

Young People, Mobile Phones and Creative Media Practices at School

Reijo Kupiainen

Abstract

Digital media has notably changed the lives of young people who use digital devices such as mobile phones as part of their everyday life, communication, social relations, identity building, and creative media production. Mobile phones are used everywhere, even in school where their use is usually banned during lessons. This article concentrates on mobile phone use of students in a secondary school in Finland. Students bring their mobile phone practices to school and break the normal social order of the school in order to create their own space and a sphere of autonomous practices. Students try to find new ways to use mobile phones in the school's learning settings and use it as a creative tool for different media productions, such as photographing, video making and fan fiction writing. Some teachers try to utilise students' media practices and give them room for alternative learning methods.

Introduction

The youth of today are variously known as Digital Natives, Millennials, or Generation M or Y who have grown up with the Internet and social media. They are said to have changed radically, live most of their lives online and have a tendency to multitask and express themselves by creating new information and art forms (Prensky 2001, Palfrey & Gasser 2008: 4). This whole generation is thought to be something completely different from earlier generations – digital immigrants – who have to learn about the digital world and technologies.

The notion of “digital natives” has generated strong debate since Marc Prensky (2001) popularised it in his essay “Digital Natives/Digital

Immigrants” (Thomas 2011a). After ten years the term has seen disdain as well as acceptance. The most optimistic views are based on so-called “techno-evangelism” and on three main assumptions (Thomas 2011b, Bennett et al. 2008: 777). According to these assumptions young people are said to 1) constitute a homogenous generation that speaks a different “technological” language from earlier generations, the “digital immigrants”, 2) have different learning styles from preceding generations of students, and 3) demand a new way of teaching and learning.

David Buckingham (2011) argues that these kinds of views typically overstate the extent and effects of technological change and differences between generations, while understating the diversity within them. There may be as much variation within the digital native generation as between the generations (Bennett, Maton & Kervin 2008: 779, Levy & Michael 2011). We must keep in mind that for example the frequency and nature of young people’s Internet use differs between age groups, socio-economic background and other demographic variables.

In spite of the fact that there are differences within generations digital technology has certainly changed something. As it is argued (Meyrowitz 1985, Morley 2000, Nikunen 2010), new media technologies have made physical boundaries more permeable and transgressed the boundaries of private and public. This can be seen for example in schools where new technology such as mobile phones is part of students’ everyday life and learning. Mobile phones open the school’s communicative space outside the school. In a way they overlay the physical location of the media user (Nikunen 2010: 75, Takahashi 2011). A mobile phone allows students to keep in touch with friends, surf on the Internet, update status information on social networking sites, listen to music, view photos, etc. during the school day. As a small hand device it is easy and unobtrusive to use in school out of the teacher’s control.

In this article I explore what meaning mobile phones have in the school context and how young people use mobile phones in school. My paper is drawn from my research project “Youth, Literacies, and the Changing Media Environment”, funded by the Academy of Finland. The research focuses on media use and literacy practices of Finnish youth, especially at school. This case study applies educational and media ethnography to study the media experiences and practices of 13–16-year-old children in one public secondary school in Finland.

Method

The ethnography was preceded by a quantitative survey on media use among the participants in August 2009. In this article I refer to observations from my notebook, interviews with students and teachers, and my survey (n=305).

The ethnographical fieldwork was conducted between August 2009 and June 2010. The data was collected using fieldnotes and formal and informal interviews. The basis of my data includes handwritten fieldnotes written during observations and at the end of each day.

I observed in the school from three to ten hours a week, mainly in Finnish language and visual arts classes. Most regularly I observed a group of Year 8 students, who had chosen an optional video production course and whose media education was implemented in their learning, more so than in Year 7 and 9.

During my ethnographic fieldwork I conducted 34 formal semi-structured interviews, 26 with students and 8 with teachers. All interviews and some of the lessons in the school were recorded by digital video recorder. All interviews have been transcribed. During my observation I used a photo and film camera in some cases as well. I filmed for example Year 7 students when they presented their own soap opera improvisations in a Finnish language class and students making a film in the video course. A photo camera was used mainly in corridors outside of classrooms. I also photographed some of the students' works that they created in different classes. Additionally, I gathered students' media analyses, essays and video films.

