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Abstract
As alternate teaching tools, Business schools routinely apply Gaming to Blended-courses, while Law schools use Mock-Trials to achieve the same real-life effect. In Political Science and International Affairs this trend is reflected in crisis-simulation games and role-playing in Graduate schools out of earlier military war-games, to be reapplied to the study of Model United Nations, international crises and U.S. Presidential politics. Since 2010 Saint Leo University’s Political Science faculty first started to expose students to education gaming based on free-standing Model U.N. at local and regional competitions, followed in 2014-2017 by the Alternative Reality Learning Education (ARLE) project to use Internet resources in multiple-connected special Blended-courses across disciplines (Political Sciences, International Studies, Criminal Justice, Communications and Business) to also teach Pre-Law/Political Science Mock-Trials, U.S. Presidential Elections simulation games and International Affairs war-games (Russia vs Ukraine). Since 2015, on-line teaching shifted to a new university-owned on-line platform D2L/Courses also for campus courses as multi-use skeleton platform for administration (grades, assessments, permanent content-loading) and also integration with an ARLE Administrator for crisis-simulations across multiple inter-disciplinary classes annually in the Political Sciences Minors of “Campaign & Elections”, “Legal Studies” and “World Politics”.
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Gaming and Blended Teaching of American Politics and International Affairs

Games as a tool for human entertainment, role-playing and education is as old as history, due to Mankind’s “innate drive to play” or Spieltrieb (Friedrich Schiller, 1794) as Homo Ludens (Johan Huizinga, 1938). According to these concepts, gaming has evolved especially in Law Schools and Business Schools as an effective role-playing educational tool for Mock-Trials and case-studies. Gaming covers several sub-fields (war-games; Law School Mock-Trials; Tailor-made educational games in Business; playing commercials-off-the-shelf games; programming and code-learning; games to promote social inclusion of marginalized groups; Model U.N. and crisis-simulations) and are recently enhanced by the impact of using multi-modality and on-line education to apply several concurrent modes of presentation/communications. Especially in recent years, the much-touted future role of the Net-Generation of children and youth who grew-up with computer games since age-2 should find a natural educational outlet in gaming.
However, this has resonated mostly in the entertainment field, rather than in university education (at times with negative psychological costs when we factor in cases of “loneliness”, “boredom” or “confusion”), or in computer coding and programming, where gaming (both on-line and face-to-face) has had only marginal effects, due to the students’ inability to grasp theoretical concepts, poor preparation or poor motivation (1).

Since 1998-99 the private Catholic Saint Leo University in Florida, USA, has reinvented itself as a fully-integrated joint traditional, long-distance and on-line university with a mixture of campus/centers, on-line and blended courses. By 2015-2017 Saint Leo University shifted to a university-owned new computer platform -- the Canadian-style D2L/Courses -- and fully redeveloped all on-line courses to interface with campus and centers courses through a joint multi-use skeleton platform for permanent content-loading and blended on-line courses. This allows D2L to integrate also gaming case-studies beyond standard business courses that routinely apply gaming exercises to blended on-line courses. In Political Sciences disciplines, games and role-playing were developed in Graduate schools since the 1980s out of earlier military war-games, which are now applied to international crises-simulations, Model United Nations, mock-trials and U.S. Presidential elections. In this context, Saint Leo University’s Political Sciences faculty (Dr. Marco Rimanelli and Frank Orlando) first started to expose students since 2010 to education gaming based on free-standing Model U.N. at local and regional competitions (Florida Southern College and University of Pennsylvania) by training motivated students of the local chapter of ΠΣΣ (Pi-Sigma-Alpha) Honors Society for Political Sciences and International Affairs.

Then, by relying on the more flexible D2L computer platform, this was followed in 2014-2017 by the creation of specialized Political Sciences courses where Frank Orlando applied gaming through the university-wide “Alternate Reality Learning Experience” (ARLE) concept to teach both U.S. Presidential Elections and Mock-Trials for the Political Sciences Minors of “Campaigns and Elections”, “Legal Studies” and “World Politics”. Multi-disciplinary faculty involvement across all schools was coordinated by Dr. Jeff Borden, Chief Innovation Officer at Saint Leo University’s Teaching and Learning Innovation department, providing funds for all classes involved and integration with an ARLE Administrator to make this experiential learning a real success (2).

