THE STEADY MARCH OF PROGRESS?

THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE CONNECTICUT LEGAL PROFESSION IN 2025

SHANE A. GLEASON[1]

More than 150 years have passed since the Illinois Supreme Court refused Myra Bradwell admission to the Illinois Bar on the basis of her sex and marital status.[2] Seventy years have elapsed since Justices O'Connor and Ginsburg struggled to find employment despite graduating at the top of their respective classes.[3] More specific to Connecticut, it has been more than 140 years since Mary Hall became the first woman admitted to the Connecticut State Bar, nearly 65 years since Margaret Driscoll became the first female Connecticut state jurist. It was less than 50 years ago that Ellen Ash Peters became the first woman appointed to the Connecticut Supreme Court.[4] These remarkable women are a part of

[1] Associate Professor of Public Policy and Law, Trinity College, 300 Summit St. Hartford CT, 06106. Shane.gleason@trincoll.edu. I am grateful to Judge A. Susan Peck (ret.) for comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript.

[2] Bradwell v. State of Illinois, 83 U.S. 130 (1873).

[3] Ruth Bader Ginsburg, MY OWN WORDS (2016); Evan Thomas, FIRST: SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR: AN INTIMATE PORTRAIT OF THE FIRST WOMAN SUPREME COURT JUSTICE (2019).

[4] A. Susan Peck, *Upcoming Survey on the Status of Connecticut Women in the Legal Profession 2024,* CT LAWYER, September|October 2024, at 14.

what Laura Moyer and Susan Haire term the "trailblazer generation." [5] In many ways they paved the way for the women in the legal profession today. However, while the legal profession is increasingly diverse and women make up a majority of law students, questions remain about how women navigate the legal profession.

Diversity in the legal profession is a normatively laudable goal for many reasons. When an institution is diverse, diverse persons are able to "see themselves" in those roles. To illustrate, Campbell and Wolbrecht[6] note adolescent women are more likely to plan to be politically engaged when they are represented by a female governor or U.S. senator. While representation is a cornerstone of the American system of government,[7] it takes on especial meaning in the courts. The *Federalist Papers* famously note the courts lack the purse and the sword; they rely on a reservoir of good feelings in order to effect their decisions. Moreover, the courts are the branch of government people are most likely to

[5] Laura P. Moyer and Susan B. Haire, *Trailblazers and Those That Followed: Personal Experiences, Gender, and Judicial Empathy,* 49 LAW & SOC. REV. 665 (2015).

[6] David E. Campbell and Christina Wohlbrecht, *See Jane Run: Women Politicians as Role Models for Adolescents,* 68 J. OF POLITICS, 223 (2006).

[7] Hanna Pitkin, THE CONCEPT OF REPRESENTATION (1967).

interact with.[8] Critically too, as the percentage of women in a given legal context changes, judicial outputs change in meaningful ways.[9]

At the same time, the legal profession remains predominantly male. Indeed, it is one of the least gender diverse professions in the United States.[10] Consequently, women have a higher probability of attrition than their male counterparts.[11] They are also more likely to experience bias and discrimination either implicitly or explicitly.[12] Given these normative benefits, it is critical to explore not just the extent to which the legal profession diversifies

---

[8] Nicholas O. Alozie. *Selection Methods and the Recruitment of Women to State Courts of Last Resort.* 77 SOCIAL SCIENCE J. 110 (1996).

[9] Paul M. Collins, Kenneth L. Manning and Robert A. Carp, *Gender, Critical Mass, and Judicial Decision Making,* 32 LAW & POLICY, 260 (2010); Meghan E. Leonard and Joseph V. Ross, *Gender Diversity, Women's Leadership, and Consensus in State Supreme Courts,* 41 J. OF WOMEN, POLITICS & POLICY, 278 (2020).

[10] Barbara L. Graham and Adriano Udani, *Structural and Partisan Effects on the Ascension of Women of Color to State Appellate Courts, in* RACE, GENDER, SEXUALITY, AND THE POLITICS OF THE AMERICAN JUDICIARY (Samantha L. Hernandez and Sharon A. Navarro eds., 2019); Deborah L. Rhode, THE TROUBLE WITH LAWYERS (2015).

[11] Roberta D. Liebenberg and Stephanie A. Scharf, *Walking Out the Door: The Facts, Figures, and Future of Experienced Women Lawyers in Private Practice*, (2019), *available at* https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/women/walking-out-the-door-4920053.pdf.

[12] Todd A. Collins, Tao L. Dumas, and Laura P. Moyer, *Intersecting Disadvantages: Race, Gender, and Age Discrimination Among Attorneys,* 98 SOCIAL SCIENCE Q., 1642 (2017).

in terms of raw numbers, but also in terms of the culture. The prevailing norms of the legal profession are often male centric[13] and can lead to women exiting the profession.[14] This was evident to the Connecticut Bar Association (CBA) as early as 1975 when it published the first survey on Connecticut women in the law.[15] In the years since, a number of surveys have been conducted as well as an oral history project.[16] 30 years have passed since the last survey was published in 1995. In that time, much has changed in the Connecticut legal profession and society writ large. Guided by this most recent survey, I revisit the 1995 survey. I find that many of the same concerns present in the 1995 survey persist to the present day.

I. A HISTORY OF SURVEYS OF WOMEN IN THE CONNECTICUT LEGAL PROFESSION

[13] Shane A. Gleason and EmiLee Smart, *You Think; Therefore I Am: Gender Schemas & Context in Oral Arguments at the Supreme Court, 1979-2016,* 76 POLITICAL RESEARCH Q., 143 (2023).

[14] Liebenberg & Scharf, *supra* note 11.

[15] Shirley Raissi Bysiewicz, Anne Isbister Ballog, and Anne Cleary Dranginis, *Women Lawyers in Connecticut: A Survey,* 69 CONN. BAR J. 123 (1975).

[16] Peck, *supra* note 4, at 15-17.

The first three surveys of Connecticut women in the legal profession were published in rapid succession in 1975, 1979, and 1981.[17] They noted remarkable gains. Women quickly rose to constitute nearly a third of law students and admitted attorneys. While women were present in nearly every level of the legal profession, they tended to cluster on the lower levels of the legal pyramid.[18] The next survey was a part of the Connecticut Task Force on Gender, Justice, and the Courts in 1991. It came at the behest of Chief Justice Peters after a number of other states began to explore gender bias within their respective legal systems. The results were stark.[19]

The Task Force report noted, "women are treated differently from men in the justice system and, because of it, many suffer from unfairness, embarrassment, emotional pain, professional deprivation and economic hardship."[20] In the aftermath of the Task Force, the Connecticut Bar Association appointed a committee on Gender Bias in the Profession. It surveyed 1,247 attorneys split close to evenly between men and women. The survey made

---

[17] Bysiewicz, Ballog, & Dranginis*, supra* note 15; Elga R. Wasserman and Barbara S. Miller, *The Changing Status of Women Attorneys in Connecticut,* 56 CONN. BAR J. 344 (1982); Connecticut Bar Association, *Gender Issues in the Legal Profession*, 69 CONN. BAR J. 161 (1995).

