service had had three years of college.

II. 1948-1951

The 287 graduates in 1951 survived an academic obstacle course of considerable difficulty if measured by the number of 1948 starters who fell by the wayside. According to the "Law School Announcement" for 1949-1950, a total of 1,057 students were enrolled in the regular sessions of 1948-1949, of whom 430 were first-year students. The July 1949 "home list" is a fair indicator of the casualty rate: 76 freshmen were sent home in July of 1949 with grade averages of less than 1.5. Another 96 persons were put on probation at this time and 11 of these were sent home in July 1950 when they failed, after two years of work, to pull up to the minimum required standard. In addition, it is estimated that 41 students withdrew voluntarily.

The dominant fact about the law school grades of the Class of 1951 is that a C, or 2.0 grade, was entirely respectable. The median grade average for the entire graduating group was 2.378. 20% had cumulative averages of less than 2.1. At the other end, the top 20% ranged upwards from 2.862.

III. 1951-1966

A. *Present Locations*

Members of the Class of 1951 who responded to the questionnaire are distributed among 33 states including the District of Columbia. Comparing figures for the 229 who responded, one can plot the movement of the group from home states to present location. The figures indicate that the State of Michigan lost a net of 9 persons to other states. Of the 91 persons who were Michigan residents when they entered law school, 67 have remained residents of the state. 24 persons who were Michigan residents when they were in law school have located outside the state, and 16 persons who came to law school from out-of-state have remained. In other words, 26% of the persons who were Michigan residents when they entered law school have located outside the state and 20% of the group of 1951 graduates who have settled in Michigan originated from out-of-state.

State	No. from state in 1948	No. presently located in state
Arizona	1	1
California	0	15
Colorado	1	5
Connecticut	6	3
Delaware	0	1
District of Columbia	0	7
Florida	1	3
Hawaii	9	8
Idaho	2	0
Illinois	18	14
Indiana	5	4
Iowa	3	4
Kansas	3	1
Kentucky	1	1
Maine	0	1
Maryland	0	1
Massachusetts	7	3
Michigan	91	82
Minnesota	2	3
Mississippi	1	0
Missouri	7	6
Montana	2	2
Nebraska	1	0
New Jersey	4	3
New York	13	20
North Carolina	1	0
Ohio	27	23
Oklahoma	1	0
Oregon	1	1
Pennsylvania	10	6
South Dakota	4	1
Tennessee	1	1
Texas	0	2
Utah	2	1
Virginia	1	1
Washington	1	4
Wisconsin	2	1
Totals	229	229

B. *Size of Communities*

In terms of the size of communities represented by present location, the questionnaires brought responses as follows:

Size of city	No. of graduates	% of respondents
Under 25,000	27	12%
25,000 to 100,000	46	20%
100,000 to 500,000	52	23%
500,000 to 1,000,000	36	16%
Over 1,000,000	66	29%

The 1964 Lawyer Statistical Report of the American Bar Foundation (ABF) locates the 296,069 lawyers in the United States as of 1963 in communities classified by size, as follows:

Size of City	% of all lawyers
Under 200,000	46%
200,000-500,000	14%
Over 500,000	40%

The only comparison possible between national figures and those applicable to the Class of 1951 relates to persons located in cities over and under 500,000 in population. It indicates that 45% of the class is located in cities over 500,000, as against 40% for all lawyers. The ABF report notes that the percentages of lawyers in cities over 500,000 in size increased 35.4% between 1951 and 1963. Presumably, most of this increase is attributable to the location patterns of lawyers entering practice since 1950. Thus, it appears that the location pattern of our class is wholly consistent with national trends.

