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***Abstract***

*Hong Kong is often perceived as a global financial centre; an international, cosmopolitan city. Though Hong Kong has prospered economically, a myriad of social problems persist which undermine equity and social justice in society and many interest groups lack political and legal representation. Consequentially, the development of public interest law provides a pedagogical opportunity to cultivate individuals with the capacity to critically engage with and respond to social problems in society. While clinical legal education programmes provide one avenue of fostering public interest lawyers, socio-legal courses also provide a valuable means of developing socially responsible lawyers. First examining the context of Hong Kong law, this article considers the development of public interest law in Hong Kong and the role of socio-legal courses in fostering the development of public interest lawyers. Specifically, the article examines The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Faculty of Law’s flagship course, ‘The Individual, the Community and the Law’ to explore how socio-legal courses can foster socially responsible lawyers.*

INTRODUCTION

Many will be familiar with Hong Kong’s neon skyline, which firmly asserts its status as a global financial centre, yet masks a society riddled with inequalities and social problems. Hong Kong’s economic success belies a significant wealth gap, with more than 1.3 million[[2]](#footnote-2) Hong Kong residents living below the poverty line as well as a significant number of vulnerable social groups including migrant workers, refugees and asylum seekers. Hong Kong’s social problems stem from a number of unique historical and political factors, which have helped to shape Hong Kong’s distinct cultural, legal and political identity. Hong Kong was formally handed over from British colonial rule to the People’s Republic of China (PRC) on July 1st, 1997. Founded on the principle of ‘one country, two systems,’ Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) enjoys a high degree of autonomy. The adoption of Hong Kong’s Basic Law,[[3]](#footnote-3) a quasi-constitutional legal framework provides for the continuation of the common law system premised upon the rule of law and independence of the judiciary for a period of fifty years until 2047.[[4]](#footnote-4)

While Hong Kong prides itself as a society built upon the rule of law with a strong, independent judiciary, Hong Kong is undermined constitutionally by a lack of separation of powers between the Legislative Council and the Executive branches of government. Further, Hong Kong currently faces a constitutional crisis with tensions over political reforms in the lead up to the 2017 appointment of the Chief Executive. Presently there is no universal suffrage, although Article 45 of the Basic Law[[5]](#footnote-5) provides that the Chief Executive of Hong Kong should eventually be elected through a process of universal suffrage.

Given Hong Kong’s post-colonial legacy and uncertain political and legal future, this article argues that cultivating law students with the ability and willingness to engage with and work towards addressing social problems is essential for strengthening social justice in Hong Kong. Socio-legal studies potentially play an instrumental role in fostering public interest lawyers, with the capacity to identify social problems, ensuing legal needs and underrepresented litigants. First, this article will consider the political situation in Hong Kong as well as cultural and social factors, which shape the 'context of law.' Second, the article will explore public interest law’s potential in Hong Kong including the current use of strategic litigation. While individuals have increasingly turned to the process of judicial review as a mechanism of redress in the face of Hong Kong’s democratic deficit, the article will argue that there is scope to strengthen public interest law by fostering socially responsible lawyers with the capacity to identify social problems and unmet legal needs. The article will finally turn to consider the role of socio-legal education in fostering public interest lawyers in Hong Kong, by critically examining the flagship course, The Individual, the Community and the Law (ICL), at the Faculty of Law, the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK). Though this paper focuses specifically on the Hong Kong context, the author hopes to add to comparative pedagogical discourses on how socio-legal studies can be effectively integrated into law curriculums in different jurisdictions to foster socially responsible lawyers with an awareness of the intersections between law and society.

THE ‘CONTEXT OF HONG KONG LAW’

