

Digital Cultures (JMC:6333:0002), Spring 2019
Monday 2–4:45 p.m., E254 AJB

Professor: Brian Ekdale, brian-ekdale@uiowa.edu, E324 AJB

Office Hours: Wednesday 12–3 p.m. or by appointment

Course Description: In *Keywords*, Raymond Williams describes culture as “one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language.” This was before social justice groups became identified by hashtags, Facebook became a primary source of both news and misinformation, watches tracked you having sex, and international diplomacy was negotiated over Twitter.

This graduate seminar explores what has become of culture (or cultures) in the digital age. Cultural studies will be our primary orientation, but we also will engage with relevant scholarship from critical theorists and social scientists as well as contemporary news coverage. We will look at some seminal pieces on digital and social media as well as more recent efforts to understand the relationship between technology and society. Although many of our readings were produced by American and European scholars writing about American and European life, I have sought to include scholarship about digital media in a variety of social, cultural, and national contexts. Digital media are global; our understanding of digital cultures should be as well.

In this seminar, you are expected to participate in weekly discussions, submit reading response briefs, work with a partner to create an annotated bibliography and in-class presentation on a digital media technology, and submit a research paper or proposal based on a topic of your choosing.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Participation (20%): The success of any seminar depends on the participation of its students. Therefore, you will be graded on your attendance, preparedness, contribution, and cooperation.

- Attendance means showing up. Simply put, you should be in seminar. If you have a legitimate reason for arriving late, leaving early, or missing class, please discuss this with me before the start of class.
- Preparedness means completing all assigned readings prior to the start of class. While I encourage you to draw from your individual experiences and areas of expertise, our discussions should be centered on the theories and concepts explored in the weekly readings.
- Contribution means sharing your ideas. Each of you offers a unique perspective based on your beliefs, upbringing, and areas of expertise. Therefore, it is important that you share your thoughts, opinions, and reactions with each other.
- Cooperation means working well with others. A seminar should be a place where everyone feels comfortable sharing their views, even if those views are uncommon or unpopular. At the same time, you must always be aware of how your words and actions affect those around you. Intolerance, antagonism, and demagoguery have no place in the healthy exchange of ideas.

Reading Response Briefs (10%): To help spark in-class discussion, each week you will write a response brief to the required readings. In your response, I want you to (1) identify the reading that resonated with you the most (i.e., the argument was most provocative, the evidence was most persuasive, the writing was most compelling, etc.) and briefly state what you appreciated about the reading and (2) identify the reading that resonated with you the least (i.e., the argument was least provocative, the evidence was least persuasive, the writing was least compelling, etc.) and briefly state what you didn't appreciate about the reading. These briefs should demonstrate that you understand the readings, you've grappled with their arguments, and you are able to clearly communicate your ideas. I am less interested in the quality of your prose than the thoughtfulness of your critiques. Therefore, your response to each article may take the form of a paragraph or a series of bullet points. Upload your response briefs to ICON at least an hour before the start of class.

- Please note that readings listed in the course schedule are broken up into two sections: required and supplemental. Seminar discussions and reading response briefs will focus on the required readings for each week. I've provided a list of supplemental readings under each topic as a resource for those of you interested in exploring the topic further.

Technology Research Presentation (20%): It is challenging to keep up with the latest scholarship in digital media. Therefore, the technology research presentations provide an opportunity for us to encounter recent research on digital technologies and cultural phenomena. For this assignment, you will work in pairs to find, review, and share research about a digital media technology (e.g. Twitch, Facebook, Tinder, Instagram, etc.). Specifically, you and your partner will do the following:

- Review recent scholarship on a digital media technology. You should collect research published in books and scholarly journals, submitted as theses or dissertations, and/or presented at academic conferences. Although you may include one or two "seminal" studies that are several years old, you should focus on research published/submitted/presented within the last 3 years. Look, in particular, for articles that adopt a social constructivist approach and/or use qualitative methods. Below are several media studies journals and conferences that feature scholarship on digital culture. This list is intended to get you started on your literature search and is by no means exhaustive.
 - Journals: *New Media & Society; Information, Communication & Society; Media, Culture & Society; First Monday; Television & New Media; Critical Studies in Media Communication; International Journal of Communication; Digital Journalism; Social Media + Society*
 - Conferences: International Communication Association; Association for Education in Journalism & Mass Communication; Association for Internet Researchers (AoIR); National Communication Association; Society for Cinema and Media Studies
- Produce an annotated bibliography of 10-12 studies reviewed above. Organize your bibliography and the selected research around 2-3 coherent themes (e.g. Facebook and Privacy, Facebook and Romance, Facebook and Racial Justice). For each entry, you should summarize the approach, methods, major arguments/findings, and how the study relates to other entries in your bibliography. You also should include a brief critique that addresses any flaws, oversights, or questionable assumptions. Each annotation should be approximately 250 words long. Annotations must reflect your original work (i.e. do not simply copy the official abstract). You may include direct quotations from the text, but direct quotations must be brief and include the relevant page number. Feel free to make connections to course readings and concepts we've discussed earlier in the semester. After you submit your annotated bibliography, I will post a copy to the course ICON. Think of your annotated bibliography as a shared resource for your fellow classmates.

