

LAW'S ODYSSEY

Hee Soo Yin and Lim Poh Bee

Temasek Polytechnic, Singapore

Legal education divorced from the real world does not promote authentic learning. Contextualised training is necessary for students to acquire an in-depth understanding of the field of study. In an industry where the rate of change is accelerating at a phenomenal rate, the students' ability to problem-solve, transfer knowledge to other domains and reflect on their learning processes are necessary for a career as para-legal professionals. This paper looks at the desired graduate profile for the Diploma in Law & Management and describes the innovations developed and being developed to achieve this desired profile and produce para-legal professionals ready for the world of work and life at the beginning of the 21st century. It sets the innovations in the wider context of historical developments in legal education viz., apprenticeship, the didactic lecture method, the Socratic dialogue, the case method, the problem method and Problem-Based Learning (PBL). In particular it traces the Diploma in Law and Management's journey into PBL as an educational strategy both to equip students with independent learning, collaborative learning, creative problem-solving skills, as well as the ability to innovate and create new knowledge and solutions.

THE QUEST

Technology, globalisation and biotechnology are radically transforming life, work and play at the beginning of the 21st century. Since the Diploma in Legal Studies (now Diploma in Law & Management) started in 1993, the Law Division (Law) at Temasek Polytechnic has continuously asked these questions:

- How do we equip and train youths in their late teens to become para-professionals in a rapidly changing legal environment and a globalised knowledge-based economy?
- What life skills are needed and how do we equip our students with these life skills?

After seeking input from the legal industry, Law decided that their desired graduate profile would be the “7 I s”, viz.,

- “In” skills (all the relevant knowledge and skills to function as a para-legal professional in a law office environment)
- Integrity
- Independent Learners

- Initiative
- Innovative
- Intra-personal skills & Inter-personal skills (team players)
- International in Perspective

CHRONICLES OF THE JOURNEY

Our Partners On The Journey

In the UK, there is a well-established professional training route to become a member of the Institute of Legal Executives (ILEX). Fellows of ILEX can go on to become Solicitors in the UK. In the USA, formal training in law for para-legals is provided in universities. In Singapore, however, legal support staff usually start in secretarial or clerical jobs in law firms and learn the law mainly on the job. Temasek Polytechnic's vision in starting the Diploma in Legal Studies was to provide formal training for para-professionals to be competent in handling basic legal and administrative functions in a law office.

The escalating pace and rate of change in the legal industry meant that the knowledge and skill sets required by a para-legal professional were constantly changing. To ensure relevance, a highly practical and process-oriented curriculum was developed with input from industry partners. Strategic training partnerships with industry and professional bodies were forged under the Temasek Partners in Academic and Creative Training (PACT) programme. Memoranda of Understanding were signed with the Supreme Court, the Subordinate Courts, the Law Society, Singapore Association of the Institute of Chartered Secretaries and Administrators (SAICSA), Institute of Legal Executives (ILEX) UK, Singapore Network Services (SNS) and Eagles Mediation & Counselling Centre (EMCC). Our partners from industry also include law firms, the judiciary, the legal service, and private and public organizations. Besides being guest lecturers and external examiners, industry partners also provide student placements for a twelve-week practical training under the Student Internship Programme (SIP) as part of the curriculum (Lee, 1998).

An Innovative Culture

To achieve the "7 I s" of the desired graduate profile, Law's culture had to be innovative. Law sought to embrace change and proactively create the para-legal professional in Singapore who would be able to help the legal industry compete in a globally competitive, knowledge-based economy. A balance had to be achieved between equipping students with relevant knowledge, industry-related skills and process and thinking skills. Law actively pursued different ways to help 17-19 year old youths learn the knowledge and practice of law. This is particularly challenging when one considers that the study of law in some jurisdictions is a postgraduate pursuit.

