

Trust and Transparency in the Information Society

INF 350G: Information in Society (27207)

INF 385T: Special Topics in Information Science (27354)

Spring 2018

UTA 1.504

Thursdays 12:00 pm – 2:45 pm

Instructor: Dr. Kenneth R. Fleischmann
kfleisch@ischool.utexas.edu
UTA 5.534

Office Hours: Thursdays 2:45-3:30 pm, by appointment, or via e-mail

I. Course Description:

What do we value in life, and how does that influence how we create, share, understand, and use information? This course will explore three everyday information values: transparency, trust, and agency. We will apply these three everyday information values to three important contexts within the information society: government, science, and media. This course will be particularly relevant to students in information studies, communication studies, radio-television-film, journalism, anthropology, sociology, psychology, philosophy, management information systems, and public policy.

II. Course Aims and Objectives:

Upon successfully completing this course, you will be able to:

- Understand the everyday information values of transparency, trust, and agency
- Apply your understanding of these concepts to enhance understanding of society at large
- Conduct original research exploring the role of these concepts in a domain of society

III. Tentative Course Schedule: ***This syllabus is subject to change with advance notice.*

Date	Topic	Readings	Assignments
Unit I: Everyday Information Values: Transparency, Trust, and Agency			
1/18	Introduction to the Course <hr/> Our Many Paths	Syllabus	Attendance & Participation (AP)
1/25	Information & Human Values <hr/> Choosing a Research Paper Topic	Schwartz, S.H. (2007). Value orientations: Measurement, antecedents, and consequences across nations. In R. Jowell, C. Roberts, R. Fitzgerald, & G. Eva (Eds.), <i>Measuring attitudes cross-nationally: Lessons from the European Social Survey</i> (pp. 169-203). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Friedman, B., & Kahn, Jr., P.H. (2008). Human values, ethics, and design. In J.A. Jacko & A. Sears (Eds.), <i>The human-computer interaction handbook</i> (2 nd ed.) (pp. 1241-1266). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Shilton, K., Koepfler, J.A., & Fleischmann, K.R. (2013). Charting sociotechnical dimensions of values for design research. <i>The Information Society</i> , 29, 259-271. Fleischmann, K.R. (2014). <i>Information and Human Values</i> (pp. 1-5). San Rafael, CA: Morgan & Claypool.	AP Discussion Questions (DQs)

2/1	Transparency <hr/> Writing a Research Paper Proposal	Star, S.L., Bowker, G.C., & Neumann, L.J. (2003). Transparency beyond the individual level of scale: Convergence between information artifacts and communities of practice. In A.P. Bishop, N.A. Van House, & B.P. Battenfield (Eds.), <i>Digital library use: Social practice in design and evaluation</i> (pp. 241-269). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Fleischmann, K.R., & Wallace, W.A. (2005). A covenant with transparency: Opening the black box of models. <i>Communications of the ACM</i> , 48(5), 93-97. Turilli, M., & Floridi, L. (2009). The ethics of information transparency. <i>Ethics and Information Technology</i> , 11, 105-112. Fluck, M. (2016). Theory, 'truthers', and transparency: Reflecting on knowledge in the twenty-first century. <i>Review of International Studies</i> , 42, 48-73.	AP DQs
2/8	Trust <hr/> Peer Feedback on Proposals	Hwang, P., & Burgers, W.P. (1997). Properties of trust: An analytical view. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i> , 69, 67-73. Friedman, B., Kahn, P.H., & Howe, D.C. (2000). Trust online. <i>Communications of the ACM</i> , 43(12), 34-40. Kelton, K., Fleischmann, K.R., & Wallace, W.A. (2008). Trust in digital information. <i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology</i> , 59, 363-374. Yeo, G. (2013). Trust and context in cyberspace. <i>Archives and Records</i> , 34, 214-234.	AP DQs Paper Proposal
2/15	Agency <hr/> Searching for Literature and Organizing a Paper	Pickering, A. (1993). The mangle of practice: Agency and emergence in the sociology of science. <i>American Journal of Sociology</i> , 99, 559-589. Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. <i>Annual Review of Psychology</i> , 52, 1-26. Fleischmann, K.R. (2007). The evolution of agency: Spectra of bioagency and cyberagency. <i>The Information Society</i> , 23, 361-371. Latour, B. (2014). Agency at the time of the Anthropocene. <i>New Literary History</i> , 45, 1-18.	AP DQs
Unit II: Transparency, Trust, and Agency in Elections and Government			
2/22	Campaigns <hr/> Peer Feedback on Outlines	Agarwal, S.D., Barthel, M.L., Rost, C., Borning, A., Bennett, W.L., & Johnson, C.N. (2014). Grassroots organizing in the digital age: Considering values and technology in Tea Party and Occupy Wall Street. <i>Information, Communication, and Society</i> , 17, 326-341. Moore, S.S., Hope, Elan C., Eisman, A.B., & Zimmerman, M.A. (2016). Predictors of civic engagement among highly involved young adults: Exploring the relationship between agency and systems worldview. <i>Journal of Community Psychology</i> , 44, 888-903. Wasike, B. (2017). Persuasion in 140 characters: Testing issue framing, persuasion, and credibility via Twitter and online news articles in the gun control debate. <i>Computers in Human Behavior</i> , 66, 179-190. Horstink, L. (2017). Online participation and the new global democracy: Avaaz, a case study. <i>Global Society</i> , 31, 101-124.	AP DQs Outline

