

University of Michigan School of Information
2019 SI 410 (AMCULT 410) Ethics and Information Technology

SUMMARY SYLLABUS

Credits: 4

Instructor:

Paul Conway, Associate Professor of Information (001)

Graduate Student Instructors

Elizabeth Whittaker, School of Information (002, 003)

Drew Asselin, School of Information (004)

Time/Locations:

Lecture (001):	T/Th 8:30 am to 9:50 am;	2255 North Quad
Discussion (002):	We 5:30 pm to 6:30 pm;	2245 North Quad
Discussion (003):	We 6:30 pm to 7:30 pm;	2245 North Quad
Discussion (004):	Th 5:30 pm to 6:30 pm;	2185 North Quad

Instructor Office Hours (4442 North Quad):

We 1:00 pm to 2:30 pm, Th 10:30 am to 11:30 am, or by appointment

GSI Office Hours:

Whittaker:	Tues, 10:30 am to 12:30 pm	3347 North Quad
Asselin:	Wed, 1:00 to 3:00 pm	1286 North Quad

Course Overview: *Ethics and Information Technology* concerns the ethical dilemmas that exist where human beings, information objects, and social computing technologies interact. The course satisfies the LSA Upper Level Writing Requirement, so significant individual and group writing assignments reinforce learning through collaborative editing, technical documentation, and blogging on the meaning and usefulness of concepts of the philosophy of information. The course explores an emerging model of information ethics from historical and cross-cultural perspectives and then applies this model to a variety of new and emerging technologies that are inherently social in their construction and use. Examples of issues that the course covers include bias in social media interaction; remembering and forgetting; privacy and surveillance; and cheating in online gaming. Students explore the technological underpinnings of associated technology systems, experiment with individual and group interaction with technologies, and examine the mechanics of ethical and unethical behaviors.

Learning outcomes (see separate matrix on levels of learning)

1. Demonstrate competency in constructing and revising written arguments on a variety of ethical norms relating to new technologies.
2. Demonstrate literacy of current models of information ethics through blog posts and collaboratively written wiki articles.
3. Demonstrate literacy in applying ethical theories to interpret personal and group behavior.
4. Demonstrate competency in evaluating choices made by self and others when serving in the roles of writer and editor roles that expose personal, social, or multicultural differences.

Instructional objective

5. Promote competency in intense engagement in course learning activities via in-class and collaborative editing and feedback that encourage multimodal expressions.

Grading Overview: See separate documents for details on assignments and expectations.

- Overall participation in lecture and discussions (Individual) 15%
- Blog/comment on philosophy and IT (Individual + Collaboration) 20%
- Create/reflect statement on online data identity (Individual + Peer Review) 10% + 10%
- Create/revise MediaWiki content (Collaboration) 15% + 30%

Attendance at all lecture sessions is very important and factors significantly into the final grade. Blogging is graded individually on initial post and on commentary and re-posts. The statement on online identity management evaluated by peers and graded individually after revisions. MediaWiki contributions are evaluated collaboratively and assessed quantitatively and qualitatively, based on revisions of individual and group contributions.

Collaborative Writing Tools

Blogger: <http://si410.blogspot.com/> [open and indexed]

SI 410 MediaWiki:

http://si410wiki.sites.uofmhosting.net/index.php/Main_Page [restricted, enrolled students]

WikiHistoryVis: <http://wikihistoryvis.herokuapp.com/> [on the fly data presentation, via API]

Required Reading (Canvas): The domain where ethics and technology intersect is rich with thoughtful writing from a variety of disciplines. One purpose of the course is to sample some of this literature. Required readings come from widely diverse sources, some of which are popularly accessible and some of which are academic in origin. Many readings are drawn from the primary research journal in the field, *Ethics and Information Technology*, from a published compilation of articles by some of the best philosophers and technologists working in the area (Kenneth Einar Himma and Herman T. Tavani (eds.). *The Handbook of Information and Computer Ethics*. New York: Wiley, 2008), from a compendium of original articles (*The Cambridge Handbook of Information and Computer Ethics*. Edited by Luciano Floridi. Cambridge University Press, 2010), and from a book by Luciano Floridi written for the general public (*The Fourth Revolution*, 2014).

Academic Integrity: All students in this course will be held to high standards of scholarship and integrity. Personal responsibility and integrity are assumed, and all forms of academic dishonesty and misconduct are prohibited. Academic dishonesty may be understood as any action or attempted action that may result in creating an unfair academic advantage for you or an unfair academic advantage or disadvantage for any other member or members of the class. The instructor will not tolerate any conduct, without regard to motive, that violates the academic integrity and ethical standards of the University community. Issues of academic integrity will be handled according to the policies established by LSA. <http://www.lsa.umich.edu/academicintegrity/procedures/index.html>

Students with Disabilities: If you need an accommodation for any reason, please let me know at your earliest convenience. Some aspects of this course, the assignments, the in-class activities, and the way we teach may be modified to facilitate your participation and progress. As soon as you make me aware of your needs, we can work with the Office of Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) to help us determine appropriate accommodations. SSD (734-763-3000) typically recommends accommodations through a Verified Individualized Services and Accommodations (VISA) form. I will treat any information you provide as private and confidential. For additional information on services and support, visit UM Services for Students with Disabilities at: <http://www.umich.edu/sswd/>.

Classroom Technology Etiquette: Students are encouraged to bring notebook computers to class and to use them actively as learning tools. Students should:

- ... *use* laptops for taking notes, conducting research required for activities, and other specific classroom tasks as assigned by the instructor. During class, do not check e-mail, chat, IM, play games, or perform other off-task activities. The instructor's test of inappropriate use is untimely laughter, snickering, and other indicators of gossip.
- ... *tweet*, if you think any 140/280 characters are worth sharing with your followers or the world in general and you can protect the privacy and anonymity of fellow class members.
- ... *engage* in class activity as actively as you would in any other class. The computer should not become a barrier to interaction and engagement, but instead should help facilitate the exchange of ideas and engagement in classroom contact. If you know you are not good at multi-tasking, minimize the use of your notebook in class.
- ... *show* sensitivity to others. You should not display screen images and multimedia content that might be distracting or offensive to other members of the class, including wallpapers, screen savers, or random browsed content. Students who do not wish to be distracted by active laptop use are welcome to sit during lectures in one of two "technology-free" areas of the classroom.

Goals of Upper Level Writing Requirement (ULWR)

- build on skills and strategies developed in first-year writing courses;
- produce complex, **analytical evidence-based arguments** that address specific audiences;
- **refine their ability to write effectively** both within and beyond specific disciplines;
- use feedback to improve their writing through **revision**;
- demonstrate familiarity with the **genres and conventions** characteristic of effective writing.

Scope of writing assignments in ULWR courses:

- require a substantial amount of **polished writing**, usually between 25 and 40 pages (7500-12,000 words) over the course of the semester (or the equivalent in digital media projects), though this may vary among disciplines;
- take a variety of forms typical of academic and professional writing in particular fields, including projects that incorporate **collaboration, digital media**, or other relevant genres;
- **integrate writing with course content**;
- are **sequenced** throughout the semester to facilitate the development of ideas and concepts;
- provide **clear and explicit guidelines** to help prepare students for challenging rhetorical tasks;
- include a clear indication of when and how **writing-related instruction** will take place during lecture and/or discussion;
- provide at least **three structured opportunities** for students to receive feedback on their writing-in-progress, and requiring substantial revision of at least 50% of their writing.

Office Hours: I encourage you to take advantage of at least one office hour session during the course. I am available and willing to provide advice on all aspects of the course, including course readings, writing assignments, laboratory exercises, grading and assessment generally, as well as the topical substance of the course itself.

