

# A Thematic Bibliography

Here we present some topical and highly useful research pertaining to improving decision making in dynamic tasks. We have identified nine themes, (i) Laboratory Experimental Approach, (ii) Debriefing and Human Facilitation, (iii) Decision Making and Learning in Dynamic Tasks, (iv), Simulation-Based Training and Tools, (v) Dynamic Decision Making, (vi) Learning Theories and Principles, (vii) System Dynamics and ILEs, (viii) Designs Principle for Learning in and with Simulations, and (ix) Healthcare and Its Dynamics, so the readers could avail this literature according to their interest in a specific theme. We hope both the researchers and practitioners can benefit from this thematic bibliography.

## 1. Laboratory Experimental Approach

- Abdel-Hamid, T., Sengupta, K., & Swett, C. (1999). The impact of goals on software project management: An experimental investigation. *MIS Quarterly*, 23(4), 1–19.
- Blazer, W. K., Doherty, M. E., & O'Connor, R. (1989). Effects of cognitive feedback on performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106(3), 410–433.
- Diehl, E., & Sterman, J. D. (1995). Effects of feedback complexity on dynamic decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 62(2), 198–215.
- Fischer, H., & Gonzalez, C. (2015). Making sense of dynamic systems: How our understanding of stocks and flows depends on a global perspective. *Cognitive Science*, 40, 496–512.
- Ford, D. N., & McCormack, D. E. M. (2000). Effects of time scale focus on system understanding in decision support systems. *Simulation and Gaming*, 31(3), 309–330.
- Gonzalez, M., Machuca, J., & Castillo, J. (2000). A transparent-box multifunctional simulator of competing companies. *Simulation and Gaming*, 31(2), 240–256.
- Größler, A., Rouwette, E., & Vennix, J. (2016). Non-conscious vs. deliberate dynamic decision-making—A pilot experiment. *Systems*, 4(13), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems4010013>.
- Howie, E., Sy, S., Ford, L., & Vicente, K. J. (2000). Human-computer interface design can reduce misperceptions of feedback. *System Dynamics Review*, 16(3), 151–171.
- Kleinmuntz, D. (1985). Cognitive heuristics and feedback in a dynamic decision environment. *Management Science*, 31, 680–701.
- Kottermann, E., Davis, D., & Remus, E. (1995). Computer-assisted decision making: Performance, beliefs, and illusion of control. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 57, 26–37.

- Lakeh, B., & Ghaffarzadegan, N. (2015). Does analytical thinking improve understanding of accumulation? *System Dynamics Review*, 31(1–2), 46–65.
- Locke, E. A. (1986). *Generalizing from laboratory to field settings: Research findings from organizational behavior and human resource management*. Lexington, MA: Heath Lexington.
- Moxnes, E. (2004). Misperceptions of basic dynamics: The case of renewable resource management. *System Dynamics Review*, 20, 139–162.
- Paich, M., & Sterman, D. (1993, December). Boom, bust, and failures to learn in experimental markets. *Management Science*, 39(12), 1439–1458.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H. (2007). Debriefing can reduce misperceptions of feedback hypothesis: An empirical study. *Simulations and Gaming*, 38(3), 382–397.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H. (2010). Perceptions of the effectiveness of system dynamics-based interactive learning environments: An empirical study. *Computers and Education*, 55, 1277–1286.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H. (2014). Yes we can: Improving performance in dynamic tasks. *Decision Support Systems*, 61, 23–33.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H., & Kayal, A. (2018). How to improve learners' (mis) understanding of CO2 accumulations through the use of human-facilitated interactive learning environments? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 184, 188–197.
- Sengupta, K., & Abdel-Hamid, T. (1993). Alternative concepts of feedback in dynamic decision environments: An experimental investigation. *Management Science*, 39, 411–428.
- Sterman, J. D. (1989). Modeling managerial behavior: Misperceptions of feedback in a dynamic decision making experiment. *Management Science*, 35, 321–339.
- Sterman, J. D., & Dogan, G. (2015). I'm not hoarding, I'm just stocking up before the hoarders get there. Behavioral causes of phantom ordering in supply chains. *Journal of Operations Management*, 39–40, 6–22.
- Sterman, J. D., & Sweeney, B. (2007). Understanding public complacency about climate change: Adults' mental models of climate change violate conservation of matter. *Climatic Change*, 80(3–4), 213–238.
- Sterman, J., Franck, T., Fiddaman, T., Jones, A., McCauley, S., Rice, P., Sawin, E., Siegel, L., & Rooney-Varga, J. (2014). World climate: A role-play simulation of climate negotiations. *Simulation & Gaming*, 46(3): 1–35.
- Te'eni, D. (1991). Feedback in DSS as a source of control: Experiments with the timing of feedback. *Decision Sciences*, 22(3), 644–655.
- Yi, S., & Davis, F. (2001). Improving computer training effectiveness for decision technologies: Behavior modeling and retention enhancement. *Decision Sciences*, 32(3), 521–544.
- Tamara, E. F., Alec, M. B., & Judith, D. S. (2013). The use of technology by nonformal environmental educators. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 44(1), 16–37.

