

## THE WAY WE TALK! TAKE II

**Barbara J. Howard**  
SUNY Geneseo  
howardb@geneseo.edu

**Daniel R. Strang**  
SUNY Geneseo  
strang@geneseo.edu

### ABSTRACT

*The purpose of this paper is to review and reveal trends of research that ABSEL has undergone and identify the impact that the most active ABSEL scholars have had on the research agenda of the organization. The authors use content analysis to reveal patterns of emphasis of research throughout the 29 years of ABSEL's existence. In addition, the authors quantitatively record and report the contribution of ABSEL's leading scholars.*

### INTRODUCTION

Over the years there has been a sustained interest in the nature of research conducted by members of ABSEL. As early as 1985, Butler et al. critically reviewed the research design utilized by ABSEL authors. In 1989, Markulis et al. provided a 15-year profile of the salient trends of the proceedings. Aspects of ABSEL's award-winning papers were reviewed by Markulis et al. (1991). In a paper that received ABSEL's best-paper recognition, Burns and Banasiewicz provided a bibliometric study of author co-citations (Burns, 1994). In celebration of its 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary a number of researchers reviewed the contributions over the decades of the 70's, 80's and 90's (Graf, 1999; Kelly, 1999; Butler, 1999). Also in 1999, Gold and Pray critically reviewed the simulations (Gold, 1999). The focus of the Gold and Pray study was targeted specifically at the algorithms and model enhancements that have been reported by ABSEL.

More recently a paper entitled, ABSEL: The Way We Talk (Howard, 2001) was presented at the annual ABSEL conference and appeared in the proceedings. Although the paper was generally well received at the conference, at least one member of the audience offered some criticisms of the methodology (admittedly minor) and suggestions for "improving the paper." This paper reports the results of a rethinking and recasting of the previous analysis. The suggestions for improvement have been incorporated into the methodology of this paper.

In addition to responding to the reaction to the initial paper, this paper extends the analysis into the focus of

ABSEL research over its 29-year history. The analysis that follows can be thought to address three fundamental questions that once answered are very telling in terms of the nature of the research conducted by ABSEL. The three basic questions stated in the simplest form are: 1. What do we say? 2. Who says it?, and 3. Who do we cite? The answers to these questions provide insights into the nature of ABSEL.

This paper makes extensive use of a technique called content analysis that was extolled by Holsti, (1969) and more recently commended and extended by Krippendorff (1980). As Krippendorff explains it "content analysis is nothing other than what everyone is doing when reading a newspaper except on a larger scale." If one considers his comment one can gain an appreciation for the new research that is featured in this paper in contrast to the research methodology of the predecessor paper. In this case the Krippendorff reference to a newspaper is totally applicable. In the earlier paper the authors performed a content analysis on the TITLE of the articles. This was perfectly analogous to reviewing the headlines of newspaper articles. Based on the comments of audience critics this current paper reports the results of a content analysis performed on the entire text of the ABSEL articles, obviously analogous to examining the entire body of Krippendorff's hypothetical newspaper articles.

Content analysis is a research technique that has been employed for over one hundred years. In its early applications it was referred to as quantitative newspaper analysis (Krippendorff, 1980). Krippendorff reports that as early as 1893 rudimentary forms where "simply measuring the column inches of a newspaper devoted to particular subject matters" were used to reveal "the truth about newspapers" (1980, p. 14). More recently content analysis has found itself in other interesting applications. In the 1930's it was employed as a method to assess the activity of propagandists in the great flurry of mass communications that preceded World War II. In this application, it was thought to be a useful tool for identifying individuals as "unethical" sources of influence. (Although the authors of this article may appreciate the value of the application of propaganda analysis for ABSEL authors, it is strictly stated that this is not an intended result of this research.)

## Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning, Volume 30, 2003

Although content analysis clearly has its critics, it is fascinating to know that British analysts were able to use it to predict the date of the deployment of Germany's V-weapons by analysis of the speeches of high ranking German officials (1980, p. 17). The advent of computers facilitated the otherwise onerous task of content analysis. Over the years software has been developed that trivializes the task of screening documents and summing word counts.

