

**INF 380K: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES  
AND THE INFORMATION PROFESSIONS**

School of Information  
The University of Texas at Austin

Spring 2004

**Unique Number:** 24090

**Class time:** Tuesdays, 6:30-8:30 PM, UTC 4.104, plus online exercises

**Instructor:** Danielle Cunniff Plumer

Email: [dcplumer@ischool.utexas.edu](mailto:dcplumer@ischool.utexas.edu)

Office: TBA

Office hrs: Tuesdays 5:00 – 6:00 PM and by appointment

Telephone: (512) 630-7905 (mobile); (512) 471-3821 (Main iSchool office)

*Please use my mobile number only for emergencies! Email is the best way to reach me.*

**TA:** TBA

**Class URL:** <http://www.ischool.utexas.edu/~i380kdcp/SP04/>

**Email List:** [i380k-dcp@lists.cc.utexas.edu](mailto:i380k-dcp@lists.cc.utexas.edu)

Students should sign up for this email list by sending an email to the instructor or by emailing [listproc@lists.cc.utexas.edu](mailto:listproc@lists.cc.utexas.edu) with no subject and the single line “subscribe i380k-dcp <firstname> <lastname>.”

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course will provide an overview of the history of information technology, broadly conceived. We will look specifically at the ways in which information professionals, and people generally, have produced and shared information, identifying changes and transitions in the mode and medium of such production, from orality to literacy, from script to print, and from analog to digital.

We will also investigate the role of the information professional in identifying, initiating, anticipating, and reacting to such changes. As future leaders in your profession, you will be expected to implement and evaluate applications, develop highly technical skills, and create strategic technology plans. This course will help to prepare you for that role through various individual and group assignments.

This is not a skills class. Although we will discuss and use specific technologies, such as HTML and its variants, the focus of the course will be on the role of these technologies in the information professions, not on the skills themselves. Other venues, such as informal workshops taught by the School of Information IT Lab staff, the General Libraries, and ACITS are more appropriate if you feel that you would benefit from skills instruction.

The course will emphasize the multiple roles and identities of information technologies, broadly understood. These technologies can be examined along a number of important axes, e.g.:

- As modes of information dissemination
- As objects of analysis

- As important sites of cultural production
- As objects of instrumental use
- As extensions of, surrogates for, or methods to obfuscate identity
- In personal and professional use
- In consideration of tensions among commercial, individual, social scientific, and other perspectives on these technologies
- In the context of differential social and professional power.

While these are only some of the important perspectives on information technologies and the information professions, the class will closely consider the scholarship about information technologies from a number of disciplinary perspectives. The course will comprise 3 units:

1. History of Information Technology and the Information Professions
2. Information Technology Use and Information Literacy
3. The Future of Information Technology and the Information Professions

## EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE

I expect all students to be involved, creative, and vigorous participants in class discussions and in the overall conduct of the class. In addition, students should expect to:

- Attend all class sessions. I encourage students to contact me if they will miss class so that we can make arrangements for making up any missed work.
- Read all assigned material prior to class. We will spend the majority of our time in class discussing the readings, and the quality of this discussion will suffer if students do not participate.
- Work approximately 4 hours a week in online assignments in addition to class time. If it is taking far more than that, please let me know. As a rule of thumb, students should expect to spend 9-12 hours a week on class assignments in addition to class time in a long semester; in a 6-week summer session, students should expect to spend 27-36 hours per week in addition to class time.
- Educate themselves and their peers. You are encouraged to bring in examples from your own experience and readings outside class to enrich our discussions.
- Hand in all assignments fully and on time. Late assignments will not be accepted except in unusual circumstances.
- Ask for any explanation and help from the instructor or the Teaching Assistant(s), either in class, during office hours, on the telephone, through email, or in any other appropriate way.
- Accept responsibility for academic success. While I will attempt to do everything in my power to make this both an enjoyable and useful course, ultimately you are responsible for your own success in this course and at The University of Texas at Austin.

Academic or scholastic dishonesty, such as plagiarism, cheating, or academic fraud, will **not be tolerated and will incur the most severe penalties**, including failure for the course. If you have any concern about behavior that may be academically dishonest, please consult the instructor. Students are also encouraged to refer to the UT General Information Bulletin, Appendix C, Sections 11-304 and 11-802 and the brochure *Texas is the Best . . . HONESTLY!* (1988) by the Cabinet of College Councils and the Office of the Dean of Students.

## EXPECTATIONS OF INSTRUCTOR'S PERFORMANCE

Students in this course have the right to expect that they will be treated as information professionals and that I as the instructor will do everything possible to make it possible for them to succeed. In addition, students have the right to expect:

- That all questions will be answered as promptly as possible. I will respond to emails and phone messages within 24 hours on weekdays and within 48 hours on weekends. In some cases, I may reply to the entire class instead of to a single individual.
- That all assignments will be graded and returned promptly. Generally, this means within one week but in any case before the next assignment is due. In some cases, assignments will be returned electronically or to student mailboxes. Students who need to make other arrangements to have their assignments returned should do so when the assignment is turned in.
- That student critiques and comments will be respected and will be used to improve the course for future classes.

Students who feel that the instructor has not or will not respect these expectations should feel free to discuss their concerns with the instructor and with Mary Lynn Rice-Lively, Associate Dean of the School of Information. She can be reached at [marylynn@ischool.utexas.edu](mailto:marylynn@ischool.utexas.edu) or by telephone at (512) 471-2371.

## STANDARDS FOR WRITTEN WORK

- Style manual:** The style manual for this course will be the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition. The APA Manual is available in the School of Information's IT Lab and through the UT General Libraries. Students are encouraged to buy their own copies, as this manual is used by many courses and instructors at UT.
- Title pages:** Students should include with all printed assignments a title page with a descriptive title, the student's name, the instructor's name, the course number and title, and the date the assignment is due.
- Format:** Papers should be computer-produced using a program such as Microsoft Word or OpenOffice, and papers should be submitted in the Blackboard Digital Dropbox (preferred) or as an email attachment in PDF format. Papers submitted in PDF format should be double-spaced, with 1 inch margins on all sides, and should use Times 12 pt. font or similar. Web sites and other electronic submissions should use Arial 10 pt. font or similar.
- Grading:** Please see the memorandum from former Dean Brooke Sheldon dated August 13, 1991 (attached) and my "Grading Standards for Graduate Writing" (attached) for an explanation of the grades used in this course. The University of Texas does not use the +/- grading system that we do at the School of Information; UT accepts only full letter grades. Therefore, for example, a B- and B+ final grade at the School of Information both translate to a final grade of B at the University level.
- Students should also consult the School of Information Web site (<http://www.gslis.utexas.edu/programs/index.html>) and the *Graduate School Catalogue* (e.g., <http://www.utexas.edu/student/registrar/catalogs/grad01-03/ch1/ch1a.html#nature> and <http://www.utexas.edu/student/registrar/catalogs/grad01-03/ch1/ch1b.html#student>) for more on standards of work and the responsibilities of students enrolled in a graduate degree program.

