INLS 500: Human Information Interactions

Instructor: Amelia N. Gibson

Email: angibson@email.unc.edu

Office: 205 Manning Hall

Class meetings: Tuesday & Thursday, 6:00 – 7:15 pm, 304 Manning Hall

Office hours: By appointment

Course Overview

Course description:

This course surveys human information interactions through broad examination of information science literature. Students examine cognitive, affective, social, and organizational/institutional approaches to understanding interactions between people and information. Emphasis is placed on the role of information professionals and information systems as mediators. Students are encouraged to analyze current events and situations, and to apply concepts, models and theories to their own information practice.

Rationale and relationship to the current curriculum: This course undergirds much of our curriculum, because it introduces students to core concepts that have implications for the practice of information science and librarianship. It is expected that it will be taken during the first or second semester of the student's career at SILS.

Course objectives:

Students successfully completing this course will:

become familiar with the empirical and theoretical literature related to information seeking, including the recognition of information needs, actions taken to resolve those needs, the roles of intermediaries (both human and machine), and the retrieval and use of information;

understand key concepts related to the ways in which information is created, structured, disseminated and used;

develop skills in reading, writing, and discussing information science concepts, models, frameworks, and theories;

critically apply theories and empirical findings to the definition and solution of problems related to human information interactions.

Teaching Philosophy:

Although this is a survey course, this class is not intended to be a "slow" introduction to information science theory or to "ease you into" graduate school. The readings cover a broad range of information science theory (which may be different from readings you have done previously). Developing an understanding of theory may be a difficult process for some students, but I fully expect you to take responsibility for your part in the co-creation of your learning experience. As the professor, I will provide you with appropriate materials and supports, and answer your questions. I will guide your exploration as you consider the implications of these concepts and theories for *your* practice. Much of your inquiry will be done in conjunction with your classmates. This class is a space in which I expect brave (but respectful) exploration of issues – a space to ask big (and little) questions, to work through messy concepts, and to think about how they apply to your own practice of information science. Read! Ask! Participate! Personalize! Let's make the semester a dynamic one!

On most days, class sessions will include variations of the following:

Highlights: Quick review of model/theory and most pertinent concepts.

Class discussion

Group work session. Students should:

Be ready to demonstrate basic understanding of the concepts, model(s), or theory introduced in the day's readings.

Be prepared for session with any assigned pre-reading

Work with group members to apply concepts to group problem or scenario

Be able to articulate how/why this applies (or does not apply) to their own practice.

Practical skills sessions: designed to help build some of the graduate level skills expected of you in the class (e.g. "How to write a literature review," "Citation and plagiarism").

Course Materials:

Students will be expected to complete readings in preparation for each class meeting. The assigned readings are listed on the course schedule and will be made available electronically, through the UNC libraries, e-reserves, or the Sakai site for the course. No textbook is required.

Assignments and evaluation:

Your major assignments for this course include the following: Participation (20%), Online Activities (5%), In-class Reflections (10%), Description and Analysis of an Information-Seeking Event (20%), System/Service Proposal (25%), and Analysis of an Example of Scholarly Communication (20%).

Late assignments. Please review the syllabus thoroughly and plan your assignment submissions ahead of time. Unless you obtain permission in advance to submit an assignment late, your base grade will be reduced by 10% of the original point base for each late day (meaning that I will start with 90% of the points and grade from there). The assignment submission link will close 7 days after the due date at 5:00 pm. After that point, you will need to see me or email me to discuss submission of your assignment. This course is very dense, and many of the intermediate deliverables build upon one another. I reserve the right not to grant assignment extensions.

Honor Code*:*

The Honor Code, which prohibits giving or receiving unauthorized aid in the completion of assignments and exams is in effect in this class. Whenever you use the words or ideas of others, they should be properly marked as a quotation (and referenced) or the source of the ideas should be cited. APA citation format is required for assignments in this class.

Please contact the instructor if you have any questions about the application of the Honor Code to your work in this class. You can learn more about the UNC Honor Code at http://honor.unc.edu and about the Instrument of Student Governance at http://instrument.unc.edu.

I also expect that students will give proper credit to other researchers through proper use of citation. APA citation style will be used for this course.

Additional Course Policies:

With the instructor's permission, late assignments will be accepted with a penalty of .5 points per day.

Laptops and mobile devices are welcome in class, but should be used only for legitimate purposes related to this course. There will be times when students will be asked to close all laptops and devices.

You will be using SILS library and IT services during the course of the semester. Please remember that many of your fellow students also need to use the same equipment and materials. Follow the proper checkout procedures and return materials promptly to be a good SILS citizen.

Email is the most efficient way to communicate with the instructor outside of class, for brief questions or notes. Normally, you should expect a response within 24 hours. If you do not receive one, please feel free to send another email. I am also happy to schedule a meeting with you. If you come by the office and my door is open, then I am available for a conversation.

Assignments

Participation (20%)

This class is a cooperative venture toward which we are all expected to contribute. This includes preparing for class by completing the readings, and actively participating in class discussions and activities in a way that demonstrates your knowledge of the material. The purpose of class discussions is to provide you with opportunities to solidify your understanding of the concepts, models and theories introduced in the readings, and to apply those concepts to practice. Full participation in classroom activities will not be possible without the basic common understanding that results from reading the course material.

