

GENDER, TECHNOLOGY, AND INFORMATION

INF 386G/WGS 393
#27890/#48651

Dr. Philip Doty
School of Information

Dr. Hillary Hart
School of Engineering

University of Texas at Austin

SP 2010

Class time: Monday 2:00 – 5:00 PM

Place: ECJ 9.236

Office: UTA 5.448 (Doty)

ECJ 8.214 (Hart)

Office hrs: Thursday 1:00 – 3:00 PM (Doty)

Monday 11:00 AM – 12:00 N (Hart)
Wednesday 2:00 -4:00 PM

By appointment other times

By appointment other times

Telephone: 512.471.3746 – direct line
512.471.2742 – iSchool receptionist
512.471.3821 – main iSchool office

512.471.4635 – direct line

Internet: pdoty@ischool.utexas.edu
<http://www.ischool.utexas.edu>

hart@mail.utexas.edu
<http://www.caee.utexas.edu/prof/hart/>

Class URL: http://courses.ischool.utexas.edu/Doty_Philip/2010/spring/INF386G/

TA: Michael McFarlin
mcfarlin@ischool.utexas.edu

Office hours

Face to face: Monday 1:00 – 2:00 PM
UTA 5.428

Virtual: Monday 2:00 – 3:00 PM

By appointment other times

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction to the course	3
Expectations of students' performance	4
Analysis and holism	5
Standards for written work	6
Editing conventions	11
Grading	12
Texts and other tools	13
List of assignments	14
Outline of course	16
Schedule	18
Assignments	21
References	24
Sources in the class schedule	
Selected important journals	

INTRODUCTION TO THE COURSE

Gender, Technology, and Information (INF 385T/WGS 390) examines the three elements of the course's title. Students will be asked to explore various perspectives on the interactions, historically and currently, among gender, technology, and information. These perspectives and concepts include narrative and metaphor, design and gender, the gendering of various technologies, identity and the Internet, the digital divide, the invisibility of information work in organizations, the history of technology, and gender and reading (including book clubs). We are fortunate to have several experts visiting this class from various departments and research centers here at UT. Students will explore various research methodologies and will produce, along with several other writing assignments, a final paper that discusses a topic of the student's choice about the intersection (s) of gender, technology, and information.

Graduate students from all disciplines and academic units in the University are welcome, and students may take the class for a letter grade or for credit/no credit.

In this course, we will assume a non-essentialist position about gender, i.e., we will not support the assertion that there are some essential, identifiable differences among people of different genders. We also are interested in gender as broadly as possible, considering but also moving beyond "feminism and . . ." or "women in . . ." as the sole focus of the course; in fact, consideration of masculinities and technology will be a specific feature of the course.

Technology is another of the significant concepts for our course. We will not limit our consideration of technology to digital technologies this semester, or, for that matter, only to information technologies. While we will examine artifacts like computers, paper, books, houses, and other technologies, technology studies includes many other elements, e.g., music, language, literary genres, social conventions, and practices of all kinds.

We would like to offer two quick words about the third and final major topic of our work this semester – information. While we will use the useful fiction of information as thing, please remember that many scholars consider it only a fiction. As such, information is not "in our minds" or "in files" or the like – thus we will avoid locutions such as "content" when speaking about information and communication. Instead, we will move beyond the cognitivism inherent in information as thing and look more to meaning making, cultural production, and social practice.

EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE

Students are expected to be involved, creative, and vigorous participants in class discussions and in the overall conduct of the class. In addition, students are expected to:

- Attend all class sessions; if a student misses a class, it is her responsibility to arrange with another student to obtain all notes, handouts, and assignment sheets.
- Read all material prior to class; students are expected to use the course readings to inform their classroom participation and their writing. We hope that you will learn to integrate what you read with what you say and write. This last imperative is essential to the development of professional expertise and to the development of a collegial professional persona.
- Educate themselves and their peers. Successful completion of graduate academic programs and participation in professional life depend upon a willingness to demonstrate initiative and creativity. Participation in the professional and personal growth of colleagues is essential to one's own success as well as theirs. Such collegiality is at the heart of scholarship, so some assignments are designed to encourage collaboration.
- Spend at least 3-4 hours in preparation for each hour in the classroom; therefore, a 3-credit graduate course requires a minimum of 10-12 hours per week of work outside the classroom.
- Participate in all class discussions.
- Complete all assignments on time; late assignments will not be accepted except in the particular circumstances noted below. Failure to complete any assignment on time will result in a failing grade for the course.
- Be responsible with collective property, especially books and other material on reserve.
- Ask for help from the instructors or the teaching assistant, either in class, during office hours, on the telephone, through email, or in any other appropriate way. Email is especially appropriate for information questions, but please recall that Doty has limited access to email outside the office. Unless there are compelling privacy concerns, it is always wise to send a copy of any email intended for the instructors to the TA as well; he has access to email more regularly.