C. Present Occupations

The 1951 group, in the main, has stayed close to the legal profession. In response to a question about their present principal occupation (defined as the source of 75% or more of current income from other than investments), the 223 who answered assorted themselves as follows:

Occupation	No. of graduates	% of those responding
1. Lawyer—private practice	136	60.9%
2. Lawyer—salaried employee of <i>other</i> than a law firm, excluding judges, teachers, and legislators	43	19.3%
3. Teacher	4	1.8%
4. Judge	2	.9%
5. Legislator (including city and local government)	2	.9%
6. Non-lawyer, including housewife	38	17.0%

Although there are small discrepancies in the questionnaire responses, the 136 private practitioners may be further classified into the following types of legal practice:

Type of practice	U-M Class of 1951 (% 1965)	National ¹ (% 1963)
1. Solo practitioner	20%	56%
2. Solo practitioner in non-partnership association with other lawyers	15%	
3. Member of partnership	62%	35%
4. Employee of partnership	3%	9%

It is also interesting to compare the type of law practice engaged in by the 1951 graduates with that of all Michigan Law School alumni:

Type of practice	U-M Class of 1951 in practice (1965)	U-M all graduates in practice (1963) ²
1. Solo practitioner (including persons in non-partnership association with others)	35%	39%
2. Member of partnership	62%	46%
3. Employee of partnership	3%	15%

The figures suggest a trend toward partnership practice by the 1951 group which is greater than that among all Michigan Law School alumni practicing in 1963, and greater than the national percentage of lawyers practicing as members of partnerships.

As might be expected, the incidence of solo practitioners is greatest in the smaller communities. Of the 49 respondents who placed themselves in this category, 8, or 16%, are in communities of less than 25,000; 12, or 24%, are in communities of 25,000 to 100,000; and 14, or 28%, are in communities of from 100,000 to 500,000 population. As shown in the first tabulation in this section, the overall percentages of class members in these three categories of cities is 12%, 20%, and 23% respectively.

The 43 respondents who indicated that they were salaried lawyers (but not teachers, judges, or legislators) work for the following organizations:

1. The national figures represent the state of practice as of 1963, and are derived from those compiled in HANKIN & KROHNKE, *THE AMERICAN LAWYERS: 1964 STATISTICAL REPORT* 32 (1965).

2. The figures for all U-M graduates represent the state of practice as of 1963, and are derived from those compiled in *id.* at 154.

Type of employer	No. of persons	% of salaried graduates	% of class
Organization for profit	31	72%	14%
Governmental unit (federal, state, and local)	8	19%	3.5%
Other	4	9%	2%

D. *Specialties*

Substantive areas accounting for more than 25% of an attorney's working time were identified as follows:³

Subject area	Number of specialists
1. Negligence	36
2. Real property	31
3. Corporation	29
4. Trust and probate	19
5. Trial, general	18
6. Domestic relations	11
7. Taxation	11
8. Patent, trademark and copyright	11
9. Municipal law	8
10. Labor law	6
11. Government contracts	6
12. Administrative law	5
13. Banking and commercial	5
14. Bankruptcy—collections	5
15. Antitrust	4
16. Oil, gas and mineral	3
17. International law	3
18. Workman's compensation	3
19. Admiralty	2
20. Criminal law	2

It is noteworthy that only 15 of 229 respondents indicated that "no area accounts for 25% or more of working time."

In addition, the respondents considered themselves to be active in the following subject areas, irrespective of whether such areas account for any given minimum of total time. The first 10 of the areas in the order of frequency are as follows:

3. The listing of specialty areas left several matters in the air. 9 respondents experienced difficulty in choosing between "Trial, general," "Negligence," and "Criminal law." Their responses are not reflected in the tabulation. Perhaps they should be distributed among these categories.

14 respondents indicated that they spent 25% or more of their time in specialties not reflected on the list. They listed "business advisory," "legislation," "insurance liquidations," "surety," "securities regulation," "insurance," "employee benefits," "aviation," and "uniform vehicle code" as descriptive of their work.

Area	Persons checking
1. Real property	91
2. Negligence	85
3. Corporation	82
4. Trust and probate	75
5. Trial, general	63
6. Taxation	52
7. Domestic relations	50
8. Workmen's compensation	35
9. Banking and commercial	34
10. Bankruptcy-collections	34

The 5 areas checked least frequently are:

Area	Persons checking
Admiralty	6
International	7
Public utility regulation	8
Oil, gas and mineral	12
Antitrust	15

E. Advice About the Law School Curriculum

In view of the patterns of experience reflected by the 1951 graduates their evaluation of the 1948-1951 law school curriculum is interesting. Asked to check three choices of subjects in which they would recommend *an increase* in course offerings, the responses were as follows:

