Simulating the Foreign Policy Decision-Making Process in the Undergraduate Classroom

Julie A. Loggins, *Western Carolina University*

ABSTRACT A simulation of the foreign policy decision-making process, as described in this article, can assist an instructor in linking students' abstract understanding of complex political events, circumstances, and decision making to the real-world interplay of the multiple factors involved in decision making. It is this type of active learning that helps bring a student's abstract understanding into the concrete world. Instead of being passive learners relying on an instructor's knowledge, students are active participants in the learning process.

While capable of understanding the complexities of the decision-making process when discussed in abstract terms, many undergraduates do not consider political decisions and actions in complex terms when examining actual events and situations. For example, while students are able to think abstractly about the various components of leaders' selectorates and how they might be accountable to different portions of those groups (Bueno de Mesquita et al. 2003), students often forget this when examining real political situations and dramatically oversimplify very complex political events. A simulation of the foreign policy decision-making process, while still a simplified representation, can assist an instructor in linking the students' abstract understanding to the real-world interplay of the multiple factors and groups involved in decision making. This type of active learning brings abstract understanding into the concrete world. Instead of being passive learners relying on an instructor's knowledge, students are active participants in the learning process, gaining experiential knowledge (McKeachie and Svinicki 2006). Simulations enhance students' interest in the subject matter at hand and encourage student interaction and collaboration with peers (Dorn 1989).

WHY USE SIMULATIONS?

While simulations have been used as a standard teaching tool for decades, current research indicates that millennials (those born after 1980 and graduating high school after 2000) respond better to learning environments that incorporate group activity and learning as well as concrete learning techniques.[1] Simulations such as the one discussed here can accommodate both of these needs for this generation. Younger students can struggle more with problem-based learning than older students, but as the literature concerning the learning styles of millennials demonstrates, this may no longer be true. Today's average college students are millennials and therefore more receptive to problem-based learning than those who preceded them in the classroom because such activities are student centered, allowing students to have a greater level of control over the learning process (Center for Teaching, Learning and Scholarship 2007).

This simulation works best when it contains what the Center for Teaching, Learning and Scholarship considers to be good problem-based learning scenarios because they

- are engaging and oriented to the real world,
- are ill-structured[2] and complex,
- generate multiple hypotheses,
- require team effort,
- are consistent with desired learning outcomes,
- build upon previous knowledge/experiences, and
- promote development of higher-order cognitive skills (Center for Teaching, Learning and Scholarship 2007).

Over the last 15 years cognitive science research has shown that students do not learn best in the traditional lecture-based classroom setting. While not an entirely new approach because of its use in teaching medical students in the 1960s, problem-based learning has gained support because of this recent cognitive research. As a result, a paradigm shift began in higher education in the late 1990s from one of teaching to one of learning, making a semester-long simulation project more prominent and effective in the undergraduate classroom (Major and Palmer 2001).

While studies have shown no significant differences between the knowledge acquired through problem-based learning and more traditional lecture-focused learning, those who participated in problem-based learning environments demonstrated a greater likelihood of using that skill spontaneously to solve new problems.

Julie Loggins *is an international relations scholar. She is currently ABD at the University of South Carolina where she has been recognized for exemplary teaching in the undergraduate classroom and is a visiting assistant professor at Western Carolina University. She may be reached via e-mail at jaloggins@wcu.edu.*

doi:10.1017/S1049096509090544

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090544 Published online by Cambridge University Press

They also retained the information acquired through problem-based learning longer (Major and Palmer 2001; McKeachie and Svinicki 2006, 227). This is an indication that problem-based learning also improves critical thinking and analytical skills in a way that can and will be used later in classroom and non-classroom settings, truly educating students.

To take full advantage of the problem-based learning process, this simulation should take place during an entire semester. While the actual simulation takes place over a two-day period, there is greater success in student learning and retention when portions of the exercise are built into the entire course, so I suggest that the entire process comprise a minimum of 30% of a student's final grade. I have used this simulation in conjunction with traditional methods of both teaching and evaluation in order to provide an opportunity for knowledge acquisition based on different learning styles, making the classroom one that uses a flexible and comprehensive view of learning.

