

The Introduction of the Law School System and the Structure of the Legal Profession in Korea: Status and Prospects*

Jae-Hyup Lee

I. Introduction

The number of legal professionals has rapidly grown in Korea. After reaching 5,000 in 2001, the total number of registered lawyers surpassed 10,000 in just the next seven years; six years later, in 2014, the number had grown to more than 20,000. In addition, workplace environments, types of work, educational background of legal professionals,¹ income levels, and workplace size have also diversified. More specifically, since 2012, the structure of the Korean legal profession has been transformed by the entry into the job market of legal professionals who, with the introduction of the law school system in 2009, went through an education and licensing process different from the previous national judicial examination system.

The law school system was introduced to contribute to the rule of law in Korea by educating and training “competent legal professionals” who could professionally and efficiently respond to the demand for legal services, which has been rapidly growing throughout the country, and react to changing international circumstances. To achieve the goal of this systemic reform, it is necessary to allow people with different socioeconomic backgrounds to enter the legal profession and pursue a variety of careers after completing their law school education and training. Because it has been five years since the first class of law school graduates was licensed as legal professionals, now is the time to examine empirically how this new cohort of professionals (the “Law

Jae-Hyup Lee is Professor, Seoul National University School of Law, Korea.

* This article is an edited translation of the following articles originally published in the Korean language: Jae-Hyup Lee, Jung Woong Rhee and Hyunjung Hwang, *Law School Lawyers in Korea, Who Are They?*, SEoul LAW JOURNAL, June 2015; Jae-Hyup Lee, Jung Woong Rhee and Hyunjung Hwang, *An Exploratory Study of Work Environment, Satisfaction, and the Diversity of Employment in the Korean Legal Profession*, SEoul LAW JOURNAL, December 2015.

1. In this article, I use “legal professionals” to refer to qualified and licensed attorneys in Korea who hold law-related positions, including: attorneys in private practice; public prosecutors; judges; in-house counsel; and public interest attorneys.

School Graduates”) are similar to and different from the generations of legal professionals who were qualified and licensed through the longstanding national judicial exam system, which included post-exam mandatory training at the Judicial Research and Training Institute (JRTI) (the “JRTI Trainees”). This comparative analysis is necessary to draw initial conclusions on whether the new system has been effective at advancing its goals.

In the United States, a systematic long-term study has been conducted on the American legal profession. The “After the JD” (AJD) project, jointly conducted by the National Association for Law Placement and the American Bar Foundation, tracked 5,000 legal professionals who graduated from law school in 2000.² That study analyzed from various angles the entry-level legal professionals’ demographic composition, workplaces, work environments, incomes, satisfaction, turnover, the impact of gender and race and professional circumstances, and the role of law school experience; it then compared them after five and ten years to identify changes in the legal profession. The Japan Federation of Bar Associations has conducted a nationwide survey of its registered members every decade since 1980. Furthermore, Professor Setsuo Miyazawa and his research team conducted surveys in 2007, 2011, and 2014 and published their findings.³

This paper presents the findings of a comprehensive study (the “Study”) of the changes that have resulted from Korea’s efforts to respond to its population’s growing need for legal services, in particular the reform of legal education and attorney qualification and, relatedly, a new emphasis on diversified legal careers. The Study was conducted using the questionnaire method, informed by the AJD project in the United States and the survey studies in Japan. The Study focused on comparing the Law School Graduates with the JRTI Trainees by examining their socioeconomic backgrounds, career paths, work environments, and satisfaction, and then considering the implications of those comparative results for the ongoing efforts in Korea to accomplish the goals of legal profession reform.

II. Research Topics and Methods

A. Research topics

The Study included four lines of research. The first line of research investigated the socioeconomic backgrounds of the Law School Graduates as compared with the JRTI Trainees who entered the legal profession. To measure socioeconomic background, the Study used variables such as parental socioeconomic status and parental educational level. Based on these

2. The NALP Foundation for Law Career Research and Education and the American Bar Foundation, *After the JD: First Results of a National Study of Legal Careers* (2004). The second and the third results of AJD study were published in 2009 and in 2014 respectively.
3. Setsuo Miyazawa et al., *Stratification or Diversification? – 2011 Survey of Young Lawyers in Japan, in EAST ASIA’S RENEWED RESPECT FOR THE RULE OF LAW IN THE 21ST CENTURY: THE FUTURE OF LEGAL AND JUDICIAL LANDSCAPES IN EAST ASIA* (Setsuo Miyazawa et al. eds. 2015).

variables, the Study examined whether parents of the Law School Graduates tend to have better jobs and/or higher levels of education than parents of the JRTI Trainees. Significantly, the Study also identifies whether there are legal professionals among their respective family members or relatives, and compares these two groups in that regard.

The second line of research considered diversity in the legal profession. More specifically, the Study examined whether the diversity of demographics and educational backgrounds identified in law school students results in diversity in occupations as the Law School Graduates enter the job market and pursue their legal careers. However, because most of the Law School Graduates are currently at an entry level, it is too early to observe many changes in jobs or to determine any trend in the occupational development of the Law School Graduates. In light of this, the Study analyzes the types of career paths that the Law School Graduates have taken so far, presents the framework for comparison based on this analysis, and discusses implications for future research.

The third line of research explored the work environment and job satisfaction of legal professionals. The Study included a multifaceted examination of annual salary, work environment, job satisfaction, and future prospects among and between the Law School Graduates and the JRTI Trainees.

The fourth and last line of research investigated what factors affect annual salaries and satisfaction in the legal profession. A previous study conducted in the United States reported that the gap between professionals in large law firms and those in other legal employment settings is widening, and that work environments continue to differ based on the race of legal professionals. In a similar way, the Study examines whether a high-ranking undergraduate school or a prestigious law school makes a difference in annual salary and job satisfaction in Korea, and whether this trend is more pronounced among the Law School Graduates than among their JRTI Trainee counterparts.

B. Research methods

To identify whether the Law School Graduates are different from the JRTI Trainees in terms of background, viewpoint, and career orientation, the Study divided the legal professionals in Korea into three groups and applied a research method that established three samples representing each of these groups. The first group is Law School Graduates from the first to third classes of law school (those who entered law school from 2009 to 2011). The second group is JRTI Trainees who were trained in the JRTI in the same period as the Law School Graduates group attended law school (JRTI Trainees entering the JRTI from 2009 to 2012, or the fortieth to forty-third classes of the JRTI) (the "Peer JRTI Trainees"). The third group is JRTI Trainees who entered the JRTI before 2008 (the thirty-ninth and earlier classes of the JRTI) (the "Career JRTI Trainees"). The Study used these legal professional groups as populations for study and statistical analysis and used the *Database of Korean Legal Professionals* published by *The Law Times* as the sampling frame to take the

three samples representing each of these three populations. In terms of region, the Study limited the subjects to legal professionals based in Seoul and the metropolitan areas of six other Korean cities.

The Study used systematic sampling, one of the random sampling methods. This method obtains the list of all those within a population who can be sampled from the sampling frame and selects the subjects at intervals that are calculated by dividing the population size by the desired sample size. With a target response rate of 20%, researchers initially made telephone requests to 5,026 legal professionals to complete a survey questionnaire; the number who completed the response in the initial samples (including re-contact) was 719, while the number who completed the response after contact was 539, a response rate of 10.8%. The response rate by group was 20.7% for the Law School Graduates, 15.4% for the Peer JRTI Trainees, and 4.2% for the Career JRTI Trainees. To meet the target sample size, the researchers contacted the next target respondents in the sampling frame. As a result, the survey was completed for a total of 1,020 respondents: 308 in the target (Law School Graduates) group, 300 in the comparison (Peer JRTI Trainees) group, and 412 in the evaluation (Career JRTI Trainees) group.

