

Navigating Topic Drift in Problem-Based Learning: A Literature-Based Facilitation Guide for Educators

Min Wei ^{1, #}, Sumin Wu ^{1, #}, Chengming Ke ^{2, *}¹ Center of Excellence, The Seventh Affiliated Hospital, Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China² Neuroscience Medical Center, The Seventh Affiliated Hospital, Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China[#] Min Wei and Sumin Wu contributed equally to this work

* Correspondence: Chengming Ke (kechengming@sysush.com)

Abstract: High-quality collaborative discourse is essential for deep learning in Problem-Based Learning (PBL). However, novice facilitators frequently struggle with topic drift, which occurs when discussions deviate from core learning objectives. Grounded in Cognitive Load Theory and instructional scaffolding, this paper analyzes the cognitive mechanisms behind topic drift in PBL. It identifies three typical deviation patterns: "Premature Resolution" (bypassing mechanistic deduction), "Detail Fixation" (over-engagement with peripheral details), and "Social Avoidance" (stemming from dysfunctional group dynamics). To address these patterns, this paper presents a literature-based facilitation guide offering specific intervention strategies and discursive prompts. These include mechanistic backtracking, metacognitive monitoring, and cognitive visualization. The study argues that effective pedagogical intervention relies on the strategic timing of facilitation rather than the immediate correction of factual errors. Ultimately, built on a foundation of relational trust, this process requires educators to shift their role from "epistemic authorities" to "cognitive coaches."

Keywords: Problem-Based Learning (PBL); Topic Drift; Facilitation Strategies; Cognitive Load; Teacher Roles; Discursive Prompts

How to cite this paper:

Wei, M., Wu, S., & Ke, C. (2026).
Navigating Topic Drift in
Problem-Based Learning: A
Literature-Based Facilitation
Guide for Educators. *Open Journal
of Educational Research*, 6(1), 15-20.
DOI: 10.31586/ojer.2026.6296

Received: February 16, 2026

Revised: March 22, 2026

Accepted: April 1, 2026

Published: April 8, 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.
Submitted for possible open-access
publication under the terms and
conditions of the Creative
Commons Attribution (CC BY)
license
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Problem-Based Learning (PBL) has become a core pedagogical model in the reform of medical and professional education. Its theoretical foundations are deeply rooted in social constructivism. Within the self-directed inquiry process of PBL, the teacher's role undergoes a fundamental shift from a traditional knowledge authority to a facilitator of the learning process [1]. As foundational PBL theorists emphasize, a facilitator's primary function is not to provide direct answers. Instead, it is to activate students' prior knowledge through metacognitive questioning and to provide instructional scaffolding. This guidance ensures that group discourse remains tightly focused on core pathological mechanisms and predetermined learning objectives. High-quality facilitation is therefore critical for bridging the gap between learners' actual and potential developmental levels, directly influencing the overall success of PBL [2].

However, facilitating effective group discourse among novice learners presents practical challenges in real-world educational settings. Constrained by developing knowledge structures and the limits of extraneous cognitive load, students are highly susceptible to "topic drift" during discussions [3]. This divergence is not always as obvious

as off-task chatter. More insidiously, it manifests as cognitive deviations decoupled from the learning objectives. Examples include the short-circuiting phenomenon of premature resolution—where students jump to diagnostic conclusions without deducing the underlying mechanisms—or an encyclopedic fixation on non-essential details. Current research highlights that if these deviations occur without timely and appropriate intervention, they relegate the discussion to surface-level learning. Furthermore, they can neutralize constructive cognitive conflict and potentially lead to the breakdown of group dynamics [4].

Recognizing the early signs of topic drift and implementing precise interventions is an essential skill for PBL facilitators. While existing literature extensively discusses macro-level facilitator responsibilities, there is a distinct lack of practical guidance on specific micro-facilitation scripts tailored to different deviation scenarios [5]. Anchored in classical PBL frameworks and contemporary empirical literature, this paper categorizes common types of topic drift. By integrating Cognitive Load Theory, it constructs a targeted, actionable set of facilitation strategies and conversational guidelines. This framework aims to help frontline educators quickly identify the cognitive barriers causing topic drift and use effective redirection to guide inefficient discussions back toward deep knowledge construction.

2. Theoretical Foundations

The theoretical framework of this study is anchored in Vygotsky's Social Constructivism and the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) [6]. PBL posits that knowledge is actively constructed by learners through negotiation and dialogue, rather than absorbed through one-way transmission from educators. However, the ability of medical students—particularly junior learners—to independently solve complex clinical problems often lags behind the intrinsic difficulty of the cases. This gap between their current capacity and the targeted learning objectives constitutes the ZPD [7].

