

The Models of Legal Education: Implication for Saudi Arabia

Awad Ali Alanzi 


Assistant Professor, Department of Law, College of Business Administration, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia.
Email: a.alwitheri@psau.edu.sa



Abstract

The model of any type of education is very important for learning and every type of learning requires a different approach. This research explores the Socratic method, the Case Method, the Problem-Based Method, Clinical Legal Education and Lecture Approach for legal education. It also discusses the merits and demerits of each educational model in the legal education context. It was observed that all teaching methods were complementary to each another and that legal education requires a mix of all as per the subject matter and resource-availability of education institutions. This research also identified the legal education model in Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia predominately adopted the lecture approach due to historical dependence on French-educated Egyptian professors. The lecture approach is very traditional and has more demerits as compared to merits with rote learning. Therefore, we suggest the Kingdom use a mixed approach for legal education for maximum advantage.

Keywords: Legal education, Case method, Problem-based method, Clinical legal education, Lecture approach, Socratic method.

Citation | Awad Ali Alanzi (2020). The Models of Legal Education: Implication for Saudi Arabia. Journal of Education and e-Learning Research, 7(3): 235-241.
History:
Received: 7 May 2020
Revised: 19 June 2020
Accepted: 21 July 2020
Published: 30 July 2020
Licensed: This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License](#) 
Publisher: Asian Online Journal Publishing Group

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.
Competing Interests: The author declares that there are no conflicts of interests regarding the publication of this paper.
Transparency: The author confirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study was reported; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.
Ethical: This study follows all ethical practices during writing.

Contents

1. Introduction	236
2. Methods of Legal Education in Law Schools	236
3. The Most Common Methods of Legal Instruction	236
4. Considerations for Improving the Legal Education	239
5. Conclusions	240
References	241

Contribution of this paper to the literature

This study contributes to the existing literature by identifying the legal education model for Saudi Arabia.

1. Introduction

In recent years, several studies have been conducted by various government and educational organizations to determine the causative factors undermining the graduation success rate of the various law schools (Jennison, 2013). These studies have also been conducted in Saudi Arabia. The results have given cause to the more progressive educators to suggest new methods and curricula for the programs. However, despite these efforts, the law schools themselves remain locked in what they see as a time-honored, traditional form of education structured around more archaic formats such as lecture presentations without student interaction (Campbell, 2016).

In the rapidly changing world of the 21st century, law students in schools all over the world are demanding programs that challenge not only their learning abilities but also their cognitive abilities. They seek the art of the legal argument, the essential component that makes an excellent attorney. The only way they can attain their goal is to learn, study, read, listen, ask questions, and challenge themselves and their teachers. Law schools and their instructional staff must cease clinging to past methodologies and open their minds to new variants. The change should begin with the pre-eminent practice of lectures. The schools need to level the educational field by not eliminating the lectures, but by making them more interactive. By doing this, it will allow students to ask questions and challenge the lecturer (Campbell, 2016).

While international influences drive the impetus for improving the Saudi legal education systems, the primary goal is to enhance the overall legal structure of the Kingdom to serve the populace at large. To accomplish this, educators should require modern educational tools such as communications, electronics, and audio-visual equipment for the classrooms. The most important tool is the well-prepared educator, who must be willing to challenge and be challenged for his students to learn. Considerable thought must be given to the school curricula and syllabi to better train the law students in their field of interest such as commercial, civil, international or other categories of law as well. This would involve establishing a basic law course coupled with relevant electives for each specific area of law. The ultimate intent will be to provide qualified legal professionals for all areas of national and international law.

The emphasis of this study will not be on supplanting the present Saudi Arabian legal educational system with an entirely new one, but rather on refining and supplementing it to meet the challenges of the 21st century. The primary goal is to upgrade the legal knowledge and skills of graduates to meet modern standards and prepare them to take their place in the Kingdom as representatives of the new national and international legal profession.

2. Methods of Legal Education in Law Schools

Legal education is taught by various methods, and the technique applied is often dependent more upon the teacher than on the subject matter. Professors in institutes of higher education and tertiary institutions should trust unique content delivery methodologies. Often the approaches applied by professors range from the Socratic to the clinical model with variants or additions of the case study approach, problem-solving, role-playing, and many other models. The characteristics of some of these methods may slightly overlap but each in its way is useful in achieving its specific objectives (Strevens, Grimes, & Phillips, 2016). However, other factors affect the success of each methodology. This is especially true in the relationship among the student, the professor, and other students. Legal instruction often entails the sharing of opinions and argument rationale, hence the importance of relationships. This research investigated and discussed some of the instructional methodologies, in the context in which they occur and their effectiveness in circumstances where they have been practiced (Sultany, 2018).