A History Of Educational Innovations

Educational Innovations Using IT

Besides equipping the LEGALAB (a computer laboratory) with all the computer applications used in the legal industry to facilitate the training of students in IT skills (Looi, 1998), the potential of IT in education was also creatively harnessed. The Interactive Multi-Media

Introduction to the Law in Singapore (IMMILS) (available on Singapore One at <http://ole.tp.edu.sg/>) was developed in 1996 to help Year 1 students transit into the world of Law for the subject Legal Systems and Methods. In 1997, the Registry of Titles Forms on the World Wide Web was developed to enable students to learn and practise completing Conveyancing Forms for the subject Conveyancing Practice. In 1998, the Dispute Resolution in Singapore CD ROM (available on Singapore One at <http://ole.tp.edu.sg/>) was developed as an interactive, multi-media courseware for the subject Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution. In 1999, a self-accessed project on VBUS (Virtual Business School) was developed for the subject Trust, Wills and Probate. VBUS is a web-based learning resource accessible to all students of Temasek Business School. In 1999 as well, an On-line Test for the subject Legal Systems and Methods was put in place. All law subjects will be on-line on VBUS by the end of 2000.

Infusing Thinking In The Curriculum

In 1998, in response to the call from the Prime Minister for “thinking schools, learning nation”, Law identified the relevant skill sets of a para-legal and purposefully infused them into the students’ training over the 3-year curriculum. As Perkins (1992, p. 103) pointed out, metacurriculum should not be a separate curriculum. “It should be blended in rather than added on. The metacurriculum is infused into the usual teaching of the subject matters, enriching and amplifying them.”

Table 1
Skill Sets For Students Of The Diploma In Legal Studies

Skill Sets	Particulars
1. Cognitive Relational Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be able to differentiate details from main ideas, broad concepts from subsets • To be able to contextualise concepts, operations and tasks
2. Cognitive Linear Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be able to structure logic into fuzzy situations • To be able to progress sequentially in any given situation
3. Decision Making Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be able to identify suitable criteria and use those criteria in arriving at decisions
4. Creative Thinking Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be able to creatively generate solutions and alternatives
5. Skills of Metacognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be able to understand one’s own thinking process
6. Reflection Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be able to reflect on experiences and self correct mistakes

Real Environment Active Learning (REAL)

In 1998, Real Environment Active Learning (REAL), a training simulating legal practice conditions for the procedural subjects Conveyancing Practice (Lim & Tan, 1999) and Civil Procedure was developed (Tan, 1998). Concept mapping was also introduced in the Law of Real Property (Leong, 1999).

Mediation & Conflict Management Training

In 1998, training in mediation skills was introduced in the subjects Family Law, Matrimonial Proceedings and Adoption, Arbitration & ADR. Besides being a dispute resolution method that is gaining prominence in the world and in Singapore, mediation is a valuable conflict management skill and a life skill. The TP-Eagles Mediation Training Centre was set up with facilities for training in mediation skills in January 1998.

Chronicles Of Law's Journey Into Problem-Based Learning (PBL)

A Look At The History Of Legal Education

Before universities offered formal training in law, lawyers were trained as apprentices on the job. Legal support staff were also trained on the job. As legal education subsequently developed into formal courses, the didactic approach of lecturing in an environment removed from the actual legal practice environment meant that legal information was taught to students who may not have been able to see why they had to learn them or how they could use the knowledge. There was often a gap between academic knowledge and its application in the context in which it is to be used (Moust, 1998).

The case method, pioneered by Langdell at the Harvard Law School in 1870, sought to bridge the gap. This method was widely adopted by law schools to integrate students' practical experience gained during their apprenticeship period and their formal training (Moust, 1998).

The way the case method is used, however, may be criticized if it was only used as a vehicle to impart rules of law by way of lectures, without engaging the students in Socratic dialogue to stimulate an understanding of the process and reasoning behind the judgments of the Court. Critics say that students should study adjudicated cases not as solutions to problems but as ways to solve these problems. In 1942, an Association of American Law Schools (AALS) Committee recommended the implementation of the problem method that trains the student to apply relevant legal rules to new situations. Students know and are trained in using case and statute law instead of merely learning the law. The problem method also trained students to become skilful problem-solvers equipped for their work as professional problem-solvers in legal practice (Moust, 1998).

The merit of the case method used effectively is that it shows students how problems are solved in the cases. The problem method goes further by letting students learn how to solve problems by actually finding, framing and analyzing issues. It is especially suitable to train future legal professionals and para-professionals as it allows students to integrate substantive law, judgment and analysis skills in authentic learning. Authentic learning has been defined as a learning process whose results can be applied both inside and outside the learning situation. "Characteristics of authentic learning are: an in-depth understanding of the field of study, the ability to transfer knowledge to other domains and the ability of students to reflect on their learning process" (Moust, 1998, p.6).

