Evaluating a cross-continent EU simulation

Rebecca Jones, Widener University

Presented at the Biannual European Union Studies Association Conference
May 17-19, 2007
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Abstract

Assessment of learning outcomes and evaluation of teaching methods are necessary in order to ensure that students are learning the lessons that faculty believe they are conveying. Quantitative data on the effectiveness of various pedagogical methods allows faculty to make adjustments to classes over time and regular assessment of student learning outcomes allows for the collection of hard data in order to show the effectiveness of teaching techniques and activities. A pre- and post-test survey was administered to participants in EuroSim 2007, a cross-continent EU simulation run by the Trans-Atlantic Consortium for European Union Studies and Simulations (TACEUSS). This paper analyzes the results of those surveys and examines the ability of evaluation/assessment surveys to capture the effectiveness of simulations in promoting affective learning and discovering changes in patterns of student interactions as outlined by Greenblat (1973). This survey will be an ongoing project, collecting data at all future EuroSims in an effort to provide a strong database of information regarding the effectiveness and usefulness of large simulations as pedagogical tools.

Assessment of learning outcomes and evaluation of teaching methods are necessary in order to ensure that students are learning the lessons that faculty believe they are conveying. Preparing for assessments connected with accreditation processes requires faculty to focus on issues such as, what are the lessons we are attempting to convey? What do we hope that students will take from our classes? Did we accomplish those goals? End-of-term evaluations and assessments help faculty determine the success of their teaching methods and decide whether or not they have reached their goals in a given class. When classes include a simulation or the simulation is a stand-alone activity, the questions increase. Is the simulation actually teaching the students, or is it simply time off from the classroom? How can faculty organize a simulation in order to achieve the intended goals? Do the students really understand the goals of the simulation? During the simulation, how do you keep students on target?

Assessment surveys are meant to answer these questions and provide a quantitative record. Quantitative data on the effectiveness of various pedagogical methods allows faculty to make adjustments to classes over time and regular assessment of student learning outcomes allows for the collection of hard data in order to show the effectiveness of teaching techniques and activities. Faculty members have many reasons for wanting to accurately evaluate non-traditional pedagogical methods such as simulations (aside from making sure we get good evaluations for tenure purposes). For one thing, simulations are non-traditional so we want to be able to determine if the lessons intended to be taught were in fact the lessons learned. Another reason for wanting some objective form of evaluation is to determine if, in addition to learning the material, the students actually gained from the experience on a personal level. Examining the literature on simulations it is clear that a large percentage is concerned with presenting evidence as to the usefulness of simulations for engaging students in the material and in a variety of learning processes, or with discussions regarding how to structure a simulation to insure it covers the desired material. In his review of the literature on simulation games, Dorn suggests that evaluation results are mixed at best. “The evidence is frequently ambiguous and ranges from enthusiastic, impressionistic, and subjective reports to objective data and analysis” (Dorn 1989, 6). There is very little discussion in the literature regarding the creation of accurate assessment tools for

simulations in general or for evaluating simulations that take place as an extra-curricular activity away from campus.

Over the last approximately 25 years, simulations have become accepted as a valid pedagogical tool. Proponents of simulations have argued that experiential learning is more effective for teaching students both facts and theories and requires students "to analyze specific situations, reflect on their observations, confront problems, and develop their own ideas" (Shellman 2001). According to Greenblat, simulations allow students to experience "environments similar to those they might not face until much later in life or might never directly experience" (Greenblat 1973, 65). Sociology and political science faculty have been more receptive to the idea of using simulations in the classroom and the subject matter in those classes tends to be more suited for simulations. In introductory American politics classes, for example, simulations can be used to understand the workings of Congressional committees, budget planning, and the writing and passing of bills (Ciliotta-Rubery & Levy 2000). Introductory comparative politics classes can include simulations on proportional representation and coalition-building (Shellman 2001) and cabinet formation (Kaarbo & Lantis 1997).

When designing and using simulations, faculty are hoping to achieve a number of goals. First, simulations are used in order to find a method for delivering subject knowledge (i.e. facts, theories) in such a way that students will retain the information. Faculty members also use simulations in order to motivate students to participate more in class. Finally, simulations are seen as a way to show students, through experience, how institutional processes such as making laws or implementing policies, function in their particular field of study.

Following Greenblat (1973), Szafran and Mandolini (1980) list five areas of evaluation that have been found to support the use of simulations as teaching tools: (1) motivation and interest, (2) cognitive learning, (3) affective learning, (4) student interaction patterns, and (5) gaining an overall assessment of the simulation. Szafran and Mandolini examine the literature to date (1980) to determine if Greenblat's characterization of the benefits of simulations holds. The focus of both articles is on the types of learning methods involved, and the more general benefits (life-learning) to the students.

Greenblat (1973) argued that simulations spur motivation and interest because participation in the simulation is interesting, it increases student interest in the topic as well as the course, and finally participation in simulations increases interest in, and enthusiasm for, learning in general. Cognitive learning is enhanced through the factual information gained, putting into use concepts such as negotiation, organization, and power, and through learning the actual processes and "real world" structures that must be navigated in order to successfully complete the simulation. In addition, cognitive learning is supported through an increased ability to identify elements of a problem, learning decision-making skills, and employing winning strategies (Greenblat 1973).

The third area of interest to evaluators of simulations is affective learning. Here, Greenblat argued that participation in simulations changes the perspectives of students; survey responses indicated an increase in empathy for others and increased insight into the issues confronted by decision makers (Greenblat 1973). Students also show an increased self-awareness and a greater sense of their own capabilities and efficacy. The fourth area where evaluations help to uncover what might be termed the side-effects of simulations is in changes in students' interaction patterns. Student-teacher relationships improve; students and teachers are more relaxed around one another and the exchange of information becomes less hierarchical. Students also gain greater insights and knowledge about their fellow students (Greenblat 1973). The final area examined by Szafran and Mandolini (1980) is overall assessment of the simulation. They did find that the literature generally supported Greenblat's contentions and that simulations were considered a useful, legitimate, and stimulating means for conveying information and experiences to students. Szafran and Mandolini (1980) also found that the literature did not explicitly discuss overall reactions to simulations, but rather assumed that participants would "endorse the overall experience and recommend its future use" (Szafran and Mandolini 1980, 24).

Subsequent discussions and evaluations of simulations (Steck, Buonanno and Eagles 1996; Ciliotta-Rubery and Levy 2000; Ip and Lisner 2001; Kaarbo and Lantis 1997; Galatas 2006; Shellman 2001) found that students generally enjoyed their experiences with simulations, felt that they learned more than they expected and more than they would in a traditional classroom setting, and would repeat the experience.

These findings, while useful and valuable, still do not help to determine whether or not students actually achieved the expected learning outcomes beyond the factual and process-oriented outcomes. In other words, students do show marked improvement in engaging and understanding the material, but the literature does not discuss affective learning or changes in patterns of student interaction mentioned by Greenblat (1973) and Szafran and Mandolini (1980).

Galatas (2006) found that asking students to write reflection papers not only reinforced the quantitative findings, but "allowed students to go beyond the close-ended format of the survey and to explore more fully their thoughts and perceptions of the simulation" (Galatas 2006, 149). He discovered that students, who at the beginning of the simulation expressed concerns regarding the potential for free-riding among their classmates, saw that the participants did indeed take their roles and the simulation quite seriously; a change in student interactions and perceptions of their fellow students was an outcome of this particular simulation. However, in discussing his simulation, Galatas (2006) emphasizes the success of the simulation in the areas of interest and motivation, cognitive learning (facts and processes about European Union institutions), and overall assessment of the simulation. There is no further discussion or analysis of affective learning or changes in patterns of student interaction.

