



Designing and Using Simulations in the International Relations Classroom

Carolyn M. Shaw & Bob Switky

To cite this article: Carolyn M. Shaw & Bob Switky (2018) Designing and Using Simulations in the International Relations Classroom, *Journal of Political Science Education*, 14:4, 523-534, DOI: [10.1080/15512169.2018.1433543](https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2018.1433543)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2018.1433543>



Published online: 23 Feb 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 635



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 7 View citing articles [↗](#)



Designing and Using Simulations in the International Relations Classroom

Carolyn M. Shaw^a and Bob Switky^b

^aWichita State University; ^bSonoma State University

ABSTRACT

The value of simulations in the classroom is well established, and there are numerous publications that feature specific role-play exercises that can readily be introduced into the classroom. Frequently, however, instructors would like to design their own simulations to fit their specific learning objectives for a class, but don't know where to start. This article lays out a series of structural and design questions for instructors to consider in order to craft their own simulations. We recognize that there is no singularly "best" way to design simulations, so this article focuses on the key components of simulations and explores different possibilities for each of these components depending on the desired goals of the instructor. We begin with the basics of class size, topic selection, learning objectives, length, and timing. Next, we discuss the design parameters—including the nature of student interaction, desired output, background information, role-specific instructions, and a timeline for the phases of the simulation. We move on to considerations about the actual running of the simulation, and wrap up with reflections on debriefing, grading, and assessment. By stepping through the design questions that are summarized in the Appendix, any instructor, experienced or new to role-playing, can develop a custom simulation to help meet the learning objectives for their courses.

KEYWORDS

Creative pedagogy;
role-playing; simulations

Introduction

With the emergence of the active learning movement, begun in earnest a generation ago (McKeachie 1986; Silberman 1996), interest in classroom simulations has grown considerably over the years. As in other fields, simulations in international relations (IR) have become important tools in peaking student curiosity, promoting creativity, and developing the critical and analytical thinking skills necessary in professional life. While the standard lecture still has its place, simulations can help students learn how to problem-solve and work in collaboration with others through peer-to-peer learning. Simulations should be designed to complement course materials. As such, they need to be constructed with clear learning objectives in mind. Any active learning exercise will replace some class time for lecture and traditional class discussion, but a well-structured simulation will be able to cover class concepts in a more engaging manner and help in retention of the material. Moreover, simulations can make a course more stimulating for both students and instructors.

CONTACT Carolyn M. Shaw  carolyn.shaw@wichita.edu  Department of Political Science Department, Wichita State University, 1845 Fairmount, Wichita, KS 67260, USA.

© 2018 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC

Simulations—often referred to as role-play exercises¹—take many different forms and have been designed for a wide variety of topics in IR. They can focus on subjects of theoretical interest, conflict studies, trade, and decision-making in general or during a crisis. In some simulations, students give advice to the president or negotiate a treaty. Simulations have been designed for students to address environmental problems or resolve a humanitarian crisis. Decision-making simulations can be based on specific decision-making bodies such as the United Nations, European Union, the Organization of American States, OPEC, and other intergovernmental or nongovernmental organizations, or they might be based on the interactions between different intragovernmental actors. The simulation topic possibilities are limited only by the instructor's imagination.

Simulations are valuable instructional tools for many reasons. One advantage is that simulations are particularly good at rendering abstract concepts more comprehensible to students. Simulations can promote affective learning that brings abstract concepts to life. For example, in debating a course of action in a military confrontation with no good options, students will feel the pressure of defending their positions or experience the discomfort of having to admit, perhaps, that they need to change their minds. Consistent with the aims of active learning, simulations are based on the idea that doing (albeit vicariously) can enhance the more passive tasks of listening and taking notes. Compared to the standard lecture, simulations can also promote student interaction and input. When role-playing, for example, shy students may be more likely to speak up because they are taking on the role of someone else and their personal views need not be shared with the class. When students don't know many classmates, role-playing can also create a greater sense of community. Moreover, simulations accommodate different cognitive styles and are particularly good for kinetic and aural learners (De Freitas 2006).