A number of unique historical and political factors have shaped the context of law in Hong Kong and continue to have implications for the rule of law and civil liberties. Hong Kong was under British Colonial rule for a period of 150 years.[[6]](#footnote-6) In the early eighties, with the lease of the New Territories due to expire in 1997, Hong Kong’s sovereignty was again called into question. Negotiations between Deng Xiaoping and Margaret Thatcher led to the signing of the Sino-British Joint Declaration[[7]](#footnote-7) in 1984, which provided for the resumption of Chinese sovereignty over Hong Kong. The Declaration stipulated that the socialist system of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) would not be practiced in Hong Kong for a period of fifty years and this principle is clearly articulated in Hong Kong’s Basic Law.[[8]](#footnote-8) Only a few years after the signing of the Sino-British Joint Declaration and prior to the handover, the Tiananmen Square massacre on June 4 1989 caused grave political concern of the potential consequences of Chinese rule on the territory, particularly that the rule of law and civil liberties may erode.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Significantly, a number of international human rights instruments were extended to Hong Kong by the British Colonial Government[[10]](#footnote-10) prior to the handover, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)[[11]](#footnote-11) as well as the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR).[[12]](#footnote-12) Article 39 of theBasic Law acknowledges that theICCPR remains in force and shall be implemented through Hong Kong laws. The ICCPR has been formally incorporated into Hong Kong law through the Hong Kong Bill of Rights Ordinance (BORO) including the principle of non-discrimination.[[13]](#footnote-13) A number of laws also aim to protect distinct groups within society that have traditionally been disadvantaged, marginalized or underrepresented within society such as women and ethnic minority groups.

Following the adoption of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (BPFA)[[14]](#footnote-14) in 1995 at the international level, the British Government also extended the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) to Hong Kong in 1996. Further, a series of piecemeal anti-discrimination legislation provide protection on the grounds of sex, disability, family status and race, specifically the Sex Discrimination Ordinance (SDO)[[15]](#footnote-15) and Disability Discrimination Ordinance (DDO)[[16]](#footnote-16) adopted in 1995, the Family Status Discrimination Ordinance (FSDO)[[17]](#footnote-17) adopted in 1997 and latterly the Race Discrimination Ordinance (RDO) adopted in 2008.[[18]](#footnote-18)

On paper, Hong Kong appears to have a strong rights-based legal framework[[19]](#footnote-19) providing for the protection of individuals and distinct interest groups within society, thus creating an enabling environment for cause lawyering particularly around civil and political rights.[[20]](#footnote-20) However, there are noticeable absences in legal protection, which leave minority groups susceptible to discrimination. Specifically, there is no anti-discrimination legislation on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. In the absence of statutory protections, individuals have increasingly sought legal redress through judicial review to challenge the constitutionality of legislation.

STRATEGIC LITIGATION AS A MEANS TO SECURE LEGAL PROTECTIONS AND ITS LIMITATIONS

Significantly, the use of strategic litigation in the form of judicial review has been adopted to secure rights, while simultaneously being used as a tool to foster public education and awareness of minority rights. To illustrate, the development of legal protections for LGBTI individuals has been piecemeal and largely as a result of judicial review cases launched to challenge existing laws which contravene Hong Kong’s Basic Law. For example, the landmark 2006 case of William TC Roy Leung[[21]](#footnote-21) successfully challenged a number of provisions under the Hong Kong Crimes Ordinance[[22]](#footnote-22) for violating privacy and equality protections situated within Hong Kong’s Basic Law (Articles 25 and 29) and BORO (Articles 1, 14 and 22) including s. 118 (C) of the Crimes Ordinance, which set the age of consent for buggery between same-sex couples at 21 years of age, with punishment of life imprisonment for offenders. Conversely, the age of consent for vaginal intercourse was set at 16 and punishment limited to five years.

In evaluating the inconsistency in age of consent between same-sex and opposite-sex couples, Judge Geoffrey Ma stated that “[d]enying persons of a minority class the right to sexual expression in the only way available to them,[[23]](#footnote-23) even if that way is denied to all, remains discriminatory when persons of a majority class are permitted the right to sexual expression in a way natural to them.”[[24]](#footnote-24) Though the Court declared relevant sections of the Crimes Ordinance unconstitutional, the ordinance was only recently amended to reflect the Court’s ruling in December 2014. The time lag between the ruling and the Legislative Council’s amendment of legislation is thus severely protracted and points to the limitations of using judicial review as a form of strategic litigation to secure minority rights.

On the one hand, a surge of judicial review cases suggests that there is broad recognition of the independence and impartiality of the Hong Kong judiciary as well as the rule of law in society.[[25]](#footnote-25) On the other hand, the use of the Courts as an avenue to seek redress could also be due to Hong Kong’s perceived democratic deficit as a result of its Executive-led Government structure, which potentially undermines equity and social justice. Significantly, the Legislative Council is made up of both geographical[[26]](#footnote-26) and functional constituencies.[[27]](#footnote-27) Functional Constituencies represent professional groups within society such as the Legal Sector, Education Sector and other interest groups, for example the Heung Yee Kuk, which represents rural indigenous interests within the New Territories. While geographical constituencies are voted in by a process of direct election, Functional constituencies are voted in by a select group of eligible voters. This leaves noticeable absences in legal and political representation, particularly for groups within society such as women who stay at home or work in the informal sector, as well as other individuals who do not belong to a recognized profession and other minority groups.