Subjects	Cred. hrs. ⁴ 1948-1951	First choice	Second choice	Third choice
1. Commercial law (including corporations)	21	38	44	36
2. Contracts and remedies	15	4	16	21
3. Criminal law	4	1	4	2
4. Domestic relations	2	1	3	6
5. Jurisprudence (professional responsibility, international law, comparative law, etc.)	12	12	14	16
6. Procedure, evidence, trial practice	11	78	21	24
7. Property	18	5	4	5
8. Public law (constitutional, administrative, municipal, labor, etc.)	16	21	21	26
9. Taxation	5	24	45	30
10. Torts and personal injury	5	6	22	15

When the same question was put in terms of recommended *decreases* in the curriculum, the responses were as follows:

4. This column shows the number of credit hours offered in the respective areas during the time the Class of 1951 was in school.

Subjects	Cred. hrs. 1948-1951	First choice	Second choice	Third choice
1. Commercial law (including corporations)	21	3	4	6
2. Contracts and remedies	15	4	4	4
3. Criminal law	4	19	33	13
4. Domestic relations	2	53	26	17
5. Jurisprudence (professional responsibility, international law, comparative law, etc.)	12	58	24	18
6. Procedure, evidence, trial practice	11	5	1	7
7. Property	18	9	11	10
8. Public law (constitutional, administrative, municipal, labor, etc.)	16	6	21	16
9. Taxation	5	3	5	5
10. Torts and personal injury	5	5	2	15

On the one hand, these results show that attorneys readily distinguish between what they do as practitioners, and what they think they should be taught in law school. Thus, although domestic relations occupies 25% or more of the working time of 11 practitioners and is an active concern of 50 more, few would urge that the two-hour course offering be increased. Indeed, the domestic relations and jurisprudence (professional responsibility, international law, comparative law, etc.) courses were singled out for reduction or elimination by many members of the class.

On the other hand, though the course offerings under the heading commercial law (including corporations) were more numerous in the 1948-1951 curriculum than any other group of courses, the responses indicate that the number of commercial law courses should be increased. Evidently, some fields of practice lend themselves to academic preparation better than others.

That the 1951 graduate recommends more training in procedure, evidence, and trial practice is interesting in this connection. It would seem that contrary to much student opinion, careful preparation for trial work in law school is very desirable.

F. *Financial Success*

The Class of 1951 was asked to answer questions about income for successive periods after graduation. The periods chosen were: (A) the first three years of post-graduate experience, presumably the years 1951-1953; (B) the second three years, presumably 1954-1956; (C) the next four years, presumably 1957-1960; and (D) the most recent four years, presumably 1961-1964. The request was to indicate the *average* for the three or four years in question of *before-tax earnings* from principal occupation, *excluding investment income*.

The responses were as follows:

		<i>Period A</i>	
%	No. of respondents		Income category
14.1	32	averaged below	\$ 3,000 per year
57.1	129	averaged from	\$ 3,000 to \$ 5,000
23.0	52	averaged from	\$ 5,000 to \$ 7,500
4.7	10	averaged from	\$ 7,500 to \$10,000
.8	2	averaged from	\$10,000 to \$12,500
.3	1	averaged above	\$12,500

		<i>Period B</i>	
%	No. of respondents		Income category
43.1	97	averaged below	\$ 7,500
35.1	79	averaged from	\$ 7,500 to \$10,000
12.0	27	averaged from	\$10,000 to \$12,500
7.1	16	averaged from	\$12,500 to \$15,000
2.7	6	averaged above	\$15,000

		<i>Period C</i>	
%	No. of respondents		Income category
7.6	17	averaged below	\$ 7,500
27.2	62	averaged from	\$ 7,500 to \$10,000
22.7	51	averaged from	\$10,000 to \$12,500
13.9	31	averaged from	\$12,500 to \$15,000
9.4	21	averaged from	\$15,000 to \$17,500
6.6	15	averaged from	\$17,500 to \$20,000
6.3	14	averaged from	\$20,000 to \$22,500
6.3	14	averaged above	\$22,500

