

# **INLS 201, Foundations of Information Science Spring 2017**

## **Basic Information**

*Date and time:* Mondays and Wednesdays, 1:50 to 3:05 p.m.

*Location:* Manning 01

## **Instructor Information**

*Instructor:* Melanie Feinberg

*E-mail:* mfeinber@unc.edu

*Office:* Manning 24 (on the garden level, just like Manning 01)

*Office hours:* Tuesdays from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m.

Anyone can come to office hours to discuss anything, without making an appointment in advance. It's a great time to ask questions about assignments, to ask for help, or just to say hello.

## **Introduction**

This course is an introductory survey of information studies. It presents a broad overview of the field, focusing on its historical areas of concern—information organization, retrieval, and behavior.

## **Learning objectives**

At the end of this course, you will:

- Be familiar with the range of topic areas associated with information studies.
- Understand fundamental concepts and concerns of these topic areas.
- Be able to relate these topic areas and concepts to current events, situations, and technologies.
- Be prepared to select further coursework in SILS according to your interests.

## **Grading**

You will be assessed based on the following elements:

- Four reading reports: 25 points each, 100 points total.
- Two midterms: 75 points each, 150 points total.
- A final exam: 100 points.
- Participation: 50 points.

There is a total of 400 points.

Final grades will be assigned according to the following schedule:

A	375 to 400
A-	360 to 374
B+	348 to 359
B	336 to 347
B-	320 to 335
C+	308 to 319
C	296 to 307
C-	280 to 295
D+	268 to 279
D	240 to 267
F	<240

## Assessment Details

### Reading reports

The four reading reports will each address one segment of the course. The reading reports are to help you understand the readings and to apply them to everyday life. (They will also help you to review for midterms and the final.)

Reading report #1:	Foundations	<i>Due January 30</i>
Reading report #2:	Organization and Structures	<i>Due February 20</i>
Reading report #3:	Retrieval and Web	<i>Due March 27</i>
Reading report #4:	People and Groups	<i>Due April 26</i>

*Bring a printed copy of each report to class. They are due when class begins and they are late if you arrive late to class.*

For each reading report, you will write an essay of between 1000 and 1500 words (about 4 pages) that:

- Explains the main points of two *primary readings* that you select from that course segment, in a way that someone who doesn't know anything about information science and who has not read the materials that you select can understand. In other words: write as if you are explaining the readings to your parents.
- Uses material from these two readings to interpret a current event, an everyday situation, or a technology that you use.

#### *Examples of reading report topics*

These are some examples to illustrate how you might use the readings to understand some aspect of everyday life. You, of course, will come up with your own ideas.

- For the Foundations segment, you might compare Floridi's definition of information with Agre's notion of institutional circuitry, and see how each of these might inform a different assessment of a search engine like Google.
- For the Organization and Structures segment, you might use Zerubavel's understanding of arbitrary dividing lines between categories and Haimson and Hoffman's discussion of authentic identities in Facebook to articulate a position on the policies regarding biological gender identity mandated by North Carolina's law known as HB2.
- For the Retrieval and Web segment, you might use Croft, Metzler, and Strohman's description of search engines and Easley and Kleinberg's description of a graph structure to compare the utility of a relational database to a search engine.

#### *Grading criteria*

Each reading report will be graded according to the following criteria:

- The two primary readings that you select are explained clearly, accurately, and sufficiently, in your own words, according to your own perspective and understanding of them.
- You use specific concepts from the readings to understand some aspect of everyday life in a useful and insightful way.
- The report is well organized and uses clear, professional language. The paper employs proper grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

#### *Late work*

Late reports are penalized 3 points for each day of lateness. A day begins when the report is due (that is, at the beginning of class) and continues until 24 hours have passed. If you think you will not complete a

report on time, you must consult with me in advance to negotiate an extension. Reasonable requests are often granted.

#### *Paper presentation details*

In making in-text references or preparing reference lists for outside sources, you may adopt any standard citation style you prefer (such as APA or the Chicago Manual of Style).

You may select whatever font, font size, margin, spacing, and other options that you like, as long as your paper is professionally presented. I will not actually count the words in a paper; directions about length are guidelines only.