The survey method used both oral interviews and written questionnaires. After requesting an interview by phone, researchers conducted in-person interviews with those legal professionals who said they would respond to the survey through meetings in their offices. For those who said they could not participate in person, a link was sent by e-mail to an online version of the questionnaire. Data were collected as described above. The research was conducted for two months beginning in August 2014, and the survey was conducted by Ipsos Korea, a research firm.

The questionnaire consisted of approximately thirty pages of structured questions. It contained questions common to all three groups, as well as questions unique to each group. All the groups were asked about their current workplace, job duties, and employment status. Respondents were also asked about their views and beliefs as legal professionals and their socioeconomic backgrounds.

C. Characteristics of the respondents

Professional characteristics are shown in Table 1. In all three groups of legal professionals, lawyers in various forms of private practice (including at firms and in-house) accounted for the highest percentage (96.8%) of the final samples. The fact that the percentages of prosecutors (0.6%) and judges (2.6%) in the samples are very low indicates that their response rate was very low. Notably, no one in the Law School Graduates group had been yet appointed as a judge, and the one prosecutor respondent in that group was a law clerk.

Of the 1,020 respondents, 88% worked in Seoul, which was higher than the percentage of the population (i.e., the sampling frame) in Seoul (80.5%). While there was no significant difference between the proportion of the

population and the sample of Law School Graduates based in Seoul, it was found that the Peer JRTI Trainees and Career JRTI Trainees based in Seoul responded relatively more than those based in other regions.

Table 1. Responses by occupation and region

Sampling frame		Law School Graduates		Peer JRTI Trainees		Career JRTI Trainees		Total	
		Sample	Sampling frame	Sample	Sampling frame	Sample	Sampling frame	Sample	
Total 9.1%		1262	308	1744	300	10,937	412	13,943	1020
		30.2%	12.5%	29.4%	78.4%	40.4%			
Occupation	1. Prosecutor	28	1	63	2	927	3	1,018	6
		2.2%	0.3%	3.6%	0.7%	8.5%	0.7%	7.3%	0.6%
	2. Judge	8	3	180	10	1,559	14	1,747	27
		0.6%	1.0%	10.3%	3.3%	14.3%	3.4%	12.5%	2.6%
	3. Lawyer (private practice)	1183	304	1489	288	8326	395	10,998	987
		93.7%	98.7%	85.4%	96.0%	76.1%	95.9%	78.9%	96.8%
	4. Others	43	-	12	-	125	-	180	-
		3.4%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%
Region	1. Seoul	923	265	1,470	271	8664	362	11,057	898
		87.3%	86.0%	84.3%	90.3%	79.2%	87.9%	80.5%	88.0%
	2. Busan	37	13	69	5	590	17	696	35
		3.5%	4.2%	4.0%	1.7%	5.4%	4.1%	5.1%	3.4%
	3. Daegu	18	6	48	5	437	9	503	20
		1.7%	1.9%	2.8%	1.7%	4.0%	2.2%	3.7%	2.0%
	4. Incheon	18	7	55	8	435	7	508	22
		1.7%	2.3%	3.2%	2.7%	4.0%	1.7%	3.7%	2.2%
	5. Gwangju	28	10	43	5	312	7	383	22
		2.7%	3.2%	2.5%	1.7%	2.9%	1.7%	2.8%	2.2%
	6. Daejeon	23	5	33	5	337	4	393	14
		2.2%	1.6%	1.9%	1.7%	3.1%	1.0%	2.9%	1.4%
	7. Ulsan	10	2	26	1	162	6	198	9
		1.0%	0.6%	1.5%	0.3%	1.5%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%
	8. Un-identified	205	-	-	-	-	-	205	-

In terms of characteristics of the respondents based on career type (Table 2), the male respondents in the Career JRTI Trainees group accounted for 81.6%, which was relatively higher than in the Law School Graduates group and the Peer JRTI Trainees group. The average age was 42.8 in the Career JRTI Trainees group, followed by an average age of 34 for both the Peer JRTI Trainees group (34.1) and the Law School Graduates group (33.9). In regard to current workplace, about 60% of the respondents worked at Korean law firms, while the percentage of solo practitioners was higher in the Career JRTI

Trainees group (12.1%) and the percentage of those working for companies and financial institutions was higher in the Law School Graduates group (19.2%).

Table 2. Respondents' characteristics by career type

(%) 308 Law School Graduates		Career type		
		300 Peer JRTI Trainees	412 Career JRTI Trainees	
Gender	Male	59.7	54.0	81.6
	Female	40.3	46.0	18.4
Age	20s	9.1	7.3	-
	30-34	52.6	57.0	13.1
	35-39	29.9	27.7	27.9
	40-44	8.1	6.7	25.5
	45-49	0.3	1.0	14.1
	50 or older	-	0.3	19.4
	Average	33.9	34.1	42.8
Workplace (current)	Solo practitioner	10.1	8.3	12.1
	Korean law firm	60.4	59.0	61.7
	Court or prosecutor's office	1.0	3.7	4.1
	State-run company or public institution	5.2	4.0	4.6
	Company or financial institution	19.2	18.0	13.8
	Others	4.2	7.0	3.6

Many of the respondents worked at large law firms, including Kim & Chang; Bae, Kim & Lee; Shin & Kim; Yulchon; Lee & Ko; and Yoon & Yang. The five largest law firms employed 17.9% of the respondents. In addition to those working at large law firms, most of the other respondents worked at small and medium law firms, listed companies, and solo practitioner law offices, while the response rate of those working in public institutions (local government, state-run companies, etc.) was relatively high. This distribution of occupations in the samples appears to generally represent the current landscape of the Korean law market.

The Law School Graduates group represented a broad cross section of the current law school landscape, with at least three graduates of twenty-four out of the twenty-five law schools in Korea responding. Of the respondents in the Law School Graduates group, 62% were based in Seoul, with 38% working in other cities. The law schools with the highest numbers of respondents were, in the following order and with the following percentages of the total respondents: Seoul National University (17.21%); Sungkyunkwan University (7.47%); Ewha Womans University (7.14%); Kyungpook National University

(5.84%); Chonnam National University (5.84%); Korea University (5.52%); Yonsei University (5.52%); and Pusan National University (5.52%).

III. Results

A. Socioeconomic backgrounds of legal professionals

1. Parental occupation and educational level

Table 3 shows the educational attainment levels of legal professionals' parents. As presented on Table 3, the JRTI Trainees group is subdivided into the Peer JRTI Trainees group, the JRTI Trainees from the thirty-fourth through the forty-third JRTI classes, and the JRTI Trainees from classes before the thirty-fourth class. The occupation and education level of an individual's parents at the time the individual graduates from high school serves as a good indicator of the individual's socioeconomic background. In the aggregate, almost 50% of the parents of the respondents were college graduates or graduate degree holders (59.2% of the fathers and 40.4% of the mothers). The percentage of parents who had graduate degrees was also significant (21.9% of the fathers and 7.1% of the mothers). These numbers appeared very high when compared with the average educational level of the age groups to which these parents belonged, based on estimates of the parents' ages. In general, legal professionals tended to come from families where the parents are highly educated, a trend that is becoming more visible and pronounced over time.

