Play it again, Sam! Teaching transferable skills through multiple repetitions of 'simple' simulations (with research benefits)

Markus Gastinger

Department of Political Science, Chair of International Politics, Technische Universität Dresden, 01062 Dresden, Germany.

E-mail: Markus.Gastinger@tu-dresden.de

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in **European Political Science**. The definitive publisher-authenticated version

Gastinger, M. (2017) 'play it again, sam! teaching transferable skills through multiple repetitions of "simple" simulations (with research benefits)', *European Political Science* 16(2): 233–245, doi:10.1057/eps.2016.20.

is **available online** at:

https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057%2Feps.2016.20

ABSTRACT The use of simulations in higher education teaching is burgeoning in political science curricula, particularly in international relations and European Union studies. This article contends that most simulations suffer from complexity bias and put too much emphasis on substantive knowledge. Drawing on the author's experience, two ideal types of simulations are developed. 'Complex' simulations focusing on negotiating *content* and 'simple' simulations focusing on negotiating *dynamics*. It is argued that the transmission of transferable skills is facilitated by multiple repetitions of similar negotiating contexts within the same module. This suggests that instructors face a trade-off between teaching transferable skills and substantive knowledge and should locate their simulations at either end of this continuum. Where students are not native speakers, not yet familiar with specialised terminology, or simply unversed in negotiating dynamics there is a particularly strong argument to make for carrying out simple simulations first, followed by complex simulations later in the curriculum. Finally, opportunities for collaborative research are highlighted. Gathering and pooling data from simple simulations bridges pedagogy and research at minimal additional cost.

Keywords teaching; active learning; European Union; transferable skills; simulations; game design.

‘It is frequent repetition that produces a natural tendency’ (Aristotle 2014: 113)

INTRODUCTION

‘The pressure is too much for me! I don’t know what to do’, Hans exclaims. I can feel his eyes turning to me for support but I continue to stare at the floor in order not to interfere with the experiment. Hans is an undergraduate BA student in his final year taking part in my simulation of EU enlargement negotiations. He is representing Germany and finds himself in a bitter dispute with France. Hans has conceded too much too early in the negotiations and has already reached his reservation point (RP). Ceding anything more at this stage risks non-ratification of the final agreement back home. In fact, Hans has already revealed this information publicly – but France considers it a deceitful bargaining strategy. The Presidency intervenes repeatedly in the final minutes, breaking into numerous ‘confessional’ meetings to talk to both parties bilaterally and, back in plenary, turning up the heat by calling on Germany and France not to risk a breakdown of the negotiations after seventy minutes of settling on all other outstanding points. Time on the countdown projected on the wall behind the Presidency is unrelentingly running out. It is now ten seconds before I will break off the simulation and declare it a failure, as I did in the first simulation. France is showing no signs of giving in. Hans feels forced to resolve the impasse. He takes a step towards France, taking him slightly beyond his RP but allowing the negotiations to end. Everyone is relieved. In the debriefing stage I point out to Hans that he must not reach his RP before trade-offs get into full swing. He never made that mistake again.

This opening paragraph is taken from one of my simulation sessions on EU enlargement. In total, we have simulated four enlargement rounds within the same module and the information provided to students was rather light on substance, which leads me to describe this class of simulations as ‘simple’ and to contrast them with ‘complex’ simulations

that make a heavier substantive commitment. This article's contribution to the literature is threefold. First, I argue that a trade-off between 'teaching substantive knowledge' (negotiating *content*) and 'teaching transferable skills' (negotiating *dynamics*) exists and that, ideally, instructors should place their simulations at either end of this continuum for modules not to become too dense informationally. Second, this contribution will stress the importance of repetition, which is *the* central pedagogical principle of skills acquisition. A succession of similar negotiation contexts helps students develop transferable skills better than one content-laden simulation extending over the whole term. Finally, I highlight the potential of using simple simulation data for theory-testing research due to their high replicability.

The data for this article has been gathered from various sources. First, the author taught two identical simulations on EU enlargement at two German universities in 2013. These simulations were designed autonomously by the author with a high degree of abstraction and focused on numerical values ('simple' simulations). He also benefited from a term-long negotiations course with numerical variables at Tulane University as an undergraduate student. Second, the author participated in an award-winning simulation on the EU services directive at the University of Salzburg as an undergraduate. This simulation focused on substantive outcomes and procedural aspects of decision-making processes in the EU over the whole cycle of the co-decision procedure with the need to draft texts ('complex' simulations). He also participated in a week-long Model United Nations (MUN) in Vienna, which fell more into this second category. Third, the author designed and supervised simulations on the EU multiannual financial framework (MFF) at the Riga Graduate School of Law. He furthermore participated in simulations of the European Council at the European Summer School of the *École Nationale Supérieure d'Arts et Métiers* (Cluny campus) and later co-organised five. These simulations fall between the first two categories, beginning with an introduction to essential bargaining concepts followed by a more complex decision-making context. These experiences – both as participant and instructor and ranging from twenty to

over one hundred students – allow me to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of different simulation styles.

