

GAMES: Virtual Worlds and Reality

Selected Papers of ISAGA 2008

Eugenijus Bagdonas & Irena Patasiene (eds.)

Editorial Board

Prof. Eugenijus Bagdonas, Kaunas University of Technology – Editor-in-Chief
Associated professor dr. Irena Patasiene, Kaunas University of Technology – Editor-in-Chief

39th ISAGA Conference Scientific committee

Prof. Dr. Arata Ichicava Ryutsu Keizai university, Japan
Dr. Elysebeth Leigh The University of Technology, Sydney, Australia
Prof. Dr. Jan H. G. Klabbers KMPC, The Netherlands
Dr. Jeremy J. S. B. Hall Churchill Fellow, Managing Partner, Hall Marketing, UK
Prof. Dr. Raimundas Jasinevicius Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania
Assoc. Prof. Dr. YY Cai Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
Prof. Dr. Richard D. Teach Georgia Institute of Technology, US
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Maria Angeles Andreu Universidad Politecnica of Valencia, Spain
Prof. Dr. Beverly Rising Universidad Pontificia Comillas de Madrid, Spain
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Igor Mayer Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands.
Dr. Pieter. van der Hijden Sofos Consultancy, The Netherlands
Dr. Amparo Garcia-Carbonell Universidad Polit'ecnica de Valencia, Spain
Prof. Dr. Willy C. Kriz University of Applied Sciences, Austria
Prof. Dr. Dmitry Kavtaradze Moscow state University, Russian Federation
Prof. Dr. Shigehisa Tsuchiya Chiba Institute of Technology, Japan
Assoc. Prof. Dr. YEO Gee Kin National University of Singapore, Singapore
Anne Villems, Tartu University, Estonia
Prof. Dr. Viktorija Barsauskiene Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Raimonda Minkute Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Danguole Rutkauskiene Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania
Prof. Dr. Eugenijus Bagdonas Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Irena Patasiene Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

Editorial Board address:

The Editorial Board of "ISAGA 2008 Selected Papers"
K. Donelaičio str. 20-101,
LT-44239 Kaunas, Lithuania
Telephone +370 37 300118; fax.: +370 37 300102
e-mail: rpk@ktu.lt, irena.patasiene@ktu.lt

Cover design: Laimute Varkalaite

© 2009 Eugenijus Bagdonas & Irena Patasiene (eds.) Kaunas University of Technology. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in the retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission in writing from the proprietor.

ISBN 978-9955-25-682-3

CONTENTS

EUGENIJUS BAGDONAS, IRENA PATASIENE	
<i>Preface</i>	i
JAN H.G. KLABBERS	
<i>Virtual worlds and reality: knowing through imitation</i>	1
ELYSSEBETH LEIGH	
<i>Exploring questions for facilitators of learning in simulations</i>	11
ELIZABETH J TIPTON MURFF	
<i>Unexpected multicultural experiential learning</i>	19
MIKA IGARASHI	
<i>Developing a Research Methodology for the Quantitative Analysis of In-Game Social Behavior</i>	23
MIKA IGARASHI, YOSUKE NAGASHIMA, AKIRA BABA	
<i>Are Tendencies in Real-World Social Behavior Reproduced in the Virtual World? – Investigation and Implications</i>	27
GINTA RAILIENĖ, RIMANTĖ HOPENIENĖ	
<i>The Assessment of Key Pedagogical Objectives using ProfitPlanner Board Game in Diversified Environment</i>	31
GERT JAN HOFSTEDE, TIM VERWAART, CATHOLIJN M JONKER	
<i>Lemon car game</i>	39
KLAUS-PETER SCHULZ, RALPH RIEDEL, MICHAEL FOX	
<i>Playing and Reflecting the Firm</i>	47
JYLDYZ TABYLDY KYZY, BRIDE MALLON, DAVID NEWMAN, PHILIP DAWID	
<i>“World of Uncertainty”: A Computer Game for Decision Makers</i>	53
ELI LINDBLAD REM	
<i>How can the multi-focused methodology applied to role plays improve educational learning / professional knowledge in higher education?</i>	57
WILLY C. KRIZ, EBERHARD AUCHTER, HELMUT WITTENZELLNER	
<i>Evaluation of Simulation Games in the German entrepreneurship education program “exist-priME-cup”</i>	63
ELLEN HIJMANS, VINCENT PETERS, MARLEEN VAN DE WESTELAKEN, JEANNETTE HELDENS, ANGELINE VAN GILS	
<i>Encounters of a safe environment in simulation games</i>	71
RICHARD TEACH, ELIZABETH JT MURFF	
<i>Confounded learning in business simulations</i>	83
JUOZAS PATASIUS, IRENA PATASIENE, MARTYNAS PATASIUS	
<i>Simulation of economic factors in public sector</i>	89
GRAZVYDAS ZAUKAS	
<i>Simulation of bank operations using “Powersim Studio”</i>	95
HARALD WARMELINK, GEERTJE BEKEBREDE, CASPER HARTEVELD, IGOR MAYER	
<i>Understanding Virtual Worlds: An Infrastructural Perspective</i>	99
SHINNOSUKE KAWAKAMI	
<i>Science Rooms : Developing a New Digital Game to Learn Science</i>	105