[18] Wasserman & Miller, *supra* note 17.

[19] Peck, *supra* note 4.

[20] Connecticut Task Force on Gender, Justice and the Courts: Report to the Chief Justice, "Executive Summary," at 12 (1991). [The full report is available at the Connecticut State Library].

four key findings. It noted: 1) a persistence of sexual harassment; 2) pay disparity; 3) women's absence from decision/policy-making positions; and 4) an excess of women in part-time positions. Now, 30 years later, it is important to ask if these findings persist in the 2020s.

A. The Connecticut Legal Profession 30 Years Later

In conjunction with the Connecticut Bar Foundation and Judge A. Susan Peck (ret.), I conducted a survey of all attorney-members of the Connecticut Bar Association. While I took the 1995 survey as my guide, I also included questions which captured changes in American life and the legal profession in the past 30 years. For instance, I included questions about the impact of the covid-19 pandemic on attorneys. The survey was prepared in Qualtrics, a popular survey platform used by both academic and commercial research firms. Members were contacted via a short e-mail inviting them to participate. Two subsequent follow-up e-mails were sent before the survey window closed. Potential respondents were incentivized with a random drawing for an Amazon gift card. In total, 5,418 members were contacted. Of this, 643 provided valid usable responses.

I present the results in several parts. First, I provide basic demographics for the respondents of the survey. I subsequently examine the four key findings of the 1995 survey.

I then address the covid-19 pandemic, and its gendered elements. I close with an overview of the results, the limitations of the survey, and suggestions for future projects.

II. DEMOGRAPHICS

643 respondents indicated their sex. 332 men and 311 women answered the survey.[21] These 643 attorneys form the core of my analysis.[22] The respondents represent all career stages. At the extremes, one respondent completed his JD in 1959 and 8 completed their degrees in 2023. Below in Figure 1, I depict a density plot of the year in which respondents

[21] An additional four respondents indicated their sex was something other than the male/female binary. While the presence of non-binary respondents indicates growing diversity in Connecticut generally and the Connecticut Bar Association specifically, the low number of these respondents makes it difficult to make any meaningful statistical inferences about non-binary lawyers. Accordingly, though scholarly consensus indicates gender is a continuum rather than a binary, I limit analysis below to just respondents indicating either male or female. Given the small number of respondents indicating anything other than male or female, I encourage future oral histories and case studies to focus on the experiences of non-binary attorneys. See Christel Baltes-Löhr, *What are We Speaking About When We Speak About Gender? Gender as a Continuum,* 6 CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES, 1 (2018).

[22] For some items, the total may be smaller. This is because respondents may have left a given question blank or they may have been precluded from answering a particular question (for example, if a respondent does not indicate having children (s)he will be precluded from a question about the number of hours each week spent on childcare.

finished law school from 1959-2023. Across the *x*-axis across the bottom of each subplot, law school graduation years are listed. The *y*-axis depicts the percentage of attorneys that graduated in that specified time frame. The first panel, depicting men, begins in 1959 and approximates a normal distribution with most attorneys earning their JD in the middle of the series. For female attorneys, conversely, there are few to no attorneys earning their JDs before the mid to late 1970s. By 2000, the average annual percentage of female JDs remains relatively constant. For its part, the total attorneys mirrors male JDs.

Turning now to all attorneys, a quarter finished law school prior to 1983. Another quarter earned their JDs after 2003. As a result, the median respondent completed their degree in 1992. There are, however, differences in graduation year based on attorney sex. The average male attorney earned his degree in 1988. The average female attorney earned hers in 1998. This difference is statistically significant and not due to random chance.[23]

[23] This is based on a *t*-test. This statistical test is commonly used in social science research. Briefly, the *t*-test examines whether differences in a given continuous measure (e.g. age, monetary values, years since a given event) between two discrete subpopulations (e.g. male and female, in-state and out-of-state) could be due to random statistical chance. If not, then the researcher can conclude the difference is statistically meaningful. See Damodar Gujarati, BASIC ECONOMETRICS, (4th ed. 2002).

Figure 1: Density Plot of Law School Graduation Year

The attorneys responding to the survey practice in a variety of areas of the law. That said, Table 1 depicts notable differences between the areas of law in which men and women practice. The first column shows the distribution for men. The second column represents women and the third column is for all respondents collectively. Women are more prevalent in administrative law than men. Conversely, men are more likely in business and corporate roles than women. Estates, trusts, or probate have a roughly comparable share of men and women. Consistent with previous work noting family law is a female issue domain, women are more prevalent in family law. While more men are in general practice than women, there is parity in non-criminal litigation.

	Male	Female	Total
Practice Area			
Administrative law	8 (2.7%)	20 (7.2%)	28 (4.9%)
Business/corporate	34 (11.5%)	13 (4.7%)	47 (8.2%)
Criminal	6 (2.0%)	8 (2.9%)	14 (2.4%)
Estates, trusts, or probate	44 (14.9%)	39 (14.0%)	83 (14.4%)
Family law	15 (5.1%)	31 (11.1%)	46 (8.0%)
General practice	39 (13.2%)	12 (4.3%)	51 (8.9%)
Litigation (non-criminal)	55 (18.6%)	57 (20.4%)	112 (19.5%)
Personal injury	29 (9.8%)	15 (5.4%)	44 (7.7%)
Other	66 (22.3%)	84 (30.1%)	150 (26.1%)
Totals	302 (50.8%)	292 (49.1%)	643 (100.0%)

Table 1: Practice Area

It is also important to ask what kinds of legal roles attorneys occupy within their jobs. Table 2 shows legal role. By a large margin, the majority of respondents are in private firms (75%). But it is important to note the marked differences between men and women. While 85% of men are in private firms, just 66% of women are. More women (8%) work in the non-profit sector and government agencies (9%) than men (3% for each). This is consistent with historical accounts stressing women often gravitated to government roles

when private firms would not hire them. Interestingly, 4% of female respondents are judges while only 1% of male respondents are.[24] These findings, which suggest this trend continues, warrants further exploration by future studies.

	Male	Female	Total
Current Job Category			
Government agency	9 (3.0%)	26 (8.9%)	35 (5.9%)
In-house counsel	7 (2.3%)	18 (6.2%)	25 (4.2%)
Judge or magistrate	3 (1.0%)	11 (3.8%)	14 (2.4%)
Non-profit	9 (3.0%)	24 (8.2%)	33 (5.6%)
Private firm	258 (85.4%)	192 (65.8%)	450 (75.8%)
Other	16 (5.3%)	21 (7.2%)	37 (6.2%)
Totals	302 (50.8%)	292 (49.2%)	594 (100.0%)

Table 2: Legal Role

[24] This may reflect a selection effect amongst female jurists. Briefly, a survey on the status of women in the legal profession may be of more interest to female judges than male judges. See Herbert F. Weisberg, Jon A. Krosnick, and Bruce D. Bowen, AN INTRODUCTION TO SURVEY RESEARCH, POLLING, AND DATA ANALYSIS, (3d ed. 1996).