Law at Temasek Polytechnic had used the case method to teach substantive law. It had also used the problem method extensively. Substantive law is taught in lectures first. Students are then given problems or scenarios and they are required to identify the issues and the relevant law, which is to be applied to the problem or scenario to propose a course of action or solution. This method is clearly proven to stimulate authentic learning and is particularly

suitable to train para-legal professionals. This however does not seem to go far enough to equip students with skills for lifelong independent learning as students are still reliant on the lecturers to lecture and teach them first. With PBL, students do not merely learn the skill of problem solving. More importantly, they learn how to learn with guidance from an instructor who acts as a facilitator (Cruickshank, 1996).

Bridges and Hallinger (1995) clearly differentiate PBL and the case method, arguing powerfully for PBL in the context of leadership development. As with the case method, PBL places considerable emphasis on developing analytical, problem-framing, and problem-solving skills. PBL also goes further to emphasise goals like lifelong learning, meeting-management skills, project-management skills, and problem-relevant knowledge. In the case method, the instructor typically leads the discussion of the case and asks probing questions which the students are expected to answer. In PBL, students direct the discussion, with the instructor serving as a resource.

The real merit of PBL, pioneered in the medical school at McMaster University and increasingly being adopted by many institutions of higher learning around the world, is that it returns the responsibility, initiative and motivation to learn to students. What triggers this desire to acquire relevant knowledge and skills are fuzzy real world problems, which the students have to understand, analyse, identify learning issues from and learn independently relevant knowledge in order to propose a solution to the problem. The starting point for learning shifts is from the lecturer to the real world problem. The real world problem provides the context for the learning and drives the learning. This mirrors legal practice. PBL allows Law students to learn how to learn in a context resembling the legal practice.

Embarking On The Journey

In late 1998, several Law lecturers were first exposed to PBL. In early 1999, Law used PBL in the subject Legal Systems and Methods. Its potential as a pedagogical philosophy and methodology was quickly recognized.

Law shares Cruickshank's (1996, p.187-188) view that PBL is well-suited for legal education as the claims made in support of PBL fit closely with the goals of professional legal education and that PBL seems to promote greater individual capacities for "learning how to learn" in the context of legal practice. PBL addresses some of the difficulties and criticisms that law schools are instructor-centred rather than learner-oriented. The critique of law professors who still use a form of Socratic method is that the questions that interest the professor comes first rather than new lines of inquiry (Cruickshank, 1996). PBL, in the hands of a trained facilitator, would promote a reunification of theory, skill knowledge, and practice knowledge (Cruickshank, 1996).

Higher order knowledge as articulated by Perkins and Simmons (Tishman, Perkins & Jay, 1995, pp.128-129) has three levels of higher order knowledge in a discipline beyond the familiar "content" level. The first is the problem-solving level explained as knowledge and know-how about handling typical problems and tasks in the discipline. The second is the evidence level that concerns knowledge and know-how about evidence and explanation in a discipline. The third is the Inquiry level that concerns how inquiry proceeds in a discipline. Law saw that PBL provides intrinsic motivation for students to develop higher order knowledge as they move along the PBL process. As Bridges, (1992, p.18) pointed out in the context of training administrators, "PBL as an instructional strategy creates the conditions

that optimize the retrieval and appropriate use of formal knowledge in future professional practice. It also increases students' motivation by programming them for success and by using an array of extrinsic and intrinsic motivational strategies".

Law, drawing on her culture of innovation and her commitment to infuse the teaching of thinking in the curriculum, readily reached a consensus to embark on the PBL journey in order to better equip our students for a world of dynamic change. In September 1999, Temasek Polytechnic's Senate approved *inter alia* Law's adoption of PBL for all substantive law subjects and a name change of the Diploma in Legal Studies to Diploma in Law & Management.