3/1	Elections <hr/> Writing an Introduction	Jones, D.W. (2009). Early requirements for mechanical voting systems. In <i>Proceedings of the First International Workshop on Requirements Engineering for E-Voting Systems</i> (pp. 1-8). New York: IEEE Press. David, S. (2004). Opening the sources of accountability. <i>First Monday</i> , 9(11). Awad, M., & Leiss, E.L. (2016). The evolution of voting: Analysis of conventional and electronic voting systems. <i>International Journal of Applied Engineering Research</i> , 11, 7888-7896. Berghel, H. (2016). Douglas Jones on today's voting machines. <i>Computer</i> , 49(10), 84-89.	AP DQs
3/8	Governance <hr/> Writing Body Sections	Bandura, A. (2002). Growing primacy of human agency in adaptation and change in the electronic era. <i>European Psychologist</i> , 7, 2-16. Nicholls, K., & Picou, J.S. (2013). The impact of Hurricane Katrina on trust in government. <i>Social Science Quarterly</i> , 94, 344-361. Kosack, S., & Fung, A. (2014). Does transparency improve governance? <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> , 17, 65-87. Piotrowski, S.J. (2017). The "open government reform" movement: The case of the Open Government Partnership and U.S. transparency policies. <i>American Review of Public Administration</i> , 47, 155-171.	AP DQs
Unit III: Transparency, Trust, and Agency in Science, Technology, and Medicine			
3/22	Artificial Intelligence <hr/> Writing Implications	Searle, J.R. (2002). Twenty-one years in the Chinese room. In J.M. Preston & M.A. Bishop (Eds.), <i>Views into the Chinese room: New essays on Searle and artificial intelligence</i> (pp. 51-69). Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press. Anderson, S.L. (2008). Asimov's "three laws of robotics" and machine metaethics. <i>AI & Society</i> , 22, 477-493. Hengstler, M., Enkel, E., & Duelli, S. (2016). Applied artificial intelligence and trust – the case of autonomous vehicles and medical assistance devices. <i>Technological Forecasting & Social Change</i> , 105, 105-120. Schildt, H. (2016). Big data and organizational design: The brave new world of algorithmic management and computer augmented transparency. <i>Innovation: Management, Policy & Practice</i> .	AP DQs
3/29	Avionics <hr/> Writing Peer Reviews	Mindell, D. (2011). <i>Digital Apollo: Human and machine in spaceflight</i> (pp. 1-16 and 263-271). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Belzer, R., Noory, G., & Wayne, D. (2015). <i>Someone is hiding something: What happened to Malaysia Airlines Flight 370?</i> New York: Skyhorse Publishing. Introduction. Fleischer, A., Tchetchik, A., & Toledo, T. (2015). Does it pay to reveal safety information? The effect of safety information on flight choice. <i>Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies</i> , 56, 210-220. Rolfe, J.M., & Staples, K.J. (2015). <i>Flight simulation</i> . New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 2: A short history of the flight simulator.	AP DQs Draft Paper

