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I

In this article, I present an approach to stimulating reflective writing that may interest law teachers looking to raise issues of professional values and clinicians seeking an alternative to the use of open-ended journal writing.\(^1\) The students whose experience will be described were enrolled in an experimental course on the legal profession, but the method employed may work equally well in a variety of clinical settings, whether externship or in-house clinics, or for that matter in other law school courses.

A. In The Beginning

In the early years of clinical legal education—for those of you who were not of sufficient years to note its arrival, I am talking about 1970-74 or thereabouts—the fortunate few of us chosen to lead legal education to the promised land of learning and labor had very little idea of what to do in our classes. Most of the first wave of clinicians had significant litigation experience and so were comfortable enough in courts and administrative hearing rooms. Many had supervised law student interns in previous work lives and so had a rough sense of the supervisory and organizational demands of student practice. But none of us had ever been in a clinical classroom before—it was no part of our own law school experience—because, of course, it was just then being invented.

We were so new at this game that often it wasn’t possible to provide students with a semester-long syllabus. There was excitement as

---

* Matthews Distinguished Professor of Law, Northeastern University School of Law. I want to thank Lisa Lerman for encouraging me to think seriously about these matters, Linda Ireland for her insightful research assistance and Brook Baker, Margaret Woo and Molly Meltsner for commenting on the manuscript. Several former students at Northeastern University School of Law graciously permitted me to quote from their writings; names and other details have been changed to protect their privacy.

well as anxiety in designing classes on short notice, on the basis of last
minute developments in clinic cases or new discoveries about what
students needed to know. But we had no casebooks or tape libraries
to help us. If publishers sensed that there was a market for clinical
materials, they hadn’t yet figured out how to serve it.2 There were a
small—though growing—number of really useful, eagerly sought,
homegrown reading lists, syllabi and teaching materials which many of
us shared.

The challenge of the classroom wasn’t made any easier by the fact
that some early clinic students elected the course with a mistaken im-
pression that student practice meant release from preparing for class.
There were also plenty of faculty skeptics looking for signs that the
clinic was an experiment that had failed. They didn’t believe that any-
thing rigorous could be conveyed about law and lawyering within law
clinic confines. As a consequence, the classroom was a stressful arena
for clinicians. Some of us initially disdained its importance in contrast
to the undoubted power of hands-on teaching in a supervisory setting,
for example reviewing student performance shortly after an interview
or court appearance. Others reacted to faculty condescension by try-
ing to appear at all times sage and in charge despite a reality of trial
and error.

In such an environment, isolating and uncertain even if not hos-
tile, early clinicians looked forward enthusiastically to meeting with
colleagues facing similar problems in other institutions. These meet-
ings were safe havens for gossip and grouting about the burdens cli-
icians carried, not that there was anything approaching unity regarding
the major issues facing clinical legal education at the time.3 Additionally,
because many of us were still clueless about the appropriate
learning objectives and approaches to realize them, there was special
interest in talk about what someone well schooled in bureaucratize
had dubbed “The Classroom Component”4 and great yearning for the

---

2 Philip Schrag and I published a collection of materials, PUBLIC INTEREST ADVOCACY: MATERIALS FOR CLINICAL LEGAL EDUCATION in 1974. Gary Bellow and Beatrice Moulton did not bring out the far more substantial set, THE LAWYERING PROCESS, until 1978. Of course, Bellow’s working drafts were available earlier and influenced many clinicians, as did David Binder & Susan Price’s LEGAL INTERVIEWING & COUNSELING: A CLIENT-CENTERED APPROACH (1977).

3 In-house clinics versus simulation and test litigation versus individual client service, to give binary form to just two items on what was a very long list. See Philip Schrag & Michael Meltsner, REFLECTIONS ON CLINICAL LEGAL EDUCATION, passim (1998).

4 I am surprised that this jargon is still in use. The difference between classroom and classroom component has always eluded me and the term “component” is particularly clumsy given its association with things mechanical. I can only guess that it was employed to signal the (absurd) notion that in the clinic the classroom is an afterthought and that only fieldwork counts. A more charitable interpretation would have the term reflect that the distinctive contribution of clinical education was in the practice realm. After delivery
basics—hours, credits, case management, exams, numbers of students, caseload, even grades.

