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The two teaching articles I have written share the word “transformation” in the title.¹ The articles also have in common that the teaching that inspired such deep reflection took place across borders and across cultures, in Nicaragua and Guatemala respectively. It struck me only recently that I never once addressed explicitly the dimensions of cross-cultural education in either article. My focus then turned to social justice lawyering. I knew from the literature that transformative learning requires learners to look deeply into themselves to question their assumptions, which rarely happens absent moving, meaningful experiences.² Thus, I was seeking to provide a transformative learning experience to law students predisposed to social justice: one that would help them grow into even
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better advocates through contextualized learning driven by human connectedness and deep self-reflection.

The global nature of my teaching would, of course, bring to bear the obvious cross-cultural aspects of my teaching. While all lawyering is cross-cultural, the students who joined me were exposed to blatant differences: ideological, economic, linguistic, cultural, and legal. Of course, through these educational experiences, my students were learning traditional intercultural skills, such as legal Spanish, comparative law and comparative legal systems, and lawyering across borders. Yet, when one of my colleagues asked me to provide some of my writings on intercultural teaching in preparation for a workshop on intercultural sensibility, I hesitantly provided my writings on transformation; I had not, after all, used the terms intercultural or cross-cultural sensibility even once in my writings. Upon reflection, I recognize now that this was largely due to my failure to recognize then that the type of transformative pedagogy I advocated in my earlier pieces should be integral to the meaning of intercultural legal sensibility for lawyers who engage across borders and across cultures.

I credit Professor Laura Nader’s insolent voice at the workshop on intercultural sensibility as a transformative moment for me as a teacher. I use the word insolent only to describe and applaud Nader’s brazen boldness as she scolded us—the law professors in the room—for engaging in the conversation about intercultural sensibility without extreme caution or acknowledging law’s potential for cultural dominance and with a seeming lack of awareness of the power imbalances in the entire enterprise. Nader’s work on the ethnography of law and conflict, which deeply influenced my own thinking and writings on the introduction of mediation in Nicaragua to resolve domestic violence cases, explains her misgivings about any pretense of neutrality in settings that educate lawyers on global engagement. Her works, Harmony Ideology: Justice and Control in a Zapotec Mountain Village and Law in Culture and Society, connect law to the colonization project and recognize law’s potential for cultural
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dominance and hierarchical hegemony, even when introduced under pretenses of taming conflict.\textsuperscript{7} One memorable moment in Nader’s intervention was when she asked workshop participants to come up with a list of ten rules on what not to do when engaging globally, a sort of do not harm list, which, as she said, might be as simple as when Western doctors learned to wash their hands so as not to introduce deadly disease into the villages they wanted to “save.”

This Article is an attempt to take up Nader’s challenge, not in the form of a list of ten; rather, I wish to reflect on what it would mean to infuse the teaching of intercultural legal sensibility with the necessary lessons to avoid perpetuating cultural dominance and global power imbalances through law. This process necessarily requires transformation on the part of all who engage globally and cross-culturally. By transformation, I am suggesting a process that will lead to cognitive and attitudinal changes. These would occur through critical self-reflection provoked by intense experiential learning opportunities and infused with meaningful human connectedness between groups and individuals whose lives are quite different from each other. In Part I of this Article, I try to answer the question of why I perceive a need for transformation in students engaged in cross-cultural lawyering and define the types of changes that I seek to promote in students (i.e., the outcomes). In Part II, I define the methodology this type of transformational learning requires as informed by the lessons offered by experienced educators in several disciplines and as adapted through my own trials and errors. My focus here is principally on summer abroad programs and on service learning opportunities that include student immersion in rich cross-cultural exchanges. Finally, in Part III, I identify ways to measure the effectiveness of law school programs that aim to teach cross-cultural sensibility, by drawing lessons from what other disciplines have done in similar programs for at least half a century.

I have chosen to write this Article in the first person for two reasons. The first is because the teaching of intercultural legal sensibility is a very personal and relational experience. As teachers, we are given the privilege and responsibility to engage with others not only about ideas, but also about values, sometimes through emotive experiences. I am acutely aware that each of us—the teacher and the students—experiences the classroom or the spaces beyond the classroom as cultural beings, with our own set of assumptions, values, and lived experiences. I try, then, to approach these teaching spaces with tremendous respect and awareness of our cultural

\textsuperscript{7} See generally LAURA NADER, HARMONY IDEOLOGY: JUSTICE AND CONTROL IN A ZAPOTEC MOUNTAIN VILLAGE (1990); NADER, LAW IN CULTURE, supra note 5.
differences, and with a commitment to mutual growth. This vision of teaching requires on my part awareness, reflection, adaptability, and transparency. My second reason to write this Article in the first person is to attempt to model this type of self-awareness, reflection, and critical assessment about my own teaching, and through this modeling, discover, reveal, and even transform my approach to teaching intercultural legal sensibility.

I. THE OUTCOME: INTERCULTURAL LEGAL SENSIBILITY AS TRANSFORMATION

A. LINKING INTERCULTURAL SENSIBILITY TO TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING

Transformative learning, which can lead to cognitive and attitudinal change, is not about forcing or manipulating students to adopt a set of values or beliefs; rather, the entire goal is to encourage adult learners to think reflectively through meaningful experiences so that the student can, if she chooses, reformulate her assumptions, understand the world from a different perspective, and be open to differences. In this sense, it is not so different from critical thinking skills taught in the law school classroom, except that the experience is more personal, intense, and, therefore, likely more impactful.

For example, when writing about our experiences teaching in rural Nicaragua and introducing our students to collectivist, Sandinista-inspired thinking, Leticia Saucedo, my co-author, and I wrote:

We did not aim to turn [our students] into Sandinistas, nor were we attaching a normative superiority to the Cooperative’s vision and method for social change…. But as academics, our role was to make students aware of these different perspectives and help them reflect upon them, while introducing them both to academic literature attempting to locate answers to [the causes of domestic violence in Nicaragua] and to a social reality that might call for different explanations and solutions.8

8 Aldana & Saucedo, Learning in Mulukukú, supra note 1, at 259. In Nicaragua, students worked for a women’s cooperative in a rural town where the Cooperative was implementing, through USAID funding, a mediation center to resolve disputes in the absence of formal justice. The Cooperative worked a great deal with men who were violent, and members hoped that mediation could bring about change in men. The cooperative mostly blamed what they labeled “structural violence” – poverty, unemployment, deep inequality, etc. – for men’s violence, and thus, welcomed the opportunity for a more restorative justice approach to traditional punishment. The students, many of them feminists and liberal in their conception of rights, had greater difficulty displacing agency away from the
Adult education should encourage reflective thinking, recognizing that all learners make epistemic assumptions that radically affect the way they understand and subsequently solve problems. Jack Mezirow, who is credited with initiating the theoretical field of transformative learning, suggests that adulthood is the time for reassessing assumptions from the formative years, which often result in distorted views of reality. Thus, he describes transformative learning as a “process of becoming critically aware of how and why our presuppositions constrain the way we perceive, understand, and feel about our world; of reformulating these assumptions to permit a more inclusive, discriminating, permeable, and integrative perspective.”

The fact that transformative learning does not seek to convert students to think in a particular way does not mean that transformative teaching does not seek cognitive and attitudinal change. As we described when we wrote about Mulukukú:

We were very purposefully trying to take students out of their comfort zone. We sought to place them in a very different social reality, one of extreme poverty, in a country that had undergone a social revolution that changed the rhetoric of oppression. We hoped that this experience would encourage students to reflect and question their own assumptions and biases, to confront fears that could limit their ability to think critically about the causes of oppression, and to consider alternative approaches to social change. We were asking students to question their liberalism; we were asking them to reconsider the value of economic and social rights; we wanted them to reconsider the role of the state or corporations in causing and solving injustice; we were introducing them to a collective model of social activism. We hoped this experience would change their vision of public interest lawyering and the role they could play, as agents of social change.

As I reflect on the Mulukukú article and read the literature on intercultural sensibility, I am struck by how much of it resonates with the type of learning objectives we were trying to achieve in Nicaragua. Intercultural sensibility is much more than the mere acquisition of individual. We explore some of these dynamics in the piece we wrote on the introduction of mediation in this town. Aldana & Saucedo, The Illusion of Transformative Conflict Resolution, supra note 6.


11 Aldana & Saucedo, Learning in Mulukukú, supra note 1, at 260.
knowledge about another’s culture or of skills, such as language. Definitions of intercultural sensibility across disciplines principally emphasize the learner’s developmental growth and personal change. C. Pepin, for example, explained that cross-cultural education must focus on personal growth because intercultural sensibility works only when it touches on mental, physical, and emotional variables and offers the learner an opportunity not only to increase knowledge and skills, but to mature in an environment capable of stimulating growth and development in a different way than in the learner’s own culture.12 William Gudykunst and Young Yun Kim describe the intercultural person as one who has achieved an advanced level in the process of becoming intercultural and whose cognitive, affective, and behavioral characteristics are not limited but are open to growth beyond the psychological parameters of only one culture . . . The intercultural person possesses an intellectual and emotional commitment to the fundamental unity of all humans and, at the same time, accepts and appreciates the differences that lie between people of different cultures.13

Claire Kramsch has termed an intercultural stance as a “third place” from where learners look critically at their own culture as well as the culture that is the focus of study.14 Theodore L. McEvoy, when writing about the opportunity of higher education to educate students in a shrinking world, defines cosmopolitanism as more than “simple worldliness,” instead suggesting a more profound inner development (i.e., “the capacity for unlimited horizons, a mystical oceanic attitude toward existence, and an abiding concern with the nature of reality and meaning”).15

Legal scholars writing on the development of intercultural legal sensibility similarly focus on the development of the law student as a multicultural being, emphasizing the importance of critical self-awareness and/or empathy toward clients and communities. The five habits of cross-cultural lawyering described in the work of Susan Bryant and Jean Koh Peters, for example, encourage cognitive awareness of cultural difference in order to take into account not only the cultural differences between the client and lawyer, but also the cultural differences among client, lawyer,

14 CLAIRE KRAMSCH, CONTEXT AND CULTURE IN LANGUAGE TEACHING 223 (1993).
decision-maker, and law.\textsuperscript{16} In turn, this awareness challenges the lawyer to question his or her own assumptions and biases so as to practice law (and mediate the application of law by others to client) based on facts.\textsuperscript{17} Carwina Weng critiques the multicultural lawyering literature that emphasizes developing awareness of the client’s culture without delving into developing cultural self-awareness.\textsuperscript{18} Weng, instead, proposes learning cultural self-awareness and teaching cognitive and social psychology to permit the learner to understand and modify his or her own unconscious biases.\textsuperscript{19} Multicultural lawyering, of course, often involves relating across racial and ethnic differences. Marjorie Silver makes very similar observations with regard to multicultural lawyering and race and prescribes a deep exploration of the learner’s own racism as a necessary precursor to competent multicultural lawyering.\textsuperscript{20} Zuni Cruz, in her piece on lawyering for indigenous peoples, writes that cultural literacy “requires an analytical framework that engenders respect . . . Those who interact with a community as lawyers do so in such a manner as to impart cultural re/production, and cultural literacy helps lawyers to move indigenous communities from cultural reproduction to cultural production.”\textsuperscript{21} Additionally, Cruz penned a joint work with Margaret Montoya on the related concept of racial literacy, which they describe as a “transformative process…based on two ideas; first that ‘race’ involves several ways of coding and decoding information and second, that these racial codes can be reinscribed with new meaning ….\textsuperscript{22} Thus, cultural or racial literacy includes also the ability to “critically analyze the social and political structures that inform … [our] realities.”\textsuperscript{23}

B. \textbf{THE PREMISES FOR TRANSFORMATION}

Having linked intercultural sensibility to transformative learning, this Article takes up more concretely the types of transformation necessary to gain intercultural legal sensibility. I will depart from several premises in framing these objectives, which must be explained first.


\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Id.} at 70-78.


\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Id.} at 383-402.


\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Id.} at 891.

\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Id.} at 892.
First, globalization has transformed the law, legal problems, and, thereby lawyering as well. Globalization challenges traditional notions of state sovereignty through the trans-nationalization of legal, political, and economic systems. Globalization also gives rise to new actors, such as global institutions and non-governmental organizations, as well as multinational corporations and armed rebel groups, all of which challenge traditional notions of state legal and moral accountability. Globalization further brings with it new clients and creates new legal challenges through such forces as transnational migration; trafficking in persons, drugs, or weapons; the transfer of goods and money across borders; and increasingly sophisticated technology. Moreover, the drive for expanded markets with cheaper labor and materials and more flexible environmental and social regulations gives rise to new challenges calling for transnational legal responses and strategies. This means that all law students who practice law will likely encounter global clients and issues requiring them to engage in multicultural lawyering in ways that call for transnational engagement with foreign, international or global actors, laws, or legal systems.

Second, law itself and lawyering are linked in complex and varied ways to culture. The meaning of culture has been reexamined over the last few decades. Anthropologists used to define culture as a fixed and stable set of beliefs, values, and institutions. Now, culture is better understood as a flexible repertoire of practices and discourses created through historical processes of contestation over signs and meaning. As anthropologist Sally Engle Merry explains, “cultural forms and practices are locally expressed but connected to global systems and economic exchange, power relations, and systems of meaning.” Moreover, culture is constructed and transformed over time through the activities of individuals and events, rather than through gradual social evolution; thus, “culture is continuously produced and reproduced at particular historical times in specific places, situated within global movements of people and capital.” Further, culture is integral to systems of power, and the maintenance of these systems depends on retaining particular cultural meanings, while moments of resistance include redefinitions of cultural meanings.

26 Id.
27 Id.
28 Id. at 577-78.
29 Id. at 578.
This richer understanding of culture has significant implications for explaining the varied linkages between law and culture. Law itself is a type cultural expression: it is a normative system comprised of a series of rules and legal institutions that attempt to define or impose a social order, and it is subject to change in response to different circumstances. In some societies, law is a fundamental part of the normative system which serves to maintain social order. Anthropologists Clifford Geertz and Lawrence Rosen theorized in the 1970s that the law is culturally embedded; in other words, that the law itself constitutes a system of cultural meaning within that society. In contrast, law in other societies is itself a cultural system imposed on another cultural system. In essence, law’s systems of meanings are not necessarily identical to those of the culture within which they operate.

This understanding of the linkages of law and culture moves us away from a simple vision of legal cultures as homogenous entities. Instead, we must re-imagine legal systems as arenas of contested cultural meanings, in which various actors compete to impose their cultural values on the normative systems. As a result, lawyering itself becomes contextualized and informed by the relationship between law and culture in that society, or between law and culture by the client.

