The University of Iowa
School of Library and Information Sciences
Spring 2017

Course	SLIS 6140: Digital Environments
Course Schedule	Mondays 1:30-4:15, Group Area E, Learning Commons
Course Website	digitalenvironments17.slack.com
Instructor	Dr. Lindsay Mattock
Office Location	3072 Main Library
E-mail	lindsay-mattock@uiowa.edu
Office Hours	by appointment

Course Overview + Objectives

"Tools are not just tools. They are cognitive interfaces that presuppose forms of mental and physical discipline and organization. By scripting an action, they produce and transmit knowledge, and in turn, model a world."[1]

Digital environments engage a host of actors, from digital tools and machines (harddisks, software applications, computing interfaces) to the people who design and use these technologies. This course will survey the various material, technological, spatial, and cultural influences on digital environments. Over the course of the term, students will gain an understanding of digital culture from and interdisciplinary point of view through the review and reflection on theoretical and historical texts and the examination of case studies from various contexts.

Course Objectives
In this course, student should develop:
- An understanding of the historical, theoretical, and material conditions that have influenced the development of contemporary digital environments;

- An awareness of interdisciplinary perspectives that can inform the development, use, and stewardship of digital media;

---

[1] Anne Burdick, Johanna Drucker, Peter Lunefeld, et.al., *Digital_Humanities* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012).

- The ability to articulate critical insights regarding challenges and issues related to the creation and use of digital media in various contexts relevant to Information Professionals.

Semester at a Glance

January 16	Martin Luther King Day
Week 1	January 23	Course Overview and Introduction
Week 2	January 30	History of Computing
Week 3	February 6	Critical Digital Pedagogy
Week 4	February 13	Digital Literacy/Fluency
Week 5	February 20	Makerspaces/Critical Making
Week 6	February 27	Youth and Digital Media
Week 7	March 6	Digital Identity/Citizenship
March 13	Spring Break
Week 8	March 20	Gaming
Week 9	March 27	Social Media
Week 10	April 3	Hactivism/Activism
Week 11	April 10	Augmented Reality
Week 12	April 17	TBD
Week 13	April 24	TBD
Week 14	May 1	Final Presentations

Course Website and Technology

We will be using Slack as our learning management system (LMS). Slack provides a single space to share documents, post messages and questions, host video conversations, and share general information of interest. Each student will receive an invitation to the Contextual Foundations Slack team <digitalenvironments17.slack.com> prior to the first class session. We will review the tool and its functions during our first meeting.

All students are expected to use these tools respectfully. Meaningful and constructive dialogue is encouraged in this course and requires a degree of mutual respect, willingness to listen, and tolerance of opposing points of view. Respect for individual differences and alternative viewpoints will be maintained at all times.

Course Texts and Required Reading

During our first class session, we will determine as a class what topics we would like to address over the course of the term. Each week you will be responsible for identifying a book or series of articles that are of interest to you as your required reading. I will provide a number of suggested readings after the topics have been determined. You are welcome to select from this list or to select reading of your own.

Course Requirements and Grading

Notes on Grades

Your work will be assessed on a three-point scale: √, √+, √-. Detailed rubrics have been provided for each of the assignments, outlining the specific requirements.

√+	√	√-
Exceeds expectations	Meets requirements	Fails to meet expectations

At the end of the term the totality of your work will be assessed according to the Final Grade Rubric.

Course Work at a Glance

Grade Point	Due Date
Weekly Attendance	Throughout term
Makers Kit Proposal	Monday, March 6
Makers Kit and Teaching Materials	Monday, April 3
Final Presentation	Monday, May 1

1. Weekly Attendance
Recorded weekly and evaluated at the end of term

This is a seminar style course. Each week you will be responsible for contributing to the class discussion by sharing your analysis of your assigned reading, as such regular and punctual attendance in class is expected. Your attendance will be recorded each week and a mark will be assessed at the end of the term according to the following rubric:

√+	√	√-
You have attended all of the required class sessions; have arrived on-time and participated in the course until dismissed	You have missed no more than 2 of the required class sessions; or have arrived late/left early a few times during the term	You have missed more than 2 of the required class sessions; and/or have frequently arrived late or left class sessions early

2. Makers Kit Proposal
Due Monday, March 6

For your final project you will develop a makers kit using the one of the available physical computing technologies: Arduino Lilypad, littleBits, or Raspberry Pi. The proposal will provide an introduction to the kit that you would like to develop. The proposal should include a description of the learning objectives, list the required materials, and introduce the audience for which the kit has been designed. We will peer review the proposals during the March 20th class session.

