INLS 500: Human Information Interactions

Instructor: Amelia N. Gibson
Email: angibson@email.unc.edu
Office: 205 Manning Hall
Class meetings: Tuesday & Thursday, 9:30 – 10:45 am, 001 Manning Hall
Office hours: Tuesdays, 2:30-3:30pm; Wednesdays 2-3pm; and 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 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, with particular emphasis on scholarly information behaviors;
- be able to investigate the ways in which the context of an information interaction can affect the process and outcomes of that interaction;
- be able to investigate information behaviors and practices, including the impact of technology on human information interactions; and
- 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.
- **Evidence Summary/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:
Since this is a "survey" course, 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%), Evidence Summary/Class discussion management (10%), Diary and Analysis of an Information-Seeking Event (20%), System/Service Proposal (25%), and In-Depth Analysis of an Example of Scholarly Communication (20%).

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

Assignments are due at the beginning of the class period on the specified due date. 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. I am also happy to schedule a meeting with you during office hours or by appointment. If you come by the office and my door is open, then I'm 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)*

Post (to Sakai) a 2-4 minute oral response 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:

Part 1 (due January 19):

- **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.

Part 2 (due April 21):

- **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.

Online Discussions *(.2 pts each)*

Participate (substantively) in online discussions moderated by your classmates at least 10 times during the semester.

Evidence Summary/Class Discussion Management (10%)

This assignment is modeled on the evidence summaries regularly published in the journal, *Evidence-Based Library & Information Practice* (http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/EBLIP/index). 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. While most of the evidence summaries in the journal do focus on the practice of librarianship, this approach can (and will, in this assignment) be extended to any information practice setting that you want to explore for your future career.

1. **Select an article (due Jan. 26):**

- It must be an empirical study (broadly defined). Authors must have systematically collected data related to their research question and must have reported their findings.
- Should be on a topic/question within the scope of this course, i.e., it should focus on human information interactions of some type.
- It can be an article from our "additional readings" list, but does not have to be; it may NOT be one of our required readings.

- An evidence summary of your selected article should NOT have already been published in *EBLIP*. You can check this by going to the journal and using the Journal Content search box at the right of the page; search by the name of the author of the article you've selected.

2. **Writing the evidence summary:** The evidence summary itself is written in a very structured format - basically an extended abstract. It begins with brief descriptions of the study's objective(s), its design, its setting, its subjects/participants, and the methods used to carry it out. Then it reports the main results and the main conclusions that can be drawn from those results. Finally, the author of the summary comments on the implications of those conclusions for practice in the relevant information setting. Additional references pertinent to the commentary should be cited, as appropriate; these can include references in the original article but should also include relevant references not cited in the article being examined.
   The full evidence summary, excluding title, study citation, and additional references, should be 1000-1500 words. You should turn in a copy of the study being examined when you turn in your summary.
3. **Sharing the evidence summary with the class (on your selected presentation date):** During the

appropriate class session, you will be asked to present a brief overview of the article you read and to manage class discussion about the article and it's relation to the day's topic. The presentation will be informal, in the sense that it will involve no slides and will be done from your seat in class. The oral presentation should take no more than 3-4 minutes of class time.

4. **Sharing evidence summary on class forum (on your selected presentation date):** On the same day as the oral presentation, you will post a message to the class discussion forum (in Sakai). It should briefly summarize the article, and should also be influenced by your presentation, in terms of incorporating any questions/issues raised by your classmates. The posting should be 300-500 words. The full evidence summary should be attached to the posting to provide more detail, and you can also attach a copy of the full article. You are responsible for monitoring the discussion of your article over the next week after your summary is presented/posted. Continue to ask follow-up questions or post responses to messages from your classmates. In other words, actively moderate the online discussion.

Evaluation criteria

The evidence summary 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 management in class and online.

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

As information professionals, we are concerned with designing systems and services that help our clients. For this assignment, you are the client. You will keep a short diary over a period of hours or days that covers an information-seeking experience with an identifiable beginning and end. It does not have to be a unique event and it may or may not have been resolved. You will analyze your thoughts, feelings, and actions based on readings and class discussions.

Intermediate Deliverables

1. **Brief Description of Event (Due 2/4)** *(3 points)*: To ensure that you're on the right track with this assignment, you should turn in a two-paragraph description of the event you expect to observe. Please describe the event, and explain how/why this event meets the requirements. *(Expository/Descriptive/Persuasive Writing)*

Final Deliverables:

1. **Diary (Due 3/3)***(5 points)* - *Describe* your information seeking event, including behaviors, strategies, thoughts, and motivations. Your diary should capture as much detail about your experience as possible, but does not have to be formal or very structured (it must be comprehensible at some level). The goal of the diary is to provide chronology and context for the analysis. Diary entries should be made as you are going through the information seeking process. *(Descriptive Writing)*

2. **Analysis of Information Seeking Event (Due 3/3)***(12 points)* – *Evaluate* your experience. *Assess* which (if any) of the information seeking and use models we have discussed in class apply to your 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 diary. 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:

- Where did you search/what sources did you consult? Why?
- What barriers or surprises did you experience?
- If you consulted systems or online sources, describe the interaction and why it worked, or did not.
- Why do you think your experience was a successful (or unsuccessful) one?
- If you consulted other people, how you were able to convey your information needs?