Today's average college students are millennials and therefore more receptive to problem-based learning than those who preceded them in the classroom because such activities are student centered, allowing students to have a greater level of control over the learning process.

BACKGROUND READING

It is essential that students have a solid conceptual understanding of the various theories of foreign policy decision making prior to the in-class portion of the exercise in order to build upon prior knowledge.[3] Since this is a U.S. foreign policy decision-making simulation, students should be familiar with works pertaining to the presidency, presidential power, management, and leadership as well as the foreign policy bureaucracy, military, Congress, and the intelligence community and their influences on foreign policy. They should also be familiar with the influence of economic factors, interest groups, governors, and other political leaders on foreign policy, as well as the media and the role of electoral politics and public opinion. In addition to influences on foreign policy, students should understand various models of decision making and theories, such as the rational actor model, rational choice theory, governmental politics model, organizational process model, the role of personality and beliefs, operational code theory, crisis decision-making theories, divided government, the CNN effect, majoritarianism, pluralism, elitism, etc.[4]

COURSE AND EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

Because students often do not understand all of the complexities of the decision-making process with respect to domestic politics, it is often more difficult for them to understand the foreign policy decision-making process because of the added complexity and the addition of more actors. Simulation of the foreign policy decision-making process can demonstrate different aspects of American foreign policy.[5] These include the following learning objectives, which students will have already encountered in abstract form through course readings,[6] lectures, and discussions:

- the impact of stress and constraints (e.g., time, information availability, and information reliability) found in crisis situations (Brecher 1977; George and Stern 2002; Hermann 1963; Rosenthal, 't Hart, and Kouzmin 1991);
- the role of interest groups in the decision-making process (Haney and Vanderbush 1999; Putnam 1988; Risse-Kappen 1991; Van Bell 1993);
- the impact of electoral politics, election timing, and partisan conflicts on the decision-making process (Marra, Ostrom, and Simon 1990; Risse-Kappen 1991);
- the institutional conflicts involved in decision making (Allison and Halperin 1972; Allison and Zelikow 1999; Art 1973; Bender and Hammond 1992; Caldwell 1977; Halperin 1971);
- the prevalence of different decision-making models (e.g., rational actor model, governmental process model, organizational process model, groupthink) under certain circumstances (Allison and Zelikow 1999; Bueno de Mesquita et al. 2003; George 1979; Holsti 1970; Janis 1982; Krasner 1972; Longley and Pruitt 1980);
- the role of personalities, trust, and personal relationships in the decision-making process (Beasley et al. 2001; Hermann 1998; Marra, Ostrom, and Simon 1990);
- the role of leadership style (Beasley et al. 2001; Hermann 1998; Shapiro and Jacobs 2000);
- the nature of public opinion and its reliability as a tool for policymaking (Fearon 1994; Foyle 1999; Graham 1994; Holsti 1992; Marra, Ostrom, and Simon 1990; Putnam 1988; Risse-Kappen 1991; Shapiro and Jacobs 2000);
- the wealth of information that policymakers must have about current political situations around the world as well as historical situations;
- the interaction of domestic and international politics (Bueno de Mesquita 2002); and
- the validity of different explanations of policymaking (e.g., elitism, pluralism, and hyperpluralism) in different situations.

Combine all of the above to have a greater understanding of the complete picture of foreign policy decision making. While some may choose to design the simulation to highlight specific objectives, in most variations all of the objectives listed above can be found to some degree in any simulation.

POSITION/ROLE SELECTION

The positions an instructor chooses for students should be determined based on the following criteria:

- What is the course level?[7]
- How many students are in the class?[8]
- Which objectives does the instructor wish to emphasize?[9]
- What types of problems does the instructor wish to include?[10]

Once the instructor has determined which objectives to emphasize and what types of problems to include, the roles for each

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090544 Published online by Cambridge University Press

group can be determined. For example, if the instructor plans to design a simulation based primarily on foreign economic policy, it is unlikely that the secretary of veteran's affairs will be needed; thus, the problems for inclusion in the simulation (at least broadly defined) need to be determined before selecting which roles/positions will be present in each group.