- Share the findings of your literature review in a 10-15 minute in-class presentation. When presenting, you should summarize the main themes of the scholarship you reviewed. Do not attempt to discuss each and every reading in depth. Instead, highlight a few exemplary studies while speaking more broadly about areas of overlap, agreement, and disagreement across the research you've reviewed.
- Assign one article or book chapter for your classmates to read in advance of your presentation day. Following your presentation, you will lead a discussion about your technology and assigned reading. You must distribute your reading by noon on the Friday before your presentation day. I will leave an hour at the end of seminar for the technology research presentation and ensuing discussion.

Research Project (50%): Each of you will develop an original research project that explores a topic of your own choosing. This scholarship should demonstrate your ability to apply course concepts to your individual research agenda. For this project, you have two options:

1. Produce a “conference ready” research paper that examines media content. This paper should include an introduction; a review of relevant literature; a description of your research puzzle or research question(s); an explanation of your methodology; a findings/analysis section; and a discussion/conclusion section that summarizes the significance of this research. This paper should be approximately 20-pages long (double-spaced, 12pt font, 1-inch margins).
2. Propose a “field ready” research study that involves human subjects. This proposal should include an introduction, a literature review, and a description of your research puzzle/question(s) and methodology. This proposal should be approximately 10-pages long (double-spaced, 12pt font, 1-inch margins). In lieu of a findings/analysis/discussion section, you must prepare a HawkIRB application for human subjects review, including subject recruitment documentation (e.g. recruitment email, etc.) and data collection instruments (e.g. interview protocols, surveys, etc.). You are not required to submit your IRB protocol for review, but you must prepare and turn in to me all of the required documentation (including relevant recruitment materials and interview protocols).

In addition to submitting your research project at the end of the semester, you must also:

- Submit a 500- to 750-word research proposal, describing your proposed topic, justifying its significant, and stating if you plan to submit a full paper or a project proposal. In your proposal, you will want to briefly review relevant literature, present a research puzzle or pose one or more research questions, and propose methods for solving this puzzle or answering these questions. The proposal is due Monday, February 25th.
- Share your research project with your peers in a formal, in-class presentation on Monday, April 29th. This 10- to 12-minute presentation should approximate a presentation at an academic conference. I will cut off any presentation longer than 12 minutes, so please ensure that you practice in advance. We will have a brief Q&A session following each presentation.

Grading Scale:

A	93–100	B-	80–82	D+	67–69
A-	90–92	C+	77–79	D	63–66
B+	87–89	C	73–76	D-	60–62
B	83–86	C-	70–72	F	59 and below

COURSE SCHEDULE

Note: Required Readings are listed in a suggested reading order. Supplemental Readings are listed alphabetically.

Week 1 (1/14) – Introductions

Required Reading

- Couldry, N., & Hepp, A. (2017). *The mediated construction of reality*. Princeton, NJ: Polity. (pp. 15-56, “The Social World as Communicative Construction”; “History as Waves of Mediatization”)

Supplemental Reading

- Peters, B. (ed.) (2016). *Digital keywords: A vocabulary of information society and culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Week 2 (1/21) – MLK DAY (no seminar)

Week 3 (1/28) – Histories

Required Readings

- Dibbel, J. (1993, December). A rape in cyberspace, *The Village Voice*. <http://www.juliandibbell.com/articles/a-rape-in-cyberspace/>
- Turner, F. (2005). Where the counterculture met the new economy: The WELL and the origins of virtual community. *Technology and Culture*, 46(3), 485–512.
- Wasserman, H. (2017). African histories of the Internet. *Internet Histories*, 1(1-2), 129-137.
- McLelland, M., Yu, H., & Goggin, G. (2018). Alternative histories of social media in Japan and China. In J. Burgess, A. Marwick, & T. Poell (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Social Media* (pp. 53-68), Washington DC: Sage.
- Jin, D. Y. (2017). Construction of digital Korea: The evolution of new communication technologies in the 21st century. *Media, Culture & Society*, 39(5), 715–726.
- Alper, M. (2015). Augmentative, alternative, and assistive: Reimagining the history of mobile computing and disability. *IEEE Annals of the History of Computing*, 37(1), 92–96