The remainder of this article is structured as follows. Section two reviews the use of simulations in political science and looks at concrete examples from European studies. Section three develops 'simple' and 'complex' simulations as two opposing ideal types. The fourth section highlights the different learning objectives of these two classes of simulations and stresses the importance of repetition. Section five charts the potential of future collaboration facilitated by simple simulations. Finally, section six provides a conclusion that sets out the main contribution and argument of the article.

SIMULATIONS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE CURRICULA

Simulations have been elegantly defined by Usherwood as a 'recreation of a real-world situation, designed to explore key [sic] elements of that situation' (2014: 2). They go back to the 1920s and the emergence of International Relations (IR) as a sub-discipline of politics, when Model League of Nations became popularised across the Unites States (US) (Kuehl and Dunn, 1997: 70–1). Simulations of the European Union (EU) reach back to the 1980s and were, again, pioneered at US universities (Zeff, 2003: 266). Although no comprehensive figures on the use of simulations in higher education institutions exist, they seem on the rise particularly in IR (Archer and Miller, 2011). In Europe the trend towards active forms of learning, and thus from 'the sage on the stage to the guide on the side' (King, 1993), is set to continue with the Bologna process (Guasti *et al,* 2015; Lightfoot and Maurer, 2014). Even if establishing a clear link between motivational levels and learning success can be difficult (Raymond, 2010; Raymond and Usherwood, 2013), simulations are widely perceived as increasing students' level of motivation and function as 'motivational hooks' to encourage engagement with the subject (Freitas, 2006: 350; Shellman and Turan, 2006). In the wake of

benchmarking tools such as the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) in the United Kingdom (UK) or the *Studienqualitätsmonitor* (SQM) in Germany, teaching quality and student satisfaction rates are likely to rise in importance in the future and will require more attention from academics.

In keeping with the major thrust of this article, I will briefly review here a selection of simulations predicated on the EU focusing on their level of complexity. EU simulations include Kaunert who met students weekly for 'plenary sessions' of the Council of Ministers with a 'range of official documents' uploaded on Blackboard (2009: 259, 262). Zeff simulates the European Council, aiming for 'realistic' relationships among actors and highlighting the 'complexities of the EU's institutions' (2003: 267). Van Dyke *et al*. ran three-day simulations across fifteen US colleges on topics warranting 'extensive study' and susceptible to 'debateable' (2000: 149) resolutions. Switky organised a short single-class session on voting rules in the Council where students were charged with preparing their country's preferences using the Internet or by contacting official EU representatives (2004: 44). Galatas (2006) also charged students with drafting resolutions on various issues followed by an in-class simulation of the Council with amendments passed by qualified majority voting (QMV) or unanimity. Brunazzo and Settembri (2015) developed a simulation of the European Citizens' Initiative where students acquire a detailed understanding of underlying issues. Elias (2014) carried out a simulation of the Czech Presidency in the Council, focusing on substantive knowledge. Both Bobot and Goergen (2010) and Fink (2015) conducted simulations of the EU chocolate directive, going through a full co-decision procedure. While this implies multiple repetitions of the same directive, the institutional context changes with every stage. While this review should not be interpreted as meaning that simulations are necessarily always 'complex', in European Studies they mostly seem to be. The remainder of this article will tease out some of the implications of this complexity bias.

In spite of the availability of guidelines (e.g., Asal and Blake, 2006; Glazier, 2011; Smith and Boyer, 1996) simulations can be painstaking to prepare. There are numerous examples of simulations in a variety of different contexts, which is both a blessing and a curse. While adding to the initially high start-up costs by having to familiarise oneself with this literature, the inspiration one can take from it is remarkable (cf. Clapper, 2015: 132). Nevertheless, the first time a lecturer adapts a simulation to her own research, learning objectives need to be identified, briefing and background material drafted, a procedure for the actual simulation selected and the form of assessment, evaluation and debriefing chosen. The first decision, however, should concern just how complex the simulation should eventually become. Most scholars' intuition (as complex and real as possible!) may not necessarily be the right choice.