		<i>Period D</i>	
%	No. of respondents		Income category
3.1	7	averaged below	\$ 7,500
4.0	9	averaged from	\$ 7,500 to \$10,000
11.6	26	averaged from	\$10,000 to \$12,500
17.0	38	averaged from	\$12,500 to \$15,000
10.7	24	averaged from	\$15,000 to \$17,500
14.8	33	averaged from	\$17,500 to \$20,000
6.7	15	averaged from	\$20,000 to \$22,500
10.7	24	averaged from	\$22,500 to \$25,000
21.4	48	averaged above	\$25,000

The ABF report notes that the average lawyer-partner in the United States earned \$18,200 in 1961 and that the average profit for individual practitioners in that year was \$7,870. It also notes that the total income for the legal services industry in 1963 was up 121.8% over 1951, and 20.6% over 1960, suggesting an annual rate of increase of about 10% over the entire period and of about 7%

during the last three years. The increase in median salaries for the Class of 1951 between the mid-points of Periods A and D was from \$4,000 to \$18,750. This increase amounted to 368% of the starting figure of \$4,000. If we treat 120 points as attributable to national increases in lawyer's income, the net growth attributable to professional development is 248%, or about 18% per year for the first fourteen years.

We can compare the earnings records of 89 respondents who are either salaried lawyers (other than those working for a law partnership), teachers, judges, legislators, or others who are in businesses unrelated to law with those of the practicing lawyer segment of the class.⁵ The following shows these two categories of persons on the basis of their average incomes during the last four years:

Average earnings Period D	<i>Practicing lawyers</i>		Average for class	<i>All others</i>	
	No.	% of category		No.	% of category
Below \$7,500	2	1.6	3.1	5	5.6
\$ 7,500-\$10,000	6	4.7	4.0	3	3.4
\$10,000-\$12,500	10	7.8	11.6	16	18.0
\$12,500-\$15,000	17	13.3	17.0	20	22.5
\$15,000-\$17,500	14	10.9	10.7	8*	9.0
\$17,500-\$20,000	17*	13.3	14.8	13	14.6
\$20,000-\$22,500	8	6.3	6.7	5	5.6
\$22,500-\$25,000	15	12.5	10.7	9	10.1
Above \$25,000	39	30.6	21.4	10	11.2
	128**	100.0	100.0	89**	100.0

* Median category.

** 8 of the respondents detached statements about income from the balance of the questionnaire; 4 respondents did not complete the income portion of questionnaire.

Among the 89 non-practitioners, 36 classified themselves as non-lawyers. 10 indicated that they were sole or co-proprietors (more than 30% interest) of various businesses, 23 said they were supervisory employees of a business organization and two classified themselves as non-supervisory employees. The following tabulation shows the average income levels in period D for these two groups of the class, and repeats the breakdown of the practicing lawyer segment for comparison:

5. 128 of the 136 respondents who indicated that they were engaged in private practice left their income statements attached to the rest of their questionnaire. All but 3 of the 92 respondents who are not practicing law also left their income statements attached.

Average earnings Period D	Practicing lawyers		Lawyer-employee		Non-lawyer	
	No.	% of category	No.	% of category	No.	% of category
Below \$7,500	2	1.6	2	3.7	3	8.3
From \$ 7,500-\$10,000	6	4.7	2	3.7	1	2.8
From \$10,000-\$12,500	10	7.8	8	15.1	8	22.1
From \$12,500-\$15,000	17	13.3	16*	30.3	4	11.1
From \$15,000-\$17,500	14	10.9	2	3.7	6*	16.6
From \$17,500-\$20,000	17*	13.3	10	19.1	3	8.3
From \$20,000-\$22,500	8	6.3	4	7.5	1	2.8
From \$22,500-\$25,000	15	11.5	4	7.5	5	14.0
Above \$25,000	39	30.6	5	9.4	5	14.0
	<u>128</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>100.0</u>

* Median category.