My ethnographical fieldwork was not limited to the school. I also observed some students in their homes when they for example played video games or tried to create a new Facebook profile. Part, but an important part, of my ethnography was so-called *netnography* (Kozinets 2010) or virtual ethnography (Hine 2000), a form of ethnographic research on the Internet and social networking sites. I followed for example some of the students' web logs, YouTube channels, social networking profiles on the IRC-gallery¹ and DeviantArt.

¹ IRC-gallery is one of the most popular Finnish social networking sites among youth. In two years it has lost its popularity to Facebook.

Mobile phone “tactics”

Using mobile phones in school is not a simple activity. Usually, for example in Finland, it is not allowed to use mobile phones for personal purposes in class at all. In primary schools students need special permission from their parents and head teacher to carry a mobile phone in school. Usually it has to be turned off during the school day. At secondary schools mobile phones are allowed but not during class.

However mobile phones are more than technical devices for communication. Rich Ling (2004) and Gitte Stald (2008) have articulated that the meaning of mobile phones lies especially in its social function: the use of the mobile phone includes social practices and identity building. Modern smart phones, which are wirelessly connected to the Internet, are used in most cases for life sharing in networked publics. As mobile devices they are more like small computers than phones in a traditional sense and are used for social networking.

Schools have several difficulties with mobile phones and social networking. Mobile phones are present at school but seldom in any formal learning settings. There are many reasons for banning mobile phones. Using mobile phones in a classroom is disturbing if students hang out on the Internet or communicate with others via text messaging. Moreover there is a danger that mobile phones are used to bully other students by publishing hurtful videos or photos on the Internet or by hurtful text messaging. For example the Trade Union of Education Finland has continually been concerned about cyber bullying in schools.

Because mobile phones are banned students must make their own strategies for the use of these devices in schools. Toshie Takahashi (2011) argues that mobile phones are used in schools *tactically*. He refers to Michel de Certeau's (1984) theory of everyday resistance, in which people undermine imposed power relations. In his theory de Certeau distinguishes between two social forces: production and consumption. Production is controlled through them who have power, who create, maintain and impose disciplined spaces. They control through what de Certeau calls “strategies”, which are processes directed toward disciplining places and maintaining power (Gomez, Stone & Hobbel 2004). In schools, teachers wield the power and mediate the surveillance. According to Steven Hodas (1993) traditional schooling technology, such as the overhead projector and blackboard, enhance the teacher's authoritative position as an information

source and reduce the teacher's physical labour of communicating written texts.

Consumers, like students at school, on the other hand, consume the products of producers; they are constrained to operate within disciplined spaces. "Products" are not only commodities but also discursive orders that define and constrain forms of social practice. Social practices and formal learning at school are largely controlled through strategies but at the same time students are able to make disciplined spaces "smooth" and "habitable" through everyday tactics (Lankshear & Knobel 2002).

De Certeau (1984: 25) gives an example of everyday tactics referring to French practice of *la perruque*. It is the the worker's own work disguised as a work for the employer. The worker, for example, uses a "company time" for his own purposes, takes some time from the company "for work that is free, creative, and precisely not directed toward profit" (ibid.). In de Certeau's theory tactics is an art of the weak, the act of some kind of occupancy. He illustrates this by practices of North African migrants living in Paris. They insinuate into the system imposed on them "the ways of 'dwelling' (in a house or a language) peculiar to [their] native Kabylia" (de Certeau 1984: 30, Lankshear & Knobel 2002). They create their own plural space to be by "art of being in between".

In schools, the students use "school and learning time" for their own purposes by using, for example, mobile phones during class. It is a tactic activity in order to smooth out the school space and make it more comfortable and liveable. This is the sustaining side of tactics, as Lankshear and Knobel (2002) argue: "It is about obtaining some satisfactions, pleasures, and "peace" that help to infuse meaning into everyday experiences and routines."

For the students the use of mobile phones and everyday communicating practices at school make the school space more habitable. Mobile phones are a technology that breaks traditional social order at school and gives students the possibility to create their own time-space and a sphere of autonomous practices in schools (Takahashi 2011).

This sphere includes different kinds of mobile phone use. From the perspective of schooling the most interesting activities are social meaning making and creative practices. This article focuses on these practices more deeply from the point of view of schools' media ecology.