Academic dishonesty, such as plagiarism, cheating, or academic fraud, will not be tolerated and will incur severe penalties, including failure for the course. If there is concern about behavior that may be academically dishonest, consult the instructors. Students should refer to the UT General Information Bulletin, Appendix C, Sections 11-304 and 11-802 and *Texas is the Best . . . HONESTLY!* (1988) by the Cabinet of College Councils and the Office of the Dean of Students.

The instructors are happy to provide all appropriate accommodations for students with documented disabilities. The University's Office of the Dean of Students at 471.6259, 471.4641 TTY, can provide further information and referrals as necessary.

ANALYSIS AND HOLISM IN READING, WRITING, AND PRESENTING

To succeed in this class, you must be analytic in your reading of others' work, in your own writing, and in your presentations. What follows are suggestions for developing analytic and critical methods of thinking and communication. These suggestions are also indications of what you should expect from the writing and speaking of others.

At the same time, however, please remember that a holistic, integrative understanding of context must always complement depth of analysis. Remember the bigger picture within which you write about specific subjects. "Intersections" is an important word to remember for the type of explorations you will be undertaking this semester.

- First and foremost, maximize clarity – be clear, but not simplistic or patronizing.
- Remember that writing is a form of thinking, not just a medium to "display" the results of thinking; make your thinking engaging, reflective, and clear.
- Provide enough context for your remarks that your audience can understand them but not so much that your audience's attention or comprehension is lost. This practice is, of course, not easy. The best way to learn this practice is to share your writing with others.
- Be specific.
- Avoid jargon, undefined terms, undefined acronyms, colloquialisms, clichés, and vague language.
- Give examples.
- Be critical, not dismissive, of others' work; be skeptical, not cynical.
- Answer the difficult but important "how?," "why?," and "so what?" questions.
- Support assertions with evidence. We will discuss in class what constitutes "evidence."
- Make explicit why evidence used to support an assertion does so.
- Identify and explore the specific practical, social, and intellectual implications of courses of action.
- Be evaluative. Synthesize and internalize existing knowledge without losing your own critical point of view. Work to develop, and then trust, your own "voice."
- Identify the specific criteria against which others' work and options for action will be assessed.

See the Standards for Written Work and the assignment descriptions in this syllabus for further explanations and examples.

STANDARDS FOR WRITTEN WORK

You will meet professional standards of clarity, grammar, spelling, and organization in writing. Review these standards before and after writing; we use them to evaluate your work.

Every writer is faced with the problem of not knowing what her audience knows; therefore, effective communication depends upon maximizing clarity. Wolcott in *Writing Up Qualitative Research* (1990, p. 47) reminds us: "Address . . . the many who do not know, not the few who do." Remember that clarity of ideas, of language, and of syntax are mutually reinforcing.

Good writing makes for good thinking and vice versa. Recall that writing is a form of inquiry, a way to think, not a reflection of some supposed static thought "in" the mind. Theodore Dreiser's *Sister Carrie* shows how this process of composition and thought works (1994, p. 144):

Hurstwood surprised himself with his fluency. By the natural law which governs all effort, what he wrote reacted upon him. He began to feel those subtleties which he could find words to express. With every word came increased conception. Those inmost breathings which thus found words took hold upon him.

We need not adopt Dreiser's breathless metaphysics or naturalism to understand the point.

All written work for the class must be done on a word-processor and double-spaced, with 1" margins all the way around and in either 10 or 12 pt. font.

Some writing assignments will demand the use of notes (either footnotes or endnotes) and references. It is particularly important in professional schools such as the School of Information that notes and references are impeccably done. Please use APA (American Psychological Association) standards. There are other standard bibliographic and note formats, for example, in the natural sciences and law, but social scientists and a growing number of humanists use APA. Familiarity with standard formats is essential for understanding others' work and for preparing submissions to journals, funding agencies, professional conferences, and the like. You may also want to consult the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (2001, 5th ed.).

