

# Chapter LXXI

## Children as Critics of Educational Computer Games Designed by Other Children

**Lloyd P. Rieber**

*The University of Georgia, Athens, USA*

**Joan M. Davis**

*The University of Washington, USA*

**Michael J. Matzko**

*Independent Consultant, USA*

**Michael M. Grant**

*The University of Memphis, USA*

### ABSTRACT

*We have long worked collaboratively with middle school students to help them design their own educational computer games. An interesting question has emerged from this work: Do students, **other than those who do the designing**, find the games to be motivating? We gave a classroom of middle school students the opportunity to play educational games created by other middle school students. These students' opinions of the games were studied and compared to their actual play behavior. This study also explored the reasons behind the children's play behaviors and critiques through interviews. Important game characteristics identified by the children included the following: (1) storyline or context; (2) challenge; and (3) competitive affordances, especially those that promoted social interaction. Interestingly, two game characteristics touted in the literature were **not** found to be important to these children: (1) integration of a game's storyline and educational content; and (2) a game's production values.*

## INTRODUCTION

Electronic gaming has become an integral part of the everyday lives of children, and they devote much time to gaming activities (Gee, 2003; Prensky, 2001, 2006; Provenzo, 1991; Turkle, 1995). Children also spend tremendous amounts of time in school. Unfortunately, children often find schoolwork uninteresting and disconnected from their lives. Student motivation continues to be one of the most difficult aspects of teaching (Ames, 1992; Ruenzel, 2000). We have long wondered if there is a way to merge the natural interests of children outside of school with the demands placed on them inside school.

One effort to do so is Project KID DESIGNER, in which elementary and middle school children have been given the opportunity and support to design their own computer games to teach classroom content (Noah, Nolan, Sharma, Matzko, Bourdeau, & Rieber, 1999; Rieber, Luke, & Smith, 1998a; Rieber et al., 1998b). While schools have typically resorted to extrinsic motivating factors, including reward systems, praise, and punishments, Project KID DESIGNER has relied on the students' intrinsic motivation based on their personal goals, objectives, and curiosities. Project KID DESIGNER has also freed the children from external criteria for how their products would be judged. Instead, the children generated their own criteria, though negotiated in design teams, for what makes a superior game.

The historical and philosophical roots of Project KID DESIGNER are founded on principles closely associated with constructionism (Harel & Papert, 1991; Kafai & Resnick, 1996; Papert, 1991; Rieber, 1996; Rieber, Smith, & Noah, 1998c). Consequently, the focus of Project KID DESIGNER has been on the role of the "child as designer" of computer games. Project-based approaches typically have students design and build working prototypes or other artifacts which represent, at least in part, their understanding of the content on which the design is based. Learn-

ing from these approaches comes from ways students must translate their understanding of the content into a design that can be shared in a public forum. Such a design process also helps students to see where gaps or inconsistencies exist in their understanding. In our previous research, we have used a research methodology best known as design research (Brown, 1992; Cobb, Confrey, diSessa, Lehrer, & Schauble, 2003; Edelson, 2002). With this methodology, "the researcher sets a pedagogical goal and finds out what it takes in terms of materials, organization, or changes in the technology to reach the goal" (Newman, 1990, p. 10). Among the advantages of using design research are that it provides a useful perspective for theory development and it produces results that are directly relevant to the improvement of school curricula (Edelson, 2002).

Some of the most powerful examples of project-based learning are when students work collaboratively in design teams. A good example is a study by Kafai and Ching (2001) in which elementary school students developed computer projects in teams about neuroscience. Kafai and Ching found the team-based project approach afforded many unique opportunities for discussions about science *during* the design process. Planning meetings gave students an authentic context to engage in systemic discussions about science. Team members who had prior experience in the team project approach often extended these discussions to consider deeper relationships.

A key assumption in all project-based approaches is that the students will find the project authentic and relevant (Blumenfeld, Soloway, Marx, Krajcik, Guzdial, & Palinscar, 1991). One way to determine this is to look at what children do with computers when given the freedom to choose. As Papert notes, a good computer project "must have roots in the culture of children; it must feel to a kid like it is connected with the kinds of things that kids do, and in particular with the kinds of things that kids do with computers" (1996, p. 114). Papert contends that the two best

21 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: [www.igi-global.com/chapter/children-critics-educational-computer-games/20146](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/children-critics-educational-computer-games/20146)

## Related Content

---

### Automated Event Recognition for Football Commentary Generation

Maliang Zheng and Daniel Kudenko (2010). *International Journal of Gaming and Computer-Mediated Simulations* (pp. 67-84).

[www.irma-international.org/article/automated-event-recognition-football-commentary/47206](http://www.irma-international.org/article/automated-event-recognition-football-commentary/47206)

### The Play of Persuasion: Why "Serious" Isn't the Opposite of Fun by Nicholas Fortugno

Nicholas Fortugno (2009). *International Journal of Gaming and Computer-Mediated Simulations* (pp. 81-88).

[www.irma-international.org/article/play-persuasion-serious-isn-opposite/3961](http://www.irma-international.org/article/play-persuasion-serious-isn-opposite/3961)

### Book Review: The Esports Education Playbook Empowering Every Learner Through Inclusive Gaming

Alvaro Brito (2022). *International Journal of eSports Multidisciplinary Research* (pp. 1-4).

[www.irma-international.org/article/book-review/302077](http://www.irma-international.org/article/book-review/302077)

### Engaging in Play through Assistive Technology: Closing Gaps in Research and Practice for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities

Fiona S. Baker (2015). *Gamification: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 1097-1112).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/engaging-in-play-through-assistive-technology/126106](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/engaging-in-play-through-assistive-technology/126106)

### Creativity and Digital Games: A Study of Developing Creativity Through Digital Games

Werner Walder Marin and Pollyana Notargiacomo (2023). *Research Anthology on Game Design, Development, Usage, and Social Impact* (pp. 1121-1139).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/creativity-and-digital-games/315532](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/creativity-and-digital-games/315532)