Mobile phones and social meaning making

A school space is pluralized. The students try to make their own time-space whenever possible in order to tactically bring their media practices to school. We can say that mobile phones and other portable media devices are part of a young person's body and identity. My example is Riku, a 15-year-old boy, who uses large red headphones that he carries around his neck almost all the time in school. In an interview he states that he is not able to get on in school without music and his mp3 player: "I get a good feeling and so ... Without music the school day would be boring. Music is important for me" (an interview, Riku, 15, male). Music and the large red headphones are an important part of his image and identity at school. He also showed this by singing, even in classrooms.

This kind of engagement with popular culture and in this case with music is not possible to separate from school: it is a tactic for pupils to make their own room in the school space. Teachers were not happy to see Riku with his headphones listening to music (and singing) in the classroom. Nevertheless these headphones were part of his visible identity and active media practice with a mobile phone.

Mobile phones are an important part of this kind of identity performance. The students find it extremely difficult to be without a mobile phone, and this says very much about its meaning. My interviews confirmed the importance of the mobile phone. Sixteen-year-old Marja said that she had lost her mobile phone the morning of our interview. She said that she would rather be late for school than leave her mobile phone at home. She received her first mobile phone when she was a Year One student at age seven, and the phone has been her social safeguard since then. All important communication happens via mobile phone: "It just has to be [...] If I have the feeling that I have to talk to someone, I call. When I am alone in town I call somebody. Always when I feel lonely I have at least something" (an interview, Marja, 16, female). The mobile phone brings friends near, and there is always someone with whom she is able to catch up. The mobile phone is the most important social communication device for her, more important than any other media device, as she reported.

Students used mobile phones for different purposes. They sent and received text messages, made phone calls, checked Facebook entries, watched You Tube videos, took photographs, shot film clips, made audio tapes and even wrote fan fiction. Corridors during breaks were especially

important spaces for the use of mobile phones. According to my survey at the school 17% of the students used mobile phones during school lessons and 58% during breaks almost every day. Accordingly, 35% of the students used mp3 players during breaks and 6% during lessons. It was impossible for the teachers to continuously keep an eye on the students' use of mobile phones and other mobile devices. During class, checking and sending text messages under the desk took only a few seconds, and if the teacher said something, the mobile phone was already in a pocket or bag.

The students continuously try to make their own space at school and negotiate their place in the school's time-space. I call this the *unofficial school space* that I separate from the *official school space*, which includes formal learning activities, classroom settings and experiences in actual teaching and learning. Official school space has a particular organisation of time and space, interaction between people in formal learning settings.

Mobile phones are used in unofficial school space, in the students' own social space where the teachers are unable to control them or where the students have made room for themselves by negotiation. Negotiation situations were typical during school lessons. The students for example asked permission to listen to music on their mobile devices when they were working on their school tasks alone.

Listening to music is sometimes a personal activity, but often students share their music experiences with others by giving one earphone to their peer. Mobile phones also become communal devices when students change ring tones, watch film clips and surf on the Internet. Unofficial school space differs from the official school space in how it opens peer-to-peer relations where students are able to share their experiences immediately. This space may be outside of the physical school space as well, for example on the Internet. Mobile phones are the most important devices for contacting the outside world because they are independent of place and physical locations. This drives the notion of social presence in a classroom. Even if the students have a physical presence in a classroom they may have a social presence on the Internet and for example social networking sites via their mobile phones.²

Two 15-year-old girls³ told me that a mobile phone is important because they have to access Facebook at school and during lessons.

² For a discussion on social presence, see Stald 2008: 154–155.

³ These girls wanted to use the nicknames Panda96 and Banaanimuusi during the interview.

- Interviewer:* Do you update your [Facebook] status by phone?
Panda96: No, I just check what is happening – friends’ updates – that’s all I do.
- Interviewer:* Is there a lot going on in Facebook during a school day? Aren’t your friends supposed to be at school?
Panda96: Yes, they are also logged into Facebook with their phones.
- Interviewer:* Is it common that students have access to the Internet on their phone?
Banaanimuusi: I only have wireless network access but it is hard to find an open network at school.
- Panda96:* But in our class most people borrow Matti’s mobile phone to get access to the Internet.
Banaanimuusi: We just listened to music on You Tube with Matti, a moment ago.