1. Analysis of High-Earners

48 respondents whose present occupations cover all categories indicated that their earnings for the last four years have exceeded \$25,000 per year. It may be useful to examine the credentials of these persons as established at the time of graduation, to see whether the factors sometimes thought to be important by employers bear any relationship to the actual achievement of financial success. Also, some outlines of the kinds of careers these persons have pursued may be useful guides to students and placement counsellors.

a. *Law school grade averages.* The grade averages for the most financially successful group in the class range almost as widely as the averages for the whole class. However, 14.5% of the class had overall grade averages of 3.0 and above, while 23% of the high earners had grade averages of 3.0 and up. Moreover, at the other end of the scale, 13.6% of the class had averages of 2.0 or below, while only 6.2% of the high-earners had grades in this range. The mean grade average for the 48 was 2.648, compared with a mean for the entire class of 2.484. Thus, there seems to be a definite correlation between high law school grades and earnings achievement after graduation.

b. *Sources of support—outside employment as student.* While only 18.5% of the entire class indicated that parental support was the most important source of income during law school days, 29.1% of the high-earners checked parental support as most important. There are differences also, in the degree to which veterans' benefits were available to the high earners and, as noted below, differences in the average age of the high-earner group. These differences may help explain the higher degree of dependence on parents. The high-earners were less dependent on veterans' benefits than the average member of the class. 59% of the entire group of respondents derived

principal support from veterans' benefits, as against 44% of the high-earners. This is due, in part, to a slightly smaller proportion of veterans among the high-earners (77%) than among the entire class (82%). The high-earners engaged more extensively in outside employment while they were in law school than did the average member of the class.⁶ It seems reasonable to conclude that the high-earner group includes a higher proportion of energetic people who kept themselves busy, as well as partially supported, by outside employment during their student days.

c. *Age.* The group which has proved most successful in a financial sense has a heavy representation of persons who were relatively young when they entered law school, as well as a relatively smaller representation of those who were older. Thus, though 16.4% of the persons who ultimately graduated with the class were 21 or younger when they entered law school, 23% of the high-earners were 21 or younger at such time. 19.6% of the entire group who graduated were 26 or older when they started law school; 16.6% of the high-earning group were in this age bracket.

d. *Marital status.* The high-earner group seems wholly typical of the entire class when the inquiry turns to marital status during law school. 27% of both groups were married when they started law study. An additional 22% of the entire class became married before graduation, as compared with 21% of the high-earners.

6. The tabulation that follows reflects the responses to a question about average hours per week spent performing outside employment. The numbers reflect percentages, with those in the top-right position of each box reflecting the portion of the high-earner group; the other number reflects the portion of all respondents, including the high-earners. Thus each box presents a comparison between the average for the class and the average for the high-earner group.

Average hours per week	First year	Second year	Third year			
Less than 10	18.3	12.5	6.2	10.4		
10-15	9.6	14.6	18.3	18.7	17.5	22.9
15-20	7.9	8.3	7.9	10.4	11.8	6.2
More than 20	7.9	10.4	12.2	16.6	11.4	16.6

It should be noted that in the boxes representing more than fifteen hours of outside work per week, the average for the high-earners exceeds that for the entire class in 5 out of 6 instances. The differences here seem greater than one might expect considering the slightly lower proportion of persons enjoying veterans' benefits in the high-earner group.

2. Comparison of Career Characteristics

a. *Size of community.* The 48 high-earners have distributed themselves among various sized communities as indicated below:

	High-earners		All respondents	
	No.	%	No.	%
Under 25,000	7	14.6	27	11.9
25,000-100,000	7	14.6	46	20.3
100,000-500,000	11	22.9	52	22.9
500,000-1,000,000	4	8.3	36	11.4
Over 1,000,000	19	39.6	66	29.1

On balance, the high-earners have tended to locate in larger cities somewhat more consistently than the rest of the class. It is somewhat surprising, however, that the differences in this respect between high-earners and the entire class are not more pronounced.

b. *Size of organization—lawyers only.* Taking only those respondents who describe themselves as practicing lawyers, the answers relating to the number of associates in law for the high-earner group as compared with all lawyers indicate the following:

	High-earners		All lawyers	
	No.	%	No.	%
No associates	7	17.9	21	15.7
1-3 associates	14	35.9	61	45.4
4-7 associates	7	17.9	23	17.2
8-15 associates	5	12.8	15	11.2
16-30 associates	1	2.6	4	3.0
31-50 associates	3	7.7	5	3.7
Over 51 associates	2	5.1	5	3.7
	39	99.9	134	99.9

This shows a slight correlation between larger offices and higher incomes. Again, however, it is surprising that the differences are not more marked.