Further, the political polarization of pan-democrats and pro-establishment lawmakers potentially risks undermining the due process of lawmaking leading to substantial delays in law reform. In 2014 for example, the Marriage (Amendment) Bill,[[28]](#footnote-28) which sought to provide post-operative transgender individuals with the right to marry following the landmark case of W v Registrar of Marriages,[[29]](#footnote-29) was vetoed in the Legislative Council by both pan-democrat and pro-establishment lawmakers.[[30]](#footnote-30) Pro-establishment lawmakers suggested that the parameters of marriage should not be extended without wider public consultation while pan-democrats objected to the requirement that transgender individuals should gave to go through full sex reassignment surgery before being recognized in their acquired gender.

Significantly, these and many other landmark cases in Hong Kong result from strategic litigation challenges, which go to the heart of the Basic Law. While constitutionally significant, pedagogically these cases also offer important illustrations of strategic litigations' promise as well as limitations, and thus form the bedrock of clinical legal education and other experiential learning courses including mooting. Though cause lawyering and the use of strategic litigation have been able to achieve considerable successes over the years, pedagogically it is also important to look beyond case law alone to wider claim-making in society and the framing of social problems, which may offer an alternative means of identifying unmet legal needs.

CLAIMS-MAKING: FRAMING SOCIAL PROBLEMS IN THE CONTEXT OF HONG KONG LAW

Merton explains social problems as physical or mental damage caused to individuals in society which may offend the values or standards of a large segment of society. [[31]](#footnote-31) Spector and Kitsuse theorise social problems as a process of claims-making.[[32]](#footnote-32) First, private problems have to be transformed into public issues, a process which is very much dependent on the power of claims-making by different groups and whether it is feasible to secure wider support from the public. During this process, resistance towards opposing claims may help to secure the objective of bringing the issue into the public domain, or if claims-making is ineffective, issues may shrink back into the private domain. Interest groups may adopt a range of strategies in a bid to secure formal recognition, [[33]](#footnote-33) whether through public demonstrations, petition campaigns or through mass media campaigns. There is a risk however, that governments may effectively try to bury the issue at this stage. At the third stage, the absence of or inadequacy of solutions generated to address the issue further problematise the issue. Finally, in the absence of an effective institutional response, groups may seek to develop alternative solutions, which lead to the generation of competing claims that effectively sustain the issue as an ongoing social problem. Equally this process of claims-making is applicable to the Hong Kong context.

In recent years, Hong Kong has witnessed a growing protest culture with regular protests taking place on a range of political, economic, social and cultural issues, which suggest a clear process of claims-making by different interest groups in society. The roots of some of Hong Kong’s social problems, many of which are interconnected, in part stem from policies and laws enacted both prior to and following the handover of Hong Kong from the British Colonial Government to the People’s Republic of China in 1997. From concerns over pressure placed upon the HKSAR Government to implement Article 23[[34]](#footnote-34) of the Basic Law, which requires the HKSAR Government to enact laws to prohibit any act of treason, secession, sedition or subversion against the Central People’s Government, [[35]](#footnote-35) to contentious proposals on national education reforms,[[36]](#footnote-36) individuals and groups within society have actively participated in public demonstrations. Increasing social and political awareness is evidenced by the growth of civil society organisations campaigning on a range of issues including the status of refugees; working conditions of migrant domestic workers; and the lack of legal protections of vulnerable groups within society including sexual minorities.[[37]](#footnote-37)

The mushrooming of civil society groups, as well as cause lawyering, has firmly entrenched recognition of some of these issues, such as the status of refugees, as social problems. Other issues, for example proposals on National Education, appear more transient in nature but may nevertheless link to the way in which Hong Kong and its citizens’ culture and identity are framed and contested, an issue which may itself develop into a social problem. Since the 1997 handover, a significant number of mainland Chinese immigrants have moved to Hong Kong,[[38]](#footnote-38) while numbers of Mainland Chinese visitors[[39]](#footnote-39) has also risen, which has resulted in social tensions between Hong Kong Chinese and Mainland Chinese.[[40]](#footnote-40) These tensions have been heightened by the recent political crisis, which has drawn attention to the fragility of a political and legal system founded on the principle of “One Country, Two Systems.”