Reflections Enroute

Starting With The End In Mind

Law was able to move decisively into adopting PBL for all substantive law subjects because she started with the end or the educational objectives of the course in mind. At Law's retreat in December 1998, future challenges brought about by the accelerated rate of change in the legal industry driven by the Singapore Judiciary because of Information Technology and globalisation were discussed. With the entry of foreign law firms, legislation allowing for corporatisation of legal practice, the emergence of multi-disciplinary and group practices, the launch of legal portals and the prospects of e-lawyering, it was clear that the future could not be predicted except that it would be radically different. Scenario planning and envisioned strategies for different possible futures brought home the point that Law graduates needed to be fast, agile, adaptable and bold enough to embrace, pre-empt and even to lead change. Consequently students need to be equipped differently to face an uncertain future. It was in this context that Law decided to equip our students with independent, collaborative learning and creative problem-solving skills for an uncertain future. PBL was readily embraced as a means to achieve this end.

No One Right Way

To prepare for the journey into PBL, a survey was made of practices in other institutions around the world. Cruickshank (1996) has written about different models around the world. It appears from the different models practised by different institutions around the world that there was no one right way. Whether it was full curriculum, pure PBL model, or full curriculum, modified PBL model or partial curriculum PBL model, it appeared that each discipline and faculty had to find their own way and navigate their own journey into PBL. It also appeared that there were many issues and difficulties in implementation. This meant that there was a need for the implementation to be managed carefully and in a deliberate and considered manner.

Decisions Along The Way

Law had to make the following decisions:

- Should PBL be adopted for the entire curriculum or in part? If in part, which part?
- Should there be integration across subjects?
- How should PBL be implemented?

Having made the decision to adopt PBL, Law had to decide whether to adopt PBL for the entire curriculum or only in part. Student feedback on PBL in Legal Systems and Methods had shown that having subjects taught by the traditional lecture, tutorial method alongside PBL subjects saw students being extremely critical of PBL. Students preferred lectures and tutorials, as it did not require them to face the anxiety of trying to find a solution when they were not given the requisite knowledge. Students were also uncomfortable with not knowing if their answers were right or whether they were on the right track. They would have preferred lecturers to give them the answers. It would seem that having subjects using PBL and subjects taught with traditional lectures and tutorials would thwart the efforts of staff using PBL. Law decided that this should be avoided.

Boud and Feletti (1997) identified one misapplication of PBL which is that of establishing small elements of PBL in a context which rewards students for the kind of behaviour favoured in a traditional lecture-plus-examination environment. Law decided that PBL should not be implemented in a piecemeal approach in the Law curriculum.

Cruickshank (1996) pointed out that the disadvantage of using PBL as a full curriculum approach may lead to gaps in knowledge about substantive law subjects and may leave students short of rule-oriented knowledge in many subjects. Students must be equipped with sufficient knowledge and skills to function competently in a law office environment when they graduate. They must also be able to learn new legal knowledge and skills independently. Law decided that there must be a balance of the training in process skills with training in relevant and current legal knowledge and skills, or else students may not be able to meet industry's requirements when they graduate.

Cruickshank (1996) pointed out that as PBL draws on the experiences of learners, the experiences of a 17-year old might be a slim resource. Taking this into account and the fact that Year 1 is a transitional year when students adjust from life and study at secondary school to Polytechnic education, Law decided that Year 1 would be used to prepare the students for PBL in the subject Legal Systems and Methods. Full PBL implementation would only begin with all the substantive law subjects in Year 2.

The procedural law subjects were placed in Year 3, as it would be the final year of training before students graduate. REAL (Real Environment Active Learning), a method pioneered by Law for procedural law subjects, sought to simulate as far as possible the real world legal environment. Students have to work through various files in different areas of legal practice from the start till the file is completed. This includes correspondence and drafting of necessary documents for these different matters. Feedback from students and employers to Law's use of REAL (Real Environment Active Learning) to teach the students very practical skills-based procedural law subjects was that it was an effective way to prepare students for the real world of legal practice (Tan, 1998; Lim & Tan, 1999). The practical attachment at law firms and legal offices during their Student Internship Programme after Year 3 Semester 1 (Lee, 1998) built on the knowledge skills and attitudes learnt by the students using REAL. To ensure that students had the requisite knowledge of procedural law and drafting skills to ensure a minimum level of competence for professional para-legal practice, Law decided to retain REAL and introduce a modified form of PBL with REAL for Year 3 procedural law subjects.

