

# **SOC331H1S: SOCIOLOGY OF TECHNOLOGY**

**Summer 2020 (July-August)**

**Tuesdays & Thursdays, 12:00-3:00pm**

**University of Toronto, St. George Campus**

**Instructor:** Andrew D. Nevin ([andrew.nevin@mail.utoronto.ca](mailto:andrew.nevin@mail.utoronto.ca))

**Office Hours:** Tuesdays from 12:00-1:00pm EST on Bb Collaborate

**Lectures:** PowerPoint slides (with audio) posted on Mondays and Wednesdays

**Tutorials:** Tuesdays from 1:00-2:00pm or 2:00-3:00pm EST on Bb Collaborate

**Discussion Sessions:** Thursdays from 12:00-1:00pm EST on Bb Collaborate

**Teaching Assistant:** Rebecca Lennox ([rebecca.lennox@mail.utoronto.ca](mailto:rebecca.lennox@mail.utoronto.ca))

**TA Contact Info:** Send questions via email or set up appointments for online meetings

---

## **Course Description**

This course invites students to critically examine the interplay between technology and society. We will discuss how our interactions with technologies, including computers and the Internet, ICTs, social media, and other digital technologies, have become central for our understanding of contemporary social life. This course provides an overview of the sociology of technology, encompassed by various topics in which technology intersects with other areas of sociological inquiry, such as social stratification, community and networks, criminology and social control, work and labour, health and aging, and many others. Students will also learn various theoretical perspectives regarding the technology-society relationship, as well as how our understanding of the social implications of technology is influenced by the unique affordances of digital data and research methods. The goal of this course is to highlight that the Internet and other technologies should not be taken for granted—they are pervasive in our day-to-day lives and are a driving force behind social change.

The main objectives and learning outcomes associated with this course are as follows:

- To demonstrate knowledge of important concepts related to the sociology of technology and to understand how they shape everyday experiences, interactions, and relationships
- To critically examine and compare theories on the complex interrelationship between technology and society
- To improve academic writing skills and the ability to synthesize theoretical and empirical evidence to articulate a compelling argument and to motivate future research

## **Prerequisites**

This is a course intended for Sociology program students. The prerequisites to take this course are SOC201H1, SOC202H1, SOC204H1 & 1.0 FCE from SOC251H1/SOC252H1/SOC254H1. Students not meeting this requirement will be removed at any time discovered and without notice. Additionally, those who have taken SOC356H1 or SOC356Y1 are ineligible to take this course.

## Course Delivery

This is a hybrid online course with both asynchronous and synchronous elements. Lectures will be delivered as Microsoft PowerPoint slides that will be posted twice per week for students to download and consume on their own time. Students will also be required to participate in synchronous online skill-building tutorials and discussion sessions for a total of 2 hours per week on Bb Collaborate. See this [link](#) for information about the recommended minimum specs for technology to facilitate remote learning and financial support to meet these requirements.

## Course Website

The course website on Quercus contains the syllabus, announcements, posted lectures, readings, discussion boards, assignment instructions, and grades. Students can also access Bb Collaborate through the course's home page, which is the platform used for participating in online tutorials, discussion sessions, and attending office hours. Please note that students are responsible for regularly checking both Quercus and their official utoronto.ca email addresses for course updates.

## Lectures, Tutorials, and Discussion Sessions

There will be two lectures posted per week (Monday and Wednesday) in the form of voiceover PowerPoint slides. Students can read and listen to this material at their own convenience, but should try to do so prior to the weekly online discussion session to get the most out of the course.

Each week on Tuesday there will be a required 1-hour online tutorial on Bb Collaborate. Students will be split into two groups: those with last names of A-L will be in Group A (1:00-2:00pm) and those with last names of M-Z will be in Group B (2:00-3:00pm). These tutorials will be led by your teaching assistant and will serve the purpose of skill-building and workshopping your course assignments in light of these skills. The topics of the tutorials are as follows: 1) writing research questions, 2) finding and reading scholarly sources, 3) integrating feedback, and 4) academic writing and citing sources. Students should read the relevant tutorial materials to help prepare for these sessions, which will be released as PowerPoint slides on Quercus the Friday before each tutorial.