## TEXTS

### Required Texts:

- Nunberg, Geoffrey, ed. (1996). *The future of the book*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ong, Walter J. (1982). *Orality and literacy: The technologizing of the word*. London: Routledge. (or similar edition)

### Recommended Texts:

- Stover, Mark. (1999). *Leading the wired organization: The information professional's guide to managing technological change*. New York: Neal-Schuman.
- A reading packet, which can be purchased from University Duplicating Service at the Graduate School of Business, GSB 3.136 (471-8281). One copy of this packet will also be placed on reserve at PCL for students who choose not to purchase it. Additional readings will be available online and/or on reserve at PCL.

## SCHEDULE

Meeting	Date	Topics
1	Jan 20	Introduction to the information professions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Reading:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Drucker (2001), "The Next Society" (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Unit I: A Brief History of Technology (broadly conceived)</b>		
2	Jan 27	Orality, literacy, and technology I <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Reading:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ong (1982), <i>Orality and Literacy</i> (Ch. 1-3)</li> <li>○ Hobart &amp; Schiffman (1998), "The Analytical World Map" (packet)</li> <li>○ Nardi &amp; O'Day (1999), "A Matter of Metaphor" (packet)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>DUE: Online exercise 1, parts a &amp; b</b></p>
3	Feb 3	Orality, literacy, and technology II <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Reading:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ong (1982), <i>Orality and Literacy</i> (Ch. 4-6; Ch. 7 opt.)</li> <li>○ Chartier (1995), "Representations of the Written Word" (packet)</li> <li>○ Nunberg (1996), "Introduction" (FOTB)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>DUE: Online exercise 1, parts c &amp; d</b> <b>DUE: Online exercise 2, part a</b></p>
4	Feb 10	Information Technology I <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Computer Networks and Protocols</li> <li>- Information Standards and Regulation</li> <li>• <i>Reading:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Bolter (1996), "Ekphrasis, Virtual Reality, and the Future of Writing" (FOTB)</li> <li>○ Hesse (1996), "Books in Time" (FOTB)</li> <li>○ Lessig (1998), "The Laws of Cyberspace" (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Recommended Reading:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Kuhn (1970), "Preface"</li> <li>○ Kling (1996), "The Seductive Equation"</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>DUE: Problems and Potentials Paper</b></p>
5	Feb 17	Information Technology II <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Open Source and Free Software</li> <li>- The Semantic Web</li> <li>• <i>Reading:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Bazin (1996), "Toward Metareading" (FOTB)</li> <li>○ Raymond (2000), "The Cathedral and the Bazaar" (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> <li>○ Berners-Lee (2001), "The Semantic Web" (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Recommended Reading:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Fisher (2003), "Studying Social Information Spaces"</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>DUE: Online exercise 2, part b</b></p>

**Unit II: Information Technology Use and Information Literacy**

- |   |        |  |
|---|--------|--|
| 6 | Feb 24 | <p>Computers and Artificial Intelligence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Reading:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Haraway (1991), “A Cyborg Manifesto” (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> <li>○ Kurzweil (2003), “The Singularity” (packet)</li> <li>○ Minsky (2003), “What Comes After Minds?” (packet)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Recommended Reading:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Winograd &amp; Flores (1987), “Computation and Intelligence”</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>DUE: Web-based presentation of Information Problems and Potentials</b><br/> <b>DUE: Technology Plan Agency and Situation Analysis (GRP)</b></p>   |
| 7 | Mar 2  | <p>Human Information Behavior &amp; Critical Thinking Skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Reading:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Olsen (1994), “Theories of Literacy and Mind” (packet)</li> <li>○ Wilson (2000), “Human Information Behavior” (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> <li>○ Brown &amp; Duguid (2002), “Learning – In Theory and In Practice” (packet)</li> <li>○ Shermis (1999), "Reflective Thought, Critical Thinking" (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> <li>○ Krumme (2001), "Major Categories in the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (Bloom 1956)" (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> <li>○ Counselling Services - University of Victoria (2003), "Bloom's Taxonomy" (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Recommended Reading:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Baecker, Grudin, Buxton, &amp; Greenberg (1995), “Human Information Processing”</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>DUE: Perspectives on Information Ethics (topic selection)</b></p> |
| 8 | Mar 9  | <p>Finding and Evaluating Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Reading:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Kuhlthau, (1991), “Inside the Search Process” (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> <li>○ Bruce (2000), “Credibility of the Web” (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> <li>○ Feldman (2002), “This is What I Asked For? The Searching Quagmire” (packet)</li> <li>○ Project SUMIT (1999), "Theory of Multiple Intelligences" (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Recommended Reading:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Nardi and O’Day (1999), “Librarians: A Keystone Species”</li> <li>○ Lueg (2003), “Exploring Interaction and Participation to Support Information Seeking in a Social Information Space”</li> <li>○ Notess (2003), "Search Engine Showdown" (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>DUE: Technology Plan Consultant/Client Selection (GRP)</b></p>  |
| — | Mar 16 | Spring Break – no class  |
| 9 | Mar 23 | <p>Information Literacy and Equity of Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Reading:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Marcum (2002), "Rethinking Information Literacy" (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> <li>○ Lerman, Oldenziel, &amp; Mohun (2003), “Introduction: Interrogating Boundaries” (packet)</li> <li>○ Lerman, Mohun, &amp; Oldenziel (2003), “The Shoulders We Stand On / The View from Here” (packet)</li> <li>○ US Dept of Commerce (2000), "Falling Through the Net: Toward Digital Inclusion" (see Introduction and Part I) (<a href="#">online</a>)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |

- Inclusion" (esp. Introduction and Part I) ([online](#))
- Eisenberg & Berkowitz (2002), “The Big6: Information Literacy for the Information Age” ([online](#))
- *Recommended Reading:*
  - AASL (1998), “Information Power” ([online](#))
  - ACRL (2000), “Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education” ([online](#))

**DUE: Online exercise 3, parts a & b**

**Unit III: The Future of Information Technology and the Information Professions**

- 10      Mar 30      Information Architecture and Usability
- *Reading:*
    - Mack & Nielsen (1994), "Executive Summary" (packet)
    - Norman (1998), "The Psychopathology of Everyday Things" (packet)
    - Nielsen (2003), "Heuristic Evaluation" (plus linked articles) ([online](#))
  - *Recommended Reading:*
    - Dillon & Morris (1996), “User Acceptance of Information Technology”

