# Student-Faculty Summer Research Program Application Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Faculty Member:</th>
<th>Sarah W. Chandler</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>2/28/2005 format MM/DD/YYYY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position or Title:</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:sallywchandler@gmail.com">sallywchandler@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Student 1:</td>
<td>Jacklyn Lopez</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>2/28/2005 format MM/DD/YYYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone (Home):</td>
<td>7328029138</td>
<td>Cell:</td>
<td>7322770477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sallywchandler@gmail.com">sallywchandler@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Level (Senior/Junior, etc.):</td>
<td>sophomore</td>
<td>GPA:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits Taken:</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Student 2:</td>
<td>Joshua Burnett</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>2/28/2005 format MM/DD/YYYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone (Home):</td>
<td>7325414681</td>
<td>Cell:</td>
<td>7377154004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TheLast1Alive@aol.com">TheLast1Alive@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Level (Senior/Junior, etc.):</td>
<td>sophomore</td>
<td>GPA:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits Taken:</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title of Project for which Support is Needed: New Pedagogies for New Literacies: Integrating Insider Mindsets into College Composition Classrooms

Abstract of Project (In less than 50 words): Our SpF4-project documented differences between insider (internet generation) and newcomer (print generation) patterns for communication, problem solving, and conceptualizing space within literacy practices surrounding video gaming. We propose to deepen analysis of these differences as a way to identify effective patterns for insider/newcomer communication which can enhance teaching with technology.

**Questions to be Answered in Students Narratives (SEE NEXT PAGE)**

Kindly structure your narrative on the following pages using the following sub-headings, please remember to keep it to 1,000 words or less. (The specified area will expand automatically with narrative).

- Academic Program - Major(s) and Minor(s)
- History - A list of past research activities related to your academic program in which you have engaged
- Prospects - How do you anticipate this project will benefit you?

**Questions to be Answered in Joint Project Narrative by Student(s) & Faculty (SEE NEXT PAGE)**
a. Context - How the project relates to important issues in your discipline  
b. Scope and Impact - Describe the project and how it will benefit Kean, the students and the larger discipline  
c. Goals and Methods - List the goals to be achieved and the methods used to achieve them  
d. Timeline - When the project started/will start and when it will be completed  
e. Plans for Dissemination - What types of publications/presentations will this work lead to and in what venues (please provide a tentative list)  
f. Detailed Budget with Justifications

Questions to be Answered in Faculty Narrative (SEE NEXT PAGE)

Kindly structure the narrative on the following pages using the following sub-headings, please remember to keep it to 1,500 words or less. This limit does not apply to the list of past research activities (sub-heading ‘c’).

a. Faculty Prospects - How will this benefit you in your academic career and research agenda  
b. Level of Interaction - How much interaction you anticipate with your students during the course of the project (be explicit)  
c. Describe what the students will specifically be doing during this research activity.  
d. Assess the students’ ability to perform the tasks needed.  
e. List of Peer Reviewed Research Publications/Presentations in the Last Two Years. (format: title, author(s), journal or venue, volume, page, date, etc.)  
f. If you received a previous SpF award, please summarize the goals of that project and how they were met, and list in detail presentations/publications/exhibits/contributions that resulted from the award.

Endorsements

We commit to working together for at least 6 weeks starting June 15th, 2005 and to continue our research during the following academic year. We promise to submit a progress report to ORSP by August 31st, 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Student 1:</th>
<th>Date: format MM/DD/YYYY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature of Student 2:</td>
<td>Date: format MM/DD/YYYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of Student 3 (if applicable):</td>
<td>Date: format MM/DD/YYYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of Faculty Member:</td>
<td>Date: format MM/DD/YYYY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Please mail a signed hardcopy of this application to ORSP IN ADDITION TO the electronic submission made to orsp@kean.edu with the subject line “SpF Program.”
NARRATIVE BY STUDENT 1

Jacklyn Lopez

Academic Program:
My intended major is English with teacher certification, and has been for many years. In addition to teaching secondary Literature, I hope to teach a creative writing course. I intend to have a double minor in media arts and theatre, my favorite elective classes thus far in my college career.

History:
Last year, I participated in the SpF4 program with undergraduate Joshua Burnett and faculty member Dr. Sally Chandler. The goals of our project, "Composing Virtual Bridges," were to discover differences in how insiders (internet generation) and newcomers (print generation) learn, determine the effects, and discover ways to shorten the mental gap between them. We had gathered a lot of interesting data by taking turns playing video games, taking notes, observing behavioral differences and similarities, and coding. Our observations and notes resulted in a discovery of many fascinating branches stemming from our subject, such as differences in constitution of cheating, different perceptions of reality, video games as a rite of passage, differences in media and story-telling, and violence in media as a few examples. In fact, we wish we could research and present them all. We chose a few of the most interesting ones and planned our talks.

We are currently participants of this program and, so far, have made one talk and it was a huge success. The presentation concentrated on the difficulties which may arise, such as communication and information gathering methods, within a research project group consisting of both insiders and newcomers, and gave specific examples from our experiences. Our talk also promoted the book our article on the same subject will be printed in.