While many Political Sciences programs take part in some form of experiential learning or simulation based on political issues, there are a variety of factors that made ARLE a unique experience for the students involved. The vast majority of simulations in Political Sciences classrooms are contained within the confines of a single course, but at Saint Leo University, the ARLE experiential-learning took place across classes, departments and schools. Thus, in 2015 Instructor Orlando’s new POL-300 “Presidency” class first applied the ARLE experiential learning project and repeated it in 2016 with the 2016 U.S. Presidential election as center-piece of his new class POL-306 “Campaigns and Elections” through learning-objectives and assignments. Orlando’s courses provided the chief players, with nine other courses pooled in the planning and execution of campus-wide multi-disciplinary simulations involving over 100 students.

Saint Leo University’s Social Sciences Department is always striving to create more opportunities for its students to engage in experiential learning, and the 2015 “U.S. Presidential Election ARLE” simulation was the first of its kind at Saint Leo University. It involved not only his “Presidency” students, but also a “Communications” class that aided the campaigns in honing their message, a “Psychology” class that ran analyzed the effectiveness of the rival campaign strategies, two
classes on “Social Media” that helped to handle the Twitter, Facebook and Instagram pages for the rival candidates, a “Multi-media Management” class that filmed campaign commercials and filmed the climactic debate event, an “Education” class (at a Center campus hours away from our University Campus) that acted as an education interest group, and an on-line “Criminal Justice” class that provided a security plan for the event. There was such interest in the event that the only negative feedbacks received were from faculty members disappointed that their classes were not invited to participate. Still, those faculty members that were hoping to be more involved were tabbed as external policy experts for ARLE students to work with in creating realistic and broad party-platforms.

In order to plan ARLE Simulation events, all involved faculty met weekly from March through Fall 2015 when the first Presidential simulation took place. Facilitating cooperation between students among all classes was of utmost concern, especially because most of these courses met at different times (and some at remote campuses or in different learning environments). Thus, a meet and greet kick-off event was planned for all participants, featuring local politicians, party members and journalists expressing their perspectives on U.S. political campaigns (3). After this, it was off to the races!

Even though several classes were taking part in the 2015 “U.S. Presidential Election ARLE”, the “Presidency” students were the focal point of the experience: students from that class provided the rival Presidential candidates, Vice-Presidential candidates, Party Leaders, Campaign Managers, Communication Directors and key policy experts. All students were allowed to apply for whichever positions and party teams (Republicans or R vs Democrats or D) they wished, but final “casting” decisions were ultimately made by the Instructor. The Presidential candidates were the centerpieces of the experience and needed to act in ready-made commercials, conduct interviews and participate in several debates. Vice-Presidential candidates had similar duties and participated in their own Vice-Presidential debate. Party Leaders were responsible for compiling their respective party platforms and shaping general policy. Campaign Managers were tasked with coordinating strategy. Communications Directors were in charge of media requests and messaging. Policy experts focused on specific issues and wrote reports that eventually comprised their party’s platform and researched topics that were useful in debate preparations.

It is important to note that these students were not just imitating real-life politicians and the ARLE Simulation’s political platforms did not needed to align completely with their counterpart in reality. In order to protect the students involved and separate their personal life from the ARLE Simulation, the Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates were given fake-names and background-stories provided by the Instructor who also approved any student “tweaking” of their fake-biographies. This allowed students to personalize their candidacies, but the safeguards protected the integrity of the process by not allowing changes that could trivialize the experience (4).