Requirement	√+	√	√-
Introduction	The proposal introduces the purpose of the kit, the intended audience, and potential settings in which the kit could be used. A variety of different contexts and audiences are proposed.	The proposal introduces the purpose of the kit, the intended audience, and potential settings in which the kit could be used.	The proposal fails to provide a clear introduction to the purpose of the kit and or the potential audience.
Objectives	The proposal includes a number of different learning objectives for the kit. Different objectives are proposed for different audiences. The objectives are appropriate for the proposed audiences.	The proposal includes a number of different learning objectives for the kit. The objectives are appropriate for the proposed audience.	The proposal fails to include learning objectives and/or the learning objectives are not appropriate for the identified audience.
Materials List	The proposal includes a complete list of the materials	The proposal includes a complete list of	The proposal fails to account for the materials

	required to build the kit. The materials list includes the cost per item and preferred vendors for the materials.	the materials required to build the kit.	required to build the kit.
Peer Review	You participate fully in the peer review, providing critical feedback to your classmates.	Not applicable for this requirement.	You did not participate fully in the discussion of the proposals, failing to provide feedback to your classmates.

3. Makers Kit Instructions and Lesson Plan
Due Monday, April 3rd

Building on the feedback from the Makers Kit Proposal, you will now develop the kit, including the instructions for the users and a lesson plan to accompany the materials. We will peer review the materials during our April 3rd class session.

Requirement	√+	√	√-
User Instructions	The instructions are written at an appropriate level for your audience. The instructions make use of appropriate graphic and visual aids where appropriate. The instructions can be followed without	The instructions are written at an appropriate level for your audience. The instructions make use of appropriate graphic and visual aids where appropriate.	The instructions were not written with consideration of your audience. And/or the instructions cannot be followed to complete the project.

	confusion by your peers.		
Lesson Plan: Learning Objectives	The learning objectives are clearly articulated and appropriate for your intended audience. The learning objectives demonstrate a consideration for different levels of learners.	The learning objectives are clearly articulated and appropriate for your intended audience.	The learning objectives are not articulated and/or are not appropriate for your intended audience.
Lesson Plan: Reading List	The lesson plan includes a list of suggested readings to accompany the lesson. The readings are appropriate for your learning objectives and the intended audience. The reading list contains a variety of materials adaptable to different audiences and learners.	The lesson plan includes a list of suggested readings to accompany the lesson. The readings are appropriate for your learning objectives and the intended audience.	The lesson plan is lacking a list of suggested readings and/or the readings are not appropriate for your intended audience.
Lesson Plan: Narrative	The lesson plan includes a narrative for the leader/instructor to guide the users of the kits through the activity. The narrative should	The lesson plan includes a narrative for the leader/instructor to guide the users of the kits through the activity. The narrative is	The lesson plan fails to include a clear narrative fro the leader/instructor and/or the narrative is not appropriate for

	define key concepts and provide the information necessary for the leader/instructor to contextualize the technology for the users. The narrative is appropriate for the intended audience.	appropriate for the intended audience.	the intended audience.
Lesson Plan: Reflection Questions	The lesson plan includes a series of reflection questions designed for the users of the kit to reflect on what they have learned using the kit. The questions match the learning objectives for the kit. The reflection questions further connect to the suggested reading and narrative.	The lesson plan includes a series of reflection questions designed for the users of the kit to reflect on what they have learned using the kit. The questions match the learning objectives for the kit.	The lesson plan fails to include reflection questions and/or the reflection questions do not match the learning objectives for the kit.
Peer Review	You participate fully in the peer review, providing critical feedback to your classmates.	Not applicable for this requirement.	You did not participate fully in the discussion of the proposals, failing to provide feedback to your classmates.

4. Final Presentation
Due Monday, May 1

During the final class meeting, you will report on the development of your kit over the course the term. In this presentation, you will address the research behind the kit materials, including a discussion of how you developed the learning objectives, the related theory and research that informed the kit design, and your findings and reflection on the process.