Kaarbo and Lantis (1997) and Shellman (2001) designed simulations to introduce students to concepts of comparative political institutions including coalition formation and proportional representation electoral systems. Both simulations had primary goals that were focused on motivation and interest and cognitive learning; "…students gain important insights about the complexities of the political process generally, and the coalition cabinet process specifically" (Kaarbo and Lantis 1997, 501). In assessing the success of the overall simulation, Kaarbo and Lantis note that their simulation "has consistently met the educational objectives of experiential learning" and point out that "students truly became engaged in the simulation and exhibited high levels of interest…" (Kaarbo and Lantis 1997, 505). Kaarbo and Lantis indicate that in open-ended questions, students mentioned improving their bargaining and communication skills, and developing better relationships with others in the class as a result of the simulation. However, the authors view these results as extra side benefits of participation in the simulation.

Shellman (2001) also identifies five cognitive learning goals for his simulation of the German electoral system but does not mention improvement in interpersonal skills or relationships among students in his assessment of the simulation.

When discussing how to design an in-class simulation, Smith and Boyer (1996) emphasize the need for clearly stated goals as the first step in the design process. However, they are only concerned with interaction and motivation and cognitive learning outcomes and not with affective learning or interaction patterns. Follow-up evaluation questions center on the overall success of the simulation in terms of goals and motivations *within* the simulation. Other evaluations of simulations such as Ciliotta-Rubery and Levy (2000) also focused on motivation and interest, cognitive learning outcomes and the overall success of the simulation.

Political science classes are ripe for simulations, because simulations allow faculty to demonstrate the concepts and theories on which they are lecturing and are "predicated on pedagogy that long-term retention and use of learning are better achieved through experiential learning" (Ip & Linser 2001). Students gain a greater understanding and appreciation for the intricacies of constitution writing if they actually sit down in a group and write a constitution. The same thing has been found with budget simulations, Congressional committee simulations, etc. (e.g. Ciliotta-Rubery and Levy 2000). Both Congressional Quarterly (CQ) and the American Political Science Association (APSA) have books full of a variety of simulations for faculty to use in the classroom. The simulations can run from the fairly simple one day, in-class exercise, to more complex multi-day or semester-long simulations. Clearly, simulations are regarded as useful and legitimate pedagogical tools by the discipline as a whole.

The difficulty arises when faculty need to assess the learning outcomes of simulations. The usual end-of-semester course evaluations do not allow for separate evaluation of simulations or other non-traditional pedagogies. Yet, the whole point of conducting a simulation is to increase the learning outcomes for our students. How do we determine what works and what does not? Most faculty evaluating the usefulness of simulations in the classroom have asked questions of students that rank various aspects of the simulation from "useful" to "useless" or "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" (e.g. Ip and Linser 2001; Steck, Buonanno, and Eagles 1996). These types of questions can be

used to quantify some aspects of learning outcomes in the simulation. In addition, Ip and Linser (2001) and Steck, Buonanno, and Eagles (1996) found that open-ended questions elicited responses that can be used to measure the utility of the simulation for students.

In the last ten years or so, setting goals for learning outcomes and creating pedagogies designed to achieve those goals have become a driving force for universities in reaccredidation processes and as tools in student recruitment. It has become necessary to create assessment tools that can accurately reflect the success of pedagogies and the achievement of expected learning outcomes. Affective learning, described by Greenblat (1973) and Szafran and Mandolini (1980) is achieved when students show an increased self-awareness and a greater sense of their own capacities and efficacy. The positive impact of a simulation should also be seen in changes in student interaction patterns. These patterns would include improved, more relaxed, less hierarchical student-teacher relationships, and improved relationships marked by greater insights and knowledge of their fellow students (Szafran and Mandolini 1980). The literature discussing evaluation of simulations has apparently dropped those two areas from consideration over the years. Given the renewed emphasis on these learning outcomes, faculty evaluating simulations should consider adding such questions to their evaluations. Creating a pre- and post-test research design that incorporates Greenblat's (1973) affective learning and changing patterns of student interactions as expected learning outcomes should result in a survey that will allow us to quantify those outcomes.

Self-assessment is another issue to be considered when discussing simulation evaluation. According to Boud and Falchikov (1989) "[s]elf assessment is formative in that it contributes to the learning process and assists learners to direct their energies to areas for improvement…" (Boud & Falchikov 1989). Self-assessment requires students to make assessments regarding their own potential and actual performance and allows them to make judgments regarding their achievements and learning outcomes (Boud & Falchikov 1989). It seems intuitive to argue that older and more experienced students would be more capable of conducting an accurate self-assessment regarding their level of preparation and their abilities in general. Topping (1998) found that studies analyzing student self-assessment suggested that "[i]n courses with many mature students, the ages and life experiences of the participants could prove very different" (Topping 1998, 251).

In order for affective learning to take place, students need to acquire a sense of their own level of performance and abilities. General evaluations of activities such as simulations and courses, tend not to ask students to rate their performance in class, but rather to rate the instructors performance or their impressions of the activity regardless of their level of participation. This method of evaluation does not promote affective learning for students or give them a "realistic sense of their own strengths and weaknesses" and the understanding "that they can use knowledge of their own achievements to direct their studying into productive directions" (Boud & Falchikov 1989, 530). Boud and Falchikov (1989) argue that while so-called "good" students have always had the ability to accurately judge their achievements, "explicit attempts need to be made to develop the capability, and opportunities need to be given for it to be openly practiced" in order for all students to benefit from affective learning opportunities (Boud & Falchikov 1989).

EuroSim

The Trans-Atlantic Consortium for European Union Studies and Simulations (TACEUSS) runs a cross-national simulation of the governing processes of the European Union called EuroSim. This simulation switches venues between European and American locations every other year. In the past, organizers have collected survey information regarding both the effectiveness of the simulation and the response of the students (Buonanno, Steck, and Eagles, 1996). This paper is a first look at renewing the effort to collect evaluative data on EuroSim. A cross-national simulation that operates on two continents provides challenges that are not normally faced when evaluating classes and even other large simulations such as the Model UN. The first round of surveys in this phase was distributed to students at EuroSim 2007 which took place April 12-15 at Canisius College in Buffalo, New York. Based on previous years' anecdotal evidence, we expected to find that students not only enjoy the simulation, but that a majority are well prepared regarding the information required, participate in sophisticated debates and discussions of the relevant issues, and find depths of abilities in themselves that they do not know they possess. At the practical end of things, e.g. cognitive learning outcomes, again based on mostly anecdotal evidence, we expected to find positive results in areas covering general knowledge of the EU, an understanding of the policy-making processes

of the EU, and specific knowledge of the policy area covered in a given year's EuroSim program. In addition, we expected to gain more quantifiable information regarding the overall success of the simulation.

The extra-curricular nature of EuroSim combined with its cross-national, continent-hopping character makes evaluation and assessment both necessary and a challenge. EuroSim provides a framework for the partial simulation of a major EU issue and in doing so provides students with an inside view of the institutions and processes of the organization. It is necessary to collect data on its success in achieving its stated goals of introducing students to an international organization that most students know very little about. Assessment is also necessary in order to show the value of EuroSim to administrators who are always budget conscious and are usually unsure of the benefits of funding such ventures. The challenges are evident in the cross-national nature of the simulation. While the simulation is conducted in English and all the participants are required to speak English fluently, misunderstandings and miscues do occur. Any evaluation survey must be formatted and worded so as to avoid as much as possible any foreseeable problems in the interpretation of questions.

In their evaluation of the EuroSim European Union simulation, Steck, Buonanno, and Eagles (1996) designed evaluation questions that were intended to address Greenblat's (1973) third and fourth areas of evaluation. The authors also found that the most useful information came from open-ended questions. By returning to a formal evaluation of the EuroSim we hope to discover if the specific learning outcomes that are planned are actually occurring and what and where we can improve the simulation both in the areas of learning outcomes as well as student enjoyment and participation. The first step in the process is to determine the desired learning outcomes. Accreditation processes ask for evidence, and processes to gather that evidence, showing improved student ability to work with peers, communicate both orally and in written form, apply critical thinking methods to problems, student interactions with faculty and other students, and a whole host of other broad criteria, in addition to gaining knowledge specific to their field of study.