When collaborative tasks exceed the boundaries of the students' ZPD, unguided groups are highly prone to cognitive divergence. This often manifests as stalled discussions or shifts toward irrelevant topics [8]. Therefore, the critical function of a PBL facilitator is to provide timely interventions within the ZPD to help students achieve cognitive leaps they cannot manage on their own.

Additionally, Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) provides a strong psychological rationale for why topic drift occurs. As Sweller outlined, human working memory capacity is inherently limited. During PBL discussions, students must simultaneously process complex clinical data (intrinsic cognitive load), navigate group social cues, and logically structure their problem-solving steps (extraneous cognitive load) [9].

When the total cognitive load exceeds working memory thresholds, learners instinctively seek cognitive offloading. Behaviorally, this defense mechanism looks like topic drift. Students transition from high-load mechanistic deduction to low-load intuitive judgments (premature resolution) or colloquial chatter (social avoidance) [10]. In many cases, topic drift is a diagnostic signal of cognitive overload rather than a poor learning attitude.

Based on this analysis, the facilitator's guidance strategies should be viewed as cognitive scaffolding. The intervention does not replace student thinking. Instead, through strategic questioning, whiteboard mind-mapping, or procedural prompts, it temporarily reduces the extraneous cognitive load of the task so working memory can focus on core problem-solving. The strategies proposed in this paper act as "soft scaffolding" [11]. They are designed to activate students' self-monitoring mechanisms via

external metacognitive prompts, enabling the group to autonomously course-correct and return to the path of deep learning.

3. Typologies and Attributions of Common "Topic Drift"

3.1. "Premature Closure" Deviation

The most common form of cognitive deviation is premature closure. Here, students bypass the deduction of pathophysiological mechanisms and guess diagnostic outcomes or formulate treatment plans directly. From a cognitive psychology perspective, this is a failed attempt by novices to emulate expert pattern recognition. As Norman noted, experts can diagnose rapidly because they possess mature illness scripts—an encapsulation of knowledge that students have not yet developed [12]. When learners skip the detailed elaboration of basic science mechanisms and rely on fragmented surface clues for intuitive judgments, they are taking a cognitive shortcut. This fundamentally misinterprets PBL's core philosophy of valuing the process over the product, reducing deep learning to a superficial guessing game.

3.2. "The Fact-Miner" Deviation

The encyclopedic or "Fact-Miner" deviation occurs when discussions become entangled in non-essential details. Students might debate the incidence rates of rare diseases or recite minute anatomical structures while neglecting the logical connections between broader concepts. The root cause is a lack of information literacy regarding how to distinguish "need-to-know" core knowledge from "nice-to-know" peripheral information. According to Cognitive Load Theory, when the abstract reasoning required for core mechanisms creates excessive intrinsic load, students subconsciously pivot to processing concrete, low-demand declarative facts to reduce their cognitive anxiety [13]. While this discussion might seem animated and productive, it ineffectively occupies working memory and impedes the construction of robust causal models.

3.3. "Social Evasion" Deviation

Social evasion manifests when discussions frequently veer into case-irrelevant personal anecdotes, hospital observations, or general chatter. While moderate socialization builds group psychological safety, persistent divergence is usually a sign of dysfunctional group dynamics [14]. Research by Dolmans *et al.* indicates that when learning tasks are too difficult or members lack self-regulated learning skills, students use superficial chatter to escape high-intensity cognitive challenges—a behavior known as social loafing [15]. Furthermore, if a group has an overly dominant member (one-voice dominance) or lacks psychological safety (group silence), the discourse is similarly pushed toward safe but ineffective peripheral topics.

4. Facilitation Strategies and Discursive Prompts for Educators

4.1. "Back-to-Mechanism" Facilitation for Cognitive Short-Circuiting

To address the cognitive short-circuiting seen in premature closure, facilitators should use "Back-to-Mechanism" guidance. Based on Bloch's hypothetico-deductive reasoning model, educators should avoid directly confirming or denying a student's conclusion. Instead, they must use targeted questioning to make the students' implicit deductive processes explicit [16].

Effective prompts emphasize the construction of causal chains. Educators can use scripts such as: "Your diagnostic hypothesis is highly plausible, but could you map out

the pathophysiological trajectory from the etiology to this specific symptom on the whiteboard?". If we withhold intervention, how would this mechanism progressively exacerbate the clinical condition in vivo?". This strategy actively shifts students from a guessing mode back to an analytical mode, prompting them to examine the logical gaps between the clinical evidence and their conclusions.