**DUE: Online exercise 4**

- 11      Apr 6      Information ethics
- *Reading:*
    - Johnson (1994), “Introduction: What is Computer Ethics?” (packet)
    - Kling (1996), “Social Controversies About Computerization” (packet)
    - Agre (2002), "Cyberspace as American Culture" ([online](#))
  - *Recommended Reading:*
    - Johnson (1994), “Philosophical Ethics”

**DUE: Perspectives on Information Ethics (Wiki posting)**

- 12      Apr 13      Privacy and Security
- *Reading:*
    - Debray (1996), “The Book as Symbolic Object” (FOTB)
    - Agre (2001), "Introduction" (packet)
    - Waldman, Cranor, & Rubin (2001), "Trust" (packet)
  - *Recommended Reading:*
    - Zimmermann (1999), “Why I Wrote PGP” ([online](#))

**DUE: Perspectives on Information Ethics (response)**

- 13      Apr 20      Emerging Technology and Technology Planning I
- *Reading:*
    - Holland (2002), "What is to Come and How to Predict It" (packet)
    - Rheingold (2002), "Always-On Panopticon or Cooperation Amplifier?" (packet)
    - Cristol (2003), “Futurism is Dead” ([online](#))
  - *Recommended Reading:*
    - Dieberger & Guzdial (2003), “CoWeb – Experiences with Collaborative Web Spaces”
    - Mattison (2003), “Quickikiwiki, Swiki, Twiki, Zwiki, and the Plone Wars”

**DUE: Technology Plan Rough Draft (GRP)**

- 14      Apr 27      Emerging Technology and Technology Planning II
- *Reading:*
    - Nunberg (1996), “Farewell to the Information Age” (FOTB)
    - Duguid (1996), “Material Matters” (FOTB)
- Group presentations on technology plans
- DUE: Online exercise 5**
- 15      May 4      Course evaluation and discussion of information futures
- *Reading:*
    - Borges (1964), "The Library of Babel" ([online](#))
    - Shneiderman (1990), "Human Values and the Future of Technology" ([online](#))
    - Landow (1996), “Twenty Minutes into the Future” (FOTB)
    - Simone (1996), “The Body of the Text” (FOTB)
- Group presentations on technology plans
- DUE: Technology Plan Comments (GRP)**
- May 11      No class
- DUE: Technology Plan Final Draft (GRP)**
- May 18      **DUE: Online exercise 2, part c**  
**DUE: Online exercise 6**

## LIST OF ASSIGNMENTS

There will be three written assignments plus in-class and online contributions. Because this course has a large online component, students should expect to spend between 3-5 hours every week in online assignments. **GRP** indicates a group assignment. Assignments will be submitted using the "Digital Dropbox" feature of Blackboard, with the exception of the Web-based Presentation and a few of the online exercises. Email attachments of assignments is not permitted except in unusual circumstances and must be approved in advance. Assignments are due by midnight on the date indicated.

Assignment	Date Due	Percent of Grade
Preparation and Participation <i>Students will be expected to arrive in class prepared and having done the assigned reading. Students are encouraged to ask questions and discuss material in class. Each student will also be responsible for taking notes in class on at least one occasion and posting those notes online.</i>	ongoing	10%
Online exercises <i>Students will complete various assignments online.</i>	ongoing	15%
Problems and Potentials in Information Technology (5-7 pages) <i>Students will research a current problem with Information Technology related to the students' areas of interest.</i>	Feb 10	15%
Web-based Presentation of Research <i>Students will revise and post their papers in HTML.</i>	Feb 24	10%
Perspectives on Information Ethics <i>Students will research and define current problems in information ethics.</i>	April 6 April 13	15%
Technology Plan (25-40 pages) — <b>GRP</b> <i>Students will work in groups of 6-7 to create a technology plan. Additional dues dates for this assignment are listed on the syllabus and the assignment description.</i>	May 11	35%

All assignments must be handed in on time, and the instructor reserves the right to issue a course grade of F if any assignment is not completed. Late assignments will not be accepted unless three criteria are met:

1. At least 24 hours before the date due, the instructor gives explicit permission to the student to hand the assignment in late.
2. At the same time, a specific date and time are agreed upon for the late submission.
3. The assignment is then submitted on or before the agreed-upon date and time.

The first criterion can be met only in the most serious of health, family, or personal situations.

All of your assignments should adhere to the standards for written work; should be clear, succinct, and specific; and should be explicitly grounded in the readings, class discussions, and other sources as appropriate. You will find it particularly useful to write multiple drafts of your papers; I will be happy to review a maximum of one draft per assignment per student, as long as drafts are submitted at least 48 hours prior to the due date of the assignment.

## Grading Standards for Graduate Writing (Danielle Cunniff Plumer)

- A Superior work.** Demonstrates a high degree of mastery of the course content.
- Is developed well, convincingly and thoroughly, with effective support that is specific, interesting, and appropriate
  - Possesses sentence variety
  - Exhibits sophisticated, appropriate use of transitions
  - Has few, if any, mechanical, grammatical, spelling, or diction errors
  - Demonstrates command of mature and unpretentious diction
- B Good Work.** This grade represents solid and acceptable performance, work that is consistent with academic expectations of students in a graduate program. A “B” paper shares most characteristics of an “A” paper, but
- Has some minor lapses in development of the central idea
  - Has some minor lapses in organization
  - Has an occasional ineffective transition
  - Contains a few sentences that are awkward or ineffective
  - Has less varied sentence structures
  - Is less sophisticated in its handling of the topic
- C Unsatisfactory Work.** In graduate school, the grade of “C” is considered unsatisfactory. Students receiving this grade should consult with the instructor in order to improve their future work. A “C” paper is generally competent, but compared to a “B” paper, it
- Has a weaker or formulaic thesis and less effective development
  - Contains some lapses in organization
  - Has poor or awkward transitions
  - Has more mechanical, grammatical, and diction problems
  - Is effective but unsophisticated in its handling of the topic
- D Unacceptable Work**
- Unlike a C paper, a “D” paper most likely demonstrates one or more of the following qualities:
- Presents a thesis too vague or too obvious to be developed effectively
  - Displays major organizational problems
  - Lacks adequate support for its thesis
  - Has confusing transitions or lacks transitions
  - Contains major problems with diction, grammar, mechanics, or spelling
  - Is ineffective in its handling of the topic
- F Failing Work**
- An “F” paper is seriously flawed. It demonstrates one of more of the following qualities:
- Has no clear thesis or central topic
  - Displays random organization
  - Lacks adequate support or specific development
  - Includes irrelevant details
  - Fails to fulfill assignment or is unduly brief
  - Contains errors in diction, grammar, mechanics, or spelling which impede understanding
  - Is academically dishonest or plagiarized

GRADING POLICY  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

The faculty of the Graduate School of Library and Information Science use the following guidelines in their grading:

A+	Extraordinarily high achievement in the course. This grade, rarely given, recognizes an exceptionally high degree of mastery of course content.
A	Superior. High degree of mastery of the course content.
A-	Excellent. Distinguished work.
B+	Good. Above average level of achievement.
B	Satisfactory. This grade represents solid and acceptable performance, work which is consistent with academic expectations of students in a graduate program.
B-	Barely satisfactory, borderline work.
C+, C, C-	These grades represent unsatisfactory work, and may indicate the instructor's reservations as to the student's ability to meet course requirements.
D	Unacceptable work. Ordinarily indicates the instructor's strong reservation as to the student's ability to meet course requirements leading to a graduate degree.
F	Unacceptable and failing.