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 to describe your information behavior will determine a large portion of your grade. Please remember that the diary will be used as a description of your search process, so large amounts of time/space within the analysis should not be spent on retelling. 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 (25%)

In this assignment, you will develop a proposal for a new service for a particular client population of a particular information organization. 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

1. **Setting/Target Audience Description (Due 2/9)***(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:

    1. 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)*.
    2. One paragraph defining/describing the client group (based on your current knowledge) *(Descriptive/Expository Writing)*.
    3. One paragraph about ***why*** you selected this setting and client group *(Persuasive Writing)*.
2. **Preliminary Searching Plan (Due 3/10)** *(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:
    1. Databases/Other sources you intend to search with brief explanations as to why
    2. Search Terms (including inclusion/exclusion criteria such as dates)
    3. 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)
3. **Preliminary Population Data (Due 3/22)** *(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.
4. **Proposed system or service (Due 3/26)** *(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 (Due 4/7):

The final proposal package will consist of three parts:

1. **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.
2. **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 assemble 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).
3. **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.

In-Depth Analysis of an Example of Scholarly Communication (20%)

In this assignment, you will work with your team to review and reflect on an example of scholarly communication. Specifically, your team will choose and analyze a set of related scholarly articles, including references and citations from, to, and among them. To be completed in teams of 2-4 people.

Intermediate Deliverables

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

Team selection (4/5*)* *(1 point)***:** 2-4 People per group (keep in mind that each group will be responsible for a minimum of 3 articles). You may want to seek group members prior to this class session.

Article Selection (due 4/12) *(2 points)***:** Choose a small set of articles (at least one for each member of your team, with a minimum of 3 articles for the team) from a concept area or research area of particular interest to the team. Articles must:

- Fall within the scope of topics taught within this course
- Have been published sometime between 1960-2013;
- One of the articles must be "significant" (must have been cited by more than 20 other publications)
- It is also required that each article in the set be directly linked to at least one other article in the set, i.e., it must cite or be cited by at least one other article in the set.
- Include the work of more than one author (you many not choose several articles by the same author).

Final Deliverables (Due 4/26)

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.

Analysis of the article (4 pages total, single-spaced, excluding references) *(6 points)***:**
Write an analysis of each article in your set. The analysis should reflect your team's 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.

How successful was the author (or authors) in making an argument or conveying their ideas? What appealed to you about the presentation (structure, illustrations, writing style, length, level of detail, etc.)? How much of the article's appeal was due to your own point of view, preferences, or familiarity with the topic? Who was the intended audience for the paper and how is this made evident?

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 about how they failed and offer suggestions for improvement.

Analysis of the scholarly context of the article (6-8 pages total, single-spaced, excluding references)*(8 points)*
To understand the scholarly context of this article, you will analyze its references and the citations to this paper.

Begin by examining the reference lists in your selected papers. How old are the citations? Who wrote the work that the author(s) cited? Is the author's (or authors') prior work 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?

Your next step is to discover who has cited the papers 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.

Write up your citation analysis. 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? What do these citations tell you about the importance (or lack of importance) of this work? If you feel the paper has not received the attention it deserves, reflect on why that may be so. If the paper has received more attention than it deserves, reflect on why that may be so. What do the citations tell you about the scholarly network in which the author(s) work?

Finally, examine the context of citations to your papers. Choose at least one citation to each of your selected papers and examine it directly. Find the point(s) in each paper at which the selected paper is cited. In which section of the paper is it cited? What does the citing author say about it? Is it cited in combination with any other papers? What does the citation context tell you about the influence of your selected paper? In addition, analyze in a similar way any instances that you found in which multiple papers from your set of selected papers were cited in the same article/document.

In evaluating the citations, what, if anything, did you learn about citation behaviors or about the citation sources themselves? (Feel free to graphically represent some of your findings, if that would be useful in discussing them.) Based on your analysis, are there particular sources, categories of readers, topics, or functions that may have found the paper particularly useful?
Writing up your analysis

Write up what your team has learned in a brief paper, 6-8 pages, single-spaced. Be sure to include the references to all the specific papers that you'll want to discuss (i.e., the original set of papers, possibly

one or more references from each, and several examples of papers citing papers in your selected set). Your writing style for this paper should be relatively formal/academic, in comparison with other assignments in this course.
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.

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.

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.

Schedule

January 12: 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

January 14: Theoretical perspectives and basic concepts

1. Bates, M. J. (1999). The invisible substrate of information science. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 50*(12), 1043-1050. [UNC libraries]
2. Marchionini, G. (2008). Human-information interaction. *Library & Information Science*

Research, 30(3), 165-174. [UNC libraries]
Read through the entire article, but focus special attention on sections 2 and 6.

January 19: 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.)