THE TWO POLES OF THE SIMPLICITY–COMPLEXITY CONTINUUM

Simulations can be arranged on a continuum ranging from simplicity to complexity. Generally, simulations consist of four building blocks: first, clear educational objectives; second, background information and briefing material; third, some procedure that needs to be followed during the simulation; and, fourth, a debriefing period dedicated to reflection (Lantis, 2000: 129; Usherwood, 2014).[1] These building blocks apply invariably to all simulations. But, depending on where the simulation is placed on the continuum of complexity, they can become rather different in practical terms (for a similar approach concerning all active learning techniques, see Bonwell and Sutherland, 1996; and focusing on learning objectives in EU simulations, see Raiser *et al*, 2015).

[1] Assessment and student grading are a potential fifth block. This aspect is, however, not included explicitly in my typology since it is unclear how this would differ systematically across simple and complex simulations.

In what follows I develop two ideal types of simulations to illustrate this point. It should be pointed out that ideal types are *extreme* points on a continuum and therefore actual cases are rare or even non-existent (Goertz, 2008: 105). Therefore I only make sparse reference to concrete simulations in this section. Moreover, and in line with the definition provided above, simulations, even when complex, are always reductions of reality focusing on *key* elements of some event. At the other end, simple political science simulations exhibit some degree of complexity by being embedded in a specific historical and/or procedural context and assigning multiple roles. Hence, 'simple' and 'complex' are relative rather than absolute terms.[2] Nevertheless, ideal types are useful for building typologies and defining essential features against which real cases can be measured (della Porta, 2008: 206). Above and beyond, they allow us to illustrate effects affected by fundamental choices of game design. Table 1 summarises my argument. Before discussing learning objectives, repetition and replicability, this section will deal with the remaining dimensions first.

Table 1: Simple and complex simulations juxtaposed

	Simple simulations	**Complex simulations**
Focus	Dynamics	Content
Briefing material	Lecturer-driven	Student-driven
Simulation procedure	Informal (e.g., consensus)	Formal (e.g., QMV)
Negotiating variables	Numerical	Text-based
Required language proficiency	Low	High
Debriefing	Intensive	Extensive
Learning objective	Transferable skills	Substantive knowledge
Repetition	Multiple	None
Replicability	High	Low

Source: Author's own table.

[2] I owe this point to an anonymous referee.

On the one end are ‘complex’ (or substantive) simulations, which approximate the fascinating decision-making dynamics underpinning contemporary international negotiations. In keeping with the literature review presented above, the bulk of simulations encountered in higher education today seem rather complex. Substantive simulations are suitable for lecturers if they wish to teach students the intricacy of political decisions and the varying interests that need to be aggregated in the process of finding consensus. Briefing material is provided by lecturers, but significant background information needs to be prepared autonomously by students as well (e.g., in the form of position papers). This helps to unburden lecturers in the preparatory stages and prepares students to engage in substantive discussions. The simulation itself typically follows real-life rules of procedure, for example with the option to raise different motions in accordance with a pre-set modus operandi or detailed rules for a weighted voting procedure. Negotiations themselves focus on variables that are text-based, with participants tasked to find formulations having the backing of a qualified majority of all delegations.

This lends itself to value-creating (Lax and Sebenius, 1986), integrative (Walton and McKersie, 1965), problem-solving or simply ‘soft’ bargaining techniques (Dür and Mateo, 2010a; Hopmann, 1974) through communicative action (Niemann, 2004; Risse, 2000), as students have greater scope to find solutions. But it can be seriously hampered where simulations are not in the students’ native language. Even for native speakers, language can prove a considerable obstacle if many technical terms are employed. Text-based simulations require participants to be sensitive to subtle nuances in the drafting language. Since negotiations in the EU take place among non-native speakers this can form one insight in itself. But if language proficiency differs widely among participants this can quickly turn into a source of frustration for everyone.

Debriefing constitutes another fundamental step in simulations as it is here that the simulation experience turns into learning and is incorporated by students (Crookall, 2010: 907–10). In general terms, it can be defined as ‘a process in which people who have had an

experience are led through a purposive discussion of that experience' (Lederman, 1992: 146). The nature of debriefing differs vastly across complex and simple simulations. In complex simulations debriefing is extensive and can deal with various points. For example, factual errors accumulating in the simulation – be they substantive or procedural – as far as they are not cleared as the simulation is ongoing (which interferes with the simulation process) need to be pointed out in its aftermath. Of course, the core bargaining dimension of simulations can also be touched upon at this stage, which is consistent with labelling them as 'extensive'. But as time overall is limited, dealing with points of substance and procedure inevitably leaves less scope for analysing the bargaining dynamics. This is a crucial point that we shall come back to in the next section.