#### THE SYMBOLS CREDIT (CR) AND NO-CREDIT (NC)

If you are working toward the MLIS degree, you may not take, on a Credit-No Credit basis, any course that is to be listed on your Application for Degree Candidacy. If you are working toward the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Library and Information Science, no more than 20 percent of the hours to be applied toward your degree may be taken on a Credit-No Credit basis.

To earn a mark of "credit," a graduate student must have completed the course work at a level equivalent to the grade of C or better.

#### THE SYMBOL OF INCOMPLETE (X)

The symbol X may be reported in case you have not completed all the assignments in a course before its conclusion. You must complete the work within the following long semester (Spring or Fall) in order for the filing of the symbol X, the instructor may (with approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies) convert the symbol X into a letter grade. This updated policy became effective Fall 1997.

An incomplete is given sparingly at the instructor's discretion. It is intended to be used only if you have been unable, for a legitimate reason, to complete some portion of the course, such as a term paper or special project. It may not be given to allow a student to do extra-credit work to raise a grade.

For more information on standards of work, please consult the GSLIS [Announcement](#) and [The Graduate School Catalog](#).

## PROBLEMS AND POTENTIALS IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

**Introduction:** This assignment asks students to research a current problem with Information Technology related to the students' area of interest. Alternatively, students may explore new developments in Information Technology that hold the promise to solve an existing problem in the students' area of interest. Students will ultimately present their findings online, using their personal Web sites.

**Weight:** 15% (paper), 10% (revised Web-based presentation)

**Due dates:** February 10 (paper)  
February 24 (Web-based presentation)

### Goals:

The goals of this assignment are:

- To identify and describe a problem or potential in information technology.
- To identify and use online and print reference sources available for research.
- To practice using APA formatting standards and other writing requirements for this class.
- To develop a Web presence and present findings online.

### Tasks:

1. Develop a 5-7 page description of the problem area. You must use reference sources; a total of 4-7 sources is recommended for a paper of this length and should include a mix of peer-reviewed articles or books, current news sources, and other online and in-print items.
2. Submit the paper using the Digital Dropbox feature of Blackboard.
3. The instructor will return the paper with suggestions for revision, and you will then revise the paper and present it on your personal Web site.
4. For your Web presentation, you may use either raw HTML or a WYSIWYG (What You See Is What You Get) editor such as Macromedia Dreamweaver or Netscape/Mozilla Composer. If you do use a WYSIWYG editor, you should at least take a look at the code view or source code to make sure that the editor has not added tags or formatting that you do not want. You may not use Microsoft FrontPage or the "Save As HTML" function of Microsoft Word or OpenOffice to create your page (Yes, I can tell -- it's pretty easy if you look at the source code!).
  - For your convenience, I have created a basic HTML document that you can use to develop your presentation. Either right-click on research-template.html and select "Save Target" or go to the page and select "File" > "Save As" (either Web page complete or HTML only should work) and give the file a name. Be sure to look at it in Notepad or in "Code view" to read the comments. Good luck!

**Notes:** You will need to be ready to post your paper to the Web fairly quickly after it is returned to you. In preparation, you might want to create a basic Web site and experiment with ways of presenting information on the Web. The iSchool IT Lab has a number of useful tutorials on this subject and also offers workshops on creating basic Webpages as well as more advanced topics.

**Sample paper:** I have uploaded a sample paper that I wrote a couple of years ago for a different class as a PDF file. While this paper was not written with this particular assignment in mind, you can use it as an example of a typical academic research paper. You should not, however, plan to present your paper online as a simple PDF document, although you may provide the PDF version of your paper online as well as the HTML version.

## PERSPECTIVES ON INFORMATION ETHICS

**Introduction:** This assignment asks students to identify, research, and present information relating to controversial subjects in information ethics, using a wiki-based discussion format. Students will work independently on developing their initial Wiki posting and will thereafter respond to and collaboratively edit the work of their peers in an effort to create a useful and authoritative information ethics resource.

**Weight:** 10% (Wiki posting), 5% (revised Web-based presentation)

**Due dates:**

Topic selection:	March 2
Wiki posting:	April 6
Response :	April 13

**Goals:**

The goals of this assignment are:

- To identify and describe various controversial topics in information ethics.
- To critique and respond to the work of other students in a positive and respectful manner.
- To create an information ethics resource that can be used in a variety of contexts.
- To use a Wiki to collaborate online.

**Tasks:**

1. From the list of topics below, or in negotiation with the instructor, each student will identify a current controversy related to information ethics of special interest to that student.
2. No more than three students may address any one topic.
3. The student must notify the instructor of the topic of choice no later than **Tuesday, March 2**.
4. Each student will write a 300- to 600-word essay about the topic and post it to the class discussion board in the appropriate folder (to be identified by the instructor) no later than **Tuesday, April 6 (10%)**.
5. It is imperative for the posting to be based on an informed opinion about the topic at hand. Each student must use print and online materials of all kinds to support the posting's argument. These sources must be appropriately cited in APA style at the end of the essay. Students should use this assignment as an opportunity to share their knowledge with their classmates.
6. Each student will then post a 200- to 400-word response to one other student's original Wiki posting. Random selection by the instructor will determine to which posting each student will respond. This response will be posted no later than **Tuesday, April 13 (5%)**. This posting, too, must go beyond the usual "this-is-what-I-think-and-believe" opining that characterizes ordinary speech – it must, instead, be legitimated by reflection, depth of analysis, and, as appropriate, fully documented sources.
7. This response posting must be offered in the spirit of critique, agreeing and disagreeing as appropriate and recognizing that reasonable people may disagree. The response should be respectful and courteous as well as pointed and thought-provoking.
8. The Technology Plan that serves as the capstone assignment for the course will also include a 4- to 6-page discussion of information ethics concerns of particular importance to the situation and community(ies) of interest that the plan is aimed to address. The Information Ethics Wiki may serve as a resource for this assignment.