OCCUPY CENTRAL AND THE UMBRELLA MOVEMENT

Hong Kong currently stands at a political impasse as whether to implement constitutional reforms in line with the Central People’s Government’s interpretation of ‘universal suffrage.’ If the Executive fails to implement constitutional reforms accordingly, it must continue with the existing nomination process of HKSAR’s Chief Executive by a 1,200-member election committee. In September 2014, ‘Occupy Central,’[[41]](#footnote-41) a civil disobedience campaign was initiated to challenge the perceived failure of Hong Kong’s Executive to implement universal suffrage in accordance with international standards under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). Article 25(b) of the ICCPR specifically states that:

*“Every citizen shall have the right and the opportunity (b) to vote and to be elected at genuine periodic elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret ballot, guaranteeing the free expression of the will of the electors”*

The Central People’s Government’s current proposal has interpreted this provision to allow for one person, one vote; however Chief Executive Candidates will first be screened and selected by a nominating committee. In effect, Hong Kong residents will have the capacity to elect the Chief Executive from a pool of only two to three candidates.[[42]](#footnote-42) Significantly, the Umbrella Movement (as it is often referred due to the images of protestors shielding themselves with umbrellas from the Police’s pepper spray) lasted for almost three months from 26 September to 15 December 2014. During the protests, the Hong Kong Bar Association condemned the excessive and disproportionate use of force used by the Hong Kong Police.[[43]](#footnote-43) The Umbrella Movement has led to significant scrutiny of the rule of law in Hong Kong and whether it is being eroded along with other civil liberties including freedom of expression.[[44]](#footnote-44)

Given Hong Kong’s unique legal and political environment, as well as an absence of adequate statutory protections and legal and political representation for vulnerable groups, there is scope to strengthen public interest law. Pedagogically, while clinical legal education courses offer one means of exposing students to public interest law, socio-legal courses may also potentially foster socially responsible lawyers with heightened sensitivity to social problems that undermine equity and social justice in Hong Kong. In turn, socially responsible lawyers may choose to go on to practice public interest law. The development of socially responsible lawyers may help to strengthen public interest law and facilitate greater public awareness of vulnerable, unrepresented groups in society.

PUBLIC INTEREST LAW AND ITS DEVELOPMENT IN HONG KONG

Broadly construed, public interest law is employed as a tool used to help marginalized individuals and groups in society though public interest lawyering is undertaken by a wide range of organisations including non-governmental organisations that work to promote and protect human rights or raise awareness of, for example, consumer claims or environmental issues.[[45]](#footnote-45) Traditionally, clinical legal education courses have been used as a means to foster public interest lawyers. Specialised legal clinics expose students to experiential learning opportunities which potentially enhance their commitment to public interest and pro bono lawyering. Many law schools in the United States have demonstrated a clear commitment towards promoting student lawyers’ participation in public service.[[46]](#footnote-46) Other jurisdictions including Australia and the United Kingdom,[[47]](#footnote-47) have adopted clinical legal education programmes. The nature of legal clinics varies substantially. Clinics may be wholly law school funded and housed on campus,[[48]](#footnote-48) whereas some programmes are offered on an externship basis[[49]](#footnote-49) and include supervised internships with key partner agencies.[[50]](#footnote-50)

In 1996, the American Bar Association encouraged law schools to provide both voluntary and mandatory legal work opportunities to law students, due to the relatively low number of pro bono lawyers compared with numbers of lawyers in practice.[[51]](#footnote-51) Such work may be counted towards the accreditation process upon becoming a legal practitioner. The American Bar Association encourages legal practitioners to complete at least 50 hours of pro bono work annually.[[52]](#footnote-52) It is important to recognize that not all pro bono work, that is the provision of free legal advice to unrepresented litigants, would automatically fall within the realm of public interest law, though free legal advice is often facilitated with the aim of benefiting marginalized individuals or vulnerable groups with unmet legal needs. Rhode suggests that the rationale behind fostering pro bono services rests on recognition of access to legal services as a fundamental need, with lawyers bearing some responsibility for ensuring that such legal services are accessible and available.[[53]](#footnote-53) Further, in a ‘democratic social order, equality before the law is central to the rule of law and to the legitimacy of the State.’[[54]](#footnote-54)