EuroSim strives to be as realistic as possible within the parameters of a simulation. TACEUSS describes EuroSim as "an exercise in experiential learning that

helps students to better understand the EU by actively preparing for, participating in, and reflecting upon a simulation of EU decision-making" (TACEUSS goals 2007) and states that EuroSim is "intended to build valuable social skills related to communication, teamwork, diplomacy and negotiation." This definition and goals fall within the area of cognitive learning defined by Greenblat (1973) and Szafran and Mandolini (1980). EuroSim also has as a goal and desired learning outcome the promotion of trans-Atlantic relations through the bringing together of U.S. and European students (TACEUSS goals 2007). Student interactions and the building of new relationships also fall into the affective learning category.

Open-ended questions in both the pre-test and post-test phase were designed to unearth information regarding affective learning and peer interaction in addition to student motivation and interest, cognitive learning, and overall assessment of the simulation. The pre-test survey focused primarily on student's assessment of their own level of preparation and their general disposition toward participating in such a simulation. The post-test survey included questions that directly address the issues of affective learning and peer interactions. Questions regarding affective learning included: Do you feel that EuroSim changed your perspective on how governments work? Do you feel that you have a greater appreciation for the pressures and stresses faced by lawmakers? Do you feel that the simulation has improved your ability to work with others? Did participation in the simulation change your relationship with your professor? How would you change your own participation in the simulation?

It is hoped that by including these questions in pre- and post-simulation surveys we can provide initial data regarding the affective learning and patterns of student interactions that are included in Greenblat's (1973) discussion of the benefits of simulations. Ip and Linser (2001) conclude that "more work is needed to find out whether a real learning-outcomes benefit has been achieved" in simulations. In the case of EuroSim in particular, quantifiable data in support of such goals will likely increase support (and funding) among deans and other administrators for non-traditional activities such as EuroSim.

Design and Hypotheses

The research design was a pre- and post-test survey. The surveys were distributed at the opening and closing banquets for EuroSim 2007. This ensured as high a response rate as possible since every student participant was expected to attend both functions. However, indications of nasty weather on Saturday night into Sunday caused four universities to leave Buffalo a day or half a day early. Skidmore College and Colgate University participants left Saturday afternoon and Hamilton College and University of Antwerp participants left early Sunday morning in an attempt to outrun the inclement weather. Therefore, the total sample size for Sunday is somewhat smaller than that gathered on Thursday.

Based on the literature regarding success of simulation evaluations and on literature discussing student self-assessment initial hypotheses were drawn up. In line with the arguments presented by Topping (1998) and Boud and Falchikov (1989), it was hypothesized that on questions requiring self-assessment (e.g. "I am worried that others are better prepared than I" and "I am comfortable working without direct faculty involvement") that freshmen would exhibit lower levels of self-confidence and upper classmen would show higher levels. In addition, based on the goal of affective learning as discussed in the literature (Greenblat 1973, Szafran & Mandolini 1980), it was hypothesized that freshmen, at the beginning of their college careers, would be more inclined to agree with the statement that participation in EuroSim would broaden their horizons at their own universities.

Data Analysis

Pre-simulation survey

A total of 18 universities with 151 students participated in EuroSim 2007 at Canisius College; European students made up almost one-third of the student participants (29.8%). The pre-simulation survey (see Appendix I - Surveys) was distributed at the opening banquet for EuroSim 2007 and collected immediately afterwards. The response rate was very high with 109 out of 115 students (94.8%) completing the survey.[1] The average age of the students was a little over 21 and half years old (mean age = 21.76 years), ranging from the youngest at 18 to 29 for the oldest. The largest delegation had

[1] See Appendix III, Table 1 for frequency distributions.

18 students while the smallest had one. The sample was 58.7% female and 41.3% male. Graduate students made up the largest overall contingent (29.4%) which is understandable given that all of the students from the Europa Institut at the University of Saarland and SUNY Brockport were graduate students or graduate law students. The largest group of undergraduates was juniors (23.5%), followed by freshman (18.6%), seniors (14.7%), and sophomores (13.7%). Almost all of the European students had traveled outside of Europe prior to this conference (93.3%) while just under two-thirds of the American students indicated that they had traveled outside their own state prior to this trip (61.3%). Finally, for 91.7% of the participants, EuroSim 2007 was their first time participating in the simulation. And 87.1% of the participants indicated that, if possible, they will attend again.

The first question was open-ended and asked students to indicate what their expectations were for EuroSim.[2] Answers ranged from an opportunity to learn more about the EU to "have fun" to improving negotiating skills. Students tended to put in more than one answer, with some giving as many as four different responses to the question. The most frequent first response was "learn more about the EU" (45.5%), followed by meeting new people/people from another country (13.6%). The most frequent secondary response was meeting new people/people from another country (14.7%) followed by "learn more about the EU" (12.8%).[3]

When asked if they felt comfortable with their overall level of knowledge and prepared for their individual role, students' response was generally positive; 57.8% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they were comfortable with their level of knowledge regarding the topic and 61.5% felt that they were prepared for their individual roles. 63.3% were not worried that others would be *less* prepared than they, but 56.8% were worried that others were *more* prepared than they were; almost 23% were undecided in each case.

One of the unique features of EuroSim is that once the simulation has started, faculty are no longer directly involved. The student directors are responsible for the day-to-day details and the student participants chair the meetings and structure the debates regarding

[2] See Appendix II for answer coding for open-ended questions.
[3] Appendix III, Table 2.

the issue. Given this rather distinctive characteristic of the simulation, we felt it was important to see whether students were comfortable with the lack of immediate faculty involvement and direction; despite one or two comments from students that faculty should be chairing meetings, 87.7% of the respondents indicated that they were quite comfortable with this set up.

Crosstabs were run to determine the existence of any relationships between class year and self-assessment regarding level of preparation and knowledge, comfort in working without direct faculty involvement.[4] It was hypothesized that freshmen would be more likely to agree with the statement "I am worried that other participants are *better* prepared than me." Interestingly, sophomores and juniors were more likely to agree with the statement than were freshmen. 57.9% of freshmen agreed or strongly agreed with the statement while 21.1% were undecided. 64.3% of sophomores agreed or strongly agreed with 35.7% undecided and 70.8% of juniors agreed or strongly agreed with 16.7% undecided. Seniors and graduate students showed somewhat more confidence in themselves and their level of preparation; 53.4% of seniors were worried about others being more prepared while 26.7% were undecided and 20% were not worried (disagreed with the statement). Graduates were the most confident, but even at that level self-doubt appears; 40% agreed with the statement "I am worried that other participants are *better* prepared than me" while 23.3% were undecided and 36.7% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

Another area of affective learning mentioned by Greenblat (1973) and Szafran and Mandolini (1980) was the idea that participation in simulations broadened students' horizons at their university by putting them in close contact with people they might otherwise not have known. Crosstabs between the variables "year in school" and "broadening horizons" were run to see if students felt that participation in EuroSim would broaden their horizons at their home university.[5] It was hypothesized that freshmen, as the newest students, would not be locked into social groups and therefore they would be more likely to agree with the statement "This simulation will broaden my horizons at my university." And in fact, 77.8% of freshmen agreed or strongly agreed

[4] Appendix III, Table 3.
[5] Appendix III, Table 4.

with that statement. 71% of sophomores agreed or strongly agreed with 21% undecided while juniors proved to be the most open to the idea with 79% agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement. Within the group of seniors, those students likely already locked into social groups on campus, only 26.7% agreed with the statement, 46.7% were undecided and 26.7% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Graduate students agreed at higher rates than seniors with 53.3% agreeing or strongly agreeing while 33.3% were undecided. This is could be due to the fact that graduate students are entering a new environment, not unlike freshmen, and therefore are more sensitive to the broader implications of participating in something new. Interestingly, within the categories of "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" for the statement "This simulation will broaden my horizons at my university," 39.1% of those in the "Strongly Agree" category were juniors while 30.4% were freshmen followed by sophomores at 17.4% and graduate students at 13%. No seniors responded with "Strongly Agree." In general, 63% felt that the simulation would broaden their horizons at their own university.