Supplemental Readings

- Barss, P. (2010). *The erotic engine: How pornography has powered mass communication, from Gutenberg to Google*. Doubleday Canada.
- Eichhorn, K. (2016). *Adjusted margin: Xerography, art, and activism in the late twentieth century*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Good, K. D. (2012). From scrapbook to Facebook: A history of personal media assemblage and archives. *New Media & Society*, 15(4), 557—573.
- Haigh, T. (2010). “Masculinity and the machine man: Gender in the history of data processing.” In T. J. Misa (ed.), *Gender codes: Why women are leaving computing* (pp. 51–71), Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

- Hu, T-H. (2015). *A prehistory of the cloud*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Humphreys. (2018). *The qualified self: Social media and the accounting of everyday life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mailland, J., & Driscoll, K. (2017). *Minitel: Welcome to the Internet*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Miller, L. (1995). “Women and children first: Gender and the settling of the Electronic Frontier.” In J. Brook & I. Boal (eds.) *Resisting the virtual life: The culture and politics of information* (pp. 49–57), San Francisco: City Lights.
- Peters, B. (2016). *How not to network a nation: The uneasy history of the Soviet Internet*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Peters, J. D. (2017). “You mean my whole fallacy is wrong”: On technological determinism. *Representations*, 140(1), 10–26.
- Streeter, T. (2010). *The Net Effect: Romanticism, capitalism, and the Internet*. New York: New York University Press.
- Streeter, T. (2017). The Internet as a structure of feeling: 1992-1996. *Internet Histories*, 1(1-2), 79-89.
- Turner, F. (2006). *From counterculture to cyberspace: Stewart Brand, the Whole Earth Network, and the rise of digital utopianism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Turner, F. (2013). *The democratic surround: Multimedia & American Liberalism from World War II to the Psychedelic Sixties*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Week 4 (2/4) – Participation and Exploitation

Required Readings

- Jenkins, H., Clinton, K., Purushotma, R., Robinson A. J., & Weigel, M. (2007). *Confronting the challenges of participatory culture: Media education for the 21st century*. Chicago, IL: The MacArthur Foundation. (pp. 1–11; “Executive Summary,” “The Needed Skills in the New Media Culture,” “Enabling Participation”)
- Jenkins, H. Ford, S., & Green, J. (2013). *Spreadable media: creating value and meaning in a networked culture*. New York: NYU Press. (pp. 47–84; “Where Web 2.0 Went Wrong”)
- Smyth, D. W. (1981/2006) “On the audience commodity and its work.” In M. G. Durham & D. M. Kellner (eds.) *Media and cultural studies: Keyworks* (pp. 230–256). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Terranova, T. (2000). Free labor: Producing culture for the digital economy. *Social Text*, 18(2), 33–58.
- Baym, N. K., & Burnett, R. (2009). Amateur experts: International fan labour in Swedish independent music. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 12(5), 433-449.
- Lorenz. T. (2018, December 18). Rising Instagram stars are posting fake sponsored content. *The Atlantic*.

Supplemental Readings

- Andrejevic, M. (2008). Watching television without pity: The productivity of online fans. *Television & New Media*, 9(1), 24–46.

- Banks, J., & Potts, J. (2010). Co-creating games: A co-evolutionary analysis. *New Media & Society*, 12(2), 253–270.
- Bird, S. E. (2011). Are we all produsers now? *Cultural Studies*, 25(4-5), 502–516.
- Booth, P. (2016). *Digital fandom 2.0: New media studies*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Deuze, M. (2006). Participation, remediation, bricolage: Considering principal components of a digital culture. *The Information Society*, 22(2), 63–75.
- Ekdale, B. & Tully, M. (2014). Makmende Amerudi: Kenya's collective reimagining as a meme of aspiration. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 31(1), 283–298.
- Fast, K., Örnebring, H., & Karlsson, M. (2016). Metaphors of free labor: A typology of unpaid work in the media sector. *Media, Culture & Society*, 38(7), 963-978.
- Gray, J., Sandvoss, C., & Harrington, C. L. (2007). *Fandom: Identities and communities in a mediated world*. New York: NYU Press.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York: New York Press.
- Jin, D. Y., & Yoon, K. (2016). The social mediascape of transnational Korean pop culture: *Hallyu 2.0* as spreadable media practice. *New Media & Society*, 18(7), 1277–1292.
- Milner, R. M. (2009). Working for the text: Fan labor and the New Organization. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 12(5), 491–508.
- Scholz, T. (ed.) (2013). *Digital labor: The Internet as playground and factory*. New York: Routledge.
- Shifman, L. (2014). *Memes in digital culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Van Dijck, J. (2009). Users like you? Theorizing agency in user-generated content. *Media, Culture & Society*, 31(1), 41–58.

