World Journal of Information Technology
ISSN: 2959-9911
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61784/wjit3022

THE APPLICATION AND PRACTICE OF GAME-BASED LEARNING IN THE TEACHING OF GAME THEORY: A STRATEGY SIMULATION GAME TO PROMOTE THE INTEGRATION OF THEORY AND PRACTICE

Jun Xie[1,2], Jian Liu[1*]
[1]*School of Information Management and Mathematics, Jiangxi University of Finance and Economics, Nanchang 330013, China.*
[2]*School of Business Administration, Nanchang Institute of Technology, Nanchang 330099, China.*
Corresponding Author: Jian Liu; Email: liujian3816@263.com

Abstract: This study investigates the application of game-based learning in game theory education, presenting a comprehensive framework for implementing gamification strategies through a "Market Gaming Simulation" approach. Traditional game theory instruction often struggles to effectively convey complex theoretical concepts and bridge the gap between abstract mathematics and practical applications. To address these challenges, this research develops and analyzes a strategic simulation game that integrates core game theory concepts—including Nash equilibrium, Prisoner's Dilemma, dynamic game analysis, mixed-strategy equilibrium, and Bayesian games—into an interactive learning environment.The study first examines the current limitations in game theory pedagogy and establishes the theoretical foundation for game-based learning implementation. It then presents a detailed design of the "Market Gaming Simulation," including game objectives, core mechanisms, role design, and operational processes. The simulation creates a competitive marketplace where students, through multiple rounds of decision-making, experience the practical applications of game theory concepts while developing strategic thinking capabilities.A systematic implementation framework is proposed, encompassing pre-course preparation, classroom execution, and post-game analysis. The framework includes comprehensive guidelines for both instructors and students, real-time feedback mechanisms, and evaluation systems. Results indicate that this gamified approach significantly enhances student engagement, improves understanding of theoretical concepts, and develops practical decision-making skills. While acknowledging implementation challenges such as the need for elevated pedagogical expertise and flexible game design, this study provides valuable insights for integrating game-based learning into game theory education, contributing to the advancement of interactive and effective teaching methodologies in higher education.
Keywords: Game theory; Game-based learning; Strategic simulation; Educational gamification; Teaching methodology; Market simulation

1 INTRODUCTION

In contemporary education, the convergence of evolving pedagogical paradigms and rapid technological advancement has catalyzed growing interest in game-based learning as an innovative instructional modality. This emerging approach distinguishes itself through the sophisticated integration of ludic elements, design thinking principles, and game mechanics into educational processes, fostering an environment that seamlessly combines intellectual challenge with engaging experience. While the immediate objective of game-based learning encompasses enhanced student engagement and participation, its broader aspirations extend to facilitating deeper cognitive processing, promoting sustained knowledge retention, and developing essential competencies including critical thinking, problem-solving capabilities, and collaborative skills—attributes increasingly vital for success in an evolving societal landscape.
Traditional pedagogical frameworks have typically positioned students as passive recipients in a unidirectional knowledge transfer model, with educators serving primarily as information transmitters. Although this conventional approach demonstrates some efficacy in conveying fundamental concepts and principles, it often falls short in cultivating students' intrinsic motivation for autonomous exploration and higher-order thinking. In contrast, game-based learning environments fundamentally transform this dynamic by incorporating elements such as competitive challenges, collaborative opportunities, role-immersion experiences, and instantaneous feedback mechanisms. This multifaceted approach creates an interactive learning ecosystem that actively engages students in the knowledge construction process, encouraging them to transition from passive observers to active participants in their educational journey.
In the context of complex mathematical problem-solving, traditional pedagogical approaches typically focus on procedural instruction through sequential step demonstration. In contrast, game-based learning transforms this experience by embedding mathematical challenges within immersive virtual adventures, where students progressively discover solution methodologies through active exploration and experimentation. This experiential approach not only creates a more engaging and dynamic learning environment but also facilitates deeper comprehension of theoretical concepts and their practical applications through contextual discovery and hands-on problem-solving. Moreover, game-based learning demonstrates particular efficacy in addressing the heterogeneous nature of student learning

preferences and cognitive styles. By offering diversified learning pathways and adaptable instructional experiences, this approach accommodates individual variations in learning tempo and cognitive processing. The inherent flexibility of game-based environments enables students to navigate educational content according to their unique cognitive patterns and learning rhythms, ultimately fostering a more personalized and effective educational experience that resonates with their individual learning modalities.

Research on game-based learning spans multiple domains and methodological approaches. In the context of preschool teacher education, Jiu and Yan [1] developed training strategies incorporating curriculum modifications and game-based microteaching simulations, emphasizing the development of essential professional competencies such as observational and communication skills. Wei and Wang [2] explored interactive narrative mechanisms in educational games, proposing design strategies that include anthropomorphic animation agents and calibrated challenge mechanisms to balance educational objectives with entertainment value. Contributing to the theoretical framework, Zhang and Shang [3] constructed a learning experience-based model for game-based education, analyzing its characteristics and examining how it promotes cognitive development and learner agency.

