

St. Catherine University  
Library and Information Science

**LIS7690: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, PEOPLE AND SOCIETY**

**3 Credit Course**

**Spring 2015**

**Wednesday, 6-9 p.m., Coeur de Catherine (CDC) Room 18**

**Syllabus date:** February 2, 2015

**Note: Please check the syllabus date and obtain a final version of this syllabus before you come to the first class.**

Instructor: Sook Lim, Associate Professor

Office: CDC Room 46

Office Hours: 4:30 to 5:45 PM on Wednesday and Thursday; and by appointment

Office Phone: 651 690 6888

Email: [slim@stkate.edu](mailto:slim@stkate.edu) (best way to contact me)

Homepage: <http://sooklim.org>

Course syllabus: <http://www.sooklim.org/teaching/teaching.html> (A final version of this syllabus will be posted both to this site and D2L.)

Some useful links: see <http://www.delicious.com/sooklim>

### **COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This seminar course critically examines information technology (IT) and its relationship to people, work and society. It covers a series of concepts and perspectives and empirical studies about social aspects of IT, also known as social informatics (SI). Along the way, you will learn how IT is interacted with social forces and social practices, and IT is not value neutral. The course will explore how seeing IT as merely a tool simplifies the complexity of IT. In turn, by understanding the social nature of IT and digital information, you will be prepared to become socially responsible information professionals and citizens with respect to IT and digital information.

### **COURSE GOAL**

This course is designed to prepare students to become socially responsible information professionals concerning IT and digital information

### **COURSE OBJECTIVES**

Upon completing this course, you will be able to:

- Understand the complex relationships among IT, people and social settings.
- Identify discourses regarding IT
- Develop critical perspectives regarding IT
- Contribute to the public debates regarding IT

- Develop conceptual tools for establishing best practices regarding digital information
- Develop professional ethics concerning IT and digital information

### REQUIRED TEXT

None

### USEFUL RESEOURCES

- Webster, F. (2014). *Theories of the information society*. (4th ed.). New York: NY. Rutledge.
- Pinter, R. (2008). Information society from theory to political practice. Gondolat – Új Mandátum, at [http://www.ittk.hu/netis/doc/NETIS\\_Course\\_Book\\_English.pdf](http://www.ittk.hu/netis/doc/NETIS_Course_Book_English.pdf)
- Rob Kling Center for Social Informatics at <http://rkcsi.indiana.edu>
- Social Informatics at <http://www.social-informatics.org>
- Consortium for the Science of Sociotechnical System (CSST) at <http://sociotech.net/readings.html>
- Berkman Center for Internet and Society at <http://cyber.law.harvard.edu>
- Pew Research Center on Internet and Technology at <http://pewresearch.org/topics/internetandtechnology>
- Neiman Reports at <http://niemanreports.org>
- Kling, R., Rosenbaum, H., & Sawyer, S. (2005). Understanding and communicating social informatics: A framework for studying and teaching the human contexts of information and communication technologies. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc.
- Kling, Rob (1996). Computerization and controversy: Value conflicts and social choices (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). San Diego: CA, Academic Press.

### ASSIGNMENTS AND COURSE POLICIES

#### ASSIGNMENTS

- Discussion leadership (24%)
- Reading responses (20%)
- An analytical review of an article or talk: An outline (8%) and presentation (2%)
- Final-paper (25%) and presentation (5%)
- Class preparation and participation (16%)

#### 1. Discussion Leadership (24%)

Plan and lead two discussions – due date varies from 2/18 through 5/13.

Task	Due date

1. Sign up for two discussion topics	2/4
2. The leader should prepare for his/her discussion session in the form of an outline analyzing and critiquing the required readings.	Post <u>your outline</u> to class Discussion by <u>6 PM</u> on Tuesday before your discussion
3. Identify 3-5 core issues based on the class readings, and organize them for class discussion.	
4. Write up a discussion outline that includes 6-9 discussion questions with a paragraph of elaboration on each.	
5. You may incorporate one or two interesting discussion question(s) posted by your classmate(s) on the topic into your discussion plan. If this is the case, please indicate the questioner's name.	