When it came to appreciating or understanding how the simulation could help with future situations in which they might find themselves, 90% of graduate students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that "This simulation will help me deal with other new situations" while 78.5% of sophomores, 75% of juniors, and 72.2% of freshmen agreed or strongly agreed. Perhaps surprisingly, only 40% of seniors agreed (none indicated "strongly agree") with the statement. Overall, 73.2% felt that the simulation would help them deal with other new situations.[6] As far as being comfortable working without direct faculty involvement, over 80% of every class level indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "I am comfortable knowing that I will be working without direct faculty involvement" and overall, 87.7% felt comfortable working without faculty involvement. It is possible that the high response rates to these questions are skewed or biased by the fact that participation in EuroSim is self-selected on the part of the students. Therefore, students who are uncomfortable working on their own without close supervision are unlikely to volunteer for such an activity.

In order to more fully reveal any differences between students regarding their ability to perform an accurate self-assessment, an ANOVA was run to determine if there

[6] Appendix III, Table 5.

was a significant difference between younger and older students with regard to their worries about being less prepared than other participants. The ANOVA and post-hoc Scheffé test revealed no significant differences based on age.

Post-simulation survey

The post-simulation survey was distributed at the closing banquet (see Appendix II). This survey contained a number of open-ended questions intended to elicit responses in the categories of affective learning and changing patterns of student interactions. Due to the weather situation, the total sample size dropped from 109 at the beginning of the simulation to 85 (73.9%) at the end. The largest group of students at the end of the simulation was juniors (28.0%), followed by graduate students (22.0%), freshman and seniors (17.1%), and sophomores (15.9%).

Overall, 74.7% of the participants rated the simulation as "good" or "very good" and 10.8% rated it as "excellent" while 13.3% rated the simulation as "fair." A majority of students (57.9%) indicated that the simulation had met or exceeded their prior expectations while 27.7% said that it met some of their expectations. 12% were undecided. 42.4% felt that the varying levels of knowledge among students was the weakest element,[7] while 18.8% thought that the topic was too narrow or technical or there was too much uncertainty about the procedures and structure of the simulation. It should be noted that variations in level of knowledge among the students has always been an issue; as the descriptive statistics show, the students participating in EuroSim vary from 18-year old freshmen to 29-year old graduate students. Despite worries regarding the varying levels of knowledge among their fellow students, 21.2% felt that the organization of the simulation was its strongest element followed by 18.8% who felt that the interaction between students was the strongest element. Almost two-thirds, 61% stated that they had never participated in any type of extra-curricular simulation prior to attending EuroSim, while 29.3% indicated that they had participated in Model UN, moot court, or another similar type of simulation; almost 10% indicated that they had participated in something similar without specifying any particular type of simulation.

In the realm of self-assessment, students appeared to have re-evaluated their own levels of preparation and knowledge at the end of the simulation. 74.1% agreed (44.7%)

[7] See Appendix II for answer coding for open-ended questions.

or strongly agreed (29.4%) with the statement "I feel I was adequately prepared for my individual role" while 74.1% agreed (40.0%) or strongly agreed (34.1%) with the statement "I knew enough about the overall topic to participate meaningfully." These totals are compared to 57.8% who were comfortable with their level of knowledge before the simulation and 61.5% who felt that they were adequately prepared for their role prior to the start of the simulation.

Interestingly enough, hindsight did not increase students' impressions that participation in the simulation would broaden their horizons at their home university. Only a slight majority (56.5%) agreed or strongly agreed, a drop from the 63% who agreed or strongly agreed with the statement prior to the start of the simulation. However, 71.8% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "I got to know people from my own university that I probably would not have met otherwise." The number of students who felt that participation in EuroSim would help them deal with other new situations dropped slightly from 73.2% at the beginning of the simulation to 70.6% at the end. Greenblat (1973) indicated that a change in the relationship between professor and student was another benefit of a well-run simulation. In the case of EuroSim the results are mixed; 37.6% of the students indicated that preparation for and participation in the simulation had improved their relationship while 42.4% suggested that there had been no change in the relationship. Of those indicating no change, several stated that the relationship was good to begin with and that they felt they already knew their professor pretty well.

Affective learning in terms of increased empathy for others and increased insight into the issues confronted by decision makers, an area that Greenblat (1973) and Szafran and Mandolini (1980) suggest is an important benefit of simulations, was measured through two questions in the post-simulation survey. The first question asked students if they thought that EuroSim had changed their perspective on how governments work (Q16). A slight majority, 50.6%, of the students indicated that they had gained a new perspective on how governments work through participation in the simulation, while 8.2% said that the simulation had somewhat changed their perspective. 30.6% indicated that the simulation had not changed their perspective on how governments worked, with some indicating that they were already familiar with the day-to-day workings of

government. The second question asked students if the simulation had given them a greater appreciation of the stresses faced by lawmakers (Q17) and 76.9% indicated that it had indeed given them a greater appreciation of those stresses. Even though the simulation was a small piece of the reality of EU governing structures, it was enough to give students a greater feel for the "real-world" experiences of trying to make a government work.

Two questions asked students to perform a general self-assessment in terms of how they would change their own preparation. 48.3% indicated that, with the benefit of hindsight, they would prepare more and do more general research on the topic or their country or party, or do more research on the processes and procedures of the EU (Q14). Only 8.2% indicated that they would not change their level or process of preparation. In terms of assessing their actual participation in the simulation, the second self-assessment question (Q20), 18.8% said that they would speak up more often, 22.4% said that they would change the emphasis of their initial research, and 15.3% indicated that they felt no change was necessary. This question may be eliminated in subsequent surveys as many students seem to feel it was redundant or overlapped with the question regarding changing their preparation processes.

Crosstabs were run again between year in school and the questions regarding level of knowledge and preparation for individual roles. In terms of self-confidence regarding their knowledge of the topic, juniors exhibit more confidence than other undergraduates; 82.6% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "I knew enough about the overall topic to participate meaningfully" while 83.3% of graduate students agreed, followed by 76.9% of sophomores, 64.3% of seniors, and 50% of freshmen. Crosstabs between year in school and feeling prepared for individual roles were run as well. Here graduate students led the way with 83.3% indicating that they felt they were adequately prepared for their individual roles; freshmen and seniors were tied with 78.6% agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement "I feel I was adequately prepared for my individual role." 69.6% of juniors agreed or strongly agreed, and sophomores appeared to feel the least prepared with only 53.9% agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement. An ANOVA showed no significant differences between assessment of preparation for individual roles and age.

The crosstabs between year in school and broadening horizons yielded some interesting results. As opposed to the responses to the pre-simulation survey, 84.7% of sophomores agreed or strongly agreed that the simulation would broaden their horizons at their home university, while 69.6% of juniors did, followed by 64.3% of freshmen. Bringing up the rear were seniors, with 42.8% agreeing and graduate students with only33.4% agreeing. The chi-square goodness-of-fit test resulted in a Pearson Chi-Square value of 28.267, with 16 degrees of freedom and a significance of $p = .029$ and the gamma measure was -.334 and significant at the .05 level with $p = .001$. Both of these measures show a statistically significant relationship between year in school and the idea that participation in EuroSim would broaden students' horizons at the home university. In other words, the younger students felt that the simulation would broaden their horizons, while the older students did not. This is in contrast to the crosstabs from the pre-simulation survey which showed that freshmen and graduate students were more likely to believe that participation in the simulation would broaden their horizons at their home university.