(An interview, two 15-year-old girls)

Our informal conversation at the beginning of a visual arts lesson shows that the school space and presence in the space is duplicated. Students are present at the same time in the classroom and on the Facebook, even during lessons. Most of the students however do not have access to the Internet via their mobile phones. According to the EU Kids Online survey 36% of Finnish 9–16-year-old children use the Internet by mobile phone or with other mobile devices (Livingstone et al. 2011: 23). If someone has access by phone, others can borrow his or her device. In these cases mobile phones are communal and “public” devices, similar to phones in rural areas, for example in parts of Africa (see e.g. Bruijn, Nymanjoh & Brinkman 2009).

Matti has a 3G phone and access to the Internet. He shares his phone with his classmates who want to check what is happening on Facebook or do something else on the Internet. I asked him what he thinks about this. “Well, it is quite funny when all of them ask me but usually I lend it for a moment,” Matti answered. He thought that he lends his phone “a few times” a day, “a quarter of an hour altogether”. Matti said that usually teachers do not notice it, but on a few occasions they have intervened (an interview, Matti, 15, male).

Mobile phone as a creative tool

Social networking with mobile phones and other devices is part of a media practice that Mizuko Ito (2009: 35 ff) and her research group calls *hanging out*. This kind of participation occurs when people spend time together. It is most of all friendship-driven sociability, where people are for example gaming, sharing and chatting on the Internet. In their interviews the vast majority of teenagers expressed their desire to “hang around, meet friends, just be” (Ito et al. 2009: 37).

In her research Mimi Ito found two other genres of participation in new media ecology. If young people are more interested in new media and its possibilities they are *messing around*. This genre of participation means that people for example play and search for information on the web. The third genre includes creative productivity and is known as *geeking out*. This refers to more intense engagement with the media and interest-driven activity. It is characteristic of young people who are involved for example in some fandom (ibid.).

These genres are not discrete. People, for example, use the Internet in different ways on different occasions. There is a time for active media producing, and there is a time for simply hanging out. In a school’s media environment all genres of participation are present: social hanging out, as we have seen earlier, interest-driven media consumption and more creative media production.

During the digital age media production is made easy for everyone, and young people are early adopters in this area as well. Mobile phones, as we have seen, are more than simply communication devices. Although so-called smart phones are not as common in the hands of teenagers, their phones include a camera and a microphone, which allow different kinds of creative media productions. Beside mobile phones young people use digital cameras everywhere they go.

At the beginning of my ethnographical fieldwork I observed Year 9 students who were visiting the local art museum. Students were viewing some paintings when one of the girls asked the museum guard if it was possible to take photos. When permission was given four of the girls started to take photos of the paintings and of each other. Later I asked one of the girls why she was taking photos. She answered that she would use the photos as background pictures in her mobile phone. (A note from my notebook.) Digital photos are everyday items that are used in different

ways. People also share their photos via the Internet and social networking sites.

Fourteen-year-old Eve publishes photographs, drawings and fan fiction on the deviantArt online community. She is a manga and anime fan and uses her mobile phone for example for fan fiction writing at school. In an interview she told me about her practices:

Eve: In school, when I get inspiration, I write with my mobile phone and later on the computer and from that to deviantArt.

Interviewer: Do you write with your mobile phone?

Eve: Yes, on my memory card, there is lots of free space.

Interviewer: Where do you do it?

Eve: Everywhere, for example if I have nothing to do during breaks at school, I take my mobile phone and write in the notebook. I write everything with my phone keyboard and then save it. Later, when I think that I could write something for deviantArt, I take my phone and copy my texts onto the computer.

(An interview, Eve, 14, female.)

Eve uses her mobile phone's notebook for fictive writing. Several other students publish for example lifestyle blogs, but no one reported that they use mobile phones for writing the web logs even though phone apps, for example for the *Wordpress* publishing platform, are available. As young people progress in their hobby they usually want better equipment.

Fourteen-year-old Gomi, a Year 8 student, uses her mobile phone for film-making at school as well as outside the school. She shares and publishes her films on her web log, which is, according to Gomi, about her everyday life. In her video clips she is just hanging out with her friends at home, in the city and at school. At school the video clips present students' artworks in art class, drawings on the blackboard, eating in the school canteen, hanging out and running in the corridors, etc.