The ARLE “U.S. Presidential Elections” simulation ran for almost the entire 2015 Fall Semester. During that time the campaigns were afforded a great deal of autonomy to pursue the strategies that they best believed would lead to victory. Along the way, both campaigns performed in debates, filmed commercials, produces flyers and buttons, engaged in voter outreach and wooed interest groups for their support. The culminating ARLE Simulation was a Mock-Presidential Debate, moderated by top students from other classes. The debate was modeled on the 2016 Presidential debates, but questions were original and created by Instructor Orlando with input
from students in other disciplines. Neither campaign had access to the debate questions beforehand, but in addition to agreements on format, their rival campaigns were able to mutually decide what issues would be focused on in the 90-minute debate. This led to a situation where students spent lots of time preparing for the event, because the prize was right around the corner. At the end of the Mock-U.S. Presidential debate, audience members and those watching at home on a live YouTube stream were allowed to vote.

The 2015 ARLE Simulation became the all-encompassing focus for the students in the “Presidency” class. While some of their “colleagues” in other classes treated it as just another assignment, the goal for the “Presidency” students was to be all in. In order to facilitate this, the course assessments changed, but not the desired learning outcomes: readings, lectures and assignments focused on Presidential campaign strategy, but the total number of tests and quizzes was decreased. Instead, students were instructed to focus their energies on carrying-out the simulation by applying what they had learned. They were graded not only on the effort and success of their performance as judged by the Instructor, but also on the evaluation of their final work by their teammates (with many team meetings taking place away from the classroom). Finally, students provided their concluding personal assessments of the experience.

The results of such experiential gaming were overwhelmingly positive. The event was attended by over 200 students, faculty and staff, with Saint Leo University President William Lennox Jr. providing opening remarks. Local media covered the events of the campaign, and students in the “Presidency” class were featured in radio interviews throughout the Tampa Bay area. Hundreds of people watched the final event on-line live on YouTube and cast their ballots. Students involved in the experience extolled the virtues of this type of experiential learning in their class exit survey, with many declaring it to be the best course that they could apply towards their future careers. In fact, one graduating Senior was able to parlay their performance in the ARLE Simulation into a job position with the Florida Democratic Party (despite having portrayed the Republican Vice-President candidate!) during the actual 2016 U.S. Presidential Elections of Donald Trump (R) vs Hillary Clinton (D). A final assessment also showed that students had learned and interiorized a great deal about U.S. Presidential elections both in general and practice (5).

While the 2015 performance was a great success, there was still room for improving the experience for students. The event was repeated in 2016 with a completely new group of students participating. Students were made aware of the ARLE university exercise in advance of their registration to the courses, and this increased overall course enrollments to the maximum number capped by the University. The onus was on faculty to improve on the communication between classes, and only those faculty members that were fully committed to making the experience a priority in their classes were invited to join. This had the effect of streamlining the process further and making the ARLE process even more successful than in the prior year. Because of the success of these type of events, ARLE exercises were planned to run mock-campaign every even year in the fall to capitalize on the excitement of campaign season and to maximize the educational element for the students involved.

In Fall 2017, Political Sciences students in several multi-disciplinary classes (POL-300 “Presidency”, POL-295 “International Relations”, POL-323 “Comparative Politics” and two classes in Criminology), were involved in a mock-trial called: “The Trial of the Century: Oswald”. This was another ARLE organized by Saint Leo’s TALI department that involved classes from
across the university, including Criminal Justice and Multimedia Management. As with the mock-election experience, the planning began in the previous Spring term. One of the most difficult decisions made was the subject matter of the trial. We aimed to find a case that had not been tried before and reflected back to the real world, but would not be so real that it alluded to ongoing cases in and around the campus community. The inspiration for the final decision came from Saint Leo’s School of Arts and Sciences commemoration the 1960s decade in a year-long celebration. One of the most famous events from that era was the live-TV assassination of U.S. President John F. Kennedy in 1963 by Lee Harvey Oswald (6).