Third, I espouse the view that lawyers have professional ethical obligations to provide access to justice and to pursue justice as a goal. The duty to provide access to justice entails an obligation to provide legal services to those who cannot afford to pay for them. The duty to pursue

30 Id.
31 For articles that explore law as culture, see, e.g., Menachem Mautner, Three Approaches to Law and Culture, 96 Cornell L. Rev. 839 (2011); Naomi Mezez, Law as Culture, 13 Yale J.L. & Human. 35 (2001).
33 Engle Merry, supra note 25, at 578.
34 Id. at 584.
35 Several legal scholars have insightfully reflected on the implications of culture to lawyering and have focused on how the linkages between law and culture as it relates to society or client should inform the ethics and strategies for lawyering. See, e.g., Duane Champagne, Justice, Culture, and Law in Indian Country: Teaching Law Students, 82 N.D. L. Rev. 915 (2006) (discussing the importance of teaching law students about tribal legal viewpoints and interests outside of federal Indian law conceptualizations); Cruz, supra note 21, at 876-885 (focusing on lawyering for indigenous peoples); Anna-Maria Marshall, Communities and Culture: Enriching Legal Consciousness and Legal Culture, 31 Law & Soc. Inquiry 229 (2006) (critiquing Palestinian feminists efforts to advocate on behalf of women including their failure to understand the limited role that law plays in the everyday lives of women and the disconnect between law’s liberalism and communitarian values); Mary Helen Mcneal, Slow Down, People Breathing: Lawyering, Culture and Place, 18 Clinical L. Rev. 183 (2011) (discussing Montana’s rural community’s culture on lawyering); and Okechukwu Oko, The Problems and Challenges of Lawyering in Developing Societies, 35 Rutgers L.J. 569 (2004) (discussing the culture of lawyering in democracies in transition with Nigeria as a case study).
36 See, e.g., Bryant, supra note 16 (discussing the importance for intercultural legal competence of understanding legal cultural and the relationship of client and the lawyer to that culture).
justice entails the lawyers’ concern with the “justice” of the client’s cause (i.e., a preoccupation with the legality and the morality of the client’s interest in a case). Each of these statements is highly controversial and has sparked a great deal of scholarly debate among legal ethics scholars.\footnote{See, e.g., Deborah L. Rhode, \textit{In the Interest of Justice: Reforming the Legal Profession} (Oxford University Press 2000); Susan D. Carle, \textit{Lawyer’s Duty to Do Justice: A New Look at the History of the 1908 Canons}, 24 LAW & SOC. INQUIRY 1 (1999); David Fagelson, \textit{Rights and Duties: The Ethical Obligations to Serve the Poor}, 17 LAW & INEQ. 171 (1999).} Much of the controversy surrounding a professional duty to provide access to justice by serving the poor or unpopular clients has centered on concerns over the lawyers’ own autonomy; that is, lawyers should have a right to choose and reject the causes they wish to pursue.\footnote{See, e.g., Fagelson, supra note 37, at 177-179; Deborah L. Rhode, \textit{Cultures of Commitment: Pro Bono for Lawyers and Law Students}, 67 FORDHAM L. REV. 2415, 2421-22 (1999).} The debate over the extent to which a lawyer should concern him or herself with the legality or morality of the client’s cause has centered around the ethical obligation of lawyers to protect the client’s own autonomy in the legal system (the “non-accountability” view).\footnote{This “non-accountability” view, embraced by Charles Fried and several other scholars with some variations, maintains that lawyers should not inquire into the justice or morality of their client’s causes because, particularly in the adversarial system, the ethical obligation of the lawyer is to the client; i.e., the lawyer must abandon his or her own morality to promote the due process of the client of having his or her case adjudicated and resolved through the legal system. Charles Fried, \textit{The Lawyers as Friend: The Moral Foundations of the Lawyer-Client Relation}, 85 YALE L.J. 1060, 1079 (1976). See also Stephen L. Pepper, \textit{Lawyers’ Ethics in the Gap Between Law and Justice}, 40 S. TEX. L. REV. 181 (1999); Stephen Pepper, \textit{Integrating Morality and Law in Legal Practice: A Reply to Professor Simon}, 23 GEO. J. LEGAL ETHICS 1011 (2010).} Further, there is a vision of the separateness of law and morality that allows a lawyer to press for the client’s lawful claims ethically so long as it does not amount to aiding the client in any illegitimate imposition of anybody else’s freedom.\footnote{See, e.g., James E. Fleming, \textit{The Lawyer as Citizen}, 70 FORDHAM L. REV. 1699 (2002).} In contrast, others propose a relationship with the client in which the lawyer would calibrate the client’s interests against the interests of other affected clients or assess the morality of the client’s interest and encourage the client to take the morally correct path through persuasion (the “moral activists” view).\footnote{See generally William H. Simon, \textit{The Practice of Justice: A Theory of Lawyers’ Ethics} (1998).} This view rejects the interpretation of law as separate from economics, morality, and politics and charges lawyers with a pursuit of the integrity of law (Fleming),\footnote{Mark E. DeGennaro, \textit{Book Review}, 25 JUST. SYM. J. 250, 250 (2000) (reviewing William H. Simon, \textit{The Practice of Justice: A Theory of Lawyer’s Ethics} (1998) (describing Simon’s proposal of a “Contextual View” of legal ethics as the view that lawyers should take action to promote justice that consider the relevant circumstances of the particular case); Feldman, supra note 40, at 1477-1483 (describing Simon’s theory of ethics as a “substantive, purposivist theory,” according to which...)} or to adopt a “contextual view” of legal ethics (Simon),\footnote{See, e.g., Heidi Li Feldman, \textit{Matters of Ethics: Apparently Substantial, Oddly Hollow: The Enigmatic Practice of Justice}, 97 MICH. L. REV. 1472, 1475 (1999) (reviewing William H. Simon, \textit{The Practice of Justice: A Theory of Lawyers’ Ethics} (1998)).} or to...
lawyer with agency as a moral being with a sense of ordinary moral obligations (Luban).44

My own view on the ethics of lawyering rejects the elevation of libertarianism—here concerns over lawyer or client autonomy—over all other moral goods, including collective societal ones to increase access and improve justice.45 Even as I recognize the legitimacy of the lawyer’s personal autonomy, I am persuaded to favor a mandated professional obligation to represent those affected by the justice gap crisis that plagues our profession,46 thereby remedying the prevalent lack of equality before the law.47 There are aspects of the non-accountability view that are persuasive, namely concerns that infusing the lawyer’s own morality into the practice of law could lead to the alienation of “unpopular” clients perceived as “immoral.” This concern is particularly acute in the context of criminal defense. Additionally the recognition of “moral pluralism”—the existence of a diversity of reasonable yet irreconcilable moral viewpoints and the irreconcilable diversity of values within a single person’s moral outlook—poses an objection to the idea that lawyers should infuse legal practice with their own moral principles.48 Yet, the implications of moral pluralism can be exaggerated and ignore that there are universal core values that can guide ethical lawyering.49 There is also the concern that “fidelity to the law,”50 as an alternative to moralistic lawyering, places too much faith on legal institutions and laws. That is, lawyers are asked to work within the legal system, treating it as flawless, ignoring that law itself cannot and does not regulate all human conduct.51 Additionally, the non-accountability view’s limits are particularly pronounced as applied to the representation of powerful actors such as transnational corporations, nation states, or other

45 SIMON, supra note 41, at 43.
47 For similar views, see, e.g., Fagelson, supra note 37, at 8-17.
49 Luban, The Inevitability of Conscience, supra note 44, at 1448; Rhode, The Profession and the Public Interest, supra note 46, at 1517.
50 “Fidelity to Law” is the title of the book by W. Bradley Wendel in which he argues that lawyers’ fidelity should be to legality, not morality, to avoid moral imperialism and self-righteousness. See David Luban, Misplaced Fidelity, 90 TEX. L. REV. 673, 673-74 (2012) (book review).
51 Luban, The Inevitability of Conscience, supra note 44, at 1448.
institutions whose influence over the lives of others is so significant. This point is important because much lawyering occurs in spaces of power imbalance. As Rhode has argued, “unqualified loyalty is difficult to justify . . . [particularly] when the client is not a ‘free citizen,’ but a profit-driven corporation, and the victims are individuals whose health, safety, and autonomy are not adequately represented.”

C. THE TYPES OF TRANSFORMATION

With these premises, I now turn to discuss the types of transformations that accompany my vision of intercultural legal sensibility. The desired transformative outcomes I seek in law students who engage cross-culturally are based on my own observations of law students I have taught, mainly in the United States. These observations are necessarily generalizations and do not apply to every student. There are, however, commonalities among many U.S. law students that deserve mention. These attitudes are shared irrespective of differences in class, ideology, ethnicity, gender, and sometimes even age among students. It appears that the commonality of having been raised in the United States, a dominant culture, and being trained as U.S. lawyers may explain, in part, some of the attitudes I have observed.

Influenced principally by the work of Dr. Milton J. Bennett on how cultural difference is construed, the desired cognitive and attitudinal change I generally seek in my students is a shift away from ethnocentrism toward ethnorelativism. Bennett created the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (“DMIS”) to explain how people construe cultural difference and identified six orientations that people seem to move through in their acquisition of intercultural sensibilities. The underlying assumption of this model is that intercultural sensibility is developed progressively over time as a person’s experiences of cultural difference become more complex and sophisticated. The first three DMIS ethnocentric stages include Denial, Defense Reversal, and Minimization. Denial is when one’s own culture is experienced as the only real culture and others are either not discriminated at all, or are construed in rather vague ways. Persons who deny other cultures are simply disinterested in other cultures, which becomes the default condition of typical, monocultural primary
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socialization. Defense against cultural difference means that the person experiences his or her culture as the only viable one. Persons at this stage are able to discern cultural difference but their worldview is not sufficiently complex to generate an equitable human experience of the other; quite the opposite, people at the Defense stage feel threatened by cultural difference and view their own culture as superior to that of others. A variation of Defense is Reversal, which like Defense, sees the world as “us” and “them,” but views the adopted culture instead as superior. Minimization of cultural difference neutralizes the threat of cultural differences by minimizing its significance, opting instead to presuppose and thus to experience culture as a universal expression of the human condition, irrespective of how religious, economic or philosophical differences may transcend universality. Persons at the state of Minimization, particularly those who belong to dominant cultures, tend to mask the dominant view of their own culture and ignore the institutional privilege it affords them.

The second three DMIS stages, labeled as ethno relative, include Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration. Acceptance is the stage when persons develop a metalevel consciousness and experience their own culture as just one of a number of equally complex worldviews. Acceptance need not mean agreement with others’ cultural differences and may even impose negative judgment towards the differences; however, the judgment does not deny the equal humanity of the other. Adaptation allows the person to adopt behavior appropriate to other cultures based on recognition of difference. Thus, the shift is not merely cognitive but also attitudinal. Finally, Integration refers to the stage when persons construe their identities at the margins of two or more cultures and central to none. Bennett suggests that cultural marginality may take two forms: an encapsulated form where separation of one’s culture is experienced as alienation, and a constructive form in which movements in and out of cultures are a necessary and positive part of one’s identity. Integration is not necessarily better than adaptation; rather, it helps to describe the cultural integration process experienced by many members of non-dominant cultures, long-term expatriates, and global nomads. Subsequent confirmatory factor

55 Id. at 30-46.
56 Id. at 31-39.
57 Id. at 39-41.
58 Id. at 41-45.
59 Id. at 47-51.
60 Id. at 51-65.
analysis of the Bennett DMIS resulted in a slightly modified model that erased the distinctions between Denial and Defense as well as Acceptance and Adaptation and created a five-dimensional model that describes the different stages of development of intercultural sensibility: Denial or Defense, Reversal, Minimization, Acceptance or Adaptation, and finally, Integration.63

I have observed different types of ethnocentric expressions among U.S. law students when they are exposed to legal systems different from their own. The Denial/Defense becomes evident when some U.S. students, for example, uncritically believe that the U.S. legal system and its laws are superior to those of other nations. Some U.S. law students espouse the belief that corruption of legal and political institutions is rampant in other nations and that it does not exist as much in their own nation. For example, some students are quick to notice and judge the due process failures of other nation’s criminal justice systems without regard to significant and comparable failures in the U.S. criminal justice system. Denial/Defense expression can also come in the form of the “missionary spirit,” which, while in many ways well-intended, is essentially an attitude of wanting to “rescue” vulnerable sectors of other societies from their poverty, their corruption, or their lawlessness.

On the other side of the spectrum, reversal expression can take the form of uncritically blaming the U.S. or other dominant powers for the ills of other cultures and societies. The “missionary” spirit can also be present in this phase, although the need to rescue is perceived as a function of ridding those nations of the external forces of globalization and of foreign institutional actors who are principally or solely blamed for the ills of that society. Recognizing that these various stages of cross-cultural development are present among some students, the teaching of transformative intercultural legal sensibility would seek to engage the study of comparative legal systems beyond a simple theoretical understanding of the largely disappearing common-civil law divide.64 Rather, it would seek to encourage students to confront the dominant economic and legal cultures to which they belong and, through this, to redefine their own notions of fairness, agency, shared responsibility, ethics and the rule of law. The student would also be asked to experience law in context in order to move

63 Id. at 433.
them beyond simplistic notions of corruption in law’s implementation or practices, or of simplistic explanations for weakened legal systems.

Another type of desired cognitive change would involve increased awareness of how mainstream U.S. legal culture differs, sometimes substantially, from that of other nations or even from that of subgroups within the U.S. who are not part of mainstream legal culture. One obvious example of this would be the recognition of how neoliberal values dominate our Western legal culture in contrast to other more collectivist cultures. In the U.S. there is a preference for liberal values that inform our notions of fairness and morality; yet, many U.S. students are insufficiently aware of just how different this normative cultural lens is from other cultures’ conceptions. Liberal theory both favors individual notions of rights and duties and individualized explanations of agency. Yet, advocating for vulnerable communities often requires a reframing of who is to blame for the poverty, the violence, the criminality, and the societal ills that plague them. It calls for a more structural explanation of the root causes of poverty and even illegality. Moreover, the solutions sought among certain vulnerable groups are often collective, as opposed to individual, which implicates solutions that call for social and economic rights, not solely the civil and political. Yet, in the U.S. legal system the preference for civil and political rights over social rights looms large and permeates nearly every law and legal institution. This can lead, in some instances, to a minimization of these legal cultural differences and to an overvaluing of individualized solutions to problems that are experienced more systemically and collectively by the locals.

Another aspect of mainstream U.S. legal culture which is engrained in U.S. law students is the prevalence of law as a solution to legal problems and the accompanying trust in the rule of law (generally U.S. centric) and

---

66 See generally id.
68 In our piece on Nicaragua we described this clash of legal cultures between liberal U.S. law students and an impassioned movement of collectivists Sandinista women. Aldana & Saucedo, Learning in Mulukú, supra note 1. Ironically, our U.S. students experiencing this clash were acting within a rule of law project that was making the same critical mistakes. We were in rural Mulukú because a USAID funded project had introduced mediation as a means of resolving conflict, including endemic domestic violence, in the community. In a separate article, my co-author and I explored the fallacy in the illusion of mediation’s transformative power to resolve conflict in the community without minimally addressing the structural causes of violence in the first place, including poverty. Aldana & Saucedo, The Illusion of Transformative Conflict Resolution, supra note 6.
U.S. legal institutions. Catholic Cardinal Francis George, when describing the role Law and Culture in the United States wrote:

[T]he law has peculiar and unique cultural functions in American society. This is the most successful nation-state in the world’s history. We’ve done very well, starting with an 18th century social contract society, in developing not only political and economic institutions that work, but also in creating a distinctive vision, a distinctive way of looking at the world. The many components of our culture largely are united by law, not by blood, not by race, not by religion, not even by language, but by law. It’s the only principal cultural component we all have in common.”

I have observed that often U.S. students overvalue traditional mechanisms such as litigation and formal complaints while undervaluing less traditional methods of grass-roots social movements, including the use of the media and social protest as a mechanism for social change. In contrast, in many other nations, and often in vulnerable communities within the U.S., law has proven illusory when addressing the problems of the poor or of other marginalized communities. Intercultural legal sensibility would seek to allow students to bring to consciousness their assumptions about the role of law and legal institutions and to reconsider their perceptions and rules of engagement as lawyers with other nations or other sub-cultural groups in the United States.


70 In the piece documenting Guatemalan indigenous communities’ use of international and domestic norms and legal systems to address concerns over transnational mining, for example, I describe the eye-opening and frustrating discovery over laws’ ineffectual power by many of the students who worked with these communities. Aldana, supra note 1. Several other legal scholars have already written thoughtfully and critically about the way in which transformative intercultural legal competence calls for different conceptions of global ethics and different rules of engagement as lawyers in different societies. In the field of law and development, for example, Amy J. Cohen has been critical of how cultural assumptions about law have erroneously shaped the largely failed U.S. law and development movement and attempts at the importation of U.S. law across the globe. Amy J. Cohen, Thinking with Culture in Law and Development, 57 BUFF. L. REV. 511 (2009). Similar themes are echoed by human rights scholars who take seriously the concerns over legal and moral imperialism in transnational and global engagement and urge rules of the game that respects the norms, circumstances, and the autonomy (also as to approach to lawyering) of local actors with which we seek to engage as lawyers. See, e.g., Caroline Bettinger-Lopez, et. al., Redefining Human Rights Lawyering through the Lens of Critical Theory: Lessons from Pedagogy and Practice, 18 GEO. J. ON POVERTY L. & POL’Y 337 (2011); Diane Champagne, Justice, Culture, and Law in Indian Country: Teaching Law Students, 82 N.D. L. REV. 915 (2006); Deena R. Hurwitz, Lawyering for Justice and the Inevitability of International Human Rights Clinics, 28 YALE J. INT’L L. 505 (2003); Anna-Maria Marshall, Communities and Culture: Enriching Legal Consciousness and Legal Culture, 31 LAW & SOC. INQUIRY 229 (2006); and Shannon M. Roesler, The Ethics of Global Justice Lawyering, 13 YALE HUM. RTS. & DEV. L.J. 185 (2010).
II. THE METHODOLOGY:
A PROCESS-ORIENTED MODEL

Having explained why intercultural legal sensibility requires transformation, this Section explains a process-oriented method that seeks to transform law students into cross-culturally sensitive lawyers. The lessons I draw are based on my decade-long teaching experiences in what I would describe as engaged multicultural pedagogy: teaching and learning that occurs beyond the classroom with meaningful opportunities of connectedness between law students and other cultural groups or societies as either clients or peers. Much of how I teach is informed by what I have learned from my clinical faculty peers, from observation, and through engagement with scholarship across disciplines.