Each week on Thursday there will be a required 1-hour online discussion session from 12:00-1:00pm EST on Bb Collaborate, which will serve as a space for Q&A, content clarifications, and collective discussions on the week's lecture and reading topics. Students should come prepared with questions and a readiness to engage in the weekly group conversations about the material.

## Course Readings

There is one required textbook for this course:

Quan-Haase, Anabel. 2020. *Technology and Society: Inequality, Power, and Social Networks*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press. ISBN: 9780199032259.

Note that the new third edition includes important updates since the second edition was published in 2016. Physical copies of the textbook are available to purchase from the UofT bookstore, which can be ordered online and then shipped to you. Alternatively, students can rent the e-book through [Vitalsource](#) (CAD) or [Redshelf](#) (USD). Unfortunately, no physical or electronic copies of the textbook are available through course reserves or Robarts Library for this term due to COVID-19.

Other reading material, including assigned and supplementary journal articles and book chapters, can be found on Quercus under “Files”. Readings marked as supplementary are not required and are not testable, although they are a great resource for those interested in reading more deeply about a particular topic and can be used as sources for the assignments. Students can also find on the course website a document with a list of supplementary media sources (e.g., documentaries, YouTube videos, PBS Frontline videos, etc.) that offer additional content on certain topics.

### Course Assignments

Assignment	Weight	Due Date
Proposal Part 1: Topic and Research Question	10%	July 20
Position Paper	20%	August 4
Proposal Part 2: Final Research Proposal	35%	August 17
Take-Home Final Assessment	15%	August 26
Skill-Building Reports (4)	10% (2.5% each)	July 17, 24, 31, August 7
Discussion Board Contributions (10)	5% (0.5% each)	Bi-weekly
Participation	5%	End of the Term
	100%	

\*\*\*A calendar with the due dates for these course assignments can be found at the end of this syllabus document. The Quercus calendar has also been updated to reflect these deadlines.

#### *Research Proposal (Parts 1 and 2) – 45%*

The major assignment for this course is a research proposal. Students will choose a topic related to the intersection of sociology and technology and then write a research proposal for a future empirical study. The steps in the process involve writing a strong research question, doing background research in the literature, choosing a hypothetical methodology to collect and analyze data, and then discussing the expected findings and their implications.

This assignment is split into two main parts. The first is a short exercise (2-3 pages) in which students outline their intended topic and tentative research question for the purposes of receiving feedback (10%). The second is the longer (9-12 pages), finalized research proposal that involves setting up a prospective study and drawing on course material and outside scholarly sources to discuss the theoretical framework, methodology, and contribution of the more developed research question (35%). More detailed instructions will be posted on Quercus.

#### *Position Paper – 20%*

Students will write one position paper based on a choice between two topics provided by the instructor (5-6 pages). The topics will reflect a statement to which students must take a stance and argue in agreement or disagreement using material from lectures and the course readings.

#### *Take-Home Final Assessment – 15%*

The take-home assessment will be essay format and allow students to draw on material from throughout the course (5-7 pages). It will be “open book” so that students can use their notes from lectures and the assigned readings. While not required, students may also choose to use any of the relevant supplementary materials within their answers. It will be held during the summer final

assessment period—students will receive the questions on Monday August 24 at 10:00am and will need to submit their answers electronically on Quercus by Wednesday August 26 at 4:00pm.

### *Skill-Building Reports – 10%*

Students will write 4 brief reports on the skill-building tutorials that they attend during the course, which will be due on the Friday following each tutorial (i.e., July 17, 24, 31, and August 7). In these reports (2 pages max), students will summarize the key takeaways from the tutorial materials (PowerPoint slides and group discussion), discuss how this content can be applied to their course assignments, and add their own personal reflections. These will each be graded out of 2.5% (for a total of 10%). They will be assessed in terms of completeness, quality, and thoughtfulness of the reflections. More detailed instructions and a rubric will be posted on Quercus.

### *Discussion Board Contributions – 5%*

Each lecture topic will have an associated online discussion board on Quercus. The course instructor will post questions on each board to which students can respond. Students will make 10 contributions to these discussions which can occur at any time over the course of the term. Students can choose to participate at times that best fit their schedules; however, the open discussion boards close every two weeks on Sunday to be graded (i.e., July 19, and August 2, 16). Each credited post will be worth 0.5%, culminating in a total of 5% when all are completed. Criteria for getting credit for a post will be made available in a document posted on Quercus.