- A discussion lasts one hour.
- You may lead your second discussion as a team.
- Your discussion leadership will be graded based on your outline and the facilitation of your class discussion:
- Outline (6 points)
  - Analysis of the readings
    - How well did you identify the core issues of the readings?
    - How well did you analyze the issues?
      - What are the key points of a reading or a group of the readings?
      - Are there any unique aspects of a reading or a group of readings?
      - Are authors' arguments/ points convincing? Why or why not?
  - Discussion questions
    - How well did you develop your discussion questions?
      - Are your questions important, thoughtful or insightful?
      - Are your questions interesting?
- Discussion (6 points)
  - Facilitation of your discussion
    - How well did you facilitate your discussion? Were you effective in making students participate in your discussion?

## 2. Reading response (20%)

Each student should select 4 topics and make one thoughtful contribution to the class discussion for each topic, describing his/her response to the readings and offering a question to explore during the class discussions. Your response (one or two paragraphs of elaboration, about 200 words) must reflect your thoughtful analysis of the readings (key points or arguments of and your reactions to the readings). Students need not reference all

of the readings for that week, but should capture the salient points of the readings. I will assess the mastery of the content of the readings. Each response to each week's readings will be no later than 8 PM on Monday, coming immediately before the class meeting. All other students are expected to read their classmates' contributions and questions before the class. Your response will be graded on a 1 to 5 basis: 1= poor reflection 2= minimal reflection of readings; 3=some reflection of readings; 4= good reflection of readings 5=excellent reflection of readings.

Students' reactions to their classmates' responses to the readings and/or question to the class will contribute to class participation points. Students are expected to participate in both online and in-class discussions. Those who actively participate in both online and in-class discussions will have more class participation points. See Participation below for the details.

### **3. Review of an article or a talk: An outline and a presentation (10%)**

This assignment connects current IT discourses to the course. To create this assignment:

- Read any current newspapers, any popular tech-world magazines, professional magazines, journals and any relevant publications.\*
- Identify an article published within the last 6 months with a subject relevant to a course topic. If you select a journal article, you may use one published since 2013.
- You may identify a talk on the Internet (e.g., TEDTalks at <http://www.ted.com/talks> or Google Talks at <https://www.youtube.com/user/AtGoogleTalks>). Select and view one talk presented since 2014.
- Prepare an outline and give a presentation.
- Your presentation must include the following elements:
  - Citation of your article or talk
  - A brief introduction of what the article or talk discusses
  - The author's perspective(s) about IT linking to the relevant readings of Week 2 through Week 4
  - Your critique of the article or talk
  - One or two questions to be discussed
  - References
- You **MUST NOT** choose the topics about which you will lead discussions.
- You may use your article or talk for your final paper (you may choose the same topic for both this assignment and final paper).
- You will sign up for a topic on the first day of class. Your presentation date will be determined by the choice of your topic. Prepare a 15 to 20-minute presentation.
- Prior to your presentation
  - Post your outline by no later than 8 PM on Monday preceding the class meeting.
  - Your outline should include the following elements:
    - Citation of your article or talk
    - Abstract (about 150 words)

- Key points of your article
- Your analysis of the author's perspective(s) about IT linking to the relevant readings of Week 2 through Week 5
- Your critique of the article or talk (e.g., the most valuable points of the article or talk as well as anything that is unclear, unconvincing or left for further study)
- Use one or two more sources to analyze your article or talk
- One or two questions to be discussed
- References
- Note: An outline should sufficient contents of your review.
- Post your presentation slides to the Discussions by noon on your presentation date.

\* *Newspapers and blogs*: New York Times, Bits at <http://bits.blogs.nytimes.com> etc.  
*Popular tech-world magazines*: Wired at <http://www.wired.com>, PC Magazine at <http://www.pcmag.com>, etc.

*Professional magazines*: Communications of the ACM, D-lib Magazine, Online Magazine, etc.

*Journals*: The Information Society, The MIS Quarterly, Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, Information Technology and Libraries, Information Technology and People, Social Science Computer Review, Sloan Management Review, etc.