The query utility that has been built into the Bernie Keys Library is ready made to perform several of the variants of basic content analysis. The precise variant used in this paper is classified as semantical content analysis. In this case the authors used the sub-category of designations analysis as a methodological tool for the analysis. According to Krippendorff the uses of this type of content analysis include; to describe trends in communication, to trace the development of scholarship, and to reveal the focus of attention (1980).

Perhaps equal in importance to *what is said?* is the question *who says it?* This article reports the results of a longitudinal review of the contributions made by ABSEL's most prolific scholars. To consider this dimension the library of all ABSEL proceedings was perused. Although no attempts were made to establish qualitative distinctions, the quantitative analysis that is reported certainly provides an indication of ABSEL's recognized and acknowledged scholars.

The third dimension that is explored in this paper addresses the question, *who do we cite?* Academicians all know how flattering it is to be cited by another scholar. Obviously a citation is a sign that the research of the author is at least worthy of comment, even though on occasion the comment might be critical. With this in mind the authors of the paper reviewed the proceedings and made a quantitative assessment of the numbers of citations of the most prominent ABSEL authors. Again, no attempt is made to ascribe qualitative distinction to the citations. The underlying premise that the reader may infer is that the quantity of citations by colleagues is at least a casual proxy for the significance of a member's scholarship.

### METHODOLOGY

The Bernie Keys Library, a single CD with the full contents of the ABSEL proceedings for the past 29 years, was used as the basis for the content analysis and the citation study. The original paper searched the titles of the proceedings for almost 50 word or word combinations that were frequently used in ABSEL research articles. The words from the previous study were used again in this follow-up study. The difference this time was that the database was searched for all occurrences of the word – not just in the titles. The search function in Adobe was utilized to conduct this process and each time the word appeared any place in a document it was counted as a "hit" for that word. There was no differentiation made between a document containing the word once and a document containing the word multiple

times – so a word that appeared once in an article was credited with 1 hit and a word that appeared several times in the same article was also credited with 1 hit. **Table 1** shows the ranking, based on the number of hits for each word, from highest to lowest, for both studies. The analysis of the rankings provides the reader with some interesting insights into ABSEL research and perhaps more telling, some possible pitfalls of the semantical content analysis method. The "results" section of this paper discusses these findings in detail. Appendix A lists the words from the previous results using only the titles (updated to include the latest volumes of the proceedings) and the new results from the extension of the search procedure to the entire document.

The authors also updated, to reflect the additional years of the proceedings, the author table originally presented. The authors would like to point out that the difficulties reported in the first paper with the various spellings, etc. of authors' names, were not encountered in this subsequent search – probably indicating a better indexing process by the compilers of the database. Application of this "cleaner" database resulted in some minor adjustments to the original authors table, but no significant changes to the list of top authors. The Bernie Keys Library was used to count the number of documents in which an author's name appeared. For this search, the authors name could appear anywhere in the document – as author or as a citation. A simple arithmetic difference between the total number of occurrences and the number of authored articles provides a convenient mechanism to determine the number of citations of an author's work. **Table 2** presents a list of the number of articles written by each author and **Table 3** presents the citation information for the same authors in rank order.

### RESULTS

A comparison of words presented in Table 1 with the same words from the earlier study (Howard, 2001, p. 114) shows that there were basically no major changes in the ranking of the words based upon frequency of appearance. There was some slight movement in the middle grouping with *Training* and *Design* each falling 2 spots and *ABSEL* and *Strategy* both moving up in rank.

Table 1 reveals that the top 4 words, *Simulation*, *Business*, *Experiential*, and *Learning* were the same under both methods even though there was a minor change in order resulting in the new order of--*Experiential*, *Business*, *Simulation*, and *Learning*. The fact that the word *Experiential* appears to have overtaken the word *Simulation* certainly has implications for an organization whose origins are firmly rooted in the promulgation of the benefits of both simulations and experiential exercises. A note of explanation specific to the top 4 words is necessary. The name of the proceedings is included in the header of each document in the Bernie Keys library – and *Business*, *Simulation*, and *Experiential* have always been in the title of the proceedings. This inflated the number of times that these words appeared, but a check of the titles and the articles

## Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning, Volume 30, 2003

indicated that these four words were indeed used in both the titles and the text of the documents sufficiently to warrant their high ranks.