ORGANIZING THE SIMULATION

Ideally an instructor will conduct the in-class portion of the simulation in two one-hour class periods, allowing students to reflect on the first day's decisions, have meetings to discuss potential international reactions to their decisions, and plan future courses of action. Students can also research the topics that arose if they did not have enough knowledge and preparation for the specific issues presented at the beginning.

Phase One: Role Assignments

It is important to introduce students to their assigned roles for the simulation early in the semester so they can begin thinking in terms of the positions they will fill. Once the group size has been determined, the instructor should decide who will be the president of each group. This can be done by random selection, voluntarily, or instructor assignment.[11]

While a simplification of the actual decision-making process, the president of each group will be responsible for compiling information to submit on behalf of the group—planning, leading, and organizing group meetings that either take place in person or via an online chat room such as those available in course-management platforms. While the president can delegate a trusted advisor, such as a chief of staff, to take notes and collect information, the ultimate responsibility for submission will be the president's, simulating that it is the president's competence (or perceived competence) that leads to political rewards and punishments of those in that decision-making group. Presidents can rely on their advisors and delegate tasks or they can attempt to be hands on in as many situations as possible, which is determined by the personality and leadership style of the student in the position of the president.

Once determined, the presidents should indicate their political positions and party affiliations. Instructors should make it clear to all students that they do not have to disclose their own partisan or ideological beliefs, but they will have to assume a partisan affiliation or ideological position during the simulation. In determining the other roles to include for each group, thought should be given to the objectives as well as the issues each group will confront. It is not necessary for all groups to have the same role positions, and this variety will enable greater comparison when students are debriefed at the simulation's end.

All roles other than the presidents will be determined by random selection. Typical positions to include are secretary of defense, secretary of state, chief of staff, and director of national intelligence. Others that have been used are chairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, and the National Foreign Trade Council. It is important for students to know that they should, in a broad sense, ideologically match the president of their group if they hold an appointed position in order match the reality of the appointment process. Students who represent particular interest groups should ideologically represent those groups and not be influenced by the ideological or partisan composition of the other members of their decision-making group or their own personal opinions. Students who are elected officials will be assigned their partisan affiliations. For variety it is interesting to create situations of unified, divided, and semi-divided government or change the percentage of majority party power from group to group. This often produces different decision-making results because of the vote margins that group members need for certain policy proposals requiring congressional approval.

Phase Two: Role Assignment Position Papers

Within the first few weeks of having their assigned roles, students should research their positions to understand their responsibilities and powers. In this process, students should find out what types of issues the individuals in their roles would handle regularly. They should also find out what current issues are at the top of the agenda for their positions. Finally, each student should choose to either be the person who currently holds the position or one who previously held it. This choice should be made with the party of the group's president in mind. If part of a group with a Democrat president, it would be unrealistic to choose to portray Henry Kissinger in the role of national security advisor, for example. Alternatively, a student may choose to fill the role as an individual with very specific views but not a particular person. Regardless of which course of action is taken, the student must explicitly state what types of values and behaviors should be expected during the simulation.

Students must distribute their findings to the other members of the group and read the papers of the other group members to be sure that everyone accurately understands each position as well as the values and behaviors that will be depicted during the course of the simulation. These papers should be scored on the basis of how accurately the students presented the information about their positions and whether or not they clearly stated their values and typical behaviors based on the individuals they are portraying.

Phase Three: Becoming Familiar with the Role

It is important that students become familiar and comfortable with the positions they are to assume prior to the actual simulation days. In order to do this, instructors can choose one of two methods: ask students to monitor the international news, as they should be doing already in an internationally focused course, and select a minimum of two issues/events about which to send options memoranda (Chittick 2006)[12] to their group president, or the instructor can select a set of approximately 10 articles covering various topics from which students can choose to write their memoranda, dramatically simplifying the process. This also imposes a bias on the students and the simulation itself regarding what current international issues are important, something of which the instructor should be mindful. These memoranda should be completed by students once every two weeks and sent to the group president, group members, and the instructor.

When completing the memorandum for each issue, students should respond from the standpoint of the positions they will hold for the simulation, helping students become more familiar with the positions. The instructor should review the options memoranda and provide feedback and other courses of action and perspectives to consider based on each student's role. Grading for this assignment should be based only on whether or not the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090544 Published online by Cambridge University Press

student completed the assignment as instructed and whether or not the memoranda positions are correlated with the student's previously stated worldview.