EVA KEERIS	
<i>Combining concepts from Modeling and Simulation and Game research: Realistic Virtual Environments ...</i>	109
M ^a ÁNGELES ANDREU-ANDRÉS, MIGUEL GARCÍA-CASAS	
<i>A Problem-Based Task becoming a Simulation</i>	115
ELENA V. ZARUKINA	
<i>Simulation and gaming methods in educational process at a higher school: enhancing students' scientific research activity</i>	121
ARATA ICHIKAWA	
<i>A Game: real and virtual worlds</i>	125
ADRIAN MALLON	
<i>Pleasure, Responsibility and the Ideated Author in Virtual-World Gaming</i>	129
MASAMI IDO, SHINTARO HAYASHI, MASAKO SASAKI, YOSHIO HAYASHI	
<i>University Education Reform by Employing Gaming-Simulation: A Case Study at Akita University in Japan</i>	137
MAAIKE DE JONG	
<i>The World, Your Playground; students at play in reconstructing reality</i>	143
ELENA LIHACHEVA, DMITRY KAVTARADZE	
<i>What is Uncertainty in Games and Simulations</i>	153
MIKHAIL KRYUKOV, ELENA LIKACHEVA, ANDRII MIROSHNYCHENKO, DMITRY KAVTARADZE	
<i>Defining Strategy in Natural Resource Management on Simulation Game CoMPAS</i>	157
YEO GEE KIN, BIMLESH WADHWA, VU TRUONG VINH, NGUYEN PHUC KHANH LUAN, TRAN QUOC TUAN	
<i>In-process Assessments in Serious Games</i>	165
JUSSI HOLOPAINEN, STAFFAN BJÖRK	
<i>Gameplay Design Patterns for Motivation</i>	169
JEANNE TOLORDAVA	
<i>Business Games and Modern Training Technologies in University Education</i>	173
BEGOÑA MONTERO FLETA, BEVERLY RISING, CARMEN PÉREZ-SABATER	
<i>New Insights into Group Work Assessment</i>	179
EUGENIJUS BAGDONAS, IRENA PATASIENE, VALENTINA DAGIENE, VYTAUTAS SKVERNYS, MARTYNAS PATASIUS	
<i>Web-based Business Game for multidisciplinary teaching</i>	189
JOAN K. TEACH	
<i>TEACHING TEACHERS TO TEACH: A Game-Frame approach</i>	195
CASPER HARTEVELD, HARALD WARMELINK, MICHELE FUMAROLA, IGOR MAYER	
<i>Bringing Concepts Alive in Second Life: A Design Based Experiment</i>	199
LIN ZHIYUAN, CHOW NAM CHI, YEO GEE KIN	
<i>Towards An Ontologically-Supported Collaborative SGX</i>	205
GERT JAN HOFSTEDÉ, VINCENT PETERS, LÉON DE CALUWÉ, DENNIS MARTENS	
<i>WHY DO GAMES WORK? In search of the active substance</i>	211
ULRICH NORBISRATH, IVAR MÄNNAMAA, ANNE VILLEMS, KÜLLI KALAMEES-PANI	
<i>Mullivelled – Wrapping Computer Games into Educational Gaming Environments</i>	219

