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Designing equality in the legal profession requires the adoption of a systems thinking approach similar to those developed by Dispute System Design scholars. Specifically, law firms that adopt a systematic approach to gender issues will be able to redesign organizational procedures and systems to remove gender biases that have crept in and to reach long-term goals to diversify leadership. This approach is referred to as Gender Balance System Design. As a whole, the legal profession can nudge itself to foster a level playing field and an environment that ensures both men and women can excel in leadership roles.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction .......................................... 2
II. Assessing Challenges Faced By Women In The Legal Profession ...................................... 4
   A. Educational Challenges ........................... 6

* Paola Cecchi-Dimeglio, J.D., LL.M., Ph.D., is a Behavioral Scientist and Chair of the Executive Leadership Research Initiative for Women and Minority Attorneys at the Center for the Legal Profession at Harvard Law School and a Senior Research Fellow at Harvard Law School and Harvard Kennedy School’s Women and Public Policy Program (WAPPP). She can be reached at pcecchidimeglio@law.harvard.edu or @HLSPaola. Acknowledgement and appreciation are extended to many members of the Harvard Law School, Harvard Kennedy School, and Harvard Business School and to colleagues at other universities especially for their faculty scholarship. The author is in particular thankful to David Wilkins, Robert Mnookin, Lawrence Susskind, Max Bazerman, Iris Bohnet, Hannah Riley Bowles, Lisa Bingham, Cathy Costantino, Tanina Rostain, Gillian Hadfield, Scott Cummings, Deborah Kolb, Carole Silver, Gary Friedman, Ronit Dinovitzer, Michelle Pekar-Lempereur, Orna Rabinovich-Einy, Ethan Katsh, Carrie Menkel-Meadow, Craig Silliman, Alan Bryan, Anne Weisberg, Melanie Heller, and Peter Kummenga for their helpful comments, guidance, assistance, and support. The author also wants to acknowledge and thank the people at firms with whom she engages in this field work. Special thanks is extended to the amazing students of the Harvard Negotiation Law Review (HNLR), who organized the fall 2017 symposium titled “Make It Work: a Symposium on Designing Equity in the Legal Profession” at Harvard Law School. A special thanks to HNLR’s Amy Feinberg and Amy Maurer, whose excellent work was indispensable to the success of this symposium, and to Sharon Kelleher, Victoriya Levina, and Basil Williams for their editorial work.
I. INTRODUCTION

As a fundamental premise, Dispute System Design (DSD) scholars recognize that neutral organizational design does not exist and that this void is evident in the handling and resolution of conflicts.1 The normative starting point of this Article stems from the same idea. It recognizes that gender is embedded in the “structure of organizations” and that most organizational designs in effect today in the legal profession are not advantageous for women to attain leadership roles.2 Law firm leaders, in general, do not manage gender balance issues in the same manner as other issues that arise in the course of business. Instead, gender balance issues are normally viewed and managed in a piecemeal, ad hoc fashion and as isolated incidents. This Article argues that viewing and managing gender balance issues more systematically, instead, provides unparalleled opportunities for law firms to learn critical information about their operations, population (including individual and group behavior), and environments. By taking this view, organizations can achieve a more holistic and global perspective.

Research shows that most default rules in organizations, by their design, impede the process of attracting, recruiting, and promoting more women.3 Gender biases are enacted in varying and complex ways through organizational behavior, organizational structures, and
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organizational policies. In fact, despite the extensive efforts made by the legal profession in general (and especially law firms) to address the lack of women in senior positions, the results remain disappointing. For instance, only 21.9 percent of law firm partners and 21.6 percent of Fortune 500 general counsels are women. In the 200 highest-grossing law firms, about 18 percent of equity partners are women, and just 4 percent of managing partners are female. Further, women lawyers are far less likely to be credited as “rainmakers” at the same rate as men, in positions of firm-wide leadership at the same rate as men, and compensated by firms at the same level as men. Much to the concern of both gender equity advocates and law firms, who understand the strategic and competitive need for having women in the ranks and the leadership, gender gaps persist in the legal profession.