As noted above, the value of simulations is well established, and there are numerous publications that feature specific role-play exercises that can readily be introduced into the classroom (Abrosio 2006; Boyer, Trumbore, and Fricke 2006; Chasek 2005; DiCicco 2014; Horn, Rubin, and Schouenborg 2016; Kempston and Thomas 2014; Kille 2002; Switky and Avilés 2007; Zapille, Beers, and Raymond 2017). The inspiration behind this article, and the multiple conference workshops on which it is based, however, is that many instructors would like to design their own simulations to fit their specific learning objectives for a class, but don't know where to start. This article lays out a series of structural and design questions for instructors to consider in order to craft their own simulations. We recognize that there is no singularly "best" way to design simulations, so this article focuses on the key components of simulations and explores different possibilities for each of these components depending on the desired goals of the instructor. We begin with the basics of class size, topic selection, learning objectives, length, and timing. Next, we discuss the design parameters—including the nature of student interaction, desired output, background information, role-specific instructions, and a timeline for the phases of the simulation. We move on to considerations about the actual running of the simulation, and wrap up with reflections on debriefing and assessment. The Appendix includes a Custom Simulation Design Worksheet that covers each of the components discussed in this article in order for instructors to create their own simulations. The prompts in the worksheet parallel each of the components discussed in this article so that an instructor can refer back to examples in the main text for more design specific ideas and considerations when stepping through the worksheet.

Getting started

Class size

When considering using a simulation, one of the first questions to address is whether it is appropriate for a given class size (regarding active learning and class size, see Cassidy, Brozik, and Brozik 2008; Gentry 1980; Gilbert 1995; Neff and Donaldson 2013). Simulations can be challenging to run in small classes (say, under 10 students) and large classes (more than 50). In the case where classes are quite small, instructors may be able to run a joint simulation with another colleague, combining classes to conduct the exercise. The assignment of roles might be arranged to complement the subject matter in the two different courses. For example, students in an International Security class might be assigned to play the roles of Defense Ministers for several countries, and students in a Political Economy class might be the Trade Ministers, with each bringing the knowledge from their unique classes to bear. When a class is very large, instructors may want to double up role assignments, split the class in half and run two parallel simulations, or have some students be observers who critique the realism of the participants or perhaps vote to approve or reject the outcome negotiated by the other players. Another option for large classes is to have a group of students play a press corps.

Topic selection

Another question to address at the outset is what the topic of the simulation will be. Topic selection is usually driven by the focus of the course and the instructor's area of expertise. Perhaps students will be negotiating a trade agreement, trying to fix an environmental problem, preventing a humanitarian disaster, or resolving a security crisis.

However, sometimes, a simulation may be chosen especially because students find the subject particularly dry or boring. A simulation is a great teaching method to bring to life what perhaps only we academics innately find interesting and important. For example, in Switky (2004), students negotiated forming coalition governments. As participants in this simulation, students develop an unexpected interest in the topic and understand much better its complexities and relevance to many countries.

Learning outcomes

The topic choice needs to be made in conjunction with establishing learning outcomes for the exercise. Just as instructors have specific objectives for students to grasp from a lecture, they should also have clear learning outcomes for a simulation. Wedig (2010) emphasizes how simulations can support course content and learning objectives in a class rather than distracting from course goals. It is easy to get carried away when thinking about what you want students to learn from a simulation, but practically speaking, three to four outcomes is the most realistic, particularly when running a simulation for the first time. When identifying learning outcomes, instructors need to consider whether they will focus on content or process (Asal and Blake 2006). A *content-oriented* simulation might include an outcome that focuses on the recognition of the interests of different parties in a negotiating context, or the substance and quality of the negotiated agreement that has been reached. For example, if students represent parties at peace talks for a civil war, the content-oriented objectives might include: recognizing that there are also demands made on the

international community in order to achieve peace, and recognizing that each party has valid claims and demands that need to be acknowledged/respected (Shaw 2006). The goal is to help students answer the “who, what, where, when” questions about a situation. Objectives that are more *process-oriented* usually help students understand the “how and why” of various political scenarios, and focus on the procedures and dynamics of the negotiations more than the final outcome. For example, a simulation designed to highlight different decision making models might have one group following a rational actor model and another mirroring the bureaucratic politics model (Shaw 2004).