3. The Most Common Methods of Legal Instruction

Legal education has evolved from the training by orators in ancient Rome to educating by social scientists in the 21st century. However, it was not until the Middle Ages that European jurists labored to draft rules aimed at protecting the discriminatory interests in service to the nobility once taught throughout the civilized world. Some might find it more appropriate to refer to the Middle Ages as the age of re-establishing special privileges and protections for the territorial legal enclaves of the aristocracy (Melchionna, 2010). In this diverse world, the two most dynamic systems are the Roman-Germanic and the Anglo-American (Hanson, 1987). For that reason, the contemporary legal educational practices of the world are generally bound by this diversity. It is the by-product of the progressive contemporary revolution of instant global communication between nations and the continuous exchange of ideas and knowledge. Our world is steadily growing smaller making comprehensive legal systems more easily accessible to globalization's influence. Legal services are regularly exchanged at international levels which even the most conservative recognize as significant (Schiller, 2012).

Currently, in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA), the process of globalization of the legal education programs requires the understanding that there is a definitive need to reconcile the past evolution of law with a vision of global education for a better future. Once accomplished, the overall effect would rapidly open new paths allowing for the expansion of legal education throughout the Kingdom, and the world. For a non-Saudi to understand the principles behind established policies, it must be known that a primary prerequisite for entering a law school within the Kingdom centers on national regulations which control the operations of high education institutions and domestic legal markets. In the beginning in the early 20th century, American law schools began to propagate a global influence of legal education methodologies by admitting international students which in turn became exporters of the main features of American law (Melchionna, 2010).

The beneficial significance of being able to share ideas is an invaluable tool in the stimulation of critical thinking (Strevens et al., 2016). It also encourages active participation and discourages passivity. Discussions may reveal the student's weaknesses in general theory and may also be helpful as an assessment tool for student performance levels. This procedure needs effective regulation by the professor as they may lose control and fail to

cover the learning objectives satisfactorily. The case study approach is also another standard legal study methodology that is uniquely practiced in the US. It has its origins in England during pre-colonial times through apprenticeship under already established legal professionals (Strevens et al., 2016). The case method involves the scrutiny and analysis of various past cases, as they are deemed relevant in a particular legal area. These cases are established precedents and can be used to offer insight on how specific legal questions and procedures should be treated. This method is also often accompanied by discussions on the cases to spur critical thinking among the legal students. This method has English roots and continues being common in many European countries such as France and the UK, as well as the U.S (Schwartz, Hess, & Sparrow, 2014).

Another educational approach often applied is the problem-based approach. This method is standard in Germany and in Japan whose systems draw tremendous influence from the Germans whereby the emphasis is not merely on the application of legal statutes, but on reasoning out of the case based on the circumstances. In this approach, the students are trained using legal problems, whereby instead of being fed information and then being tested using issues later, the process is reversed. The teaching is done using arguments in such a way that the students can work their way out towards solutions (Strevens et al., 2016). The students are often asked to engage in mock court proceedings with the lecturer as the judge and the other students as the jury. It is one of the practical parts of legal training where real-life situations can often be successfully simulated and used by the lecturer to teach the students. The method is also applied in legal education programs in many other countries, including the US, Canada, England, and Germany (Katz & O'Neill, 2009).

The fifth method is the use of legal clinics. Legal clinics are used as a technique at the advanced learning stages. They are usually legal practices that are often established under the legal studies department of a higher learning institution. These legal practices are then operated by the law students who take pro-bono cases and offer other legal solutions to the community for free. In the process of their training during a legal clinic, a student can interact with the real world and gain practical experience in different aspects of the legal profession. At this point, the students are usually working as apprentices under the head of the legal clinic who is often a registered legal practitioner. It is a common instructional technique in the American and Canadian colleges and universities offering legal programs. In France, apprenticeship is also practiced, which is similar to legal clinics (Gane & Guang, 2017).