On account of the equally dramatic subsequent assassination of Oswald also on live-TV while in Police custody by Jack Ruby, Oswald never stood trial for his unprecedented political crime and so took to the grave all secrets surrounding the assassination decision, which in turn syphoned out decades of conspiracies. Our idea was to set up an experience where the truth could finally come out in a trial setting. The ARLE team decided to avoid creating an alternate universe where we could conduct the trial during 1963-64, opting instead to focus on the facts of the trial and legal process, without having to divert attention to making sure that we were being faithful to the period. Since Oswald was dead (both in reality and in this mock-trial scenario), a criminal trial would be difficult to pull-off. Instead, we created a plausible scenario where the Oswald’s family was hoping to cash in on a life insurance policy. But the policy would not pay out if the holder committed a felony. Thus, the Oswald family challenged the insurance company’s decision to withhold benefits to his descendants. What followed was a civil trial that finally litigated the domestic aspect of the Oswald Case in what we called “The Trial of the Century: Oswald”.

While students from Criminal Justice classes were arguing the case on strictly legalistic terms, Political Sciences students were involved as background experts: students in the “International Relations” and “Comparative Politics” classes acted as country and leadership experts on different governments and organizations that were interacting with the United States at the time of the assassination, such as the Soviet Union, European countries and NATO. Students in the “Presidency” class served as experts on a variety of domestic conspiracy theories (on who was “operating” behind Oswald) that have circulated over the past 50 years, including the CIA, FBI and Mafia. Students learned a great deal about their subject area in the context of the larger class. This experience took place as a graded class project. Support was provided to both the plaintiff and defendant throughout the process until the trial at the end of the semester (7).

The ARLE faculty coordination team met regularly during the Summer 2017 to plan and develop the learning exercise, and then actual ARLE mock-trial took place over a Friday and Saturday in November 2017. The ARLE team was able to secure a respected former judge to preside over the trial in order to add another layer of verisimilitude to the proceedings. As with the mock-election the years before, local media covered the case as a learning exercise open to the public to attend. The jury was comprised of volunteers, and because of the high visibility of the experience, there was no shortage of students willing to join in. We had interest to staff two juries, one that served as the actual jury, and the other that consisted of jurors that were eliminated after voir dire. Neither of the juries knew which of their groups was the actual jury, and they all participated as though their jury was the true decider.

In addition to the jury, dozens of students, faculty members, school administrators and members of the local community attended the trial. Once again, within the context of the University’s
blended-courses and technologies, this event was live-streamed across the world so family members and others curious about the outcome could enjoy the hard work of the participants, as well as other students from Saint Leo Centers in different locations. Most students in Political Sciences courses were called to the stand as expert witnesses in their respective fields, and successfully withstood examination and cross-examination, while sticking to their well-rehearsed researched version of events. In the end, the main jury found Oswald guilty. In the context of the case, this meant that the insurance company did not need to pay out the benefits to the Oswald family. Coincidentally, the alternate jury comprised of members dismissed during voir dire found the opposite! In future iterations of this learning game, we would like to place cameras in the deliberation room to record the reasoning used by the jury to reach their own decisions so that we can compare the different results and use this as an additional post-fact learning tool.

This process was successful for all classes involved, including Political Sciences. All students were able to learn a great deal about an important period in political history from a variety of different perspectives (legal, domestic, international, communications, and conspiracies), but perhaps more importantly, they were forced to work on their individual critical communication skills and team-efforts, while faculty strove to coordinate multi-disciplinary assignments and the mock-trial between all classes. Preparing witnesses involves a great deal of research, but answering questions in front of hundreds of people in a courtroom setting was a new experience for many of our students and valuable to build their self-confidence in public speaking. By observing in this mock-trial context the interaction of the different elements of the legal system (judges, prosecutors, defense, jury, experts, witnesses, security), the ARLE game has emerged as both a solid blended learning tool and a recruiting ground for careers-preparation, because many of our students are actively planning their future careers or are exploring Law School as a realistic professional goal (8).