Length and timing

Another important early decision the instructor must make deals with the length of the simulation. A wide variety of options exist. At a minimum, the simulation could cover an hour-long class, but this short time frame is difficult to pull off. A simulation lasting 2 to 3 hours is common, but others may last for weeks. And, some simulations form the structure of an entire semester (Elias 2014). A challenge in multiday or multiweek simulations is carrying over the energy and coherence of debate from one class period to the next. Injecting an “update” into a multiday exercise is one way to energize and advance the negotiations in a simulation. Instructors can also choose to appoint a “rapporteur” from each group of students to take notes, or simply help the groups get started with the next session if needed. Dynamics can change between sessions as actors have a chance to further consider the situation and their response to it. We have found that students will sometimes even continue discussions and negotiations after the end of the class period. When considering the length of the simulation, instructors should also take into account the preparatory time leading up to the exercise, and the time to be spent debriefing afterwards.

A final early consideration involves when, during the semester, to run the simulation. There are reasonable arguments for running simulations near the start, the middle, or the end of the semester. Simulations that are run early in the semester can be referred back to throughout the semester to illustrate various points being discussed in class. It can be more challenging, however, to stage a simulation during the first third of the semester when students may still be getting a handle on the nature of the course and have little mastery of the content. Simulations conducted during the middle of the semester may provide an effective boost of energy to the course after students have settled into a routine. Simulations that take place at the end often encourage students to pull all their knowledge and skills together in order to play their role effectively. This can help students synthesize and contextualize the topics they have been learning throughout the semester. Any of these approaches can work effectively, but the timing should be part of a strategic decision by the instructor.

Design of the simulation

Once an instructor has considered the topic, timing, and desired learning outcomes for a simulation, its time to consider the key elements of its design, including: the nature of student interaction, desired output, background information, role-specific instructions, and a timeline for the phases of the simulation. Asal and Kratoville (2013) also examine how each of these components contributes to effective learning. As noted above, a Custom

Simulation Design Worksheet at the end of this article includes these and other features at the core of good simulations.

Student interactions

First, the simulation needs to be structured so that there are cooperative and competitive aspects to the students' interactions with each other in the simulation. For example, students might be members of a country delegation that has to negotiate with other countries to solve a particular problem. Some states may share common interests and thus align with like-minded states, while others may have opposing interests. An added layer of complexity might exist if students in a single delegation have different bureaucratic interests as well (i.e., Secretary of State vs. Secretary of Defense). It can be helpful to build in some degree of interdependence between groups, either shared authority, expertise, or need for resources from others. Although some simulations simply have individual actors interacting, another option is to organize students into groups (three to five students per group is ideal) as, for example, members of the Cabinet, a congressional committee, a negotiating team, etc. In a treaty formation simulation, for example, intragroup debate (say, among one national delegation) is followed later by negotiations between groups of students representing other national delegations.

Another aspect of student interaction involves deciding who gets to talk to whom and in what format. These interactions should be realistic. For example, the public does not get to have personal conversations with the President, but they can write messages, or ask the press to publish op-eds. The timing of interactions between groups should also be considered. Would the various actors have unlimited time for conversation/strategizing, or would they face some time constraints? For example, a lobbying group might spend a lot of time researching their position and rallying their key arguments, but only have 5 minutes in which to brief the President. They must be concise and persuasive with the short time that they have. Cabinet members, however, might have a much longer period to candidly debate policy options with the President. Similarly, instructors should consider whether actors can bargain one on one and/or privately, or whether their discussions take place in public in a larger group where they might struggle to get their message heard.

