

INLS 584: Information Ethics

Instructor: Amelia N. Gibson

Email: angibson@email.unc.edu

Class meetings: Monday - Thursday, 4:15-6:15 pm, 303 Manning Hall

Office hours by appointment

Course Overview

Course Description

Overview. The intention of this course is to introduce students to the variety of ethical issues they will need to address as information professionals. After a brief overview of moral theories and their application to ethical issues, as well as ethical codes of conduct for the information professions, the class will focus on particular issues that are most salient to information professionals, such as societal implications of information creation and use, information/data as intellectual property, privacy, access to information/censorship, access to information technology, effects of computerization on the work environment (job displacement, deskilling, ergonomic issues, electronic monitoring), effects of computer-mediated communication on understandings of identity and relationships, and effects of computerization on democracy and government.

Rationale and relationship to the current curriculum. Many of the courses in the SILS curriculum briefly address ethical issues, such as censorship, intellectual property rights, the effects of systems design, and others. By focusing entirely on ethics, this course will enable the participants to develop their skills in reasoning about such issues.

A note on the course. This course is largely student-led and discussion based. As a summer course, we will adhere to a rigorous reading and writing schedule. Students should come prepared to engage with challenging ideas and classmates fully but respectfully.

Textbook and Readings

Rachels, J., & Rachels, S. (2014). *The Elements of Moral Philosophy* (8th edition). Dubuque: McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages.

The text is available at UNC Student Stores.

Additional readings will be available as noted in the class schedule. These readings will be selected by the instructor and class participants.

Assignments and Evaluation

The final grade will be based on one major paper, two small assignments, and class participation (including leadership of one class session):

- The major paper will be due at the end of the semester. It may be an integrative literature review on a particular ethical issue/case, a review of a particular court case or set of cases with implications for information ethics, or a critical review of a current book related to topics discussed in the course. In each case, there will be intermediate deliverables due throughout the semester. (30%)
- Each student will be asked to develop one scenario describing an ethical dilemma. (15%)
- Each student will be asked to respond to one scenario describing an ethical dilemma. (15%)
- Each student will be asked to plan and lead a class session. (20%)
- Each student will be expected to participate actively throughout the semester, including during the class meetings and in the online discussion forum (20%).

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.

Graduate Grading Scale

| 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. |

Undergraduate Grading Scale

| Letter | Numeric | Description of grade |
|--------|---------|----------------------|
|--------|---------|----------------------|

| grade | range | |
|-------|----------|--|
| 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. |

Honor Code. The Honor Code, which prohibits giving or receiving unauthorized aid in the completion of assignments, is in effect 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.

Library and Lab Resources. You will be using SILS library and lab resources 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.

Assignments

MAJOR PAPER (30%)

The major assignment is a paper, due at the end of the semester. It may be any *one* of the following, or an alternative specific project/paper proposed by the student and approved by the instructor:

- An *integrative literature review* on a particular ethical issue/case. The goal of this assignment is to analyze a particular ethical issue or case in depth. The student will

identify and study the literature related to that issue or case. The review will integrate and critique the major points made in the literature.

- A **review of a particular court case or set of cases** with implications for information ethics. The goal of this assignment is similar to the previous alternative, but the focus of the review is on a particular legal case or set of related cases. The review will integrate and critique the major points made through the selected case(s), including references to other relevant literature.
- A **critical review of a current book** related to topics discussed in the course. In addition to providing a recommendation concerning the quality of the book reviewed, the student should analyze the content of the book in relation to issues in information ethics. (The book to be reviewed must be at least 150 pages in length; a [list of possible books](#) is available for inspiration.)

The major paper should be approximately 8-10 single-spaced pages. It will be evaluated, based on the following criteria: the quality (logic, depth, etc.) of the reasoning about ethical issues and the application of moral principles, clarity (including grammatical correctness), and completeness. It is expected to be of publishable quality, and students are encouraged to prepare their papers in anticipation of submission for publication.

Intermediate Deliverables:

Deliverable 1 (Due June 25):

For *literature reviews*, the following deliverables will be handed in for comment:

- A one-page proposal of the topic/question to be covered in the review

For *reviews of court cases*, the following deliverables will be handed in for comment:

- A list of the case(s) to be reviewed and a one-paragraph summary of the connecting theme.