It is next important to break down the roles that attorneys occupy in each of these roles. Table 3 shows what types of positions attorneys in private practice hold. More men than women are solo practitioners. More women than men are staff attorneys. More women than men are associates and non-equity partners. However, far more men than women are equity partners. This is keeping with recent reports[25] noting that while women are increasingly present as associates, they still lag behind their male counterparts for partner roles.[26]

	Male	**Female**	**Total**
Role in Private Practice			
Solo practitioner	94 (37.5%)	41 (21.5%)	135 (30.5%)
Staff attorney	5 (2.0%)	13 (6.8%)	18 (4.1%)
Associate	24 (9.6%)	71 (37.2%)	95 (21.5%)

[25] American Bar Association, *Women in the Legal Profession, Profile of the Legal Profession 2024*, (2024), *available at* https://www.americanbar.org/news/profile-legal-profession/women/.

[26] I asked a similar question of attorneys working in government agencies. However, there are so few attorneys in the data (34). Moreover, 80% of the respondents answered they were engaged in "other government practice;" just seven respondents answered they were in the attorney general's office, a prosecutor, or public defender. For these reasons, I exclude this question from the results discussion.

Non-equity partner	34 (13.5%)	34 (17.8%)	68 (15.4%)
Equity partner	94 (37.5%)	32 (16.8%)	126 (28.5%)
Totals:	258 (57.3%)	192 (42.7%)	450 (100.0%)

Table 3: Private Practice Roles

Relatedly, workplace size is critical. Table 4 breaks down office size by numbers of attorneys. Across male and female attorneys, most attorneys work in firms with no more than 10 attorneys. However, I note some variation. Slightly more than a third of all male attorneys are solo practitioners; just a fifth of female attorneys are. At the other end of the spectrum, slightly more women than men work in firms with more than 26 attorneys. However, small sample sizes indicate caution must be taken in generalizing these results.

	Male	**Female**	**Total**
Current Office Size			
Just me	106 (35.6%)	56 (19.9%)	162 (28.0%)
2-10	131 (44.0%)	115 (40.9%)	246 (42.5%)
11-25	28 (9.4%)	66 (23.5%)	94 (16.2%)
26-100	26 (8.7%)	33 (11.7%)	59 (10.2%)
101 or more	7 (2.3%)	11 (3.9%)	18 (3.1%)
Totals	298 (51.5%)	281 (48.5%)	579 (100.0%)

Table 4: Workplace Size

Though women are increasingly present in the legal profession, there may be variable levels of professional satisfaction.[27] So, I ask to what extent women (and men) are satisfied in their legal careers. After all, if one is dissatisfied they may be less likely to seek advancement or may select out of the profession entirely. Relatedly, I ask the extent to which attorneys are satisfied with their work/life balance. In doing so, I use a Likert scale.[28] Turning first to job satisfaction, more men than women report they are extremely satisfied with their jobs. Men and women are roughly comparable in terms of reporting they are somewhat satisfied. For the lower levels of satisfaction, women tend to report dissatisfaction slightly more frequently than men.

Why might women report dissatisfaction more than men? One possible reason is work life balance. Across a number of studies in a host of disciplines, women are

[27] Collins, Dumas, & Moyer, *supra* note 12.

[28] Likert scales are a standard tool of social scientific research that ask respondents to rank responses on an ordinal scale. Generically, these often include "strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree." Here, I ask the respondents to express the extent to which they agree with a statement on a scale from 'extremely dissatisfied' to extremely satisfied.' See Larry M. Bartels and Henry E. Brady, *The State of Quantitative Political Methodology, in* POLITICAL SCIENCE: THE STATE OF THE DISCIPLINE II (Ada W. Finifter, ed., American Political Science Association) (1993).

shouldered with a higher level of domestic work, even in egalitarian partnerships. This can lead to struggles with work-life balance.[29] This bears out in the survey results. A full quarter of women report dissatisfaction (either extremely or somewhat) with their work-life balance. In comparison, just 16% of men report dissatisfaction. By comparison, just 29% of women are extremely satisfied with their work-life balance. Conversely 33% of men are extremely satisfied.

	Male	Female	Total
Job Satisfaction			
Extremely dissatisfied	4 (1.3%)	7 (2.4%)	11 (1.8%)
Somewhat dissatisfied	17 (5.6%)	22 (7.5%)	39 (6.5%)
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	10 (3.3%)	15 (5.1%)	25 (4.2%)
Somewhat satisfied	144 (47.4%)	142 (48.6%)	286 (48.0%)
Extremely satisfied	129 (42.4%)	106 (36.3%)	235 (39.4%)
Work-Life Balance			
Extremely dissatisfied	9 (3.0%)	23 (7.8%)	32 (5.3%)

[29] Carol S. Wharton, *Finding Time for the "Second Shift": The Impact of Flexible Work Schedules on Women's Double Days,* 8 GENDER & SOC. 189 (1994).

Somewhat dissatisfied	39 (12.8%)	52 (17.7%)	91 (15.2%)
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	18 (5.9%)	13 (4.4%)	31 (5.2%)
Somewhat satisfied	139 (45.6%)	122 (41.5%)	261 (43.6%)
Extremely satisfied	100 (32.8%)	84 (28.6%)	184 (30.7%)
Totals	305 (50.9%)	294 (49.1%)	599 (100.0%)

Table 5: Job and Work-Life Balance Satisfaction

I next turn to the question of whether job satisfaction or concerns over work-life balance would prompt an attorney to consider employment outside of the profession. Nearly 60% of respondents would not consider leaving the legal profession. The figures vary somewhat by respondent sex. Whereas 66% of men would not consider outside employment, only 56% of women feel the same. By the same token, 25% of attorneys would consider outside employment. Here, 20% of men and 32% of women would consider this.

How then might women be retained in the legal profession? One of the key ways to promote continued work and success in the legal profession is having a mentor.[30] To this end, I ask respondents whether or not respondents have had a mentor. If so, I then ask whether mentors have been male, female, or some combination thereof. More than two-thirds of respondents have had a mentor (70% of men and 73% of women). 65% of men had at least one mentor that shared their sex. For women, however, just 43% had a female mentor. This is problematic because female mentors may be better able to speak to the unique challenges faced by women in the legal profession.[31] Part of the problem may be supply; there were few women in senior roles in the legal profession prior to the late 1970s.[32] Particularly, as more women enter the legal profession and advance into more senior roles,[33] it is conceivable this result may be different in the future.[34]

---

[30] Fiona M. Kay and Jean E. Wallace, *Mentors as Social Capital: Gender, Mentors, and Career Rewards in Law Practice,* 79 SOCIOLOGICAL INQUIRY, 418 (2009).