We have been accepted to give two additional presentations; one is panel presentation in San Diego at the Composition and Rhetoric area of the Conference of the National Popular Culture Association. My presentation, “Violence, Puberty, and You!” talks about how video games, especially violent video games, are used as more of a rite of passage than an entertainment. These games teach important life-lessons never taught in classes, which, contrary to popular belief, help children grow into strong-willed people, ready to face the working world and their lives. We have also been accepted to the Computers and Writing Conference at Stanford, where we will be promoting our article which will appear in an upcoming book edited by Danielle DeVoss and Heidi McKee.

Prospects:
This project will give me good experience with big research projects, which will be very useful during my college career, especially during graduate school. It will also help me gain experience towards my English major. As an English teacher, one has to understand the various ways to help his or her students build literacy skills and story comprehension. Of course, one cannot teach a person who has different assumptions from the teacher. This project helps me understand what some of those differences may be and put those in consideration.
I also feel that this project is important to the future of teaching. As times change, so does our technology. More than ever before, there is a need for courses concerning computers, teachers, and the classroom because of the increasing effects computers have on the student. This is not an official statistic, but I would say at least three out of every five students are insiders, putting into consideration both computers and video games. These aspects do affect the student body and make it difficult to learn by the same methods as a newcomer teacher. We must find a way to clarify these differences and teach new tutorial methods. Perhaps I will eventually have the chance to teach a college course of faculty digital literacy.

NARRATIVE BY STUDENT 2 (If Applicable)

Joshua Burnett

Academic Program
I am currently a sophomore enrolled at Kean University in the Broadcast Communications program. I was accepted to Kean as a journalism major; however, at the end of the Fall ‘03 term, chose to switch to Broadcast Communications as it was more in line with one of my career goals, to work in some facet of radio - be it as an on-air personality, a show producer or engineer, station manager, or one of many other various radio-related professional positions. I’ve co-hosted a radio show on Kean’s radio station, 90.3 FM WKNJ, since the Fall ’03 semester and plan to continue doing so until I graduate.

I’ve always enjoyed writing in various levels - poetry, essays, newspaper articles, and so on - and want to incorporate that into a degree from Kean as well. Therefore, I plan to declare a minor in English following my sophomore year, focusing either in writing or journalism.

History
Along with Dr. Sally Chandler and fellow Kean student Jacklyn Lopez, I have spent the past year working on an SpF4-funded research project, "Composing Virtual Bridges: Collaborative Study of What Video Games Can Teach about Learning and Literacy in which we researched and analyzed literacy practices in video games and digital technologies. Our first paper and presentation, "Report from the Digital Contact Zone: Collaborative Research and the Hybridizing of Cultural Mindsets," looked at how myself and Jackie, as students who have grown up with video games and digital technologies, worked with Sally, who grew up and learned in the print generation. This paper and presentation gave me a deeper insight into how I (as well as many of my peers) learn, the differences in beliefs and assumptions between many professors and their students, and the differences between insider and newcomer mindsets (as described in our papers).

Prospects
The benefits of this project have been nearly immeasurable, from personal to professional to academic. I’ve found a realm of study I can be excited about researching, a subject that has not been studied over and over again in years past. The learning principles we studied over the summer were exciting and interesting, and have very real impact on the way teachers and students communicate and understand each other. In specific relation to my major, this project has provided me with many opportunities to communicate through speeches, roundtable discussions, peer-reviewed journal articles, and research papers. The project has even had an effect on the way I participate and learn in various classes here at Kean. I often find myself referring back to our methods of research when researching a paper for class, or thinking of our research on insider and newcomer mindsets when trying to bridge the gap with a professor who is not as technologically savvy. One time in particular stands out during the Fall ’04 semester, when I made a presentation in class utilizing Microsoft Powerpoint as well as a handful of internet
The professor took me aside after class and said that he was amazed how attentive the students were during my presentation, and how difficult he found it to use technology in that way. I talked to him briefly about how, through this project, we had examined the different mindsets of most students and professors and that by using our research, I was able to construct a presentation that would be interesting and informative to my peers.

I look forward to continuing our research for another year. I feel as though we’ve only hit the tip of a gigantic, largely uncharted iceberg, and the idea of delving deeper and into wider-ranging aspects is highly appealing. I believe that this project will have a great effect on the way students and professors communicate in the classroom, and am highly interested in pursuing that belief more in-depth. The subject matter that we’ve been researching over the past year is a very new area of study worthy of being perused to it’s fullest extent – the area that we have been studying is relevant to today’s world and could conceivably change the way that teachers across the board teach material to their students, both here at Kean and at other institutions. When both professors and their students become aware of the differences each carries in their assumptions, values, and beliefs in regard to modern technologies, the internet, and so on – their differing mindsets – the gulf between them can be bridged. Through the course of SpF5, we hope to start building that bridge. It’s a great challenge, but I look forward to it.