Do not use a general dictionary or encyclopedia (including Wikipedia) for defining terms in graduate school or in professional writing. If you want to use a reference source to define a term, use a specialized dictionary such as *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* or subject-specific encyclopedia, e.g., the *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. The best alternative, however, is having an understanding of the literature related to the term sufficient for you to provide a definition in the context of that literature.

Use a standard spell checker, but be aware that spell checking dictionaries have systematic weaknesses: they exclude most proper nouns, e.g., personal and place names; they omit most technical terms; they omit most foreign words and phrases; and they cannot identify the error in using homophones, e.g., writing "there" instead of "their," or in writing "the" instead of "them."

It is imperative that you **proofread your work thoroughly and be precise in editing it**. It is often helpful to have someone else read your writing, to eliminate errors and to increase clarity. If you have any questions about these standards, we will be pleased to discuss them with you at any time.

Remember, every assignment must include a title page with:

- The title of the assignment
- Your full name
- The date
- The class number – INF 386G or WGS 393.

Since the production of professional-level written work is one of the aims of the class, we will read and edit your work as the editor of a professional journal or the moderator of a technical session at a professional conference would. The reminders below will help you prepare professional written work appropriate to any situation. Note the asterisked errors in #'s 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 21, and 25 (some have more than one error):

1. Staple all papers for this class in the upper left-hand corner. Do not use covers, binders, or other means of keeping the pages together.
2. Number all pages after the title page. Notes and references do not count against page limits.
3. Use formal, academic prose. Avoid colloquial language, *you know?* It is essential in graduate work and in professional communication to avoid failures in diction – be serious and academic when called for, be informal and relaxed when called for, and be everything in between as necessary. For this course, avoid colloquialisms such as "deal with," "handle," "goes into," and "buy into." Because they have become largely emptied of meaning, avoid words such as "agenda," "factors," and "areas."
4. Avoid clichés. They are vague, *fail to "push the envelope," and do not provide "relevant input."*
5. Avoid computer technospeak like "input," "feedback," or "processing information" except when using such terms in specific technical ways.
6. **Avoid using "content" as a noun.**
7. Do not use the term "relevant" except in its information retrieval sense. Ordinarily, it is a colloquial cliché, but it also has a strict technical meaning in information studies.
8. Do not use "quality" as an adjective; it is vague, cliché, and colloquial. Instead use "high-quality," "excellent," "superior," or whatever more formal phrase you think appropriate.
9. Study the APA style convention for the proper use of ellipsis* . . . *
10. Avoid using the terms "objective" and "subjective" in their evidentiary senses; these terms entail major philosophical, epistemological controversy. Avoid terms such as "facts," "factual," "proven," and related constructions for similar reasons.
11. Avoid contractions. *Don't* use them in formal writing.
12. Be circumspect in using the term "this," especially in the beginning of a sentence. *THIS* is often a problem because the referent is unclear. Pay strict attention to providing clear referents for all pronouns. Especially ensure that pronouns and their referents agree in number; e.g., "each person went to their home" is a poor construction because "each" is singular, as is the noun "person," while "their" is a plural form. Therefore, either the referent or the pronoun must change in number.
13. "If" ordinarily takes the subjunctive mood, e.g., "If he were [not "was"] only taller."
14. Put "only" in its appropriate place, near the word it modifies. For example, it is appropriate in spoken English to say that "he only goes to Antone's" when you mean that "the only place he frequents is Antone's." In written English, however, the sentence should read "he goes only to Antone's."
15. Do not confuse possessive, plural, or contracted forms, especially of pronouns. *Its* bad.
16. Do not confuse affect/effect, compliment/complement, or principle/principal. Readers will not *complement* your work or *it's* *principle* *affect* on them.