The most significant changes were in the number of times that *Participant(s)* and *Review* appeared when the entire document was searched compared to titles only. They went from 29<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> and 35<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup>, respectively, in their rankings. *Effectiveness* and *Regression* both moved up 9 positions. *Survey*, *Design* and *Demand* all increased their rankings by 5 spots or more.

Interestingly, the words *Game* and *Gaming* both fell in rank from 5<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup>, respectively. The word *Exercise* fell from 6<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> place. *International* and *Internet* both lost ground as well. *Assessment* went from 15<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> position, while *Evaluation* dropped from 10<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> place. Even the ranking of the word *ABSEL* fell by 6 positions taking it out of the top 20 to the 24<sup>th</sup> spot.

At first glance these findings might seem to indicate a major shift in the thinking about “what we say” as words like *Game* and *Gaming*, *Exercise*, *Assessment* and *Evaluation* seemed to lose ground. But a closer inspection might actually question that conclusion. As a result of the whole document search, words like *Participant(s)*, *Review*, *Regression*, *Survey*, and even *Design* and *Demand* all took a more prominent position than in the previous study. However, these words are commonly used and integral components of the ABSEL language. One would expect them to occur frequently in the context of research, but not necessarily be the focus of the paper being presented, and therefore, not to receive the prominence associated with keywords found in the title of an article. To demonstrate this point, imagine the multiple meanings of the words *Demand* (to demand something versus a demand curve or function) and *Review* (a compilation of research versus “let’s review our findings”) and it is easy to see that the usage of the word in the body of the paper does not mean it is the focal point. Ironically, one could also conclude that the higher prevalence of words such as *Exercise*, *Assessment* and *Evaluation*, *International* and *Internet* in the title only search may be a deliberate attempt by the authors to include a “buzz” word in the title of the paper.

The updated ABSEL Authors list in Table 2 shows that the leading authors have not changed much since the previous study. Jim Gentry has overtaken Tony Faria as the top author (must be Jim’s honeymoon is over and he is back to the grindstone) and Precha Thavikulwat has edged into the top 5 list. Gosen (pud), Wolfe, Burns, Cannon, Wheatley, Strang, and Anderson round out the new top 10

list. The re-emergence of Dan Berenstuhel to the list of “active” authors is also noted and welcomed.

Table 3 presents the results of the citation analysis component. It should be no surprise to the ABSEL readership that Joe Wolfe and Bernie Keys are the organization’s two most cited ABSEL authors. Not far behind are Jim Gentry, Al Burns and Dick Teach. As long-time ABSEL contributors it is only natural that their works will be so often cited by others. Appendix B shows an alphabetical listing of the authors’ citation information.

## CONCLUSIONS

As was the case with the first content analysis study, this updated research found that ABSEL researchers used words that have a strong relationship to the organization’s name. *Business*, *Simulation*, *Experiential* and *Learning* were again the four most common words and that would be expected. The new methodology did not alter the overall conclusion that we talk about topics such as *Participant(s)*, *Groups*, *Performance*, *Evaluation*, *Assessment*, *Exercise*, and even *Survey*, *Design*, *Demand*, and *Review*.

However, the impetus for rethinking and repeating this study was the suggestion that perhaps the original methodology could be improved and that the results would be a better indicator. With that in mind the authors again used a form of content analysis but searched the entire body of the document and not just the titles. While the process was even easier than the original, it is not clear that the results are any more representative than those of the first study. It became very clear to the authors that the frequency of the word usage did not always indicate that the focus of the paper was on that topic. The meteoric rise in rank from 35<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> of the word *Review* was the perfect example of what might be wrong with the new methodology. The word clearly could be used in several contexts even in instances in which it was not the focal point of the discussion. While content analysis has long been accepted as a valid research method, a weakness may be the arbitrary “scoring” method – in this case – word count (Babbie, 1973). While using titles only may have its limitations, it appears that for the most part it may be a better indicator of the main topic the paper is presenting.