Empirical evidence supporting game-based learning's effectiveness has emerged through various meta-analyses and experimental studies. Wang et al. [4] investigated the impact of game-based feedback systems like Kahoot! on academic performance and student attitudes, revealing significant positive effects moderated by subject matter and knowledge types. Similarly, Li et al. [5] conducted a meta-analysis of 35 experimental and quasi-experimental studies, demonstrating substantial positive effects of game-based learning across different disciplines, educational levels, and knowledge domains. Shen et al. [6] specifically examined knowledge retention, finding moderate positive effects influenced by factors such as academic level, intervention duration, and digital game typology.

Domain-specific applications of game-based instruction have yielded promising results across various fields. Chen [7] investigated simulation sandbox games in Modern Business Management education, while Ambrosio Mawhirter and Ford Garofalo [8] documented the implementation of simulation-based gaming strategies in nursing education to enhance clinical preparedness and self-reflection. Zhao and Mei [9] examined the relationship between teaching reform and research capacity development in graduate-level game theory courses, providing valuable insights into the integration of pedagogical innovation and scholarly development.

Game theory education, in particular, has become a focal point for investigating innovative teaching methodologies. Several researchers have explored various approaches to enhance game theory instruction: Support [10] advocated for case-based teaching methods, while Rogmans and Abaza [11] studied the effectiveness of business strategy simulation games, noting important correlations between student motivation and participation levels. Huang [12] analyzed interactive teaching methods in game theory education, proposing improvements in case selection, practical application, theoretical exposition, and feedback mechanisms. Pu [13] investigated case-based teaching in undergraduate game theory courses, developing principles for effective case implementation.

Interdisciplinary perspectives have further enriched game-based learning research. You et al. [14] examined the integration of military online games with military education, providing valuable insights for incorporating gaming elements in game theory instruction. Zhang et al. [15] demonstrated the effectiveness of carefully designed educational games through their mathematics game "Fraction Run Run Run," which significantly improved fourth-grade students' conceptual understanding of fractions.

This comprehensive review of literature reveals the substantial potential of game-based learning in education, particularly in game theory instruction. Future research should focus on developing and implementing innovative game-based teaching methods that enhance learning outcomes while maintaining pedagogical rigor. Such investigations will contribute to both the theoretical advancement of game-based learning and its practical application in educational settings.

2 ANALYSIS OF THE NEED FOR GAME-BASED LEARNING IN TEACHING GAME THEORY

2.1 Analysis of Current Game Theory Teaching Status

Contemporary game theory instruction faces significant challenges in effectively conveying complex theoretical concepts to students. This observation emerges from a systematic review of teaching practices in undergraduate economics programs, focusing specifically on game theory courses.Traditional lecture-based instruction methods often struggle to effectively demonstrate the dynamic nature of strategic interaction. Course materials typically emphasize mathematical formalism and theoretical proofs, while providing limited opportunities for students to experience the practical applications of these concepts. Common teaching approaches focus heavily on solving equilibrium problems through mathematical methods, but students often struggle to connect these solutions to real-world strategic decision-making scenarios.

Pedagogical challenges become especially pronounced when delving into advanced topics in game theory. These challenges manifest in several key areas:

First, dynamic game analysis introduces a significant hurdle. Students are required to grasp the intricate process of sequential decision-making—understanding how participants' choices at various stages influence one another. The primary difficulties lie in two aspects: backward induction and the plausibility problem. The backward induction method involves reasoning backward from the final stage of a game to determine the optimal strategy, but this approach assumes that the game's structure is transparent and universally understood by all participants. This assumption, however, falters when applied to intricate dynamic games with myriad potential decision paths, significantly increasing computational costs. Take, for example, a business competition model: a firm may threaten to reduce prices to deter new entrants, but the entrants must assess the credibility of such a threat, given that price cuts might undermine the firm's long-term objectives. This complexity exacerbates the challenge of applying backward induction. The plausibility problem, on the other hand, revolves around the central issue of whether the initial actor in a dynamic game can trust that the subsequent participant will make a move that aligns with their interests. A favorable action from the latter is termed a "promise," while an unfavorable one is labeled a "threat." Students must not only comprehend these distinctions but also possess the ability to evaluate the credibility of such promises and threats within real-world contexts, blending theoretical knowledge with deep situational insight.

The second challenge arises with the concept of mixed-strategy equilibrium. Here, students must adopt a probabilistic mindset, understanding that randomness can sometimes constitute the optimal choice. Mixed strategies involve assigning probabilities to pure strategies, with players making random selections from these pure strategies in each instance of the game. For instance, in a game of rock-paper-scissors, the optimal strategy is to randomize choices—each option being chosen with an equal probability of 1/3. This unpredictability ensures that opponents cannot exploit patterns in one's decisions. Yet, many students struggle to comprehend why randomness is optimal in such cases, necessitating a firm grasp of probability theory. Beyond this, students must learn to compute expected returns under mixed strategies, optimizing their choices by maximizing these returns. This requires not only a solid understanding of probability theory but also the ability to apply it in multifaceted real-world environments, such as market competition models where firms calculate their expected returns based on the strategic choices of rivals.

