

**COMMUNICATION MANAGEMENT 533:
EMERGING COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES**

**Annenberg School for Communication & Journalism
University of Southern California
[Spring 2015]**

MEETINGS

Wednesdays, 6:30pm-9:20pm | ANN-305

INSTRUCTOR

Mike Ananny, PhD

Assistant Professor

Annenberg School for Communication & Journalism

<http://mike.ananny.org>

ananny@usc.edu

@ananny

Office Hours: Wednesdays, 4:30-6pm (or email for appointment)

Office Location: ANN-310B

There are no required books to purchase. All readings are provided through Blackboard.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This masters-level survey course equips future communication managers with the critical skills necessary to interpret and create new networked communication technologies. The course defines ‘communication technologies’ as not only devices and tools – but also as the practices, institutions, and values that shape their emergence and power. Each week’s materials are organized into “foundations” and “applications”, helping students see broad arcs of technological innovation and how particular examples fit within them.

The course starts with a short introduction to foundational ideas in the study and design of communication technologies and proceeds as a thematic tour of contemporary systems and controversies, including: networked information algorithms, “big data”, and the quantified self; encryption tools and networked privacy techniques; drones, digital mapping, and location-based apps; public sphere technologies, networked journalism, and online activism; net neutrality, common carriage, and the right to be forgotten; online currencies and networked financial systems; online labor markets; tools and strategies for disconnection; online counter-cultures and networks of resistance; and ethical tensions in the design and field study of emerging information technologies.

By the end of the course, students should be able to describe the social and technological dynamics of new communication technologies. They should leave the course ready to see tools, institutions, practices and values within broad patterns of innovation and power – able to say not only what a particular communication technology *is* (its features and dynamics) but also why it *matters* (its social and political power).

INSTRUCTOR BIOGRAPHY

Mike Ananny is an Assistant Professor at the University of Southern California's Annenberg School for Communication & Journalism, Affiliated Faculty with USC's Science, Technology and Society research cluster, and a Faculty Associate at Harvard's Berkman Center for Internet & Society. He studies the public significance and sociotechnical dynamics of networked news systems. He has held fellowships and scholarships with Stanford's Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society, the Pierre Elliott Trudeau Foundation, the LEGO Corporation, and Interval Research. He was a founding member of Media Lab Europe's research staff, a postdoc with Microsoft Research's Social Media Collective, and has worked or consulted for LEGO, Mattel, and Nortel Networks. His PhD is from Stanford University (Communication), SM from the MIT Media Lab (Media Arts & Sciences), and BSc from the University of Toronto (Human Biology & Computer Science). He has published in a variety of venues including *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, *International Journal of Communication*, the *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *American Behavioral Scientist*, *Television & New Media*, and the proceedings of the ACM's conferences on *Computer-Human Interaction* and *Computer Supported Collaborative Learning*. He is writing a book on a public right to hear in an age of networked journalism (under contract with MIT Press).

THE BEST WAY TO GET AN 'A' IN THIS CLASS

- do all the assigned readings *before* the class (doing so will help the lecture make sense and I'll draw on both the required and recommended readings in my lectures);
- turn your phone *off* during class and don't wander off to social media while using your laptop (you'll take the best notes and increase your grade if you stay focused on class in class);
- make friends with fellow students, trade notes, form study groups, and write 3 practice exam questions after each class;
- leave yourself time to edit and revise your responses to the 'reflection' assignments (i.e., don't leave it until the night before to write them);
- participate often and thoughtfully in discussion sections, and come to my office hours (this will help you stay connected to the course);
- practice applying the concepts we discuss in class immediately as you use and encounter new communication technologies.

This course is designed not only to expose you to a variety of ideas and controversies associated with communication technologies, but also the varied *ways* that people communicate about and debate communication technologies.

I'm asking you to consider a variety of materials in this class – everything from videos, podcasts, and long-form popular press articles to easily accessible book chapters and more challenging scholarly pieces published in academic journals. Part of being a reflective practitioner or engaged observer of these issues is integrating scholarly articles with popular press accounts to come to your own opinion. This class will give you practice doing this. Each class has a list of materials you are required to read and make notes on – but you are not responsible for readings labeled 'Recommended/Background'.

Some readings are more challenging or longer than others. At a masters level, part of what you're learning is how to consider a significant amount of material in a relatively short period of time. Give yourself sufficient time to read and flag difficult bits for us to talk about in lecture, discussion sections, or office hours. A class like this works best if everyone has done the reading ahead of time and you come to class with questions and I'll be keeping track of participation. The best kind of comment or question helps move the conversation forward.

ASSIGNMENTS & GRADING

Weekly Questions, Attendance, Participation (60 points)

You are expected to do all of the assigned readings, come to class prepared to participate, and actively contribute to each week's discussion. To that end, you must submit via the Blackboard 'Discussion' link one question on that week's assigned materials by Wednesday at 12noon. The best questions will help open the conversation and start good discussions (e.g., "What kind of privacy rules should algorithm designers follow?") and *not* be simple definitional questions (e.g., "What's an algorithm?") Individual questions will not be graded but must be completed each week. Failure to submit questions will result in a low grade on this component.

