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Many students view the neat geographical line drawn on maps from Tijuana, Mexico, to Brownsville, Texas, as a nearly two-thousand-mile boundary separating two sovereign nations. In Congress, politicians argue over the need to erect double-layer fences and deploy Predator drones to secure the southern border before moving forward with immigration reform. The Department of State’s most recent travel warning for Mexico warns U.S. citizens of narcotics-related gun battles in broad daylight, kidnappings, and homicides. Despite this divisive discourse, Mexico and the United States are deeply interconnected through economic, historical, and political ties. During the summer of 2012, while preparing a unit on U.S.-Mexico relations for my undergraduate Introduction to Latin American Studies course, I decided to develop a simulation game as an interactive way for students to engage with the material and explore the complexity of U.S.-Mexico relations.
American & Latino Studies course, I began searching for ways to guide my class past the simplistic and antagonistic “us - them” paradigm toward an understanding of border spaces as politically messy, culturally diverse, and socially complex. What kind of pedagogical strategy would allow my students to analyze complicated issues, such as undocumented immigration, drug trafficking, and border violence, from different theoretical and practical perspectives? My course preparation coincided with a summer workshop at the College of the Holy Cross in Worcester, MA, designed to introduce faculty to the case method and other role-playing pedagogical activities for use in a variety of academic disciplines. I was drawn to the way in which the case method inverts the common top-down lecture and compels students to be active participants using real world situations. Championed by the Harvard Business School since the early 1900s, the case method is well known for its emphasis on student-centered discussions that engage participants in the kind of deep learning that leads to critical thinking and independent problem solving. In John Boehrer and Marty Linsky’s succinct introduction to teaching with cases, the authors describe how this methodology differs from the traditional university classroom dynamic:

The students engage in the text rather than examine it. They are active and animated: offering ideas, raising questions, building on each other’s statements, constructing a collective analysis, reframing the discussion, challenging the teacher, and learning from each other [...] the teacher is structuring and facilitating the students’ work rather than delivering information, giving explanations, or providing answers.

The case method seemed like an excellent pedagogical strategy for introducing U.S.-Mexico border issues to my students. However, after several unsuccessful searches of academic case study databases
for a pre-existing resource on the specific border challenges mentioned above, I realized with excitement and some apprehension that I would have to develop my own project.4

Ultimately I created a U.S.-Mexico border simulation game that incorporated role-play, student-led discussion and analysis, a democratic classroom environment, and learning through action and decision-making rather than rote memorization and lectures – teaching strategies that also characterize the case method.5 While case studies, particularly in business schools, generally mirror situations that have actually occurred in the past, my simulation was based on a fictitious present-day event and required players to make decisions in real time that would affect the outcome of the game. One of the acknowledged risks of the case method is the initial change in classroom culture that can frustrate students who are not accustomed to the more active learning environment.6 Simulation games, on the other hand, are part of mainstream youth culture. Most students already understand the participatory and co-creative dynamic of computer games such as SimCity and Second Life. For the current digital generation, simulation games in the classroom (digital or live role-play) provide a familiar platform and can reduce the initial anxiety associated with the use of unfamiliar pedagogical techniques.

Furthermore, contemporary digital simulation games known as MMORPGs, or massively multiplayer online role-player games, are highly complex and generate diverse social environments that encourage player interaction, collaboration, and competition.7 Although my simulation was not computer-based, this was precisely the dynamic that arose in the classroom, as students moved beyond a superficial understanding of the border and delved deeper into the complexity and interconnectivity of the issues

4 Bill Bigelow’s teaching resource The Line Between Us: Teaching about the Border and Mexican Immigration (2006) includes role-plays and simulations but is designed for use in secondary education classrooms.
5 Boehrer and Linsky, “Teaching with Cases,” 56. In 1990, Boehrer and Linsky outlined future directions for teaching with cases, including the development of simulations (both computer-driven and live classroom role-play) and wondered “whether this represents a true departure from the case method, a technical enhancement of the case writer’s and teacher’s art, or something in between.”
through dialogue, partnership, and negotiation. In this paper, I provide an outline of the simulation game, including general instructions and materials, description of roles, and step-by-step tasks.\(^8\) I also show how the project encouraged independent learning, presented problems for students to solve through group work, and gave students the opportunity to learn by doing – pedagogical strategies that have been shown to foster the kind of deep learning associated with more successful learners.\(^9\) Finally, I discuss several improvements and modifications for different classroom environments.

