Generating Inquiry:

Based on outcomes listed in the [Department of Writing and Rhetoric's website](#), I understand this outcome to mean that by the end of this course I should be able to contribute meaningful inquiry to a past or present subject that is related to writing, language, literacy, and/or rhetoric. In other words, I should be able to look at a critical conversation and make interesting, involved questions in it which relate to writing.

I argue that I met this outcome because I found and established a niche research subject out of a pre-existing critical conversation that contributed with unique research, conclusions, and data. In my **Potential Research Questions** assignment, I illustrate this through my very first proposed research question, "Why has script writing become such a structured form of writing/development that there are definitive taboos for script writers?" (Scruggs, 2025, 3). This first research question establishes a very involved and educated line of inquiry that relates itself to writing in a meaningful and inventive manner. By generating inquiry in something I'm already knowledgeable and interested in, I found a niche topic related to coding rhetoric that was worth investigating. On the other hand, if I had chosen a subject that I wasn't knowledgeable or interested in I would likely have made an uninventive research article that would likely have already been answered. In addition to this, my **Genuine Inquiry Reading Response** also displays my understanding of generating inquiry through my direct reflection of my initial learning of it at the beginning of the semester: "[Genuine inquiry] is driven by the desire to ask meaningful questions and explore the unknown rather than merely confirming preconceived answers or beliefs." (Scruggs, 2025, 1). This very early artifact demonstrates the understanding and commitment to the involvement of the generated inquiry and how it contributes new knowledge. It's very much in opposition to clean and organized research which likely wouldn't

take much time or effort to commit to because the outcomes and conclusions may be obvious. In other words, research questions about the obvious are rarely interesting or contribute to a meaningful conversation, thus genuine inquiry is spurred by involved and intelligent thought into an interested subject.

Multiple Ways of Writing

Based on outcomes listed in the Department of Writing and Rhetoric's website, I understand this outcome to mean that by the end of this course I should be able to purposefully integrate and understand the potential of writing in different ways, communicating ideas through language barriers, and tying multiple literacies together into my writing in ways that actively support my goals.

I met this outcome by effectively integrating a coding system to display a line of thinking without literal explanations and analysing the similarities and differences between scripts that were made within different language barriers. The ePortfolio itself is also a manner of multimodality by creating an online version of my research with more elaborate methods of explanations such as visual elements, as I illustrated in my **ePortfolio Reflection 2**, where I claim that "…most websites will utilize a variety of tabs, menus, or other dividers to neatly sort content that the user would be interested in, so that they can quickly and efficiently reach only the parts they care about." (Scruggs, 2025, 1). This effectively showcases an understanding that the tools available to websites vary from those available for written reports, and how the tools offered by online methods contribute to easier and more effective understanding of the material. By utilizing the strengths of online mediums and the strengths of traditional writing, you use

multimodality to create a more effective piece of literature. Similarly, through the **Coding Reflection** artifact you can see my understanding and use of rhetorical coding practices to better communicate the information behind pieces of information, such as with codes like "Script Organization… Documentation and Comments… Debugging & Error Handling… Warnings & User Control… Standardization vs. Customization…" helping the reader to draw connections between would might have otherwise been loose or sporadic information (Scruggs, 2025, 1-2). The usage of codes can dramatically amplify the reader's understanding of the writing by directly presenting the line of thought the author took when arriving at a conclusion through simply showing the direct information and the associated codes.

Information Literacy

Based on outcomes listed in the [Department of Writing and Rhetoric's website](), I understand this outcome to mean that by the end of this course I should be able to critically evaluate sources for the author's credibility and the ethicality of the research as well as it's relevance to my own and the impact it will have on my writing/research as a whole.

I've met this outcome through critically evaluating various primary and secondary sources for credibility and relevance to my niche research question. The most obvious example of this achievement is in the **Synthesis Chart**, where I collected secondary sources and organized their information via their credibility and relevance, as well as determining that the research showcased in these sources were ethically acquired. In this synthesis chart, I analysed Mikhail Fiadotau's "Dezaemon, RPG Maker, NScripter: Exploring and Classifying Game 'Produsage' in 1990s Japan" for these criteria, concluding that it "…contributes valuable insights

into the historical and regional factors influencing game creation, making it relevant to my analysis… of scripting in RPG Maker VX Ace," and that it was "Credible due to its publication in a peer-reviewed journal (Journal of Gaming & Virtual Worlds)." (Scruggs, 2025, 1). I directly and critically assessed the source for its relevance and credibility, ascertaining that it was highly relevant and credible towards my own research question. Expanding on this, my **Annotated Bibliography & Literature Review** clarified the secondary sources and further focused in on my niche while using the sources to support the need of my research, stating how "Fiadotau (2016) examines how developers challenge game engine limitations… Owens(2011) explores RPG Maker forums serve as learning spaces…While existing studies explore RPG Maker scripting from multiple angles, none specifically address what RPG Maker VX Ace scripters themselves consider essential, modular, or ideal in a script's structure." (Scruggs, 2025, 4). This serves to hone down how these other sources are relevant but different to my own research question, and why my research question is important.