### *Participation – 5%*

Participation will be holistically assessed at the end of the term to consider attendance for tutorials (4) and discussion sessions (6), as well as the quality of engagement in those group environments. Please note that optional drop-in tutorials are not graded for participation.

## **Course Policies and Resources**

This section outlines the course policies related to communication, best practices for online participation, deadline extensions and late penalties, grade appeals, and academic integrity, as well as resources for accessibility and writing support.

### *Communication*

When emailing your instructor or TA, please use your utoronto.ca address. Include “SOC331” and a brief description in the subject line, so your email can be easily prioritized. Emails will typically be answered within 48 hours (except weekends and holidays). Students should bear this in mind if last-minute questions or issues arise, especially before any assignment deadlines.

Please note that for simple and concise questions, email is the preferred method of communication. However, for more in-depth questions, students should attend office hours and/or schedule an appointment with the instructor or TA. While your TA is your first point of contact for discussing course material, you should email your instructor for any personal questions regarding illness, special accommodations, missed assignments, deadline extensions, grading inquiries, or anything else you might want to discuss privately. Emails asking questions that are answered in the course syllabus will not receive a response—always ensure you carefully read through the syllabus first.

### *Best Practices for Online Participation*

There are a few guidelines and expectations for engagement in synchronous environments (i.e., tutorials and online discussion sessions) and on the Quercus discussion boards:

- Be respectful to other speakers or posters on the discussion boards
- Mute your microphones unless you are speaking to reduce background noise
- Use the “raise your hand” feature and wait to be called upon before you speak
- Recording online discussions or tutorials is strictly forbidden without the instructor's permission.
- Tutorials and discussion sessions will begin at 10 minutes past the hour, so please wait patiently until the Bb Collaborate session becomes available for you to join

### *Missed Sessions, Deadline Extensions, and Late Penalties*

Students who are unable to attend tutorials or online discussion sessions are responsible for obtaining notes on all material covered, as well as information regarding administrative announcements. Video recordings will be made available on Quercus by your instructor for those who are unable to attend these sessions.

Electronic copies of assignments are due on Quercus by 11:59pm on the scheduled due dates unless otherwise stated. The instructor and TA will NOT accept electronic copies of assignments via email. Late assignments are penalized at a rate of 5% per day (24-hr period, including weekends and holidays). After 10 days, the late assignment will no longer be accepted. Exceptions for late penalties will only be considered in cases that align with declared absences or accessibility accommodations. The process for requesting deadline extensions are as follows:

- Students must use the Absence Declaration tool on ACORN to formally declare an absence from academic participation on the day of the assignment submission
- Students must also inform the instructor in writing within 3 days of the missed assignment
- Students eligible to get an extension will be informed by email
- For extensions on the basis of accessibility accommodations, students should contact the instructor as soon as possible

### *Grade Appeals*

Instructors and teaching assistants take the marking of assignments very seriously and will work diligently to be fair, consistent, and accurate. Nonetheless, mistakes and oversights occasionally happen. In the case of a mathematical error, simply alert the TA or instructor of the error.

For more substantive appeals you must adhere to the following policies. To appeal a grade and have your work re-assessed, you must provide written justification to your TA explaining the basis for this reconsideration and, where relevant, attach your original assignment with comments. You should specifically address how you believe your assignment better met the criteria from the assignment guidelines while also taking into account the individual comments or community feedback. To start this re-assessment process, students must wait 24 hours following the return of the grades and comments—any grade appeals sent within this timeframe will not be considered. Note, that as per FAS policy, once your work has been re-assessed, the grade can go up, down, or remain the same based on this second evaluation. Subsequent appeals will go to the course instructor. Furthermore, no requests for grade appeals will be granted after two weeks following the return of the assignment's grade and feedback.

### *Academic Integrity*

Academic integrity is fundamental to learning and scholarship at the University of Toronto. Participating honestly, respectfully, responsibly, and fairly in this academic community ensures that the University of Toronto degree that you earn will be valued as a true indication of your individual academic achievement and will continue to receive the respect and recognition it deserves. Familiarize yourself with the University of Toronto's *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* ([link](#)). To avoid issues related to plagiarism, please see the advice on documentation format and methods of integrating sources ([link](#)).

