

IDS2 – Survey of Information Studies  
Fall 2012 – Unique number 28715

Professor: James Howison  
Meeting: Monday 12-3pm in UTA 5.428  
Office Hours: By appointment, email [jhowison@ischool.utexas.edu](mailto:jhowison@ischool.utexas.edu)

### **Objectives**

1. Appreciate Information Studies as an intellectual area and a social phenomenon
2. Develop broad familiarity with research questions and approaches across Information Studies
3. Learn to read and analyze academic research articles, including those outside one's area of interest
4. Understand and demonstrate skills in bibliographic analysis
5. Develop succinct research proposals appropriate for different fields in Information Studies

### **Introduction**

The core of this course is reading, analyzing and discussing academic articles across a broad conceptualization of Information Studies as an intellectual area. The material covered will give you a clear base of familiarity with the major research questions, approaches and genres of Information Studies. As a scholar in Information Studies you will eventually be expected to have extremely deep familiarity with your chosen areas of concentration, but (as we will see) Information Studies is a broad area and a competent Information scholar is able to intelligently appreciate and discuss research with scholars from quite different backgrounds.

### **Class 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. We will learn how to approach these discussions in the first class.

### **Assignments**

*Weekly papers.* Students will prepare a 2-3 page paper each week, focusing on two of the readings for that week. The paper will consist of a structured analysis and a free-form reflective short essay. We will discuss the form of the structured analysis in the first class meeting. Each student should be prepared to initiate a discussion based on their papers.

*Bibliographic analysis.* One student each week will present a bibliographic analysis of the readings for that week, analyzing the citations in the readings and showing how this reading has come to be cited in the literature since its publication. This analysis will be conducted with the Web of Science tool; we will cover doing these analyses in the first two meetings of class.

*Research Design papers.* There are two of these papers, one due early in the semester, one later. Each paper will choose a single phenomenon (a different one for each paper) and present three research designs approaching the phenomenon from different areas of Information Studies. The designs must be coherent and reasonable and, most importantly, must demonstrate an understanding of the discourse to which they are aimed, using appropriate research questions, language, methods, justification and reference literature. Students will present these in the final week of class.

### Schedule

Class #	Date	Title	Comment
	3 Sept	-----No Class-----	Labor Day
1	10 Sept	Introduction	
2	17 Sept	Information Organization	
3	24 Sept	Information Behavior	
4	1 Oct	Information Institutions	
	8 Oct	-----No Class-----	Research Design 1
5	15 Oct	Information Retrieval	
6	22 Oct	Social Informatics/Sociotechnical	
7	29 Oct	Human Computer Interaction	
8	5 Nov	Computer supported cooperative work	
9	12 Nov	Information Systems	
10	19 Nov	Information Policy and Economics	
11	26 Nov	Digital Humanities	Thanksgiving week, note class is on
12	3 Dec	Research Design Presentations	

### Bibliography

#### Introduction

1. Booth et al. Chapter 3 "From Topics to Questions"
2. Davis (1971) "That's interesting"
3. Olson and Grudin (2009) The Information Schools Phenomenon

#### Information Organization

1. Booth et al. Section III (Chpts 7 – 11) “Making a claim and supporting it”
2. Beghtol (1986) Semantic Validity
3. Mai (2010) Classification in a social world
4. Star and Bowker (2007) Enacting Silence
5. Feinberg, M. (2011). How information systems communicate as documents: the concept of authorial voice. *Journal of Documentation*, 67(6), 1015–1037. doi:10.1108/00220411111183573

#### 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. Bates, Marcia J. (1989). The Design of Browsing and Berrypicking Techniques for the Online Search Interface. *Online Review* 13(5): 407-424
4. Wilson, T. D. (1984). The cognitive approach to information-seeking behaviour and information use. *Social Science Information Studies*, 4(2), 197–204.

#### Information Institutions/ Scholarly Communication

1. 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.
2. 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. doi:10.1002/asi.10353
3. Hedstrom, Margaret,(1991) "Understanding Electronic Incunabula: A Framework for Research on Electronic Records," *American Archivist*, 54: 334-54.
4. Trace, C. B. (2011). Beyond the Magic to the Mechanism: Computers, Materiality, and What It Means for Records to Be “Born Digital.” *Archivaria*. Retrieved from <http://www.synergiescanada.org/journals/bcn/archivaria/454/13358>

#### Information Retrieval

1. Page, L., Brin, S., Motwani, R., & Winograd, T. (1998). *The PageRank Citation Ranking: Bringing Order to the Web*. Retrieved from [citeseer.nj.nec.com/page98pagerank.html](http://citeseer.nj.nec.com/page98pagerank.html)
2. Voorhees, E. (2002). The philosophy of information retrieval evaluation. *Evaluation of cross-language information retrieval systems* (pp. 143–170).
3. Voorhees, E. M. (2007). TREC: Continuing information retrieval’s tradition of experimentation. *Commun. ACM*, 50(11), 51–54. doi:10.1145/1297797.1297822

4. SWIRL 2012 Report (Lorne)
5. 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.  
doi:10.1145/1772690.1772735

#### Socio-Technical systems/Social informatics

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. Spinuzzi, C. (2012). Working Alone Together: Coworking as Emergent Collaborative Activity. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*.  
doi:10.1177/1050651912444070

#### Human Computer Interaction

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.  
doi:10.1037/h0043158
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. doi:10.1145/1124772.1124849
3. Carroll, John M. (1997). Human-computer interaction: Psychology as a science of design. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48, 61-83.
4. 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.

#### Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)

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. Olson, G. M., & Olson, J. S. (2000). Distance matters. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 15, 139–179.
4. Kittur, A., & Kraut, R. E. (2008). Harnessing the Wisdom of Crowds in Wikipedia: Quality Through Coordination. *CSCW 2008: Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work* (p. ACM Press).

### Information Systems

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. doi:10.1287/orsc.10.6.791

### Information Policy and Economics

1. MacKie-Mason, J. K., & Varian, H. R. (1995). Pricing the internet. Public access to the Internet, 269–314.
2. Rochet, J. C., & Tirole, J. (2003). Platform competition in two-sided markets. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 1(4), 990–1029.
3. Wright, J. (2004). One-sided logic in two-sided markets. *Review of Network Economics*, 3(1), 3.
4. Lessig “Code is Law” Chpt 4.
5. Saltzer et al (1984) End to End Argument
6. Zittrain (2008) Forward and Part I (Chpt 1,2 and 3) “Rise and Stall of the Generative Net” (from cc version online).

### Digital Humanities

1. Svensson, Patrik (2010) “The Landscape of Digital Humanities” DH Quarterly. 4.1
2. Svensson (2012) “Envisioning the Digital Humanities” DH Quarterly. 6.1
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