The lessons I offer are informed as well by explanations in social science and psychology about how people change behavior and attitudes about themselves and others as cultural beings. I have already mentioned Bennett’s DMIS, which has widely influenced educators in developing models for the intercultural teaching of adult learners. Bennett describes the process of gaining intercultural sensitivity in terms of stages of personal growth in a continuum of increasing sophistication in dealing with cultural difference, moving from the ethnocentric through stages of greater recognition and acceptance of difference; i.e., ethnorelativism. Other influential models–Helms, Racial Identity Development, and Banks, The Typology of Ethnicity—are more focused on teaching multiculturalism in the context of ethnicity and race, emphasizing a developmental approach to help students transcend their racially defined identity. None of these models specifically address the particular goals of legal intercultural sensibility, but they do inform how to construct learning environments for adult U.S. law students that are conducive to helping them gain an understanding of other legal cultures and a professional identity as multicultural lawyers.

---

71 Bennett, Towards Ethnorelativism, supra note 53.
72 Id.
73 Helm’s model of White racial identity development consists of two sections of three stages each. The first section consists of stages that describe the process of abandoning racism (contact, disintegration, and reintegration), while the second describes the development of positive White identity (pseudo-independence, immersion/emersion, and autonomy). See Gretchen McAllister & Jacqueline Jordan Irvine, Cross-Cultural Competency and Multicultural Teacher Education, 70 REV. OF EDUC. RES. 3, 6–8 (2000).
74 Bank’s model involves six stages: ethnic psychological captivity, ethnic encapsulation, ethnic identify, clarification, bi-ethnicity, multi-ethnicity and reflective nationalism, and globalism and global competency. Each state is gradual but is not strictly sequential and linear. Also, every ethnic group is highly diverse and dynamic and may not begin at the same stage in the culture learning process, but once a person experiences a certain stage, he or she is likely to experience the stages above sequentially and developmentally. See id. at 12–14.
A. THE CONTEXT AND THE EXPERIENTIAL

Intercultural learning happens best when students are connected to experiences in social contexts. Law students gain an amazing opportunity to learn in depth about another legal system and to understand the nature of the conflicts in that society or community when connected meaningfully with its actors and participants. There is tremendous transformative power in the affective and the relational, especially when the aim is to help students gain different perspectives, appreciate and embrace differences, alter conduct, and potentially shift values.

In my own teaching, I have adopted models for student engagement across cultures domestically and across borders through service learning opportunities and study-abroad programs. The service learning opportunities have taken place as part of the immigration curriculum. Students are required to organize and participate in immigration events that provide legal services to immigrants as part of the assessment in an immigration course. I have also offered an immigration practicum to provide students with a more direct and active role in shaping, organizing, and executing the service learning projects in partnership with community immigration services providers. The study-abroad programs have taken place in Nicaragua and Guatemala, with field placements in other parts of Latin America. These programs have included a classroom component

75 Teaching intercultural sensibilities could also occur in the classroom, particularly when the classroom brings together intercultural students and learning opportunities. Some studies have assessed the viability of classroom-based intercultural learning. See, e.g., Dennis O. Durocher, Jr., Teaching Sensitivity to Cultural Difference in the First-Year Foreign Language Classroom, 40 FOREIGN LANGUAGE ANNAALS 1, 143 (2007).
77 The types of services students have provided include Citizenship and Deferred Action for Early Childhood Arrivals (DACA) fairs, consultations with detained immigrants, and know-your-rights or immigration workshops on topics such as family-based unification, Temporary Protective Status (TPS), and civil liberties in immigration enforcement.
78 In an essay titled Learning in Mulukukú: A Journey of Transformation, Professor Leticia Saucedo and I reflect on the lessons we learned from co-teaching a course titled Domestic Violence in Post-Conflict Society: The Case of Nicaragua. The course combined a two-week intensive pre-preparation training in the U.S. with a three-week immersion experience of six U.S. law students with a Sandinista feminist cooperative in rural Nicaragua grappling with the implementation of U.S-style mediations to resolve conflicts in their community. Aldana & Saucedo, Learning in Mulukukú, supra note 1.
79 In 2009, I co-founded the Inter-American Program at McGeorge with a bilingual classroom component in Guatemala that has also involved over 100 students in guided service learning and field placement opportunities in Guatemala and other parts of Latin America. Inter-American Program, UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC, McGEORGE SCHOOL OF LAW, http://mcgeorge.edu/Students/Academics/International Study/Inter-American Program.htm (last visited Oct. 24, 2015). The essay, Transforming Students, Transforming Self: The Power of Teaching Social Justice Struggles in Context, documents the experiences of some of the students who have participated in the program and who have completed placements with organizations in Guatemala working with indigenous communities and their struggles with transnational mining. Aldana, supra note 1.
that offers students comparative perspectives on language, culture, and skills, as well as intensive field experiences with local organizations or firms. Based largely on these experiences and the literature on cross-cultural teaching and learning, I offer the following lessons, many of which were the product of insight gained from trial and error.

B. THE IMPORTANCE OF PREPAREDNESS

Preparedness refers both to the level of preparation by the teachers to engage in cross-cultural teaching and the preparedness of students to acquire cross-cultural sensibilities or engage in cross-cultural integration. The teachers who engage in the teaching of intercultural sensibility must themselves be prepared and equipped to guide the students in a process of self-reflection and adaptation that will require flexibility in thought and changes in conduct. Unfortunately, this central point is not always present when exposing students to cross-cultural learning opportunities. The teacher of cross-cultural sensibility should be well-versed in the theory of intercultural sensibility development and empirical studies examining the theory’s validity in order to understand the psychology of adult learning and its implications for methods of instruction. The teacher must also possess highly developed cross-cultural sensibilities that combine a practice of critical self-awareness with a nuanced understanding of the social context within which the students and teacher seek to engage. Ideally, the teacher who takes students to another country to teach comparative perspectives or to engage them in a local project will speak the language of that country (or of the community), will have spent time in the country meaningfully learning its culture through engagement with local laws, actors, and institutions, prior to student immersion. If the teacher is beginning this journey, he or she should engage with a more experienced teaching partner who can help the new teacher interpret the context, translate across cultures, and provide insight about the parallel universes operating locally when issues arise.

I have found in my own teaching that being able to help students identify and address when they are making reasonable (from their cultural lens) yet likely wrong inferences about the meaning of particular practices or norms has been a critical part of their learning of cross-cultural sensibilities. This has required that I, too, constantly practice cross-cultural

---

sensibility through critical self-awareness and adaptation. One memorable example of this involved helping students reconsider assumptions of fraud on the part of immigration clients based on the client’s different cultural relationship with time. Certain Hmong immigrants applying for citizenship, for example, cannot remember dates to complete the Naturalization process, such as their own birth date, the birth dates of their children, or of their wedding. In their journal reflections, several students assumed that the clients must have “lied” in the original green card application about their identity and age and that of their children since they could not remember when any of them were born without consulting their official immigration documents. In my comments to students, I suggested that they might consider alternative explanations other than fraud for the clients’ inability to recall dates. This was an important step. I also, however, consulted a Hmong organization co-partnering with us on the Citizenship Fair and sought recommended books that might explain why date recollection of birth dates was difficult for Hmong clients. I learned that Hmong refugees commonly made up dates to satisfy the immigration form’s requirements of dates that did not translate to their cultural experience. Hmong refugees who were coming from rural areas did not measure time or record dates in the same way that Western culture did.\(^{81}\) This realization, which resulted from my own practice in cultural sensibility and adaptation, created a wonderful teaching opportunity on cultural difference as we discussed in class the difference between fraud and the Hmong cultural adaptation of dates.

\(^{81}\) For a wonderful description of this cultural realization, see Chapter 1 of Anne Fadiman’s book:

Foua’s own date of birth was recorded on Lia’s Delivery Room Record as October 6, 1944. In fact, she has no idea when she was born, and on various other occasions during the next several years she would inform MCMC personnel, through English-speaking relatives such as the nephew’s wife who had helped her check into the hospital for Lia’s delivery, that her date of birth was October 6, 1942, or, more frequently, October 6, 1926. Not a single admitting clerk ever appears to have questioned on the latter date, although it would imply that Foua gave birth to Lia at the age of 55. Foua is quite sure, however, that October is correct, since she was told by her parents that she was born during the season in which the opium fields are weeded for the second time and the harvested rice stalks are stacked. She invented the precise day of the month, like the year, in order to satisfy the many Americans who have evinced an abhorrence of unfilled blanks on the innumerable forms the Lees have encountered since their admission to the United States in 1980. Most Hmong refugees are familiar with this American trait and have accommodated it in the same way. Nao Kao Lee has a first cousin who told the immigration officials that all nine of his children were born on July 15, in nine consecutive years, and this information was duly recorded on their resident alien documents.

Students must also be prepared to engage in cross-cultural learning. By this, I do not mean that cross-cultural educational programs should pre-select only students who already possess high levels of intercultural sensibilities, which can be tested prior to their participation. There may be instances when prescreening students for intercultural sensibilities is desirable because the stakes of ill-prepared or ill-disposed student participation to third parties are high. In general, however, institutions of higher learning, including law schools, should be open to including as many students as possible in their journey towards acquiring intercultural sensibilities. In fact, because learning intercultural legal sensibility is developmental, studies that test students’ stages of intercultural development prior to and at the completion of certain study-abroad programs reveal that students who have the most room to grow make the greatest progress.

Students, however, must be predisposed to grow in cross-cultural sensibility which means they must be open to exploring their own culture, questioning their own assumptions, being exposed and even being vulnerable to difference, and, at times, being willing to adapt or integrate. In general, this predisposition is not difficult to find. Certain factors such as curiosity about other countries or cultures, inclination to public interest law and working with vulnerable communities, prior exposure to another culture or country, or even being members of minority cultural groups in the United States are good indicators of this predisposition. Moreover, many law students are intentional in their choice to participate in certain types of cross-cultural learning experiences offered in law school precisely because of their predisposition to become more inter-culturally competent.

82 Many study-abroad programs at universities and colleges have used the Intercultural Development Index (IDI), a tested and reliable instrument for measuring intercultural legal competence, at the beginning and at the completion of the program in order, for example, to trace the effectiveness of their program in advancing a student’s intercultural competence. This instrument and others that could be used to measure a student’s level of intercultural legal competence are described in Part III infra.

83 If prescreening is desirable, one question becomes how to conduct such prescreening. A best practice would be to use reliable assessment tools (see Part III of the Article infra for a discussion of reliable assessment tools, such as Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), over student’s self-perceptions or self-assessment. In fact, studies have found that in general people’s self-perception of their degree of ethnorelativism does not match the actual results in more accurate measurements, which tend to place them at greater levels of ethnocentrism. See Paula J. Pedersen, Teaching Toward an Ethnorelative Worldview Through Psychology Study Abroad, 20 INTERCULTURAL EDUC. 73, 77 (2009) [hereinafter Pedersen, Teaching Toward an Ethnorelative Worldview].

Preparedness must also mean paving the way for students to be self-aware and even critical of their own culture, to be prepared to recognize and be open to cultural differences, and to be willing to adapt their own conduct or behavior, if necessary, in order to adapt or integrate to the new environment. How exactly is this achieved? I have learned through trial and error that there are several steps that should be undertaken before and during the experience to create an appropriate learning environment and to maximize cross-cultural learning. One critical component is the need to approach students themselves as cultural beings during the pre-program orientation and during the program, which entails getting to know the students and, through that, helping them to recognize themselves and their peers as cultural beings. One mistake I have made in the past was focusing solely on helping students understand the culture and context to which they would be exposed as part of the pre-program orientation without requiring critical self-awareness of their own cultural lens. In both the Nicaragua and Guatemala programs, for example, I have taught or co-taught very rich, inter-disciplinary courses prior to the field experience designed to educate students on the complex history of the country or the current socio-political climate that should inform the student’s understanding of the issues they are likely to confront. This is a vital step in the process and should still be a part of any orientation, especially if students are expected to function at a high level of engagement as law students in the country.85

While pre-training on history and culture is crucial, it fails to consider the student’s personal journey to becoming an aware cultural being in response to these more complicated understandings of the issues they will experience. Thus, I have since modified my approach to student preparedness to include a lot more of the personal, which means creating safe learning spaces to explore likely biases, cultural differences, and student attitudes86 to those differences that are particularly relevant to lawyering across cultures. These include attitudes towards socialism, communism, collectivism; towards claims of racial or other types of injustice; towards allocation of agency for social ills and poverty; and towards the social responsibility of multinational corporations. One way I

85 For example, the students who accompanied us to Nicaragua could not comprehend the application of U.S. style mediation in rural Nicaragua or Nicaragua’s phenomena of domestic violence without understanding Nicaragua’s history of revolution and counter-revolution and their ongoing struggles with economic and structural inequality. Similarly, students who would work on indigenous people’s struggles with transnational mining or on the war time trials in Guatemala or even on the implementation of trade agreements in Guatemala could not possibly engage thoughtfully in this work without first learning about Guatemala’s civil conflict, ongoing racial tensions, and struggles with democratic transition and economic reforms.

86 E.g., attitudes toward socialism, communism, collectivism; attitudes toward claims of racial or other types of injustice; attitudes toward allocation of agency for social ills and poverty.
have done this in my Immigration and Nationality class is through the use of a class survey that probes students’ personal positions or responses to issues to be discussed in class and encounter as part of service learning in order to connect students to the broader conversations taking place around the issues. I intentionally conduct the survey anonymously ahead of the discussion and present the group results to the students. This prepares students to be aware of their own views and to consider how their views fit into those of other students in the class. It also allows me to present the group results to frame class discussion in a way that is personal yet not individualized. To do this even more effectively, I also employ short videos of personal narratives by persons outside the class presenting more than one side of the issues covered in the survey.87 By way of example, this method allows me to frame conversations as follows: X has argued in favor of closed borders. What are the arguments that X employs? In the survey results of the class, at least N% of you seems to agree with X on Y and Z arguments. What makes X arguments appealing? What assumptions are X and those of you who agree with X making for their position? Do the studies that we have read in class support those assumptions? What do you make of the studies? Do you agree with their methodology? What other studies would you like to see done and why?

This more personalized approach to the engagement of the hard debates around immigration has proven very effective in helping prepare students for the service learning projects that come later in the course. By the time students are asked to engage directly with immigrant clients, they are more aware of their own views on immigration and immigrants, have already been asked to critically examine and question their assumptions, and at times have already begun to embrace or respect different perspectives. During the training for the service learning projects, I have learned how critically important it is to train students not only on the substantive law of the service they will provide, but also on lawyering skills, including on practicing cross-cultural sensibilities. This part of the training relies on the Five Habits of Cross-Cultural Lawyering developed by Sue Bryant and Jean Koh Peters.88 As part of the training, students are asked to explore their pre-conceived notions of the type of client they are likely to meet. They are asked to anticipate the attitudes and feelings they are likely to

87 In Immigration and Nationality Law, I have used short clips from several sources that employ personal narratives to share very different views on immigration, on issues such as the morality and utility of borders, the deportation of persons based on crime, and family unity. One great source of short clips that add a very personal and varied dimension to the hard conversations on the immigration debate is Border Stories. BORDER STORIES, http://borderstories.org/ (last visited Oct. 24, 2015).
88 Bryant & Koh Peters, supra note 3.
have toward those clients, both positive and negative. Then they are asked to consider how they will adapt to these attitudes, reactions, and feelings in order to do an effective job as advocates for the clients. I have also incorporated specific examples of lawyering moments that provide rich lessons on cross-cultural lawyering based on insights I have gained from student reflections of past service learning projects.\textsuperscript{89} I use these examples to help students practice the habit of parallel universes, which asks them to consider different explanations for the client’s behavior that may be less negative than the explanation they imagine. At a minimum, I prepare students to anticipate their biases and to grapple with how these biases may alter their conduct in ways that are subtle but harmful to clients.\textsuperscript{90}

Another effective approach, when available, has been to encourage cross-cultural exchanges in the classroom that are both personal and conversational, and whose purpose is to help students from different cultures become more aware of differences, uncover assumptions and discover areas of convergence. Ideally, these types of exchanges can occur among peers in shared spaces of co-participation, such as in the classroom or in joint projects. In the Inter-American Program, for example, we have always co-enrolled law students and/or lawyers from Latin America. I did not always, however, involve these local students in the orientation until more recently. Not involving them earlier was a huge mistake. Not surprisingly, the deep learning that happened organically through the cross-cultural exchanges and friendships formed between U.S. and Latin

\textsuperscript{89} In general, these examples create profiles of the types of clients and issues that will usually provoke negative feelings or lead students to make assumptions of fraud. These include the client with several DUls or a domestic violence conviction; the client who is receiving public benefits and is applying for a fee waiver; the client who is dominated by the spouse in the interactions; the client who cannot remember dates or addresses; the client who does not speak English after living in the U.S. for many years; or the client who struggles with the oath of allegiance.