-Online Assignment 1 due: What is your information science? (before class)
-Evidence Summary Date/Topic Selection due at midnight after class

January 21: 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, p263-274.)
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 26: Databases/Search lab

1. Bring your written notes on "What is your Information Science?"
2. 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.

Evidence Summary Article Title Due (midnight after class)

January 28: 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 specifiability 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]

February 2: 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]

Evidence Summary: Rebecca Greenstein

February 4: Studying/analyzing information needs

1. Herman, E. (2004). Research in progress: Some preliminary and key insights into the information needs of the contemporary academic research. Part 1. *Aslib Proceedings, 56*(1), 34-47. [UNC libraries]
2. Watson, B. R., & Cavanah, S. (2015). Community Information Needs: A Theory and Methodological Framework. *Mass Communication and Society*, *18*(5), 651-673. http://www.tandfonline.com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/doi/pdf/10.1080/15205436.2015.1059948

Diary and Analysis of an Information Seeking Event: Brief description due at midnight after class

February 9: 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]

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

Evidence Summary: Natalee Seely

February 11: Incidental Information Acquisition: Browsing and Serendipity

1. 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]
2. 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]
3. Bates, M.J. (1989). The design of browsing and berrypicing 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).

February 16: Interactive Information Retrieval

1. Marchionini, G. (2006). Exploratory search: From finding to understanding. *Communications of the ACM, 49*(4), 41-46. [UNC libraries]
2. 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]

February 18: Assessment of information quality/value

1. 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]
2. 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]

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

February 23: 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]

February 25: Finding and Re-finding Information

1. Capra, R., & Pérez-Quiñones, M.A. (2005). Using Web search engines to find and refind information. *IEEE Computer, 38*(10), 36-42. [UNC libraries]
2. Jones, W., Bruce, H., & Dumais, S. (2001). Keeping found things found on the Web. *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management,* 119-126. [UNC libraries]

Evidence Summary: Melissa Hyland

March 1: 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 TWO*** 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]

Evidence Summary: Elijah Hood

March 3: Situation and Context/ Intro to Social Paradigms of Information Behavior

Situation and Context

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. (2007). *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)

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

March 8: 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. 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]

Evidence Summary: Rae Hoyle

March 10: Information Poverty, Small Worlds, and Community Contexts (also E-Participation & Information Literacy)

1. Chatman, E.A. (1996). The impoverished life-world of outsiders. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 47*(3), 193-206. [UNC libraries]
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. Sandra Fisher-Martins: The Right to Understand http://www.ted.com/talks/sandra_fisher_martins_the_right_to_understand

System/Service Proposal: Preliminary Searching Plan due at midnight after class

Spring Break (March 11-20) NO CLASS

March 22: 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]

System/Service Proposal: Preliminary Population Data due at midnight

Evidence Summary: Aileen Ma

March 24: 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]

Choose one of the following:

1. 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]
2. Shah, C., & Kitzie, V. (2012). Social Q&A and virtual reference -- Comparing apples and oranges with the help of experts and users. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, 63*(10), 2020-2036. [UNC libraries]

Evidence Summary: Kahlee Leingang

March 29: Information Retrieval Systems 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. 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. Parser, E. (2011). Beware online "filter bubbles". TED Talk. http://www.ted.com/talks/eli_pariser_beware_online_filter_bubbles.html

March 31: Social systems and Media (Collaborative Search/Social intermediation, Recommender systems, Social Q&A, etc.)

1. Shah, C., & Kitzie, V. (2012). Social Q&A and virtual reference -- Comparing apples and oranges with the help of experts and users. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, 63*(10), 2020-2036. [UNC libraries]
2. 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

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]

Submit group members for Scholarly Communication Assignment by midnight after class

Evidence Summary: Jasmine Plott

April 7: 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.

System/Service Proposal: Final Deliverables due midnight after class

April 12: Scholarly publishing as an industry/Intellectual property and distribution

1. 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.)
2. 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]
3. Seadle, M. (2007). Copyright cultures. *Library Hi Tech, 25*(3), 430-435. [UNC libraries]
4. Heather Brooke: My battle to expose government corruption (TED Talk). http://www.ted.com/talks/heather_brooke_my_battle_to_expose_government_corruption

Submit Article titles for Scholarly Communications assignment by midnight after class

April 14: 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 19: The Future of Information: Cyborgs and Robots and Secrecy and Participation (or In Which We Ask Where We Are Going?)

1. Aronson, L. (2014, July 19). The Future of Robot Caregivers. *New York Times*. Retrieved from

http://www.nytimes.com/2014/07/20/opinion/sunday/the-future-of-robot-caregivers.html?_r=0 2. Amber Case. We Are All Cyborgs Now (TED Talk). http://www.ted.com/talks/amber_case_we_are_all_cyborgs_now# 3. **Your choice: Select an article to discuss in class on the future of information science in your specific area of interest.**
April 21: Make up day/Snow day **"What Is Your Information Science?" due at midnight (Sakai)**
April 26: Wrap Up **Scholarly Communication Assignment due midnight after class.**