Even after parents' educational level was divided into three subgroups (high school graduate or lower, college graduate, and master's degree or higher), no significant difference was found in fathers' educational level between the Law School Graduates group and the Peer JRTI Trainees group ($\chi^2=2.53$, $df=2$, $p=0.28$). The percentage of mothers who had obtained a bachelor's degree or higher by the time that respondents in the Law School Graduates group had finished high school (52%), when compared with the mothers of the respondents in the Peer JRTI Trainees group (42.8%), was close to a statistically significant difference ($\chi^2=5.72$, $df=2$, $p=0.057$).

Table 3. Educational attainment of legal professionals' parents

	Father					Mother				
	Law school	40th - 43rd	34th - 43rd	Prior to 34th	Total	Law school	40th - 43rd	34th - 43rd	Prior to 34th	Total
Elementary school graduate or less	2%	7.1%	10.2%	18.4%	8.2%	4.6%	7.7%	15.0%	36.0%	13.4%
Middle school graduate	3%	4.4%	6.6%	14.9%	6.3%	7.6%	12.1%	12.3%	13.7%	11.1%
High school graduate	24%	23.1%	25.2%	22.4%	23.8%	32.8%	34.3%	31.3%	29.7%	32.4%
2-year college graduate	3.6%	2.4%	1.3%	2.3%	2.5%	3%	3%	2.6%	2.3%	2.8%
4-year university graduate	39.8%	39.1%	36.7%	31.6%	37.5%	41.1%	35.4%	33.0%	16.6%	33.3%
Master's degree	15.5%	14.6%	12.4%	6.3%	12.9%	8.9%	5.4%	4.4%	1.7%	5.6%
PhD degree	12.2%	9.2%	7.5%	4.0%	8.8%	2%	2%	1.3%	0.0%	1.5%
The number of the respondents (excluding no responses)	304	294	226	174	998	302	297	227	175	1001

In terms of the parents' occupation at the time that the subjects graduated from high school, only a few differences existed between the Law School Graduates group and the Peer JRTI Trainees group. The percentage of parents in the Law School Graduates group in occupations with ten or more subordinates (45.8%) ($\chi^2=4.11$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) or in management or executive positions (24.7%) ($\chi^2=9.61$, $df=1$, $p<0.01$) was significantly higher than that of parents of the Peer JRTI Trainees group. However, there was no difference between the two groups in the percentage of parents working for companies with fifty or more employees, or in the percentage of parents who were self-employed or working as professionals. By contrast, there was a large difference in the occupations of parents of those in the JRTI Trainees group from and since the thirty-fourth class of the JRTI (1,000 of whom passed the national judicial exam) and those before the thirty-fourth class. The parents of JRTI trainees in the thirty-fourth class and later were more prominently represented than the parents of JRTI Trainees before the thirty-fourth class in all the employment settings that the survey separately tracked, including companies with fifty or more employees, management or executive member positions, and professional positions (Table 4). This distinction demonstrated that the

parental socioeconomic backgrounds of young legal professionals were, on average, higher than those of older legal professionals.

Table 4. Parents' occupations by legal professional group

	Law school	40th - 43rd	34th - 43rd	Before 34th	Total	
					%	n
Company with 50 employees or more	39.6%	40.0%	37.0%	26.9%	36.9%	376
10 subordinates or more	45.8%	37.7%	33.5%	27.5%	37.4%	381
Self-employed	39.0%	33.0%	34.8%	29.7%	34.5%	353
Management or executive member	24.7%	14.7%	14.8%	9.9%	16.9%	172
Professional such as doctor and lawyer	18.5%	16.7%	13.5%	7.7%	14.9%	152

Note: This table shows the percentage of occupations of one parent at the time the subjects graduated from high school, and therefore some numbers in the columns could overlap.

Taken as a whole, parents of legal professionals were relatively highly educated and had stable jobs, and in this regard there was little difference between the Law School Graduates group and the Peer JRTI Trainees group. A significant generational difference, however, was identified between younger legal professionals and older legal professionals. Parents of the former were, on average, more educated and had more stable jobs than those of the latter. This difference in parental socioeconomic background could reflect intergenerational changes in Korea, as Korea has grown rapidly for the past half-century and its people have achieved greatly enhanced average educational levels and living standards. Parents of legal professionals are a typical example of this growth and change in socioeconomic background. The contrast is illustrated by the clear difference between the classes of the JRTI before the thirty-fourth class and the other legal professionals included in the Study. By subdividing the JRTI Trainees according to particular ranges of JRTI Trainee classes (before the thirty-fourth, thirty-fourth class and later (thirty-fourth to forty-third), and since the fortieth class (fortieth to forty-third)), the trend toward higher education level and higher professional status of parents reaches levels that approach, and in some respects match, the levels of the Law School Graduates group.

2. Presence of legal professionals in the family

Table 5 shows the data for the presence of other legal professionals in the family. Among all the respondents, those who had a parent who practiced law represented 3.4% of the group, and those whose nuclear family member (parent, spouse, brother, or sister) practiced law represented 8.9%. In

addition, 30.3% of respondents had an extended family member or relative who was a legal professional. When each of the three groups was examined as to whether any parent ($\chi^2=2.65$, $df=2$, $p=0.26$), nuclear family member ($\chi^2=1.63$, $df=2$, $p=0.44$), or extended family member or relative ($\chi^2=4.70$, $df=2$, $p=0.10$) was a legal professional, however, no significant difference was found. By contrast, when the Career JRTI Trainees group was divided into those before and after the thirty-fourth JRTI class, there was a stark difference: The results of career legal professionals of the thirty-fourth and later classes were similar to those of law school graduates and the fortieth to forty-third classes of the JRTI. Accordingly, it appears that the tendency of a law family to generate legal professionals has solidified in recent years, regardless of whether the new professional is a Law School Graduate or a Peer JRTI Trainee.

Table 5. Presence of legal professionals in the family

	Law school	40th - 43rd	34th - 43rd	Before 34th	Total	
					%	n
At least one parent is a legal professional.	3.6%	4.7%	3.0%	1.6%	3.4%	35
At least one nuclear family member is a legal professional.	8.4%	10.7%	8.7%	7.1%	8.9%	91
At least one extended family member or relative is a legal professional.	26.3%	29.7%	33.0%	17.8%	30.3%	309

When the results above are considered together, it is difficult to argue that the introduction of the law school system allows only people from wealthy or legal professional families to enter law school. Few differences in socioeconomic background existed between the Law School Graduates group and the Peer JRTI Trainees group. Whether from law school or the JRTI, however, the current generation of legal professionals shows a parental socioeconomic level that is significantly higher than that of the Career JRTI Trainees group. More important, before and after the thirty-fourth class of the JRTI (i.e., the point at which the number of those passing the exam increased to 1,000), differences in parental socioeconomic background increased. The phenomenon of legal professionals with parents of a higher level of income and education, or as it is commonly understood, of a higher socioeconomic background, is consistent with the broader pattern by which the Korean population has become more highly educated and prosperous over the past fifty years. Notably, this trend is pronounced among the parents of respondents of both the Law School Graduates group and the Peer JRTI Trainees group.

*B. Distribution and diversity of legal occupations**1. Distribution of legal occupations*

Regarding the current workplaces of legal professionals in the Study (Table 6), about 60% of the respondents said they worked in Korean law firms (large firms, 19.9%; medium firms, 19.4%; and small firms, 21.2%), followed by private-sector companies (16.7%), solo practices (10.4%), and public institutions (8.6%).

The workplace distribution of men and women differed ($\chi^2=24.61$, $df=6$, $p<0.001$). Among the respondents, relatively more women held positions at small law firms (22.8%) and private-sector companies (19.2%), while relatively more men were employed at medium and large law firms (42.4%).

