

Appendix 1 – changes in relation to the SWIM1 role-playing game

All phases have been renamed.

	SWIM1	SWIM2
Phase 1	Task initiation	Creative idea development
Phase 2	Pre-focus exploration	Creative pre-focus exploration
Phase 3	Focus formulation	Critical focusing
Phase 4	Information collection	Critical, analytical research
Phase 5	Search closure	Conclusion, reflection and broader perspective
Phase 6		Exam and critical assessment

Phase 1/Act 1 – Creative idea development

In SWIM2 phase 1, we wish to stress the value and importance of creative idea development – i.e. to get some ideas on the table and work with them. This element is not present in SWIM1.

In SWIM2, focus has shifted to an earlier stage in the process. In SWIM1, for example, the speaker mentions that the study group is about to come up with a preliminary problem definition. Still, the “right answer” is that they should take care of formalities first. This is often confusing to the player who believes that he/she is farther on in the process than is actually the case.

In SWIM2 formalities are no longer a main concern. From experiences with SWIM1 and conversations with Kuhlthau, we have decided to stress creative idea development as the early phases usually are the hardest. It is often difficult to get started.

Thus, the right answer (strategy) is no longer that of character profile 2 (competencies), but that of character profile 3 (creativity).

Phase 2/Act 2 – Creative pre-focus exploration

The characteristics of the phase are made plain – i.e. the students have a lot of ideas, but also feel frustrated and uncertain of how to proceed. The presence of “the uncertainty principle” is emphasized.

A new feature is the occurrence of two conflicts instead of one. In SWIM1, act 2, the conflict arises when the study group must decide on what to do next (choice of method and information resource). In SWIM2, act 2, the first conflict concerns their own work process. That is, first they discuss where they are, then they discuss the nature of their information needs, and finally they discuss what to do next.

The information specialist in act 2 was not present in SWIM1. In SWIM2, the information specialist acts as counsellor¹ and coaches the study group through a discussion about work process and their present information need. The method is based on the four basic information literacy abilities – recall – summarize – paraphrase – extend – mentioned by Kuhlthau (*Seeking meaning*, p. 141). Thus during her session with the study group, the information specialist makes the students reflect and acknowledge what they have learned, and describe the actions, needs and emotions that characterise the phase. The player either chooses the right answer or it is given by the information specialist; i.e. that they need to form a general view of the project.

The second conflict is similar to the one in SWIM1. It concerns the study group's disagreement regarding choice of method/information resource in terms of solving their present information need.

Phase 3/Act 3 – Critical focusing

There are two conflicts instead of one. Furthermore, it has been an expressed wish to let the project advisor play a far more central part in the game than was the case in SWIM1. However, there is a clear distinction between the role of the information specialist and the role of the project advisor. The distinction is partly based on Kuhlthau's descriptions of formal and informal mediators and partly on our own perception of the advantage of emphasizing those points in the "process" where one may benefit from the use of mediators regarding information search process, project content and choice of method.

With regard to the project advisor in act 3, the study group has gone through a highly creative process and reached a point where they have acquired a "sense of direction" and are now ready to choose focus. The project advisor helps them regarding choice of method and focus by coaching them in connection with their problem selection.

Phase 4/Act 4 – Critical, analytical research

The information specialist in SWIM1, act 4, who sparks the group's conflict regarding how to go about their in depth search for information, has been moved from act 4 to act 2 in SWIM2. This is partly because we believe that the need for professional assistance is greater in the beginning of the process and partly for the sake of variation in the game.

In SWIM1, character profile 3's (Thor) tendency to always suggest "using the Internet" may easily be perceived as a continuous surface approach to information search. In SWIM2, act 4, character profile 3 (Jacob) suggests using key theorists instead as an indication of his switch from a Fast Surfer to a Deep Diver approach in the course of the game.

¹ Cf. Kuhlthau's description of "the counsellor".

Phase 5/Act 5 – Conclusion, reflection and broader perspective

There are no major changes compared to SWIM1.

Phase 6/Act 6 – Exam and critical assessment

Although the player is not actively involved in any choices/interaction in act 6, it may well be perceived as a final sixth phase in which the study group express and reflect on what they have learned. Thus contrary to SWIM1, act 6, in which the project advisor and external examiner merely inform the study group of their grade, right and wrong choices and their consequences, the group's own reflection and acknowledgement is expressed far more clearly in SWIM2. The project advisor is coaching, not informing, the group. The recommended information search strategy emerges from the project advisor's and individual group member's discussion at the exam. Thus, the choices, consequences and recommended strategy are summed up to the player.