## 2. Debriefing and Human Facilitation

- Allen, J. A., Baran, B. E., & Scott, C. W. (2010). After-action reviews: Avenue for the promotion of safety climate. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 42, 750–757.
- Dismukes, R. K., & Smith, G. M. (Eds.). (2000). *Facilitation in aviation training and operations*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Dreifuerst, K. T. (2009). The essentials of debriefing in simulation learning: A concept analysis. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 30(2), 109–114.
- Ellis, S., & Davidi, I. (2005). After-event reviews: Drawing lessons from successful and failed experience. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 857–871.
- Fanning, M., & Gaba, M. (2007). The role of debriefing in simulation-based learning. *Simulation in Healthcare*, 2(2), 115–125.

- Kim, J., & Pavlov, O. (2017). Game-based structural debriefing: A design tool for systems thinking curriculum. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3218674>.
- Lederman, L. C. (1992). Debriefing: Towards a systematic assessment of theory and practice. *Simulation and Gaming*, 23(2), 145–160.
- Pavlov, O., Saeed, K., & Robinson, L. (2015, February). Improving instructional simulation with structural debriefing. *Simulation and Gaming*, 46, 383–403.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H. (2007). Debriefing can reduce misperceptions of feedback hypothesis: An empirical study. *Simulations and Gaming*, 38(3), 382–397.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H., & Kayal, A. (2018). How to improve learners' (mis) understanding of CO2 accumulations through the use of human-facilitated interactive learning environments? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 184, 188–197.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H., & Kayal, A. (2018). How to improve learners' (mis) understanding of CO2 accumulations through the use of human-facilitated interactive learning environments? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 184, 188–197.
- Rogers, E. W., & Milam, J. (2004). Pausing for learning: Applying the after action review process at the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center. In *Proceedings of the IEEEAC* (pp. 4383–4388). Piscataway, NJ: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers.
- Ron, N., Lipshitz, R., & Popper, M. (2002). How organizations learn: Post-flight reviews in a F-16 fighter squadron. *Organization Studies*, 27, 1069–1089.
- Tannenbaum, S. I., & Cerasoli, C. P. (2013). Do team and individual debrief enhance performance? A meta-analysis. *Human Factors*, 55(1), 231–245.

### 3. Decision Making and Learning in Dynamic Tasks

- Bakken, B. E. (1993). *Learning and transfer of understanding in dynamic decision environments*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT, Boston.
- Barnett, S., & Ceci, S. (2002). When and where do we apply what we learn? A taxonomy for far transfer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(4), 612–637.
- Berry, D. C. (1991). The role of action in implicit learning. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 43A, 881–906.
- Cohen, I. (2008). Improving time-critical decision making in life-threatening situations: Observations and insights. *Decision Analysis*, 5(2), 100–110.
- Fischer, H., & Gonzalez, C. (2015). Making sense of dynamic systems: How our understanding of stocks and flows depends on a global perspective. *Cognitive Science*, 40, 496–512.
- Gagné, R. M. (1985). *The conditions of learning and theory of instruction*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Gagné, R. M., Briggs, L. J., & Wager, W. W. (1992). *Principles of instructional design* (4th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Garris, R., Ahlers, R., & Driskell, J. E. (2002). Games, motivation, and learning: A research and practice model. *Simulation and Gaming*, 33(4), 441–467.
- Issacs, W., & Senge, P. (1994). Overcoming limits to learning in computer-based learning environments. In J. Morecroft & J. Sterman (Eds.), *Modeling for learning organizations* (pp. 267–287). Portland, OR: Productivity Press.
- Lane, D. C. (1995). On a resurgence of management simulations and games. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 46, 604–625.
- Mayer, W., Dale, K., Fraccastoro, K., & Moss, G. (2011). Improving transfer of learning: Relationship to methods of using business simulation. *Simulation & Gaming*, 42(1), 64–84.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H. (2007). Debriefing can reduce misperceptions of feedback hypothesis: An empirical study. *Simulations and Gaming*, 38(3), 382–397.