Designing equality in the legal profession requires the adoption of a system-thinking approach similar to DSD utilized by organizations to deal with disputes. The adoption of a systemic view of gender balance issues will allow law firms to re-design organizational procedures and systems to remove biases that have crept into attracting, recruiting, and promoting more women in leadership and reaching long-term goals to diversify the legal profession and its leadership. Yet, the realization of more equal gender representation in the legal profession requires choices and actions that are not yet part of the law firm management thinking and procedures.


7. Id.

As a step forward in the conversation of addressing systemic issues related to gender, this Article introduces a Gender Balance System Design (GBSD) approach, which will be useful for scholars, law practitioners, judges, and legislators across the world to design and/or improve upon a system that levels the playing field for the genders within an organization. This approach provides new solutions for closing the gender gaps in law firms and the legal profession generally. This Article reviews the challenges faced by women in their education and in the legal profession, considers the steps that are necessary to make changes happen in the legal profession, and provides solutions to nudge the legal profession in designing equality.

II. Assessing Challenges Faced by Women in the Legal Profession

Since Ury et al.’s 1988 book, Getting Disputes Resolved: Designing Systems To Cut The Costs Of Conflict, a robust literature has appeared in the field of DSD. Since the 1960s, a growth in research has focused on providing solutions to tackle conflict situations. In some of the early literature on the subject, scholars from all of the social sciences sought to understand factors leading to conflicts. This led conflict literature to identify and compare ways of dealing with conflicts. Conflict literature found that a problem-solving approach to prevent and solve conflict efficiently was the most sustainable one in the long run. Building on this approach, conflict scholars have differentiated between types of conflict (e.g., cooperative-constructive versus competitive-destructive conflicts) and have extensively studied conflict styles in organizational settings.

Progressively, conflict scholars developed a more detailed and systematic approach to conflict, which included distinctions between interpersonal, intragroup, and intergroup conflict. They then derived the structures (and the values supporting these structures) developed in organizations, which facilitated the management of conflicts.9 This led conflict literature to identify and compare ways of dealing with conflicts.10 Conflict literature found that a problem-solving approach to prevent and solve conflict efficiently was the most sustainable one in the long run. Building on this approach, conflict scholars have differentiated between types of conflict (e.g., cooperative-constructive versus competitive-destructive conflicts) and have extensively studied conflict styles in organizational settings.

12. See Roger Fisher & Daniel Shapiro, Beyond Reason: Using Emotions As You Negotiate 74, 89 (2005); Henri Barki & Jon Hartwick, Conceptualizing The Construct Of Interpersonal Conflict, 15 Int’l J. Conflict Mgmt. 216, 222–30, 244 (2004);
conflict in organizations.\textsuperscript{13} Subsequently, they differentiated and inte-
grated power-based, right-based, and interest-based approaches
into ways to tackle conflicts.\textsuperscript{14} In this effort, in the late 1980s, conflict
scholars proposed principles and models of DSD. DSD falls into the
field of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). ADR concerns a set of
dispute resolution processes and techniques designed to provide al-
ternatives to adjudicated conflict settlements. The purpose of the in-
troduction of such techniques is to reduce caseloads of traditional
court and litigation expenses, as well as to provide disagreeing par-
ties with more control over the process and results in a dispute reso-
lation process as well as achieve a higher level of mutual satisfaction.
Since then, the field has flourished through the multitude of inputs
and works of both practitioners and scholars. DSD can be described
as an intentional and methodical creation of an effective, efficient,
and fair dispute resolution process model based on the unique needs
of a particular system or organization.

The different models have helped to shape the theory of DSD and
have provided different pillars for understanding the rationale of
DSD.\textsuperscript{15} All the different models have recognized that effective DSD
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must include a step design process and an in-depth assessment of the current system, including identification of the challenges faced by users of the system before implementing, evaluating, and adapting a new design. This Article argues that a similar approach should be crafted and applied to issues faced by women in their legal career. In fact, an approach with a clear step design process and assessments of the current system is key to assessing the systemic issues affecting women while in law school and when they enter and evolve in the legal profession.