The topics for this assignment include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Civil disobedience online
- Privacy of online users' transactions in for-profit, non-profit, or public organizations
- Liability of information providers for inaccurate information
- Spoofing of email addresses and/or URLs
- Gender and information ethics
- Dominance of the Internet by English
- Identity theft
- The intellectual commons/public domain
- Conflict between free speech and privacy
- Digital locators of persons, cars, and the like
- Customer loyalty programs
- Tension between surveillance related to intellectual property and privacy
- Plagiarism
- Hacking/cracking
- Privacy of information in public archives
- Government agencies' selling public information, e.g., drivers' licenses information
- Software piracy
- Privacy in public
- Use of biometrics for identification
- Circumvention of restrictions of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA)
- Peer-to-peer file sharing
- Punishment of workers for private use of workplace information technologies
- Repetitive strain injuries
- Failure of complex information systems, e.g., airplanes, public utilities, and weapons systems
- Database matching in government
- Private use of strong cryptography
- Anonymity/pseudonymity
- Reverse engineering
- Speech codes barring, e.g., racist, sexist, and other offensive speech
- Collection development in publicly supported information agencies
- Use of Internet filters
- Sharing of online passwords to others' property, e.g., e-reserves, with unauthorized users
- Use of public resources to display pornographic material
- Investigative reporting online
- Recording customer service calls
- Ethical questions related to telecommuting
- Unfettered access to information by legal minors.

Please recall that ethical controversies of all kinds usually involve more than two “sides” and that using the metaphor of “debate” when discussing social controversies tends to obscure more than it explains. We are culturally conditioned to think of controversies as “either/or” and “black or white” – which itself may be a controversial topic!

**Note:** I have found, in grading freshman composition papers over the years, that students produce better work when they are not emotionally invested in the topic. If you do choose to research a topic that is highly meaningful to you, try to play “devil's advocate” with yourself to find the weaknesses in your argument.

## TECHNOLOGY PLAN

**Introduction:** This assignment asks students to develop a technology plan for a real or hypothetical information agency based upon a student-created scenario. Students will work in groups of 6 or 7 for this assignment and should divide the work accordingly. Students will use a Wiki as a collaborative workspace to share planning materials, notes, evaluations, and comments; while other types of collaboration (such as email) may also be used, students will be asked to reflect upon the strengths and weaknesses of a Wiki as a collaborative writing tool at the end of the assignment.

**Weight:** 35% (25% Consultant role; 10% Client role)

**Due dates:**

Information agency and situation analysis:	Feb 24
Consultant/client selection:	Mar 9
Rough draft of technology plan:	Apr 20
Comments on technology plan:	May 4
Final draft of technology plan:	May 11

**Goals:**

The goals of this assignment are:

- To learn how to develop strategic goals and measurable objectives.
- To develop practical budgeting and assessment skills.
- To understand the difference between output and outcome measures.

**Tasks:**

1. Form a group of 6 or 7 students. For the purposes of this exercise, it may be best to work with other students who have similar interests, e.g., academic librarianship.
2. Identify a situation for which a technology plan might be useful. Develop a 300-500 word description of the situation and the information agency in which it would be found. The primary requirement is that this be a technological-based situation, and one that will require evaluation of software packages, as well as hardware and other concerns. Some examples:
  - Creating a digitization lab in an academic library special collections unit.
  - Developing an infrastructure for laptop use, including access to the Internet, in a public library.
  - Designing an Intranet for a small software development corporation.
 Some constraints you might want to keep in mind: the timeframe for completion of the technology plan is 6 months to a year (a short-term plan). You will specify a maximum contract amount for the work to be done, and all work will be performed by the consultants, using agreed upon resources (both technological and personal) from your group.
3. Groups will post their situation analyses to the class wiki by February 21.
4. Each group should select one situation analysis for which the group will develop a technology plan. A group may not select its own analysis! In other words, each group of students will be acting as consultants to another group of students, developing a technology plan for them. In addition to the situation analyses, a consultant group should be prepared to interview their clients to gain insight into the user and business requirements for the plan. At least two people from each group should be present at the interview, along with the instructor.
5. Each group will develop a technology plan, including at a minimum the following elements:

- **Introduction and overview** of the information agency and program or project. Be sure to use the situation analysis provided by your clients as well as information gathered during interviews with the clients. (3-4 pages)
  - **Assessment** of existing resources and future needs. Include both technological and human resources and needs in this assessment. Sample forms for the assessments will be provided by the instructor, or you may develop your own forms. (4-6 pages)
  - **Ethics review** of critical information ethics concerns implicit in the situation. Students should take advantage of the materials assembled by their peers in the Perspectives on Information Ethics assignment. (4-6 pages)
  - **Comparison** of possible alternative solutions, include a cost-benefit analysis of two or more software packages. Students should particularly search for open-source alternatives to use in their comparison. (4-6 pages)
  - **Strategic plan**, including a mission statement, goals, and measurable objectives. Each plan should have, at a minimum, three general goals with at least three but no more than five measurable objectives per goal, with some narrative explanation for each goal. You may wish to add additional action steps for each objective, explaining exactly how and when the objective will be met, but this is not required. (5-7 pages)
  - **Budget** for the period of the plan (no more than one year). By necessity, all costs will be estimates. Consider hardware and software costs. Also consider the costs of infrastructure (such as building a new facility or rewiring an existing facility), staff (including both wages and benefits), and miscellaneous costs (such as photocopying, travel and training, etc.). A sample budget template will be provided by the instructor, or you may develop your own form. (1-2 pages)
  - **Evaluation** section, explaining how the program or project will be evaluated to determine whether the plan is working. In this section, you will wish to distinguish between outputs and outcomes. (4-6 pages)
6. A draft of the final plan should be given to the clients for review by April 20. While this does not need to be complete, it should be at least 15 pages in length and include rough drafts of each of the sections.
  7. Consultants will deliver a presentation on the technology plan to the clients (and the rest of the class) on either April 27 or May 4. Time will be strictly limited to 15 minutes per group.
  8. Clients will return the draft plan with 1-2 pages of comments by May 4.
  9. The final technology plans, consisting of 25 doublespaced pages minimum, are due in the Digital Dropbox of Blackboard by midnight on May 11.

Sample paper: I have uploaded three sample plans to Blackboard. They are all in HTML format, so you should be able to see them by just clicking on them.