A not so earth-shattering result was finding that some of the more senior ABSELites are also the most frequently cited. The most prolific authors are also some of the most cited authors and they have been active in ABSEL for two decades or more. Their expertise in the area of simulations and experiential learning is well documented.

## Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning, Volume 30, 2003

TABLE 1  
CONTENT ANALYSIS RANKINGS

<b>Full Document</b>		<b>Title Only</b>	
<b>Word</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Word</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Experiential	1	Simulation	1
Business	2	Business	2
Simulation	3	Experiential	3
Learning	4	Learning	4
Effectiveness	5	Game	5
Participant(s)	6	Exercise	6
Research	7	Performance	7
Case (Study)	8	Case (Study)	8
Performance	9	Research	9
Game	10	Evaluation	10
Group	11	Gaming	11
Review	12	Group	12
Model	13	Model	13
Exercise	14	Effectiveness	14
Evaluation	15	Assessment	15
Design	16	International	16
Strategy	17	Systems	17
Training	18	ABSEL	18
Systems	19	Strategy	19
Gaming	20	Training	20
Demand	21	Design	21
Assessment	22	Leadership	22
Survey	23	Pedagogy/Pedagogical	23
ABSEL	24	Ethics/Ethical	24
International	25	Cognitive	25
Pedagogy/Pedagogical	26	Demand	26
Leadership	27	Internet	27
Cognitive	28	Cooperative (Learning)	28
Grading	29	Participant(s)	29
Player	30	Survey	30
Regression	31	Grading	31
Ethics/Ethical	32	Collaborative	32
Cooperative (Learning)	33	Player	33
AACSB	34	Algorithm	34
Internet	35	Review	35
Algorithm	36	Service Learning	36
Collaborative	37	AACSB	37
Typology	38	Inter-Group	38
Inter-Group	39	Meyers-Briggs	39
Ethnocentric	40	Regression	40
Service Learning	41	Ethnocentric	41
Meyers-Briggs	42	Typology	42

## Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning, Volume 30, 2003

TABLE 2  
ABSEL AUTHORS (1974-2002)

