

The Ethical Identity of Law Students

Richard Moorhead,^α Catrina Denvir,^β Rachel Cahill-O'Callaghan,^ζ Maryam Kouchaki^δ and Stephen Galoob^ε

ABSTRACT

This paper uses measures of values, moral outlook and professional identity to explore the ethical and professional identity of law students. We do so in two jurisdictions, surveying 441 students studying in England and Wales and 569 students studying in the US. The survey covers the first and final years of an undergraduate law degree and the postgraduate vocational stage in England and Wales, as well as students in all years of the JD programme in the US. We explore whether law students towards the end of their legal education have ethical identities predictive of less ethical conduct than those at the beginning of their legal education; whether law students intending careers in business law have values and profiles consistent with less ethical conduct than those intending to work for government or individuals; and what factors might explain these differences in ethical outlook. Our findings suggest that ethical identity is strongly associated with gender and career intentions. They also suggest weaker moral identities for students intending to practice business law. Ultimately, our findings support a conclusion that is more nuanced than the predominant theses about the impact of legal education on student ethicality which tend to suggest legal education diminishes ethicality.

INTRODUCTION

Ethical decision making is a central element of legal practice. The growth of behavioural economics and moral psychology has prompted a burgeoning interest in behavioural legal ethics (Wooley and Wendell 2010, Perlman 2015). One strand of research suggests we each have an individual ethical identity, part nature part nurture, which influences whether and how we see ethical problems and how we respond to

^α Professor Richard Moorhead, Centre for Ethics and Law, UCL Faculty of Laws, London, correspondence, r.moorhead@ucl.ac.uk. The authors would particularly like to thank the law schools that participated in the study, Professor Shalom Schwartz for providing the values questionnaire and the Legal Education Foundation and Edmond J. Safra Center for funding assistance with parts of the project.

^β Centre for Ethics and Law, UCL Faculty of Laws, London

^ζ Cardiff Law School, Cardiff University

^δ Northwestern University; Kellogg School of Management

^ε College of Law. University of Tulsa

them (Haidt 2013, but contrast Alfano 2014). This paper examines facets of the ethical identity of law students and how external factors influence this identity.

Ours is the first quantitative study to examine the ethical identity of law students across the multiple dimensions of values, moral outlook and professional identity and in more than one jurisdiction. Our findings are relevant to a number of debates about legal education and professionalisation. We concentrate on four areas of particular interest.

- A strong concern in the legal education literature is that law school diminishes ethicality. We examine whether the ethical identities of law students at the beginning of their legal education differ from those at the end of their legal education and, if so, whether these differences are consistent with less ethical conduct.
- A second issue concerns professional socialization. We examine whether law students who intend to practice law have ethical identities consistent with less ethical conduct than those who do not intend to practice law.
- A more specific element of socialisation is the interpenetration of business and law. Here we examine whether law students intending careers in business law have values and profiles consistent with less ethical conduct than students intending to work as lawyers for other kinds of client.
- Finally, we examine whether gender, undertaking pro-bono work, or clinical coursework are associated with difference in ethical outlook.

Section I contextualises our study in the broader literature. Section II outlines our methods and analytical strategy. Section III presents our results, and Section IV analyses these results.

I. CONTEXT

A common theme of legal scholarship is that lawyers have lost their moral compass (Kronman, 1995) and that the globalization and financialisation of law firms strengthen commercial values over professional ones (Flood, 1993). Whilst important influences on ethical behaviour may be found in practice itself (see, for example, Mather and Levin, 2012), we focus our analysis on legal education. Legal education is supposed to lay the foundations for an ethical profession, positively socialising students into “thinking like a lawyer.” Yet many commentators criticize legal education for failing to achieve these tasks (e.g. Edwards 1992, Feldman 1995, Nicolson 2005, Kronman 2003). Legal education has been implicated as a cause of diminished ethicality (e.g. Schleef 1997, Thornton 1998, Arthurs 2000). It is said to guide students away from moral reasoning in favor of a “legal hubris” through which law students create a new identity that pushes morality to the margins of their discourse (Mertz 2007). Law school curricula and pedagogical approaches are said to limit professional values to “part of the hidden curriculum, which tends to be strongly individualistic, pragmatic and even cynical in outlook” (Webb 2011: 9).

Empirical attempts to quantify the influence of legal education on ethical identity and professionalism are rare. Sheldon and Krieger (2004) found, consistent with diminished ethicality, that US law students lost autonomy and shifted from intrinsic to extrinsic values during their studies. In other words, the motivation of US students

shifted away from interest in the subject towards professional success. This shift was bound up with career choices and performance: intrinsically motivated students performed better in their courses initially, became attracted to better-paid jobs, and then became more extrinsically motivated. Perversely, virtue led to success, which in turn diminished virtue. Hedegard (1997) also detected decreased altruism in first-year US law students. Another study, using moral reasoning scales, found that US lawyers' moral reasoning may be stunted (Landwehr, 1996). A recent virtues-based study in England and Wales suggested that the majority of law students lack formal ethical education (Arthur et al, 2014). By contrast, some studies have found that law school has little effect on ethical reasoning (Palermo and Evans 2005), and others are inconclusive on the impact of law school (Cahill et al 1996, Diacoff 1996).

Contrary to this pessimism, Chambliss suggests that academic commentators are "biased toward critical accounts of 'ethical fading,'" their analyses often being "based on unspecified and/or internally inconsistent benchmarks" (Chambliss, 2012:48). Chambliss hypothesizes that lawyers may be subject to "both ethical fading and ethical learning at different stages of their careers, in different practice contexts, and with respect to different issues in their work" (Chambliss, *ibid*). Hamilton and Monson share this optimism, pointing to psychological models and qualitative work that predicts ethical learning across a person's career and suggest that "an ethical professional identity can be developed across the life span" (Hamilton and Monson, 2011).

In general, accounts of diminished ethicality amongst law students rely on two types of explanation. One explanation is that the choices of students influence the make-up of practicing lawyers. Here the concern is that less ethical types are attracted to the profession. Daicoff (1996) suggests a host of psychological pathologies more prevalent amongst law students and lawyers than others. If "bad" people choose law or are selected by law schools or law firms, then lawyers as a group would be more inclined to be "bad." Under this explanation, educational and career choices may reflect value preferences rather than shape them (Sagiv et al, 2004).

A second explanation is that, during periods of profound personal change, socialization affects characteristics that, under other circumstances, are considered immutable. One such change is the adoption of a professional identity during a period of intense education (Bardi and Goodwin 2011). While there is reason to expect that socialization will only rarely and slowly affect identity change (Erlanger and Klegon 1978), there is also reason to think that legal education is one of the rare occasions when this effect might be realized (cf. Bardi et al, 2014). Here, the concern is that socialisation during legal education or entry into practice diminishes ethicality.

On the other hand, legal ethics education and clinical or pro bono programs are two key areas in which legal educators have sought to improve ethicality. Few studies address the impact of ethics education on the ethicality of law students (but see Hamilton and Monson, 2012), and such studies tend to focus on moral reasoning. Hartwell (1995) tested the impact of ethical courses based on the "consensus opinion" technique, finding statistically significant differences regarding moral judgement but otherwise no effect. Evans and Palermo (2009) found some association between a tendency toward ethical conduct and an exposure to ethics courses in Australia. Conversely, Willging and Dunn (1981) tested the impact of a course on

professionalism and found no significant change in moral reasoning. Work by Landsman and McNeel (2003) also found no change in moral reasoning over students' time in law school, although their work did not specifically measure the impact of ethics courses (2003).

Similarly, although clinical courses and pro bono programs are sometimes portrayed as a partial antidote to diminished ethicality during law school, there is very little data on the impact of such programs. Sandefur and Selbin (2009) found no evidence linking clinical training to future pro bono service or civic participation, while also finding a relationship between such training and the choice of more "altruistic" career paths. Nicolson also found a link between pro bono experience and a greater interest in access to justice work through a small qualitative study of his own students (Nicolson, 2010 and 2015). Evans and Palermo (2009) found that experience in clinical courses was associated with a significant impact on ethical decision making in law students. Granfield (2006), examining the impact of mandatory pro bono during law school on the amount of pro bono done post law school, found no significant impact, although they found some evidence of pro bono increasing empathy in law students, e.g. through increased exposure to more "marginal" groups (see also Rhode, 2005).

As we can see from the studies considered so far, work on the ethical identity of law students has generally focused on a single jurisdiction and has concentrated on a single dimension of either ethical identity or moral reasoning. As a result, judgments of 'ethicality' are defined by only one or two indicators. Whilst there is little consensus about the fundamental components of moral disposition (Cohen et al 2014, Cohen and Morse 2014), Bebeau (2002) suggests a number of facets of ethicality could be considered, including ethical sensitivity, ethical implementation, moral motivation and identity formation. Our study analyzes sensitivity, motivation and identity formation through measures of moral outlook, values and identity. Ethical implementation (that is, the ability to act on ethical decisions) is hard to measure directly, but several of the indicators we use are also associated with the ethicality of actual behaviour.

As a result, our study goes significantly beyond existing work to provide a more complete picture of ethical identity. Our study also covers two jurisdictions: England and Wales (undergraduate and professional postgraduate students) and US postgraduates. We thus have a stronger basis for drawing conclusions about law student ethical identity. That said, although our study deploys a broad range of indicators, it does not definitively measure the ethicality of law students. The indicators utilized in our study afford an opportunity to explore ethicality across a wide range of dimensions, but they do not provide an exhaustive picture of this phenomenon. Nor do they examine the power of situational influences on ethicality (Alfano 2014).

Most of our indicators have been linked to how people behave. Three of our predictors are particularly important here: moral identity, moral attentiveness, and moral disengagement. Moral identity refers to the extent to which people define their self-conception by moral traits. People with a stronger moral identity are more likely to engage in ethical behaviours, such as volunteering (Aquino and Reed 2002). Moral attentiveness is the extent to which individuals regularly consider morality and moral

elements in their experiences. Greater moral attentiveness has been associated with greater moral awareness and behaviour (Reynolds, 2008). In contrast, moral disengagement refers to rationalizations that people make to justify immoral behaviour. Those with higher moral disengagement have a demonstrated tendency towards immoral behaviour (Detert *et al* 2008).

It will be apparent that much of what we measure as ethical identity is quite general in nature. That is, our ethical indicators measure the propensity to engage in moral behaviour at a general, rather than professionally specific, level. In particular, the predictors of unethical conduct that we utilize are often associated with increased inclinations to lie or cheat. Some might argue that such general indicators are not refined enough to inform judgments about professional ethics – although lying and cheating are characteristics incompatible with basic professional principles. Furthermore, there is evidence that general indicators are associated with ethically questionable professional decision-making by lawyers (Moorhead and Cahill-O’Callaghan, 2016).

Our study is also interested in professional identity. Conventional wisdom equates professions with virtue and law school with a process of professional identity formation. Sociologists have long suggested that codes of conduct and service to the public are essential characteristics of professions and that professions are a form of moral community (Parsons 1951, Durkheim 1957, Goode 1957). There is a voluminous literature on whether professions live up to their claims (see, for example, Moorhead, 2015). Our interest here is in psychological referents of professionalism and occupational identification: are law students identifying as professionals, as lawyers and what is the nature of that identification? This topic is relevant to a host of recent work, including studies linking occupational identities to ethicality of conduct (Cohen *et al* 2014).