The third area of difficulty involves Bayesian games, which are grounded in incomplete information and conditional probability. In these games, participants must make decisions in the face of asymmetric information. Each participant is characterized by a "type," which encapsulates a set of attributes, including their possible actions and payoff functions. While each participant knows their own type, they must infer the types of others through probability distributions, adding layers of complexity to decision-making. Students must understand the concepts of "type" and "belief" and apply them to real-world scenarios. For instance, in an auction, a bidder may not know the valuations of competitors but must form a strategy based on prior distributions of those valuations. This introduces significant challenges for students when trying to navigate the complexities of Bayesian games.

Within Bayesian games, finding the Bayesian Nash Equilibrium (BNE) further complicates matters. Here, participants must not only estimate the types of others but also predict their strategies based on these estimations. In an auction, for example, bidders need to compute their optimal bidding strategy by assessing the probability distributions of their competitors' bids. This intricate process demands not only proficiency in probability theory but also a deep understanding of market dynamics and the ability to apply mathematical reasoning in complex environments.

Hessani's Transformation presents a novel perspective by proposing the conversion of a "static game with incomplete information" into a "dynamic game with complete but imperfect information." This is achieved by introducing a virtual "nature" player, which randomizes the selection of types, thus resolving information asymmetry through probabilistic methods. While this approach provides students with valuable insights into information asymmetry, it simultaneously heightens the complexity of the theories and requires students to apply these concepts with flexibility in real-world scenarios. For instance, firms in a competitive market must adjust their strategies based on the varying information asymmetry they face. Such adjustments demand not only theoretical comprehension but also an astute awareness of market conditions.

Classroom observations reveal that while students often demonstrate the ability to mechanically apply learned algorithms to solve game theory problems, they struggle with flexible application in real-world contexts. One notable challenge is the difficulty students face in recognizing strategic interactions in actual situations. While they may be adept at calculating a Nash equilibrium, identifying the game structure in real-world competition or cooperation scenarios remains elusive. This disconnect between theoretical knowledge and practical application is a significant hurdle. Another issue arises from students' reliance on mathematical formulas and algorithms without developing an intuitive understanding of key concepts such as equilibrium. While they may know how to compute a mixed-strategy equilibrium, they often fail to grasp the rationale behind random strategy selection in certain scenarios, hindering flexible application. Furthermore, students tend to apply learned concepts only within familiar contexts, struggling to adapt their knowledge to new or unknown situations. For example, while they can solve the classic Prisoner's Dilemma, they may be unable to find an effective solution in novel cooperative scenarios. Finally, although students excel in performing mathematical derivations during theoretical studies, they often find it challenging to clearly articulate their strategic reasoning in real-world decision-making.

The pedagogical challenges inherent in these advanced game theory topics require students to not only master complex theoretical concepts but also to apply them effectively in real-world situations, fostering both intuitive understanding and strategic thinking. To address these issues, integrating a game-based learning approach could prove invaluable. By simulating real-world scenarios, game-based learning offers students rich interactive experiences and immediate feedback, bridging the gap between theory and practice. This approach not only stimulates engagement but also enhances students' ability to connect theoretical knowledge with practical applications, ultimately strengthening their strategic thinking and decision-making capabilities.

2.2 Application Value of Game-based Learning in Game Theory Teaching

Gamification offers promising solutions to address the identified challenges in game theory education. The incorporation of game-based learning elements can create more engaging and effective learning environments that bridge the gap between theoretical understanding and practical application.

Interactive learning environments provide students with immediate feedback on their strategic decisions, allowing them to develop intuitive understanding through experimentation. This approach addresses a key limitation of traditional teaching methods where feedback often comes only through graded assignments or examinations. Through carefully designed game scenarios, students can observe how different strategies affect outcomes and develop a deeper understanding of equilibrium concepts.

Strategic simulation games particularly enhance learning in several key areas:

Understanding Dynamic Games:

Interactive scenarios allow students to experience the sequential nature of decision-making firsthand. Students can observe how their choices influence subsequent decisions by other players, making the concept of backward induction more tangible. These simulations help students grasp the importance of credible threats and promises in strategic interactions.

Mixed Strategy Equilibrium:

Game-based exercises can demonstrate the value of randomized strategies in competitive situations. Through repeated play, students naturally discover why mixed strategies might be optimal in certain scenarios, making abstract probability concepts more concrete and understandable.

Incomplete Information Games:

Simulations can effectively model situations with asymmetric information, helping students understand how beliefs and updating processes affect strategic decisions. This experiential learning approach makes Bayesian concepts more accessible and practical.

2.3 Insufficiencies in Traditional Game Theory Course Systems

Traditional textbooks and teaching materials often present game theory in a highly abstract way. While this approach preserves mathematical rigor, it typically falls short in providing sufficient real-world examples, interactive learning opportunities, and support for the development of strategic thinking skills. The shortcomings of this pedagogical approach are particularly evident in several key areas:

First, the lack of practical examples. Textbooks usually focus on the derivation of theories and the construction of mathematical models but fail to connect these theories with specific real-world scenarios. For instance, when discussing competitive strategies among firms, there are few concrete cases that illustrate how game theory's analytical methods can be applied in actual market environments. This absence of real-world examples makes it difficult for students to link abstract theoretical knowledge to practical problems, hindering their ability to understand and apply game theory effectively.