- Qudrat-Ullah, H., & Kayal, A. (2018). How to improve learners' (mis) understanding of CO2 accumulations through the use of human-facilitated interactive learning environments? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 184, 188–197.
- Rogers, E. W., & Milam, J. (2004). Pausing for learning: Applying the after action review process at the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center. In *Proceedings of the IEEEAC* (pp. 4383–4388). Piscataway, NJ: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers.
- Ron, N., Lipshitz, R., & Popper, M. (2002). How organizations learn: Post-flight reviews in a F-16 fighter squadron. *Organization Studies*, 27, 1069–1089.
- Sengupta, K., & Abdel-Hamid, T. (1993). Alternative concepts of feedback in dynamic decision environments: An experimental investigation. *Management Science*, 39, 411–428.
- Sterman, J. D. (1989). Modeling managerial behavior: Misperceptions of feedback in a dynamic decision making experiment. *Management Science*, 35, 321–339.
- Sterman, J. D., & Dogan, G. (2015). I'm not hoarding, I'm just stocking up before the hoarders get there. Behavioral causes of phantom ordering in supply chains. *Journal of Operations Management*, 39–40, 6–22.
- Sterman, J. D., & Sweeney, B. (2007). Understanding public complacency about climate change: Adults' mental models of climate change violate conservation of matter. *Climatic Change*, 80(3–4), 213–238.
- Sterman, J., Franck, T., Fiddaman, T., Jones, A., McCauley, S., Rice, P., Sawin, E., Siegel, L., & Rooney-Varga, J. (2014). World climate: A role-play simulation of climate negotiations. *Simulation & Gaming*, 1–35.

## 4. Simulation-Based Training and Tools

- Bell, B. S., Kanar, A. M., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2008). Current issues and future directions in simulation-based training in North America. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(8), 1416–1434.
- Faria, A. J. (1998). Business simulation games: Current usage levels – An update. *Simulation and Gaming*, 29, 295–308.
- Fischer, H., & Gonzalez, C. (2015). Making sense of dynamic systems: How our understanding of stocks and flows depends on a global perspective. *Cognitive Science*, 40, 496–512.
- Gaba, D. M., Howard, S. K., Fish, K. J., Smith, B. E., & Sowb, Y. A. (2001). Simulation-based training in anesthesia crisis resource management (ACRM): A decade of experience. *Simulation and Gaming*, 32, 175–193.
- Lane, D. C. (1995). On a resurgence of management simulations and games. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 46, 604–625.
- Lane, M., & Tang, Z. (2000). Effectiveness of simulation training on transfer of statistical concepts. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 22(4), 383–396.
- Maier, F. H., & Größler, A. (2000). What are we talking about? – A taxonomy of computer simulations to support learning. *System Dynamics Review*, 16(2), 135–148.
- Mayer, W., Dale, K., Fraccastoro, K., & Moss, G. (2011). Improving transfer of learning: Relationship to methods of using business simulation. *Simulation & Gaming*, 42(1), 64–84.
- NTSA. (2011). President's notes. *Training Industry News*, 23(4), 2–2.
- Spector, J. M. (2000). System dynamics and interactive learning environments: Lessons learned and implications for the future. *Simulation and Gaming*, 31(4), 528–535.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H. (2008). Behavior validity of a simulation model for sustainable development. *International Journal of Management and Decision Making*, 9(2), 129–139.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H., & BaekSeo, S. (2010). How to do structural validity of a system dynamics type simulation model: The case of an energy policy model. *Energy Policy*, 38(5), 2216–2224.

- Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Research*, 27(2), 4–12.
- Sing, D. T. (1998). Incorporating cognitive aids into decision support systems: The case of the strategy execution process. *Decision Support Systems*, 24, 145–163.
- Söllner, A., Bröder, A., & Hilbig, E. (2013). Deliberation versus automaticity in decision making: Which presentation format features facilitate automatic decision making? *Judgment and Decision making*, 8(3), 278–298.
- Söllner, A., Bröder, A., & Hilbig, E. (2013). Deliberation versus automaticity in decision making: Which presentation format features facilitate automatic decision making? *Judgment and Decision making*, 8(3), 278–298.
- Sterman, J. D. (1992). Teaching takes off – Flight simulators for management education, *OR/MS Today*, pp. 40–44.
- Sterman, J., Franck, T., Fiddaman, T., Jones, A., McCauley, S., Rice, P., Sawin, E., Siegel, L., & Rooney-Varga, J. (2014). World climate: A role-play simulation of climate negotiations. *Simulation & Gaming*, 1–35.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1995). Expertise in complex problem solving: A comparison of alternative conceptions. In P. Frensch & J. Funke (Eds.), *Complex problem solving: The European perspective* (pp. 3–25). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Horvath, J. A. (1995). A prototype view of expert teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 24(6), 9–17.
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285.
- USDOA. (1993). US Department of the Army, Military Operations: U.S. Army Operations Concept for Combat Identification, TRADOC Pam 525–58 (Fort Monroe, Va.: Training and Doctrine Command, 31 August 1993):1.

## 5. Dynamic Decision Making

- Abdel-Hamid, T., Sengupta, K., & Swett, C. (1999). The impact of goals on software project management: An experimental investigation. *MIS Quarterly*, 23(4), 1–19.
- Brehmer, B. (1990). Strategies in real-time dynamic decision making. In R. M. Hogarth (Ed.), *Insights in decision making* (pp. 262–279). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Diehl, E., & Sterman, J. D. (1995). Effects of feedback complexity on dynamic decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 62(2), 198–215.
- Edwards, W. (1962). Dynamic decision theory and probabilistic information processing. *Human Factors*, 4, 59–73.
- Fischer, H., & Gonzalez, C. (2015). Making sense of dynamic systems: How our understanding of stocks and flows depends on a global perspective. *Cognitive Science*, 40, 496–512.
- Ford, D. N., & McCormack, D. E. M. (2000). Effects of time scale focus on system understanding in decision support systems. *Simulation and Gaming*, 31(3), 309–330.
- Gonzalez, M., Machuca, J., & Castillo, J. (2000). A transparent-box multifunctional simulator of competing companies. *Simulation and Gaming*, 31(2), 240–256.
- Größler, A., Rouwette, E., & Vennix, J. (2016). Non-conscious vs. deliberate dynamic decision-making—A pilot experiment. *Systems*, 4(13), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems4010013>.
- Hogarth, R. M. (1981). Beyond discrete biases: Functional and dysfunctional aspects of judgmental heuristics. *Psychological Bulletin*, 9(2), 197–217.
- Howie, E., Sy, S., Ford, L., & Vicente, K. J. (2000). Human-computer interface design can reduce misperceptions of feedback. *System Dynamics Review*, 16(3), 151–171.
- Keeney, R. L., & Raiffa, H. (1976). *Decisions with multiple objectives*. New York: Wiley.