Requirement	√+	√	√-
Introduction	The presentation provides an introduction to your kit and the audience(s) and context(s) for which it was designed. Your rationale for targeting this audience/context is clearly articulated.	The presentation provides an introduction to your kit and the audience(s) and context(s) for which it was designed.	The presentation fails to address the audience and context for which the kit was designed.
Learning Objectives	The presentation discusses the learning objectives that you designed and the pedagogy of your kit. The pedagogical discussion references the course discussion/reading or other appropriate literature.	The presentation provides an introduction to the learning objectives of the kit and the motivation for the design of these objectives.	The presentation fails to discuss your kit's learning objectives.

Theoretical Implications	The presentation includes a discussion of how the theory over the course of the term applies to your kit. The discussion is grounded in the course materials, referencing the course reading or other appropriate literature.	The presentation includes a discussion of how the theory over the course of the term applies to your kit.	The presentation fails to reflect on the course topics and how they relate to the design and development of your kit.
Conclusions/Findings/Future Work	The presentation concludes with a discussion of the major findings from your work this term and offers suggestions for extending this work in the future.	The presentation concludes with a discussion of the major findings, reflecting on the implications of your work this term.	The presentation fails to provide a reflection on the implications of your work.
Q & A	You are prepared to answer questions related to your research and participate in discussion.	Not applicable for this requirement.	You are not prepared to answer questions about your presentation. And/or you fail to ask questions or offer comments related to your classmates' presentations.

4. Final Grade

Evaluated at the end of term

At the end of the term your scores will be averaged together with each mark awarded a value as follows:

√+	√	√-	no credit
1	0	-1	-2

Your final letter grade will be determined according to the following rubric:

Letter Grade	Description of Work
A	**Exceptional work:** Demonstrates an outstanding understanding – both theoretical and factual – of the course materials. This is work that consistently exceeds expectations. An average > .75
A-	**Outstanding work:** Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of the course materials. Greatly surpasses course expectations. An average > .5
B+	**Very good work:** Demonstrates a better-than-average command of the course materials. An average > .25
B	**Solid work:** Demonstrates expected command of the course materials. This grade is awarded to work that meets course expectations. An average >= 0.
B-	**Marginal work:** Demonstrates an incomplete understanding of the course materials. This work does not meet course expectations. An average < 0.
C	**Unacceptable work in a graduate program:** Students earning below a B- have failed to submit assignments or have otherwise received no credit on multiple assignments. An average < -1.

F	Failing grades are reserved for extreme circumstances when a majority of assignments have not been submitted or in cases of plagiarism. Please refer to the course "Academic Integrity" policy on page 11 of this syllabus.

Class Policies

Office Hours

With the variances is everyone's work and class schedules it is difficult to agree upon one particular time that suits everyone's needs. Therefore, formal office hours will not be scheduled. Students are always welcome to schedule individual appointments at any point during the term. I am also available via email or Direct Message through Slack.

Assignment Deadlines

All assignments will be submitted to Slack as outlined in the assignment description. Assignments are due by 1:30pm on the due date stated in the syllabus. **Late assignments will not be accepted.** This policy protects both your time and mine. Timely submission allows me to fairly evaluate everyone work. It also ensures that you will remain on track to complete all of your work by the end of the term. I will make exceptions for extenuating circumstances, so please reach out to me if you believe that you cannot meet an assignment deadline. See *Extenuating Circumstances and Incomplete Grades* below.

Extenuating Circumstances and Incomplete Grades

Life happens – I realize that all of you are balancing other courses along with, work, families, pets, etc., etc., etc., while completing your degree. While I believe that you must attend class each week to get the most out of this course, I understand that extenuating circumstances (illness, bereavement, etc.) may interfere with your ability to participate fully in the course. It is your responsibility to contact me as soon as possible if such a circumstance will prevent you from completing the coursework according to the set schedule or attending a class session. I will then work with you to determine the best path forward for your particular situation. Incomplete grades will only be granted under these circumstances.

Academic Integrity

All students are expected to adhere to the standards of academic honesty. Citation is one of the key competencies of information literate individuals and as such it is crucial for LIS professionals to learn the standards of and practice proper attribution. It is your responsibility to ensure that you are following these standards. Any student engaged in plagiarism, cheating, or other acts of academic dishonesty, will be subject to disciplinary action.