3.1. The Socratic Method

In America (U.S.), the Socratic, Case, and Problem methods are the most common legal training approaches. Of the three, the Socratic Method is frequently considered to be the ideal method. In the Socratic method, students are required to discuss legal issues while the professor interacts with them in such a way that he does not reveal an opinion, allowing the students to think and analyze questions for themselves. Traditionally, U.S. universities often administered one examination to be taken at the end of a course. However, in response to a rising need for professionalism in legal practice, better testing techniques have been adopted whereby tests are administered periodically throughout the length of the course (Sheppard, 2007).

The Problem method is conventional and frequently combined with other methods such as the Socratic. It is an educational technique that teaches the ability to learn from a particular scenario. It is designed to present students with both real and simulated case problems in the hopes of stimulating them to exercise their legal knowledge. The problem-based approach has also been proven to be effective in compelling students to study widely different issues and learn to proficiently research topics to understand better and employ information obtained through lectures and assignments. Often, the student is presented with problems they may not be able to solve at their current level of proficiency thereby forcing them to seek to improve their knowledge through all available resources, including meeting with professors (Sultany, 2018).

3.2. The Case Method Model

Although it is often less commonly used in schools as compared to the Socratic or Case-Dialogue methods, the case method is arguably one of the primary modes of teaching law in America. In many cases, it is applied along with the Socratic method when used in the discussion, analysis, and arguments of cited historical cases. The case method entails the study and analysis of original judicial proceedings and decisions to understand the legal framework. It is used in many countries for legal training systems, including the U.S., Canada, UK and France. The case method is also useful in allowing the students to mentally visualize a hypothetical situation whereby they analyze the case from different legal standpoints of the parties involved in the case (Sheppard, 2007).

One of the distinct advantages of this method is that it employs actual historical cases to illustrate and demonstrate specific legal principles and applications. It is, therefore, one of the most relevant means of delivery. Additionally, when applied to its maximum, case law study actively engages the students' minds by encouraging them to create an effective argument and interact with a realistic view of the legal framework (Sheppard, 2007). In turn, the method enhances the understanding and retention of legal knowledge and the student's ability to prepare and present sound legal arguments. Cases are also useful reference points during problem solutions, as they are past precedents. One of the disadvantages of this method is that it is difficult to analyze all the cases that have been through the courts. Thus, some relevancy that would have been more useful in the illustration of a concept may be left out. Some of the cases may be too old to be studied (Katz & O'Neill, 2009). The case method also puts the students under tremendous pressure since it involves full reading and students have to learn a significant amount of content to pass the examination.

3.3. The Problem-Based Method

Generally, law courses are taught through the case method, while professors work to engage students in the process of education by analyzing and studying a series of court decisions and guide them on how a judge comes to a decision (Arnow-Richman, 2013). While the case study method remains the signature pedagogy style of instruction in law schools, the problem-based method is becoming an attractive model to legal educators in many facilities (Admiraal, Wubbels, & Pilot, 1999). In traditional legal education, problems employed by professors as

hypotheticals or real examples to examine the students' engagement in the class and to encourage them to interact with the professor. Some law professors use problems as capstone exercises. When coupled with the Socratic method, the students are better prepared for the final examinations, and ultimately the courtroom. The problem method is also a good tool for summing up provided material (Arnow-Richman, 2013).

The case-dialogue instructional model was found to improve the lecture-textbook method of teaching and assisting students in perfecting their analytical skills and articulating perceptions of the rules of law and judges' policy considerations (Hawkins-León, 1998). The problem method does not ignore cases, statutes and law codes (Morgan, 1998). Law professors focus on the lecture format and providing the student with an applicable study of cases for homework assignments, although there is some freedom for other teaching methods (Admiraal et al., 1999). To be an effective method, the professor must use a complex problem that includes several issues and statutes but the core of the problem-based method is the class discussions (Hawkins-León, 1998).

The primary merit of the problem-based system is when the class is working on provided situations, they deconstruct and analyze the problems (Grimes, 2015). There is a linkage between teaching by using the problem method and the case method, while students are focusing on task grades, the law professors' task is to bring the student's thinking closer to a practical lawyer. To ensure the eligibility of law professors teaching law and to achieve its goals, the law professors use more strong motivations to engage students in the class objectives and raise their performance in general. By using varieties and alternative training methods, the law professors are able to test the full breadth of students' knowledge, enhancing the effectiveness of the legal education. The problem-based method depends on the situation of pretending client problems with extensive use.