Course Evaluation: Your end-of-term evaluation of SI 410 is useful to the instructor and to the School of Information. A link to the online evaluation form is in your Canvas dashboard. We will allow time in class for completion of the evaluation.

SI 410 2018 Learning Outcomes Matrix

	Overall Level	Blog/Commentary (Blogger) 20%				Data Identity (MediaWiki) 20%				Collaborative Wiki Writing/Editing (MediaWiki) 45%							
		Independent + Collaborative				Individual + Peer Review				Collaborative							
		Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6	Task 7	
				Create Draft	Basic Format	Peer Review	Substantive Revision	Create Content	Basic Format	Basic Editing	Advanced Formatting	Advanced Editing	Talk Discuss	WikiVis Use			
# Learning/Instruction Objective																	
1	Construct/revise arguments in three genres	C	A	L	L	C	L	L	L	C	L	L	L	C	C	A	-
2	Apply ethical models re: ICT	L	A	A	A	L	A	-	A		A	-	L	-	L	-	-
4	Evaluate role choices in social media	C	A	L	L	C	-	-	A	L	A	-	L	-	C	C	L
5	Advanced collaborative editing on shared work	C	-	-	A	-	-	-	L	L	A	-	-	L	C	C	L

Key:

A= Awareness of domain of knowledge and its larger context

L= Literacy with skills or topic and can apply skill in basic manner

C= Competency to apply skill or knowledge at an entry professional level

M= Mastery of the area of knowledge with ability to supervise, guide or teach others

2019 SI/AMCULT 410 Ethics and Information Technology

LECTURE/DISCUSSION SCHEDULE AND DEADLINES

Week 0: Course Setup & Key Ideas

10 January Course overview, background survey, ethics “test”

Week 1: Ethics after the Information Revolution

15 January Fourth Revolution

16 January Writing platforms: logins and tour of features

17 January Writing: Blogging with Purpose

Review Blog Assignment

Week 2: Truth and Ethical Norms

22 January Truth, bullshit, and ethical norms

23 January Discussion

24 January What’s new in IT ethics?

Friday **Due @ 5:00 pm**

First Blog Post

Week 3: Luciano Floridi and the Philosophy of Information

29 January Luciano Floridi’s Information Ethics

30 January Discussion: Is global IE possible

31 January Case: David Gelernter’s counter-vision

Friday **Due @ 5:00 pm**

Comments on Blog Posts

Week 4: Bias in Application Design

5 February Bias in context, code, application

6 February Discussion

7 February Workshop: MediaWiki editing

Friday **Due @ 5:00 pm**

Review Data Identity Assign

Second Blog Post

Week 5: Privacy, Informational and Otherwise

12 February Perspectives on personal privacy

13 February Discussion

14 February Case: Breaches of Privacy (Cambridge Analytica)

Friday **Due @ 5:00 pm**

Comments on Blog Post

Draft Data Identity Statement

Week 6: Anonymity and Harassment Online

19 February Anonymity Reconsidered

20 February Discussion

21 February Case: Breaches of Anonymity (Duke LaCrosse)

Friday **Due @ 5:00 pm**

Peer Review of Statement

Choose MediaWiki Topic

Blog Post Revision

Week 7: Surveillance and Voyeurism

26 February Surveillance and Voyeurism (Gay Talese)

27 February Discussion

28 February Open Discussion on Personal Ethics

Friday **Due @ 5:00 pm**

Review MediaWiki Assignment

Revise Data Identity Statement

WINTER BREAK (March 4 to 8) – Find Spring. Bring to Ann Arbor.

Week 8: Wikipedia Trust

12 March Wikipedia and Authority Management
 13 March Discussion
 14 March Writing: Advanced MediaWiki Mechanics
 Friday **Due @ 5:00 pm**

Full MediaWiki Article**Week 9: Algorithms and Bots**

19 March Algorithmic Transparency
 20 March Discussion
 21 March Case: Wikipedia Bots [guest lecture]
 Friday **Due @ 5:00 pm**

MediaWiki Collaboration**Week 10: Social Bias and Social Media**

26 March Gender, Race, Age and Endless Variation on Bias
 27 March Discussion [writing revision strategy]
 28 March Continuing Consideration Bias
 Friday **Due @ 5:00 pm**

Substantive Revision**Week 11: Censorship and Global Information**

2 April Censorship from Personal to Global
 3 April Discussion
 4 April Case: TBD
 Friday **Due @ 5:00 pm**

MediaWiki Collaboration**Week 12: Online Property and Theft**

9 April Intellectual Property: Ideas and Ownership
 10 April Discussion
 11 April Case: Plagiarism
 Friday **Due @ 5:00 pm**

MediaWiki Collaboration**Week 13: Honesty and Cheating in the Digital Environment**

16 April Multiple Perspectives on Cheating
 17 April Discussion
 18 April Advanced MediaWiki Style + self-assessment
 Friday **Due @ 5:00 pm**

MediaWiki Collaboration**Week 14: Wrap up and Unsolicited Advice**

23 April Ethics in the Post-Truth Age + course evaluation

 28 April **[Sunday] Due @ 5:00 pm**

Final MediaWiki Edits

University of Michigan School of Information

2019 SI/AMCULT 410 Ethics and Information Technology *Reading and Discussion Guide*

Week 0: Course Setup and Key Ideas

The first class meeting establishes the key themes of the course, reviews the assignments and reading/writing expectations, and includes an “ethics test” and a round robin discussion of social media.

Required Reading:

- Floridi, Luciano. 2014. “Self-Understanding: The Four Revolutions,” in Floridi, *The Fourth Revolution*. [16 pages]
- In class: video: “The Fourth Revolution.” [1:54]
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W06fWz1mWNg&t=26s>
- Optional: Luciano Floridi: “The Fourth Technological Revolution.” TEDxMaastricht [8:50]
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c-kJsyU8tgi&t=84s> [CC]

Week 1: Ethics after the Information Revolution

Required Readings:

- Floridi, Luciano. 2010. *Cambridge Handbook*, Chapter 1, “Ethics after the Information Revolution.” [16 pages]
- Moor, James. H. 2005. “Why We Need Better Ethics for Emerging Technologies,” *Ethics and Information Technology* 7:111-119. [8 pages]
- Hill, Doug. 2014. “The Eccentric Genius Whose Time May Have Finally Come (Again).” *The Atlantic*, June 11, 2014. [8 pages]
- In class: video: Greg Adamson – “Norbert Wiener Conference in 2014” [7:25]
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PFFg1ihv-Oo> [CC]

Optional Depth:

- Brey, Philip A. E. 2012. “Anticipating Ethical Issues in Emerging IT.” *Ethics and Information Technology* 2012 [13 Pages].
- Bynum, Terrell Ward. 2010. *Cambridge Handbook*, Chapter 2. “The historical roots of information and computer ethics.” [18 pages]
- *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine* 34 (3) 2015: 33-71. Special Section on Norbert Wiener and the 21st Century. [not in Canvas] <https://ieeexplore-ieee-org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/xpl/tocresult.jsp?isnumber=7270418&punumber=44>

What to look for: Floridi’s chapter is a general introduction to the field of computer and information ethics. Hill revisits the relevance of Norbert Wiener and cybernetics. Moor defines emerging technologies rather broadly and then makes a bold claim about why better ethics are needed now. Read this article for the heart of his argument, rather than for his definitions.

Discussion questions:

1. What, if anything, is the difference between computer ethics and information ethics?
2. Is computer ethics a new field of study or an ancient area of scholarship faced with new challenges?
3. Why is there a “policy gap” between technology and ethical norms? What to do?

