

arguments for both sides should be evenly balanced. In the preparation for the moot, students learn the skills of problem solving, legal analysis and legal reasoning. One major advantage of a moot is that students can be questioned on their responses and so they require a real knowledge of the law. They also have to develop a strategy and oral communication skills.

It is useful for students to submit a summary of their arguments the day before the moot, thus allowing opposing counsel legitimately to question the arguments and get a taste for court procedures. The moot marking sheet is provided to students in advance at Bond and followed up by formal instruction on mooting by highlighting the assessment criteria. Dialogue between the bench and the student allows the higher level skills of analysis and evaluation rather than the lower skills, such as knowledge, to be assessed. Feedback should aim to reinforce appropriate behaviour as well as point out errors and students usually learn much from listening to the assessment of peers. Videotaping moots has been found to be useful because self-analysis has proven to be a very effective form of feedback. Mooting programs take no more time than setting and marking assignments as four students can moot and be assessed in an hour. Local practitioners could also be used as members of the bench.

In the face of the increasing demand upon tax professionals to provide comprehensive value-added service to their clients, they should be given the best opportunities to acquire the skills they will need in practice. Many of these skills are also those required in a moot.

TEACHERS

The integration of teaching and research in the law department

D Oliver

30 *Law Teacher* 2, 1996, pp 133–149

The author's purpose in the article is to examine the evidence about the relationship between the activities of teaching and research in law and the advantages and disadvantages of combining the two. This question is examined from the point of view of those law teaching departments which may not be eligible for the U.K.'s Higher Education Funding Council (HEFCE) funding for research. It is widely agreed that the HEFCE prefers to fund research that simply keeps up with the cases and statutes of the day.

The orthodox view on the combination of research and teaching is that the two are mutually beneficial. Nonetheless, this generally accepted wisdom has been challenged. However, there does appear to be evidence that the two activities do enhance one another, at least in relation to legal research, but it is also clear that good teaching can take place in departments with little or no research activity.

A quick survey of law teachers on this matter revealed several reasons why teaching and researching should be kept together. The experience of explaining concepts leads to a deeper appreciation of them and allows clarification of thought on the subject. Teaching keeps researchers up to date with a wider view of the subject and maintains the researcher's critical faculties. Students may be able to offer critical insight into areas of

research, especially LLM students. Research assists teaching by generating primary source material and original insights into the subject. Research leads to the introduction of new courses and the research activity of teachers helps to shape students' attitudes to scholarship generally.

There are, however, disadvantages in combining the two. In particular, time pressures can cause staff faculty to devote less effort to teaching and researchers may assume that students have a greater background than they actually do by neglecting to teach the basics and imposing too great a workload on their students. Researchers may communicate the view to their students that teaching is an inferior activity to research and distracts them from their real work.

Whilst the cuts to HEFCE funding will affect the amount and type of research conducted in many law departments, it is wrong to assume that no research activity will be conducted in them. It is possible to conduct research in law cheaply compared with other disciplines. A difficulty in such low-funded departments is that staff may become demotivated and their teaching suffer. Conversely, the pressure to conduct meaningful research may relieve some staff of stress, thereby increasing staff morale and allowing greater time to be spent concentrating on teaching. There is no possibility that any government will ever return to the old position of providing research funding to all universities.

Good teaching and good research do not simply happen and the two must be well managed. The institutional ethos must support their co-

to be more responsible for their own learning. Consumer culture in education has made students overly dependent on tutors and there is a general agreement in the literature that teaching methods focus on student learning, rather than the teaching activities of tutors. Accordingly, teachers should seek to ensure that learning experiences of students are active and not passive. For this type of active learning students do not require a high number of contact hours, but quality contact hours. However, getting students to change will not solve many of the problems associated with the integration of teaching and research. Researchers need to learn how to manage their own research activity, possibly by developing short, medium and long term research plans.

The author gives a detailed description of a hypothetical law school containing staff with a flair for research and little desire to teach and vice-versa, with across the board expectations from the law school in terms of research output and teaching responsibilities. An action plan for this hypothetical law school is postulated, where the particular talents of the staff are exploited. Students are to be encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning. For the plan to succeed all staff must be committed to the objectives.

TEACHING METHODS & MEDIA

All I ever needed to know about teaching law school I learned teaching kindergarten: introducing gaming techniques into the law school classroom

J L Rosato

45 *J Legal Ed* 4, December 1995, pp 568–581

Law teachers generally have not sought techniques from educators outside of law schools. In the law school environment, gaming has been primarily limited to clinical legal education, but there are potential benefits to students, such as increased motivation and confidence, improved cognitive ability and greater learning co-operation between students, which justify its inclusion in the broader curriculum.

Creating a game requires an initial investment of time spent in defining educational objectives in terms of subject matter and process (skills and values), and then designing, preparing, playing and modifying the game. Different kinds of games satisfy different objectives. Role plays satisfy process objectives, such as building skills in litigation and communication by requiring students to be lawyers and judges. Game shows are better suited to review legal doctrine and to test the students' comprehension of information in a problem-solving context.

The design of the game should satisfy the educational objectives which have been decided on, be easy to play, and contain opportunities for positive reinforcement. If the game is well-designed, little preparation will be

required. Using a format from an existing game is easier than developing your own because everyone has an idea how to play, while even an existing game will require some modification for a large classroom. Consider whether the contestants will be chosen by volunteering or being called on, whether the participants will play individually or in teams with or without conferring, how long the students will have to answer questions, how many students will be permitted to participate, how credit for answers will be allotted and what rules will ensure that the educational objectives of the game are achieved with the least amount of chaos. The game should be evaluated and modified shortly after it is played either by an evaluation by the teacher or a class debriefing and discussion session held afterwards.

Role plays are effective ways to teach doctrine, skills and values within the traditional law school curriculum. They not only test the students' legal analysis and reasoning, but also develop essential lawyering skills in context. Students get a sense of how lawyers gather facts and develop an argument, how judges decide cases, how lawyers advise clients.

Gaming can be an effective way to accomplish your educational objectives. Any loss of course coverage is outweighed by the depth of understanding of the subject matter which the students will attain and by the development of essential skills and values. Students enjoy gaming and the enthusiasm generated in one class can affect the rest of the curriculum. More students will be involved in the