Students agree that by taking this course, submitted works may be subjected to processing through *Turnitin* for a review of textual similarity and detection of possible plagiarism. In doing so, students will allow their essays to be included as source documents in the *Turnitin* reference database, where they will be used solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism. The terms that apply to the University's use of the *Turnitin* service are described on the *Turnitin.com* website. Assignments not submitted through *Turnitin* will receive a grade of zero (0%) unless a student instead provides, along with their paper, sufficient secondary material (e.g. reading notes, outlines of paper, rough drafts of the final draft, etc.) to establish that the paper they submit is truly their own. The alternative (not submitting via *Turnitin*) is in place because, strictly speaking, using *Turnitin* is voluntary for students at the University of Toronto.

### *Accessibility*

The University of Toronto is committed to accessibility. If you require accommodations or have any accessibility concerns, contact your instructor as soon as possible to discuss how best to assist you in the course. Furthermore, if you are registered with Accessibility Services, you will need to supply the appropriate documentation or your counselor will need send an email message on your behalf. You can visit this [link](#) for more information.

### *Writing Support*

Students are encouraged to make use of the available writing support at the University of Toronto. All seven [writing centres](#) will be operating during this summer session, and all will be offering remote instruction. The modality may differ by college. Students should visit each individual centre's site for information on how to make an appointment. In the summer, students may book up to TWO appointments per week.

There are also more than 60 advice files on all aspects of academic writing available from this [link](#). Furthermore, students can take advantage of the summer offerings through the [English Language Learning \(ELL\) Program](#).

## Lecture and Reading Schedule

Every attempt will be made to follow this schedule; however, it is subject to change at the discretion of the instructor. Any adjustments to topics or readings will be announced on Quercus. Note that all readings outside of the textbook are accessible under “Files” on the course website.