Conclusions

Greenblat (1973) and Szafran and Mandolini (1980) argued that inclusion of affective learning assessment questions is necessary in order to ensure that simulations are effective at the highest level possible. The pre- and post-simulation surveys included questions that required students to think about their own level of preparation and analyze the extended benefits of participating in EuroSim. The data analysis showed that in this initial phase of assessment, the hypothesis regarding year in school and assessment ability was not supported in either the pre- or post-simulation survey. The second hypothesis which stated a negative relationship between year in school and belief that participation would broaden horizons at the home university was supported in the post-simulation survey. It is apparent that students do gain more than just cognitive learning from simulations and that they appreciate the opportunity to learn and practice negotiating skills, research skills, and speaking skills, as well as the opportunity to meet new people, not only from their own universities, but from other schools and countries as well.

The anecdotal evidence from previous years was supported as well. Students enjoyed the simulation, got a lot out of it, and the majority were well-prepared both in the topic area and for their individual roles. Based on statements from Widener University students, cognitive learning outcomes were also positive and the data supported the argument that participation in simulations, even those that may appear to be somewhat divorced from reality, do indeed give students a greater understanding of the processes of governments and the pressures faced by lawmakers to come to a compromise.

Future surveys will be modified to clarify some of the questions as well as attempt to ask more in-depth questions regarding affective learning and changes in patterns of interactions. In addition, it is likely that the pre-simulation survey will be shortened and will focus primarily on self-assessment questions regarding level of preparation in terms of both topic and role. The post-simulation survey will be modified to change some of the open-ended questions into ordinal responses of agree/disagree, useful/not useful, etc. Open-ended questions will focus on self-assessment as a product of hind-sight, as well as on patterns of interaction among students.

Anecdotal evidence has long supported the argument that simulations are valid pedagogical tools and provide for student learning outcomes on a more holistic level; the current quantitative data, limited though it is at the present, provides empirical support for this argument as well. By including questions designed to identify patterns of affective learning and changes in student interactions, it is hoped that future assessments of simulations will provide even greater support for their use both in and out of the classroom.

Appendix I – Surveys

Pre-simulation Survey

Canisius College, Buffalo, New York
April 12-15, 2007

PRE-SIMULATION SURVEY

This survey is designed to gain your feedback regarding your perceived level of preparation for the simulation as well as assist the faculty in ensuring the highest level of preparation for all participants. Please answer every question as completely as possible.

1. What are your expectations for the simulation?

Please circle the number under each statement that best reflects your view of the preparation and information regarding the simulation.

(5) Strongly Agree	**(4) Agree**	**(3) Undecided**	**(2) Disagree**	**(1) Strongly Disagree**

2. I am comfortable with my knowledge of the overall topic of the simulation.

5 4 3 2 1

3. I feel prepared for my individual role.

5 4 3 2 1

4. I am worried that other participants are *less* prepared than me.

5 4 3 2 1

5. I am worried that other participants are *better* prepared than me.

5 4 3 2 1

6. I feel that I have received adequate training in parliamentary procedure.

5 4 3 2 1

7. This simulation will help me understand more about the EU.

5 4 3 2 1

8. This simulation will help my future career plans.

5 4 3 2 1

9. This simulation will broaden my horizons at my university.

5 4 3 2 1

10. This simulation will help me deal with other new situations.

5 4 3 2 1

11. I feel well informed regarding the organizational details of Eurosim (e.g. hotels, registration, etc.)

5 4 3 2 1

12. I feel well informed regarding the structure of the simulation (e.g. meetings, roles, expectations).

5 4 3 2 1

13. I am comfortable knowing I will be working with students from the United States and Europe.

5 4 3 2 1

14. I am comfortable knowing I will be working ***without*** direct faculty involvement.

5 4 3 2 1

The next section asks you to evaluate the usefulness of the online course management system (Blackboard).

(5) Extremely Useful	**(4) Useful**	**(3) Undecided**	**(2) Not very Useful**	**(1) Not at all Useful**

15. Did you find Blackboard useful?

5 4 3 2 1

- Was it easy to use?

YES NO

16. Was Blackboard useful with regard to communicating with your simulation peers (e.g. other ministers, party members, etc.)?

5 4 3 2 1

17. Did Blackboard help with your research? (i.e. did it provide access to adequate resources?)

5 4 3 2 1

- Would you recommend using a course management system in future EuroSims?

YES NO

Demographic information

18. Gender M F

19. Age _____

20. Name of university _____

21. Year in school _____

22. Is this your first time participating in EuroSim? YES NO

- If no, how many EuroSims have you attended (counting this one)? _____

23. If you are not leaving school or graduating, do you plan on participating in EuroSim again?

YES NO

24. Was your participation in EuroSim through a class or through a club? _____

European students:

25. Have you traveled outside of Europe before this trip? _____

- If yes, to what countries? _____

U.S. students:

26. Have you traveled outside of your home state before this trip?_____

- If yes, where have you traveled? _____

Thank you for participating in this survey.

Post-simulation survey

Canisius College, Buffalo, New York
April 12-15, 2007

POST-SIMULATION SURVEY

Now that we have completed the simulation, this survey is designed to gain your feedback regarding EuroSim and assist the faculty in insuring the best simulation experience possible for all participants. Please answer every question as completely as possible.

1. Over all how would you rate the simulation?

(5) Excellent	(4) Very Good	(3) Good	(2) Fair	(1) Poor

2. Did the simulation fail to meet, meet, or exceed your prior expectations?

(5) Exceeded Expectations	(4) Met Expectations	(3) Undecided	(2) Met Some	(1) Failed to Meet

Please circle the number under each statement that best reflects your view of the preparation and information regarding the simulation.

	(5) Strongly Agree	(4) Agree	(3) Undecided	(2) Disagree	(1) Strongly Disagree
3. I was comfortable working without direct faculty involvement.	5	4	3	2	1
4. I feel I was adequately prepared for my individual role.	5	4	3	2	1
5. I knew enough about the overall topic to participate meaningfully.	5	4	3	2	1
6. I thought the expert witness panels were useful.	5	4	3	2	1

7. This simulation helped me to understand more about the EU.

5 4 3 2 1

8. This simulation will help my future career plans.

5 4 3 2 1

9. This simulation will broaden my horizons at my university.

5 4 3 2 1

10. I got to know people from my own university that I probably would not have met otherwise.

5 4 3 2 1

11. Participation in this simulation will help me deal with other new situations.

5 4 3 2 1

12. My pre-simulation training in parliamentary procedure was enough.

5 4 3 2 1

If you chaired a committee:

13. I felt comfortable in my role as chair of my committee.

5 4 3 2 1

These questions are designed to understand the particulars of your simulation experience. Please answer the following questions as completely as possible (beyond a simple yes or no):

14. Is there any way in which **you** would change **your** preparation process?

15. How could your professor have changed the preparation process?

16. Do you feel that EuroSim changed your perspective on how governments work?

17. Do you feel that you have a greater appreciation for the pressures and stresses faced by lawmakers?

18. Do you feel that the simulation has improved your ability to work with others?

19. Did participation in the simulation change your relationship with your professor?

20. How would you change **your own** participation in the simulation?

21. What do you feel were the weakest elements of the simulation?

22. What do you feel were the strongest elements of the simulation?

23. Have you ever participated in something like this before?

Demographic information

24. Gender M F

25. Age _____

26. Name of university _____

27. Year in school _____

28. Is this your first time participating in EuroSim? YES NO

    - If no, how many EuroSims have you attended (counting this one)? _____

29. If you are not leaving school or graduating, do you plan on participating in EuroSim again?

    YES NO

30. Was your participation in EuroSim through a class or through a club?_____

European students:

31. Have you traveled outside of Europe before this trip? _____

    - If yes, to what countries? _____

U.S. students:

32. Have you traveled outside of your home state before this trip?_____

    - If yes, where have you traveled? _____

Thank you for participating in this survey.