A. Educational Challenges

In the last half of the twentieth century, women’s access to education has grown, and the very nature of available employment has provided women with more opportunities.16 Today, in the United States, women constitute nearly 50 percent of the country’s workforce and comprise 50.8 percent of the population.17 Similarly, studies have documented an increase in the number of women students across academic disciplines. Overall, women currently constitute more than 60 percent of all Bachelor’s and Master’s cohorts and almost 50 percent of professional degree graduates.18 Yet, in academic areas that have been historically male-dominated, gender gaps persist and, although subtle, are still pernicious. The law is an example of such an area.

For a long time, women’s broadening educational paths, including their increased attendance of law schools, were expected to lead to a proportional increase in female leaders, including in the legal profession. That expectation has not yet occurred.19 “The passage of
time, for years cited as a reason for hope, has failed to put a major
dent in the huge disparities” in both career advancement and leader-
ship positions for women in law. In fact, it took almost a century of
struggle for women, both at the state and federal levels, to gain the
right to be admitted to practice law, and it is only relatively recently
that women were admitted at approximately the same rate as men
into law school.

For example, in the 1950s and 1960s, women made up just 4 per-
cent of first-year law students. Women represented 20 percent in
1974 and 40 percent in 1985 of registered law students. Still, it was
not until 2001 that women matriculated at law school at approxi-
mately the same rate as men. 2016 was the first year in which the
number of female enrollees surpassed male enrollees at United
States law schools. In 2017, women made up the majority of law
school attendees at 51.3 percent.

Even though legal education has made important steps toward
closing the gender gap, a robust body of empirical research on gender
and diversity in law schools consistently demonstrates how and why
legal education makes it more difficult for female students to succeed
in law school and well beyond, including obtaining leadership roles.
One of the key, fundamental problems identified is that law schools constitute environments founded on a culture of masculinity. Despite appearing gender-neutral, inequalities in law schools result from “unconscious biases” and structures that fundamentally and disparately affect women.

Several systemic issues that contribute to these inequalities include the experience of the recipients of the legal knowledge, curriculum design, its content and its delivery, and the disproportionate number of role models between genders stemming from the gendered difference in faculty members teaching law school courses. First, gender legal scholars have recognized that men seem to be the primary recipients of legal knowledge and classroom attention. Experiences in law school for men seem to be significantly different than for women and minorities. Most of the theorizing and research on women’s experiences in law school demonstrates that women in law school seem to be disproportionately alienated and intimidated by their experiences. The competitive classroom environment in law school


significantly discourages women from participating in class. Over-
all, women are less comfortable with the classroom experience—par-
ticularly with the use of the Socratic method. The adverse impact of
the Socratic method on female students exists and is widely recog-
nized; this negative impact on women contrasts startlingly with the
impact on their male counterparts. Women in law schools also re-
port to be less confident in their abilities. As a result, compared to
men, women consistently underperform in law school in terms of
grades. Scholars have attributed this phenomenon to a mismatch
between goals of law schools, on the one hand, and individual law
students or distinct groups of students, on the other.

Additionally, individual courses are gendered both in the male/
female proportion of the faculty teaching the subjects and in the na-
ture of the courses. For instance, Merritt and Reskin’s study
showed that men were significantly more likely than women to teach
Constitutional Law and women were more likely than men to teach
skills courses and Trusts and Estates. Professor Marjorie Korn-
hauser’s seminal empirical study on gender and law school demon-
strated that 80 percent of law school courses she examined suffered
from a gender disparity. She defines this as a “statistically signifi-
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gender distortion.” The nature of the class is more or less perceived as inherently gendered. For instance, students are more inclined to perceive a course in corporate finance as gendered male, compared to family law, which is more likely to be perceived as gendered female.

Professor Kornhauser notes that women are more likely to teach classes that are viewed as less prestigious, meaning courses that faculty members are less interested in teaching and therefore confer less power on the teaching faculty member, than those taught by men. Faculty members with more power in shaping the institution generally do not teach, what she refers to as “low-status courses.”

Consequently, these perceptions and their effects may influence law students’ career choices and options well beyond law school, especially for women. Indeed, research has repeatedly demonstrated that experiences in law school are indicative of future career options and experiences in a legal career.