3.4. Clinical Legal Education

The fundamental understanding of the law and personal deportment are the significant objectives of law schools. Law school graduates must be accomplished to engage in to achieve maximum professionalism (Stuckey, 2007). While criticism arose concerning the potential omission of the traditional model of legal education which concentrates on the analytical skill in the preparation of students for law practice, there remained a severe lack of efficient and effective practical training, most specifically preparation and presentation of the argument. To improve the path of legal education, and to respond to students' desire to learn how to use the law, the educators and law professors worked to find a new model that would not only work well with the traditional training but also complement the overall course curriculum and satisfy the vast majority of educators. Globally, the first proposal of the clinical education in law schools was by a Russian professor Alexander Lyublinsky in early 1901, which was sixteen years before the earliest proposals for clinics appeared in the United States (Wilson, 2004). He was fortunate enough to realize his belief when he was able to introduce clinical legal education to law schools. Its unique ability is to integrate the practical skills and law education, thus providing an opportunity for interdisciplinary education (Duquette, 1997).

Today, the clinical legal education method has grown and spread among law schools throughout the world. However, around the world, some legal education systems have not been enthusiastic about applying the clinical education model. There is remains a dedication to the archaic forms of traditional learning paradigm as the best methods of legal education.

Unfortunately, the Saudi Arabian culture of legal education has adhered to the old style of legal education within law schools regarding the analytical technique of clinical legal education, but correspondingly begin to internalize the integrity, competence and clients' incumbent on a professional attorney (Babich, 2007). Therefore, with the clinical legal education model, students gain an ideal education under a private attorney who is licensed to practice. Students also obtain a significant chance to integrate their academic life with the reality of the legal profession to better recognize and adapt to the practice and implementation of the law. It is this type of educational methodology that provides a practical experience under the direct supervision of legal professionals before taking the bar examinations.

The legal clinic students, under the guidance of a licensed lawyer, would engage in pro-bono representation of persons from different socio-economic status than their own who seek assistance with various of legal issues. It is this type of exposure that may motivate them to give attention to the public interest and service of the community (Wilson, 2004). However, the legal services provided to clients create innovative training for students to recognize approaches to interaction and service to clients while applying the tenets of appropriate professional ethical standards and values learned in school and required by the legal institutions.

The real value of participating in legal clinics would not immediately be realized by all students. There will be those students who will criticize having to donate their time and effort to the less fortunate. Unfortunately for them, it will be their loss as there is educational value in learning by doing. When coupled with the provision of legal services, law schools' curricula provide substantially more reflective experiential training for future legal practice. Thus, the experience that cannot be made available in traditional education also cannot create a reflective and public-minded legal professional in the future (Wilson, 2004).

In the American legal education curricula, the practice of pro-bono clinical legal education has become firmly entrenched. The schools have constructed their course syllabi and curriculum relying on legal clinic experiences to be a valuable tool. In their pursuit of quantifiable educational opportunities for their students, American law schools have attempted to design and construct the perfect combination of clinical and classroom education programs for developing practical competency, and increasingly expecting them to be educationally disciplined and focused. The highest standards of ethics and professionalism should be adhered to within law schools (Joy, 2003). Law schools in various countries appear to lack knowledge similar to those in American law schools. Additionally, the culture of the legal system and society in some countries has placed stringent restrictions on the disclosure of case information. The governments are rarely willing to commit funds for the development of clinical education when facing seemingly insurmountable demands on their meager budgets. While some law schools have drawn from indigenous sources to create effective clinical programs, most of the new clinical programs started internationally are begun with funding from foreign donors (Wilson, 2004).

3.5. Lecture Method

This method verbally presents facts to students required to take notes but not allowed to ask questions (Elizabeth & Major, 2018). Lecturing is the actual physical act of presenting information to students, and while it may be common in legal education, employing it as the singular mode of information delivery is often discouraged. There are many reasons for this the prime of which is lecturing is a one-way street of knowledge. At present, law schools such as those in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia tend to cling to the lecture method as a long-established and time-honored system of instruction. The typical scenario of a lecture lesson is the professor or lecturer stands in front of the classroom facing the students and delivers his lecture. He may do it with visual aids or handouts but what he does not do is interact with his students. There is no question and answer process during the lecture, not after. The students are expected to be respectful, pay attention, and take copious notes, but they are not allowed to ask questions (Katz & O'Neill, 2009).