**United States/Mexico Border Simulation Game**

My two-day simulation focused on the negotiation of solutions to controversial and complex issues, including immigration, drug trafficking, and border violence, that affect residents, businesses, and federal and local government agencies on both sides of the U.S.-Mexico border. Two weeks prior to the game, students ranked their top three choices from a list of twenty-four roles, including officials from the Mexican and U.S. governments, as well as local interest groups with competing agendas (e.g., human rights activists, militia minutemen, women affected by border violence, international manufacturing companies, drug cartels).\(^10\) The roles represented a variety of perspectives on both sides of the geographical division to create opportunities for students to move beyond the “us – them” paradigm that commonly misconstrues their understanding of the region. In the introductory narrative,
students were informed that, after a series of high-profile violent incidents along the U.S.-Mexico border, they had been summoned to bilateral talks mediated by representatives from the United Nations’ International Institute of Peace. Their objective was to negotiate a proposal with written provisions directly addressing these pressing issues that needed to pass by a majority vote on the final day of the game. By employing an open, public negotiation process (described in further detail below), the border simulation required students to hone their listening skills and to present clear, logical arguments that would persuade their peers to support their cause. This process placed the responsibility on the students to learn from each other, rather than an expert faculty member, and helped them take ownership of the learning process, one of the hallmarks of a successful case study.

One week before the simulation took place, I distributed a sixteen-page data packet to all the students with statistics, news excerpts, graphs, popular media images, and government reports related to drug trafficking, the illegal arms trade, the U.S. and Mexican economies, immigration, violence along the border, and defense budget expenditures. The content of the materials packet was culled from real sources including the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, the Global Commission on Drug Policy (GCDP), congressional legislation, recent academic publications, the Pew Research Hispanic Center, and national media outlets. Excerpts from the Secure Fence Act (2006), the Department of Justice’s National Drug Threat Assessment report (2011), and the GCDP’s War on Drugs report (2011), as well as numeric comparisons between U.S. and Mexican labor compensation rates, graphs detailing drug seizures at the border, and political cartoons illustrating divergent views on immigration, comprised the raw data that students had to analyze and interpret as they decided which materials would best support their position. In addition, each player received personalized, private instructions with a detailed description of their character, as well as a bullet-point list of expectations, restrictions,
required props or behavior, and tasks to be completed. For example, the President of Mexico was informed that:

- you can negotiate privately with any other player and move freely between groups
- you control the Mexican Defense budget and can shift funding percentages unilaterally
- you should avoid losing U.S. military aid at all costs
- you cannot be caught negotiating with any drug cartel players
- you must create a visual image from your election campaign and come dressed in a suit

Using this information, students were asked to identify their top priorities and determine their positions on the three main issues (immigration, drug trafficking and border violence). By placing some restrictions on what the players could and could not do in their roles, the instructions ensured a complex negotiation process in which the students could not reach an easy or quick solution. For example, theoretically the legalization of drugs would reduce much of the violence on both sides of the border and create economic opportunities for both countries; however, the Mexican activist who tried to negotiate this point with some excellent arguments based on the data packet encountered fierce opposition from most of the other players in the game for different sociopolitical reasons. This particular student, who spent the entire game trying to convince her peers to legalize drugs but ultimately failed to have her provision included in the final proposal, articulated her frustration at the end of the game. Her experience served as a lesson for the entire class about the difficulty of implementing “easy” solutions to complex transnational problems. It also highlighted the simulation’s ability to encounter the limitations of theory by confronting the student with the broader sociopolitical context of her apparently sound policy decision.11