Final output

Second, instructors need to decide what their desired final output is for the simulation—what outcome do they want the actors to reach? These can take a variety of forms, including a negotiated agreement (written or verbal), a final judgment, the creation of a new policy, a written statement, holding a debate, and so on. This output should be logically linked to the learning outcomes for the simulation. If the emphasis is on the negotiation process itself, then less importance might be given to creating a high quality final written document. If the learning outcomes are content-focused, then the precision of a final written document might be more important. It should be noted that producing a written document is usually more time consuming, so this should be taken into account when designing the simulation. Sometimes providing a set of prewritten options for the parties to discuss and vote on can be effective in advancing a final agreement without the students having to draft such an agreement from scratch. On a final note, failure to reach an agreement or new policy may not represent a failure for the simulation. It may

be very realistic that a definitive conclusion to negotiations is not achieved. This should be explained to the students in the debriefing (discussed below).

Background information

Third, students will usually need background information before engaging in the simulation. Prior to the first simulation day, instructors should provide clear materials in the form of one or more class lectures, reading assignments, or a one- to two-page handout. Even if students think they know about the topic (and many won't), it still helps to provide a common background to all participants. This can sometimes be challenging to determine what key information students need to effectively play their roles, and what details are secondary and unnecessary. They need details about the relevant conditions that will affect their decision-making. Students may need to do research on their own, especially if they are supposed to be representing a particular person or member of an IGO, etc. If students do engage in presimulation research and/or writing, it is worth considering whether they should be required to share their papers with other actors or not. They might write a paper establishing their simulation persona or laying out a policy position. A sharing of such statements may help students recognize and strategize about who their potential allies and opponents are before the simulation begins. Unless there is a graded component to these activities, however, students will not do a lot of advanced preparation. As we have found, most will read the background information (perhaps just a handout) but not much more. So, as part of the preparation, the instructor may assign a short paper or give a quiz that is due before the simulation begins or on the first day of the simulation so the students are familiar with the context of the simulation and well prepared to play their roles.

Role-specific instructions

Fourth, role-specific instructions need to be prepared for particular assignments. For example, students representing top foreign policy advisors would need different instructions from those playing NGO activists. These instructions often include one or more specific goals that you want each player to try to achieve. Examples include achieving autonomy, controlling more territory, making trade concessions, widening an alliance, or protecting certain rights. It is often in providing these specific details that instructors can build in the competitive and cooperative interactions that they want to simulate in the exercise. If a diplomat from country A has good relations with country B, but poor relations with country C, this can be spelled out in the role assignment and will obviously affect the dynamics of the negotiations that follow. You can also provide information on "side issues" that may complicate negotiations. For example, if the main focus is determining the agenda for an upcoming human rights conference, but several countries have conflicts with each other over trade issues or border disputes, students playing those roles can choose to overlook the disputes, or link them to their bargaining on the human rights discussions (Kille 2002). Role-specific instructions may also provide more detailed information to some, but not all, players, altering the negotiation dynamics. The possibilities are really endless. The manner in which these role instructions are written significantly shape the interactions that take place in the simulation. They can be written for groups of students, or individuals, depending on the context. Sometimes, students themselves

can contribute to creating these identities by doing research on particular actors in advance of the simulation.

Timeline

Finally, a timeline needs to be established for the simulation. It usually helps to break down the simulation into phases. In a treaty negotiation simulation, for example, one phase may involve each national delegation determining as a group, their initial negotiating position. The next phase would cover the first round of international negotiations. Another phase would involve another round of intradelegation assessments of the progress so far, followed by another round of international negotiation. Once the phases are established, consider how much time needs to be spent on each phase. Instructors running a simulation for the first time can only make educated guesses about the duration of each phase. They need to be patient and flexible; students may get through the phases more quickly or more slowly than expected.