Table 6. Distribution of legal professions by gender

	Solo practitioner	Law firm (small)	Law firm (medium)	Law firm (large)	Public institution	Private-sector company	Others	Total
Female	7.1%	22.8%	16.3%	16.9%	11.8%	19.2%	5.9%	338
Male	12.0%	20.4%	21.0%	21.4%	7.0%	15.4%	2.8%	682

A comparison of the three education and training groups (Law School Graduates, Peer JRTI Trainees, and Career JRTI Trainees) (Table 7) reveals statistically significant differences in their workplace distributions ($\chi^2=62.05$, $df=12$, $p<0.001$). In short, the percentage of the Law School Graduates group and the Peer JRTI Trainees group working at small law firms and private-sector companies was higher than that of the Career JRTI Trainees group, while those in the Career JRTI Trainees group were more likely to work at large law firms than their younger counterparts. The fact that the Law School Graduates group and the Peer JRTI Trainees group are both employed relatively more in private-sector companies implies that a considerable number of entry-level positions in recent years have been in non-law firm settings.

Table 7. Distribution of legal professions by legal professional group

	Solo practitioner	Law firm (small)	Law firm (medium)	Law firm (large)	Public institution	Private-sector company	Others	Total
Law School Graduates	10.1%	31.2%	17.9%	11.4%	7.1%	19.2%	3.2%	308
Peer JRTI Trainees	8.3%	22.0%	19.0%	18.0%	9.3%	18.0%	5.3%	300
Career JRTI Trainees	12.1%	13.1%	20.9%	27.7%	9.2%	13.8%	3.2%	412
Total (N=1020)	10.4%	21.2%	19.4%	19.9%	8.6%	16.7%	3.8%	1020

Differences between the Law School Graduates group and the Peer JRTI Trainees group are on the edge of statistical significance ($\chi^2 = 12.51$, $df=6$, $p=0.051$). Differences between the two groups are found in the percentages of those working for small law firms and large law firms. Peer JRTI Trainees were more likely to begin their careers in large law firms. By contrast, Law School Graduates joining a firm were more likely than Peer JRTI Trainees to begin their careers at small law firms or as solo practitioners; the percentage of the Law School Graduates group going into public institutions or other jobs was lower than that of the Peer JRTI Trainees group.

Given these findings, the question of whether Law School Graduates are pursuing a greater variety of jobs than Peer JRTI Trainees cannot be conclusively answered. This is because Law School Graduates, like Peer JRTI Trainees, are still at an entry level, having begun work only a few years ago. It will be possible to draw a meaningful conclusion about the diversity of occupations pursued by Law School Graduates only if career paths are tracked and statistically analyzed for a longer period.

2. Job choice factors and desired turnover

Respondents, grouped according to whether they worked in the private sector or the public sector, were asked whether particular factors affected their job choice (Table 8). Between these two groups, significant differences were identified in “expectations for mid- and long-term income” ($t=-2.64$, $df=37.42$, $p<0.05$), “interest in a particular law-related field” ($t=2.32$, $df=40.46$, $p<0.05$), “expectations for balance between work and personal life” ($t=2.03$, $df=38.44$, $p<0.05$), “opportunity to make social contributions” ($t=2.73$, $df=37.70$, $p<0.01$), “fame in the sector” ($t=2.70$, $df=40.88$, $p<0.01$), and “opportunity for a career path in the future” ($t=3.09$, $df=46.18$, $p<0.01$).

Table 8. Job choice factors by sector

	Law school total	Private sector (n=276)	Public sector (n=32)
Expectations for mid- and long-term income	4.52	4.60	3.81
Interest in a particular law-related field	4.67	4.60	5.25
Annual salary enough to pay off student loans	2.83	2.88	2.41
Whether student loan repayment support or a student loan repayment program is provided	1.63	1.59	1.94
Opportunity to develop professional knowledge	5.02	4.97	5.38
Expectations for balance between work and personal life	4.60	4.53	5.19
Opportunity to make social contributions	3.91	3.82	4.69
Fame in the field	4.46	4.38	5.13
Opportunity for a career path in the future	4.85	4.78	5.47
Others	3.68	3.68	3.69

In total, 45.1% of respondents stated a desire to change jobs, with the percentage varying depending on workplace ($\chi^2=77.08$, $df=6$, $p<0.001$). The percentage of solo practitioners (17.9%) and those working at large law firms (31.5%) who desired to change jobs was relatively low compared with that of those working in public institutions (60.0%) or others (66.7%).

When turnover desire was examined by group (Law School Graduates, Peer JRTI Trainees, and Career JRTI Trainees), younger legal professionals (Law School Graduates, 52.3%; Peer JRTI Trainees, 51.3%) were more likely to desire a change of job than older legal professionals in the Career JRTI Trainees group (35.2%) ($\chi^2=27.44$, $df=2$, $p<0.001$).

3. Career path

To examine whether the introduction of the law school system has increased the diversity of legal occupations at the entry level, it is necessary to consider how legal professionals in the past chose and changed careers. The issue of career path is inherently a dynamic analysis, so rather than conduct a cross-sectional study of career choices at a specific point, the analysis must examine the changes and dynamics of the legal profession and track particular career trajectories. To do this, the Study recorded how often those in the Career JRTI Trainees group changed their workplaces and what kind of career paths they

took. The reason the Study only considered the career paths of the Career JRTI Trainees group was that those in the Law School Graduates group and the Peer JRTI Trainees group were, in most cases, still in their first legal professional job, and so no depth of analysis could be provided by considering their work histories.

The average length of the post-JRTI career of the respondents in the Career JRTI Trainees group was 11.63 years, and it was most often the case that they reported changing their workplace once (40.8%). Of the others, 25.2% stated they changed their workplace twice, while 13.4% indicated three times. The remaining 15.1% said they had not left for another job and instead continued at their first workplace. It was most often the case that their first jobs were in Korean law firms (49.0%), followed by the judicial branch (10.2%), solo practice (9.5%), public institutions (8.7%), and prosecutor's offices (6.6%). The average number of years of service at the first job for legal professionals who had changed jobs at least once was five. The average number of years at the first job was relatively longer among female legal professionals, those at Korean law firms, those with an annual salary of less than 60 million Korean won, or about \$53,500, and those with an annual salary of 200 million Korean won, equivalent to around \$178,400 or more. Furthermore, when asked why they left their first job, 16.0% answered "to change their career," followed by 14.6% who responded that they "felt there was a limited possibility for career development."

Table 9 examines career paths, comparing the current workplace with the first workplace. Several types of career paths are revealed. Of the legal professionals who started as solo practitioners, 46.2% still worked as solo practitioners, 28.2% worked at small law firms, and 12.8% worked at medium law firms. The highest percentage of the legal professionals who had their first job at Korean law firms worked at large law firms (30.2%), followed by medium law firms (27.2%) and small law firms (14.4%), demonstrating that most legal professionals who began their career at law firms continued to work at law firms. Also, most of those who began their careers in the judicial branch currently worked in large law firms (35.7%) or medium law firms (26.2%), and a few moved on to practice law as solo practitioners (4.8%). Meanwhile, the highest percentage of those whose first jobs were in prosecutor's offices currently worked as solo practitioners (33.3%), followed by large law firms (25.9%) and medium law firms (14.8%). In addition, of those with a first job in a private-sector company, most transitioned to positions as in-house lawyers in other companies (84.2%), and in no case was such an individual shifted to work as a solo practitioner.