\textsuperscript{90} One common example of this is when a student mistakes their role as advocate and the accompanying ethical responsibility not to assist clients in the commission of fraud with the role of a government lawyer to detect fraud. This issue is very difficult to navigate because in immigration law, unlike criminal law, immigrant clients do not have a right against self-incrimination and are asked to affirmatively disclose information that will hurt them as part of any immigration process. Immigration lawyers are asked to be zealous advocates while at the same time they cannot assist the client knowingly or with reckless disregard in the commission of fraud. Margaret Mikyung Lee, \textit{Legal Ethics in Immigration Matters: Legal Representation and Unauthorized Practice of Law}, CRS Report to Congress, at 4-6, http://trac.syr.edu/immigration/library/P4026.pdf (last visited Feb. 21, 2014). The problem arises when students act like government lawyers and ask probing questions when they suspect the client is lying in response to negative feelings they harbor about the client. I caution students that this conduct can really hurt the attorney-client relationships including in cases where the fraud is not real and could even result in a violation of their ethical duty to be a zealous advocate for the client if the probing results in the disclosure of information that will complicate or harm the representation of the client unnecessarily. Sometimes, asking probing questions to the client when the lawyer thinks the matter over which they suspect fraud may be discoverable is the right thing to do. In such cases, the lawyer wants to ensure the client is not hiding something that, if undisclosed, will hurt the client even more when it is discovered through the process. Admittedly, this judgment is hard to make. The problem resides, however, when the student is motivated to discover the fraud because the student does not want to have anything to do with the client he or she thinks is lying to the government.
American students in the program taught me volumes about the importance of the affective and inter-personal in the development of cross-cultural sensibilities. The involvement of Latin American students in the orientation program more formally has allowed me to capitalize on the richness that results from cross-cultural exchanges among peers and to dictate a process of relating that encourages awareness, reflection, and even adaptation.

So far, the one-day orientation that precedes the Guatemala program has been executed in two parts. The first part has involved a small-group exercise in which U.S. and Latin American students must share with each other responses to a series of questions that probe their knowledge about each other’s history, culture, and current events. The exercise asks them to share impressions of aspects of each other’s countries relevant to the program (e.g., perceptions about U.S. foreign policy in Guatemala; perceptions about trade, perceptions about legal systems and laws; etc.) and encourages them to share what they most liked and disliked about their respective cultures.91 The rule is that students must listen to each other without interruption and with an open-mind. After each question, the whole class comes together and each group is asked to share what they heard and what they learned from each other. In addition, students from the group are given the opportunity to clarify or expand based on what they hear or learn during the reporting. After the exercise, the whole group is asked to reflect on the insights they gained from the exercise. The exercise, which is both light and intense, has proven to be very fruitful. In general, students start to build relations based on a deeper awareness of differences and similarities that is also positive, respectful, and constructive. They start to discover how much or how little they know about each other’s culture, history, or the issues that face their respective nations. They start to build greater curiosity for learning more. Students also start to appreciate how connected their worlds and issues are to each other.

Having gained this ground, the second part of the orientation in the Guatemala program has involved a lecture that is primarily oriented toward exposing U.S. students to the most salient historical moments in Guatemala and explaining the most pressing social issues facing the country, with a focus on topics that will be addressed during the remainder of the program.

91 Examples of the types of questions include: What do you know about my President and what are your impressions of him/her?; Your impressions of my President are True/False; What do you consider was a defining moment in the history of your country and why?; How would you characterize the relationship between your country and mine?; What, if any, aspect of U.S./Latin American relations would you change and why?; What is one of the most important issues facing your country today?; What are your impressions of my country’s laws and legal system? If I were to leave my country to live in your country, I would miss X the most/least; What is a popular phrase in your country and what does it mean?; While I am in your country or when you visit my country, you must do or visit X.
Guatemalan and Latin American students are encouraged and invited to weigh in and even to disagree with the perspective of the country that is being presented. The lecture is undoubtedly heavy and critical and does not tread lightly on hard topics including racism, violence, impunity, corruption, and extreme poverty, nor does it spare the role of Guatemala, the U.S., multinational corporations, or the community in the challenges confronting the country. Then, throughout the courses that follow and in the field placements, students are given the opportunity to engage directly with these issues. In the classroom students work jointly on academic projects that ask them to explore, inter alia, the resolution of legal issues, whether in trade, environment, labor, immigration, or human rights, that involve actors, laws, and legal institutions from their respective nations in modern issues affecting both nations. In the field, students are placed with organizations in several countries of the Americas that are working on issues of fair trade, economic development, environmental justice, rule of law, transitional justice, and human rights. Overall, this approach of encouraging meaningful and personal cross-cultural exchanges as part of the program has been very effective beyond the professional lessons that students have gained, such as improving their linguistic legal sensibility or understanding of each other’s legal systems. Also, students have gained self-awareness about themselves as cultural beings and have started to critically examine their own assumptions, including how they view problems and the solutions to problems.

C. INVOLVING LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND CREATING PLURALISTIC SPACES

The Section above on preparedness already makes clear the critical importance of meaningful and personal cross-cultural exchanges to the acquisition of cross-cultural sensibilities or sensibility. In this Section, I focus on how to involve local communities and how to create pluralistic spaces so as to encourage the creation of shared meaning and understanding across cultures.

I came across the term “pluralistic classrooms” in the readings documenting the challenges to teaching in desegregated classroom spaces in the U.S. post Brown v. Board of Education. The literature indicated that the effectiveness of desegregated classrooms would fail (was failing) when

---

92 For an article discussing the types of projects conducted by students participating in the field placements, see Aldana, supra note 1.
the only thing that changed was composition of the students and everything else remained the same.\textsuperscript{94} This new reality of pluralistic classrooms demanded a shift away from homogeneous content, methods of instruction, and perspectives in order to embrace multiculturalism. This obvious point made me reflect on how to achieve these aims in legal education, especially in the context of programs that intentionally immersed students in cross-cultural settings, such as study-abroad programs and service learning, in order to promote their intercultural legal sensibility.

In my own experience, I realized that teaching intercultural legal sensibility could not happen effectively unless the means for doing so reflected values and created spaces that welcomed and promoted awareness and respect for cultural differences. Indeed, learning to embrace difference requires the relational.\textsuperscript{95} In addition, when the cross-cultural exchanges involved the entry of dominant (or simply other) cultures into local spaces, it would also require mindfulness of power dynamics and respect for the local. The involvement of local actors early on as leaders, partners, and/or as peers in the shaping of the pluralistic spaces is critical to achieve these aims.

My use of the words leaders, partners, and peers to describe local involvement is very intentional. It suggests an engagement based on mutual respect, equality, and often deference. This is especially true when the type of engagement may involve the student beyond the classroom directly in the resolution of local struggles and with community groups or clients. The teacher of intercultural legal sensibility has to model for students that locals know their reality best, and that they also own the solutions and define the terms of our participation. Our job is to help students become aware of their own understanding of issues and problems and how these might differ (or not) from the way in which local actors view the issues. It is also to help students manage conflict with locals thoughtfully and to help them adapt and integrate their conduct to the local cultural reality in ways that also respect the students’ own culture and autonomy.

In study-abroad program classrooms it is also critically important to include local actors as leaders, partners, and peers. Research in social psychology supports the view that cross-cultural exchanges have the most likelihood of improving cross-cultural sensibilities when the two groups

\textsuperscript{94} Id. at 152.
\textsuperscript{95} Psychologist Jonathan Haidt’s work teaches us that the way to build new forms of civil politics to transcend the ideological cultural wars in the United States is not through making winning arguments, but through building relationships with those with whom we disagree. See generally, \textsc{Jonathan Haidt}, \textit{The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion} (2012).
possess equal status, seek common goals, are cooperatively dependent upon each other, and interact with the positive support of authority, laws, or custom. Most U.S. law schools understand this and include local faculty as teachers in their sponsored summer abroad programs, while many study-abroad programs also co-enroll local students in the programs. A different model of summer abroad program, generally referred to as an island program, immerses students in host universities of other nations. Studies measuring the effectiveness of cross-cultural gains in students suggest that students gain more in hybrid programs that involve a mixture of U.S. and host or other international students in contrast to immersion in courses made up almost entirely of host country students. The explanation for this, however, cannot be disengaged from other factors important to cross-cultural development, especially the critical importance of cultural intervention (discussed below), which can be implemented better in educational programs designed by the sending school.

In the Inter-American Program, I have learned that co-teaching models that involve U.S. and local law professors can be ideal. When the co-teaching is done well, students benefit tremendously, not only substantively, but through the modeling of cross-cultural sensibilities. This is achieved as professors share spaces collaboratively as co-equals, discovering and exploring culturally-informed differences through issues respectfully discussed in class. The introduction of accomplished lawyers and other professionals as guest speakers, or as supervisors of field placements into the program, allows students to see positive role models of local persons within government, the private sector, or with non-profit groups who are defining, owning, and attempting to find their solutions to the challenging problems affecting their countries and communities.

In social service learning projects managed by law schools, in which students are expected to provide direct legal services to clients, it can be more challenging to infuse the cross-cultural experience as one that involves local actors as leaders, partners, and peers. Part of the challenge resides in the focus of social service learning projects on limited and contained individual representation of clients. Partnerships are forged with grass-roots organizations primarily to execute the goals of the legal services fairs. In such settings, it is unrealistic to consider a meaningful implementation of alternative models to the attorney-client relationships—
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such as community lawyering\(^\text{98}\) or rebellious lawyering\(^\text{99}\)—where the attorney-client relationship becomes a broader tool to return power and empower clients or communities. Many important steps can be taken, however, to ameliorate the inherent power inequality and cultural distance that arises when lawyers view their role solely as fixing that client’s legal problem. In the Section on preparedness, I discussed strategies for humanizing the immigrant client, for example, through a deep, personal, and expansive exploration of the tough issues around the legitimacy of that client’s presence in the U.S. and his or her belonging as a member of the community. Moreover, class discussion often portrays immigrants as activists and catalysts for social change through political advocacy and litigation, and not solely as victims.\(^\text{100}\) The service learning project then attempts to present a richer vision of the clients rather than simply as people who need free legal services.\(^\text{101}\)

There can be numerous challenges with the involvement of local actors and the creation of pluralistic spaces for learning. One challenge pertains to the very complex meaning of culture, which as explained earlier, can be highly contested and fluid in response to power dynamics and social changes. What this means is that local actors cannot be presented to students as essentialized ambassadors of a local culture that is homogenous and fixed. Humanists and social scientists agree that culture cannot be taught from an ethnographic or objectivists perspective; cultural identity is inherently subjective and all students must be treated as cultural subjects.


\(^\text{100}\) I use the *Immigration Stories* book as a supplement in the course when I teach the constitutional cases. When discussing each case, I intentionally discuss the lawyers and the lawyering lessons behind each case and highlight not only the individual lawyer or organization but the social movement backing the lawyer and organization in each case. David A. Martin & Peter H. Schuck, *Immigration Stories* (2005).

\(^\text{101}\) By way of example, the beauty of the DACA immigration service learning project was the ability to connect dreamers as individual applicants into a modern, visible, and compelling social movement that is largely credited with President Obama’s adoption of DACA. See generally Walter J. Nicholls, *The Dreamers: How the Undocumented Youth Transformed the Immigrant Rights Debate* (2013). Many students who participated in the DACA projects related very intimately with the plight of the DACA applicants but also learned to view many of them as leaders in their community and in their families. I do not dismiss the concern that DACA divided the undocumented youth as the deserving vs. the non-deserving client. We did spend time in class discussing and critically analyzing this bifurcation. Still, the profile of most DACA applicants as high achievers against all odds spoke to my students and allowed many to shift their views on undocumented immigration, not only as to the DACA applicants but also as to the parents who often accompanied their children to the DACA events.
rather than as cultural objects. Thus, depending on the type of cross-cultural exchange, it may be beneficial to introduce students to a diverse range of local actors with different perspectives, experiences, and visions about their own local reality, in part to teach students to recognize the importance of inter-cultural differences based on very different life realities and experiences within the same country.

By way of example, as part of the Inter-American Program in Guatemala, McGeorge has generously supported the inclusion of up to ten local law students and lawyers as an essential part of the program without charging them, other than a nominal fee to cover basic expenses. The justification for the tuition waiver has been to achieve a diverse range of participants in the program, and not just the privileged and wealthy. In a country like Guatemala, where class exclusion and racial oppression have been historically (and still remain) fierce, the task of inclusion is all that much more critical. Even with the tuition waiver, however, achieving class and ethnic diversity in the program has been a tough challenge. In the first few years, the program mostly enrolled law students from private law schools in Guatemala for several reasons, including: the barriers of bilingualism; limited access to information about the program; and the costs associated with time away from employment and travel to Antigua.

The lack of ethnic and class diversity in a program that attempts to deal with the profound social and legal problems facing Guatemala presented serious challenges when local students, who were not themselves sufficiently self-aware of their own culture of privilege in Guatemala, would minimize, deny, or become quite defensive about a critical race and/or critical class approach to the history and modern reality of Guatemala or Latin America. One unfortunate incident occurred in the classroom in the beginning years of the program when two Guatemalan students reacted very defensively to a presentation by our guest speakers, a group of environmental justice lawyers who defended indigenous people’s right to self-determination in the use of natural resources found in their land. The two students made remarks about the backwardness of indigenous people in Guatemala and blamed the environmental group, Madre Selva, for Guatemala’s lack of progress as a nation. To my dismay,
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104 Initially, for pedagogical reasons having to do with language as part of intercultural training, we wanted local students to have at least a basic proficiency in English. We have begun to make exceptions to this rule in order to increase class and ethnic diversity.
one of the students declared that had it not been for the forced completion of the Hydroelectric Chixoy, none of the students in the class would be able to use their iPhones and computers. Unfortunately, the building of this dam in the late 1970’s had cost the lives of nearly five-hundred indigenous people, mostly women and children, at the hands of paramilitaries when the community refused to leave their lands. At the time of the incident, I assumed the student who made the remark was aware of this history, causing me to react angrily and with tremendous pain. I withdrew from the Guatemalan student who made the comment for the remainder of the program. This was a mistake.

The incident helped me grow tremendously as a teacher. I grew to realize that in the program attempting to teach intercultural legal sensibility, I had to think as well about the cross-cultural sensibilities of the Guatemalan students and their own journey. I recognized that the focus of the Inter-American Program remained largely about the intercultural training of the U.S. students, but it could not be at the exclusion of the educational goals of the locals who enrolled as students. This incident taught me to include Latin American students in all aspects of the program as learners of cross-cultural sensibilities and not solely as potential teachers. This incident solidified for me the critical importance of remaining intentional about the selection of students in the program both from the U.S. and from Latin America. Ideally, a representative number of students participating in the program from both the sending and the host country should already possess healthy levels of cross-cultural awareness to recognize themselves and others as cultural beings, be sufficiently sensitive and respectful to difference, and be open to an honest examination of their own social reality and culture. Another useful lesson from the incident is the need to create space for dialogue among the peers about the issues and their feelings, and not solely with the professors in the program. This can only happen when a critical mass of the students in the program possess sufficient self-awareness and maturity to engage each other in hard exploratory conversations that challenge each other in constructive ways.

Another important lesson from the incident relates to the need for balance in the creation of safe pluralistic spaces in which to explore cultural differences. By balance, I mean achieving equilibrium of emotions as part of the goals of the program. I speak of emotions because the road to intercultural growth is very personal and emotive, and disequilibrium in
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emotions can be counter-productive to the development of cross-cultural sensibilities. Psychological studies suggest that humans have a tendency to block out experiences that are too strange or threatening to the way they think or learn, or to resort to the psychological defense mechanism of providing a more compatible interpretation.\footnote{See Charles Lawrence III, *Unconscious Racism Revisited: Reflections on the Impact and Origins of “The Id, The Ego, and Equal Protection”*, 40 CONN. L. REV. 931 (2008).} Equilibrium should not mean, however, shielding students from intense or hard emotions, or sanitizing the reality of the human experience of social injustice in the host country. This would only minimize the experiences of the host country, which does not model cross-cultural sensibility at all. Instead, equilibrium can be infused in intercultural training in several ways. For instance, Guatemala is a beautiful country with significant problems, which can and do overwhelm students. I have had some students in the program who have experienced despair and deep sadness. This is not in itself bad. The situations that students learn about or engage in are sometimes dark. I have learned, however, the critical importance of balance. One way to introduce balance is to “lighten” the experience for students with grace while maintaining depth. Guatemala is not all dark. The country is also rich in culture, tradition, spirituality, food, music, and topography. The program, thus, strives to create “light” by satisfying the needs our students have for comfort and safety, as well as fun spaces, especially ones shared with other members of the community. Another strategy to bring “light” to the experience is to introduce a counter-narrative to despair of the social-justice issues in the country. In Guatemala, this is easy to do because there are a number of everyday heroes, many of whom are lawyers, that still believe in Guatemala and are committed to improving it through innovation, dedication, and social-justice lawyering. Thus, we have included as part of the Inter-American Program a speaker series and field visits that are intended to introduce students to constructive models for social change and institutions that are seeking to transform Guatemala.