Attendance is mandatory, and absences will affect your participation grade. Students are expected to be on time, courteous to classmates and the course instructor, and to follow guidelines regarding use of electronics in class.

Participation grades will be based on the following:

> Attendance *(.2 points per class x 25 classes= 5 grade points)*
>
> Meaningful participation in class discussions and group activities. There will be daily assessments of in-class participation *(.6 points per class x 25 classes = 15 grade points)*
>
> Respectful exchange with the professor, classroom guests, and your classmates (this includes your attention/demeanor during others' presentations).

You will need your laptop for class sessions.

Online Mini-Assignments/Discussions (5%)

What is Your Information Science? *(1.5% each)*

Record and post (to Sakai) two 2-4 minute oral responses (one at the beginning of the semester, and one at the end of the semester) to the question "What is does information science mean to/for you?" Your response should take the form of an audio or video recording, and include the following:

<u>Part 1 (due January 16):</u>

> Define: Give your own definition of information science.
>
> Describe: Describe the field as you understand it, and your subfield/area of interest specifically, as it fits into the larger landscape of information science.
>
> Personalize: Describe your professional interests and how they fit into the field, and what you hope to learn this semester.

Post a bulleted summary of your response, and a link to your recording.

Part 2 will be a public statement about your understanding of the field and your place within it. These responses should be designed for a public audience (not just for me) that includes other professors who you might be interested in working with, peers, and prospective employers (due April 10):

> Define: Define information science.
>
> Describe: Describe the field as you understand it, and your subfield/area of interest specifically, as it fits into the larger landscape of information science. Describe 2-3 theories that you find most relevant to your practice of information science.
>
> Personalize: Describe your professional interests and how they fit into the field, and how the theories you have selected potentially inform your future practice.

Post a bulleted summary of your response, and a link to your recording.

Group Document Annotations *(3 points)*

Introduce one document for hypothes.is annotation in the forums (1 point), with a link and a brief explanation as to how the document relates to something you have read or discussed in class. Annotations can include thoughtful reactions (3-5 sentences minimum per page), connections to readings, or suggestions as to what an author might have missed. Annotations should be either shallow and broad (several short annotations per document) or narrow and deep (fewer, lengthier annoations per document). One or two brief comments will not count. Create substantive annotations on at least 4 documents (.5 pts each) during the semester. Group annotations should use the tag INLS500.

In-Class Reflections: Reading and Understanding Research and Theory (10%)

At various points during the semester you will be asked to write brief, structured summaries and reflections on one of the day's readings. These reflections will be done in writing during class time, will be timed, and will be followed by discussion. These assignments are modeled on the evidence summaries regularly published in the journal, *Evidence-Based Library & Information Practice* (http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/EBLIP/index), and are intended to help you develop (and practice) your skill in extracting salient information from scholarly publications. As you can see from examining a few examples in the journal, each evidence summary focuses on a particular research study that has implications for the practice of the information professions.

Evaluation criteria

Your summary notes and reflections will be evaluated on the accuracy of its description of the original article, your understanding of the conclusions of the study being examined (their

validity, their pertinence to particular information practice settings), and the depth and validity of your in-class and online commentary on the study being examined. You will also be graded on your discussion.

Description and Analysis of an Information-Seeking Event (20%)

For this assignment, you will pair with a classmate to conduct a think aloud observation of an exploratory search activity (approximately 45 minutes of searching) related to the System/Service Assignment. You will take notes on your partner's actions, and descriptions, and analyze their behaviors in light of those descriptions and in light of the course readings and class discussions. You should demonstrate a clear understanding of concepts, models and theories covered in class and in the readings.

Intermediate Deliverables

Choose partner, date and time for observation (January 30) *(2 points)*: To ensure that you're on the right track with this assignment, both members should submit the name of their partner, and a mutually agreed-upon time and date for the think aloud observation.

Final Deliverables:

Description of search behavior (March 6) *(5 points)* - *Describe* your partner's information seeking event, including behaviors, strategies, verbalized thoughts, and motivations. Your description should capture as much detail as possible, but does not have to be formal or very structured (it must be comprehensible at some level). The goal of this description is to provide chronology and context for the analysis. *(Descriptive Writing)*

Analysis of Information Seeking Event (March 6) *(13 points)* – *Evaluate* the information seeking experience. *Assess* which (if any) of the information seeking and use models we have discussed in class apply to your partner's situation - as motivation, as information-seeking process, or as use. Write a brief report (3-4 single-spaced pages) that interprets the experience. Concentrate on analysis and application of the models and theories learned in class, rather than retelling what you have already presented in the description. The goal here is to demonstrate that you can use the terminology, and apply the concepts, models, and theories learned in class to your own information seeking behavior. *(Expository/Analytical Writing)*

A few questions you should consider:

What search strategies did your partner engage? Did those strategies work? What did they do when they did? When they didn't?

What information behaviors did s/he display?

Where did your partner search/what sources did your partner consult? Why?

What barriers or surprises did s/he experience?

Why do you think the experience was a successful (or unsuccessful) one?

Be sure to relate your observations to readings and discussions from class. Cite them as appropriate.