In summary, the following career paths for Career JRTI Trainees can be observed with some frequency: (1) solo practitioner → solo practitioner, (2) law firm → law firm, (3) court → law firm, (4) prosecutor's office → solo practitioner, and (5) in-house lawyer → in-house lawyer. It would be meaningful to examine whether the common career paths will remain the same or differ in the future as Law School Graduates continue their careers. Furthermore, once foreign law firms are allowed to employ Korean lawyers, the existing career landscape will

change, and therefore the types of career paths could be different from those of the previous generation of legal professionals. In the future, a follow-up study should track and analyze career trajectories in the changing landscape of Korean legal practice.

Table 9. Career paths

First/ current	Solo practitioner	Law firm (small)	Law firm (medium)	Law firm (large)	Public institution	Private- sector company	Others	Total
Solo practitioner	46.2%	28.2%	12.8%	5.1%	2.6%	0.0%	5.1%	9.5%
Korean law firm	7.4%	14.4%	27.2%	30.2%	3.5%	13.9%	3.5%	49.0%
Judicial branch	4.8%	11.9%	26.2%	35.7%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	10.2%
Prosecutor's office	33.3%	3.7%	14.8%	25.9%	11.1%	7.4%	3.7%	6.6%
Public institution (excluding judge and prosecutor)	8.3%	2.8%	13.9%	27.8%	30.6%	8.3%	8.3%	8.7%
Private- sector company	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	5.3%	5.3%	84.2%	0.0%	4.6%
Court- appointed defense attorney	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Nonprofit organization	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Educational institution	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Financial institution	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	1.9%
Others	5.7%	11.4%	17.1%	51.4%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%
Total	50	54	86	114	38	57	13	412

C. Work environments of legal professionals

1. Annual salary

The average annual salary of the legal professionals who responded to the survey was 154.5 million Korean won, or about \$137,700, while the median was 82.5 million Korean won, or about \$73,600. Because the annual salary is distributed unevenly and the standard deviation is high, it is more meaningful to compare the median than the average. Compared by type of workplace (Table 10), the median annual salary is far higher for large law firms (157.5

million Korean won, or about \$140,500) than for any other group. Those working at large law firms earned two and a half times more than those working at public institutions or as solo practitioners (both at 60 million Korean won, or about \$53,500), who had the lowest median annual salaries. The annual salary level for legal professionals employed at large law firms is among the highest of all occupations in Korea.

Table 10. Annual salary by type of workplace in [millions of] Korean won

	Average annual salary	Standard deviation	Median	Bottom 25%	Top 25%
Solo practitioner	83.94	83.48	60.00	40.00	100.00
Law firm (small)	72.12	28.36	65.00	60.00	80.00
Law firm (medium)	115.10	81.08	99.00	80.00	120.00
Law firm (large)	181.68	84.15	157.50	137.88	200.00
Public institution	69.04	24.82	60.00	55.00	80.00
Private-sector company	89.34	36.73	80.00	65.00	100.50
Others	89.11	67.75	80.00	60.00	95.00
Total	105.45	73.57	82.50	60.00	130.00

Differences in annual salary among the three legal professional groups (Table 11) were statistically significant ($F=105.7$, $df=2$, $p<0.001$). The explanation for the fact that the Law School Graduates group had a lower median annual salary than the Peer JRTI Trainees group, at least in part, is a structural delay before Law School Graduates can commence legal practice: They are required to complete six months of practical training after they pass the bar exam. Subtracting these six months would affect the estimation of the annual salary. In addition, the data also reflect the fact that more respondents in the Peer JRTI Trainees group were employed at large law firms than those in the Law School Graduates group, as described in Table 7.

Table 11. Annual salary by legal professional group in [millions of] Korean won

	Average annual salary	Median	Bottom 25%	Top 25%
Law School Graduates	72.51	60.00	57.25	80.00
Peer JRTI Trainees	87.99	80.00	60.00	100.00
Career JRTI Trainees	144.81	115.00	94.00	175.00

Table 12 compares salaries by gender and legal professional group. Neither the Law School Graduates group nor the Peer JRTI Trainees group had a significant pay gap based on gender. By contrast, the Career JRTI Trainees group showed a significant difference between the genders. Males accounted for 81.6% of the Career JRTI Trainees group, while females accounted for 18.4%. The average length of law career for males and females was 12.76 years and 6.57 years, respectively. The gender distribution in the Career JRTI Trainees group differed little from that for all the legal professionals (see Table 6). Relatively more female legal professionals worked at public institutions (14.5%) and private-sector companies (21.1%).

Table 12. Annual salary by gender and legal professional group in [millions of] Korean won

	Female				Male			
	Average annual salary	Median	Bottom 25%	Top 25%	Average annual salary	Median	Bottom 25%	Top 25%
Law School Graduates	72.54	60.00	53.00	80.00	72.50	60.00	60.00	80.00
Peer JRTI Trainees	87.31	80.00	60.00	98.00	88.59	80.00	65.00	100.00
Career JRTI Trainees	110.73	100.00	84.00	133.75	152.21	120.00	95.00	180.00

2. Working hours

Table 13 shows data on working hours. It was found that the average number of working hours per week of the respondents was slightly above 50. Time worked in the office accounted for 42.2 out of those 50 hours per week; and outside the office, 7.0 hours. Overtime amounted to 9.6 hours per week outside regular working hours. On the other hand, it was found that respondents, on average, spent 3.7 hours per week on professional networking outside their working hours.

The average number of working hours among different workplaces showed significant differences ($F=13.41$, $df=6$, $p<0.001$). More specifically, large and medium law firms had a statistically significant greater length of working hours than solo practices, small law firms, private-sector companies, and others. However, no statistically significant difference was found among the other workplaces.

The percentage of those working 60 hours or more per week was higher in medium and large law firms than in other institutions ($\chi^2=75.28$, $df=6$, $p<0.001$). Approximately 27.4% of respondents reported that they worked 60 hours or more per week, and the highest percentage of those was in large law firms (41.9%). Meanwhile, the percentages of those working 60 hours or more per week in private-sector companies (10%) and solo practice (17.9%) were relatively lower. However, it should be noted that 26% of respondents

working in public institutions reported that they worked 60 hours or longer per week; thus, it appears that legal professionals work many hours not only in the private sector, but also in the public sector.

Table 13. Weekly working hours by workplace type

	Average	Standard deviation	Median	Bottom 25%	Top 25%	The percentage of those working for 60 hours or more
Solo practitioner	45.75	12.85	48	40.00	50	17.9%
Law firm (small)	49.58	12.5	50	45.00	60	25.9%
Law firm (medium)	54.67	13.93	50	48.25	60	38.9%
Law firm (large)	55.53	15.00	55	49.50	60	41.9%
Public institution	50.47	14.48	50	42.75	60	26.1%
Private-sector company	46.83	10.78	48	44.25	50	10.0%
Others	46.24	8.60	45	44.00	50	5.1%
Total	50.84	13.68	50	45.00	60	27.4%

Many legal professionals focused on work in a specialized field. The questionnaire asked whether they considered themselves specialists in their fields, and whether 50% of the work they performed was in their own field. Among those who focused more than half of their work on a particular field but nonetheless did not think of themselves as specialists were solo practitioners (22.6%), those in small law firms (35.2%), and those in public institutions (42.0%). By contrast, the percentage of legal professionals at large law firms who focused on a specific field in their actual work was high, and so was the percentage of those at large law firms who considered themselves specialists (70.4%).