What is interesting in her video clips is that school is seen from the perspective of young people and students. In some of her clips Gomi also make comments about teachers and incidents at school. When these clips are shared on the Internet the school is shown not only as a place for learning but as a social community and unofficial school space where students live and spend time together. The school is shown not only as a place for learning, as the official website of the school tells us, but as a social com-

munity and unofficial school space where students live and spend time together. This kind of creative media producing is part of the tactics that change the order of the space from official to unofficial. De Certeau (1984: 30) writes that tactics use, manipulate, and divert spaces. However tactics do not create a whole new, controlled place. Rather, a tactic is a mobility that surpasses boundaries. In this way Gomi's video making is not limited to the school, but it shows us a seamless transition between school, city, home and the Internet, where school is just one but an important part of everyday life.

Eve and Gomi offer examples of the creative use of mobile phones and other mobile devices in the unofficial school space. One question, of course, is what creative media production is, and are young people in general truly active participants in a so-called "participatory culture"? My survey showed that all young people are not as keen to produce and share their media productions. While 37% of 13–16-year-old children reported that it is important to publish some of their own stuff on the Internet, the importance was much higher in the case of entertainment (81% reported it is important) and social networking (68% regarded it important).

The EU Kids Online (Livingstone et al. 2011: 34) survey found that the most common online activities among 9–16-year-old children in Europe were using the Internet for schoolwork, playing games and watching video clips. These practices are classified as content-based activities, meaning that children consume media contents made by others. These activities are much more popular than participatory or conduct-based activities where children create and share content on the Internet. For example only 11% of 9–16-year-olds reported that they write a web log or have an online diary (ibid.). My own survey showed that 16% of 13–16-year-old school kids write a web log every month or more often. What is more common is to share photos via the Internet and social networking sites. Half of the children according to my survey did this, but does this kind of sharing have anything to do with creativity?

The answer is connected to the question of photographing activity and online life that offer possibilities for different kinds of practices. In most cases photos by young people are simply snapshots of friends and random situations. But as my examples show, taking and sharing photos can lead to more conduct-based activities and interest-driven modes of media production (Ito et al. 2009: 17). Of course, this is not without problems in school context. When students share photos taken in school on their social networking sites they usually do not have their peers' permission. Some-

times this leads to conflicts. For example, the head teacher in my research reported that teachers often have to solve conflicts that photo sharing on Facebook has caused. Students are not fully aware what is accepted in online life and what is morally, ethically and legally problematic and forbidden.

Mimi Ito and her colleagues argue that digital devices and ease of copying, pasting and using of digital media-production tools facilitate experimenting and playing with one's own stuff. Young people start by messing around with their home videos and modifying photos but soon they begin to become more serious about their skills and craft and "develop a hobbyist network to support their work" (ibid.: 58). As with some of the lifestyle bloggers at my surveyed school, they want better devices in order to make better photos and are not satisfied with available design templates for their blog sites. This, of course, does not concern all young people. More important are the affective spaces and networks where young people express themselves and share their feelings, skills and knowledge with others with the same interests. Charles Leadbeater (2009: 21) states that these kinds of communities provide their participants "recognition for the worth of their contribution, the value for their ideas, the skills of their trade". Recognition, participation and collaboration are ingredients in this creativity that requires not only several creative individuals but a supportive context, community, group or organisation. Leadbeater calls this kind of creativity We-Think. We-Think is a social practice: "When We-Think takes hold, what matters is social organisation: how we publish, debate, test, refine and reject ideas so that we think together" (ibid.: 20).

Students with their creative media practices are keen to share and participate in online spheres where they meet people with the same interests and endeavours. Mobile phones are one of many applications that enable a rich communicative habitat and creative environment.

Mobile phones and formal learning

Gomi's interest in filmmaking has its effects at school as well. In Year 7 she made an animation film for history class about the assassination of Russian Major General Bobrikov on 16 June, 1904 in Finland. In Year 9 she made a short film for a civics class.