Evaluation criteria:

Grades will be based upon the quality and depth of your *analysis* of the experience. A description of the need and what motivated it, any obstacles you experienced, sources used, tasks performed, and results obtained along with your evaluation of those results should be included in the paper. Your ability to apply multiple concepts, models and theories, and use the terminology learned in class will determine a large portion of your grade. Please remember that large amounts of time/space within the analysis should not be spent on rehashing the description. While this paper is relatively informal in style, it should be formatted using APA style and should include citations to the literature as appropriate

System/Service Proposal (24%)

In this assignment, you will develop a brief proposal for a new service for a particular client population of a particular information organization, and support that proposal with a more extensive, in-depth review of the literature on the information needs and behaviors of your client group. Some examples might include the development of a public library instruction program for retirees in the community, new ways to track IT support questions related to a litigation support system in a law firm, or a new institutional repository intended to handle the multimedia materials created by performing arts faculty on a university campus (these examples are intended to be suggestive, not comprehensive or restrictive.)

Intermediate Deliverables:

Setting/Target Audience Description (Due February 6) *(2 points)* : This brief description will outline your intended setting, the organization to which you will be writing your memo/proposal, and the target population or client group. You will submit three paragraphs:

One paragraph describing the setting you've selected, including the name (real or fictional) of the organization to which you will be proposing your system/service *(Descriptive/Expository Writing)*.

One paragraph defining/describing the client group (based on your current knowledge) *(Descriptive/Expository Writing)*.

One paragraph about *why* you selected this setting and client group *(Persuasive Writing)*.

Preliminary Searching Plan (Due February 13) *(3 points)*: This portion of the project is intended to encourage you to think systematically about your search process. Provide a bulleted list of the following:

Databases/Other sources you intend to search with brief explanations as to why

Search Terms (including inclusion/exclusion criteria such as dates)

What elements/factors you intend to use to judge the relevance/quality of information you find (1-3 sentences each - no more than 1 page)

Preliminary Population Data (Due March 20) *(4 points)*: Provide a detailed outline, a concept map/matrix, or a similar sketch of what you've learned about the population. Include the preliminary list of references to the articles you're using as evidence.

Proposed system or service (Due March 22) *(2 points)*: 1-2 paragraph description of your proposed system or service. Briefly describe your solution and how it meets the needs of your population.

Final Deliverables (April 3):

The final proposal package will consist of three parts:

Memo *(2 points)*: A 2-page (single-spaced) memo to the leader of your information organization, presenting your proposal and providing arguments supporting its adoption. This memo should describe your system or service, and briefly make an argument for its adoption.

Client Population Analysis *(10 points)*: A brief description (4-6 pages, single-spaced) of the client population and an analysis of its information needs, based on your knowledge of its behaviors. This analysis should be evidence-based, i.e., it should rely on prior studies and/or descriptions of the client population and their information behaviors as reported in the literature. To support your analysis, you will be expected to cite and assess the relevant literature. This appendix will serve as your support documentation (the strength of this document, and the depth of your analysis will determine the bulk of your grade).

Search Strategies *(2 points)*: A listing of the databases/resources you used to learning about the client population, and the specific search strategies/terms used in each. You should also describe your inclusion/exclusion criteria (e.g., range of years or other limits you placed on your searches) and the criteria you used to make judgments about the relevance or usefulness of the items you selected. This appendix should be a bulleted list or outline format, rather than narrative. There's no limit on its length, but it is likely to be 1-3 pages, single-spaced.

Research and Theory In and Outside of the Field:

Conducting an Analysis of Scholarly Communication (20%)

In this assignment, you will work with your team to conduct a small-scale bibliographic analysis of research one theory, model, framework, or clearly defined concept in information science. Your team will choose a topic from the list provided, create a bibliography of scholarly works on the topic, analyze the scholarly context of four selected articles (1 per team member), and describe the corpus of written work (in *and* outside of LIS) about the selected topic, based on bibliographic records. This assignment is to be completed in teams of 4 people.

Intermediate Deliverables

One group member should submit all deliverables via Sakai. Be sure to include the names of all group members in the submission box and on all documents.

Team selection (due February 15) *(1 point)*: 4 People per group (please read through the entire assignment before you choose your group).

Topic Selection (due February 20) *(2 points)*: Your team should choose one of the following topics and authors as a starting point for analysis:

Information poverty (Chatman)

Information Search Process (Kuhlthau)

Anomalous states of knowledge (Belkin)

Relevance (Saracevic)

Information Intents (Todd)

Sensemaking (Dervin)

Serendipity (Erdelez)

Task-based Information Retrieval (Vakkari)

Browsing and Berrypicking (Bates)

Distributed Cognition (Hollan)

Search parameters/Preliminary Bibliography (due February 27): Provide a guide outlining your search strategies (see Bates), and criteria for inclusion and exclusion of articles. As you conduct your analysis, you will encounter other authors (these are given as a starting point), but you should be careful about establishing boundaries for your topic area. Be very intentional about how you determine that a topic does or does not fit within the parameters of your search, and

describe this in detail. Search parameters: (min 1 page); Preliminary bibliography (1 article per group member).

Final Deliverables (Due during scheduled class final - TBA)

One group member should submit final deliverables via Sakai. Be sure to include the names of all group members in the submission box and on the final document. Each group member should also submit peer evaluations individually via Sakai.

1. Final Bibliography of research on your given topic. This bibliography should be as expansive as you can make it (suggested minimum of 30 items), and should, ideally, contain research from inside and outside of the field of Information & Library science. Bibliography should use APA (6th edition) format.

