

LAW JOBS: PROFESSIONAL REGULATION, THE DIVISION OF LEGAL LABOR, AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

*Emily S. Taylor Poppe**

INTRODUCTION	1217
I. A TALE OF TWO FIELDS.....	1220
A. <i>Medical and Legal Occupations over Time</i>	1220
B. <i>Divisions of Labor</i>	1222
C. <i>Visions of the Future of the Legal Field</i>	1224
II. INSTITUTIONAL FORCES	1225
A. <i>Professionalization Projects</i>	1225
B. <i>Compositional Effects</i>	1226
III. THE EFFECTS OF OCCUPATIONAL CHANGE	1227
A. <i>Access to Justice</i>	1228
B. <i>The Development of Law</i>	1229
C. <i>Regulatory Adaptation</i>	1230
CONCLUSION.....	1231
APPENDIX.....	1233

INTRODUCTION

Over the past century, changing economic conditions, technological advances, and shifts in the composition of the American workforce have transformed the organization of many fields. Meanwhile, the legal field has remained stubbornly unchanged. Although multiple forces underlie this

* Professor of Law and Faculty Director of the Initiative for Inclusive Civil Justice, University of California, Irvine School of Law. Jorge Iniguez provided excellent assistance on the larger research project from which this Essay is drawn. This Essay was prepared for the Colloquium entitled *Lawyers and Their Institutions*, hosted by the *Fordham Law Review* and co-organized by the Stein Center for Law and Ethics on October 18, 2024, at Fordham University School of Law. Thank you to Bruce Green for the invitation to participate in this Colloquium, and to Colloquium participants for their helpful feedback.

stasis, the extensive regulation of the legal industry¹ is an important factor.² For example, prohibitions on the unauthorized practice of law paired with a broad definition of “legal advice”³ have helped to maintain the role of lawyers as the dominant source of legal services.⁴ Likewise, limitations on lawyers’ ability to share fees or enter into business with nonlawyers have hindered outside investment and further entrenched a business model centered on the legal profession.⁵

However, this situation may be changing. Antitrust concerns threaten to unsettle the role of the organized bar and state supreme courts in regulating the legal profession.⁶ Regulatory barriers to alternative legal service delivery models have fallen in the face of First Amendment challenges.⁷ Legal technology companies openly threaten to flout the boundaries of permissible practice.⁸ And, in a dramatic departure from historical practice, states are experimenting with regulatory schemes that allow alternative business models and the provision of legal advice by people and things other than

1. Although the organized bar claims that the legal profession is self-regulated, see MODEL RULES OF PRO. CONDUCT pmbl. ¶ 10 (AM. BAR ASS’N 2024) (“The legal profession is largely self-governing.”), the reality is more complex, see Fred C. Zacharias, *The Myth of Self-Regulation*, 93 MINN. L. REV. 1147, 1171 (2009) (referencing the regulatory role played by state supreme courts, the organized bar, federal agencies, and state and federal legislatures).

2. See Deborah L. Rhode, *Professional Integrity and Professional Regulation: Nonlawyer Practice and Nonlawyer Investment in Law Firms*, 39 HASTINGS INT’L & COMPAR. L. REV. 111, 111 (2016) (describing the significance of the legal profession’s monopoly over the “delivery and financing of legal services”). *But cf.* Nuno Garoupa & Milan Markovic, *Deregulation and the Lawyers’ Cartel*, 43 U. PA. J. INT’L L. 935, 944 (2022) (pointing out that “despite various top-down [deregulatory] reforms, little has fundamentally changed”).

3. Lauren Sudeall, *The Overreach of Limits on “Legal Advice”*, 131 YALE L.J.F. 637, 637 (2022) (“[C]urrent definitions and applications of ‘legal advice’ are overly and unnecessarily broad.”).

4. See, e.g., Derek A. Denckla, *Nonlawyers and the Unauthorized Practice of Law: An Overview of the Legal and Ethical Parameters*, 67 FORDHAM L. REV. 2581, 2585 (1999) (“[A]nti-UPL sources of law and regulation . . . greatly enlarged the areas of practice that now must be performed exclusively by lawyers.”); Robert W. Gordon, *Lawyers, the Legal Profession & Access to Justice in the United States: A Brief History*, 148 DÆDALUS 177, 186 (2019) (“Throughout the twentieth century, using statutes prohibiting the ‘unauthorized practice of law,’ the bar has fought turf wars with many competitors . . .”).

5. See JASON SOLOMON, DEBORAH RHODE & ANNIE WANLESS, STAN. CTR. ON THE LEGAL PROF., HOW REFORMING RULE 5.4 WOULD BENEFIT LAWYERS AND CONSUMERS, PROMOTE INNOVATION, AND INCREASE ACCESS TO JUSTICE 3 (2020).

6. Elizabeth Chambliss, *Evidence-Based Lawyer Regulation*, 97 WASH. U. L. REV. 297, 315 (2019) (noting that the Supreme Court’s decision in “*N.C. Dental* has launched a new conversation about the authority of state bar associations to police their own markets—and the role of state supreme courts in policing bar regulatory activity”).

7. See, e.g., *Upsolve, Inc. v. James*, 604 F. Supp. 3d 97 (S.D.N.Y. 2022); Press Release, ACLU, ACLU and NAACP Secure Access to Public Eviction Records in Data Scraping Case (Sept. 13, 2023, 10:28 AM), <https://www.aclu.org/press-releases/aclu-and-naacp-secure-access-to-public-eviction-records-in-data-scraping-case> [<https://perma.cc/ZE68-C275>] (reporting settlement of a First Amendment challenge brought against the South Carolina court by the South Carolina State Conference of the NAACP).

8. See Megan Cerullo, *AI-Powered “Robot” Lawyer Won’t Argue in Court After Jail Threats*, CBS NEWS, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/robot-lawyer-wont-argue-court-jail-threats-do-not-pay/> [<https://perma.cc/W4XK-32SF>] (Jan. 26, 2023, 1:08 PM) (detailing stunt proposed by Joshua Browder, CEO of DoNotPay, to have a defendant fight a traffic ticket with the use of an AI-powered assistant).

lawyers.⁹ This includes the adoption of a regulatory sandbox in Utah and Arizona's abrogation of restrictions on fee-sharing, as well as the legal paraprofessional and lay legal service provider roles that have been created in several states.¹⁰

Such regulatory reforms, coupled with advances in legal technology and changes in the economics of legal services delivery, have the potential to transform the legal industry.¹¹ Indeed, this potential has inspired colorful analogies, with commentators likening the situation to a "roiling sea of change"¹² or a "tidal wave" that will "scour the [legal] landscape when it gets here."¹³ These commentators assume that the future will involve a greater division of legal labor. But what will a diversified legal field really look like? What are the forces that will drive its evolution? And what will these changes mean for the development of law, access to justice, and the regulation of the legal field?