Generally, the literature suggests that stronger professional identity should lead to behaviours supportive of a profession’s norms and assumes that a profession’s norms are pro-social. However, recent work on moral licensing suggests a potentially contrary idea: that association with ostensibly moral groups and institutions can help people to establish moral credentials that increase their likelihood of biased and immoral behaviours (Kouchaki 2011, Castilla and Benard 2010). For example, Kouchaki’s findings support the conclusion that thinking of oneself as a professional provides a ‘moral license’ to behave less ethically. Our study analyzes how students’ professional identifications are associated with ethical decisions. However, because the relationships between professional identification and ethicality are complex, we do not use professional identity as a proxy for ethical improvement or degradation.

A final theme of importance is gender. Gilligan famously, but controversially, suggested that women have different moral voices to men (Gilligan 1982). This potential difference associated with gender has been hypothesized to be nuanced and subject to social moderators (Minow, 1990, Romany, 1991). Outside of the law, much quantitative work studies the interaction of gender, ethical identity and ethical decision making (Beutel and Manini 1995, Glover, 2002, Roxas, 2004). Empirical work on this topic yields no clear conclusion. Some studies suggest that women are more disposed towards ethicality, while others find no difference between men and women (Moorhead, 2012). Our research builds on these studies by examining the

relationship between gender and other facets of personality associated with ethical decision making in law students.

II. METHODS

The issues explored in our study are:

1. Whether law students towards the end of their legal education have values and profiles different from those at the beginning of their legal education and, if so, whether the values and profiles of those towards the end of their legal education are more predictive of less ethical conduct than those at the beginning of their education.
2. Whether law students who intend to practice law have values and profiles predictive of less ethical conduct than those who do not intend to practice law.
3. Whether law students intending to pursue careers in business law have values and profiles consistent with less ethical conduct than students intending to work for government or individuals.
4. Whether factors other than progression through legal education (such as gender, exposure to pro bono work or clinical courses, and taking ethics courses) are associated with differences in ethical outlook.

Students in our study were invited to participate online via an email or an invitation on an online teaching message board sent to them by their course coordinators. We sought a range of law schools in terms of geographical location and league ranking. Five law schools were recruited in England and Wales, three Russell Group, one post-1992 university and one institution specializing in professional education. Five law schools were recruited in the US, including one Ivy League school and two state universities. Students based in the US were offered a \$10 Amazon voucher for completing the survey while students based in England and Wales were offered a £10 Amazon voucher.

1,010 students were included in the analysis, 441 based in England and Wales and 569 in the US. We estimate the response rate was 18 per cent for England and Wales and 19 per cent for the US, an average response rate for a survey of this length (Sheehan, 2001). Although we have a large sample of responses, levels of response are not sufficient to claim representativeness of all students. Because our main interest is in comparisons within the sample (e.g., whether law students intent on practicing law have different profiles than those who do not intend to practice law), this sample size is sufficient for statistical analysis.

The survey questions covered five different areas:

1. *Demographics*: This section covered a range of questions about respondents including age, gender, career intentions (including whether they were considering entering practice, what kind of lawyer they would like to be and the area of practice aspired to), pro-bono and legal work experience.

2. *Values*: This is our first indicator of ethical identity. Values are human goals that are trans-situational—applicable across all social contexts - “as standards or criteria to guide not only action but also judgement, choice, attitude, evaluation, argument, exhortation, rationalisation and... attribution of causality.” (Rokeach, 1973). Values were analysed using the Schwartz 40-Item Portrait Questionnaire (PVQ). The PVQ instrument assesses how important each of ten overarching values is to the respondents: power; achievement; hedonism; stimulation; self-direction; universalism; benevolence; tradition; conformity; and, security. Respondents read 40 statements and were asked how much the person described in the statement sounds like them on a scale of 1 (very much like me) to 6 (not at like me). E.g. “*He thinks it is important to be rich. He wants to have a lot of money and expensive things*” or “*It is very important to him to help the people around him. He wants to care for their well-being.*” Analysing these responses provided a relative ranking of values, with high value scores indicating important values and negative scores indicating less important values to the respondent.

3. Moral outlook was assessed using four different instruments.¹
 - a. *Moral identity*: Aquino and Reed’s 10 Item Moral identity Scale was used to assess motivation towards moral conduct (Aquino and Reed 2002). Respondents considered a set of moral traits (being caring, compassionate and fair) and then to rate how they felt in relation to a number of statements: e.g. “*It would make me feel good to be a person who has these characteristics.*” Higher scores are predictive of better moral cognition (i.e., recognising moral problems) and behaviour (i.e., acting ethically on those problems).¹

 - b. *Moral attentiveness*: Reynolds 5-Item Moral Attentiveness Scale was used to assess the extent to which an individual recognizes moral aspects in everyday experiences, and regularly thinks about moral matters (Reynolds 2008). Respondents rated a range of statements to explore how often ethical issues come into play in their daily lives. E.g. “*I often reflect on the moral aspects of my decisions*”. Higher scores are consistent with greater moral attentiveness and moral behaviour.

 - c. *Moral Disengagement*: Moral disengagement is the extent to which people are inclined to morally disengage—that is, to behave unethically without feeling distress. Moral disengagement was assessed using Moore *et al*’s 8-Item Moral Disengagement Scale (Moore et al 2012). Respondents rated agreement with a number of statements designed to assess their propensity towards engaging in what might be broadly perceived as ‘immoral’ or ‘unethical’ behaviour. E.g. “*It is okay to spread rumours to defend those you care about*”. Higher scores are indicative of a greater propensity towards unethical behaviour.

¹ Ibid.

- d. *Entitlement*: A sense of entitlement is “a stable and pervasive sense that one deserves more and is entitled to more than others” (Campbell et al 2004). Our study assessed entitlement using Campbell’s Psychological Entitlement Scale, adapted in a manner similar to that of Zitek et al (2010). Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with statements of entitlement, “*I honestly feel I’m just more deserving than others*” and “*people like me deserve an extra break now and then.*” Higher scores are consistent with a stronger level of entitlement. In broad terms, a high level of entitlement is associated with more egocentric, selfish behaviour.²
4. Professionalism:² To better understand the influence of different facets of professional and occupational identity, our study examined three constructs.
- a) *Legal professional identification* reflects a perception of oneness with the group of “lawyer” or “attorney”, a perception that allows individual group members to perceive themselves as psychologically intertwined with the fate of the group. This construct was assessed using the Mael and Ashforth’s Professional Identification Scale, as adapted by Hekman *et al* (Mael and Ashforth 1992, Hekman et al 2009). Respondents rated a series of statements, including “*In general, when someone praises lawyers, it feels like a personal compliment,*” and, “*In general, when someone criticizes lawyers, it feels like a personal insult.*” Higher scores reflect stronger levels of identification with the legal profession.
- b) A distinct but related concept is *occupational commitment*. This construct captures the reasons *why* a person is committed to an occupational group and has three elements:
- affective commitment, an emotional commitment to the occupation;
 - continuance commitment, a belief that leaving the profession will be costly; and,
 - normative commitment, feeling an obligation to remain in the occupational group.

Occupational commitment has been linked to behaviour congruent with that identity and initialization of, and adherence to group values (Ashford 1989). Lower normative and continuance commitment have been linked to intention to leave one’s profession, while affective commitment has been linked to performance and behaviours that advance one’s profession as a reflection of the individual’s enthusiasm for the occupation (Meyer 1993).

² Ibid.

We measured occupational commitment using an adapted version of Meyer et al's occupational commitment scale (Meyer et al, 1993). Respondents were required to rate the statements including "*I am proud to be associated with the legal profession*" and "*I am enthusiastic about law*". Higher scores are consistent with stronger occupational commitment.

- c) We also measure *professional role identity*: the overall importance that a person places on being a 'professional' as part of his or her self-definition—in other words, whether someone's being a professional represents a central part of who he or she is. This measured general identification as a 'professional,' rather than identification with the legal profession specifically. Callero's professional role identity scale was used to assess respondents' sense of self or identity as a professional (Callero 1985). Respondents were asked to express their agreement or disagreement with statements like "*To be a professional person is an important part of my identity*". Higher scores are consistent with a stronger professional role identity.

We tested the reliability of our indicators. All scales demonstrated good reliability.

The survey instrument finished with a series of ethical decision making scenarios presented in vignettes which were designed to elicit a response which examines ethical decision making. This approach is commonly used to explore ethical decision making (Evans and Palermo 2002, Galoob and Li 2013). Our results analyze participant responses to a vignette that is most germane to predicting clear unethicity, which is the topic of interest to this study.

THE ANALYTICAL STRATEGY

Our analysis treats our ethical identity indicators (values, moral outlook and professional commitment/identification) as dependent variables. We consider the relationship between these dependent variables and our independent variables (gender, stage of education, intention to practice, various elements of career choice, whether a student has engaged in a pro bono program and whether they have had ethical training). For example, our analysis addresses questions such as whether students later in their legal education have different values than students earlier in their education (controlling for independent variables like gender).

Our analysis utilises several multivariate response models that isolate statistically significant effects associated with each independent variable. For example, if a person's values are related to gender and career intentions, then the multivariate analysis estimates the associations of gender and career intentions independently of each other. As a result, our results provide an estimate of how much gender is associated with values independently of career intentions (and the other independent variables). Similarly, we can estimate how much career intentions are associated with values independently of gender and the other independent variables. Although our analysis examines variation in the dependent variables associated with the

independent variables, we do not attribute causal influence to the independent variables.

The results are reported in the appendix. Each model has two versions: one with an England and Wales reference category (version 1) and another with a US reference category (version 2). Having two reference categories enables us to look at differences in England and Wales and US perspectives respectively.

- Model A examines variance in values (Table 6 and Table 7)
- Model B examines variance in moral outlook and professional outlook (Table 8 and Table 9)
- Model C examines variance values for those intending to practice law (Table 10 and Table 11).
- Model D examines variance in moral outlook and professional outlook (Table 12 and Table 13).

From these models we can see whether a respondent's gender, stage of education, intention to practice, career choice, engagement in a pro bono program, and ethical training have any independent relationship with his or her values, moral outlook or professional identity; whether the results differ for those who do or do not intend to practice law; and how the differences compare in the US and England and Wales.

Models E and F present analysis of whether values, professional and moral outlook are correlated with responses to an ethical dilemma concerning deliberate overbilling (which, among our vignettes, provided the clearest indication of propensity to behave unethically). Here, ordinal regression models are used (Table 12 to Table 15). In both models, we examine the independent relationships between propensity to overbill and pro bono experience, gender, ethics training, year level, intention to practice law, values, the moral and professional outlook measures and (in Model F) the type of law they wish to practice. Model E includes all respondents. Model F looks only at those who wished to practice law (where we can look at the type of practice they intend to follow).

The final two models, G and H are similar to Models A to D, but allow us to explore the impact of country without reference to year level. This provides a simpler, more general test of the differences associated with jurisdiction. Thus, Model G replicates Model A but replaces the year level variable with a country variable (E&W/US), and in the same manner, Model H replicates Model C. The results can be seen in Table 16 and Table 17.

II. RESULTS

DO LAW STUDENTS' VALUES, MORAL OUTLOOK AND PROFESSIONALISM DIFFER AT DIFFERENT STAGES OF EDUCATION?