The task in the civics class for the students was to describe a "life career" of a human being from birth to death. The students were free to use

any kind of content and material they wanted. The aim was that the students represent the whole trajectory of human life within society where there are different normative situations based on law. The students had to find out for example what a person has to take into account in a marriage or divorce, and what a prenuptial agreement, child benefit or housing benefit is. The students used different media platforms and social network sites to present different life careers. They used magazines, animations, children's books, posters, photographs, Facebook sites, Habbo etc. It was a point of pride for the students to invent something new that had not been done by the other students. A civics teacher explained this task in the following way:

A starting point was that at first civic issues are fragmented, but they are related to each other. [...] We speak about autonomous learning. I see that a student has really to deal with information and find information, understand it, and see the big picture. A student has to be active and go through these things. [...] This [task] is especially for students who underachieve in tests or just do not learn from books or can't write proper answers in an essay. Many students who are not so good at tests are good here.

(Interview with a civic teacher, male.)

This is a classical example of the "learning by doing" pedagogy that, of course, has own challenges: it takes time and space. The students may find it difficult to receive personal guidance from the teacher because there are so many students in the classroom, and the teacher can find it difficult to assess the students' very different presentations.

Some teachers know very well that the students have different learning styles and that some of them are active media producers who enhance their skills in creative media practices. The teachers also understand the contradiction between school and out-of-school practices and learning environments. Some teachers even try to find ways to use media devices and mobile phones in formal learning settings. The teachers recognised that a creative media production is an opportunity for some of the students to learn school subjects, and they gave the students room to express themselves in untraditional ways.

One interesting relation between the school and mobile phones is how the students themselves create many initiatives on how to use mobile phones in the classroom. For example in a Finnish language class, Year 7

students had the task to plan a short scene for their own soap opera. In the curriculum a soap opera is part of a learning area called “Media and literary knowledge”. The students planned a scene and improvised it in front of the classroom. One of the groups invented the use of a mobile phone as a recorder of “sound effects” for their soap opera. The mobile phone audio recorder was used in other cases as well. The students for example recorded music for their short film in another Finnish language class using a mobile phone as an audio recorder. Some students searched for pictures from the Internet using a mobile phone and used them as a model in a visual arts class.

Not only the students, but also some teachers invented creative uses for mobile phones in formal learning settings. For example a visual arts teacher said that they sometimes use mobile phones when they make drawing sketches outside of school. The teacher advised the students to take a picture with their mobile phone so that the students could continue to draw in the classroom. Sometimes the students had to prove that they had visited for example a particular checkpoint during a school day, and one acknowledged way to do this was to show a photo from one of the students’ mobile phone to the teacher: “Look, we were there.”

These are only a few examples of how students and teachers find new ways to use mobile phones in formal learning settings. Mobile phones can be helpful devices especially for creative schoolwork because new mobile phones include a camera and microphone, which offer possibilities for media productions and audiovisual integration in the classroom. These however are not the only possibilities. For example the GPS logger of a mobile phone can be used in physical education and geography. The possibilities are unlimited.

Conclusion

Digital devices, for example mobile phones, are embodied in young people’s everyday life in a way that they feel naked and helpless without these devices. They are used to communicating via mobile phones and the Internet, seeking information and sharing their life and feelings via these devices and platforms. Mobile phones are not separated devices but situated in a rich communicative and creative environment consisting of multiple platforms and devices. They are part of the body, identity and everyday practices.

As we have seen these kinds of devices are parts of creative life as well. Creative life and media production include learning but not in the classical teacher-oriented way that Paulo Freire (1970: 77) calls the banking concept of education. Rather, students learn from themselves in peer-to-peer relations and by active problem solving. Mimi Ito (2009: 58) and her colleagues state that young people who are successful in learning technology and media skills sometimes become experts among their friends, teachers and classmates.

Young people's use of mobile devices in schools shows that the boundaries of school space are blurring. Media use is a part of everyday online life, social identity and so-called life sharing. This means that young people share their experiences and information online on different kinds of social networking sites. For example they publish and share videos, photos, writings and drawings made at school on social networking sites and web logs. This sharing ties different physical and virtual spaces together and connect school to the public sphere of the Internet. We can say that the media environment and using mobile phones in schools opens an unofficial school space for the students. Using digital devices is a part of tactics to create an uncontrolled space for social life in and outside physical school boundaries with peer-to-peer relations and identity performances.