3. *Pro bono service*

Under Article 27 of the Attorney-at-Law Act, lawyers are required to complete a minimum number of hours of pro bono service per year. In principle, the requirement is 30 hours, but local bar associations are allowed to reduce the requirement to 20 hours. *Lawyers' White Paper 2010* gave the average number of pro bono hours actually worked as 29.84. In the Study, hours of pro bono service varied depending on the workplace. The average showed significant differences among respondent groups ($F=8.82$, $d=6$, $p<0.001$). Solo

practitioners performed 38.95 hours of pro bono service, followed by 26.01 hours for those working in large law firms.

4. Job satisfaction

When the importance of the factors that respondents considered in choosing their current workplace was considered (Table 14), the average on a seven-point scale showed work environment and colleagues as highest (5.05), followed by corporate reputation (4.62) and annual salary (4.60). All three groups responded that they accorded the most weight to work environment and colleagues in choosing current workplace. In addition, all three groups gave the least consideration to providing convenience for family.

The items that showed statistically significant differences among the three groups included working hours, shared values, job stability, geographical location, training and education opportunity, and providing convenience for family. The Law School Graduates group considered working hours more than other groups did in choosing their workplace ($F=5.27$, $df=2$, $p<0.01$). As to whether their company shared the legal professional's values ("shared values"), the Peer JRTI Trainees group considered this less than the other two groups did ($F=5.57$, $df=2$, $p<0.01$). Job stability was also evaluated differently, and the Career JRTI Trainees group considered job stability more than the other two groups did ($F=7.26$, $df=2$, $p<0.001$). As to the workplace's geographic location, the Peer JRTI Trainees group considered it more important than the Career JRTI Trainees did ($F=3.54$, $df=2$, $p<0.05$). Training and education opportunity was also considered differently ($F=9.59$, $df=2$, $p<0.001$). The Law School Graduates group considered training and education opportunity more than the other two groups did. Career JRTI Trainees considered providing convenience for family less than the other groups did ($F=8.09$, $df=2$, $p<0.001$). No significant difference was found in the other items among the three groups.

Table 14. Job satisfaction factors by legal professional group

	Total	Law school Graduates	Peer JRTI Trainees	Career JRTI Trainees
Annual salary	4.60	4.50	4.62	4.67
Employee benefits	3.88	3.91	4.00	3.77
Work environment/colleagues	5.05	5.14	5.02	5.01
Working hours	4.31	4.54	4.32	4.13
Opportunity for social contribution	3.25	3.29	3.25	3.22
Possibility of promotion	3.26	3.26	3.25	3.27
Shared values	4.40	4.58	4.14	4.45
Job stability	4.48	4.38	4.27	4.70
Geographic location	4.15	4.25	4.29	3.98
Corporate scale	4.33	4.28	4.49	4.25
Reputations	4.62	4.60	4.57	4.67
Training and education opportunity	4.30	4.65	4.28	4.06
Providing convenience for family	3.14	3.34	3.31	2.86

Overall, legal professionals' job satisfaction with their current workplaces was high: 67% were "generally" or "very" satisfied. The average satisfaction on a five-point scale showed similarly high levels of satisfaction for the Law School Graduates group (3.64), the Peer JRTI Trainees group (3.65), and the Career JRTI Trainees group (3.76). Differences among the groups were not statistically significant. Based on gender, however, females' job satisfaction (3.60) was lower to a statistically significant extent than that of males (3.73) ($t=2.44$, $df=643.981$ $p<0.05$).

In terms of satisfaction depending on the workplace (Table 15), large law firms and public institutions showed relatively higher levels of satisfaction. However, differences among large and small law firms, public institutions and small law firms, and private-sector companies and large law firms were statistically significant ($F=4.91$, $df=6$, $p<0.001$), while differences among other workplaces were not significant.

Table 15. Workplace satisfaction by workplace type

	Average	Standard deviation	Median	Bottom 25%	Top 25%
Solo practitioner	3.75	0.79	4	3	4
Law firm (small)	3.49	0.89	4	3	4
Law firm (medium)	3.67	0.79	4	3	4
Law firm (large)	3.89	0.76	4	4	4
Public institution	3.81	0.72	4	3	4
Private-sector company	3.64	0.80	4	3	4
Others	3.67	0.77	4	3	4
Total	3.69	0.81	4	3	4

The overall level of satisfaction (Table 16) was high in large law firms, but differences were apparent in specific areas. Large law firms scored high in satisfaction with work or occupational competency factors such as annual salary, employee benefits, work environment, and corporate reputation. Meanwhile, private-sector companies and public institutions scored high in satisfaction with personal life, considering such factors as working hours, balance between work and personal life, and providing convenience for family (including newborn care).

Table 16. Overall level of job satisfaction by factor

	Average	Standard deviation
Annual salary	4.15	1.52
Employee benefits	3.73	1.58
Work environment, colleagues	4.91	1.44
Working hours, amount of work	4.35	1.60
Opportunity for social contributions including pro bono service	3.58	1.58
Possibility of promotion	3.61	1.55
Shared values	4.25	1.56
Job stability	4.31	1.55
Corporate reputations	4.59	1.52
Education and training opportunity (including personal mentoring)	4.14	1.67
Performance evaluation method	3.68	1.50
Balance between work and personal life	4.21	1.70
Autonomy in performing work	4.93	1.52
Opportunity to develop expertise	4.73	1.60
Providing convenience for family (including newborn care)	3.42	1.72

After performing a principal component analysis using the fifteen detailed items above, the Study was able to derive three principal components of legal professionals' job satisfaction. They are: (a) work environment and values; (b) the amount of work and personal life; and (c) monetary compensation. As a statistical matter, these three principal components explained about 62% of the total variance.

Component (b), the amount of work and personal life, encompasses satisfaction variables such as working hours and the amount of work, balance between work and personal life, and providing convenience for family including newborn care. Component (c), monetary compensation, includes satisfaction variables such as annual salary and employee benefits. Component (a), work environment and values, had the most explanatory power, and it represents all the other variables.

The Study examined differences in these three satisfaction components depending on workplace (Table 17) and gender (Table 18). Different workplaces showed differences in all three components: work environment and values ($F=11.4$, $df=6$, $p<0.001$), the amount of work and personal life ($F=33.54$, $df=6$, $p<0.001$), and monetary compensation ($F=28.01$, $df=6$, $p<0.001$). For work environment and values, those in large law firms showed a higher level of satisfaction than those in other workplaces. Those in public institutions also showed a high level of satisfaction with work environment and values, which was higher to a statistically significant level than that of solo practitioners or those in small law firms.

As to the amount of work and personal life, those in large law firms showed the lowest level of satisfaction, while those in public institutions and private-sector companies showed the highest levels. Legal professionals at large law firms showed the highest level of satisfaction with monetary compensation, followed by those in private-sector companies. Legal professionals who were solo practitioners, those in small law firms, and those in public institutions showed lower levels of satisfaction with monetary compensation.

Table 17. Differences in the three principal job-satisfaction components by workplace

	Work environment and values	Amount of work and personal life	Compensation
Solo practitioner	-0.29	0.16	-0.36
Law firm (small)	-0.25	-0.04	-0.37
Law firm (medium)	-0.09	-0.28	-0.05
Law firm (large)	0.39	-0.55	0.64
Public institution	0.24	0.48	-0.35
Private-sector company	0.08	0.61	0.18
Others	-0.29	0.36	-0.07

Gender differences were observed only in work environment and values. Males showed a higher level of satisfaction with work environment and values than females ($t=-2.41$, $df=653.84$, $p<0.05$). The other components did not show statistically significant differences.

Table 18. Differences in the three principal job-satisfaction components by gender

	Work environment and values	Amount of work and personal life	Compensation
Male	0.05	0.04	-0.02
Female	-0.11	-0.02	0.01

5. Prospects for the future

Differences in respondents' perceived future prospects are charted in Table 19.