'Opening' Readings (3 x 20 points = 60 points)

Three times during the semester, you will *individually* 'open' one of the foundational readings. I'll say more in class about what this means, but the ideal opening is *very* short summary of the paper's key themes and then active leadership of a discussion that: stays close to the reading (does not diverge beyond what it says); compares it to other readings and the course themes; and generates new ways to help your fellow students understand and relate to it. It's not required, but you may provide a hand-out or show supporting media if you think they'll help the conversation about that reading.

In-Class Case Studies (2 x 40 points = 80 points)

Twice during the semester, *individually or in pairs*, you will lead a discussion on an emerging communication technology, organization, or event. You have considerable freedom to define the topic of the case study and I can provide ideas if necessary. You will make a very short (5-minute) presentation on the technology/organization/event and then lead a 20-30 minute discussion on it. I expect you to come prepared with discussion questions, a short activity, or other materials that engage your fellow students in the case.

Reflections (2 x 75 points = 150 points total)

Twice during the semester, you'll submit a short written reflection (approximately 750 words) on some aspect of the course. Each reflection will be graded out of 75 points and I will announce the topics at least two weeks in advance. They will not require not reading or research beyond what is assigned in the class. Due dates:

- **Reflection #1:** Wednesday, February 25th
- **Reflection #2:** Wednesday, April 1st

NOTE: You can *revise and resubmit ONE reflection assignment* for re-grading. You must resubmit *no later than 14 days* after the reflection has been returned to you. No resubmissions will be accepted after 14 days. You do not *have to* revise and resubmit any reflection assignment; it is your choice.

Final Paper Proposal (10 points): April 15

In preparation for your final paper (see below), you will submit a short proposal that describes what you're going to do, what questions or materials you'll be working with, what your timeline is, and any resources you require. This is meant to be a small check-in so that you and I can understand what your final project will be and what you need to make it successful.

Final Presentation (25 points): April 29

In the final class you will give an individual 10-12 minute presentation on the current state of your final paper. Since the final paper is not due at that class (it is due May 8), the presentation should be a preliminary discussion of your analysis and an opportunity to have a class discussion about challenges you're encountering and to get feedback from me and your fellow students.

Final Paper (115 points): May 8

You have considerable freedom to decide the topic of your final project (e.g., you might choose to expand on one of your reflection assignments), but I ask you to choose one of the following formats:

1. A traditional “deep analysis” (2,000-3,000 words) in which you closely analyze, compare, and synthesize *at least 5* of the class’s “Foundations” readings.;
2. A system evaluation (2,000-3,000 words) in which you apply *at least 2* “Foundations” readings to an existing communication technology, using the readings to analyze the technology and suggest ways that it might be changed in light of the readings;
3. A system design in which you prototype a new communication technology (we can discuss different design approaches and prototyping materials) *and* write a paper (1,500 words) on how your prototype at least 2 of the class’s “Foundations” readings. For this third, system design option, you may work in groups to *prototype* a system, but each group member must submit his/her own paper.

For all formats and papers, you are encouraged to use the readings we’ve discussed in class, consult the “recommended/supplemental” reading list at the end of the syllabus, and find sources of your own. I will say more about this project in class. In the final class, you will give a 10-15 minute presentation on the state of your final project, getting feedback from the class that should feed into your final paper submission (due during the exam period).

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS: 500 points

Final grades will be assigned to the following total point ranges:

	500-467 = A	466-450 = A-	
449-433 = B+	432-416 = B	415-400 = B-	
399-384 = C+	383-367 = C	366-350 = C-	
349-333 = D+	332-316 = D	315-300 = D-	
	299-Below = F		

Late Policies:

Unless there is a valid, documented medical/family reason and the student has communicated with the instructor before an assignment’s due date, late assignments will not be accepted without penalty. If an assignment is submitted late, we will subtract one partial letter grade for every 24 hours the assignment is late. *E.g.*, an assignment handed in 24 hours late can only earn a maximum possible grade of A-minus; 48 hours late, B-plus, etc. No assignment will be accepted more than 72 hours past the due date, unless discussed with the instructor before the original due date.

I’ll generally answer your email within about 24 hours, but I usually don’t answer email on weekends or after 7pm on weekdays. If it’s an urgent matter (*e.g.*, an emergency that will prevent you from completing an assignment), please mark the subject line of your email ‘urgent’. If you have a longer question that would be best addressed in a conversation, please my office hours or make an appointment. I’m always happy to meet with students and more involved questions are often best addressed face to face.

Please make friends with your fellow students – they’re often your best first point of contact if you missed a class. **I can’t summarize whole classes either in person or email so please be sure to have a few friends you can borrow notes from if you miss a class.** It’s also a good idea to form small study groups to review material.