A debriefing session must also be incorporated into the time line. This is the part of the simulation where the learning outcomes are highlighted and the instructor can help students recognize how the interactions and outcomes of the simulation fit with the rest of the course content. The debriefing may also serve, in part, as an assessment tool for the instructor to determine if the simulation achieved what it was conceptually designed for. Since this is such an important part of the exercise, the time allotted to this activity must not be an afterthought. How to run the debriefing session is discussed below.

Running the simulation

There are a few final tasks to consider before the simulation gets underway: role assignments, physical space requirements, the instructor's role, and whether to inject an update or crisis.

Role assignments

Simulations typically involve role-playing where students may play a general role (such as a member of Congress or a business leader) or a specific person (such as the Secretary of Defense or Secretary General of the United Nations). In some simulations, students are organized into teams who all play the same role. Depending on the simulation topic, the groups may be national delegations, members of an NGO, top advisors to the President, members of an interest group, or journalists. Role assignment may be random, done through self-selection, or determined by the instructor. If students choose their own roles, many will be happier to participate because they got the role they preferred. However, many will not get their preference and, more importantly, random assignments or self-selection can lead to a mismatch between quality of the student and the responsibilities that go with a particular role. An instructor-led approach, in which the better students are assigned to the more pivotal roles in the simulation, can lead to more predictable, quality outcomes. If there are not key roles, then self-selection or random assignment can work effectively.

Physical space requirements

One consideration to take into account before running a simulation is what room requirements are needed. A room with moveable seats is preferable to, say, stadium seating.

Moveable seats allow teams to strategize together in small groups, create a conference-like setting with a large circle of seats, create a courtroom-like setting with a bench, defendant and plaintiff seats, etc. Consider whether conference tables, computers, projectors, and printers/copiers are needed to enhance the nature of the interactions and to produce the desired output at the end. Two or more rooms may be needed if the class is large, or you have separate negotiating groups that you do not want to overhear each other. Another small but important practical preparatory consideration is the method by which students can identify each other in their roles. One simple solution is to create name-tags or name placards.

Instructor's role

During the simulation, instructors need to consider their own role. Ideally, the simulation should be as student-run as possible. As such, the instructor may choose to be a nonparticipant who steps in only to clarify the rules or important facts, or, more broadly, to make sure that the simulation doesn't go off the rails due to very unrealistic behavior by one or more students. Alternatively, the instructor may be a partial participant. In a simulation involving a humanitarian crisis, for example, the instructor may play a relatively uninvolved role as the U.S. President who receives policy advice from students. Most of the work would involve student deliberation and debate about what advice to give the President. The instructor may choose to be a generic president or the specific President in power (with that President's own predilections) (Switky 2014). A moderate role for the instructor can be that of "expert witness" who is available to provide additional information to students should they choose to ask for it. The level of activity in this situation depends greatly on whether students recognize they don't have enough information and their ability to formulate good queries. This can lead to varied outcomes when some groups seek more information than others, an interesting result to explore in the debriefing.

Updates/crises

If time allows, injecting a realistic crisis into the deliberations can enhance the simulation. This may also be a way to help carry energy from the first day of the simulation into the second day of the exercise. The crisis may or may not be directly related to the topic of the simulation. For example, a simulation about European Union foreign ministers addressing concerns about Russian activities in Ukraine might include a crisis involving a major bank failure in Greece. For a period of time, the students will need to redirect their attention to the crisis before getting back to the main topic at hand. Crises may also take the form of escalating the situation about which the students are negotiating. It might even take the form of a "response" to decisions or recommendations that were made in the previous class period.