4/5	Health Informatics <hr/> Peer Feedback	Armstrong, D. (2014). Actors, patients and agency: A recent history. <i>Sociology of Health & Illness</i> , 36, 163-174. Johnson, F., Sbaffi, L., & Rowley, J. (2016). Students' approaches to the evaluation of digital information: Insights from their trust judgments. <i>British Journal of Educational Technology</i> , 47, 1243-1258. la Cour, A., Hecht, J., & Stilling, M.K. (2016). A vanishing act: The magical technologies of invisibility in care work. <i>Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization</i> , 16, 77-96. Cunningham, A., & Johnson, F. (2016). Exploring trust in online health information: A study of user experiences of patients.co.uk. <i>Health Information and Libraries Journal</i> , 33, 323-328.	AP DQs Draft Reviews
Unit IV: Transparency, Trust, and Agency in Media			
4/12	Instant Replay <hr/> Giving a Research Presentation	Oldfather, C.M., & Fernholz, M.M. (2009). Comparative procedure on a Sunday afternoon: Instant replay in the NFL as a process of appellate review. <i>Indiana Law Review</i> , 43, 45-78. Berman, M.N. (2011). Replay. <i>California Law Review</i> , 99, 1683-1743. Royce, R. (2012). Refereeing and technology: Reflections on Collins' proposals. <i>Journal of the Philosophy of Sport</i> , 39, 53-64. Collins, H., Evans, R., & Higgins, C. (2016). <i>Bad call: Technology's attack on referees and umpires and how to fix it</i> . Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Introduction and Chapter 1: Justice and decision making in sports.	AP DQs
4/19	Reality Television <hr/> Presentations	Boone, R.T. (2003). The nonverbal communication of trustworthiness: A necessary survival skill. In M.J. Smith & A.F. Wood (Eds.), <i>Survivor Lessons: Essays on Communication and Reality Television</i> (pp. 97-110). Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc. Chung, C.-Y. (2007). Hyperreality, the question of agency, and the phenomenon of reality television. <i>Nebula</i> , 4, 31-44. Couldry, N. (2009). Teaching us to fake it: The ritualized norms of television's "reality" games. In S. Murray & L. Ouellette (Eds.), <i>Reality TV: Remaking Television Culture</i> (pp. 82-99). New York: New York University Press. Esch, M.S. (2012). Privacy: What has reality TV got to hide? In K.W. Bunton & W.N. Wyatt, <i>The Ethics of Reality TV: A Philosophical Examination</i> (pp. 41-60). New York: Continuum International.	AP DQs Presentations
4/26	YouTube <hr/> Presentations	van Dijck, J. (2009). Users like you? Theorizing agency in user-generated content. <i>Media, Culture & Society</i> , 31, 41-58. Kim, G. (2011). Online videos, everyday pedagogy, and female political agency: "Learning from YouTube" revisited. <i>Global Media Journal</i> , 11, 1-16. Lobato, R. (2016). The cultural logic of digital intermediaries: YouTube multichannel networks. <i>Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies</i> , 22, 348-360. Wu, K. (2016). YouTube marketing: Legality of sponsorship and endorsements in advertising. <i>Journal of Law, Business & Ethics</i> , 22, 59-92.	AP DQs Presentations
5/3	Presentations	N/A	Presentations Final Paper

IV. Course Requirements

1. Class attendance and participation policy

(a) Because the vast majority of the learning in this class will occur within the classroom, you are required to attend class regularly. Attendance will be taken during each class period. Absences will only be excused in situations following university policy (illness, religious holy days, participation in University activities at the request of university authorities, and compelling absences beyond your control) with proper documentation and timely notification (prior to class for non-emergencies). Excessive tardiness may be considered as an unexcused absence except in situations following university policy.

(b) Class participation is a critical element of this course. The effectiveness of the course will be significantly impacted by the quality of your participation. Class participation is not merely attendance, but rather factors in your overall contributions to the collaborative learning environment, based on both the quantity and quality of your interactions in all aspects of the course. Discussion of class participation with the instructor is encouraged in order to ensure that you are making the most of the classroom experience and the accompanying opportunities for learning. You are expected to participate in all aspects of class discussion. You should come to class prepared to discuss the required readings, as well as your perspectives on these readings. You should strive for balance in your contributions, and your participation will not be based on who speaks the loudest or the longest, but on consistent participation of significant quantity and, most importantly, quality.

(c) Your attendance and class participation grade will be calculated by multiplying the numerical assessment of your class participation by the percentage of classes that you attend (with exceptions made for documented, university-recognized absences as noted above). Please note that regular attendance and active participation in each class session are critical for receiving a good grade in this course. For example, by actively participating in each class, you will receive a full letter grade higher than if you were to skip half of the classes or to be half-awake for all of the classes.

2. Course Readings/Materials

(a) All course readings will be available on the course Canvas site

(b) Please make sure to complete all readings before coming to class

3. Discussion Questions

At 9 am on each class day (except the first and final weeks), you will submit three discussion questions via Canvas. For the first unit, you may choose to ask your research questions on any topic relevant to the topic and readings for the week. For the remaining units, you should ask one question explicitly related to transparency, one question explicitly related to trust, and one question explicitly related to agency. Each question should be one sentence in length, and should demonstrate that you have completed the readings for the week and have thoughtfully considered the readings and the overall topic.