4.2. Metacognitive Monitoring for Information Overload

When facing the information overload of the "Fact-Miner" deviation, facilitation should pivot to metacognitive monitoring. As Bridges noted, a critical responsibility of a PBL facilitator is helping students establish criteria to filter information and explicitly distinguish between core concepts and background details [17]. When discussions get stuck in the minutiae, facilitators should avoid abrupt interruptions and instead reawaken the group's goal orientation through reflective questioning [18].

Recommended prompts include: "This biochemical detail is certainly intriguing, but how specifically does it assist us in differentiating between our current three differential diagnoses?". Let's take a time-out to review the learning objectives on the board. Is our current trajectory helping us reach that goal, or do we need to course-correct?". These prompts transfer the locus of control back to the learners, building their capacity for self-regulated learning.

4.3. Process Intervention and Cognitive Visualization for Dysfunctional Dynamics

To correct social evasion or dysfunctional group dynamics, educators must deploy process intervention and visualization strategies. When discourse devolves into general chatter or is monopolized by one student, verbal warnings often have limited effect. Sieben recommends using physical tools like whiteboards or concept maps to restore conversational order [19].

Facilitators can intervene with scripts such as: "The discussion has been highly engaging, but to ensure no critical points are omitted, who would like to step up and synthesize these perspectives into a concept map on the board?"(To set boundaries on tangential topics): "While that anecdote resonates well, as future physicians, we must ground our discourse in objective evidence. Let's redirect our focus to the laboratory findings mentioned earlier." By mandating visualization, the facilitator interrupts the ineffective verbal loop and reconsolidates the group's attention through a clear, shared task.

4.4. The Dynamic Principle of Facilitation: Scaffolding Fading

The implementation of all facilitation strategies must follow the principle of scaffolding fading. According to the Cognitive Apprenticeship framework, the frequency and depth of a facilitator's intervention should progressively decrease as students' competencies improve [20].

In the early stages of PBL, facilitators provide hard scaffolding through direct procedural prompts and specific corrective scripts. As the group matures, facilitators should transition to soft scaffolding. This fosters student autonomy through non-verbal encouragement (like eye contact), brief affirmations ("Mhm, and then?"), or strategic silence. The ultimate goal of PBL facilitation is not for the teacher to perpetually correct errors, but for learners to autonomously recognize when they have drifted off-topic and recalibrate themselves. This self-awareness is the definitive hallmark of mature metacognitive capacity.

5. Discussion and Recommendations

The efficacy of PBL pedagogy relies heavily on the precise timing of interventions and a fundamental shift in how educators perceive their role. Literature suggests that facilitators should follow the principle of minimal intervention, giving students the cognitive space to make mistakes and self-correct. However, this restraint is not indefinite. The optimal window for intervention usually opens when the discourse shows a sustained loss of direction (e.g., deviating from learning objectives for over three minutes) or when profound factual errors remain uncorrected by peers [21]. At this point, the educator must decisively step out of the "epistemic authority" role and act as a "cognitive coach". Rooted in Stalmeijer's framework of Cognitive Apprenticeship, the mandate of a coach is not to dispense correct answers [22]. Rather, it is to help students monitor their own cognitive processes through expert modeling and explicit coaching. This requires educators to suppress the urge to deliver mini-lectures and restrict their interventions strictly to the metacognitive level, thereby safeguarding student agency within the PBL ecosystem.

It must be acknowledged, however, that standardized facilitation scripts are not universal remedies; their success is heavily constrained by the quality of the teacher-student rapport [23]. As the research shows, without robust psychological safety, a facilitator's Socratic questioning can easily be misinterpreted as an interrogation, leading to defensive group silence [24]. Therefore, these prompts must be built on an authentic connection. Educators must invest deliberate effort early in the curriculum to cultivate an inclusive learning climate, making it clear that interruptions and questions are meant to deepen comprehension, not evaluate performance. Only when learners trust the facilitator as a co-explorer rather than a hidden evaluator can these strategies truly catalyze deep learning.

