

Meiguo, “Beautiful Country”†: An Empirical Study of the Experiences of Chinese Students in U.S. Law Schools

Xiaohan Sun, Kenneth G. Dau-Schmidt & Zhenxing Ke††

While legal education plays an important role in upholding the rule of law and protecting the rights of individuals, there is a dearth of research on the impact of differences in institutional and cultural contexts on legal education. This Article examines the impact of educational systems and culture on the law school experiences of American and Chinese students and assesses whether the students’ experiences meet the educational goals of law school diversity. Using data from LSSSE 2020-2021, we compared and evaluated the law school experiences of 21,706 American and 218 Chinese students using descriptive statistics and linear regression. We found that differences in educational systems and cultures influence Chinese students’ satisfaction with law school to some extent. Chinese students focus more on interactions with faculty rather than students, and their enjoyment of law school life relies more singularly on quantifiable achievement motivations. This study contributes to an understanding of how culture and institutions have shaped the development of legal education in different countries, and how a very different socio-political environment affects the satisfaction of American and international Chinese students with their law school experience. These findings help to rethink whether legal education effectively contributes to the fulfilment of liberal legalism. In addition, the findings urge policymakers and law schools to adjust their strategies in order to achieve the goal of diverse interactions in legal education.

† In Mandarin Chinese, the United States is referred to as 美国 (meiguo), a two-character word composed of the character for “Beauty” and the character for “nation,” or “country.”

†† Xiaohan Sun, Assistant Professor of Law, Xiamen University. S.J.D. 2018, Indiana University-Bloomington. sun.xiaohan9@icloud.com; Kenneth G. Dau-Schmidt, Willard and Margaret Carr Professor of Labor and Employment Law, Indiana University-Bloomington. B.A. 1978, University of Wisconsin-Madison; M.A. 1981, J.D. 1981, Ph.D. (Economics) 1984, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor. kdauschm@iu.edu; Zhenxing Ke, Assistant Professor of Law, Nankai University. S.J.D. 2018, Indiana University-Bloomington. kezhenxing@nankai.edu.cn. We are grateful to the editors of this journal for their valuable assistance, and to Professor Ryan for his insightful feedback during the revision process. This research was supported by the Fujian Provincial Federation of Social Sciences (Grant No. FJ2023JDZ010).

Introduction

Although the number of Chinese students who study in the United States has declined in recent years, Chinese students have continued to constitute the highest percentage of international students at universities.¹ Chinese students come to the United States not only because they value the quality of American education and see it as pathway to jobs, and perhaps emigration, but also because they are curious about the cultural differences between China and the United States. Chinese legal education is an undergraduate pursuit, undertaken primarily through summary materials and faculty lectures, with the students memorizing an outline of the relevant law and demonstrating mastery of the material through traditional exams, including essay questions, multiple-choice questions, and case analyses. American legal education is a graduate pursuit, undertaken primarily through the Langdellian method of case study and faculty Socratic examination, with the student demonstrating mastery of the material by “issue spotting” and writing legal opinions on hypothetical fact situations. As to culture, China advocates an introverted culture, where students are encouraged to exercise social compliance and tolerance.² In contrast, it is commonly believed that the West encourages an extroverted culture, where students are encouraged to challenge, or improve an oppressive social status quo in order to assert their rights. The enormous differences in the educational systems and culture between China and the United States pose not only an attraction, but also a potential obstacle to the success of Chinese students in their American studies.

American law schools are eager to help their international students succeed in their studies in order to fulfill that portion of their educational mission and ensure the continued attendance of international students, along with their tuition dollars.³ Indeed, it is not an exaggeration to say that the continued competitiveness and prestige of American Universities in the world depends in no small part on how they treat their international students. To this end, American law schools commonly employ professional staff and faculty dedicated to enhancing the experience of their international students. Even faculty committed primarily to the education of American law students commit a considerable amount of time to addressing the needs of international students and supervising their articles and theses. International students are included in the efforts of American law school Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) officers to ensure that all students feel included in the enterprise and social life of the law school.⁴ Additionally, because all law

1. U.S. Immigr. & Customs Enft, *SEVIS by the Numbers: Annual Report on International Student Trends*, U.S. DEPT. OF HOMELAND SEC. (2022), https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/2024-05/22_0406_hsi_sevp-cy22-sevis-btm.pdf [https://perma.cc/F6DS-DSAN].

2. Xiaokang Tang et al., *Qualitative Study on Chinese Students' Perception of U.S. University Life*, 8 J. INT'L STUDENTS 151, 168–69 (2018).

3. Kathryn Hendley & Alexander J. Straka, *International Students from the Perspective of U.S. Law Schools*, 72 J. LEGAL EDUC. 5, 63 (2024).

⁴ However, in recent years, pressure from executive orders has led some universities to restructure or eliminate their Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) offices and related

students will eventually play a significant role in upholding the rule of law and protecting the rights of individuals from diverse backgrounds in the future, it is imperative that they enjoy positive experiences of diverse interaction in their legal education. American faculty commonly have discussions with and receive instruction from international student staff and DEI staff on how to improve the experiences of both international and domestic law students. In short, American law schools commonly commit significant resources and personnel to ensuring the success of international law students in their programs. They hope that by committing this amount of energy and resources, they will help increase the number of positive interactions international students have with American faculty, students, and staff, that this will further help Chinese students integrate into the experiences provided by their law school, and, by consequence, help them enjoy and succeed at their American legal studies.

Previous studies have examined various aspects of Chinese international students' experiences in the United States with a particular focus on diverse interactions. However, these studies have focused on undergraduate students. However, few studies have specifically explored and compared the impact of the respective legal education systems on the self-reported experiences and satisfaction of international Chinese and American students. The Law School Study of Student Engagement (LSSSE) data set provides a unique opportunity to explore how student activities and perceptions of the law school environment shape students' experience and satisfaction.

Legal education is not only related to the laws regulating the social order but is also considered a source of professional culture formation.⁵ American legal education is framed by liberal legalism and pursues diverse interactions to shape students' understanding of civil rights values.⁶ Legal education in China provides laws and cases to large classes of students through one-way lectures. Although most Chinese codes are of Germanic origin, China is in fact a "mixed jurisdiction" with legislation influenced by different legal systems.⁷ As a result, much Chinese legislation falls somewhere between

positions, reflecting a shifting national landscape in the approach to diversity-related work. See also David A. Lieb et al., *Texas is Poised to Become the Latest GOP State to Exert Control over University Curriculum*, AP NEWS (Jun. 3, 2025, 5:38 AM), <https://apnews.com/article/colleges-universities-dei-texas-ohio-florida-6ad0bf2c6f9255426aa1b39d3b01a0a1> [https://perma.cc/TH27-BPSX]. Exec. Order No. 14151, 90 Fed. Reg. 8339 (Jan. 29, 2025); Exec. Order No. 14173, 90 Fed. Reg. 8633 (Jan. 31, 2025).

5. ROGELIO PÉREZ-PERDOMO, *LEGAL EDUCATION IN THE WESTERN WORLD: A CULTURAL AND COMPARATIVE HISTORY* (2024).

6. Etienne C. Toussaint, *The Purpose of Legal Education*, 111 CAL. L. REV. 1, 56–65 (2023); Gary Orfield & Dean Whitley, *Diversity and Legal Education: Student Experiences in Leading Law Schools*, in *DIVERSITY CHALLENGED: EVIDENCE ON THE IMPACT OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION* 143, 171–72 (Gary Orfield & Michael Kurlaender, eds. 2001).

7. Philip J. McConaughay & Colleen B. Toomey, *China and the Globalization of Legal Education: A Look into the Future*, in *THE GLOBALIZATION OF LEGAL EDUCATION: A CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE* 308, 317 (Bryant Garth & Gregory Shaffer eds., 2022); Lutz-

German “legal certainty” and American “legal indeterminacy.”⁸ Chinese Legal education also focuses on lecturing regarding legal theories and case studies, which means the focus is often on teaching instead of interaction. At this time, undergraduates who receive Chinese legal education come to the United States to study abroad, and their experiences can reveal the difficulties and problems in the process of accomplishing the goal of diversification of legal education in the United States. Therefore, it is necessary to explore the impact of different systems and cultures on students’ experiences with legal education in order to assess the impact of legal education on students’ diverse interactions. This article first explores the impact of institutions and cultures on the legal education system. Second, the article comparatively analyses the learning experiences and satisfaction of international Chinese students studying at U.S. law schools and compares these experiences and satisfaction with American students. The article specifically compares the interactions between students and faculty, staff, and students in both countries, and the relationship between the interactions and satisfaction with the law school experience.

I. A Brief Comparison of the Chinese and American Cultures and Educational Systems

1. Chinese Culture

Although both the People’s Republic of China (PRC) and the United States (US) were born in revolution, there are several important and easily identifiable differences between them that have impacted their cultures and educational systems. China has an ancient culture which developed under the circumstances of greater population density and greater racial and ethnic homogeneity than that of the United States. China can trace a proud history of culture and governance that goes back over 3500 years.⁹ China’s population has been in excess of 100 million since at least the 1500’s and, at 1.419 billion in 2024, is currently more than 4 times the population of the United States.¹⁰ Finally, China’s population and history has been dominated by the Han clan, which currently constitutes over 90 % of the population.¹¹ China’s long cultural history and homogeneity facilitates the adoption of rules of social cooperation and government control that are necessary for

Christian Wolff, *Structural Problem Solving: German Methodology from a Comparative Perspective*, 14 LEGAL EDUC. REV. 19, 22–23, 38; James R. Maxeiner, *Legal Certainty and Legal Methods: A European Alternative to American Legal Indeterminacy?*, 15 TUL. J. INT’L & COMP. L. 541, 541–56 (2007).

8. Maxeiner, *supra* note 7, at 541–56; McConaughay & Toomey, *supra* note 7, at 317.

9. JOHN KEAY, CHINA: A HISTORY (2011).

10. John H. McClendon, *The Changing Pace of Population Growth in China*, 48 AM. BIOLOGY TCHR. 159, 161 (1986); *China Demographics*, WORLDOMETER (2024), <https://www.worldometers.info/demographics/china-demographics/> [https://perma.cc/MBN4-VFBD].

11. JAMES B. MINAHAN, ETHNIC GROUPS OF NORTH, EAST, AND CENTRAL ASIA: AN ENCYCLOPEDIA 89–95 (2014).

maintaining order over such a large population. Despite the titanic changes wrought by the Chinese revolution, the social rules of order found in Confucianism still influence Chinese culture and education today.