The first day of the two-day simulation opened with a joint session of all parties at a venue reserved in the campus conference center building to create an ambience of professionalism and authenticity. Signs indicated where each delegation should sit (U.S. government; Mexican government;...
U.S. interest groups; Mexican interest groups; press table), facing a table headed by the UN mediators. Many students assumed that these groups, purposely divided by national identity, would share the same interests and perhaps lead to a U.S.-Mexico showdown. But as the game progressed, students realized the artificiality of this division and had to find ways to negotiate the issues beyond national loyalty. As outlined in their private instructions, students were expected to arrive in character, with their required prop or attire. For example, the government officials attended the negotiations in business attire, the corrupt Mexican developer created a bogus land title claiming his family as the rightful landowners of a border territory in question, and the journalists brought recording devices for their interviews. When designing the simulation, one of my colleagues suggested that the use of realia (props, costumes, decorations, photos) can help students stay in character and lends a sense of legitimacy to the game. Indeed, when asked to identify the best aspects of the game, students cited the authenticity and complexity of the simulation which “avoided a trite, meaningless approach” to the issues.¹² During the first fifteen-minute round, the UN mediators reiterated the context for the bilateral negotiations and asked all the players to give a short introduction in which they were free to briefly explain their motives and demonstrate any behavior indicated in their private instructions. The Mexican activist, for example, read a poem dedicated to his twenty-four-year old son who was a victim of drug cartel violence in Morelos, while the founder of the Minutemen project gave a discourse using inflammatory language to defend his position on U.S. border security. Following the introductions, delegations met separately for fifteen minutes to discuss their priorities and outline strategies for negotiating a solution with other parties. Players then broke out into three simultaneous forty-five-minute working groups focused on the issues of drug trafficking, immigration, and border violence, during which students had to discuss and

¹² All student citations about the border simulation game were taken from the post-game survey administered at the end of my course. Respondents’ names have been omitted to protect the confidential nature of the survey.
negotiate possible solutions, policy changes, and business deals with representatives from other delegations.

Each working group was chaired by a UN mediator in charge of keeping track of the suggested provisions on their assigned topic. To help guide the discussions and ensure that the working groups produced specific, realistic provisions, each UN mediator distributed a printed mandate to the players in her working group. The Drug Trafficking Working Group was tasked, among other items, with creating a budget proposal for the allocation of U.S. and Mexican anti-drug funding based on the information provided in the data packet, whereas the Immigration Working Group had to consider the role of the U.S. in encouraging or discouraging undocumented immigration and to analyze the impact, on both sides of the border, of the Secure Fence Act. The Border Violence Working Group had to come up with strategies for reducing drug cartel violence in Ciudad Juárez, and decide under what circumstances the U.S. would lift its State Department Travel Warning for Mexico. Players were allowed to move freely among the different working groups to ensure that their interests were represented in the written provisions. At the end of this round, the UN mediator in charge of each working group had to organize all the provisions in an online forum that would be made available to everyone on day two of the simulation. The provisions contained joint declarations, conflicting conditions, and individual requests, as well as confidential messages (which would only be revealed to the senior-level negotiating team). Players from the press were responsible for writing up news briefs employing their particular media outlet’s angle and posting them to the class website within twenty-four hours. The news briefs allow the players to see both sides of the big picture, beyond their specific objectives, during the negotiations.\(^\text{13}\)