In the light of the diminished ethicality thesis, we examine the extent to which law students differed in their values, professional and moral outlook at different stages of

legal education. The results for values are shown in Figure 1. A person's values can be simplified to four dimensions (Schwartz, 2012):³

- a. Self-transcendence – valuing the welfare and interests of others (valuing something intrinsically).
- b. Self-enhancement – valuing one's own interests and relative success and dominance over others (valuing something extrinsically).
- c. Conservation – valuing order, self-restriction, preservation of the past, and resistance to change.
- d. Openness to change – readiness for change and valuing independence of thought, action and feeling

A higher rating of *openness to change* is associated with a greater appetite for change and risk. Greater *self-enhancement* centers on the individual's preference for economic position or social status. Both openness to change and self-enhancement are extrinsic values. That is, they signal valuing things for what they give to the individual rather than as things that are good in and of themselves. Stronger extrinsic values are associated with unethical behaviour (Mumford 2003). *Self-transcendence* encompasses universal values and benevolence to others. Such values look beyond the self and are seen as intrinsically worthwhile. They are most associated with pro-social behaviour (Karp 1996). *Conservation* values (safety and security) are a set of values associated with caution and associated with less risk taking and less unethical conduct (Whitfield, 2009).




Figure 1. Mean PVQ Scores on the basis of stage of degree

³ Schwartz, S. H. (2012). "An Overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture," 2(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1116> accessed 05/07/16. A ten-dimension analysis is also possible.

The value profiles of students suggest that law students educated in both England and Wales and the US value self-transcendence and openness to change above self-enhancement and conservation. There are not many obvious trends: US and E&W students look broadly similar.

To look more closely at potential differences, we used multivariate response models. These examined the relationship between values and stage of education (Model A in the appendix) and the relationship between moral and professional outlooks and stage of education (Model B in the appendix). Each of these models controlled for a range of other factors that might influence ethical identity (like gender and pro bono experience), enabling us to isolate the association between course stage and ethical identity.

The results from our models are summarized in Table 1. We compare the profiles of first year undergraduates studying in the E&W with third/fourth year E&W students and LPC/BPTC students. In the US, the profiles of first year US law students are compared with second and third year students.³ The – sign indicates a lower score on an indicator than exhibited by first year students, and the + sign indicates a higher on an indicator.

Table 1: *Models Summary* – Law students’ professional, ethical and moral indicators by year

		E&W STUDENTS		US STUDENTS	
Reference Group		First Year Students		First Year Students	
		Third/Fourth Year	LPC/BPTC	Second Year	Third Year
VALUES	Openness	-	-	-	-
	Self-Enhancement	-	-	-	+
	Self-Transcendence	+	+**	-	-
	Conservation	+	-	+	-
MORALS	Moral identity	+	-	-	-***
	Moral Attentiveness	+	+	-	-***
	Moral Disengagement	-	-***	+	+
	Entitlement	-	-*	-	+
PRO ID	Professional Role Identity	-	-	-	-**
	Legal Professional Identification	+	+	-	-*
	Occupational Commitment				
	Continuance	+	+	+	+
Affective	+	+	+***	+***	

* indicate a statistically significant effect at *0.05, **0.01 and ***<0.001

Looking first at E&W students, the values of undergraduates did not differ significantly from year one to year three when the analysis controlled for the influence of the other independent variables. However, there was a significant difference between the postgraduate students who had commenced vocational training (LPC/BPTC). They were more likely to value self-transcendence⁴ highly than both first years⁵ and 3rd/4th years.⁶

In the US, there were no statistically significant differences in the values of US students when compared across the three years of law school.

Regarding moral outlook, LPC/BPTC students were significantly more morally attentive, less morally disengaged, and had less of a sense of entitlement at statistically significant levels when compared to first year students.⁷ There was no consistent or significant pattern in relation to the professional identity indicators.

In contrast to E&W students, for the US students moral identity and moral attentiveness were lower in the third year when compared with first year students.⁸

In the US, levels of professional role identity (thinking of oneself in general terms as a professional)⁹ and legal professional identification¹⁰ were both significantly lower for students in the third year of education than for students in the first year. However, affective commitment to the profession significantly *increased* in later years of US legal education (with both second- and third-year students exhibiting higher levels of

affective commitment to the legal profession).¹¹ This was in contrast to England and Wales, where our results indicated no significant pattern, our results are consistent with the conclusion that, among US students, *identification* as a professional or a lawyer is gradually replaced by an *affective commitment* to being a lawyer.

If law students are socialized into being professional lawyers during law school, then we would expect to see both stronger legal professional identification and greater occupational commitment over the course of students' legal education. The evidence from the surveys suggests a more nuanced phenomenon with professional and legal professional commitment waning in the US yet occupational commitment increasing. Legal professional identification reflects a perception of being psychologically intertwined with the fate of the group, which has been linked to initialization of, and adherence to, group values. Affective commitment captures a positive emotional attachment to the profession by creating a felt obligation to care about the profession, advance the profession and meet the profession's objectives. Given the tensions between the profession's claim of virtue (value of service to public and code of conduct) and a perceived risk of diminished ethicality (acceptance of otherwise questionable behaviour) consonant with role morality might explain stronger affective commitment but lower identification. More simply, it might reflect a growing realization amongst US law students that being a lawyer is more of a "job" and less of a profession.

The claim that law school diminishes the ethicality of law students would predict higher moral disengagement and lower moral attentiveness and moral identity later in a students' legal education. Although there is little evidence to support this aspect of diminishing ethicality in E&W, lower moral identity and attentiveness (coupled with lower professional identification but higher affective commitment) amongst US third years is consistent with the diminished ethicality thesis. If this profile is reflected in decision making, then we would expect a positive relationship between *affective* commitment and unethicality. We would also expect a negative relationship between legal professional identification and unethicality (because legal professional identification requires an initialization of, and adherence to, the profession's values in some meaningful way). We analyse this question below in discussing the responses to our ethical vignette.

CAREER INTENTIONS

In our sample, 58 % (n=73) of those in their first year of an LLB E&W wanted to practice law, 57% (n = 78) of those in their third/fourth year of an E&W LLB intended to practice, which increased to 95% (n = 170) in the group of those undertaking their vocational education LPC/BPTC. Of the US students, there was a decrease associated with year of education: 89% (n=178) in their first year intended to practice, followed by 83% (n=139) in their second year and 82% (n=167) in their third year. Table 2 compares the values, professional identification and moral outlook indicators of those who intend to be lawyers with those who do not intend to be lawyers. The data combines both students in E &W and the US. The first column of results focuses on the differences between those intending to practice and those not intending to practice.

Interestingly we see a number of significant effects in values and professional identification but only one significant difference in moral outlook between the two groups. Those intending to practice law:

- Valued openness to change and self-transcendence significantly less, and conservation significantly more than law students who did not intend to practice law.¹²
- They had stronger moral identity, occupational commitment (continuance), professional role identity and legal professional identity scores, but lower affective commitment scores. The latter may signal a shift from an emotional to more realistic connection with the profession.¹³
- Intending practitioners did not have significantly different moral disengagement, moral attentiveness or entitlement scores.

These results suggest that intention to practice law is associated with a weakening inclination to ethicality on some measures (for example, lower valuing of self-transcendence), and a stronger inclination on others (such as stronger moral identity and valuing conservation more). Respondents intending to practice law also displayed predictably stronger levels of identification with and continuance commitment to the legal profession, but lower affective commitment. Such a set of identity indicators is suggestive of a process of professional identity formation impacting on the students' ethical identity and an identity that may be more consistent with the role-based morality of a legal professional.

The second and third columns of Table 2 examine differences within the group of students who intend to be practitioners by more specific career intention (Models C and D in the appendices). These results compare respondents who intended to work in government or for private clients with those who intended to pursue a career working with or for businesses and companies (either in private practice or in-house), as well as with those who intended to practice in other areas or who were unsure of the area in which they wanted to practice.

Table 2: Models Summary – Law students’ professional, ethical and moral indicators: do they intend to be a lawyer? If so, what type of lawyers?

			TYPE OF LAW	
		Intends to be Lawyer	Company/Business	Other/Unsure
Reference Category		Does Not	Government/Individual	
VALUES	Openness	-*	+	+
	Self-Enhancement	+	+***	+
	Self-Transcendence	-**	-***	+
	Conservation	+*	-	-*
MORAL OUTLOOK	Moral identity	+**	-	+
	Moral Attentiveness	+	-***	+
	Moral Disengagement	-	+	+
	Entitlement	+	+	+
PROFESSIONAL IDENTIFICATION	Professional Role Identity	+***	+	-
	Legal Professional Identification	+***	-	-
	Occupational Commitment			
	Continuance	+***	+	+
	Affective	-***	+	+

* indicate a statistically significant effect at *0.05, **0.01 and ***<0.001

Respondents inclined towards business-focused practice valued self-enhancement more highly and self-transcendence less than those intending to work for government or individuals.¹⁴ Those who were unsure, or who had other intentions for their career, valued conservation less than those heading for a career in government or working for private clients.¹⁵ Intending business lawyers had (or had developed) a values profile consistent with weaker ethical propensity. Similarly, those intending to work with/for business/companies had a lower level of moral attentiveness than those intending to work for Government or individuals.¹⁶

Our findings thus suggest that those pursuing a career working for businesses or companies had ethical identities more associated with a greater susceptibility to unethical behaviour than those pursuing careers working for government or private clients.

PRO BONO, ETHICS TRAINING AND GENDER EFFECTS

We turn now to additional phenomena that might be associated with differences in values, ethical outlook and professional identity. We investigated three issues here: gender, pro bono experience, and whether students had received ethics training.

Table 3: Models summary – effects on values, moral outlook and professionalism associated with pro bono, ethics training and gender

		PRO BONO	GENDER	ETHICS TRAINING
		Yes	Female	Some
Reference Category		<i>No</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>None</i>
VALUES	Openness	+*	-	+
	Self-Enhancement	-	-**	-
	Self-Transcendence	+***	+***	-
	Conservation	-**	+	+
MORAL OUTLOOK	Moral identity	+**	+***	+**
	Moral Attentiveness	+	+	+*
	Moral Disengagement	-	-***	-
	Entitlement	-	-*	-*
PROFESSIONAL IDENTIFICATION	Legal Professional Identification	-	+***	+
	Professional Role Identity	+	+*	+
	Occupational Commitment			
	Continuance	-	+*	+
	Affective	-	-***	-

* indicate a statistically significant effect at *0.05, **0.01 and ***<0.001.

Table 3 summarizes the extent to which female students, those who had done pro bono work, or those that had experienced some ethics training had higher (indicated by a +) or lower (indicated by a -) scores on the values, moral and professional outlook indicators.

60% of our respondents were female. Our results indicate that, in comparison with male respondents, female respondents:

- Valued self-enhancement less and self-transcendence more highly.¹⁷
- Had a stronger sense of moral identity, exhibiting a greater likelihood of wanting to be seen as a moral individual.¹⁸
- Had a lower level of moral disengagement and a lower sense of entitlement.¹⁹

These differences in female respondents are all consistent with a greater disposition to behave ethically. In terms of professional identity, the female respondents:

- Had higher levels of legal professional identity and professional role identity.²⁰
- Had greater levels of continuance commitment to the legal profession, while also exhibiting lower levels of affective identity.²¹

44% of respondents had experience of pro bono work. Those who had undertaken pro-bono work valued conservation less and self-transcendence and openness more than those who had not done pro bono.²² Their stronger preference for an intrinsic value (self-transcendence) predicts greater ethicality but the weaker emphasis on conservation and greater openness to change can be associated with more risky behaviour. Respondents who had done pro bono were more also likely to indicate a stronger moral identity.²³ Our results do not resolve the causal question of whether respondents who chose to do pro bono programmes already had stronger moral identities, or (alternatively) whether their identities were strengthened by their experiences in the programmes.