Academic Conduct

Plagiarism—presenting someone else’s ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words—is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with the discussion of plagiarism in *SCampus* in Section 11, *Behavior Violating University Standards* <https://scampus.usc.edu/1100-behavior-violating-university-standards-and-appropriate-sanctions>. Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in *SCampus* and university policies on scientific misconduct, <http://policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct>.

Support Systems

Discrimination, sexual assault, and harassment are not tolerated by the university. You are encouraged to report any incidents to the *Office of Equity and Diversity* <http://equity.usc.edu> or to the *Department of Public Safety*, <http://capsnet.usc.edu/department/department-public-safety/online-forms/contact-us>. This is important for the safety of the whole USC community. Another member of the university community – such as a friend, classmate, advisor, or faculty member – can help initiate the report, or can initiate the report on behalf of another person. The Center for Women and Men <http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/cwm/> provides 24/7 confidential support, and the sexual assault resource center webpage <http://sarc.usc.edu> describes reporting options and other resources.

COURSE SCHEDULE

The schedule and readings described below may change as the semester progresses. If it does I'll be sure to give you plenty of notice, mention changes in class, and send an email summarizing the changes.

All readings under **FOUNDATIONS** and **APPLICATIONS** are required, unless a choice is indicated.

(Recommended readings are not required.)

Week #1: January 14

INTRODUCTION

There is no required reading, but come to class prepared with:

- your own definition of “emerging communication technology”;
- one example technology you think fits your definition;
- reasons why you think it is important for someone in your program to study them;
- your learning goals for the semester.

Week #2: January 21

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY ‘EMERGING COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES’? AFFORDANCES & CONSTRAINTS, SOCIAL VS. TECHNOLOGICAL DETERMINISM, DOMESTICATION

Reading / Listening Due

FOUNDATIONS:

Baym, N. (2010). Making new media make sense. *Personal connections in the digital age* (pp. 22-49). New York, NY: Polity Press.

Marvin, Carolyn. (1990). Introduction. *When old technologies were new: Thinking about electric communication in the late nineteenth century* (Reprint ed., pp. 3-8). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Norman, D. (2013). The psychopathology of everyday things. *The design of everyday things* (pp. 1-36). New York, NY: Doubleday.

Reading / Listening Due

FOUNDATIONS:

Clark, J., Couldry, N., Kosnik, A. T. D., Gillespie, T., Jenkins, H., Kelty, C., . . . Dijck, J. v. (2014). Participations, Part 5: Platforms. *International Journal of Communication*, 8, 1446–1473.

DiSalvo, C. (2012). Design and agonism. *Adversarial design* (pp. 1-26). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. → **PAGES 1-17 ONLY**

Friedman, B. (2004). Value sensitive design. *Encyclopedia of human-computer interaction* (pp. 769-774). Great Barrington, MA: Berkshire Publishing Group.

Nissenbaum, H. (2001, March, 2001). How computer systems embody values. *IEEE Computer*, 118-120.

APPLICATIONS: Watch/read both

Video: Google. (nd). *How search works: From algorithms to answers*. Retrieved January 6, 2014, from <http://www.google.com/insidesearch/howsearchworks/thestory/>

Rosen, J. (2013, April 29, 2013). The delete squad: Google, Twitter, Facebook and the new global battle over the future of free speech. *The New Republic*. Retrieved January 6, 2014, from <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/113045/free-speech-internet-silicon-valley-making-rules>

Recommended:

Friedman, B., & Nissenbaum, H. (1996). Bias in computer systems. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 14(3), 330-347.

Friedman, B., Kahn, P.H., & Borning, A. (2006). Value sensitive design and information systems. In P. Zhang & D. Galletta (Eds.), *Human-computer interaction in management information systems: Foundations* (pp. 348-372). London, UK: M.E. Sharpe.

Gillespie, T. (2010). The politics of 'platforms'. *New Media & Society*, 12(3), 347-364.

Introna, L., & Nissenbaum, H. (2000). Defining the Web: The Politics of Search Engines. *IEEE Computer*, 54-62.

Introna, L., & Nissenbaum, H. (2000). Shaping the Web: Why the Politics of Search Engines Matters. *The Information Society*, 16(3), 1-17.

Jiang, Min. (2013). The business and politics of search engines: A comparative study of Baidu and Google's search results of Internet events in China. *New Media & Society*. doi: 10.1177/1461444813481196

Nissenbaum, H. (2001, March, 2001). How computer systems embody values. *IEEE Computer*, 118-120.

Winner, L. (1986). Do artifacts have politics? *The whale and the reactor* (pp. 19-39). Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Week #4: February 4
INFORMATION ALGORITHMS

Reading / Listening Due

FOUNDATIONS:

Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. Boczkowski & K. A. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society* (pp. 167-194). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Goffey, A. (2008). Algorithm. In M. Fuller (Ed.), *Software studies: A lexicon* (pp. 15-20). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

APPLICATIONS: Read *at least two* and come to class prepared to discuss.