Since the Han Dynasty, Confucianism has emphasized the culture of the group and downplayed the sense of rights in Chinese society. Confucianism strongly stressed loyalty to the emperor and filial piety to parents.¹² This does not mean that the people have no sense of rights, but only that people's sense of rights has been suppressed.¹³ The Chinese enlightenment movement took place in the late nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century.¹⁴ The Enlightenment before the 1911 Revolution (Xinhai Geming) was against Legalism (Fali) and, contrarily, espoused the benevolence, righteousness and morality in Confucianism.¹⁵ However, after the May Fourth period, the Enlightenment increasingly turned against Confucianism, which resulted in the rejection of the "benevolence, righteousness and morality" of Confucianism and the promotion of a strong state and weak citizen under Legalism.¹⁶ The rights of individual citizens were not emphasized during this period. When the People's Republic of China was established in 1949, the rights of the individual were still not sufficiently emphasized due to a lack of institutional protections. At that time, the State requested the people to unconditionally conform to the State's arrangements. After the reform and "opening up" of China in the late 1970s under Deng Xiaoping, an increased awareness of citizens' rights stemmed from the development of the rule of law, even though the State popularized the collectivist aspects of Confucianism through legislation and education.¹⁷ A soft individualism has emerged among young Chinese parents and their

12. Gao Hongjun (高鸿钧), *Zhongguo Gongminquanli Yishi De Yanjin* [The Evolution of Chinese Rights Consciousness], in *ZHONGGUO GONGMINQUANLI YISHI DE YANJIN* [THE EVOLUTION OF CITIZENS' RIGHTS AWARENESS IN CHINA, TOWARDS AN AGE OF RIGHTS: A STUDY ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CITIZENS' RIGHTS IN CHINA] (Xia Yong (夏勇) ed., 2000).

13. *Id.*; GAO HONGJUN (高鸿钧), *XIN JI ZHI BANG FALIXUE WENJI* [GOVERNING THE COUNTRY WITH HEART: A COLLECTION OF LEGAL THEORY ESSAYS] (2015).

14. Xinyan Jiang, *Enlightenment Movement*, in *THE ROUTLEDGE HISTORY OF CHINESE PHILOSOPHY* (Bo Mou ed., 2008).

15. Qin Hui (秦晖), *Xinwenhuayundong Yu Zhongguo Wenhua Weilai* [The New Culture Movement and the Future of Chinese Culture], *THE ARTICLE* (Aug. 10, 2015, 08:11 AM), https://m.theArticle.cn/newsDetail_forward_1362055.

16. Qin Hui (秦晖) & Tu Weiming (杜维明), *Xinwenhuayundong Yu Zhongguo Wenhua De Weilai (Yuanzhao Luntan)* [The New Culture Movement and the Future of Chinese Culture (Roundtable Forum)], 7 *EXPL. AND FREE VIEWS* 4, 4–5 (2015); Qin Hui (秦晖), *Xinwenhuayundong De Zhudiao Ji Suowei Bei Yadao Wenti Xinwenhuayundong Bainian Fansi (xia)* [The Main Tone of the New Culture Movement and the So-called Problem of Being "Overwhelmed"—Reflections on the Centenary of the New Culture Movement (Part 2)], 10 *TANSUO YU ZHENGMING* [EXPL. & DEBATE] 74, 82 (2015).

17. For example, the Education Act (2021) and the Higher Education Law of the People's Republic of China (2018 Amendment) both emphasize collectivism. For instance, citizens have begun to challenge the legality of concrete administrative acts of governmental entities in the form of lawsuits. Zhang Xian sued the Wuhu Municipal Personnel Bureau for a dispute over administrative recruitment decisions for civil servants.

children's generation, who have begun to seek rights and interests.¹⁸ This individualism is subordinated to the relationship between the individual and the state, rather than the relationship between the individual and society as in Western countries.¹⁹

2. Chinese Legal Education

During the first three decades of the PRC, from 1949 to 1978, legal education in China was very informal. This was in no small part because there were only eight laws in force.²⁰ The few existing legal textbooks were mainly about extra-territorial laws, such as statutes from Taiwan, Japan, Germany, and the United States. Bright undergraduates of any discipline could pass the bar examination without much specialized preparation.²¹

This began to change in 1978 during the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee of the Party when Deng Xiaoping became China's paramount leader and began his program of reforms and economic development.²² Deng Xiaoping's ambitions for economic development required the nurturing of a legal system, including a system of legal education that was up to the task. Accordingly, from 1978 to 1997, the PRC was devoted to the restoration of China's legal system in accordance with Deng Xiaoping's theory, including the restoration and rebuilding of more than 80 law schools.²³ The Tenth National Congress, held in 1997, proposed that China be governed by the "rule of law" for the first time, replacing the term "rule by law" with "rule of law."²⁴ Further economic expansion required further development of China's legal system, and at the beginning of the 21st century, the number of law schools expanded dramatically following the Ministry of Education's "enrollment expansion" policy.²⁵ It was also during this time that Chinese

18. TERESA KUAN, LOVE'S UNCERTAINTY: THE POLITICS AND ETHICS OF CHILD REARING IN CONTEMPORARY CHINA (2015); Sung won Kim, Kari Elle Brown & Vanessa L. Fong, *Chinese Individualisms: Childrearing Aspirations for the Next Generation of Middle-Class Chinese Citizens*, 45 ETHOS 342 (2017); Canglong Wang, *Individual Self, Sage Discourse, and Parental Authority: Why Do Confucian Students Reject Further Confucian Studies as Their Educational Future?*, 13 RELIGIONS 154 (2022).

19. Yunxiang Yan, *The Chinese Path to Individualization*, 61 BRITISH J. SOCIO. 489 (2010).

20. Xu Xianming (徐显明), Huang Jin (黄进), Pan Jianfeng (潘剑锋), Han Dayuan (韩大元) & Shen Weixing (申卫星), *Gaigekai fang Sishi Nian De Zhongguo Faxuejiaoyu* [Legal Education in China during the Forty Years of Reform and Opening Up], 3 ZHONGGUO FALU PINGLUN [CHINA L. REV.] 2, 2-27 (2018).

21. *Id.*, at 10.

22. Cheng Meidong (程美东), *1976–1978 Zhongguoshehui De Yanhua Jian Lun Huaguofeng Shiqi Zhengzhihuanjing De Biandong Yu Shiyi Jie Sanzhongquanhui De Zhaokai* [The Evolution of Chinese Society from 1976 to 1978: A Discussion on the Changes in the Political Environment During the Hua Guofeng Period and the Convening of the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee], 6 XUEXI YU TANSUO [STUDY & EXPL.] 32, 32-41 (2008).

23. Xianming et al., *supra* note 20, at 8.

24. Ding Junping (丁俊萍) & He Xuanda (何炫达), *Dang De Jilu Jiqi Xiangguangainian Bianxi* [Analysis of "Party Discipline" and Related Concepts], 4 LILUN YU GAIGE [THEORY & REFORM] 22, 37 (2024).

25. Mary Albrecht, Cultural Influences on Chinese International Students

students began studying abroad in great numbers.²⁶ Since 2011, legal education has entered a relatively stable phase, which has shifted from an informal legal education to a formal legal education. The concept of "rule of law professionals" was put forward at the Fourth Plenary Session of the 18th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC) in 2013.²⁷ Subsequently, Xi Jinping emphasized that it is necessary to adhere to the road of socialist rule of law with Chinese characteristics to cultivate a large number of high-quality rule of law professionals.²⁸ China has also made efforts in these years to establish its own system of legal disciplines, with special emphasis on localization of the disciplines. As required by President Xi, law professors should be Chinese academic creators and worldwide academic contributors rather than the transmitters of western theories.²⁹ This signifies that China's legal education model must form its own textbook system, curriculum system, and discipline system, all of which are based on Marxist legal thoughts and socialist rule of law theories with Chinese characteristics.³⁰

Chinese teaching philosophy requires students to respect and obey the professors who, in turn, have absolute authority in education. This arrangement discourages students from challenging the professor's knowledge.³¹ Therefore, Chinese students have less interaction and participation in class, and they usually play a passive and obedient role in the classroom.³² Previous studies demonstrate that Chinese students agree that the U.S. legal system is superior to China's, but they also believe that China's existing legal system is better adapted to China.³³ Chinese legal education is undeniably developing towards specialization, but its development goal is mainly to train a large number of high-quality specialists. To this end, studies have shown that the rethinking of Chinese legal education has focused on the mode of education (e.g., the design of the academic system) rather than on

Willingness to Approach Instructors Online at a US Institution of Higher Learning (Mar. 2016) (Ph.D. dissertation, Northeastern University) (on file with the Northeastern University Library Digital Repository Service).

26. Xianming et al., *supra* note 20, at 8.

27. *Id.* at 10.

28. XI JINPING, *Promote Overall Law-based Governance of China and Give Play to the Positive Role of the Rule of Law in the Moderation of State System and Capacity for Governance*, in ON UPHOLDING THE OVERALL LAW-BASED GOVERNANCE 274 (2020).

29. *Id.* at 178.

30. *Id.* at 176.

31. Kirby, et al., *Studying in a Second Language: The Experiences of Chinese Students in Canada*, in THE CHINESE LEARNER: CULTURAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL AND CONTEXTUAL INFLUENCES 45, 63 (D. A. Watkins & J. B. Biggs eds., 1999); Martin L. Maehr & Ryoko Yamaguchi, *Cultural Diversity, Student Motivation and Achievement*, in STUDENT MOTIVATION: THE CULTURE AND CONTENT OF LEARNING 123 (F. Salili, C.Y. Chiu & Y.Y. Hong eds., 2001); Sally Chan, *The Chinese Learner—A Question of Style*, 41 EDUC.+ TRAINING, 294, 294-305 (1999).

32. Chan, *supra* note 31, at 295-305; Naxin Zhao & Douglas McDougall, *Cultural Influences on Chinese Students' Asynchronous Online Learning in a Canadian University*, 22 J. DISTANCE EDUC. 59, 63 (2008).

