

INF391D.10 Survey of Information Studies

School of Information, UT-Austin

Fall 2015

Class time: Tuesdays, 3:00-6:00PM

Instructor: Yan Zhang

Email: yanz@ischool.utexas.edu

Phone: 512-471-9448

Office: 5.434

Classroom: UTA5.428

Office hrs: Tuesdays, Noon-2:00PM; By appointment other times

Course Description

An overview of the major ideas, concepts, and theories of Information Studies. Prerequisite: Admission to the doctoral program; consent of the graduate advisor.

Learning Objectives

- Appreciate Information Studies as an intellectual area and a social phenomenon; become familiar with a broad range of established and emerging areas of research in Information Studies.
- Understand the role of models, theories, and frameworks in scholarly research and in Information Studies in particular
- Understand the role and importance of well-defined research questions and objectives
- Develop broad familiarity with the broad range of research methods used in Information Studies
- Learn to read and analyze academic research articles, including those outside one's area of interest
- Demonstrate practical skills in investigating a new topic in Information Studies and managing the information resources acquired in that investigation
- Being able to write substantial literature reviews that summarize and synthesize published research in Information Studies

Course Structure

This is a doctoral seminar. As such class sessions will primarily consist of group discussions. These discussions will help us, as a group, to understand and analyze an article both for its empirical and theoretical content and as a piece of research.

Required Text

The majority of the readings will be academic articles available as PDFs. There is just one book needed for the course, and it is one that will be useful to you throughout your PhD.

Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2008). *The Craft of Research* (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: University Of Chicago Press. *[Note: definitely get the third edition]*

Pan, M. L. (2008). *Preparing Literature Reviews: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (3rd edition). Glendale, CA: Pyczak Publishing. *[Note: the 4th edition is out, but is much more expensive than the 3rd edition. I think the 3rd edition is sufficient for this class, based on my reading of the comments on Amazon as well as a book review about the 3rd edition this book. It will certainly be fine if you want to get the most recent edition]*

Disability Accommodations

Any student with a documented disability (physical or cognitive) who requires academic accommodations should contact the Services for Students with Disabilities area of the Office of the Dean of Students at

471-6259 (voice) or 471-4641 (TTY for users who are deaf or hard of hearing) as soon as possible to request an official letter outlining authorized accommodations.

Statement on Academic Honesty

This course and your PhD study is about becoming an independent scholar. You must familiarize yourself with appropriate academic conduct and honesty by reading this guide: UT Austin Academic Integrity (<http://www.utexas.edu/cola/cwgs/files/pdf-4/ai2012.pdf>)

Other UTexas Academic Honesty Resources:

1. Definitions of plagiarism and University procedures (http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/acadint_plagiarism.php)
2. Plagiarism tutorial (<http://www.lib.utexas.edu/services/instruction/learningmodules/plagiarism/>)

Assignments and Grading

Weekly Reading Analysis (45%)

You will prepare a 1-2 page reading analysis of two of the assigned research paper readings for that week's research area. The analysis can be structured using the following form:

1. Title of the article:
2. Theoretical framework (to understand the role of theories and models in research papers):
3. Research Qs:
4. I am studying [topic]:
because I want to know [an indirect question that indicates what you do not know or understand about your topic]:
in order to help their readers [so what?]
5. In what way is this paper interesting, in the specific sense used by Davis (1971)? If it is not, why not? (a paragraph)
6. A paragraph or two reaction to the paper. You may include aspects that you'd like to discuss.

The analyses are due at 9:00AM Monday morning, the day before class, so that I can read and grade them prior to class.

Literature Review (30%)

The ability to write a good literature review is critical for success in the doctoral program and for your future career as a scholar. Many course assignments, most conference and journal articles, and certainly your dissertation will require you to analyze, synthesize, and critique the current status of a body of literature. More importantly, conducting good literature reviews can help you have a solid understanding of a topic area, including what's been done before, which approaches and methods have led to promising – or not so promising – paths of investigation, and where there are gaps in the literature that suggest useful areas for new research.