[31] Rosabeth Moss Kanter, *Some Effects of Proportions of Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Response to Token Women,* 5 AMERICAN J. OF SOCIOLOGY 965 (1977); Deborah L. Rhode, *Gender and Professional Roles,* 63 FORDHAM L. R. 39 (1994).

[32] Susan B. Haire and Laura P. Moyer, DIVERSITY MATTERS: JUDICIAL POLICY MAKING IN THE U.S. COURTS OF APPEALS (2015).

[33] American Bar Association, *supra* note 25.

[34] This is, of course, may be contingent on specialty.

Finally, job satisfaction cannot be measured without reference to one's life beyond work. To this end, I ask several questions about relationship status and how it impacts their career. The overwhelming majority of respondents are married or in a committed relationship (82%). However, this varies by sex; 90% of men are partnered compared to 73% of women. More women (13%) are divorced or separated than men (3%). Likewise, more women are single (12%) than men (5%). This may bespeak how the demands of the legal profession interplay with domestic expectations in relationships.

	Male	Female	Total
Relationship Status			
Divorced or Separated	9 (3.0%)	35 (12.5%)	44 (7.6%)
Married or committed relationship	271 (90.0%)	206 (73.3%)	477 (82.0%)
Single	14 (4.7%)	34 (12.1%)	48 (8.2%)
Widowed	7 (2.3%)	6 (2.1%)	13 (2.2%)
Totals	301 (51.7%)	281 (48.3%)	582 (100.0%)

Table 6: Relationship Status

I then inquire how attorneys' relationships (or lack thereof) impact their careers. While a plurality of both men (45%) and women (41%) feel their relationship has had no impact on their career, 21% of women feel their relationship status has been detrimental to

career progress. By contrast, only 7% of men feel the same. Relatedly, 48% of men feel their relationship status has helped their career; 38% of women feel similarly.

	Male	Female	Total
Relationship's Impact on Career			
Definitely hurt	4 (1.3%)	21 (7.5%)	25 (4.3%)
Somewhat hurt	16 (5.3%)	38 (13.5%)	54 (9.3%)
Had no impact	134 (44.7%)	114 (40.6%)	248 (42.7%)
Somewhat helped	56 (18.7%)	58 (20.6%)	114 (19.6%)
Definitely helped	90 (30.0%)	50 (17.8%)	140 (24.1%)
Totals:	301 (51.7%)	281 (48.3%)	582 (100.0%)

Table 7: Relationship Impact on Career

It is next important to ask how one's relationship impacts career activities. 84% of attorneys in the survey have partners not in the legal profession. However, there is some variation across men and women; 77% of women and 89% of men are partnered with non-attorneys. Even if a partner is not in the legal profession, it is still possible for them to participate in one's career. Namely, does one's partner join them for professional events? Approximately 50% of attorneys are only sometimes joined by their partners in professional

activities. A further third are never joined by partners. Just 16% are often or always joined. This is remarkably consistent across both male and female attorneys.

	Male	Female	Total
Partner's Involvement			
Never	92 (34.1%)	71 (34.6%)	163 (34.3%)
Sometimes	136 (50.4%)	100 (48.8%)	236 (49.7%)
Often or Always	42 (15.6%)	34 (16.6%)	76 (16.0%)
Totals	270 (56.8%)	205 (43.2%)	475 (100.0%)

Table 8: Partner's Involvement in Professional Activities

With basic demographic backgrounds covered, I now turn to stepping through the key findings of the 1995 survey.

III. REVISITING THE 1995 SURVEY

A. The Prevalence of Sexual Harassment

I measure the prevalence of sexual harassment with a series of questions asking whether attorneys have observed female attorneys receiving various forms of sexual harassment. These questions range in level of severity. Specifically, I ask whether respondents have observed female attorneys referred to with terms of endearment such as "dear" or "sweetie." I also ask if respondents observed female attorneys receiving

comments on physical appearance. At the most extreme end, I ask about whether respondents observe female attorneys receiving physical advances. I also ask about the prevalence of sexist jokes and how often respondents observe women interrupted and witness women's contributions ignored.

Across all these questions, the disparity between men and women is stark. While 91% of men report never hearing terms of endearment used toward women, over 66% of women report hearing these terms used at least sometimes. Comments on appearance exhibit an even more stark gender disparity. 60% of men report never hearing comments on women's physical appearance; only 20% of women share this assessment. Likewise, just 1% of men often or always hear comments about women's physical appearance. By contrast, 7% of women often or always hear such comments.

When it comes to verbal advances, 96% of men report never hearing verbal advances. A further 4% report only sometimes witnessing such comments. No male respondents in the data report such comments often or always. For women, on the other hand, 64% report never hearing advances. 30% report sometimes. 7% report often or always. Physical advances, thankfully, are rarely reported in the data. That said, there are sex-based differences. While 99% of men report never witnessing physical advances toward women, only 81% of women report never observing physical advances. A similar pattern is at play

for sexist jokes. While all male respondents save for one in the data report never or sometimes hearing sexist jokes, 12% of women report hearing sexist jokes often or always.

Interruptions are fundamentally about control of a conversation, and ultimately power.[35] The findings here are in line with the literature on the legal profession broadly, women are interrupted more.[36] But, perceptions of this vary on the basis of sex. Over 90% of men report witnessing women being interrupted never or sometimes. By contrast, over 50% of women report witnessing women being interrupted often or always. Relatedly, while well over 90% of men feel the contributions of women are never or sometimes routinely ignored, only 73% of women share this sentiment.

	Male	**Female**	**Total**
Terms of Endearment			
Never	256 (90.8%)	124 (44.1%)	380 (67.5%)
Sometimes	24 (8.5%)	127 (45.2%)	151 (26.8%)

[35] Lyn Kathlene, *Power and Influence in State Legislative Policymaking: The Interaction of Gender and Position in Committee Hearing Debates,* 88 AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REV. 560 (1994); Malliga Och, *Manterrupting in the German Bundestag: Gendered Opposition to Female Members of Parliament?,* 6 POLITICS AND GENDER 388 (2020).

[36] Shane A. Gleason, *Since You Put It That Way… Gender Norms and Interruptions at Supreme Court Oral Arguments,* 105 SOCIAL SCIENCE Q., 582 (2024); Dana Patton and Joseph L. Smith, *Gender, Ideology, and Dominance in Supreme Court Oral Arguments,* 41 J. OF WOMEN, POLITICS, AND POLICY, 393 (2020).