Thursday Session: Blogging with purpose. Tips on how to write compelling blog posts and the mechanics of effective commentary. These issues are essential to the completion of the first writing assignment.

Week 2: Truth and Ethical Norms

Required Readings:

- Saslow, Eli. 2018. "How Lies Become Truth in Online America." *The Washington Post*, November 17, 2018. [7 pages]
- Vallor, Shannon. 2010. "Social Networking Technology and the Virtues." *Ethics and Information Technology* 12: 157-170. [14 pages]
- Frankfurt, Harry. 2009. "On Truth, Lies, and Bullshit." In *The Philosophy of Deception*, ed. Clancy W. Martin. Oxford University Press, pp. 37-48. [11 pages]
- In class: video: Bullshit! Featuring Harry Frankfurt. [5:50] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D9Y-1Jcov4> [CC]

Optional Depth:

- Arendt, Hannah. 1967. "Truth and Politics." *The New Yorker*, February 25, 1967. [19 pages]
- DePaulo, Bella. 2004. "The Many Faces of Lies" (chapter 12) [28 pages]
- Frankfurt, Harry. 1986 "On Bullshit." *Raritan* 6 (2): 81-96. [16 pages]
- Olsson, Erik. 2008. "Knowledge, Truth and Bullshit" [commentary on Frankfurt] [17 pages]
- Tavani, Herman T., 2002. "The Uniqueness Debate in Computer Ethics: What Exactly Is at Issue, and Why Does It Matter?" *Ethics and Information Technology* 4 (1): 37-54. [18 pages]
- Van den Hoven, Jeroen. 2010. *Cambridge Handbook*, Chapter 4, "The use of normative theories in computer ethics." [18 pages]

What to look for: Frankfurt's summary chapter and the optional classic article from 1986 lay out the notion of objective truth and the problems of its two alternatives (lies and bullshit). Saslow demonstrates how this plays out in social media. Vallor provides an ethical framework that emphasizes values, which of course may vary across people, space, and time.

Discussion questions:

1. How are value systems relevant to the types of social technologies that you use every day?
2. What are some of the factors in the design of morally sound technology systems?
3. Is there anything special about new technologies that challenges our ethical foundations? Why?

Thursday Session: A round-robin conversation on applying Information Ethics to real-world situations. The basic question is "does ICT create new ethical dilemmas?"

Week 3: Luciano Floridi and the Philosophy of Information

Required Reading:

- Floridi, Luciano. 2010. *Cambridge Handbook*, Chapter 5, "Information ethics" [23 pages]
- Floridi, Luciano. 2014. "Space: Infosphere," in Floridi, *The Fourth Revolution*. [34 pages]
- Gelernter, David. 1999. "The Second Coming: A Manifesto." *The Edge* 12/31/1999. [8 pages] <https://www.edge.org/conversation/the-second-coming-a-manifesto>
- In class: video: Luciano Floridi. "How Intelligent is Artificial Intelligence." [6:08] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hcoa7OMAmRk&t=25s>

Optional Depth:

- Optional video: Luciano Floridi Turing Lecture on information ethics.
<https://www.oii.ox.ac.uk/videos/turing-lecture-ethics-in-the-age-of-information/> [from minute 33:00 to 55:00] [CC]
- Adam, Alison. 2008. "Ethics for Things." *Ethics and Information Technology* 10: 149-154. [6 pages] A strong argument for accepting the agency of non-humans in our moral and social networks.
- Floridi, Luciano and Sanders, J.W. 2004. "On the Morality of Artificial Agents," *Mind and Machine* 14: 349-379. [30 pages]
- Grodzinsky, Frances, et al. 2008. "The Ethics of Designing Artificial Agents." *Ethics and information Technology* 10 (2-3): 115-121. [7 pages]
- Winner, Langdon. 1980. "Do Artifacts Have Politics?" *Daedalus* 109 (1): 121-136. [16 pages]

What to look for: Floridi's concepts are the philosophical foundation of the course. Read his chapter in the *Cambridge Handbook* for the key concepts. Another chapter from *The Fourth Revolution* connects the idea of the Infosphere to environmentalism. Floridi bases his assertions, in part, on the concepts of objects, properties, and relationships that underpin object oriented programming and discrete math. The optional depth articles provides greater context (conceptual and historical) on the agency of things, as well as a deep critique of Floridi's ideas.

Discussion questions:

1. Why do you think that Floridi might be at the center of an important philosophical movement?
2. How is that relevant to the course?
3. Do information objects have ethical properties?

Thursday Session: Gelernter is a brilliant computer scientist whose counter-vision for technology design may or may not be contrary to Floridi's notion of the Infosphere. Much food for thought in a piece written 18 years ago. The optional Godzinsky article is also a reasoned "attack" on Floridi's key concept of artificial agency.

Week 4: Bias in Application Design

Required Readings:

- Brey, Philip. 2010. *Cambridge Handbook*, Chapter 3, "Values in technology and disclosive computer ethics." [17 pages]
- Friedman, Batya, Peter Kahn, and Alan Borning. 2008. "Value Sensitive Design and Information Systems. In *Handbook of Information and Computer Ethics*, Himma and Tavani, pp. 59-101. [36 pages]
- Turilli, Matteo and Luciano Floridi. 2009. "The ethics of information transparency." *Ethics and Information Technology* 11 (2): 105-112. [8 pages]

Optional Depth:

- Eglash, Ron and Julian Bleecker. 2001. "The Race for Cyberspace: Information Technology in the Black Diaspora." In *Science as Culture*, 10 (3): 353-374. [9 pages]

What to look for: Turilli/Floridi and Brey both approach the issue of bias in terms of transparency and disclosure. Look for Brey's three-part typology of bias and the different ways that Turilli and Floridi define transparency. Friedman is a long-standing proponent of methods for detecting value-based bias in ways that can improve design.

Discussion questions:

1. What roles do application designers play in engineering bias?
2. What are some methods for detecting and addressing bias in design?

Thursday Session: The focus is on forms of autobiography, which will inform your writing for the second assignment.

Week 5: Privacy, Informational and Otherwise

Required Readings:

- Floridi, Luciano. 2014. "Privacy: Informational Friction," in Floridi, *The Fourth Revolution*. [28 pages]
- Haimson, Oliver L. and Anna Lauren Hoffmann. 2016. "Constructing and enforcing 'authentic' identity online: Facebook, real names, and non-normative identities." *First Monday* 21 (June). [15 pages].
- Benkler, Yochai. 2018. "Mammon's Algorithm: Marketing, Manipulation, and Clickbait on Facebook." (Ch. 9). *Network Propaganda: Manipulation, Disinformation, and Radicalization in American Politics*. Oxford University Press, pp. 296-288. [20 pages]
- In class: video: "Luciano Floridi: Privacy and Power in the Digital Age"
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3zdRskstzO0>

Optional Depth:

- Romm, Tony, et al. 2018. "D.C. Attorney General Sues Facebook." *Washington Post*, December 19, 2018. [3 pages]
- Shoemaker, David W. 2010. "Self-exposure and exposure of the self: information privacy and the presentation of identify," *Ethics and Information Technology* 12: 3-15. [13 pages]
- Mooradian, Norman. 2009. "The importance of privacy revisited." *Ethics and Information Technology* 11:163-174. [12 pages]
- Cocking, Dean. 2008. "Plural Selves and Relational Identity: Intimacy and Privacy Online," in *Information Technology and Moral Philosophy*, edited by Jeroen Van Den Hoven and John Weckert. Cambridge University Press, pp. 123-41. [19 pages]

What to look for: Personal privacy may be one of the most complex ethical issues facing us today. Floridi frames the issue in terms of frictions. A large question arises about the extent to which our online identities are extensions or projections of the self in which control resides in front of the screen.

