learning environment. For law schools this is especially necessary because most law students do not have the luxury of making their studies their sole focus in life. Most law students must work during the school year. Consequently, institutions that respect diversity must have flexible academic policies that accommodate students' varying circumstances.

A curriculum that respects diversity recognises that both the sequencing and the content of courses must be responsive to the diverse needs of the students. The sequencing of courses should build from the students' existing knowledge base and experience, lay an appropriate foundation and provide context for the subject matter, and develop levels of sophistication progressively. Effective curriculum design also integrates skills with substantive courses; provides interdisciplinary course options; helps students see the relationships among their courses; incorporates supplemental and background materials; and includes diverse content, perspectives, and values. The effective curriculum design provides various learning options outside the classroom, such as clinical courses, externships, independent studies and small seminar courses.

The principle that effective pedagogy respects diverse talents and ways of learning is firmly grounded in theories of adult learning, metacognition, multiple intelligences and learning styles. Theories of metacognition indicate that learners maximise their learning and performance when they are aware of how they learn, match their learning method to the learning task, receive frequent and prompt feedback and then modify their methods to increase their learning effectiveness.

Theories about learning styles indicate that learners have a preferred mode of learning, that people learn in different ways, that a variety of learning styles will be present in any classroom, and that no one teaching method is effective for all students. Students can enhance their learning and performance when they learn more about their own styles and when the instructional methods match their particular styles. Once students understand their own preferred style, they can use alternative learning strategies.

Law teachers who respect different ways of learning teach students about learning styles, provide students with learning style assessments, learn about their students' styles, teach study strategies for the different styles, and use a variety of teaching methods. Effective pedagogical practice respects diverse talents and ways of learning not only by teaching the skills of learning and using a variety of methods, but also by approaching the educational endeavour from a learner-based perspective.

Effective law teachers are interested in and actively learn about their students' diverse ideas, values, interests, motivations, and backgrounds. Effective teachers use what they know about their students when they introduce new information. Teachers also can use information they have gleaned to increase their sensitivity and the students' sensitivity toward other students.

Respecting diverse talents and ways of learning may be the most radical of the seven principles in that it requires a significant shift for most educators. It threatens our notion of standards and causes us to broaden the way we define achievement and determine success. Such a shift may even cause us to add new standards of excellence, such as mastery of learning skills as well as content, and proficiency in more than one type of intelligence. Adopting a worldview that respects diversity challenges us to reconsider our values and modify our actions. But implementing this principle could have a significant impact on legal education and the legal profession. In respecting diversity, law schools will accept, teach, and graduate students who will be better equipped to address the legal needs of our changing society.

REVIEW ARTICLE

The law school – global issues, local questions

F Cowie (ed.)

Ashgate Dartmouth, 1999

260pp.

This book is a collection of nine essays contributed by authors from the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada and Italy. It is edited by Fiona Cownie, who is the convenor of the Working Group on the Legal Professions, a sub-group of the International Sociology Association's Research Committee on the Sociology of Law.

As the editor notes in her foreword, whereas legal education is carried out differently in different jurisdictions, there are many issues of common concern to legal educators. She also maintains that, while in the past the study of legal education has been neglected and marginalised, there is now a growing professionalisation to the research into legal education, which in turn leads to a greater self-awareness.

In the first chapter Anthony Bradney looks at the proper role for liberal education in law and concludes that, although there is widespread acceptance among legal academics of the value of a liberal legal education, it is likely that they do not fully comprehend what is entailed in this notion. In many instances, their endorsement is no more than a manifestation within the law school of an opposition to vocational education and to the intrusion of the professional associations into the their curriculum preserves. Roger Brownsword in chapter 2 takes up the challenge issued in the United Kingdom by Lord Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Legal Education and Conduct to law schools to assume the responsibility for producing good citizens as well as good lawyers.

Fiona Cownie mounts a strong argument in chapter 3 for less emphasis to be placed on research as the principal area of activity for legal academics and more on acquiring an understanding of educational theory and practice as a founda-

tion for enhanced teaching skills. The Australian scholar, Andrew Goldsmith, in a very wide-ranging chapter 4, contends that law schools stand at the crossroads with respect to their relationships with their universities, the market forces converging upon them and the future of legal scholarship as traditionally conceived.