At this point students should begin to acquire information someone in their particular positions would have. For example, a secretary of energy would know what portion of U.S. energy usage comes from various sources (e.g., oil, solar, natural gas, etc.) as well as from where the U.S. receives each type of energy (e.g., does the U.S. receive more oil from Canada, Mexico, or Kuwait?). The type of information will vary from position to position and the instructor can assist students in what information would be valuable for them to have on hand, being mindful of any bias that may be imparted in the process.

It is also at this point that the instructor will inform the group of how long members have held their positions, when the next election is to be held for each elected official, the partisan composition of the Congress, current public opinion polls, and any other relevant information pertinent to the educational objectives. This information should be updated during the course of the semester. For example, as elections for particular offices grow nearer, the instructor should disseminate updated opinion polls and election projections. Additionally, the instructor can create scandals or potentially scandalous situations with which members of the group must deal. Then the instructor can either create a public scandal or consider the issue "resolved effectively" and something that will remain private. It is the addition of these types of issues that can make the simulation more complex, which will have greater learning benefits in advanced classes, but in an introductory course this additional information can become overwhelming and detrimental to the learning and evaluative process.

Phase Four: Group Strategy

Within the month prior to the simulation, each group should meet to discuss the important issues facing its administration. I would advise that students rely on the options memoranda written during the course of the semester, but students are not limited to these memoranda for determining the important issues the United States faces, especially if other issues have moved to the forefront of the political agenda in recent weeks. Remaining limited to the memoranda written during the semester will simplify the process but will not hinder the learning experience. Adding new issues at this point, similar to the addition of scandals above, can also be more detrimental in an introductory course.

During these meetings, the president will determine the process for determining the issues that are at the top of the foreign policy agenda. This is a simplification, however, because issue salience is determined by a variety of factors and changes across time and issue type. The group should present a set of four to six major, broadly defined goals for the administration. Goals should be broad, conceptual ideas such as spreading democracy, increasing oil independence, or reducing the occurrence of terrorism. For each goal, specific regions and countries of focus and specific objectives and courses of action should be defined. Additionally, each group should provide a rationale for the focus regions and countries as well as the courses of action. For example, if students have decided that spreading democracy is a goal of the administration, they may choose to focus the administration's efforts in Africa, specifically in Sudan and Somalia because of the increased presence of non-democratic government actions in the area of Darfur, Sudan, and the increased presence of non-democratic actions by the Islamic Courts Union in Somalia. Given that each of these countries has been recently cited as having an increase in terrorist recruitment, a focus on democratic reform might also be linked to national security concerns and a stated goal of reducing terrorism. Specific actions related to democracy promotion might be civic education, promotion of equal rights for women and various ethnic groups through increased human rights monitoring, or reductions in foreign aid until improvements in human rights are seen or until democratic elections are held. It is this process that will help students move from their often oversimplified views of U.S. foreign policy goals and translate them into specific actions.

Each group should also identify four to six potential problems it sees on the horizon for the United States. For example, students may identify the continued non-compliance of Iran with respect to its nuclear programs or the lack of expansion of women's rights in the Middle East as a potential problem. In each case, the group should identify three prioritized possible courses of action, the rationalization behind them, and their perceived ramifications. This helps students look at the future implications of their actions, hopefully assisting them in making what they think would be the best decision.

While this might seem like a lengthy assignment for the group, it is still a dramatic oversimplification of the real world. It proves to be beneficial to the group if the members determine the major goals and focal regions and countries as well as potential problems together. The president can then delegate the specifics to teams who have the expertise to deal with each subject area. Once each team has completed its task, it can present the information to the remainder of the group or the president for approval, a process determined by each president's leadership style. Once complete, each group should submit one copy of its administration's strategy to the instructor for evaluation and use in determining the issues each group will face.

Phase Five: Determining Simulation Issues

After the instructor has received each group's strategy, the issues each group will address during the simulation can be determined. Given the timeframe, it is possible for each group to deal with approximately five different situations, with one of those developing into a larger situation. Not all of them need to be introduced during the first session, but I recommend that at least three of them be introduced at this time.