47% of respondents had experience of ethics training. This rate was much lower for undergraduate respondents since ethics is rarely taught at an undergraduate level in England and Wales. Our results indicate statistically significant relationships between ethics training and values or professional identification, with respondents who had done ethics courses indicating stronger moral identity, greater moral attentiveness and a lower level of entitlement.²⁴

The pro bono and the ethics training data suggest that there may be positive ethical impacts from both kinds of intervention, since we find an association between ethical identity and both elements of legal education independent of our other measures. However, it is possible that respondents who select ethics courses (where they are not mandatory) or choose to do clinical or pro bono programmes may have different ethical identities than those who do not (See, especially, Schmedemann, 2008).

A TEST OF ETHICALITY?

All of the indicators analyzed so far are indirect, in that they are precursors to ethical conduct and ethical behaviour. However, our results also indicate a more direct, albeit self-reported, assessment of propensity to behave unethically in a legal context.²⁵ Respondents were asked to respond to the following vignette, which was designed to test the ethicality of their decision-making:

Imagine that you are a lawyer consulting on a project. You are completing a time sheet that will determine whether or not you will earn a £3000/\$5000 bonus. You are five hours short of the 500 billable hours necessary. However you could bill 5 hours spent on a training course in order to meet the goal without anyone finding out, although this is against company policy.

Respondents were then asked: “How likely is it that you will bill the 5 hours in order to reach your target?” and asked to answer on the basis of 7-point scale: (1) very

unlikely, (2) unlikely, (3) somewhat unlikely, (4), undecided, (5) somewhat likely, (6) likely, (7) very likely.

There is not much doubt about the ethical approach here. Billing the client for work spent on training rather than time spent on their case is a clear personal and professional conflict, as well as being fraudulent. The results from our respondents were as follows:




Figure 2. How likely would our respondents be to misrepresent their hours?

Figure 2 indicates that the majority of respondents in the E&W and the US reported that they would be either very unlikely or unlikely to claim the hours in order to receive the bonus. Conversely, almost 1 in 4 respondents in E &W (24%) were likely to claim the hours, with 12% likely or very likely to claim the hours. For US respondents only 1 in 5 reported being likely with 8% of respondents likely or very likely to claim the extra hours.²⁶

Whilst self-reporting of likely behaviour is commonly used as one means of understanding ethicality, it has limitations. When we have presented these results to students and colleagues they suggest quite strongly that the results under-estimate the likelihood of unethical conduct. This intuitive response fits with the view that these findings would be subject to a bias which may inhibit admissions of likely unethical conduct, even though the survey is anonymous. We do not see this data as representing a concrete estimate of likely unethical conduct, but we do see an indication that they would be likely to misrepresent hours as indicating a stronger propensity to engage in unethical conduct. As such, our results provide an (admittedly imperfect) opportunity to examine propensity to unethical conduct in a more direct way.

Two ordinal regression models were fitted to explore whether the response to this test was related to the values, ethics and professionalism indicators of our cohort. The first looked at all students, the second focused on only those who intended to pursue a career in law.²⁷ The results are summarized in Table 4. The + indicates a positive association with more ethical conduct and the – indicates a negative association. Blanks indicate an absence of any difference. The statistically significant associations are the most important and are marked with asterisks.

There are relatively few significant associations within the models (Table 4). In terms of our interest in progression through legal education, LPC/BPTC respondents were less likely to agree they would falsify their timesheet than first years and third/fourth year E&W respondents.²⁸ Similarly, respondents in the latter years of their US degree were somewhat more likely to act ethically, although the findings were not significant. There is also confirmation that higher moral disengagement scores were associated with less ethical behaviour.²⁹

Finally, among those who intended to practice law, higher levels of affective commitment were associated with less ethical behaviour.³⁰ These results are consistent with the conclusion that affective commitment creates a felt obligation to the profession's objectives, rather than a deeper commitment to its values.

Table 4. Outcome of the ethics question on the basis of education, values, morals and professionalism, comparing all students (Model E) and those intending to practice (Model F).

		Model	E	F
Pro Bono		Yes compared to No	-	-
Gender		Female compared to Male	-	-
Ethics Training		Some compared to None	-	-
Year Level	E&W	3rd/4th Year compared to 1 st year E&W	-	+
		LPC/BPTC compared to 1 st year E&W	+*	+**
Year Level	US	2nd Year compared to 1 st year US	-	-
		3rd/4th Year compared to 1 st year US	-	-
Lawyer		Yes compared to No	+	
Type of Law		Business/Company compared to Government/Individuals		-
		Other/Unsure compared to Government/Individuals		-
		Openness	+	+
Values		Self-Enhancement	-	-
		Self-Transcendence	-	-
		Conservatism	+	+
Moral Outlook		Moral identity	+	+
		Moral Attentiveness	+	+
		Moral Disengagement	-***	-***
		Entitlement	-	-
Professional Identification		Legal Professional Identification	-	-
		Professional Role Identity	-	-
		Occupational Commitment		
		Continuance	-	+
	Affective	-	-*	

A COMPARISON OF US AND E&W STUDENTS

Finally, we compare the US and E&W students. There are a number of reasons why we might expect differences across these jurisdictions. One is the potential for cultural differences between students in the US and England and Wales, differences that may affect values and other elements of ethical identity. A second is the potential for differences in the structure and approach of US and E&W education. US respondents were, on average, older than the E&W respondents. Furthermore, the JD education leads immediately into practice, whereas even the BPTC/LPC postgraduate courses predate a process of practical work based training that makes actual qualification more distant for the England and Wales students.

In the models above, we are able to compare individual year groups with each other (so US Year 1 can be compared with E&W Years 1, 2 and 3 in turn for example). We also modelled a simpler comparison replacing the year level with an E&W/US variable to show differences between the two countries without reference to year.³¹ The significant differences were as follows:

- First year undergraduate respondents in E&W valued self-transcendence less than US and other E&W respondents.³²
- First year US and second year US respondents demonstrated higher moral identity scores than E&W LPC/BPTC respondents,³³ and collectively US respondents also demonstrated a higher overall degree of moral identity than E&W respondents.³⁴
- There were no significant differences between the moral attentiveness scores of US respondents and E&W respondents.
- US respondents demonstrated lower levels of moral disengagement than E&W respondents.³⁵
- US respondents were associated with lower entitlement scores when compared to E&W respondents.³⁶
- US respondents were associated with higher continuance and affective commitment scores.³⁷
- Compared to first year E&W respondents, First Year US respondents demonstrated more ethical behaviour on the billing task but LPC/BPTC respondents were also significantly more likely to not overbill than third/fourth year E&W respondents and third/fourth year US respondents.³⁸

The most significant differences between these jurisdictions were apparent only at the level of individual year cohorts, rather than between US and E&W respondents as a whole. Where there were differences at the collective level, the US respondents had stronger ethical identities than the respondents in E&W.

IV. DISCUSSION

Which factors that we studied appeared to be the most strongly associated with the ethical identity of law students?

Our results suggest that gender was most consistently associated with differences in ethical outlook, professional identity and values differences. Female respondents had identities that, on a wide range of indicators, were suggestive of a greater propensity to be more ethical. They valued self-enhancement less and self-transcendence more highly than the male respondents. They had a stronger sense of ethical identity and lower levels of moral disengagement and entitlement. Female respondents demonstrated higher levels of legal professional identification. The female respondents also had greater levels of continuance commitment to the profession but lower levels of affective attachment with the legal profession. In our study, affective commitment was associated with greater ethical weakness. The identity of female respondents was significantly and consistently more ethical than the male respondents, although in the one clear – if imperfect - test of ethicality that they were given they did not differ significantly from the men.

What of the diminished ethicality thesis? Comparing respondents at different stages of their legal education, our results suggest that the moral identities of students differ over the course of legal education. However, our results do not provide clear grounds for causal inference. As a cross-sectional study, we can examine whether any associations between level of progression are consistent or inconsistent with the diminished ethicality thesis, but a longitudinal study might provide greater insight into possible causal influences.

Taking each element of ethical identity in turn, amongst England and Wales respondents our analysis does not support the diminished ethicality thesis. Indeed, values profiles indicated a disposition towards intrinsic values that was significantly stronger amongst students in the later stages of their legal education. In terms of moral outlook, E&W respondents in the later years of their studies were significantly less morally disengaged and had less of a sense of entitlement.

For US respondents, the picture is less comforting. We did not find significant differences in values across the year groups, but we did find differences in moral outlook: moral identity and moral attentiveness were significantly weaker amongst the US respondents in the third year when compared with those in the first year. There were also differences in professional commitment and identification consistent with the diminished ethicality thesis. Third-year US respondents had significantly lower professional role identity but second- and third-year respondents had higher levels of the more problematic affective commitment. Counter-intuitively, third-year respondents had lower levels of legal professional identification.

These results suggest professional identity may be evolving in contradictory, perhaps unsatisfactory, ways. The meaning of professional identification and its construction during legal education are topics that bear greater scrutiny. Why do US students appear more affectively committed to being lawyers, while identifying less as legal professionals, later in their courses of study? Is affective commitment really associated with a greater propensity to behave unethically?

After gender, the most pervasive differences in ethical identity were found in comparing students who did and did not intend to practice law once they left law school. Intention to practice law was associated with a set of values, moral outlook and professional commitment and identification that was mixed in nature. Elements of ethical identity associated with less ethicality can be seen in the significantly lower valuing of self-transcendence and higher professional role identification but there are also some positives: a stronger moral identity and valuing of conservation as well as displaying predictably stronger levels of identification with, and continuance (but not affective) commitment to, the legal profession. If we adopt Chambliss' (2012) language, the ethical identity of law students intending to practice law is consistent with both ethical fading and ethical development.

Comparing respondents who intended to practice business law and those intending to practice law for individuals or government, our results indicated more signs of ethical fading amongst the would-be business lawyers. These respondents valued self-enhancement significantly more and self-transcendence significantly less. They were also identified as significantly less morally attentive. Given that different career intentions are associated with different kinds of ethical identity; our results suggest that the pull of the legal profession may have more of an effect on ethical identity than any socializing effects from the push of legal education.

That would oversimplify the story though. We also examined the impact of two purportedly humanising elements of legal education. Clinical and pro bono programmes and ethics courses are both aimed at making students more ethical and more oriented towards the public interest, rather than self-interest. Students who have been engaged in such programmes appear to value self-transcendence significantly more, consistent with what proponents of these programmes would hope for. They also value openness to change more and conservation less, a value profile associated with being more willing to take risks, which in turn can be associated with greater propensity to be unethical. Equally, proponents of innovation would argue lawyers need to be more open to change and taking more risks if society is to be better served by the legal system (Hadfield 2013).

Students with experience of pro bono and clinical programmes were also significantly more morally attentive. The results for students having experience of ethics training suggest those who have experience of ethics courses had stronger moral identity, greater moral attentiveness and lower senses of entitlement. Their moral identities can be seen to be more ethical as a result. We should also note that the effects we found on pro bono and ethics education are weaker or absent for respondents from England and Wales. These results suggest that the influence of pro bono, clinical and ethics programs are significantly weaker in England and Wales, where they are also generally less well developed (Moorhead, 2015).

Being a cross-sectional study these results support the claims that clinical and pro bono and ethics courses are beneficial, but we do not rule out the possibility that the associations we found are caused by more ethically inclined students selecting these courses (or selecting them earlier in their degree programmes – as US respondents, BPTC and LPC respondents would all be expected to complete a professional ethics course). Moreover, because not all our respondents had completed ethics courses, we

are not able to ascertain whether respondents with particular moral identities choose these programmes rather than being changed by them.