## ONLINE EXERCISES

### 1. iSchool account, email, and Web space, plus Blackboard (5 pts.)

There are four parts to this exercise:

- a. Account.** Students who **don't** already have iSchool accounts should register for one at [https://www.ischool.utexas.edu/technology/accounts/account\\_signup.html](https://www.ischool.utexas.edu/technology/accounts/account_signup.html) (**to repeat: students who already have accounts should skip this step**). It takes 24-48 hours to activate an account, so students should complete this step as soon as possible. **Due: January 27.**

iSchool Technology FAQs (Opt.):

- How do I sign-up for a School of Information account?

- b. Email.** Using the iSchool account they have created, students must send an email to the teaching assistant. Students may use a Unix-based mail program (mail, Pine, etc.), a Web-based mail program (Webmail), or any other mail program (Outlook, Eudora), but the mail must originate from the iSchool account. The TA will respond to the email, and students must respond to the response. **Due: January 27.**

iSchool Tutorials (Opt.):

- UT Webmail
- Pine e-mail Tutorial

- c. Web space.** Students should create a `public_html` directory in their iSchool account and set the appropriate permissions (students who have previously created a `public_html` directory in their account may skip this step). Students should create a simple Web page in their account to serve as the initial page, including, at a minimum, the student's name and contact information, unless the student already has an online presence with similar details. Alternatively, students may use the UT WebSpace allotted to them for this exercise. Students should email the teaching assistant when the page is up. **Due: February 3.**

iSchool Tutorials (Opt.):

- Tutorials: Web Development
- d. Blackboard.** Students should verify the email account listed for them in Blackboard and correct it as needed, using the Personal Information: Address Change section of UT Direct. The teaching assistant will send an email out to all members of the class through Blackboard; you must reply to this email to complete the assignment. **Due: February 3.**

## 2. Technology Self-Assessment (15 pts.)

There are three parts to this exercise:

- a. **Introduction.** Students will post a brief introduction of themselves on our class wiki, including information about their technological and academic backgrounds, career goals, and concerns about the class. Length: 300-500 words. **Due as a wiki posting: January 27.** (Send the link to the teaching assistant when you're done.)
- b. **Diagnostic questionnaire.** Students will complete an online questionnaire in Blackboard and answer questions about their current level of technological experience and comfort. **Due: February 17.**
- c. **Post-mortem.** At the end of class, students will write a short description of the ways in which this class helped or hindered their progression as information professionals. Students should include suggestions for improving class assignments, IT Lab tutorials, and readings. Length: 1-3 pages. *Points will be assigned for completion ONLY; instructor will not read papers or postings until after final grades have been posted.* **Due in the Digital Dropbox (Blackboard): May 18.**

## 3. Texas Information Literacy Tutorial (20 pts.)

- a. **TILT.** All students should register themselves in TILT, complete the Introduction and Modules 1-3, including online quizzes, and mail the results of the quizzes to the teaching assistant. Students are also encouraged to read the supporting documentation and FAQs. **Due: March 23.**
- b. **Evaluation.** Students will evaluate TILT as an information literacy tool. Evaluations should include at least three critical comments (either good or bad), with at least one screenshot, and two suggestions for redesign. Total length of the evaluation should be 2-3 pages. **Due in the Digital Dropbox (Blackboard): March 23.**

## 4. Dublin Core exercise (25 pts.)

Students will generate Dublin Core metadata for their Web presentation, using the Dublin Core Metadata Template provided by the Nordic Metadata Project. Students unfamiliar with Dublin Core may want to read about the project or about using Dublin Core metadata first. **Due as online metadata: March 30.**

1. You should enter the requested information for as many elements as you can (you do not need an LC subject heading or Dewey/LC classification number!). Explore the drop-down boxes to see what options are available, and use the hyperlinks for each DC element if you want to learn more about it.
2. When you have filled out the form, you should click on the "Return Metadata" button, with "for inclusion in HTML-4 document" in the drop-down box.
3. Using your mouse, select the metadata that appears on your screen, including both the parts in the <meta> and <link> tags. Copy this and paste it into a blank text document or go directly to step 4.

4. You will have to modify the source code for your Web presentation to include this metadata. If you are using Dreamweaver or a similar WYSIWYG editor, open your document and select "View" > "Code." You will need to paste the metadata from step 3 into the "head" of your HTML document, usually after the <title>.
5. Save your document and upload it again to your public\_html directory.
6. Send the link to the teaching assistant when you're done.

### **5. Predicting the Future of Information Technology (20 pts.)**

Working individually, students will generate at least one prediction for how IT in their professions will change in the next 5, 10, and 25 years, respectively (at least three predictions total), with short explanations of each. Total length: 300-500 words. **Due as a wiki posting: April 27.** (Send the link to the teaching assistant when you're done.)

### **6. Wiki assessment (15 pts.)**

Working individually, students will evaluate the use of a Wiki as a knowledge management and group workflow tool. Feel free to discuss problems with the particular Wiki used in class and with the difficulties inherent in online or remote teams. Total length: 1-2 pages. **Due as a wiki posting: May 11.** (Send the link to the teaching assistant when you're done.)

## REFERENCES

## I. Required Readings

- Agre, Philip E. (1998). Introduction. In Philip E. Agre & Marc Rotenberg (Eds.), *Technology and privacy: The new landscape* (pp. 1-28). Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Agre, Philip E. (2002). Cyberspace as American culture. *Science as Culture*, 11(2), 171-189. Also available at <http://polaris.gseis.ucla.edu/pagre/sac.html>
- Bazin, Patrick. (1996). Toward metareading. In Geoffrey Nunberg (Ed.), *The future of the book* (pp. 153-168). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Berners-Lee, Tim, Hendler, James, & Lassila, Ora. (2001, May). The Semantic Web. *Scientific American*. Also available at <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?articleID=00048144-10D2-1C70-84A9809EC588EF21>
- Bolter, David Jay. (1996). Ekphrasis, virtual reality, and the future of writing. In Geoffrey Nunberg (Ed.), *The future of the book* (pp. 253-272). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Borges, Jorge Luis. (1964). The library of Babel (James E. Irby, Trans.). In Donald A. Yates & James E. Irby (Eds.), *Labyrinths: Selected stories & other writings* (pp. 51-58). New York: New Directions. Also available at [http://jubal.westnet.com/hyperdiscordia/library\\_of\\_babel.html](http://jubal.westnet.com/hyperdiscordia/library_of_babel.html)
- Brockman, John (Ed.). (2003). *The new humanists: Science at the edge*. New York: Barnes and Noble Books. (Original work published)
- Brown, John Seely, & Duguid, Paul. (2000). Learning -- In theory and in practice. In *The social life of information* (pp. 117-146). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Bruce, Bertram C. [Chip]. (2000). Credibility of the Web: Why we need dialectical reading. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 34(1), 97-109. Also available at <http://www.lis.uiuc.edu/%7Echip/pubs/credibility.shtml>
- Chartier, Roger. (1995). Representations of the written word. In *Forms and meanings: Texts, performances, and audiences from codex to computer* (pp. 6-24). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Counselling Services - University of Victoria. (2003). *Bloom's taxonomy*. Retrieved January 14, 2004, from <http://www.coun.uvic.ca/learn/program/hndouts/bloom.html>
- Cristol, Hope. (2003, December). Futurism is dead. *Wired*, 11.12. Also available at <http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.12/view.html?pg=1>
- Debray, Régis. (1996). The book as symbolic object. In Geoffrey Nunberg (Ed.), *The future of the book* (pp. 139-152). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Drucker, Peter. (2001, November 1). The next society. *The Economist*. Also available at [http://www.economist.com/surveys/displayStory.cfm?Story\\_id=770819](http://www.economist.com/surveys/displayStory.cfm?Story_id=770819)
- Duguid, Paul. (1996). Material matters: The past and futurology of the book. In Geoffrey Nunberg (Ed.), *The future of the book* (pp. 63-102). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Eisenberg, Michael B., & Berkowitz, Robert E. (2002). *The Big6: Information literacy for the Information Age*. Retrieved January 13, 2003, from <http://www.big6.com/>