---

\(^{13}\) The reports can also provide the instructor with an excellent platform to discuss media bias during the debriefing session. For example, the U.S. reporter’s comments about the Mexican President’s “tendency to make promises that he does not intend to keep” and judgment about the Mexican government’s “unreliability and inconsistency” led to a lively discussion about the role of the media in shaping the U.S. public’s perception of its southern neighbor.
At the beginning of our next class meeting, the UN mediators had thirty minutes to present the written provisions which were projected on a large screen for all players to view. The students quickly realized there were conflicting provisions, as well as recommendations that would not be in their character’s best interest. Next the U.S. and Mexican Presidents and Secretaries of State convened in a separate room with one of the UN mediators to begin writing the final proposal. This closed meeting was broadcast to the rest of the class (via Skype) and the UN mediator was tasked with updating the text of the proposal using an online chat forum so the other players could see and hear the negotiation process in live time. The video feed was left intentionally one-way, so the senior-level negotiators were unaware as to what was happening in the other room. As the Presidents and Secretaries of State crafted the final proposal, the remaining players were free to continue to negotiate with one another and relay written messages, revised provisions, and recommendations to the other room via the UN mediators. Certain players (e.g., the Mexican Army General and the U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security) were granted direct cell phone access to their respective leaders. The dynamic in both rooms during this thirty-five minute session was intense and lively. The senior-level negotiators maintained a serious tone as they tried to craft a proposal that would take into account the different opinions expressed during the working group sessions while also accurately reflecting their own political stance. In the other room, players continued to form alliances and compromise on certain provisions as they watched the final proposal unfold on the projection screen. As I asked students to clarify their positions and continue to negotiate their objectives, I was keenly aware of how my role as teacher had changed from lecturer to facilitator. Prior to running the pilot, I had been concerned about this part of the simulation. What would the players who were not in the negotiation room do? Would they be tempted to stop role-playing? Would they get bored? What I found most helpful for this particular segment was to set aside my own desire to control the direction of the game and listen carefully to the different constituencies as
they continued to negotiate with each other and with the players in the “war room.” By trusting in my students’ ability to think deeply and critically about the issues, I could move away from the impulse to provide the correct answer and focus on asking more questions. I was prepared, if the dynamic became stagnant or if the negotiators reached a quick settlement, to introduce setbacks (e.g. drug cartel violence, large-scale protests, an international crisis). In my case, as we neared the final vote, I allowed the Mexican Army General (who was receiving kickbacks from one of the drug cartels) to “assassinate” one player before the final vote in order to achieve his game objectives. The setback created a sense of uncertainty and reminded the players that there are many external factors that could influence the negotiation process in real life. At the end of the proposal writing session, all parties reconvened in one room and the UN mediators read through the negotiated deal between the two countries so all players could decide if it was in their best interests to approve or reject the proposal. This last round included an anonymous “yes” or “no” vote by paper ballot that was then tallied and announced by the UN mediators.

Finally, I dedicated thirty minutes of our next class to a debriefing session. This is a crucial opportunity for students to move from their role in the simulation to a position of critical analysis. We talked about the different struggles and obstacles certain players faced, their reasons for compromising on particular issues, and their opinion on how realistic the final proposal was (e.g., the Mexican President’s decision to “opt out” of NAFTA until U.S. companies dramatically improved maquiladora working conditions was politically creative but very unlikely, if not legally impossible). We also discussed the ways in which the simulation contributed to their understanding of U.S.-Mexico political relations and broader border issues. My role at this stage in the simulation continued to be mediator and, at times, “group therapist” as I realized the extent to which the students had become emotionally involved in the game. We talked about their feelings of frustration and accomplishment, depending on
the extent to which the final proposal mirrored their intended objectives. While talking about feelings in the classroom might be considered an academic risk, research has shown that encouraging reflection and supporting students’ personal development (both intellectual and emotional) are two pedagogical strategies that foster deep learning as opposed to surface learning.\textsuperscript{14} It was quite clear during our debriefing session that by taking on a persona and becoming emotionally invested in that person’s perspective, my students had moved beyond the mere memorization of facts about the border and had become actively involved in the learning process itself.

**Pedagogical Benefits**

Overall, student feedback and faculty observation of the working groups on the first day of the simulation indicated that this was an excellent way to keep everyone involved in the game. Students who rarely raised their hand in the traditional lecture-style classroom were suddenly transformed into active, engaged participants and learners. The working group dynamic forced each individual player to articulate his/her position and lobby for his/her interests, while trying to discern the other players’ position on the issues. Students had to rely on their argumentative, analytical, and interpersonal skills in order to achieve their objectives. The simultaneous sessions (held in adjoining rooms to enable players to move about freely and quickly) created a sense of urgency and heightened emotional investment. The open structure of the working groups encouraged students to decide for themselves, rather than be told, where they needed to put their focus and energy to achieve their objectives in the game. As Harvard Business School student Albert H. Dunn observed, “[b]y placing its emphasis on free discussion of the case material in class, instead of on authoritative exposition of the material by an instructor, the case method involves the student in the risk of uncertain progress.”\textsuperscript{15} In addition to the students’ willingness to take this risk, I also had to surrender my control of the class – quite literally on

\textsuperscript{14} Cross and Harris Steadman, *Classroom Research*, 122-128.
\textsuperscript{15} Dunn, “Basic Characteristics of the Case Method,” 93.
the first day, as I could only physically be in one working group room at a time. As I stepped aside and put my trust in the technique, I observed what many instructors have experienced using the case method: my students had shifted their focus from me as the authority to each other.¹⁶ When I did enter the working group sessions, the students were actively lobbying for equal time to express their interests.