In determining the issues and types of situations each group will manage, each group's strategy should include two to three issues, but the instructor should also choose parts of the world or topics previously ignored by the group in order to demonstrate the reality of the decision-making process.[13] While the topic areas and issues can be selected in advance of the simulation, in order to more closely represent reality, it is ideal to wait until the week or weekend before the simulation to determine the specific issues, incorporating some real events and other fictitious, yet plausible, events as well.

Phase Six: Organization of Information

Once the specific events have been determined, the instructor should begin dividing up the sequence of events temporally and based on who should receive certain pieces of information. For example, the secretary of the treasury should not be receiving information pertaining to intelligence collected by a reconnaissance

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090544 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mission. The instructor can help students dealing with domestic politics constraints by reminding relevant members of the decision-making group of the current domestic situation, such as election timing or campaign funding considerations. In organizing the information to be disseminated, the instructor should be mindful of how information is worded. The instructor should be conscious of the impact of value-based statements in the simulation setting and relay only facts, allowing students to make any value judgments that are present during the simulation.

Phase Seven: The Simulation Sessions

On the days of the simulation sessions, each group should have a separate, private meeting place. It is also helpful for the group members if the instructor has made name tags with the students' names, positions, and the individuals (if any) they are choosing to embody, along with partisan affiliations, if appropriate. Each group should also have a note-taker who will disseminate the group's deliberations and decisions to the instructor and the other group members.

During the simulation sessions the instructor will not be able to be present at all times with each group. An outside observer can be placed in the room or each group's session can be recorded.[14] Video or tape recording each group is useful for students when writing their assessment papers and as an instructional tool for the entire class. In addition, it is necessary that each group have one or more outside individuals present to assume the roles of other world leaders, international organizations, interest groups, voters, etc. during the simulation with whom to consult. This is a good opportunity to utilize the expertise of graduate students. It frees up the instructor, and it means that each group will have to interact with different personalities and philosophical and ideological beliefs, increasing the element of uncertainty for their decisions.

Initially, each group should have the basic information about their group members that they received earlier in the semester (see phase three) as a reminder of the current political situation. When beginning the flow of information, the instructor may wish to issue information to several group members at once so that the group has enough information to begin thinking about what issues they may be facing, controlling the amount and speed of incoming information to vary the level of stress.

When presented with information, it is up to each group member whether or not to share it with the rest of the group. Group members may choose to decide if the information received is relevant to the situations being discussed or if it is best left unknown until they know more. This may be of particular concern when information pertains to a potentially scandalous event. Group members should be cautioned that others, possibly potential political enemies, may also receive the same information and choose to act.

When approximately 15 minutes remain during the first session the instructor will notify the group that they need to decide what actions, if any, they will be taking. Group members should keep in mind that the simulation experience is supposed to encompass approximately one to two weeks of decision-making time and that failing to take any action at all could be disastrous in certain situations. Once each group has reached a set of decisions they should be disseminated to the instructor and all group members.

Between the first and second simulation sessions each group may choose to meet and discuss possible scenarios or consequences and potential flaws or errors in the decisions that were made during the first session, better preparing them for the second session. Also, during this time the instructor will evaluate each group's decisions and develop the second session's events and issues accordingly.

The second session should progress similarly to the first. The instructor should remind each group of the decisions made during the previous session and then resume the transmission of information to each group. By the end of the second session, each group should have reached some conclusion about how to handle all the events and issues with which they have been presented and give these decisions to the instructor and all group members.

Phase Eight: Debriefing and Assessment

Since simulations and other problem-based learning activities are viewed as non-traditional teaching methods, scholars suggest that instructors use non-traditional assessment tools to evaluate students as well. While there are a several options, the two I selected for this simulation are peer evaluation and personal reflection (Major and Palmer 2001).[15]

It is important that two sets of information be transmitted to students as quickly as possible after the simulation has concluded: (1) all of the information presented to each group during the simulation, including what information was factual and what was fictitious, and (2) all of the notes that were taken during the two sessions. Students need to know all of the information because it all may not have been shared with the group during the simulation exercise. It is also important that they know what information they received was factual and what was not so as not to unnecessarily alarm them or to leave them misinformed about events in the world. Students are often surprised by the information and events that were factual and those that were not. Students should use the notes and the information received to write an assessment of the simulation experience and evaluate it as a learning tool.[16] The purpose of the student assessment will be dependent upon the educational objectives. It is important, though, that the instructor have the students write an overall assessment of the simulation, as well as an assessment of other group members and themselves. The instructor can guide these assessments by asking questions about the role of domestic politics, public opinion, interest groups, etc.[17]