Research Genre Production

Based on outcomes listed in the Department of Writing and Rhetoric's website, I understand this outcome to mean that by the end of this course I should be able to make and show the literary choices made in public or academic research genres and how these decisions matter to and reflect upon specific communities within these genres.

I argue that I met this outcome because I made specific choices in my research methods to best reflect my community in which I was analysing. I would also specifically organize my ePortfolio to tailor to this community while also being accessible to the uninformed. For my

research methods, I had decided on interviews over typical polls or questionnaires so that I could directly speak with other scripters and see their entire thought processes behind their responses as well as their general attitudes, as I proposed in my **Research Proposal** artifact, "…I plan to use interviews and observations. Interviews will involve speaking with 3-5 scripters of varying experience levels to understand their perspectives on what makes a script effective or ideal." (Scruggs, 2025, 1). Game development is heavily dependent on creativity, and scripting in RPG Maker VX Ace is simply and application of game development, so by considering and analysing not just the participants' responses, but also their attitudes and behaviours, I managed to get a firmer understanding of how I should write my research project. Supporting this was my analysis of Driscoll's writing in relation to research methods done in my **Primary Research Methods** assignment, as I extrapolated that "As Driscoll (2011) explains, interviews allow researchers to collect detailed and specific information directly from participants, which is particularly useful when exploring niche or expert topics (p. 163)." (Scruggs, 2025, 1). These artifacts contribute towards understanding the personalities behind who I would be analysing and how I altered by choices to better understand and reflect the community I would be contributing to.

Contributing Knowledge

Based on outcomes listed in the Department of Writing and Rhetoric's website, I understand this outcome to mean that by the end of this course I should be able to critically analyse primary evidence and draw conclusions from it which relate to and contribute to the critical conversation with other secondary sources and their authors.

I met this outcome by using my coding methods with my primary data to draw clear and concise conclusions while inviting further research. I had concluded that clear documentation, modular structure, and accessible language were the foundations of an ideal script and that a script is not just a functional tool but also text designed for human readers just as much as it is for mechanical readers. I had come to this conclusion in the **Coding Reflection** with the primary observations I identified and stating that, "These patterns suggest that a universal script format isn't about strict rules, but about widely accepted practices that enhance clarity and usability." (Scruggs, 2025, 4). This was only the beginning of my concluding claim, and I would later expand it to the full conclusion with greater analysis. Meanwhile, it was through the **Analysing Primary Data Reading Response** that I had developed my coding skills specifically to draw these conclusions, where I outline the steps I would take in coding my data, "The first step in coding involves organizing and preparing the data, which may include anonymizing participants to maintain ethical integrity…[Next steps are outlined until the final step is finished]" (Scruggs, 2025, 1). The process I outlined demonstrates my understanding of how I should go about coding and drawing conclusions based on my analysis and interpretation of my primary evidence.

Revision

Based on outcomes listed in the [Department of Writing and Rhetoric's website](), I understand this outcome to mean that by the end of this course I should be able to demonstrate the negotiation of differences within my work and others and demonstrate an intention with feedback from myself and others when drafting, revising, and editing my own or others' work.

I met this outcome by revising my own annotated bibliography and final research article as well as those of others and offering critical feedback which added to others' work. For instance, I was initially in dire need of a revision because I had started writing my Annotated Bibliography with a strong sense that my readers would understand what I was talking about. This was not the case. So, I ended up revising my cover letter for the **Annotated Bibliography Peer Review** to begin with, "As a brief introduction to this topic, RPG Maker VX Ace (RPGMA) is a video game engine marketed by Kadokawa Corporation used by new and experienced developers alike." (Scruggs, 2025, 2). This single line dramatically improved by writing by giving much needed preface onto the subject I was talking about. Meanwhile, in my **Final Research Article Peer Review**, I had to revise again as it still wasn't entirely clear to many readers, so I revised that line instead to "RPG Maker VX Ace is a rookie game development program released in the west on March 12, 2012. RPG Maker is made to be extremely simple for new developers as well as having tools available for more experienced developers in the form of RGSS3 scripting." (Scruggs, 2025, 4). This version seemed to finally get that preliminary knowledge across so now almost every reader would be able to understand exactly what I was researching, at least in a rudimentary sense. Both revisions demonstrate my ability to negotiate differences in and act with intention on feedback from readers.