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GAME PLAYING WITH A BITE! AN EVALUATIVE SIMULATION

by

Robert G. Johnson
Hyak Junior High School
Bellevue, Washington

Through involvement in an evaluative simulation, students will develop insights into the factors influencing manufacturing locations. In addition, thinking and group skills are developed by organizing and designing a proposal for industrial location. This activity goes beyond most simulations in that the evaluation of students is an integral part of the activity. Evaluation serves not only its regular functions but also increases motivation and the sense of achievement.

Strategy for Teaching.

The activity can involve two or more classes. In this discussion, Class 1 will be a chamber of commerce group seeking a printing plant, and Class 2 will simulate the industry judging the proposal. Concurrently, Class 2 will be writing proposals to attract an automobile factory, and Class 1 will simulate the manufacturer judging the proposals.

Class Guide:

Day 1
- Divide class into five groups. Each group is a city Chamber of Commerce.
- Each group designs a proposal to attract an industry specified by the teacher.
- The students design their own city (i.e., size, population, industrial factors...) in order to attract the industry.

Day 2
- Completion of proposals.

Day 3
- Student groups assume a different role...they will be manufacturers.
- Teacher leads the class in developing criteria for manufacturer's location.
- Groups rank the proposals from the other class... 1 - 5.
- By adding all rankings for each proposal an over-all ranking is
### (A) -- THE U. S. PACIFIC NORTHWEST POPULATION SHIFT 1960-1970: (All changes are positive.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland Sphere of Influence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1,766,687</td>
<td>2,056,171</td>
<td>287,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Idaho</td>
<td>508,717</td>
<td>536,132</td>
<td>27,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Washington</td>
<td>235,109</td>
<td>276,324</td>
<td>41,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,512,513</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,868,627</strong></td>
<td><strong>356,114</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Sphere of Influence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Washington</td>
<td>2,618,105</td>
<td>3,076,568</td>
<td>458,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Idaho</td>
<td>158,474</td>
<td>164,980</td>
<td>6,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Montana</td>
<td>274,194</td>
<td>308,472</td>
<td>34,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>226,167</td>
<td>294,607</td>
<td>68,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,276,940</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,844,627</strong></td>
<td><strong>567,687</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Pacific Northwest</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,789,453</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,713,254</strong></td>
<td><strong>923,801</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Seattle Sphere, % of Total Increase in Population:**

 Seattle Sphere, % of Total Population 1960 = 56.6% of Total  
 Seattle Sphere, % of Total Population 1970 = 57.3% of Total

### (B) -- SEATTLE AND PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREAS: (All changes are positive.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle (King, Snohomish and Pierce Counties)</td>
<td>1,428,803</td>
<td>1,804,660</td>
<td>371,513</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland (Multnomah, Washington, Clackamas and Clark (Washington) Counties)</td>
<td>821,897</td>
<td>972,593</td>
<td>170,596</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Population Difference Between Seattle and Portland Areas:**  
606,906 - 832,067 = 200,924

POST EVALUATIVE SIMULATIONS DISCUSSION

1. Dynamics of evaluative simulations.
2. Benefits of evaluative simulations.

- Motivation benefits.
- Directs attention to specific area.
- Expansion beyond areas normally evaluated.
- Provides greater degree of realism.
Day 2.
Chamber of Commerce, seeking magazine company.

Day 3
Automobile manufacturers rank Chamber of Commerce proposals.

Day 4
Proposals return with rankings.

Figure 1. Flow-chart of the strategy.

CLASS II
Industry seeking automobile Chamber of Commerce

CLASS I
Company "Time-Lite" seeking magazine Chamber of Commerce

Figure 1.