Discussion questions:

1. In what ways is privacy a feature (or a bug) of the system?
2. Does privacy matter only if you care about the cost-benefit tradeoff of the social media applications?

Thursday Session: The session is a case study on Cambridge Analytica as an example of breach of privacy. There will be a lot to discuss regarding Facebook and data privacy in general.

Week 6: Anonymity and Harassment Online

Required Readings:

- Wallace, Kathleen A. 2018. "Online Anonymity," in *Himma and Tavani*, pp. 165-190. [25 pages]
- Acquisti, Alessandro, et al. 2014. "Face Recognition and Privacy in the Age of Augmented Reality." *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality* 6 (2): 1-20. [20 pages]
- Massanari, Adrienne. 2015. "#Gamergate and The Fapping: How Reddit's algorithm, governance, and culture support toxic technocultures." *New Media & Society* 19 (3): 229-46. [17 pages]
- Johansson, Marcus, 2009. "Why unreal punishments in response to unreal crimes might actually be a really good thing," *Ethics and Information Technology* 11 (1): 71-79. [9 pages]
- In class: video: "Alessandro Acquisti. What will a future without secrets look like?" [14:57]
http://www.ted.com/talks/alessandro_acquisti_why_privacy_matters

Optional Depth:

- Brennan, Geoffrey and Pettit, Philip. 2008. "Esteem, Identifiability, and the Internet," in *Information Technology and Moral Philosophy*, edited by Jeroen Van Den Hoven and John Weckert. Cambridge University Press, pp. 175-94. [20 pages]
- Powers, Thomas. 2003. "Real wrongs in virtual communities," *Ethics and Information Technology* 5: 191-198. [8 pages]
- Stroud, Scott R. 2014. "The Dark Side of the Online Self: A Pragmatist Critique of the Growing Plague of Revenge Porn." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 29: 168-183. [16 pages]

What to look for: Wallace provides an important definition of the loss of anonymity. The other readings provide case studies on the impact on personal security and identity due to the loss of anonymity in the online environment, including through unauthorized face recognition and harassment of various sorts. The case study on Thursday builds on this idea. Johansson speculates on the viability of genuine punishment of real wrongs in online environments.

Discussion questions:

1. What is the difference between anonymity and identifiability?
2. What are the personal advantages and disadvantages of anonymity in the online environment?
3. Does online anonymity threatened or empowered you? Both?

Thursday session: We will present and discuss a case study on the breach of anonymity [trigger warning] and the technologies of personal data aggregation.

Week 7: Surveillance and Voyeurism

This week builds on the previous two weeks and juxtaposes surveillance with voyeurism in an effort to find the ethical boundaries of collecting and using personal information.

Required Readings:

- Talese, Gay. 2016. "The Voyeur's Motel." *The New Yorker*, April 11, 2016.
- Doyle, Tony. 2009. "Privacy and perfect voyeurism," *Ethics and Information Technology* 11:181-189. [8 pages]
- Dubbeld, Lynsey. 2003. "Observing bodies. Camera surveillance and the significance of the body." *Ethics and Information Technology* 5: 151-162. [12 pages]
- Richardson, Ruth and Brian Hurwitz. 1987. "Jeremy Bentham's self-image: an exemplary bequest for dissection." *British Medical Journal* 295 (18 July): 195-198. [4 pages]

Optional Depth:

- Browne, Simone. 2016. [interview] "The Surveillance of Blackness: From the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade to Contemporary Surveillance Technologies." [7 pages]. See also the introduction to Browne's *Dark Matters: On the Surveillance of Blackness*. <https://www.scribd.com/document/283448443/Dark-Matters-by-Simone-Browne>
- Lyon, David and Zygmunt Bauman. 2011. *Liquid Surveillance: A Conversation*, London: Polity Press, chapter 6, "Probing surveillance ethically," pp. 132-141 [10 pages]
- Patton, Jason W. 2000. "Protecting privacy in public? Surveillance technologies and the value of public spaces." *Ethics and Information Technology* 2: 181-187. [7 pages]

What to look for: Journalist Gay Talese is a provocative true story of voyeurism in action. In class we will conduct thought exercises on the implications of the emergent global "surveillance culture." Doyle generalizes the relationship between privacy and voyeurism, while Dubbeld explores what surveillance is looking at. The

optional readings by Browne and Patton are particularly relevant to the discussion. The article on Jeremy Bentham's bequest extends voyeurism into the after-life. It's just a fun, weird read.

Discussion Questions:

1. What are some of the dimensions of surveillance that might pose ethical dilemmas? Is any surveillance value neutral?
2. What are the moral implications of the various forms of surveillance (past, present, future)?

Thursday session: We will continue discussion of the readings and conduct an in-class exercise on the implications of surveillance technologies on personal identity.

Week 8: Wikipedia Trust and Value

Required Readings:

- Forte, Andrea, Vanessa Larco, and Amy Bruckman. 2009. "Decentralization in Wikipedia Governance." *Journal of Management Information Systems* 26 (1): 49-72. [24 pages]
- Zittrain, Jonathan. 2008. "The Lessons of Wikipedia," in *The Future of the Internet and How to Stop It*. New Haven: Yale University Press, Chapter 6, pp. 127-48. [21 pages]

Optional Depth:

- de Laat, Paul B. 2005. "Trusting virtual trust," *Ethics and Information Technology* 7: 167-80. [14 pages]
- Priedhorsky, Reid, et al. 2007. "Creating, destroying, and restoring value in Wikipedia. *Group'07*, November 4-7, Sanibel Island, Florida. [10pages]
- Riehle, Dirk. 2006. "How and Why Wikipedia Works: An Interview with Angela Beesley, Elisabeth Bauer, and Kizu Naoko," *WikiSym '06*, August 21-23, Odense Denmark. [6 pages]
- Shi, Feng and Misha Teplitskiy. 2018. "The Wisdom of Polarized Crowds." [forthcoming in *Nature Human Behavior*] [17 pages]

What to look for: Wikipedia is a complex information ecosystem. Read for how this system functions to ensure quality (value) and limit its absence. Look for the roles played by human agents (including research scholars) and artificial agents.

Discussion Questions:

1. Why do you trust or not trust Wikipedia? Be very specific.
2. Is Wikipedia an Infosphere in the context of Floridi's definition?
3. What are some of the socio-political aspects of Wikipedia that transcend its specific content?

Thursday Session: An intermediate to advanced tutorial on the MediaWiki software tool that serves as a platform for the assignment in module 2. The lab will demonstrate the tool, provide an opportunity to practice, and explain the assignment. Students will have an opportunity to share editing tricks. The use of images and references will be reviewed.