Writing a good literature review is much more than simply summarizing a handful of related papers. A useful literature review will convey an understanding of the breadth and depth of published work in a specific area, give the reader a good sense of the prominent theories, methods, systems, controversies, etc. that exist in the area – as well as the important authors and seminal publications – and show the reader where there are gaps in the literature that might suggest where more research is needed. Writing a literature review that meets these criteria is challenging and practice definitely helps. This assignment is intended to help you gain more experience with the process.

The deliverable for this assignment is a written literature review on a topic of your interest. The length and details of the submission may vary depending on the topic selected, but generally I expect the final product to be a 3-4 page long (1500-2500 words) and discuss at least 15-20 references (some perhaps very briefly, others more thoroughly). You are free to use any established reference style (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago) in this assignment. You are recommended to use a reference management tool (e.g., EndNote, Zotero, Mendeley) to help you organize the references.

A draft on this assignment, which will be assigned 10 of your final course grade, is due electronically, submitted to my email by 9:00AM on November 17th. I will return your draft with comments by the beginning of class on November 24th. The final version of the assignment will be assigned 20% of our final course grade, is due electronically, submitted to my email by 9:00AM on our last class day, December 1st.

The grade for your final deliverable of this assignment will be based on the following rubric:

Criteria	Observed qualities		
	Excellent (A/A-)	Good (B+)	Poor (B and below)
<i>Introduction to topic area</i>	Clear introduction to topic area; effective orientation for body of review provided	Overall topic area less effectively described; limited orientation to body of review	No clear explanation of the topic area; no transition to body of review
<i>Body of review</i>	Critical synthesis present; consistent and logical transitions; cohesive narrative going from general to specific	Limited critical analysis or attempt at synthesis; some connections made between references, but lack of consistent logical flow	No clear relationship between reference summaries; no critique beyond summary descriptions
<i>Coverage</i>	Thorough, consistent coverage of topic area; in-depth discussion where appropriate	Adequate overall coverage of topic area but superficial coverage of references	Omission of references clearly important to topic area; minimal references; consistent sketchy coverage of references
<i>Conclusion</i>	Solid, logical summary of review; insights and suggestions follow from body of review	Some conclusion or overall synthesis provided but not well supported by body of review	No clear summary or synthesis of topic area provided; summary disconnected from review
<i>Clarity of writing</i>	Clearly written, coherent argument; structural variety; reads as a connected, informative narrative	Generally well-written but flow of argument not always easy to follow; lack of variety in structure from paragraph to paragraph	Significant spelling or grammar mistakes; difficult to follow flow of narrative or arguments made
<i>Citations/References</i>	All references match citations; proper citation and reference style followed throughout	Correct citation and reference format used but occasional minor omissions or formatting problems	Inconsistencies between citations and references; incorrect citation or reference formatting

The overall grading for this class is broken down as following: Participation in class discussions (15%), weekly reading analysis (there will be 9 analyses in total, 45%), literature review (30%), and the presentation of the literature review (10%).

The assignments will only be accepted late if the instructor grants permission, at least 24 hours before the due date, for the students to turn the assignment in late, on an agreed-upon date. Except in extreme circumstances, this assignment will be docked several points for each day it is late. I will use the following schedule as the basis for calculating grades: A = 94-100, A- = 90-93, B+ = 87-89, B = 84-86, B- = 80-83, C+ = 77-79, C = 74-76, C- = 70-73, D = 60-69, F <60.