A common objective of promoting law students participation in mandatory[[55]](#footnote-55) or voluntary pro bono legal programmes is to provide practical legal training[[56]](#footnote-56) and skills as well as raise awareness of future lawyers’ professional duty to help marginalized groups in society to access justice.[[57]](#footnote-57) Through participation in pro bono programmes, it is anticipated that upon admission to practice, lawyers will be committed to providing pro bono legal services, irrespective of their other professional duties and demands on their time. While there is no such equivalent requirement of pro bono hours stipulated by the Hong Kong Bar Association or Law Society[[58]](#footnote-58) there is growing recognition of the need to strengthen legal ethics in Hong Kong. Significantly, the Redman-Roper Report on legal education in Hong Kong, which was commissioned by the Advisory Steering Committee of the Review of the Legal Education and Training in Hong Kong in 2000, highlighted the importance of experiential learning opportunities as a means to instill students with a sense of social responsibility.[[59]](#footnote-59)

The Redman-Roper report expressed concern that legal education in Hong Kong adopted a black-letter law approach, with the result that law graduates lacked an expanded view of the world.[[60]](#footnote-60) Further, the report suggested that narrow, doctrinal approaches to the study of law inhibited the development of law graduates’ ability to respond professionally to the needs of ordinary people or those in the ‘sandwich class,’ that is those in the lower-middle class bracket, whose legal needs were often not met. Significantly, the report suggested that ‘law should not be seen as a narrow, self-referential discipline, but as one intimately connected with other bodies of knowledge and modes of social control and organization.’[[61]](#footnote-61) The report’s findings are particularly salient given the number of vulnerable groups in Hong Kong including female migrant workers, refugees and those living in poverty, who lack adequate access to justice, a constitutional right guaranteed under Article 35 of the Basic Law.[[62]](#footnote-62)

Awareness of public interest law in Hong Kong, though limited, is developing and there are notable examples of public interest lawyering. During the 1980s, Pamela Baker, a solicitor, pioneered the use of public interest law by bringing a series of landmark cases to challenge Government policies on the treatment of Vietnamese Refugees.[[63]](#footnote-63) Subsequent strategic litigation cases on minority rights, as discussed above in relation to LGBTI rights, and environmental issues such as the judicial review case of Clean Air Foundation Ltd v The Government of Hong Kong[[64]](#footnote-64) can also be construed as public interest cases. More recently, a network of Public Interested Lawyers, *Hong Kong Public Interest Law Group*,[[65]](#footnote-65) which draws together legal practitioners, academics and students was founded in 2013.

Further, several Faculties of Law in Hong Kong have sought to develop clinical legal education programmes largely in response to the recommendations of the Redman-Roper report, which suggested that clinical legal education should be incorporated at all stages of legal education.[[66]](#footnote-66) The Law Faculty at The Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK), founded[[67]](#footnote-67) with the vision that all law students should be engaged in the active learning of law in its social context,[[68]](#footnote-68) developed the Refugee Rights Clinic programme in partnership with the Justice Centre Hong Kong.[[69]](#footnote-69) This particular clinical legal programme was also developed at the Law Faculty of The University of Hong Kong. Additionally, the CUHK’s Law Faculty developed a flagship course, *The Individual, the Community and the Law*, which adopts a ‘context of law’ approach.

***Socio-Legal Studies: An Alternative Means of Fostering Public Interested Lawyers?***

While clinical legal programmes have been adopted by Law Schools with a view to fostering public interested lawyers, it is less clear whether socio-legal courses such as the *Individual, the Community and the Law* course, have the capacity to foster the same level of engagement with public interest law. First, the doctrinal bias of the undergraduate law curriculum makes the integration of socio-legal studies and empirical research methods particularly challenging.[[70]](#footnote-70) Second, law schools often exist in a vacuum and there is limited engagement with other disciplines such as the humanities or the social sciences, which means that legal scholars often lack the requisite empirical research and wider interdisciplinary skills required to teach and support student learning of alternative approaches to the study of law.