CONCLUSIONS

Our survey of law students in the United States and England and Wales provides a number of insights that are relevant to contemporary debates about legal education and the legal profession. In both jurisdictions we find ethical identity strongly associated with gender and career intentions. Female respondents, in particular, exhibited moral identities associated with more ethical conduct. Intending lawyers have different ethical identities to those not intending to practice law. Those differences are mixed in terms of the predicted effect on ethicality. Scholarly anxiety about the influence of business on professional identity is supported by the weakening of moral identities seen in students intending to practice business law.

As such our results suggest that the strongest influences on ethical identity are external to or only peripherally related to legal education. The ethical identity of law students as a body is heavily influenced by the innate characteristics of the students, and particularly how many women, are attracted to law schools and their career intentions (which may be strongly influenced by law firms – although also perhaps by law schools - as well as individual student preferences).

Conversely, our results both support and challenge the claim that legal education diminishes student ethicality. Respondents in England and Wales showed a greater tendency to manifest ethical identities associated with ethical behaviour later in law school. Respondents from US law schools reflected a more complex picture, showing signs of both strengthening and weakening ethical identity throughout legal education.

Our evidence on the point has limitations. This is a cross-sectional, not a longitudinal study and – in spite of the wide variety of indicators we use - it is possible that ethical degradation occurs at law school but eludes our measurements. However, a significant body of work suggests the relevance and utility of the measures we use and, indeed, our indicators have picked up some significant differences that are plausible and consistent with existing theory (Moorhead 2012). This suggests that our measures are insightful indicators for the purposes of this debate. In sum, if law school leads to a profound change in the ethical identity of law students, we would expect to see signs of it in our data and we do not. Neither the US nor the E&W data is consistent with a strong diminution in ethicality taking place at law school. As such our data casts doubt on the literature which suggests law school is a site of profound and negative identity change.

Similarly, the ethical identities of respondents in England and Wales appeared to strengthen later in legal education, and it is possible that our results are driven by general ethical maturation, rather than considerations specific to law school. It is also possible that, but for law school, the ethical identities of students would have matured more strongly (or – in the case of our US students- with less contradiction) than in fact took place. Further work would be needed to establish whether ethical maturation was inhibited by law school. The impact of pro-bono and ethical programmes would be more clearly seen in longitudinal approaches too.

In the meantime, our data suggests that the diminished ethicality thesis is questionable, that law students do show signs of ethical growth alongside a more equivocal process of professional commitment and identification, and that some elements of legal education (such as ethics and clinical programmes) appear to be associated with stronger ethicality. The pull effect of career intentions and the conflicting evolution of professional identity we have found suggest law schools may need to look harder at how they prepare their students for legal practice and the jobs market and firms should consider how they signal their own ethical identities. Furthermore, whether ethical degradation occurs or not, between a fifth and a quarter of our students were prepared to admit hypothetically they were willing to falsify time records for personal (and business) gain.

-end-

Appendices

Table 5. Factor Loadings for Professional Identity Scales⁴ (bolded numbers demonstrates where loadings occur)

Questions	Factor Loadings				Communalities
	<i>Legal Professional Identification</i>	<i>Continuance Commitment</i>	<i>Gen. Professional Identification</i>	<i>Affective Commitment</i>	
Legal Professional Identification Scale Questions					
In general, when someone praises lawyers, it feels like a personal compliment.	0.58			-0.16	0.46
In general, when someone criticizes lawyers, it feels like a personal insult.	0.61				0.37
When I talk about lawyers, I usually say "we" rather than "they".	0.54				0.31
Law's successes are my successes.	0.74			-0.12	0.59
If a story in the media criticized lawyers, I would feel embarrassed.	0.76			0.13	0.51
Profession Identification Scale Questions					
I often think about being a professional			0.67		0.51
I do not have any clear concept of myself as a professional person.			0.42		0.20
To be a professional person is an important part of my identity.	0.16	0.10	0.78		0.69
Occupational Commitment					
I am proud to be associated with the legal profession.			.13	-.72	0.66
I am enthusiastic about law.			.11	-.73	0.62
Changing professions now would be difficult for me to do.		.86			0.71
Too much of my life would be disrupted if I were to change my direction.		.91			0.78
I feel a responsibility to the legal profession to continue in it.	.22	.34		-.29	0.39
Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel that it would be right to leave law now.	.12	.38		-.25	0.30
Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings	3.95	1.49	1.08	0.56	
% of Total Variance	28.18	10.67	7.73	4.02	
Total Variance				50.60%	

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring. Rotation Method: Oblim with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 7 iterations. Small numbers suppressed (<0.10)

Table 6: Model A.1 Values - Parameter Estimates
(Reference Group for Year Level: First Year E&W)

			Openness		Self-Enhancement		Self-Transcendence		Conservation	
			Est	S.E	Est	S.E	Est	S.E	Est	S.E
Constant			0.28***	0.07	0.02	0.06	0.16***	0.06	-0.35***	0.06
Pro Bono		No								
		Yes	0.10*	0.04	-0.06	0.04	0.12***	0.04	-0.10*	0.04
Ethics		No								
		Yes	0.04	0.05	-0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.04	0.05	0.04
Female		Male								
		Female	-0.03	0.04	-0.11**	0.04	0.11***	0.03	0.01	0.03
Want to be Lawyer		No								
		Yes	-0.15***	0.05	0.06	0.05	-0.09*	0.04	0.09*	0.04
Year Level	E&W	1 st Year								
		3 rd / 4 th Year	-0.03	0.08	-0.07	0.07	0.03	0.06	0.06	0.06
		LPC/BPTC	-0.08	0.08	-0.11	0.08	0.18**	0.07	-0.02	0.07
	US	1 st Year	-0.02	0.07	-0.10	0.07	0.17**	0.06	-0.04	0.06
		2 nd Year	-0.07	0.08	-0.12	0.07	0.13*	0.06	0.04	0.07
		3 rd Year	-0.03	0.08	-0.03	0.08	0.11	0.07	-0.05	0.07

**Table 7: Model A.2 Values - Parameter Estimates
(Reference Group for Year Level: First Year US)**

		Openness		Self-Enhancement		Self-Transcendence		Conservation	
		Est	S.E	Est	S.E	Est	S.E	Est	S.E
Constant		0.25***	0.07	-0.08	0.06	0.33***	0.06	-0.39***	0.06
Pro Bono	No								
	Yes	0.10*	0.04	-0.06	0.04	0.12***	0.04	-0.10*	0.04
Ethics	No								
	Yes	0.04	0.05	-0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.04	0.05	0.04
Female	Male								
	Female	-0.03	0.04	-0.11**	0.04	0.11***	0.03	0.01	0.03
Want to be	No								
Lawyer	Yes	-0.15***	0.05	0.06	0.05	-0.09*	0.04	0.09*	0.04
	1 st Year	0.02	0.07	0.10	0.07	-0.17**	0.06	0.04	0.06
	E&W 3 rd /								
	4 th Year	0.00	0.07	0.03	0.07	-0.14*	0.06	0.10	0.06
Year Level	LPC/BPTC	-0.05	0.07	-0.01	0.07	0.01	0.06	0.02	0.06
	1 st Year								
	US 2 nd Year	-0.05	0.06	-0.02	0.06	-0.03	0.06	0.07	0.06
	3 rd Year	-0.01	0.07	0.07	0.07	-0.06	0.06	-0.01	0.06

Table 8: Model B.1 Other Ethical Identity Indicators - Parameter Estimates
(Reference Group for Year Level: First Year E&W)

		Moral identity		Moral Attentiveness		Moral Disengagement		Entitlement		Legal Professional Identity		Professional Role Identity		Occupational Commitment			
		Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Continuance		Affective	
		Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.
Constant		4.69***	0.08	4.06***	0.13	2.74***	0.08	2.92***	0.12	0.63***	0.10	0.51***	0.09	-0.81***	0.10	0.66***	0.09
Pro Bono	No																
	Yes	0.17***	0.05	0.09	0.08	-0.03	0.05	-0.03	0.08	-0.01	0.06	0.02	0.06	-0.05	0.06	-0.05	0.06
Ethics	No																
	Yes	0.15	0.06	0.21	0.09	-0.06	0.06	-0.19	0.09	0.13	0.07	0.11	0.07	0.03	0.07	-0.13	0.06
	Male																
Female																	
	Female	0.40***	0.05	0.07	0.07	-0.40***	0.05	-0.15*	0.07	0.23***	0.06	0.13*	0.06	0.15**	0.06	0.31***	0.05
Want to be	No																
Lawyer	Yes	0.17*	0.06	0.10	0.10	-0.11	0.06	0.09	0.09	0.49***	0.07	0.56***	0.07	0.73***	0.07	0.81***	0.07
	First Year																
	Third/ Fourth Year	0.01	0.10	0.03	0.15	-0.07	0.10	-0.09	0.14	0.20	0.11	-0.13	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.20	0.10
	LPC/BPTC	-0.09	0.10	0.13	0.16	-0.43***	0.10	-0.35*	0.15	0.04	0.12	-0.03	0.12	0.09	0.12	0.15	0.11
	First Year	0.33***	0.09	0.14	0.14	-0.47***	0.09	-0.34**	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.05	0.10	0.13	0.10	0.12	0.09
	Second																
	Year	0.18	0.10	-0.03	0.15	-0.38***	0.10	-0.39***	0.14	0.06	0.11	-0.12	0.11	0.26*	0.11	0.41***	0.10
	Third Year	-0.10	0.10	-0.31	0.16	-0.39***	0.11	-0.30	0.15	-0.12	0.12	-0.23	0.12	0.23	0.12	0.57***	0.11

Table 9: Model B.2 Other Ethical Identity Indicators - Parameter Estimates (Reference Group for Year Level: First Year US)

		Moral identity		Moral Attentiveness		Moral Disengagement		Entitlement		Legal Professional Identity		Professional Role Identity		Occupational Continuance		Occupational Commitment Affective		
		Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	
Constant		5.02***	0.08	4.20***	0.13	2.27***	0.08	2.58***	0.12	0.50***	0.10	0.46***	0.09	0.68***	0.10	0.78***	0.09	
Pro Bono	No																	
	Yes	0.17***	0.05	0.09	0.08	-0.03	0.05	-0.03	0.08	-0.01	0.06	0.02	0.06	-0.05	0.06	-0.05	0.06	
Ethics	No																	
	Yes	0.15**	0.06	0.21*	0.09	-0.06	0.06	-0.19*	0.09	0.13	0.07	0.11	0.07	0.03	0.07	-0.13*	0.06	
Female	No																	
	Yes	0.40***	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.40***	0.05	-0.15*	0.07	0.23***	0.06	0.13*	0.06	0.15**	0.06	0.31***	0.05	
Want to be Lawyer	No																	
	Yes	0.17*	0.06	0.10	0.10	-0.11	0.06	0.09	0.09	0.49***	0.07	0.56***	0.07	0.73***	0.07	0.81***	0.07	
Year Level	E&W	First Year	-0.33***	0.09	-0.14	0.14	0.47***	0.09	0.34**	0.13	-0.13	0.10	-0.05	0.10	-0.13	0.10	-0.12	0.09
		Second Year	-0.33***	0.09	-0.11	0.13	0.40***	0.09	0.25	0.13	0.07	0.10	-0.17	0.10	-0.04	0.10	0.08	0.09
	US	LPC/BPTC	-0.42***	0.09	-0.01	0.13	0.04	0.09	0.00	0.13	-0.09	0.10	-0.08	0.10	-0.05	0.10	0.03	0.09
		First Year																
	Second Year	-0.15	0.08	-0.17	0.12	0.09	0.08	-0.05	0.12	-0.07	0.10	-0.17	0.09	0.13	0.10	0.29***	0.09	
	Third Year	-0.43***	0.09	0.45***	0.13	0.08	0.09	0.05	0.13	-0.25*	0.10	-0.28**	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.45***	0.09	