Berg, Nate. (2014, June 25, 2014). Predicting crime, LAPD-style. *The Guardian*. Retrieved August 20, 2014, from <http://www.theguardian.com/cities/2014/jun/25/predicting-crime-lapd-los-angeles-police-data-analysis-algorithm-minority-report>

Elder, J. (2013, November 24, 2013). Inside a Twitter robot factory. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved January 5, 2014, from <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304607104579212122084821400>

Garber, M. (2013, August 23, 2013). How Google's Autocomplete was ... created / invented / born. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved March 3, 2014, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2013/08/how-googles-autocomplete-was-created-invented-born/278991/>

Lohr, S. (2013, March 10, 2013). Algorithms get a human hand in steering web. *New York Times*. Retrieved April 2, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/11/technology/computer-algorithms-rely-increasingly-on-human-helpers.html>

Madrigal, A. (2014, January 2, 2014). How Netflix reverse engineered Hollywood. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved January 6, 2014, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/01/how-netflix-reverse-engineered-hollywood/282679/>

Stoller, Matthew. (2014, April 9, 2014). Uber's algorithmic monopoly. *Observations on credit and surveillance*. Retrieved July 4, 2014, from <http://mattstoller.tumblr.com/post/82233202309/ubers-algorithmic-monopoly-we-are-not-setting-the>

Sweeney, Latanya. (2013). Discrimination in online ad delivery. *Communications of the ACM*, 56(5), 44-54. doi: 10.1145/2447976.2447990. <http://cacm.acm.org/magazines/2013/5/163753-discrimination-in-online-ad-delivery/fulltext>

Reading / Listening Due

FOUNDATIONS:

boyd, d., & Crawford, K. (2012). Critical questions for big data. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 662-679.

Lerman, J. (2013). Big data and its exclusions. *Stanford Law Review*, 66, 55-63.

Neff, G. (2013). Why big data won't cure us. *Big Data*, 1(3), 117-123. doi: 10.1089/big.2013.0029

APPLICATIONS: Read **at least two** and come to class prepared to discuss.

Balkin, J.M. (2014, March 5, 2014). Information fiduciaries in the digital age. *Balkinization*. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from <http://balkin.blogspot.co.uk/2014/03/information-fiduciaries-in-digital-age.html>

Bedoya, Alvaro M. (2014, November 7, 2014). Big data and the underground railroad. *Slate*. Retrieved November 7, 2014, from http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/future_tense/2014/11/big_data_underground_railroad_history_says_unfettered_collection_of_data.single.html

Crawford, K. (2013, April 1, 2013). The hidden biases in big data. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved August 27, 2013, from http://blogs.hbr.org/cs/2013/04/the_hidden_biases_in_big_data.html

Healy, Kieran. (2013, June 9, 2013). Using metadata to find Paul Revere. Retrieved August 20, 2014, from <http://kieranhealy.org/blog/archives/2013/06/09/using-metadata-to-find-paul-revere/>

Madrigal, A. (2014, April 14, 2014). Behind the machine's back: How social media users avoid getting turned into big data. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved June 3, 2014, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/04/behind-the-machines-back-how-social-media-users-avoid-getting-turned-into-big-data/360416/>

Miller, C. C. (2013, July 29, 2013). Apps that know what you want, before you do. *The New York Times*. Retrieved July 30, 2013, from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/30/technology/apps-that-know-what-you-want-before-you-do.html?_r=0&pagewanted=all

Singer, E. (2011, June 21, 2011). The measured life. *MIT Technology Review*. Retrieved January 4, 2014, from <http://www.technologyreview.com/featuredstory/424390/the-measured-life/>

Tufekci, Zeynep, & King, Brayden. (2014, December 7, 2014). We can't trust Uber. *New York Times*. Retrieved December 8, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/08/opinion/we-cant-trust-uber.html>

Articles from *Aljazeera America's* "Living with data" series: <http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/9/15/living-with-data.html>

Recommended:

Gitelman, L., & Jackson, V. (2013). Introduction. In L. Gitelman (Ed.), *"Raw data" is an oxymoron* (pp. 1-14). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kang, Jerry, Shilton, Katie, Estrin, Deborah, Burke, Jeff, & Hansen, Mark. (2012). Self-surveillance privacy. *Iowa Law Review*, 97, 809-847.

Reading / Listening Due

FOUNDATIONS:

Angwin, J. (2014). Hacked. *Dragnet nation* (pp. 1-20). New York, NY: Times Books.

boyd, d. (2012). The politics of 'real names'. *Communications of the ACM*, 55(8), 29-31.

Marwick, Alice E., & boyd, danah. (2014). Networked privacy: How teenagers negotiate context in social media. *New Media & Society*. doi: 10.1177/1461444814543995

Solove, D. (2011). Introduction. *Nothing to hide: The false tradeoff between privacy and security* (pp. 1-20). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

APPLICATIONS: Read at least two and come to class prepared to discuss.