B. Challenges to Achieving Leadership Positions

Without a doubt, women’s experiences in law school affect their career trajectories long after graduation, including the leadership roles and opportunities that will arise along their careers. In fact, over the last two decades, a rich body of literature across disciplines has developed on the structural barriers or hurdles women face in the legal profession in attaining leadership positions.

The first hurdle that affects women’s likelihood of attaining positions of leadership is that they are more likely to leave the practice of law than men. This movement affects the pool of women that remain on trajectories to leadership positions. In fact, women leaving

41. Id.
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44. See Deborah L. Rhode et al., Legal Ethics 54, 58 (2012); Deborah L. Rhode & Amanda Packel, Leadership: Law, Policy, and Management 75–79 (2011); Rhode, Gender and the Profession, supra note 4, at 1002, 1006.
46. See Boutcher & Silver, supra note 45, at 1142, 1147.
the practice of law begins early in their career and accelerates over time.47 Overall, women are more likely to leave the practice of law before they reach leadership positions (e.g., before partnership decisions are made).48 Up until now, most of the empirical research has focused on the barriers preventing women from becoming leaders in law, but very few studies have been able to document the factors that lead women to decide to leave their positions in law.49

The second hurdle is the under-representation of women in senior positions in law, which leaves young women aspiring to leadership positions with few role models.50 Research has shown that women’s under-representation in senior positions can signal that being female is a liability.51 As a result, would-be women leaders are discouraged from turning to senior women for developmental advice and support.52 For instance, in a study comparing experiences of women law associates as a function of women’s representation in their firm’s partnership, those in firms with few women partners were less likely to experience gender as a positive basis for identification with senior women. Those women were also less likely to perceive senior women as role models with legitimate authority.53 Not only were senior women scarce, but their scarcity made others perceive them unfit as role models.54 As such, limited access to leadership positions for women has historically diminished both role modeling and opportunities for aspiring female professionals.

Third, women are often left out of vital mentoring relationships in the legal world, and their exclusion results in a negative cycle. Women lacking mentors are less likely to advance and more inclined to leave practice settings. Therefore, fewer women rise and act as mentors to new female associates in these settings.55

47. See Rhode & Packel, Leadership, supra note 44, at 80–88.
48. See Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Beyond The Double Bind: Women And Leadership 120 (1995); see also Headworth et al., supra note 8, at 46, 117.
49. See Jamieson, supra note 48, at 120.
51. Id.
52. Id.
54. Id.
55. Id.
Fourth, lack of networking access and opportunities for women presents a lasting hurdle for women to make it to leadership positions. Networking is conceptually distinct from mentoring, with a definition somewhat more fluid. It constitutes a part of the informal organizational system that is crucial for both men and women to advance through the organizational hierarchy.56 When women lack access to networking, they struggle to advance in the organization.

Lastly, inflexibilities in law firm work schedules and structures are recognized as barriers to women attaining leadership roles.57 Women typically assume the principal role for caregiving over their lifetime. As a result, women frequently have to take time out from their careers to fulfill the caregiver role. Research has shown that women continue to pay a high penalty for “off-ramping” and leaving their careers.58 Such off-ramps keep women from taking or being considered for promotional opportunities, and when they do re-enter the career stream, it is difficult for them to gain momentum in the promotion process and parity in earning power with their male counterparts.59

III. MAKING STEPS TO CHANGE: GENDER BALANCE SYSTEM DESIGN

A. An Interdisciplinary Approach

The concept of Gender Balance System Design (GBSD) originates in DSD and builds on DSD’s interdisciplinary and systemic approach to solving conflict to level the playing field for the genders.60 Karl Popper noted, “[w]e are not students of some subject matter, but students of problems. And problems may cut right across the borders of any subject matter or discipline.”61 Popper’s statement reflects the truth that scholars are, much of the time, compelled to refer to other disciplines to solve problems. Social science scholarship abounds with examples of the integration of knowledge from various research fields. For example, in the nineteenth century, Louis Pasteur laid down the foundations of microbiology and immunology by addressing

56. Id.
57. Id.
58. Id.
practical questions about diseases and wine spoilage. Similarly, social scientists must respond to the myriad of forces influencing human society when conducting research. The integration and synthesis of ideas and methods from other disciplines creates a platform for conversations and connections among disciplines. Furthermore, research demonstrates that, on an individual basis, the exposure to ideas outside one’s own discipline positively impacts researchers within their own disciplines.

