include the number of active attorneys, the year of adoption, number of hours required and the source of the MCLE rule. We are also given the reporting method and date, the provisions for exemptions from compliance and whether credits can be carried over from year to year.

There is also a section on how compliance is enforced. This outlines how delinquents are identified, including the keeping of attendance records and whether they are audited, as well as the specific features of the disciplinary proceedings that may be taken. It also contains a description of the accreditation requirements to be undergone by providers before MCLE credit can be claimed for their courses.

Obviously, there are considerable variations among the states about precisely what are the activities beyond course attendance in which the attorney can engage that attract MCLE credit. A summary table deals with credits for teaching, writing, the use of audio and videotape, computer-based education, in-house training and for other activities, as well as earning credits for special requirements such as ethics instruction.

As far as the mechanics of course accreditation in each of the states is concerned, there is a section on whether a formal accreditation application is required and such administrative details as the submission date, who should submit, whether course materials and program evaluation forms need to be supplied, whether there is an application fee, whether the course has to be formally presented and whether an attendance list is required. Fortunately, most states have adopted standardised forms and copies of a *Uniform application for accreditation of continuing legal education* form and a *Uniform certificate of attendance* form are provided.

Although the coverage appears to be both comprehensive and accurate, so far as the reader can judge, there are a couple of MCLE features which have not been clearly chronicled. For example, there are some states which have separate and distinct MCLE requirements for recently admitted practitioners, which appear not to have been described. Moreover, to the extent that states have established schemes for accrediting specialists in specific areas of practice, there will usually be a prescribed MCLE element for candidates for specialist accreditation, on which this publication is also silent. To avoid unnecessary duplication in the interests of harmonising the accreditation procedures, it is a pity that there appears to be no provision for lodging the standard application once, rather than in each individual state.

The final section presents an international supplement which lists the limited MCLE prescription in other countries. It is noteworthy that, despite the increasing popularity in the United States of mandating learning for practising attorneys, the 'MCLE movement' has enjoyed far less appeal elsewhere. Indeed, the authors seem to be claiming that they have only identified four countries or states where a comprehensive MCLE scheme is in operation: Australia (New South Wales); England (Worcestershire); the Netherlands; and Scotland, although they do not mention that there are specific MCLE requirements in England and Wales for newly admitted solicitors.

For CLE providers in the United States this book must be an invaluable resource. With conflicting MCLE requirements in different states, it could be a nighmare if you were trying to run, for example, a national conference attracting attorneys from around the country, particularly in taking the necessary steps to ensure that all participants would be entitled to claim MCLE credit for their attendance in their home state. However, it is also of considerable interest to those jurisdictions outside the US contemplating the design of their own MCLE schemes. They will be able to delve into this comprehensive summary of the main characteristics of the various American MCLE rules in order to see how others have approached these questions in order to assist with the formulation of a scheme relevant to their own needs.

Editor

TEACHING METHODS & MEDIA

Looking for Leviathan: students embrace and resist co-operative norms in prisoners' dilemma game
N Razook
32 *Law Teacher* 2, 1998, pp 157–168

As an experiential device to teach students how law and law-related concepts are tied to human behaviour, the Prisoners' Dilemma is a powerful learning tool. The game's essential elements, choice, responsibility, trust, deceit and even compacts, backed by either 'a formidable Leviathan' or some lesser force, allow students to exhibit and experience a variety of behaviours that underlie legal and extra-legal concepts.

In Prisoners' Dilemma, each of the teams has to make a choice between strategy A or B and match that choice against the choice of another team. Cloaked with the information provided by simple rules, each team makes a choice and communicates this choice to a neutral player to determine its payoff based on the choice of its matched team. The object of the game is to gain as many positive points as possible. Both teams can win; both can lose; or one team can win while the other loses.

The teams play the game through three 'game series'. In Series One, teams are ignorant of their matched partner. During Series Two, teams are told their matched partner but are unable to

negotiate. In Series Three, teams both know their partner and are able to forge deals.