33. Xinchu Zhao & Yu Xie, *Western Influence on (People's Republic of China) Chinese Students in the United States*, 36 COMPAR. EDUC. REV. 509, 510 (1992).

the method of education.³⁴ Chinese law schools do not yet have unfettered ability to engage in policy formation due to the Party's concerns about such empowerment turning into social instability.³⁵ Thus, the dominance of an internationalized legal elite does not naturally constitute an investment in "liberal legalism."³⁶

3. American Culture

In contrast with China's long history, the history of the U.S. is barely more than 400 years.³⁷ Americans are proud of their pioneer and immigrant heritage, which selected for and fostered a spirit of individual responsibility and initiative.³⁸ Moreover, the American population reached 100 million only in the 1920's³⁹ and currently rests at about 341 million.⁴⁰ As a result, American culture and law developed in a situation of relatively less population density and relatively greater demand for labor than in China. Further, the U.S. population includes a wide variety of racial and ethnic groups. Americans who identify as White are the largest racial group (71.0%), but this group includes people who also boast another racial heritage (9.4%)⁴¹

34. Qian Dajun (钱大军), *Xinjian Haishi Fuzhi Woguo Faxue Zhiyejiaoyu Gaige De Kunjing Yu Qianjing* [New Construction or Copying: Dilemma and Prospects of My Country's Legal Vocational Education Reform], 6 DANGDAI FAXUE [CONTEMP. L.] 141, 142-143 (2011); Xu Xianming (徐显明) & Zheng Yongliu (郑永流), *Huigui Benwei Jing Guo Jishi—Liu Nian Zhifa Xue Jiaoyu Moshi Gaige Lun Gang* [Returning to the Basics, Running the Country and Benefiting the World—An Outline of the Reform of the Six-Year Legal Education Model], in LIU NIAN ZHIFA XUE JIAOYU MOSHI GAIGE [REFORM OF THE SIX-YEAR LEGAL EDUCATION MODEL] 3 (Xu Xianming & Zheng Yongliu, eds.); Zhan Zhongle (湛中乐), *Jiaoyufa Xue Yanjiu De Wenti Fanwei Yu Fangfa* [Problems, Scope and Methods of Educational Law Research], 17 ZHONGGUO GAODENGJIAOYU [CHINA HIGHER EDUC.] 20, 21-22 (2014).

35. BRYANT GARTH & GREGORY SHAFFER, *The Globalization of Legal Education: A Critical Perspective*, in THE GLOBALIZATION OF LEGAL EDUCATION: A CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE 3, 40 (Bryant Garth & Gregory Shaffer eds., 2022).

36. Taisu Zhang & Tom Ginsburg, *China's Turn Toward Law*, 59 VA. J. INT'L L. 306, 388-389 (2019).

37. BHU SRINIVASAN, *AMERICANA: A 400-YEAR HISTORY OF AMERICAN CAPITALISM* (2017).

38. SEYMOUR MARTIN LIPSET, *REVOLUTION AND COUNTERREVOLUTION. CHANGE AND PERSISTENCE IN SOCIAL STRUCTURES* 37-60 (1970); SEYMOUR MARTIN LIPSET, *CONTINENTAL DIVIDE: THE VALUES AND INSTITUTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA* 20-21 (1990); SEYMOUR MARTIN LIPSET, *AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM: A DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD* 31 (1996) [hereinafter AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM]; Edward Grabb, Douglas Baer & James Curtis, *The Origins of American Individualism: Reconsidering the Historical Evidence*, 24 CAN. J. OF SOCIO. / CAHIERS CANADIENS DE SOCIOLOGIE 511, 515 (1999).

39. *Historical Population Change Data (1910-2020)*, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU (Apr. 26, 2021), <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/dec/popchange-data-text.html> [https://perma.cc/3ZXMF2QJ].

40. *Id.* Percentages in this paragraph are expressed in terms of the total US population.

41. *Race and Ethnicity in the United States: 2010 Census and 2020 Census*, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU (August 12, 2021), <https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/interactive/race-and-ethnicity-in-the-united-state-2010-and-2020-census.html> [https://perma.cc/KMM2-2WNC].

and multiple ethnic groups that are highly integrated by marriage.⁴² Significant racial subgroups also exist including African Americans (12.4%), Asians (6.0%), Native Americans (1.1%), and those who claim multiple racial heritages (10.2%).⁴³ Americans who identify as Hispanic or Latino are among the largest ethnic groups (18.7%).⁴⁴ Although one would be foolish to underestimate the diversity in China's population of 1.4 billion, it is fair to say that American culture and politics has spent a larger share of its energy and resources in accommodating diversity in race, ethnicity and culture. Perhaps, then, it was inevitable that the United States would adopt cultural and political institutions based in individual liberty, individual rights, and responsibilities due to its pioneer history, relative low population density, and great diversity in population.

Forged on the North American frontier, American culture is defined by the autonomy and rugged individualism of classic Lockean liberalism.⁴⁵ Liberalism holds that citizens are inevitably self-interested.⁴⁶ The goal of classic liberalism is to encourage citizens to pursue their own views and goals without state intervention.⁴⁷ Under this view, molding the citizenry towards a common good would prove elusive because one cannot remove individuals' self-interest, and, in fact, the existence of this diversity of interest precludes a common good except on the narrowest of issues. Liberalism also holds that individuals are endowed with certain natural rights that are reserved by the individual in the social contract and not dependent on the government for their legitimacy.⁴⁸ Moreover, the experience of America's founding fathers with British colonial rule made them "suspicious" of big government. The Founding Fathers accordingly drafted the U.S. Constitution to incorporate the ideas of limited government, decentralized decision-making, and prohibitions on government interference with individual rights and liberties.⁴⁹

42. Alli Coritz et al., *Census Bureau Releases 2020 Census Population for More Than 200 New Detailed Race and Ethnicity Groups*, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU (September 21, 2023), <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2023/09/2020-census-dhc-a-race-overview.html> [<https://perma.cc/QSP8-CQ45>].

43. *Race and Ethnicity in the United States: 2010 Census and 2020 Census*, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU (August 12, 2021), <https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/interactive/race-and-ethnicity-in-the-united-state-2010-and-2020-census.html> [<https://perma.cc/L3K2-NQND>].

44. *Id.*

45. Kenneth G. Dau-Schmidt & Carmen L. Brun, *Lost in Translation—The Economic Analysis of Law in the United States and Europe*, 44 COLUM. J. TRANSNAT'L L. 602, 605 (2006); AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM, *supra* note 38.

46. See JOHN LOCKE, THE SECOND TREATISE OF GOVERNMENT (AN ESSAY CONCERNING THE TRUE ORIGINAL, EXTENT AND END OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT) AND A LETTER CONCERNING TOLERATION 64 (J.W. Gough ed., Basil Blackwell & Mott, Ltd. 1966) (1690) ("[Y]et men, being biased by their interest . . .").

47. See *id.* at 63–66.

48. See *id.* at 43.

49. See DEREK BOK, THE STATE OF THE NATION: GOVERNMENT AND THE QUEST FOR A BETTER SOCIETY 11 (1996).

4. American Legal Education

In the 1860s, access to the legal profession in the United States was relatively informal. At that time, part-time law schools provided legal education to working-class and immigrant students and many aspiring lawyers just “read” for the Bar under the tutelage of an experienced attorney.⁵⁰ In the 20th century, however, legal education in the United States became progressively more elitist, and elite lawyers have created a hierarchical structure in legal education that excludes the masses from educational institutions and bar associations.⁵¹ In the 1920s, the American Bar Association (ABA), in conjunction with the American Law Institute, developed a set of accreditation requirements that excluded many part-time schools with overly lax admissions requirements and curricula,⁵² and state bar exams began to require students to hold a diploma from an ABA-accredited school in order to take the state’s bar exam.⁵³

Since the end of the Nineteenth Century, American legal education has been dominated by a fairly unique method of instruction: the Langdellian case method. First introduced by Christopher Columbus Langdell at Harvard Law School in 1870, this case method consists of three basic elements: (1) the casebook, (2) active student participation, and (3) the problem method of examination.⁵⁴ Under this method, law students read books consisting of a collection of edited cases from which they are to learn an outline of the existing law. The students are actively engaged during class through Socratic dialogue in which the professor helps them understand what they have read about the law by posing questions and asking them to apply what they have learned to hypothetical scenarios. Finally, the students are tested on their understanding of the law both by the “problems,” or hypotheticals that are posed in class, and by “issue spotting,” questions on the final exam which consist of hypothetical fact situations on which the student is asked to discuss the legal issues, and their merits, raised in the hypothetical. The purpose of this system of instruction is to teach the students how to discover and apply the law as they will in practice, by reading, discussing and applying cases.⁵⁵ This method of instruction and evaluation is much more demanding of

50. ROBERT GRANFIELD, MAKING ELITE LAWYERS: VISIONS OF LAW AT HARVARD AND BEYOND 33 (1992); ROBERT BOCKING STEVENS, LAW SCHOOL: LEGAL EDUCATION IN AMERICA FROM THE 1850S TO THE 1980S 75 (1983); RANDALL COLLINS, THE CREDENTIAL SOCIETY: AN HISTORICAL SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION AND STRATIFICATION 155 (2019); see Lucille A. Jewel, *Bourdieu and American Legal Education: How Law Schools Reproduce Social Stratification and Class Hierarchy*, 56 BUFF. L. REV. 1155, 1176 (2008).

51. Jewel, *supra* note 50, at 1175; GRANFIELD, *supra* note 50 at 26–27; STEVENS, *supra* note 50.

52. Warren A. Seavey, *The Association of American Law Schools in Retrospect*, 3 J. LEGAL EDUC. 153, 153–67 (1950).

53. STEVENS, *supra* note 50, at 177–78.

54. Edwin W. Patterson, *The Case Method in American Legal Education—Its Origins and Objectives*, 4 J. LEGAL EDUC. 1 (1951); see also STEVENS, *supra* note 50; Anthony Chase, *The Birth of the Modern Law School*, 23 AM. J. LEGAL HIST. 329 (1979); Russell L. Weaver, *Langdell’s Legacy: Living with the Case Method*, 36 VILL. L. REV. 517 (1991).

55. *Id.* Patterson, at 20.

student engagement and initiative than either traditional Chinese methods of education or American undergraduate education. It can be stressful enough for American students, let alone those working in a second language and foreign culture, studying a foreign legal system.

American culture and the American educational system are much less deferential to the knowledge and authority of professors than the Chinese culture and system. Professors are revered in the Chinese system, with students jotting down their every assertion for later recitation on the exam.⁵⁶ The American system, by contrast, especially the legal Socratic dialogue, is much more of a discussion about the subject with the students maintaining a right to have opinions and positions that differ from those of their professors.⁵⁷ Indeed, the quality of American professors is now not only judged by their student teaching evaluations, but American professors can be called to task and subject to "re-education" due to even anonymous "bias" or "harassment" reports by students under school's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion and Title IX programs.⁵⁸ Undoubtedly Chinese students who are used to the traditional Chinese reverence of professors are sometimes taken aback by the treatment of professors they witness in the United States. However, even in China, there have been some changes in recent years. Influenced by feminist ideology, some Chinese students have reported sexual harassment by their professors on the internet.⁵⁹ Moreover, under China's system of state ideological control, students can become classroom monitors and report "politically incorrect statements" by professors.⁶⁰

II. Research Questions and Methods

This study examines data from the 2020 and 2021 LSSSE surveys to

56. In traditional Chinese society, emperor (ruler), parents and teacher were regarded as the supreme authorities comparable to heaven and earth. LIANG SHUMING (梁漱溟), *ZHONGGUO WENHUA YAOYI* [THE ESSENTIAL MEANING OF CHINESE CULTURE] (1949); KWANG-KIM HWANG, *FOUNDATIONS OF CHINESE PSYCHOLOGY: CONFUCIAN SOCIAL RELATIONS* (2012).