Date	Topics
Lecture 1: July 6	<p><b><u>Introduction to the Sociology of Technology</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Defining and studying “technology”</li> <li>• History of technological development</li> </ul> <p><b>Required Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 1 (selections: pp. 1-11, 20-21)</li> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 2 (pp. 24-46)</li> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 3 (selections: pp. 65-68)</li> </ul> <p><b>Supplementary Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bargh, John A. and Katelyn Y. McKenna. 2004. “The Internet and Social Life.” <i>Annual Review of Psychology</i> 55:573-590.</li> <li>• DiMaggio, Paul, Eszter Hargittai, W. Russell Neuman, and John P. Robinson. 2001. “Social Implications of the Internet.” <i>Annual Review of Sociology</i> 27(1):307-336.</li> <li>• Haigh, Thomas. 2011. “The History of Information Technology.” <i>Annual Review of Information Science and Technology</i> 45(1):431-487.</li> </ul>
Lecture 2: July 8	<p><b><u>Theoretical Perspectives on Technology</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sociological theories of technology and the technology-society relationship</li> <li>• Ethical dimensions of technological development</li> </ul> <p><b>Required Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 3 (selections: pp. 49-65, 68-69)</li> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 12 (selections: pp. 262-274, 278-279)</li> </ul> <p><b>Supplementary Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chayko, Mary. 2015. “The First Web Theorist? Georg Simmel and the Legacy of ‘The Web of Group-Affiliations’.” <i>Information, Communication, &amp; Society</i> 18(12): 1419-1422.</li> <li>• Feenberg, Andrew. 1999. “Preface” (pp. 1-9). In <i>Questioning Technology</i>. New York: Routledge.</li> <li>• Green, Eileen and Carrie Singleton. 2013. “‘Gendering the Digital’: The Impact of Gender and Technology Perspectives on the Sociological Imagination” (pp. 34-50). In <i>Digital Sociology: Critical Perspectives</i>. London: Palgrave Macmillan.</li> </ul>
Lecture 3: July 13	<p><b><u>Digital Research Methods</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordances of digital data: Technology-enabled data collection and analysis</li> <li>• Methodological and ethical considerations of digital data</li> </ul> <p><b>Required Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hampton, Keith N. (2017). “Studying the Digital: Directions and Challenges for Digital Methods.” <i>Annual Review of Sociology</i> 43:167-188.</li> <li>• McCay-Peet, Lori and Anabel Quan-Haase. 2017. “What is Social Media and What Questions Can Social Media Research Help Us Answer” (pp. 13-26). In <i>The Sage Handbook of Social Media Research Methods</i>. London: Sage.</li> </ul> <p><b>Supplementary Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• boyd, danah and Kate Crawford. 2012. “Critical Questions for Big Data.” <i>Information, Communication, &amp; Society</i> 15(5):662-679.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Davis, Jenny L. and Tony P. Love. 2019. "Generalizing from Social Media Data: A Formal Theory Approach." <i>Information, Communication, &amp; Society</i> 22(5): 637-647.</li> <li>• Edelmann, Achim, Tom Wolff, Danielle Montagne, and Christopher A. Bail. 2020. "Computational Social Science and Sociology." <i>Annual Review of Sociology</i> 46:24.1-24.21.</li> <li>• Golder, Scott A. and Michael W. Macy. 2014. "Digital Footprints: Opportunities and Challenges for Online Social Research." <i>Annual Review of Sociology</i> 40(1): 129-152.</li> <li>• Zeller, Frauke. 2017. "Analyzing Social Media Data and Other Data Sources: A Methodological Overview" (pp. 386-404). In <i>The Sage Handbook of Social Media Research Methods</i>. London: Sage.</li> </ul>
<p>Lecture 4: July 15</p>	<p><b><u>Technological Adoption and Digital Inequalities</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adoption and diffusion of technological innovations</li> <li>• Digital divide and related inequalities associated with technology</li> </ul> <p><b>Required Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 5 (pp. 95-115)</li> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 6 (pp. 119-138)</li> </ul> <p><b>Supplementary Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Epstein, Dmitry, Erik C. Nisbet, and Tarleton Gillespie. 2011. "Who's Responsible for the Digital Divide? Public Perceptions and Policy Implications." <i>The Information Society</i> 27(2): 92-104.</li> <li>• Haight, Michael, Anabel Quan-Haase, and Bradley Corbett. 2014. "Revisiting the Digital Divide in Canada." <i>Information, Communication, &amp; Society</i> 17(4):503-519.</li> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 8: Genders and Technology (pp. 162-181)</li> <li>• Robinson, Laura et al. 2015. "Digital Inequalities and Why They Matter." <i>Information, Communication, &amp; Society</i> 18(5):569-582.</li> </ul>
<p>Lecture 5: July 20</p>	<p><b><u>Community, Networks, and Relationships in the Digital Age</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the "global village" to "networked individualism"</li> <li>• Social capital, online social networking, and technology-mediated social relationships</li> </ul> <p><b>Required Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 9 (selections: pp. 184-198, 204-205)</li> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 10 (selections: pp. 208-213, 216-225)</li> </ul> <p><b>Supplementary Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barbosa Neves, B. 2013. "Social Capital and Internet Use: The Irrelevant, the Bad, and the Good." <i>Sociology Compass</i> 7(8): 599–611.</li> <li>• boyd, danah. 2006. "Friends, Friendsters, and MySpace Top 8: Writing Community into Being on Social Network Sites." <i>First Monday</i> 11(12).</li> <li>• Quan-Haase, Anabel, Andrew D. Nevin, and Veronika Lukacs. 2018. "Romantic Dissolution and Facebook Life: A Typology of Coping Strategies for Breakups." In <i>Emerald Studies in Media and Communication: CITAMS@30 (Vol 18)</i>. UK: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.</li> <li>• Rainie, Lee and Barry Wellman. 2012. "The New Social Operating System of Networked Individualism" (pp. 3-20). In <i>Networked</i>. Cambridge: The MIT Press.</li> <li>• Wellman, Barry, Anabel Quan-Haase, James Witte, and Keith Hampton. 2001. "Does the Internet Increase, Decrease, or Supplement Social Capital? Social Networks, Participation, and Community Commitment." <i>American Behavioral Scientist</i> 45(3):436-455.</li> </ul>