This Essay considers these questions, putting to the side debates about the likelihood of expanded regulatory reform or its capacity to engender increased occupational competition.¹⁴ Part I uses census data to track the evolution of the legal and medical fields over time, highlighting the distinctive structure of the legal field and providing an informative comparative case; while law has largely resisted a greater division of labor, the medical field has been transformed through vertical and horizontal divisions of labor as well as the introduction of specialized versions of affiliated occupations. Part II considers how institutional forces are likely to come into play if legal professional regulatory reform enables similar divisions of legal labor. Finally, in Part III, the Essay considers the implications of these dynamics for the development of law, access to justice, and regulatory design.

The Essay complicates popular narratives by highlighting the potential for underexplored institutional forces to give rise to unintended consequences. Although this effort is understandably speculative, it suggests that those on all sides of current regulatory debates may be overestimating their ability to forecast the future. Accordingly, the Essay argues that the most consequential reforms may not be the substantive reforms giving rise to the next iteration of legal professional regulation, but rather those that structure

9. See JESSICA BEDNARZ, INST. FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE AM. LEGAL SYS., UNLOCKING LEGAL REGULATION: LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE 2 (2024) (summarizing recent legal regulatory innovation).

10. *Id.* at 1–3.

11. See Lucian T. Pera, *Ethics, Lawyering, and Regulation in a Time of Great Change: Field Notes from the (R)evolution*, 74 S.C. L. REV. 801, 804 (2023) ("[W]e live in the midst of the greatest period of change in the business and practice and regulation of law in more than a century.").

12. *Id.* at 803.

13. Jordan Furlong, *The Looming Crisis in Lawyer Self-Regulation*, SUBSTACK (Dec. 14, 2023), <https://jordanfurlong.substack.com/p/the-looming-crisis-in-lawyer-self> [https://perma.cc/2N99-5XES].

14. For discussion of these issues, see *infra* Conclusion.

the future regulatory process and will affect the ability to adapt to a changing legal field.

I. A TALE OF TWO FIELDS

In imagining the future of the legal field, comparisons are often made to the field of medicine.¹⁵ To enhance access to justice, for example, commentators point to the need to establish a “continuum of care” in law akin to that in medicine, made possible by an expanded range of service providers.¹⁶ In this way, the medical field is used to exemplify a greater division of labor. But just how different are law and medicine?¹⁷ This part uses occupational classifications from the Census to explore the disparity in the division of labor across the two fields over time.

Of course, occupational census classifications are not objective truths but constructed categories that imperfectly attempt to capture empirical reality.¹⁸ Yet, as discussed below, they also reflect key occupational characteristics, offering evidence of the evolution of occupations and the changing division of labor across sets of related occupations within a given field.

A. Medical and Legal Occupations over Time

The Appendix to this Essay identifies all medical and legal occupations recognized by the Census from 1880 to 1990.¹⁹ This period captures key

15. See, e.g., Laural A. Rigertas, *Collaborations Between Lawyers and New Legal Professionals: A Path to Increase Access to Justice and Protect Clients*, 24 KAN. J.L. & PUB. POL’Y 539, 545 (2015) (“The health care profession may be able to give the legal profession some alternative models to consider.”); Rebecca L. Sandefur & Lucy Ricca, *Outside the Box: How States Are Increasing Access to Justice Through Evidence-Based Regulation of the Practice of Law*, 108 JUDICATURE, no. 1, 2024, at 58, 60 (arguing that regulatory reforms in Arizona and Utah are aimed at “expand[ing] authorized sources of legal help—similar to the earlier transformation of the medical profession, which now incorporates multiple types of professionals and entities”).

16. See, e.g., CONF. OF CHIEF JUSTS., CONF. OF STATE CT. ADM’RS, RESOLUTION 5: REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT TO MEANINGFUL ACCESS TO JUSTICE FOR ALL (2015), https://ccj.ncsc.org/__data/assets/pdf_file/0013/23602/07252015-reaffirming-commitment-meaningful-access-to-justice-for-all.pdf [<https://perma.cc/789R-DGE3>] (calling for “a continuum of meaningful and appropriate services” to achieve access to justice).

17. For example, although the role of insurance differentiates the legal and medical fields, there are many similarities in debates over occupational licensing and the effect on the divisions of labor. See, e.g., Morris M. Kleiner, Allison Marier, Kyoungh Park & Coady Wing, *Relaxing Occupational Licensing Requirements: Analyzing Wages and Prices for a Medical Service*, 59 J.L. & ECON. 261, 262 (2016) (describing how “scope-of-practice regulations affect the boundaries and shared work space between two [medical] occupations that might otherwise function as imperfect or even perfect substitutes in the production of goods and services”).

18. See Arthur M. Ross, *Living with Symbols*, AM. STAT., June 1966, at 16 (“Let us therefore recognize candidly that statistical truths, like the other truths about man’s social life, are created rather than discovered.”).

19. Most occupations during this period are not explicitly categorized by field, so this listing rests on researcher judgments about which occupations constitute legal or medical occupations. The occupations are drawn from the following census reports: U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, 1880, TABLES OF OCCUPATIONS: NUMBER OF PERSONS IN THE UNITED STATES ENGAGED IN EACH SPECIAL OCCUPATION, WITH DISTINCTION OF AGE AND SEX AND OF

moments in the development of the fields of law and medicine while avoiding data distortions arising from changes in the collection of occupation data and the classification of occupations by the U.S. Census Bureau in the years since.²⁰

As the Appendix reveals, the legal occupations recognized by the Census remained remarkably limited and consistent between 1880 and 1990. In 1880 there were only Lawyers.²¹ The lack of division within the legal field at that time was notable even to census workers, who in response to the 1880 Census noted:

[T]he distinctions in the profession of the law, which are known and recognized decisively in England and on the continent, are not maintained in this country, except in a few great cities, and there only in exceptional cases. The same person with us is law-scrivener, collector of debts, prosecutor of claims, counselor, attorney, [and] possibly also judge.²²

Yet even in 1990, the only legal occupations the Census identified were Lawyers and Judges.²³ Moreover, in the period between 1880 and 1990, the only other legal occupations ever recognized were Abstractors, Notaries, and Justices of the Peace, which were tracked in 1920 and 1930.²⁴