Second, the disconnect between theory and practice. Even when textbooks include cases, these examples are often oversimplified and idealized, bearing little resemblance to real-world complexities. For example, when explaining mixed-strategy equilibrium, while equilibrium strategies can be calculated mathematically, there is little guidance on how to apply these strategies in real decision-making contexts. This gap between theory and practice makes it challenging for students to use their game theory knowledge to analyze and make decisions in real-world situations.

Third, the lack of interactive learning opportunities. Traditional teaching methods predominantly rely on lectures and passive learning, with few opportunities for active engagement or participation. For instance, when teaching dynamic game analysis, students may grasp the inverse induction method only through lectures and reading, without hands-on practice or opportunities to deepen their understanding through interactive exercises. This lack of engagement diminishes students' interest in learning and limits their grasp of complex concepts.

Finally, insufficient development of strategic thinking skills. A core objective of game theory is to cultivate students' strategic thinking abilities—the capacity to make informed decisions in complex, competitive situations. However, traditional methods often prioritize knowledge transmission over fostering strategic thinking. For example, while students may understand Bayesian Nash equilibrium in theory, practical applications, such as how to reason and make decisions based on incomplete information, are rarely addressed. This lack of emphasis on strategic thinking prevents students from effectively applying game-theoretic reasoning to solve real-world problems.

While traditional textbooks and materials uphold the mathematical rigor of game theory, they suffer from notable deficiencies in providing practical examples, demonstrating real-world applications, fostering interactive learning, and cultivating strategic thinking. These limitations hinder students' ability to understand and apply game theory, thereby restricting their problem-solving capacity in real-world scenarios. Consequently, there is a need for new teaching methods and resources, such as game-based learning, to address these gaps and enhance the effectiveness of game theory education.

3 DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGIC SIMULATION GAMES: AN EXAMPLE OF A PRACTICAL GAME - "MARKET GAMING SIMULATION"

3.1 Game Objectives and Core Mechanisms

3.1.1 Game objectives

The primary aim of this simulation is to immerse students in the practical application of game theory, fostering a deep, intuitive understanding of its core concepts. These include, but are not limited to, Nash equilibrium, the Prisoner's Dilemma, dynamic game analysis, mixed-strategy equilibrium, and Bayesian games. The game intends to achieve several educational outcomes: first, to enable students to grasp the theoretical foundations of game theory, allowing them to intuitively understand fundamental concepts and theories; second, to provide a tangible framework for the application of these theoretical constructs to real-world scenarios, thus bridging the gap between abstract theory and practical problem-solving; third, to sharpen students' decision-making capabilities by enhancing their strategic thinking, empowering them to make informed, optimal choices within complex, competitive environments; and finally, to strengthen their teamwork and communication skills through collaborative decision-making processes. This multifaceted approach ensures that students not only learn theoretical models but also develop essential skills for real-world applications in economics, business, and beyond.

3.1.2 Core mechanisms

The game's design hinges on several pivotal game theory principles, each of which is strategically embedded within its mechanics to cultivate both individual and collective strategic thinking. The Nash equilibrium is simulated through repeated decision-making rounds, enabling students to experience and analyze equilibrium states emerging from various strategic choices. The Prisoner's Dilemma is enacted in a classic scenario, where participants directly confront the repercussions of cooperation versus betrayal, thereby internalizing the tension between individual and collective interests. Dynamic game analysis is integrated through sequential decision-making, allowing students to explore backward induction and understand the intricacies of strategic reasoning in multistage games. The concept of mixed-strategy equilibrium is illustrated through probabilistic decision-making, encouraging students to think in terms of expected utility while grappling with uncertainty and randomness in strategy selection. Finally, Bayesian games are introduced through settings characterized by incomplete information, where students must navigate conditional probabilities and belief formation, sharpening their ability to make decisions under uncertainty.

3.2 Game Roles and Scene Setting

3.2.1 Character design

The careful and deliberate design of player roles is a cornerstone of the game's educational and interactive success. Each role must be meticulously crafted to ensure that the gameplay is both engaging and pedagogically enriching. In this context, players are assigned distinct responsibilities, with each role contributing uniquely to the overall dynamics of the game. For instance, Firm A makes decisions regarding pricing, production volume, and marketing inputs, while Firm Bsimilarly handles pricing, production, and marketing, but also assumes additional decision-making responsibilities. Consumers, acting as market participants, make purchasing choices based on product pricing and perceived quality, introducing an element of consumer behavior into the simulation. The Government, tasked with market regulation and policy-making, provides an external influencing force on the market dynamics. Non-player roles, such as the Market Regulator, may be controlled either by the instructor or a computer program, overseeing market information dissemination and environmental adjustments. Similarly, Competitors, also managed by the instructor or a program, simulate the actions of rival firms, enriching the competitive landscape. To ensure the game's effectiveness and interactivity, detailed role manuals and instructional materials are essential, helping students quickly familiarize themselves with their responsibilities. Additionally, the game must undergo iterative testing and refinement, incorporating feedback from both instructors and participants to fine-tune character roles and optimize the overall gameplay experience.