Further, in the context of Hong Kong’s legal education environment, Jones suggests that as a result of globalization and neo-liberalist capitalism, lawyers have been discouraged from critical engagement with the law and this has proved to be the case in Hong Kong, particularly as a result of the socio-political context post-97,[[71]](#footnote-71) though this may be changing as the rule of law and other founding principles of the HKSAR come under pressure.[[72]](#footnote-72) The Law Society professional practice requirements[[73]](#footnote-73) also leave less room in the curriculum to develop elective courses as compared with other non-vocational degree programmes.

Rather than taking law as the starting point, the Faculty of Law’s flagship course, the *Individual, the Community and the Law* (hereafter ICL) adopts a ‘context of law’ approach, [[74]](#footnote-74) which first focuses on the identification of ‘social problems’ affecting distinct groups in society. This is not to preclude analysis of law and how it relates to social problems. While a ‘context of law’ approach does consider the role of the law, importantly law is not presented as the primary solution to social problems, which may instead be addressed by other cultural, economic, political or social means. Indeed the law can sometimes exacerbate social problems through inadequately or poorly drafted legislation or through the ‘silences’ of the law,[[75]](#footnote-75) which can result in unmet legal needs. It was envisaged that a ‘context of law’ approach would steep students with a rich understanding of law’s limitations as well as its promise and potentially foster students’ awareness of social justice and public interest lawyering. Similar to mandatory pro bono programmes the ICL course is compulsory for all third year undergraduate LLB Law students.

In the longer term, Emeritus Professor Mike McConville, the founding Dean of the Law Faculty at CUHK, conceived that the course may influence students’ career aspirations and choices. Though it may take several years for graduating students to reflect on their ICL learning experience,[[76]](#footnote-76) for some students, the course would heighten their awareness of inequity and social injustice within society and they would thus become socially responsible lawyers. In the longer term, it was envisaged that through students’ exposure to social problems, the empirical research and learning opportunities offered by the ICL course would encourage LLB graduates to give something back to the community whether through engagement with public interest law, pro bono or other community service provision.

Without black letter law as the familiar starting point, ICL proves to be somewhat tempestuous. Given that the majority of the compulsory law courses on the LLB programme adopt a doctrinal approach to the study of law and focus on substantive law with little consideration of the cultural, social and political context in which the law is situated, many students feel somewhat uncomfortable to engage with contextual factors as well as social research methods. Starting from the social problem, students are introduced to qualitative and quantitative research methods as well as research ethics before undertaking fieldwork with multiple stakeholders across legal, policy, NGO and other circles. While the course does not include any direct client representation or shadowing of practicing lawyers as such, students do have direct contact with research subjects during empirical research which may involve a process of identifying unmet legal needs.

A principal aim of the ICL course is to encourage students to develop socio-legal research projects for the benefit of selected vulnerable groups within society such as minority groups, migrant workers, ex-offenders and unrepresented litigants. The nature of the ICL course does not lend itself to the traditional lecture-tutorial model, which most doctrinal law courses follow. Pedagogically, the course is delivered through multiple methods including interactive lectures, tailored individual group tutoring as well as drop-in advice sessions. Working in groups, students design and implement empirical research projects to effectively unpack how social problems impact upon individuals and the wider community, taking account of the role of the law in relation to the social problem. Since the first cohort of ICL students in 2008/09, students have identified and engaged with a wide range of social problems. ICL groups have researched on a broad range of topics, though specific topics routinely surface each academic year including access to housing; the status of refugees; the status of LGBTI individuals; and implications of the *Small House Policy on Land Use and Rights in the New Territories*.[[77]](#footnote-77)

During the first semester, groups focus on drafting a research proposal which includes a detailed, critical review of secondary literature from which substantive research questions are identified and an appropriate research methodology designed. At the beginning of the course, delivery is weighted toward interactive lectures, where all groups are introduced to socio-legal analysis of social problems and to research ethics, which are particularly important given the human element involved in the design of such research projects including direct engagement with vulnerable individuals or groups. For example, student groups study the Stanley Milgram experiment to learn about the use of deception and its ethical implications[[78]](#footnote-78) as well as review different academic disciplines’ ethics codes.[[79]](#footnote-79)

Formal screening of research proposals by the University Survey and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee may help to legitimise the research process and strengthen student’s understanding of the role and importance of ethics in research. During the drafting of ethics applications, student groups receive substantial guidance and support from the course leader on research design and administrative colleagues provide additional research support by screening ethics applications. The application is primarily vetted at the faculty level before submission to the university level. Thus applications are reviewed and refined multiple times before submission to the university level.