NATIVITY, at tbl.32 (1881); U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, 1890, TOTAL PERSONS 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER IN THE UNITED STATES ENGAGED IN EACH SPECIFIED OCCUPATION, CLASSIFIED BY SEX, GENERAL NATIVITY, AND COLOR, at tbl.6 (2d ed. 1896); U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, 1900, TOTAL PERSONS 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER ENGAGED IN EACH SPECIFIED OCCUPATION (IN DETAIL), CLASSIFIED BY SEX, at tbl.91 (1902); U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, 1910, TOTAL PERSONS 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER ENGAGED IN EACH SPECIFIED OCCUPATION, at tbl.IV (1914); U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, 1910, NUMBER OF PERSONS 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER ENGAGED IN PRINCIPAL OCCUPATIONS, CLASSIFIED BY SEX, at tbl.14 (1914); U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, 1920, TOTAL PERSONS 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER ENGAGED IN EACH SPECIFIED OCCUPATION, CLASSIFIED BY SEX, FOR THE UNITED STATES, at ch. 2, tbl.4 (1921); U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, 1930, GAINFUL WORKERS 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY OCCUPATION AND SEX, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1930, 1920, AND 1910, at tbl.3 (1932); U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, 1940, PERSONS 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER IN THE LABOR FORCE (EXCEPT NEW WORKERS), 1940, AND GAINFUL WORKERS 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER, 1930, BY OCCUPATION AND SEX, WITH AN ADJUSTMENT FACTOR AND ADJUSTED 1930 TOTAL FIGURES, FOR THE UNITED STATES, pt. 1, at tbl.2 (1943); U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, 1950, DETAILED OCCUPATION OF THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE AND OF EMPLOYED PERSONS, BY SEX, FOR THE UNITED STATES, URBAN AND RURAL: 1950, pt. 1, at ch. 3, tbl.1 (1953); U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, 1960, PC(2)-7A, DETAILED OCCUPATION OF EMPLOYED PERSONS, BY SEX, FOR THE UNITED STATES, URBAN AND RURAL: 1960, at tbl.1 (1963); U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, 1970, PC(S1)-32, DETAILED OCCUPATION OF EMPLOYED PERSONS, BY RACE AND SEX: 1970, at tbl.223 (1973); U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, 1980, PC80-S1-15, DETAILED OCCUPATION OF THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE BY SEX: 1980 AND 1970 (1984); U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, 1990, CP-S-1-1, DETAILED OCCUPATION OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE BY SEX, RACE, AND HISPANIC ORIGIN: 1990, at tbl.1 (1992).

20. After 2000, questions regarding occupation were shifted from the decennial Census to the American Community Survey and a new classification system was adopted. Although the classification of occupations also changed repeatedly during the focal period, the 2000 reclassification was more extensive, frustrating efforts to trace occupations across periods.

21. *See infra* Appendix.

22. U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, DEP'T OF THE INTERIOR, REMARKS UPON THE TABLES OF OCCUPATIONS 708 (1880).

23. *See infra* Appendix.

24. Justices are also sometimes explicitly included with Judges. *See infra* Appendix.

Meanwhile, the variety of medical occupations expanded dramatically over this period. In 1880, the only medical occupations enumerated by the Census were Physicians and Surgeons, Dentists, Nurses, and Midwives, all of which were included in the Professional and Personal Services group.²⁵ However, by 1990, there were twenty-five medical occupations found not only in the equivalent Managerial and Professional Specialty Occupations group, but also in the Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support Occupations and Service Occupations groups.²⁶

The most recent Census system of occupational classification, adopted in 2018 and used to code occupational data from the American Community Survey, is more detailed and more explicitly distinguished by field.²⁷ In that system, there are six Legal Occupations: Lawyers; Judicial Law Clerks; Judges, Magistrates, and Other Judicial Workers; Paralegals and Legal Assistants; Title Examiners, Abstractors, and Searchers; and other Legal Support Workers.²⁸ This system thus suggests a much greater division of legal labor. Yet, even there, the discrepancy between the legal and medical fields remains. Compared to the six legal occupations, there are forty-six medical occupations included in just the Healthcare Practitioners and Technical Occupations group.²⁹ There are an additional fourteen medical occupations in the Healthcare Support Occupations group, and several additional medical occupations in other groups, such as Medical Scientists and Clinical and Counseling Psychologists within the Life, Physical, and Social Science Occupations group.³⁰

B. Divisions of Labor

How is labor divided to generate the greater number of medical occupations? The census data offer evidence of three patterns in the division of medical labor. First, there is evidence of vertical divisions of labor, with nursing offering a good example. As early as 1910, the Census distinguished Trained Nurses from all other Nurses and Midwives; whereas the former fell within the Professional Service group, the latter were included in the Domestic and Personal Service group.³¹ By 1990, the Census identified Registered Nurses, Licensed Practical Nurses, Nursing Aides (included with Orderlies and Attendants), and Health Aides, Except Nursing.³² Moreover, nurses of all levels fit within a larger medical service provision hierarchy that

25. *See infra* Appendix.

26. *See infra* Appendix.

27. 2018 *Standard Occupational Classification System*, U.S. BUREAU OF LABOR STATS., https://www.bls.gov/soc/2018/major_groups.htm [<https://perma.cc/QZ5F-DTDK>] (last visited Feb. 14, 2025).

28. *See id.*

29. *See id.*

30. *See id.*

31. *See infra* Appendix.

32. *See infra* Appendix.

by 1990 also included Physicians and Physicians' Assistants, as well as a variety of specialized doctors, therapists, and support occupations.³³

Second, the medical field offers evidence of horizontal divisions of labor, as an increasing number of substantive specialties are recognized over time. For example, the 1990 Census identifies multiple kinds of therapists individually—Respiratory, Occupational, Physical, and Speech Therapists are all distinguished—and there is an additional catchall category for Therapists Not Elsewhere Classified.³⁴ Similarly, specialization underlies the recognition of Dietitians and Podiatrists as those occupations are distinguished from Physicians and other Health Diagnosing Practitioners Not Elsewhere Classified.³⁵

Finally, the decennial census data highlight the rise of medical-specific versions of other occupations. For example, as early as 1940, the Census included Physicians' and Dental Offices Attendants within the Clerical, Sales, and Kindred Workers group.³⁶ In 1970, the Census began to categorize Health Administrators within the Managers and Administrators group.³⁷ And in 1980, the Census included a separate category for Medical Scientists.³⁸ Relatedly, as medical technology advanced, categories were dedicated to identifying those who worked with particular instruments or the application of technology in particular medical settings. For example, in 1970, the Census began to identify Clinical Laboratory Technologists and Technicians, Radiologic Technologists and Technicians, Health Record Technologists and Technicians, and Health Technologists and Technicians Not Elsewhere Classified.³⁹

In contrast, the census occupation classification system offers only limited evidence of similar divisions of legal labor. By including Paralegals and Legal Assistants, the 2018 classification structure begins to point to a vertical division of legal labor.⁴⁰ However, there is little evidence of horizontal divisions of labor or the creation of law-affiliated occupations.