Course Schedule

<p>Week 1 – Sep. 1, 2015 Introduction</p> <p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UT iSchool PhD Student Handbook (https://www.ischool.utexas.edu/forms/DoctoralProgramHandbookFall2014.pdf) 2. iSchool faculty (https://www.ischool.utexas.edu/people/faculty_directory) and doctoral students (https://www.ischool.utexas.edu/people/phd-students)
<p>Week 2 – Sep. 8, 2015 Discussion about research</p> <p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Booth et al. Section III (Chapters 7-11) “Making a claim and supporting it” 2. Davis (1971) “That’s interesting” 3. Olson and Grudin (2009) The Information Schools Phenomenon 4. Booth et al. Section I (Chapter 1-2) “Research, Researchers, and Readers”
<p>Week 3 – Sep. 15, 2015 Information Organization</p> <p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Beghtol (1986) Semantic Validity 2. Mai (2010) Classification in a social world 3. Star and Bowker (2007) Enacting Silence 4. Feinberg, M. (2011). How information systems communicate as documents: the concept of authorial voice. <i>Journal of Documentation</i>, 67(6), 1015–1037. 5. Booth et al. Section II, Chapter 3-4 (Topics, Questions, and Problem)
<p>Week 4 – Sep. 22, 2015 Information Behavior</p> <p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dervin, B., & Nilan, M. (1986). Information needs and uses. <i>Annual review of information science and technology</i>, 21, 3–33. 2. Pettigrew, K. E., Fidel, R., & Bruce, H. (2001). Conceptual frameworks in information behavior. <i>Annual review of information science and technology (ARIST)</i>, 35, 43–78. 3. 3. Bates, Marcia J. (1989). The Design of Browsing and Berrypicking Techniques for the Online Search Interface. <i>Online Review</i> 13(5): 407-424 4. 4. Wilson, T. D. (1984). The cognitive approach to information-seeking behaviour and information use. <i>Social Science Information Studies</i>, 4(2), 197–204.
<p>Week 5 – Sep. 29, 2015 Information Retrieval</p>

Readings:

1. Page, L., Brin, S., Motwani, R., & Winograd, T. (1998). The PageRank Citation Ranking: Bringing Order to the Web.
2. Voorhees, E. M. (2007). TREC: Continuing information retrieval's tradition of experimentation. *Commun. ACM*, 50(11), 51–54.
3. SWIRL 2012 Report (Lorne)
4. Horowitz, D., & Kamvar, S. D. (2010). The anatomy of a large--scale social search engine. *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web, WWW '10* (pp. 431–440). New York, NY, USA: ACM.

Week 6 – Oct. 6, 2015 Literature Review

Readings:

1. Booth et al. Section II, Chapter 5-6 (Sources and Engaging Sources)
2. Pan. Evaluating and interpreting research literature; Taking notes and avoiding unintentional plagiarism; Preparing a topic outline for the first draft; Writing the first draft: basic principles, optional techniques, statistical issues in qualitative reviews; Building tables to summarize literature; Revising and refining the first draft

Week 7 – Oct. 13, 2015 Information Institutions/Scholarly Communication

Readings:

1. Cronin, B., Shaw, D., & Barre, K. L. (2004). Visible, less visible, and invisible work: Patterns of collaboration in 20th century chemistry. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 55(2), 160–168.
2. Moravcsik, M. J., & Murugesan, P. (1975). Some Results on the Function and Quality of Citations. *Social Studies of Science*, 5(1), 86–92.
3. Shuai, X., Pepe, A., & Bollen, J. (2012). How the Scientific Community Reacts to Newly Submitted Preprints: Article Downloads, Twitter Mentions, and Citations. *PLoS ONE*, 7(11), e47523.
4. LeMaistre, T., Embry, R. L., Zandt, L. L. V., & Bailey, D. E. (2012). Role Reinvention, Structural Defense, or Resigned Surrender: Institutional Approaches to Technological Change and Reference Librarianship. *The Library Quarterly*, 82(3), 241–275.
5. Booth et al. Section IV, Chapter 1 (Introductions and Conclusions)

Week 8 – Oct. 20, 2015 Socio-Technical Systems/Social Informatics & Literature Review