I hope I don’t have to persuade anyone that after a while this sort of intramural reporting, say on whether a clinic should be restricted to third year students or how long a class should meet, could get pretty dreary. It distracted us from devoting our full energies to more substantial matters—our own identity as clinicians, for example, or how best to balance serving clients AND students at the same time, issues of role acquisition and role conflict, speculating on learning theory and designing the best supervisory models. Not our most dignified, elevated moments, I assure you, but that this was a necessary phase no one should doubt. (Lewis and Clark had to count casks of flour before they left St. Louis for the land beyond Missouri; someone must check whether the astronauts have enough toothpaste.) Given the ultimate outpouring of energy by clinicians—the long list of interesting innovations they have either pioneered or influenced in class and workplace, the truly staggering range of lawyering experiences they have made available to students, the stimulating readings and range of exercises they employ, the sets of materials and tapes as well as many valuable articles—well, it seems a small price to pay to have occasionally taken up the time of Gary Bellow or Philip Schrag or Joe Harbaugh or Harry Subin or Elliott Milstein with nuts and bolts.

B. Nuts and Bolts

It’s in this spirit that I hesitantly walk through what I do in a course called Perspectives on Lawyering. (It was originally called Being a Lawyer after Howard Lesnick’s book of readings, but the students rebelled, claiming that it made their transcripts look too soft, and renamed it.) Given the history I’ve related of clinicians describ-

\hspace{1cm}
of the remarks on which this article is based, I was pleased to discover similar comments directed by Robert Condlin—another survivor of the early days—at the concept of “academic component.” See Robert J. Condlin, Learning From Colleagues: A Case Study in the Relationship Between “Academic” and “Ecological” Clinical Legal Education, 3 CLIN. L. REV. 337, 438 n.42 (1997).


7 To name a few of those with whom I first debated how best to define clinical legal education, as well as discuss syllabi, ideal credit allocation and the propriety of final exams.


9 During the 1997-98 academic year when I was on sabbatical, an altered version of the course—without the writing component described here—was taught by my colleagues David Hall and Jane Scarborough and members of the law firm Hale & Dorr. The course
ing the particulars of their courses, I won't be offended if some of you take this time to look over your organizer, check your voice mail or confirm a dinner date.

But, in truth, though the details are dull, the energy tapped by this course is powerful. I hope that examples of student writing will illustrate this, because the strength of the papers depends significantly on the course curriculum as a whole.

The specific context for the reflective writing that is my subject is an upper level elective in which students are told they will have an opportunity to explore how to get and retain satisfaction practicing law.10 The course and its writing portion might be considered "clinical"—should that label be important—for students are throughout asked to put themselves in a variety of lawyers' roles. The reason for this course, they are told before they enroll and at the first class meeting, is that so many people believe the profession has gone wrong and so many lawyers are disappointed, even miserable, about the course of their own professional lives, that members of the faculty11 thought it worth exploring if an earlier and greater awareness of professional role would help avoid future pitfalls. We were spurred by the Lesnick book,12 the MacCrate Report's emphasis on transmission of values,13 and the creative philanthropy of the W.M. Keck Foundation.14 But mostly, I think, we were trying to respond to vast changes in the circumstances of legal practice15 and an explosion in professionalism offerings at American Law Schools in recent years. While most

is described in Redefining the American Lawyer, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, March 2, 1998, at 64.

10 The larger context is a law school program structured around externships. Every Northeastern student must to graduate successfully complete four quarter-long work experiences supervised by a lawyer or judge. See Daniel J.Givelber, Brook K. Baker, John McDevitt & Robyn Miliano, Learning Through Work: An Empirical Study of Legal Internship, 45 J. LEGAL EDUC. 1 (1995). It is possible, therefore, that the student writing I see is informed by practice experience to a greater degree than would be the case in other law schools. It is certainly my impression after having taught the course three times that in their writing students drew more on concrete experience than received wisdom about the legal profession.

11 The idea for the course emerged from conversations with an experienced practitioner and law teacher, my colleague Stephen Subrin.

12 See also ANTHONY KRONMAN, THE LOST LAWYER (1993).


of these courses share an interest in ethical inquiry and fostering personal responsibility in the practice of law, they are not characterized by a common approach; yet while a number require journal writing, I know of only a few that emphasize the sort of structured writing assignments that will be discussed here.