Week 9: Algorithms and Bots

Required Readings:

- Rossiter, Ned and Soenke Zehle. 2013. "Toward a Politics of Anonymity." *Routledge Companion to Alternative Organization*, pp. 151-162. [12 pages]
- de Laat, Paul B. 2015. "The use of software tools and autonomous bots against vandalism: Eroding Wikipedia's moral order?" *Ethics and Information Technology* (Sept 2015). [14 pages]
- Geiger, R. Stuart and David Ribes. 2010. "The work of sustaining order in Wikipedia: The banning of a vandal." CSCW 2010, Feb 6-19, Savannah Georgia. [10 pages]

- Halfaker, Aaron & John Riedl. 2012. "Bots and Cyborgs: Wikipedia's Immune System." *IEEE Computer* (March 2012), pp. 79-82 [4 pages]

Optional Depth:

- Di Paoli, Stefano and Kerr, Aphra. 2012. "On crimes and punishments in virtual worlds: bots, the failure of punishment and players as moral entrepreneurs". *Ethics and Information Technology* 14: 73-87. [15 pages]
- Santana, A. and Wood, D. 2009. "Transparency and social responsibility issues for Wikipedia," *Ethics and Information Technology* 11: 133-44. [12 pages]
- Tsvetkova M, GarcõÃa-Gavilanes R, Floridi L, Yasseri T. 2017. "Even good bots fight: The case of Wikipedia." *PLoS ONE* 12(2): e0171774. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0171774

What to look for: This week is a sort of case study on the ethical challenges posed by artificial agents, centered on Wikipedia functionality. Halfaker and de Laat consider the impact of the use of bots to control the sprawling Infosphere of Wikipedia. Zittrain is a well-known public intellectual [and PBS commentator] whose focus is on the unintended societal consequences of Internet culture.

Discussion questions:

1. Can trust in information quality be reduced to statistical probability?
2. How much is trust in information tied to knowing who the author is? Consider your position in the context of other web-based information. What are the limits of transparency as an ethical principle applied to text?
3. Where is control exercised in Wikipedia? Wikipedia has many errors, some detectable and some not. What are some strategies for identifying the weaknesses in Wikipedia content?

Thursday Session: The lecture and discussion focuses on the roles that bots (snippets of code with specific functions) play in maintaining the quality of Wikipedia.

Week 10: Bias in Social Media

Required Readings:

- Eglash, Ron. 2018. "A generative perspective on engineering: Why the destructive force of artifacts is immune to politics," pp. 75-88 in Subrahmanian, Eswaran, Odumosu, Toluwalogo, Tsao, Jeffrey Y. (Eds.) *Engineering a Better Future: Interplay of Social Science, Engineering and Innovation*; New York: Springer. [4 pages]
- Lupton, Deborah. 2015. "Digital Bodies," [a preprint for a chapter in the *Routledge Handbook of Physical Cultural Studies*, edited by D. Andrews, M. Silk and H. Thorpe. London: Routledge, 2017. [12 pages]
- Noble, Safiya Umoja. 2018. "Critical Surveillance Literacy in Social Media: Interrogating Black Death and Dying Online." *Black Camera* 9 (2): 147-160. [14 pages]

Optional Depth:

- Benabou, Roland and Jean Tirole. 2016. "Mindful Economics: The Production, Consumption, and Value of Beliefs." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30 (3) Summer 2016: 141-164. [24 pages]
- Reeves, Joshua & Jeremy Packer. 2013. "Police Media: The Governance of Territory, Speed, and Communication," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 10:4, 359-384. [26 pages] An historical treatment with contemporary implications.

What to look for: The supporting articles by Deborah Lupton and Safiya Noble greatly expand the context of surveillance as one that breaches the boundary between social norms and technological affordances.

Discussion questions:

1. Is the ghost in the machine or in the system?

2. How can we overcome cultural and community norms to confront bias in social media?
3. Are you optimistic or pessimistic about social media? What is your evidence for your stance?

Thursday Session: In class discussion of the basis for social media bias. Additional case study examples presented.

Week 11: Censorship and Global Information

Required Readings:

- Mathiesen, Kay. 2008. "Censorship and Access to Expression," in *Himma and Tavani* (2008), pp. 573-588. [16 pages]
- Chen, Adrian. 2014. "The Laborers Who Keep Dick Pics and Beheadings Out of Your Facebook Feed." *Wired*, October 23, 2014. [21 pages]
- Floridi, Luciano, 2015. "Should You Have the Right to be Forgotten on Google?" *NPQ Spring* (2015). [6 pages]

Optional Depth:

- Partridge, Stephanie L. 2013. "Pornography, ethics, and video games," *Ethics and Information Technology* 15:25-34. [10 pages]

What to look for: Kay Mathiesen focuses on the impact on information ethics of three aspects of global transformations in IT: deliberative democracy; neo-colonialism; and pluralism. Read for the connections between these global issues and ethical challenges. The Internet Age has generated much writing on censorship. Mathiesen offers a definition that provides a moral basis for censorship. Read her chapter for her definition and for how she works her way toward acceptable censorship. Chen's tale shows the human toll on censors. Floridi summarizes some of the issues behind "the right to be forgotten" as it pertains to Google.

Discussion questions:

1. Is censorship possible in an Internet with few boundaries? There is no simple answer to this question when one considers events in China, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Turkey, and the European Union.

Thursday Session: Wrap up, practical implications and instructions for completing the assignments. If time permits, we will report on a re-take of the ethics test from the first week of class.

Week 12: Online Property and Theft

Required Readings:

- Snapper, John. 2008. "The Matter of Plagiarism: What, Why, and If," in *Himma and Tavani* (2008), pp. 533-552. [18 pages]
- Miller, Joseph Scott. 2009. "Hoisting Originality." *Cardozo Law Review* 31 (2): 451-495. [45 pages]

Optional Depth:

- Fisher, William, et al. "Reflections on the Hope Poster Case," *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology* 25 (2) 2012: 244-338. [96 pages]
- Melton, Gary Warren. 2014. "An examination of the bootleg record industry and its impact upon popular music consumption." *Journal of Popular Music Studies* 26 (2-3): 399-408. [10 pages]
- Scherzinger, Martin. 2014. "Musical Property: Widening or Withering?" *Journal of Popular Music Studies* 26 (1): 162-192. [31 pages]

What to look for: Snapper's article is one of the best treatments of plagiarism from an ethical perspective. It crosses the analog/digital divide quite well. Read for the three-part argument. Miller's treatment of the Obama-

Fairey poster controversy in 2008 to almost the present is a refreshing take on copyright. The optional depth readings provide more detail and additional perspectives on this important case study.

Discussion questions:

1. What is plagiarism? Think creatively. How do we find the boundaries of plagiarism in the online environment?
2. Question about open access and rights

Thursday Session: Case study and small group exercise on plagiarism.

Week 13: Honesty and Cheating in the Digital Environment

Required Readings:

- Mazar, Nina, On Amir, and Dan Ariely. 2008. "The Dishonesty of Honest People: A Theory of Self-Concept Maintenance." *Journal of Marketing Research* 45 (Dec 2008): 633-644. [12 pages]
- Vazquez, Irene Serrano and Mia Consalvo. 2015. "Cheating in Social Network Games." *New Media and Society* 17 (6): 829-844. [16 pages]
- Cohn, Alain, et al. 2018. "Honesty in the Digital Age." University of Zurich Working Paper No. 280. Pp. 1-5, 20-21. [7 pages]
- Consalvo, Mia. 2007. *Cheating: Gaining Advantage in Videogames*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
 - Chapter 4, Gaining Advantage, pp. 83-106. [24 pages]

Optional Depth:

- Consalvo, Mia. 2007. *Cheating: Gaining Advantage in Videogames*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
 - Chapter 3. Genies, Sharks, and Chips, pp. 65-82. [17 pages]
 - Chapter 5, The Cheaters, pp. 107-128. [22 pages]

What to look for: This week explores cheating in virtual environments and the ethical consequences, such as they are. For Consalvo, the issue is the single common reason that cheating takes place in online gaming, as opposed to three distinctive ways that people rationalize cheating. Read for the common reason and the specific rationalizations and make a short list for sharing.