Table 10: Model C - Values (Students who intend to practice law only) Parameter Estimates

		Openness		Self-Enhancement		Self-Transcendence		Conservation		
		Est	S.E	Est	S.E	Est	S.E	Est	S.E	
Constant		0.07	0.08	-0.04	0.08	0.18**	0.07	-0.22***	0.07	
Pro Bono	No									
	Yes	0.09	0.05	-0.04	0.05	0.11**	0.04	-0.11**	0.04	
Ethics	No									
	Yes	0.06	0.05	-0.02	0.05	-0.05	0.04	0.02	0.05	
Female	Male									
	Female	-0.01	0.04	-0.09*	0.04	0.10**	0.04	-0.01	0.04	
Year Level	E&W	1 st Year								
		3 rd /								
		4 th Year	-0.02	0.10	-0.10	0.10	0.01	0.08	0.08	0.09
	US	LPC/BPTC	-0.07	0.09	-0.14	0.09	0.16*	0.08	0.01	0.08
		1 st Year	-0.03	0.08	-0.14	0.08	0.12	0.07	0.03	0.07
		2 nd Year	-0.07	0.09	-0.19*	0.09	0.16*	0.08	0.05	0.08
	3 rd Year	-0.07	0.10	-0.11	0.10	0.12	0.08	0.03	0.08	
Type of Law	Government/Individuals									
	Business/Company	0.06	0.05	0.21***	0.05	-0.17***	0.04	-0.06	0.04	
	Other/Unsure	0.05	0.06	0.10	0.06	0.03	0.05	-0.10*	0.05	

Table 11: Model D Other Ethical Indicators (Students who intend to practice law only) Parameter Estimates

		Moral identity		Moral Attentiveness		Moral Disengagement		Entitlement		Legal Professional Identity		Professional Role Identity		Occupational Commitment Continuance		Affective	
		Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.
Constant		4.93***	0.10	4.39***	0.16	2.55***	0.10	2.98***	0.15	-0.16	0.12	0.07	0.11	-0.28*	0.12	-0.13	0.10
Pro Bono	No																
	Yes	0.18**	0.06	0.04	0.09	0.02	0.06	-0.03	0.09	-0.01	0.07	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.07	-0.08	0.06
Ethics	No																
	Yes	0.10	0.07	0.16	0.10	-0.04	0.06	-0.18	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.08	-0.14*	0.06
Female	Male																
	Female	0.35***	0.05	0.00	0.08	-0.37***	0.05	-0.18*	0.08	0.22***	0.06	0.14	0.06	0.16*	0.06	0.30***	0.05
	First Year																
	Third/Fourth Year	0.02	0.12	0.08	0.19	-0.15	0.12	-0.08	0.18	0.27	0.14	-0.08	0.13	0.20	0.15	0.15	0.12
Year Level	E&W																
	LPC/BPTC	-0.12	0.12	0.13	0.18	-0.48***	0.11	-0.35*	0.17	0.10	0.13	-0.05	0.12	0.15	0.14	0.14	0.11
	First Year	0.26*	0.10	0.09	0.16	-0.51***	0.10	-0.37*	0.15	0.21	0.12	0.05	0.11	0.26*	0.12	0.06	0.10
	US																
	Second Year	0.14	0.11	-0.02	0.17	-0.39***	0.11	-0.43*	0.17	0.11	0.13	-0.19	0.12	0.32***	0.13	0.40***	0.11
	Third Year	-0.14	0.12	-0.25	0.19	-0.45***	0.12	-0.32	0.18	-0.02	0.14	-0.25	0.13	0.25	0.14	0.50***	0.12
	Government/Individuals																
	Business/																
	Company	-0.01	0.06	0.33***	0.10	0.09	0.06	0.06	0.09	-0.02	0.07	0.02	0.07	0.13	0.07	0.03	0.06
Type of Law	Other/Unsure	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.12	0.10	0.07	0.14	0.11	-0.10	0.09	-0.11	0.08	0.05	0.09	0.06	0.08

Table 12: Model E.1 Billing Scenario - Parameter Estimates (Reference Group for Year Level: First Year E&W)

		Est.	SE
Ethics Qn	Very Unlikely	-0.10	0.61
	Unlikely	1.39	0.61
	Somewhat Unlikely	2.03**	0.61
	Undecided	2.58***	0.61
	Somewhat Likely	3.76***	0.62
	Likely	5.01***	0.64
	Very Likely	0.00	-
Pro Bono	No	0.00	-
	Yes	-0.05	0.13
Gender	Male	0.00	-
	Female	-0.15	0.13
Ethics Training	None	0.00	-
	Some	-0.04	0.15
Year Level	E&W		
	1 st Year	0.00	-
	3rd/4th Year	-0.04	0.24
Year Level	US		
	LPC/BPTC	0.65*	0.26
	1 st Year	0.43	0.22
Lawyer	US		
	2nd Year	0.28	0.24
	3rd/4th Year	0.06	0.26
Values Measures	Lawyer		
	No	0.00	-
	Yes	0.32	0.17
Values Measures	Openness	0.08	0.31
	Self-Enhancement	-0.43	0.45
	Self-Transcendence	-0.09	0.46
Moral Measures	Conservatism	0.41	0.56
	Moral identity	0.14	0.09
	Moral Attentiveness	0.03	0.06
Moral Measures	Moral Disengagement	-0.74***	0.091
	Entitlement	-0.11	0.061
	Legal Professional Identification	-0.03	0.08
Professional Measures	Role Identity	-0.01	0.09
	Occupational Commitment		
	Continuance	-0.03	0.07
Professional Measures	Affective	-0.18	0.10

Table 13. Model E.2 Billing Scenario - Parameter Estimates (Reference Group for Year Level: First Year US)

		Est.	SE
Ethics Qn	Very Unlikely	-0.52	0.61
	Unlikely	0.96	0.61
	Somewhat Unlikely	1.6**	0.61
	Undecided	2.15***	0.61
	Somewhat Likely	3.33***	0.62
	Likely	4.58***	0.64
	Very Likely	0.00	-
Pro Bono	No	0.00	-
	Yes	-0.05	0.13
Gender	Male	0.00	-
	Female	-0.15	0.13
Ethics Training	None	0.00	-
	Some	-0.04	0.15
Year Level	1 st Year	-0.43	0.22
	E&W 3rd/4th Year	-0.47*	0.21
	LPC/BPTC	0.22	0.22
	1 st Year	0.00	-
US	2nd Year	-0.15	0.20
	3rd/4th Year	-0.37	0.22
	No	0.00	-
Lawyer	Yes	0.32	0.17
	Openness	0.08	0.31
Values Measures	Self-Enhancement	-0.43	0.45
	Self-Transcendence	-0.09	0.46
	Conservatism	0.41	0.56
Moral Measures	Moral identity	0.14	0.09
	Moral Attentiveness	0.03	0.06
	Moral Disengagement	-0.74***	0.09
	Entitlement	-0.11	0.06
Professional Measures	Legal Professional Identification	-0.03	0.08
	Role Identity	-0.01	0.09
	Occupational Commitment		
	Continuance	-0.03	0.07
	Affective	-0.18	0.1

Table 14. Model F.1 Billing Scenario (Students who intend to practice law only) Parameter Estimates (Reference Group for Year Level: First Year E&W)

		Est.	SE
Ethics Qn	Very Unlikely	-0.30	0.61
	Unlikely	1.21	0.61
	Somewhat Unlikely	1.83**	0.61
	Undecided	2.39***	0.62
	Somewhat Likely	3.56***	0.62
	Likely	4.80***	0.65
	Very Likely	0.00	-
Pro Bono	No	0.00	-
	Yes	-0.04	0.13
Gender	Male	0.00	-
	Female	-0.19	0.13
Ethics Training	None	0.00	-
	Some	-0.04	0.15
Year Level	E&W		
	1 st Year	0.00	-
	3rd/4th Year	0.04	0.25
	LPC/BPTC	0.73**	0.26
US	1 st Year	0.55*	0.22
	2nd Year	0.36	0.25
	3rd/4th Year	0.12	0.27
Type of Law	Government/Individuals	0.00	-
	Business/Company	-0.10	0.15
	Other/Unsure	-0.20	0.17
Values Measures	Openness	0.09	0.31
	Self-Enhancement	-0.42	0.46
	Self-Transcendence	-0.05	0.47
	Conservatism	0.40	0.57
	Moral identity	0.15	0.10
Moral Measures	Moral Attentiveness	0.03	0.06
	Moral Disengagement	-0.72***	0.09
	Entitlement	-0.12	0.06
Professional Measures	Legal Professional Identification	-0.01	0.08
	Role Identity	-0.02	0.09
	Occupational Commitment		
	Continuance	0.003	0.07
	Affective	-0.24*	0.10

Table 15. Model F.2 Billing Scenario (Students who intend to practice law only) Parameter Estimates (Reference Group for Year Level: First Year E&W)

		Est.	SE
Ethics Qn	Very Unlikely	0.25	0.60
	Unlikely	1.76**	0.60
	Somewhat Unlikely	2.38***	0.60
	Undecided	2.94***	0.61
	Somewhat Likely	4.11***	0.62
	Likely	5.35***	0.64
	Very Likely	0	-
Pro Bono	No	0	-
	Yes	-0.04	0.13
Gender	Male	0.00	-
	Female	-0.19	0.13
Ethics Training	None	0.00	-
	Some	-0.04	0.15
	1 st Year	-0.55*	0.22
Year Level	E&W 3rd/4th Year	-0.51*	0.22
	LPC/BPTC	0.18	0.22
Year Level	US 1 st Year	0.00	-
	2nd Year	-0.19	0.21
	3rd/4th Year	-0.43	0.23
Type of Law	Government/Individuals	0.00	-
	Business/Company	-0.09	0.15
	Other/Unsure	-0.20	0.17
Values Measures	Openness	0.09	0.31
	Self-Enhancement	-0.42	0.46
	Self-Transcendence	-0.05	0.47
	Conservatism	0.40	0.57
Moral Measures	Moral identity	0.15	0.10
	Moral Attentiveness	0.03	0.06
	Moral Disengagement	-0.72***	0.09
	Entitlement	-0.12	0.06
Professional Measures	Legal Professional Identification	-0.01	0.08
	Role Identity	-0.02	0.09
	Occupational Commitment		
	Continuance	0.003	0.07
	Affective	-0.24*	0.10

Table 16: Model G – US E&W comparison of values - Parameter Estimates

		Openness		Self-Enhancement		Self-Transcendence		Conservation	
		Est	S.E	Est	S.E	Est	S.E	Est	S.E
Constant		0.25***	0.05	-0.03	0.05	0.20***	0.04	-0.33***	0.04
Pro Bono	No								
	Yes	0.09*	0.04	-0.07	0.04	0.14	0.03	-0.10	0.03
Ethics	No								
	Yes	0.02	0.04	-0.04	0.04	-0.01	0.03	0.04	0.03
Gender	Male								
	Female	-0.03	0.04	-0.12	0.04	0.11	0.03	0.01	0.03
Want to be Lawyer	No								
	Yes	-0.16***	0.05	0.04	0.05	-0.05	0.04	0.08	0.04
Country	E&W								
	US	0.004	0.04	-0.01	0.04	0.05	0.03	-0.03	0.03

Table 17: Model H US E&W comparison of for outlook and identity - parameter Estimates

		Moral identity		Moral Attentiveness		Moral Disengagement		Entitlement		Legal Professional Identity		Professional Role Identity		Occupational Commitment			
														Continuance		Affective	
		Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.	Est	S.E.
Constant		4.7***	0.1	4.1***	0.1	2.6***	0.1	2.83***	0.1	-0.5***	0.1	-0.5***	0.1	-0.8***	0.1	0.7***	0.1
Pro Bono	No																
	Yes	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-0.1	0.1	-0.06	0.07	-0.03	0.1	-0.02	0.1	-0.02	0.06	0.03	0.05
Ethics	No																
	Yes	0.01	0.05	0.1	0.1	-0.1	0.1	-0.24***	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.1	0.1	0	0.05
Female	Male																
	Female	0.4	0	0.1	0.1	-0.4	0.1	-0.15*	0.07	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	-0.3	0.1
Want to be	No																
Lawyer	Yes	0.19***	0.06	0.17	0.09	-0.20**	0.06	0.03	0.09	0.49***	0.07	0.60***	0.07	0.72***	0.07	-0.85***	0.07
Country	E&W																
	US	0.19***	0.05	-0.12	0.08	-0.19***	0.05	-0.15*	0.07	-0.04	0.06	-0.04	0.06	0.13*	0.06	0.22***	0.05

¹ All of the instruments used a scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree).