### **Presentation due based on your choice of topic**

#### **4. Final paper (25%) and presentation (5%)**

This paper should explore one of the topics covered in class. You may explore topics that we did not cover in class (e.g., social movements, online game/music, open-access, online security, crowdsourcing, etc.). Write an analytical literature review of your topic. Your format should include a review of pertinent academic literature. This paper should be about 10 to 11 pages double-spaced in length and must contain at least 10 different citations and references to scholarly work. You are free to use the course readings. However, I expect you to read as many as possible. I will assess your paper based on the below grading criteria for papers.

You are expected to make an oral presentation to the class on your paper. You will have a maximum of 10 minutes. Select the most important points and arguments to discuss. Post your presentation file (e.g., PowerPoint slides) to the Discussion by 4 PM on May 20.

**Due: May 20**

#### **5. Participation (16 points)**

**Online participation points (reaction to postings before each class, 8 points)**

- 11 or more topics: 8 points
- 10 topics: 7 points
- 8-9 topics: 6 points
- 6-7 topics: 5 points
- 4-5 topics: 4 Points
- 2-3 topics: 3 points
- 1 topic: 2 points
- No reaction: 0 point

Notes: I will also consider the quality of reactions (e.g., one bonus point of thoughtful reactions throughout the semester). A reaction should be more than a simple agreement or disagreement (e.g., I agree or I disagree) for this assignment.

### **In-class participation points (8 points)**

- Regular attendance, frequent contribution or thoughtful and insightful ideas: 8 points
- Regular attendance and moderate contribution: 7.5 points
- Two absences (unexcused) or occasional contribution: 7
- Three or more absences: 4 or lower points

### **COURSE AND GRADING POLICIES**

1. Regular class attendance is expected of all students. Attendance means that (1) students are expected to arrive at class on time and stay for the duration of the class; and (2) students, whether present or not, are responsible for in-class content. First day attendance is required. It is very difficult to keep up without attending every class. If you know you have to miss class, you should notify me in advance. If you miss more than two classes without a notification, your attendance will affect your grade through your participation points. If this is the case, you would not be able to obtain more than 50 % of participation points.
2. Class participation is critical in your learning process. Your participation grade will be based on the quality and quantity of your contributions to course discussions. You are fully expected to complete the readings and to participate in both online and in-class discussions.
3. All assignments are due on the specified dates. Absence from class is not an excuse for a late assignment. In the event of an emergency that prevents you from submitting an assignment on the specified date, you should contact me and get my permission in advance. Without my permission, there will be a penalty for a late assignment (a 5% reduction in grade for each day or hour late).
4. In case of an excused absence, make-up course requirements (e.g., presentation, case analysis, etc.) must be scheduled at a mutually convenient time. It is the student's responsibility to arrange a make-up schedule with me. In case of an unexcused absence, make-up of course requirements that were missed must be completed by the student within two school days of their original date. If not completed within this timeframe, the total point value of this course requirement is forfeited.

5. **INCOMPLETE GRADE:** A grade of incomplete is given only when unusual circumstances deem it appropriate. Ordinarily, such circumstances would involve matters that are not wholly within your control, such as illness. If you wish to receive an incomplete grade you must complete a Petition for Incomplete Grade form (available online) no later than the last day of the term in which course requirements are due. You must be making satisfactory progress in the course and you must have completed 75% of the course at the time the petition is filed. Incompletes are awarded at my discretion. If granted, the normal deadline for completion of the work is no more than eight weeks after the last day of classes in the session or sub-session in which the course is offered. I may establish a due date after the normal deadline if you request it and special circumstances warrant it. I will submit an alternate grade that will automatically be recorded if you do not complete the requirements for the course by the deadline. If you complete the course requirements in the time allotted, I must submit the final grade by the deadline. Extensions to the due date originally agreed to by you and I must be approved by the appropriate academic dean.
6. Writing is one of the most important skills in your graduate education. You are expected to understand the elements of good formal writing at the graduate level, and you should work hard to improve your writing skills. If you need some help with your writing, St. Catherine University provides writing assistance through the O'Neill Writing Center (room 21) in the Coeur de Catherine building.
7. You are responsible for checking your St. Kate's email account for messages from me. Check your email at least once a day.
8. You are expected to conduct yourself in accordance with the highest standards of academic honesty and integrity. Appropriate credit must be given to original creators of all works used. Please see the college's Academic Integrity Policy at [http://minerva.stkate.edu/academiccatalog.nsf/web\\_retrieve/mina-7lgbze?OpenDocument](http://minerva.stkate.edu/academiccatalog.nsf/web_retrieve/mina-7lgbze?OpenDocument).