Discussion questions:

1. Why do individuals cheat? Why do online players tolerate other's cheating behavior, or do they?
2. In the real world, trust is fragile and cheating (along with lying) are major factors in the loss of trust? How is trust compromised in the online environment? Once compromised, can trust be restored? Does it matter?

Thursday Session: If time permits, pairs of students will take the Bartle Test and compare the results. The Bartle Test is a very simple (perhaps simplistic) gaming personality test. For background, skim: Richard Bartle, *Designing virtual worlds*. (2003). Berkeley, CA: New Riders Publishing, Chapter 3, "Players," pp.125-174. We will provide instructions on taking the ungraded "test" in advance of the lab session.

Week 14: Takeaways

The final class session will feature a summary of key take away points and explicit instructions on completing the MediaWiki assignment in ways that maximizes your grade.

Required Readings:

- Toyama, Kentaro. 2015. "Geek Myths Debunked: Dispelling Misguided Beliefs about Technology," in *Geek Heresy: Rescuing Social Change from the Cult of Technology*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Floridi, Luciano. 2014. "Environment: The Digital Gambit," chapter 9 in *The 4th Revolution*, pp. 205-215.

University of Michigan School of Information

SI/AMCULT 410 Ethics and Information Technology

Blogging on Philosophy and Information Technology [20% of total grade]

Blogging well is an important writing skill, one that comes with reflection and practice. The overall goal of the assignment is to combine insightful reading with succinct and creative writing in the form of blog posts that improve in quality, partly through revision. Although there are many great examples of individual blog sites, the model we point to for inspiration is the blog platform **Medium** <https://medium.com>.

This assignment has two purposes. The first purpose is to provide a framework for reading, assessing, and interpreting the readings assigned in the first three weeks of class. These readings are part of a larger body of literature on an emerging philosophy of ethics and information technology. They are complex and sometimes dense, but provide a foundation for understanding the ideas presented in the rest of the course. The second purpose of the assignment is to express your learning from these readings in two blog posts, commentary on the blog posts of fellow students, and substantive revision of one of the two posts to demonstrate a deeper grasp of content and style.

Requirements

Blog Posts: Each student must post two (2) blog entries and one revision over a six-week period. Each blog post must cover the readings in the first module. The posts can be focused on a single reading for a given week. Alternatively, the posts may compare and contrast the readings for a given week on a single theme or idea present in two or three of the readings. Finally, blog posts may involve an assessment of one reading in a week in comparison with information or ideas that you get from other sources, including news media, movies, music, or the general information environment. The highest grades for the assignment will be given to students who demonstrate critical insight and improved writing across the assignment.

Commentary: Every student must also comment on the blogging of fellow students in the discussion section of the blogger utility. Commentary may focus on the quality and style of the blog post or on the substance of the argument/analysis presented in the post. Each student must post at least three separate comments on the blog posts other than your own. Students are allowed and encouraged to comment on comments posted to their individual blog posts. There is no limit to the number of comments that can be appended to blog posts. Students will not be rewarded for excessive commentary but will be rewarded for succinct and insightful commentary.

Word Length: One of the key skills in blogging and commentary is to say a lot with few words. Blog posts must be a minimum of 250 words in length and may not exceed 400 words in length. Any commentary appended to blog posts must be at least 25 words in length and may not exceed 100 words per comment. Over the two posts in six weeks, students are expected to improve the quality of their writing in terms of depth of analysis, succinctness, and style. At any point after the commentary period for the

second blog post, students must choose one of their two posts and make substantive improvements in the style and substance, including the use of illustrations where appropriate.

Grading the Assignment

A maximum of 20 points may be earned for this assignment. The points are awarded for the combination of blog posting, commentary, and revision.

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Deadline</i>	<i>Blog Points</i>	<i>Comment Points</i>	<i>Improvement</i>
Post 1	Week 2	2	1	
Post 2	Week 4	4	2	
Revision	Week 6	5	3	6
Total Points		11	6	6

The assignment of points for blog posting and commentary is based on the instructor’s assessment of three factors: 1) the depth of analysis of the blog posts and commentary, which reflects the careful study of the assigned readings; 2) succinctness of writing, which usually derives from careful composition and self-editing prior to posting; and 3) blog writing style, including attention to grammar, punctuation, and power of the writing to grab the reader’s attention. Six points are reserved for rewarding improvement in writing across the two blog posts and your revision. It is possible to lose some points on the two blog posts but still end up with the full total of 20 points for the assignment, if extra effort results in significant improvement in the revision.

Deadlines to Keep in Mind

Please see course schedule (posted in Canvas) for deadlines. Submission deadlines are firm. Late submissions will be penalized 20% of the total assignment grade.

#	Learning/Instruction Objective	Overall Level	Blog/Commentary (Blogger) 20% Independent + Collaborative			
			Task 1 Blog 1	Task 2 Blog 2	Task 3 Comment	Task 4 Revise
1	Construct/revise arguments in three genres	C	A	L	L	C
2	Apply ethical models re: ICT	L	A	A	A	L
4	Evaluate role choices in social media	C	A	L	L	C
5	Advanced collaborative editing on shared work	C	-	-	A	-
Key:						
A= Awareness of domain of knowledge and its larger context						
L= Literacy with skills or topic and can apply skill in basic manner						
C= Competency to apply skill or knowledge at an entry professional level						
M= Mastery of the area of knowledge with ability to supervise, guide or teach others						

University of Michigan School of Information

SI/AMCULT 410 Ethics and Information Technology

Assignment: Your Online Data Identity

[10% + 10% of total grade]

This assignment is experimental in nature. We may modify some of the specific procedural details. The purpose of this assignment is to construct an “ethical autobiography” of your online data identity, with particular emphasis on what information may be accumulated about you by data brokers and/or identity-based social media applications. The assignment explores the ethical implications of identity representation by examining the extent to which your online identity is authentic, complete, and stable.

During the course module on avatars and identity, you will complete a four-step assignment:

- 1) Attempt to discover what information about you is online and how that information may or may not be shared;
- 2) write and illustrate an autobiographical statement in the class MediaWiki;
- 3) review and comment on the statements of at least two other students in the class
- 4) revise the statement in response to feedback received from students and instructors, along with the comparison of your statement with others in the class.

You will build, share, and edit the narrative and visual aspects of your statement in the class MediaWiki tool. Additionally, each student is responsible for providing feedback to at least two fellow students about their statements.

Step 1: Search and Find Your Data Identity

- A. Search and find yourself online using Google and/or other search engines. Pay attention to what information is open as opposed to behind a paywall.
- B. Search for yourself using the data broker account for the class. If you find a report on you, download it and study it carefully. We will provide login information.
- C. Assess the specific factual details about you that are present in one or more social media applications. Assess how much of this information is available or not. Refer to appropriate data sharing policies.
- D. Depending on what you find out about your personal data, pursue one or more privacy statements from the sources of the data (if you can find them).

Step 2: Write and Illustrate a Statement on Your Data Identity

Purpose: Report your findings conceptually (not the specific data). Describe the extent to which you (embodied) and your (digital) embodiment online are accurate, authentic, and stable. In practice, your statement will state a theme and then discuss those elements of your online

identity that provide evidence for the ethical relationship between you and your data identity. The concept of “ethical relationship” goes to how tightly coupled are the values that you express through your online identity or identities.

You may get as creative as you wish (or MediaWiki allows) in thinking through and documenting how you construct and reconstruct your online data identity.

Ideas: Refer to the class PowerPoint presentation for questions that you might ask of yourself and attempt to answer in your autobiographical statement. Discuss the concept of “autobiography” in at least two discussion sections, referring to sources provided by the Instructor.