57. Patterson, *supra* note 54, at 17.

58. Melanie Burney, *N.J. Bias Incidents at Highest Level in 30 Years, Especially in Schools and Colleges*, THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER (2024), <https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/us/n-j-bias-incidents-at-highest-level-in-30-years-especially-in-schools-and-colleges-here-s-what-to-know-from-a-new-report/ar-BB1jzNqH> [<https://perma.cc/QC8V-QKQS>].

59. Xiao Han, *Uncovering the Low-Profile #MeToo Movement: Towards a Discursive Politics of Empowerment on Chinese Social Media*, 6 GLOB. MEDIA & CHINA 364, 365 (2021); Jing Zeng, *MeToo as Connective Action: A Study of the Anti-Sexual Violence and Anti-Sexual Harassment Campaign on Chinese Social Media in 2018*, 14 JOURNALISM PRAC. 171 (2020).

60. Javier C. Hernández, *Professors, Beware. In China, Student Spies Might Be Watching*, N.Y. TIMES (Nov. 1, 2019), https://www.nytimes.com/2019/11/01/world/asia/china-student-informers.html?_ga=2.191829802.1292849428.1572683139-329481157.1543803052 [<https://perma.cc/FX2T-GQUY>]. And of course, China had the experience of the "Cultural Revolution." Parris H. Chang, *The Cultural Revolution and Chinese Higher Education: Change and Controversy*, 26 J. GEN. EDUC. 187 (1974).

analyze and compare the American law school experiences of international students from the People's Republic of China (PRC) and domestic students from the United States of America (USA). The survey years 2020 and 2021 are the first LSSSE surveys to collect data on LLM students, including on their nations of their origin. The LSSSE survey results included students from 68 law schools in 2020 and 61 law schools in 2021. These law schools reflect a good mix of American law schools in terms of prestige, public or private status, geography, and the number and diversity of their students.⁶¹ A total of 21,924 law school students responded to the LSSSE survey during these two years, including 218 international students from the PRC and 21,706 students from the US. As shown in Table 1 below, there were 166 JD students and 52 LLM students from the PRC and 21,588 JD students and 118 LLM from the US.

Table 1: Research Questions Numbers of Sample			
	Total	JD students	LLM students
International Chinese Students (PRC)	218	166	52
American Students (USA)	21,706	21,588	118
Total	21,924	21,754	170

The LSSSE survey asks the law students a variety of questions concerning the student's demography, their law school activities and experiences, and the student's satisfaction with those experiences and their overall law school experience. Among the demographic questions, the LSSSE survey asks the student's age, race, ethnicity, gender, national origin, and degree program. If these questions are left blank by the students, their law school supplies LSSSE with the school's available data. The survey also asks a broad array of questions about the student's law school activities and experiences including: their time spent in class preparation and on family matters; their participation in journals, moot court, and student groups; and their interactions with other law students, law school faculty, administrators, and staff. Finally, the survey asks about the law student's satisfaction with their progress in their legal education, their interactions with the other law school constituencies, and their "overall" experience in law school. This article summarizes individual survey questions related to the two main subjects. Here, we analyze the individual survey questions to student characteristics, as well as to student activities and behaviors. We also examine students' satisfaction with the law school life, and the difference in how the Chinese and American students rate their overall law school experiences.

61. *Diversity and Exclusion: 2020 Annual Survey Results*, LSSE (September 29, 2020), <https://lsse.indiana.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Diversity-and-Exclusion-Final-9.29.20.pdf> [<https://perma.cc/TB9P-MVTL>]; *The Covid Crisis in Legal Education: 2021 Annual Survey Results*, LSSE (January 24, 2022), <https://lsse.indiana.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/COVID-Crisis-in-Legal-Education-Final-1.24.22.pdf> [<https://perma.cc/WZ5G-C82K>].

These questions ask students to consider how law school has contributed to their acquisition of certain competencies and experiences that are relevant to their legal careers.

The first research question we examine is to compare the personal characteristics of Chinese and American students. In this exercise, we examine the students' personal characteristics with respect to age, gender, parents' education level, first-generation status, undergraduate GPA, LSAT score, and mode law school grade. We do not examine race and ethnicity because the Chinese students are generally all of the same race and ethnicity. We examine these characteristics to identify significant differences between the Chinese and American students with respect to these variables. These questions include: (1) what is the highest level of education completed by either of your parents, (2) are you a first-generation student (first in your family to go to college), (3) the student's age, (4) the student's gender (female or male), (5) the student's LSAT score, (6) the students' undergraduate GPA, and (7) what have most of your grades been until now at this law school?

The second research question we examine is to analyze mean differences in participation in law school activities between Chinese and American students. To this end, we examine the activities associated with diverse interactions in the law school experience. These questions examine the student's ability to assimilate into law school culture. This research question also examines differences in diversity interactions between Chinese and American students in law school. These questions included whether the student: (1) asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions, (2) had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity, (3) had serious conversations with students with very different religious, political, or personal beliefs, (4) participated in student journal, (5) participated in moot court, and (6) was a member of a student organization.

The purpose of the third research question is to identify the survey activities related to the distribution of work hours. We clarify the differences between Chinese and American students with regard to the distribution of their work hours. The work hours' distribution was measured through nine questions that asked about the students': (1) hours per week reading assigned materials, (2) hours per week preparing for class other than reading, (3) total time preparing for class, (4) hours per week performing legal pro bono work (NOT for a class), (5) hours per week working for pay, (6) hours per week exercising, (7) hours per week relaxing and socializing, (8) hours per week sleeping, and (9) hours per week of care for dependents living with them (parents, children, spouse, etc.).

The fourth research question explores the students' satisfaction with various aspects of their interactions at law school. Students' satisfaction was measured through eight questions that included questions about student interactions and collaborations in and out of the class: (1) academic advising help, (2) job search help, (3) library assistance, (4) technology help, (5) relationships with other students, (6) relationships with faculty members, (7) relationships with admin staff & offices, and (8) how would you evaluate your entire educational experience at your law school?

Based on the research questions above, we regress the variable for the student's overall satisfaction with their entire educational experience⁶² against all the possible predictors in tables 1-4. We run separate regressions for JD and LLM students and enter "Chinese" as a dummy variable (1=PRC, 0 = USA) to see whether, controlling for differences in the other predictors (more women, more time preparing, etc.), there is a significant difference in how the Chinese and American students rate their overall law school experience. Undergraduate GPA has to be dropped from the regression for JD students because there are not enough Chinese students for whom this variable is reported, and, for similar reasons, LSAT and Undergrad GPA have to be dropped from the regression for LLM students. Also, total hours preparing for class is dropped in the regressions because it is just the sum of two included variables, hours reading and hours other than reading preparing for class. Finally, for the LLM students, we use a selective iterative process to find the regression equation based on select dependent variables which provides the greatest explanatory power in explaining the student's satisfaction with his or her overall law school experience. We do not use this iterative process for the JD students because so many of the available dependent variables are statistically significant that it is not necessary to drop insignificant variables to get a predictive equation.

III. Mean Results on Experiences and Satisfaction: The Impact of Differences in Educational Systems and Culture

Table 2 lists the basic questions tested in the first research question and the result of their descriptive statistics. From Table 2, we see that PRC JD students have somewhat less-educated parents and have a significantly higher LSAT score than their U.S. counterparts. The PRC LLM students also have slightly less-educated parents than their American counterparts, are younger, and are more likely to be female. It is not surprising that PRC students' parents have a relatively low level of education.

In 1998, about when the student's parents would have been in college, the number of university students in China was only 7.8 million, 9.8 percent of the population of the same age, which is considerably lower than the analogous level of college enrollment in developed countries like the US, and also lower than the international minimum standard of 15 percent for the generalization of higher education.⁶³ It is also not surprising that the PRC JD students have a higher average LSAT score than the U.S. JD students, because it will probably only pay, in terms of scholarships and future employment prospects, for the best Chinese students to incur the costs of travel to the US for education. The reasons for a younger age for the LLM students may be related to several factors. First, because law in an undergraduate degree in

62. Entire Educational Experience (Entirexp: How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at your law school? (1-4) 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Excellent).

63. Guo Liang (郭梁), *Daxue Kuo Zhao Chubei Juliang Rencai* [Universities expanding to stockpile huge amounts of talent], THE ARTICLE (2017), http://Article.people.com.cn/mszk/html/2017-06/05/content_1781186.htm.

China, and a graduate degree in the U.S., Chinese JDs who are eligible for an LLM in the U.S. will generally be younger than their U.S. counterparts. Moreover, because education level is strongly associated with employment, PRC students are strongly influenced by the perceptions of others in their peer group.⁶⁴ As a result, peer pressure drives Chinese students to pursue higher education at a younger age. Additionally, age discrimination in employment in China makes it more difficult to find a job after age 35, thereby prompting many Chinese students to obtain the highest required degree as early as possible before entering the workforce. These factors combine to make PRC students younger than their U.S. counterparts. Finally, the fact that a higher proportion of PRC students are female may be related to gender discrimination in employment, such as higher requirements for women in recruitment and employment.⁶⁵ Alternatively, it may be that, like in the US, in China there are greater family responsibilities placed on men based on social role theory to leave education and enter the workforce in order to make money in order to enter the next phase of their life with a wife and kids, or else they will not be able to meet the society’s gender expectations.⁶⁶

Table 2: Personal Characteristics
Comparisons of Group Means (Independent Samples Test)

	JD Students (PRC N = 166, USA N = 21,588)			
Survey Question	Origin Country	Mean	Std. Dev.	2-Sided p (= Var)
What is the highest level of education completed by either of your parents? (1=No HS; 2=HS 3=SomeCollege; 4=Assoc.Degree; 5=Bach Degree; 6=MastersDegree; 7=Doctorate or Prof.Degree)	PRC	4.71*	1.711	0.046
	USA	4.98	1.685	
First-Generation Status (neither parent holds a bachelor's degree: 0 = No; 1 = yes)	PRC	0.28	0.452	0.62
	USA	0.27	0.442	
Student Age	PRC	27	4.338	0.169
	USA	27.73	6.787	

64. Mowei Liu & Xinyin Chen, *Friendship Networks and Social, School and Psychological Adjustment in Chinese Junior High School Students*, 40 PSYCH. SCHS. 5 (2003).