	First Year	Latest Year	Authored Articles		First Year	Latest Year	Authored Articles
Gentry, James	1974	2002	44	Chanin, Michael	1982	1991	8
Faria, A. J.	1974	2002	42	Golden, Peggy	1986	1990	8
Gosenpud (Gosen), Jerry	1980	2002	36	Hoover, J. Duane	1974	1980	8
Wolfe, Joseph	1976	2002	36	Jackson, George	1982	1998	8
Thavikulwat, Precha	1982	2002	30	Jensen, Ronald	1974	1999	8
Burns, Alvin	1975	2002	29	King, Albert	1977	1984	8
Cannon, Hugh	1987	2002	29	Morgan, Sandra	1993	2002	8
Wheatley, Walter	1986	1999	29	Overby, John	1988	2000	8
Strang, Daniel	1978	2002	28	Pillutla, Sharma	1994	2002	8
Anderson, Philip	1984	2002	27	Sampson, Nancy	1977	1995	8
Markulis, Peter	1983	2002	27	Snyder, Stephen (LT)	1993	1999	8
Fritzche, David	1974	2002	25	Stratton, Willaim	1978	1998	8
Graf, Lee	1980	2000	22	Whitney, Gary	1982	1992	8
Berenstuhel, Daniel	1975	2002	21	Decker, Ronald	1981	1995	7
Biggs, William	1975	2000	21	Halterman, Carroll	1979	1995	7
Washbush, John	1991	2002	21	Kline, Donald	1981	1994	7
Butler, John	1981	2002	20	Micklich, Douglas	1998	2002	7
Goosen, Kenneth	1974	2002	20	Mills, Janet	1983	1988	7
Lawton, Leigh	1986	2002	20	Morse, Kenneth	1997	2002	7
Dickenson, John	1976	2002	19	Schellenberger, Robert	1981	1990	7
Pray, Thomas	1978	2002	19	Ward, William	1982	1990	7
Page, Diana	1985	2002	18	Whatley, Arthur	1976	1985	7
Teach, Richard	1984	2002	18	Winchell, Michael	1992	2000	7
Patz, Alan	1987	2002	17	Boozer, Robert	1993	2000	6
Schreier, James	1975	1990	17	Chesteen, Susan	1990	2001	6
Frazer, J. Ronald	1975	1996	16	Churchill, Geoffry	1974	1980	6
Gold, Steven	1981	2001	16	Cotter, Richard	1985	1998	6
Smith, Jerald	1974	1999	16	Curran, Kent	1987	1990	6
Keys, Bernard	1974	1999	15	Edge, Alfred	1979	1992	6
Maddox, E. Nick	1987	2001	15	Lambert, David	1980	1988	6
Platt, Richard	1992	2002	15	Leonard, Thomas	1994	1999	6
Barton, Richard	1974	1990	14	Moschella, Paul	1983	2001	6
Hemmasi, Masoud	1987	2000	14	Newstrom, John	1982	1989	6
Hornaday, Robert	1986	2001	14	Roderick, Roger	1979	1993	6
Catalanello, Ralph	1976	1994	13	Roge, Joseph	1995	1997	6
Chiesl, Newell	1979	2001	13	Ruble, Thomas	1978	1990	6
Howard, Barbara	1995	2002	13	Savai, Antonio	1993	2001	6
McAfee, Bruce (R. Bruce)	1978	2002	13	Wilterding, Jim	1980	1997	6
Nulsen, Ray	1974	1996	13	Wingender, John	1987	2001	6
Roberts, Ralph	1974	1999	13	Wolfe, Douglas	1974	1979	6
Sanders, Patricia	1982	2000	13	Armstrong, Terry	1989	1997	5
Vik, Gretchen	1979	2002	13	Badgett, Tom	1977	1983	5
House, William	1977	1995	12	Basuray, Tom	1979	1981	5
Kelley, Lane	1978	2001	12	Beatty, Richard	1974	1977	5
Wellington, William	1990	2002	12	Boyd, Charles	1982	1985	5
Crino, Michael	1978	2001	11	Bradley, Michael	1988	1996	5
Gomolka, Eugene	1982	1990	11	Byrne, Eugene	1975	1979	5
Malik, S. Dolly	1995	2001	11	Efraty, David	1994	1998	5
Scott, Timothy	1994	2002	11	Fuhs, F. Paul	1980	1988	5
Leonard, Nancy	1994	2000	10	Hall, Jeremy	1994	1996	5
Oppenheimer, Robert	1984	2002	10	Hsu, Ti	1985	1998	5
Palia, Aspy	1989	2002	10	Hunsaker, Johanna	1981	1993	5
Peach, Brian (E. Brian)	1997	2002	10	Hunsaker, Phillip	1977	1990	5
Pittenger, Khush	1996	2002	10	Klepeter, Wendy	1991	1995	5
Dutton, Richard	1976	1992	9	Miesing, Paul	1981	1991	5
Napier, Herman	1974	1988	9	Morgan, Fred	1985	1990	5
Whiteley, Richard	1989	2001	9	Raveed, Sion	1978	1981	5
Certo, Samuel	1974	1985	8				

## Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning, Volume 30, 2003

TABLE 3  
ABSEL AUTHOR CITATIONS

Rank Order	Total Hits	Articles Authored	Non-author Cites
Wolfe, Joseph	288	36	252
Keys, Bernard	228	15	213
Gentry, James	228	44	184
Burns, Alvin	170	29	141
Teach, Richard	144	18	126
Scott, Timothy	134	11	123
Faria, A. J.	164	42	122
Berenenstuhl, Daniel	135	21	114
Fritzsche, David	142	28	114
Gosenpud (Gosen), Jerry	147	36	111
Biggs, William	128	21	107
Anderson, Philip	123	27	96
Pray, Thomas	114	19	95
Certo, Samuel	92	8	84
Roberts, Ralph	95	13	82
Jensen, Ronald	84	8	76
Gold, Steven	90	16	74
Lawton, Leigh	91	20	71
Graf, Lee	92	22	70
Goosen, Kenneth	86	20	66
Nulsen, Ray	76	13	63
Butler, John	82	20	62
Cotter, Richard	65	6	59
Kelley, Lane	71	12	59
Snyder, Stephen (LT)	61	8	53
Byrne, Eugene	57	5	52
Edge, Alfred	57	6	51
Washbush, John	72	21	51
Wheatley, Walter	80	29	51
Patz, Alan	66	17	49
Strang, Daniel	75	28	47
Catalanello, Ralph	59	13	46
Frazer, J. Ronald	61	16	45
Golden, Peggy	53	8	45
Page, Diana	60	18	42
Thavikulwat, Precha	70	30	40
Barton, Richard	52	14	38
Sanders, Patricia	51	13	38
Dickinson, John	56	20	36
Jackson, George	44	8	36
Cannon, Hugh	64	29	35
Schellenberger, Robert	39	7	32
Whiteley, Richard	41	9	32
Armstrong, Terry	36	5	31
Wellington, William	43	12	31
Hornaday, Robert	43	14	29
Markulis, Peter	56	27	29
Miesing, Paul	34	5	29

## Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning, Volume 30, 2003

Schreier, James	46	17	29
Whitney, Gary	35	8	27
House, William	38	12	26
Hsu, Ti	29	5	24
Badgett, Tom	27	5	22
Boyd, Charles	27	5	22
Churchill, Geoffry	28	6	22
Whatley, Arthur	29	7	22
Beatty, Richard	26	5	21
Hoover, J. Duane	29	8	21
Malik, S. Dolly	32	11	21
Decker, Ronald	27	7	20
Leonard, Nancy	30	10	20
Napier, Herman	28	9	19
Chanin, Michael	26	8	18
Curran, Kent	24	6	18
Wingender, John	24	6	18
Lambert, David	23	6	17
Mills, Janet	24	7	17
Basuray, Tom	21	5	16
Hemmasi, Masoud	30	14	16
Howard, Barbara	29	13	16
Sampson, Nancy	24	8	16
Chiesl, Newell	28	13	15
Crino, Michael	26	11	15
Bradley, Michael	18	5	13
Dutton, Richard	22	9	13
Hunsaker, Phillip	18	5	13
Maddox, E. Nick	28	15	13
Overby, John	20	8	12
Roderick, Roger	18	6	12
Gomolka, Eugene	22	11	11
Morgan, Sandra	19	8	11
Smith, Jerald	27	16	11
McAfee, Bruce (R. Bruce)	23	13	10
Palia, Aspy	20	10	10
Ruble, Thomas	16	6	10
Vik, Gretchen	22	13	9
King, Albert	16	8	8
Leonard, Thomas	14	6	8
Morse, Kenneth	15	7	8
Newstrom, John	14	6	8
Peach, Brian (E. Brian)	18	10	8
Platt, Richard	23	15	8
Pillutla, Sharma	15	8	7
Stratton, William	15	8	7
Halterman, Carroll	13	7	6
Kline, Donald	13	7	6
Morgan, Fred	11	5	6
Fuhs, F. Paul	10	5	5
Oppenheimer, Robert	15	10	5
Pittenger, Khush	15	10	5

**Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning, Volume 30, 2003**

Raveed, Sion	10	5	5
Roge, Joseph	11	6	5
Wilterding, Jim	11	6	5
Chesteen, Susan	10	6	4
Klepetar, Wendy	9	5	4
Ward, William	11	7	4
Wolfe, Douglas	10	6	4
Moschella, Paul	9	6	3
Boozer, Robert	8	6	2
Efraty, David	7	5	2
Hall, Jeremy	7	5	2
Micklich, Douglas	8	7	1
Hunsaker, Johanna	5	5	0
Savaia, Antonio	6	6	0
Winchell, Michael	7	7	0