For *book reviews*, the following deliverables will be handed in for comment:

- The citation of the book to be reviewed, and a one-paragraph summary of the relevant theme.

Deliverable 2 (Due July 9):

For *literature reviews*, the following deliverables will be handed in for comment:

- An annotated bibliography of the documents to be included in the literature review

For *reviews of court cases*, the following deliverables will be handed in for comment:

- An annotated bibliography of the other sources that will be used to review the case and its ethical implications

For *book reviews*, the following deliverables will be handed in for comment:

- An outline of the major points made in the book, or an extensive abstract of the book

Deliverable 3 (Due July 16):

For *literature reviews*, the following deliverables will be handed in for comment:

- An outline of the major points of the review.

For *reviews of court cases*, the following deliverables will be handed in for comment:

- An outline of the ethical issues to be raised and discussed in the review

For *book reviews*, the following deliverables will be handed in for comment:

- An outline of the ethical issues raised by the book and to be discussed in the review.

DEVELOPING A SCENARIO DESCRIBING AN ETHICAL DILEMMA (15%)

Each student will be asked to develop one scenario describing an ethical dilemma. Throughout the course, we will be working with a variety of such scenarios, varying in length from a paragraph to a collection of articles. Each dilemma presents a realistic (or real) situation in which issues related to information ethics are raised.

Writing a scenario describing an ethical dilemma is like writing a story. It should be realistic, vivid, and fairly detailed. For the purposes of this assignment, it should raise one or more ethical issues for each of three or more actors within the story. It should conclude with a set of questions that could be used to generate discussion pertaining to the ethical issues faced by each actor. It should be approximately 1.5 - 2 single-spaced pages in length, including questions (at least 1 written page).

It is anticipated that each student will choose to develop a scenario in his or her particular area of interest. Thus, the due dates will be associated with the scheduling of particular topics for discussion in the course. In general, the scenarios associated with a particular topic will be due three days after we have finished discussing the topic in class. Students are encouraged to use the class discussion of a draft scenario, to get feedback concerning its clarity and effectiveness in raising ethical issues. All scenarios must be completed and turned in for grading before class on July 27, at the latest.

The scenarios written by students will be evaluated on the following criteria: realism, effectiveness in raising important ethical issues, clarity, and vividness.

RESPONDING TO ONE SCENARIO OF AN ETHICAL DILEMMA (15%)

Each student will respond to a scenario depicting an ethical dilemma. It may be a scenario developed by another member of the class, or one of the scenarios included on our reading lists. The response is due approximately 7 days after the issue raised by the scenario is discussed in class (up to July 28).

Responding to a scenario entails identifying and responding to the ethical issues faced by each actor in the scenario. For each actor, identify the ethical issues faced by that person. For each issue, state whether the person acted ethically and the basis for your judgment about the person's actions. If the scenario does not specify the actions taken (i.e., it specifies only the situation), then describe the possible actions that could be taken by each actor, state which are ethical and which are not, and why you believe each action to be ethical or unethical. The written response should be 2-3 single-spaced pages in length.

The responses will be evaluated on the following criteria: clear identification of the ethical issues raised, quality of reasoning about those issues, and application of moral theories in that reasoning.

LEADING A CLASS DISCUSSION (20%)

Each student will be expected to lead at least one class session of interest to him or her, either alone or with a partner. The session leader(s) will select appropriate class readings (in consultation with the instructor), present an overview of the issues to be discussed, and lead a discussion or in-class exercise that will enable the class members to wrestle with the issue.

Students will sign up on June 25 for the topic of the class discussion that they wish to lead. Reading lists will be due on July 2. The instructor will then schedule the class sessions, July 13-28.

Leadership of a class session will be evaluated on the following criteria: the student's demonstration of an in-depth understanding of the issue being discussed (based on individual conversations with the instructor, as well as in-class leadership), and the student's ability to engage the class members in wrestling with that issue.

CLASS PARTICIPATION (20%)

Each student will be expected to participate actively in the class, through both in-class and online discussion. Class participation will be evaluated on the substance and quality of the student's comments, either in class or on the online discussion board.