Often or Always	2 (0.7%)	30 (10.7%)	32 (5.7%)
Comments on Appearance			
Never	168 (59.8%)	57 (20.3%)	225 (40.0%)
Sometimes	110 (39.1%)	150 (53.4%)	260 (46.3%)
Often or Always	3 (1.1%)	74 (26.3%)	77 (13.7%)
Verbal Advances			
Never	270 (96.1%)	180 (64.1%)	450 (80.1%)
Sometimes	11 (3.9%)	81 (28.8%)	92 (16.4%)
Often or Always	0 (0.0%)	20 (7.1%)	20 (3.6%)
Physical Advances			
Never	276 (98.6%)	227 (81.1%)	503 (89.8%)
Sometimes	4 (1.4%)	48 (17.1%)	52 (9.3%)
Often or Always	0 (0.0%)	5 (1.8%)	5 (0.9%)
Sexist Jokes			
Never	206 (73.6%)	149 (53.0%)	355 (63.3%)
Sometimes	73 (26.1%)	98 (34.9%)	171 (30.5%)
Often or Always	1 (0.4%)	34 (12.1%)	35 (6.2%)
Interruptions			
Never	150 (53.4%)	37 (13.2%)	187 (33.3%)
Sometimes	115 (40.9%)	92 (32.7%)	207 (36.8%)

Often or Always	16 (5.7%)	152 (54.1%)	168 (29.9%)
Contributions Ignored			
Never	229 (81.2%)	81 (28.8%)	310 (55.1%)
Sometimes	50 (17.7%)	124 (44.1%)	174 (30.9%)
Often or Always	3 (1.1%)	76 (27.0%)	79 (14.0%)
			563
Totals	282 (50.1%)	281 (49.9%)	(100.0%)

Table 9: Perceptions of Various Forms of Sexual Harassment

What might explain the gulf between men and women in perceiving sexist behavior towards women? One possible avenue is respondents' own perceptions of negative treatment on the basis of their own sex. In order to assess this, I ask respondents to report how often they feel uncomfortable because of their sex in the legal profession. 91% of men never feel uncomfortable. Only 50% of women share this sentiment. Just 1% of male respondents report feeling uncomfortable on the basis of sex often or always. By contrast, over 8% of women feel uncomfortable often or always.

	Male	Female	Total
Experiencing Discomfort			
Never	257 (90.8%)	142 (50.4%)	399 (70.6%)
Sometimes	24 (8.5%)	117 (41.5%)	141 (25.0%)
Often or Always	2 (0.7%)	23 (8.2%)	25 (4.4%)
Totals	283 (50.1%)	282 (49.9%)	565 (100.0%)

Table 10: Frequency of Experiencing Discomfort on the Basis of Sex

B. Disparities in Compensation

When it comes to compensation, studies across a number of fields note that women are routinely paid less than similarly situated men.[37] The survey results bear this out. Respondents were asked to classify their compensation into a series of ordinal categories.[38] While a similar percentage of men and women earn less than $100,000,

[37] Sebawit G. Bishu and Mohamad G. Alkadry, *A Systemic Review of the Gender Pay Gap and the Factors That Predict It,* 49 ADMINISTRATION AND SOC. 65 (2017).

[38] Since respondents often have a difficult time accurately reporting exact levels of compensation, I ask this question with ordinal categories ranging from under $50,000 to over $500,000. See John Micklewright and

disparities begin to emerge in the $100,000 to $149,999 range. 28% of women earn in this range as opposed to 18% of men. Indeed, the percentage of women in each ordinal band decreases as one moves to progressively higher levels of compensation. Men, for their part, steadily increase in percentage from $250,000 to the maximal ordinal category (Over $350,000). At that highest level, 15% of men earn over $400,000; just 5% of women do. This demonstrates that the pay gap observed in the 1995 survey persists.

	Male	**Female**	**Total**
Compensation			
Under $100,000	56 (20.3%)	57 (21.0%)	113 (20.7%)
$100,000 to $149,999	50 (18.1%)	76 (28.0%)	126 (23.0%)
$150,000 to $199,999	40 (14.5%)	58 (21.4%)	98 (17.9%)
$200,000 to $249,999	35 (12.7%)	37 (13.7%)	72 (13.2%)
$250,000 to $299,999	29 (10.5%)	16 (5.9%)	45 (8.2%)
$300,000 to $349,999	26 (9.4%)	14 (5.2%)	40 (7.3%)
Over $350,000	40 (14.5%)	13 (4.8%)	53 (9.7%)
Totals	276 (50.5%)	271 (49.5%)	547 (100.0%)

Sylke V. Schnepf, *How Reliable are Income Data Collected with a Single Question?* 173 STATISTICS IN SOCIETY SERIES A 409 (2010).

Table 11: Total Compensation

C. Exclusion From Decision-Making and Policy-Making Roles

I ask respondents a series of questions about the tasks they routinely engage in during their practice. I ask for example whether an attorney has primary control over the client file, engages in document preparation, research, plans litigation strategy, takes on pretrial or settlement negotiations, participates in trial or hearings, or takes on a managerial role. I measure these on a Likert scale which ranges from "Never" to "Always."

Looking first to primarily handling client files, 9% of women never undertake this task, compared to just 3% of men. At the other end, 82% of women often or always undertake this task. By contrast, 95% of men handle the primary client file. Document preparation is more equitable, but fewer women (78%) than men (81%) often or always are involved in this task. Litigation planning privileges men. While a relatively even percentage of men and women sometimes participate, more men (64%) are often or always involved in litigation planning than women (55%). Fewer women (55%) than men (63%) are often or always involved in pretrial or settlement talks. While an equitable number of women (51%) and men (52%) are often or always engaged in trials or hearings, a greater portion of women (24%) than men (16%) are never engaged in trials or hearings.

	Male	**Female**	**Total**

Primary File			
Never	8 (2.7%)	24 (8.7%)	32 (5.6%)
Sometimes	7 (2.4%)	27 (9.7%)	34 (6.0%)
Often or Always	278 (94.9%)	226 (81.6%)	504 (88.4%)
Document Preparation			
Never	8 (2.7%)	5 (1.8%)	13 (2.3%)
Sometimes	47 (16.1%)	55 (19.9%)	102 (17.9%)
Often or Always	237 (81.2%)	217 (78.3%)	454 (79.8%)
Litigation Planning			
Never	48 (16.4%)	67 (24.2%)	115 (20.2%)
Sometimes	56 (19.2%)	57 (20.6%)	113 (19.9%)
Often or Always	188 (64.4%)	153 (55.2%)	341 (59.9%)
Pretrial/Settlement			
Never	48 (16.5%)	70 (25.3%)	118 (20.8%)
Sometimes	60 (20.6%)	54 (19.5%)	114 (20.1%)
Often or Always	183 (62.9%)	153 (55.2%)	336 (59.2%)
Trial/Hearings			
Never	48 (16.4%)	67 (24.2%)	115 (20.2%)
Sometimes	92 (31.4%)	69 (24.9%)	161 (28.2%)
Often or Always	153 (52.2%)	141 (50.9%)	294 (51.6%)

Totals	293 (51.4%)	277 (48.6%)	570 (100.0%)

Table 12: Frequency Engaging in Various Legal Tasks

Another key aspect of achieving parity in the legal profession does not involve legal tasks at all. Rather, as women move into managerial roles they may be able to better effect gender parity in the workplace. Accordingly, I ask respondents how often they engage in management practices. There is considerable parity between men and women. This provides some measure of optimism that greater representation at the upper levels of the legal profession may ultimately have an impact on the broader legal culture. This must, however, be tempered by work in management and organizational psychology which notes senior women in an organization often internalize dominant professional norms and enforce them more vigorously than their male counterparts.[39] Particularly, as professional and gender norms are often misaligned with each other in male dominated professions (including the legal profession), this may actually be a hinderance to future gender parity.[40]

	Male	**Female**	**Total**
Management Freq.			