In Perspectives On Lawyering—as in many of these courses—students are introduced to issues regarding the relationship of lawyers to the adversary system (and its alternatives), to other lawyers, to clients and to their own sense of self. They read a range of materials, from newspaper stories about lawyers and clients, to fiction, to excerpts from familiar books and law review articles of commentators like Wasserstrom, Fried, Rosenthal, Glendon, and Luban. They will talk about these and also role play, work on problems compiled by Lesnick and others, meet in small groups, and even do a field investigation.

They will also watch videotapes from my collection—maybe Rita’s Case, Douglas Frenkel’s Who’s in Charge, or old chestnuts like Valdez v. Alloway’s Garage or short scenes aimed at one aspect or another of lawyer role, culture or behavior from a movie of my selection or more likely something I’ve taped myself from the vast array of lawyering models broadcast daily on cable.

C. The Process

The writing that students do takes place then in an atmosphere replete with often clashing, controversial ideas, images and behavior of lawyers. Almost every week in an academic quarter of eleven weeks, two days before a three-hour class, students must submit two copies of a short paper responsive to that week’s assignment. Though I tell them guardedly that they can go on as long as they want, I sug-

---

21 See Glendon, supra note 15.
24 Who’s in Charge—a video produced by Douglas Frenkel for the University of Pennsylvania Law School Center on Professionalism—presents an extended colloquy between an overbearing lawyer and an ambivalent client attempting to make an important litigation-related decision.
25 See Below & Moulton, supra note 2, at 586.
26 For example, Class Action (Twentieth Century Fox 1991).
gest that they aim to say what they have to say in two to three pages, and usually they do.

These papers are read as soon after I get them as I can; I spend no more than fifteen minutes on each. I write my comments in the margin, though sometimes I append a typed note. They are photocopied and returned to students at the next day’s class. From the other submitted copy—the copy I haven’t used for my comments—I select excerpts I want to have read to the class and ask students for permission; a portion of every class meeting is devoted to reading a few parts of these papers and discussion of the reading.

That’s the rough sequence but the key communications here are three: First, the assignment; second, the papers themselves; third my comments. (In the case of the excerpts read in class there are the additional steps of class reading, reaction and discussion.)

**D. Assignments**

The nature of the assignments can be gleaned from their titles such as, How Did I Get Here?, On Friendship, How Have I Changed, Giving or Getting Advice, Autonomy, Do Clothes Make the Lawyer? Working With Or For Someone I Don’t Like, What Do I Think About Lying, How Will It Be?

Each comes with a brief anecdote or bit of guidance from me as in “How Did I Get Here?” I say—

A friend of mine, an experienced criminal lawyer, thinks that he became a lawyer because he had to learn how to defend himself. In other words, his inner experience of childhood was one of charges, guilt or potential guilt; he found a professional outlet to deal with a personal need. It’s obvious that such personal choices often have profound social implications. What’s really interesting (to me at least) is whether awareness of such private agendas or private sources of social behavior affect our satisfaction with work, career, and social identity. Or put another way, the origins of work choices are rarely discussed; would such discussion help us gain satisfaction, comfort or knowledge with or about work?

The “Advice” assignment reads:

Give an account of an occasion where someone gave you advice. Did you think at the time that it was good advice or bad advice? In any case, did you follow it? How did you decide that it was good advice or bad advice? What do you think of the advice now, and why? If it was bad advice, explain what would have been good advice.

---

27 A paper which I hope permits students to develop their own concept of friendship before encountering Fried’s. See note 19 supra.
If you recognize the advice as good when it was given, are you saying that it was unnecessary?

Now, describe what constitutes good advice.

The “Friendship” assignment is equally concise but also includes a collection of quotations from varied sources—personal ads to Shakespeare:

Describe from your own experience a particular example of friendship working or friendship not working. Use a dialogue or a specific event(s).

How do you understand what happened?

What relevance, if any, is there for your work?

Here is what one student, who may or may not be representative, said about the instructions: “They were key. They focused our task without cramping it and distinguished this work from journal writing where students are set at sea by being told to write anything they want. The instructions themselves conveyed an important message. For example, with the ‘How Did I Get Here’ essay it was important that you asked for more than an essay on Why I Came To Law School. You told a story so we tended to tell one also.”

Each assignment asks students to perform some version of the following—First write a brief description of the event, encounter, dialogue, memory or narrative that fits the assignment. Second tell what you think the event, encounter, etc. means as if you were talking to a peer, a relative, an employer or someone you met on the bus, etc., as you wish. Third describe the relevance of what you’ve written about to you personally, your growth, choices or future, etc.