Student groups are also introduced to both quantitative and qualitative research skills including questionnaire planning and design, interviewing social research subjects and focus group planning and facilitation. Though initially lectures are interactive, individual groups ordinarily break off to undertake group exercises and then relate generic case-based and research methods exercises to their own research topics. Alongside these modules on socio-legal analysis and social research methods, external speakers including NGO representatives, pro bono lawyers and academics are invited to give guest lectures on public interest lawyering.

To illustrate, the Hong Kong Federation of Women’s Centres (HKFWC), [[80]](#footnote-80) which runs a free legal advice clinic, is invited to introduce student groups to the situation and status of women in Hong Kong including issues such as disparity in economic earnings between men and women. Further, HKFWC help to facilitate the sharing of pro bono lawyers, peer counsellors and service users, which gives student groups’ direct insight into the scope and nature of services provided by HKFWC’s free legal advice clinic. The aim of these sessions is to draw the connection between public interest lawyering and the design and development of student groups’ own empirical research projects.

With ethics approval confirmed, during semester two, student groups undertake fieldwork with research subjects. Student groups design research instruments including interview schedules and questionnaires, which are reviewed during individually tailored group tutoring. During the design process, the course leader offers detailed feedback on the phrasing and sequencing of interview and survey questions as well as any complications which may arise including the potential for bias in the design of questions or interviewer bias. Additionally, student groups are introduced to data analysis, particularly analysis of qualitative data using coding or framework analysis, which is informed by grounded theory.[[81]](#footnote-81) Given that it is difficult to teach generic social research skills when each individual group is working on a highly specialized topic, over time the ICL course design has evolved[[82]](#footnote-82) to allow greater use of group tutoring individually tailored to the needs of each ICL group. Group tutoring is scheduled at key points in the research process including during the formation of research topics, submission of research ethics applications, design of research instruments and supervision during fieldwork.

The course includes both formative and summative assessment. In semester one student groups are required to give an oral research presentation in the latter part of the semester, which frames the social problem, identifies a research question and an appropriate research methodology to answer the question. Groups also submit a written research proposal, which includes a detailed literature review as well as a proposed research methodology, which may include quantitative or qualitative social research methods or a combination of both. In semester two, student groups are again required to give an oral research presentation to present preliminary empirical research findings from their fieldwork.

Importantly, during oral research presentations other peer groups are invited to ask questions and give written feedback directly to individual groups for their consideration. This interactive process is designed to support student learning by encouraging student groups to identify any limitations in the research process including any potential for bias and how this may impact upon research findings. Individual groups are also required to undertake a self-evaluation of their group's research process in relation to each assessment. Including all groups in the evaluation process (while not informing the formal assessment process) helps to foster a sense of collegiality in the research process. At the end of the course student groups submit a final written report which includes an executive summary, a detailed literature review, research methodology, empirical research data analysis and findings as well as a conclusion. Though some groups present recommendations, this is not ultimately the goal of the ICL course, which instead aims to focus on unpacking the complexity of the social problem.

The design and implementation of the ICL course has not been without problems. The Faculty initially adopted the ICL as a compulsory[[83]](#footnote-83) course requirement on both the undergraduate (LLB) and postgraduate (JD) programmes. However, the structure and design of the course deviates substantially. On the LLB programme the course is offered across two semesters, allowing for substantial guidance and support during the research process. Conversely, on the JD programme the course was only offered in summer semester, a substantially shorter term spanning seven weeks. This proved to be inherently problematic as student groups were required to design and implement research projects within a substantially shorter timeframe. Further, the course structure did not allow for the same level of guidance or support at all stages of the research process.[[84]](#footnote-84)

At the undergraduate level, given the doctrinal bias of the undergraduate law curriculum, students often lack a solid grounding in socio-legal research at the point upon which they enter the course, which may hinder their understanding of the aims and objectives of the course as well as their socio-legal analysis of social problems. The recent adoption of foundational core courses on legal analysis and argumentation as well as jurisprudence and ethics in the Faculty of Law’s LLB curriculum may allow greater scope to strengthen students understanding of alternative approaches to the study of law. Further, given the limited number of elective courses that law students can opt to take in the first and second year of the LLB degree, the majority of students lack a solid grounding in public interest law although courses such as administrative and constitutional law do expose students to strategic litigation cases and a limited number of individual law students also take clinical legal programmes such as the Refugee Rights Clinic alongside the ICL course.