Among the most cited motives for interdisciplinary research is the increased need to address complex problems that must be attacked simultaneously with deep knowledge from different perspectives. Such motives have led scholars, including those in the field of law, to powerfully combine knowledge in an interdisciplinary manner. Take, for instance, the initiative of Dean Christopher Columbus Langdell, who applied the principles of pragmatism to the study of law to support breakthrough ways to solve legal problems, which led to the emergence of the field of Law and Economics. As a result, the study of law is not just a technical pursuit but also a dialectical process of inference. Langdell suggested that law students must be given some means of experimentation and research to discover the fundamental scientific axioms that ought to be used in studying, teaching, and judging the law. His idea grew out of the observation of the process used in other fields such as philosophy, chemistry, and biology, where experimentation based on a series of questions led to a logical conclusion. In addition, the field of Law and Economics was developed in response to the need for “gaining a better understanding of the economic nature and consequences of law.” This field has

---
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adroitly handled the phenomenon of internationalization and has proposed better understandings of several areas of law that now can be studied in conjunction with economic analyses.

B. \textit{Designing Gender Based Systems}

Designing gender equality in the legal profession should be informed by these interdisciplinary experiences. Closing the gender gap in the legal profession requires raising unexplored issues and studying different disciplines and systems of thinking, including DSD.\textsuperscript{67} DSD is the result of organizational decision-making dynamics. Designing gender equality entails attention to the same dynamics. Both dispute and gender issues revolve around changing the understanding and behavior of agents towards a specific topic, as well as the processes for managing the issues at individual, group, and organizational levels. The successes of such an endeavor are dependent on the understanding and appreciation of the organizational procedures that stem from decision-making processes of leaders of organizations.

In theory, such decision-making processes seem rather straightforward: leadership defines a goal and course of action. If a problem emerges, possible options and actions are identified for solving the problem. The different options are then analyzed and compared, and the most effective one is selected and adopted by the organization. This account of organizational function and procedure seems linear, logical, and capable of addressing and disposing of any challenges that might arise.\textsuperscript{68} If it were this simple, then the legal profession and, more particularly, law firms, would not continue to struggle with attracting, retaining, and promoting women. Given that the legal profession houses individuals who are adept at problem solving, lawyers are disposed to assume that the challenge is easily resolved. Were it this simple, a solution would have been devised and implemented, and more women would work in law firms and at senior level positions. However, practice proves to be more difficult to change than theory suggests. A solution, therefore, requires planned, intentional actions that remove biases in the existing system and approaches that nudge more women into leadership in law firms.

\textsuperscript{67} In 2008, the Program on Negotiation (PON) at Harvard Law School organized a symposium on DSD. The symposium aimed to enhance thought and offer tools to approach complex problems through DSD practice and theory. The author is thankful for the guidance, advice, and suggestions that she received from Cathy Costantino, Orna Rabinovich-Einy, Ethan Katsh, Carrie Menkel-Meadow, Peter Kamminga, and other participants in the University of Tilburg TISCO conference on “Exploring the Key Tasks of Dispute Systems” in 2009.

\textsuperscript{68} See \textit{OSTROM}, supra note 2, at 30–45.
I argue that the only way to do this is by using a systematic and systemic approach. The framework I developed is called “Gender Balance System Design” (GBSD). GBSD consists of designing solutions based on data that are tailored to an organization’s specific needs and of redirecting systems to remove biases. Just as in DSD, the smallest details matter in GBSD. GBSD represents a step-change in an organization’s management culture and requires action from an organization’s leadership, including a visible and consistent commitment, as well as the necessary resources, incentives, and accountability systems. Given the various ways in which GBSD may be developed, the outcomes of institutional efforts may vary widely.

GBSD is the process of assessing planned action with respect to its implications for women and men. Elements assessed include procedures, policies, metrics, and programs, in all areas and at all organizational levels. GBSD’s key objective is to design better procedures that align with organizational strategy and seek to bring more women to all aspects of institutions. GBSD is a system-thinking approach for making women’s and men’s concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of procedures.