Week 5 (2/11) – Affordances

Required Readings

- Gibson, J. J. (1979). *The ecological approach to visual perception*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (pp. 127–143; “The Theory of Affordances”).
- Hutchby, I. (2001). Technologies, texts and affordances. *Sociology*, 35(2), 441–456.
- Evans, S. K., Pearce, K. E., Vitak, J., Treem, J. W. (2017). Explicating affordances: A conceptual framework for understanding affordances in communication research. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 22: 35–52.
- Nagy, P., & Neff, G. (2015). Imagined affordance: Reconstructing a keyword for communication theory. *Social Media + Society*, 1(2), 1–9.
- Shaw, A. (2017). Encoding and decoding affordances: Stuart Hall and interactive media technologies. *Media, Culture & Society*, 39(4), 592–602.

Supplemental Readings

- boyd, d. (2010). Social network sites as networked publics: Affordances, dynamics, and implications. In Z. Papacharissi (ed.), *Networked self: Identity, community, and culture on social network sites*. (pp. 39–58). New York: Routledge.

- Bucher, T., & Helmond, A. (2017). The affordances of social media platforms. In J. Burgess, A. Marwick, & T. Poell (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Social Media* (pp. 53-68), Washington DC: Sage.
- Gaver, W. (1996). Affordances for interaction: The social is material for design. *Ecological Psychology*, 8(2), 111–129.
- Hartson, R. (2003). Cognitive, physical, sensory, and functional affordances in interaction design. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 22(5), 315–338.
- Norman, D. A. (2002). *The design of everyday things* (2nd edition). New York: Basic Book.
- Pearce, K. E. (2015). Democratizing kompromat: The affordances of social media for state-sponsored harassment. *Information, Communication & Society*, 18(10), 1158–1174.
- Schrock, A. R. (2015). Communicative affordances of mobile media: Portability, availability, locatability, and multimediality. *International Journal of Communication*, 9, 1229–1246.
- Treem, J. W., & Leonardi, P. M. (2013). Social media use in organizations: Exploring the affordances of visibility, editability, persistence, and association. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 36(1), 143-189.
- Wellman, B., Quan-Haase, A., Boase, J., Chen, W., Hampton, K., Díaz, I., & Miyata, K. (2003). The social affordances of the Internet for networked individualism. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 8(3).

Week 6 (2/18) – Algorithms

Required Readings

- Striphas, T. (2015). Algorithmic culture. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 18(4-5), 395–412.
- Crawford, K. (2016). Can an algorithm be agonistic? Ten scenes from life in calculated publics. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 41(1), 77–92.
- Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of Oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press. (pp. 64–109, “Searching for Black Girls”)
- Bucher, T. (2017). The algorithmic imaginary: Exploring the ordinary affects of Facebook algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(7), 30–44.
- Cotter, K. (2018). Playing the visibility game: How digital influencers and algorithms negotiate influence on Instagram. *New Media & Society*, OnlineFirst.

Supplemental Readings

- Ananny, M. (2016). Toward an ethics of algorithms: Convening, observation, probability, and timeliness. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 41(1), 93–117.
- Broussard, M. (2018). *Artificial Unintelligence: How Computers Misunderstand the World*. MIT Press.
- Bucher, T. (2018). *If...then: Algorithmic power and politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Diakopoulos, N. (2015). Algorithmic accountability: Journalistic investigation of computational power structures. *Digital Journalism*, 3(3), 398–415.

- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor.* St. Martin's Press.
- Gillespie, T. (2016). Algorithmically recognizable: Santorum's Google problem, and Google's Santorum problem. *Information, Communication & Society*. Online First.
- Hallinan, B., & Striphas, T. (2016). Recommended for you: The Netflix Prize and the production of algorithmic culture. *New Media & Society*, 18(1), 117–137.
- Introna, L. D., & Nissenbaum, H. (2000). Shaping the Web: Why the politics of search engines matters. *The Information Society*, 16(3), 169–185.
- Manovich, L. (2013). *Software takes command.* New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Kitchin, R. (2016). Thinking critically about and researching algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society*, Online First.
- Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sandvig, C., Hamilton, K., Karahalios, K., & Langbort, C. (2014). Auditing algorithms: Research methods for detecting discrimination on Internet platforms. Paper presented at the International Communication Association, Seattle, WA.

Week 7 (2/25) – Infrastructures and Platforms

Research Proposal Due

Required Readings

- Larkin, B. (2013). The politics and poetics of infrastructure. *Annual review of anthropology*, 42(1), 327–343.
- Starosielski, N. (2015). “Fixed flow: Undersea cables as media infrastructure.” In L. Parks & N. Starosielski (Eds.), *Signal traffic: Critical studies of media infrastructure*. (pp. 53-70). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Gillespie, T. (2010). The politics of ‘platforms.’ *New Media & Society*, 12(2), 347–364.
- Srnicek, N. (2017). *Platform capitalism.* Malden, MA: Polity.
- Plantin, J-C., Lagoze, C., Edwards, P.N., & Sandvig, C. (2018). Infrastructure studies meet platform studies in the age of Google and Facebook. *New Media & Society*, 20(1), 293–310.