65. Xiao Shengli (肖胜利), *Erhai Zhengcexia de Nüxing Jiuye Qishi Wenti* [Study on Gender Employment Discrimination Under the Two-child Policy], 7 LEGAL SYS. & SOC’Y 165 (2016); Yan Tian (阎天), *Nüxing Jiuye zhong de Suanfa Qishi: Yuanqi Tiaozhan yu Yingdui* [Algorithmic Discrimination in Women’s Employment: Origins, Challenges and Countermeasures], 5 J. CHINESE WOMEN’S STUD. 64, 70 (2021).

66. Tiffany Trzebiatowski & Maria del Carmen Triana, *Family Responsibility Discrimination, Power Distance, and Emotional Exhaustion: When and Why are there Gender Differences in Work–life Conflict?* 162 J. BUS. ETHICS 15, 15–18 (2020); Alice H. Eagly & Wendy Wood, *Explaining Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Meta-analytic Perspective*, 17 PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY BULLETIN, 306, 306–315; Xu Yuehua et al., *Work–family Interference in Urban China: Gender Discrimination and the Effects of Work–family Balance Policies*, 4 N.P.J. URBAN SUSTAIN 1, 1 (2024).

Female (1 = Female; 0 = Male; OW Missing)	PRC	0.6	0.492	0.843
	USA	0.59	0.492	
LSAT score	PRC	160**	6.326	<.001
	USA	154.4	6.725	
Undergraduate GPA	PRC	3.467	0.429	0.124
	USA	3.362	0.435	
What have most of your grades been up to now at this law school? (GPA)	PRC	3.295	0.429	0.11
	USA	3.233	0.496	
LLM Students (PRC N = 52, USA N = 118)				
Survey Question	Origin Country	Mean	Std. Dev.	2-Sided p (= Var)
What is the highest level of education completed by either of your parents? (1=No HS; 2=HS 3=SomeCollege; 4=Assoc.Degree; 5=Bach Degree; 6=MastersDegree; 7=Doctorate or Prof.Degree)	PRC	4.39*	1.845	0.013
	USA	5.18	1.84	
First-Generation Status (neither parent holds a bachelor's degree: 0 = No; 1 = yes)	PRC	0.35	0.483	0.095
	USA	0.23	0.421	
Student Age	PRC	25.8**	3.991	<.001
	USA	39.16	11.75	
Female (1 = Female; 0 = Male; OW Missing)	PRC	0.70*	0.463	0.032
	USA	0.52	0.502	
LSAT score	PRC	N/A	N/A	N/A
	USA	150.9	6.298	
Undergraduate GPA	PRC	N/A	N/A	N/A
	USA	3.054	0.520	
What have most of your grades been up to now at this law school? (GPA)	PRC	3.449	0.368	0.267
	USA	3.528	0.450	
** Significant at 0.01 level, two-tailed test assuming equal variance.				
* Significant at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test assuming equal variance.				

In Table 3 we examine mean differences in participation in law school activities between PRC and USA students. We see that PRC students are less likely to ask questions in class and less likely to have conversations with students with very different religious, political, or personal beliefs. In addition, PRC JD students are less likely to have serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity and less likely to participate in a student organization, but PRC LLM students are more likely to participate in Moot Court than their American counterparts. That PRC students are less likely to ask questions in class, have conversations with diverse students, and participate in student organizations is no doubt due in part to the fact that they are working in a second language in all of those interactions. Traditional Chinese deference to professors may also explain the fact they are less likely to ask questions in class, but it is common experience in the American academy that Chinese students are more likely to ask questions after class than their American counterparts. That PRC students are less likely to have conversations with different students is quite striking, since the vast majority

of students in American law schools are of different races, ethnicities, and beliefs than PRC students. That PRC LLM students are MORE likely to participate in Moot Court than American LLM students is hard to explain, except that perhaps the American LLM students are more likely to have already availed themselves of that opportunity in their JD program.

The lower propensity of Chinese students to interact with different students may also be due to the fact that Chinese students probably do not regard social integration as crucial to their university achievements.⁶⁷ The U.S. university expects to enhance student interactions through a variety of means. However, the goals of PRC students are likely to be different from the typical American student, putting a higher emphasis on grades and other external recognitions of achievement over social interactions. Although PRC students actually want to connect with domestic U.S. students, they may internally perceive such actions to be unlikely. Therefore, most of the interpersonal interactions would take place with PRC students from their home countries due to comfort and convenience.⁶⁸

Moreover, PRC students' study in foreign countries is largely influenced by their educational and cultural experiences in their home countries.⁶⁹ The Chinese education model does not emphasize differences in "race," "ethnicity," "religion," or "personal beliefs," and therefore PRC students report relatively low rates of diverse interactions in Table 3. Unlike the American theory of multicultural education, which has a strong folk component in both content and form, the development and practice of ethnic education in China has always operated within the framework of ethnic policy. Such Chinese education places greater emphasis on identification with the unified culture of the state.⁷⁰ In other words, this Chinese education is policy-driven, and its path is top-down. In China, therefore, the understanding of multicultural education tends to be more oriented towards, or equated with, minority education.⁷¹

Furthermore, by contrast, studies of American students have noted that those students gained a profound educational experience from their interactions with students of other races and that diverse interactions changed students' understandings of civil rights values.⁷² Although Chinese students studying social sciences in the United States need to better understand American culture, values, and social systems, because many of these students

67. Tang, *supra* note 2, at 168–69.

68. *Id.* at 168.

69. Kirby, et al., *supra* note 31, at 63.

70. XUEQIANG ZHANG, ZHONGGUO SHAOSHU MINZU JIAOYU YU MEIGUO DUOYUAN WENHUA JIAOYU BIJIAO YANJIU [A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ETHNIC MINORITY EDUCATION IN CHINA AND MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES] 12-13 (2011).

71. *Id.*, at 16, 22-24. China's education for ethnic minorities is targeted only at ethnic minority students. The operation of independent minority schools is the main form of minority education. In terms of ethnic education policy, ethnic minority education focuses on policy preferences and administrative approaches.

72. Orfield & Whitley, *supra* note 6, at 30–31.

come from far less diverse societies, on many questions about the value of diversity, foreign students returning to their home countries have a much less urgent need to understand diversity than their American counterparts.⁷³ Although Chinese students who choose to return to China to practice law after graduation must be prepared to work with clients, colleagues, and others in the judicial and regulatory systems, differences in race, ethnicity, and beliefs have not been effectively emphasized for a long time. In addition, Chinese students are subjected to a top-down nationalistic education, which tends to prioritize indoctrination over the development of critical thinking skills.⁷⁴ As a result, Chinese students tend to defer themselves to social hierarchies when it comes to interpersonal relationships. Despite this, it is worth noting that diverse interactions enhance students' sense of professional and academic achievement, so law schools need measures to enhance diverse interactions among foreign students, especially those from less diverse countries.⁷⁵ This is good news for law schools because it is possible to shape and encourage interaction. For instance, law schools can encourage intra- and extra-curricular collaboration among students and promote diverse interactions among groups through student interest groups and activity groups.

Table 3: Participation in Law School Activities
Comparisons of Group Means (Independent Samples Test)

	JD Students (PRC N = 166, USA N = 21,588)			
Survey Question	Origin Country	Mean	Std. Dev.	2-Sided p (= Var)
Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions? (1=Never; 2=Sometimes; 3=Often; 4=Very Often)	PRC	2.47**	0.843	<.001
	USA	2.8	0.845	
Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity? (1=Never; 2=Sometimes; 3=Often; 4=Very Often)	PRC	2.35**	0.951	<.001
	USA	2.73	0.96	

73. Zhao & McDougall, *supra* note 32, at 64; Jianhua Feng, *The Adaptation of Students from the People's Republic of China to an American Academic Culture*, ERIC, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED329833.pdf> [<https://perma.cc/8S7G-NCQ4>]; Orfield & Whitla, *supra* note 6, at 30–31.

74. Yan Wing Leung, *Nationalistic Education and Indoctrination*, 6 CITIZENSHIP, SOC. AND ECONS. EDUC. 116 (2004).

75. See Carole Silver, Louis Rocconi, Heather Haeger & Lindsay Watkins, *Gaining from the System: Lessons from the Law School Survey of Student Engagement About Student Development in Law School*, 10 UNIVERSITY OF ST. THOMAS L. J. 286 (2012); Ernest T., Pascarella, *Student-faculty Informal Contact and College Outcomes*, 50 REV. OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH 545, 545–95 (1980); ERNEST T. PASCARELLA & PATRICK T. TEREZINI, *HOW COLLEGE AFFECTS STUDENTS: A THIRD DECADE OF RESEARCH* (2005); George D. Kuh & Shouping Hu, *The Effects of Student-Faculty Interaction in the 1990s*, 24 REV. HIGHER EDUC. 309 (2001); Young K. Kim & Linda J. Sax, *Student-Faculty Interaction in Research Universities: Differences by Student Gender, Race, Social Class, and First-Generation Status*, 50 RSCH. HIGHER EDUC. 437 (2009).

Had serious conversations with students with very different religious, political, or personal beliefs? (1=Never; 2=Sometimes; 3=Often; 4=Very Often)	PRC	2.19**	0.928	<.001
	USA	2.72	0.941	
Participate in Student Journal? (0=No; 1=Yes or Plan To)	PRC	0.49	0.501	0.376
	USA	0.46	0.498	
Participate in Moot Court? (0=No; 1=Yes or Plan To)	PRC	0.3	0.458	0.914
	USA	0.29	0.454	
Member of Student Organization? (0=No; 1=Yes or Plan To)	PRC	0.55**	0.499	<.001
	USA	0.72	0.447	
LLM Students (PRC N = 52, USA N = 118)				
Survey Question	Origin Country	Mean	Std. Dev.	2-Sided p (= Var)
Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions? (1=Never; 2=Sometimes; 3=Often; 4=Very Often)	PRC	2.42**	0.723	<.001
	USA	3.15	0.854	
Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity? (1=Never; 2=Sometimes; 3=Often; 4=Very Often)	PRC	2.11	0.8	0.094
	USA	2.39	1.082	
Had serious conversations with students with very different religious, political, or personal beliefs? (1=Never; 2=Sometimes; 3=Often; 4=Very Often)	PRC	2.06*	0.864	0.039
	USA	2.41	1.071	
Participate in Student Journal? (0=No; 1=Yes or Plan To)	PRC	0.23	0.423	0.477
	USA	0.18	0.385	
Participate in Moot Court? (0=No; 1=Yes or Plan To)	PRC	0.36**	0.484	<.001
	USA	0.13	0.335	
Member of Student Organization? (0=No; 1=Yes or Plan To)	PRC	0.38	0.489	0.336
	USA	0.3	0.461	
** Significant at 0.01 level, two-tailed test assuming equal variance.				
* Significant at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test assuming equal variance.				