Although the lecture method is a vital tool in the education process, especially during the first years of legal studies, when students are introduced to the law they can also have drawbacks such as being uninspiring to the students. Lectures are also often used when the tutor needs to give explanations of various legal concepts. Lecturing is a conventional technique, practiced in the UK, France, U.S., Arabic countries such as Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar, and the UAE, and in China, Singapore, and Japan (Gane & Guang, 2017). The lecture method has various advantages, the first of which is its cost-effectiveness. It is one of the least expensive methods of legal education. Lecturing assists students to develop their active listening skills, which are paramount for any lawyer. Lectures can also be carried out without any supplementary learning materials or a particular setting. The lecturer usually has organized the material for the student before the lecture (Schwartz et al., 2014). Lectures typically involve the oral presentation of one person, the lecturer to many, the students. There is no argument as to the value of the lecture; they do save resources and usually cover extensive amounts of information in each session.

A distinct disadvantage is that students may find it hard to concentrate. Lecturing should, thus, be accompanied by other techniques of legal instruction such as audio/visual and handouts, to maximize effectiveness (Katz & O'Neill, 2009). Students may sometimes miss out on some of the information communicated due to inefficient note-taking skills or the inability to keep up with the lecturer's pace. Any possible clarification may also not necessarily be accessible to obtain as in most cases; questions are customarily asked at the end of the lecture session, but only if the lecturer remains available after class. This method is considered a general weakness in legal education due to its inability to impart both the knowledge and skill sets that lawyers need. The over-reliance on this method with its dependency on the inadequate delivery of much-needed information required to meet the aspirations and demands of promising new legal practitioners in the Kingdom.

Proper educational methods have evolved significantly over the last few centuries. Once the lecture method was common in legal training in law schools throughout the European countries and the United States. However, after the adoption of the case method, it declined in use. The decline is attributed to the fact that it does not stimulate students during the lesson, as it fails to grab and hold their attention when the professor only lectures. More importantly, the lack of interaction between professor and students hurts both (Hazard, 1951). Currently, the most dominant educational strategy employed in legal education is the Socratic method, which is similar to a lecture, and the case study technique. The role-playing method is also used, and the legal clinics always assist the student in entering actual legal practice (Gane & Guang, 2017).

Conclusively, it should be noted that teaching techniques interrelate with each other, and it is almost impossible to teach using one specific method while avoiding all others. All approaches are, therefore, essential, as they complement one another. Nevertheless, the teaching methodology used is usually based on two factors; the lecturer's choice or personality, and the nature of the material that the students should learn. A good example can be seen for legal Arab learning institutions to integrate the Arabs' way of teaching with western cultures of legal teaching. While most Arabs' higher learning institutions are slowly changing their technique to cope with the increased demand for quality law graduates. However, it seems to be without keeping up with the development in terms of speed and quality.

4. Considerations for Improving the Legal Education

In the late 20th and early 21st-century legal education programs began an explosive expansion around the world that significantly altered the identity and objectives of learning law. In the typical modern format of legal education, a professional training model has separately prevailed over the more traditional professional education and the apprenticeship model of training. For example, modern American law schools offer a 3-year post-graduate law degree with the goal of focusing on the application of the relevant academic knowledge required to practice law (McMorrow, 2009). It has become a trend-setter that law schools in many other countries have attempted to emulate by reforming in legal education (Kim, 2012).

Unlike the American legal education system, the Saudi Arabian legal instructional model is not entirely expected to train practicing attorneys. It strives towards goals leading to generations of law graduates to be better at understanding theories and principles of law but not to become critical thinkers. In fact, the current legal system reflects the realities of Saudi Arabia and its singular goals of addressing domestic public interest and culture. However, rather than being invested in the global legal experience and taking advantage of integrating a new legal education model that will best suit its present, and more importantly, future legal market needs, the legal education authorities have chosen the old path. This attitude is demonstrated in current law school curriculum and syllabi designed to include classes on study skills, law, and non-law subjects. However, what the Saudi model of education has been adopting in law classrooms is exclusively the lecture method. Unfortunately, it is becoming evident that the lecture method alone does not offer the critical thinking skills required of lawyers in the 21st century.