Of course, some of this is an artifact of the data. The medical field is larger than the legal field,⁴¹ meaning that smaller occupations within the medical field are more likely than those within the legal field to merit census recognition. Plus, abstracted classifications inevitably overlook variety that exists in real life. For example, most lawyers specialize in a particular area of practice not reflected in the monolithic category of Lawyer.⁴² Likewise,

33. *See infra* Appendix.

34. *See infra* Appendix.

35. *See infra* Appendix.

36. *See infra* Appendix.

37. *See infra* Appendix.

38. *See infra* Appendix.

39. *See infra* Appendix.

40. *See infra* Appendix.

41. *Current Employment Statistics: Employment and Earnings Table B-1a*, U.S. BUREAU OF LAB. STAT., <https://www.bls.gov/web/empsit/ceseeb1a.htm> [<https://perma.cc/K786-FRND>] (last visited Feb. 14, 2025).

42. *See, e.g.*, Lynn Mather & Leslie C. Levin, *Why Context Matters*, in *LAWYERS IN PRACTICE: ETHICAL DECISION MAKING IN CONTEXT* 8 (Leslie C. Levin & Lynn Mather eds.,

there are additional positions held within the legal field not captured in the census categories, such as legal technology developers and practice management experts.

Yet, at the same time, there are important reasons why this differentiation is not captured in the census data. Most lawyers still graduate from law schools with a juris doctor (JD) degree, and the vast majority qualify to practice through a single certification process.⁴³ In addition, affiliated occupations—including those relating to legal technology and practice management—are still more closely associated with their general functions, and they are not sufficiently constituted as specialized occupations to require differentiation in the Census. In short: this is not *just* an artifact of the data. Rather, the data reflect, even if not perfectly, a meaningful difference in the ways that these two fields have evolved and are currently structured.

C. Visions of the Future of the Legal Field

This raises the question of what the legal field might look like if regulatory reform and other forces align to increase the division of legal labor. The vertical division of legal labor is the primary focus in many visions for the future of the legal industry. Indeed, current reforms creating new paraprofessional roles and forms of nonlawyer legal service providers are explicitly aimed at achieving this sort of differentiation.⁴⁴

Horizontal differentiation in the forms of substantive or client-based specialization has received less attention but could also give rise to a more complex legal field in the future. As noted above, the legal profession is currently greatly specialized in practice but retains largely uniform educational and certification regimes.⁴⁵ However, in a future where legal tasks are divided and reassigned, lawyers might embrace more formal horizontal divisions of labor as they seek to protect their claims of professional expertise within given subfields. Legal paraprofessionals are often already tied to substantive areas,⁴⁶ and future legal occupations might likewise develop within specific areas of legal expertise.

Finally, as a more diversified legal industry emerges, we would also expect that support occupations—many of which already exist—could become more explicitly defined as *legal* occupations. For example, specialties in law for

2012); JOHN P. HEINZ ET AL., URBAN LAWYERS: THE NEW SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE BAR 37 (2005) (reporting that “33% of . . . practicing lawyers [in Chicago] worked only in one field” with many others working across clusters of related areas); RONIT DINOVTZER, BRYANT G. GARTH, RICHARD SANDER, JOYCE STERLING & GITA Z. WILDER, AFTER THE JD: FIRST RESULTS FROM A NATIONAL STUDY OF LEGAL CAREERS 33–34 (Janet E. Smith, Abbie F. Willard & Paula A. Patton eds., 2004) (finding “new lawyers develop a specialization fairly early in their careers”).

43. *See Bar Exams*, A.B.A., https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/resources/bar-admissions/bar-exams/ [<https://perma.cc/T5P7-GPA8>] (last visited Feb. 14, 2025).

44. *See supra* note 15.

45. *See supra* Part I.A.

46. *See generally* MICHAEL HOULBERG & JANET DROBINSKE, INST. FOR ADVANCEMENT AM. LEGAL SYS., THE LANDSCAPE OF ALLIED LEGAL PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS IN THE UNITED STATES (2022).

managers, assistants of various forms, investigators, software developers, and information technology managers could all emerge or become stronger.

II. INSTITUTIONAL FORCES

Although popular visions for the future of the legal field anticipate much of this differentiation, less attention has been afforded to the institutional forces that are likely to accompany an increase in the division of legal labor. As a first step toward addressing this gap, this part draws attention to professionalization projects and compositional effects, phenomena that are largely unacknowledged in current debates over regulatory reform.

A. Professionalization Projects

Professionalization is the process through which occupations become “increasingly specialized, organized, and autonomous, developing distinct knowledge claims, titles, associations, and career tracks.”⁴⁷ Ultimately, the goal of this process is not simply to formalize and institutionalize the existence of a profession, but to support the profession’s jurisdictional claim.⁴⁸ This represents a form of social closure⁴⁹ that plays out through a predictable set of mechanisms. As Professor Kim Weeden describes:

The workhorses of social closure . . . [include] five highly institutionalized strategies—licensing, credentialing, certification, unionization, and representation by associations—that create social and legal boundaries around occupations. Each affects occupational rewards through a unique combination of four mechanisms: restricting the supply of labor in an occupation, enhancing overall demand for a product or service, solidifying an occupation’s claim to be the sole provider of that service, or signaling to customers that the occupation provides a service of a particular quality.⁵⁰

To the extent that new legal occupations have emerged, their professionalization projects remain in the early stages. For example, although many commentators envision new forms of autonomous legal service providers,⁵¹ these occupations currently remain largely under the control of lawyers.⁵² In the longer term, it is unlikely that all emerging and

47. Elizabeth Chambliss, *The Professionalization of Law Firm In-House Counsel*, 84 N.C. L. REV. 1515, 1517–18 (2006).

48. ANDREW ABBOTT, *THE SYSTEM OF PROFESSIONS: AN ESSAY ON THE DIVISION OF EXPERT LABOR* 59 (1988).

49. MAX WEBER, *Open and Closed Relationships*, in *ECONOMY AND SOCIETY* 44 (Guenther Roth & Claus Wittich eds., 1978) (1922) (describing how social exclusion can be used to generate “monopolized advantages”).