<p>Lecture 6: July 22</p>	<p><b><u>Technology Across the Life Course</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aging with technology: Experiences of youths and seniors</li> <li>• Technology and education</li> <li>• Technology implications for health, mental health, and healthcare</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Required Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chesley, Noelle and Britta E. Johnson. 2014. “Information and Communication Technology Use and Social Connectedness over the Life Course.” <i>Sociology Compass</i> 8(6):589–602.</li> <li>• Margaryan, Anoush, Littlejohn, Allison, and Gabrielle Vojt. 2011. “Are Digital Natives a Myth of Reality? University Students’ Use of Digital Technologies.” <i>Computers &amp; Education</i> 56(1): 429-440.</li> <li>• Quan-Haase, Anabel, Martin, Kim, and Kathleen Schreurs. 2016. “Interviews with Digital Seniors: ICT Use in the Context of Everyday Life.” <i>Information, Communication &amp; Society</i> 19(5): 691-707.</li> </ul> <p><b>Supplementary Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cotten, Shelia R., George Ford, Sherry Ford, and Timothy M. Hale. 2014. “Internet Use and Depression Among Retire Older Adults in the United States: A Longitudinal Analysis.” <i>Journals of Gerontology, Series B</i> 69(5):763-771.</li> <li>• Hargittai, Eszter. 2010. “Digital Na(t)ives? Variation in Internet Skills and Uses among Members of the ‘Net Generation’.” <i>Sociological Inquiry</i> 80(1):92–113.</li> <li>• Pantic, Igor. 2014. “Online Social Networking and Mental Health.” <i>Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking</i> 17(10): 652-657.</li> <li>• Prensky, Marc. 2001. “Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants.” <i>On the Horizon</i> 9(5):2–6.</li> <li>• Quan-Haase, Anabel., Guang Ying Mo, and Barry Wellman. 2017. “Connected Seniors: How Older Adults in East York Exchange Social Support Online and Offline.” <i>Information, Communication &amp; Society</i> 20(7): 967-983.</li> </ul>
<p>Lecture 7: July 27</p>	<p><b><u>Work, Labour, and Digital Creators</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technology and the division of labour</li> <li>• The digital workplace: Work extending technologies, automation, gig economy, etc.</li> <li>• Digital and immaterial labour (e.g., Web 2.0)</li> </ul> <p><b>Required Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 7 (pp. 140-158)</li> <li>• Ritzer, George. 1983. “The ‘McDonaldization’ of Society.” <i>Journal of American Culture</i> 6(1):100-107.</li> </ul> <p><b>Supplementary Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chesley, Noelle. 2014. “Information and Communication Technology Use, Work Intensification and Employee Strain and Distress.” <i>Work, Employment, and Society</i> 28(4):589–610.</li> <li>• Coté, Mark and Jennifer Pybus. 2007. “Learning to Immaterial Labour 2.0: MySpace and Social Networks.” <i>Ephemera</i> 7(1):88-106.</li> <li>• Nevin, Andrew D. and Scott Schieman. 2020. “Technological Tethering, Digital Natives, and Challenges in the Work-Family Interface.” <i>The Sociological Quarterly</i>, DOI: 10.1080/00380253.2019.1711264.</li> <li>• Ollier-Malaterre, Ariane, Jerry A. Jacobs, and Nancy P. Rothbard (2019). “Technology, Work, and Family: Digital Cultural Capital and Boundary Management.” <i>Annual Review of Sociology</i> 45:425-447.</li> <li>• Ritzer, George. 2004. “McDonaldization and Its Precursors.” In <i>The McDonaldization of Society</i> (pp. 24-42). Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.</li> </ul>
<p>Lecture 8: July 29</p>	<p><b><u>Internet Culture</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation of ‘self’ on the Internet</li> <li>• Production and consumption of Internet culture (e.g., memes)</li> <li>• Online subcultures and collective identities</li> <li>• Ideological polarization on the Internet (e.g., “echo chambers” and “culture wars”)</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Required Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 10 (selections: pp. 213-216)</li> <li>• Boero, Natalie and C.J. Pascoe. 2012. “Pro-Anorexia Communities and Online Interaction: Bringing the Pro-Ana Body Online.” <i>Body &amp; Society</i> 18(2):27-57.</li> <li>• Hogan, Bernie. 2010. “The Presentation of Self in the Age of Social Media: Distinguishing Performances and Exhibitions Online.” <i>Bulletin of Science, Technology, &amp; Society</i> 30(6): 377-386.</li> </ul> <p><b>Supplementary Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bail, Christopher A. et al. 2018. “Exposure to Opposing Views on Social Media can Increase Political Polarization.” <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i> 115(37):9216-9221.</li> <li>• Barberá, Pablo et al. 2015. “Tweeting from Left to Right: Is Online Political Communication More Than an Echo Chamber?” <i>Psychological Science</i> 26(10):1531-1542.</li> <li>• Ferreday, Debra. 2003. “Unspeakable Bodies: Erasure, Embodiment and the Pro-Ana Community.” <i>International Journal of Cultural Studies</i> 6(3):277-295.</li> </ul>