Sometimes students follow this formula; more often they just write—which is fine with me because the instruction is merely a guidepost, a pedagogical device for getting at more than you bargained for when you started out. Embedded in the formula is information which will, I believe, affect the papers even if students don’t literally apply it.

Because reflection implicates choice and personal responsibility, students are never required to write on any one topic. There are always alternatives offered, and regularly selected, such as “Instead of writing about yourself pick a brief excerpt from the biography of a lawyer which illustrates the subject of the assignment.” Some law teachers worry that reflective writing may lead students across the proper line between privacy and disclosure, especially as disclosure—for example revelations of substance abuse, unethical lawyer conduct

---

28 Many of the best of them are the creation of Professor John D. Ayer of University of California at Davis, who teaches a course in personal and professional responsibility and permitted me to draw upon his evocative syllabus.
or material fit for a referral to counseling—may lead to a consequent-
ial response as well as altering the formal student-teacher relationship. 
They point also to the potentially coercive effects of the power imbal-
ance between students and faculty when an assignment suggests dis-
closure and they are concerned about the effects of reciprocal
disclosure.\textsuperscript{29} My personal experience supports the presence of these 
risks but also the utility of dealing with them as best one can within 
the traditional confines of the advising function teachers have always 
played.\textsuperscript{30}

\section*{E. Papers}

The second phase is the papers themselves. For one familiar with 
ordinary lawyer prose, the majority are amazing. The papers are re-
markably well written, non-verbose, lacking in pretension and pom-
posity. I take this freshness of presentation to mean that the 
assignments are being used as intended, to float and examine con-
struction of personal identity of seeming importance to the writer.\textsuperscript{31} 
The papers direct themselves to the topic assigned—say friendship or 
advise giving and receiving; they usually hold to a legal context, even 
if one isn’t inherent in the assignment. But the personal element usu-
ally makes the actual subjects of the papers: who am I?; what do I 
believe?; what does it all mean?; and how should I live? The writers 
believe they are being authentic; they trumpet that what they are say-
ing is reality. In effect, they are saying to me that their writing often 
uncovers material they haven’t always admitted to themselves. But 
while the papers are full of personal information rarely do they read 
as confessonals. Students are informed that they need only indicate 
that they don’t want their papers, or any portion thereof, shared with 
the rest of the class and though almost every assignment brings one or 
two students who take advantage of this “No Questions Asked” vow 
of privacy, class members understand that if everyone were to claim it 
something of real value would be lost to the group as a whole.

\textsuperscript{29} For sensitive treatments of this complex of issue, see Kathleen A. Sullivan, \textit{Self-Dis-
losure, Separation and Students}, 27 \textit{Ind. L. Rev.} 115 (1993); Jennifer P. Lyman, \textit{Getting 

\textsuperscript{30} I think Professor Lyman got it right: “Learning more about real students creates 
problems for clinical teachers, just the way learning more about clients seriously complicates 
the practice of law.” Lyman, \textit{supra} note 29 at 228.

\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Mary Catherine Bateson, Peripheral Visions} 84-87 (1994). For psychological 
perspectives on the formation of the self, see generally \textit{Eric Erikson, Childhood and 
Society} (1963) and \textit{Identity: Youth and Crisis} (1968); \textit{Robert Kegan, The Evolv-
ing Self} (1982).
F. Commenting

The last phase is my feedback, though last is a relative term—
these papers have led to continued conversations with students ex-
tending after course completion and even graduation. My feedback is
pedagogically correct in that it is prompt, specific and sought. But
there are additional characteristics. I rarely if ever criticize viewpoint;
in other words, I’m there to reflect back what has been said and open
up its implications. I seldom take a different position, except to sug-
gest a way for a student to deal with something that a student has one
way or other indicated she wants to deal with. I’m sure my views
sneak in more often than I realize but I’m not being coy in saying I
don’t want this to happen. I’m trying to amplify not to correct, as in
the notion called “active” or “empathetic” listening—paraphrasing
what the speaker is understood to have conveyed, including both con-
tent and emotion. This sort of comment has a way of bringing writers,
like speakers, closer to the implications of the position they’ve taken,
and—if feelings as well as content are “heard”—confirming that they
have been understood. A related type of comment—the “What would
it mean?” question—aids at enlargement of awareness. “What would
it mean,” I might write in the margin, “if your concept of autonomy
was adopted by all the associates at the law firm you expect to work
for?” Or: “What would it mean if you started getting the kind of ad-
vice you say you tend to give?”

