Appendix

The research reported in this book comes from two case studies that were approved by the institutional review boards at the universities where I was affiliated during the research. Both case studies used similar data collection, coding, and analysis, which had two goals:

1. Better understanding the places and operations of transient literacy *in situ* by observing and video recording individuals and groups spending time using networked mobile devices in shared social places, and
2. Contextualizing the use of these materials and purpose of these interactions through qualitative interviews, including general questions about space use, technologies, and social contacts for composing practice as well as specific questions related to the specifics of their time spent during prior observations.

Choosing Sites and Participants

I chose these two sites because of familiarity, as well as because they represented different relationships to transient literacies. The Technology Commons was a designed environment for temporary university learning, while the Gone Wired Café had no official relationship to mobile work. Different demographic groups also tended to use each space. My choices for recruiting individual participants differed to some degree in each site. At the Gone Wired Café, I approached four individuals who I saw observed working routinely over a number of weeks in the café. My cases thus focus exclusively on individuals who had incorporated the coffeehouse into their work routines, and three of the four cases were graduate or professional students (Ed and Kathryn [Chapter 1], Kim [Chapter 3]) with in addition to one working professional (Dave [Chapter 2]). In the Technology Commons, I recruited individual participants to fit with patterns of place, technology use, and social positioning that I observed frequently over several weeks, while also attempting to choose a diverse set of cases in terms of gender and race. This meant that several case participants were not routine or regular users of the center.

Data Collection

My data collection methods were similar in both sites. Both involved an initial observation phase. During six weeks in 2009, I conducted participant observation within the Gone Wired Café for five days a week at varied times of the

day. During participant observation, I observed the café's macro activity, noting prevalent technologies and software, observing when the café contained the most people writing, and determining where individuals who wrote often located themselves. I sat at different locations of the café, recorded observations, and composed several hundreds of pages of handwritten field notes, which I later synthesized in typed research memos. During six weeks in 2012, I worked with a research assistant to conduct similar observational research in the Technology Commons. During this observation, we made use a more systematic observational approach—the "sweep method" (Given & Leckie, 2003)—which allowed the two data gatherers to observe in similar ways. The sweep method, in particular, enabled us to account for the number of people, technologies, and social arrangements that were present in the learning center at particular moments of time for several weeks. Using a shared analytical tool, we "swept" each zone of the Technology Commons, and we both also collected handwritten or typed narrative field notes about spatial use during participant observation, which we synthesized into typed research memos. The goal of this phase of research was to serve as a preliminary guide for familiarizing myself with each place, its materials, and its users before turning toward more specific cases. This phase was invaluable in later analysis of both video and interview data.

Following the observation phase, I recruited individuals in both sites willing to participate in case research. I found most individuals to be surprisingly open and willing to share their routines and their time with me. As I told those who agreed to talk with me, I regularly work in public places, sometimes for writing extended prose but more often for taking care of other symbolic tasks (checking email, transcribing interviews, discussing writing with others or some time to look at social media) and I almost always do that work with virtual and material resources for information and social support. Gone Wired and the Technology Commons attract writers who find these spaces to be useful or comfortable, even if temporarily, when others would not. Thus, it is important to remember that this research traces those who already choose these locations for their work. Each case study participant was engaged in multiple writing projects, routinely communicated with people geographically removed from his or her current physical location, and used social media either moderately or extensively during time spent working.

After identifying participants and obtaining consent, I filmed a work or leisure session participants conducted at the café or social learning space. My decision to videotape and analyze participants' practice was motivated by situated action research. The goal in videotaping was to access both on-screen and off-screen practices. I disturbed individuals as little as possible and positioned the external video camera positioned to capture a view of their laptop

or other computing device screens, the artifacts present on their tables, and their bodies within the space (from behind). This enabled me to observe and analyze how individuals encountered and manipulated various physical and virtual objects within their workspaces at multiple levels of scope, to capture tacit practices that potentially would be overlooked in retrospective self-reports, and to record conversations and immediate social encounters.

After analyzing work sessions, I contacted case participants to schedule at least one and sometimes more semistructured, stimulated recall interviews. Four videotaped participants from the Technology Commons did not respond to interview requests and thus were only included in analysis of observations. During interviews, questions addressed habits for organizing work space and time across locations, practices and motivations for working in the particular site, as well as specific details related to operations I analyzed in video recordings. These questions expanded the story of the interactive sequences that participants exhibited in their work and leisure sessions by contextualizing their micro movements within their personal perceptions, which helped to highlight what I would later identify as both proximities and orientations.

Data Preparation, Coding, and Analysis

For participants at both sites, I transcribed interviews, fieldnotes, and the dialogue of filmed work and leisure sessions when applicable. For textual data, I segmented conversational data by conversational turns and fieldnotes by sentences. For embodied data in video format, I watched video sessions closely and repeatedly and segmented the actions of work sessions into sequences, noting the amount of time spent in each action. I entered these data into a relational database for further coding procedures.

I practiced two kinds of coding. The first was a thematic coding of both textual and embodied data. During this analysis, I categorized materials taken up during the action of literacy, as well as forms of interaction among materials. These categorizations led me to the dimensions of interaction and materiality presented in this book. Second, along with analysis for themes, I also time-mapped work sessions to trace sequences of interaction. For the purposes of this analysis, I drew on Slattery's (2005, 2007) analysis of central mediating artifacts or resources that held participants' attention during unfolding action as a way to make Lucy Suchman's interactional approach more tangible. I used these coded work sessions to create visualizations of writing activity at the micro level. These visualizations identified patterns of use for networked technologies such as microblogs (i.e., Twitter), social networking sites (i.e., Facebook, LinkedIn), blogs, and email as well as other material resources like word processing programs, phones, and other external technologies.