Table 19. Differences in perceived future prospects by legal professional group

	Average	Standard deviation	Median
Law School Graduates	3.04	0.66	3.00
Peer JRTI Trainees	2.94	0.64	3.00
Career JRTI Trainees	2.75	0.80	3.00
Total	2.89	0.73	3.00

While there was no difference observed between the Law School Graduates group and the Peer JRTI Trainees group about their prospects for the future, Career JRTI Trainees had a more negative outlook than the other two groups ($F=15.34$, $df=2$, $p<0.001$). On the other hand, no statistically significant

difference in perceived prospects for the future was observed among different workplaces.

One of the most important factors to consider in predicting future prospects is the opening of the Korean legal services market, because competition is expected to become more fierce as the market opens. The Study investigated attitudes toward the opening of the legal services market (Table 20), whether positive (supportive) or negative (opposed), and measured the average level of support for the statements on a 7-point scale. The respondents gave 4.38 points on average to the statement, "Even if I work under foreign lawyers, I should be able to perform work related to Korean law independently." This statement garnered the most supportive responses on average. For the next statement, "I want to work at a foreign law firm," the respondents gave relatively supportive responses (3.63 points). Following that was "Foreign lawyers should be allowed to directly hire Korean lawyers to perform work," which scored 3.37 points, tending toward a less supportive view of the opening of the legal market. The statements "It is necessary to treat and manage foreign lawyers as members of the Korean Bar Association" and "Foreign lawyers should also be allowed to perform work related to Korean law in particular fields such as the financial sector" scored 2.65 points and 2.72 points, respectively, and showed relatively opposed responses. Two statements that suggested less agreement with the opening of the legal services market, namely "The current phase-by-phase opening of the law market will be sufficient" and "Control and supervision should be implemented more thoroughly so that foreign lawyers cannot perform work related to Korean law," scored 4.37 and 4.62 points, respectively. The respondents who agreed with these two items scored above the median (4 points), indicating that respondents did not greatly support the opening of the legal services market.

Table 20. Attitude toward opening of the legal services market, by legal professional group

	Total (n = 1020)	Law School Graduates (n = 308)	Peer JRTI Trainees (n = 300)	Career JRTI Trainees (n = 412)
The current phase-by-phase opening of the law market will be sufficient.*	4.37	4.26	3.96	4.76
Foreign lawyers should be allowed to directly hire Korean lawyers and perform work.	3.37	3.81	3.23	3.15
Foreign lawyers should also be allowed to perform work related to Korean law in particular fields such as the financial sector.	2.72	3.19	2.51	2.53
I want to work at a foreign law firm.	3.63	4.01	3.70	3.29
Even if I work under foreign lawyers, I should be able to perform work related to Korean law independently.	4.38	4.60	4.40	4.20
Control and supervision should be implemented more thoroughly so that foreign lawyers cannot perform work related to Korean law.*	4.62	4.32	4.58	4.89
It is necessary to treat and manage foreign lawyers as members of the Korean Bar Association.	2.65	2.82	2.46	2.66
The combined score for the opening of the legal services market (combining the items above).	3.35	3.69	3.26	3.17

Note: A higher score in the items marked with * indicates respondents' negative attitude toward the opening of the legal services market.

Among the three groups, the level of support for the opening of the legal services market varied, from highest to lowest, as follows: the Law School Graduates group, the Peer JRTI Trainees group, and the Career JRTI Trainees group. More important, the Law School Graduates group (3.69 points) showed a combined score for support for the opening of the legal services market that was higher, at a statistically significant level, than the scores for the Peer JRTI Trainees group (3.26) and the Career JRTI Trainees group (3.17) ($F=16.34$, $df=2$, $p<0.001$).

D. Factors in legal professionals' annual salary and satisfaction

1. Annual salary

The Study performed a regression analysis, with the annual salary of legal professionals as a dependent variable, to identify what types of variables

affected the income of legal professionals (Table 21). Because annual salary, a dependent variable, shows great deviations overall, and it is likely that its extreme values could distort the average, the Study used the common logarithm for analysis. Accordingly, the analysis provides more meaningful results by comparing the effect sizes among explanatory variables by using the “standardized regression coefficient” among other presented regression coefficients.

Table 21. Regression analysis: annual salary and satisfaction

	Regression coefficient	Standardized regression coefficient	t value	p value	
Constant	1.43***	0.00***	10.51	0.00	
Gender (male)	0.02	0.04	1.48	0.14	
Career	0.01***	0.40***	15.92	0.00	
Law firm (small)	0.06**	0.10**	2.60	0.01	
Law firm (medium)	0.18***	0.32***	8.21	0.00	
Law firm (large)	0.38***	0.63***	15.96	0.00	
Public institution	0.01	0.01	0.32	0.75	
Private-sector company	0.15***	0.24***	6.41	0.00	
Others	0.12***	0.10***	3.81	0.00	
Specialist	0.05***	0.10***	4.43	0.00	
Working hours	0.00	0.05	1.95	0.05	
Paternal educational level	0.00	0.02	0.61	0.54	
Maternal educational level	0.00	0.00	-0.09	0.93	
Parental legal professionals	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.99	
Company with 50 employees or more	0.03*	0.07*	2.40	0.02	
10 subordinates or more	-0.03	-0.05	-1.79	0.07	
Self-employed	0.00	-0.01	-0.22	0.83	
Management or executive member	-0.01	-0.01	-0.41	0.68	
Professional	-0.03	-0.04	-1.55	0.12	
Undergraduate from Seoul National University, Yonsei University, and Korea University	0.02*	0.05*	2.02	0.04	
Undergraduate GPA	0.00	0.04	1.52	0.13	
F	58.89***	df	847	R ²	0.58

*p<.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

The most important variable in determining annual salary was workplace. After adjusting for the variables of gender and career, it was found that those

in law firms, private-sector companies, and others had a higher level of annual salary than solo practitioners.

The parental background variable did not show a statistically significant effect in most cases. The respondent's annual salary was found to be higher when a parent worked in a company with fifty employees or more, but it is difficult to infer a causal relationship from this result. Because the significance of this variable was not consistent across the three groups, it is highly likely that this variable has an "interaction effect" that is highlighted only in a particular group.

Interestingly, those who identified themselves as specialists had a higher annual salary than those who did not. This result suggests that legal specialization may result in higher annual salaries.

Alma mater also made a difference in annual salary. Overall, the legal professionals who graduated from Seoul National University, Yonsei University, and Korea University, which are generally regarded as the most prestigious universities in Korea, received higher annual salaries than those who did not. This effect was not found in analyses of each of the groups. For the Law School Graduates group, the law school they attended had a statistically significant effect on salary and was more important than the undergraduate school. Graduation from those three universities did not show a statistically significant effect among the two other groups. It would be inappropriate to conclude that graduation from one of those three universities assures a legal professional of a high annual salary, though the particular value of a prestigious law degree for Law School Graduates may indicate that these factors are significant for entry-level positions.

In the Career JRTI Trainees group, only workplace, career, and specialization were statistically significant variables in relation to income level. Unlike young legal professionals, no significance was found in this group for undergraduate school, undergraduate grade point average (GPA), or parental background. While young legal professionals aiming to get their first job with a high annual salary benefit from a prestigious law school degree or an impressive law school or undergraduate GPA, the effect of these factors may fade as their career continues. In other words, over the course of a legal career, professional reputation may become the most important factor in determining salary level, ultimately displacing the role of alma mater and GPA in setting the market value for a legal professional's services.