50. Kim A. Weeden, *Why Do Some Occupations Pay More Than Others?: Social Closure and Earnings Inequality in the United States*, 108 AM. J. SOCIO. 55, 57 (2002).

51. See, e.g., Rigertas, *supra* note 15, at 545–46 (offering advanced practice legal nurses as a template for the creation of independent legal nonlawyer practitioners).

52. See DAVID FREEMAN ENGSTROM, LUCY RICCA, GRAHAM AMBROSE & MADDIE WALSH, DEBORAH L. RHODE CTR. ON LEGAL PRO., *LEGAL INNOVATION AFTER REFORM: EVIDENCE FROM REGULATORY CHANGE* 49 (2022) (“[T]he evidence thus far suggests that lawyers, far from being displaced by newly configured entities and new service delivery models, [] instead face a host of new opportunities to extend their reach via a mix of conventional service

future legal occupations will accept this limitation. Instead, the ability to practice independently is likely to be one among several contested dimensions that effectively divide legal labor across a more complex occupational ecosystem.

Theory suggests that issues like this will be addressed by an increasingly formalized set of actors.⁵³ For example, professional organizations will arise to promote the interests of new occupations, with an accompanying growth of conferences, publications, and practice supports. Likewise, lobbying efforts and unionization drives will further influence the boundaries of new legal occupations and their associated rewards.

The transformation of the legal field through the professionalization projects of new legal occupations and renewed battles with competing professions will affect—and be affected by—institutions other than regulators. For example, new educational institutions could arise to serve the original and continuing educational needs of a diverse range of legal occupations, or existing educational institutions could adapt to train students for new roles.⁵⁴ New economic actors could intervene as investors or owners.⁵⁵ Even beyond their regulatory capacity, courts and judicial workers will shape the contours of new occupations, as will clients. Visions for the future of the legal field that ignore these follow-on effects fail to grapple with the full panoply of consequences triggered by a greater division of legal labor.

B. Compositional Effects

Research on occupational segregation and stratification suggests that compositional dynamics will also play a role in structuring the legal field as new occupations are established. Occupations remain segregated by gender⁵⁶ and race and ethnicity,⁵⁷ and the rewards associated with occupations, including prestige and compensation, are determined not only by the skills and credentials necessary to undertake the tasks associated with an occupation but also by the demographic characteristics of incumbents.⁵⁸

delivery, nonlawyer assistance, and software that were not possible previously.”); *see also* HOULBERG & DROBINSKE, *supra* note 46.

53. *See generally* Weeden, *supra* note 50.

54. *See, e.g.*, Laurel A. Rigertas, *The Legal Profession’s Monopoly: Failing to Protect Consumers*, 82 FORDHAM L. REV. 2683, 2702–03 (2014).

55. *See generally* Nuno Garoupa & Milan Markovic, *Legal Market Decartelization*, 58 U.C. DAVIS L. REV. (forthcoming 2025) (forecasting the potential role of private equity firms in the legal market).

56. *See, e.g.*, Asaf Levanon & David B. Grusky, *The Persistence of Extreme Gender Segregation in the Twenty-First Century*, 122 AM. J. SOCIO. 573, 574 (2016).

57. *See, e.g.*, KIM A. WEEDEN, OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION, PATHWAYS: THE POVERTY AND INEQUALITY REPORT, 33, 34–35 (2019).

58. *See, e.g.*, Asaf Levanon, Paula England & Paul Allison, *Occupational Feminization and Pay: Assessing Causal Dynamics Using 1950–2000 U.S. Census Data*, 88 SOC. FORCES 865, 878, 881 (2009) (finding a negative association between the female proportion of an occupation and its associated rewards after controlling for other occupational characteristics); Francine D. Blau & Lawrence M. Kahn, *The Gender Wage Gap: Extent, Trends, and Explanations*, 55 J. ECON. LIT. 789, 825–28 (2017).

Focusing on gender segregation as a key example, women now outnumber men in terms of matriculation to law school,⁵⁹ although they remain underrepresented in the profession overall,⁶⁰ among judges,⁶¹ and in senior leadership at U.S. law firms.⁶² In contrast, paralegals and legal assistants are overwhelmingly (85 percent) female.⁶³ Theory suggests that such female-dominant gender imbalances will negatively affect the wages and other advantages of emerging legal occupations.⁶⁴

There is likely to be an endogenous relationship between occupational composition and the characteristics of emerging legal occupations. Similar dynamics might also affect the distribution of wages and other benefits among members of the bar. For example, if horizontal divisions of labor become more formalized, female-dominated practice areas could become specialist occupations. To the extent that women are overrepresented, and wages are depressed as a result, the formalized division of labor would have the unintended effect of undermining gains toward gender equality within the legal profession. Thus, compositional dynamics could distort the structure of the legal field. Yet, issues of gender and other demographic imbalances have largely been ignored in discussions of regulatory reform and the creation of new legal services delivery models.

III. THE EFFECTS OF OCCUPATIONAL CHANGE

Thus, research on institutional dynamics suggests that if regulatory reform leads to an increased division of legal labor, an increasingly complex ecosystem of legal occupations will emerge through a process that is informed not only by regulation but also by other institutional forces. This part considers the attendant implications for access to justice, the development of law, and the future regulatory regime.

59. AM. BAR ASS'N, PROFILE OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION 2023, at 43 (2023).

60. *Id.* at 72.

61. *Id.* at 59.

62. NAT'L ASS'N FOR L. PLACEMENT, 2023 REPORT ON DIVERSITY IN U.S. LAW FIRMS 17 (2024).

63. *Paralegals & Legal Assistants*, DATAUSA, <https://datausa.io/profile/soc/paralegals-legal-assistants> [<https://perma.cc/D9GA-2YEE>] (last visited Feb. 14, 2025).

64. *See supra* note 58.