[39] Belle Derks, Colette Van Laar, and Naomi Ellemers, *The Queen Bee Phenomenon: Why Women Leaders Distance Themselves From Junior Women,* 27 THE LEADERSHIP QUARTERLY, 456 (2016).

[40] Shane A. Gleason and Krystoff Kissoon, *Well Said!: Professional Norms and Female Justices' Evaluation of Lower Court Opinion Text,* 47 LAW & POLICY, 1 (2025).

Never	146 (49.2%)	126 (45.2%)	272 (47.2%)
Sometimes	94 (31.6%)	102 (36.6%)	196 (34.0%)
Often or Always	57 (19.2%)	51 (18.3%)	108 (18.8%)
Totals	297 (51.6%)	279 (48.4%)	576 (100.0%)

Table 13: Management Frequency

In a similar vein, it is important to ask whether attorneys perceive men or women to be advantaged in various legal roles. Specifically, I ask about productivity, job security, judicial selection, hiring & promotion, compensation, assignments, advancement, support staff access, client contact access, and social access to colleagues. Across all of these items, I find marked differences in perceptions across men and women. In terms of productivity, just 14% of men believe men are advantaged. By contrast, 65% of women believe men are advantaged. By contrast, 12% of men believe women are advantaged. Only 9% of women share this sentiment. A similar pattern emerges for job security. 13% of men feel men are advantaged. 63% of women feel men are advantaged.

Just 7% of male respondents believe men are advantaged in judicial selection. By contrast, 53% of women feel men are advantaged. Likewise, 48% of men and 13% of women feel women are advantaged in judicial selection. A similar pattern is at play in feelings about hiring and promotion. 14% of men believe men are advantaged. By contrast,

69% of women believe men are advantaged. In terms of compensation, 21% of men feel men are advantaged. 78% of women believe men are advantaged. This item is unique in that I can compare it to the reported compensation above. Based on that, men are actually advantaged. In terms of assignments, 8% of men feel men are advantaged. 64% of women feel men are advantaged.

With respect to advancement, 14% of men feel men are advantaged. 74% of women believe men are advantaged. The picture is less stark with respect to access to support staff. Just 5% of men believe men are advantaged. 39% of women believe men are advantaged. With respect to client contact access, 8% of men feel men are advantaged. 49% of women feel men are advantaged. Finally, when it comes to social access to colleagues, 15% of men feel men are advantaged. 55% of women feel men are advantaged in social access to colleagues.

Looking at the items in Table 15, an interesting macro-level pattern begins to emerge. In all items, save for judicial selection, the most frequently selected category for men is that men and women are treated equally. This indicates men do not believe they are disadvantaged relative to women. Rather they perceive gender equality in the legal profession. By contrast the most frequently selected category for women in all items, save for support staff access, is that men are advantaged. Taken collectively, this indicates that

men and women perceive two very different realities when it comes to whether men or women are advantaged in the legal profession.

	Male	Female	Total
Productivity			
Men are advantaged	42 (14.4%)	176 (64.5%)	218 (38.7%)
Men and women are treated equally	214 (73.5%)	75 (27.5%)	289 (51.2%)
Women are advantaged	35 (12.0%)	22 (8.1%)	57 (10.1%)
Job Security			
Men are advantaged	39 (13.4%)	170 (62.5%)	209 (37.2%)
Men and women are treated equally	210 (72.4%)	89 (32.7%)	299 (53.2%)
Women are advantaged	41 (14.1%)	13 (4.8%)	54 (9.6%)
Judicial Selection			
Men are advantaged	19 (6.6%)	143 (53.4%)	162 (29.0%)
Men and women are treated equally	133 (45.9%)	89 (33.2%)	222 (39.8%)
Women are advantaged	138 (47.6%)	36 (13.4%)	174 (31.2%)
Hiring & Promotion			
Men are advantaged	41 (14.2%)	186 (68.6%)	227 (40.6%)
Men and women are treated equally	170 (59.0%)	73 (26.9%)	243 (43.5%)

Women are advantaged	77 (26.7%)	12 (4.4%)	89 (15.9%)
Compensation			
Men are advantaged	61 (21.1%)	214 (78.4%)	275 (48.9%)
Men and women are treated equally	210 (72.7%)	55 (20.1%)	265 (47.2%)
Women are advantaged	18 (6.2%)	4 (1.5%)	22 (3.9%)
Assignments			
Men are advantaged	24 (8.3%)	175 (64.1%)	199 (35.5%)
Men and women are treated equally	242 (84.0%)	93 (34.1%)	335 (59.7%)
Women are advantaged	22 (7.6%)	5 (1.8%)	27 (4.8%)
Advancement			
Men are advantaged	41 (14.1%)	201 (73.6%)	242 (43.0%)
Men and women are treated equally	179 (61.7%)	65 (23.8%)	244 (43.3%)
Women are advantaged	70 (24.1%)	7 (2.6%)	77 (13.7%)
Support Staff Access			
Men are advantaged	14 (4.8%)	132 (48.7%)	146 (26.1%)
Men and women are treated equally	249 (86.2%)	128 (47.2%)	377 (67.3%)
Women are advantaged	26 (9.0%)	11 (4.1%)	37 (6.6%)
Client Contact			
Men are advantaged	24 (8.2%)	127 (46.5%)	151 (26.8%)
Men and women are treated equally	247 (84.9%)	135 (49.5%)	382 (67.7%)
Women are advantaged	20 (6.9%)	11 (4.0%)	31 (5.5%)

Social Access to Colleagues			
Men are advantaged	42 (14.5%)	149 (54.6%)	191 (33.9%)
Men and women are treated equally	229 (79.0%)	115 (42.1%)	344 (61.1%)
Women are advantaged	19 (6.6%)	9 (3.3%)	28 (5.0%)
Totals	291 (51.6%)	273 (48.4%)	564 (100.0%)

Table 14: Perceptions of Sex Based Advantages

D. Part-time Work & Balancing Obligations

The overwhelming majority of respondents (78%) work full time in the legal profession. .In contrast to earlier surveys, I find a greater portion of women than men (84% to 73%) work full time. What then might be the reason for part-time work across men and women? The disparity in full and part-time status may be explained by the fact that men in the sample obtained their JDs, on average, earlier than their female counterparts.[41] To this end, 94% of part-time men are transitioning to retirement. Conversely, 64% of part-time women are transitioning to retirement. A further 32% of part-time women cite child or family care as their primary reason for part-time work. It is important to note the reasons for part-time work discussed in this paragraph are based on just 53 part-time men and 28 part-time

[41] 4% of women and 7% of men are retired.

women. Therefore, while these findings deviate markedly from the 1995 survey, any conclusions drawn here should be done with caution.