Some teachers try to find ways to utilise young people's media practices in formal school settings. The students had the possibility for example to make "video essays" or films instead of written essays. Teachers who used different methods noticed that some students have more motivation for learning and can use their own strengths when they are allowed to use creative media practices.

The students' creative media practices at school show that it is not possible to understand learning as a separate area from the rest of everyday activities. Rather, learning is placed in the context of everyday experiences of participation in the world. Informal and formal learning converge, especially in the context of different media practices.

References

- Bennett, S., Maton, K. & Kervin, L. 2008. The “digital natives” debate: A critical review of the evidence. *British Journal of Educational Technology* 39(5): 775–786.
- Bruijn, M., Nymanjoh, F. & Brinkman, I., eds. 2009. *Mobile Phones: The New Talking Drums of Everyday Africa*. Langaa: RPCIG.
- Buckingham, D. 2011. Foreword. In: Thomas, M., ed. *Deconstructing Digital Natives. Young People, Technology and The New Literacies*. E-book. London & New York: Routledge.
- De Certeau, M. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. By S. Rendall. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
- Freire, P. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Continuum.
- Gomez, M., Stone, J. & Hobbel, N. 2004. Textual tactics of identification. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 35(4): 391–410.
- Hine, C. 2000. *Virtual Ethnography*. London: Sage.
- Hodas, S. 1993. Technology refusal and the organizational culture of schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*. <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/viewFile/687/809> (24/11/2010)
- Ito, M., Baumer, S., Bittanti, M., Boyd, D., Cody, R., Herr-Stephenson, B., Horst, H. A., et al. 2009. *Hanging Out, Messing Around, and Geeking Out: Kids Living and Learning with New Media*. Cambridge (Mass.)/London: The MIT Press.
- Kozinets, R. V. 2010. *Netnography. Doing Ethnographic Research Online*. London: Sage.
- Lankshear, C. & Knobel, M. 2002. Steps Towards a Pedagogy of Ractics. Paper presented at the National Council of teachers of English Assembly for Research Mid-Winter Conference, New York. <http://www.oocities.org/c.lankshear/pectact.html> (13/09/2011)
- Leadbeater, C. 2009. *We-Think. Mass Innovation, Not Mass Production*. London: Profile Books LTD.
- Levy, M. & Michael, G. 2011. Analyzing students’ multimodal texts; the product and the process. In: Thomas, M., ed. *Deconstructing Digital Natives. Young People, Technology and The New Literacies*. E-book. London & New York: Routledge.
- Ling, R. 2004. *The Mobile Connection: The Cell Phone’s Impact on Society*. San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers.
- Livingstone, S., Haddon, L. Görzig, A. & Ólafsson, K. 2011. *Risks and Safety on the Internet. The Perspective of European Children. The London School of Economics and Political Science*. www.eukidsonline.net. (20/4/2011)
- Meyrowitz, J. 1985. *No Sense of Place: The Impact of Electronic Media on Social Behavior*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Morley, D. 2000. *Home Territories: Media, Mobility and Identity*. London New York: Routledge.
- Nikunen, K. 2010. Online among us. Experiences of virtuality in everyday life. *Nordicom Review* 31 (2010): 75–82.
- Palfrey, J. & Gasser, U. 2008. *Born Digital. Understanding the First Generation of Digital Natives*. New York: Basic Books.
- Prensky, M. 2001. Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon* 9(5): 1–6.
- Stald, G. 2008. Mobile identity: youth, identity, and mobile communication media. In: D. Buckingham, ed. *Youth, Identity, and Digital Media*. The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Series on Digital Media and Learning. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press: 143–164.

- Takahashi, T. 2011. Japanese youth and mobile media. In: Thomas, M., ed. *Deconstructing Digital Natives. Young People, Technology and The New Literacies*. E-book. London & New York: Routledge.
- Thomas, M., ed. 2011a. *Deconstructing Digital Natives. Young People, Technology and The New Literacies*. E-book. London & New York: Routledge.
- Thomas, M. 2011b. Technology, education, and the discourse of the digital native. In: Thomas, M., ed. *Deconstructing Digital Natives. Young People, Technology and The New Literacies*. E-book. London & New York: Routledge.

Reijo Kupiainen
Aalto University
Department of Art and Media
PO Box 181
FIN-28101 Pori, Finland
e-mail: reijo.kupiainen@aalto.fi