A. Access to Justice

Empirical evidence documents the prevalence of civil legal problems,⁶⁵ the limited supply of legal assistance,⁶⁶ the increase in pro se litigation,⁶⁷ and the resulting detriments to individuals, communities, and the civil justice system.⁶⁸ Whether regulatory reform will mitigate these harms by increasing the available sources of legal assistance is core to current regulatory debates. Some proponents of regulatory reform emphasize its potential to support technological innovations that will expand access to justice.⁶⁹ Others argue that regulatory reform will facilitate new forms of nonlawyer legal service providers who will help to address this crisis.⁷⁰ In contrast, opponents argue that dismantling the legal profession's monopoly will harm consumers by unleashing providers of insufficient or conflicted legal advice.⁷¹

Rather than adjudicate between these competing predictions, this Essay instead seeks to highlight how institutional forces could complicate efforts to control the effects of regulatory reform. Importantly, as forms of social closure, professionalization projects aim to expand and protect the advantages held by a given occupation.⁷² This objective may or may not align with the objectives of reform advocates who hope to use the division of legal labor to achieve particular ends. For example, regulatory reforms facilitating the vertical division of legal labor intended to promote the rise of

65. See, e.g., HAGUE INST. FOR INNOVATION L. & INST. FOR ADVANCEMENT AM. LEGAL SYS., JUSTICE NEEDS AND SATISFACTION IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 28 (2021) (reporting that 66 percent of Americans experienced at least one legal problem in the past four years).

66. See, e.g., LEGAL SERVICES CORP., THE JUSTICE GAP: THE UNMET CIVIL LEGAL NEEDS OF LOW-INCOME AMERICANS 48 fig.4D (2022) (finding that 93 percent of low-income Americans did not receive any or enough legal help to address civil legal problems they experienced).

67. See NAT'L CTR. FOR STATE CTS., THE LANDSCAPE OF CIVIL LITIGATION IN STATE COURTS 31–33 (2015); Anna E. Carpenter, Colleen F. Shanahan, Jessica K. Steinberg & Alyx Mark, *Judges in Lawyerless Courts*, 110 GEO. L. J. 509, 511 (2022).

68. See, e.g., HAGUE INST. FOR INNOVATION L. & INST. FOR ADVANCEMENT AM. LEGAL SYS., *supra* note 65, at 69.

69. Benjamin H. Barton, *The Future of American Legal Tech: Regulation, Culture, Markets*, in LEGAL TECH AND THE FUTURE OF CIVIL JUSTICE 21, 43 (David Freeman Engstrom ed., 2023) (“There is a version of the future where technology solves the access-to-justice and related pro se crisis and makes an immeasurable difference in the lives of the poor and middle class in America and all over the world.”).

70. Rebecca L. Sandefur, *Legal Advice from Nonlawyers: Consumer Demand, Provider Quality, and Public Harms*, 16 STAN. J. C.R. & C.L. 283, 313 (2020) (“A just and accessible legal system would include a range of kinds of providers, both traditional lawyers and others.”).

71. See MODEL RULES OF PRO. CONDUCT r. 5.5 cmt. 2 (Am. Bar Ass'n 1983) (“[L]imiting the practice of law to members of the bar protects the public against rendition of legal services by unqualified persons.”); MODEL RULES OF PRO. CONDUCT r. 5.4 cmt. 1 (Am. Bar Ass'n 1983) (“These limitations [on fee-sharing] are to protect the lawyer's professional independence of judgment.”). Of course, such arguments have long been criticized as attempts to shroud protectionist impulses. See, e.g., Deborah L. Rhode & Lucy Buford Ricca, *Protecting the Profession or the Public?: Rethinking Unauthorized-Practice Enforcement*, 82 FORDHAM L. REV. 2587, 2588–89 (2014).

72. See Weeden, *supra* note 50, at 59.

not-for-profit human-based legal service delivery models may also enable the rise of technology-based and for-profit models. If the occupational closure efforts of market-based models are more successful, they could effectively crowd out the kinds of occupations that the original regulatory reforms were intended to support. Thus, institutional theory identifies mechanisms through which social hierarchies may be instated and reinstated as occupations evolve.

B. The Development of Law

In addition, institutional forces are also likely to have consequences for the development of law. In his classic work on the juridical field, sociologist Pierre Bourdieu characterizes the legal field as “the site of a competition for monopoly of the right to determine the law.”⁷³ Although Bourdieu notes that many aspects of this competition parallel the jurisdictional turf wars of other fields, he argues that the nature of the legal field has certain attributes that influence this process.⁷⁴ In particular, he connects the legal field’s emphasis on hierarchies of authority to these contests. This suggests that even in a newly diversified field, the right to determine law is likely to persist as the primary differentiating feature.

Yet, at the same time, the emergence of layers of legal workers suggests that a greater number of legal intermediaries may influence the law, whether directly or indirectly. As law is filtered through a greater number of intermediaries, and lawyers themselves come to occupy new spaces within the legal field, the introduction of new professional systems of logic will likely affect the interpretation, administration, and effect of substantive and procedural laws.⁷⁵

Research on the identities of lawyers operating outside of traditional legal environments documents how lawyers both retain and evolve elements of their professional identities and practices. For example, legal scholarship bemoaning the “judicialization” of business arbitration⁷⁶ points to lawyers as one cause of the increasing similarities between arbitration and litigation.⁷⁷ This work suggests that lawyers in some circumstances retain their professional habits, despite pressures from other actors to conform. However, scholarship on in-house counsel suggests a more complex process

73. Pierre Bourdieu, *The Force of Law: Toward a Sociology of the Juridical Field*, 38 HASTINGS L.J. 814, 817 (Richard Terdiman trans., 1987).

74. *See id.*

75. *See* Shauhin Talesh & Jérôme Pélisse, *How Legal Intermediaries Facilitate or Inhibit Social Change*, in STUDIES IN LAW, POLITICS, AND SOCIETY 111, 119–20 (Austin Sarat ed., 2019).

76. Thomas J. Stipanowich, *Arbitration: The “New Litigation”*, 2010 U. ILL. L. REV. 1, 8 (“By the beginning of the twenty-first century . . . it was common to speak of U.S. business arbitration in terms similar to civil litigation—‘judicialized,’ formal, costly, time-consuming, and subject to hardball advocacy.”).

77. *Id.* at 11.

in which lawyers' responses shift in different situations.⁷⁸ This work suggests the potential for lawyers to adopt a range of different identities when occupying new occupational positions outside of traditional legal practice.⁷⁹ Together, this raises questions about the persistence of traditional legal professional logic and habits among lawyers within a changing legal field.