Schedule

| Class Date | Topic/Readings |
|-------------------|--|
| 22-Jun | <p>Course Overview; Intro to Ethical Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rachels, Chapter 1, What is morality? (key: sections 1.5 & 1.6) |
| 23-Jun | <p>Cultural relativism; Subjectivism; Emotions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rachels, Chapter 2, The challenge of cultural relativism (key: sections 2.2, 2.4, 2.8, & 2.9) Rachels, Chapter 3, Subjectivism in ethics (key: sections 3.1-3.4) Artz, J. M. (2000). The role of emotion in reason, and its implications for computer ethics. <i>Computers and Society</i>, 30(1), 14-16. [Sakai Resources] |
| 24-Jun | <p>Morality and religion; Egoism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rachels, Chapter 4, Does morality depend on religion? (key: sections 4.2 & 4.3) Rachels, Chapter 5, Ethical egoism (key: sections 5.2-5.4) |
| 25-Jun | <p>Social contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The idea of a social contract (key: sections 6.1, 6.3, & 6.5) <p><i>Assignments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student led discussion: Topic Due Literature review: Topic/question due Review of court cases: List of cases due Book review: Citation due |
| 29-Jun | <p>Utilitarianism, Absolute moral rules, and Kant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rachels, Chapter 7, The utilitarian approach (key: section 7.1) Rachels, Chapter 8, The debate over utilitarianism (key: sections 8.1, 8.3, & 8.4) Rachels, Chapter 9, Are there absolute moral rules? (key: sections 9.2, 9.4, & 9.5) Rachels, Chapter 10, Kant and respect for persons (key: section 10.1) |
| 30-Jun | <p>Kant, continued; Alternative ethical approaches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rachels, Chapter 11, Feminism and the ethics of care (key: sections 11.1 & 11.2) <i>Optional:</i> Adam, A. (2008). The gender agenda in computer ethics. In Himma, K.E., & |

| | |
|-------|--|
| | Tavani, H.T. (eds.), <i>The Handbook of Information and Computer Ethics</i> . Wiley, 589-619. [Sakai Resources] |
| 1-Jul | <p>Alternative ethical approaches/ Values clarification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rachels, Chapter 12, The ethics of virtue (key: sections 12.1 & 12.2) • Rachels, Chapter 13, What would a satisfactory moral theory be like? (key: section 13.4) • Smith, M. (1977). <i>A Practical Guide to Value Clarification</i>. Lajolla, CA: University Associates. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Chapter 1, The need for exploring values, p3-18 [Sakai Resources] |
| 2-Jul | <p>Applying moral theories as information professionals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smith, H. J., & Hasnas, J. (1999). Ethics and information systems: the corporate domain. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 23(1), 109-127. (Read pages 109-119 only.) [UNC libraries] • Fallis, D. (2007). Information ethics for twenty-first century library professionals. <i>Library Hi Tech</i>, 25(1), 23-36. (Skim entire article; focus on two sections: The theories, and Limitations of the theories) [UNC libraries] • Kizza, J.M. (2007). Ethics and the professions. In <i>Ethical and Social Issues in the Information Age</i>. London: Springer, 65-96. (Read sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.4.1.) [Sakai Resources] • <i>Optional</i>: Floridi, L. (2008). Foundations of information ethics. In Himma, K.E., & Tavani, H.T. (eds.), <i>The Handbook of Information and Computer Ethics</i>. Wiley, 3-23. [Sakai Resources] <p><i>Assignments:</i></p> <p>Student led discussion reading lists due</p> |
| | |
| 6-Jul | <p>Professional codes of ethics/conduct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALA Code of Ethics. (2008, January 22). American Library Association. http://www.ala.org/advocacy/proethics/codeofethics/codeethics • Mathiesen, K., & Fallis, D. (2008). Information ethics and the library profession. In Himma, K.E., & Tavani, H.T. (eds.), <i>The Handbook of Information and Computer Ethics</i>. Wiley, 221-244. (Focus on sections 9.1 and 9.2; read other sections as interested.) [Sakai Resources] • ACM code of ethics and professional conduct. (1992, October 16). Association for Computing Machinery. http://www.acm.org/constitution/code.html. • Huff, C. (1996). Unintentional power in the development of computer systems. <i>Computers & Society</i>, 26(4), 6-9. [Sakai Resources] • ASIS&T professional guidelines. Adopted 5/30/92. http://www.asis.org/AboutASIS/professional-guidelines.html. |