After the simulation ended, students were asked to complete an online survey with specific questions about the extent to which the simulation furthered their understanding of Latin America, how to improve or modify the simulation, and what they considered the best aspects of the game. All of the respondents (twenty-three students) agreed that the simulation game furthered or deepened their understanding of Latin American/Latino Studies, and they unanimously recommended including the simulation game in future classes. When asked how the game contributed to their understanding of U.S.-Mexico political relations and broader U.S.-Mexico border issues, most comments fell into two main categories: (1) helped student understand the complexity of U.S. & Latin American/Mexican relations and (2) allowed student to identify with a Latin American and/or Mexican perspective. Students pointed out the political and economic advantages that the United States wields over Mexico, as well as conflicting interests within each individual country that can sabotage international negotiations, and finally cultural differences that add varying levels of complexity to the process. One representative comment read:

> The relationship between Latin America and the U.S. is full of contradictions and competing interests. For this reason, and as it has been playing out in real life thus far, an agreement on how to deal with the U.S./Mexican border is unlikely to happen. This demonstration helped me understand how this issue is not a simple one, and therefore, it

¹⁶ Gragg, “Because Wisdom Can’t be Told,” 11. This Harvard Business professor noted “[t]he case plan of instruction may be described as democratic in distinction to the telling method, which is in effect dictatorial or patriarchal. With the case method, all members of the academic group, teacher and students, are in possession of the same basic materials in the light of which analyses are to be made and decisions arrived at. [...] A significant aspect of democracy in the classroom is that it provides a new axis for personal relationships. No longer is the situation that of the teacher on the one hand and a body of students on the other. The students find their attention transferred from the teacher to each other.”
would take a lot of commitment and responsibility for Mexico and the United States to come to the same terms.

Students also lauded the game’s ability to keep the players focused on solving practical problems rather than simply analyzing the situation in the abstract. For example, one student wrote [the game] “allowed me to look at U.S./Mexico relations from a practical standpoint [and] provided data that theoretical study on the issue would not provide. This allowed me to place myself in the shoes of my character and apply the data and knowledge I had.” The latter part of this comment highlights the player’s emotional connection to the issues which confirms Prof. Ann Velenchik’s observation that “active learning methods appeal to students in the affective domain, motivating them to engage with the material even when it is quite challenging.”

Within the safety of their role, my students could argue their side of the issue without the typical reticence about saying the “wrong” thing or hurting a peer’s feelings by disagreeing with their point of view. Finally, several players reflected on how the game challenged them to bring to bear what they had learned in the classroom to life beyond the college campus: “The exercise gave us the understanding that by studying Latin America and Latino Studies we are given an opportunity to do something with that knowledge, whether pursuing it as a career or just giving us the knowledge to go out into the world and make it a better place”; “[The game] made me wonder whether any of us in the future will take some of the solutions we spoke about in class and actually apply them to the real life problem.” These comments suggest that, in much the same way that digital gamers seek out related external content such as TV shows, merchandise, and message boards to enhance their simulated experience, a successful academic simulation game can engage students to the point that they seek out additional information on the topic through other channels long after the class has ended.

17 Velenchik, “Teaching with the Case Method.” In my post-game survey, several students pointed out this aspect of the simulation, with comments such as “the border simulation game really opened my eyes to how the people of Latin America must feel.”

18 One of the benefits of role-playing in the classroom, as projects such as Barnard College’s Reacting to the Past have also shown, is the ability to draw shy students into the discussion and to allow more assertive students to take on leadership roles without being labeled “arrogant” or “too smart.”
Modifications & Lessons Learned