Supplemental Readings

- Bowker, G. C., Baker, K., Millerand, F., & Ribes, D. (2009). “Toward information infrastructure studies: Ways of knowing in a networked environment.” In J. Hunsinger, L. Klastrup, & M. M. Allen (eds.), *International Handbook of Internet Research* (pp. 97–117). Springer Netherlands.
- Brock, A. (2018). Critical technocultural discourse analysis. *New Media & Society*, 20(3), 1012-1030.
- de Brujin, M., Nyamnjoh, F., & Angwafo, T. (2010). Mobile interconnections: Reinterpreting distance, relating and difference in the Cameroonian Grassfields. *The Journal of African Media Studies*, 2(3), 267–285.

- Gehl, R. W. (2014). *Reverse engineering social media: Software, culture, and political economy in new media capitalism*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Harrell, D. F. (2013). *Phantasmal media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Larkin, B. (2008). *Signal and noise: Media, infrastructure, and urban culture in Nigeria*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Lessig, L. (2006). *Code 2.0*. New York: Basic books.
- Parks, L., & Starosielski, N. (2015). *Signal traffic: Critical studies of media infrastructure*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Plantin, J-C., & Punathambeka, A. (2018). Digital media infrastructures: Pipes, platforms, and politics. *Media Culture & Society*, Online First (special issue)
- Srinivasan, R. (2017). *Whose global village? Rethinking how technology shapes our world*. New York: NYU Press.
- Starosielski, N. (2015). *The undersea network (sign, storage, transmission)*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Week 8 (3/4) – Big Data

Required Readings

- boyd, d., & Crawford, K. (2012). Critical questions for big data. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 662–679.
- Kitchin, R. (2014). Big data, new epistemologies, and paradigm shifts. *Big Data & Society*, 1(1), 1–12.
- Arora, P. (2016). The bottom of the data pyramid: Big data and the Global South. *International Journal of Communication*, 10: 1681–1699.
- Hargittai, E. (2018). Potential biases in big data. *Social Science Computer Review*, Online First.
- Kramer, A. D., Guillory, J. E., & Hancock, J. T. (2014). Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(24), 8788–8890.
- Flick, C. (2016). Informed consent and the Facebook emotional manipulation study. *Research Ethics*, 12(1), 14–28.

Supplemental Readings

- Baym, N. K. (2013). Data not seen: The uses and shortcomings of social media metrics. *First Monday*, 18(10).
- Drucker, J. (2011). Humanities approaches to graphical display. *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, 5(1).
- Hargittai, E. (2015). Is bigger always better? Potential biases of big data derived from social network sites. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 659(1), 63–76.
- Kosinski, M., Matz, S. C., Gosling, S. D., Popov, V., & Stillwell, D. (2015). Facebook as a research tool for the social sciences: Opportunities, challenges, ethical considerations, and practical guidelines. *American Psychologist*, 70(6), 543–556.

- Mahrt, M., & Scharkow, M. (2013). The value of big data in digital media research. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 57(1), 20–33.
- Markham, A. N., Tüdenberg, K., & Herman, A. (2018). Ethics as Methods: Doing Ethics in the Era of Big Data Research—Introduction. *Social Media+ Society*, 4(3) (special issue)
- Michel, J-B et al. (2010, December 15). Quantitative analysis of culture using millions of digitized books. *Science*, 331(176).
- Shah, D. V., Cappella, J. N., & Neuman, W. R. (2015). Big data, digital media, and computational social science possibilities and perils. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 659(1), 6–13.
- Zelenkauskaite, A. & Bucy, E. P. (2016). A scholarly divide: Social media, Big Data, and unattainable scholarship. *First Monday*, 21(5).

Week 9 (3/11) – Privacy and Surveillance

Tech Presentation: Twitter (Mehrnaz & Eric)

Required Readings

- Solove, D. J. (2004) *The digital person*. New York: NYU Press. (pp. 27-55; “Kafka and Orwell: Reconceptualizing Information Privacy”)
- Nissenbaum, H. (2011). A contextual approach to privacy online. *Daedalus*, 140(4), 32-48.
- Michaelsen, M. (2018). Exit and voice in a digital age: Iran’s exiled activists and the authoritarian state. *Globalizations*, 15(2), 248–264.
- Andrejevic, M., & Burdon, M. (2015). Defining the sensor society. *Television & New Media*, 16(1), 19–36.
- Valentino-DeVrise, J., Singer, N., Heller, M.H., & Krolik, A. (2018, December 10). Your apps know where you were last night, and they’re not keeping it secret. *New York Times*.