ELISABET M NILSSON	
<i>Simulated real worlds: science students creating sustainable cities in the urban simulation computer game SimCity 4</i>	227
CĂTĂLINA CIUCE, ELYSSEBETH LEIGH, HIDEHIKO KANEGAE	
<i>The development of a frame-game designed for organizational change management processes</i>	233
IRENA STANISLAVA BAJORUNIENE, VIKTORIJA BARSAUSKIENE, IRENA PATASIENE, AGNE KAZAKEVICIUTE	
<i>The Implementation of Business Game for Stimulating Socially Discriminated People Integration into Labour Market</i>	237
QINGQING DONG, ZHONGYI SUN, BRIAN MAC NAMEE	
<i>Physics-Based Table-Top Mixed Reality Games</i>	243
RAIMONDA MINKUTĖ, RIMA ŽITKIENĖ, DALIA KUNIGĖLIENĖ	
<i>The Analysis of the Importance of Students' Practice during Their Studies: Case of the Study Programme in Business Administration</i>	249
KLAUS-PETER SCHULZ, MICHAEL FOX	
<i>Creating Understanding and Meaning across Cultures: Playing a Business Game with Groups from the US, South Africa and Germany</i>	257
ARTHUR VAN BILSEN, GEERTJE BEKEBREDE, IGOR MAYER	
<i>Understanding complex infrastructure systems by playing games: Is it possible?</i>	265
SHINTARO HAYASHI, AKIRA TASUNE, AKIHIKO FUJINAWA , MASAMI IDO, YOSHIO HAYASHI	
<i>Libra 2: a Gaming Simulation for Learning Evacuation during Volcanic Eruption Crises</i>	271

A Problem-Based Task becoming a Simulation

M^a Ángeles Andreu-Andrés, Miguel García-Casas

Abstract

This paper describes the procedure followed to turn a problem-based task into a simulation carried out by several groups of students of engineering from different nationalities, as well as the steps chased to pursue its goal: the students' presentation of a new instrument or service developed by every group that will facilitate, in their opinion, the Technical Engineer in Topography's task enormously.

The relevance of this paper consists in the way a pedagogical strategy of active learning such as problem-based learning, in which learners are encouraged to take responsibility for their group and organize and direct the learning process with support from a tutor or teacher, becomes a simulation as both strategies are used to enhance content knowledge and foster the development of communication, self-directed learning skills and problem-solving.

Keywords: simulation, problem-based learning, socioconstructivism, cooperative learning, active learning.

What is Problem-Based Learning?

It is a pedagogical strategy for posing contextualized, real world situations, and providing resources, instruction, and guidance to learners as they develop content knowledge and problem-solving skills (Mayo, Donnelly, Nash, & Schwartz, 1993). The ability to solve problems is more than just accumulating knowledge; it is the development of cognitive strategies that help students analyze ill-structured situations to produce meaningful solutions.

According to the Central Queensland University of Australia (2002:2) Problem-Based Learning (PBL) encourages students to take responsibility for their own learning. On their webpage, dedicated to provide their students information on this learning methodology, they point out that "the PBL process follows the following format:

1. A PBL activity would involve students meeting as small groups to discuss a particular problem situation that has no easy or straight forward answer.
2. The problem situations they face will be messy, authentic and are likely to occur in real life.
3. The group would use their own knowledge and experience when discussing the problem and treat it as if they were personally asked to solve it.
4. From here the group would come up with a number of hypotheses that are likely to explain and solve the problem situation.
5. Once these hypotheses have been established the group then negotiates an area of exploration for each member and retires independently to carry out the research.
6. After sufficient time has elapsed to allow the research to be completed the group will meet again to discuss the problem in light of the information discovered by the group members.
7. Now the group will draw conclusions as to nature of the problem and the best fit solution, given the information known.
8. Finally, the group makes a professional presentation as to the solution and its consequences."

The historical origins of Problem-Based Learning date back to the early 1970s at the Medical School of McMaster University in Canada though its intellectual beginnings are far older (Rhem, 1998). This approach has flourished in medical schools; nevertheless, sciences in general and humanities have started to take it up. John Cavanaugh, vice-provost for Academic Programs and Planning at Delaware (Rhem, 1998:2) sorts out the place of PBL among the learning strategies as follows:

“Imagine a family tree: Active Learning would be at the top. Cooperative/Collaborative would be a subset of that, [...] PBL [would be] a subset of Coop/Collab based on cases [as] all forms of group work don’t center on cases; problem-based groups do”.