Another factor related to equilibrium relates interestingly to the amount of time that students spend with host nationals in the learning environment. At least some studies indicate that it is extremely helpful to spend between thirty and fifty percent of the time abroad with host nationals while in the process of cross-cultural learning.\footnote{Vande Berg et al., supra note 84, at 24.} A critique of some study-abroad programs is that students end up primarily spending time with each other abroad.\footnote{Michael Vande Berg, *Intervening in Student Learning Abroad: A Research-Based Inquiry*, 20 INTERCULTURAL EDUC. 15, 16 (2009).} However, at least for some students, spending over fifty percent
of their time with host nationals on the ground can be overwhelming and counterproductive to their intercultural development, whereby they risk becoming even more ethnocentric. A related point on introducing equilibrium into any intercultural program conveys the intensity of difference. Sometimes the local will be extremely different from the cultural and life experiences of the students — such as when a local organization, client or host, has a very strong political and ideological vision of social change in its country. This was the model we adopted in the Nicaragua program, in which we intentionally chose to work with a Sandinista-feminist Cooperative in rural Nicaragua. The choice to work with an organization with such a strong leftist vision of social justice intentionally sought to expose our students to a different vision of justice and advocacy in order to challenge their own views about law, agency, rights, and lawyering. This choice, however, did provoke disequilibrium in students who retreated defensively out of a desire to maintain their liberal vision of justice. I raise this issue here to clarify that I do not mean to suggest that learning intercultural legal sensibility must necessarily happen or can only happen in contexts that are ideologically neutral or diverse. The reality is that social justice activism does not work this way. Lawyering happens in a context of conflicting visions about agency, the root causes of poverty and violence, and the role of the state or other actors, including international institutions, corporations, or governments, in providing solutions to problems. Students cannot and should not be shielded from these experiences. However, any program that introduces students to norms, beliefs, and visions of justice that likely conflict with their own must be prepared to deal with the clashes likely to arise from the engagement. One way to address this is in the pre-orientation or orientation phases of the program. In the Nicaragua program, all enrolled students knew about the Cooperative’s vision and approach to social activism since it was introduced to them during the pre-orientation sessions of the program. Nonetheless, it was not enough, and the teacher as well as the student must be prepared to deal with it in the field. Professors Bryant and Koh Peters, in their seminal article on the Five Habits for Cross-Cultural Lawyering, include this scenario as Habit 5: the straw that broke the camel’s back. Normally, as Bryant and Koh Peters explain about Habit 4, there are Red Flags that precede a lawyer’s or law student’s inability to adapt or integrate cross-culturally and accompanying tendency to act
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defensively or negatively. The next Section discusses, therefore, the critical importance of reflection and self-awareness, as well as constant cultural intervention and guidance, to try to prevent or ameliorate these types of clashes in the journey towards intercultural sensibility.

D. GUIDED ENGAGEMENT AND GUIDED REFLECTIONS

By now it should be evident that acquiring intercultural legal sensibility demands self-awareness and awareness of others as prerequisites toward achieving mutual understanding and acceptance, and consequently either adaption or integration. This process does not happen through osmosis or simply through immersion in another culture. In 1963, the U.S. psychologist and educator George Kelly wrote:

A person can be witness to a tremendous parade of episodes and yet, if he fails to keep making something out of them ... he gains little in the way of experience from having been around when they happened. It is not what happens around him that wakes a man experienced; it is the successive construing and reconstruing of what happens, as it happens, that enriches the experience of his life.

The literature on teaching intercultural legal sensibility repeatedly emphasizes the importance of cultural mentors and cultural intervention as key to the process of gaining intercultural sensibility. In fact, psychologists and intercultural education studies indicate that immersion without intervention can even lead to regression rather than progression in the development toward intercultural sensibilities, particularly among male students. For this reason, cultural mentoring/intervention has been recognized as the single most important component of intercultural education.

The teaching of intercultural sensibility has to recognize the subjective experiences of the student, as well as recognize that his or her learning will
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occur in developmental stages. Therefore, the cultural intervention has to be both individualized and frequent, ideally prior to, and at various points throughout the duration of the education experience, as well as at re-entry. Students will come to the experience at different stages of intercultural sensibilities (i.e., ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism) and may even shift back and forth within the spectrum of development in response to the educational experience. The cultural mentor may need to help the adult learner take notice and interpret what he or she has experienced. It is quite possible that some students may completely miss cultural differences that may be more apparent to the mentor or to others with greater sensibility and awareness to difference.

At other times, the role of the cultural mentor is also to improve cultural literacy. Sometimes law students working in a host nation are simply unaware of how the host legal system is different from their own or are unfamiliar with the historical or socio-political context in which an issue arises in that nation. Clarifying those issues can go a long way toward improving awareness and common understanding. The cultural mentor also has to question the learner’s interpretation by questioning the assumptions and suggesting the exploration of alternative perspectives or interpretations based on differences in culture, class, values, etc., that the adult learner may not have considered. Sometimes, the adult learner is simply unaware that his or her worldview is deeply influenced by his or her culture and life experiences.

The process of increasing awareness can and is often emotive and could provoke conflict or defensiveness and resistance on the part of the adult learner. Sometimes the conflict is external and relational and involves the clash of culture between and among host and guests or even between mentor and learner. At other times, the adult learner resists the process of learning because he or she feels exposed or does not trust the cultural mentor. When this happens, the cultural mentor has to acknowledge the need to build trust with the learner and also to respond with compassion. Bennett suggests, for example, that this may be a time to work with the student on increasing cultural self-esteem, such as through discussions of what is “good” about one’s own culture, accompanied by what is “good” about another’s culture. Bennett cautions further that it would be premature at this stage of the learner’s development to emphasize values
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associated with ethnorelativism—that cultures are simply different and not bad or good—because the learner simply has not reached this stage of intercultural sensibility.\footnote{Id. at 189.} Other times, the cultural mentor has to be able to recognize and identify to the adult learner when he or she has begun to reconstruct their own experiences based on greater cultural sensibilities and awareness. In addition, the cultural mentor can help facilitate integration or mediate in ways that are respectful to the adult learner and the host, particularly in experiential learning where the law student must learn to relate and adapt or integrate to the host.

To allow for a more developmental approach to intercultural learning, it may also be wise to ease students into increasingly intense intercultural experiences, which involves sequencing the types of intercultural learning in ways that slowly increase the stakes (i.e., client interaction or other types of involvement in the field) or the intensity of difference. For example, in the project in Nicaragua, we sequenced the experience by first doing a pre-orientation program in the U.S., during which students interacted with Nicaraguans displaced by the war residing in the U.S. We then spent two weeks in Managua, where students met and interacted with several women’s groups and government officials working on issues of domestic violence. Finally, in the last week, we traveled to rural Mulukukú where students stayed in the Cooperative’s housing, interacting with locals in the Cooperative’s health and legal clinics daily. Additionally, in the Inter-American Program, students must first enroll in a 3-week classroom experience in Antigua, Guatemala, where they interact with Latin American law students and lawyers as peers prior to placement in eight-week externships in Guatemala City or other parts of Latin America. The sequencing in each of these programs ensured that students were introduced progressively to increasing intensity of cultural difference, in terms of environment (e.g., city vs. rural or classroom vs. field placement), the people they were meeting (e.g., other law students vs. grass roots activists or clients), and the amount of time spent fully immersed and alone with the other culture.

Cultural intervention can be both formal and informal. It is best when it is frequent, and when there is a fluid and intimate dialogue of trust between the teacher and student to explore how the student is experiencing and processing cultural difference. The most common approach to formalize a process of reflection and feedback is, of course, through journal writing. Over years of teaching, I have experimented with how to make journal
writing as effective as possible for the student learner. The model that has worked the best is the one I have implemented as part of the field placements in the Inter-American Program. After the three-week classroom program in Antigua, between six and eight students enroll in externships in Latin America (Guatemala, Costa Rica, Chile and Uruguay). I provide direct supervision of the students’ substantive legal work as well as cultural guidance on issues that students raise in their journal entries. I combine weekly phone calls with e-mail communication and substantial feedback in the six journal entries students submit during weeks two through seven of the externship. The students may choose the topic of the journal entries, based on what is most present or pressing in the way they are experiencing the field placement. Although students are provided with a list of potential topics that encourage them to think comparatively about law, legal systems, and lawyering, I also encourage them not to limit themselves to the list, but to aim to be as personal as possible and to write about issues that have impacted or affected them on a personal level. Over the years, students have worked on issues ranging from immigration to environmental justice, trade and development, corporate law, transitional justice, and domestic violence. They have been exposed, inter alia, to diverse perspectives and ideologies, a range of advocacy and lawyering strategies, a multitude of norms, an array of clients including corporations and indigenous communities, and a wide variety of office cultures and dynamics. These office cultures and dynamics include everything from the government or inter-governmental office to the grass-roots non-profit, the private law firm, or trade associations. With very few exceptions, students have been very probing, open, and aware. Students have chosen topics that run the gamut from observations about a country’s laws, legal procedures or legal institutions, to impressions about the effectiveness of a particular lawyering or advocacy strategy, to discussions about agency and solutions to intractable legal problems that affect their clients, and even to personal challenges dealing with inter-office dynamics.

My job as cultural mentor has been to engage the students where they are, and to guide their learning. For some students, this means asking more
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probing questions, revealing their assumptions, encouraging them to support their claims with more data or support, or asking them to consider alternative explanations. For others, my job is to get them to go deeper, beyond the descriptive or general and to let me hear their voice and see their cultural being. This often requires building trust and modeling expectations by sharing my personal stories or reactions to what the student is describing, and asking the student to react to those. Largely, this process occurs through providing timely comments (within days of receiving the entries) on the student’s journal entries, then following up by e-mails or phone calls to discuss some issues more personally and privately with the student when greater and more intimate intervention is required. For example, I will especially reach out to students when their journal entries reveal conflict or struggles with the experience, as well as when the journal entry is too reserved and the student appears withdrawn and reticent to engage. I have found that this extra step of reaching out to students beyond my comments in the journal entries is the key to helping some students grow and deepen their intercultural awareness. This extra step helps to build trust, and at times has also been conducive to helping students grow professionally. My intervention, for example, has guided students to navigate conflict they may be experiencing with local actors by helping to increase understanding and encouraging better communication. With very few exceptions, students are generally very receptive to this level and type of intervention.

In the Inter-American Program, I have chosen to share journal entries and my comments to them with the group. Sharing experiences within a small group has facilitated a sense of intimacy, allowing students to be open, with little to no conflict or resistance. There are several reasons for this choice. First, the learning can improve tremendously when students learn from each other. I have used two different strategies to encourage this type of mutual learning. As part of the journal entry assignment, I have either asked students to choose to read and respond to each other’s journal entries (with my comments), or I have assigned a particular journal entry to a student to read and respond, to serve several teaching objectives. Having experimented with both of these approaches, I prefer the latter, although each has yielded positive results. When students choose whose journal entry to read, I am respecting their autonomy and allowing them to choose which journal entry speaks to them the most. Sometimes, however, students may choose to comment on what is most safe for them, rather than what challenges them to grow the most. The latter approach allows me to be intentional about why I am asking a specific student to read another’s journal entry. Sometimes, the students experiencing common issues may
have different reactions. The ability to observe how two people can experience similar issues differently is extremely helpful to the learning process. Other times, I find that students struggle with cultural difference in similar ways, even if the issues are dissimilar. Pairing students can help them avoid feeling isolated in their experience and can also nurture them, especially when I am challenging them both to recognize and transcend their cultural bias. Other times, my hope is that a student who is engaging too superficially with issues can read a journal that models great cultural awareness and flexibility in considering alternative explanations or viewpoints. I specifically ask students to consider what they learn about their own experience through the lens of another student’s journal entry. I also ask students to consider what questions they have for the other student and what observations they might offer to the other student that may help her grow or resolve the situation. Many times, this process can help students gain insight about their own experience and help them better see how they can alter their perspective or conduct in their own context. I have also found that students take seriously the opportunity to help each other grow, which in some cases can lead to greater openness with each other as peers than with me as a cultural mentor.

Depending on the program design, journaling can be less frequent with fewer opportunities for feedback. In the immigration service learning programs, for example, the opportunity for deep reflection based on experience occurs usually only once after students participate in the immigration fairs. As part of their learning, students’ work product includes a ten-page reflective article that asks them to reflect on lessons they learned through the experience about legal and ethical issues, as well as how the experience shifted their perspectives about immigrants and immigration, and to share and consider any intercultural lawyering lessons. I offer each individual student significant feedback on the journal entries that attempt to apply the types of cultural intervention practices already described. This time, however, the journal entries and feedback are not public. One reason for this is that the group is too large (between twenty and fifty) and lacks the cohesion of shared experiences to allow for the same level of group trust and intimacy. I opt, therefore, to create a safer space for students to share more openly, including asking that they present their reflections anonymously. Additionally, the feedback is only on a single (albeit long) journal entry, with little opportunity for further engagement and development. This is not ideal. I have tried to ameliorate these limitations by including collective thinking about the broad themes and lessons from the journal entries, and by including a debriefing session after the fair. In addition, the journal entries have significantly informed how I have
constructed the training for future student participation in similar service learning opportunities. I have shared quotes (anonymously) from the journal entries, and I have designed fact patterns to engage in rich intercultural discussions based on the reactions, experiences, and the collective wisdom that students have imparted to me over the years.

Post-entry reflection opportunities are also important components of intercultural training. Post-entry, as the name suggests, takes place within weeks after the completion of intercultural programming and allows students to come together as a group to discuss their experiences and what they have learned. At McGeorge, the law school implemented its post-entry program for the first time in 2013 and included all students who had completed overseas field placements. During the workshop, students reflected upon their experiences through discussions that followed a detailed outline of topics for observation and reflection provided to the students before they left for their internships. A richness of this experience was that students were able to connect with students who had worked in other parts of the world to compare experiences. Furthermore, the timing of the workshop allowed students to reflect back on their experiences after they had reinserted back into their own culture, which provided an opportunity for reflection away in space and time from the actual experience.

The role of cultural mentor requires teachers to engage very personally with the student learner and to be open to the student’s stages of development, even to the beliefs and attitudes that the teacher may find personally offensive. Earlier in the Article, I describe some tense moments with students when their attitude and conduct have challenged my ability to continue to engage with them openly and patiently. Deep intercultural engagement is emotional for the teacher and the student alike; it is also a time-intensive process which means that the educator must have the time and energy to engage intensively with students. This has several implications. To the educational institution, it means taking the role of the cultural mentor seriously and not overburdening the cultural mentor with too many work-demands as part of the educational experience. In addition, the cultural mentor needs peers and partners to turn to, not only for moral and emotional support, but also for help in intervening with students who may represent a challenge.

E. THE THEMATIC FOCUS OF THE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

I began this Article by outlining my vision of the types of transformation I sought in U.S. law students through their participation in the intercultural experiential courses or programs. These goals can
generally be described as encouraging students to be more discerning of local (or the client’s) legal norms, culture, and institutions (which requires recognizing their own legal culture and noting difference); to learn to respect and value local (or the client’s) choices and autonomy, including on strategies for social change and attributions of agency (which need not equate to agreement or acceptance); and to infuse their engagement with ethics and a commitment to justice. In my own teaching, I have also chosen for law students to learn these lessons in particular contexts that, more likely than not, vastly depart from their own experiences. Some students engage in public interest lawyering with generally poor and sometimes undocumented immigrant communities in the U.S. through service learning projects. Other students engage with issues affecting developing nations by taking on vulnerable communities as clients as part of study-abroad programs that include field placements with local institutions and organizations. In either case, students are asked to confront these differences with an awareness of the power and/or privileges they may hold as members of an economically, legally, and politically dominant culture, or as part of a group with privileged social status due to education or wealth. This all means, of course, that program or course design must include content or experiences that enhance students’ opportunities to develop into inter-culturally sensitive lawyers in the context in which they are learning. Thus, for example, students who study abroad cannot be expected to critically examine their own legal culture without a thoughtful introduction to comparative perspectives in the areas of law they are studying and socio-political reality of the host nation in which these laws apply. If students are expected to consider the ethical dimensions of global engagement in that nation, whether through rule of law projects, trade, or foreign investment, then they must be asked to consider the ethical rules that govern (or should govern) and their implementation in context. If students are asked to consider different visions of agency and different strategies for seeking social change, then they must be exposed explicitly to those differences, ideally through experiential opportunities to engage in social movements. None of this precludes introducing a range of perspectives, including conflicting visions of norms, ethics, agency, and solutions to legal problems. In fact, intercultural exploration demands that these different visions be explored. Of critical importance is that students also explore how the different cultures and life experiences of guests and hosts shape said visions and beliefs, and that each learns to respect and adapt to those differences.