2. Bibliographic analysis of the literature (4 pages/2000 words total). This section should examine your entire bibliography for trends (geographic, chronological, bibliographic, and conceptual). Suggested approaches/questions: What does the corpus of literature on this topic "look like?" What fields/subfields does it cover? Where is research on this topic published (what journals/institutions)? What conference proceedings include the topic? What are the most popular journals? Where (geographically) are the journals and authors located? Who is citing this work? What do these citations tell you about the importance (or lack of importance) of this topic? What do the titles suggest about the conceptual/theoretical development of the topic? What related topics exist in the literature? *Note: If your final bibliography is too expansive, you may need to examine a subset of the literature. Please see me to discuss strategies for doing this if this is the case.*

Analysis of one article and its scholarly context (1 analysis per group member; 1000-1250 words each. 5000 word max total, excluding references) *(6 points)*. The group must include the work of more than one author. Select one article from the final bibliography and provide the following analysis:

> 1 page (500 words): Very brief analysis of your article. The analysis should reflect your impressions of the paper with respect to the article's structure and content. The review should describe what you found useful in the article, what you liked about it, what the article's deficiencies or limitations are, and how the article has influenced your thinking about the field or about practice. You should relate your discussion to other readings or topics from the class. *Note:* It may be more fun to be critical, but one of the goals of this assignment is to recognize that the author is trying to make a point, to convey information that he/she/they believe is important, so it is important to appreciate that and place your comments in context. Consider the target audience when assessing the appropriateness of form and content. When the authors have failed in their effort, be precise (but concise) about how they failed and offer suggestions for improvement.

1- 1.5 pages (500-750 words): Analysis of scholarly context of your article. Begin by examining the reference list in your selected paper. Suggested approaches/questions: How old are the citations? Who wrote the work that the author(s) cited? In what journals or other media were the references published? What clues do the references give you about the purpose of the paper or the intended audience? How much overlap is there between the reference lists of the several articles in your selected set? Who has cited the paper you selected? You may check the following online citation indexes: ISI Web of Science (available online through the UNC Library e-research tools), Scopus (available online through the UNC Library e-research tools), Google Scholar, CiteSeer X (from Penn State University), the ACM Digital Library (for some technical papers), and/or other online databases that might include your paper and that include citation data. At a minimum, conduct citation searches in (1) the ISI Web of Science database or Scopus and (2) at least one of the other citation databases. Be sure to keep track of which citations were discovered in which database. How many times has each of the selected articles been cited? Who has cited each? Are there examples of bibliographic coupling (i.e., where two or more of your selected articles are citing the same article/document)? In what fields/disciplines are your selected articles cited?

4. Final list of search terms & expanded/revised search parameters. Provide a guide outlining your search strategies (see Bates), and criteria for inclusion and exclusion of articles. As you conduct your analysis, you will encounter other authors (these are given as a starting point), but you should be careful about establishing boundaries for your topic area. Be very intentional about how you determine that a topic does or does not fit within the parameters of your search, and describe this in detail. Search parameters: (min 1 page); Preliminary bibliography (min 30 references).

5. Peer Evaluation *(3 points)*: Assign each team member a grade (0-5 points) and provide a 3-4 sentence qualitative evaluation of each of your team members based on their participation in this project. I will grade you based on the thoughtfulness and quality of your assessment. Submit this assessment separately via Sakai.

Evaluation criteria

Grades will be based on evidence of your understanding of the selected papers, the depth and thoroughness of your analysis of the set of papers and their scholarly context, evidence of your understanding of scholarly communication and scholars' use of information, and clarity of expression. Because this is the final paper, adherence to page limits is important. Excess of 1 page above the upper page limits will result in a reduction of points. Your writing style for this paper should be relatively formal/academic, in comparison with other assignments in this course.

Examples of Bibliographic Analyses:

Du, H., Li, N., Brown, M. A., Peng, Y., & Shuai, Y. (2014/6). A bibliographic analysis of recent solar energy literatures: The expansion and evolution of a research field. *Renewable Energy*, *66*, 696–706. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2014.01.018

Zhao, D., & Strotmann, A. (2008). Evolution of research activities and intellectual influences in information science 1996–2005: Introducing author bibliographic-coupling analysis. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 59*(13), 2070-2086. http://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20910

Grading

UNC-CH graduate students are graded on the H/P/L/F scale. The following definitions of these grades will be used for this course. While assignments are not graded "on a curve," most students should expect to get a P, if they fully complete the course assignments.

Letter grade	Numeric range	Description of grade
H	95-100	High Pass: Clear excellence; beyond expectations for the course.
P	80-94	Pass: Entirely satisfactory; fully meets expectations for the course.
L	70-79	Low Pass: Minimally acceptable; clear weaknesses in performance.
F	Below 70	Fail: Unacceptable performance.
IN	NA	Work incomplete.

Grading scale for INLS 500 (undergraduate students)		
Letter grade	Numeric range	Description of grade
A	95-100	Mastery of course content at the highest level of attainment that can reasonably be expected of students at a given stage of development.
A-	90-94	
B+	88-89	
B	86-87	Strong performance demonstrating a high level of attainment for a student at a given stage of development.
B-	84-85	
C+	82-83	
C	80-81	A totally acceptable performance demonstrating

		an adequate level of attainment for a student at a given stage of development.
C-	78-79	
D+	74-77	
D	70-73	A marginal performance in the required exercises demonstrating a minimal passing level of attainment.
F	Below 70	For whatever reason, an unacceptable performance. The F grade indicates that the student's performance in the required exercises has revealed almost no understanding of the course content.