Saint Leo University plans to continue to stage in the future infrequent multi-disciplinary mock-trials, provided they contain also a strong political component where all types of Political Sciences students can serve as experts, alongside their Criminologist colleagues. Essential in this context is to continue faculty supervision as a group, with both types of students and classes assembled together for briefings, because the negative element that emerged out of the intense preparation for ARLE mock-trials was the deep-seated rivalry and unwillingness to cooperate between students in Criminal Justice and Political Sciences, where the former who were in-charge of the trial setting discounted completely the latter expertise and field, refusing to consider or use their role as pre-trial experts because the Political Scientists’ international and diplomatic knowledge as experts challenged the pre-ordained way the Criminologists as Prosecution and Defense wanted to envisage the trial as a purely domestic legal proceedings with only minor international input. This enraged the Political Science students who strenuously insisted that all legal challenges (from either Prosecution or Defense) meant to prove that Oswald had, or had not, acted as a “foreign agent”, and related conspiracies tied to this or that enemy country (USSR, Cuba, or Red China) or government agencies (CIA, FBI) or non-state actors (Batistas Cuban exiles, or the Mafia), required detailed expert-witnesses who had to first recount the geo-strategic background of the Cold War and positions of each major country involved to provide circumstantial or decisive proof or debunking each conspiracy theory. Only in this way could the Insurance company debunk legally Oswald’s family claim by proving his actions
as part or not of a global conspiracy tied to the Cold War. This clash of visions among students shows the need to counter “tunnel-vision” among students who rigidly apply and defend only their own institutional positions learned in class (9).

Finally, concerning adapting gaming to international affairs Professor Marco Rimanelli has also experimented on compressing the ARLE model into a two-parts in two-weekends war-game simulation on one of the most important current international political crises on “Crimea and East Ukraine Secessionism: Russia vs Ukraine/E.U./NATO/U.S./U.N., 2013-2018”. This will become at Saint Leo University a graded Cap-Stone experiential assessment for both first-time students in his introductory courses (POL-295 “International Relations”, POL-110HA “Democracy”) and more advanced classes (POL-323 “Comparative Governments”, POL-426 “Diplomatic History/Foreign Policy”, POL-428 “International Law & Organizations”), as well as available courses by Instructor Orlando, by applying the original global crisis-simulation he successfully launched in 2014 at John Cabot University in Rome, Italy, as part of his 2013-2014 U.S. Fulbright-Schuman Chairship Award with its related multi-university teaching and research. This international triple crisis-simulation on the Ukraine (Maidan Revolution in Kiev, Crimea, Eastern Ukraine) involved students from different Political Sciences classes working together to re-enact the current Russo-Ukrainian crisis and international clash (with the U.S./NATO/E.U./U.N. supporting pro-Western Ukraine against Russia) over pro-Russian Ukrainian insurgent secessionists (Crimea and Eastern Ukraine) and NATO/E.U./international sanctions against Russia.

This faculty-led gaming exercise mirrors traditional war-games (used at the Pentagon, U.S. State Department and CIA) in which the student-players are led through the crisis’ timeline, key stages and actors to then develop a plausible future conflict-resolution scenario. This faculty-led war-game exercise provided student-players with background information on the timeline of the 2013-2018 Ukrainian crisis and conflicting political interests pursued by the major Powers (Russia, Ukraine, U.S.A., Germany, Great Britain, France, China), international organizations (North Atlantic Treaty Organization/NATO, European Union/E.U., United Nations/U.N.) and non-state actors (pro-Russian ex-Ukrainian President in exile, pro-Russian Ukrainian secessionists in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine, international media, demonstrators, terrorists). As all students become familiar during class-time with the basic issues at play, and each parties’ claims and counter-claims, they also become able to re-enact the 2013-2017 time-line of events and diplomatic duels in the first part of the gaming exercise during an initial two-days weekend war-game. Then they can re-enact with realistic confidence their chosen roles and take over specific personae out of the official players roles, often with most students re-enacting 2/3 different roles in multiple policy settings (based on multiple roles vs the numbers of student volunteers) (10).