In Table 4, we see that the Chinese students report spending more time in all of the survey activities (reading, preparing for class, pro bono work, relaxing, or sleeping) except working for pay, and caring for dependents. One would expect Chinese students to spend more time preparing for class, as they are working in a second language (and are generally very good students), and because there are legal limits on how much they can work for pay. Further, they are less likely to have dependents in the country with them than U.S. students. PRC students also seem to spend more hours on average exercising, but the difference is not significant. Only the pro bono work is surprising. This is related to the fact that obtaining a bar license requires the completion of a certain amount of pro bono work, so Chinese students often need to spend more time on pro bono work to ensure that they can obtain a bar license by the time they complete their studies in three years.

Table 4: Distribution of Work Hours Comparisons of Group Means (Independent Samples Test)				
JD Students (PRC N = 166, USA N = 21,588)				
Survey Question	Origin Country	Mean	Std. Dev.	2-Sided p (= Var)
Hours per Week Reading assigned materials	PRC	22.51**	10.453	<.001
	USA	18.4	9.387	
Hours per Week Preparing for class, other than reading	PRC	12.41*	8.542	0.022
	USA	10.93	8.192	
Total Time Preparing for Class	PRC	34.92**	15.48	<.001
	USA	29.32	14.85	
Hours per Week Legal pro bono work	PRC	3.77**	8.411	<.001
	USA	1.40	3.85	
Hours per Week Working for pay	PRC	4.87**	8.946	<.001
	USA	8.66	12.27	
Hours per Week Exercising	PRC	5.54	7.804	0.166
	USA	5.02	4.725	
Hours per Week Relaxing and socializing	PRC	9.99**	8.11	<.001
	USA	7.89	6.349	
Hours per Week Sleeping	PRC	34.1**	8.16	0.002
	USA	31.67	9.79	
Hours per Week of care for dependents living with you (parents, children, spouse, etc.)	PRC	5.66	10.39	0.875
	USA	5.53	10.63	
LLM Students (PRC N = 52, USA N = 118)				
Survey Question	Origin Country	Mean	Std. Dev.	2-Sided p (= Var)
Hours per Week Reading assigned materials	PRC	24.13**	9.284	<.001
	USA	16.36	10.12	
Hours per Week Preparing for class, other than reading	PRC	12.29	9.926	0.106
	USA	9.97	7.814	
Total Time Preparing for Class	PRC	36.25**	15.67	<.001
	USA	26.34	15.95	
Hours per Week Legal pro bono work	PRC	4.04	8.613	0.259
	USA	2.72	6.125	
Hours per Week Working for pay	PRC	3.02**	6.818	<.001
	USA	19.3	15.79	
Hours per Week Exercising	PRC	6.34	6.412	0.064
	USA	4.69	4.736	
Hours per Week Relaxing and socializing	PRC	11.09**	7.87	<.001
	USA	6.77	5.598	
Hours per Week Sleeping	PRC	33.29	8.989	0.214
	USA	31.26	10.07	
Hours per Week of care for dependents living with you (parents, children, spouse, etc.)	PRC	5.45**	10.29	<.001
	USA	13.48	14.81	
** Significant at 0.01 level, two-tailed test assuming equal variance.				
* Significant at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test assuming equal variance.				

In table 5, we examine what the students say about their satisfaction with various aspects of the law school experience. We see that PRC JD students are more satisfied with their interactions with staff and faculty than their U.S. counterparts, while PRC LLM students are only more satisfied with their

interactions with staff than their U.S. counterparts. In terms of the LLM degree, the degree is a short-term program. Generally, the purpose of Chinese LLM students is to earn the master's degree and obtain a license to practice law. As a result, Chinese LLM students tend to have more contact with administrative staff for advice about the program and receive relatively limited help and information from faculty, except for questions in or after class. Just comparing the mean values on the students' rating of their overall law school experience, we see no significant differences between PRC and U.S. LLM students, which is an interesting finding because it speaks well of how the U.S. law schools treat foreign students. We will see later in our regression analysis that a student's satisfaction with their interactions with faculty is one of the strongest predictors of whether a student enjoys their law school experience. That is, students perceive that the more frequent student-faculty interactions are, the more diverse interactions they reported, which suggests that student-faculty interactions have a positive impact on students' development.⁷⁶

As seen in Table 5, the mean value of the American JD students' satisfaction with faculty-student interactions (5.37) is not much different from the mean value of their satisfaction with interactions between other students (5.4). However, Chinese students had a greater mean of satisfaction with faculty-student relationships (5.67) in comparison with the mean value of their satisfaction with relationships with other students (5.26). This is because Chinese students place more importance on the influence of authority on themselves. Chinese students do not lack critical thinking, but they prefer to follow the professor's questions closely and give answers.⁷⁷ Chinese society was influenced by its political philosophy of social stability, which was based on hierarchical relations, and those in authority utilize Confucianism to shape the collectivist beliefs of the Chinese.⁷⁸ In other words, the Chinese social hierarchy consists of authority and subordinates, and the system requires that subordinates need to follow and obey their superiors.⁷⁹

Table 5: Satisfaction in the Law School Community Comparisons of Group Means (Independent Samples Test)				
	JD Students (PRC N = 166, USA N = 21,588)			
Survey Question	Origin Country	Mean	Std. Dev.	2-Sided p (= Var)
Academic advising help (1=Not Used; 2=Very Unsatisfied;	PRC	3.94**	0.899	<.001

76. *Id.*, Silver et al., at 305-12.

77. Kirby, et al., *supra* note 31; Zhao & McDougall, *supra* note 32, at 64.

78. Nekane Basabe & Maria Ros, *Cultural Dimensions and Social Behavior Correlates: Individualism-Collectivism and Power Distance*, 18 INT'L REV. OF SOC. PSYCH. 189, 191 (2005); Albrecht, *supra* note 25, at 31-32; Geert Hofstede & Michael Harris Bond, *The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth*, 16 ORGANIZATIONAL DYNAMICS 5, 8 (1988).

79. Albrecht, *supra* note 25, at 31-32; Jia Wang et al., *Confucian Values and the Implications for International HRD*, 8 HUM. RES. DEV. INT'L 311 (2007).

3=Unsatisfied; 4=Satisfied; 5=Very Satisfied)	USA	3.55	1.097	
Job search help (1=Not Used; 2=Very Unsatisfied; 3=Unsatisfied; 4=Satisfied; 5=Very Satisfied)	PRC	3.66**	1.113	<.001
	USA	3.23	1.303	
Library assistance (1=Not Used; 2=Very Unsatisfied; 3=Unsatisfied; 4=Satisfied; 5=Very Satisfied)	PRC	3.95	1.220	0.114
	USA	3.78	1.404	
Tech help (1=Not Used; 2=Very Unsatisfied; 3=Unsatisfied; 4=Satisfied; 5=Very Satisfied)	PRC	3.92	1.056	0.147
	USA	3.79	1.144	
Relationships with Other Students (1–7: 1=Unfriendly, unsupportive, alienating; 7=Friendly, supportive sense of belonging)	PRC	5.26	1.541	0.252
	USA	5.4	1.565	
Relationships with Faculty Mems (1–7: 1=Unfriendly, unsupportive, alienating; 7=Friendly, supportive sense of belonging)	PRC	5.67**	1.405	0.006
	USA	5.37	1.438	
Relationships with Admin Staff (1–7: 1=Unfriendly, unsupportive, alienating; 7=Friendly, supportive sense of belonging)	PRC	5.52**	1.572	<.001
	USA	4.96	1.711	
How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at your law school? (1=Poor; 2=Fair; 3=Good; 4=Excellent)	PRC	3.1	0.828	0.991
	USA	3.1	0.811	
LLM Students (PRC N = 52, USA N = 118)				
Survey Question	Origin Country	Mean	Std. Dev.	2-Sided p (= Var)
Academic advising help (1=Not Used; 2=Very Unsatisfied; 3=Unsatisfied; 4=Satisfied; 5=Very Satisfied)	PRC	4.15*	0.744	0.035
	USA	3.77	1.196	
Job search help (1=Not Used; 2=Very Unsatisfied; 3=Unsatisfied; 4=Satisfied; 5=Very Satisfied)	PRC	3.21*	1.215	0.017
	USA	2.62	1.574	
Library assistance (1=Not Used; 2=Very Unsatisfied; 3=Unsatisfied; 4=Satisfied; 5=Very Satisfied)	PRC	4.28**	0.601	<.001
	USA	3.55	1.522	
Tech help (1=Not Used; 2=Very Unsatisfied; 3=Unsatisfied; 4=Satisfied; 5=Very Satisfied)	PRC	4.13	0.878	0.167
	USA	3.87	1.223	
Relationships with Other Students (1–7: 1=Unfriendly, unsupportive, alienating; 7=Friendly, supportive sense of belonging)	PRC	5.19	1.63	0.587
	USA	5.33	1.583	
Relationships with Faculty Mems (1–7: 1=Unfriendly, unsupportive, alienating; 7=Friendly, supportive sense of belonging)	PRC	5.47	1.409	0.398
	USA	5.68	1.524	

Relationships with Admin Staff (1=7: 1=Unfriendly, unsupportive, alienating; 7=Friendly, supportive sense of belonging)	PRC	5.55	1.462	0.897
	USA	5.51	1.63	
How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at your law school? (1=Poor; 2=Fair; 3=Good; 4=Excellent)	PRC	3.23	0.703	0.435
	USA	3.33	0.82	
** Significant at 0.01 level, two-tailed test assuming equal variance.				
* Significant at the 0.05 level, two-tailed test assuming equal variance.				

IV. Regression Results on Experiences and Satisfaction: The Impact of Differences in Educational Systems and Culture

In this section, we use regression analysis to examine and compare the experiences of Chinese and American students in American law schools. First, we use the student's evaluation of his or her entire law school experience as the dependent variable,⁸⁰ and regress it against every plausible predictor of that experience listed in Tables 1 through 5, along with a dummy variable for whether the student is Chinese. This regression equation is estimated separately for the JD students (Regression 1) and the LLM students (Regression 2) because it is likely that the students in these different programs have different experiences and different needs in fulfilling their degree requirements. This "kitchen sink" modeling approach works well for the JD students, where there are lots of observations to drive significant results, but is less effective for the LLM students, where there are many fewer observations.⁸¹ For the LLM students, we rerun the regression in an iterative process, retaining the Chinese and female dummy variables but otherwise dropping the least significant independent variable, until the explanatory power of the model (R^2) begins to decline. The resulting regression equation is reported as regression 3. It occurred to us that Chinese students may value various factors in a qualitatively different way, and so we ran additional regressions including interaction terms for Chinese with several of the most important variables including: mode grade; job search help; relationships with other students; relationships with faculty; and relationships with administrative staff. However, none of these interaction terms proved statistically significant in the regression equation, helping to affirm the soundness of our basic model.