IN	NA	Work incomplete.

Schedule

January 11: Introductions and Course Overview

1. Read Course Syllabus.

2. Wilson, T.D. (2010). Fifty years of information behavior research. *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, 36*(3), 27-34. http://www.asis.org/Bulletin/Feb-10/FebMar10_Wilson.pdf.

3. Wildemuth, B.M., & Case, D.O. (2010). Early information behavior research. *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, 36*(3), 35-38. http://www.asis.org/Bulletin/Feb-10/FebMar10_Wildemuth_Case.pdf

4. Marchionini, G. (2008). Human-information interaction. *Library & Information Science Research, 30*(3), 165-174. [UNC libraries] (Skim through the entire article, but focus special attention on sections 2 and 6.)

January 16: Theoretical perspectives and basic concepts

1. Halverson, C. A. (2002). Activity theory and distributed cognition: Or what does CSCW need to DO with theories? *Computer Supported Cooperative Work: CSCW: An International Journal, 11*(1-2), 243–267. http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015298005381 (Read through the end of section 2 – "Why Theory?")

2. Bates, M. J. (1999). The invisible substrate of information science. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 50*(12), 1043-1050. [UNC libraries]

3. Choose ONE of the following**:**

- Samek, T. (2014). Chapter 1. *Librarianship and human rights: a twenty-first century guide*. Elsevier. (In Digital Course Reserves)
- Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). Machine bias. *Pro Publica*. https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing
- Winn, S. The Hubris of Neutrality in Archives. Retrieved from https://medium.com/on-archivy/the-hubris-of-neutrality-in-archives-8df6b523fe9f
- Bourg, C. Bathrooms, libraries, and the limits of welcoming. Retreived from https://chrisbourg.wordpress.com/2017/07/28/nc-is-a-no-go-bathrooms-libraries-and-the-limits-of-welcoming/
- Timberg, S. (2016, May 3). Could Google results change an election? Retrieved from http://www.salon.com/2016/05/10/could_google_results_change_an_election_theres_never_been_a_more_efficient_way_to_shift_swing_voters_than_this/
- Allam, A., Schulz, P. J., and Nakamoto, K. (2014). The impact of search engine selection and sorting criteria on vaccination beliefs and attitudes: Two experiments manipulating Google output. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 16*(4), 1–20. UNC Libraries

- Pinkerton, B. (2016, August 12). He's brilliant, she's lovely: Teaching computers to be less sexist. NPR. Retrieved from http://www.npr.org/sections/alltechconsidered/2016/08/12/489507182/hes-brilliant-shes-lovely-teaching-computers-to-be-less-sexist

Online Assignment 1 due: What is your information science?
Plagiarism Tutorial

January 18: Affective approaches to Information Behavior

1. Kuhlthau, C., Heinström, J., & Todd, R.J. (2008). The 'information search process' revisited: Is the model still useful? *Information Research, 13*(4), Proceedings of the 7th Conference on Information Seeking in Context, Vilnius, September 2008). http://informationr.net/ir/13-4/paper355.html.
2. Lopatovska, I., & Arapakis, I. (2011). Theories, methods and current research on emotions in library and information science, information retrieval and human-computer interaction. *Information Processing & Management, 47*(4), 575-592. [UNC libraries] (Focus your reading on sections 2 and 4.1.)

January 23: Cognitive approaches to information behavior

1. Ingwersen, P., & Järvelin, K. (2005). *The Turn: Integration of Information Seeking and Retrieval in Context.*Springer. [UNC libraries - electronic resource] (Skim, and read Section 6.1, Building the conceptual framework, p.263-274.) Read through this once. DON'T PANIC.

2. Dinet, J., Chevalier, A., & Tricot, A. (2012). Information search activity: An overview. *Revue européene de psychologie appliqué, 62*(2), 49-62. (Read sections 2.1-2.2.1.) [UNC libraries] (Sections 2.1-2.2.1 - background for understanding the Ingwersen and Järvelin model)

January 25: Experiencing an information need

1. Belkin, N. (1980). Anomalous states of knowledge as a basis for information retrieval. Canadian Journal of Information Science, 5,133-143. [In Sakai Resources] (Pay special attention to his explanation of the specificability of an information need, p.136-139, with Figure 3.)
2. Case, D.O. (2012). Information needs and information seeking. In Looking for Information: A Survey of Research on Information Seeking, Needs, and Behavior. 3rd edition. Boston: Academic Press, 77-93. [Chapter in Sakai Resources; book on reserve in SILS Library - ZA3075 .L665 2012]
3. Taylor, R.S. (1968). Question negotiation and information seeking in libraries. College & Research Libraries, 29(3),178-194. (Read about the four levels of "questions," on pages 182-183; we'll come back to the rest in a few weeks.) [In Sakai Resources]
4. Savolainen, R. (2006). Information use as gap-bridging: The viewpoint of sense-making methodology. Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, 57(8), 1116-1125. [UNC libraries]

January 30: Expressing information needs

1. Bates, M.E. (1998). Finding the question behind the question. Information Outlook, 2(7), 19-21. [In Sakai Resources]
2. Sparck-Jones, K., Robertson, S.E., & Sanderson, M. (2007). Ambiguous requests: Implications for retrieval tests, systems and theories. ACM SIGIR Forum, 41(2), 8-17. [Online]
3. Nückles, M., & Ertelt, A. (2006). The problem of describing a problem: Supporting laypersons in presenting their queries to the internet-based helpdesk. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 64(8), 648-669. (Read sections 1-3, p648-651.) [UNC libraries]