Readings:

1. Trist, E. L., & Bamforth, K. W. (1951). Social and psychological consequences of the longwall method of coal-getting. *Human Relations*, 4(1), 28.
2. Sawyer and Rosenbaum (2000) *Social Informatics in the Information Sciences: Current Activities and Emerging Directions*. *Informing Science* 3 (2).
3. Howison, J., & Crowston, K. (in press). Collaboration through open superposition. *MIS Quarterly*.
4. Haythornthwaite, C. (1996). Social network analysis: An approach and technique for the study of information exchange. *Library & Information Science Research*, 18(4), 323–342.

Week 9 – Oct. 27, 2015 Human Computer Interaction

Readings:

1. Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 63(2), 81–97.
2. Dillon, A., Kleinman, L., Choi, G. O., & Bias, R. (2006). Visual search and reading tasks using ClearType and regular displays: two experiments. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human Factors in computing systems, CHI '06* (pp. 503–511). New York, NY, USA: ACM.
3. Wainer, J., Dabbish, L., & Kraut, R. (2011). Should I open this email?: Curiosity and attention to email messages. To appear in *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI 2011)*, Vancouver, CA.

Review article (optional):

4. Carroll, John M. (1997). Human-computer interaction: Psychology as a science of design. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48, 61-83.
5. Booth et al. Section IV, Chapter 12-14 (Planning, Drafting, and Revising)

Week 10 – Nov. 3, 2015 CSCW-Computer Supported Cooperative Work

Readings:

1. Grudin, J. (1988). Why CSCW applications fail. *Proceedings of CSCW 1988* (p. ACM Press).
2. Hollan, J., & Stornetta, S. (1992). Beyond being there. *Proceedings of ACM SIGCHI*.
3. Luther, K., Fiesler, C., & Bruckman, A. (2013). Redistributing leadership in online creative collaboration. In *Proceedings of the 2013 conference on Computer supported cooperative work* (pp. 1007–1022). New York, NY, USA: ACM.
4. Cataldo, M., & Herbsleb, J. D. (2008). Communication networks in geographically distributed software development. In *CSCW '08: Proceedings of the ACM 2008 conference on Computer supported cooperative work* (p. ACM–588).

Week 11 – Nov. 10, 2015 [ASIST]

Week 12 – Nov. 17, 2015 Archive

Readings:

1. Cook, T. (2013). Evidence, memory, identity, and community: four shifting archival paradigms. *Archival Science*, 13(2-3), 95–120. doi:10.1007/s10502-012-9180-7
2. McKemmish, S. (2001). Placing records continuum theory and practice. *Archival Science*, 1(4), 333–359.
3. Trace, C. B., & Dillon, A. (2012). The evolution of the finding aid in the United States: from physical to digital document genre. *Archival Science*, 12(4), 501–519. doi:10.1007/s10502-012-9190-5
4. Patricia Galloway (2010) Digital Archiving. In Marcia Bates and Mary Niles Maack (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*, 1518-1527.

Week 13 – Nov. 24, 2015 Information Systems

Readings:

1. Ellis, D., Allen, D., & Wilson, T. (1999). Information Science and Information Systems: Conjunct subjects disjunct disciplines. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 50(12), 1095–1108.
2. Orlikowski, W. J., & Iacono, C. S. (2001). Research Commentary: Desperately Seeking the “IT” in IT Research: A call to theorizing the IT Artifact. *Information Systems Research*, 12(2), 145.
3. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information

technology. *MIS quarterly*, 319–340.

4. Jarvenpaa, S. L., & Leidner, D. E. (1999). Communication and Trust in Global Virtual Teams. *Organization Science*, 10(6), 791–815.

5. Booth et al. Section IV, Chapter 15 (Communicating Evidence Visually), Chapter 17 (Revising Style)

Week 14 – Dec. 1, 2015 Final Presentation (literature reviews)