The *Chicago Manual of Style 16th Edition* stresses the importance of providing proper attribution when reusing the materials of others, arguing that this practice "not only bolsters the claim of fair use but also helps avoid the accusation of plagiarism."[2]

Plagiarism is a serious offence that includes:

- stealing or passing off the ideas or words of another as one's own
- using another's work without crediting the source
- committing literary theft
- presenting as new and original a product or idea derived from an already existing source[3]

Plagiarism can be avoided by following the guidelines for proper citation and paraphrasing. Sections 13.1-13.6 of the *Chicago Manual of Style 16th Edition* <chicagomanualofstyle.org/16/ch13/ch13_toc.html> may be referenced for guidance. The University Writing Center <writingcenter.uiowa.edu> is another on-campus resource that is available to all students enrolled in course at the University.

Acts of plagiarism will be evaluated by the professor on a case-by-case basis and will be reported to the department. No credit will be given for plagiarized assignments. Minor transgressions will be documented in the student's departmental file. If the case is deemed to be sufficiently egregious, the offence will be reported to the Graduate College and may result in expulsion from the program. Please review the policies in the *School of Library and Information Science Student Handbook* slis.grad.uiowa.edu/current-students and the *Graduate College Rules and Regulations* grad.uiowa.edu/manual-part-1-section-iv-academic-standing-probation-and-dismissal.

---

[2] *The Chicago Manual of Style, 16th Edition* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010): 190.

[3] *Merriam-Webster Online,* s.v. "plagiarize," accessed January 6, 2016, http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/plagiarize

Students with Disabilities

Many students require particular accommodations in the classroom. I am happy to work with you to ensure that you have the best learning experience possible. If you are or may be requesting an accommodation, please speak with me privately and contact Student Disability Services, 3015 Burge Hall, 319-335-1462/319-335-1498 (TTY), as early as possible in the term. This will ensure that we both have all the tools and information that we need to have a successful semester working together. A comprehensive description of the services of that office can be obtained at http://sds.studentlife.uiowa.edu.

Reading Schedule

The reading schedule is subject to modification. The reading is to be completed before the assigned class each week.

JANUARY 16 – MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. DAY

Week 1 | January 23 – Course Overview and Introduction

No assigned reading

Week 2 | January 30 – History of Computing

Janet Abbate, *Recoding Gender: Women's Changing Participation in Computing* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012).

Janet Abbate, *Inventing the Internet* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000).

Martin Campbell-Kelly, *From Airline Reservations to Sonic the Hedgehog* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004).

Paul E. Ceruzzi, *A History of Modern Computing, Second edition* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003).

Paul E. Ceruzzi, *Reckoners: The Prehistory of the Digital Computer, From Relays to the Stored Program Concept*, 1935-1945 (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1983).

N. Katherine Hayles, *Writing Machines* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002).

Gerard O'Regan, *A Brief History of Computing, Second Edition* (New York: Springer, 2012).

Brian Winston, *Media Technology and Society, A History: From Telegraph to the Internet* (New York: Routledge, 1998).

Week 3 | February 6 – Digital Pedagogy

Helen Beetham and Rhona Sharpe, *Rethinking Pedagogy for a Digital Age: Designing for 21st Century Learning* (New York: Routledge, 2013).

Brett D. Hirsch, ed., *Digital Humanities Pedagogy Practices, Principles and Politics* (Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2013).

Maria T. Accardi, *Feminist Pedagogy for Library Instruction* (Sacramento: Library Juice Press, 2013).

William I. Bauer, *Music Learning Today: Digital Pedagogy for Creating, Performing, and Responding to Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

Antonia Darder, Marta Baltodano, and Rodolfo D. Torres, eds., *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2009).

bell hooks, *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* (New York: Routledge, 1994).

Monty L. McAdoo, *Fundamentals of Library Instruction* (Chicago: ALA, 2013).

Peter Merrosy, *Pedagogy for Creative Problem Solving* (New York: Routledge, 2017).

Week 4 | February 13 – Digital Literacy / Fluency

David Buckingham, *Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture* (Malden, MA: Polity, 2003).