Angwin, Julia. (2014, July 21, 2014). Meet the online tracking device that is virtually impossible to block. *ProPublica*. Retrieved October 20, 2014, from <http://www.propublica.org/article/meet-the-online-tracking-device-that-is-virtually-impossible-to-block>

Calo, M. R. 2011. Peeping Hals. *Artificial Intelligence*, 175(5-6), 940-941.

Levy, Steven. (2014, January 7, 2014). How the NSA almost killed the internet. *Wired*. Retrieved March 2, 2014, from <http://www.wired.com/2014/01/how-the-us-almost-killed-the-internet/all/>

Solove, Daniel. (2011, May 15, 2011). Why privacy matters even if you have 'nothing to hide'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 2, 2014, from <http://chronicle.com/article/Why-Privacy-Matters-Even-if/127461/>

Vertesi, J. (2014, May 1, 2014). My experiment opting out of big data made me look like a criminal. *Time*. Retrieved May 1, 2014, from <http://time.com/83200/privacy-internet-big-data-opt-out/>

Examine selected privacy and encryption tools and issues from the Electronic Frontier Foundation's *Surveillance Self-Defense* project: <https://ssd.eff.org/> & the *Radical Librarian* project: <http://boingboing.net/2014/09/13/radical-librarianship-how-nin.html>

Recommended:

Brunton, F., & Nissenbaum, H. (2011). Vernacular resistance to data collection and analysis: A political theory of obfuscation. *First Monday*, 16(5).

Greenwald, G. (2014). The harm of surveillance. *No place to hide* (pp. 170-209). New York, NY: Metropolitan Books.

Stutzman, F., Grossy, R., & Acquisti, A. (2012). Silent listeners: The evolution of privacy and disclosure on Facebook. *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality*, 4(2), 7-41.

Reading / Listening Due

FOUNDATIONS:

Humphreys, L. (2010). Mobile social networks and urban public space. *New Media & Society*, 12, 763-778.

Oppenheimer, M. (2014, January 17, 2014). Technology is not driving us apart after all. *New York Times Magazine*. Retrieved January 20, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/19/magazine/technology-is-not-driving-us-apart-after-all.html>

Gynnild, A. (2014). The robot eye witness: Extending visual journalism through drone surveillance. *Digital Journalism*. doi: 10.1080/21670811.2014.883184

APPLICATIONS: Read *at least two* and come to class prepared to discuss.

Ellis, Justin. (2014, June 12, 2014). The notification knows where you are: Breaking News debuts news alerts tied to your location. *Nieman Journalism Lab*. Retrieved July 2, 2014, from <http://www.niemanlab.org/2014/06/the-notification-knows-where-you-are-breaking-news-debuts-news-alerts-tied-to-your-location/>

Madrigal, A. (2012, September 6, 2012). How Google builds its maps—and what it means for the future of everything. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved January 6, 2014, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/09/how-google-builds-its-maps-and-what-it-means-for-the-future-of-everything/261913/>

Mier, Brian. (2014, October 13, 2014). The mailman mapping Brazil's largest favela by hand. *Vice*. Retrieved October 24, 2014, from <http://motherboard.vice.com/read/the-mailman-mapping-brazils-largest-favela-by-hand>

Miller, G. (2014, December 8, 2014). The huge, unseen operation behind the accuracy of Google Maps. *Wired*. Retrieved December 18, 2014, from <http://www.wired.com/2014/12/google-maps-ground-truth/>

Mirani, Leo, & Wong, Herman. (2014, April 23, 2014). Uber's usage maps are a handy tool for finding the world's rich, young people. *The Atlantic's City Lab*. Retrieved October 3, 2014, from <http://www.citylab.com/tech/2014/04/ubers-usage-maps-are-handy-tool-finding-worlds-rich-young-people/8954/>

Podcast: On the Media. (2014, March 28, 2014). The world according to Google maps. Retrieved October 1, 2014, from *On The Media* <http://www.onthemedialab.org/story/world-according-google-maps/>

Selected visualizations from the Oxford Internet Institute's *Information Geographies* project: <http://geography.oii.ox.ac.uk/>

Review *HarrassMap* project: <http://harassmap.org/en/>

Recommended:

Bahir, Eitan, & Peled, Ammatzia. (2013). Identifying and tracking major events using geo-social networks. *Social Science Computer Review*. doi: 10.1177/0894439313483689

De Souza e Silva, A., & Frith, J. (2010). Locative mobile social networks: Mapping communication and location in urban spaces. *Mobilities*, 5(4), 485–505.

Frith, Jordan. (2014). Communicating through location: The understood meaning of the Foursquare check-in. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*. doi: 10.1111/jcc4.12087

Gordon, E., & de Souza e Silva, A. (2011). Introduction. *Net locality: Why location matters in a networked world* (pp. 1-18). New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell.

Reading / Listening Due

FOUNDATIONS:

Mitchelstein, E., & Boczkowski, P. (2013). Tradition and transformation in online news production and consumption. In W. H. Dutton (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of internet studies* (pp. 378-400). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Pariser, E. (2011). The user is the content. *The filter bubble* (pp. 47-76). New York, NY: Penguin Press.