#### **Participation**

Participation will be graded according to these criteria:

- *Attendance.*  
It is important for you to attend class. Please be seated and ready when class begins. If personal difficulties (serious illness, etc.) make attendance problematic, please consult with me so that we can make an appropriate plan.
- *Deportment.*  
You should be attentive in class and respectful of your classmates and the instructor. Turn off cell phones and other devices that might disrupt class. Use laptops and other devices to support current course activities only. (Occasionally we all daydream. Be aware, however, that I notice when you are looking at something else during class. Also, I see when you fall asleep. Just saying.)
- *Engagement.*  
Engagement includes: reading the assigned materials before class; asking questions when you do not understand the readings; making observations about the readings and being able to summarize their main points; participating in class activities; responding to discussion questions or other questions that I might ask during a lecture; actively listening and taking notes. I welcome productive disagreement (especially with me), as long as it is expressed constructively and courteously. I value all informed opinions and encourage you to share them.

#### **Schedule**

All readings are available in the Resources area of the course Sakai site.

*Primary readings* are scholarly or instructional materials; they are primarily taken from academic monographs, edited collections, journals, conference proceedings and textbooks, although there are also some online materials. They are written for specialized audiences: academic researchers or students.

*Current perspectives* are from popular news media, and most of these are from the last year or so. These pieces are written for the general public. I have designated these separately in the syllabus because they are directed toward different audiences, and you will read them differently. Additional current perspectives may be added as the semester proceeds.

*All primary readings and current perspectives are required.*

The readings listed as *optional* are just that: extra material for those interested in the topic. You don't have to read any optional readings.

Date	Topics	To read before class
Wednesday, January 11	Introduction What is information?	Course syllabus
Monday, January 16	<i>Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday</i> <i>No class</i>	
Wednesday, January 18	Foundations: What is information?	Floridi, 2010 (chapters 2, 3, and 4) Agre, 1995
Monday, January 23	Foundations: History of information science	<i>Primary readings</i> Saracevic, 2010  <i>Optional</i> Bates, 1999 Aspray, 1999 Bush, 1945
Wednesday, January 25	Foundations: What is information science today?	<i>Primary readings</i> Furner, 2015  <i>Current perspectives</i> Lankes, 2016 Iyer, 2017
Monday, January 30	Information organization: Categories	<i>Primary readings</i> Borges, 1964 Dupre, 2006 Zerubavel, 1991  <i>Current perspectives</i> Gyasi, 2016
Wednesday, February 1	Information organization: Identity	<i>Primary readings</i> Thompson, 2010 Haimson and Hoffmann, 2016  <i>Current perspectives</i> Sanger-Katz, 2016
Monday, February 6	Information organization: Description	<i>Primary readings</i> Daston, 2016  <i>Current perspectives</i> Rosenberg, 2016
Wednesday, February 8	Information structures: Category structures	Hunter, 2002 Berlin, et al 1993
Monday, February 13	Information structures: Document structures and markup	Birnbaum, 2012  <i>Optional</i> Renear, 2004
Wednesday, February 15	Information structures: Relational databases	Roman, 2002 (chapters 1-3)
Monday, February 20	Midterm review	
Wednesday, February 22	Midterm 1	
Monday, February 27	Retrieval: Overview	Croft, Metzler, and Strohman, Ch 1-2 (pages 1-17 only)
Wednesday, March 1	Retrieval: Retrieval models	Croft, Metzler, and Strohman, Ch. 7 (pages 233-250 only)