Supplemental Readings

- Andrejevic, M. (2007). *iSpy: Surveillance and power in the interactive era*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Arora, P. (2018). Decolonizing privacy studies. *Television & New Media*, Online First.
- boyd, d. (2008). Facebook’s privacy trainwreck. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 14(1), 13–20.
- Debatin, B., Lovejoy, J. P., Horn, A.-K., & Hughes, B. N. (2009). Facebook and online privacy: Attitudes, behaviors, and unintended consequences. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 15(1), 83–108.
- Fuchs, C. (2012). The political economy of privacy on Facebook. *Television & New Media*, 13(2), 139–159.
- Humphreys, L. (2011). Who’s watching whom? A study of interactive technology and surveillance. *Journal of Communication*, 61(4), 575–595.
- Marwick, A. E., & boyd, d. (2014). Networked privacy: How teenagers negotiate context
- Nissenbaum, H. (2009). *Privacy in context: Technology, policy, and the integrity of social life*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Rudder, C. (2014). *Dataclysm: Who we are (when we think no one's looking)*. New York: Random House Incorporated.
- Solove, D. J. (2007). *The future of reputation: Gossip, rumor, and privacy on the Internet*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Tufekci, Z. (2014). Engineering the public: Big data, surveillance and computational politics. *First Monday*, 19(7).
- Zimmer, M. (2010). “But the data is already public”: On the ethics of research in Facebook. *Ethics and information technology*, 12(4), 313–325.
- Zittrain, J. (2008). *The future of the Internet and how to stop it*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

SPRING BREAK

Week 10 (3/25) – Digital Work

Tech Presentation: Instagram (Katy & DJ)

Required Readings

- Neff, G. (2012). *Venture labor: Work and the burden of risk in innovative industries*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (pp. 39–68, “The Origins and Rise of Venture Labor”)
- Marwick, A. (2013). *Status update: Celebrity, publicity, & branding in the social media age*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (pp. 163-204, “Self Branding: The (Safe for Work) Self”)
- Duffy, B.E. (2017). (Not) getting paid to do what you love: Gender, social media, and aspirational work. New Haven: Yale University Press. (pp. 45-97, “(Not) Just for the Fun of It: The Labor of Social Media Production”)
- Graham, M., Hjorth, I., & Lehdonvirta, V. (2017). Digital labor and development: Impacts of global digital labor platforms and the gig economy on worker livelihoods. *Trasnferi*, 23(2), 135–162.
- Chayka, K. (2018, February 8). When you’re a “digital nomad,” the world is your office. *New York Times*.

Supplemental Readings

- Abidin, C., & Brown, M. L. (2018). *Microcelebrity Around the Globe: Approaches to cultures of internet fame*. Emerald Publishing.
- Abidin, C. (2018). *Internet celebrity: Understanding fame online*. Emerald Publishing.
- Casilli, A. A. (2017). Digital labor studies go global: Toward a digital decolonial turn. *International Journal of Communication*, 11: 3934–3954.
- Cohen, N. S. (2012). Cultural work as a site of struggle: Freelancers and exploitation. *TripleC*, 10(2), 141–155.
- Fuchs, C. (2014). *Digital labour and Karl Marx*. New York: Routledge.
- Gillespie, T. (2018). *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Graham, M., Lehdonvirta, V., Wood, A., Barnard, H., Hjorth, I., & Simon, D. P. (2017). *The risks and rewards of online gig work at the global margins*. Oxford: Oxford Internet Institute.
- Rosenblat, A. (2018). *Uberland: How algorithms are rewriting the rules of work*. Oakland, CA: California University Press.
- Rosenblat, A., & Stark, L. (2016). Algorithmic labor and information asymmetries: A case study of Uber's drivers. *International Journal of Communication*, 10: 3758–3784.
- Scholz, T. (2017). *Uberworked and underpaid. How workers are disrupting the digital economy*. Malden, MA: Polity.

Week 11 (4/1) – Media Industries

Tech Presentation: YouTube (Victoria & Laurel)

Required Readings

- Deuze, M. (2007). *Media work*. Malden, MA: Polity. (pp. 1–47, “Liquid Life, Work, and Media”)
- Herbert, D., Lotz, A. D., & Marshall, L. (2018). Approaching media industries comparatively: A case study of streaming. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, Online First.
- Lopez, L. K. (2017). Always on the phone: The invisible role of Hmong women in diasporic media industries. *Communication, Culture and Critique*, 10(2), 185–202.
- Mohan, S., & Punathambekar, A. (2018). Localizing YouTube: Language, cultural regions, and digital platforms. *International Journal of Culture Studies*. Online First.
- Adalian, J. (2018, June 11). Inside the binge factory. *Vulture*.