Zuckerman, Ethan. (2014). New media, new civics? *Policy and Internet*. doi: 10.1002/1944-2866.POI360

APPLICATIONS: Read at least two and come to class prepared to discuss.

Ball, James. (2014, June 5, 2014). Guardian launches SecureDrop system for whistleblowers to share files. *The Guardian*. Retrieved September 5, 2014, from <http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/jun/05/guardian-launches-securedrop-whistleblowers-documents>

Bell, E. (2014, November 23, 2014). What's the right relationship between technology companies and journalism? *The Guardian*. Retrieved January 2, 2015, from <http://www.theguardian.com/media/media-blog/2014/nov/23/silicon-valley-companies-journalism-news>

Dredge, S. (2014, March 10, 2014). Strictly algorithm: How news finds people in the Facebook and Twitter age. *The Guardian*. Retrieved January 2, 2015, from <http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/mar/10/journalism-democracy-algorithms-facebook-google-twitter>

Fitts, A. S. (2014, December 29, 2014). To keep or ditch the comments? *Columbia Journalism Review*. Retrieved December 29, 2014, from http://www.cjr.org/behind_the_news/demise_of_comment_sections_or.php

Hampton, K., Rainie, L., Lu, W., Dwyer, M., Inyoung, S., & Purcell, K. (2014, August 26, 2014). Social media and the 'spiral of silence': Summary of findings. *Pew Research Internet Project*. Retrieved January 2, 2015, from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/08/26/social-media-and-the-spiral-of-silence/>

Madrigal, A. (2012, December 11, 2012). Against 'objective' algorithms: The case of Google News. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved November 5, 2014, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/12/against-objective-algorithms-the-case-of-google-news/266137/>

Miller, Claire Cain. (2014, August 26, 2014). How social media silences debate. *New York Times*. Retrieved September 3, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/27/upshot/how-social-media-silences-debate.html>

New York Times. (2014). *Innovation*. New York Times. → *leaked internal report of innovation strategy at the New York Times; can focus on the "Executive Summary"*.

Somaiya, R. (2014, October 26, 2014). How Facebook is changing the way its users consume journalism. *The New York Times*. Retrieved December 27, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/27/business/media/how-facebook-is-changing-the-way-its-users-consume-journalism.html>

Tufekci, Z. (2014, August 14, 2014). What happens to #ferguson affects ferguson: Net neutrality, algorithmic filtering and ferguson. *Medium - The Message*. Retrieved January 1, 2015, from <https://medium.com/message/ferguson-is-also-a-net-neutrality-issue-6d2f3db51eb0>

NET NEUTRALITY, THE RIGHT TO BE FORGOTTEN, & TECHNOLOGIES OF COMMON CARRIAGE

Reading / Listening Due

FOUNDATIONS:

Madrigal, Alexis C., & LaFrance, Adrienne. (2014, April 25, 2014). Net neutrality: A guide to (and history of) a contested idea. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved October 20, 2014, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/04/the-best-writing-on-net-neutrality/361237/>

Sandvig, Christian. (2007). Network neutrality is the new common carriage. *info*, 9(2/3), 136-147.

Toobin, Jeffrey. (2014, September 29, 2014). The solace of oblivion: In Europe, the right to be forgotten trumps the Internet. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved October 2, 2014, from <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/09/29/solace-oblivion>

APPLICATIONS: Read ***at least two*** and come to class prepared to discuss.

Liptak, A. (2007, September 27, 2007). Verizon reverses itself on abortion messages. *New York Times*. Retrieved January 6, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/27/business/27cnd-verizon.html>

Schewick, Barbara van. (2014, May 6, 2014). The case for rebooting the network neutrality debate. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved September 3, 2014, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/05/the-case-for-rebooting-the-network-neutrality-debate/361809/>

Podcast: The New Yorker. (2014, September 23, 2014). Jeffrey Toobin and Tim Wu on the right to be forgotten. *WNYC*. Retrieved October 2, 2014, from <http://www.wnyc.org/story/jeffrey-toobin-and-tim-wu-on-the-right-to-be-forgotten/>

The Economist. (2014, October 4, 2014). The right to be forgotten: Drawing the line. *The Economist*. Retrieved October 10, 2014, from <http://www.economist.com/news/international/21621804-google-grapples-consequences-controversial-ruling-boundary-between>

Vega, T. (2013, May 28, 2013). Facebook says it failed to bar posts with hate speech. *New York Times*. Retrieved January 6, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/29/business/media/facebook-says-it-failed-to-stop-misogynous-pages.html>

Zittrain, Jonathan. (2014, May 14, 2014). Don't force Google to 'forget'. *New York Times*. Retrieved May 15, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/05/15/opinion/dont-force-google-to-forget.html>

Reading / Listening Due

FOUNDATIONS:

Castronova, Edward. (2014). Weirdly normal: Virtual economies and virtual money. *Wildcat currency: How the virtual money revolution is transforming the economy* (pp. 5-40). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lewis, Michael. (2014, March 31, 2014). The wolf hunters of Wall Street: An adaptation from 'Flash boys: A Wall Street revolt,' by Michael Lewis. *New York Times*. Retrieved October 20, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/06/magazine/flash-boys-michael-lewis.html>

Swartz, Lana, & Maurer, Bill. (2014, May 22, 2014). The future of money-like things. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved October 30, 2014, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/05/future-payment-systems/370902/>

APPLICATIONS: Read *at least two* and come to class prepared to discuss.