### **STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES**

St. Catherine University is committed to equal access for all and recognizes that disability is an aspect of diversity. The University's goal is to create learning environments that are usable, equitable, inclusive and welcoming. If there are aspects of the instruction or design of this course that result in barriers to the learning environment, accurate assessment or your achievement, please contact me and the Resources for Disabilities office as soon as possible. Access Consultants can be reached in the O'Neill Center at [651-690-6563](tel:651-690-6563) to discuss academic adjustments or accommodations (<http://minerva.stkate.edu/offices/academic/oneill.nsf>).

### **ASSESSMENT**

#### **Grading Scale**

- A: 95-100%, Excellent
- A-: 90-94%, Very good, needs a few work
- B+: 87-89%, Good, needs some work
- B: 83-86%, Fair, needs significant work
- B-: 80-82%, Poor

- C: 70- 79%, Unacceptable for graduate work
- F: Below 70%, Fail

#### Grading criteria for the final paper

- *Substantive analysis*: Do you considerably analyze the arguments or issues you examine and seriously engage with alternative arguments? Are the ideas or arguments developed sufficiently?
- *Evidence*: Are you clear about what evidence is in the case you consider? Are you clear about the breadth of applicability of the evidence you cite? Do you cover relevant literature sufficiently? Do you use credible information sources? Do you provide an assessment of evidence quality as appropriate?
- *Clarity of presentation*: Are terms defined? Are your ideas clearly expressed? Is your paper focused or does it wander? Are your main points clearly presented? Does each paragraph have a central idea that the reader can easily identify?
- *Coherent organizations*: Is your paper organized effectively? Is the sequence of points made logical and clear?
- *Originality of ideas (bonus points)*: Do your own views and voice come through clearly? Does your paper have a creative or unique point of view?
- *Difficulty of topic or issue (bonus points)*: Does your paper deal with an unusual challenge? Is your paper intellectually demanding?
- *Citations and format*: Have you cited ideas and facts that are not your own? Are references in correct APA style (both in the text and list of references)? Is your tone appropriate for an academic paper? There should be few spelling and grammatical errors. Your paper should have the format below.

All assignments are expected to have:

- Your name, date submitted, and assignment title
- Page numbers
- An original title for the assignment if any
- 1” margins
- 12 point Times New Roman or a similarly readable font style
- Subheadings with the document (if more than 4 pages)
- APA citations of works cited
  - If you are not familiar with APA format, please visit the SCU Library website at <http://libguides.stkate.edu/citationguides>

#### **DESIRE2LEARN (D2L)**

There is a D2L site for this course. I will post course materials on the site.

#### **COURSE OUTLINE AND SCHEDULE**

(Note: Schedule and Readings Subject to Change)

**Week 1, February 4**



## **Introduction to the course**

Kling, R. (2007). What is social informatics and why does it matter? *The Information Society*, 23(4), 205-220.

Due: Sign up for discussion leadership, reading responses and analytical or talk review

## **Week 2, February 11**

### **Conceptual orientations toward IT**

Bijker, W (2010). How is technology made?-That is the question!. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 34, 63–76 [ILL]

Orlikowski, W. (2010). The sociomateriality of organisational life: considering technology in management research. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*. 34, 125–141  
Available at <http://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/66547>

Rieger, O. (2008). Opening up institutional repositories: Social construction of innovation in scholarly communication, *Journal of Electronic Publishing*. 11(3). [Read the theories], a reading of week 4

Scott, S. & Orlikowski, W. (2014). Entanglements in practice: Performing anonymity through social media, *MIS Quarterly*, 38 (3). 873-893. [Focus on pp. 870-880]

### Optional reading

Bijker, W. E. (2001). Social construction of technology. In N. J. Smelser & P.B. Baltes (eds). *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Vol 23. pp. 15522-15527. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.