- Kleinmuntz, D. (1985). Cognitive heuristics and feedback in a dynamic decision environment. *Management Science*, *31*, 680–701.
- Lakeh, B., & Ghaffarzadegan, N. (2015). Does analytical thinking improve understanding of accumulation? *System Dynamics Review*, *31*(1–2), 46–65.
- Moxnes, E. (2004). Misperceptions of basic dynamics: The case of renewable resource management. *System Dynamics Review*, *20*, 139–162.
- Paich, M., & Sterman, D. (1993, December). Boom, bust, and failures to learn in experimental markets. *Management Science*, *39*(12), 1439–1458.
- Payne, J. W., Bettman, J. R., & Johnson, E. J. (1993). *The adaptive decision maker*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Payne, J. W., Johnson, E. J., Bettman, J. R., & Coupey, E. (1990). Understanding contingent choice: A computer simulation approach. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, *20*, 296–309.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H. (2007). Debriefing can reduce misperceptions of feedback hypothesis: An empirical study. *Simulations and Gaming*, *38*(3), 382–397.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H. (2010). Perceptions of the effectiveness of system dynamics-based interactive learning environments: An empirical study. *Computers and Education*, *55*, 1277–1286.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H. (2014). Yes we can: Improving performance in dynamic tasks. *Decision Support Systems*, *61*, 23–33.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H., & Kayal, A. (2018). How to improve learners' (mis) understanding of CO2 accumulations through the use of human-facilitated interactive learning environments? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *184*, 188–197.
- Rogers, E. W., & Milam, J. (2004). Pausing for learning: Applying the after action review process at the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center. In *Proceedings of the IEEEAC* (pp. 4383–4388). Piscataway, NJ: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers.
- Ron, N., Lipshitz, R., & Popper, M. (2002). How organizations learn: Post-flight reviews in a F-16 fighter squadron. *Organization Studies*, *27*, 1069–1089.
- Sengupta, K., & Abdel-Hamid, T. (1993). Alternative concepts of feedback in dynamic decision environments: An experimental investigation. *Management Science*, *39*, 411–428.
- Sterman, J. D. (1989). Modeling managerial behavior: Misperceptions of feedback in a dynamic decision making experiment. *Management Science*, *35*, 321–339.
- Sterman, J. D., & Dogan, G. (2015). I'm not hoarding, I'm just stocking up before the hoarders get there. Behavioral causes of phantom ordering in supply chains. *Journal of Operations Management*, *39–40*, 6–22.
- Sterman, J. D., & Sweeney, B. (2007). Understanding public complacency about climate change: Adults' mental models of climate change violate conservation of matter. *Climatic Change*, *80*(3–4), 213–238.
- Sterman, J., Franck, T., Fiddaman, T., Jones, A., McCauley, S., Rice, P., Sawin, E., Siegel, L., & Rooney-Varga, J. (2014). World climate: A role-play simulation of climate negotiations. *Simulation & Gaming*, 1–35.

## 6. Learning Theories and Principles

- Briggs, P. (1990). Do they know what they are doing? An evaluation of word-processor user's implicit and explicit task-relevant knowledge, and its role in self-directed learning. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, *32*, 385–298.
- Rouwette, A., Großler, A., & Vennix, M. (2004). Exploring influencing factors on rationality: A literature review of dynamic decision-making studies in system dynamics. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, *21*, 351–370.



- Collins, A. (1991). Cognitive apprenticeship and instructional technology. In L. Idol & B. F. Jones (Eds.), *Educational values and cognitive instruction: Implications for reform* (pp. 121–138). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Conant, R., & Ashby, W. (1970). Every good regulator of a system must be a model of the system. *International Journal of System Science*, 1, 89–97.
- Cox, R. J. (1992). Exploratory learning from computer-based systems. In S. Dijkstra, H. P. M. Krammer, & J. J. G. van Merriënboer (Eds.), *Instructional models in computer-based learning environments* (pp. 405–419). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Davidson, P. I., & Spector, J. M. (1997). Cognitive complexity in system dynamics based learning environments. *International System Dynamics Conference*, Istanbul, Turkey: Bogazici University Printing Office, pp. 757–760.
- Glöckner, A., & Betsch, T. (2008). Multiple-reason decision making based on the automatic processing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 34, 1055–1075.
- Kwakkel, J. H., & Pruyt, E. (2013). Explanatory modeling and analysis and approach for model-based foresight under deep uncertainty. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 80(3), 419–431.
- Schön, D. (1984). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Research*, 27(2), 4–12.
- Sing, D. T. (1998). Incorporating cognitive aids into decision support systems: The case of the strategy execution process. *Decision Support Systems*, 24, 145–163.
- Söllner, A., Bröder, A., & Hilbig, E. (2013). Deliberation versus automaticity in decision making: Which presentation format features facilitate automatic decision making? *Judgment and Decision making*, 8(3), 278–298.
- Söllner, A., Bröder, A., & Hilbig, E. (2013). Deliberation versus automaticity in decision making: Which presentation format features facilitate automatic decision making? *Judgment and Decision making*, 8(3), 278–298.
- Spector, J. M. (2000). System dynamics and interactive learning environments: Lessons learned and implications for the future. *Simulation and Gaming*, 31(4), 528–535.
- Sterman, J. D. (1994). Learning in and around complex systems. *System Dynamics Review*, 10.
- Sterman, J. D. (1992). Teaching takes off – Flight simulators for management education, *OR/MS Today*, pp. 40–44.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1995). Expertise in complex problem solving: A comparison of alternative conceptions. In P. Frensch & J. Funke (Eds.), *Complex problem solving: The European perspective* (pp. 3–25). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Horvath, J. A. (1995). A prototype view of expert teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 24(6), 9–17.
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285.
- Mayer, W., Dale, K., Fraccastoro, K., & Moss, G. (2011). Improving transfer of learning: Relationship to methods of using business simulation. *Simulation & Gaming*, 42(1), 64–84.
- Tannenbaum, S. I., & Cerasoli, C. P. (2013). Do team and individual debrief enhance performance? A meta-analysis. *Human Factors*, 55(1), 231–245.
- Tebbens, D., & Thompson, K. (2009). Priority shifting and the dynamics of managing eradicable infectious diseases. *Management Science*, 55, 650–663. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1080.0965>.
- Thatcher, C., & Robinson, J. (1985). *An introduction to games and simulations in education. Simulations*. Hants: Solent.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science, New Series*, 185(4157), 1124–1131.