By way of example, as part of the Inter-American program in Guatemala, we have offered courses that focus on trade and development,
environmental justice, transitional justice, comparative land reform, comparative access to information, comparative criminal procedure, and comparative antitrust (or anti-competitive) laws. The professors teaching these courses, both U.S. and Latin American professors, approach the subjects while remaining mindful of differences in context and culture, emphasizing how these contextual and cultural differences may call for different norms, different advocacy or lawyering strategies, and perhaps different ethical considerations and visions of agency. In the classroom, the students who are both from the U.S. and Latin America are asked to reflect together in discussions and in-group projects on how their own cultural differences and life experiences inform the issues with which they are presented. In the context of field placements, students engage directly with these contextual and cultural differences and are asked to reflect on them in ways that promote cultural understanding, adaptation, and at times, integration.

A developmental model of intercultural legal education, thus, does not suggest the teaching of a particular subject matter. Rather, what is critical is that any curriculum or experiences incorporate processes that will encourage the adult learner to become aware of his or her culture and to discern differences from the cultures of others, including his or her peers. It is also about modeling and teaching values of acceptance and respect, and offering meaningful opportunities for adaptation or integration through rich field experiences. There are a few studies, for example, that positively assess the acquisition of intercultural sensibilities in the context of service learning programs that placed students in situations with people who are economically, socially, ethnically, or culturally different from themselves. To be effective, these service-learning programs built the necessary processes for improving intercultural sensibility, such as for reflection and cultural mentoring.

A different question, however, is whether providing specific training on the meaning and process of acquiring intercultural sensibilities should also be part of the program. Some undergraduate study-abroad programs, including my own university’s, do include a specific focus on intercultural
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training as a central component of the program of study.\textsuperscript{131} The intercultural training can employ intercultural exercises or activities that are intended to illustrate in non-threatening ways the various stages of intercultural development, some of which have been developed by educational psychologists, including Bennett.\textsuperscript{132} Others suggest at a minimum providing students with intercultural materials designed to prepare them to become better learners of intercultural sensibilities.\textsuperscript{133} Some programs even measure a student’s intercultural development pre-participation and share those results with students to individualize and guide their learning in the programs.\textsuperscript{134} Some educators and studies support the claim that a reason why students do not always achieve the benefits of study-abroad programs may be their lack of prior training for intercultural experiences.\textsuperscript{135} Intercultural training, for example, can help students become aware of how culture can affect their perspectives and can also assist them in coping with the stresses experienced in intercultural encounters.\textsuperscript{136} It can also perhaps even help in building trust between the teacher and student if the student understands the purpose of the teacher’s cultural interventions.

F. THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE

Foreign language instruction should ideally also be a part of intercultural training. The acquisition of a second language alone will not necessarily lead to greater intercultural awareness on the part of students. The prevalent assumption that language study will automatically promote intercultural sensibilities is unsupported by research.\textsuperscript{137} Unfortunately, language is sometimes taught as an analytical process that emphasizes


\textsuperscript{132} For a great discussion of five exercises and their implementation in a French foreign language class, see Durocher, supra note 75, at 152-55.


\textsuperscript{134} See, e.g., Pedersen, Assessing Intercultural Effectiveness Outcomes, supra note 115, at 73 (describing the methodology of a year-long undergraduate study-abroad program in Central England); and Durocher, supra note 75, at 150 (students in a year-long language French class were pre-tested using the Intercultural Development Inventory to evaluate their level of sensitivity to cultural difference in order, \textit{inter alia}, to incorporate a set of international cultural training activities appropriate to the student’s level of sensitivity).


\textsuperscript{136} Id.

\textsuperscript{137} Gail Robinson-Stuart & Honorine Nocon, Second Culture Acquisition: Ethnography in the Foreign Language Classroom, 80 MODERN LANGUAGE J. 431, 432 (1996).
memorization without accounting for the cultural context of language. Some studies measuring language proficiency or language studies and intercultural sensibility fail to show a relationship between language ability and intercultural sensibility. Other studies of foreign language programs, particularly of those offered in dominant cultures that do not incorporate culture into language instruction, have revealed that the mere acquisition of bilingual functionality either does not alter negative feelings towards the native speakers of the language acquired and sometimes can perpetuate or enhance pre-existing prejudices. Similarly, studies of the linkages between language acquisition and cultural adaptation or integration among certain foreign groups residing in another country, for example, suggest that high levels of instrumental functionality in the host language do not necessarily translate into more positive views about the host culture.

The methodology of language instruction, thus, is critical to enhancing students’ intercultural awareness. Second language scholars have long recognized the linkages between language acquisition and culture and treat sociolinguistic sensibility as a key component of language learning. Sociolinguistic sensibility seeks to situate language learning in context and emphasizes the pragmatic, functional, and authentic use of language over simple memorization and rules. In this way, language learning is

139 See Robinson-Stuart & Nocon, supra note 137, at 434.
140 Caitlin Hanna & Christine Wiskowski, Measures of Progress in Foreign Language and Cross-Cultural Awareness: A Preliminary Report, 7 FOREIGN LANGUAGE CULTURE 33, 41 (2005) (reporting on a study conducted in the Department of International Cultural Studies at Marioka Junior College of Japanese students that compared language proficiency scores with intercultural sensibility measures and which failed to find that language ability correlated with students’ intercultural awareness). See also Paige et al., supra note 133, at 267.
144 Hanna & Wiskowski, supra note 140, at 33. See also Celeste Kinginger, A Tele-Collaborative Course on French-American Intercultural Communication, 72 FRENCH REV. 853, 854 (1999).
inherently a process in increasing awareness of cultural differences and eventually adapting to those differences as language sensibility improves. Ideally, this methodology would seek to establish meaningful connections between language learners and native speakers as well as creating positive and multi-dimensional inter-personal and intercultural experiences. The methodology requires that language learners be taught awareness of their own culture and the ability to recognize cultural differences relative to the native speakers. Moreover, the methodology does not assume benign outcomes from the awareness and experience of difference (quite the contrary, it could potentially exaggerate difference and breed distance), but incorporates reflection as part of language learning to promote the creation of what some language scholars describe as second culture; i.e., a space that encourages acceptance and/or shared meaning. One effective example of this type of methodology involves the use of ethnographic techniques in which language learners are asked to conduct interviews with native speakers in the community within a positive learning structure and with training on active listening and an emphasis on critical self-reflection. A study of this methodology as applied in San Diego State University to Spanish learners revealed that as a result of this training, students acquired a new meta-awareness of their own culture and culturally conditioned perceptions. Moreover, they tended to improve their perceptions of native Spanish speakers in their community. Other successful models include: the incorporation of intercultural training as part of language instruction; the implementation of community-based service learning to teach culture as part of language programs; and the creation of hybrid classrooms where students learning each other’s language share meaningful spaces (including through the use of technology) as part of the learning process.

A few U.S. law schools have begun to introduce the teaching of legal language training as part of the law school curriculum. Many students

145 See Robinson-Stuart & Nocon, supra note 139, at 434-35; Kinginger, supra note 144, at 854; Mark Joel Webber, The Role of Culture in a Competence-Based Syllabus, 26 THEORY INTO PRACT. 251, 252-54 (1987).
147 Robinson-Stuart & Nocon, supra note 137, at 435-36.
148 Id. at 437-44.
149 See, e.g., Durocher, supra note 75, at 150-55.
150 See, e.g., Kinginger, supra note 144, at 855-62.
151 In addition to the McGeorge School of Law, for example, the Sturm College of Law at the University of Denver has a Lawyering in Spanish program, which introduces a bilingual curriculum as part of the law school experience. UNIVERSITY OF DENVER, LAWYERING IN SPANISH, http://www.law.du.edu/index.php/lawyering-in-spanish/lawyering-in-spanish-faculty (last visited Nov. 5, 2015). Other schools, including American University, are also innovating to teach certain subjects, such as Immigration Law, with a bilingual approach. American University, Immigration Law, https://www.wcl.american.edu/registrar/coursesapp/inf_course.cfm?number=LAW-655-.
come to law school with some language proficiency, and while many of these students are able to use their language skills in clinics or field placements, few are given formal language training that also emphasizes the intercultural. At McGeorge, we have introduced legal Spanish as a core focus of the Inter-American Program. The Inter-American Program has a three-week classroom component in Antigua, Guatemala and an eight week field placement component in several countries of Latin America. In the field placement component, language instruction and culture are integrated to promote not only legal Spanish proficiency as a skill but also as a means to improve students’ intercultural legal sensibility. The Program attempts to do this in several ways: by offering substantive law courses taught in Spanish or English that emphasize the comparative and the local; by co-enrolling law students or lawyers from Latin America in these courses who are also in the process of acquiring English language proficiency with U.S. students; by introducing students to collaborative and intercultural experiential learning opportunities both in the classroom and in the field placements; and by incorporating guided reflections and feedback as part of the learning.

Offering substantive law courses in Spanish in Guatemala constitutes an approach to learning legal Spanish that meaningfully integrates culture with a focus on law. Professors of these courses have included U.S. professors who are fully bilingual in Spanish and who bring great intercultural strengths and focus. The courses intentionally cover salient and current issues affecting U.S.-Latin American relations, especially as they play out in Guatemala. Also, the courses have been taught by Guatemalan law professors or lawyers, alone or in partnership with U.S.

152 One exception to this are legal clinics that, while they do not directly teach language, do engage bilingual students in the representation of clients in the foreign language combined with intercultural training. See, e.g., Muneer I. Ahmad, Interpreting Communities: Lawyering Across Language Difference, 54 UCLA L. Rev. 999 (2007). Muneer Ahmad, is beyond the scope of this essay.


154 Spanish, of course, is not the only language spoken in Guatemala. Indeed, Guatemala recognizes that at least 21 Mayan language are spoken in the country, in addition to Garifuna. Mayan languages are experiencing a revival as part of revitalization politics and millions of people still speak at least one of these languages. Nora C. England, Mayan Language Revival and Revitalization Politics: Linguists and Linguistic Ideologies, 105 AM. ANTHROPOLOGIST 733 (2003). The Inter-American Program, however, does not have the resources to incorporate Mayan language instruction, and it is unlikely to be a preferred choice for many U.S. law students who are seeking to learn Spanish. We do, however, teach students about this linguistic richness as part of the program and introduce students to speakers of Mayan language as part of our programming on Mayan customary law.
As an integral part of the courses, the program organizes relevant field trips and guest speakers. For example, students have visited Sololá and have met with indigenous mayors to learn about indigenous people’s struggles with environmental issues and the implementation of indigenous customary law in Guatemala.

For students at the beginning stages of Spanish language acquisition, the approach also combines cultural training and language. Students enroll in a course, for example, taught largely in Spanish, and are introduced to simulations and problems involving transnational and intercultural issues. As part of the course, the simulated client is often a Latin American immigrant in the U.S. facing legal issues (family, immigration, tort law, etc.), from which students learn about the law and appropriate solutions. Beyond the substantive law, students are asked to consider how to lawyer for the client with intercultural sensibility. This requires them to engage in the Five Habits for Cross-Cultural Lawyering by exploring their differences and similarities with the client, and anticipating and attempting to advocate for the client in light of the cultural differences between the client and the U.S. legal system. Additionally, students enroll in a local language school for up to four hours a day of individualized interaction with local Spanish instructors who provide both language and cultural instruction. These teachers function as more than just language instructors. Through activities such as discussions of local issues and politics in addition to field trips, teachers become cultural mentors. Finally, the more advanced students who conduct field placements are asked to lawyer in Spanish, but as has been described in this Article, receive significant guidance not only as to technical legal Spanish and comparative law but also as to cultural training through journaling and other types of cultural interventions.

### G. OTHER FACTORS

Studies attempting to measure the effectiveness of programs aiming to teach intercultural sensibility have identified other factors relevant to program design that could be important to the experience but not already discussed here. These additional factors include the duration of the
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155 Bryant & Koh Peters, supra note 3.

156 For example, the Georgetown Consortium study of 61 programs of more than 1300 U.S. undergraduate students isolated eight factors, including program duration, student pre-departure second language proficiency; the language used in coursework abroad; the context of the academic work abroad; where students are housed; whether they participate in guided/structured experiential activities abroad; and the frequency with which resident faculty provide guided reflection on student experience. Vande Berg, supra note 108, at 18. See R.M. Paige & E.M. Stallman, Using Instruments in Education Abroad Outcomes Assessment, in A GUIDE TO OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT IN EDUCATION ABROAD 106 (Mel C. Bolen ed., 2007) (listing the same eight factors as endorsed by the Education Abroad Outcomes and Research Committee for research purposes on measuring the teaching of intercultural competence).
program and where students are housed—whether with other U.S. students, host country students, international students, or a host family. Other studies have also isolated factors related to background variables and learner characteristics to measure how and whether they matter to the acquisition of intercultural competencies. These factors include gender (female vs. male), academic major, prior language study (in high school or college), and previous experience living in another culture or prior study abroad.\footnote{See, e.g., Vande Berg et al., supra note 84, at 18-20.}

Issues of program duration and student housing have not been explicitly tied to learning outcomes; instead, these have largely been dictated by institutional concerns and student preferences, including the academic calendar, the local organization, and safety considerations. For example, the Inter-American program’s field placements last about seven to eight weeks following a three-week classroom experience, and typically house U.S. students in separate facilities.\footnote{Some studies suggest that the optimum range of time is 13-18 weeks. Vande Berg et al., supra note 84, at 20.} Studies indicate that program duration and housing choices cannot be isolated from the more critical factors of guided mentorship and cultural intervention.\footnote{Vande Berg, supra note 108, at 23-29. While longer exposure may be better to acquire intercultural sensibility,\footnote{See, e.g., Pedersen, Teaching Toward an Ethnorelative Worldview, supra note 83, at 79-82 (finding that a year-long-study-abroad program with intentional pedagogy and guided reflection results in the most change overall as compared to other programs with shorter duration); Engle & Engle, Assessing Language Acquisition, supra note 141, at 235 (same). See also Adriana Medina-López-Portillo, Intercultural Learning Assessment: The Link Between Program Duration and the Development of Intercultural Sensitivity, \textit{10 Frontiers: The Interdisc. J. of Study Abroad} 179, 180 (2004) (reporting on a study that program duration may be an important predictor of one specific element of intercultural learning, namely the development of intercultural sensitivity).} While unguided long experiences can simply firm up ethnocentric tendencies in students,\footnote{Pedersen, Teaching Toward an Ethnorelative Worldview, supra note 83, at 82 (finding that a short-term-duration program revealed positive changes in the intercultural learning of students).} shorter programs with significant guidance can be shown to be quite effective.\footnote{See id. at 77.} Similarly, living with host families, in conjunction with interventions and tools for the student to use for meaningful and productive interactions with the family can provide rich, intercultural learning experiences.\footnote{See id. at 82 (finding that a short-term study-abroad program (a couple of weeks) with intentional intervention did show positive results in the intercultural scores of participants as compared to those who did not have a study abroad). See also Philip H. Anderson et al., \textit{Short-term Study Abroad and Intercultural Sensitivity: A Pilot Study}, \textit{30 Int’l J. of Intercultural Relations} 457 (2006) (same).} I have found that law students are generally less open to housing with host families because they like their privacy, time to study, and comfort. For such students, the challenges
associated with housing with host families tend to outweigh other educational goals. Mindful that separate housing can lead to isolated spaces of enclaves of U.S. culture, I have compensated by hosting several cultural events, mandatory weekend trips, and unique academic projects that require U.S. students to socialize and interact with other Latin American students enrolled in the program.