- Feldman, Susan. (2002). This is what I asked for? The searching quagmire. In Anne P. Mintz (Ed.), *Web of deception: Misinformation on the Internet* (pp. 175-195). Medford, NJ: Information Today.
- Haraway, Donna. (1991). A cyborg manifesto: Science, technology, and socialist-feminism in the late twentieth century. In *Simians, cyborgs and women: The reinvention of nature* (pp. 149-181). New York: Routledge. Also available at <http://www.stanford.edu/dept/HPS/Haraway/CyborgManifesto.html>
- Hesse, Carla. (1996). Books in time. In Geoffrey Nunberg (Ed.), *The future of the book* (pp. 21-36). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hobart, Michael E., & Schiffman, Zachary S. (1998). The analytical world map. In *Information ages: Literacy, numeracy, and the computer revolution* (pp. 146-172). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Holland, John H. (2002). What is to come and how to predict it. In John Brockman (Ed.), *The next fifty years: Science in the first half of the twenty-first century* (pp. 170-182). New York: Vintage Books.
- Johnson, Deborah G. (1994). Introduction: What is computer ethics? In *Computer ethics* (pp. 1-15). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kling, Rob. (1996). Social controversies about computerization. In Rob Kling (Ed.), *Computerization and controversy: Value conflicts and social choices* (2nd ed., pp. 10-15). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Krumme, Gunter. (2001). *Major categories in the taxonomy of educational objectives (Bloom 1956)*. Retrieved January 14, 2004, from <http://faculty.washington.edu/krumme/guides/bloom.html>
- Kuhlthau, Carol C. (1991). Inside the search process: Information seeking from the user's perspective. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 42(5), 361-371. Also available at <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/jtoc?ID=27981>
- Kurzweil, Ray. (2003). The singularity. In John Brockman (Ed.), *The new humanists: Science at the edge* (pp. 215-232). New York: Barnes and Noble Books.
- Landow, George P. (1996). Twenty minutes into the future, or how are we moving beyond the book? In Geoffrey Nunberg (Ed.), *The future of the book* (pp. 209-238). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lerman, Nina E., Mohun, Arwen P., & Oldenziel, Ruth. (2003). The shoulders we stand on/The view from here: Historiography and directions for research. In Nina E. Lerman, Ruth Oldenziel & Arwen P. Mohun (Eds.), *Gender & technology: A reader* (pp. 425-449). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lerman, Nina E., Oldenziel, Ruth, & Mohun, Arwen P. (2003). Introduction: Interrogating Boundaries. In Nina E. Lerman, Ruth Oldenziel & Arwen P. Mohun (Eds.), *Gender & technology: A reader* (pp. 1-9). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lessig, Lawrence. (1998). *The laws of cyberspace*. Retrieved January 13, 2004, from [http://www.lessig.org/content/articles/works/laws\\_cyberspace.pdf](http://www.lessig.org/content/articles/works/laws_cyberspace.pdf)
- Mack, Robert L., & Nielsen, Jakob. (1994). Executive summary. In Jakob Nielsen & Robert L. Mack (Eds.), *Usability inspection methods* (pp. 1-23). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Marcum, James W. (2002). Rethinking information literacy. *Library Quarterly*, 72(1), 1-26. Also available at <http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?db=aph&jn=%22LIQ%22&scope=site>
- Minsky, Marvin. (2003). What comes after minds? In John Brockman (Ed.), *The new humanists: Science at the edge* (pp. 197-214). New York: Barnes and Noble Books.

- Nardi, Bonnie A., & O'Day, Vicki L. (1999). A matter of metaphor: Technology as tool, text, system, ecology. In *Information ecologies: Using technology with heart* (pp. 25-47). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Nielsen, Jakob. (2003). *Heuristic evaluation*. Retrieved January 13, 2004, from <http://www.useit.com/papers/heuristic/>
- Norman, Donald. (1998). The psychopathology of everyday things. In *The design of everyday things* (pp. 1-33). New York: Doubleday.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey. (1996). Farewell to the information age. In Geoffrey Nunberg (Ed.), *The future of the book* (pp. 103-138). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey. (1996). Introduction. In Geoffrey Nunberg (Ed.), *The future of the book* (pp. 9-20). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Olson, David R. (1994). Theories of literacy and mind from Levy-Bruhl to Scribner and Cole. In *The world on paper: The conceptual and cognitive implications of writing and reading* (pp. 44). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ong, Walter J. (2002). *Orality and literacy: The technologizing of the word*. London: Routledge. (Original work published 1982)
- Project SUMIT. (1999). *Theory of multiple intelligences*. Retrieved January 14, 2004, from <http://www.pz.harvard.edu/sumit/MISUMIT.HTM>
- Raymond, Eric S. (2000, August 2, 2002). *The cathedral and the bazaar*. Retrieved January 13, 2004, from <http://www.catb.org/~esr/writings/cathedral-bazaar/cathedral-bazaar/>
- Rheingold, Howard. (2002). Always-on panopticon... Or cooperation amplifier? In *Smart mobs: The next social revolution* (pp. 183-215). Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing.
- Shermis, S. Samuel. (1999). *Reflective thought, critical thinking*. Retrieved January 14, 2004, from [http://www.ericfacility.net/databases/ERIC\\_Digests/ed436007.html](http://www.ericfacility.net/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed436007.html)
- Shneiderman, Ben. (1990). Human values and the future of technology: A declaration of empowerment. *ACM SIGCAS Computers and Society*, 20(3), 1-6. Also available at <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=97351.97360&coll=Portal&dl=ACM&CFID=15623739&CFTOKEN=60308395>
- Simone, Raffaele. (1996). The body of the text. In Geoffrey Nunberg (Ed.), *The future of the book* (pp. 239-252). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic and Statistics Administration, & National Telecommunications and Information Administration. (2000). *Falling through the Net: Towards digital inclusion. A report on Americans' access to technological tools*. Retrieved January 13, 2004, from <http://search.ntia.doc.gov/pdf/fttn00.pdf>
- Waldman, Marc, Cranor, Lorrie Faith, & Rubin, Avi. (2001). Trust. In Andy Oram (Ed.), *Peer-to-peer: Harnessing the benefits of a disruptive technology* (pp. 242-270). Beijing: O'Reilly.
- Wilson, Thomas D. (2000). Human information behavior. *Informing Science*, 3(2), 49-55. Also available at <http://citeseer.nj.nec.com/wilson00human.html>