PBL and Simulation: Similarities and Differences

In PBL the main focus is the problem, a messy and ill-defined one as real problems are. It should be authentic or at least based on reality that does not necessarily have a right answer; the problem comes first instead of the concepts, which requires information-gathering by the student besides reflection on the process and on the content. The learners, not the teachers, choose which path to follow to solve it, meanwhile teachers become tutors and coaches for them (Merrill, 2005).

Both PBL and Simulation are active learning/teaching strategies that involve learners in *doing* rather than just learning about something which is crucial for any higher level learning and a notable trend in engineering education. If we admit that lecturing focuses on the teacher, active learning strategies (PBL and Simulation, in our case) underline the importance of the learners’ activities in such a way that students are mentally active, according to Cameron (1999), and their learning is most effective as they are involved in the learning experience rather than being passive recipients of the information (Pfeiffer, 1994).

Thanks to both strategies, our students interact, work out problems together by collaborating in a proposal based on the socioconstructivism (Vygostky, 1978) since group interdependency is a key to share learning and knowledge at the individual and the group level (see tables 1 and 2). Hall (2007) points out that this is primarily a constructivist approach that conceptualizes learning as a private process within an individual and then includes aspects of sociocultural theories in recognition of the value of others in the learning process: socioconstructivism proposes that the meaningful construction of knowledge occurs when a learner interacts with other learners.

The framework that guides the creation of authentic learning is the experimental learning cycle (ELC) and at the heart of it is the challenge or problem to solve from which we want students to acquire knowledge, skills and attitudes. Simulation and PBL belong to it but perhaps the main difference between these two active learning strategies lies in the fact that Simulation provides experiential learning while PBL also offers a self-directed learning process in which learners decide what to study based on a problem case, question or scenario that drives their learning.

Whereas in PBL students —working together in groups with the help of a facilitator and using 'problems' or scenarios as a basis for study— share their existing knowledge and understanding of the scenario, agree what they need to learn to solve the problem, discuss their progress, evaluate their work and decide next steps, Simulation structures the information students receive to focus their learning on the intended curriculum and increases the strategy’s effectiveness in a wider variety of ways, in accordance with Maxwell, Mergendoller and Bellisimo (2004).

Describing the Problem-Based Task: towards the Simulation

The Problem-Based Task (PBT) was carried out by five groups of four students of engineering — from different nationalities studying English at the Universidad Politécnica of Valencia, Spain— who benefited by using a simulation-structured information at the time the simulation —in which the PBT situation turned into— made use of a PBL framework to promote student-directed learning and problem-solving skills to explain a simulated scenario with several possible solutions.

Understanding a Simulation as a replica of actual events presented in a manner with a specific purpose (Dumblekar, 2004), students were introduced to the scenario as shown in table 1.

Table 1: Scenario

Your Problem-Based Learning Task becoming a Simulation

- 1) *In a few days an important prospect customer is meeting you to attend your presentation on a new instrument or service your company has developed that will facilitate the Technical Engineer in Topography's tasks enormously. Your team's presentation will sum up, in a few minutes, your instrument or service characteristics and advantages and will probably determine the future of your company as millions of euros have been invested on the design and development of the instrument or service your team presents.*
- 2) *You and your team are responsible for the project.*
- 3) ***Problem:*** *you are not sure what a good presentation is. You do not know what the important customer is going to focus his/her attention on during the presentation of your project.*
- 4) *As the situation is so important for you and your company's future **you have to:***
 - a. *Decide and design what super instrument or service you are going to present the prospect customer.*
 - b. *Search and decide what a good oral presentation is.*
 - c. *Prepare a rubric or grid that allows you to assess the presentations of the super products or services of the rest of the teams and, therefore, any future oral presentation.*
 - d. *Deadline: Your important customer will show up on _____.*

Briefing Phase

As mentioned above, each team was formed by four students from different language backgrounds (Spanish, French, German, Polish, Turkish and Czech) and an heterogeneous competence in English by using a PBL framework to promote student-directed learning and problem-solving but providing them with basic information and instruction during the briefing phase as shown in table 2.