² To test the utility of the scales in this context the 14 questions from above scales were subject to factor analysis using Principal Axis analysis with oblimin rotation. This analysis yielded 4 factors explaining a total of 50.6 per cent of the variance.² KMO and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity both indicate that the set of variables were adequately related for factor analysis with the KMO above Kaiser's recommendation of 0.5 (0.795) and correlations within the matrix were significantly different from zero, meaning that factor analysis was warranted (Barlett's Test $\chi^2(91) = 4981.53$, $P < 0.000$).

³ Note, the only difference between versions 1 and 2 of the tables is that in both Model A.1 and model B1 the reference category is set as 'First Year E&W' whilst in Models A.2 and B.2 the reference category is set as 'First Year US'. This allows us to explore differences among E&W and US respondents with greater ease.

⁴ $\beta = 0.18$, $\chi^2 = 6.64$, $p = 0.001$

⁵ $\beta = 0.18$, $\chi^2 = 6.64$, $p = 0.001$

⁶ $\chi^2(2df) = 5.57$ $p = 0.02$

⁷ Moral disengagement $\beta = -0.43$ $\chi^2 = 17.49$ $p < 0.001$. LPC/BPTC respondents also had lower levels of moral disengagement than third/fourth year respondents ($\chi^2(2df) = 13.44$ $p = 0.001$). Sense of entitlement $\beta = -0.35$ $\chi^2 = 5.30$ $p = 0.02$

⁸ Moral identity ($\beta = -0.43$ $\chi^2 = 24$ $p < 0.001$) and moral attentiveness ($\beta = -0.45$ $\chi^2 = 11.04$ $p < 0.001$).

⁹ $\beta = -0.25$ $\chi^2 = 5.80$ $p = 0.016$

¹⁰ $\beta = -0.28$ $\chi^2 = 7.95$ $p = 0.005$

¹¹ Second years ($\beta = 0.29$ $\chi^2 = 11.12$, $p < 0.001$) and third years ($\beta = 0.45$ $\chi^2 = 22.64$ $p < 0.001$)

¹² Openness to change ($\beta = -0.15$ $\chi^2 = 9.09$, $p = 0.003$), self-transcendence ($\beta = -0.08$ $\chi^2 = 4.17$, $p = 0.04$) and conservation ($\beta = 0.91$ $\chi^2 = 4.51$, $p = 0.03$).

¹³ Moral Identity ($\beta = -0.17$ $\chi^2 = 7.0$, $p = 0.008$), occupational commitment (continuance) ($\beta = 0.73$ $\chi^2 = 97.1$, $p < 0.001$), professional role identity ($\beta = 0.56$ $\chi^2 =$

62.26, $p < 0.001$), legal professional identity scores ($\beta = 0.49$, $\chi^2 = 43.56$, $p < 0.001$) and affective commitment scores ($\beta = -0.81$, $\chi^2 = 144.73$, $p < 0.001$).

¹⁴ Self enhancement ($\beta = 0.21$, $\chi^2 = 18.00$, $p < 0.001$) and self-transcendence ($\beta = -0.16$, $\chi^2 = 16.03$, $p < 0.001$)

¹⁵ $\beta = -0.10$, $\chi^2 = 4.04$, $p = 0.04$

¹⁶ $\beta = -0.33$, $\chi^2 = 11.51$, $p < 0.001$. At the same time, those intending to work for businesses/for companies were significantly more likely to score lower on moral attentiveness than those who indicated other/undecided, χ^2 (2df) 15.08, $p < 0.001$.

¹⁷ Self-enhancement ($\beta = -0.11$, $\chi^2 = 9.34$, $p = 0.002$) and self-transcendence ($\beta = 0.11$, $\chi^2 = 11.72$, $p < 0.000$).

¹⁸ $\beta = 0.40$, $\chi^2 = 67.45$, $p < 0.001$. Simulating from Model B.1 whilst controlling for other variables predicted score for males (5.0) brought them slightly closer to 'neither agreeing nor disagreeing' on the scale whilst the predicted mean for females (5.4) brought them in line with 'agreeing' with the statements asked.

¹⁹ Moral disengagement ($\beta = -0.40$, $\chi^2 = 63.66$, $p < 0.001$) and entitlement ($\beta = -0.15$, $\chi^2 = 5.04$, $p = 0.04$).

²⁰ Legal professional identity ($\beta = -0.23$, $\chi^2 = 16.01$, $p < 0.001$) and professional role identity ($\beta = -0.13$, $\chi^2 = 5.09$, $p = 0.02$).

²¹ Commitment to the legal profession ($\beta = 0.15$, $\chi^2 = 7.20$, $p = 0.01$) and affective identity ($\beta = -0.31$, $\chi^2 = 34.90$, $p < 0.001$).

²² Conservation ($\beta = -0.10$, $\chi^2 = 8.39$, $p = 0.004$) and self-transcendence ($\beta = 0.12$, $\chi^2 = 12.15$, $p < 0.001$) and openness ($\beta = 0.95$, $\chi^2 = 5.14$, $p = 0.020$)

²³ $\beta = -0.17$, $\chi^2 = 10.59$, $p = 0.001$.

²⁴ Moral identity ($\beta = 0.15$, $\chi^2 = 6.14$, $p = 0.01$) and moral attentiveness ($\beta = 0.21$, $\chi^2 = 5.42$, $p = 0.02$) and entitlement ($\beta = -0.20$, $\chi^2 = 4.69$, $p = 0.03$).

²⁵ Similar questions have been used by Evans and Palermo (2008) and Arthur *et al* (2014)

²⁶ This is broadly comparable to findings on a question aiming at similar issues in Arthur *et al*, 2014. They also found quite high levels of susceptibility to overbill among the solicitors in their sample.

²⁷ Model E looked at all respondents whilst Model F looked more specifically at those who intended to pursue a career in law on the basis of potential area of legal practice, split into the same three groups as detailed in previous Models B and D (Government/Individual client work, Company/Business work or Other/Undecided). Model E and Model F also changed the reference group so that results could be compared against first year US respondents and against first year E &W respondents.

²⁸ Model E: $\beta=0.65$, $\chi^2 = 6.32$, $p=0.01$; Model F: $\beta=0.73$, $\chi^2 = 8.04$, $p=0.005$) and third/fourth year E&W respondents (Model E: $\chi^2 =8.34$, $p=0.004$; Model F: $\chi^2 = 8.20$, $p=0.004$)

²⁹ Model E: $\beta=-0.74$, $\chi^2 = 65.70$, $p<0.001$; Model F: $\beta=-0.72$, $\chi^2 = 59.16$, $p<0.001$

³⁰ Model F1 & F2: $\beta=-0.24$, $\chi^2 = 5.98$, $p=0.01$

³¹ Models G and H. Full results for these models can be found in the Appendix.

³² LPC/BPTC ($\beta= 0.18$ $\chi^2 = 6.64$ $p=0.01$)) and first ($\beta= 0.17$ $\chi^2 = 7.91$ $p=0.005$) and second year ($\beta= 0.13$ $\chi^2 = 64.40$ $p=0.04$) US respondents valued self-transcendence more highly than first year E&W respondents.

³³ First year US Respondents: χ^2 (2df)= 23.9 $p<0.001$; Second year US Respondents: χ^2 (2df)= 10.21, $p=0.01$

³⁴ $\beta= 0.19$ $\chi^2 = 14.86$ $p<0.001$

³⁵ $\beta= -0.19$ $\chi^2 = 14.21$ $p<0.001$

³⁶ $\beta= -0.15$, $\chi^2 = 4.4$ $p=0.04$.

³⁷ Continuance commitment ($\beta= 0.13$, $\chi^2 = 5.05$ $p=0.03$) and affective commitment($\beta= 0.22$, $\chi^2 = 16.32$ $p<0.001$)

³⁸ $\beta=0.58$, $\chi^2 = 6.10$, $p=0.0$. Model E: χ^2 (2df)=8.34 , $p=0.004$; Model F: χ^2 (2df) = 8.20, $p=0.004$, Model E: χ^2 (2df)=8.73 , $p=0.003$; Model F: χ^2 (2df) = 9.24, $p=0.002$

REFERENCES

Alfano, A. (2014) *Character as Moral Fiction*, (Cambridge University Press).

Aquino K., & Reed II, A. (2002) "The Self Importance of Ethical identity", 83 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1423.

James Arthur and et al, "Virtuous Character for the Practice of Law Research Report" (Jubilee Centre, University of Birmingham, 2014).

Harry W. Arthurs, "Poor Canadian Legal Education: So Near to Wall Street, So Far From God," *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 38 (2000): 381.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989) "Social identity theory and the organization." 14 *Academy of Management Review*, 20.

Anat Bardi and Robin Goodwin, "The Dual Route to Value Change: Individual Processes and Cultural Moderators," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 42, no. 2 (2011): 271–87.

Bardi, A, Buchanan, K.E., Goodwin R., Slabu, L., Robinson, M., (2014) 'Value Stability and Change during Self-Chosen Life Transitions: Self-Selection versus Socialization Effects.', 106 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 131.

Bebeau, M.J., (2002) 'The Defining Issues Test and the Four Component Model: Contributions to Professional Education', 31 *Journal of Moral Education* , 271.

Bogoch, B. (1997) 'Gendered Lawyering: Difference and Dominance in Lawyer-Client Interaction', 31 *Law and Society Review*, 677.

Buetel A.M. & Marini, M. M. (1995) 'Gender and Values' 60 *American Sociological Review* 436.

Cahill, M., Erlanger, H.S., Epp, C.R., Haines, K.M. (1996) "Law Student Idealism and Job Choice: Some New Data on an Old Question," 30 *Law & Society Review* 851.