Meanwhile, the growth of legal intermediaries offers the potential for law to be interpreted through the lenses of an increasingly diverse range of professions. For example, work on the "managerialization" of law illustrates how other professions' logic can shape the interpretation of legal topics.⁸⁰ That research illustrates how, "[a]s law is communicated by and among professions, it is filtered through a variety of lenses, and colored by different professional backgrounds, training, and interests."⁸¹ In the case of antidiscrimination law, managers introduced a diversity rhetoric that differed from civil rights laws in important ways⁸² but was widely adopted by organizations and ultimately came to influence the meaning of law.⁸³

Although this phenomenon is best documented in the case of business managers interpreting and applying antidiscrimination law, it also occurs in other contexts.⁸⁴ Moreover, scholars argue that several trends—including the ambiguity in legal rules and their increasing complexity—will generate ongoing opportunities for legal intermediaries to influence the development of law and thus effect or hinder social change.⁸⁵ Thus, the occupational structure of the legal field will determine the range of professional logics through which legal topics are filtered, ultimately impacting the development of law.

C. Regulatory Adaptation

The institutional processes described above suggest that it may be more difficult than is often recognized to predict the consequences of substantive regulatory reforms. This is especially true given the role of occupations themselves in pressuring regulatory structures as they seek to establish jurisdictional boundaries. This emphasizes the importance of enhancing regulatory capacity to adapt to an evolving legal field.

78. See Robert L. Nelson & Laura Beth Nielsen, *Cops, Counsel and Entrepreneurs: Constructing the Role of Inside Counsel in Large Corporations*, 34 L. & SOC'Y REV. 457, 460 (2000).

79. See *id.*

80. See Lauren B. Edelman, Sally Riggs Fuller & Iona Mara-Drita, *Diversity Rhetoric and the Managerialization of Law*, 106 AM. J. SOCIO. 1589, 1615 (2001).

81. *Id.* at 1596.

82. *Id.* at 1626 ("Diversity rhetoric . . . offers a conception of equal employment opportunity that is quite different from that embodied in the statutory language of Title VII or other civil rights laws.").

83. See generally FRANK DOBBIN, *INVENTING EQUAL OPPORTUNITY* (2009).

84. See Talesh & Pélisse, *supra* note 75, at 125–27.

85. *Id.* at 116–18.

Scholars have emphasized the importance of facilitating regulatory adaptation in other contexts characterized by uncertainty.⁸⁶ Likewise, in the legal context, knowing that unexpected events may undermine the intended policy objectives of substantive reforms, the process of evaluating and responding to these realities is key. Yet regulatory fragmentation, such as that in the legal field, has a detrimental effect on efforts to monitor changing realities, promote shared learning, or support substantive adaptation.⁸⁷ This suggests that the complex web of regulation that structures the legal field may hinder efforts of adaptive regulation.

This challenges advocates on all sides of current substantive regulatory debates to consider how to create a more nimble and responsive system of regulation. That is, assuming that legal labor becomes more diversified and the legal field becomes complex with a greater number of competing and potentially overlapping occupations each seeking to further its own professional jurisdiction, there will be a need not only for more substantive regulation governing these various occupations, but also for a more adaptive system of regulation. This emphasizes the importance of considering not only the *what* but also the *how* of legal professional regulation.

CONCLUSION

This moment could represent an inflection point in the regulation of the legal field. Many commentators assume that if this is the case, the result will be a greater division of legal labor. However, it remains unclear what the future holds for the legal industry. Despite signals that reform might quickly spread to other jurisdictions, some states have reached a *détente* that largely preserves the status quo.⁸⁸ Even if reforms are enacted and effective, retrenchment remains a possibility.⁸⁹ And, on top of that, the effect of regulatory reform remains unclear. Actual disruption thus far has been limited even in the states with the most aggressive regulatory reforms.⁹⁰

86. See Alejandro E. Camacho, *Adapting Governance to Climate Change: Managing Uncertainty Through a Learning Infrastructure*, 59 EMORY L.J. 1, 23 (2009) (“Though most commenters have focused on substantive strategies that seek to minimize or reverse the adverse effects of climate change on natural systems, the most crucial adaptations may take the more indirect form of procedural governmental strategies.”).

87. *Id.*

88. See, e.g., Joyce E. Cutler, *California Lawmakers OK Bill to Keep Bar from Expanding Access*, BLOOMBERG L. (Aug. 22, 2022, 6:26 PM), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/california-lawmakers-ok-bill-to-restrain-expanding-access> [<https://perma.cc/2X2G-XN8S>] (describing adoption of state legislation to prevent the State Bar of California from implementing regulatory reforms).

89. See, e.g., Letter from Debra L. Stephens, C.J. of the Sup. Ct. of the State of Washington, to Stephen R. Crossland, Chair of the Ltd. License Technician Bd., Terra Nevitt, Interim Exec. Dir. of the Washington State Bar Ass’n & Rajeev Majumdar, President of the Washington State Bar Ass’n (June 5, 2020), https://www.wsba.org/docs/default-source/licensing/llt/1-2020-06-05-supreme-court-letter-to-steve-crossland-et-al.pdf?sfvrsn=8a0217f1_7 [<https://perma.cc/2H2X-8R5W>] (announcing the sunset of the Washington Limited License Legal Technicians Program).

90. See FREEMAN ENGSTROM ET AL., *supra* note 52, at 49 (“[M]uch of the legal innovation in evidence in [] states [that have adopted regulatory reforms] involves lawyers, whether

Plus, there are those who question whether regulatory reform is likely to engender greater competition.⁹¹

Despite this uncertainty, it is worthwhile to consider what the future of the legal field might look like. Because the organization of the legal industry is so strongly tied to the regulatory regime, changes in regulation are likely to play a significant role in shaping this future. As Professor Rebecca Sandefur and Thomas M. Clarke point out, to the extent that lawyers are responsible for this regulatory regime, they find themselves in the somewhat strange position of designing their own competition.⁹² For this reason, it is important to understand the likely effects of regulatory reform as jurisdictions continue to evaluate whether and how to modify regulations affecting the legal industry.