Lee Crockett, Ian Jukes, Andrew Churches, *Literacy Is Not Enough: 21st-Century Fluencies for the Digital Age* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2011).

John R. Drakers, ed., *Defining Technological Literacy: Towards an Epistemological Framework* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

Elsa M. Garmire and Greg Pearson, eds., *Tech Tally: Approaches to Assessing Technological Literacy* (Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2006).

Paul Gilster, *Digital Literacy* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1997).

Debra Hayes, Robert Hattam, Barbara Comber, Lyn Kerkham, Ruth Lupton, Pat Thomson, *Literacy, Leading, and Learning* (New York: Routledge, 2017).

Jan Rune Holmevik, *Inter/vention: Free Plan in the Age of Electracy* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012).

Carrey Jewitt and Gunther Kress, *Multimodal Literacy* (New York: P. Lang, 2003).

Peter Pericles Trifonas, ed., *Learning the Virtual Life*: *Public Pedagogy in a Digital World* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

Week 5 | February 20 – The Makers Movement / Critical Making

John Burke, *Makerspaces: A Practical Guide for Librarians* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014).

Laura Fleming, *World of Making: Best Practices for Establishing a Makerspace for Your School* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2015).

Matthew Hamilton, *Make it Here: Inciting Creativity and Innovation in Your Library* (Santa Barbara: Libraries Unlimited, 2015).

Ian Hodder, *Entangled: An Archaeology of the Relationship Between Humans and Things* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012).

Tim Ingold, *Making: Anthropology, Archeology, Art, and Architecture* (New York: Routledge, 2013).

Joan Horvath, Richard Cameron, Dug Adrianson, eds., *The New Shop Class: Getting Started with 3D Printing, Arduino, and Wearable Tech* (Berkeley: Apress 2015).

Matt Ratto and Megan Boler, eds., *DIY Citizenship: Critical Making and Social Media* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2014).

Week 6 | February 27 – Youth and Digital Culture / Myth of Digital Native

Shakuntala Banaji and David Buckingham, *The Civic Web: Young People, the Internet, and Civic Participation* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013).

Brigid Barron, Kimberly Gomez, Nichole Pinkard, and Caitlin K. Martin, *The Digital Youth Network: Cultivating Digital Media Citizenship in Urban Communities* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Presss, 2014).

Carrie James, *Disconnected: Youth, New Media, and the Ethics Gap* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016).

Mizuko Ito, *Engineering Play: A Cultural History of Children's Software* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009).

John Palfrey and Urs Gasser, *Born Digital: How Children Grow Up in a Digital Age* (New York: Basic Books, 2016).

John Palfrey and Urs Gasser, *Born Digital: Understanding the First Generation of Digital Natives* (New York: Basic Books, 2008).

Katie Salen Tekinbas, et. al., *Quest to Learn: Developing the School for Digital Kids* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2011).

Week 7 | March 6 – Digital Identity/Citizenship

Susan Bearden, *Digital Citizenship: A Community-Based Approach* (Thousand Oaks, Corwin, 2016).

B. Coleman, *Hello Avatar, Rise of the Networked Generation* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011).

Wolfgang Ernst, *Digital Memory and The Archive* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013).

Richard H. R. Harper, *Texture: Human Expression in the Age of Communication Overload* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010).

N. Katherine Hayles, *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999).

N. Katherine Hayles, *How We Think: Digital Media and Contemporary Technogenesis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

Alan Liu, *The Laws of Cool: Knowledge Work and the Culture of Information* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 2004).

Anthony McCosker, Sonja Viviennne, and Amelia Johns, *Negotating Digital Citizenship: Control, Contest, and Culture* (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016).

Karen Mossberger, Caroline J. Tolbert, and Romona S. McNeal, *Digital Citizenship: The Internet, Society, and Participation* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008).

Helen Nissenbaum, *Privacy in Context: Technology, Policy, and the Integrity of Social Life* (Stanford, CA: Stanford Law Books, 2010).

Ken Hillis, Susanna Paasonen, and Michael Petit, eds., *Networked Affect* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015).

Sherry Turkle, *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other* (New York: Basic Books, 2011).

MARCH 13 – SPRING BREAK

Week 8 | March 20 – Gaming

Steven J. Brams, *Game Theory and the Humanities: Bridging Two Worlds* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011).