Regression 1 for the JD students yields a wealth of significant results. Examining the standardized coefficients for the dependent variables we see that the student's relationship with faculty is the greatest contributor to student satisfaction with their overall law school experience (0.246), followed by: relationships with administrative staff (0.223); relationships with other students (0.181); academic advising help (0.150); mode grades (0.088);

80. The variable "Entirexp" can take on values 1 through 4 according to the following scale: 1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Excellent.

81. A "kitchen Sink" regression includes every plausible available explanatory variable, including the "kitchen sink" (an American colloquialism).

technological assistants (0.070); and job search help (0.059). All of these results are significantly different from zero at a level below 0.001. Previous studies have shown that Chinese students have stronger achievement motivation compared to American students.⁸² In this regard, curricular and technological innovations favored by administrators are far less important than the professors and classmates students meet, so improving higher education means focusing on the quality of the relationships students have with others on campus.⁸³

There are other significant results, but none of the other variables have the impact on student overall satisfaction of these variables. Conversations with students of different religious, political, or personal beliefs (0.034) and asking questions in class (0.026) both have a significantly positive impact on the student's overall experience in law school but are less than one-seventh as important as the student's relationship with faculty. Previous research has suggested that when students are more satisfied with their perceptions of law school (e.g., a supportive and friendly environment), they report more diverse interactions.⁸⁴ Interestingly, participating in a student organization (-0.019) and library assistance (-0.021) have a significantly negative impact on the student's law school experience, and conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity has a negative impact (-0.014) but is significant at only the 0.068 level. The coefficient for the female dummy variable is negative (-0.009), but not significantly different from zero, suggesting that women enjoy their law school experiences as much as men, other things being equal.

Finally, the standardized coefficient for the dummy variable for Chinese students is significantly negative, but of relatively small size (-0.024), suggesting that PRC JD students do not enjoy their law school experience as much as their American counterparts, other things being equal, but that the difference is fairly small. This result is consistent with the comparison of mean values for overall satisfaction with their law school experience between these two populations in Table 5. Nevertheless, Chinese JD students enjoy their law school experience significantly less than their U.S. counterparts. This may be due to the fact that Chinese JD students' satisfaction of law school life is more single-mindedly dependent on achievement motivation. In fact, Chinese society is obsessed with quantifiable assessment on performance. Aside from grades, U.S. law schools are not as concerned with quantitatively assessing students' achievements in other activities, and as a result, Chinese students cannot realize their achievements as strongly as U.S. students. In contrast, the competitive environment in China is fierce, and most of the competition on campus is evaluated quantitatively in terms of grades. Therefore, for Chinese students, they pursue good grades because grades are

82. Zhao & McDougall, *supra* note 32, at 64; Martin L. Maehr & Ryoko Yamaguchi, *Cultural Diversity, Student Motivation and Achievement*, in STUDENT MOTIVATION: THE CULTURE AND CONTENT OF LEARNING 123 (F. Salili, C.Y. Chiu & Y.Y. Hong eds., 2001).

83. DANIEL F. CHAMBLISS & CHRISTOPHER G. TAKACS, *HOW COLLEGE WORKS* (2014).

84. Silver et al., *supra* note 75, at 312.

closely related to respect, social status, likeability of faculties, and parental approbation; and it also means a better job with good salary.⁸⁵

Dependent Variable	Regression 1			
How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at your law school? (1-4) 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Excellent	JD Students Survey Years 2020, 2021 (N = 21,876, consisting of 166 PRC and 21,710 USA) F (26, 16,424) = 507.1, Prob > F = <0.001 R-squared = 0.474, Root MSE = 0.581			
Independent Variables	Coefficient	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficient	Significance
Chinese (1=PRC, 0=USA)	-0.235**	0.055	-.024	<.001
Female (1=Fem, 0=Male)	-0.014	0.01	-.009	.136
Student's Age	0.004**	0.001	.033	<.001
Parents' Education (1-7)	0.006*	0.003	.014	.021
LSAT Score	0.004**	0.001	.030	<.001
Mode Law School Grade	0.142**	0.011	.088	<.001
Asked Questions in Class?	0.025**	0.006	.026	<.001
Conversations with students of different race or ethnicity?	-0.012 ^t	0.006	-.014	.068
Conversations with students of diff. relig, poli., or pers Beliefs?	0.029**	0.007	.034	<.001
Participated in Journal	0.033**	0.01	.020	.001
Participated in Moot Court	0.029**	0.01	.017	.004
Member Student Organization	-0.034**	0.011	-.019	.002
Hours per Week Reading	0.001**	0.001	.017	.007
Hours per Week Preparing for Class (other than reading)	-0.001	0.001	-.009	.174
Hours per Week Legal Pro Bono (not required for class)	-0.004**	0.001	-.020	<.001
Hours per Week Exercising	-0.002 ^t	0.001	-.010	.090
Hours per Week Relaxing and Socializing	0.001	0.001	.007	.279
Hours per Week Sleeping	0.002**	0.001	.030	<.001
Hours per Week Providing Care for Dependents	0.001 ^t	0.000	.010	.099
Academic Advising Help (1-5)	0.11**	0.005	.150	<.001

85. Li Qi, *On Grades*, CHINA RSCH. CTR. (2020), <https://www.chinacenter.net/2020/china-currents/19-1/on-grades/> [https://perma.cc/DL7D-H2NJ].

Dependent Variable How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at your law school? (1-4) 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Excellent	Regression 1 JD Students Survey Years 2020, 2021 (N = 21,876, consisting of 166 PRC and 21,710 USA) F (26, 16,424) = 507.1, Prob > F = <0.001 R-squared = 0.474, Root MSE = 0.581			
Independent Variables	Coefficient	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficient	Significance
Job Search Help (1-5)	0.036**	0.004	.059	<.001
Library Assistance (1-5)	-0.012**	0.004	-.021	<.001
Technology Assistance (1-5)	0.049**	0.005	.070	<.001
Your Relationships with Other Students (1-7)	0.094**	0.003	.181	<.001
Your Relationships with Faculty Members (1-7)	0.139**	0.004	.246	<.001
Your relationships with Administrative Staff (1-7)	0.105**	0.004	.223	<.001
Constant	-0.662**	0.121		<.001
** Coefficient is significantly different from zero at the 0.01 level. * Coefficient is significantly different from zero at the 0.05 level. t Coefficient is significantly different from zero at the 0.1 level.				

In Regressions 2 we examine the PRC and U.S. LLM students and regress the student's satisfaction with their entire law school experience against possible explanatory variables. Regression 2 is our "kitchen sink" regression but omits and the student's LSAT score because that variable is missing for most Chinese LLM students. In Regression 2 we see that the only variables with coefficients that are significantly different from zero at the 0.05 level or greater are whether the student asked questions in class (positive), whether the student participated in journal (negative), and the student's relationship with faculty (positive). Comparing standardized coefficients, we see that the student's relationship with faculty (0.384) dominates both asking questions (0.207) and participating in journal (-0.181), as well as all the other variables in the equation.

The coefficient for the Chinese dummy variable is positive, suggesting they enjoy law school more than their U.S. counterparts, but it is significant at only the 0.098 level. The fact that Chinese LLM students appear to enjoy American law schools more than American LLM students, while Chinese JD students enjoy law school less than American JD students, may be due to the differences in their objectives in their academic programs. LLM students aim to either study for a short period of time to obtain a bar license, or transfer to an SJD program to pursue a doctoral degree. Additionally, LLM students have less peer pressure than JD students, so they are not very concerned about obtaining high grades. As shown in Regression 2, grades are not the driving variable in determining satisfaction with law school for LLM students like

they are for JD students. Although we do not have a definitive explanation for all of our results, they are consistent with the idea that positive relationships with faculty is the most important determiner of whether an LLM student enjoys his or her American law school experience, and that, when Chinese LLM students get enough attention from U.S. faculty, they are at least as happy as their U.S. counterparts, perhaps even happier.

Dependent Variable	Regression 2			
How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at your law school? (1-4) 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Excellent	LLM Students Survey Years 2020, 2021 (N = 172, consisting of 53 PRC and 119 USA) F (25, 104) = 6.422, Prob > F = <0.001 R-squared = 0.607, Root MSE = 0.564			
Independent Variables	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>Standardized Coefficient</i>	<i>Significance</i>
Chinese (1=PRC, 0=USA)	0.267 ^t	0.16	.159	.098
Female (1=Fem, 0=Male)	-0.151	0.115	-.093	.193
Student's Age	0.011 ^t	0.006	.166	.062
Parents' Education (1-7)	-0.011	0.032	-.023	.743
LSAT Score	---	---		
Mode Law School Grade	-0.161	0.133	-.083	.229
Asked Questions in Class?	0.192**	0.071	.207	.008
Conversations with students of different race or ethnicity?	0.043	0.08	.055	.591
Conversations with students of diff relig, poli., or pers Beliefs?	0.037	0.083	.047	.659
Participated in Journal	-0.381*	0.18	-.181	.037
Participated in Moot Court	0.136	0.164	.069	.410
Member Student Organization	-0.145	0.135	-.084	.285
Hours per Week Reading	0.004	0.007	.056	.519
Hours per Week Preparing for Class (other than reading)	-0.002	0.008	-.023	.787
Hours per Week Legal Pro Bono (not required for class)	0.000	0.008	-.002	.976
Hours per Week Exercising	-0.006	0.011	-.038	.582
Hours per Week Relaxing and Socializing	-0.004	0.008	-.036	.621
Hours per Week Sleeping	-0.007	0.006	-.083	.256
Hours per Week Providing Care for Dependents	0.003	0.005	.058	.485
Academic Advising Help (1-5)	0.098 ^t	0.058	.140	.098
Job Search Help (1-5)	0.032	0.045	.059	.474

Dependent Variable How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at your law school? (1-4) 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Excellent	Regression 2 LLM Students Survey Years 2020, 2021 (N = 172, consisting of 53 PRC and 119 USA) F (25, 104) = 6.422, Prob > F = <0.001 R-squared = 0.607, Root MSE = 0.564			
Independent Variables	Coefficient	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficient	Significance
Library Assistance (1-5)	-0.063	0.054	-.110	.246
Technology Assistance (1-5)	0.029	0.063	.041	.652
Your Relationships with Other Students (1-7)	0.066	0.046	.130	.159
Your Relationships with Faculty Members (1-7)	0.207**	0.063	.384	.001
Your relationships with Administrative Staff (1-7)	0.055	0.054	.108	.306
Constant	0.869	0.622		.166
** Coefficient is significantly different from zero at the 0.01 level. * Coefficient is significantly different from zero at the 0.05 level. t Coefficient is significantly different from zero at the 0.1 level.				