This Essay argues that such a shift would trigger institutional processes that have largely been overlooked in current debates over regulatory reform. Highlighting mechanisms that are likely to play a role in structuring the organization, work, and composition of occupations within the legal field, this Essay points to the complex dynamics involved as occupations fight to establish and exercise their professional authority. This complexity increases the potential for unintended consequences to emerge and calls into question our ability to accurately predict the effects of reform. In light of this, the Essay suggests that procedural, rather than substantive, regulatory reforms may ultimately prove most consequential, as an adaptive regulatory regime is needed to promote access to justice, prevent consumer harm, and enhance legal development.

traditional law firms exploring new, tiered service delivery models, or companies building out legal verticals by hiring lawyers to practice within them.”). *But see* Rebecca L. Sandefur, Thomas M. Clarke & James Teufel, *Seconds to Impact?: Regulatory Reform, New Kinds of Legal Services, and Increased Access to Justice*, 84 L. & CONTEMP. PROBS. 69, 79 (2021) (“The impact of these reforms on access to justice will take several years to manifest, and observers must be patient enough to allow the necessary time to pass before drawing conclusions about whether the promise of these efforts was borne out.”).

91. *See* Garoupa & Markovic, *supra* note 2, at 965.

92. Rebecca L. Sandefur & Thomas M. Clarke, *Designing the Competition: A Future of Roles Beyond Lawyers?: The Case of the USA*, 67 HASTINGS L.J. 1467, 1469 (2016) (“[C]ourts and bar associations, stewards of the jurisdictional core of the legal profession, are in a sense designing their own competition as they create [] new [legal services] roles that nibble at the U.S. legal profession’s strong monopoly on both representation and legal advice.”).

APPENDIX

Medical and Legal Census Occupations, 1880–1990

<i>Year</i>	<i>Medical Field Occupations</i>	<i>Legal Field Occupations</i>
1880	Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians and Surgeons • Nurses • Dentists • Midwives 	Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawyers
1890	Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians and Surgeons • Dentists Domestic and Personal Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nurses and Midwives 	Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawyers
1900	Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians and Surgeons • Dentists Domestic and Personal Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trained Nurses • Nurses • Midwives 	Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawyers
1910	Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians and Surgeons • Dentists • Trained Nurses Domestic and Personal Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nurses and Midwives 	Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawyers, Judges, and Justices
1920	Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians and Surgeons • Dentists • Trained Nurses • Osteopaths • Physicians' and Surgeons' Attendants and Helpers • Dentists' Assistants and Apprentices Semiprofessional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healers Domestic and Personal Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nurses • Midwives 	Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawyers, Judges, and Justices Semiprofessional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstractors, Notaries, and Justices of Peace
1930	Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians and Surgeons 	Professional Service

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dentists • Trained Nurses • Osteopaths • Physicians' and Surgeons' Attendants • Dentists' Assistants and Apprentices <p>Semiprofessional Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healers • Chiropractors <p>Domestic and Personal Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nurses • Midwives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawyers, Judges, and Justices <p>Semiprofessional Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstractors, Notaries, and Justices of Peace
1940	<p>Professional Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians and Surgeons • Dentists • Trained Nurses and Student Nurses • Osteopaths • Pharmacists <p>Semiprofessional Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healers and Medical Service Workers • Chiropractors • Optometrists <p>Service Workers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practical Nurses and Midwives • Hospital and Other Institution Attendants <p>Clerical, Sales, and Kindred Workers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians' and Dental Offices Attendants 	<p>Professional Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawyers and Judges
1950	<p>Professional, Technical, and Kindred Workers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians and Surgeons • Dentists • Professional Nurses • Professional Nurse Students • Osteopaths • Pharmacists • Chiropractors 	<p>Professional, Technical, and Kindred Workers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawyers and Judges

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Optometrists • Medical and Dental Technicians • Therapists and Healers <p>Clerical and Kindred Workers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians' and Dentists' Office Attendants <p>Service Workers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practical Nurses • Midwives • Hospital and Other Institution Attendants 	
1960	<p>Professional, Technical, and Kindred Workers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians and Surgeons • Dentists • Professional Nurses • Professional Nurse Students • Osteopaths • Pharmacists • Chiropractors • Optometrists • Medical and Dental Technicians • Therapists and Healers • Dieticians and Nutritionists <p>Clerical and Kindred Workers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians' and Dentists' Office Attendants <p>Service Workers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practical Nurses • Midwives • Hospital and Other Institution Attendants 	<p>Professional, Technical, and Kindred Workers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawyers and Judges
1970	<p>Professional, Technical, and Kindred Workers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians, Medical and Osteopathic • Dentists • Registered Nurses • Pharmacists • Chiropractors 	<p>Professional, Technical, and Kindred Workers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawyers • Judges

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Optometrists • Dieticians • Therapists • Podiatrists • Dental Hygienists • Therapy Assistants • Health Practitioners Not Elsewhere Classified • Clinical Laboratory Technologists and Technicians • Radiologic Technologists and Technicians • Health Record Technologists and Technicians • Health Technologists and Technicians Not Elsewhere Classified <p>Managers and Administrators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health Administrators <p>Service Workers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practical Nurses and Midwives • Lay Midwives • Dental Assistants • Nursing Aides, Orderlies, and Attendants • Health Aides, Except Nursing • Health Trainees 	
1980	<p>Managerial and Professional Specialty Occupations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians • Physicians' Assistants • Dentists • Registered Nurses • Pharmacists • Optometrists • Dieticians • Podiatrists • Health Diagnosing Practitioners Not Elsewhere Classified 	<p>Managerial and Professional Specialty Occupations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawyers • Judges

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inhalation Therapists • Occupational Therapists • Physical Therapists • Speech Therapists • Therapists Not Elsewhere Classified • Medicine and Health Managers • Medical Scientists <p>Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support Occupations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Licensed Practical Nurses • Dental Hygienists • Clinical Laboratory Technologists and Technicians • Radiologic Technicians • Health Record Technologists and Technicians • Health Technologists and Technicians Not Elsewhere Classified <p>Service Occupations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nursing Aides, Orderlies, and Attendants • Dental Assistants • Health Aides, Except Nursing 	
1990	<p>Managerial and Professional Specialty Occupations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physicians • Physicians' Assistants • Dentists • Registered Nurses • Pharmacists • Optometrists • Dieticians • Podiatrists • Health Diagnosing Practitioners Not Elsewhere Classified • Respiratory Therapists 	<p>Managerial and Professional Specialty Occupations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawyers • Judges

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Occupational Therapists• Physical Therapists• Speech Therapists• Therapists Not Elsewhere Classified• Medicine and Health Managers• Medical Scientists <p>Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support Occupations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Licensed Practical Nurses• Dental Hygienists• Clinical Laboratory Technologists and Technicians• Radiologic Technicians• Health Record Technologists and Technicians• Health Technologists and Technicians Not Elsewhere Classified <p>Service Occupations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nursing Aides, Orderlies, and Attendants• Dental Assistants• Health Aides, Except Nursing	
--	---	--