Bustillos, M. (2013, April 2, 2013). The Bitcoin boom. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved January 8, 2014, from <http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/elements/2013/04/the-future-of-bitcoin.html>

Dibbel, J. (2007, June 17, 2007). The life of the Chinese gold farmer. *New York Times Magazine*. Retrieved January 8, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/17/magazine/17lootfarmers-t.html?pagewanted=all>

Goldstein, Jacob. (2013, October 8, 2013). Putting a speed limit on the stock market. *New York Times Magazine*. Retrieved July 5, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/13/magazine/high-frequency-traders.html?pagewanted=all>

Henning, Peter J. (2014, October 20, 2014). Why high-frequency trading is so hard to regulate. *The New York Times*. Retrieved October 23, 2014, from <http://dealbook.nytimes.com/2014/10/20/why-high-frequency-trading-is-so-hard-to-regulate/>

Popper, Nathaniel. (2013, December 21, 2013). Into the bitcoin mines. *The New York Times*. Retrieved October 20, 2014, from <http://dealbook.nytimes.com/2013/12/21/into-the-bitcoin-mines/>

Scott, Brett. (2013, August 28, 2013). Riches beyond belief. *Aeon*. Retrieved October 28, 2014, from <http://aeon.co/magazine/society/so-you-want-to-invent-your-own-currency/>

The "Los Angeles Payment Project": <http://alippman.com/>

Recommended:

Mauer, Bill. (2012). Payment: Forms and functions of value transfer in contemporary society. *Cambridge Anthropology*, 30(2), 15-35.

Maurer, B., Nelms, T.C., & Swartz, L. (2013). "When perhaps the real problem is money itself!": The practical materiality of Bitcoin. *Social Semiotics*. doi: 10.1080/10350330.2013.777594

Reading / Listening Due

FOUNDATIONS:

Neff, Gina. (2012). The social risks of the dot-com era. *Venture labor* (pp. 1-38). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kushner, S. (2013). The freelance translation machine: Algorithmic culture and the invisible industry. *New Media & Society*. doi: 10.1177/1461444812469597

Terranova, T. (2012). Free labor. In T. Scholz (Ed.), *Digital labor: The Internet as playground and factory* (pp. 33-57). London, UK: Routledge.

APPLICATIONS: Read ***at least two*** and come to class prepared to discuss.

Chen, Adrian. (2014, October 23, 2014). The laborers who keep dick pics and beheadings out of your Facebook feed. *Wired*. Retrieved October 23, 2014, from <http://www.wired.com/2014/10/content-moderation/>

Irani, L. (2015, January 15, 2015). Justice for "data janitors". *Public Books*. Retrieved January 16, 2015, from <http://www.publicbooks.org/nonfiction/justice-for-data-janitors>

Madrigal, A. (2013, February 22, 2013). Facebook workers try to spend less than 1 second determining whether content is 'appropriate'. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved January 6, 2014, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2013/02/facebook-workers-try-to-spend-less-than-1-second-determining-whether-content-is-appropriate/273402/>

Raphel, Adrienne. (2014, July 22, 2014). Taskrabbit redux. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved October 23, 2014, from <http://www.newyorker.com/business/currency/taskrabbit-redux>

Singer, Natasha. (2014, August 16, 2014). In the sharing economy, workers find both freedom and uncertainty. *New York Times*. Retrieved August 28, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/17/technology/in-the-sharing-economy-workers-find-both-freedom-and-uncertainty.html>

Reading / Listening Due

FOUNDATIONS:

- Portwood-Stacer, L. (2012). Media refusal and conspicuous non-consumption: The performative and political dimensions of Facebook abstention. *New Media & Society*. doi: 10.1177/1461444812465139
- Satchell, C., & Dourish, P. (2009). Beyond the user: Use and non-use in HCI. Paper presented at the OZCHI. Pp. 9-16.
- Selwyn, N. (2003). Apart from technology: understanding people's non-use of information and communication technologies in everyday life. *Technology in Society*, 25(1), 99-116.

APPLICATIONS: Read at least two and come to class prepared to discuss.