Implementation of GBSD uses nudging techniques to improve outcomes and impacts. First, GBSD fosters a better understanding of individuals and organizations, especially with respect to their decision-making processes. Second, design-thinking and organizational behavior help the legal profession develop solutions and nudges that

---


can influence processes and decisions, aligning them to an organization’s long-term goal of removing biases that have infiltrated the system. The knowledge and utilization of nudges by the legal profession is still in its infancy, but is increasingly receiving attention.74

Similar to DSD, GBSD offers a framework for how individuals should behave with respect to each other and within organizations. As such, the design adopts policies and procedures to instill new behaviors. In other words, organizations devise and implement more effective ways of recognizing when and where gender biases might occur and intervene to prevent these biases.

Biases affect the manner in which group members interact with each other and how individuals from different groups relate to one another. Biases also underpin the results of people’s interactions. If policies or procedures work well, people within organizations are likely to use and repeat them. With this in mind, GBSD focuses on the design structure of organizations, with the objective of leveling the playing field by removing biases in the system.

IV. IMPLEMENTING CHANGES: NUDGING OUR PROFESSION TO LEVEL THE PLAYING FIELD

Before designing a gender balance system within a law firm, it is necessary to ask several questions. These questions include, but are not limited to: “What is the observed behavior that needs to be changed?” “What is the target behavior that we would like the users to exhibit?” “What are the barriers that are keeping the users from the target behavior?” “How can the behavior change be measured for effectiveness?”75

Consider the scenario in which a group of hiring attorneys is tasked with choosing between candidate X and candidate Y. Each attorney has a preference for either candidate X or candidate Y, based on the extent to which each candidate furthers that attorney’s personal goals and objectives. GBSD analysis begins with the assumption that individual and group decisions are driven by two factors: first, by the incentives and constraints faced by decision-makers and, second, by seemingly arbitrary features of the decision-making process that may also affect which candidate people choose.

A “nudge” approach can address these incentives, constraints, and other features of the decision-making process. A nudge approach

74. Cecchi-Dimeglio, To Hire More Women, Follow These Steps, supra note 70, at 69.
75. Id.
refers to a system created or designed to change a specific behavior. It is an umbrella term for many different methods and strategies that can be utilized to change organizational behavior.\textsuperscript{76} Nudges are ways of inducing behavioral change, but not all things inducing behavioral change are nudges.\textsuperscript{77} Nudges are intentional, strategic, and incremental. Most of these methods and strategies have been tried and tested in the field or in laboratory settings. Finally, the design of nudges is data-driven.\textsuperscript{78} The ability to tap into the power of data is essential in designing and assessing the impact of nudges. When data is correctly leveraged, decisions can be made more efficiently and confidently.\textsuperscript{79}

For instance, in the hiring context, data can assist individuals and organizations in making better overall decisions in hiring and candidate selection processes.\textsuperscript{80} In considering the hiring data for every current male and female attorney, tens of thousands of data points enable us to pinpoint bias in the process.\textsuperscript{81} As the research confirms, during the interview process, various problems arise, often simultaneously, in terms of biases and inconsistent hiring standards.\textsuperscript{82} Biases influence perceptions and evaluations, and this psychological dynamic is particularly prominent during the hiring process.\textsuperscript{83}

There are several causes of bias in the hiring process. First, hiring decisions are based on limited information about applicants.\textsuperscript{84} Furthermore, hiring often necessitates relatively fast decision-making and is routinely performed under the pressure of compressed timeframes.\textsuperscript{85} Compounding these challenges and increasing the likelihood of reliance on bias, the interview process presents multiple
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temptations to assess candidates in ways that are particularly vulnerable to bias. Nonetheless, many lawyers erroneously believe that their training and aptitude renders them adept at fairness and less prone to biases; they tend to believe that biases do not influence them as much as they influence others.

Second, by nature of their diversity and in the absence of governing or overriding policy or strategy, interviewers diverge with respect to how they rate applicants, as well as how they apply evaluation standards in the hiring process.

Third, many personnel are involved in hiring decisions. Participants range from hiring partners, to managing partners, to practice or group leaders, and so on. The interface between candidates for employment and these wide-ranging personalities generate communications from organizations that can be inconsistent or ambiguous.