Date	Topics	To read before class
Monday, March 6	Retrieval: Relevance and usefulness	<i>Primary readings</i> Saracevic, 2007 Lampe, et al, 2012
Wednesday, March 8	Retrieval: Credibility	<i>Primary readings</i> Rieh, 2010 Forte, et al, 2014  <i>Current perspectives</i> Kang and Goldman, 2016 Tavernise, 2016 Peters, 2016
Monday, March 13	<i>Spring break</i> <i>No class</i>	
Wednesday, March 15	<i>Spring break</i> <i>No class</i>	
Monday, March 20	Web: Networks and graphs	Easley and Kleinberg, ch. 13
Wednesday, March 22	Web: Structure	Easley and Kleinberg, ch. 14 (read 397-409 and 412-417 only)
Monday, March 27	Web: Search	<i>Primary readings</i> Teevan and Dumais, 2011 Noble, 2013  <i>Current perspectives</i> Segal, 2011
Wednesday, March 29	Midterm 2	
Monday, April 3	People: Information needs, seeking, and behaviors	Case and Given, 2016 (chapters 1-2)
Wednesday, April 5	People: Everyday information behavior	Volda, Harmon, and Al-ani, 2011 Agosto and Hughes-Hassell, 2005
Monday, April 10	People: Personal information management and personal archiving	Teevan, Capra, and Perez-Quinones, 2007 Marshall, 2013
Wednesday, April 12	People: Interaction design	<i>Primary readings</i> Rogers, 2012, chapter 1  <i>Optional</i> Rogers, 2012, chapter 2 Grudin, 2012
Monday, April 17	Groups: Ethics and values in design	<i>Primary readings</i> Shilton, 2012  <i>Current perspectives</i> Badger, 2016
Wednesday, April 19	Groups: Information policy	<i>Primary readings</i> Grimmelman, 2012 Centivany, 2016

Date	Topics	To read before class
Monday, April 24	Groups: Information privacy	<i>Primary readings</i> Moore, 2016  <i>Current perspectives</i> Duhigg, 2012 Harney, 2016 Hasan, 2016
Wednesday, April 26	Wrap up and review	

## Policies

### Instructor communication

For specific, concrete questions, e-mail is the most reliable means of contact for me. You should receive a response within a day or so, but sometimes it may take 2-3 days. If you do not receive a response after a few days, please follow up. Please keep this in mind when you are scheduling your own activities, especially those related to exam preparation. If you wait until the day before an exam to ask me a clarification question, there is a good chance that you will not receive a response before the exam.

It is always helpful if your e-mail includes a targeted subject line that begins with “INLS 201.” Please use complete sentences and professional language in your e-mail also.

For more complicated questions or help, come to office hours (no appointment necessary!) or make an appointment to talk with me at a different time. I cannot discuss grades over e-mail; if you have a question about grading, you must talk with me in person.

You are welcome to call me by my first name (“Melanie”). However, you may also use “Dr. Feinberg” if that is more comfortable for you. Either is fine.

### Academic integrity

The UNC Honor Code states that:

*It shall be the responsibility of every student enrolled at the University of North Carolina to support the principles of academic integrity and to refrain from all forms of academic dishonesty...*

This includes prohibitions against the following:

- Plagiarism.
- Falsification, fabrication, or misrepresentation of data or citations.
- Unauthorized assistance or collaboration.
- Cheating.

All scholarship builds on previous work, and all scholarship is a form of collaboration, even when working independently. Incorporating the work of others, and collaborating with colleagues, is welcomed in academic work. However, the honor code clarifies that you must always acknowledge when you make use of the ideas, words, or assistance of others in your work. This is typically accomplished through practices of reference, quotation, and citation.

*If you are not certain what constitutes proper procedures for acknowledging the work of others, please ask the instructor for assistance.* It is your responsibility to ensure that the [honor code](#) is appropriately followed. (The [UNC Office of Student Conduct](#) provides a variety of honor code resources.)

The UNC Libraries has online tutorials on [citation practices](#) and [plagiarism](#) that you might find helpful.

### Students with disabilities

Students with disabilities should request accommodations from the UNC office of Accessibility Resources and Service (<https://accessibility.unc.edu/>).

### Bibliography

Denise Agosto and Sandra Hughes-Hassell. 2005. Photos, places, and questions: an investigation into the everyday information seeking behaviors of urban young adults. *Library and Information Science Research* 27, 141-163.

Phil Agre. 1995. Institutional circuitry: thinking about the forms and uses of information. *Information Technology and Libraries* 14(4): 225-230.

William Aspray. 1999. Command and control, documentation, and library science: the origins of information science at the University of Pittsburgh. *IEEE Annals on the History of Computing* 21(4): 4-20.

