

INF391D.10 Survey of Information Studies
School of Information, UT-Austin
Spring 2020

Class time: Tuesdays 9:00 - 12:00
Instructor: Yan Zhang
Email: yanz@ischool.utexas.edu
Phone: 512-471-9448
Office: UTA5.416
Classroom: UTA5.428
Office hrs: By appointment

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

Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., Williams, J. M., Bizup, J., & FitzGerald, W. T. (2016). *The Craft of Research, Fourth Edition* (Fourth edition). University of Chicago Press.

Machi, L. A., & McEvoy, B. T. (2016). *The Literature Review: Six Steps to Success* (Third edition). Corwin.

Other readings will be available as PDFs in Canvas.

Recommended Reading

Sonnenwald, D.H. (2016). *Theory Development in the Information Sciences*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

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 Discussion Questions (30%); ***Due at 9:00AM each Monday***

Analyzing two of the assigned research paper readings for each week by following the template below and ***post two questions (or aspects of the papers) to the discussion board on Canvas*** for in-class discussion.

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 find out [Conceptual question]
in order to help my readers [conceptual significance]
so that [potential practical applications]
5. In what way is this paper interesting, in the specific sense used by Davis (1971)? If it is not, why not?

Participation in Class Discussions (20%)

This is a seminar class so in-class participation is important.

Literature Review (40% (writing) +10% (presentation)); ***Due: May 5th***

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.

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	Correct citation and reference format used	Inconsistencies between citations and references;

	citation and reference style followed throughout	but occasional minor omissions or formatting problems	incorrect citation or reference formatting
--	--	---	--

In fairness to students who turn in assignments on time, all late papers will be penalized by lowering the earned grade one grade level (e.g., from A- to B+; from B to B-) for each day that the assignment is late. No assignment submitted more than one week after the due date will be accepted. These penalties will not apply to students who know in advance that they will be submitting an assignment late, and let me know in advance. "In advance" means up until 24 hours before due date. I will use the following schema 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

Week 1 – Jan. 21, 2020	Introduction
<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) 	
Week 2 – Jan. 28, 2020	Research
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Booth et al. Section I (Chapter 1-2) "Research, Researchers, and Readers" 2. Booth et al. Section III (Chapters 7-11) "Making an Argument" 3. Davis (1971) "That's interesting" 	
Week 3 – Feb. 4, 2020	iSchool phenomenon
Guest: Dean Eric Meyer	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Olson, Gary, & Grudin, Jonathan. (2009). TIMELINE The information school phenomenon. <i>Interactions</i>. https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/1487632.1487636 2. Dillon, A. (2012). What it Means to be an iSchool. <i>Journal of Education for Library and Information Science</i>, 53(4), 267–273. JSTOR. 3. Wiggins, A., & Sawyer, S. (2012). Intellectual diversity and the faculty composition of iSchools. <i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology</i>, 63(1), 8–21. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21619 4. Machi & McEvoy, Introduction (Doing and producing literature review); Chapter 1 – Step 1 	
Week 4 – Feb. 11, 2020	Information Organization
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Svenonius (2001) Information organization. Chapter 1 in book: <i>The Intellectual Foundation of Information Organization</i>, pp.1-15. 2. Star and Bowker (2007) Enacting Silence 3. Mai (2010) Classification in a social world 	

4. Feinberg, M. (2011). How information systems communicate as documents: the concept of authorial voice. *Journal of Documentation*, 67(6), 1015–1037.
5. Booth et al. Section II, Chapter 3-4 (Topics, Questions, and Problem)
6. Machi & McEvoy, Chapter 2 – Step 2

Week 5 – Feb. 18, 2020 Information Behavior

1. Dervin, B., & Nilan, M. (1986). Information needs and uses. *Annual review of information science and technology*, 21, 3–33.
2. Pettigrew, K. E., Fidel, R., & Bruce, H. (2001). Conceptual frameworks in information behavior. *Annual review of information science and technology (ARIST)*, 35, 43–78. 3.
3. Bates, Marcia J. (1989). The Design of Browsing and Berrypicking Techniques for the Online Search Interface. *Online Review* 13(5): 407-424.
4. Poltrock, S. et al. (2003). Information seeking and sharing in design teams. *Group'03* (pp. 239-247).
5. Booth et al. Section II, Chapter 5-6 (Sources and Engaging Sources)
6. Machi & McEvoy, Chapter 3 – Step 3

Week 6 – Feb. 25, 2020 Information Retrieval

1. Brin, S. & Page, L. (1998). The anatomy of a large-scale hypertextual Web search engine.
2. 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.
3. Voorhees, E. M. (2007). TREC: Continuing information retrieval's tradition of experimentation. *Commun. ACM*, 50(11), 51–54.
4. SWIRL 2012 Report (Lorne)
5. Ruthven (2008) *Interactive Information Retrieval*, ARIST, p. 43-91
6. Machi & McEvoy, Chapter 4 – Step 4