Ian Bogost, *How to Do Things With Video Games* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011).

Mary Flanagan and Helen Nissenbaum, *Values at Play in Digital Games* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014).

Raiford Guins, *Game After: A Cultural Study of Video Game Afterlife* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014).

Katherine Isbister, *How Games Move Us: Emotion By Design* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016).

Jesper Juul, *The Art of Failure: An Essay on the Pain of Playing Video Games* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013).

Jesper Juul, *A Casual Revolution: Reinventing Video Games and Their Players* (Cambirge, MA: MIT Press, 2009).

Yasmin B. Kafai and Quinn Burke, *Connected Gaming: What Making Video Games Can Teach Us about Literacy and Learning* (Cambrige, MA: MIT Press, 2016).

Lev Manovich, *The Language of New Media* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001).

Janet H. Murray, *Inventing the Medium: Principles of Interaction Design as a Cultural Practice* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012).

Michael Z. Newman, *Atari Age: The Emergence of Video Games in America* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2017).

Michael Nitsche, *Video Game Spaces: Image, Play, and Structure in 3D Worlds* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008).

Anastasia Salter and John Murray, *Flash: Building the Interactive Web* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014).

Steven Tadelis, *Game Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2013).

Mark J. P. Wolf, ed., *Video Games Around the World* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015).

Week 9 | March 27 – Social Media

Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (New York: Verson, 2006).

Daren C. Brabham, *Crowdsourcing* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013).

Albert-Laszlo Barabasi, *Linked: The New Science of Networks* (Cambridge, MA: Perseus, 2002).

Pablo J. Boczkowski and Eugenia Mitchelstein, *The News Gap: When the Information Preferences of the Media and the Public Diverge* (Cambrige, MA: MIT Press,

Finn Brunton, *Spam: A Shadow History of the Internet* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015).

Judith Donath, *The Social Machine: Designs for Living Online* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014).

Kevin Howley, *Community Media: People Places, and Communication Technologies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Richard Ling, *New Tech, New Ties: How Mobile Communication is Reshaping Social Cohesion* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008).

Joseph M. Reagle, *Reading the Comments: Likers, Haters, and Manipulators at the Bottom of the Web* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015).

Joseph M. Reagle, *Good Faith Collaboration: The Culture of Wikipedia* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010).

Limor Shifman, *Memes in Digital Culture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014).

Week 10 | April 3 – Hactivism/Activism

Joseph G. Bock, *The Technology of Nonviolence: Social Media and Violence Protection* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012).

Finn Brunton and Helen Nissenbaum, *Obfuscation: A User's Guide for Privacy and Protest* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016).

Sasha Costanza-Chock, *Out of the Shadows, Into the Streets!: Transmedia Organizing and the Immigrant Rights Movement* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014).

James Leach and Lee Wilson, eds., *Subversion, Conversion, Development: Cross-Cultural Knowledge Exchange and the Politics of Design* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014).

Elisabeth Soep, *Participatory Politics: Next Generation Tactics to Remake Public Spheres* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014).

Week 11 | April 10 – Augmented Reality

William Bainbridge, *The Warcraft Civilization: Social Science in a Virtual World* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010).

Steven Benford and Gabriella Giannachi, *Performing Mixed Reality* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011).

Steve Dixon, *Digital Performance: A History of New Media in Theater, Dance, Performance Art, and Installation* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015).

Anne Friedberg, *The Virtual Window: From Alberti to Microsoft* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006).

Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992).

Vili Lehdonvirta, *Virtual Economies: Design and Analysis* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014).

Peter Ludow and Mark Wallace, *The Second Life Herald: The Virtual Tabloid that Witnessed the Dawn of the Metaverse* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007).

William J. Mitchell, *City of Bits: Space, Place and the Infobahn* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000).

Susan Elizabeth Ryan, *Garments of Paradise: Wearable Discourse in the Digital Age* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014).

Nick Yee, *The Proteus Paradox: How Online Games and Virtual Worlds Change Us and How They Don't* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014).

Week 12 | April 17 – Open

Topics TBD

Week 13 | April 24 – Open

Topics TBD

Week 14 | May 4 – Final Presentations

No assigned reading