In summary, Law adopted a partial curriculum PBL model.

The table below shows the progression of student learning over the three-year curriculum.

Table 2
Major Learning Stages in the Law Curriculum

Yr 1 Lectures & Tutorials <i>Transition year</i>	Yr 2 Substantive Law subjects using PBL	Yr 3 Sem 1 Procedural subjects using REAL + PBL	Student Internship Programme (SIP)	Yr 3 Sem 2 Procedural subjects using REAL + PBL
PBL introduced in Legal Systems & Methods	Learning how to learn independently & collaboratively using PBL	Learning procedural law in simulated legal practice environment	Learning in actual legal practice environment	Reinforcement of learning after SIP

The next question was “Should there be integration across subjects going PBL?” It was decided that since the real world saw problems spanning different areas of law, to mirror the real world, there should be integration of different substantive law subjects.

Crossing Traditional Boundaries

After deciding to adopt full PBL in Year 2, an implementation plan was drawn up. The Division was divided into 2 clusters according to the subjects in Semesters 1 & 2 of the Year 2 curriculum. This facilitated an integrated approach to the design of problems, the solution of which spanned different subject areas. This meant that academic staff used to being trained according to different branches of law had to cross these traditional boundaries and step into different areas of substantive law. Academic staff cannot be experts in only one area but need to be able to work with experts in other areas to collaboratively design problems that integrated different areas of the law. They also had to be able to coach and assess students in different areas of the law while facilitating the students through the PBL process.

Academic staff also had to shift from a teacher-centred to a student-centred role. Wilkerson and Gijsselaers (1996, p.103) summarise it as a movement from “sage-on-the-stage” to “guide-by-the-side”.

The PBL teacher must be comfortable at relinquishing authority and skilled at exerting indirect control through the selection of problems and the use of probing questions. He or she must become a skilled observer, able to determine when to intervene to terminate an unproductive aspect of the discussion, and when to allow a mistake to be followed to its illogical conclusion. The effective PBL teacher is attentive to the social and academic interactions among students and skilled in maximizing both the task and process aspects of group discussions. Finally, he or she can demonstrate problem-solving strategies predominant in the discipline without denying students the opportunity to practice using those strategies. Knowing how to

say “I don’t know” and acknowledging mistakes are critical skills for the role model in any discipline.

Journeying Together As A Community Of Practice

An academic staff may still not be confident to implement PBL after attending many training sessions if he or she does not take the risk in actual experimentation. Expertise is gained by putting into practice what one learns as well as reflecting and learning from that experience.

After being trained as a Division in various PBL workshops organized by the Temasek Centre for Problem-Based Learning in late 1999, Law “took the plunge into PBL implementation” together and formed a community of practice to reflect, share and learn from, as well as to review and evaluate the effectiveness of students’ learning using different approaches to PBL. “Unplugged” sessions, a bi-monthly meeting for sharing ideas, learning points and discussion of academic issues in the Law division provided a natural forum for staff sharing on PBL implementation.

Law also participates actively in Temasek Business School’s PBL task force. Formal and informal networks of practitioners are also being formed across schools at Temasek Polytechnic. The tacit knowledge gained from the experimentation of various teams when shared becomes explicit knowledge that can be accessed for the benefit of many others. Pitfalls can be avoided and best practices shared. The explicit knowledge made available to others in turn becomes impetus for more creative innovation in PBL implementation. These communities of practice also form the natural forum to raise and address pertinent issues arising from the implementation of PBL.

Preparing Potential Students

Law’s adoption of PBL was publicised to incoming students so that they would make an informed decision in choosing the Diploma. The principals of all secondary schools in Singapore were informed of the adoption of PBL in the Diploma in December 1999. The adoption of PBL was also included in all publicity materials and publicity efforts to potential students of the course. Materials were developed to prepare the students with the necessary skills before they embarked on PBL.

THE JOURNEY CONTINUES

Law has just begun her PBL journey. PBL efforts must be measured for their achievement of intended educational objectives. Whilst it is too early for research data on PBL in Law, it is encouraging to note Winsor’s (1997) report that students and members of review panels have signified approval of the worth of PBL in the College of Law, New South Wales. The College of Law which revamped its curriculum in 1995 found that once students are initiated into PBL, they enjoy the experience and tend to develop not only their legal but also interpersonal skills. It is also confident that results of further research will show that PBL is a good teaching/learning vehicle in the field of law. Evaluation studies need to be made as Law implements PBL.