JOINT PROJECT NARRATIVE BY FACULTY MEMBER AND STUDENT(S)

Background

"Tech-Wrecked Teaching," in The Chronicle of Higher Education, reports that college instructors who use technology often use it badly. The article emphasizes that "technology can make teaching more interactive, and that is what students are drawn to..." but observes that in practice, smart classrooms often become places where faculty use technology in ways which lead students to cruise the net or check email (Jeffrey R. Young, 2004, v. LI No 12, Sec A, p. 31). Research on "new literacies" - the emerging social practices for creating and interpreting meanings which have evolved with the internet -- suggests that one reason faculty tend to use technology in ways which students have trouble relating to, is that students and faculty have different expectations, values and beliefs about how to communicate, solve problems, and interact within digital spaces. These differences in assumptions, or mindset, are characterized by literacy researchers as the basis of many conflicts and misunderstandings arising between newcomers -- members of the print generation -- and insiders --individuals who have come of age with the internet.

New literacy researchers Colin Lankshear and Michele Knobel claim that so long as newcomer administrations and faculty remain unaware of differences between insider and newcomer mindsets, digital technology can not realize its full potential in teaching and research, and the digital communication gap between insiders and newcomers will widen (2003). A study of video gaming and literacy can help bridge this gap because social and literacy practices surrounding video gaming are concrete examples of preferred insider patterns for teaching, learning, and communicating; through understanding the "good principles of learning" embodied in gamers' practices, newcomers and insiders can work together to create pedagogies for effective teaching across digital generation. (James P Gee, 2003). In our project, "New Pedagogies for New Literacies,", Jackie Lopez, Josh Burnett and I focus and deepen work from SpF4 on how newcomers and insiders interact and communicate in "digital contact zones," to develop both theory and practice to allow "teaching with technology" to realize its full potential in college composition classrooms (Danielle DeVoss and Heidi McKee, eds., forthcoming).

Scope and Impact
Work from SpF4 identified and classified 1) classes of literacy competencies acquired through computer gaming, 2) specific competencies, problem solving strategies and identities acquired within specific gaming contexts; and 3) how insider/newcomer differences played out within our cross-digital-generation research project. During work for SpF5 we will deepen our characterization and theorization of particular aspects of insider/newcomer interactions relevant to teaching college composition courses. Specifically, we will explore how differences in newcomer/insider mindsets bear upon: 1) effective digital pedagogies for teaching college composition; 2) conceptions of ownership as they relate to cheating and plagiarism; and 3) conceptions of identity and engagement across digital generations.

Our project will benefit the larger discipline by developing theory to integrate insider principles for literacy and learning into the academy's predominantly newcomer practices. For example, one primary difference between newcomer and insider patterns for learning identified by the literature and our research is that: while newcomers prefer linguistic directions provided before engaging in a learning task, insiders prefer "learning through doing". SpF4 documented Jackie and Josh's preferences for "learning through doing" both within gaming and conducting our research project. Just as Jackie and Josh "learned" video games through playing games rather than reading directions, they "learned" qualitative research methods -- not through reading theoretical works (like Sally) but through an interactive process of talk with Sally, modeling research methods observed in examples (both print and experiential), and receiving feedback. They looked up "directions" only at the point of need. By further characterizing insider/newcomer literacy practices, we can generate specific, usable suggestions for teaching with technology in ways which engage insider students.

Because this project is conducted at Kean University by Kean students, findings will be both relevant and available to our faculty and students. Also, through collaboration with the Kean Instruction Team, the GENED program, and the Composition program, findings can provide a basis for professional development initiatives relevant to teaching with technology.

Goals
1) Continue data collection to develop theory and practice for teaching college composition across insider/newcomer differences.

2) Revise presentations from Spring 2005 as articles for peer-reviewed journals (1)

3) Develop panel presentations on effective teaching across insider/newcomer difference in mindsets.

Methods
As in SpF4, we will use qualitative research methods to identify, characterize, and classify literacy practices surrounding gaming (2). Last summer we established clear, accountable "codes" (language for naming, classificating, and categorizing studied phenomena) to describe social practices surrounding gaming, game structures and functions, and our preferred (newcomer v. insider) practices for conducting research. We will deepen and extend our codes as we collect further data and review the research. We will use this additional data and analysis to develop particular, detailed theory and practice regarding: 1) features of pedagogies for effective communication across digital generation; 2) newcomer/insider conceptions of ownership as they relate to cheating and plagiarism; and 3) conceptions of identity and engagement across digital generation.

Timeline
March 15 - May 15 (completion of SpF4 work; set up SpF5 work)
2. Submit abstract for 2006 Conference on College Composition and Communication.


4. Kean University Faculty Research Forum (March 30)

5. Query Computers and Composition editor Kristine Blair.

May 15 - June 15
1. Data collection: deepen and focus analysis of insider-newcomer mindsets as they relate to composition pedagogies and "cheating" -

2. Work on talk for Association of Internet Researchers (AOIR) panel in October, 2005.


4. Draft Computers and Composition article.

June 15 - August 15
1. Presentation: Computers and Writing Conference, Stanford University (June 16).

2. Meet twice weekly to take gather and analyze data;

4. Circulate drafts for AOIR talk and Computers and Composition article.

August 15 - September 15
1. Meet twice weekly to collect data and work on papers.

2. Submit Computers and Composition article.

3. Submit AOIR paper (due September 1).

4. Check calls for papers for spring conferences, edited collections, and composition journals; develop abstracts for appropriate venues.