The teaching of law courses in Saudi Arabia has consistently relied solely on the lecture model of instruction while refusing to address much-needed changes. Legal education appears to be decisively outdated, and its old folder of approaches is restrictively inefficient and insufficient for today's law students. It has become increasingly evident that for law students to be successful in the legal field, they must possess a significantly different set of knowledge and skills from those provided. There must be a definitive interaction between the lecturer and the

students offering the opportunity for legal discussions about, and perhaps even challenges to the subject matter. The interaction not only opens a dialogue between the lecturer and the students, but it also allows him to evaluate his presentation and skills personally. Along with this, it allows him the opportunity to better gauge individual students by observing their participation in the interaction, including the quality of questions they might ask (Stuckey, 2007).

Studies have proven that students who participate in interactive programs tend to learn faster, retain, and are more open to new knowledge. While this is the ideal scenario, contemporary evidence strongly suggests any number of other factors come into play when assessing lecture-based curriculum performance. If coupled with the more active Socratic method of education, the student's role in his education would no longer be passive; active participation would undoubtedly be the keystone of success for both school and student (Stuckey, 2007). By employing open and honest in-class discussions of the lecture material, students will learn to recognize relevant case facts and their appropriate management in the courtroom. They learn about precedent-setting court rulings, how they came about, and how they are best applied in actual practice. Someday, the existing curriculum of the "Science of Law," in the Kingdom will be replaced by factual case methodologies and debate to prepare future attorneys to practice law (Moskovitz, 1992).

To bring legal education up to a competitive level with schools in other countries requires valid assessment of some of the older, more archaic traditions still enforced in the country's law schools. The logical point to begin must be the lecture-based curriculum. That is not to say there is no longer extended value in lectures, for that, would be an unfair assessment. The upgraded system would allow for open communication and the exchange of questions and ideas in the classroom. For the proposal of improving legal education (Kim, 2012). However, in the Kingdom, law professors may believe that change or improvement of legal education through applying a model of instructing that formed in the foreign law schools is not necessary, or appropriate for the educational process in the country, nor would it lead to positive outcomes. They perhaps consider that the case method of teaching is no more than an educational tool for assisting students in learning, not as a prime instructional tool method of education.

In fact, the burden of preparing students for law practice is on law schools. It assumes that law professors are cognizant of the responsibility to ensure that law school graduates be prepared to provide professional legal services before they are eligible a license to provide legal services. The law programs should be designed to provide students with organized learning that increasingly leads graduates to gain a comprehensive knowledge required for their first professional jobs. Members of the legal profession and others who are concerned about the public's interests should ask why licensing authorities continue to issue unrestricted licenses to practice law without testing for minimal competency in the broad range of skills and values required for the essential practice of law (Stuckey, 2007).

It is appropriate for the researcher to take into account attendant concerns of educators who are essential to the successful implementation of the proposal if innovations are to succeed. Developing a program without conducting a needs assessment can be a costly mistake producing limited results. With the transformational changes occurring in Saudi education, professional development must be strategically planned, focused, and specific to support instructors in the modifications required for implementation (Boatright, 2014). There exist differences in the Stages of Concern of professors for understanding the apprehension and questions of professors concerning the evolution of legal education methods in Saudi law schools during the submission or application of the proposal. It is therefore imperative that the researcher uses a theoretical framework as a guideline and clarify for understanding the change process. However, the theoretical framework is the assertion that facilitating change requires the understanding of the existing attitudes and perceptions of the individuals in the change process. This understanding solidifies the fact that the most critical factor in any change process is the people involved (Boatright, 2014).

5. Conclusions

Law professors need to improve their methods for achieving educational objectives and perhaps consider integrating traditional pedagogical methodologies with the more modern contemporary techniques. Traditional wisdom never goes out of style and can be of immeasurable value in determining whether current instructional methods are achieving the school objectives. On the whole, acceptance of change in legal education is not easily accomplished, especially in an environment that is properly and profoundly rooted in history and traditions. It is a struggle between what is perceived as religious teachings and what are human-made laws. However, the Kingdom has been proven to produce robust and progressive leadership in its monarchy while maintaining respect for traditions. It is no easy task and will require those with good legal knowledge and skills to help pave the way.

Unfortunately, Law has faced difficulties within the legal academia in the Kingdom. From its birth in 1980, legal education has steadily fallen behind its international peers. The once hoped for an abundant crop of highly trained and qualified practitioners of law became an unrealized dream. The tragedy is compounded by the burden of not having affordable, skilled legal representation in a growing economy and society. For the Kingdom to move forward, the legal education must lay the groundwork and pave the path, or the transformational change hoped for in the 21st Century will not materialize.