3.2.2 Scene design

The market environment is carefully modeled to simulate a competitive marketplace, where students must make crucial decisions about pricing, production, and marketing. This competitive context is enriched with specific cooperation and competition scenarios, such as joint R&D ventures or price wars, which encourage students to balance collaborative and adversarial strategies. Moreover, the game incorporates incomplete information elements, featuring scenarios where certain variables—like product quality or competitors' strategies—are hidden or uncertain. Such design choices not only mirror real-world market conditions but also compel students to employ strategic thinking under conditions of ambiguity, pushing them to develop an adaptive, information-gathering mindset. As the game evolves, these elements contribute to a rich, dynamic learning environment that mimics the complexities of actual business and economic decision-making.

Here's the enhanced version of the provided content, incorporating more sophisticated language and varied sentence structures to improve readability and academic rigor:

3.3 An Operational Set of Game Rules and Processes

3.3.1 Game rules

Initial Setup：

The simulation begins with each firm being allocated an initial capital of 1,000 units and an initial market share of 50%.

Information Provision:

Firm A and Firm B: Both firms face an initial production cost of 50 units per product, with a maximum production capacity of 100 units.

Consumers: The initial demand for the product is set at 150 units, with a demand elasticity of -2. This implies that for every 10% increase in price, demand will decrease by 20%.
Government: A starting tax rate of 10% on the profits of the firms is imposed.
Decision Stage:
Pricing Decision: Firm A and Firm B independently set the product price within the range of 50 to 200 units.
Production Quantity Decision: Both firms independently determine their production volumes, with a permissible range from 0 to 100 units.
Marketing Input Decision: Each firm also decides on its marketing budget, with the range set from 0 to 500 units.
Implementation Phase:
Market Outcome Calculation:
Demand Calculation: Demand is computed as:

$$\text{Quantity Demanded} = \text{Initial Demand} \times \left(1 + \text{Price Elasticity} \times \frac{\text{Price} - \text{Initial Price}}{\text{Initial Price}}\right)$$

Market Share Calculation:

$$\text{Market Share} = \frac{\text{Firm Demand}}{\text{Total Demand}}$$

Sales Calculation:

$$\text{Sales} = \text{Price} \times \text{Market Share} \times \text{Quantity Demanded}$$

Profit Calculation:

$$\text{Profit} = \text{Sales} - \text{Costs} - \text{Marketing Inputs} - \text{Taxes}$$

Tax Calculation:

$$\text{Tax} = \text{Profit} \times \text{Tax Rate}$$

Consumer Choice: Consumers decide which firm's product to buy, influenced by both price and quality. Product quality is determined by production volume and marketing inputs, where:

$$\text{Quality} = \frac{\text{Production Volume}}{100} + \frac{\text{Marketing Inputs}}{500}$$

Government Regulation: The government adjusts market conditions by regulating tax rates based on market outcomes. If the combined profit of Firm A and Firm B exceeds 2,000 units, the tax rate increases to 15%. If the total profit falls below 1,000 units, the tax rate is reduced to 5%.
Feedback Stage:
Market Results Feedback: The system displays immediate market results, including sales figures, profits, and shifts in market share.
Feedback on Other Players' Decisions: The decisions made by Firm A and Firm B are displayed, offering transparency in the game and helping students understand market dynamics.
Strategy Advice: The system provides strategic recommendations, such as advising Firm A to lower its price if it is too high compared to Firm B, to enhance its market share.
Adjustment Phase:
Strategy Adjustment: Based on the feedback, both firms adjust their strategies in preparation for the next decision-making round. For example, if Firm A’s profit is lower than expected, it might opt to lower its price or increase its marketing budget.

3.3.2 Game flow

Introduction:
Before the game begins, the instructor introduces the game’s background and objectives through a multimedia presentation, engaging students by presenting realistic market competition scenarios. Videos, animations, or slides can be used to vividly demonstrate how the game replicates these market dynamics.
Explanation of Rules:
The instructor explains the game mechanics, covering the initial setup, the decision-making phase, the execution phase, the feedback phase, and the adjustment phase. A simple example is presented to illustrate the entire process, ensuring students understand the flow of the game.
Grouping and Role Assignment:
Students are divided into small groups of 4-5 members, ensuring diversity in background and ability within each team. Roles are then assigned to each group, such as Firm A, Firm B, Consumer, and Government. These roles are designed to align with the educational goals of the simulation, ensuring clear responsibilities and objectives for each participant.
Initial Setup:
The game begins with the allocation of resources: each firm starts with an initial capital of 1,000 units and an equal market share of 50%. Information relevant to the firms and consumers is also provided, such as production costs, demand elasticity, and the government tax rate.
Rounds of Decision-Making:
The game proceeds with multiple rounds of decision-making.
Round One:
Decision-Making Phase: Firm A and Firm B each decide on product pricing, production volume, and marketing inputs. For example, Firm A might choose a price of 100 units, production of 80 units, and marketing inputs of 200 units, while Firm B may opt for a price of 120 units, production of 70 units, and marketing inputs of 300 units.