References

- [1] Yew EH, Goh K. Problem-based learning: An overview of its process and impact on learning. *Health Professions Education*. 2016;2(2):75-79.
- [2] Zhao W, He L, Deng W, Zhu J, Su A, Zhang Y. The effectiveness of the combined problem-based learning (PBL) and case-based learning (CBL) teaching method in the clinical practical teaching of thyroid disease. *BMC Medical Education*. 2020;20(1):1-10.
- [3] Dolmans DH, Loyens SM, Marcq H, Gijbels D. Deep and surface learning in problem-based learning: a review of the literature. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*. 2016;21(5):1087-1112.
- [4] Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. *BMC Med Educ*. 2019;19(1):321.
- [5] Animaw Z, Asaminew T. Medical Students' Perspective on Assessment Mechanism During Problem-Based Learning at Debre Tabor University: An Explanatory Mixed Study. *Adv Med Educ Pract*. 2023;14:859-873.
- [6] Vygotsky LS. *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1978.
- [7] Torre DM, Daley BJ, Sebastian JL, Elnicki DM. Overview of current learning theories for medical educators. *Am J Med*. 2006;119(10):903-907.
- [8] Gartmeier M, Hapfelmeier A, Grünwald M, Häusler J, Pfurtscheller T, Seidel T, Berberat P. Is there an increase over time in the complexity of teacher questions and student responses in case-based clinical seminars? A cross-sectional video study. *BMC Med Educ*. 2022;22(1):871.
- [9] Eddy K, Jordan Z, Stephenson M. Health professionals' experience of teamwork education in acute hospital settings: a systematic review of qualitative literature. *JBI Database System Rev Implement Rep*. 2016;14(4):96-137.
- [10] van Merriënboer JJ, Sweller J. Cognitive load theory in health professional education: design principles and strategies. *Med Educ*. 2010;44(1):85-93.
- [11] Masava B, Nyoni CN, Botma Y. Scaffolding in Health Sciences Education Programmes: An Integrative Review. *Med Sci Educ*. 2022;33(1):255-273.
- [12] Norman G, Monteiro S, Sherbino J, Ilgen J, Schmidt H, Mamede S. The causes of errors in clinical reasoning: cognitive biases, knowledge deficits, and dual process thinking. *Academic Medicine*. 2017;92(1):23-30.
- [13] Kirschner PA, Sweller J, Kirschner F, Zambrano J. From cognitive load theory to collaborative cognitive load theory. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*. 2018;13(2):213-233.

-
- [14] Burgess A, van Diggele C, Roberts C, Mellis C. Facilitating small group learning in the health professions. *BMC Medical Education*. 2020;20(Suppl 2):457.
- [15] Dolmans DH, De Grave W, Wolfhagen IH, van der Vleuten CP. Problem-based learning: future challenges for educational practice and research. *Med Educ*. 2005;39(7):732-741.
- [16] Bloch RR, Noyes K, Bautista N, Restini CB. Causal Mechanistic Reasoning as a Tool to Explore Medical Students' Predictions of Pharmacology Phenomenon: Connecting Core Concepts with Clinical Applications. *Med Sci Educ*. 2025;35(5):2329-2342.
- [17] Bridges DR, Davidson RA, Odegard PS, Maki IV, Tomkowiak J. Interprofessional collaboration: three best practice models of interprofessional education. *Med Educ Online*. 2011;16.
- [18] Bransen D, Govaerts MJB, Sluijsmans DMA, Driessen EW. Beyond the self: The role of co-regulation in medical students' self-regulated learning. *Med Educ*. 2020;54(3):234-241.
- [19] Sieben JM, Heeneman S, Verheggen MM, Driessen EW. Can concept mapping support the quality of reflections made by undergraduate medical students? A mixed method study. *Med Teach*. 2021;43(4):388-396.
- [20] Belland BR, Walker AE, Kim NJ, Lefler M. Synthesizing Results From Empirical Research on Computer-Based Scaffolding in STEM Education: A Meta-Analysis. *Rev Educ Res*. 2017;87(2):309-344.
- [21] Dolmans DH, Schmidt HG. What do we know about cognitive and motivational effects of small group tutorials in problem-based learning? *Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract*. 2006;11(4):321-36.
- [22] Stalmeijer RE, Dolmans DH, Wolfhagen IH, Scherpbier AJ. Cognitive apprenticeship in clinical practice: can it stimulate learning in the opinion of students? *Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract*. 2009;14(4):535-46.
- [23] Sandars J, Goh PS. Design Thinking in Medical Education: The Key Features and Practical Application. *J Med Educ Curric Dev*. 2020;7:2382120520926518.
- [24] Ho YR, Chen BY, Li CM. Thinking more wisely: using the Socratic method to develop critical thinking skills amongst healthcare students. *BMC Med Educ*. 2023;23(1):173.