September 15 through academic year
1. October 5 - 9, AOIR panel; begin revising panel presentation as article

2. Continue to meet once a week to: prepare/rehearse talks, draft and revise manuscripts, and make decisions about future presentations; collect data as necessary.

Plan for dissemination
College Composition and Communciation (CCC) and College English are among the most important and most widely read journals regarding composition theory and practice. Computers and Composition is the most important journal on teaching composition with technology. Publications in these journals will reach our focus audience. Because our work has implications
across disciplines, we also plan to present/publish work in two interdisciplinary fields related to our focus on literacy and technology: cultural studies and internet research.

Presentations for 2005-2006:


3. Panel: Conference on College Composition and Communication (planned): March 2006


Journals and edited collections:
Computers and Composition Online: An International Journal (article on mindset differences and composition pedagogy)

The Journal of Popular Culture (article on mindset differences and conceptions of identity)

CCC, College English, or some other composition and pedagogy journal (article on classroom practice to address mindset differences)


Budget and justification
1. Books (for list + price, see Appendix2) : $600.00
   Justification: While several of these books are available in our library, these books need to be part of Jackie and Josh's private "library," available for the constant reading and re-reading necessary for beginning scholars to become members of the research community.

2. Arrangement to lease (or purchase) laptops with software packages through Kean University for Jackie and Josh (this number is not definite) approx $1000 x2
   Justification: Our research process for collecting, analyzing, and writing up data is dependent upon access to a computer. During SpF4 we were often limited by the fact that only Sally had a laptop. All data was collected on Sally's laptop and many times Josh and Jackie could not open or respond to data or MS drafts because they did not have access to computers which could handle files we exchanged. At conferences, Jackie and Josh had to rely on Sally's computer to transport and present materials. While they burned CDs of their presentations, Sally had to run their powerpoints, and provide software for last minute changes.

Game rental: $150
Justification: We have a sufficient "library" from last years research, and can supplement data through renting games, if necessary.

Total request: $2750
NARRATIVE BY FACULTY MEMBER

How will this benefit your academic career and research agenda?

My research focuses on patterns for communication across difference, and how literacy practices (the social interactions which surround the creation and interpretation of texts) mediate that communication. Our SpF4 gathered data on an emerging dimension of difference -- differences between digital generations. My discipline studies literacy, the creation of texts, and how to teach composition, and within composition studies "digital difference" is an pressing issue.

Researchers including Cindy Selfe and Gail Haiwisher, Colin Lankshear and Michele Knobel, Richard Lanham, James Inman, and Donna Alverman have drawn attention to the need for print generation faculty to conceptualize college composition programs in terms of internet generation students. As we welcome more and more members of the internet generation into our classrooms, understanding communication dynamics between the "print generation" (most faculty) and the "internet generation" (most students) is paramount for successful teaching. This project positions me to contribute to the study of communication dynamics which are of enormous import for effective teaching in general, and for the effective teaching of college composition in particular. Last year's SpF4 project allowed me to contribute several talks and one publication to the academy's consideration of these issues. A second year would allow us to work from 2004-05 into a series of articles based on talks presented during Spring 2005. These articles establish my standing in the community of researchers focused on generational difference, technology, and composition studies.

The fact that my work with Jackie and Josh is a collaborative study with (rather than a study conducted on) gamers and internet generation students has made our research especially valuable to the academy. For our research process, Jackie, Josh, and I engage in reflective, interactive exploration of differences between print and internet generation practice. Through this process we have developed detailed, contextual descriptions of how insider literacy practices play out within particular processes for thinking, composing, and conducting the work of the academy. This information is of crucial interest to composition teachers and to the academy in general. Because internet generation literacy practices have not yet been widely studied, and because there are very few self representations by internet generation students, our work has met with high success in terms of being accepted for presentations and publication, and it should continue to do so in the future.

b. Level of Interaction

During work for SpF4, Jackie, Josh and I met on the average of twice a week throughout the summer for data collection and analysis, and once a week to compose papers and plan presentations during the academic year. Data collection sessions were from 2 to 5 hours; meetings for composing papers were about 2 hours. During initial data collection, Jackie and Josh learned methods for qualitative data collection and analysis through taking notes and developing analyses patterned on my practice. They collected and analyzed data, received feedback, and then developed more notes and analyses which incorporated that feedback. While this year's data sessions may include less overt "teaching," we found that even after Jackie and Josh had mastered basic qualitative methods we continued to learn from one another through
interactive data collection. We found this process particularly effective for developing data on differences between the digital generations' literacy practices. Because of this, we expect to continue to collect and analyze data in collaborative, reflective meetings, and to compose papers through collaborative processes.

During meetings where we develop abstracts for future publications and conferences or where we work on manuscripts and presentations, we brainstorm ideas (one of us always takes notes on the laptop while the others talk), analyze data, exchange and revise drafts, gather information from internet sources, and talk through materials we have agreed to read. As due dates approached, we tended to meet more frequently. In addition to face-to-face meetings, we use email to exchange drafts, provide and request references, exchange and edit notes and analyses of data, and arrange meetings. This process was very productive for us, and we expect to continue this for SpF5.