Appendix II – Coding

Pre-simulation survey

Q1:
1 = Meet new people/people from another country
2 = Learn more about the EU
3 = Work in a multi-cultural environment
4 = Do well in the simulation/use my knowledge
5 = Challenge myself
6 = Have fun
7 = Develop negotiating skills
8 = Gain new experiences
98 = Unclear as to meaning
99 = Don't know/No answer

Q2 – 14:
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Undecided
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree
99 = Don't know/No answer

Q15 – Q17:
1 = Not at all useful
2 = Not very useful
3 = Undecided
4 = Useful
5 = Extremely Useful
99 = Don't know/No answer

Post-simulation survey

Q1:
1 = Poor
2 = Fair
3 = Good
4 = Very Good
5 = Excellent
99 = Don't know/No answer

Q2:
1 = Failed to meet
2 = Met some
3 = Undecided
4 = Met expectations
5 = Exceeded expectations

Q3 – Q13:
1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Undecided
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

Q14: 1 = Do more research in general
2 = Research other countries/parties
3 = No change in preparation process/level
4 = More on parliamentary/legal procedure
5 = Other
99 = Don't know/No answer

Q15: 1 = More discussion on topic
2 = More information on structure and procedures of institutions
3 = No change needed
4 = Other
99 = Don't know/No answer

Q16: 1 = Yes – new perspective
2 = Somewhat
3 = Not an accurate representation of reality
4 = No
5 = Other
99 = Don't know/No Answer

Q17: 1 = Yes
2 = No
3 = Other
99 = Don't know/No answer

Q18: 1 = Yes – get other views
2 = Yes – an opportunity to work w/ students from other countries
3 = Yes (nothing further stated)
4 = No
5 = Other
99 = Don't know/No answer

Q19: 1 = Yes – closer/better
2 = No change
99 = Don't know/No answer

Q20: 1 = Speak up more/be more active
2 = Be true to role
3 = Change what initially studied/more preparation
4 = Other
5 = No change
99 = Don't know/No answer

Q21: 1 = Varying levels of knowledge among students
2 = Topic too narrow and/or too technical
3 = Not sure what to do/discuss at some points
4 = Weak Commission or Secretariat
5 = Food/drinks at breaks
6 = Other
99 = Don't know/No answer

Q22: 1 = International atmosphere
2 = Interactions between students
3 = Organization
4 = Well-prepared students
5 = Expert witnesses
6 = Other
99 = Don't know/No answer

Q23: 1 = Yes – Model UN/moot court/previous EuroSim
2 = Yes – no specifics given
3 = No
99 = Don't know/No answer

Demographic questions for both pre- and post-simulation surveys:

Q18 and Q24: Gender
1 = Female
0 = Male
99 = Don't know/No answer

Q20 and Q26: Name of university (no #15)
1 = Babes-Bolyai University
2 = Canisius College
3 = Colgate University
4 = Cornell University
5 = East Stroudsburg University
6 = Europa Institut (University of Saarland)
7 = Hamilton College
8 = Niagara University
9 = New York University
10 = Skidmore College
11 = St. John Fisher College
12 = SUNY Brockport
13 = SUNY Geneseo
14 = University of Antwerp
16 = University of Lower Silesia
17 = University of Trier
18 = University of Twente
19 = Widener University
99 = Don't know/No answer

Q21 and Q27: Year in school
1 = Freshman
2 = Sophomore
3 = Junior
4 = Senior
5 = Graduate
99 = Don't know/No answer

Q22 and Q28: Is this your first time participating in EuroSim?
1 = Yes

2 = No
99 = Don’t know/No answer

Q23 and Q29: Plan on participating again?
1 = Yes
2 = No
99 = Leaving school/No answer

Q24 and Q30: Was your participation through a class or a club?
1 = Class
0 = Club
99 = Don’t know/No answer

Q25 and Q31: Traveled outside Europe before this trip?
1 = Yes
0 = No
99 = Don’t know/No answer

Q26 and Q32: Traveled outside home state before this trip?
1 = Yes
0 = No
99 = Don’t know/No answer

Appendix III – Statistical Tables

Pre-simulation frequencies

University attend

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Babes-Bolyai	2	1.8	1.9	1.9
	Canisius College	11	10.1	10.2	12.0
	Colgate University	6	5.5	5.6	17.6
	E. Stroudsburg Univ.	9	8.3	8.3	25.9
	Europa-Institut	15	13.8	13.9	39.8
	Niagara University	7	6.4	6.5	46.3
	St. John Fisher College	7	6.4	6.5	52.8
	SUNY Brockport	9	8.3	8.3	61.1
	SUNY Geneseo	12	11.0	11.1	72.2
	University of Antwerp	9	8.3	8.3	80.6
	University of Lower Silesia	2	1.8	1.9	82.4
	University of Trier	8	7.3	7.4	89.8
	University of Twente	5	4.6	4.6	94.4
	Widener University	6	5.5	5.6	100.0
	Total	108	99.1	100.0	
Missing	99	1	.9		
Total		109	100.0		

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	108	18	29	21.76	2.713
How many attended	109	0	3	.19	.659
Valid N (listwise)	108				

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	45	41.3	41.3	41.3
	Female	64	58.7	58.7	100.0
	Total	109	100.0	100.0	

Year in School

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Freshman	19	17.4	18.6	18.6
	Sophomore	14	12.8	13.7	32.4
	Junior	24	22.0	23.5	55.9
	Senior	15	13.8	14.7	70.6
	Graduate	30	27.5	29.4	100.0
	Total	102	93.6	100.0	
Missing	99	7	6.4		
Total		109	100.0		

Traveled outside Europe (EU students)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	6	5.5	14.3	14.3
	Yes	36	33.0	85.7	100.0
	Total	42	38.5	100.0	
Missing	99	67	61.5		
Total		109	100.0		

Traveled outside state (US students)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	1	.9	1.5	1.5
	Yes	64	58.7	98.5	100.0
	Total	65	59.6	100.0	
Missing	99	44	40.4		
Total		109	100.0		

First EuroSim attended

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	9	8.3	8.3	8.3
	Yes	100	91.7	91.7	100.0
	Total	109	100.0	100.0	

Will come again

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	9	8.3	12.9	12.9
	Yes	61	56.0	87.1	100.0
	Total	70	64.2	100.0	
Missing	99	39	35.8		
Total		109	100.0		

Expectations for EuroSim 1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Meet new people/from another country	12	11.0	13.6	13.6
	Learn about EU	40	36.7	45.5	59.1
	Work in int'l environment	3	2.8	3.4	62.5
	Use knowledge	8	7.3	9.1	71.6
	Have fun	11	10.1	12.5	84.1
	Negotiating skill	9	8.3	10.2	94.3
	Gain new experiences	2	1.8	2.3	96.6
	No idea	1	.9	1.1	97.7
	Unclear as to meaning	2	1.8	2.3	100.0
	Total	88	80.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	21	19.3		
Total		109	100.0		

Expectations for EuroSim 2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Meet new people/from another country	16	14.7	35.6	35.6
	Learn about EU	14	12.8	31.1	66.7
	Use knowledge	1	.9	2.2	68.9
	Challenge self	1	.9	2.2	71.1
	Have fun	2	1.8	4.4	75.6
	Negotiating skill	7	6.4	15.6	91.1
	Gain new experiences	4	3.7	8.9	100.0
	Total	45	41.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	64	58.7		
Total		109	100.0		

Comfortable w/ level of knowledge

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	2.8	2.8	2.8
	Disagree	7	6.4	6.4	9.2
	Undecided	36	33.0	33.0	42.2
	Agree	49	45.0	45.0	87.2
	Strongly Agree	14	12.8	12.8	100.0
	Total	109	100.0	100.0	