REFERENCES

- Babbie, E. R. (1973) *Survey Research Methods*. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.
- Burns, A., A. Banasiewicz (1994) "The Intellectual Structure of ABSEL: A Bibliometric Study of Author Co-Citations Over Time." *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Exercises* 21, 7-12.
- Butler, J. (1999) "ABSEL's Contributions to Experiential Exercises in the 90s." *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning* 26, 16-24.
- Butler, R., P. Markulis, and D. Strang (1985) "Learning Theory and Research Design: How has ABSEL Fared?" *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Exercises* 12, 86-90.
- Gold, S. and T. Pray (1999) "Business Simulations – Algorithms and Model Enhancements: A 25 Year Review." *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning* 26, 32.
- Graf, L. A. (1999) "ABSEL's Contributions to Experiential Learning/Experiential Exercises: The decade of the 1970s." *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning* 26, 25-31.
- Holsti, O. (1969) *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Howard, B. and D. Strang (2001) "ABSEL: The Way We Talk." *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning* 28, 11-116.
- Kelly, L. and W. Brice (1999) "The Contributions of ABSEL During the 1980's." *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning* 26, 8-10.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980) *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Markulis, P., P. Ricci, and D. Strang (1991) "A Critical Review and Assessment of ABSEL's Award-Winning Procedure and Protocols." *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Exercises* 18, 61-65.
- Markulis, P., P. Ricci, and D. Strang (1989) "A Review of Salient Trends in Proceeding's Characteristics: A Fifteen Year Profile of ABSEL." *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Exercises* 16, 200-203.

## Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning, Volume 30, 2003

### APPENDIX A ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF CONTENT ANALYSIS WORDS

Word	Full Document		Title Only	
	Number	Rank	Number	Rank
AACSB	125	34	2	37
ABSEL	428	24	36	18
Algorithm	98	36	4	34
Assessment	466	22	46	15
Business	1837	2	367	2
Case (Study)	1219	8	82	8
Cognitive	333	28	18	25
Collaborative	64	37	6	32
Cooperative (Learning)	133	33	15	28
Demand	474	21	17	26
Design	828	16	32	21
Effectiveness	1481	5	47	14
Ethics/Ethical	147	32	19	24
Ethnocentric	12	40	1	41
Evaluation	879	15	62	10
Exercise	886	14	143	6
Experiential	1885	1	329	3
Game	998	10	154	5
Gaming	551	20	59	11
Grading	230	29	8	31
Group	990	11	58	12
Inter-Group	16	39	2	38
International	426	25	45	16
Internet	99	35	17	27
Leadership	358	27	24	22
Learning	1612	4	329	4
Meyers-Briggs	2	42	2	39
Model	906	13	50	13
Participant(s)	1315	6	14	29
Pedagogy/Pedagogical	358	26	23	23
Performance	1099	9	122	7
Player	200	30	5	33
Regression	167	31	2	40
Research	1271	7	64	9
Review	989	12	4	35
Service Learning	9	41	3	36
Simulation	1833	3	494	1
Strategy	738	17	36	19
Survey	460	23	12	30
Systems	601	19	40	17
Training	728	18	36	20
Typology	34	38	1	42

## Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning, Volume 30, 2003

### APPENDIX B ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF AUTHORS AND CITATIONS

	<b>Total Hits</b>	<b>Articles Authored</b>	<b>Non-author Cites</b>
Anderson, Philip	123	27	96
Armstrong, Terry	36	5	31
Badgett, Tom	27	5	22
Barton, Richard	52	14	38
Basuray, Tom	21	5	16
Beatty, Richard	26	5	21
Berenenstuhl, Daniel	135	21	114
Biggs, William	128	21	107
Boozer, Robert	8	6	2
Boyd, Charles	27	5	22
Bradley, Michael	18	5	13
Burns, Alvin	170	29	141
Butler, John	82	20	62
Byrne, Eugene	57	5	52
Cannon, Hugh	64	29	35
Catalanello, Ralph	59	13	46
Certo, Samuel	92	8	84
Chanin, Michael	26	8	18
Chesteen, Susan	10	6	4
Chiesl, Newell	28	13	15
Churchill, Geoffry	28	6	22
Cotter, Richard	65	6	59
Crino, Michael	26	11	15
Curran, Kent	24	6	18
Decker, Ronald	27	7	20
Dickinson, John	56	20	36
Dutton, Richard	22	9	13
Edge, Alfred	57	6	51
Efraty, David	7	5	2
Faria, A. J.	164	42	122
Frazer, J. Ronald	61	16	45
Fritzsche, David	142	28	114
Fuhs, F. Paul	10	5	5
Gentry, James	228	44	184
Gold, Steven	90	16	74
Golden, Peggy	53	8	45
Gomolka, Eugene	22	11	11
Goosen, Kenneth	86	20	66
Gosenpud (Gosen), Jerry	147	36	111
Graf, Lee	92	22	70
Hall, Jeremy	7	5	2
Halterman, Carroll	13	7	6
Hemmasi, Masoud	30	14	16
Hoover, J. Duane	29	8	21
Hornaday, Robert	43	14	29
House, William	38	12	26
Howard, Barbara	29	13	16
Hsu, Ti	29	5	24

## Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning, Volume 30, 2003

Hunsaker, Johanna	5	5	0
Hunsaker, Phillip	18	5	13
Jackson, George	44	8	36
Jensen, Ronald	84	8	76
Kelley, Lane	71	12	59
Keys, Bernard	228	15	213
King, Albert	16	8	8
Klepeter, Wendy	9	5	4
Kline, Donald	13	7	6
Lambert, David	23	6	17
Lawton, Leigh	91	20	71
Leonard, Nancy	30	10	20
Leonard, Thomas	14	6	8
Maddox, E. Nick	28	15	13
Malik, S. Dolly	32	11	21
Markulis, Peter	56	27	29
McAfee, Bruce (R. Bruce)	23	13	10
Micklich, Douglas	8	7	1
Miesing, Paul	34	5	29
Mills, Janet	24	7	17
Morgan, Fred	11	5	6
Morgan, Sandra	19	8	11
Morse, Kenneth	15	7	8
Moschella, Paul	9	6	3
Napier, Herman	28	9	19
Newstrom, John	14	6	8
Nulsen, Ray	76	13	63
Oppenheimer, Robert	15	10	5
Overby, John	20	8	12
Page, Diana	60	18	42
Palia, Aspy	20	10	10
Patz, Alan	66	17	49
Peach, Brian (E. Brian)	18	10	8
Pillutla, Sharma	15	8	7
Pittenger, Khush	15	10	5
Platt, Richard	23	15	8
Pray, Thomas	114	19	95
Raveed, Sion	10	5	5
Roberts, Ralph	95	13	82
Roderick, Roger	18	6	12
Roge, Joseph	11	6	5
Ruble, Thomas	16	6	10
Sampson, Nancy	24	8	16
Sanders, Patricia	51	13	38
Savaia, Antonio	6	6	0
Schellenberger, Robert	39	7	32
Schreier, James	46	17	29
Scott, Timothy	134	11	123
Smith, Jerald	27	16	11
Snyder, Stephen (LT)	61	8	53
Strang, Daniel	75	28	47
Stratton, William	15	8	7

## Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning, Volume 30, 2003

Teach, Richard	144	18	126
Thavikulwat, Precha	70	30	40
Vik, Gretchen	22	13	9
Ward, William	11	7	4
Washbush, John	72	21	51
Wellington, William	43	12	31
Whatley, Arthur	29	7	22
Wheatley, Walter	80	29	51
Whiteley, Richard	41	9	32
Whitney, Gary	35	8	27
Wilterding, Jim	11	6	5
Winchell, Michael	7	7	0
Wingender, John	24	6	18
Wolfe, Douglas	10	6	4
Wolfe, Joseph	288	36	252