While I find women are more likely to work full time than men, it is still possible that women are balancing professional and domestic duties. To this end, I ask respondents whether they have childcare responsibilities. If so, I then follow-up with a question about how much time they spend per week on childcare. Overall, 23% of respondents have childcare responsibilities. Broken down by sex, 17% of men and 30% of women report childcare responsibilities. Before proceeding, it is important again to urge caution in extrapolating these results: Just 54 men and 92 women report childcare responsibilities. Moreover, as noted above, since women answering the survey tend to have obtained their JDs at a later date than their male counterparts, the greater propensity for childcare responsibilities may at least in part be a function of age and the presence of younger children.

Slightly more than a third of respondents report spending 10 or less hours a week on childcare. However, when broken down by sex, 44% of men and 33% of women report less than 10 hours a week spent on childcare. At the other end, 25% of respondents spend 41 hours or more on childcare each week. Differences emerge when examining this by sex; 29% of women and just 17% of men spend more than 41 hours on childcare each week.

	Male	Female	Total
Hours/Week			
0-10	24 (44.4%)	30 (32.6%)	54 (37.0%)
11-20	13 (24.1%)	17 (18.5%)	30 (20.5%)
21-30	4 (7.4%)	11 (12.0%)	15 (10.3%)
31-40	4 (7.4%)	7 (7.6%)	11 (7.5%)
41 or more	9 (16.7%)	27 (29.3%)	36 (24.7%)
Total	54 (37.0%)	92 (63.0%)	146 (100.0%)

Table 15: Hours Per Week Spent on Childcare

It is also critical to explore how childcare responsibilities are distributed within a relationship. Accordingly, I asked respondents who reported childcare responsibilities *and* being either married or in a committed relationship how they distribute childcare with their partner. Across all respondents, a slight majority (51%) of respondents report equitable splits in childcare responsibilities. This roughly holds true for men (55%) and women (48%). However, there are still notable variations based on sex. 42% of women mostly or exclusively handle care as opposed to 4% of men. At the same time, 9% of women report their partners mostly or exclusively handle care. However, 41% of men report their partners mostly or exclusively handle care.

	Male	Female	Total
Childcare Distribution			
R exclusively/mostly handles	2 (4.1%)	32 (42.7%)	34 (27.4%)
R & partner split	27 (55.1%)	36 (48.0%)	63 (50.8%)
Partner exclusively/mostly handles	20 (40.8%)	7 (9.3%)	27 (21.8%)
Total	49 (39.5%)	75 (60.5%)	124 (100.0%)

Table 16: Childcare Distribution in Relationship

Though any findings on the role of childcare in part-time status must be taken with a grain of salt, it is still possible to explore the impact of family and childcare on women more broadly in the legal profession. Respondents who reported childcare responsibilities were asked how these obligations impacted their choice of a specialty, the cases taken, and hours worked. For both specialty and case choices, the most frequent response item for both men and women is "not at all." However, when viewed by respondent sex, 77% of men report childcare responsibilities had no bearing on specialty choice compared to 53% of

women.[42] When it comes to case choices, not at all is again the modal category. In this item, however, men (69%) and women (62%) are relatively similarly situated. With respect to hours worked, a similar portion of men and women report childcare responsibilities have no bearing on hours worked. However, 38% of women (compared to 8% of men) report childcare responsibilities impacts work hours a great deal.

	Male	**Female**	**Total**
Specialty Choice			
Not at all	40 (76.9%)	48 (53.3%)	88 (62.0%)
A little	9 (17.3%)	13 (14.4%)	22 (15.5%)
A moderate amount	2 (3.8%)	12 (13.3%)	14 (9.9%)
A great deal	1 (1.9%)	17 (18.9%)	18 (12.7%)
Case Choice			
Not at all	36 (69.2%)	56 (62.2%)	92 (64.8%)
A little	8 (15.4%)	16 (17.8%)	24 (16.9%)
A moderate amount	7 (13.5%)	11 (12.2%)	18 (12.7%)
A great deal	1 (1.9%)	7 (7.8%)	8 (5.6%)
Hours Worked			
Not at all	7 (13.5%)	12 (13.3%)	19 (13.4%)
A little	27 (51.9%)	22 (24.4%)	49 (34.5%)
A moderate amount	14 (26.9%)	22 (24.4%)	36 (25.4%)
A great deal	4 (7.7%)	34 (37.8%)	38 (26.8%)
Totals	52 (36.6%)	90 (63.4%)	142 (100.0%)

[42] This finding should be qualified. Since women are more likely to report childcare impacts their specialty choice, it follows that they may already select out of areas with cases that are time consuming or unpleasant for someone with childcare responsibilities. This should be explored in greater depth by future scholars.

Table 17: Impact of Childcare Responsibilities of

Specialty Choice, Case Choice, and Hours Worked

It is worth noting that in order to have childcare obligations, one must first have or adopt children. However, work considerations can factor into one's decision to have a child. I asked respondents if their current workplace offers maternity or family benefits either formally or on an ad hoc basis. The majority of both men and women report that their firms offer maternity and family benefits. While this is undoubtedly progress from a time when women in the legal profession felt compelled to hide their pregnancies in order to preserve their employment,[43] it is worth noting the gap between men and women in the no category. While 27% of men report their firms do not offer maternity benefits, just 16% of women make a similar report.[44] This raises two possibilities for future research. One, it is possible that men and women segregate into firms offering benefits that more closely align with their needs. The other, and more likely, explanation is that men and women are

[43] Moyer & Haire, *supra* note 5.

[44] For family benefits, the finding is similar. 24% of men report their firms do not offer family benefits compared to 16% of women.

attuned to such benefits at different rates and may have different understandings of the benefits available.

	Male	Female	Total
Maternity			
No	75 (26.9%)	44 (16.4%)	119 (21.7%)
Unsure	47 (16.8%)	45 (16.7%)	92 (16.8%)
Yes	157 (56.3%)	180 (66.9%)	337 (61.5%)
Family			
No	68 (24.4%)	43 (16.0%)	111 (20.3%)
Unsure	43 (15.4%)	44 (16.4%)	87 (15.9%)
Yes	168 (60.2%)	182 (67.7%)	350 (63.9%)
Totals	279 (50.9%)	269 (49.1%)	548 (100.0%)

Table 18: Perception of Maternity and Family Benefits Availability

Having access to benefits is only half the battle. If utilizing benefits will be negatively received, the intended recipient may be less likely to make use of it. To this end, I asked respondents if they would be disadvantaged for using maternity or family benefits.[45]

[45] This is only asked of respondents responding that their firm offers maternity/family leave benefits.