Prepared for individual role

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	1.8	1.8	1.8
	Disagree	7	6.4	6.4	8.3
	Undecided	33	30.3	30.3	38.5
	Agree	52	47.7	47.7	86.2
	Strongly Agree	15	13.8	13.8	100.0
	Total	109	100.0	100.0	

Worried others less prepared

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	24	22.0	22.0	22.0
	Disagree	45	41.3	41.3	63.3
	Undecided	26	23.9	23.9	87.2
	Agree	10	9.2	9.2	96.3
	Strongly Agree	4	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	109	100.0	100.0	

Worried others more prepared

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	6	5.5	5.5	5.5
	Disagree	16	14.7	14.7	20.2
	Undecided	25	22.9	22.9	43.1
	Agree	43	39.4	39.4	82.6
	Strongly Agree	19	17.4	17.4	100.0
	Total	109	100.0	100.0	

Comfortable working w/o faculty involvement

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	.9	.9	.9
	Undecided	12	11.0	11.3	12.3
	Agree	35	32.1	33.0	45.3
	Strongly Agree	58	53.2	54.7	100.0
	Total	106	97.2	100.0	
Missing	99	3	2.8		
Total		109	100.0		

Broaden my horizons at university

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	1.8	1.9	1.9
	Disagree	11	10.1	10.2	12.0
	Undecided	27	24.8	25.0	37.0
	Agree	45	41.3	41.7	78.7
	Strongly Agree	23	21.1	21.3	100.0
	Total	108	99.1	100.0	
Missing	99	1	.9		
Total		109	100.0		

Help deal with other new situations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	1.8	1.9	1.9
	Disagree	4	3.7	3.7	5.6
	Undecided	23	21.1	21.3	26.9
	Agree	57	52.3	52.8	79.6
	Strongly Agree	22	20.2	20.4	100.0
	Total	108	99.1	100.0	
Missing	99	1	.9		
Total		109	100.0		

Comfortable w/ level of knowledge * Year in School Crosstabulation

			Year in School					
			Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Total
Comfortable w/ level of knowledge	Strongly Disagree	Count	1	1	0	0	0	2
		% within Comfortable w/ level of knowledge	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Year in School	5.3%	7.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.0%
	Disagree	Count	2	1	2	2	0	7
		% within Comfortable w/ level of knowledge	28.6%	14.3%	28.6%	28.6%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Year in School	10.5%	7.1%	8.3%	13.3%	.0%	6.9%
	Undecided	Count	9	5	4	7	9	34
		% within Comfortable w/ level of knowledge	26.5%	14.7%	11.8%	20.6%	26.5%	100.0%
		% within Year in School	47.4%	35.7%	16.7%	46.7%	30.0%	33.3%
	Agree	Count	7	6	16	4	14	47
		% within Comfortable w/ level of knowledge	14.9%	12.8%	34.0%	8.5%	29.8%	100.0%
		% within Year in School	36.8%	42.9%	66.7%	26.7%	46.7%	46.1%
	Strongly Agree	Count	0	1	2	2	7	12
		% within Comfortable w/ level of knowledge	.0%	8.3%	16.7%	16.7%	58.3%	100.0%
		% within Year in School	.0%	7.1%	8.3%	13.3%	23.3%	11.8%
Total		Count	19	14	24	15	30	102
		% within Comfortable w/ level of knowledge	18.6%	13.7%	23.5%	14.7%	29.4%	100.0%
		% within Year in School	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Post-Simulation frequencies

Overall rating

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Fair	11	12.9	13.3	14.5
	Good	32	37.6	38.6	53.0
	Very Good	30	35.3	36.1	89.2
	Excellent	9	10.6	10.8	100.0
	Total	83	97.6	100.0	
Missing	99	2	2.4		
Total		85	100.0		

Prior expectations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Failed to meet	2	2.4	2.4	2.4
	Met some	23	27.1	27.7	30.1
	Undecided	10	11.8	12.0	42.2
	Met expectations	32	37.6	38.6	80.7
	Exceeded expectations	16	18.8	19.3	100.0
	Total	83	97.6	100.0	
Missing	99	2	2.4		
Total		85	100.0		

Comfortable working w/o faculty

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	1	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Disagree	3	3.5	3.6	4.8
	Undecided	7	8.2	8.3	13.1
	Agree	21	24.7	25.0	38.1
	Strongly agree	52	61.2	61.9	100.0
	Total	84	98.8	100.0	
Missing	99	1	1.2		
Total		85	100.0		

Felt adequately prepared for role

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	4	4.7	4.7	4.7
	Disagree	4	4.7	4.7	9.4
	Undecided	14	16.5	16.5	25.9
	Agree	38	44.7	44.7	70.6
	Strongly agree	25	29.4	29.4	100.0
	Total	85	100.0	100.0	

Knew overall topic

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	1	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Disagree	6	7.1	7.1	8.2
	Undecided	15	17.6	17.6	25.9
	Agree	34	40.0	40.0	65.9
	Strongly agree	29	34.1	34.1	100.0
	Total	85	100.0	100.0	

Broaden horizons at univ

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	6	7.1	7.1	7.1
	Disagree	9	10.6	10.6	17.6
	Undecided	22	25.9	25.9	43.5
	Agree	34	40.0	40.0	83.5
	Strongly agree	14	16.5	16.5	100.0
	Total	85	100.0	100.0	

Got to know others at univ

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	12	14.1	14.1	14.1
	Disagree	9	10.6	10.6	24.7
	Undecided	3	3.5	3.5	28.2
	Agree	26	30.6	30.6	58.8
	Strongly agree	35	41.2	41.2	100.0
	Total	85	100.0	100.0	

Deal w/ new situations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	4	4.7	4.7	4.7
	Disagree	4	4.7	4.7	9.4
	Undecided	17	20.0	20.0	29.4
	Agree	38	44.7	44.7	74.1
	Strongly agree	22	25.9	25.9	100.0
	Total	85	100.0	100.0	

Change own preparation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	More prep/gen'l research	23	27.1	32.9	32.9
	Research other countries/parties more	8	9.4	11.4	44.3
	More on process/procedures	18	21.2	25.7	70.0
	No change	7	8.2	10.0	80.0
	5	14	16.5	20.0	100.0
	Total	70	82.4	100.0	
Missing	99	15	17.6		
Total		85	100.0		

Change perspective on gov'ts

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes - gained new perspective	43	50.6	53.1	53.1
	Somewhat changed	7	8.2	8.6	61.7
	Not an accurate rep of reality	5	5.9	6.2	67.9
	No	26	30.6	32.1	100.0
	Total	81	95.3	100.0	
Missing	99	4	4.7		
Total		85	100.0		

Greater appreciation of stresses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	60	70.6	76.9	76.9
	No	18	21.2	23.1	100.0
	Total	78	91.8	100.0	
Missing	99	7	8.2		
Total		85	100.0		

Changed relationship w/ professor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes - closer/better	32	37.6	47.1	47.1
	No change	35	41.2	51.5	98.5
	4	1	1.2	1.5	100.0
	Total	68	80.0	100.0	
Missing	99	17	20.0		
Total		85	100.0		

Change own participation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Speak up more/be more active	16	18.8	24.2	24.2
	Be true to role	2	2.4	3.0	27.3
	More prep/change initial research	19	22.4	28.8	56.1
	Other	15	17.6	22.7	78.8
	No change	13	15.3	19.7	98.5
	6	1	1.2	1.5	100.0
	Total	66	77.6	100.0	
Missing	99	19	22.4		
Total		85	100.0		

Strongest element 1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	International atmosphere	9	10.6	12.5	12.5
	Interactions between students	16	18.8	22.2	34.7
	Organization	18	21.2	25.0	59.7
	Well-prepared students	11	12.9	15.3	75.0
	Expert witness panels	3	3.5	4.2	79.2
	Other	15	17.6	20.8	100.0
	Total	72	84.7	100.0	
Missing	99	13	15.3		
Total		85	100.0		