| | |
|--------|--|
| 7-Jul | <p>#hasjustinelandedyet: Public sphere, Online commentary, Public shaming and Bullying</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fuchs, C. (2014). Twitter and democracy: A new public sphere? In <i>Social media: A critical introduction</i>. (pp. 179-210). London: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi: http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.4135/9781446270066.n8 Habermas, J., Lennox, S., & Lennox, F. (1974). The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article (1964). <i>New German Critique</i>, (3), 49–55. http://doi.org/10.2307/487737 Justine Sacco's Nightmare Before Christmas, Twitter-Version. (2013). Retrieved June 10, 2015, from http://www.forbes.com/sites/kashmirhill/2013/12/21/justine-saccos-nightmare-before-christmas-twitter-version/ Steven Salaita's long-anticipated lawsuit against the U. of Illinois includes a twist. InsideHigherEd. (n.d.). Retrieved June 10, 2015, from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/01/30/steven-salaitas-long-anticipated-lawsuit-against-u-illinois-includes-twist |
| 8-Jul | <p>Information Access and the Digital Divide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harambam, J., Aupers, S., & Houtman, D. (2013). The Contentious Gap. <i>Information, Communication & Society</i>, 16(7), 1093–1114. http://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.687006 Epstein, D., Nisbet, E. C., & Gillespie, T. (2011). Who's Responsible for the Digital Divide? Public Perceptions and Policy Implications. <i>The Information Society</i>, 27(2), 92–104. http://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2011.548695 Anderson, G., & Whalley, J. (2015). Public library internet access in areas of deprivation: The case of Glasgow. <i>Telematics and Informatics</i>, 32(3), 521–537. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2014.12.001 National Broadband Map: http://www.broadbandmap.gov/technology |
| 9-Jul | <p>Ethics of remixing, derivative content, and fair use of intellectual property (N.W.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pressman. (2008). "Fair use: Law, ethics and librarians." <i>Journal of Library Administration</i>, 47(3-4), 89-110. Available from UNC. (Just read page 89-99). United States Copyright Office. "More information on fair use." Retrieved from http://copyright.gov/fair-use/more-info.html Stim, R. "Measuring fair use: The four factors." Retrieved from http://fairuse.stanford.edu/overview/fair-use/four-factors/ Broussard, S. L. (2007). "The copyleft movement: Creative commons licensing." <i>Communication Research Trends</i>, 26(3). Available from UNC. Levine, R. (2008, August 6). "Steal this hook? girl talk flouts copyright law." <i>New York Times</i> Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/07/arts/music/07girl.html?_r=0 <p>Assignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major paper deliverable 2 due |
| 13-Jul | <p>Copyright and Cultural Artifacts: The Case of Happy Birthday (H.P.)</p> |

| | |
|--------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brauneis, R. (2008). Copyright and the World's Most Popular Song. <i>J. Copyright Soc'y USA</i>, 56, 335. http://scholarship.law.gwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1303&context=faculty_publications (This is a book, so there is no need to read the entire thing. It provides detailed context surrounding the “Happy Birthday” song and its history. Please read sections IIIB and IIID, and skim IIIC. Also feel free to look at the conclusion or skim the rest of the book.) • Rodman, G. B., & Vanderdonckt, C. (2006). Music for nothing or, I want my MP3: The regulation and recirculation of affect. <i>Cultural Studies</i>, 20(2-3), 245-261. http://www.comm.umn.edu/~grodman/pubs/Music.pdf • Happy Birthday, We'll Sue. (n.d.). Retrieved July 6, 2015, from http://www.snopes.com/music/songs/birthday.asp • The legal brawl over “Happy Birthday To You” - CBS News. (n.d.). Retrieved July 6, 2015, from http://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-fierce-legal-fight-over-the-happy-birthday-to-you/ • Who Owns the Copyright to “Happy Birthday”? (n.d.). Retrieved July 6, 2015, from http://priceconomics.com/who-owns-the-copyright-to-happy-birthday/ • Why “Happy Birthday” song is not in movies - Business Insider. (n.d.). Retrieved July 6, 2015, from http://www.businessinsider.com/why-happy-birthday-song-not-in-movies-2015-6 |
| 14-Jul | <p>Fair Use and the Electronic Distribution of Copyrighted Materials for Educational Purposes (J.S.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The Librarian of Congress on DVDs and Fair Use”. (October 29, 2012). <i>Library Journal</i>. Retrieved from: http://lj.libraryjournal.com/blogs/annoyedlibrarian/2012/10/29/the-librarian-of-congress-on-dvds-and-fair-use/ • Pressman, R. (2008). “Fair Use: Law, Ethics, and Librarians.” <i>Journal of Library Administration</i>, 47(3), 89-110. Retrieved from: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01930820802186423#.VZVpwsY-C9Y • Storch, J. (October 20, 2014). “Why We Need Bright Lines.” <i>Inside Higher Ed</i>. Retrieved from: https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2014/10/20/ruling-copyright-fair-use-will-hurt-professors-students-and-publishers-essay • Trope, R, Sobiesk, E., and Suchan, W. (2007) “Overcoming the Ethical Dangers of Academic Fair Use in the High Technology Classroom.” <i>American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference and Exposition</i>, Conference Proceedings. Retrieved from: http://search.asee.org/search/fetch;jsessionid=41hdamdat3tj1?url=file%3A%2F%2Flocalhost%2FE%3A%2Fsearch%2Fconference%2F14%2FAC%25202007Full2655.pdf&index=conference_papers&space=129746797203605791716676178&type=application%2Fpdf&charset= |