At the other end of the continuum are 'simple' (or dynamic) simulations. Rather than detailing the decision-making environment, procedurally and substantively, these simulations have as their core objective highlighting the dynamics of negotiations. Students are typically not charged with drafting their own positions before the simulation but are given all the necessary information, including payoffs or RPs. In fact, in my simple simulations I explicitly *discourage* students from looking up information beforehand to prevent them from being influenced by real-world outcomes. The briefing material sets out a plausible story of issues to be negotiated but keeps it short and simple so as not to detract from the negotiations. Simulation variables are typically numerical values like prices, subsidies, quotas or transition periods. These variables can be set more or less freely, which enables lecturers to manipulate the zone of possible agreement (ZOPA). It is important that zones vary from simulation to simulation and students should never have even a rough indication of their outlines.

Students can be sure that a ZOPA always exists and agreements can, in principle, always be struck. The simulation procedure is very informal and in the end the agreement of all parties is needed, which means students do not have to familiarise themselves with the details of QMV. This sets the stage for very vibrant simulations in which one student's gain is

another student's loss. While both integrative, value-creating and distributive, value-claiming negotiations occur in real life, the latter has the advantage of allowing *exact* statements about how well students have performed and helps to pinpoint mistakes by those underperforming (e.g., opening bid too low, too frequent concessions, going beyond one's RP). This facilitates debriefing. Although using simulation outcomes as a basis for grading is tricky, the ability to formulate precise statements about students' in-simulation performance unleashes their full pedagogic potential. Language proficiency is also less of an issue since a basic level suffices to survive in most situations. In contrast to complex simulations, debriefing is intensive and focuses on how simulations unfolded and how the varying rates of success among students can be explained.

PICKING SIDES FOR AN ENCORE

The most fundamental difference between simple and complex simulations can be found with regard to the learning objective. Simple simulations focus on transferable skills, such as the ability to prevail in a distributive zero-sum negotiating setting, whereas complex simulations are best placed to share substantive knowledge. Undeniably, complex simulations also do train students in a number of transferable skills, such as thorough preparation for important meetings, elaboration of their own positions, reacting quickly to the stance of others and public speaking. However, these skills are equally trainable in simple simulations. The unique point of complex simulations really is the better retention of substantive knowledge. Once students have worked through the institutional mechanics of an organisation applied to a case first hand, the experience is bound to be more memorable than merely reading about it. But chunks of that substantive knowledge are not transferable to other situations. For example, the detailed understanding of the rules of procedure of any given body or the content of particular EU directives bring students limited benefits if they do not find employment in areas where

they profit from that insight (on the connection of skills and employability, see Maurer and Mawdsley, 2014).[3]

Another central element in all simulations is time, which leads to the value of repetition. Based on the insight gained from negotiation simulations, I consider credible deadlines the single most important determinant of bringing negotiations to a successful close.[4] Only if participants know that simulations run seventy minutes – and seventy minutes only – can the sort of 'pressure' described in the opening paragraph build up. In a ninety-minute block per session this leaves twenty minutes for debriefing, which suffices considering this pattern is repeated four times.[5] In the first simulation I do not yet project a giant countdown on the wall behind the Presidency. The first simulation failing to produce agreement has explanatory value in itself (Sasley, 2010) and the sense of frustration experienced by the group is a prerequisite for the weight on participants' shoulders felt in subsequent negotiations. Since the simulation is repeated four times, students have every opportunity to improve on their performance. By the time of the third simulation I am always impressed with students' steep learning curve. After a few negotiating sessions the degree of professionalisation attained is remarkable. Repetition truly is the source of natural tendency.

With this I come to the trade-off between teaching different sorts of skills. Although we all want our students to take away as much as possible, there is a natural limit to how much one can learn in any one module. In fact, 'information overload' verifiably has a detrimental effect on student learning through lower retention rates (e.g., Aiken *et al*, 1975;

[3] Notwithstanding more civic benefits such as learning how political decisions are crafted (see Curtis 2012: 79).

[4] Note that 'successful' should not necessarily be equated with 'good'. While time pressures force negotiators into decisions, these can be sub-optimal or even unviable in the long term (Carnevale and Lawler 1986). In simulations long-term effects of decisions need not concern us.