## **Week 3, February 18**

### **Discourses and controversies about IT**

Feenberg, A. (2009). Critical theory of communication technology: Introduction to the special section. *The Information Society*. 25(2).

Morozov, E. (2011). The net delusion. BookTV [video].  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Iltrxa2RUQc> or

Shirky, C. (2010, June). How cognitive surplus will change the world [Video], TED.com at  
[http://www.ted.com/talks/lang/eng/clay\\_shirky\\_how\\_cognitive\\_surplus\\_will\\_change\\_the\\_world.html](http://www.ted.com/talks/lang/eng/clay_shirky_how_cognitive_surplus_will_change_the_world.html)

Winner, L. (1997). Technology today: utopia or dystopia? *Social Research* 64(3), 989-997

Van Dijck, J., & Nieborg, D. (2009). Wikinomics and its discontents: A critical analysis of Web 2.0 business manifestos. *New Media & Society*, 11(5), 855-874.

#### Additional useful resources

Shteyngart, G. (2010). *Super sad true love story*, Random House (Read this novel when you have time to spare).

Kubrick, S. (Director/ Screenwriter) and Clarke, A. (Screenwriter). (1968). *2001: A space odyssey* [Motion Picture]. United States: MGM (View this movie when you have time to spare).

Morozov, E. (2011). *The net delusion: The dark side of Internet freedom*. PublicAffairs.

Koltay, T. (2011). New media and literacies: amateurs vs. professionals. *First Monday*, 16 (1) at

<http://www.uic.edu/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/viewArticle/3206/2748>

### **Week 4, February 25**

#### **Socio-Technical Interaction Networks**

Meyer, E. T. (2006). Socio-technical Interaction Networks: A discussion of the strengths, weaknesses and future of Kling's STIN model. In Berleur, J., Numinen, M.I., Impagliazzo, J., (Eds.), *IFIP International Federation for Information Processing, Volume 223, Social Informatics: An Information Society for All? In Remembrance of Rob Kling* (pp. 37-48). Boston: Springer.

[http://mypage.iu.edu/~etmeyer/files/HCC7\\_STIN\\_Meyer.pdf](http://mypage.iu.edu/~etmeyer/files/HCC7_STIN_Meyer.pdf)

Zhu, X. and Eschenfelder, K. (2010). Social construction of authorized users in the digital age. *College & Research Libraries*. 71(6). 548-568.

Walker, S., & Creanor, L. (2009). The STIN in the Tale: A Socio-technical Interaction Perspective on Networked Learning. *Educational Technology & Society*, 12 (4), 305–316.

Rieger, O. (2008). Opening up institutional repositories: Social construction of innovation in scholarly communication, *Journal of Electronic Publishing*. 11(3).

### **Week 5, March 4**

#### **IT, work and organizations**

Barrett, M., Oborn, E., Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. (2012). Reconfiguring boundary relations: Robotic innovations in pharmacy work. *Organization Science*, 23, 1398-1408. Available at <http://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/67890>

Leonardi, P. (2013). When does technology use enable network change in organizations? A comparative study of feature use and shared affordances, *MIS Quarterly*, 37(3), 749-775.

Pollock, N. (2005). When is a work-around? Conflict and negotiation in computer systems development. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 30(4), 596-514. [e-reserve]

Kennedy, T., Wellman, B. and Amoroso, J. (2011). Can you take it with you?: Mobility, ICTs and work-life balance. J. Katz (ed.) in *Mobile communication: Dimensions of social policy* (pp. 191-210). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 2011. At <http://groups.chass.utoronto.ca/netlab/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Can-You-Take-It-with-You-Mobility-ICTs-and-Work-Life-Balance.pdf>

#### Optional reading:

Markoff, J. (2011, March 4). Armies of expensive lawyers, replaced by cheaper software, *The New York Times*.  
[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/05/science/05legal.html?\\_r=2&src=me&ref=homepage](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/05/science/05legal.html?_r=2&src=me&ref=homepage)

### **Week 6, March 11**

#### **IT and social relationships**

Miki, K. and Russell, D. (2011). Virtual civil society: The new frontier of social capital? *Political Behavior*. 33(4), 625-644.