February 1: Information Seeking: Selection of information sources

1. Savolainen, R. (2008). Source preferences in the context of seeking problem-specific information. *Information Processing & Management*, *44*(1): 274-293. [UNC libraries]

2. Lu, L, & Yuan, Y.C. (2011). Shall I Google it or ask the competent villain down the hall? The moderating role of information need in information source selection. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, *62*(1), 133-145. [UNC libraries]

3. Gibson, A. N., Kaplan, S., & Vardell, E. (2017). A Survey of Information Source Preferences of Parents of Individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 1-16.

Description and Analysis of an Information Seeking Event: Choose partner, time and date for observation.

February 6: Databases/Search lab (Co-instructor: Rebecca Vargha)

Bring the draft of your system/service proposal Preliminary plan for literature searching

Koufogiannakis, D. (2013). EBLIP7 Keynote: What we talk about when we talk about evidence. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, *8*(4), 6-17. http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/EBLIP/article/view/20486.

System/Service Proposal: Setting/Target Audience Description due at midnight after class

February 8: ALISE Conference – no class

February 13: Guest Lecture (Gary Marchionini)

System/Service Proposal: Preliminary plan for literature searching due at midnight after class

February 15: Browsing and Serendipity

Bawden, D. (2011). Encountering on the road to Serendip? Browsing in new information environments. In Foster, A., & Rafferty, P. (eds.), *Innovations in Information Retrieval: Perspectives for Theory and Practice.* London: Facet Publishing, 1-22. [SILS Library - Z699 .I56 2011; copy of this chapter in Sakai Resources]

Bates, M.J. (2007). What is browsing -- really? A model drawing from behavioural science research. *Information Research, 12*(4), Paper 330. [http://informationr.net/ir/12-4/paper330.html]

Bates, M.J. (1989). The design of browsing and berrypicking techniques for the online search interface. *Online Review, 13*(5), 407-424. [Sakai Resources] (Skim quickly; pay special attention to the techniques listed on page 412; you're expected to incorporate all of them in your searching for Assignment 3).

Final assignment: Group selection due

February 20: Interactive Information Retrieval

Marchionini, G. (2006). Exploratory search: From finding to understanding. *Communications of the ACM, 49*(4), 41-46. [UNC libraries]

Vakkari, P., & Huuskonen, S. (2012). Search effort degrades search output but improves task outcome. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, 63*(4), 657-670. [UNC libraries]

Final Assignment: Topic Selection Due

February 22: Relevance Judgments

1. Saracevic, T. (2007). Relevance: A review of the literature and a framework for thinking on the notion in information science. Part II: Nature and manifestations of relevance, [and] Part III: Behavior and effects of relevance. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, 58*(13), 1915-1933, 2126-2144. [UNC libraries: Part II, Part III]
2. Xie, I., & Benoit, E., III. (2013). Search result list evaluation versus document evaluation: Similarities and differences. *Journal of Documentation, 69*(1), 49-80. [UNC libraries]
3. Bush, V. (1945). As we may think. *Atlantic Monthly, 176*(1), 101-108. [Reprinted in *interactions, 3*(2), 35-46, March 1996]

4. Olson, H. A. (2001). The Power to Name: Representation in Library Catalogs. *Signs*, *26*(3), 639–668. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3175535

February 27: Assessment of information quality/value

Rieh, S.Y. (2002). Judgment of information quality and cognitive authority in the Web. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, *53*(2), 145-161. [UNC libraries]

Tombros, A., Ruthven, I., & Jose, J.M. (2005). How users assess web pages for information seeking. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, *56*(4), 327-344. [UNC libraries]

Final Assignment: Search parameters/preliminary plan for literature searching & Preliminary bibliography due

March 1: Human Intermediaries and Imposed Queries

1. Ellis, D., Wilson, T.D., Ford, N., Foster, A., Lam, H.M., Burton, R., & Spink, A. (2002). Information seeking and mediated searching. Part 5. User-intermediary interaction. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, *53*(11), 883-893. [UNC libraries]
2. Gross, M. (1995). The imposed query. *RQ*, *35*(2), 236-243. [UNC libraries or Sakai Resources]
3. Agosto, D.E., Rozaklis, L., MacDonald, C., & Abels, E.G. (2011). A model of the reference and information service process: An educators' perspective. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, *50*(3), 235-244. [UNC libraries

March 6: Personal Information Management (PIM) & Re-Finding

1. Teevan, J., Capra, R., and Perez-Quinones, M.A. (2007). How People Find Personal Information. In Jones, W. and Teevan, J. (Eds.), Personal Information Management. (pp. 22-34). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press. [full text is available electronically through UNC Library]
2. Barreau, D.K. and Nardi, B. (1995). Finding and reminding: file organization from the desktop. SIGCHI Bulletin, 27(3):39-43. http://old.sigchi.org/bulletin/1995.3/barreau.html
3. Dearman, D., & Pierce, J. (2008). It's on my other computer! Computing with multiple devices. Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI 2008), ACM Press, 767-776.