<p>Lecture 9: August 3</p>	<p><b><u>Crime, Deviance, and Social Control on the Internet</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanations of cyber-crime, cyber-deviance, and cyberbullying</li> <li>• Social control: Criminal justice, governmentality, surveillance, privacy</li> </ul> <p><b>Required Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 10 (selections: pp. 225-232)</li> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 11 (pp. 235-254)</li> <li>• Stalans, Loretta J. and Mary A. Finn. 2016. “Understanding How the Internet Facilitates Crime and Deviance.” <i>Victims &amp; Offenders</i> 11:510-518.</li> </ul> <p><b>Supplementary Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buckels, Erin E., Paul D. Trapnell, and Delroy L. Paulhus. 2014. “Trolls Just Want to Have Fun.” <i>Personality and Individual Differences</i> 67:97-102.</li> <li>• Hinduja, Sameer and Justin W. Patchin. 2008. “Cyberbullying: An Exploratory Analysis of Factors Related to Offending and Victimization.” <i>Deviant Behavior</i> 29(2): 129-156.</li> <li>• Jaishankar, K. 2010. “The Future of Cyber Criminology: Challenges and Opportunities.” <i>International Journal of Cyber Criminology</i> 4(1):26-31.</li> <li>• Maimon, David and Eric R. Louderback. 2019. “Cyber-Dependent Crimes: An Interdisciplinary Review.” <i>Annual Review of Criminology</i> 2:191-216</li> <li>• Raynes-Goldie, K. 2010. “Aliases, Creeping, and Wall Cleaning: Understanding Privacy in the Age of Facebook.” <i>First Monday</i> 15(1):1-8.</li> </ul>
<p>Lecture 10: August 5</p>	<p><b><u>Political Sociology in the Digital Age</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Power and politics in digital spaces: Democratizing power and the new public sphere</li> <li>• Digital policies, jurisdiction, and online rights (e.g., net neutrality)</li> <li>• Civic engagement: Online social movements, hacktivism, slacktivism</li> </ul> <p><b>Required Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 9 (selections: pp. 198-204)</li> <li>• Brym, Robert, Melissa Godbout, Andreas Hoffbauer, Gabriel Menard, and Tony H. Zhang. 2014. “Social Media in the 2011 Egyptian Uprising.” <i>The British Journal of Sociology</i> 65(2):266-292.</li> </ul> <p><b>Supplementary Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brym, Robert, Anna Slavina, Mina Todosijevic, and David Cowan. 2018. “Social Movement Horizontality in the Internet Age? A Critique of Castells in Light of the Trump Victory.” <i>Canadian Review of Sociology</i> 55(4):624-634</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Castells, Manuel. 2008. "The New Public Sphere: Global Civil Society, Communication Networks, and Global Governance." <i>The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science</i> 616(1):78-93.</li> <li>• Tufekci, Zeynep. 2017. "Introduction." In <i>Twitter and Tear Gas: The Power of Fragility and Networked Protest</i>. New Haven: Yale University Press.</li> </ul>
Lecture 11: August 10	<p><b><u>Critical Media Studies</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tailored online environments: Web 3.0, filter bubble, serendipity</li> <li>• "Algorithms of oppression" and data discrimination</li> <li>• Fake news, misinformation, targeted advertising, and "clickbait"</li> </ul> <p><b>Required Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 4 (selections: pp. 89-91)</li> <li>• McLuhan, Marshall. 1964. "The Medium is the Message". In <i>Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man</i> (pp. 1-10). New York: Signet.</li> <li>• Tandoc Jr, Edson C., Zheng W. Lim, and Richard Ling. 2018. "Defining 'Fake News': A Typology of Scholarly Definitions." <i>Digital Journalism</i> 6(2):137-153.</li> </ul> <p><b>Supplementary Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fuchs, Christian. 2011. "A Contribution to the Critique of the Political Economy of Google." <i>Fast Capitalism</i> 8(1).</li> <li>• Pariser, Eli. 2011. "Introduction." In <i>The Filter Bubble: How the New Personalized Web is Changing What We Read and How We Think</i>. New York: Penguin Press.</li> <li>• Rubin, Victoria. L., Jacqueline Burkell, and Anabel Quan-Haase. 2010. "Everyday Serendipity as Described in Social Media." <i>Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology</i> 47(1):1-2.</li> </ul>
Lecture 12: August 12	<p><b><u>New Directions in the Sociology of Technology</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sci-Fi or reality?: Augmentation, transhumanism, AI, self-driving vehicles</li> <li>• Future questions and challenges facing society</li> <li>• Conclusion: Course themes and takeaways</li> </ul> <p><b>Required Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 1 (selections: pp. 11-19)</li> <li>• Quan-Haase (2020) – Chapter 12 (selections: pp. 258-262)</li> <li>• Bonnefon, Jean-Francois, Azim Shariff, and Iyad Rahwan. 2016. "The Social Dilemma of Autonomous Vehicles." <i>Science</i> 352(6293):1573-1576.</li> <li>• Cyborg Rights: <a href="https://biohackinfo.com/cyborg-rights/">https://biohackinfo.com/cyborg-rights/</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Supplementary Readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chen, Angela. 2017. "They Want to Be Literally Machines". <i>The Verge</i>. Retrieved (<a href="https://www.theverge.com/2017/2/25/14730958/transhumanism-mark-oconnell-interview-cyborg-hacker-futurist-biohackers">https://www.theverge.com/2017/2/25/14730958/transhumanism-mark-oconnell-interview-cyborg-hacker-futurist-biohackers</a>).</li> <li>• Pedersen, Isabel. 2014. "Are Wearables Really Ready to Wear?" <i>IEEE Technology and Society Magazine</i> 33(2):16-18.</li> <li>• Pedersen, Isabel. 2016. "Home is Where the AI Heart Is." <i>IEEE Technology and Society Magazine</i> 35(4):50-51.</li> <li>• Pedersen, Isabel and Tanner Mirrlees. 2017. "Exoskeletons, Transhumanism, and Culture: Performing Superhuman Feats." <i>IEEE Technology and Society Magazine</i> 36(1):37-45.</li> </ul>