Ellison, N., Vitak, J., Gray, R. & Lampe, C. (2014). Cultivating social resources on social network sites: Facebook relationship maintenance behaviors and their role in social capital processes, *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19(4): 855-870.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/store/10.1111/jcc4.12078/asset/jcc412078.pdf?v=1&t=i55jarqz&s=12f2e0c5a172989ad52b4c0bc811ec8163656>

Pollet, T., Roberts, S. and Dunbar, R. (2011). Use of social network sites and instant messaging does not lead to increased offline social network size, or to emotionally closer relationships with offline network members. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*. 14 (4). 253-258.

Rainie, L. & Wellman, B. (2012, July-August). The individual in a networked world: Two scenarios, *The Futurist*, 24-27. at <http://groups.chass.utoronto.ca/netlab/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/The-Individual-in-a-Networked-World-Two-Scenarios.pdf>

Hampton, K., Rainie, L., Lu, W., Shin, I. and Purcell, K. (2015, January 15). Social media and the cost of caring, Pew Internet Research Project.  
<http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/01/15/social-media-and-stress/>

Further readings:

Granovetter, M. (1982) The Strength of weak ties (Revisited). In P. Marsden & N. Lin (Eds), *Social Structure and Network Analysis*, (pp. 105-130). Sage.

**Week 7, March 18**

**IT and inequality**

Rainie, L. (2013, Nov. 5), The state of digital divides (videos & slides) at  
<http://www.pewinternet.org/2013/11/05/the-state-of-digital-divides-video-slides/>

Chen, W. (2013). The implications of social capital for the digital divides in America, *The Information Society* 29, 13-25.

Nafus, D. (2012). Patches don't have gender: What is not open source software. *New Media & Society*. 14(4) 669–683.

Where are the women in Wikipedia? (2011). Room for debate, *The New York Times* at  
<http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2011/02/02/where-are-the-women-in-wikipedia>

Braithwaite, A. (2014). Seriously, get out: Feminists on the forums and the War(craft) on women, *New Media & Society*, 16(5), 703-718.

Warschauer, M. & Ames, M. (2010). Can one laptop per child save the world's poor? *Journal of International Affairs*, 64(1), 33-51.

Further readings:

Van Deursen, A. and Van Dijk, J. (2011). Internet skills and the digital divide. *New Media & Society*, 13(6), 893–911

Halford, S. and Savage, M. (2010). Reconceptualizing social digital inequality. *Information Communication and Society*. 13(7). 937-955.

**Week 8, March 25**

**Collaboration**

**Online class**

Forte, A and Lampe, C. (2013). Defining, understanding and supporting open collaboration: Lessons from the literature. *American Behavioral Scientist*. At

<http://www.andreaforte.net/ForteLampe-Submitted.pdf>

Loveland, J. & Reagle, J. (2013). Wikipedia and encyclopedic production, *New Media & Society*, 15(8), 1294-1311.

Niederer, S. and van Dijck, J. (2010). Wisdom of the crowd or technicity of content? Wikipedia as a sociotechnical system, *News Media & Society*, 12 (8). 1368-1387.

Sanger, L. (2010), Individual knowledge in the Internet age. *EDUCAUSE Review*, 45 (2): 14-24, at <http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ERM1020.pdf>.

### **Week 9, April 1 (Spring Break)**

**No Class!**

### **Week 10, April 8**

#### **IT, community and empowerment**

Östman, J. (2012). Information, expression, participation: How involvement in user-generated content relates to democratic engagement among young people, *New Media & Society* 14(6) 1004–1021.

Lagos, T., Coopman, T. & Tomhave, J. (2014). “Parallel poles”: Towards a theoretical framework of the modern public sphere, civic engagement and the structural advantages of the internet to foster and maintain parallel socio-political institutions, *New Media & Society*, 16(3), 398-414.

Goldberg, G. (2011). Rethinking the public/virtual sphere: The problem with participation. *New Media Society*, 13(5) 739–754.

Yuan, E. (2012). A culturalist critique of ‘online community’ in new media studies, *New Media & Society*, 15(5), 665-679.