## II. Recommended Readings

- American Association of School Librarians, & Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (1998). Information literacy standards for student learning. In *Information power: Building partnerships for learning* (pp. 8-46). Chicago: American Library Association. Also available at [http://www.ala.org/aaslTemplate.cfm?Section=Information\\_Power&Template=/ContentManagement/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=19937](http://www.ala.org/aaslTemplate.cfm?Section=Information_Power&Template=/ContentManagement/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=19937)
- Association of College and Research Libraries. (2000). *Information literacy competency standards for higher education*. Chicago: American Library Association. Also available at [http://www.ala.org/Content/NavigationMenu/ACRL/Standards\\_and\\_Guidelines/standards.pdf](http://www.ala.org/Content/NavigationMenu/ACRL/Standards_and_Guidelines/standards.pdf)
- Baecker, R., Grudin, J., Buxton, W., & Greenberg, S. (1995). Human information processing. In R. Baecker, J. Grudin, W. Buxton & S. Greenberg (Eds.), *Readings in Human-Computer Interaction* (pp. 571-586). San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann.
- Dieberger, Andreas, & Guzdial, Mark. (2003). CoWeb -- Experiences with collaborative Web spaces. In Christopher Lueg & Danyel Fisher (Eds.), *From Usenet to Cowebs: Interacting with social information spaces* (pp. 155-166). London: Springer.
- Dillon, Andrew, & Morris, Michael. (1996). User acceptance of information technology: Theories and models. In Martha Williams (Ed.), *Annual review of information science and technology* (Vol. 31, pp. 3-32). Medford, NJ: Information Today.
- Fisher, Danyel. (2003). Studying social information spaces. In Christopher Lueg & Danyel Fisher (Eds.), *From Usenet to Cowebs: Interacting with social information spaces* (pp. 3-19). London: Springer.
- Johnson, Deborah G. (1994). Philosophical ethics. In *Computer ethics* (pp. 16-36). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kling, Rob. (1996). The seductive equation of technological progress with social progress. In Rob Kling (Ed.), *Computerization and controversy: Value conflicts and social choices* (2nd ed., pp. 22-25). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Kuhn, Thomas. (1970). Preface. In *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lueg, Christopher. (2003). Exploring interaction and participation to support information seeking in a social information space. In Christopher Lueg & Danyel Fisher (Eds.), *From Usenet to Cowebs: Interacting with social information spaces* (pp. 232-252). London: Springer.
- Mattison, David. (2003, April). Quickiwiki, Swiki, Twiki, Zwiki, and the plone wars: Wiki as a PIM and collaborative content tool. *Searcher*, 11, 32-48. Also available at <http://www.infotoday.com/searcher/apr03/mattison.shtml>
- Nardi, Bonnie A., & O'Day, Vicki L. (1999). Librarians: A keystone species. In *Information ecologies: Using technology with heart* (pp. 79-104). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Notess, Greg. (2003). *Search engine showdown: The users' guide to Web searching*. Retrieved January 14, 2004, from <http://www.searchengineshowdown.com/>
- Winograd, Terry, & Flores, Fernando. (1986). Computation and intelligence. In *Understanding computers and cognition: A new foundation for design* (pp. 93-106). Boston: Addison-Wesley.

Zimmermann, Philip. (1999). *Why I wrote PGP*. Retrieved January 13, 2004, from <http://www.philzimmermann.com/essays-WhyIWrotePGP.shtml>

### III. Wikis & CSCW

Barron, Daniel D. (2003). Blogs, wikis, alt com, and the new information landscape: A library media specialist's guide. *School Library Media Activities Monthly*, 20(2), 48-51.

Dieberger, Andreas, & Guzdial, Mark. (2003). CoWeb -- Experiences with collaborative Web spaces. In Christopher Lueg & Danyel Fisher (Eds.), *From Usenet to Cowebs: Interacting with social information spaces* (pp. 155-166). London: Springer.

Guzdial, Mark, Rick, Jochen, & Kerimbaev. (2000). *Recognizing and supporting roles in CSCW*. Proceedings of the 2000 ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work, Philadelphia, PA (pp. 261-268).

Leuf, Bo, & Cunningham, Ward. (2002). *What is wiki*. Retrieved January 14, 2004, from <http://wiki.org/wiki.cgi?WhatIsWiki>

Leuf, Bo, & Cunningham, Ward. (2001). *The Wiki way: Quick collaboration on the Web*. Boston: Addison-Wesley.

Lueg, Christopher, & Fisher, Danyel (Eds.). (2003). *From Usenet to Cowebs: Interacting with social information spaces*. London: Springer.

Matias, Nathan. (2003). *What is a wiki?* Retrieved January 14, 2004, from <http://www.sitepoint.com/article/1241>

Mattison, David. (2003, April). Quickiwiki, Swiki, Twiki, Zwiki, and the plone wars: Wiki as a PIM and collaborative content tool. *Searcher*, 11, 32-48. Also available at <http://www.infotoday.com/searcher/apr03/mattison.shtml>

Moulthrop, Stuart, Bernstein, Mark, & Carton, Sean. (2002). *Self-assembling hypertexts, weblogs, and wikis*. Proceedings of the Thirteenth ACM Conference on Hypertext and Hypermedia, College Park, MD (p. 149).

Portland Pattern Repository. (2004). *Front page*. Retrieved January 14, 2004, from <http://c2.com/cgi/wiki>

Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. (2003). *Main Page*. Retrieved January 14, 2004, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/>

Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. (2003). *Wiki software*. Retrieved January 14, 2004, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wiki\\_software](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wiki_software)