| | |
|--------|--|
| 15-Jul | <p>Cyberwarfare (W.K.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patrick Lin, Fritz Allhoff, and Neil C. Rowe. 2012. War 2.0: cyberweapons and ethics. <i>Commun. ACM</i> 55, 3 (March 2012), 24-26. DOI=10.1145/2093548.2093558 http://doi.acm.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1145/2093548.2093558 "Europe's Biggest Cybersecurity Threat Isn't Hackers." <i>Information Management Journal</i> 49, no. 1 (January 2015): 10. <i>Library & Information Science Source</i>, EBSCOhost Kremer, Jens1. 2014. "Policing cybercrime or militarizing cybersecurity? Security mindsets and the regulation of threats from cyberspace." <i>Information & Communications Technology Law</i> 23, no. 3: 220-237. <i>Library & Information Science Source</i>, EBSCOhost Maniscalchi, Jago. <i>What is Cyberwar?</i> DigitalThreat.Net, September 2011. http://www.digitalthreat.net/2011/09/what-is-cyberwar/ |
| 16-Jul | <p>Internet Misogyny (J.M.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Power, N., Okolosie, L., Campbell, B., & Smith, J. (n.d.). Is Misogyny Worse Now than Before the Internet. Retrieved July 3, 2015. http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/may/08/misogyny-worse-than-before-internet Wu, B. (n.d.). [UPDATED] Gamergate Death Threat Is a Slam Dunk for Prosecutors. Will They Act? Retrieved July 3, 2015. http://www.themarysue.com/will-prosecutors-act-on-gamergate-death-threat/ Hess, A. (n.d.). Why Women Aren't Welcome on the Internet. Retrieved July 3, 2015. http://www.psmag.com/health-and-behavior/women-arent-welcome-internet-72170 Oliver, J. (2015). Last Week Tonight with John Oliver: Online Harassment [Television series episode]. In <i>Last Week Tonight</i>. HBO. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PuNIwYsz7PI <u>Gender trolling: Misogyny Adapts to New Media</u> Karla Mantilla Vol. 39, No. 2, A SPECIAL ISSUE: CATEGORIZING SEXUALITIES (2013) , pp. 563-570 Published by: Feminist Studies, Inc. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/23719068 Schenk, Samantha (2008) "Cyber-Sexual Harassment: The Development of the Cyber-Sexual Experiences Questionnaire," <i>McNair Scholars Journal</i>: Vol. 12: Iss. 1, Article 8. Available at: http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mcnair/vol12/iss1/8 <p>Assignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major Paper Deliverable 3 due |