#### Further readings:

Fuglsang, L (2005). IT and senior citizens: Using the Internet for empowering active citizenship. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 30(4), 468-495

Chen, N., Dong, F., Ball-Rokeach, S., Parks, M. and Huang, J. (2012). Building a new media platform for local storytelling and civic engagement in ethnically diverse neighborhoods, *New Media & Society*, 14(6) 931–950

### **Week 11, April 15**

## **Digital lives and digital readings**

Dretzin, R. (Producer/ director). (2010, Feb. 2). Frontline: Digital nation [Television broadcast]. Arlington, VA: PBS.

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/digitalnation/view/>

Bollmer, G. D. (2013). Millions now living will never die: Cultural anxieties about the afterlife of information, *The Information Society*, 29, 142-151.

Cull, B. (2011). Reading revolutions: Online digital text and implications for reading in academe, *First Monday*, 16 (6) at

<http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/3340/2985>

Coiro, J. (2012): Digital literacies: Understanding dispositions toward reading on the Internet. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*. 55(7). 645-648.

Zickuhr, K. & Rainie, L. (2014, January 16). E-reading rises as device ownership jumps, Pew Internet Research Project at <http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/01/16/e-reading-rises-as-device-ownership-jumps/>

## Optional readings

Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. Basic Books (Read this book during your break.)

Parker-Pope, T. (2012, May 17). Does Facebook turn people into narcissists? *The New York Times*

<http://well.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/17/does-facebook-turn-people-into-narcissists/>

Eisenberg, A. (2013, May 25). Bequeathing the keys to your digital afterlife. *The New York Times*, at <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/26/technology/estate-planning-is-important-for-your-online-assets-too.html?hpw>.

## **Week 12, April 22**

### **Data: Big Data, data reuse & data literacy**

Goes, P. (2014). Editor's comments: Big data and IS research, *MIS Quarterly*, 38(3), iii-viii

Bryant, A. & Raja, U. (2014). In the realm of big data..., *First Monday*, 19(2/3),

<http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/4991/3822>

Boellstorff, T. (2013). Making big data, in theory, *First Monday*, 18(7), <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/4869/3750>

Eschenfelder, K. & Johnson, A. (2014). Governing the data commons: Controlled sharing of scholarly data, *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 65(9), 1757-1775.

Mukherjee, R. (2014). Interfacing data destinations and visualizations: A history of database literacy, *New Media & Society*, 16(1), 110-128

Further readings:

*First Monday*, vol. 18 (10), Special issue on Big Data at <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/issue/view/404/showToc>

**Week 13, April 29**

**IT, undesirable outcomes and unintended consequences**

Holt, T. J. (2009). Examining the role of technology in the formation of deviant subcultures, *Social Science Computer Review*. 28 (4). 466-481.

Taylor, P. A. (2005). From hackers to hacktivists: Speed bumps on the global superhighway? *New Media & Society*, 7(5), 625-646.

Daniels, J. (2009). Cloacked websites: Propaganda, cyber-racism and epistemology in the digital era. *New Media & Society*, 11(5), 659-683.

Kowalski, R. M., Giumetti, G. W., Schroeder, A. N., & Lattanner, M. R. (2014, February 10). Bullying in the Digital Age: A Critical Review and Meta-Analysis of Cyberbullying Research Among Youth. *Psychological Bulletin*. At [http://www.homeworkmarket.com/sites/default/files/q2/07/03/cyberbullying\\_metaanalysis.pdf](http://www.homeworkmarket.com/sites/default/files/q2/07/03/cyberbullying_metaanalysis.pdf)

Hampton, K., Rainie, L., Lu, W, Dwyer, M., Shin, I. and Purcell, K. (2014). Social media and spiral of silence. Pew Internet Research Project.