Description and Analysis of an Information Seeking Event: Final Deliverables due at midnight after class

March 8: Information Use

1. Cooke, N. A. (2014). Connecting: Adding an affective domain to the information intents theory. *Library & Information Science Research, 36*(3), 185-191.

2. Each of the studies below examined or proposed a different type/aspect of information use. To support our class discussion today, *select ONE* of these articles and read them before coming to class. If the study examined additional information behaviors (e.g., information seeking), skim those sections; focus on the sections discussing USE of the information.

- *Reading e-books:* ChanLin, L.-J. (2013). Reading strategy and the need of e-book features. *Electronic Library, 31*(3), 329-344. [UNC libraries]
- *Using information from PubMed to help solve neuroscience problems:* Mirel, B., Tonks, J.S., Song, J., Meng, F., Xuan, W., & Ameziane, R. (2013). Studying PubMed usages in the field for complex problem solving: Implications for tool design. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, 64*(5), 874-892. [UNC libraries]
- *Discussing found information with a physician or using it to improve one's health:* Warner, D., & Procaccino, J.D. (2004). Toward wellness: Women seeking health information. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, 55*(8), 709-730. [UNC libraries]
- *Eight different ways that information is used within organizational contexts:* Choo, C.W., Bergeron, P., Detlor, B., & Heaton, L. (2008). Information culture and information use: An exploratory study of three organizations. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, 59*(5), 792-804. [UNC libraries]
- *Packaging and sharing information with stakeholders:* Mutshewa, A. (2010). The use of information by environmental planners: A qualitative study using Grounded Theory methodology. *Information Processing & Management, 46*(2), 212-232. [UNC libraries]
- *Use of images for the information they provide or as illustrations:* McCay-Pett, L., & Toms, E. (2009). Image use within the work task model: Images as information and illustration. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, 60*(12), 2416-2429. [UNC libraries]
- *Use of images by four different groups of users*: Beaudoin, J.E. (2014). A framework of image use among archaeologists, architects, art historians and artists. *Journal of Documentation, 70*(1), 119-147. [UNC libraries]
- *Selection and use of particular pieces of information in house listings:* Savolainen, R. (2009). Interpreting informational cues: An explorative study on information use among prospective homebuyers. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, 60*(11), 2244-2254. [UNC libraries]

March 9 (5 pm) - March 18: Spring Break/No Classes

March 20: Situation and Context/ Intro to Social Paradigms of Information Behavior

1. Sonnenwald, D.H. (1999). Perspectives of human information behaviour: Contexts, situations, social networks and information horizons. In *Exploring the Contexts of Information Behaviour: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Research in Information Needs, Seeking and Use in Different Contexts (August 13-15, 1998, Sheffield, UK).* Taylor Graham, 176-190. [Sakai Resources]

2. Samek, T. (2014). *Librarianship and Human Rights: A Twenty-First Century Guide*. Oxford: Chandos. (Read Chapter 1: An Urgent Context for Twenty-first Century Librarianship, p. 3-22)
3. Cool, C. (2001). The concept of situation in information science. *Annual Review of Information Science & Technology, 35,* 5-42. [SILS Library Reference - Z699.A1 A65 v.35, or Sakai Resources] ("Situation, context, and interaction with information," pages 7-9)

System/Service Proposal: Preliminary Population Data due at midnight

March 22: Domain, Disciplinary, and Organizational Contexts

1. Taylor, R.S. (1991). Information use environments. *Progress in Communication Sciences, 10,* 217-255. [Davis Library - P87 .P74 v10, or Sakai Resources]
2. Chancellor, R. (2015). Getting It from the Source: What Librarians Think About Lawyer Search Behavior. *Law Libr. J.*, *107*, 287.
3. Fisher, K.E., & Naumer, C.M. (2006). Information grounds: Theoretical basis and empirical findings on information flow in social settings. In Spink, A., & Cole, C. (eds.), *New Directions in Human Information Behavior.* Springer, 93-111. [UNC libraries]

System/Service Proposal: Proposed system or service due (midnight after class)

March 27: Everyday Life Information Seeking (ELIS)

1. Savolainen, R. (1995). Everyday life information seeking: Approaching information seeking in the context of "way of life". *Library & Information Science Research, 17*(3), 259-294. [UNC libraries]
2. Rieh, S.Y. (2004). On the Web at home: Information seeking and web searching in the home environment. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 55*(8), 743-753. [UNC libraries]
   (Focus special attention on the literature review, and the results for research questions 1 & 2)
3. McKenzie, P.J. (2003). A model of information practices in accounts of everyday-life information seeking. *Journal of Documentation, 59*(1), 19-40. [UNC libraries]

March 29: Information Poverty, Small Worlds, and Community Contexts (also E-Participation & Information Literacy)

1. Yu, L. (2006). Understanding Information Inequality: Making Sense of the Literature of the Information and Digital Divides. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, *38*(4), 229–252. http://doi.org/10.1177/0961000606070600
2. Jaeger, P. T., & Burnett, G. (2010). *Information Worlds: Social Context, Technology, and Information Behavior in the Age of the Internet* (1 edition.). New York: Routledge. Chapter 2. [Sakai Resources]
3. Gibson, A. N., & Kaplan, S. (2017). Place, community and information behavior: Spatially oriented information seeking zones and information source preferences. *Library & Information Science Research*, *39*(2), 131-139.