## 7. System Dynamics and ILEs

- Alessi, A., & Kopainsky, B. (2015). System dynamics and simulation-gaming: Overview. *Simulation and Gaming*, 48(2–3), 223–229.
- Forrester, J. W. (1961). *Industrial dynamics*. Cambridge, MA: Productivity Press.
- Homer, J. B., & Hirsch, G. B. (2006). System dynamics modeling for public health: Background and opportunities. *American Journal of Public Health*, 96(3), 452–458.
- Meadows, D. L., Fiddaman, T., & Shannon, D. (1993). *Fish Banks, Ltd.: A micro-computer assisted group simulation that teaches principles of sustainable management of renewable natural resources* (3rd ed.). Durham, NH: Laboratory for Interactive Learning, Hood House, University of New Hampshire.
- Plate, R. (2010). Assessing individuals' understanding of nonlinear causal structures in complex systems. *System Dynamics Review*, 28(1), 19–33.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H. (2007). Debriefing can reduce misperceptions of feedback hypothesis: An empirical study. *Simulations and Gaming*, 38(3), 382–397.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H. (2010). Perceptions of the effectiveness of system dynamics-based interactive learning environments: An empirical study. *Computers and Education*, 55, 1277–1286.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H. (2014). Yes we can: Improving performance in dynamic tasks. *Decision Support Systems*, 61, 23–33.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H., & Kayal, A. (2018). How to improve learners' (mis) understanding of CO2 accumulations through the use of human-facilitated interactive learning environments? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 184, 188–197.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H., Saleh, M. M., & Bahaa, E. A. (1997). Fish Bank ILE: An interactive learning laboratory to improve understanding of 'The Tragedy of Commons'; a common behavior of complex dynamic systems. *Proceedings of 15th International System Dynamics Conference*, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H., & Tsasis, P. (Eds.). (2017). *Innovative healthcare systems for the 21st century*. New York: Springer.
- Rouwette, A., Großler, A., & Vennix, M. (2004). Exploring influencing factors on rationality: A literature review of dynamic decision-making studies in system dynamics. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 21, 351–370.
- Spector, J. M. (2000). System dynamics and interactive learning environments: Lessons learned and implications for the future. *Simulation and Gaming*, 31(4), 528–535.
- Sterman, J. D. (1989). Modeling managerial behavior: Misperceptions of feedback in a dynamic decision making experiment. *Management Science*, 35, 321–339.
- Sterman, J. D. (1994). Learning in and around complex systems. *System Dynamics Review*, 10, 291–323.
- Sterman, J. D. (2000). *Business dynamics: Systems thinking and modeling for a complex world*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sterman, J. D. (1992). Teaching takes off – Flight simulators for management education, *ORMS Today*, pp. 40–44.
- Sterman, J. D., & Dogan, G. (2015). I'm not hoarding, I'm just stocking up before the hoarders get there. Behavioral causes of phantom ordering in supply chains. *Journal of Operations Management*, 39–40, 6–22.
- Sterman, J. D., & Sweeney, B. (2007). Understanding public complacency about climate change: Adults' mental models of climate change violate conservation of matter. *Climatic Change*, 80(3–4), 213–238.
- Sterman, J., Franck, T., Fiddaman, T., Jones, A., McCauley, S., Rice, P., Sawin, E., Siegel, L., & Rooney-Varga, J. (2014). World climate: A role-play simulation of climate negotiations. *Simulation & Gaming*, 1–35.