<http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/08/26/social-media-and-the-spiral-of-silence/>

Further readings:

Foderard, L. (2010, September. 29). Private moment made public, then a fatal jump. New York Times at [http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/30/nyregion/30suicide.html?\\_r=1&hp](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/30/nyregion/30suicide.html?_r=1&hp)

Miller, C. C. (2014, August, 14). How social media silences debates, The New York Times

[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/27/upshot/how-social-media-silences-debate.html?hpw&rref=technology&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&version=HpHedThumbWell&module=well-region&region=bottom-well&WT.nav=bottom-well&\\_r=0&abt=0002&abg=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/27/upshot/how-social-media-silences-debate.html?hpw&rref=technology&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&version=HpHedThumbWell&module=well-region&region=bottom-well&WT.nav=bottom-well&_r=0&abt=0002&abg=0)

Douglas, K. M., McGarty, C., Bliuc, A., & Lala, G. (2005). Understanding cyberhate: Social competition and social creativity in online white supremacist groups. *Social Science Computer Review*, 23, 68-76.

## **Week 14: May 6**

### **IT and privacy**

Fornaciari, F. (2014). Pricey privacy: Framing the economy of information in the digital age, *First Monday*, 19(12) at <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/5008/4184>

Martin, K. (2013). Transaction costs, privacy, and trust: The laudable goals and ultimate failure of notice and choice to respect privacy online, *First Monday*, 18(12), at <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/4838/3802>

Taddicke, M. (2014). The ‘privacy paradox’ in the social web: The impact of privacy concerns, individual characteristics, and the perceived social relevance on different forms of self-disclosure, *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 19(2): 248-273.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/store/10.1111/jcc4.12052/asset/jcc412052.pdf?v=1&t=i55jz68e&s=98df45872d997d69eae23b9589b87fd6187fee0>

Chen, B. (2013, January 11). Smartphones become life’s remote control. The New York Times at <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/12/technology/smartphones-can-now-run-consumers-lives.html>.

Paul, P. (2012, Feb. 10). Don’t tell me, I don’t want to know. New York Times at <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/12/fashion/tmi-i-dont-want-to-know.html?pagewanted=1&hpw>



Ketcham, C. and Kelly, T. (2010, April 9). The more you use Google, the more Google knows about you," AlterNet, [http://www.alternet.org/media/146398/the\\_more\\_you\\_use\\_google\\_the\\_more\\_google\\_knows\\_about\\_you](http://www.alternet.org/media/146398/the_more_you_use_google_the_more_google_knows_about_you)

*Additional resources*

Sengupta, S. and Miller, C. (2013, January 18). Search option from Facebook is a privacy test. The New York Times at <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/19/technology/with-graph-search-facebook-bets-on-more-sharing.html>

Electronic Frontier Foundation, <https://www EFF.org/issues/privacy>

Privacy in Nieman Reports,  
<http://www.nieman.harvard.edu/Microsites/NiemanReportsTheDigitalLandscape/Privacy.aspx>

**Week 15, May 13**

**Copyright, fair use, libraries and relevant issues**

Lessig, L. (2010, January 26). For the love of culture. *The New Republic*, at <http://www.tnr.com/article/the-love-culture?page=0,0>

Svensson, M. and Larsson, S. (2012). Intellectual property law compliance in Europe: Illegal file sharing and the role of social norms, *New Media & Society* 14(7) 1147–1163

Eschenfelder, K., Desai, A. and Downey, G. (2011). The pre-Internet downloading controversy: The evolution of use rights for digital intellectual and cultural works. *The Information Society*. 27(2). 69-91.

Association of Research Libraries (2012). Code of best practices in fair use for academic and research libraries. ARL. at <http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/publications/code-of-best-practices-fair-use.pdf>

Hansen, D., Cross, W. and Edwards, P. (2013). Copyright policy and practice in electronic reserves among ARL libraries. *College & Research Libraries*. 74(1). 69-84.

*Additional resource*

Adler, P., Butler, B., Aufderheide, P. and Jaszi, P. (2010, December 20). Fair use challenges in academic and research libraries, Association of Research Libraries at [http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/arl\\_csm\\_fairusereport.pdf](http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/arl_csm_fairusereport.pdf)

Lessig, L. (2010, April). Re-examining the remix [Video], TED.com at [http://www.ted.com/talks/lessig\\_nyed.html](http://www.ted.com/talks/lessig_nyed.html).

**Week 16, May 20**

Student Presentation

**Due: Final paper**