[5] If there are four simulations in one module, this cumulatively amounts to almost a full session dedicated entirely to feedback.

Russell *et al*, 1984). The basic intuition behind these findings is easy to grasp. As our brains have a limited capacity to process new information, whenever they are faced with too much input details are wiped out until the workload becomes manageable. Over ambition is, perhaps, the most frequent mistake committed by junior lecturers who want to teach negotiation skills *and* substantive knowledge at the same time. Given that students' capacity to absorb information is limited, the trade-off between objectives is self-evident. In a benign interpretation one could argue that every student simply picks the skills set that they are most interested in. A more disconcerting reading would hold that the learning outcomes become random.

For lecturers who have already prepared numerous simulations this may all too easily be forgotten. But seemingly simple information, such as the different roles of EU institutions or procedural rules, were difficult to grasp for us at the beginning, too. In the same vein, basic bargaining concepts like RP, ZOPA or BATNA may be trivial for us today. But when we were first initiated into them their power to conceptually grasp different negotiating settings and shape our behaviour did not reveal itself to us instantly. Of these two pools of information the first one may be larger. International organisations like the EU are today complex institutions with formal and informal decision-making procedures operating in an intricate web of multiple stakeholders with different, usually conflicting, interests. But the negotiation literature is also sophisticated and far from trivial (e.g., Dür *et al*, 2010; Odell, 2000; Odell, 2010; Raiffa, 1982). Hence the admonition put forth in this article that teaching substantive knowledge and transferable skills *simultaneously* may be counterproductive. Lecturers are well advised to pick either of the two sides and should carefully consider if simple simulations may not be more beneficial for their intended purposes and student population.

THE UNTAPPED RESEARCH POTENTIAL

Simple simulations have another major advantage: replicability. In economics – which has frequently foreshadowed developments in political science – a whole branch has grown out of experiments with undergraduate students. Vernon L. Smith received the Nobel Prize 'for having established laboratory experiments as a tool in empirical economic analysis' (The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, 2002). In the humanities college-based experiments quickly rose to prominence, too, even if drawing general conclusions from student populations was identified as problematic (Sears, 1986). Although in political science the adoption of experiments was initially considered practically and ethically unattainable (Lijphart, 1971: 683–4) and generalising findings to the elite-driven processes with which political scientists are typically concerned proves equally problematic (Mintz *et al*, 2006), experiments have in the meantime been firmly included in our methodological toolbox (e.g., Druckman *et al*, 2006; Druckman *et al*, 2011; Margetts and Stoker, 2010; McDermott, 2002). Though far from flawless, the omission of experimental methods as a valid research strategy to test political science hypotheses imposes unwarranted limitations on our field's rate of development.

Simulations are not proper experiments because participants are not assigned randomly and control groups are difficult to establish. But every simulation has the potential to become a quasi-experiment (Asal *et al*, 2013; McBurney and White, 2009: 345–8), thus blurring the lines between research and pedagogy. The argument that these quasi-experiments can help to evaluate learning outcomes and – in a European context – identity formation has already been made (Guasti *et al*, 2015; Rünz, 2015). But almost any storyline can be broken down into a number of issues that lend themselves to numerical negotiations with a clearly definable ZOPA. This gives these quasi-experiments a yet untapped potential to help our cumulative understanding of bargaining outcomes. Ideally, participants record their opening

bids and concessions through an online system with which to keep track of bargaining moves with surgical precision. But all other data collection strategies are in principle equally available (e.g., surveys, interviews, participant observation) and can ideally be triangulated. Simulations failing to record results in a systematic fashion are not realising their full potential.

In contrast to complex simulations with text-based variables, simple simulations can be perfectly manipulated and outcomes precisely measured. Each numerical negotiating variable can be defined by the area around its median. If students negotiate a financial envelope, such as the EU's MFF, and state A as net contributor has been given a RP of 1.1 trillion Euros (or less) and state B as net beneficiary one of 0.9 trillion Euros (or more), the median is 1 trillion and the ZOPA is 0.2 trillion Euros. This means that the ZOPA extends 10 per cent around the median.[6] Irrespective of the narrative offered to students to explain what this variable represents, it can be compared to variables in all simulations where the ZOPA exhibits the same properties. Similarly, the success of state A and state B in the negotiations can be accurately measured. If the simulation ends with 1.1 trillion, state B's success rate is 100 per cent, whereas with 0.9 trillion state A's victory would be total. If the outcome settles right on the median both states share a 50 per cent rate of success.[7]

With the dependent variable operationalised a number of independent variables hypothesised to influence negotiation outcomes can be tested. From a gender perspective, it would be interesting to see if male students outperform female students – or if negotiations

[6] This generally computes as the median minus the difference of median and ZOPA, all divided by two.