Joy Hillyer (chapter 5) provides a brief review of the history of professional legal education in England and Wales. She also suggests ways in which the future for vocational legal education can be divined by a reflective focus upon what lawyers are doing and likely to be doing in the future and how the opportunities for new partnerships between law schools and the legal profession can be seized. John Flood discusses in chapter 6 how the impact of globalisation on economies and societies can be characterised as the advent of a new imperialism and how this in turn will shape the future law school, as well as the law firms which the law graduate will enter.

The focus then moves to legal education beyond the shores of the United Kingdom. Olgiati surveys (chapter 7) the policy on legal education in the European Community from a socio-legal perspective and with particular reference to legal professionalisation. In a chapter (8) with which those from other jurisdictions will be able to identify striking similarities with their own situations, Thomasset and Laperriere look at the troubled relationship between the law schools and the Bar in Quebec, Canada, and how the latter exercises professional domination over the former through the confinement of legal training and research.

Finally, in the concluding chapter (9), Julian Webb weaves together a number of the separate threads defining the socialising role of the law school, namely the liberal education push, the legitimacy of a role for law schools in producing good citizens and the tensions generated by globalisation. He suggests that out of the recent history of unparalleled activity and upheaval for legal education has emerged significant shifts in educational thinking and practice, namely, from elite to mass provision, from the highly structured to the flexible curriculum, from content to process and from classical liberal to performance-based outcomes. He warns that underlying these developments is the power of the market and its attempts to commodify education as a symbolic good.

This is an interesting and thought-provoking collection of essays, distinguished by a diversity of themes and issues, as well as a scholarly approach. They each aim to delineate the future role for the law school by identifying the social influences that are currently in the process of crafting that future. However, it is unfortunate that, by and large, they each stand in isolation the one from the other. It is a pity that the editor did not consider it to be part of her role to contribute a concluding chapter in which she made an effort to analyse and synthesise the common themes that emerge from the authors in order to paint a composite picture of that future.

Editor

PURPOSE

Pro bono or partnership? Rethinking lawyer's public service obligations for a new millennium

L White

50 *J Legal Educ* 1, 2000, pp 134-146

In October of 1999 the Association of American Law Schools released *Learning to Serve*, the final report of its Commission on Pro Bono and Public Service Opportunities.

On the one hand, the report sets forth a dynamic vision of public service as partnership with low-income individuals and communities. In this vision, public service is not an add-on to the lawyer's regular workday. Rather, service is integrated into the very core of the legal profession's practice norms. At the same time, the report sets forth a different vision, in which the core of the lawyer's public service responsibility is individual voluntary pro bono representation of 'indigents' in intense but brief routine matters. This is an old pro bono model. The world has changed a lot since the early 1990s, when that model emerged. Unlike a century ago, our profession now endorses normative commitments to race and gender equality, within our professional roles and institutions and in the world at large.

Partnerships in public service are getting created in many law schools. Throughout its report, the Commission points toward this emerging model. According to this model, students go into low-income communities prepared to listen, to engage in self-reflection and then to join hands with others so that both partners may be opened up by the difference between them and changed for the better. A consensus of best practice is emerging in university and law school public service initiatives that embrace this idea of service as partnership rather than charity. The Commission's report gives many examples of law school projects that are based on a partnership model. But, at the same time, the report's text and recommendations seem, repeatedly, to lapse back into an older way of thinking about how professional service opportunities, in law firms as well as law schools, should be designed.

The old model that conceives of the lawyer's public service responsibility as pro bono representation emerged early in the twentieth century, when the legal profession's ethical self-identity was consolidated. Changing gender roles, changing race norms and changing immigration patterns mean that the old pro bono model is less suitable for lawyers' public service obligations. Even without the added burden of pro bono obligations, lawyers with care taking responsibility are squeezed for time just keeping up with the excessive number of hours a week they are expected to work for pay. The profession's public service obligations need to get done while the day-care centres are open. In firms, lawyers need to have this work counted and credited in their billable hours. In law schools, teachers need leave time from teaching to supervise students' public service activities. Students need academic credit or pay or other official rewards for the hours that they spend on public serv-