Format and style: The autobiographical statement will take the form of an illustrated essay, edited in the SI 410 MediaWiki site. You may compose your initial statement in MS Word or other text editing software and then cut and paste into MediaWiki. The reflection should not exceed 1,500 words in length (the equivalent of 6 double spaced pages of text). You may edit and revise your reflection in the MediaWiki site up to the deadline of the assignment. The writing may conform to any writing style that you choose – be creative. The narrative does not have to be written in first person. The narrative does not have to be written in present tense but may shift to reflect the temporal aspects of your Facebook identity.

Illustrations: Upload at least two illustrations to MediaWiki site and then embed the images in your essay, adding appropriate caption information. Format the illustrations in relationship to the appropriate surrounding text. The illustrations can take the form of discrete images from your social media applications, illustrations created (by you) on the fly, or another source.

Remember: to create a new page in edit mode, place the name of the page inside a pair of double brackets. Example [[Mavis Staples]]

Step 3: Comment on the Writing of Other Students

Assessment of your essay models the peer-review system used most of the articles you have read in the class: students are the reviewers, the instructor is the editor who makes the final call on publication. On a first come basis, each student will comment on the quality of the work presented two statements (other than your own) of fellow students.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Each autobiographical statement will receive a minimum of two (2) discussion comments. You may add comments to more than two statements of fellow students after you have distributed your two initial comments.

The commentary must be placed under the “Discussion” tab and entered in edit mode. Be sure to add your name. This is not an anonymous exercise. The commentary should focus on two issues:

- 1) **Seriousness of purpose:** how deeply did the author of the statement assess his or her data identity relative to the “real him or her;” assess the genuineness of the effort.
- 2) **Quality of writing:** how well-crafted is the statement in terms of style, logical flow, and grammar?

Your role as a commentator is to offer positive reinforcement where appropriate and constructive suggestions for improving the autobiographical statement.

Step 4: Revise your Statement

Based on the comments you receive and on your open comparison of the work of other students in the class, revised your statement to improve the style and substance of your contribution. In one of the class discussion period, you will have an opportunity to discuss the statements of the students in your section.

Grading: Final grades are assigned by the Graduate Student Instructors and the Instructor and submitted individually and privately through Canvas. Grading will be strongly influenced but not determined by peer commentary posted on discussion tabs. The total assignment is worth 20% of your final grade, or 20 of 100 points. The following is the rubric for assigning the 20 points:

- Up to ten (10) points for the extent to which the first draft of your autobiography statement describes and illustrates those primary and secondary elements of your online identity that relate to your theme; and that the theme itself that relates to authenticity, embodiment, and/or temporality. Refer to the class PowerPoint presentation for examples of questions to address.
- Up to ten (10) points for the quality and depth of your analysis of your final product, after revisions. online identity focused on a theme

Deadlines: See schedule

SI 410 Learning Outcomes Matrix			Online Identity (MediaWiki) 20% Individual + Peer Review			
		Overall Level	Task 1 Create Draft	Task 2 Basic Format	Task 3 Peer Review	Task 4 Substantive Revision
#	Learning/Instruction Objective					
1	Construct/revise arguments in three genres	C	L	L	L	C
2	Apply ethical models re: ICT	L	A	-	A	
4	Evaluate role choices in social media	C	-	-	A	L
5	Advanced collaborative editing on shared work	C	-	-	L	L
Key:						
A= Awareness of domain of knowledge and its larger context						
L= Literacy with skills or topic and can apply skill in basic manner						
C= Competency to apply skill or knowledge at an entry professional level						
M= Mastery of the area of knowledge with ability to supervise, guide or teach others						

University of Michigan School of Information

SI/AMCULT 410 Ethics and Information Technology

Collaborative Wiki Writing and Editing [45% of total grade]

Concept: The assignment is designed to accomplish four interrelated goals.

1. Learn some of the mechanics of writing with the assistance of a collaborative wiki tool.
2. Model the writing style and structure of collaboratively developed encyclopedias.
3. Expose some of the ethical dilemmas that accompany collaborative writing and editing in a wiki environment.
4. Synthesize and extend the philosophical concepts of the course.

Since this assignment contributes toward satisfaction of the LS&A Upper Level Writing Requirement, the principal focus of the work is on producing a specific written article for the class wiki and then editing your work and the writing of other students in the class. The net result is a useful compendium of articles on ethics and information technology.

How to Get Started: The class MediaWiki site is the location for all of the writing and editorial work for the assignment. It is accessible through the course Canvas site (“Wiki”). Make sure you are comfortable using the basic writing and editing tools at MediaWiki. An excellent set of help pages is available through MediaWiki [<http://www.mediawiki.org/wiki/Help:Contents>] and through the “Help” link in the class MediaWiki site.

Procedures

1. Choose a topic. Select from the list of potential topics posted to Canvas and discussed in class. You must identify a unique topic; i.e., two students in the class may not draft an initial article on the same topic. Create a new page for the article and enter the topic on the index page, with a link to your article.

Concept. Ideas such as “information integrity,” “privacy in the online environment,” “virtual reality,” “Infosphere,” “digital ontology,” are all drawn from the course readings and discussion. It is also acceptable to extend the course concepts into the realm of new and popular media (e.g., “virtual reality in film,” “rock and roll and technology,” “technology ethics in the movies,”) or to apply the concepts in an international or multicultural setting (e.g., women and new media in China). Follow your own personal interests and apply them to the assignment. Use the syllabus and the reading/discussion guides as a key to identifying concepts. The syllabus and reading guides will also lead you to articles that you can use to both write your draft article and document your ideas. If you choose this option, you must provide a definition of the concept that relates it directly to ethics and information technology.

Person. You may write a biographical article for the author of any of the articles listed on the syllabus. Some people are more well known and “documentable” than others. You may also write a biographical statement for any person who has advanced the understanding of computer ethics or information ethics in the past 50 years. Some of these people are mentioned in assigned articles but

are not themselves authors of articles that you read. If you choose this option, you must be sure to explain the major contribution(s) the person has made to ethics and information technology.

Object. You may write a descriptive article on an information object (or product) that has or transmits ethical properties. “Avatar,” “LambdaMoo,” “Second Life,” “The Matrix,” “Halo:Reach” are all examples of objects with ethical implications. If you choose this option, you must identify in your draft article the ethical issues associated with your object.

2. Find information. Some topics may already have Wikipedia entries and other online encyclopedia entries. It is OK to start with pre-existing information, make major revisions, and then add your own ideas. For example, Luciano Floridi has an entry in Wikipedia that might serve as a point of departure. His entry does not do a very good job describing his ideas, but focuses instead on his career biography.

PLAGIARISM ALERT: Do not attempt to pass off Wikipedia entries as your own work. You may start with Wikipedia entries to get ideas, but you must document your starting point. It is extremely easy for the instructor to identify plagiarized content from Wikipedia and other online sources. The opportunity of this assignment is to work with existing content as raw material for something you wish to say, while documenting where you got your content and ideas.

3. Write a full article and submit under your own username. Your article should contain between 750 and 1000 words, longer if necessary. Articles that are too short won’t have enough substance to edit. Articles that are too long are hard to read and may require major surgery to make them readable. The technical quality of your initial writing will be stronger if you draft your article in a word processing program and then cut the results into the MediaWiki site. Additionally, if you edit and adapt content that you find in other sources, it will be easier to maintain quality if you paste and edit in a word processing program, then edit and revise within the MediaWiki site. Your first draft article should contain the three major components of a good Wikipedia article: an opening paragraph that grabs the attention of the reader, the body of the article in one or more sections, and references, formatted as fully as possible according to Wikipedia guidelines. First draft articles that are largely undocumented blather will be graded harshly.