Execution Phase: Based on these decisions, market outcomes are calculated, showing, for example, that Firm A has a market share of 60%, sales of 4,800 units, and profits of 3,800 units, while Firm B has a market share of 40%, sales of 3,360 units, and profits of 2,640 units.
Feedback Phase: The system provides immediate feedback, displaying sales, profits, and market share changes, while also offering strategic advice, such as recommending Firm B reduce its price to increase its market share.
Adjustment Phase: Based on this feedback, the firms adjust their strategies. For instance, Firm B might decide to lower its price to 110 units, increase production to 80 units, and reduce marketing input to 250 units.
Round Two:
Decision-Making Phase: Firm A and Firm B adjust their pricing, production, and marketing inputs in response to the feedback from the previous round. For example, Firm A might choose a price of 105 units, production of 85 units, and marketing input of 220 units, while Firm B opts for a price of 110 units, production of 80 units, and marketing input of 250 units.
Execution Phase: Market outcomes are recalculated, showing, for instance, Firm A with a market share of 55%, sales of 4,675 units, and profits of 3,900 units, while Firm B has a market share of 45%, sales of 3,960 units, and profits of 3,080 units.
Feedback Phase: Immediate feedback is given, highlighting any changes in market dynamics, such as advising Firm A to further optimize production and marketing strategies.
Adjustment Phase: Firms adjust their strategies for the next round. For example, Firm A may decide to increase production to 90 units and reduce marketing input to 200 units.
Subsequent Rounds:
The process repeats for several rounds, with each round offering immediate feedback to help students refine their strategies.
Final Analysis:
At the end of the game, the instructor leads a discussion on the market results, encouraging students to analyze the impact of different strategies on market share and profitability. Key game theory concepts, such as Nash equilibrium and the effects of price wars, are discussed in relation to the strategies employed during the game. Students are also encouraged to reflect on their decision-making process and share insights from their experiences, fostering teamwork and enhancing their communication and collaboration skills. In a final summary, the instructor reinforces the core concepts of game theory and emphasizes their application in real-world business and economics.

3.4 Game Feedback and Evaluation Mechanism

3.4.1 Instant feedback system

The instant feedback system plays a pivotal role in strategy simulation games, enhancing classroom interaction, fostering personalized learning, developing essential competencies, and aligning with the needs of modern education. By providing real-time assessment, the system strengthens student engagement and offers a more effective tool for both learning and teaching, thereby improving overall educational quality. The system includes the following components:
Market Results: Immediately after each round, the system displays the market outcomes, including sales, profits, and changes in market share. For instance, the system shows the sales, profits, and market share for both Firm A and Firm B.
Other Player Decisions: It displays the decisions made by Firm A and Firm B, allowing students to better understand market dynamics. For example, the system shows the pricing strategies, production volumes, and marketing inputs chosen by each firm.
Strategy Recommendations: The system offers strategic suggestions to help students refine their decisions. For example, it may advise Firm A to lower its price to increase market share or recommend that Firm B boost its marketing input to enhance product quality.

3.4.2 Evaluation indicator system

After collecting feedback, an evaluation index system should be established to assess the data. The evaluation system can be divided into four key areas:
Theoretical Understanding: This assesses students' grasp of core game theory concepts through tests and questionnaires. For example, multiple-choice and short-answer questions are used to evaluate students' understanding of concepts like Nash equilibrium and the Prisoner's Dilemma.
Practical Application: This aspect evaluates students' ability to apply theoretical knowledge to real-world scenarios based on the actual outcomes of their decisions. Students are assessed on market results such as sales, profits, and market share across multiple rounds of decision-making.
Decision-Making Skills: This measures students' strategic thinking and decision-making abilities by documenting their decisions across several rounds. For example, it analyzes how students adapt their strategies in different market conditions, assessing their flexibility and decision-making processes.
Teamwork: This evaluates students' teamwork and communication skills through group performance and peer feedback. The effectiveness of their collaboration is assessed through group discussion notes and mutual evaluations among team members.

4 GAME-BASED TEACHING STRATEGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES

4.1 Preparation

4.1.1 Teacher preparation

Pedagogical mastery of game mechanics requires instructors to develop comprehensive familiarity with the game's intricate rule systems, strategic objectives, and underlying mechanical frameworks. This foundational understanding encompasses not only the nuanced responsibilities associated with each role but also the complex decision-making algorithms governing round progression and the mechanisms for delivering instantaneous feedback. Such thorough preparation enables educators to facilitate student engagement with optimal efficacy.

The development of instructional materials demands meticulous attention to detail, incorporating comprehensive game manuals, strategically designed resource cards, and sophisticated market analysis forms. These pedagogical tools must articulate the sequential progression of gameplay while delineating role-specific responsibilities with sufficient clarity to facilitate rapid student comprehension and participation. For instance, the game manual should encompass detailed algorithmic frameworks for decision-making processes within each round, supplemented by practical examples that illustrate theoretical concepts.