4. Research Paper

Throughout the semester, you will develop a research paper that applies transparency, trust, and agency to a topic of your choosing, to be selected in consultation with the instructor. You must apply readings from the course as well as outside readings to analyzing a topic that is broadly related to but distinct from the topics covered in class. We will spend a significant amount of time early in the semester helping you to select your topic, and we will continue to devote approximately half the class time each week to collectively brainstorming how to develop and improve everyone's research papers. You are ultimately responsible for your own paper, but there will be many opportunities to get formal and informal feedback on your ideas and writing.

Paper Proposal: Your paper proposal must include the proposed title of your research paper as well as a one-page description of the goals of your research paper (briefly introducing the topic; briefly describing how transparency, trust, and agency apply to it; and briefly outlining your strategy for finding appropriate outside readings). Research paper proposals will be graded according to the following criteria: suitability and creativity of the topic; connection of the topic to transparency, trust, and agency; and appropriateness of the plan for finding appropriate outside readings.

Paper Outline: Your outline needs to use bulleted lists, filling in as much detail as you have ready at this point, and incorporating feedback from the paper proposal. Typically, your outline should be broken into at least five sections (introduction, transparency, trust, agency, and implications), each of which should be broken into 2-5 subsections. You also need to include a list of at least 10 references of relevance to the paper, including at least 5 references which are peer-reviewed journal articles, refereed conference proceedings papers, or academic books or book chapters from beyond the course syllabus (henceforth, scholarly outside readings). Citations must follow APA style (there are many online resources to which you can refer; I recommend: <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>). Research paper outlines will be graded according to the following criteria: clarity of the plan for the paper; appropriateness of the plan for the paper; and appropriateness of the references.

Paper Rough Draft: Your rough draft must be at least a half-complete version of your final paper, and must incorporate feedback from incorporate feedback from the proposal and outline. Within that requirement, you may choose to what extent and in what ways you develop the paper; for example, you can provide half of your final paper or the complete paper with each section half written. However, for all omitted sections, please provide a description that is further developed from the outline. The rough draft should be 1,500-5,000 words. You must cite at least 20 sources, including at least 10 scholarly outside readings, and all citations must follow APA style. Research paper rough drafts will be graded according to the following criteria: suitability and creativity of the topic, appropriate mobilization of the concepts of transparency, trust, and agency; and overall coherence and clarity of writing.

Reviews of Rough Drafts: You will be selected to review two papers written by peers. Please prepare one-page reviews of each paper, including a brief summary of the purpose and content of the paper as you understood it, the strengths of the paper, and constructive feedback on how to improve it. Reviews will be graded according to the following criteria: clarity, insightfulness, and helpfulness.

Final Paper: Your final paper must incorporate feedback from all previous stages of the paper development. Your paper must be complete, coherent, and easy to read. Please make sure to proofread your paper thoroughly prior to submission. The final paper must be 3,000-5,000 words and should cite at least 30 sources, including at least 15 scholarly outside readings. Final research papers will be graded according to the following criteria: suitability and creativity of the topic, appropriate mobilization of the concepts of transparency, trust, and agency; and overall coherence and clarity of writing.

Final Presentation: During one of the three final weeks of the semester, you will present your research paper to the class in the form of an audiovisual presentation. The presentation week and length will be announced well in advance of the date. You may give a presentation using a visual aid such as PowerPoint, Prezi, or Keynote, create and demonstrate a website or other technology, or create a video. Research paper presentations will be graded according to the following criteria: quality of research, quality of visual presentation, and quality of oral presentation.

5. Late Assignment Policy

All assignments must be submitted via Canvas by the posted deadline. Late assignments will only be excused in situations following university policy (illness, religious holy days, etc.) with proper documentation and timely notification (prior to the deadline for non-emergencies). In all other cases, assignments received after the deadline will be penalized 10% per 24-hour period. Assignments submitted even one minute late (without prior authorization or extreme emergency circumstances) will have an automatic deduction of 10% prior to grading of the assignment; otherwise perfect assignments submitted 5 days late will only receive half-credit; and 10 day late assignments will not be graded or receive credit.