CONCLUSIONS

Each time I conducted this simulation, students responded positively, even those who had previously not been as engaged as others in the class. This has been a very effective tool for use in the undergraduate classroom for several reasons:

- It has brought students' abstract understanding to a concrete level.
- It has enhanced and developed students' abilities to effectively analyze and critique foreign policies.[18]
- It has increased the involvement of students in their own educational process.[19]
- It has encouraged interaction and collaboration among students at a time when class sizes at most institutions are increasing and depersonalizing the educational process.

As a result, instructors are able to address educational issues that studies have shown to be relevant to the current generation of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090544 Published online by Cambridge University Press

students. This simulation should be viewed as a valuable tool to enhance the educational experience of students, improve the retention of information through experience,[20] and even potentially increase student retention at the institution. ■

NOTES

I would like to thank Sally Hansen of Daytona State College for her comments and continued feedback on the development of this simulation as well as her comments on multiple manuscript drafts. Additionally, I would like to thank the department of political science at the University of South Carolina for the many teaching opportunities I received so that I could develop, enhance, and use this simulation in the classroom. The students who participated in the simulations provided essential feedback for its continued improvement and should be recognized for their valuable contributions to the experience of those who followed them. Lastly, yet certainly not least in importance, I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers and the editorial staff at PS: Political Science and Politics *for their valuable critiques, commentary, and assistance.*

1. For additional information about millennials and their differences in learning styles and preferences, as well as successful teaching techniques for this generation, see Carlson (2005), Raines (2002), and Skiba and Barton (2006).
2. This is defined as a problem that has no definitive answer.
3. While it is possible to present the students with the theoretical literature either before or after the simulation exercise, I have done the simulation after having introduced the requisite theories of foreign policy decision making. This is in conjunction with one of the basic premises of problem-based learning—experiential learning should build on prior knowledge.
4. A supplemental bibliography containing a sample of what the author has assigned to students is provided in the appendix, available online with other supplemental materials at http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayJournal?jid=PSC. The two textbooks I used (Chittick 2006; Rosati and Scott 2007) cover these subject areas, but I've found that supplemental readings often enhance student learning.
5. While this simulation can be modified and used to simulate foreign policy decision making in settings other than the United States, this incarnation is for foreign policy decision making in the United States.
6. For a complete list of supplemental materials, please contact me directly at jaloggins@wcu.edu.
7. I have used this simulation in the course Conduct and Formulation of U.S. Foreign Policy, which is typically taken by upper-level political science majors. It should be noted, however, that this course has no prerequisites and is open to all majors of all grade levels. I found no significant difference in simulation performance, participation, and understanding between those who were upper-level political science majors and those who were not. With adequate preparation through the completion of reading assignments and class discussions, all students have the tools necessary to complete all portions of the simulation and receive the benefits.
8. I have conducted this simulation in classes averaging between 40 and 50 students as well as a summer school class of 24. The classes were divided into groups of between 10 and 15 students depending on the class size and the number of positions/groups I chose to represent in each group.
9. I have varied the objectives from simulation to simulation. In some respect, each of the objectives is addressed in each simulation, but particular attention is given to objectives focusing on concepts students have demonstrated greater difficulty in understanding (i.e., concepts that students struggled to demonstrate their understanding either in the classroom or on assignments/quizzes/exams).
10. I have typically focused on foreign policy issues that are current, thus it is important for students to monitor internationally focused news as discussed in phase three.
11. While randomly selecting presidents to lead each group can work, it sometimes produces leaders who have no desire to lead and who are unwilling and unable to perform the duties required for the simulation to run smoothly and have the greatest impact on student learning. As a result, I advise seeking volunteers who know and are willing to accept the responsibilities of the position, thus mimicking the campaigning process, or to assign the position of president to students who the instructor knows will be willing and able to fulfill the roles and responsibilities involved. It is important, however, for the instructor to clarify the responsibilities of the president during the simulation before asking for volunteers.
12. I took the options memorandum mentioned here, available as supplemental material online at the Cambridge University Press Web site, from the ancillaries provided with Chittick (2006), and it should be used as a guide.
13. The impact of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the Bush administration's agenda is a perfect example of this.
14. It is important to note that an outside observer might interfere with the group's cohesive behavior. The psychological factor of having a new person present may disrupt the group dynamic that exists and disrupt the simulation exercise.
15. While I use non-traditional assessment techniques following the simulation, I also use traditional assessment tools. While the research cited here indicates that traditional assessment tools do not work well for students who partake in non-traditional learning, I have noted an improvement in exam scores (a traditional evaluation tool) after participation in the simulation and the completion of the non-traditional assessments. For example, in the spring semester of 2007, 33 of 46 students improved their final exam scores when compared to their previous exam scores. The average student improved this score 4.97 points over the previous exam. This includes one student who did not take the final exam and received a 0. For all students who actually took the final exam, the average improvement over the previous exam was 6.66 points. This same degree of improvement was not seen from the first exam to the second exam. Only 12 of 46 students improved their scores between the first and second exams with an average improvement of 3.2 points.
16. Anyone wishing to see an example of the debriefing and examples of the types of scenarios I have used in past simulations should e-mail me at jaloggins@wcu.edu.
17. For more information concerning the specifics of assessment assignments I have used, please contact me directly.
18. When students who have participated in this simulation have gone into other classes other professors have shared with me that the complexity of their answers, explanations, and understanding is higher than that of their peers who have not participated in such an exercise. I have also noted this when I have the students again in my own classes.
19. During the spring 2007 semester I conducted this simulation in a class of 46. Thirty-eight students responded to the end-of-course evaluations, and of those 38, 21 cited the simulation as the most enjoyable and useful component of the course.
20. While purely anecdotal, I would like to note that through conversations with former students who have participated in this simulation, they retained information as a result of the simulation that they had not previously retained or even understood during semesters when the simulation was not used in class.