Table 2: Information and decision phase

Besides the information dealing with your instrument or service and oral presentations that you can search in the library and on the Internet, the following files are available on PoliformaT()-Ingsup-Resources:*

1. *Link to the video Professional Presentations (scenes 14:00 to 20:26 minutes).*
2. *File on Designing Visual Aids.*
3. *File on Getting Started. Some tips. Communication Skills.*
4. *File on Guidelines for Oral Presentations.*
5. *File on Oral Presentation Advice and How to give a Bad Talk.*
6. *File on Presentations Vocabulary.*

() Our university online platform*

Teams worked on the task in class sessions for eight hours before the deadline (simulation proper), starting by thinking back the best speeches, lectures or presentations they have ever attended, and designing their product or service. Each team devoted the time and effort they considered necessary outside class sessions to reach their goal. The teacher observed and facilitated the students' task during class sessions and by electronic mail and office hours.

Before the simulation started, every team provided the facilitator (their teacher) their grid to assess a good oral presentation, according to the information gathered, their experience on the topic and every team member's agreement. The facilitator studied all the proposals and merged them in one under the consensus among students. This final grid was used by team members to assess their peers during the simulation.

Simulation Proper

Following the patterns that students considered make an oral presentation successful (delivery, body language, tone of voice, structure and organization, visual aids, etc.), every team presented the features and advantages of their products or services to the rest of their classmates that acted as prospect customers and asked for particular details of their interest.

During the simulation students assessed their peers' presentation according to the agreed grid which allowed students to vote for the best product or service. Comments and suggestions from the learners let presenters reflect on their performance and learn from it.

Debriefing

After the simulation, participants answered an open questionnaire on:

- The activity;
- Their feelings and reactions;
- Their learning;
- The activity and learning application, either academically or professionally;
- Proposals of improvement.

Their answers, attitude and behavior guide the facilitator to improve the activity the following courses.

Author information

M^a Ángeles Andreu-Andrés, Universidad Politécnica of Valencia (Spain).
Miguel García-Casas, IES La Morería, Mislata-Valencia (Spain).

References

- Cameron, B.J. (1999). *Active Learning: Green Guide 2*. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Society for teaching and Learning in Higher Education.
- Central Queensland University (2002). *Problem-based Learning*. "What is PBL?" http://pbl.cqu.edu.au/content/what_is_pbl.htm [Last access: 24th November 2007].
- Dumblekar, V. (2004). "Management simulations: Tests of effectiveness". Online posting on *Simulation and Gaming: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Theory, Practice and Research* web site. http://www.unice.fr/sg/resources/dumblekar_2004_management.htm [Last access: 26th December 2005].
- Hall, A. (2007). "Vygotsky goes online: Learning design from a sociocultural perspective". *Proceedings Learning and Socio-cultural Theory: Exploring Modern Vygotskian Perspectives Workshop*. Wollongong University. <http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1005&context=llrg> [Last access: 16th January 2008].
- Mayo, P., Donnelly, M. B., Nash, P. P., and Schwartz, R. W. (1993). "Student Perceptions of Tutor Effectiveness in problem based surgery clerkship". *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*. 5(4), 227-233. *Simulation & Gaming*, 35 (4), 488-498.
- Maxwell, N.L., Mergendoller, J.R. and Bellisimo, Y. (2004). "Developing a problem-based learning simulation: An economics unit on trade".

- Merrill, H.S. (2005). "Case Study, Problem-Based Learning and Simulation in Online Graduate Courses". *19th Annual Conference on Distance teaching and Learning*. The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System.
http://www.uwex.edu/disted/conference/Resource_library/proceedings/03_04.pdf [Last access: 26th December 2007].
- Pfeiffer, J.W. (1994). *Theories and models in applied behavioral science*. Vol. 2, San Diego, California: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Rhem, J. (1998). "Problem-Based Learning: An Introduction". *The National Teaching and Learning Forum*, 8 (1) http://www.ntlf.com/html/pi/9812/pbl_1.htm [Last access: 11th January 2003].
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.