Fourth, interviewers misinterpret candidate information as well as misconceive or ignore an applicant’s motivation to join the firm.

Fifth, several common cognitive biases arise in the hiring process. For example, employers can make assumptions about candidates based on their own past experiences.

Cognitive dissonance is the tendency to rationalize or modify evidence that does not support our choices. Employers’ decisions are shaped by a “framing effect”: the way data is presented affects the conclusions drawn from it. These decisions are also influenced by an “anchoring effect”: decisions tend to be based on information that is acquired early on in the hiring process. Decision frames—the ways in which outcomes of candidates are presented—can be affected by norms, habits, personal characteristics, and the environments in which options are presented.
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Finally, other factors that impact the evaluation process include the pool of applicants interviewed. The day that interviews are conducted also affect the relative impression of the quality of the applicant.\footnote{See Madeline E. Heilman, Gender Stereotypes and Workplace Bias, 32 Res. in Org. Behav. 113, 117, 121 (2012).}

Thorough, well-designed interview processes consider how applicants, including women, are treated before, during, and after interviews. Any hiatuses in the design processes of interviews can put women in a disadvantageous position. A consistent process with well-defined decision points and different levels of evaluators is a strategy that ensures that all applicants who reach a particular stage in the system, including women, are advantageously positioned.

These nudges have been applied at national and international law firms. A summary of the extensive empirical analysis and interventions conducted at those firms follows.\footnote{Randomized field experiments have grown increasingly popular in economics and social sciences, yet their application to the legal field overall is relatively new. The practice of conducting randomized experiments is drawn from medicine, where drugs and treatments are tested on animal and human subjects in controlled conditions to assess their efficacy. Randomized field experiments are used to test theories and treatments among humans in a natural, real-world setting (the “field”), where participants face the incentives, constraints, and settings that govern their daily lives. The randomized control trial (RCT) is a trial in which subjects are randomly assigned to one of two groups: one (the experimental group) receiving the intervention that is being tested, and the other (the comparison group or control) receiving an alternative (conventional) treatment.}

The first form of nudge being used to reduce gender bias is the so-called “encouragement nudge.” Before meeting a candidate, an email is sent to people involved in the hiring process, primarily partners and associates, requesting their targeted feedback on specific skills the practice group seeks from the potential hire.\footnote{See Paola Cecchi-Dimeglio, Nudging Recruitment: Designs that Work for Increasing the Pool of Female Talent at Law Firms (Harvard Univ. Working Paper, 2016).}

A. **Encouragement Nudge**

The first form of nudge being used to reduce gender bias is the so-called “encouragement nudge.” Before meeting a candidate, an email is sent to people involved in the hiring process, primarily partners and associates, requesting their targeted feedback on specific skills the practice group seeks from the potential hire.\footnote{See Cecchi-Dimeglio, Three Nudges That Translate Into Hiring More Women, supra note 73, at 17, 36.}
The encouragement consists of two parts. First, there is bold text at the top of the page in the subject area of the email that explicitly asks hiring partners and associates to keep in mind how important it is for the firm to recruit more women and how much the firm values women as employees. Second, associates and partners participating in the hiring process are asked to state how many women they have been working with over the last week and within the last month, and then are asked to rank those women among the employees within their practice groups. These questions are designed to remind participants about their own personal experience at the firm and compel individuals to reflect on the presence of women at the firm, the number of women at the senior level, and the distribution or clustering of women across practice groups. Participants are able to see how the actual number of women might differ compared to the professed values of the firm and its expressed commitment to having more women in the organization. The encouragement email and two short questions serve as a reminder for participants involved in hiring.

This information disclosure serves as a nudge that may make employers more likely to select one behavior over another, but it does so without affecting existing choice incentives or options. The idea behind targeted information-giving as a nudge is not to induce in-depth thinking, but for the message to act as a heuristic, a “rule of thumb.”