Debriefing, grading, and assessment

As noted above, a key component of the simulation is the debriefing session. At the end of the formal simulation, time needs to be saved to drive home the learning objectives of the exercise. Simulations can often be emotionally intense, so it is important to encourage students to step out of their roles during the debriefing, and to remind them that their

opponent in the simulation is simply a classmate who was playing a role. Debriefing may be student-led or instructor-led. If the student-led approach is adopted, instructors could simply ask the class what they thought were the most important points about the simulation and listen as the students reflect on their experiences. Students are often quite eager to step out of their roles and talk candidly about the strategies that they employed and the frustrations that they experienced. Students might be asked to write reflection papers prior to an in-class discussion, and then share their individual insights with their classmates in a guided debriefing. Such essay prompts may help them focus on the established learning outcomes. Similarly, the instructor could have each group of students write a description of several of the simulation's important lessons. If there is time, each group can present one or more of their lessons to the class followed by an instructor-led class discussion. It is helpful if the groups hand in these papers so that the instructor can get a record of what concepts were, or were not, grasped. The complete list of student lessons can then be posted online so that students can review the material prior to the next exam (Switky 2014).

Alternatively, the instructor can lead a (usually shorter) discussion of the simulation's most important themes and, where appropriate, articulate links between the students' actions and decisions in the simulation with what happens in the real world.

For any exercise that requires preparation and takes time in the class, it is important to include some graded element to promote strong student participation. Grading student performance in the simulation may take several forms. Students may be graded in terms of their participation specifically in the simulation, or simply as part of the semester's overall participation grade. Their participation may be linked to "winning" (i.e., achieving a particular goal/task assigned to their actor) or simply linked to their attendance and level of engagement. Students may be assigned at least one paper related to the simulation. If the paper is assigned prior to the simulation, it can be used as a preparatory tool. If the simulation runs for several weeks, the students might have a writing assignment done in-character related to the progression of the simulation. A paper assignment that follows the simulation would give students another opportunity to reflect on the learning outcomes as well as their own role in the simulation. In addition to evaluating participation and written assignments, the instructor may, of course, give students a quiz on the material or put simulation-related questions on the next exam. Regardless of the grading method, the instructor should make sure that the weight of the grade is consistent with the time invested. A "reaction" paper to a 2-hour simulation may be worth, say, 10% of the course grade whereas an eight- to 10-page paper of a semester-long simulation could be worth 70%.

A final consideration for employing simulations in the class is the assessment component—determining whether an exercise was successful in achieving the identified learning outcomes. This might effectively be built into the debriefing and graded components, or it may be a separate component. Apart from a reflective essay, a pretest and posttest can be an effective way to assess student learning based on their simulation experience. Regardless of approach, one final question will enhance the debriefing process and help the instructor improve the simulation for future iterations. Instructors should ask what students liked and didn't like about the role-play exercise. Students often have very good recommendations about how to tweak a simulation that instructors might not have considered.

Conclusions

Some additional recommendations, learned from experience, are worth offering. Perhaps most important of all is to be flexible. Sometimes, for example, students want more information than the instructor can (or wishes to) provide. Simulations are, by definition, simplified versions of reality. So, students need to work within the informational confines established by the instructor. A common challenge in running a simulation for the first time is time management. If one phase of the simulation, for example, has run over its time budget, the instructor should be prepared to drop something from the simulation (such as a crisis), shorten one or more of the remaining phases of the simulation, or adjust the course content that follows the scheduled simulation. The instructor also needs to be flexible during the exercise if two or three extroverts start dominating the discussions. Students need to be encouraged to play their roles realistically. This can be particularly relevant because students often choose to act based on their personal beliefs and not as the person (or position) they are supposed to represent. And, of course, the instructor needs to be ready if one or more students who have important roles don't show up for class.

We recommend that instructors start small and build in complexity as they design new simulations and modify them. Be prepared to make revisions—perhaps substantial ones—in light of the experience with the first simulation. Ultimately, a well-designed simulation can become one of the most thought-provoking and memorable exercises of the semester for students and one of the most enjoyable parts of the semester for the instructor.

Appendix: Custom simulation design worksheet

Use this worksheet to help develop a simulation of your own. Work through each of the questions below, and keep reminding yourself of what your overall learning objectives are for the exercise.