To do this will require improvement and advances in Saudi Arabian law schools to include, but not be limited to new strategies, creative innovations, and modern techniques to explore multiple dimensions of legal education. However, to be successful legal educators must develop a broad range of learning competencies that will challenge the minds of students. They must foster analysis skills for interpretive and problem-solving assignments that demonstrate the function of facts as they evolve in legal arguments and decisions. By incorporating innovative methods into Saudi legal education, there creates an urgency which will enable students to gain experience managing legal complications and develop their abilities for expository and problem-solving exercises in analysis simulating the implications of critical decisions and contextual factors.

References

- Admiraal, W., Wubbels, T., & Pilot, A. (1999). College teaching in legal education: Teaching method, students' time-on-task, and achievement. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(6), 687-704.
- Arnow-Richman, R. (2013). Employment law inside out: Using the problem method to teach workplace law. Saint Louis University Law Journal, U Denver Legal Studies Research Paper No. 13-31.
- Babich, A. (2007). The apolitical law school clinic. *Clinical Law Review*, 11(2), 447-472.
- Boatright, T. (2014). Technology integration for common core state standards implementation: Developing differentiated professional development based on the concerns-based adoption model. Dissertations No. 24 Brandman Digital Repository, Brandman University.
- Campbell, R. W. (2016). The end of law schools: Legal education in the Era of legal service businesses. *Mississippi Law Journal*, 85, 1-25.
- Duquette, D. N. (1997). Developing a child advocacy law clinic: A law school clinical legal education opportunity. *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform*, 31(1), 1-32.
- Elizabeth, B. F., & Major, C. H. (2018). *Interactive lecturing: A handbook for college faculty*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gane, C., & Guang, R. H. (2017). *Legal education in the global context*. London: Routledge.
- Grimes, R. (2015). Problem-based learning and legal education—a case study in integrated experiential study. *REDU. University Teaching Magazine*, 13(1), 361-375.
- Hanson, M. (1987). The influence of French law on the legal development of Saudi Arabia. *Arab Law Quarterly*, 2(3), 272-291. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1163/157302587x00318>.
- Hawkins-León, C. G. (1998). The socratic method-problem method dichotomy: The debate over teaching method continues. *Brigham Young University Education and Law Journal*, 1998(1), 1-18.
- Hazard, J. N. (1951). Comparative law in legal education. *University of Chicago Law Review*, 18(2), 264-279.
- Jennison, B. P. (2013). Beyond langdell: Innovation in legal education. *Catholic University Law Review*, 62(3), 643-674.
- Joy, P. A. (2003). The law school clinic as a model ethical law office. *William Mitchell Law Review*, 30(1), 35-50.
- Katz, H. E., & O'Neill, K. F. (2009). *Strategies and techniques of law school teaching: A primer for new (and not so new) professors*. United States: Aspen Publishers, Inc.
- Kim, R. (2012). The americanization of legal education in South Korea: Challenges and opportunities. Brooklyn Journal of International Law, Suffolk University Law School Research Paper No. 12-15.
- McMorrow, J. A. (2009). Comparative legal education: An introduction to US legal education and preparation for the practice of law. *Jurist Review*, 20(6), 1-28.
- Melchionna, L. (2010). Global legal education and comparative visa regulations. Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, 19, St. John's University School of Law Legal Studies Research Paper No. 09-0171.
- Morgan, T. D. (1998). Use of the problem method for teaching legal ethics. *William & Mary Law Review*, 39(2), 409-414.
- Moskovitz, M. (1992). Beyond the case method: It's time to teach with problems. *Journal of Legal Education*, 42(2), 241-270.
- Schiller, S. (2012). A new global legal order, with or without America: The case for accrediting foreign law schools. *Emory International Law Review*, 26, 411-441.
- Schwartz, M. H., Hess, G. F., & Sparrow, S. M. (2014). *What the best law teachers do*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Sheppard, S. (2007). *The history of legal education in the united states: Commentaries and primary sources*. Clark: Lawbook Exchange Limited.
- Strevens, C., Grimes, R., & Phillips, E. (2016). *Legal education: Simulation in theory and practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Stuckey, R. T. (2007). *Best practices for legal education: A vision and a road map*. Philadelphia: Clinical Legal Education Association.
- Sultany, N. (2018). Law and revolution: Constitutionalism after the Arab spring. Oxford constitutional theory. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, R. J. (2004). Training for justice: The global reach of clinical legal education. *Penn State International Law Review*, 22(3), 421-431.