PBL is intended as a vehicle to equip our students in independent, collaborative learning and creative problem-solving skills. It seeks to help students learn how to learn. Forgarty (1997)

is very clear that all the thinking skills infused in the curriculum and learned in the PBL process have as their end the intelligent classroom. Gardner's (1999) caution that Multiple Intelligences cannot be an end in themselves or serve as a goal for a school or an educational system, and that every educational institution must reflect on its goals, mission and purposes continuously is also instructive for PBL. Even if its end is the intelligent classroom, PBL cannot be the goal for Law in and of itself. Law's goal is to equip our students with the "7 I s" for a world of dynamic change. In the face of a future of accelerating changes in the 21st century, our students must not only be equipped as independent learners and creative problem-solvers, they must also be equipped to create and use knowledge to value-add, innovate and invent new products and solutions for hitherto unimagined problems of the future. It will be particularly challenging, however, to evaluate PBL for such longer-term outcomes (Boud & Feletti, 1997).

REFERENCES

- Boud D., & Feletti G. (Eds.). (1997). *The Challenge of Problem-Based Learning* 2nd Edition. London: Kogan Page.
- Bridges, E. M., & Hallinger P. (1995). *Implementing Problem Based Learning in Leadership Development*, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon.
- Bridges, E. M. (1992). *Problem Based Learning for Administrators*, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon.
- Cruickshank, D. A. (1996). Problem-Based Learning In Legal Education. In J. Webb & C. Maughan (Eds.), *Teaching Lawyers' Skills* London: Butterworths. (pp.187-239).
- Fogarty, R. (1997). *Problem-Based Learning and Other Curriculum Models for the Multiple Intelligences Classroom*. Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight Training and Publishing, Inc.
- Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence Reframed: Multiple Intelligences For The 21st Century*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lee, Y. S., & Keay-William, L. (1998). *The Work-Related Curriculum: A Student Internship Programme in the Singapore Context*. Paper presented at Higher Education Research & Development Society of Australasia Conference, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Leong, E. S. F. (1999). *Concept Mapping in Law of Real Property*. Paper presented at Higher Education Research & Development Society of Australasia Conference, Melbourne.
- Lim, C. (1999) *Bringing the Workplace to our Classrooms - A Study of the Real Environment Active Learning Project in Conveyancing Practice*. Paper presented at the Temasek Polytechnic Annual Staff Development Conference, Singapore.
- Lim, C., & Tan, K. (1999) *Workplace Practices - A Cornerstone to Effective Learning?* Paper presented at Higher Education Research & Development Society of Australasia Conference, HERDSA, Melbourne, Australia
- Looi, K. P. (1998). *Technology in the Courtroom: Obtaining or Producing Graphics and Animation for Use in Court Hearings*. Paper presented at the Technology in the Courtroom - Perspectives From the Bench & the Bar and the Courts Seminar, Singapore.
- Moust, J. H. C. (1998). The Problem-Based Education Approach at the Maastricht Law School. *The Law Teacher, Journal of the Association of Law Teachers*, 32, 5-36.
- Perkins, D. (1995). *Smart Schools: Better Thinking and Learning for Every Child*, New York: The Free Press.
- Tan, K. (1998). *Real Environment Active Learning: Optimising Active Learning by Replicating Actual Environments of the Workplace*. Paper presented at the Temasek Polytechnic Annual Staff Development Conference, Singapore.

- Tishman, S., Perkins, D. N., & Jay, E. (1995). *The Thinking Classroom: Learning and Teaching in a Culture of Thinking*. Needman Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wilkerson, L., & Gijsselaers, W.H. (Eds.). (1996). *Bringing Problem-Based Learning to Higher Education: Theory and Practice*, 68, Winter, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Winsor K. (1997). Applying Problem-based Learning to Practical Legal Training. In D. Boud & G. Feletti (Eds.), *The Challenge of Problem-Based Learning* 2nd Edition (pp. 224-232). London: Kogan Page.