1. What is the topic of your simulation? (This will likely be one of the specific segments of your class, so be fairly specific.)
2. What are the main concepts that you want your students to understand better after participating in this exercise? (What are your learning objectives? Try to limit it to three to four learning objectives; be realistic.)
3. How much time do you want to devote to the simulation exercise? (Consider in-class time, presimulation preparation by the students, and debriefing and assessment time.)
4. Who are the different actors necessary to include in the simulation? (Individual business or government leaders, NGO or interest group representatives, analysts, legislative or judicial leaders, mediators/facilitators, faction leaders, etc.)
5. Will individual students represent these actors, or will groups of students collectively play each role? (Keep in mind the size of your class and how you might choose to assign grades.)
6. What outcome do you want the actors to reach? What form will this outcome take? (A negotiated agreement, a final judgment, creation of a new policy, a written document, an oral report, a final vote, etc.)
7. What types of interactions will the actors have with each other?
Who will communicate with whom and how?
(These should be realistic interactions and linked to producing the final desired outcome noted above. If these actors would not interact with each other in the real world, or would

only interact in certain arenas, keep this mind. Interactions or arenas could include: meetings, formal decision-making procedures, hierarchal reporting, issuing judgments, lobbying for particular outcomes, etc. Are they collaborating or competing?)

8. What background information are you going to provide to the students and in what format? (Class lecture[s], a reading assignment, links to useful web sites, etc.)
9. Will you provide additional information once the simulation begins? (e.g., a crisis or update?)
10. Will the students need to do advanced preparation? If so, what kind?
11. What role specific information or instructions will you give to each set of actors?
12. How long will the actors have to carry out their interactions before arriving at the desired outcome? (What is your working time line or phases for the exercise?)
13. What role will you play as the instructor? (Active participant, major or minor interjection of your presence when things/students go astray, a completely hands-off approach, etc.)
14. How will you conduct a debriefing for the exercise? What types of questions will you ask? (Will the debriefing be student-led or instructor-led? Keep in mind your original learning objectives. How will you know if the students have achieved these objectives?)
15. How will you grade students for the simulation? (Participation, outcome, written work, quiz, etc.)
16. Are there special room requirements or other materials you need for the simulation? (Placards or nametags, copiers, computers, etc.)

Note

1. We use these terms interchangeably, but recognize that some scholars make specific distinctions between these two terms (see, for example, Lantis, Kille, and Krain 2010).

Notes on contributors

Carolyn M. Shaw holds a PhD in Government from the University of Texas at Austin. She serves as Professor and Chair of Political Science at Wichita State University. Her research interests include international organizations, peacekeeping and the promotion of human rights, as well as pedagogy, particularly role playing. Her work on social media in the classroom has even been translated into Portuguese. She is also quite active in Model United Nations, traveling with her students twice annually to national and international conferences.

Bob Switky holds a PhD in Political Science from the Claremont Graduate University and is a lecturer in Political Science at Sonoma State University in California. He has written numerous articles on international affairs and on pedagogy in international relations. He is author of *Wealth of an Empire: The Treasure Shipments that Saved Britain and the World*, is a coauthor of *World Politics in the 21st Century* and is coeditor of *The Political Consequences of Regional Trading Blocs*.

References

- Abrosio, Thomas. 2006. "Trying Saddam Hussein: Teaching International Law Through an Undergraduate Mock Trial." *International Studies Perspectives* 7:159–171.
- Asal, Victor, and Elizabeth Blake. 2006. "Creating Simulations for Political Science Education." *Journal of Political Science Education* 2 (1):1–18.