Week 7 – March 3, 2020 Information Institutions/Scholarly Communication

1. Moravcsik, M. J., & Murugesan, P. (1975). Some Results on the Function and Quality of Citations. *Social Studies of Science*, 5(1), 86–92.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Booth et al. Section IV, Chapter 16 (Introductions and Conclusions)
5. Machi & McEvoy, Chapter 5 – Step 5

<p>Week 8 – March 10, 2020 Socio-Technical Systems/Social Informatics</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sawyer and Rosenbaum (2000) Social Informatics in the Information Sciences: Current Activities and Emerging Directions. <i>Informing Science</i> 3 (2). 2. Howison, J., & Crowston, K. (2014). Collaboration through open superposition. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 38(1), 29-50. 3. Haythornthwaite, C. (1996). Social network analysis: An approach and technique for the study of information exchange. <i>Library & Information Science Research</i>, 18(4), 323–342. 4. Machi & McEvoy, Chapter 6 – Step 6
<p>Week 9 – March 17, 2020 Spring break</p>
<p>Week 10 – March 24, 2020 Attending conference</p>
<p>Week 11 – March 31, 2020 Information Systems</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ellis, D., Allen, D., & Wilson, T. (1999). Information Science and Information Systems: Conjunct subjects disjunct disciplines. <i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science</i>, 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. <i>Information Systems Research</i>, 12(2), 145. 3. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. <i>MIS quarterly</i>, 319–340. 5. Jarvenpaa, S. L., & Leidner, D. E. (1999). Communication and Trust in Global Virtual Teams. <i>Organization Science</i>, 10(6), 791–815.
<p>Week 12 – April 7, 2020 Human Computer Interaction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carroll, J.M. (1997). Human-computer interaction: Psychology as a science of design. <i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>, 48, 61-83. 2. Dillon, A., Kleinman, L., Choi, G. O., & Bias, R. (2006). Visual search and reading tasks using ClearType and regular displays: two experiments. <i>Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human Factors in computing systems, CHI '06</i> (pp. 503–511). New York, NY, USA: ACM. 3. Civan-Hartzler, A., McDonald, D.W., Powell, C., Skeels, M.M., Mukai, M., & Pratt, W. (2010). Bringing the field into focus: User-centered design of a patient expertise locator. In <i>the Proceedings of CHI 2010</i>, 1675-1684. 4. Epstein, Ping, Fogarty, and Munson (2015). A lived informatics model of personal informatics. <i>Proceedings of the UbiComp'15 conference</i> (pp. 731-742). 5. Booth et al. Section IV, Chapter 12-14 (Planning, Drafting, and Revising)
<p>Week 13 – April 14, 2020 CSCW-Computer Supported Cooperative Work</p>

1. Grudin, J. (1988). Why CSCW applications fail. Proceedings of CSCW 1988.
2. Hollan, J., & Stornetta, S. (1992). Beyond being there. Proceedings of ACM SIGCHI.
3. Barbarin, A., Veinot, T.C., & Klasnja, P. (2015). Taking our time: Chronic illness and time-based objects in families. CSCW2015 (pp. 288-301).
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. 579–588).
5. Poltrock, S. et al. (2003). Information seeking and sharing in design teams. Group'03 (pp. 239-247).
6. Booth et al. Section IV, Chapter 15 (Communicating Evidence Visually), Chapter 17 (Revising Style).

Week 14 – April 21, 2020 Digital Humanities

1. Svensson, Patrik (2010) “The Landscape of Digital Humanities” DH Quarterly. 4.1 [open access: search the title of the article in Google and the fulltext is available online]
2. Svensson, Patrik (2012) “Envisioning the Digital Humanities” DH Quarterly. 6.1 [open access]
3. Clement, T. E. (2008). “A thing not beginning and not ending”: using digital tools to distant-read Gertrude Stein’s *The Making of Americans*. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 23(3), 361–381.
4. Ciccoricco (2012) *The Materialities of Close Reading: 1942, 1959, 2009*. DH Quarterly 6.1 [open access]

Week 15 – April 28, 2020 Archive

Guest: Ciaran Trace

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. Thibodeau, K. (2016). Breaking Down the Invisible Wall to Enrich Archival Science and Practice. Paper presented at the IEEE Big Data 2016: 1st CAS workshop. December 8, 2016. [paper and slides]
4. Patricia Galloway (2010) Digital Archiving. In Marcia Bates and Mary Niles Maack (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*, 1518-1527.

Week 16 – May 5, 2020 Final presentation