# JULY 2020

Sun	Mon	Tues	Wed	Thurs	Fri	Sat
28	29	30	1	2	3	4
4	Lecture 1 Posted	Live Syllabus Presentation (12-1pm)	Lecture 2 Posted	Discussion Session (12-1pm)	10	11
12	Lecture 3 Posted	Tutorial 1: (1-2, 2-3pm)	Lecture 4 Posted	Discussion Session (12-1pm)	17	18
19	Lecture 5 Posted	Tutorial 2 (1-2, 2-3pm)	Lecture 6 Posted	Discussion Session (12-1pm)	24	25
Discussion Board Closes (Set 1)	Due Date: Topic/RQ				Due Date: Skill Report 2	
26	Lecture 7 Posted	Tutorial 3 (1-2, 2-3pm)	Lecture 8 Posted	Discussion Session (12-1pm)	31	1
					Due Date: Skill Report 3	

# AUGUST 2020

Sun	Mon	Tues	Wed	Thurs	Fri	Sat
26	27	28	29	30	31	1
2  Discussion Board Closes (Set 2)	3  Lecture 9 Posted	4  Tutorial 4 (1-2, 2-3pm)  Due Date: Position Paper	5  Lecture 10 Posted	6  Discussion Session (12-1pm)	7  Due Date: Skill Report 4	8
9	10  Lecture 11 Posted	11  Optional Drop-In Tutorial (1-3pm)	12  Lecture 12 Posted	13  Discussion Session (12-1pm)	14	15
16  Discussion Board Closes (Set 3)	17  Due Date: Research Proposal	18  Optional Drop-In Tutorial (1-3pm)	19  Final Assessment Period Begins	20	21	22
23	24  Take-Home Assessment Starts (10am)	25	26  Take-Home Assessment Due (4pm)	27  Final Assessment Period Ends	28	29
30	31	1	2	3	4	5