## 8. Designs Principle for Learning in and with Simulations

- Klabbers, G. (2000). Gaming and simulation: Principles of a science of design. *Simulation and Gaming*, 34(4), 569–591.
- Kriz, W. C. (2003). Creating effective learning environments and learning organizations through gaming simulation design. *Simulation and Gaming*, 34(4), 495–511.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H., Saleh, M. M., & Bahaa, E. A. (1997). Fish Bank ILE: An interactive learning laboratory to improve understanding of ‘The Tragedy of Commons’; a common behavior of complex dynamic systems. *Proceedings of 15th International System Dynamics Conference*, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Schön, D. (1984). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science, New Series*, 185(4157), 1124–1131.

## 9. Healthcare and Its Dynamics

- Krentza, H., & Gill, M. (2010). The five-year impact of an evolving global epidemic, changing migration patterns, and policy changes in a regional Canadian HIV population. *Health Policy (Amsterdam)*, 90(17): 296–302.
- Montaner, J., Lima, V., Barrios, R., Yip, B., Wood, E., Kerr, T., & Kendall, P. (2010). Association of highly active antiretroviral therapy coverage, population viral load, and yearly new HIV diagnoses in British Columbia, Canada: A population-based study. [www.thelancet.com](http://www.thelancet.com), 376, 532-539.
- Qudrat-Ullah, H., & Tsasis, P. (Eds.). (2017). *Innovative Healthcare Systems for the 21st Century*. ISBN 978-3-319-55773-1.
- Roberts, C. A., & Dangerfield, B. C. (1992). Estimating the parameters of an AIDS spread model using optimization software: Results for two countries compared. In J. A. M. Vennix, J. Faber, W. J. Scheper, & C. A. T. Takkenberg (Eds.), *System dynamics 1992* (pp. 605–617). Cambridge, MA: System Dynamics Society.
- Robertson, B., Schumacher, L., Gosman, G., Kanfer, R., Kelley, M., & DeVita, M. (2009). Simulation-based crisis team training for multidisciplinary obstetric providers. *Simulation in Healthcare*, 4, 77–83.

# Index

## A

Affordable and reliable healthcare, 55  
AIDS population, 31–33  
Aviation, 1

## C

Causal understanding, 7  
CO<sub>2</sub> accumulation, 69  
Cognitive ability, 5  
Cognitive apprenticeship theory, 11, 13, 24  
Collins's apprenticeship model, 10, 12, 13  
Contact frequency, 33, 36, 37  
Correlational heuristics, 5  
Cost-benefit analysis, 68  
Cumulative knowledge, 69

## D

Debriefing, 2  
Debriefing-based SDILE  
  decision makers and learners, 46  
  decision making and learning, 48–49  
  and decision strategy, 50  
  and decision time, 51  
  dynamic tasks, 60  
  and heuristic knowledge, 52  
  outcome-oriented, 45  
  perceptions, 53  
  process-oriented, 45, 47  
  and structural knowledge, 51  
  subject effects, 47, 53  
  training with process-oriented, 58  
  users' decision making and learning, 58  
Debriefing games, 17

Debriefing models, 68  
Decisional aid, 2, 6, 57, 58, 60, 63  
Decision strategies, 15, 18–21, 23–25, 30, 31, 37, 39, 46–48, 50, 53, 54  
Decision time, 23–25, 30, 31, 37, 39, 40, 47, 48, 51, 53  
Dynamic complexity, 5  
Dynamic decision making (DDM), 4, 5, 10, 23, 56, 67–69, 71  
Dynamic task, 1  
  categories, decisions, 3  
  description, 2  
  driving a car, 3  
  driving decision, 2, 3  
  ILEs (*see* Interactive learning environments (ILEs))  
  learning and decision making, 5–6  
  real-world experimentation, 6  
  SDILEs, 2 (*see also* System dynamics-based ILEs (SDILEs))  
  SIADH-ILE, 2  
  system dynamics, 2  
  time-critical tasks, 4  
  workshop-based short training programs, 2

## E

Effects of the practice, 53  
Efficacy of SDILEs, 7  
Efficient decision makers, 56, 58, 60, 62  
Effort, 39  
Effort-reward hypothesis, 68  
Evaluation science, 68, 69  
Evaluative model, 10