[7] Generally, one minus: the student's distance from the RP, over the ZOPA divided by one hundred. Where, as in the example of the opening paragraph, one student manages to get past another's RP the success rate should nevertheless be defined as 100 and zero per cent, respectively. Where students negotiate more than one variable all outcomes could be aggregated to arrive at a single measure of success.

among exclusively female students give rise to more equitable agreements closer to the median. This could help explain why today, with male negotiators dominating in this area of public service, international negotiations appear ever so acrimonious. Culturally, it is worthwhile to investigate if bargaining outcomes can be explained by students coming from collectivist or individualist cultures (Dür and Mateo, 2010b: 686). Universities across Europe are in a special position here because of the diversity of the student population owing to the popularity of exchange programs like ERASMUS.

Let me elaborate on another important practical implication of this approach. In order to use the gathered data for further analysis one needs clear student properties concerning the hypothesis one is aspiring to test. For example, if state A is represented by one student from a collectivist and another from an individualist culture, the outcome of the simulation could not give us insight into how cultural characteristics impact international negotiations. Therefore students will preferably not negotiate in teams,[8] as is often the case, or the process of team-building will need to be more actively managed by lecturers. Crucially, this problem is mitigated if we assume that eventually data from hundreds of simulations will become available. To stick to the example, even if the two students representing state A show conflicting properties concerning their cultural backgrounds, they may still both be female or converge on some other variable of interest and could provide added value for addressing other questions.

[8] Some students could, for example, be tasked to acts as observers in the simulation/quasi-experiment, perhaps even charged to focus on other observable implications of interest (e.g., counting soft or hard bargaining strategies like 'threats' or 'compromise proposals', respectively). This also alleviates the problem of lecturers being unable to be in several locations at the same time when negotiations break into a more informal mode and occur in various smaller groups.

Collecting data over multiple replications of comparable simulations holds the promise of refining our understanding of what drives negotiating success (e.g., Fink, 2015) which is part and parcel of the international politics of interdependence encountered today. Moreover, establishing collaboration among lecturers interested in simulations could help overcome the (often prohibitively) high start-up costs for simulations. Although lecturers increasingly use simulations in the classroom and report about them in scholarly journals, the original game designs are still not generally made available for replication.[9] By sharing and refining a pool of simple simulations their comparability, robustness and replicability can be increased and the data generated can be accumulated for additional scientific gain.

CONCLUSIONS

Let me end by noting that simple simulations do not make for one-sided or 'easy' modules. In Germany modules consist of around thirteen sessions per term of ninety minutes each. Subtracting three introductory sessions (one general, one on negotiating concepts, and another on EU enlargement), four sessions for actual simulations and one closing session with feedback and a final debate (e.g., on the final frontiers of the EU), leaves five substantive sessions for complementary material. These can be filled empirically by covering the historical context and state of the EU at the time of enlargement rounds (e.g., following Dinan, 2010) or, more theoretically, with major theories of European integration. Wiener and Diez (2009) have assembled an excellent edited volume on the strengths and weaknesses of

[9] Sharing game designs publicly is problematic since students could look up the confidential instructions of others by downloading the journal article. Therefore, a closed electronic system open only to instructors after registration may be preferable.

different theoretical approaches resorting to the common example of EU enlargement. This complementary part in the module also determined most of the students' final grades. The feedback I received at the end of the term was overwhelming. Combining simple simulations with substantive sessions that are clearly separated may be one strategy to combine substantive knowledge and transferable skills after all.

References

Aiken, E. G., Thomas, G. S. and Shennum, W. A. (1975) 'Memory for a lecture: effects of notes, lecture rate, and informational density', *Journal of Educational Psychology* 67(3): 439–444.

Archer, C. C. and Miller, M. K. (2011) 'Prioritizing active learning: an exploration of gateway courses in political science', *PS: Political Science & Politics* 44(2): 429–434.

Aristotle (2014) *De sensu and de memoria: text and translation with introduction and commentary*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Asal, V. and Blake, E. L. (2006) 'Creating simulations for political science education', *Journal of Political Science Education* 2(1): 1–18.