While joint work composing papers was interactive and collaborative, in SpF4 Jackie and Josh also produced single-authored talks, and a joint-authored (just the two of them) paper through mentored work with me. We also expect to continue this pattern for SpF5.

c. What student(s) will specifically be doing during this research activity.

Jackie and Josh will participate in all work described in the joint narrative. This includes:

- reading and discussing the research literature;
- choosing games/genres for analysis;
- engaging in participant observation of video gaming;
- engaging in reflective documentation and analysis of our research process;
- coding game structures, player activities, and higher level interactions, as well as research processes and interactions;
- categorizing and theorizing data about gaming and literacy practices surrounding research;
- theorizing data and analyses in light of research on literacy practices and gaming theory;
- developing presentations and articles to report findings.

d. Students' ability to perform the tasks needed.

I had the pleasure of working with Jackie and Josh as students in my advanced composition course during Spring, 2004, and I have now worked with them for nearly a year on our SpF4 project. With respect to their abilities to conduct high quality research -- both have demonstrated outstanding aptitude for identifying data which embodies key concepts related to our study, solid composition skills for articulating those concepts in print and in oral presentations, and exceptional creativity and presence when giving talks at venues where they are often the only undergraduate speakers.

In addition to being strong writers, good speakers, and accomplished gamers, Jackie and Josh are reflective, analytic thinkers. Their analyses in their paper (see Appendix 3) and in their panel presentations have been outstanding.

e. List of Peer reviewed Research/Presentations in the Last Two Years.

Publications.
Burnett, Joshua, Jacklyn Lopez and Sally Chandler. "A Report from the Digital Contact Zone: Collaborative Research and the Hybridizing of Cultural Mindsets." accepted for publication in Digital Writing Research: Technologies, Methodologies, and Ethical Issues. eds Heidi A. McKee and Danielle N. DeVoss (forthcoming)


Scholarly presentations:


"Do plagiarism detection services protect or subvert intellectual property rights? Whose rights and for what ends?" Chair, round table discussion special session on Intellectual Property at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, San Francisco, March, 2005.


"Designing a Writing Center for Wayne State University Students." Presented at Academic Success Summit organized by the Wayne State University Academic Success Center. Detroit, Michigan, February, 2003.

"So you think you're teaching writing: Writing Center tutors talk back." Presented with Joan Mullin at a regional conference on teaching writing organized by Wayne State University. Detroit, Michigan, February, 2003.
f. Goals of SpF4 and how they were met, and list of publications/presentations resulting from the project
Goals:
1) Conduct collaborative research within a model which empowers subjects (students) and which allows for articulation of perspectives often silenced by traditional research paradigms;

2) Develop data and theory within the emerging fields of electronic literacies, gaming, learning and teaching;

3) Develop a series of short, "do-able" explorations of data to generate high-quality publications/presentations;

4) Lay groundwork for long-term, student-directed research at Kean for developing student-centered innovations in teaching, course offerings and research within the composition program.

We successfully addressed all goals from our SpF4 project. With respect to the first goals, as analyzed in "Report from the Digital Contact Zone," our research process empowered Jackie and Josh to "change" the way I originally planned the project. With respect to goals two and three, we gathered data to support 3 separate topics, and produced talks/papers on each of these topics: characterization of differences between insider/newcomer literacy practices (Jackie and Josh's paper); patterns for communication across digital differences("Report from the Digital Contact Zone)," and differences in patterns for conceptualization of identity and self (papers for the Composition, Rhetoric and Popular Culture Area of the Conference of the National Popular Culture Association, San Diego, March, 2005.

With respect to the final goal, the SpF4 program itself has laid groundwork for long-term, student-directed research in general. We have contributed to this endeavor by developing and documenting one process for student-directed, collaborative research with faculty which can be used within a range of disciplines here at Kean.

Publications:


Presentations:
"Writing Research in Digital Spaces: Issues, Challenges, and Possibilities," Roundtable discussion chaired by Heidi McKee and Danielle DeVoss, with Will Banks, Joshua Burnett, Sally Chandler, Doug Eyman, Michelle Eble, Colleen Reilly, Julia Romberger, Michelle Sidler, Beatrice Quarshie Smith, for Computers & Writing 2005, New Writing and Computer Technologies, at Standford, June, 2005 (accepted).


"Violence, Puberty, and You: Video Games and Coming of Age." Jacklyn Lopez.
Talk for panel (with Josh and Jackie) at the Composition, Rhetoric and Popular Culture Area of
the Conference of the National Popular Culture Association, San Diego, March, 2005 (accepted).

"Writing Research in/for Digital Contexts," roundtable discussion chaired by Danielle DeVoss
and Heidi McKee, with Colleen Reilly, Joshua Burnett, Jacklyn Lopez, Sally Chandler, and Jim
Porter, for Writing Research in the Making, at University of California, Santa Barbara, in
February 2005.