I am not teaching writing so my comments on better means of
expression are as few as I can get away with, though I do recommend
a lot of follow-up books and articles. This is hard on me. I love to edit
and goodness knows many students, not to mention law teachers,
would profit from a good editor. But this course is about grasping who
you are and where you are more than slaying the beasts of expository
writing. I am trying to stimulate reflection, not teaching a formal set of
skills. While there is a place where ungrammatical, misspelled, awk-
ward prose defeats the clarity presumably required for growth in
awareness it is important to take student writers as much as where
they are, or think they are, as possible. Still I do get fussy. My compro-
mise is to make a few copy editing squiggles with my pencil, often
using proof reader marks, when I can stand it no longer, but not to
write too many “good writing” comments on the manuscript. I have a
hard time with misspelling, especially the howlers. But I don’t often
rewrite and I do my best to downplay the writer’s style and syntax in

---

32 For more on this and similar guides to reflection, see Alan Parky & Robert Dolan, Story Revisions: Narrative Therapy in the Postmodern World 128 et seq. (1994).
favor of measuring the student’s true intentions.33

Here is what the student I quoted earlier had to say about this phase: “I have two points about the comments. Firstly, they were not nearly so key as the instructions because the instructions shape where you are going with your essay. Second, we read and valued your comments but I wonder if you could have forced the comments into a more crucial role by requiring rewrites on at least a couple of assignments. We took in your insights but then went off to the next class or assignment; maybe we should have been forced to really examine and think about your comments.”

The student’s comment contributes to the improvement of the course. She is urging me, quite effectively I think, to create conditions under which members of the class produce a higher quality paper by insisting on at least a second draft. Offering the opportunity to learn isn’t enough. “It’s not enough to set a nutritious table. We must also produce well-nourished minds.”34

II

Here are some excerpts from the student writing I’ve been discussing. I’ve selected them because I think they illustrate the method when it works well; if you disagree, the approach I’ve used is probably not for you.

1. In an earlier assignment, this student answered the question, “What is the first sentence of your autobiography?” by saying “I have a stunning sense of self-delusion.” Now the student is writing about how she ended up in law school or at least that’s where she starts out. She describes a difficult childhood and then comes back to what she calls her “self-delusion:”

It has probably been my survival. It explains my resilience. Lest you think that I have even one inkling of belief that I can “Save the World” let me stop you. My sense of self-delusion isn’t one of grandeur—it’s rather a passion for things that do not logically follow from my childhood. It’s an unflinching desire, perhaps even a feeling of entitlement, to be fulfilled and . . . to enjoy life in whatever I do. My personal history reveals more about why I think I will succeed than why I chose law school. Law school was more or less an accident—my partner told me the year before we split up, “You’re smart. You should go to law school.” But back to my childhood. It could have been unbearable. Maybe because of my relationship with my parents, I never felt passive or a victim. Growing up in a

33 I feel this is a necessary focus but nevertheless fear that Anne LaMott, author of

Bird By Bird (1994)—one of the bibles of good writers—will never forgive me.

34 Steve Nathanson, Education: Too Important to be Left to Students? 4 Teaching Matters No. 2, November 1998, at 1.
dysfunctional—do we still call it that?—household taught me to try to make everything fine. I learned how to make people feel good by making them feel they make me feel good. . . . As a lawyer I can imagine a time sitting around a table trying negotiate a deal where the clients believe I can make the deal work, the other side feels somehow moved to want to work with me, and the passion I have for the deal will be contagious to the others. My self-delusion, it is stunning—don’t you think?

2. Here’s another version of the same “How Did I Get Here?” assignment:

In the fifth grade I informed my mother that when I grew up I was going to be either a truck driver or a lawyer. The truck driver option came from then popular movies and television shows like Convoy, Smokey and the Bandit and B.J. and the Bear. To me it seemed that the big rigs ruled the road and that the drivers could explore the country and make fools out of police officers who thought a gun and badge gave them all the power in the world. The lawyer option was also taken from the media, though I can’t remember any specific programs or movies. I know being a lawyer came from the media because no one in my family was a lawyer or socialized with one. The only thing I knew about attorneys was that they had money and power—two things my family lacked—and initially it was this appeal of having money and power and thereby catapulting myself out of a white trash existence that I felt was trying to suck me in that influenced me to go to law school.