Technical infrastructure validation necessitates rigorous testing of the gaming environment, with particular emphasis on network stability, platform compatibility, and device interoperability. In the context of online implementations, comprehensive validation of student access credentials and participation capabilities is essential. This includes conducting stress tests to evaluate platform performance under various load conditions, thereby preemptively identifying potential technical impediments to seamless gameplay.

4.1.2 Student preparation

The pedagogical foundation requires students to acquire fundamental game theory concepts through structured pre-learning activities. This theoretical groundwork encompasses essential paradigms such as Nash equilibrium and the Prisoner's Dilemma, facilitated through diverse learning modalities including textual resources, multimedia presentations, and preparatory lectures. Educational materials should integrate theoretical frameworks with practical applications, demonstrating the real-world relevance of game theory principles.

Comprehensive rule comprehension necessitates students' prior engagement with game documentation, supplemented by multimedia instructional resources designed to enhance understanding of game mechanics. For optimal learning outcomes, instructors should provide concise yet comprehensive multimedia presentations demonstrating initial setup procedures and preliminary decision-making processes, ensuring students can effectively navigate the gaming environment.

4.2 Class Implementation

4.2.1 Game introduction and rules explanation

The pedagogical approach to game introduction necessitates a sophisticated multimedia presentation framework that effectively contextualizes the simulation within real-world market dynamics. Through the strategic integration of diverse media elements—including high-fidelity video content, dynamic animations, and interactive slide presentations—instructors can effectively illustrate the complex interplay between theoretical frameworks and practical market scenarios. For instance, multimedia presentations might incorporate case studies demonstrating the evolutionary dynamics of price competition and collaborative research initiatives within competitive markets.

The explication of game mechanics demands a methodologically rigorous approach to rules dissemination, encompassing detailed elucidation of multiple operational phases: initial configuration, strategic decision-making, execution protocols, feedback mechanisms, and strategic recalibration processes. The incorporation of empirically grounded examples significantly enhances student comprehension of these mechanical frameworks. For instance, instructors should provide comprehensive numerical analyses of initial market conditions, including detailed breakdowns of capital allocation, cost structures, and market share distributions across participating entities.

The implementation of demonstrative examples requires careful orchestration of simplified scenarios that effectively illuminate the game's mechanical intricacies. Such demonstrations should encompass comprehensive walkthroughs of decision-making processes, incorporating detailed analyses of strategic choices regarding pricing strategies, production volumes, and marketing resource allocation, culminating in systematic evaluation of market outcomes.

4.2.2 Student grouping and role assignment

The strategic formation of student groups necessitates careful consideration of demographic and cognitive diversity, optimally structuring teams of 4-5 participants with complementary skill sets and disciplinary backgrounds. This heterogeneous approach to group composition maximizes the potential for cross-pollination of ideas and enhances the sophistication of strategic decision-making processes.

Role distribution within the simulation framework requires systematic allocation of distinct organizational functions, including but not limited to corporate entities (Firms A and B), consumer representatives, and regulatory authorities. Each role must be accompanied by clearly delineated objectives and operational parameters that facilitate meaningful engagement with the simulation's strategic elements.

4.2.3 Guidance and intervention during game play

Real-time pedagogical support necessitates continuous monitoring of student decision-making processes, coupled with strategic intervention when suboptimal strategies emerge. For example, when pricing decisions deviate significantly from market equilibrium, instructors should provide targeted guidance regarding demand elasticity considerations and competitive strategy optimization.

Dynamic intervention protocols require instructors to maintain flexible approaches to difficulty modulation and information dissemination, ensuring optimal learning outcomes through strategic adjustment of game parameters. The introduction of exogenous market shocks or new competitive entities can effectively stimulate more sophisticated strategic thinking among participants.

The implementation of feedback mechanisms must prioritize immediate response cycles that facilitate rapid learning and strategy refinement. Comprehensive market analysis reports, incorporating key performance metrics such as revenue generation, profitability indices, and market share dynamics, should be supplemented with strategic recommendations for optimization of decision-making processes.

4.2.4 Post-game analysis and discussion

The post-game analytical framework should incorporate rigorous examination of market outcomes, facilitating detailed discussion of strategic choices and their consequent impacts on market dynamics. This analysis should encompass comprehensive evaluation of competitive strategies, including price warfare implications and the strategic value of collaborative research and development initiatives.

Theoretical integration requires systematic exploration of the connections between game theory principles and their practical applications in market contexts. Discussions should emphasize the practical utility of theoretical frameworks such as Nash equilibrium in strategic decision-making processes, while examining the implications of game-theoretic paradoxes in corporate collaboration scenarios.

Intra-group discourse should facilitate comprehensive exchange of experiential insights and strategic learning outcomes, emphasizing the development of collaborative decision-making capabilities. Post-game analysis should incorporate detailed examination of team dynamics, communication efficacy, and collective decision-making processes.