There are many fewer LLM students than JD students in our data set. As a result, there are many fewer observations to drive the results in Regression 2 than in Regression 1. As a consequence, our analysis of the LLM students would benefit if we could prune some of the less significant variables from our regression equation in order to focus on the most important and interesting variables in order to avoid spurious results. Also, except for retaining the Chinese student dummy variable and a few other theoretically interesting variables, it would be useful to let the data tell us which variables to drop from the equation. To do this, we begin with Regression 2 and re-run the regression several times, each time dropping the least significant non-core variable, watching to make sure there is not a major drop in the explanatory power of the equation (R^2), until all of the remaining non-core variables are significant at least at the 0.2 level. The resulting equation in Regression 3 uses the Chinese student dummy variable, the female student dummy variable, and the relationship variables as variables of core theoretical interest and retains seven other independent variables that our iterative process tells us are of greatest explanatory value and significant at least at the 0.2 level.

In Regression 3, we see that, for LLM students, the variables with significant coefficients are age (positive), whether the student asks questions in class (positive and large), academic advising (positive and large), relationships with other students (positive), and relationships with faculty (positive and large). Comparing the standardized coefficients, we see that, once again, the dominant variable in determining the student's enjoyment of his or her law school experience is the student's relationship with faculty

(0.367), followed by asking questions in class (0.181), academic advising (0.174), and relationships with other students (0.150). By contrast, participating in journal (-0.115) or a student organization (-0.110) have a negative impact on the LLM student's law school experience, but the results are shy of statistical significance. The coefficient for the female student dummy variable is negative, but once again not large or statistically different from zero. The coefficient for the Chinese student dummy variable is positive, but significant at only the 0.077 level, suggesting that, other things equal, the Chinese LLM students enjoy their law school experience as much as their U.S. counterparts (maybe more). It seems that for LLM students to have good experiences in their programs, the law schools should have good advisors and faculty who are engaged with the students and encourage questions and student relationships.

Dependent Variable	Regression 3			
How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at your law school? (1–4) 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Excellent	LLM Students Survey Years 2020, 2021 (N = 172, consisting of 53 PRC and 119 USA) F (12, 136) = 14.87, Prob > F = <0.001 R-squared = 0.567, Root MSE = 0.542			
Independent Variables	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>Standardized Coefficient</i>	<i>Significance</i>
Chinese (1=PRC, 0=USA)	0.222 ^t	0.125	.133	0.077
Female (1=Fem, 0=Male)	-0.098	0.096	-.061	0.312
Student's Age	0.01*	0.005	.157	0.032
Asked Questions in Class?	0.162**	0.057	.181	0.005
Conversations with students of different race or ethnicity?	0.066	0.048	.086	0.173
Participated in Journal	-0.23 ^t	0.133	-.115	0.087
Member Student Organization	-0.185	0.112	-.110	0.102
Hours per Week Sleeping	-0.008	0.005	-.090	0.132
Academic Advising Help (1-5)	0.121**	0.046	.174	0.009
Your Relationships with Other Students (1-7)	0.074*	0.037	.150	0.047
Your Relationships with Faculty Members (1-7)	0.198**	0.052	.367	<.001
Your Relationships with Administrative Staff (1-7)	0.051	0.047	.099	0.281
Constant	0.377	0.356		0.292
** Coefficient is significantly different from zero at the 0.01 level. * Coefficient is significantly different from zero at the 0.05 level. ^t Coefficient is significantly different from zero at the 0.1 level.				

V. Discussion and Conclusions

This Article examines and compares Chinese and American law students' self-reported experiences and satisfaction with their legal education, particularly their various activities and interactions on campus. We found that American students were more likely to ask questions in class, more likely to talk to different students, and more likely to participate in extracurricular activities compared to Chinese students. Unlike American students, Chinese students' mean satisfaction with interactions with faculty and staff was higher than the mean for interactions with other students. Chinese JD students were also more satisfied with their interactions with faculty and administrative staff compared to American students, while Chinese LLM students' satisfaction with faculty and staff was not significantly different from that of American students. These differences are probably related not only to the fact the Chinese students are working in a second language, but also to China's indigenous educational system and culture where Confucianism's social hierarchy and collectivism are deeply-rooted. Chinese students are influenced by China's political philosophy, which places greater importance on the influence of authority over them, and as a result, Chinese JD students are more concerned with interaction with faculty members and relatively less concerned with communication and interaction with other students. Collectivist education provides group-oriented social relationships in which the cult of authority is emphasized.

While these behavioral patterns and cultural preferences are significant, one should not overlook the deeper structural friction between Chinese students' prior educational experiences and the normative expectations embedded in U.S. legal education. Specifically, the U.S. law school model, rooted in its assumptions about American legal academic culture, promotes active classroom participation, critical thinking, and the expression of individual viewpoints. For students from an exam-driven and authority-oriented educational system, these expectations are not intuitively accessible. On one hand, individual behavior within organizations is not merely the result of rational choices, but also a response to established institutional environments, norms, and cultural expectations.⁸⁶ Differences in institutional logic lead to varying expectations for academic interactions among students. For Chinese students, the faculty-student relationship carries more than mere academic significance. Rather, it brings with it symbolic value as a representation of institutional authority. In such cultural logic, in addition to faculty being transmitters of knowledge, they are also institutional agents wielding resources and evaluative power. Therefore, Chinese students tend to use their relationships with faculty as their core indicators when evaluating their legal education experiences. By contrast, they are relatively less sensitive to peer interactions. On the other hand, this cultural mismatch may cause student discomfort or disengagement, making the faculty-student

86. Paul J. DiMaggio & Walter W. Powell, *The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields*, 48 AM. SOC. REV. 147, 149 (1983).

relationship particularly important in this context.⁸⁷ Through continuous and meaningful interactions with faculty, Chinese students can better understand, internalize, and ultimately embrace the norms of the new academic culture, thereby enhancing their overall satisfaction with their legal education. Therefore, positive faculty-student interactions serve a consolatory and integrative role, enabling students from significantly different cultural systems to reconcile their prior expectations with the institutional logic of American legal education. This explains why, as demonstrated in our regression analysis, students' perceptions of the faculty-student relationship are the strongest predictor of their overall satisfaction with law school.

We also found that satisfaction with student perception of their interactions with faculty is the strongest predictor of whether a student enjoyed their law school learning experience. In a regression analysis of the responses of JD students, we found that relationships with faculty, administrators and other students were the largest positive influence on enjoyment of law school, followed by academic advising and law school grades. After controlling for other variables, Chinese JD students enjoyed their law school experience significantly less than the American students. This is perhaps because Chinese JD students' appreciation of law school life is more singularly dependent on quantifiable achievement motives, which are often quantified through performance grades at Chinese universities. Other than quantifiable grades, U.S. law schools are not obsessed with evaluating students' achievement in other activities. The function of Chinese students' cultural capital in reinforcing class distinctions is magnified by the fact that it is typically embodied in quantifiable achievements that students can convert into desirable job opportunities. Collectivism, unlike egalitarianism, does not significantly weaken the role of cultural capital in class division.⁸⁸ As a result, evaluation mechanisms that rely on non-quantifiable criteria may seem unintelligible to social groups that prioritize quantitative performance. Such divergences in the expression of cultural capital reduce students' overall satisfaction with the law school experience. For law school JD programs, the differences in education systems and cultures affect Chinese students' satisfaction with law schools to some degree, and it is difficult for law schools to enhance Chinese students' experiential satisfaction through diverse interactions. Law schools, therefore, face additional challenges in promoting integration and a better sense of experience for students from less diverse countries. Legal education is directly or indirectly linked to the functioning of the legal system, and legal education is recognized as a locus of the formation of professional culture.⁸⁹ As Chinese students' understanding of

87. See also Nicole M. Stephens et al., *Unseen Disadvantage: How American Universities' Focus on Independence Undermines the Academic Performance of First-generation College Students*, 102 J. PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCHOL. 1178, 1178-97 (2012).

88. Anders Vassenden & Metere Jonvik, *Cultural Capital as a Hidden Asset: Culture, Egalitarianism and Inter-Class Social Encounters in Stavanger, Norway*, 13 CULTURAL SOC. 37, 37-56 (2018).

89. PÉREZ-PERDOMO, *supra* note 5.

diversity interactions has begun to change in the early 21st century, they tend to agree that diversity interactions are an important advantage.⁹⁰ Given the various advantages of diverse interactions, it is important for law schools to consciously explore ways to promote interaction and cooperation among students from different backgrounds.

For LLM students, we found once again that a student's perceived relationship with faculty is the most important determiner of the student's satisfaction with his or her law school experience. Other variables that were important in determining satisfaction with their overall law school experience were asking questions in class, academic advising, relationships with other students, and age—but none of these was more than half as important as the student's relationship with faculty. Positive relationships with faculty are the most important factor in determining whether LLM students enjoy their learning experience, and if Chinese LLM students receive enough attention from U.S. faculty, we found that they are at least as satisfied as U.S. students. Because the LLM is a short-term program in which the student's goal is to obtain a diploma and bar certification, differences in legal educational systems and cultural differences have not had an impact on LLM students' satisfaction. This is good news for LLM programs in law schools because, to improve student satisfaction in law school, law schools need to pay attention on providing good mentors and faculty who encourage students to ask questions and build student relationships. The short-term nature and instrumental rationality of LLM programs result in a relatively low degree of social embeddedness, allowing students to avoid fully adapting to the new institutional environment.⁹¹ Their learning experience is shaped primarily by key points, such as whether faculty answer questions and create a safe learning atmosphere. Consequently, despite differences in legal education systems and cultural backgrounds, these variations have a limited impact on LLM students' overall satisfaction. Nonetheless, the limited impact of cultural differences on student satisfaction in short-term programs does not negate the critical role of culture in the learning process, as emphasized by diversity pedagogy. Diversity pedagogy theory points out the inseparable connection between culture and cognition, and it is important for professors in law schools to understand and recognize the key role that culture plays in the teaching-learning process.⁹² Certainly, it also means that schools need to pay attention to the isolation of Chinese students from other cultural groups.⁹³ Pedagogical practices in law schools should help international students adapt to their new environment and weaken the cultural boundaries between American and international Chinese students.

90. Orfield & Whitla, *supra* note 6, at 30–31.

91. See also W. RICHARD SCOTT, INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS (2nd ed. 2001).

92. Rosa Hernández Sheets, *What Is Diversity Pedagogy?*, 16 MULTICULTURAL EDUC. 11 (2009); ROSA HERNÁNDEZ SHEETS, DIVERSITY PEDAGOGY: EXAMINING THE ROLE OF CULTURE IN THE TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS (2004).

93. Yige Dong, *How Chinese Students Become Nationalist: Their American Experience and Transpacific Futures*, 69 AM. Q. 559, 559, 567 (2017).