2. Job satisfaction

A regression analysis was also conducted to identify the factors affecting job satisfaction (Table 22). The analysis was performed with the results of a five-point satisfaction scale, with current workplace as a dependent variable. As in the explanatory model used for annual salary, the Study used demographics, working hours, workplace, specialization, parental background, undergraduate school, and GPA as explanatory variables. In addition, annual salary and

hours of pro bono service, which are expected to have a close correlation with job satisfaction, were included in the model.

Table 22. Regression analysis: factors affecting job satisfaction

	Regression coefficient	Standardized regression coefficient	t value	p value	
Constant	1.86*	0.00*	2.38	0.02	
Gender (male)	0.14*	0.08*	2.18	0.03	
Age	-0.01*	-0.09*	-1.98	0.05	
Annual salary	0.65***	0.19***	3.89	0.00	
Working hours	0.00	-0.07	-1.95	0.05	
Solo practitioner	0.00	0.00	-0.02	0.98	
Law firm (small)	-0.27*	-0.14*	-2.52	0.01	
Law firm (medium)	-0.27*	-0.14*	-2.44	0.01	
Law firm (large)	-0.24	-0.12	-1.87	0.06	
Private-sector company	-0.26*	-0.12*	-2.31	0.02	
Others	-0.13	-0.03	-0.84	0.40	
Specialist	0.10	0.06	1.81	0.07	
Hours of pro bono service	0.00**	0.11**	3.07	0.00	
Paternal educational level	0.01	0.03	0.55	0.59	
Maternal educational level	0.02	0.03	0.61	0.54	
Parental legal professionals	0.41*	0.09*	2.53	0.01	
Company with 50 employees or more	0.13	0.08	1.90	0.06	
10 subordinates or more	-0.12	-0.07	-1.63	0.10	
Self-employed	-0.02	-0.01	-0.39	0.69	
Management or executive member	0.13	0.06	1.67	0.10	
Professional	-0.11	-0.05	-1.18	0.24	
Undergraduate from Seoul National University, Yonsei University, and Korea University	0.08	0.05	1.34	0.18	
Undergraduate GPA	0.01	0.05	1.41	0.16	
F	4.024***	df	838	R ²	0.10

The results of this regression analysis show that the factor with the largest effect on job satisfaction was annual salary. When other conditions remain the

same, an increase of 1 point in annual salary leads to an increase of 0.65 points in job satisfaction, the largest change in job satisfaction of all the explanatory variables.

Workplace also had a significant effect. Compared with legal professionals in public institutions, those in small and medium law firms and those in private-sector companies showed a lower level of satisfaction. In an earlier simple comparison of job satisfaction averages, the satisfaction level of those in large law firms was found to be higher than that of legal professionals in public institutions. However, when adjusting for the effect of other variables (in other words, when the annual salary and other conditions remained the same), working in public institutions had a higher level of satisfaction.

Of the demographic factors, males had a higher level of job satisfaction than females, and older respondents tended to have a lower level of satisfaction. Among other parental background variables, the only variable that correlated to job satisfaction was whether a respondent had a parent who was a legal professional; in that case, respondents with such a parent had a higher level of job satisfaction than those for whom neither parent was a legal professional. This result invites the conjecture that satisfaction in the former case was higher because those respondents were accustomed to the work environment and lifestyle of legal professionals and were able to make educated choices to enter the legal profession.

The hours of pro bono service produced an interesting result: Longer hours of pro bono service correlated with higher job satisfaction. It may be the case that the experience of contributing to society through the provision of legal services to disadvantaged individuals, or with a public interest objective, leads to higher job satisfaction.

IV. Conclusions and Implications

A number of major conclusions and implications can be drawn from the Study. First, the Study's examination of socioeconomic and family background revealed differences that were primarily generational. A comparison of parental occupation and educational level of Law School Graduates and Peer JRTI Trainees revealed only slight differences (mothers of Law School Graduates were on average more educated, and their fathers were more likely to hold a manager-level position), and there were no significant and systematic differences in socioeconomic background. Instead, differences were identified among different generations. In other words, the socioeconomic background levels of Law School Graduates and Peer JRTI Trainees were systematically higher than those of Career JRTI Trainees. This generation gap was also observed in the likelihood of having a legal professional among parents or family members. There was no difference between Law School Graduates and Peer JRTI Trainees in the percentage of family members or extended family relatives who were legal professionals. Rather, the differences were generational: As compared with Career JRTI Trainees, younger legal professionals tended to have more legal professionals among their family members.

Second, it was found that the demographic or educational diversity of Law School Graduates had not yet led to diversity in legal occupations, at least at an entry level. As demonstrated by the Study's findings, young legal professionals overwhelmingly worked at law firms, and many more worked in the private sector than in the public sector. The number of those pursuing fields other than Korea's conventional legal occupations (judge, prosecutor, and lawyer in private practice) was also limited. It is not certain whether this distribution in legal occupations is attributable to individual choice or to structural restraints in the market for legal talent. In addition, most Law School Graduates are still at the entry level; thus, it is difficult to generalize and draw definitive conclusions, as it is too early to track and observe changes in their jobs and a longer trajectory in their legal careers.

The comparison of types of career paths of Career JRTI Trainees indicated that it is possible that future legal professionals will take different career paths from those of earlier generations. Already, Law School Graduates showed differences from the Career JRTI Trainees when it came to job choice preferences and their views on the opening of the Korean legal market. In a system in which the traditional barriers among judges, prosecutors, and lawyers in the judicial system are effectively eliminated, most young legal professionals would prefer to start their careers as lawyers in private practice. When the law market in Korea is entirely opened in the future, such practice could include employment at a foreign law firm. In the future, it should be possible to identify the dynamic changes (and, potentially, increases in diversity) within the Korean legal profession as the market opens and as Law School Graduates progress further into their careers.

Third, there were multifaceted findings related to legal professionals' work environments and job satisfaction. Generally, all three groups provided positive self-evaluations of their own workplaces, and their views of their prospects for the future were relatively favorable as well. Interestingly, annual salary, an external measure of the socioeconomic success, did not always correspond to internal self-satisfaction. While the Law School Graduates group had a lower average annual salary than the Peer JRTI Trainees group, there was no difference in job satisfaction. As suggested by the results, job satisfaction was affected by many factors, such as work environment and values, the amount of work and personal life, and monetary compensation; the level of satisfaction varied among respondents depending on how each legal professional prioritized those factors.

Fourth, workplace was found to be the most important variable influencing annual salary and job satisfaction. Differences in parental socioeconomic background did not affect annual salary, a result found in all three groups (Law School Graduates, Peer JRTI Trainees, and Career JRTI Trainees). In the Law School Graduates group, however, graduation from a prestigious law school and a high law school GPA affected annual salary. In comparison, undergraduate GPA affected annual salary in the Peer JRTI Trainees group. In contrast, the undergraduate school and GPA of Career JRTI Trainees did not

affect their annual salary. This implies that while educational institution and performance variables may be important in securing a first job at a workplace with a high salary, their effect diminishes as legal professionals accumulate more experience in law and compete successfully in the legal market.

In general, job satisfaction was highly correlated with annual salary; yet, when controlling for other variables, legal professionals in public institutions showed a higher level of satisfaction. This demonstrates that values other than annual salary are important in the life of legal professionals, and that satisfaction may differ depending on the degree of self-actualization. In addition, longer hours of pro bono service resulted in a higher level of satisfaction. Therefore, the Study indicates that, throughout successive generations of legal professionals, the occupation carries a sense of social responsibility to serve the public interest.