The culminating plenary session should synthesize key learning outcomes, emphasizing the practical applications of game theory in strategic management contexts. This comprehensive review should highlight the significance of dynamic game analysis in corporate strategy formulation and the practical utility of mixed-strategy equilibrium concepts in managing market uncertainty.

5 CONCLUSION

This research presents a comprehensive investigation into the application of gamification in game theory education, demonstrating remarkable efficacy through the implementation of a meticulously designed "Market Game Simulation." The integration of theoretical frameworks with practical applications has yielded significant improvements in student engagement, decision-making capabilities, and collaborative competencies. Empirical evidence strongly indicates that this gamified pedagogical approach substantially enhances students' comprehension of fundamental game theory concepts, particularly in critical domains such as Nash equilibrium, the Prisoner's Dilemma, and dynamic game analysis. The incorporation of real-time feedback mechanisms has demonstrably optimized the learning process, enabling students to dynamically adjust their strategies and develop sophisticated strategic thinking capabilities.

Furthermore, the implementation of role-playing elements and multi-round decision-making protocols has proven instrumental in developing students' capacity for optimal decision-making in complex scenarios while simultaneously fostering enhanced communication and collaborative skills through team-based learning experiences. This interactive learning environment has catalyzed unprecedented levels of student engagement and classroom dynamism, representing a significant advancement in traditional pedagogical methodologies.

Nevertheless, this research acknowledges certain limitations. The successful implementation of gamified instruction necessitates elevated levels of pedagogical expertise and classroom management proficiency, while game design frameworks require flexible adaptation to diverse learning objectives. Future research trajectories might explore the optimization of game mechanics for broader educational contexts and disciplinary applications, potentially incorporating emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence to facilitate more precise personalized learning support systems.

In conclusion, this research contributes innovative methodological approaches and practical guidelines to game theory pedagogy, providing compelling evidence for the transformative potential of gamification in educational contexts. Through the strategic integration of gamification elements into curriculum design, educators can cultivate more engaging and interactive learning experiences, effectively developing students' theoretical understanding and practical capabilities while establishing a robust foundation for their future professional development. The findings underscore the significant potential of gamified learning approaches in revolutionizing traditional educational paradigms and enhancing learning outcomes across multiple dimensions of student development.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

FUNDING

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant numbers 72162018), the Jiangxi Province Graduate Innovation Special Funds Project (Grant numbers YC2020-B038)，Nanchang Institute of Technology Research Project on Teaching Reform (Grant numbers 2021SZJG005)

REFERENCES

[1] Ju Y, Yan L D. Professional training strategies for preschool normal students under the background of curriculum gamification reform. Early Childhood Education, 2020(3): 50-55.
[2] Wei X D, Wang Y. Research on educational game design strategies based on interactive narrative mode. Research in Electro-Education, 2023(9): 108-113.
[3] Zhang L, Shang J J. Research on game-based learning theory from the perspective of learning experience. Research in Electro-Education, 2018(6), 56-62.
[4] Wang J, Hu Y, Fan W X. Do game-based learning feedback systems really improve students' academic performance and emotional attitudes? A meta-analysis of 37 Kahoot!-related experimental and quasi-experimental studies. Research in Electro-Education, 2024(12), 76-85.
[5] Li Y B, Song J Y, Yao Q. H. The impact of game-based learning methods on students' learning outcomes: A meta-analysis of 35 experimental and quasi-experimental studies. Research in Electro-Education, 2019(11): 56-62.
[6] Shen K J, Su H Y, Shang J J. How does game-based learning affect knowledge retention? A meta-analysis of 38 experimental and quasi-experimental studies. Modern Distance Education Research, 2024(6), 55-68.
[7] Chen Q B. Incorporating simulation games into the teaching methods of "Modern Enterprise Management". Weekly Journal, 2016(99): 157-158.
[8] Ambrosio Mawhirter D, Ford Garofalo P. Expect the unexpected: Simulation games as a teaching strategy. Clinical Simulation in Nursing, 2016, 12(4): 132-136.
[9] Zhao Z H, Mei L. Cultivating scientific research capabilities in graduate course teaching reform under the "Double First-Class" initiative: A case study of the "Game Theory" course. Research in Higher Education, 2019, 37(3): 121-126.
[10] Yuan Z. Exploration of case teaching in game theory courses. Education and Teaching Forum, 2021(30): 86-91.
[11] Rogmans T, Abaza W. The impact of international business strategy simulation games on student engagement. Simulation & Gaming, 2019: 1-15.
[12] Huang X. Discussion on interactive models in undergraduate game theory teaching. Economic Research Guide, 2012(22): 251-252.
[13] Pu X J. The use of cases in undergraduate game theory teaching. Journal of Jiangnan University (Educational Science Edition), 2009, 29(4): 372-375.
[14] You Y P, Guo F F, Chen Z Q. The application of military online games in military education. Modern Educational Technology, 2007, 17(10): 49-52.
[15] Zhang L, Hu R N, Zeng J L, et al. How to design scientific, effective, and interesting educational games: A study on the design of mathematical games from the perspective of learning science. Research in Electro-Education, 2021(10): 70-76.