The rationale for separate rules for each of the three Game Series is to approximate three different behavioural and interactive possibilities that might provoke legal questions. Series One seeks to illustrate those rather random occurrences, such as motor vehicle accidents in which an unanticipated event inspires the parties to react to legal issues. The working hypothesis stemming from such occurrences is that the parties will initially embrace competitive postures because they neither know each other nor have the opportunity to negotiate the rights and liabilities arising from the accident.

Series Two illustrates those cases in which parties have a working knowledge of their partner or adversary but for which *ex ante* allocation of rights and liabilities has not been fleshed out, at least in so far as it applies to the issue at hand. Examples here include many product liability actions and at will employee-employer relations. Series Three illustrates those cases in which *ex ante* allocation of rights and liabilities through explicit agreements (contracts) can influence prisoners' dilemma-type outcomes. By their nature, contracts both reward and enforce co-operation. However, their legal effectiveness depends upon the presence of a strong regime of contract enforcement.

After several rounds in Series One, a 'race-to-the-bottom', in which every team chose the dominant strategy and lost three points for each round became the norm. Overcoming this norm proved to be difficult. Students concluded that they were operating in a 'stage of nature'. The teams' most compelling question arising from The Game was why people ever chose to co-operate in prisoners' dilemma-type situations. Only a formidable Leviathan — an enforceable regime of contract rules, for example — might provide any assurance that mutually co-operative agreements will survive such a dilemma. Without this Leviathan, the incentive for a contracting party to defect is simply too strong.

The teams chose to elect captains to represent them in an inter-team conference intended to establish both co-operative norms and sanctions for defecting teams. The product of these discussions was a 'social contract' in which each team agreed to play A, except in those cases in which a team was matched with a defecting team from a previous round, in which case the team matched with the defector had to play B. This fragile arrangement encouraged wholesale co-operation for the final three rounds of Series One but collapsed early in Series Two when a team defected.

In general, students honoured their social contract. After the defection, the other teams attempted to punish the defecting team while maintaining co-operation among themselves.

It was essential to assign grade points to The Game so that students would view it as something more than a protracted, risk-free exercise. At least 20 minutes of each of the last four classes were allotted to a thorough discussion of The Game and its learning value. The student course evaluations and their comments about The Game were uniformly positive.

A prisoners' dilemma game offers students a rich and fascinating environment in which to experience the ways that human behaviour affects formal and informal norms. Students may or may not overcome their own self-interest in favour of jointly maximising outcomes or co-operate without an omniscient Leviathan. The lessons they may learn, notwithstanding the game's outcome, illustrate a good deal about the legal and extra-legal environment in which we live.

Meeting procedure: a vehicle to better teach Corporations Law and a professional legal skill
M Tzannes & P King
15 *J Prof L Educ* 2, 1997, pp 123–136

Many students experience some difficulty when they come to study Corporations Law. Conceptually it is difficult for them to bridge the gap between what a natural person can do and what a corporation must do in order to carry out the same function. It is difficult, given the students' vacuum of commercial experience, to convey the restrictions placed upon both corporations and those who manage their affairs merely by attempting to transfer this knowledge intellectually in the form of lectures and tutorials. This approach tends to result in graduates who are static in their learning and professional development because as students they were merely taught rules which only had a limited shelf life.

Professional courses are concerned primarily with the application of rules, as contrasted to academic courses which are concerned, among other things, with attempting to understand and criticise rules. Traditionally, practical legal training (PLT) courses have tended to utilise simulation. In relation to Corporations Law, this approach has resulted in requiring students to undertake common tasks normally associated with this area of legal practice. This form of simulation is a common teaching and learning strategy used by many law schools and PLT institutions.

The Faculty of Law at the University of Western Sydney considered these educational problems when designing its new course in Corporations Law. The university integrates skills teaching into the academic component of the course in every compulsory core subject. In each subject a key practical skill is identified and it becomes the subject of instruction and assessment. As a sound