While my simulation was piloted in an English-language, introductory course on Latin American & Latino Studies, the game could be modified for different classes or academic purposes. The original concept for my border simulation took shape during a workshop to develop one-day intensive symposium sessions on public policy for a group of fifteen-to-twenty undergraduate scholars. If the game is played in this setting, the students have to commit to an entire day of negotiations and there is inevitably less time to reflect and debrief after the game. Because the students would not necessarily have any content-specific background knowledge, the game could be modified to include a more detailed introduction about U.S.-Mexico border issues. In addition to giving ample time for students to process the sixteen-page data packet, I highly recommend screening one of the many related films prior to the simulation to give the students a visual sense of life along both sides of the border. We viewed Ricardo Martínez’s The Wall (2010), but other options include El Norte (Gregory Nava, 1983), Sin nombre (Cary Fukunaga, 2009), La misma luna (Patricia Riggen, 2007), and Which Way Home (Rebecca Cammisa, 2009). Another possible modification is to adapt the game for a course on Latino or Latin American Culture taught in Spanish or for a class on translation. For the former, Spanish language materials could be added to the data packet or replace the English documents completely. For the latter, the students themselves could translate the private instructions into Spanish prior to the start of the simulation. In either case, the students assigned to the Mexican roles would be expected to speak exclusively to each other in Spanish, but interact with the U.S. players in English. The UN mediators and a few U.S. players could also be bilingual. The blending of languages would add another dimension of complexity and authenticity to the game that could lead to interesting discussions about translation, cultural misunderstanding, and power in the post-game debriefing session.
When asked how the game could be improved, some of my students suggested more preparation time with the professor to “explain the data/materials” and “analyze the information packet.” However, this process of independent analysis on the part of the student is an essential part of the case method strategy. As Velenchik has noted, one of the pedagogical issues that the case method addresses is “use of evidence” which requires students to read and analyze quantitative evidence in order to solve a problem. By asking students to manipulate and analyze raw data (that may or may not be relevant to their objectives), the learning process becomes driven by their own interpretations (which leads to excellent post-game discussions) rather than the professor’s “correct” answer.

Accustomed to the traditional college lecture in which knowledge is imparted by the professor, students do not immediately see the benefits of doing this work themselves and may even balk at having to formulate their own position when faced with unstructured data evidence. Despite their initial discomfort or uncertainty about reading and analyzing sixteen pages of data, my students were able to identify the materials that were relevant to their player’s interests and draw on the statistics and reports to bolster their arguments. One of the acknowledged risks of these kinds of role-playing activities is that students who have never participated in a simulation before may need some time to feel comfortable with the process. Some of my students reflected this anxiety in their comments by requesting more “guidance” and “pre-game preparation” because “I wasn’t sure how it was going to play out” and suggesting that the UN mediator roles be assigned to instructors rather than students to “accelerate and clarify negotiations.” A brief pre-game explanation or Q&A session might be helpful in diminishing students’ anxiety about what is going to happen when the game begins. One could also post this information online or include it in the player instructions. I do not think that an entire class period is necessary, however, as part of what makes the simulation exciting and beneficial from a pedagogical standpoint is letting the students figure things out on their own. Regarding the inclusion of
faculty members as players (namely UN mediators), I recommend maintaining the exclusively student-run dynamic, even at the risk of occasional confusion. We did have faculty members present during the simulation, but they were there as independent observers or as “expert” consultants who could provide additional information about certain issues. In addition, I suggest having a separate, private meeting with the UN mediators before the game begins to go over the structure of the working group sessions and the negotiation process. Another recommendation from the student survey was to extend the length of the game to allow for more time to develop provisions in the working groups and to write the final proposal.¹⁹

There will always be some aspect of the simulation that can be improved or modified, however, it is important to remember that the unfinished nature of the game is perhaps its greatest strength as a pedagogical strategy. In one of the earliest statements about the theory underlying the case method, Arthur Dewing recognized that this type of teaching method “is crude and clumsy in execution; it is inefficient, in that no scale of accomplishment can be established and empirically applied; it lacks the technical excellence ordinarily associated with good teaching.” Yet, despite the messy nature of case studies, Dewing concludes that by giving students the opportunity to discuss and deal with unexpected situations, rather than asking them to memorize acquired knowledge, “we teach them to think.”²⁰ – and, in my opinion, this reward far outweighs any pedagogical risks we may encounter along the way.

¹⁹ The simulation was played over the course of two class periods of seventy-five minutes each, not including the debriefing session. A different group of students commented that the urgency created by the tight deadline was a fun aspect of the game and contributed to the authenticity of the negotiation process.

²⁰ McNair, The Case Method, 2-3.
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