Asal, V., Kollars, N. A., Raymond, C. and Rosen, A. M. (2013) 'Editors' introduction to the thematic issue: bringing interactive simulations into the political science classroom', *Journal of Political Science Education* 9(2): 129–131.

Bobot, L. and Goergen, A. (2010) 'Teaching European negotiations: the EU chocolate directive simulation', *International Negotiation* 15(2): 301–323.

Bonwell, C. C. and Sutherland, T. E. (1996) 'The active learning continuum: choosing activities to engage students in the classroom', *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* (67): 3–16.

Brunazzo, M. and Settembri, P. (2015) 'Teaching the European Union: a simulation of Council's negotiations', *European Political Science* 14(1): 1–14.

Carnevale, P. J. D. and Lawler, E. J. (1986) 'Time pressure and the development of integrative agreements in bilateral negotiations', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 30(4): 636–659.

Clapper, T. C. (2015) 'Theory to practice in simulation: an overview', *Simulation & Gaming* 46(2): 131–136.

Crookall, D. (2010) 'Serious games, debriefing, and simulation/gaming as a discipline', *Simulation & Gaming* 41(6): 898–920.

Curtis, S. (2012) 'How relevant are other ways to learn?', in C. Gormley-Heenan and S. Lightfoot (eds.) *Teaching Politics and International Relations*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 78–90.

della Porta, D. (2008) 'Comparative analysis: case-oriented versus variable-oriented research', in D. della Porta and M. Keating (eds.) *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 198–222.

Dinan, D. (2010) *Ever closer union: an introduction to European integration*, 4th Ed., Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Druckman, J. N., Green, D. P. and Kuklinski, J. H. (eds.) (2011) *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Druckman, J. N., Green, D. P., Kuklinski, J. H. and Lupia, A. (2006) 'The growth and development of experimental research in political science', *American Political Science Review* 100(4): 627–635.

Dür, A. and Mateo, G. (2010a) 'Bargaining power and negotiation tactics: the negotiations on the EU's financial perspective, 2007–13', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48(3): 557–578.

Dür, A. and Mateo, G. (2010b) 'Choosing a bargaining strategy in EU negotiations: power, preferences, and culture', *Journal of European Public Policy* 17(5): 680–693.

Dür, A., Mateo, G. and Thomas, D. C. (2010) 'Negotiation theory and the EU: the state of the art', *Journal of European Public Policy* 17(5): 613–618.

Elias, A. (2014) 'Simulating the European Union: reflections on module design', *International Studies Perspectives* 15(4): 407–422.

Fink, S. (2015) '36 different chocolate directives: how does the setting influence negotiation outcomes in an EU simulation?', *European Political Science* 14(3): 241–253.

Freitas, S. I. de (2006) 'Using games and simulations for supporting learning', *Learning, Media and Technology* 31(4): 343–358.

Galatas, S. E. (2006) 'A simulation of the Council of the European Union: assessment of the impact on student learning', *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39(1): 147–151.

Glazier, R. A. (2011) 'Running simulations without ruining your life: simple ways to incorporate active learning into your teaching', *Journal of Political Science Education* 7(4): 375–393.

Goertz, G. (2008) 'Concepts, theories, and numbers: a checklist for constructing, evaluating, and using concepts or quantitative measures', in J. M. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady, and D. Collier (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 97–118.

Guasti, P., Muno, W. and Niemann, A. (2015) 'EU simulations as a multi-dimensional resource: from teaching and learning tool to research instrument', *European Political Science* 14(3): 205–217.

Hopmann, P. T. (1974) 'Bargaining in arms control negotiations: the seabeds denuclearization treaty', *International Organization* 28(3): 313–343.

Kaunert, C. (2009) 'The European Union simulation: from problem-based learning (PBL) to student interest', *European Political Science* 8(2): 254–265.

King, A. (1993) 'From sage on the stage to guide on the side', *College Teaching* 41(1): 30–35.

Kuehl, W. F. and Dunn, L. (1997) *Keeping the covenant: American internationalists and the League of Nations, 1920-1939*, Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Lantis, J. S. (2000) 'The United Nations Security Council restructuring summit', in J. S. Lantis, L. M. Kuzma, and J. Boehrer (eds.) *The New International Studies Classroom: Active Teaching, Active Learning*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner, pp. 129–139.

Lax, D. A. and Sebenius, J. K. (1986) *The Manager as Negotiator: Bargaining for Cooperation and Competitive Gain*, New York, NY: Free Press.