c. *Practice specialties.* As indicated earlier, respondents were asked to indicate which, if any, of 21 categories of possible specialization engaged 25% or more of their time. The proportions of high-earners' and of all responding practitioners in the specializations most mentioned are as follows:

7. Among the responses of the practicing lawyers in the high-earner category, 3 checked "antitrust," 1 checked "criminal law," and 2 checked "oil, gas and minerals." None of the other lawyer-respondents indicated these specialties. 2 practitioners who were not in the high-earner category indicated specialization in "public utility regulation," an area which drew no response from the high-earners. High-earners and

Specialty area	All practitioners		High-earners	
	No. of specialists	%	No.	%
Negligence and trial, general	50	37.5	15	38.4
Corporations, and banking and commercial law	23	17.2	6	15.4
Real property, and oil, gas and minerals	22	16.4	10	25.6
Trust and probate	19	14.2	5	12.8
Domestic relations	9	6.7	1	2.5
Taxation	8	6.0	3	7.7
Municipal	6	4.5	1	2.5
Labor	5	3.7	3	7.7
Bankruptcy—collections	5	3.7	2	5.1

Several aspects of this are noteworthy. The first is that all segments of the lawyers in the class are heavily involved in litigation. Almost 40% of the entire group mark this as taking up a quarter or more of their time. The only categories in which there seem to be significant differences in the degree of specialization between high-earners and all lawyers from the class are real property and domestic relations. The tabulation suggests that high-earners tend more frequently to specialize in real property subjects, and to eschew work in the area of domestic relations, which in turn suggests that lawyers who can afford to do so stay away from divorce work.

d. *Job changes.* Respondents were asked to indicate the number of different positions they have held since graduation. The 199 who responded line up as follows:

No. of positions since graduation	No.	%
One	41	20.6
Two	66	33.2
Three	42	21.1
Four	24	12.1
Five	11	5.6
More than five	15	7.4
	199	100.0

43 of 48 high-earners, including all occupations, responded to this question. Their answers permit the following classifications:

other lawyers were represented in all other categories that drew response. Three possible specialty areas drew no response from any respondents: "admiralty," "government contracts," and "international law."

The high-earners tended to be more specialized. 39 respondents in this category checked a total of 55 subject matter areas as representing 25% or more of their working time. This is a rate of 1.4 specialties per person. Overall, 134 respondents checked a total of 167 specialties, or 1.2 per person.

No. of positions since graduation	No.	%
One	13	30.1
Two	13	30.1
Three	8	18.7
Four	4	9.4
Five	2	4.7
More than five	3	7.0
	<u>43</u>	<u>100.0</u>

If the practicing lawyer contingent among the high-earners is isolated, there are 39 returns which line up as follows:

No. of positions since graduation	No.	%
One	12	30.8
Two	12	30.8
Three	8	20.5
Four	3	7.7
Five	2	5.1
More than five	2	5.1
	<u>39</u>	<u>100.0</u>

The figures tend to corroborate the long-standing assumption that law school graduates who aspire to financial success as practicing attorneys are well advised to choose their first location with care and then to stay put.

A further analysis of the earnings records of the high-earners shows that starting salaries bear a direct relationship to the ultimate earning power of the law school graduate: practitioners in the high-earner group in the Class of 1951 did significantly better during the first three years after graduation. Only 12.8% of this group indicated average earnings for the first three years of below \$3,000 as against 17.6% of their classmates now in the lower income brackets. 30.8% of the high-earners made an average of \$3,000 to \$5,000 during the first three years, as against 63.9% of their classmates. 54% of the high-earners averaged better than \$5,000 per year for the first three years, compared to 18.6% of those not presently included in the high-earner group. These figures demonstrate rather convincingly that those who have managed to do best financially in recent years have enjoyed comparative economic success consistently throughout the years following graduation.

IV. CONCLUSION

An almost endless number of comparisons and analyses might be generated on the basis of the comprehensive data recorded in the Class of 1951 survey. It is hoped that this report will move alumni,

faculty, and law students of the University of Michigan Law School to identify additional data of interest or utility to them. If the questionnaire used for the 1951 class survey is not sufficient to supply needed information, the questions readers of this summary may ask will aid in perfecting the next questionnaire.