REFERENCES

Allison, Graham T., and Morton H. Halperin. 1972. "Bureaucratic Politics: A Paradigm and Some Policy Implications." *World Politics* 24 (Spring Supplement: Theory and Policy in International Relations): 40–79.

Allison, Graham T., and Philip Zelikow. 1999. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis.* 2nd ed. New York: Longman.

Art, Robert. 1973. "Bureaucratic Politics and American Foreign Policy: A Critique." *Policy Sciences* 4: 467–90.

Beasley, Ryan K., Juliet Kaarbo, Charles F. Hermann, and Margaret G. Hermann. 2001. "People and Processes in Foreign Policymaking: Insights from Comparative Case Studies." *International Studies Review* 3 (2): 217–50.

Bender, Jonathan, and Thomas Hammond. 1992. "Rethinking Allison's Models." *American Political Science Review* 86 (2): 301–22.

Brecher, Michael. 1977. "India's Devaluation of 1966: Linkage Politics and Crisis Decision Making." *British Journal of International Studies* 3: 1–25.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce. 2002. "Domestic Politics and International Relations." *International Studies Quarterly* 46: 1–9.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, Alastair Smith, Randolph Siverson, and James Morrow. 2003. *The Logic of Political Survival.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Caldwell, Dan. 1977. "Bureaucratic Foreign Policy-Making." *American Behavioral Scientist* 21: 87–110.

Carlson, Scott. 2005. "The Net Generation Goes to College." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* October 7. http://chronicle.com/free/v52/i07/07a03401.htm.

Center for Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship. 2007. "Background of Problem-Based Learning." Samford University. www.samford.edu/ctls/pbl_background.html.

Chittick, William O. 2006. *American Foreign Policy: A Framework for Analysis.* Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Dorn, Dean S. 1989. "Simulation Games: One More Tool on the Pedagogical Shelf." *Teaching Sociology* 17 (1): 1–18.

Fearon, James D. 1994. "Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes." *American Political Science Review* 88 (3): 577–92.