Appendix 1: Reasearch methods from SpF4

Data collection and analysis is recursive, and generally will move through the following steps.
1. Collect data through observing game play, analyzing games, and documenting research
practices.
2. Engage in focused coding of insider-newcomer practices; refine coding systems (include
categories to characterize: concepts of: identity; "cheating;" preferred practices for
learning games, taking notes, coding, organizing and writing up data; patterns for abstraction;
etc).
3. Document literacy practices surrounding gaming (observe both "live" and video clips of play,
conduct interviews of each other, analyze reflective reconstructions, etc; begin collection of data
on other gamers);
4. Refine, extend codes/characterizations of player patterns of play/ such as patterns for:
   identifying important features of the game;
   negotiating/memorizing two digital spaces;
   negotiating/interpreting storylines;
   transferring "skills" from one game to the next;
   capitalizing on interactions with other players;
   connecting to other gamers.
5. Refine, extend codes/characterizations of patterns for conducting research/such as patterns for:
   gathering background information (eg cruising the net v. reading "classic" texts. . .)
   taking notes (eg player centered, game centered, character centered. . .)
   generating codes (eg in vivo codes v abstract characterization, and etc.)
   representing categories (narrative, descriptive, classification. . .)
   drafting essays/presentations (patterns in organization, relationships to digital writing. . .)
6. Periodically re-establish reliability through reflexive analysis of notes and coding.
7. Use data as a basis for interrogating existing characterizations of composing/interpretation
strategies of insiders/newcomers
8. Theorize basis for transfers between identified aspects of game and academic literacies.
Appendix 2: Book list

We have already purchased necessary books on gaming, gaming history, and gaming literacies. Books on this list fall into 3 classes: collections on composition and digital technology (4 & 5); important works on particular issues in composition and digital technology (1, 6, 7, & 8), and collections we can use to make interdisciplinary connections (2&3). While two of these books are in our library, as we write papers on our proposed topics, we will make regular and repeated use of these texts. What is more, these texts will especially useful for both Jackie (an education major with major in English/writing) and Josh (a communications major with a proposed second major in English) as the continue work in their fields.


$32.50 (x2)


$29.95 (x2)


$49.95 (x2)


$46.95 (x2)


$25.46 (x2)


$72.00 (x2)

$22.50 (x2)


$27.00 (x2)

Total: $514.72  (Prices are estimated from Amazon and may change).

Total request: $600.00
Describing the Digital Generation Gap: 
Differences between Insider and Newcomer Mindsets

By Joshua Burnett and Jacklyn Lopez

How Josh, an insider, plays video games

[Josh loads Silent Hill 2 and picks up the controller]
Josh: Jackie promised she wouldn't be annoying and keep telling me what to do.
Jackie: Why is everybody laughing?

Josh sets difficulty: Action = normal, Riddle = normal.

Josh: (looking at street names) Here! There you go! Benson, Harris, these are all the last names of members of a band. (Sees a zombie) I still don't have any weapons! . . . I guess I just follow the blood stains.

Jackie: It's always great to follow the bloodstains. (Jackie points to a section on the screen)

Josh: I saw that! (mock irritation)

Jackie: No, I didn't say anything!

Josh: You lifted your hand! (Josh goes the way Jackie pointed) Oh, I got a health drink.

-- from Sally's notes on Josh playing Silent Hill 2: 07/19/04

How Sally, a newcomer to gaming and the internet, plays video games

Sally: . . . How do I walk? (Josh shows her) How am I gonna get out? This is going to take all of my concentration! (makes her character leave the room) YES! If I have to fight a zombie, I'm dead . . . What does it mean when it [the controller] vibrates?

Jackie: What are you doing when it vibrates?

Sally: I'm just holding it.

Jackie and Josh are trying not to laugh

Jackie: No, in the game.

Sally: Oh . . .

-- from Jackie's notes on Sally playing Silent Hill 2: 07/19/04

In our study of video gaming, literacy, and learning, we spent many hours watching each other play video games. Our intention was to document gamers' literacy practices -- social practices for discovering, understanding, creating, and communicating meaning and information. We took notes on what gamers do as they play games. Our intention was to help college instructors understand the internet generations' literacy
practices. Because most instructors were socialized in literacy practices from the print generation, we felt documenting gamers' literacy practices could provide important information about how to communicate effectively with students.

As illustrated by the above excerpts, we found striking differences in the ways members of our research team played games. In the above notes, Josh, a student and a long-time gamer, draws upon many experiences with games and digital spaces. He wants to figure the game out for himself. In contrast, Sally, a faculty member who is a relative newcomer to the internet and only began playing video games for this study, asks questions and does not understand many of the conventions associated with virtual spaces. One view on these differences is that they arise from lack of experience, and that as print-generation players, or newcomers, gain more experience they will soon understand online spaces in the same ways as members of the internet generation, or insiders. Studies suggest that this is both true and not true. Researchers who have studied differences between insiders and newcomers have found that socialization in material versus virtual spaces causes individuals to think differently (Gee, 2003; Lankshear and Knobel, 2003; Selfe and Haiwisher, 2004). That is, insiders and newcomers operate from different mindsets -- assumptions, values and beliefs about space, knowledge, and identity. These different mindsets cause newcomers and insiders to understand virtual spaces quite differently.