Compared with doctrinal law courses, ICL is labour intensive [[85]](#footnote-85) for both students and the course leader, particularly during the second semester when student groups go out into the ‘field’ to interview civil society actors and policymakers. Greater flexibility is required to provide the tailored group tutoring, which individual student groups rely upon during the research process. On average, there are twelve ICL groups each year, the projects of which are distinct and consequentially require the design and implementation of different research methodologies. Thus the course leader has to be adaptable in order to respond to the individual research needs and challenges of each group.

As with other law courses, each semester students must complete a course teaching evaluation questionnaire to provide feedback on their learning experiences. However, this generic evaluation does not adequately capture how the ICL course impacts, if at all, on students’ perceptions of the rule of law, access to justice and public interest law, key elements which underpin the philosophy of the ICL course’s design. Thus, in 2014/15 a pedagogical research project was initiated - *Fostering Public Interested Lawyers: The Individual, the Community and the Law.[[86]](#footnote-86)* This empirical research project aims to learn more about students’ specific learning experiences on the ICL course including the influence that the course has had, if any, on LLB students and graduates’ career aspirations and choices as well as perceptions of access to justice, the rule of law and public interest lawyering in Hong Kong.

While not directly inspired by any similar pedagogical evaluations of clinical legal programmes, insight was drawn from two large-scale surveys in the United States, after the JD.[[87]](#footnote-87) However, the research project differs substantially given that the aim of the survey is to evaluate the influence, if any, of a single socio-legal course as opposed to the entire JD or LLB programme’s impact on career aspirations and choices. Further, given the focus of the ICL course on social problems, the research specifically intends to evaluate whether the course influences LLB students and graduates' understanding of the connection between social problems, the individual, the community and the law.

At this stage it is too premature within our pedagogical research project to fully evaluate whether socio-legal education, and specifically the ICL course, can provide an effective means of fostering public interested lawyers as a way to strengthen equity and social justice in Hong Kong. However, from our initial survey results with students entering the ICL course,[[88]](#footnote-88) the majority of students are aware that public interest law aims to help marginalized groups within society (77%), though there is a lack of awareness amongst students as to the practicalities of public interest law including whether it is not-for-profit. 60% of students were uncertain as to whether public interest law is not-for-profit and 14% of students think it is carried out on a for-profit basis. The majority of students have undertaken legal internships (88%), and many students have also undertaken community service programmes (49%) with a relatively small percentage having undertaken overseas social service programmes (14%). Only a minority of students have participated in any of the Law Faculty’s public interest programmes such as the Refugee Rights Clinic (9%) or the Refugee Pro Bono Project (5%). These findings suggest that only a limited number of LLB students voluntarily enter public interest law programmes.

While the pedagogical aims and objectives of the ICL course may differ substantially to clinical legal education programmes, the inclusion of empirical research with multiple stakeholders from legal, NGO and policy circles may effectively sensitize students to the cultural, social and political context in which law operates, and thus heighten students’ awareness of the limitations of the law and lawyering. By exploring social problems experienced by vulnerable groups, students are exposed to different social strata within society. By engaging directly with stakeholders from civil society as well as policymakers and members of the vulnerable groups themselves, students can gain meaningful insight into the practical constraints of the law in providing an effective remedy to such vulnerable groups and the problems which they experience. Our ongoing pedagogical research aims to give an indication of the impact of ICL over time, if at all, on students’ perceptions of the rule of law, access to justice and public interest law.

CONCLUSION

Though historically Hong Kong has prospered economically, a myriad of social problems persist which undermine equity and social justice in society. The development of public interest law in Hong Kong provides a pedagogical opportunity to cultivate socially responsible lawyers with the capacity to critically engage with and respond to social problems in society. Law schools within Hong Kong have increasingly adopted clinical legal education programmes as a means of fostering public interest lawyers. While pedagogically distinct, socio-legal courses such as ICL may complement efforts to foster public interest lawyers through allowing students to engage in empirical research with multiple stakeholders to unpack the context of law in which social problems are situated and consider the role of the individual, the community and the law’s response. This article has demonstrated how pedagogically law schools can contribute meaningfully to the development of law students' sense of social responsibility. The ‘impact’ of socio-legal courses may be challenging to measure longitudinally, but potentially such courses allow for a seed of social awareness to be planted, which may bear fruit in the future.
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