- Asal, Victor, and Jayson Kratoville. 2013. "Constructing International Relations Simulations: Examining the Pedagogy of IR Simulations Through a Constructivist Learning Theory Lens." *Journal of Political Science Education* 9 (2):132–143.
- Boyer, Mark A., Peter Trumbore, and David O. Fricke. 2006. "Teaching Theories of International Political Economy from the Pit: A Simple In-Class Simulation." *International Studies Perspectives* 7:67–76. doi:10.1111/j.1528-3577.2006.00231.x.
- Cassidy, Christopher M., Dallas Brozik, and Doris Brozik. 2008. "Class Size and Game Design." *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning* 35: 28–33.
- Chasek, Pamela S. 2005. "Power Politics, Diplomacy and Role Playing: Simulating the UN Security Council's Response to Terrorism." *International Studies Perspectives* 6:1–19. doi:10.1111/j.1528-3577.2005.00190.x.
- De Freitas, Sara I. 2006. "Using Games and Simulations for Supporting Learning." *Learning, Media and Technology* 31:343–358.
- DiCicco, Jonathan M. 2014. "National Security Council: Simulating Decision-Making Dilemmas in Real Time." *International Studies Perspectives* 15 (4):438–458.
- Elias, Anwen. 2014. "Simulating the European Union: Reflections on Module Design." *International Studies Perspectives*. 15 (4):407–422. doi:10.1111/insp.12009.
- Gentry, James W. 1980. "Group Size and Attitudes Toward the Simulation Experience." *Simulations and Games* 11 (4):451–460.
- Gilbert, Sid. 1995. *Quality Education: Does Class Size Matter?* Ottawa, ON, Canada: Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education.
- Horn, Laura, Olivier Rubin, and Laust Schouenborg. 2016. "Undead Pedagogy: How a Zombie Simulation Can Contribute to Teaching International Relations." *International Studies Perspectives*. 17 (2):187–201. doi:10.1111/insp.12103.
- Kempston, Tanya, and Nicholas Thomas. 2014. "The Drama of International Relations: A South China Sea Simulation." *International Studies Perspectives* 15 (4):459–476. doi:10.1111/insp.12045.
- Kille, Kent J. 2002. "Simulating the Creation of a New International Human Rights Treaty: Active Learning in the International Studies Classroom." *International Studies Perspectives*. 3 (3):271–290. doi:10.1111/1528-3577.00096.
- Lantis, Jeffrey S., Kent J. Kille, and Matthew Krain. 2010. "The State of the Active Teaching and Learning Literature." In *The International Studies Encyclopedia*, eds. Robert A. Denemark and Renée Marlin-Bennett. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- McKeachie, Wilbert J. 1986. *Teaching Tips: A Guidebook for the Beginning College Teacher*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Neff, Kelly S., and Stewart I Donaldson. 2013. *Teaching Psychology Online: Tips and Strategies for Success*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Shaw, Carolyn M. 2004. "Using Role-Play Scenarios in the IR Classroom: An Examination of Exercises on Peacekeeping Operations and Foreign Policy Decision Making." *International Studies Perspectives* 5:1–22. doi:10.1111/j.1528-3577.2004.00151.x.
- Shaw, Carolyn M. 2006. "Simulating Negotiations in a Three-Way Civil War." *Journal of Political Science Education* 2 (1):51–71.
- Silberman, M. 1996. *Active Learning: 101 Strategies to Teach Any Subject*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Switky, Bob. 2004. "Party Strategies and Electoral Systems: Simulating Coalition Governments." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 37 (1):101–104.
- Switky, Bob. 2014. "Simulating a Foreign Policy Dilemma: Considering US Humanitarian Intervention." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 47 (3):682–686. doi:10.1017/s1049096514000833.
- Switky, Bob, and William Avilés. 2007. "Simulating the Free Trade Area of the Americas." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40 (2):399–405.
- Wedig, T. 2010. "Getting the Most from Classroom Simulations: Strategies for Maximizing Learning Outcomes." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 43 (3):547–555. doi:10.1017/s104909651000079x.
- Zappile, Tina M., Daniel J. Beers, and Chad Raymond. 2017. "Promoting Global Empathy and Engagement through Real-Time Problem-Based Simulations." *International Studies Perspectives* 18 (2):194–210.