- Cohen, Roger. (2012, January 2, 2012). A time to tune out. *The New York Times*. Retrieved October 20, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/03/opinion/cohen-a-time-to-tune-out.html>
- Norton, Quinn. (2014, February 17, 2014). Twitter I love you but you're bringing me down. Retrieved October 20, 2014, from <https://medium.com/@quinnnorton/twitter-i-love-you-but-youre-bringing-me-down-96f86c76b9d6>
- Iyer, P. (2011, December 29, 2011). The joy of quiet. *The New York Times*. Retrieved November 19, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/01/opinion/sunday/the-joy-of-quiet.html>
- Turkle, S. (2012, April 21, 2012). The flight from conversation. *The New York Times*. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/22/opinion/sunday/the-flight-from-conversation.html>
- Wortham, J. (2011, December 13, 2011). The Facebook resisters. *The New York Times*. Retrieved November 20, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/14/technology/shunning-facebook-and-living-to-tell-about-it.html>
- The "Non Use Project": <http://nonuse.org/>

Recommended:

- Brubaker, Jed R., Ananny, Mike, & Crawford, Kate. (2014). Departing glances: A sociotechnical account of 'leaving' Grindr. *New Media & Society*. doi: 10.1177/1461444814542311
- Crawford, K. (2011). Listening, not lurking: The neglected form of participation. In H. Greif, L. Hjorth, A. Lasén & C. Lobet-Maris (Eds.), *Cultures of participation: Media practices, politics and literacy* (pp. 63-74). Berlin, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Lee, S. K., & Katz, J. E. (2014). Disconnect: A case study of short-term voluntary mobile phone non-use. *First Monday*, 19(12). doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5210/fm.v19i12.4935>
- Light, Ben, & Cassidy, Elija. (2014). Strategies for the suspension and prevention of connection: Rendering disconnection as socioeconomic lubricant with Facebook. *New Media & Society*. doi: 10.1177/1461444814544002
- Wyatt, S., Thomas, G., & Terranova, T. (2002). They came, they surfed, they went back to the beach: Conceptualising use and non-use of the Internet. In S. Woolgar (Ed.), *Virtual society? Technology, cyberbole, reality* (pp. 23-40). Oxford, UK.

Week #14: April 15

HACKING, RESISTING, COUNTER-CULTURES, & BEING "ANTI-SOCIAL" ONLINE

-- PROPOSAL DUE --

Reading / Listening Due

FOUNDATIONS & APPLICATIONS:

Coleman, G. (2011). Hacker politics and publics. *Public Culture*, 23(3), 511-516.

Coleman, E. Gabriella. (2014). Hacker. In M.-L. Ryan, L. Emerson & B. J. Robertson (Eds.), *The Johns Hopkins guide to digital media* (pp. 245-248). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Driscoll, K. (2013, August 11, 2013). The tedium is the message: Finn Brunton's "Spam: A Shadow History of the Internet" *Los Angeles Review of Books*. Retrieved August 16, 2013, from <http://lareviewofbooks.org/review/the-tedium-is-the-message-finn-bruntons-spam-a-shadow-history-of-the-internet>

Phillips, W. (2011). Meet the trolls. *Index on Censorship*, 40, 68-76.

In-Class Viewing (no need to watch before class):

The Documentary Network. (2014, June 29, 2014). *The Internet's own boy: The story of Aaron Swartz*. Retrieved August 3, 2014, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vXr-2hwTk58>

Luminant Films. (2012). *We are legion: The story of hacktivists*: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ISqurTMe7Rw>

Week #15: April 22

ETHICAL BOUNDARIES: DESIGNING, TESTING & UNDERSTANDING EMERGING COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES

Reading / Listening Due

FOUNDATIONS:

Markham, Annette, & Buchanan, Elizabeth. (2012). Ethical Decision-Making and Internet Research: Recommendations from the AoIR Ethics Working Committee. *Association of Internet Researchers*. 2nd revision. Retrieved October 19, 2014, from <http://aoir.org/reports/ethics2.pdf>

Ess, Charles. (2014). Ethics in digital media. In M.-L. Ryan, L. Emerson & B. J. Robertson (Eds.), *The Johns Hopkins guide to digital media* (pp. 183-188). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

APPLICATIONS: Read all (they're not long)

Goel, Vinu. (2014, August 12, 2014). As data overflows online, researchers grapple with ethics. *New York Times*. Retrieved October 2, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/13/technology/the-boon-of-online-data-puts-social-science-in-a-quandary.html>

LaFrance, Adrienne. (2014, August 20, 2014). How much should you know about the way Facebook works? *The Atlantic*. Retrieved October 2, 2014, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/08/how-much-should-you-know-about-how-facebook-works/378812/>

Meyer, R. (2014, September 8, 2014). Everything we know about Facebook's secret mood manipulation experiment. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved December 3, 2014, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/06/everything-we-know-about-facebooks-secret-mood-manipulation-experiment/373648/>

Gray, Mary L. (2014, August 19, 2014). Microsoft Research faculty summit 2014 ethics panel recap. *Microsoft Research Social Media Collective*. Retrieved October 2, 2014, from <http://socialmediacollective.org/2014/08/19/msr-faculty-summit-2014-ethics-panel-recap/>

Week #16: April 29

STUDENT PRESENTATIONS & COURSE WRAP-UP

NO FINAL EXAM.

FINAL PAPERS DUE: Friday, May 8