Lederman, L. C. (1992) 'Debriefing: toward a systematic assessment of theory and practice', *Simulation & Gaming* 23(2): 145–160.

Lightfoot, S. and Maurer, H. (2014) 'Introduction: teaching European studies – old and new tools for student engagement', *European Political Science* 13(1): 1–3.

Lijphart, A. (1971) 'Comparative politics and the comparative method', *American Political Science Review* 65(03): 682–693.

Margetts, H. and Stoker, G. (2010) 'The experimental method: prospects for laboratory and field studies', in D. Marsh and G. Stoker (eds.) *Theory and Methods in Political Science,* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 308–324.

Maurer, H. and Mawdsley, J. (2014) 'Students' skills, employability and the teaching of European studies: challenges and opportunities', *European Political Science* 13(1): 32–42.

McBurney, D. and White, T. (2009) *Research Methods*, 8th ed., Belmont: Cengage Learning.

McDermott, R. (2002) 'Experimental methodology in political science', *Political Analysis* 10(4): 325–342.

Mintz, A., Redd, S. B. and Vedlitz, A. (2006) 'Can we generalize from student experiments to the real world in political science, military affairs, and international relations?', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50(5): 757–776.

Niemann, A. (2004) 'Between communicative action and strategic action: the Article 113 Committee and the negotiations on the WTO Basic Telecommunications Services Agreement', *Journal of European Public Policy* 11(3): 379–407.

Odell, J. (2010) 'Three islands of knowledge about negotiation in international organizations', *Journal of European Public Policy* 17(5): 619–632.

Odell, J. S. (2000) *Negotiating the World Economy,* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Raiffa, H. (1982) *The art and science of negotiation,* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Raiser, S., Schneider, A. and Warkalla, B. (2015) 'Simulating Europe: choosing the right learning objectives for simulation games', *European Political Science* 14(3): 228–240.

Raymond, C. (2010) 'Do role-playing simulations generate measurable and meaningful outcomes? A simulation's effect on exam scores and teaching evaluations', *International Studies Perspectives* 11(1): 51–60.

Raymond, C. and Usherwood, S. (2013) 'Assessment in simulations', *Journal of Political Science Education* 9(2): 157–167.

Risse, T. (2000) ''Let's argue!': communicative action in world politics', *International Organization* 54(1): 1–39.

Rünz, P. (2015) 'Beyond teaching: measuring the effect of EU simulations on European identity and support of the EU', *European Political Science* 14(3): 266–278.

Russell, J. I., Hendricson, W. D. and Herbert, R. J. (1984) 'Effects of lecture information density on medical student achievement', *Academic Medicine* 59(11): 881–889.

Sasley, B. E. (2010) 'Teaching students how to fail: simulations as tools of explanation', *International Studies Perspectives* 11(1): 61–74.

Sears, D. O. (1986) 'College sophomores in the laboratory: influences of a narrow data base on social psychology's view of human nature', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51(3): 515–530.

Shellman, S. M. and Turan, K. (2006) 'Do simulations enhance student learning? An empirical evaluation of an IR simulation', *Journal of Political Science Education* 2(1): 19–32.

Smith, E. T. and Boyer, M. A. (1996) 'Designing in-class simulations', *PS: Political Science & Politics* 29(04): 690–694.

Switky, B. (2004) 'The importance of voting in international organizations: simulating the case of the European Union', *International Studies Perspectives* 5(1): 40–49.

The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences (2002) 'The Sveriges Riksbank Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel 2002', *Press release* 9 October, available at http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economic-sciences/laureates/2002/press.html, accessed February 2016.

Usherwood, S. (2014) 'Constructing effective simulations of the European Union for teaching: realising the potential', *European Political Science* 13(1): 53–60.

Van Dyke, G. J., Declair, E. G. and Loedel, P. H. (2000) 'Stimulating simulations: making the European Union a classroom reality', *International Studies Perspectives* 1(2): 145–159.

Walton, R. E. and McKersie, R. B. (1965) *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations: An Analysis of a Social Interaction System*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Wiener, A. and Diez, T. (eds) (2009) *European Integration Theory*, 2nd ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zeff, E. E. (2003) 'Negotiating in the European Council: a model European Union format for individual classes', *International Studies Perspectives* 4(3): 265–274.

About the Author

Markus Gastinger received his PhD from the European University Institute in 2014. At time of publication, he is research associate and lecturer at the Chair of International Politics of the Technische Universität Dresden, Germany. You can find him at: http://markus-gastinger.eu/