The educational programming discussed in this Article has also largely been dictated by student preference through self-selection. As explained earlier, access to intercultural training should be available to every student in law school because lawyering is cross-cultural. Moreover, students of all stages in intercultural development have the potential to grow and benefit from well-designed programs. On the other hand, in the Inter-American program, the bilingual nature of the educational experience requires the selection of students with at least a basic Spanish language proficiency, indicating that many of them come with previous experiences living abroad or have learned foreign languages prior to these experiences. While data on these factors may not drive (and perhaps should not drive) student selection decisions in intercultural programming, these studies do shed insight into whether the results argue for different methodological approaches for certain types of students. For example, a few studies suggest females typically show greater gain in intercultural development in similar educational programs, suggesting a need to be more attentive and specific to the learning needs of males.165 Other factors that correlate positively with greater aptitude for increasing intercultural development include majoring in humanities, social sciences, and studying foreign languages.166 Nevertheless, differences between those with and without prior experiences studying or living abroad have not been statistically significant, and in fact, those who have never lived in another culture tend to show the greater gains in intercultural sensibility from original exposure.167

III. MEASURING INTERCULTURAL LEGAL SENSIBILITY

Undergraduate schools and many professional schools have for decades implemented educational programs that immerse students in other countries or other cultures believing that such programs offer students tremendous opportunity for positive personal growth, including the acquisition of

165 Vande Berg et al., supra note 84, at 18.
166 Id. at 19-20.
167 Id. at 19.
greater intercultural competencies.\textsuperscript{168} Generally, law schools are very far behind universities and colleges in being intentional and concrete about defining what intercultural lawyering should mean for the practice of law and in assessing whether the educational programming adopted actually achieves the identified outcomes.\textsuperscript{169} By contrast, for at least six decades, universities and some professional schools have been developing the best practices for teaching intercultural competencies and synergistically developing instruments that more precisely identify factors—including participant characteristics and elements of program design—that contribute to the development of intercultural sensibilities or other related goals in adult learners.\textsuperscript{170} In general, these studies are measuring the impact of educational programs such as summer abroad or service learning on student acquisition of intercultural sensibilities, although some studies also focus on the effectiveness of trainings of professionals who work in intercultural settings.\textsuperscript{171}

The lessons from these studies in general show positive outcomes from the educational experiences in terms of gains in intercultural sensibility.\textsuperscript{172} Finally, I discuss the instruments available in other disciplines to measure intercultural competencies and other related goals and discuss the lessons

\textsuperscript{168} See e.g., Lisa Altshuler et al., Assessing Changes in Intercultural Sensitivity Among Physician Trainees Using the Intercultural Development Inventory, 27 INT’L. J. OF INTERCULTURAL RELATIONS 387, 388 (2003). See also Durocher, supra note 75, at 119 (discussing a partnership between eight faculty members from 4 U.S. universities seeking to teach greater intercultural sensibilities to business students).

\textsuperscript{169} Andrea A. Curcio et al., Using Existing Frameworks to Develop Ways to Teach and Measure Law Students’ Cultural Competence, in THE LEGAL PROFESSION: EDUCATION AND ETHICS IN PRACTICE (David A. Frenkel ed., 2013).

\textsuperscript{170} Colleges and universities have been measuring intercultural results of educational programs since at least the 1950s. David Comp et al., Literature and Resources for Education Abroad: Outcomes Assessment, in A GUIDE TO OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT IN EDUCATION ABROAD 97, 117 (Mell C. Bollen ed., 2007). See also Dennison Nash, The Personal Consequences of a Year of Study Abroad, 47 J. HIGHER EDUC. 191, 193 (1976); W. Frank Hull IV, Cross-Cultural Experiential Programming, 27 INT’L REV. EDUC. 64, 68-71 (1981) (discussing the few early studies of international programming in the 1970s).

\textsuperscript{171} See, e.g., Anaida Colón-Muñiz et al., Language, Culture and Dissonance: A Study Course for Globally Minded Teachers with Possibilities for Catalytic Transformation, 21 TEACHING EDUC. 61 (2010).

\textsuperscript{172} See, e.g., Jerry S. Carlson & Keith F. Widaman, The Effects of Study Abroad During College on Attitudes Toward other Cultures, 12 INT’L J. INTERCULTURAL REL. 1, 13-16 (1988); Susan G. Sample, Intercultural Development and the International Curriculum (unpublished report, University of the Pacific) (on file with author) (reporting on positive intercultural gains at the University of the Pacific among students participating in the School of International Studies); Nash, supra note 170, at 196-201; Eingle & Engle, Assessing Language Acquisition, supra note 141, at 230; Anderson et al., supra note 163, at 464; Vande Berg, supra note 108; Pedersen, Teaching Toward an Ethnorelative Worldview, supra note 83, at 82-85; Paige et al., supra note 133, at 265; Nelson & Scott, supra note 129, at 452-455. But see Altshuler et al., supra note 168, at 399 (reporting no gain in intercultural development in a group of health professionals following brief trainings on intercultural sensibilities); Jane Jackson, Intercultural Learning on Short-Term Sojourns, 20 INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION S59 (Supplement 1, 2009) [hereinafter Jackson, Intercultural Learning] (reporting on several studies of study-abroad programs where inadequate preparation and unsettling intercultural encounters had negative effects on students such as entrenching negative stereotypes about the host country).
and best practices that law schools and law professors can learn from to develop similar studies in order to advance best practices in the way intercultural competencies are taught.

A. INSTRUMENTS AND METHODOLOGIES FOR MEASURING INTERCULTURAL SENSIBILITY

Scholars studying intercultural communications have designed several instruments and methodologies for measuring intercultural legal sensibility. These studies rely on either quantitative or qualitative measurements and sometimes combine the two methods to deepen insights and validate data.

1. Quantitative Measurements

   a. Institute for the International Education of Students MAP (Model Assessment Practice)

   The Institute for the International Education of Students ("IES") developed the IES MAP for internal program assessment and first published it in 1999. The IES MAP is widely recognized now as a leader in study-abroad program assessment, and the IES freely shares and distributes the tool to faculty and administrators of such programs. The IES MAP focuses on four academic areas: student learning environment; student learning, including assessment of intercultural development; resources for academic and student support; and program administration and development. It is a list of best practices in each of these areas that schools can use to self-assess their educational programming and provide guidelines that are easily accessible to anyone on the Internet.

   b. The Intercultural Development Inventory

   A 2003 article titled “Measuring Intercultural Sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory,” describes the development of the Intercultural Development Inventory ("IDI"), which was constructed to measure the reliability of M.J. Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) in capturing the different phases of orientations toward cultural difference. The IDI measures an individual
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174 Id.
175 Id.
177 Hammer et al., supra note 62.
178 See supra text accompanying notes 53-64 for a description of DMIS.
or group’s fundamental worldview orientation to cultural difference, and thus the individual or group’s capacity for intercultural sensibility. The IDI has been tested for validity and reliability in measuring a person’s degree of intercultural sensitivity guided by the DMIS model. Since its development, the IDI has become a widely used measurement of program effectiveness in helping students grow in intercultural sensibility. Dozens of employers and high school, college, and graduate programs have used the IDI to evaluate wide-ranging educational programming, including study abroad, service learning, classroom teaching, and trainings.

c. Other Measures

Other assessment instruments of intercultural sensitivity include the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI), the Intercultural Conflict Style Inventory (ICSI), the Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture

179 The IDI consists of a series of 50 statements with which the subject must either choose to disagree or agree or a five-point scale. IDI scores vary from an absolute low 5 to a perfect 25, when issues of cultural difference in five categories: DD, which combines the Denial and Defense stages of the DMIS and indicates a worldview that simplifies and polarizes cultural difference; R, which indicates a worldview that reverses “us” and “them” and polarization where “them” is superior; M, which refers to Minimization or a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal issues; AA, which combines Acceptance and Adaptation and indicates a worldview that can comprehend and accommodate complex and cultural difference; and EM, which measures “encapsulated marginality,” characterized by feelings of cultural alienation in which one’s worldview incorporates a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives. Engle & Engle, Assessing Language Acquisition, supra note 141, at 229.

180 Hammer et al., supra note 62, at 440.

181 See, e.g., Engle & Engle, Assessing Language Acquisition, supra note 141, at 229 (reporting on a study using the IDI to test the effectiveness of a semester or full-year study-abroad program in French study at the University Center of Provence (AUCP); Altshuler, supra note 168, at 397 (reporting on the first use of the IDI in training for healthcare professionals); Anderson et al., supra note 163, at 460 (using the IDI on monolingual college students majoring in business administration); Jane Jackson, Globalization, Internationalization, and Short-Term Stays Abroad, 32 INT’L J. INTERCULTURAL REL. 349 (2008) [hereinafter Jackson, Globalization] (using the IDI on college English-major students who grew up in Hong Kong and spoke Cantonese as their first language); Medina-López-Portillo, supra note 160, at 183 (using the IDI to assess U.S. participants in study-abroad programs in Mexico); Michael J. Vande Berg et al., The Georgetown University Consortium Project: A Report at the Halfway Mark, 10 FRONTEIERS: THE INTERDISC. J. OF STUDY ABROAD 101, 109 (2004) [hereinafter Vande Berg et al., Halfway Mark] (relying on the IDI to evaluate the effectiveness of study-abroad programs at 4 different colleges); Jackson, Intercultural Learning, supra note 172 (relying on the IDI in part, to evaluate students from Hong Kong who took part in a short-term sojourn in England after fourteen weeks of preparation); Pedersen, Assessing Intercultural Effectiveness Outcomes, supra note 115, at 74 (using IDI to test the effectiveness of short-term and year-long study-abroad programs in psychology); Paige et al., supra note 133, at 253 (using the IDI to test the effectiveness of different types of service learning programs in Hong Kong in teaching intercultural competence).

182 The CCAI is a 50-item self-assessment instrument that tries to assess a person’s orientation to new ways of thinking and behaving by measuring four qualities of intercultural adaptability: flexibility and openness (FO), personal autonomy (PA), emotional resilience (ER), and perceptual acuity (PAC). R. Michael Paige & Elizabeth Stallman Madden, Assessment of Cultural Knowledge, in THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS 46 (Carol A. Chapelle ed., 2013) [hereinafter Paige & Stallman Madden].

183 The ICSI is a self-assessment instrument that measures a person’s orientation to conflict in intercultural communication terms. It measures tendencies in intercultural communication in conflict
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(SILC), the Sociocultural Adjustment Scale (SCAS), the Cross-Cultural World-Mindedness Scale, and the Intercultural Adjustment Potential Scale (ICAPS). These tests are generally used to identify and measure certain attitudes and responses to cultural differences. They are useful because they identify the type of orientation and training that is appropriate for the student, and may also be used to identify educational progress, similar to the IDI, if pre-entry and post-entry tests may trace changes in the results of each participant.

2. Qualitative Measurements

Researchers also combine (or rely solely on) qualitative assessments with the more objective data to assess students’ progress in intercultural development. Some studies, for example, conduct interviews with students who have participated in particular programs designed to improve intercultural sensibility. One significant challenge with self-assessment to measure student growth is that generally students tend to overestimate their self-perceptions about intercultural sensibilities.

situations such as directness vs. indirectness (DI scale) and emotional responsiveness vs. emotional restraint (ER). The test yields four intercultural conflict patterns: discussion (direct and emotionally restrained); engagement (direct and emotionally expressive); accommodation (indirect and emotionally restrained) and dynamic (indirect and emotionally expressive). Id. 44-9.

184 The SILC measures an individual’s tendency to use particular learning skills when living in another culture and can be used to determine to what extent students use certain types of culture-learning strategies during their education abroad experience. The SILC is a 52-item series of statements that ask respondents to indicate how often they use a particular strategy for culture learning, based on nine different approaches: adaptation; culture shock/coping strategies; interpreting culture; communicating across cultures; communication styles; nonverbal communication; interacting with culturally different people; home-stay strategies; and reentry strategies. Id. at 45.

185 SCAS consists of 29 items designed to test a person’s socio-cultural adaptation in terms of how that persons thinks (cognitive dimension) and responds (behavioral dimension) to a new culture. Id. at 47.

186 The CCWMS measures a variety of attitudes and values such as immigration, patriotism, world government and global economic justice based on responses to 26 statements with which the participant must agree or disagree strongly. Id. 44-9.


188 Paige & Stallman Madden, supra note 182, at 44-9.

189 One such study asked U.S. college students who had participated in a year abroad program in France the open-ended question of what their main accomplishments had been, or sought self-assessment by way of self-conceptions through the completion of open phrases like “I am …” or through a series of more directed questions aimed at assessing degrees of acculturation (e.g., preference for speaking French). Nash, supra note 170, at 192. See also Medina-López-Portillo, supra note 160, at 184 (similar study design for a U.S. study-abroad program in Mexico). Yet another study used a survey instrument in a Spanish foreign language program that implemented service learning in order to improve students’ intercultural development. The survey instrument was designed by the Spanish department based on the learning objectives identified for the program in five categories: Applied Spanish and Service Satisfaction; Cultural Understanding and Knowledge of Hispanics; Citizenship and Social Responsibility; Leadership Skills and Personal Development; and Career Impact. Nelson & Scott, supra note 129, at 456-460.

190 See, e.g., Altschuler et al, supra note 168, at 393.
In some studies, researchers take an ethnographic approach and rely on formal and informal observations. These include reading students’ reflective journals and weekly open-ended surveys designed to draw out their views, intercultural adjustment, and reactions to cultural differences. In such studies, researchers use open coding and pattern-matching techniques to analyze the qualitative data. Usually, one researcher assesses the data (e.g., interviews, journal entries) to aim for consistency in the observation.\textsuperscript{191}

3. Methodologies

The instruments and methods used to measure and evaluate the effectiveness of teaching intercultural sensibility vary. Typically, many quantitative studies use observations gathered before and after the educational programs. These studies also often assess students during their educational experience such as study abroad. For example, using the IDI, students can be assessed prior to the program on their degree of intercultural sensibility, which also allows for the categorization of students according to factors that may already influence where they may score on the pre-test.\textsuperscript{192} It can also help teachers and students gain insight about students’ stages of intercultural development, which can help guide and tailor the type of cultural mentoring necessary for a particular student during the program.\textsuperscript{193}

Many studies also rely on control groups of students who have not participated in an intercultural learning experience, such as those who choose to stay at home rather than study abroad.\textsuperscript{194} The selection of the control group is always challenging and may put in question the validity of the results in the study. For example, it may not be possible to find comparable students for the control group whose differences from the participants, aside from the intercultural educational experience itself, may

\textsuperscript{191} See, e.g., Medina-López-Portillo, supra note 160, at 184. See also Colón-Muhiz et al., supra note 171, at 66-7; Paige et al., supra note 133, at 258, 261-2.

\textsuperscript{192} One such study conducted by the American University of Provence of a semester or year-long French study program abroad, for example, was able to determine that students with previous study abroad or with two years of foreign language study tended to score higher in the pre-IDI test than others. This knowledge also allowed researchers to trace student’s degree of progress (or even regression) based on their participation in the program being assessed. Engle & Engle, \textit{Assessing Language Acquisition}, supra note 141, at 230. See also Vande Berg et al., \textit{Halfway Mark}, supra note 181, at 109; Durocher, supra note 75, at 150-55 (describing a similar methodology of testing students three times: at entry; during the program; and post-entry).

\textsuperscript{193} \textit{Id.} The American University of Provence study also distinguished students who completed the study-abroad program for a semester and those who stayed the full year in order to trace the progression of the IDI score over time. Not surprisingly, students who stayed for the full year showed greater progress in the IDI score than those who stayed only a semester. Jackson, \textit{Intercultural Learning}, supra note 172, at 235.

\textsuperscript{194} See, e.g., Nash, supra note 169, at 194, 196. See also Durocher, supra note 78, at 123.
explain the outcome in the study. Another challenge relates to the lack of motivation of control students in particular to participate in the study; students generally respond more easily when they are motivated by faculty at the home institution.

Many studies are simply measuring whether participation in the educational experience in general has helped students gain intercultural sensibility. Though these types of studies generally fail to distinguish which components of the program can actually be credited with the success, this has started to change. In June 1998, for example, John and Lili Engle pioneered a very different approach to measuring the success of study-abroad programs by classifying them into eight independent variables that could significantly impact student learning. Until then, the differentiation focused on program type (e.g., island, direct enrollment, experiential, service learning, etc.), without highlighting the differences in program design or factors that may contribute to the success of the program. These new factors which have both programmatic and participant characteristics include length of the program, student pre-departure second-language sensibility, required second language use (in class and out), host or home institution faculty, type of courses students take abroad (immersion in host university vs. a separate program consisting of only program students or also international students), presence or absence of mentoring and guided cultural reflection, the inclusion of experiential learning opportunities; and the type of student housing.