The student goes on to describe a more sophisticated understanding of what attorneys do based on pre-law school work in the court system. She decides that it is the power to do good that really motivates her and concludes with this paragraph:

While this is the short version of what got me here, I also have to note that whether its truck driver or attorney I will be pursuing a career traditionally dominated by white males. I think this is important because while my family has caused me much frustration over the years the fact that I had the courage to pursue one of these occupations is directly related to my mother and grandmother teaching me that while money will always be a factor in life it should never limit your perspective, choices or decision to achieve your goals.

3. In this excerpt a student describes her philosophy of life—how she has always wanted to follow Right Occupation, part of Buddhism’s Eightfold Path, which means to her that she should use her energy for actions that have a positive effect on society. For seven years she had worked as a journalist and had a responsible position in putting together the evening news on a major network. But she came to believe that this work had a negative impact on viewers:
I wanted to have a different impact on society. I imagined lying on my death bed many years in the future, closing my eyes and seeing the lives I had improved during my life. Then I could pass away content.

She quits the television job, moves into her parents’ home, is both unemployed and undirected. But that summer

the Senate is considering the confirmation of Justice Ginsburg. I watched the hearings and found the work she had done in civil liberties and gender discrimination inspiring. Then one July morning I walked on the beach with my aunt who was going through a divorce.

“There’s a woman,” she said, “in my lawyer’s office.” As soon as I heard “woman lawyer” I didn’t hear the rest. I knew my future.

4. “How Did I Get Here?” — the assignment which is the source of the first three examples — is an early assignment, an obvious icebreaker. Let me conclude with an excerpt from the last assignment (which is in lieu of an exam). I ask each student to interview a lawyer of their choice so long as it’s not a member of our faculty. After setting out the context of the interview, they are to report the answers to four questions—

— What are the interviewee’s greatest satisfactions in practicing law?
— How have these satisfactions changed over time?
— What significant obstacles did he or she have to overcome to gain the satisfactions identified?
— What are the implications of the answers given by the interviewee to the three previous questions for the student?

Kevin interviewed Phyllis, a college friend who was in practice with a small firm doing real estate work. In her answers, this lawyer was quick to point out that there was a low level of competency expected of women real estate lawyers in her city. The student wrote:

This holds great significance for me. As a gay man, I have an enormous fear of encountering the same thing. It can be pretty easy to buy into feeling inadequate or incompetent when you are not part of the “in” group. And when the public questions whether your group belongs in a healthy society . . . I sometimes feel that if my colleagues have a difficulty time accepting me as a person, how are they ever going to accept me as a professional?

I find myself in a real struggle right now, trying to figure out how to “come out” in a professional environment. And I’m asking how can I practice law in the face of such a serious obstacle? Phyllis addresses this situation with a sort of “fuck you” response; she creates a real “me against the world” dynamic. I have enough self-confidence to pull this off for a while but I want something more for myself. In other words, Phyllis’ method helps her get accepted as a
professional but I also and more importantly want to be first ac-
cepted as a person. For many years I thought the way to do this was
to act as if the “gay” part was not worth mentioning. But I wonder
now about following Phyllis’ example. Am I a lawyer who happens
to be gay or a gay who happens to be a lawyer?

CONCLUSION

As I hope you can see students take advantage of these papers to
cross into the intersection of life and work. Despite the passion and
the sense of connection with their feeling evoked by this writing, I
don’t know how far students take the questions both they and these
assignments raise. Without further evidence I am not prepared to con-
clude that the papers and the professions course in which they are
embedded will change anyone’s life or the way they will serve their
clients. But it is clear, I think, that students are driven to considerable
reflection about who they are, what they believe and how this might
play out in what they do or expect to do as lawyers.

One reason I am generally happy with the results of this writing is
that I’m comfortable with both the relative intimacy the method pro-
duces and with a measure of disclosure and self-disclosure which stim-
ulates (but doesn’t overstimulate) it. These may be matters of
personal style and, as my colleague Brook Baker reminds me, not
every law teacher will (or should) have the same comfort level; nor is
the method laid out in this article the only means of facilitating stu-
dent learning about the personal dimensions of professional life. Nev-
ertheless, if you believe as I do that growth and development proceed
from stimulating the natural agenda of the learner then these narra-
tives, conversations and personal assignments offer a writing experi-
ence that can be deeply supportive and nurturing.