Across both men and women, the most frequent answer in each item is that an attorney would definitely not be disadvantaged for using leave benefits. However, there are marked differences between men and women. A combined 21% of female respondents feel they would probably or definitely be disadvantaged for using maternity leave. By contrast, just 9% of men answered in the same way. Relatively similar patterns are present in the family benefits item. Much like the above item exploring the presence of leave policies, this suggests men and women have fundamentally different understandings of available leave.[46]

	Male	**Female**	**Total**
Maternity Benefits			
Definitely not	89 (58.9%)	71 (44.7%)	160 (51.6%)
Probably not	30 (19.9%)	29 (18.2%)	59 (19.0%)
Might or might not	19 (12.6%)	26 (16.4%)	45 (14.5%)
Probably yes	9 (6.0%)	27 (17.0%)	36 (11.6%)
Definitely yes	4 (2.6%)	6 (3.8%)	10 (3.2%)
Family Benefits			
Definitely not	92 (55.1%)	77 (42.3%)	169 (48.4%)

[46] This item has a relatively low number of respondents and just a handful answered in the two 'yes' categories. As such, any extrapolation should be qualified.

Probably not	32 (19.2%)	37 (20.3%)	69 (19.8%)
Might or might not	24 (14.4%)	32 (17.6%)	56 (16.0%)
Probably yes	13 (7.8%)	27 (14.8%)	40 (11.5%)
Definitely yes	6 (3.6%)	9 (4.9%)	15 (4.3%)
Total	167 (47.9%)	182 (52.1%)	349 (100.0%)

Table 19: Consequences of Taking Maternity/Family Leave

IV. THE ROLE OF COVID-19

While there is undeniable value in examining how the findings from previous surveys of the Connecticut legal profession hold up in the 2020s, it is also important to acknowledge the world has changed in many ways since the 1990s. Perhaps one of the most shocking and jarring changes to the world generally and the legal profession specifically is the covid-19 pandemic. The pandemic forced courts to radically alter their normal proceedings and shift much of their work online. The pandemic exasperated existing gender disparities and often merged professional and care giving responsibilities.

To measure how covid-19 impacted Connecticut attorneys generally and men and women specifically, I designed a battery of questions asking whether the pandemic reduced hours or compensation and whether covid interrupted an attorney's career path.

Just over half of attorneys report covid did not reduce hours or pay. However, when examining the results for men and women separately, an interesting pattern emerges. While 61% of women report covid did not reduce hours or compensation, only 46% of men reported covid had no impact on their hours or compensation. Conversely, 14% of women report covid impacted their hours or compensation compared to 16% of men. A similar pattern is evident when examining covid's impact on career path. 84% of all attorneys report no or little impact on career path. Broken down by sex, 80% of women and 89% of men report no or little impact. Conversely, 9% of women and 4% of men report a lot or a great deal of impact.

	Male	**Female**	**Total**
Hours/Compensation			
Not at all	128 (46.4%)	169 (61.2%)	297 (53.8%)
A little	56 (20.3%)	33 (12.0%)	89 (16.1%)
A moderate amount	46 (16.7%)	34 (12.3%)	80 (14.5%)
A lot	25 (9.1%)	15 (5.4%)	40 (7.2%)
A great deal	21 (7.6%)	25 (9.1%)	46 (8.3%)
Career Path			
Not at all	226 (81.0%)	189 (67.5%)	415 (74.2%)
A little	21 (7.5%)	35 (12.5%)	56 (10.0%)
A moderate amount	22 (7.9%)	30 (10.7%)	52 (9.3%)
A lot	7 (2.5%)	14 (5.0%)	21 (3.8%)
A great deal	3 (1.1%)	12 (4.3%)	15 (2.7%)
Total	279 (49.9%)	280 (50.1%)	559 (100.0%)

Table 20: Covid's Impact on Career

Ultimately, the covid pandemic has had a mixed impact on attorneys on the basis of sex. In general, attorneys report no to little impact in either compensation or in terms of career path. If anything, women fared better with respect to hours and compensation. When it comes to career path, women were more likely to be impacted a lot or a great deal. It is important to note though that this is a relatively small (N=26) number which makes statistical generalizations difficult. Moreover, this may be a function of career stage.

V. DISCUSSION

The legal profession nationally, and in Connecticut specifically, has made tremendous strides in terms of diversity. Yet much remains to be done. Following the lead of the 1995 study, I examine attitudes on the prevalence of sexual harassment, pay disparity, women's absence from policy-making and decision-making positions, and the unique challenges of part-time work. I note both continuity and departures from the 1990s. Thus, while there is cause to celebrate, there are also opportunities for growth.

In terms of sexual harassment, men largely perceive the problems gone. Women, however, generally recognize several microagressions still present in the day-to- day practice of law. Pay disparities in the legal profession, as in the workplace generally, largely remain. Women are increasingly present in decision-making roles in levels approximating their male counterparts. However, men and women differ in their perceptions of which sex

is advantaged in a host of legal activities. When it comes to part-time work, most attorneys work full time. While this suggests women have broken the part-time loop present in 1995, I find women still handle the brunt of childcare responsibilities. This forces female attorneys to balance their work with more domestic responsibilities than their male counterparts.

While this survey provides a valuable update to the 1995 study, and hopefully lays the foundation for a future follow-up, there are a number of limitations which future studies should address. Perhaps the biggest limitation is that the CBA is a voluntary bar association. Thus, I am only able to survey attorneys who have maintained their memberships. Thus, I cannot draw on a survey sample fully representative of Connecticut lawyers- rather it is properly understood as a survey of current attorney-members of the CBA and my results can only be generalized to that population.

It is also important to note that, while the sample and response rate are well within the range of normal for survey research, there were a relatively low number of respondents for some of the more nuanced questions dependent on other answers. For example, I had asked a question about how covid impacted the decision to retire. However, I had so few retired attorneys respond to the survey that I could not make any meaningful inferences. In a similar manner, respondents were overwhelmingly from private practice. Accordingly, I cannot make inferences about attorneys working for the State. One possible solution to this survey's limitations in generalizability is to conduct in-depth case studies in the same

vein as the oral history project the CBF has pursued.[47] In depth interviews with key legal actors[48] can also increase the utility for generalization.

VI. CONCLUSION

Women are increasingly present in the Connecticut legal profession, yet sex-based disparities persist. While I identify several markers of progress, there is clearly more work that needs to be done to fully incorporate women into the profession.

[47] Peck, *supra* note 4.

[48] Alyx Mark, COURTS UNMASKED: CIVIL LEGAL SYSTEM REFORM AND COVID-19 (2025).