The Georgetown University Consortium Project was the most ambitious study that took all eight of the Engle factors into account. This particular study, which was a three-year assessment, decided to include the students at four different institutions of higher learning—Georgetown, University of Minnesota, Rice University, and Dickinson College—to capture a diverse range of very different student profiles participating in sixty-one different study-abroad programs compared with those staying at home as a control group.
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199 Other studies look at some but not all of the Engle factors. See, e.g., Anderson, et. al., supra note 163, at 460 (study seeking to ascertain whether a four-week program in an English speaking country improves the cultural sensitivity of its participants).
200 Vande Berg et al., Halfway Mark, supra note 181, at 101. The finding of this major study included fourteen findings related to intercultural education: (1) that study abroad participants made significant progress in intercultural learning; (2) that females but not males increased their IDA significantly as a result of the study abroad; (3); that certain academic majors such as humanities, social science, and foreign languages showed greater gains in IDA when compared to students in other majors; (4) that prior language study is significantly associated with gains in intercultural competence; (5) that
Additional programmatic factors that some studies have attempted to isolate as potentially significant to the learning of intercultural sensibility have included pre- and post-programmatic interventions, such as orientations, trainings about intercultural sensibility, and post-entry programs. Additionally, some studies evaluate whether addressing intercultural sensibility as part of job training is helpful for improving human development in intercultural sensibilities. Additional characteristic factors that some studies have assessed as predictive of intercultural sensitivity include gender, nationality, cultural background, and academic ability. Interestingly, several studies confirm that females tend to gain greater intercultural sensibilities when exposed to similar educational programming as compared to males.

Another variation of some studies is to measure the long-term impact of certain educational experiences by surveying participants months or years after the completion of the program. Other studies have used the IDI test to assess students’ long-term effects of study-abroad programs.

Previous experience living in another culture and (6) prior study abroad was not meaningfully associated with intercultural competence gains, although these students tended to start the program with higher IDI scores; (7) that program duration is significantly associated with intercultural gains and that 13-18 weeks showed the greatest gains; (8) that teaching courses in the target language was positively associated with intercultural gains; (9) that students who enrolled in target language courses made significantly more intercultural progress than those who did not; (10) that students learn best when they study in a hybrid classroom that combines host and U.S. students as opposed to in classrooms made up entirely of host country students; (11) that students who received cultural mentoring made greater gains in intercultural competence than students who did not; (12) that students' perceptions of degrees of similarity or dissimilarity of the host culture matters to intercultural gains, with the largest gain occurring among students who perceived the other culture as dissimilar as opposed to very similar, similar, or very dissimilar; (13) that students who lived with other U.S. students or with students from the host country showed statistically significant gains in intercultural learning in contrast to those who lived with host families (although those who chose to live with host families tended to have higher IDI scores); and (14) that students who tended to spend more time with host nationals tended to show greater intercultural gains. Vande Berg et al., supra note 84, at 18-24. Vande Berg et al., Halfway Mark, supra note 181, at 112-13. Altshuler et al., supra note 168, at 390. See, e.g., id. at 392. See also Jackson, Globalization, supra note 181, at 351 (using the IDI on college English-major students who grew up in Hong Kong and spoke Cantonese as their first language).

Rexeisen et al., supra note 187, at 4 (studying, inter alia, whether academic ability as measured by GPA scores related to changes in intercultural development). Altschuler et al, supra note 168, at 394. See also Vande Berg, supra note 108, at 20. The 2002 survey conducted by the Institute for the International Education of Students, for example, surveyed more than 3,400 students (23% yield rate of response) years after participated in IES study-abroad programs. The students overwhelmingly self-reported that they continued to develop their self-confidence and worldview after returning home from their study-abroad experience. See Rexeisen et al., supra note 187, at 7-13 (finding that while college-aged U.S. students who studied in London showed short-term gains in intercultural development, the findings raised questions about the long-term effects since IDI score declined over time).
B. MEASURING IN THE INDIVIDUAL CLASSROOM

Rubrics can also be developed and used to measure individual students’ intercultural legal sensibility. Other disciplines have already designed incredibly useful rubric instruments that law professors can adapt when assessing intercultural legal competence. For example, reading journal entries or observations of either actual or simulated lawyering experiences (e.g., client interviews, etc.) can be used to accomplish this objective.\footnote{A few great sample model rubrics to measure intercultural legal sensibility have been designed by the Association of American Colleges & Universities. See, e.g., \textit{Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Value Rubric}, ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES \& UNIVERSITIES, https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/VALUE/InterculturalKnowledge.pdf.}

Appendix A includes a rubric I adapted from these other disciplines to apply to the assessment of journal entries by students engaging across cultures in field placements or though service learning opportunities.

C. MEASURING BEYOND INTERCULTURAL LEARNING

While many academic disciplines and professions are aiming for similar gains in intercultural sensibilities, there is no question that specific fields of study and professions also have distinct learning outcome objectives. For example, foreign language programs also wish to assess language competencies and a number of assessment instruments have been developed to measure, \textit{inter alia}, the degree of language proficiency that is acquired in study-abroad opportunities as compared to stay-at-home programs.\footnote{See, e.g., Vande Berg et al., \textit{Halfway Mark}, supra note 181, at 108 (describing the Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview (SOPI) and the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) language competencies measurements). See also R.M. Paige & E.M. Stallman, \textit{Using Instruments in Education Abroad Outcomes Assessment}, in \textit{A GUIDE TO OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT IN EDUCATION ABROAD} 106 (Mel C. Bolen ed., 2007) (discussing, in addition to the OPI and SOPI, the Speech Act Measure (SAM) and the Language Strategies Survey (LSS) which are used to measure second language acquisition).}

Few other disciplines, however, have developed similar instruments to test learning objectives beyond language and intercultural competencies, but there is some progress from which law schools can benefit.

One study conducted as part of the Georgetown University Consortium Project, for example, included a third domain of discipline-specific learning objectives other than language and intercultural proficiency to assess the gains of study-abroad programs. To develop such instruments, researchers held a series of workshops with faculty from different disciplines, including humanities, business, engineering and science, to agree on a set of discipline-specific learning outcomes and to design potential instruments to measure those gains.\footnote{Vande Berg et al., \textit{Halfway Mark}, supra note 181, at 110.} At the end of the workshop, the four-disciplines
agreed on the following four additional learning outcomes: an ability to function on multicultural teams; an understanding of ethical and professional responsibility; an understanding of the impact of disciplinary solutions in a global and societal context; and an ability to apply the disciplinary knowledge.\textsuperscript{210} Moreover, the faculty consultants developed an interview guide that was field-tested and consisted of three different hypothetical scenarios, each of which asked students to imagine how they would respond to a series of questions posed by an interviewer during a job interview or an interview for admission to graduate school.\textsuperscript{211} This is a fairly new instrument, but it reflects consensus among representatives of these various disciplines on learning outcomes and ways to measure gains in those outcomes from certain types of educational experiences.\textsuperscript{212}

There are also other instruments that measure either gains in substantive knowledge or measure ethics and values in ways that could be useful to educational programs that include global and social justice engagement. The most widely adopted approaches used in the study of moral judgment are the Defining Issues Test (DIT2), which is based on an adaptation of L. Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development, and the Ethics Position Questionnaire (EPQ), which is based on D.R. Forsyth’s approach to the study of moral reasoning. Kohlberg proposed a six-state developmental framework for understanding moral orientation: pre-convention stages 1 and 2 focus more-or-less on self-centered fear of punishment; in convention stages 3 and 4 individuals tend to make moral decisions based on rigid rules or for reasons that are influenced by peers; the principle stages 5 and 6 is when behavior is more autonomous and is controlled by universal principles of right and wrong.\textsuperscript{213} The DIT2 instrument is comprised of five moral dilemmas, each of which is followed by twelve statements that participants rate according to their importance to the solution of the dilemma.\textsuperscript{214} In contrast to Kohlberg’s more rigid model, Forsyth believes in personal variation in moral judgments and behavior that can be understood in terms of a person’s preference for idealism or relativism. Forsyth’s approach does not present a developmental model but relies on idealism and relativism to provide a classification of an individual’s moral orientation.\textsuperscript{215} The EPQ study asks students to complete three different questionnaires: demographic/psychographic questionnaire, a
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moral reasoning survey, and an intercultural development inventory or a similar test, at the beginning and at the conclusion of the study-abroad experience. This approach allows for studying the relationship between intercultural sensibility and moral judgment (as measured by the EPQ study).216 Another study called the “new environmental paradigm” (NEP) assesses eco-values and measures environmental orientation. The most recent scale called the NEP2 is comprised of fifteen Likert scale questions that evenly measure the resulting five hypothesized facets of ecological worldview: (1) people’s beliefs about how easily the balance of nature is upset; (2) the right of humanity to rule over the rest of nature; (3) the existence of physical limitations for growth of human populations; (4) the possibility of an eco-crisis; and (5) human exceptionalism or the belief that humans are exempt from the constraints of nature.217

D. SOME PRELIMINARY LESSONS FOR LAW SCHOOLS FROM STUDY DESIGN AND THE RESULTS OF STUDIES MEASURING INTERCULTURAL SENSIBILITY AND BEYOND

There are a number of valuable lessons for law schools to draw upon from the wealth of theory, research, and studies in other disciplines evaluating educational programs designed to teach students intercultural sensibility and other values of intercultural engagement, including ethics. The first is the need for law school faculty to come together to establish common learning outcomes and objectives in a more systematic way across a number of teaching methodologies (clinics, field placements, service learning, and study abroad), to prepare lawyers who will work with a variety of clients in different settings. Of course, this effort has already begun. This Article, as well as the many others cited in Part II have already theorized on the desired skills, values, attitudes and practices associated with good intercultural lawyering. A more recent book chapter co-authored by Andrea Curcio also starts to help legal educators think about developing desired outcomes in the area of educating interculturally competent lawyers whether as a community of educators or as individuals.218 Curcio, for example, offers a series of proposed learning outcomes in intercultural

216 Id.
218 Andrea A. Curcio et al., Using Existing Frameworks to Develop Ways to Teach and Measure Law Students’ Cultural Competence, in THE LEGAL PROFESSION: EDUCATION AND ETHICS IN PRACTICE (David A. Frenkel ed., 2013).
lawyering training categorized in terms of knowledge, attitudes, and skills.\textsuperscript{219}

The second lesson is that law schools need to start measuring the effectiveness of educational programs designed to help law students develop into the type of interculturally competent lawyers we have identified. The great news is that law schools can rely on pre-existing instruments already tested for validity and reliability in other disciplines. The IDI, for example, as well as some of the ethics assessments have applicability in all academic fields. Further, law schools can learn significantly from best practices in the methodology that has developed in other disciplines to measure the effectiveness of educational programs in teaching intercultural sensibility. For example, law schools individually should assess their own programming, whether by isolating specific programs or by testing the entire curriculum’s effectiveness in teaching students intercultural sensibility as part of the law school program. This would mean testing all incoming students for their intercultural sensibility at admissions and then again at graduation, at a minimum. Ideally, as well, students could be tested as part of their participation in programs offered at the school to help schools identify the most effective programs to teach intercultural sensibility in the context of law schools (i.e., simulations, clinics, field placements, and service learning). We can also implement the best practices that other disciplines have adopted after their own testing on educational programs that are comparable to ours. Ideally, law schools should partner on joint projects to assess programming to improve the data and learn from each other.

We also, as law faculty, need to consider adapting or developing our own instruments that respond to the identified particular intercultural or related values associated with intercultural lawyering. Here, too, there has been some progress. Curcio partnered with social scientists to develop a twenty-nine question survey instrument designed specifically for law students based on previously identified learning outcomes and conducted a pilot study of the instrument to test it for validity and reliability.\textsuperscript{220} The study sought information about students’ knowledge of how culture affects the lawyering process, their attitudes toward cultural diversity education, and their awareness of how their cultural background affects the ways in which they, and others, communicate and interact.\textsuperscript{221} The survey also asked demographic questions and contained a series of open-ended questions
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seeking information about the survey design as well as students’ thoughts about the role culture plays in their worldview and interactions. After some revisions, this survey instrument has already been administered to incoming and upper-level law students at two law schools with some promising results about the effectiveness at these two law schools in teaching intercultural sensibilities. For example, in general, upper level students revealed greater awareness on how culture influenced lawyering and legal decision-making. The study, however, did not identify which aspects of the educational experience could be credited with these gains. The results also isolated certain demographic factors (such as gender and ethnicity) significant to intercultural sensibilities. The study, for example, revealed that minorities and women in law school tend to be more self-aware compared to other students of how culture influences their views of the U.S. legal system. The authors acknowledge several limitations to this initial study, including the unreliability of self-reporting, however, it is promising and exciting that legal educators are partnering with social scientists to conduct and develop instruments to be applied in the context of legal education.

A third important lesson for law schools relates to our preparedness as legal educators to engage in the teaching of intercultural competencies. As law schools increase (or seek to increase) the multicultural and class diversity in the enrollment of law students into their J.D. or L.L.M. programs, the pluralistic classroom demands approaches to teaching that recognize and are sensitive to differences not only in what we teach but also how we teach law. Moreover, as law schools shift to consider more seriously the inclusion of intercultural legal education for all law students as an essential component of legal training in response to shifting demographics in the U.S. or the role of globalization in transforming the practice of law, law schools must take seriously whether the educators are ready to practice intercultural sensibility in the traditional law school classroom or to teach intercultural competencies in programs with that stated purpose. The results may surprise us. In 2008, Kenneth Cushner published the results of a few recent studies testing the intercultural

---

\[222\] Id.
\[223\] Id.
\[224\] Id.
\[225\] Id.
\[226\] Id.
sensibility of mostly elementary school teachers in the U.S. and Hong Kong relying on the IDI instrument. This study revealed low levels of intercultural sensibility among the overwhelming majority of teachers. Cushner suggested that the lack of diversity among teachers in the samples contributed to the low scores given the influence that early socialization has on the development of ethnic and cultural identity. Law schools have made some progress in diversifying law faculty, but not on offering intercultural training to educators. This may also need to change.

A fourth lesson may relate to how and whether a law school’s ability to assess intercultural sensibility accurately should bear on admissions decisions. In this Article I have argued in favor of educating all students admitted to law school in intercultural competencies irrespective of their developmental stage. Once admitted, law schools need to provide a curriculum that is responsive to the needs of the profession and the needs of students. Levels of intercultural sensibility should not, in my view, impede access to law schools. Intercultural sensibility is teachable and students do make progress from thoughtful educational programming designed to teach intercultural sensibility. A different issue, however, is whether high levels of intercultural sensibility should weigh in favor of students seeking admission into law schools and the profession. Currently, law school admissions decisions are primarily focused on measuring a narrow set of skills such as reading, writing, and analysis as measured by the LSAT or GPA, although many law schools do consider other factors such as demonstrated leadership, overcoming hardship, and work experience, to name a few. We have not, however, measured highly desirable skills, such as intercultural sensibility, as part of admissions decisions. This is at least something worth exploring.

IV. CONCLUSION

My purpose in writing this Article has been to welcome a conversation about the meaning of a law school’s responsibilities to educate interculturally competent lawyers and the implications of this on how we teach our students. My hope is also that it will provoke reflection among law
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faculty and law schools about how we can improve and learn from other disciplines that have been thinking systematically through these issues for much longer than we have. Another goal is to encourage us to come together as legal educators and in partnerships with other disciplines to design joint studies of our respective educational programming. We owe it to our students and to the profession.
### Appendix A: Journaling and Intercultural Knowledge and Effectiveness: A Sample Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Cultural Self-awareness</th>
<th>Cultural Worldview Frameworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Beginning</td>
<td>Demonstrates little or no awareness of one's own assumptions, judgments, and/or biases about self and others</td>
<td>Demonstrates surface understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing</td>
<td>Begins to identify one's own assumptions, judgments, and/or biases about self and others</td>
<td>Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conversant</td>
<td>Articulates the influence of one's own assumptions, judgments, and/or biases during interactions with members of one's own culture and the culture of others</td>
<td>Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Advanced</td>
<td>Evaluates one's own assumptions, judgments, and/or biases related to one's own culture and the culture of others</td>
<td>Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Curiosity

**BEGINNING 1**

- Demonstrates minimal interest in learning more about other cultures.

**DEVELOPING 2**

- Asks simple or surface questions about other cultures.

**CONVERSANT 3**

- Asks deeper questions about other cultures and seeks out answers to these questions.

**ADVANCED 4**

- Asks complex questions about other cultures, seeks out and articulates answers to these questions that reflect multiple cultural perspectives.

4. Openness

**BEGINNING 1**

- Shows minimal receptivity to interacting with culturally different others.
- Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his responses to culturally different others, and is unaware of own judgment.

**DEVELOPING 2**

- Reveals openness to most, if not all, interactions with culturally different others.
- Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others.

**CONVERSANT 3**

- Begins to suspend judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.

**ADVANCED 4**

- Suspends judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.
- Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others, but is aware of own judgment and expresses a willingness to change.