FAIR WARNING: The first draft must demonstrate some independent learning on the chosen topic, through a combination of clear description of the concept/person/object and documentation of sources. It is impossible to get a good grade on the initial submission without demonstrating learning about the chosen topic.

If you have a good topic in mind for your first draft, do this: create a MediaWiki page for that topic right away, enter a paragraph that basically describes the topic, and enter the page on the PAGE NAME of your page/topic on the lists of Topics & Categories page. To do this, go into Edit mode and mimic the editing codes that are already there. Once you have “claimed” your topic in this way, you have until February 19 to flesh out the article to demonstrate knowledge of the topic. The goal of the assignment for the rest of the term is to apply collective knowledge to the first drafts to improve the quality of the individual articles and the collective MediaWiki site.

I want to emphasize how important it is that your first draft demonstrates knowledge of the topic, is documented, and has the basic format of a Wikipedia style article. Your first draft should contain the

three major components of a good Wikipedia article: an opening paragraph that grabs the attention of the reader, the body of the article in one or more sections, and references (which do not have to be formatted correctly on the first pass). First draft articles that are largely undocumented blather will be graded harshly. The editing guidance posted on Canvas contains a link to a great article in Wikipedia about what makes for a good article. Here is a link to that article:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Good_articles We are striving in our assignment to reach or exceed Wikipedia's own expectations.

4. Edit your own work in MediaWiki. Add links, references, illustrations. Add appropriate sub-headings to make the article look and read well. You may undo other student's editing if you feel that the editing is wrong.

5. Edit someone else's article with attribution. You may edit the wording to improve the readability. You may correct spelling and punctuation. You may add footnotes, links, illustrations, and even new sections. You may delete portions of the article if you feel that doing so improves understanding. You will not achieve full credit for this assignment without substantive editorial work on another student's draft article. Anemic editorial efforts will be penalized up to 5 of 15 grade-points for the assignment.

MESSING AROUND ALERT: Sarcasm doesn't communicate well in a wiki encyclopedia setting. Because this is only an exercise, the instructor is quite tolerant of efforts at humor (lame or not) in this assignment, as long as it is pretty clear what the intent is. Visual puns and humor are easier to grasp than written parody. While we strive for truth in our work here, we will learn that truth is rarely objective or absolute; one person's truth is another person's joke. And vice versa.

7. Cross-link articles. Up to five points of extra credit for this assignment will be given to students who create "meta-articles" that pull together two or more individual articles under a broader topic and provide internal links to those individual articles at the MediaWiki site.

Assignment Deadlines: See course schedule for specific deadlines

Deliverables: Each student is responsible for making contributions to the collective SI 410 MediaWiki site. Each student must draft and submit one original article on a topic related to Ethics and Information Technology. Each student must edit and improve the work of at least two articles submitted and edited by other students in the class. Each student must contribute illustrations to the MediaWiki site. Each student must add at least four references to one or more articles submitted to the MediaWiki site. The quantity of your editorial work is an important factor in your final grade for this assignment.

Because this assignment is fundamentally about writing and editing in a "wiki mode," the quality and style of your written contributions and editorial engagement are the most important measure of success. Additionally, because this assignment involves learning how to use a particular software tool in a way that exposes students to the ethical challenges of collaborative authorship, the quantity and variety of your work on the site as a whole is an important measure of success.

Grading: Refer to separate grading rubric and details on using assessment technologies

This assignment is worth 45 percent of your total grade (45/100 points) for the class. Grades will be assigned individually, based on the following criteria:

1. Quality of the written article that you submit originally to the MediaWiki course site.
2. Clear evidence of time invested in writing, editing, and adding appropriate illustrations, and other substantive content to the written articles submitted and edited by you and others in the class, as evidenced by your presence in the “History” tabs of multiple article sites.
3. Contributions to the “Discussion” sections of one or more articles, showing where ethical issues arise in the creating or editing of article content.
4. Evidence of ability to describe one or more key ideas covered in the course readings, class lectures, and discussion, in part through the insertion of citations to published readings or links to appropriate websites.

It will be important to begin with a quality entry, as your original submission will be worth 15 points. The remaining 30 points will come from your substantive contributions to other students’ articles. If you lose points on the original submission, it is possible to recover up to 5 of the initial 15 points through revision within the established deadlines. The highest grades for this assignment will go to students who demonstrate a grasp of the distinctive combination of 1) the “wikipedia” style of writing (which requires demonstration of expertise), 2) the acquisition of the technical skills required to display, illustrate, and document the substance of a wiki article, and 3) substantive editorial work on the wiki.

SI 410 Learning Outcomes Matrix			Collaborative Wiki Writing/Editing (MediaWiki) 45% Collaborative						
#	Learning/Instruction Objective	Overall Level	Task 1 Create Content	Task 2 Basic Format	Task 3 Basic Editing	Task 4 Advanced Formatting	Task 5 Advanced Editing	Task 6 Talk Discuss	Task 7 WikiVis Use
1	Construct/revise arguments in three genres	C	L	L	L	C	C	A	-
2	Apply ethical models re: ICT	L	A	-	L	-	L	-	-
4	Evaluate role choices in social media	C	A	-	L	-	C	C	L
5	Advanced collaborative editing on shared work	C	A	-	-	L	C	C	L
Key:									
A= Awareness of domain of knowledge and its larger context									
L= Literacy with skills or topic and can apply skill in basic manner									
C= Competency to apply skill or knowledge at an entry professional level									
M= Mastery of the area of knowledge with ability to supervise, guide or teach others									

SI 410 MediaWiki Grading Plan

Grading: The assignment is worth 45 percent of your total grade (45/100 points) for the class. Grades will be assigned individually, based on the following criteria:

1. Quality of the written article that you submit originally to the MediaWiki course site.
2. Clear evidence of time invested in writing, editing, and adding appropriate illustrations, and other substantive content to the written articles submitted and edited by you and others in the class, as evidenced by your presence in the “History” tabs of multiple article sites.
3. Contributions to the “Discussion” sections of one or more articles, showing where ethical issues arise in the creating or editing of article content.
4. Evidence of ability to describe one or more key ideas covered in the course readings, class lectures, and discussion, in part through the insertion of citations to published readings or links to appropriate websites.

It will be important to begin with a quality entry, as your original submission will be worth 15 points. The remaining 30 points will come from your substantive contributions to other students’. If you lose points on the original submission, it is possible to recover up to 5 of the initial 20 points through revision. The highest grades for this assignment will go to students who demonstrate a grasp of the distinctive combination of 1) the “wikipedia” style of writing (which requires demonstration of expertise), 2) the acquisition of the technical skills required to display, illustrate, and document the substance of a wiki article, and 3) substantive editorial work on the wiki.

Individual Wiki Article **10 points max**

Revision of Wiki Article **10 points max**
Quality of writing differential between first version and final product.

MediaWiki Collaborative Editing **25 points max**

- **Quality of editing** (blue star articles) 5 points (all or none)
 - All aspects of the article (words, format, punctuation, structure, ethical considerations, etc.)
- **Quality of your writing** (style and substance) 10 points
 - Primarily from blue star articles
 - Wiki style and substance
 - References
 - Assessment of ethical issues
- **Editing** multiple articles (total # articles) 5 points (quintiles)
- **Quantity** of contributions (total # characters) 5 points (quintiles)

The primary tool for ongoing monitoring (instructors and students) is the WikiHistoryVis application that extracts edit history in real time and formats for comparative use. Here is a link to that tool:

<http://wikihistoryvis.herokuapp.com/>