- Experimental approach  
 debriefing sessions, 37, 38  
 decision making and task performance, SIADH-ILE, 36–37  
 dynamic task  
 accumulations, 33  
 contact frequency and infectivity rate, 33  
 feedback loops, 31  
 HIV/AIDS epidemic, 31  
 modeling and simulation-based training, 31  
 susceptible population, 32  
 laboratory, 29  
 limitations, 56  
 measurements, 37–39  
 procedures and participants, 35–36  
 research model, 30, 31  
 standard protocols, 30  
 validation, system dynamics models, 34
- F**  
 Facilitator support, 11–13  
 Feedback loops, 1–5, 56, 60  
 Fisheries management tasks, 56  
 Fratricides, 5
- G**  
*Gagné's* learning theory, 13, 14  
 Game-Based Structural Debriefing (GBSD), 17  
 Gameplay, 6
- H**  
 H3a, 51  
 HAART vaccine, 36  
 Hawthorne effects, 35  
 HCI design principles, 10, 11, 24  
 Healthcare domains, 71  
 Health policy, 46  
 Health professionals, 69  
 Heuristic knowledge, 18, 22–25, 46, 47, 49, 52, 53  
 Highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART), 33, 37–39, 49, 50, 58  
 Hiring decisions, 4  
 HIV/AIDS epidemic, 30–32, 36, 37  
 HIV/AIDS prevention, 56, 57  
 Human-computer interaction (HCI), 7  
 Human-human interactions, 59
- I**  
 Incentives, 57  
 Instructional events, 13, 14, 24  
 Interactive learning environments (ILEs)  
 computer simulation-based, 6  
 description, 6  
 system dynamics (*see* System dynamics-based ILEs (SDILEs))
- L**  
 Learning objective, 36
- M**  
 Management of HIV/AIDS situation, 68  
 Managerial decision making, 3  
 Managerial practice, 62–64  
 Managerial practice field, 70  
 Market strategy tasks, 56  
 Medical screening, 58  
 “Misperception of feedback hypothesis”, 58  
 Modeling and explaining, 11, 12  
 MOF hypothesis, 18  
 Multivariate analysis, 50
- O**  
 Operational decisions, 3  
 Outcome-oriented debriefing, 45, 49, 51–53, 58
- P**  
 Performance improvement, 59  
 Practice, 59  
 Prevention and treatment options, 68  
 Process-oriented debriefing, 45, 47, 49, 51–54, 58, 59, 68  
 Production scheduling tasks, 56
- S**  
 Scripted discussion, 30  
 SIADH-ILE, 32  
 causal interactions, 32  
 computer program, 31  
 debriefing, 17, 30  
 decision making and task performance, 36–37  
 decision panel, 34  
 decision strategies, 15  
 decision time, 39  
 experimental setting, 56

- HCI and learning principles, 11
  - HIV/AIDS prevention, 57
  - healthcare domain, 59
  - human performance, dynamic task, 60–61
  - instructional events, 14
  - laboratory experiment, 30
  - learning enhancing activities, 17
  - measures, decision making and learning, 40
  - perceived utility, 59
  - program, 30
  - simulation model, 30
  - task, 35
  - users, 37
    - users decision making and learning, 55
  - Simulator-based training, 9
  - Situated learning, 11
  - Software project environments, 56
  - Strategic decisions, 3
  - Structural knowledge, 10, 13, 18, 22–25
  - Structure-behavior graphs, 59–61, 64
  - Structured debriefing, 10
    - cognitive overload challenge, 15
    - decision accuracy and efficiency, 21
      - and decision strategy, 19–21
      - and decision time, 21
    - effective learning, 15
    - and heuristics knowledge, 22
    - mental model, 15
    - SDILE and task performance, 18–19
    - and structural knowledge, 22
    - structural learning challenge, 15
    - transfer learning
      - challenge, 15
      - decision making skills, 15
      - vs. feedback sessions, 16
      - GBSD framework, 17
      - learning enhancing activities, 16
      - simulation-based training, 15
      - structural elements, 16
  - System dynamics, 2, 6, 46
  - System dynamics-based ILEs (SDILEs), 2, 6, 7, 63
    - challenges, 10
    - experimental simulations, 56
    - H3a, 51
    - measurement, decision making and learning, 23, 24
    - proposed multidimensional evaluation model, 23–24
- T**
- Task performance, 13, 17, 18, 22, 23, 25, 45, 47, 49, 53, 54
  - Task performance metric, 37
  - Time-critical tasks, 4
  - Time delays, 56
  - Transfer learning, 40–42, 69
- V**
- Video arcade syndrome, 62, 64
- W**
- Workshop-based short training programs, 2