Strongest element 2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	International atmosphere	3	3.5	17.6	17.6
	Interactions between students	2	2.4	11.8	29.4
	Well-prepared students	2	2.4	11.8	41.2
	Expert witness panels	1	1.2	5.9	47.1
	Other	9	10.6	52.9	100.0
	Total	17	20.0	100.0	
Missing	99	68	80.0		
Total		85	100.0		

Weakest element 1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Varying levels of knowledge/preparation	36	42.4	46.2	46.2
	Topic too narrow/technical	8	9.4	10.3	56.4
	Uncertainty in procedures/structure	8	9.4	10.3	66.7
	Problems w/ Commission	5	5.9	6.4	73.1
	Food/drinks at breaks	1	1.2	1.3	74.4
	Other	20	23.5	25.6	100.0
	Total	78	91.8	100.0	
Missing	99	7	8.2		
Total		85	100.0		

Weakest element 2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Varying levels of knowledge/preparation	4	4.7	15.4	15.4
	Topic too narrow/technical	3	3.5	11.5	26.9
	Uncertainty in procedures/structure	6	7.1	23.1	50.0
	Problems w/ Commission	3	3.5	11.5	61.5
	Food/drinks at breaks	1	1.2	3.8	65.4
	Other	9	10.6	34.6	100.0
	Total	26	30.6	100.0	
Missing	99	59	69.4		
Total		85	100.0		

Participated in similar before

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes - UN/Moot court/other simulation	24	28.2	29.3	29.3
	Yes - no specifics given	8	9.4	9.8	39.0
	No	50	58.8	61.0	100.0
	Total	82	96.5	100.0	
Missing	99	3	3.5		
Total		85	100.0		

Comfortable w/ level of knowledge * Year in school Crosstabulation

			Year in school					
			Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Total
Comfortable w/ level of knowledge	Strongly disagree	Count	1	0	0	0	0	1
		% within Comfortable w/ level of knowledge	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	7.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.2%
	Disagree	Count	1	1	0	3	1	6
		% within Comfortable w/ level of knowledge	16.7%	16.7%	.0%	50.0%	16.7%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	7.1%	7.7%	.0%	21.4%	5.6%	7.3%
	Undecided	Count	5	2	4	2	2	15
		% within Comfortable w/ level of knowledge	33.3%	13.3%	26.7%	13.3%	13.3%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	35.7%	15.4%	17.4%	14.3%	11.1%	18.3%
	Agree	Count	4	7	13	3	6	33
		% within Comfortable w/ level of knowledge	12.1%	21.2%	39.4%	9.1%	18.2%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	28.6%	53.8%	56.5%	21.4%	33.3%	40.2%
	Strongly agree	Count	3	3	6	6	9	27
		% within Comfortable w/ level of knowledge	11.1%	11.1%	22.2%	22.2%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	21.4%	23.1%	26.1%	42.9%	50.0%	32.9%
Total		Count	14	13	23	14	18	82
		% within Comfortable w/ level of knowledge	17.1%	15.9%	28.0%	17.1%	22.0%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Prepared for individual role * Year in school Crosstabulation

			Year in school					
			Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Total
Prepared for individual role	Strongly disagree	Count	2	1	1	0	0	4
		% within Prepared for individual role	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	14.3%	7.7%	4.3%	.0%	.0%	4.9%
	Disagree	Count	1	2	1	0	0	4
		% within Prepared for individual role	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	7.1%	15.4%	4.3%	.0%	.0%	4.9%
	Undecided	Count	0	3	5	3	3	14
		% within Prepared for individual role	.0%	21.4%	35.7%	21.4%	21.4%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	.0%	23.1%	21.7%	21.4%	16.7%	17.1%
	Agree	Count	9	4	12	6	6	37
		% within Prepared for individual role	24.3%	10.8%	32.4%	16.2%	16.2%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	64.3%	30.8%	52.2%	42.9%	33.3%	45.1%
	Strongly agree	Count	2	3	4	5	9	23
		% within Prepared for individual role	8.7%	13.0%	17.4%	21.7%	39.1%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	14.3%	23.1%	17.4%	35.7%	50.0%	28.0%
Total		Count	14	13	23	14	18	82
		% within Prepared for individual role	17.1%	15.9%	28.0%	17.1%	22.0%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Broaden my horizons at university * Year in school Crosstabulation

			Year in school					
			Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Total
Broaden my horizons at university	Strongly disagree	Count	1	0	0	2	3	6
		% within Broaden my horizons at university	16.7%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	7.1%	.0%	.0%	14.3%	16.7%	7.3%
	Disagree	Count	0	1	5	2	1	9
		% within Broaden my horizons at university	.0%	11.1%	55.6%	22.2%	11.1%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	.0%	7.7%	21.7%	14.3%	5.6%	11.0%
	Undecided	Count	4	1	2	4	8	19
		% within Broaden my horizons at university	21.1%	5.3%	10.5%	21.1%	42.1%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	28.6%	7.7%	8.7%	28.6%	44.4%	23.2%
	Agree	Count	7	5	12	5	5	34
		% within Broaden my horizons at university	20.6%	14.7%	35.3%	14.7%	14.7%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	50.0%	38.5%	52.2%	35.7%	27.8%	41.5%
	Strongly agree	Count	2	6	4	1	1	14
		% within Broaden my horizons at university	14.3%	42.9%	28.6%	7.1%	7.1%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	14.3%	46.2%	17.4%	7.1%	5.6%	17.1%
Total		Count	14	13	23	14	18	82
		% within Broaden my horizons at university	17.1%	15.9%	28.0%	17.1%	22.0%	100.0%
		% within Year in school	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.267[a]	16	.029
Likelihood Ratio	30.297	16	.017
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.216	1	.007
N of Valid Cases	82		

a. 19 cells (76.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .95.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	-.334	.101	-3.232	.001
N of Valid Cases		82			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

References

Boud David, and Nancy Falchikov. 1989. Quantitative Studies of Student Self-Assessment in Higher Education: A Critical Analysis of Findings. *Higher Education* 18: 529-49

Ciliotta-Rubery, Andrea and Dena Levy. 2000. Congressional Committee Simulation: An Active Learning Experiment. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 33 (4): 847-51.

Dorn, Dean S. 1989. Simulation games: One more tool on the pedagogical shelf. *Teaching Sociology* 17 (1): 1-18.

Falchikov, Nancy and David Boud. 1989. Student Self-Assessment in Higher Education: A Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research* 59 (4): 395-430.

Galatas, Steven E. 2006. A Simulation of the Council of the European Union: Assessment of the Impact on Student Learning. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39 (1): 147-51.

Greenblat, Cathy S. 1973. Teaching with simulation games: A review of claims and evidence. *Teaching Sociology* 1 (1): 62-83.

Ip, Albert and Roni Linser. 2001. Evaluation of a Role-Play Simulation in Political Science. *The Technology Source*. January/February. Available online at http://ts.mivu.org/default.asp?show=article&id=1034.

Kaarbo, Juliet and Jeffrey S. Lantis. 1997. Coalition Theory in Praxis: A comparative Politics simulation of the Cabinet Formation Process. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 30 (3): 501-6.

Shellman, Stephen M. 2001. Active Learning in Comparative Politics: A Mock German Election and Coalition-Formation Simulation. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 34 (4): 827-34.

Smith, Elizabeth T. and Mark A. Boyer. 1996. Designing In-Class Simulations. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 29 (4): 690-4.

Steck, Henry, Laurie Buonanno, and Munroe Eagles. 1996. Pedagogical Strategies and Assessment Results in Cross-National Simulations: Conclusions from a Two-Continent Model EU Simulation. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.

Szafran, Robert F. and Ann F. Mandolini. 1980. Student Evaluations of a Simulation Game. *Teaching Sociology* 8 (1): 21-37.

Topping, Keith. 1998. Peer Assessment between Students in Colleges and Universities. *Review of Educational Research* 68: 249-76.