John Perry Barlow was the first to discuss differences between internet and print-generation mindsets. He referred to these different mindsets as "native" and "immigrant," respectively (Barlow in Tunbridge, 1995). In their overview of researchers' characterizations of mindsets, Colin Lankshear and Michele Knobel use the terms "insider" and "outsider" / "newcomer." In our discussion we use "insider" and "newcomer" because these terms avoid the political/ethnic implications of the terms
"immigrant" and "native," and because we feel that they also suggest an ability to change and re-orient with on-going experience. That is, newcomers can become insiders as they become more familiar with digital spaces.

An overview of these researchers' characterization of differences between newcomers and insiders is provided in Table 1. Our research supplements this general representation with particular, contextual definitions of insider and newcomer mindsets. It also illustrates the kinds of confusions and miscommunications which arise when insiders and newcomers work together (Burnett, Lopez and Chandler, forthcoming). In general, we found that differences between newcomers and insiders were not so black-and-white as the literature suggests; rather individual variations arose from the always changing nature of experiences in both virtual and physical spaces. Newcomers may enter virtual spaces with unexamined assumptions, values, and beliefs that reflect socialization in print. This mindset will influence their interpretation of online experiences, but that mindset is also "changed" by experiences in digital spaces. More importantly, newcomers change through interactions with insiders.

In this paper we focus on defining insider and newcomer mindsets with respect to three categories of difference: differences in conceptions of virtual space; differences in assumptions, values, and beliefs about knowledge; and differences in conceptions of self and identity. We use examples from our study to illustrate how general differences in mindsets play out as newcomers and insiders interact. We believe documenting these differences can help newcomer faculty gain a better understanding of how insider students learn and participate in the classroom. This increased understanding of difference can help lessen the miscommunication and misunderstanding between
newcomer teachers and insider students.

**Differences between Insider and Newcomer Mindsets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptions of space</th>
<th>Insiders</th>
<th>Newcomers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- basis for valuing</td>
<td>virtual products increase in value with increasing familiarity</td>
<td>material products increase in value with scarcity, and exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- freedom</td>
<td>freedom connects to unlimited access to information</td>
<td>freedom connects to protection of property and safety of the material self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- learning</td>
<td>learning through doing; what is learned often remains embodied</td>
<td>learning through abstract, linguistic articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- socialization</td>
<td>newcomers are brought up to speed as quickly and as much as possible; collaborative interactive</td>
<td>controlled, competitive access to space; institutional policing of access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conceptions of knowledge**

| - nature of knowledge | dispersed, relative, and emerging; connected to processes for storage and access | located in the self, categorical, and fixed; independent of processes for storage and access |
| - expressing knowledge | embedded, multi-modal | primarily linguistic, abstract |
| - creating knowledge  | knowledge is created through collaborative, interactive processes | knowledge is immanent to physical spaces; it can be observed, discovered, |
Mindset differences associated with conceptions of space

Most differences between insider and newcomer mindsets derive from the contrasting experiences, consequences, and communication systems structured by virtual as opposed to material spaces. Lankshear and Knobel point out that virtual spaces are "practically limitless" so that, at least in theory, there is "room' for anyone and everyone to participate to the fullest extent of their interests and capabilities" (2003, p. 58). What is more, the products of virtual spaces are "non-physical stuff: . . . ideas, information, theories, data. . ." (p. 53).

One result of unlimited space and the creation of non-physical products is an economics where the value of digital products increases as more users discover and learn how to use them. This economics is in contrast to the economics of material space, where increased supply and use result in decreased value for a particular product. For example,
things such as "designer" clothes go down in price as they becomes more available, while internet resources are of little value unless they are widely available and experience high use. A second result of the ever-increasing number of virtual products is a need for what Richard Lanham calls "human-attention structures" (Lanham, 1993). Since virtual spaces are infinitely vast and constantly growing, users are currently producing more products than any one person can keep track of, evaluate, or learn how to use. This results in an increasing demand for structures to organize information to help users find and understand what they need (Lanham, 1994).

These two features of virtual spaces' economics structure insider mindsets. For example, insiders value "learning through doing" over learning through instruction or receiving information up-front as abstract, linguistic statements. As insiders "learn through doing" they explore, restructure, and develop attention structures for the spaces they participate in. This insider valuing of learning through doing assures that experienced users will continue to make online spaces more accessible and usable by creating attention-structures.

Insiders valuing of learning through doing corresponds to the "situated, experiential, and embodied forms of learning and thinking" James Gee observes as favored by gamers (Gee, 2003, p. 76). In the opening excerpt from our notes, Josh is playing a game which Jackie has played before, but he does not want her to tell him how to play. He wants to learn the game through playing it. If he follows Jackie's directions, he might miss discovering a feature of the game she has not yet noticed. This preference for self-directed learning is in contrast to Sally's approach. She asks for instruction. In our analysis, we found that Sally asked for directions and solutions to game problems more frequently than Jackie and Josh. While Jackie and Josh sometimes asked for information, Sally asked for much more specific instruction, even after she "knew" what
she was supposed to do. This connects both to insider values for learning through doing, and to newcomers' tendency to "learn" through articulating what they are learning in language.