Foyle, Douglas. 1999. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Elite Beliefs as a Mediating Variable." *International Studies Quarterly* 41: 141–69.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090544 Published online by Cambridge University Press

George, Alexander L. 1979. "The Causal Nexus between Cognitive Beliefs and Decision-Making Behavior: The 'Operational Code.'" In *Psychological Models in International Politics*, ed. L. S. Falkowski. Boulder: Westview Press.

George, Alexander L., and Eric Stern. 2002. "Harnessing Conflict in Foreign Policy Making: From Devil's Advocate to Multiple Advocacy." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 32: 484–508.

Graham, Thomas W. 1994. "Public Opinion and U.S. Foreign Policy Decision Making." In *The New Politics of American Foreign Policy*, ed. D. A. Deese. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Halperin, Morton H. 1971. "Why Bureaucrats Play Games." *Foreign Policy*, Spring, 70–80.

Haney, Patrick J., and Walt Vanderbush. 1999. "The Role of Ethnic Interest Groups in U.S. Foreign Policy: The Case of the Cuban American National Foundation." *International Studies Quarterly* 43: 348–54.

Hermann, Charles F. 1963. "Some Consequences of Crisis Which Limit the Viability of Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 8: 61–82.

Hermann, Margaret G. 1998. "International Decision Making: Leadership Matters." *Foreign Policy* 110: 124–37.

Holsti, Ole R. 1970. "The Operational Code Approach to the Study of Political Leaders: John Foster Dulles' Philosophical and Instrumental Beliefs." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 3: 123–57.

———. 1992. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann Consensus." *International Studies Quarterly* 36: 439–66.

Janis, Irving L. 1982. *Groupthink*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Krasner, Stephen. 1972. "Are Bureaucracies Important? (Or Allison's Wonderland)." *Foreign Policy* 7: 159–79.

Longley, Jeanne, and Dean G. Pruitt. 1980. "Groupthink: A Critique of Janis's Theory." *Review of Personality and Social Psychology* 1: 74–93.

Major, Claire H., and Betsy Palmer. 2001. "Assessing the Effectiveness of Problem-Based Learning in Higher Education: Lessons from the Literature." *Academic Exchange Quarterly* 5 (1). www.rapidintellect.com/AEQweb/mop4spro1.htm.

Marra, Robin F., Charles W. Ostrom, and Dennis M. Simon. 1990. "Foreign Policy and Presidential Popularity." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 34: 588–623.

McKeachie, Wilbert J., and Marilla Svinicki. 2006. "Active Learning: Cooperative, Collaborative, and Peer Learning." In *McKeachie's Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers*, ed. W. J. McKeachie and M. Svinicki. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Putnam, Robert D. 1988. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." *International Organization* 42: 427–60.

Raines, Claire. 2002. "Managing Millennials." In *Connecting Generations: The Sourcebook for a New Workplace*, ed. Claire Raines. Menlo Park, CA: Crisp Publications.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas. 1991. "Public Opinion, Domestic Structure, and Foreign Policy in Liberal Democracies." *World Politics* 43: 479–512.

Rosati, Jerel A., and James M. Scott. 2007. *The Politics of United States Foreign Policy*. 4th ed. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Rosenthal, Uriel, Paul 't Hart, and Alexander Kouzmin. 1991. "The Bureaucratic Politics of Crisis Management." *Public Administration* 69: 211–33.

Shapiro, Robert Y., and Lawrence R. Jacobs. 2000. "Who Leads and Who Follows? U.S. Presidents, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy." In *Decisionmaking in a Glass House*, ed. B. Lebens Nacos, R. Y. Shapiro, and P. Isneria. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Skiba, Diane J., and Amy J. Barton. 2006. "Adapting Your Teaching to Accommodate the Net Generation of Learners." *The Online Journal of Issues in Nursing* 11 (2). www.nursingworld.org/MainMenuCategories/ANAMarketplace/ANAPeriodicals/OJIN/TableofContents/Volume112006/Number2May31/tpc30_416076.aspx.

Van Bell, Douglas. 1993. "Domestic Imperatives and Rational Models of Foreign Policy Decision Making." In *The Limits of State Autonomy: Societal Groups and Foreign Policy Formulation*, ed. D. Skidmore and V. M. Hudson. Boulder: Westview Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090544 Published online by Cambridge University Press