V. Grading Procedures

Grades will be based on:

Attendance and Participation (20%)

Discussion Questions (10%)

Research Paper (70%)

Paper Proposal: (5%)

Paper Outline: (10%)

Paper Rough Draft: (15%)

Reviews of Rough Drafts (10%)

Final Paper: (20%)

Final Presentation: (10%)

Grading Scale:

	B+	87-89	C+	77-79	D+	67-69								
A		93-100	B		83-86	C		73-76	D		63-66	F		0-59
A-		90-92	B-		80-82	C-		70-72	D-		60-62			

VI. University Policies

Religious Holy Days

By UT Austin policy, you must notify the instructor of your pending absence at least fourteen days prior to the date of observance of a religious holy day to receive an accommodation.

Q Drop Policy

If you want to drop a class after the 12th class day, you need to execute a Q drop before the Q-drop deadline, typically near the middle of the semester. Under Texas law, you are only allowed six Q drops while you are in college at any public Texas institution. For more information, see: <http://www.utexas.edu/ugs/csacc/academic/adddrop/qdrop>

Student Accommodations

Students with a documented disability may request appropriate academic accommodations from the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement, Services for Students with Disabilities, 512-471-6259 (voice) or 1-866-329-3986 (video phone). <http://ddce.utexas.edu/disability/about/>

- Please request a meeting as soon as possible to discuss any accommodations
- Please notify the instructor as soon as possible if the material being presented in class is not accessible
- Please notify the instructor if any of the physical space is difficult for you

Academic Integrity

Each student in the course is expected to abide by the University of Texas Honor Code:

“As a student of The University of Texas at Austin, I shall abide by the core values of the University and uphold academic integrity.”

This means that work you produce on assignments is all your own work.

Always cite your sources. If you use words or ideas that are not your own (or that you have used in previous class), you must make that clear otherwise you will be guilty of plagiarism and subject to academic disciplinary action, including failure of the course.

You are responsible for understanding UT’s Academic Honesty Policy which can be found at the following web address: http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/acint_student.php

University Resources for Students

The university has numerous resources for students to provide assistance and support for your learning, use these to help you succeed in your classes

The Sanger Learning Center

Did you know that more than one-third of UT undergraduate students use the Sanger Learning Center each year to improve their academic performance? All students are welcome to take advantage of Sanger Center's classes and workshops, private learning specialist appointments, peer academic coaching, and tutoring for more than 70 courses in 15 different subject areas. For more information, please visit <http://www.utexas.edu/ugs/slc> or call 512-471-3614 (JES A332).

The University Writing Center

The University Writing Center offers free, individualized, expert help with writing for any UT student, by appointment or on a drop-in basis. Consultants help students develop strategies to improve their writing. The assistance we provide is intended to foster students' resourcefulness and self-reliance. <http://uwc.utexas.edu/>

Counseling and Mental Health Center

The Counseling and Mental Health Center (CMHC) provides counseling, psychiatric, consultation, and prevention services that facilitate students' academic and life goals and enhance their personal growth and well-being.

<http://cmhc.utexas.edu/>

Student Emergency Services

<http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/emergency/>

ITS

Need help with technology? <http://www.utexas.edu/its/>

Libraries

Need help searching for information? <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/>

Canvas

Canvas help is available 24/7 at <https://utexas.instructure.com/courses/633028/pages/student-tutorials>

Important Safety Information

BCAL

If you are worried about someone who is acting differently, you may use the Behavior Concerns Advice Line to discuss by phone your concerns about another individual's behavior. This service is provided through a partnership among the Office of the Dean of Students, the Counseling and Mental Health Center (CMHC), the Employee Assistance Program (EAP), and The University of Texas Police Department (UTPD). Call 512-232-5050 or visit <http://www.utexas.edu/safety/bcal>.

Evacuation Information

The following recommendations regarding emergency evacuation from the Office of Campus Safety and Security, 512-471-5767, <http://www.utexas.edu/safety/>

Occupants of buildings on The University of Texas at Austin campus are required to evacuate buildings when an alarm or alert is activated. Alarm activation or announcement requires exiting and assembling outside, unless told otherwise by an official representative.

- If campus is closed, or if the building is locked down, class is automatically cancelled; please stay safe.
- Familiarize yourself with all exit doors. Remember that the nearest exit door may not be the one you used when entering the building.
- Students requiring assistance in evacuation shall inform their instructor in writing during the first week of class.
- In the event of an evacuation, follow the instruction of faculty or class instructors. Do not re-enter a building unless given instructions by the following: Austin Fire Department, The University of Texas at Austin Police Department, or Fire Prevention Services office.
- Link to information regarding emergency evacuation routes and emergency procedures can be found at: www.utexas.edu/emergency