Features of virtual space also influence social interactions. Because more participation by more users results in more "elites," individuals who create attention structures and the other non-material products necessary to use online space, the socialization of newcomers to "becoming 'insiders' to practices, as far as possible, and as quickly as possible" is core insider value (Lankshear and Knobel, 2003, p. 68). Our notes contain many instances of insiders placing a high priority on "getting newcomers up to speed." In the following example, we see Jackie instructing Don on how to win a "fight."

Don is taking Randy's place (who played the training). Don is an experienced gamer but has not played this game before.

**Don:** What do the buttons do?

**Jackie:** (shows) Energy, kick, punch, guard.

**Don:** Do you use the shoulder buttons?

**Jackie:** Upper punch (explains).

Randy adds information from his experience. All players present relate suggestions. Jackie and Don fight.

**Jackie:** [noticing that Don does not understand how to make his character run] Oh yeah, to run, tap the ( shows).

**Don:** OK.

**Don:** What about the up and down?

What is remarkable here is that Jackie is in the process of "fighting" Don as she provides instruction. This means, she is attending to what Don needs to know, even as she is striving to "beat" him, and she is trying to beat him. Though video games are often competitive, competition plays out within complex terms. Gamers engage the collaborative, supportive mindsets characteristic of insiders in their play. It is important to win, but creating a game where everyone is playing at their best, is at least as important for insiders as winning. These interactive, collaborative values derive from the unlimited dimensions of virtual spaces.
Differences in mindset with respect to knowledge

Our notes illustrate a number of differences between newcomers and insiders with respect to knowledge and the processes through which it is created. For example, in the opening quote where Sally is playing Silent Hill 2, Sally immediately begins asking questions: “How do I walk? How am I going to get out? What does it mean when [the controller] vibrates?” Sally’s method for obtaining knowledge is to ask questions which will produce linguistic representations of what she needs to know. This indicates an underlying assumption that knowledge can be abstracted from experience and stated in language. She expects that Jackie and Josh can teach her, or that she can learn important features of the game without experiencing them herself. On the other hand, when Josh played the game, he makes a guess as to what he should be doing in the game (“I guess I’ll follow the blood stains...”) and then learns the game through an interactive process where he acts on generalized principles about how the game works, often without ever stating them in language. For insiders, part of the enjoyment and satisfaction of learning is to gain knowledge as an emerging entity rather than being told everything from the beginning.

Another example of insiders and newcomers' different assumptions about the nature of knowledge and what counts as "truth" is in this same set of notes. As Sally is watching Josh play Silent Hill 2, Josh enters a space which is dark and a cluster of creatures which appear to be butterflies fly up in front of him. Sally comments that "...butterflies don't fly in the dark...these people have their nature facts wrong." This indicates an (unconscious) expectation that virtual spaces will or should reflect patterns and rules from real world spaces. It also suggests an assumption that knowledge consists of "discovered" facts, as if knowledge can be accounted for in terms of a single principle or is derived from one set of rules or one space. In contrast, insiders believe that
knowledge is created in many different forms, and that it emerges in conversations between individuals within a given space. Because nothing is "real" online, insiders would never conceive of knowledge as one fixed fact”; rather they think of knowledge as relative, emerging, and connected to the place where it is created.

**Differences in conceptions of self and identity**

During the course of our research, we realized that it’s difficult for newcomers to integrate their print-world identities with the character they control in a virtual space. For instance, when Sally took notes at the beginning of the project, her representations of her character were written as if she were watching a television show rather than as if she were "in" the game. She referred to her character in the third person. In contrast, Jackie and Josh merged players' and characters' identities and represented themselves as the character they played when the spoke. For example, Sally wrote, "Josh made his character pull a stake from the fence . . ."; and Jackie wrote, "Josh picks up the light . . ."

Sally demonstrated her mindset with respect to identity even more in the opening example.

**Sally:** . . . What does it mean when it [the controller] vibrates?

**Jackie:** What are you doing when it vibrates?

**Sally:** I'm just holding it.

*Jackie and Josh are trying not to laugh*

**Jackie:** No, in the game.

**Sally:** Oh . . .

Sally is alarmed by the vibrating controller and asks what it means. Rather than telling her, Jackie resorts to insider methods for instruction and asks Sally what she (meaning the character Sally was playing in the game) was doing when the controller began to vibrate. Sally answers by saying that she wasn't doing anything. She (her physical self) was just sitting there.
Jackie and Sally’s reactions are consistent with their relative positions within insider and newcomer mindsets: Sally’s defining context was a physical body in the material world, a person playing a video game. Jackie’s defining context was that of the rules of the video game’s space. For Jackie, it was as if she became a part of the game.

**Conclusions**

Because faculty members at most universities are primarily newcomers, and because more and more students are insiders, learning to communicate across digital generations will continue to be an important issue for all of us. While our research illustrates some particular communication and mindset issues which arose within our project on video games and literacy, the limited number of subjects in our study and the scope of our data means we cannot offer broad generalizations or detailed descriptions of how a given population of insiders or newcomers will behave or interact. Because of this, we conclude by calling for more studies on literacy practices which surround digital spaces - studies that develop more detailed characterizations of insider and newcomer mindsets, the way newcomers and insiders communicate, and the way they work together.
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