Emily Badger. 2016. We're all a little biased, even if we don't know it. *New York Times*, October 5, 2016. Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/07/upshot/were-all-a-little-biased-even-if-we-dont-know-it.html>

Marcia Bates. 1999. The invisible substrate of information science. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 50(12): 1043-1050.

Lucy M. Berlin, Robin Jeffries, Vicki O'Day, Andreas Paepcke, and Cathleen Wharton. (1993) Where did you put it? Issues in the design and use of a group memory. *Proceedings ACM CHI 1993*, 23-30.

David J. Birnbaum. 2012. What is XML and why should humanists care? An even gentler introduction to XML. Available at: <http://dh.obdurodon.org/what-is-xml.xhtml>

Jorge Luis Borges. 1964. The analytical language of John Wilkins. In *Other Inquisitions 1937-1952*. Translated by Ruth Simms. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Vannevar Bush. 1945. As we may think. *The Atlantic Monthly* July, 1945. Available online at <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1945/07/as-we-may-think/303881/>

Donald Case and Lisa Given. 2016. *Looking for information: a survey of research on information needs, seeking, and behavior*. 4th ed. London: Emerald. Chapters 1-2.

Alissa Centivany. 2016. Values, ethics, and participatory policymaking in online communities. *Proceedings of the 79th Annual Meeting of the Association for Information Science and Technology (ASIS&T '16)*. Copenhagen, Denmark, October 14-18, 2016.

Bruce W. Croft, Donald Metzler, and Trevor Strohman. 2015. *Search Engines: Information Retrieval in Practice*. Boston: Addison-Wesley. Chapter 1 and the first parts of chapters 2 and 7. Available at: <https://ciir.cs.umass.edu/irbook/>

Lorraine Daston. 2015. Cloud physiognomy: describing the indescribable. *Representations* 135, Summer 2015, 45-71.

Adam Duhigg. 2012. How companies learn your secrets. *New York Times*, February 16, 2012. Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/19/magazine/shopping-habits.html>

John Dupre. 2006. Scientific classification. *Theory, Culture, and Society* 23(2-3): 30-32.

David Easley and Jon Kleinberg. 2010. *Networks, crowds, and markets: reasoning about a highly connected world*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 13 (375-395) and selections from chapter 14 (397-409 and 412-417).

Andrea Forte, Nazanin Andalibi, Thomas Park, and Heather Willever-Farr. 2014. Designing information-savvy societies: an introduction to assessability. *Proceedings of the ACM conference on Human-Computer Interaction (ACM SIGCHI) 2014*.

Luciano Floridi. 2010. *Information: a very short introduction*. London: Oxford University Press. Chapters 2-4, 19-59.

Jonathan Furner. 2015. Information science is neither. *Library Trends* 63(3): 362-377.

James Grimmelmann. 2013. What to do about Google? *Communications of the ACM* 56(9), 28-30.

Yaa Gyaasi. I'm Ghanian-American. Am I black? *New York Times* June 18, 2016.

Jonathan Grudin. 2012. The evolution of human-computer interaction. In *Human-Computer Interaction Handbook*, 3rd ed. J. Jacko, ed. Taylor & Francis.

Oliver Haimson and Anna Lauren Hoffman. 2016. Constructing and enforcing "authentic" identity online: Facebook, real names, and non-normative identities. *First Monday* 21(6). Available at <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/6791>

John Harney. 2016. For dissidents, a phone hack to foil prying eyes: cover the camera. *New York Times*, December 14, 2016. Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/14/world/what-in-the-world/for-dissidents-a-phone-hack-to-foil-spying-eyes-cover-the-camera.html>

Mehdi Hasan. 2016. Peter King's really bad idea. *New York Times*, December 20, 2016. Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/20/opinion/peter-kings-really-bad-idea.html>

Eric J. Hunter. (2002) *Classification made simple*. 2nd ed. Aldershot, England: Ashgate. (Ch. 1-5)

Pico Iyer. 2017. What do we know? *New York Times*, January 1, 2017. Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/31/opinion/sunday/what-do-we-know.html>

Cecilia Kang and Adam Goldman. 2016. In Washington pizzeria attack, fake news brought real guns. *New York Times*, December 5, 2016. Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/05/business/media/comet-ping-pong-pizza-shooting-fake-news-consequences.html>

Cliff Lampe, Jessica Vitak, Rebecca Gray, and Nicole Ellison. 2012. Perceptions of Facebook's value as an information source. *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Human-Computer Interaction (ACM SIGCHI) 2012*, 3195-3204.