Callero, P. L. (1985) 'Role-Identity Saliency' 48 *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 201

Campbell, W.K., Bonacci, A.M., Shelton, J., Exline J. J., Bushman, B.J. (2004) 'Psychological Entitlement: Interpersonal Consequences and Validation of a Self-Report Measure.' 83 *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 29.

Castilla, E. J., & Benard, S.(2010) 'The Paradox of Meritocracy in Organizations.' 55 *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 543.

Chambliss, E (2012) 'Whose Ethics? The Benchmark Problem in Legal Ethics Research', in *Lawyers in Practice* (University Of Chicago Press, Chicago and London).

Cohen, T. R., Panter, A.T., Turan, N., Morse, L., Kim, Y. (2014). "Moral character in the workplace." (2014). Cohen, Taya R., and Lily Morse. "Moral character: What it is and what it does." 34 *Research in Organizational Behaviour* , 43.

Collier,R. (2005) "'Be Smart, Be Successful, Be Yourself ...'?: Representations of the Training Contract and Trainee Solicitor in Advertising by Large Law Firms', 12 *International Journal of the Legal Profession* , 51.

Daicoff, S. (1996) *Lawyer, Know Thyself: A Review of Empirical Research on Attorney Attributes Bearing on Professionalism*, 46 AM. U. L.R. 1337.

Detert, J. R., Klebe Treviño, L., Sweitzer, V.L. (2008) 'Moral disengagement in ethical decision making: a study of antecedents and outcomes.' 93 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 374.

Durkheim, E. (1957) *Professional ethics and civic morals.*(Routledge, London).

Edwards, H.T. (1992) "The Growing Disjunction between Legal Education and the Legal Profession," 91 *Michigan Law Review*, 34.

Erlanger, H.S. & Klegon, D. A., (1978) 'Socialization Effects of Professional School: The Law School Experience and Student Orientations to Public Interest Concerns', 13 *Law & Society Review*, 11.

Evans, A. & Palermo, J (2002) 'Australian Law s Perceptions of Their Values: Interim Results in the First Year of a Three-Year Empirical Assessment', 5 *Legal Ethics*, 103.

Evans A. & Palermo, J. (2008) 'Empirical Insights into Clinical Method and Ethics Courses in Climbing the Hill Towards Lawyers' Professionalism.' 17 *Griffith Law Review*, 252.

Evans A. & Palermo, J., (2009) 'Empirical Insights into Clinical Method and Ethics Courses in Climbing the Hill Towards Lawyers' Professionalism', SSRN Scholarly Paper (Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, 4 November 2009), <http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1500111>.

Farmer, S.M, Tierney, P., Kung-McIntyre, K. (2003) Employee Creativity in Taiwan: An Application of Role Identity Theory. 46 *Academy of Management Journal*, 618.

Feldman, H.L. (1995)"Codes and Virtues: Can Good Lawyers Be Good Ethical Deliberators," S. Cal. 69 L. Rev. 885

Flood, J. (1993) 'Megalawyering in the Global Order: The Cultural, Social and Economic Transformation of Global Legal Practice', 6 *International Journal of the Legal Profession* 169.

Galoob S & Li, S. (2013) 'Are Legal Ethics Ethical?' 26 *Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics* 481

Gilligan, C. (1982) *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (Harvard University Press).

Glover, S., Bumpus, M., Sharp, G., & Munchus, G. (2002). Gender differences in ethical decision making. 17 *Women in Management Review*, 217

Goode, J. (1957). Community within a community: The professions: Psychology, sociology and medicine. 25 *American Sociological Review*, 902.

Granfield, R. (2006) "Institutionalizing Public Service in Law School: Results on the Impact of Mandatory Pro Bono Programs," 54 *Buff. L. Rev.* 1355.

Haidt, J. (2013) *The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion*, (Vintage).

Hamilton, N.& Monson, V. (2011) 'The Positive Empirical Relationship of Professionalism to Effectiveness in the Practice of Law', 24 *Geo J. Legal Ethics* 137.

Hamilton N.W. & Monson, V. (2012) 'Legal Education's Ethical Challenge: Empirical Research on How Most Effectively to Foster Each Student's Professional Formation (Professionalism)', SSRN Scholarly Paper (Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, 30 July 2012), <http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2004749>.

Hartwell, S. (1995) 'Promoting Moral Development through Experiential Teaching', 1 *Clinical Law Review*, 505.

Hedegard, J. M. (1979) The Impact of Legal Education: An In-Depth Examination of Career Relevant Interests, Attitudes, and Personality Traits Among First-Year Law Students, *Am. B. Found. Res. J.* 791,

Hekman, D.R., Bigley, G.A., Steensma, H.K., and Hereford, J.F. (2009) Combined Effects of Organizational and Professional Identification on the Reciprocity Dynamic for Professional Employees, 52 *Academy of Management Journal*, 506.

Karp, D.G. (1996) 'Values and their Effect on Pro-Environmental Behaviour.' 28 *Environment and Behaviour*, 111.

Kouchaki, M. (2011) 'Vicarious Moral Licensing: The Influence of Others' Past Moral Actions on Moral Behaviour.' 101 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 702.

Kronman, A (1995) *The Lost Lawyer: Failing Ideals of the Legal Profession* (Belknap Press of Harvard University Press).

Kronman, A (2003) *The Lost Lawyer* in Deborah L. Rhode, *In the Interests of Justice: Reforming the Legal Profession* (Oxford University Press).

Landsman M., & McNeel, S.P. (2003) 'Moral Judgment of Law Students across Three Years: Influences of Gender, Political Ideology and Interest in Altruistic Law Practice', 45 *S. Tex. L. Rev.* 891.

Lawrence J. Landwehr, L.J. (1982) "Lawyers as Social Progressives or Reactionaries: The Law and Order Cognitive Orientation of Lawyers", 7 *Law & Psychol Rev.* 39, 39-42 (1982) in Daicoff, S. (1996) *Lawyer, know thyself: A review of empirical research on attorney attributes bearing on professionalism*, 46 *AM. U. L. REV.* 1337.

Mael, F.A., Ashforth, B.E. (1992) Alumni and Their Alma Mater: A Partial Test of the Reformulated Model of Organizational Identification. 13 *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 103.

Mather, L. and Levin, L.C. (2012) *Lawyers in Practice: Ethical Decision Making in Context*. Chicago: (Chicago: University Of Chicago Press).

Menkel-Meadow, C. (1985) 'Portia in a Different Voice: Speculations on a Women's Lawyering Process', 1 *Berkeley Women's LJ*, 39.

Mertz, E (2007) *The Language of Law School: Learning to 'Think Like a Lawyer'* (OUP USA,)

Meyer, J., Allen, N., and Smith, C. (1993) Commitment to Organisations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three Component Conceptualization. 78 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 538.

Minow, M. (1990) "Adjudicating differences: conflicts among feminist lawyers." 149 *Conflicts in Feminism*, 150.

Moore, C., Detert, J.R., Klebe Travino, L., Baker, V.L., and Mayer, D.M. 2012. "Why Employees do Bad Things: Moral Disengagement and Unethical Organizational Behaviour," 61 *Personnel Psychology* 1.

Moorhead, R. *et al.*, (2012) "Designing Ethics Indicators for Legal Services Provision" (London: Legal Services Board, 2012)

Moorhead, R (2014) "Precarious Professionalism: Some Empirical and Behavioural Perspectives on Lawyers," *Current Legal Problems*.

Moorhead, R & Cahill-O'Callaghan, R. (2016) "False Friends? Testing Commercial lawyers on the claim that Zealous Advocacy is Founded in Benevolence towards Clients rather than Lawyers Personal Interest," *Legal Ethics*, forthcoming.

Mumford, M, Helton W, Decker B, Connelly M, Van Doorn J. (2003) "Values and beliefs related to ethical decisions." 7 *Teaching Business Ethics*, 139

Nicolson, D (2005) "Making Lawyers Moral? Ethical Codes and Moral Character," 25 *Legal Studies* 601.

Nicolson, D. (2010) "Learning in justice: ethical education in an extra-curricular law clinic," in: M. Robertson, L. Corbin, K. Tranter, & F. Bartlett (Eds) *The Ethics Project in Legal Education* (London, Routledge), pp. 171–190.

Nicolson, D. (2015) "Legal education, ethics and access to justice: forging warriors for justice in a neo-liberal world" 22/1 *International Journal of the Legal Profession* 51-69

Palermo J & Evans A., (2005) 'Zero Impact: Are Lawyers Values Affected by Law School', 8 *Legal Ethics*, 240.

Parsons, T. (1951) *The social system*. (Free Press, New York).

-
- Perlman, A.M. (2015) *A Behavioral Theory of Legal Ethics*, 90 *IND. L.J.* 1639.
- Prince-Gibson, E. & Schwartz, S. H. (1998) 'Value Priorities and Gender' 61 *Social Psychology Quarterly* 49
- Reynolds, S. (2008), "Moral Attentiveness: Who Pays Attention to the Moral Aspects of Life?" 93 *Journal of Applied Psychology* 1027
- Rokeach, M. (1973) *The Nature of Human Values* (The Free Press)
- Romany, C. (1991) "Ain't I a Feminist?." 4 *Yale JL & Feminism* 23.
- Roxas, M. & Stoneback J. (2004). "The importance of gender across cultures in ethical decision-making." 50 *Journal of Business Ethics* 149.
- Sagiv, L., & Schwartz S. (2000) 'Value Priorities and Subjective Well-Being: Direct Relations and Congruity Effects', 30 *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 177.
- Sagiv, L., Roccas, S., Hazan, O. (2012) 'Identification with groups: the role of personality and context.' 80 *Journal of Personality*, 345.
- Sandefur, R., & Selbin, J. (2009) 'The Clinic Effect' 16 *Clinical Law Review*, 57.
- Schleef, D. (1997) 'Empty Ethics and Reasonable Responsibility: Vocabularies of Motive among Law and Business Students' 22 *Law & Social Inquiry* 619.
- Schmedemann, D.A. (2008) "Pro Bono Publico as a Conscience Good," 35 *William Mitchell Law Review* 977.
- Sheenan, K.B. (2001) E-mail Survey Response Rates: A Review. 6 *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 2.
- Sheldon K.M. & Krieger, L.S. (2004) 'Does Legal Education Have Undermining Effects on Law Students? Evaluating Changes in Motivation, Values, and Well-Being', 22 *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 261
- Thornton, M. (1998) 'Technocentrism in the Law School: Why the Gender and Colour of Law Remain the Same' *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, 36, No. 2 (1998):369-398
- Webb, J. (2011) "Taking Values Seriously: The Democratic Intellect and the Place of Values in the Law School Curriculum," in *The Ethics Project in Legal Education*, Routledge Research in Legal Ethics (London and New York: Routledge, 2011), 9–32.
- Whitfield, S.C., Rosa, E.A., Dan, A., Dietz, T. (2009) 'The Future of Nuclear Power: Value Orientations and Risk Perception.' 29 *Risk Analysis*, 425.
- Willging, T. E. & Dunn, T. G. (1981) 'Moral Development of the Law Student: Theory and Data on Legal Education' 31 *J. Legal Educ.* 306.

Williams, B., Onsman, A., Brown, T. (2010) 'Exploratory Factor Analysis: A Five-Step Guide for Novices, 8 *Journal of Emergency Primary Health Care* , Article 990399

Woolley A. & Bradley, W. (2010) *Legal Ethics and Moral Character*, 23 *GEO. J. LEGAL ETHICS* 1065

Zitek, E.M., Jordan, A.H., Monin, B., Leach, F.R. (2010) Victim Entitlement to Behave Selfishly 98 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 245.