| | |
|--------|---|
| 20-Jul | <p>Surveillance Capitalism (D.A.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andrejevic, M. (2002). The kinder, gentler gaze of Big Brother. <i>New Media & Society</i>, 4(2). doi:10.1177/14614440222226361, from http://nms.sagepub.com/content/4/2/251.full.pdf • Foster, J., & McChesney, R. (2014). Surveillance Capitalism. <i>Monthly Review</i>., from http://monthlyreview.org/2014/07/01/surveillance-capitalism/ • French Parliament adopts law boosting surveillance powers :: WRAL.com. (2015, June 24). Retrieved July 6, 2015, from http://www.wral.com/french-parliament-adopts-law-boosting-surveillance-powers/14735978/ • John Edward Campbell & Matt Carlson (2002) Panopticon.com: Online Surveillance and the Commodification of Privacy, <i>Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media</i>, 46:4, 586-606, DOI: 10.1207/s15506878jobem4604_6, from http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15506878jobem4604_6 • Peltz, J. (2015, June 22). NYC: Settlement in principle in Muslim surveillance lawsuit :: WRAL.com. Retrieved July 6, 2015. from http://www.wral.com/nyc-settlement-in-principle-in-muslim-surveillance-lawsuit/14731777/ |
| 21-Jul | <p>Ethics of Free streaming music (K)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “AMAs: Artists split on Spotify after Taylor Swift controversy” http://www.latimes.com/entertainment/music/posts/la-et-ms-spotify-taylor-swift-controversy-20141124-story.html • “Taylor Swift's Letter To Apple: Stern, Polite, And Necessary” http://www.forbes.com/sites/hughmcintyre/2015/06/21/taylor-swifts-letter-to-apple-stern-polite-and-necessary/ • “Dörr, D. J., Wagner, D.-V. T., Benlian, P. D. A., & Hess, P. D. T. (2013). Music as a Service as an Alternative to Music Piracy? <i>Business & Information Systems Engineering</i>, 5(6), 383–396. http://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-013-0294-0 (read but skip statistical analyses) • Weijters, B., Goedertier, F., & Verstreken, S. (2013). Online Music Consumption in Today’s Technological Context: Putting the Influence of Ethics in Perspective. <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>, 124(4), 537–550. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1892-y |
| 22-Jul | <p>Freedom of Speech in the Workplace (Social Media and Other Channels) (L)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morgan, H., & Davis, F. (2013). Social Media and Employment. Law Summary of Key Cases and Legal Issues. Retrieved from http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/events/labor_law/2013/04/aba_national_symposiumontechnologyinlaboremploymentlaw/10_socialmedia.authcheckdam.pdf • The Ethical Challenges of Social Media. (2011, December). Retrieved from http://www.ibe.org.uk/userfiles/social_media_briefing.pdf • Questions & Answers on Speech in the Workplace. (2014, July 1). Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/advocacy/proethics/explanatory/workplacespeech • Valinsky, J. (2013, February 26). Woman fired after calling job. Retrieved from |

| | |
|--------|--|
| | <p>http://www.dailydot.com/news/jessica-bibbs-facebook-job-joke-fired/</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Woman fired for Kerry bumpersticker. (2004, September 12). Retrieved from http://www.dailykos.com/story/2004/09/13/50456/-Woman-fired-for-Kerry-bumpersticker# |
| 23-Jul | <p>Personal Privacy and Security Online (P.H.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Google privacy debate. (2005). <i>Analyst Wire</i>, Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/463850904?accountid=14244 • Crowe, D., & Al-Hamdani, W. A. (2013, October). Google Privacy: Something for Nothing?. In <i>Proceedings of the 2013 on InfoSecCD'13: Information Security Curriculum Development Conference</i> (p. 27). ACM. • Bennett, C. J., Clement, A., & Milberry, K. (2012). Introduction to cyber-surveillance. <i>Surveillance & Society</i>, 9(4), 339-347. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1314689528?accountid=14244 (Skim, but pay attention to the 'special issue' section in particular) • Young, A. L., & Quan-Haase, A. (2009, June). Information revelation and internet privacy concerns on social network sites: a case study of facebook. In <i>Proceedings of the fourth international conference on Communities and technologies</i> (pp. 265-274). ACM. • Britz, J. J. (2010). Technology as a threat to privacy: ethical challenges to the information profession. (http://web.simmons.edu/~chen/nit/NIT'96/96-025-Britz.html) • Bambauer, D. E. (2013). Privacy Versus Security. <i>J. Crim. L. & Criminology</i>, 103, 667. (http://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=7454&context=jclc) |
| 27-Jul | Topic TBD/Make-up day |
| 28-Jul | <p>Wrap Up</p> <p><i>Assignment:</i> Major Paper due</p> |