B. Structural Nudge

The second form of nudge currently being used is a so-called “structural nudge.” One example of a “structural nudge” is a “competency and work model” analysis. Law firms employing this model take into account the core competencies that the firm is seeking in employees and strives to close gender gaps in top ranks based on those core competencies.
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102. The most basic component of structural consistency is standardization of questioning. Early studies stipulated question content and sequence through interview guides and question patterns or arrays. See generally Eldon F. Wonderlic & Carl I. Hovland, The Personnel Test: A Restandardized Abridgment of the Otis S-A Test for Business and Industrial Use, 23 J. APPLIED PSYCHOL. 685, 687 (1939); Carl I. Hovland & Eldon F. Wonderlic, Prediction of Success from a Standardized Interview, 23 J. APPLIED PSYCHOL. 537, 541, 544 (1939).
Law firms establish a clear list of criteria in advance, both at the firm level and at the group level. The list includes what is required for associates based on their years of practice. This list is provided to each interviewer in advance of their interviews. Each competency is asked about in interviews by at least one interviewer across the several interview rounds, and the most important competencies are asked about several times. Some of these competencies are evaluated either through situational questions or by asking the candidate to use concrete examples from their experience demonstrating each competency.

Situational questions present applicants with a hypothetical situation relevant to a specific legal issue and ask how they would respond. This type of exercise yields a high degree of job-relevant information about the applicant, eliminating guessing and the reliance on differences in gender stereotyping for both male and female applicants. Situational interview questions are based on the premise that people’s intentions, decision-making, and actions are predictive of their future behavior. They are also useful in assessing competencies from a gender-neutral point of view. Applicants are also asked to describe a previous event that occurred during their time as a lawyer or in school that is relevant to the competencies sought. Answers can include descriptions of the most challenging deal, merger, or litigation in which they were involved. These questions are meant to prompt the candidate to demonstrate competencies through the use of concrete, experience-based examples of how he or she would perform in a particular practice area. While levels of expertise and competencies vary from entry-level attorneys to more experienced lawyers, past experiences in both cases can also serve as a good indicator of potential.

Custom behavioral interview questions are designed to focus on specific competencies, whether an applicant can do the job, and assessment of motivational fit for the job and the firm. Such interview questions can assess applicants’ ability to investigate facts,
professionalism when working with clients, and effort to understand instructions given by clients. Interview questions relating to job fit and firm fit are designed in a gender-neutral way and seek to explore applicants’ preferences.

Interviewers can also evaluate interviewees’ responses against pre-determined rating scales. Different points on rating scales should correspond to specific behaviors.111 This precision will promote a shared, standardized scale for what kinds of behaviors represent weak, moderate, and strong performance on interview questions. These scales should be based on important criteria pre-established by the firm and the firm’s list of competencies.

C. Altering-Conditions Nudge

The third form of nudge is the so-called “altering-conditions nudge.”112 After interviewers assign independent ratings for each applicant, firms compute a general review of an applicant’s responses. Interviewers do not review the other interviewers’ questions. This approach ensures the use of a single rating for each competency across the different interviewers.113 Upper and lower bounds and standard deviations are included in the final ratings of all candidates. In this system, interviewers rate specific applicants against set criteria before making their own judgments about whether or not to hire an applicant.

Finally, evaluators are asked to decide whom to include rather than whom to exclude from a list of individuals for a job offer.114 This nudge helps employers to evaluate each candidate in isolation and, subsequently, to evaluate candidates after seeing all the options available.115 The nudge also helps steer interviewers away from subjective or biased strategies and arrive at decisions based on more objective criteria, especially when considering female candidates.

V. Conclusion

The late Nobel Prize winner, Elinor Ostrom, observed that interdisciplinary research inspires creative breakthroughs. This Article
aims to contribute to a “second generation” of DSD research by providing a novel approach for using system design to solve gender issues. Increasingly, organizations find themselves undertaking efforts to attract, hire, and promote more diverse candidates, and especially women, to leadership roles. However, even the best intentions, actions, and expectations are failing to close the gender gap, particularly in leadership positions in law firms. Closing this gap is achievable through the creation of consistent, bias-reducing systems and sets of procedures that level the playing field in the workplace. Gentle nudges and consistent processes will enable law firms and other organizations to achieve the goals that continue to elude them. By removing obstacles and barriers in our understanding of how to solve these problems, we can mitigate biases to allow both women and men to compete and excel in the legal profession.