Supplemental Readings

- Banks, M. J., Conor, B., & Mayer, M. (2016). *Production studies, the sequel! Cultural studies of global media industries*. New York: Routledge.
- Caldwell, J. T. (2008). *Production culture: Industrial reflexivity and critical practice in film and television*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Chadwick, A. (2017). *The hybrid media system: Politics and power*. Oxford University Press.
- Chen, A. (2014, October). The laborers who keep dick pics and beheadings out of your Facebook feed, *Wired*. <http://www.wired.com/2014/10/content-moderation/>
- Curtin, M., & Swanson, K. (2016). *Precarious creativity: Global media, local labor*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Downey, G. D. (2014). Making media work: Time, space, identity, and labor in the analysis of information and communication infrastructures. In T. Gillespie, P. J. Boczkowski, & K. A. Foot (eds.), *Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society*. (pp. 141-166). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ekdale, B. (2018). Global frictions and the production of locality in Kenya's music video industry. *Media, Culture & Society*, 40(2), 211-227.
- Gray, J. (2010). *Show sold separately: Promos, spoilers, and other media paratexts*. New York: New York University Press.

- Gregg, M. (2015). Inside the data spectacle. *Television & New Media*, 16(1), 37-51.
- Hamilton, J. F. (2014). Historical forms of user production. *Media, Culture & Society*, 36(4), 491–507.
- Mayer, V., Banks, M. J., & Caldwell, J. T. (2009). *Production studies: Cultural studies of media industries*. New York: Routledge.
- Mayer, V. (2011). *Below the line: Producers and production studies in the new television economy*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- McRobbie, A. (2016). *Be creative*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Week 12 (4/8) – Journalism

Tech Presentation: Facebook (Mir & Nick)

Required Readings

- Lewis, S. C. (2012). The tension between professional control and open participation: Journalism and its boundaries. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(6), 836–866.
- Thorson, K., & Wells, C. (2015). Curated flows: A framework for mapping media exposure in the digital age. *Communication Theory*, 26, 309–328.
- Bunce, M. (2017). Management and resistance in the digital newsroom. *Journalism*, Online First.
- Zamith, R. (2018). Quantified audiences in news production. *Digital Journalism*, 6(4), 418–435.
- Bauerlein, M., & Jeffery, C. (2018, December 4). It's the end of news as we know it (and Facebook is feeling fine). *Mother Jones*.

Supplemental Readings

- Ananny, M., & Crawford, K. (2015). A liminal press: Situating news app designers within a field of networked news production. *Digital Journalism*, 3(2), 192–208.
- Anderson, C. W. (2013). Towards a sociology of computational and algorithmic journalism. *New Media & Society*, 15(7), 1005–1021.
- Belair-Gagnon, V. (2018). News on the fly: Journalist-audience online engagement success as a cultural matching process. *Media, Culture & Society*, Online First.
- Carlson, M. (2015). The robotic reporter: Automated journalism and the redefinition of labor, compositional forms, and journalistic authority. *Digital Journalism*, 3(3), 416–431.
- Coddington, M. (2014). Clarifying journalism's quantitative turn: A typology for evaluating data journalism, computational journalism, and computer-assisted reporting. *Digital Journalism*, 3(3), 331–348.
- Edgerly, S. (2017). Making sense and drawing lines: Young adults and the mixing of news and entertainment. *Journalism Studies*, 18(8), 1052-1069.
- Mellado, C., Moreira, S. V., Lagos, C., & Hernández, M. E. (2012). Comparing journalism cultures in Latin America: the case of Chile, Brazil and Mexico. *International Communication Gazette*, 74(1), 60-77.
- Ryfe, D. M. (2013). *Can journalism survive? An inside look at American newsrooms*. Malden, MA: Polity.

- Hermida, A. (2014). *Tell everyone: Why we share and why it matters*. Doubleday Canada.
- Lewis, S. C. & Westlund, O. (2015). Actors, actants, audiences, and activities in cross-media news work, *Digital Journalism*, 3(1), 19–37.
- Robinson, S. (2011) Journalism as process: The labor implications of participatory content in news organization, *Journalism & Communication Monographs*, 3(13), 137–210.
- Singer, J. B. (2005). The political j-blogger: “Normalizing” a new media form to fit old norms and practices. *Journalism*, 6(2), 173–198.
- Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D. (2013). *Mediating the message in the 21st century: A media sociology perspective*. Routledge.
- Usher, N. (2014). *Making news at the New York Times*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Week 13 (4/15) – News & Information

Tech Presentation: Video Games (Brandon & Abby)

Required Readings

- Carlson, M. (2018). The information politics of journalism in a post-truth age. *Journalism Studies*, 19(13), 1879-1888.
- Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380), 1146-1151.
- Govil, N., & Baishya, A. K. (2018). The bully in the pulpit: Autocracy, digital social media, and right-wing populist technoculture. *Communication Culture & Critique*, 11(1), 67-84.
- Phillips, W. (2018). The oxygen of amplification: Better practices for reporting on extremists, antagonists, and manipulators online. (“Executive Summary” and “Part 1: In Their Own Words”)
- Dickerson, C. (2017, September 26). How fake news turned a small town upside down. *New York Times*.