The policy roles rehearsed by student-players focus on these actors: U.S.A. (U.S. Presidents Barack Obama (D) to Donald Trump (R), Vice-Presidents, National Security Advisors, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Secretary of Homeland Security/C.I.A.); Russia (Russian President Vladimir Putin, Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev, Foreign Affairs Minister, Defense Minister, FSU Intelligence Chief); NATO (Secretary-General, Supreme Allied Commander-Europe/SACEUR, North Atlantic Charter/N.A.C.); E.U. (President, Foreign Affairs Secretary, Security Chief, EuroParliament); U.N. (Secretary-General, Security Council 5 Veto permanent Powers -- U.S.A./Russia/Great Britain/France/China -- and biannual rotating members, General Assembly; International Court of Justice); pro-West Ukraine (Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko, Foreign Affairs Minister, Defense Minister, Intelligence Chief); pro-Russian non-state secessionist actors
(pro-Russian ex-Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich in-exile after the Maidan Revolution in 2013-14, pro-Russian Ukrainian secessionists in Crimea in 2014 and Eastern Ukraine in 2014-18, pro-Russian demonstrators, pro-Russian terrorists); and international non-state actors (international media, anti-Russian demonstrators, Islamic terrorists).

The key policy-decision positions to be debated and re-enacted by students are: U.S. White House NSC; Russia’s Kremlin; NATO’s NAC; E.U.’s Secretariat; U.N.’s Security Council and General Assembly; Ukraine’s Kiev government; and pro-Russian secessionist hide-away. As a blended campus war-game all these policy players have to meet in different classrooms, relabeled by their flags, to develop decision-making positions and resolutions, and then announce them to both other international diplomatic counterparts in their own rooms ahead of their own decision-making proceedings, as well as public press-releases to the international media. On-line students at Saint Leo University Centers and military bases can also participate in this blended exercise through instantaneous video-conferencing (with the technical limitation that VTT is available only in major auditoria: TECO, Selby, Boardrooms A-B-C, or the Library), experts and policy contributions and mini-videos on smart-phones via Discussion Board postings displayed on scroll-down screens, as well as live-feeds on iPhones monitoring (11).

In the second part of the gaming exercise during a follow-up weekend war-game all student-players were able to re-apply their policy roles and national interests rehearsed previously along the 2013-2017 timeline to a new rational possible alternative policy future for 2018 to bring this international crisis-simulation to a successful conclusion or an explosive surprise end. Thus, student-players were forced to pursue both free-wheeling (students-initiated from their respective policy roles) and controlled policy interactions (by faculty’s hidden involvement to stir-up the diplomatic waters through secret initiatives or surprise events) with related responses and changes in their respective policy positions until they could arrive to an agreed conclusion spinning the same lessons-learned of the original crisis’ timeline in whichever way the student-players saw it fit and logical as end-result of their polities and crisis-simulation. In this context, the faculty made proceedings more difficult and uncertain by challenging each player with uncontrollable interactions of hostile non-state actors: demonstrators; pro-Russian terrorists against Ukraine and secretly controlled by the Kremlin; or Islamic terrorists (Al-Qaeda, ISIL) attacking a key international gathering as targets of opportunity (U.N., NATO or E.U.) to provoke uncontrolled Western reactions and chaos. In the end, the students-players can rationalize their current and desired policy positions, and the collective push and pull of each actor’s interactions with others in an uncontrolled end-result by promoting either diplomatic conflict-resolution, or an explosive escalation of the crisis into an uncontrollable wider conflict.

To conclude, all these successful experiential-learning blended exercises have as educational goal to bring together both campus and on-line/Center students in contemporary war-games, mock-trials, mock-Presidential elections and also traditional Model U.N. remote exercises. The lessons-learned is that through planning and faculty control of the learning materials and gaming exercise proceedings, the students become exposed to the complexity of contemporary international diplomatic interactions or domestic political and legal scenarios, with their ability to rouse the public opinion and bring the student-players to live through their actions each policy decision and their consequences to the best of their abilities. Finally, the costs of staging these experiential-learning blended exercises remains limited (in the case of multi-disciplinary or single-
discipline classes coordination), while their proceedings and conclusions are filmed and posted on YouTube and Saint Leo University’s website as a visual record for advertisement on academic activities and future training of a new generation of student-players in similar scenarios (12).
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