4. Sandra Fisher-Martins: The Right to Understand http://www.ted.com/talks/sandra_fisher_martins_the_right_to_understand

April 3: Information Retrieval Systems, Social systems and Media as Intermediaries

1. Marchionini, G., & White, R. (2007). Find what you need, understand what you find. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 23*(3), 205-238. [UNC libraries]
2. **Skim:** White, R.W. (2009). Designing information-seeking support systems. In *Information Seeking Support Systems: An Invitational Workshop (June 26-27, 2008, Chapel Hill, NC),* 55-58. http://ils.unc.edu/ISSS/ISSS_final_report.pdf.
3. Noble, S. U. (2013). Google Search: Hyper-visibility as a Means of Rendering Black Women and Girls Invisible. *InVisible Culture:* Issue 19. http://ivc.lib.rochester.edu/google-search-hyper-visibility-as-a-means-of-rendering-black-women-and-girls-invisible/
4. Van Dijck, J. (2012). Facebook and the engineering of connectivity: A multi-layered approach to social media platforms. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies, 19*(2), 141-155. http://con.sagepub.com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/content/19/2/141.full.pdf+html
5. Choose 1 of the following:
    a. Tufekci, Z. (2017). We're building a dystopia just to make people click on ads. TED Talk. https://www.ted.com/talks/zeynep_tufekci_we_re_building_a_dystopia_just_to_make_people_click_on_ads
    b. Parser, E. (2011). Beware online "filter bubbles". TED Talk. http://www.ted.com/talks/eli_pariser_beware_online_filter_bubbles.html
    c. O'Neil, C. (2017). The era of blind faith in big data must end. TED Talk. https://www.ted.com/talks/cathy_o_neil_the_era_of_blind_faith_in_big_data_must_end?utm_source=tedcomshare&utm_medium=referral&utm_campaign=tedspread-b

System/Service Proposal: Final Deliverables due midnight after class

April 5: Scholarly work and the role of scholarly communication

1. Bornmann, L., & Marx, W. (2012). The Anna Karenina principle: A way of thinking about success in science. *Journal of American Society for Information Science & Technology, 63*(10), 2037-2051. [UNC libraries]
2. Evans, J.A. (2008, July 18). Electronic publication and the narrowing of science and scholarship. *Science, 321*(5887), 395-399. [UNC libraries]

April 10: Metrics of scholarly productivity

1. Smith, L.C. (1981). Citation analysis. *Library Trends, 30*(1), 83-106. [In Sakai Resources]
2. Chang, Y.-W. (2013). The influence of Taylor's paper, Question-Negotiation and Information-Seeking in Libraries. *Information Processing & Management, 49*(5), 983-994. [UNC libraries]

3. Priem, J., & Hemminger, B.M. (2010). Scientometrics 2.0: Toward new metrics of scholarly impact on the social Web. *First Monday, 15*(7). http://www.uic.edu/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/viewArticle/2874/2570.
4. Ware, M., & Mabe, M. (2009). *The STM Report: An Overview of Scientific and Scholarly Journal Publishing.* International Association of Scientific, Technical, and Medical Publishers. www.stm-assoc.org/2009_10_13_MWC_STM_Report.pdf. (Section 4 (p45-57) provides a great summary of open access issues. Also read section 2.18 (p39-40) for a brief introduction to some of the copyright issues involved in scholarly publishing.)

"What Is Your Information Science?" due at midnight (Sakai)

April 12: Intellectual property and distribution

1. Harnad, S., Brody, T., Vallieres, F., Carr, L., Hitchcock, S., Gingras, Y., Oppenheim, C., Hajjem, C., & Hilf, E.R. (2008). The access/impact problem and the green and gold roads to open access: An update. *Serials Review, 34*(1), 36-40. [UNC libraries]
2. Seadle, M. (2007). Copyright cultures. *Library Hi Tech, 25*(3), 430-435. [UNC libraries]
3. Heather Brooke: My battle to expose government corruption (TED Talk). http://www.ted.com/talks/heather_brooke_my_battle_to_expose_government_corruption

April 17: The Invisible College and Diffusion Theory: How Ideas Move

1. White, H.D. (2003). Pathfinder networks and author cocitation analysis: A remapping of paradigmatic information scientists. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, 54*(5), 423-434.
   (Focus your reading on two sections: "ACA Mapping" and "PFNETs and Their Advantages." Also study the figures, and skim the text around them in enough depth to get a basic understanding of what the figures mean.)
2. Haythornthwaite, C. (1996). Social network analysis: An approach and technique for the study of information exchange. *Library & Information Science Research, 18,* 323-342. [UNC libraries]
   (Be sure you understand all the basic concepts described on pages 323-331; then you can skim lightly to page 338, then focus on the last section (pages 338-340).)
3. Rogers, E. (1995). *Diffusion of Innovations.* 4th ed. New York: Free Press. [SILS Library Reserves - HM101 .R57 1995; copy of relevant sections of Chapter 1 and Chapter 10 in Sakai Resources].
   (Read pg. page 5, beginning with the section on "What is diffusion?" through page 31, before the "hybrid corn" example; skip the "scurvy" boxed example if you need to limit your time on thisAlso examine Figure 5-1 on page 163. If you have any extra time at all, also read pages 389-400, "The innovation process in organizations.")

April 24: Conference day/Snow day/Readings TBA

April 26: Conference day/Snow day/Readings TBA

April 19: Wrap up