David Lankes. 2016. The knowledge school and an election mandate. Personal blog. Available at: <https://davidlankes.org/?p=9047>

Adam Moore. 2016. Privacy, speech, and values: what we have no business knowing. *Ethics and Information Technology* 18: 41-49.

Safiya Noble. 2013. Google search: hyper-visibility as a means of rendering black women and girls invisible. *InVisible Culture: an Electronic Journal for Visual Culture* 19. Available at: <http://ivc.lib.rochester.edu/google-search-hyper-visibility-as-a-means-of-rendering-black-women-and-girls-invisible/>

Cathy Marshall. 2013. Social media, personal data, and reusing our digital legacy. In *Personal Archiving: Preserving Our Digital Heritage*. D. Hawkins, ed. Medford, New Jersey: Information Today, 85-108.

Jeremy Peters. 2016. Wielding claims of “fake news,” conservatives take aim at mainstream media. *New York Times*, December 25, 2016. Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/25/us/politics/fake-news-claims-conservatives-mainstream-media-.html>

Allen Renear. 2004. Text encoding. In *A Companion to Digital Humanities*. Susan Schriebman, Ray Siemens, and John Unsworth, eds. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 218-239. Available at: <http://digitalhumanities.org/companion/view?docId=blackwell/9781405103213/9781405103213.xml>

Soo Young Rieh. 2010. Credibility and cognitive authority of information. In *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences*, Marcia Bates, ed. New York: CRC Press, 1337-1344.

Yvonne Rogers, Helen Sharp, and Jenny Preece. 2011. *Interaction design: beyond human-computer interaction*. 4th ed. Wiley. Chapter 1 (chapter 2 is optional).

Steven Roman. 2002. *Access Database Design and Programming*. 3rd ed. Sebastopol, California: O'Reilly. Chapters 1-3, 3-29.

Eli Rosenberg. 2016. The mountain that tops Everest (because the world is fat). *New York Times*, May 16, 2016.

Margot Sanger-Katz. 2016. Is terrorism getting worse? In the West, yes. In the world, no. *New York Times*, August 16, 2016.

Tefko Saracevic. 2007. Relevance: a review of the literature and a framework for thinking about the notion in information science. Part II: nature and manifestations of relevance. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 58(13): 1915-1933.

Tefko Saracevic. 2010. Information science. In *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences*, Marcia Bates, ed. New York: CRC Press, 2570-2586.

David Segal. 2011. The dirty little secrets of search. *New York Times*, February 12, 2011. Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/02/13/business/13search.html>

Katie Shilton. 2012. Values levers: building ethics into design. *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 38(3): 374-397.

Jaime Teevan, Robert Capra and Manuel A. Perez-Quinones. 2007. How people find personal information. In *Personal Information Management*. William Jones and Jaime Teevan, eds. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Jaime Teevan and Susan Dumais. 2011. Web retrieval, ranking and personalization. In *Interactive Information Seeking, Behaviour and Retrieval*. Ian Ruthven and Diane Kelly, eds. London: Facet Publishing.

Sabrina Tavernise. 2016. As fake news spreads, more readers shrug at the truth. *New York Times*, December 6, 2016. Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/06/us/fake-news-partisan-republican-democrat.html>

Henry Thompson. 2010. What is a URI and why does it matter? Available at: <http://www.ltg.ed.ac.uk/~ht/WhatAreURIs/>

Amy Volda, Ellie Harmon, and Ban Al-ani. 2011. Homebrew databases: complexities of everyday information management in nonprofit organizations. *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Human-Computer Interaction (ACM SIGCHI) 2011*.

Eviatar Zerubavel. 1999. *The fine line: making distinctions in everyday life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 2, 21-32.

### **Acknowledgements and thanks**

This syllabus includes elements of INLS 201 sections taught by Diane Kelly, Ron Bergquist, and Ryan Shaw.