Supplemental Readings

- Boczkowski, P. J., & Papacharissi, Z. (Eds.). (2018). *Trump and the Media*. MIT Press.
- Jung, J., Song, H., Kim, Y., Im, H., & Oh, S. (2018). Intrusion of software robots into journalism: The public’s and journalists’ perceptions of newswriting by algorithms and human journalists. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 71: 291–298.
- King, G., Pan, J., & Roberts, M. E. (2017). How the Chinese government fabricates social media posts for strategic distraction, not engaged argument. *American Political Science Review*, 111(3), 484-501.
- Muirhead, R., & Rosenblum, N. (2018). The new conspiracists. *Dissent*, 65(1), 51–60.
- Thorson, E. (2016). Belief echoes: The persistent effects of corrected misinformation. *Political Communication*, 33(3), 460-480.
- Tully, M., Vraga, E. K., & Smithson, A. B. (2018). News media literacy, perceptions of bias, and interpretation of news. *Journalism*, Online First.

- Waisbord, S. (2018). Truth is What Happens to News: On journalism, fake news, and post-truth. *Journalism studies*, 19(13), 1866-1878.

Week 14 (4/22) – Research Project Work

Possible presentation from Human Subjects Board about IRB protocols

Individual meetings with Brian to discuss student research projects

Week 15 (4/29) – Research Presentations

Student Research Project Presentations

Finals Week

Research project due during assigned final exam period (day/time TBA)

COURSE POLICIES

Academic Misconduct: Plagiarism and academic misconduct occurs when a student presents ideas and/or words that are not her own. It is academic fraud. Clear evidence of academic misconduct will result in a failing grade for the assignment and possibly the course. Per college policy, I am required to report academic misconduct to the departmental DEO.

According to the University of Iowa Academic Policies, academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to:

- Presenting ideas from sources that you do not credit
- Using direct quotations without quotation marks and/or without credit to the source
- Paraphrasing information and ideas from sources without credit to the source
- Failing to provide adequate citations for material obtained through electronic research
- Downloading and submitting work from electronic databases without citation
- Submitting material written by the student for a previous course at this or any other institution
- Submitting material written by someone else as one's own, including purchased papers

Students are responsible for understanding this policy. If you have questions, please ask for clarification.

Administrative Home: The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is the administrative home of this course and governs matters such as the add/drop deadlines, the second-grade-only option, and other related issues. Different colleges may have different policies. Questions may be addressed to

120 Schaeffer Hall, or see the CLAS Academic Policies Handbook at <http://clas.uiowa.edu/students/handbook>.

Electronic Communication: University policy specifies that students are responsible for all official correspondences sent to their University of Iowa e-mail address (@uiowa.edu). Faculty and students should use this account for correspondences ([Operations Manual, III.15.2](#), k.11).

Accommodations for Disabilities: A student seeking academic accommodations should first register with Student Disability Services and then meet privately with the course instructor to make particular arrangements. See www.uiowa.edu/~sds/ for more information.

CLAS Final Examination Policies: The final examination schedule for each class is announced by the Registrar generally by the fifth week of classes. Final exams are offered only during the official final examination period. **No exams of any kind are allowed during the last week of classes.** All students should plan on being at the UI through the final examination period. Once the Registrar has announced the date, time, and location of each final exam, the complete schedule will be published on the Registrar's web site and will be shared with instructors and students. It is the student's responsibility to know the date, time, and place of a final exam.

Making a Suggestion or a Complaint: Students with a suggestion or complaint should first visit with the instructor (and the course supervisor), and then with the departmental DEO. Complaints must be made within six months of the incident (CLAS [Academic Policies Handbook](#)).

Understanding Sexual Harassment: Sexual harassment subverts the mission of the University and threatens the well-being of students, faculty, and staff. All members of the UI community have a responsibility to uphold this mission and to contribute to a safe environment that enhances learning. Incidents of sexual harassment should be reported immediately. See the UI [Comprehensive Guide on Sexual Harassment](#) for assistance, definitions, and the full University policy.

Reacting Safely to Severe Weather: In severe weather, class members should seek appropriate shelter immediately, leaving the classroom if necessary. The class will continue if possible when the event is over. For more information on Hawk Alert and the siren warning system, visit the [Department of Public Safety website](#).