17. Avoid misplaced modifiers; e.g., it is inappropriate to write the following sentence: "As someone interested in the history of Mesoamerica, it was important for me to attend the lecture." The sentence is inappropriate because the phrase "As someone interested in the history of Mesoamerica" is meant to modify the next immediate word, which should then, obviously, be both a person and the subject of the sentence. It should modify the word "I" by preceding it immediately. One good alternative for the sentence is: "As someone interested in the history of Mesoamerica, I was especially eager to attend the lecture."
18. Avoid use of "valid," "parameter," "bias," "reliability," and "paradigm," except in limited technical ways. These are important research terms and should be used with precision.
19. Remember that the words "data," "media," "criteria," "strata," and "phenomena" are all PLURAL forms. They *TAKES* plural verbs. If you use any of these plural forms in a singular construction, e.g., "the data is," you will make the instructors very unhappy :-).
20. "Number," "many," and "fewer" are used with plural nouns (a number of horses, many horses, and fewer horses). "Amount," "much," and "less" are used with singular nouns (an amount of hydrogen, much hydrogen, and less hydrogen). Another useful way to make this distinction is to recall that "many" is used for countable nouns, while "much" is used for uncountable nouns.
21. *The passive voice should generally not be used.* We will discuss its appropriate use in class.
22. "Between" is used with two alternatives, while "among" is used with three or more.
23. Generally avoid the use of honorifics such as Mister, Doctor, Ms., and so on when referring to persons in your writing, especially when citing their written work. Use last names and dates as appropriate in APA.
24. There is no generally accepted standard for citing electronic resources. If you cite them, give an indication, as specifically as possible, of:
 - responsibility (who?)
 - title (what?)
 - date of creation (when?)
 - date viewed (when?)
 - place to find the source (where? how?).

See the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (2001, 5th ed., pp. 213-214, 231, and 268-281) for a discussion of citing electronic material and useful examples. Also see Web Extension to American Psychological Association Style (WEAPAS) at <http://www.beadsland.com/weapas/#SCRIBE> for more guidance.
25. *PROFREAD! PROOFREED! PROOOFREAD!*
26. Citation, quotation, and reference are nouns; cite, quote, and refer to are verbs.
27. Use double quotation marks ("abc."), not single quotation marks ('xyz.'), as a matter of course. Single quotation marks are to be used to indicate quotations within quotations.
28. Provide a specific page number for all direct quotations. If the quotation is from a Web page or other digital source, provide at least the paragraph number and/or other directional cues, e.g., "(Davis, 1993, section II, ¶ 4)."
29. In ordinary American English, "as" does not have the same meaning as "because."
30. Avoid the locution "due to."

31. Use "about" instead of the tortured locution "as to."
32. In much of social science and humanistic study, the term "issue" is used in a technical way to identify sources of public controversy or dissensus. Please use the term to refer to topics about which there is substantial public disagreement, NOT synonymously with general terms such as "area," "topic," or the like.
33. On a related note, avoid the locution of "public debate." Such a locution makes a series of faulty assumptions:
 - It presumes that a public policy issue has only two "sides." There are usually three or four or more perspectives on any topic of public dissensus that merit consideration. "Debate" hides this complexity.
 - "Debate" implies that one "side" and only one "side" can be correct; that presumption ignores the fact that the many perspectives on a public policy issue have contributions to make to its resolution.
 - "Debate" implies that there can be and will be one and only one "winner." This presumption naively ignores the fact that some public policy issues are intractable, that these issues are often emergent as are their resolutions, and that compromise is success rather than failure or "surrender."
34. Please do not start a sentence or any independent clause with "however."
35. Avoid the use of "etc." – it is awkward, colloquial, and vague.
36. Do not use the term "subjects" to describe research participants. "Respondents," "participants," and "informants" are preferred terms and have been for decades.
37. Do not use notes unless absolutely necessary, but, if you must use them, use endnotes not footnotes.
38. Please adhere to these orthographic (spelling) conventions:
 - Web with a capital "W."
 - Web site, two words, with a capital "W."
 - Internet with a capital "I" to indicate the TCP/IP-compliant computer network with a shared address convention. Otherwise, internet with a lower-case "i" simply means any of the many millions of networks of networks

SOME EDITING CONVENTIONS FOR STUDENTS' PAPERS

SYMBOL	MEANING
#	number OR insert a space; context will help you decipher its meaning
AWK	awkward; and usually compromises clarity as well – we will try to name the source of the awkwardness (e.g., run-on sentence, noun strings ...)
BLOCK	make into a block quotation without external quotation marks; do so with quotations ≥ 4 lines
caps	capitalize
COLLOQ	colloquial and to be avoided
dB	database
FRAG	sentence fragment; often that means that the verb and/or subject of the sentence is missing
ITAL	italicize
j	journal
lc	make into lower case
lib'ship	librarianship
org, org'l	organization, organizational
P	punctuation error
PL	plural
Q	question
Q'naire	questionnaire
REF?	what is the referent of this pronoun? to what or whom does it refer?
RQ	research question
sp	spelling
SING	singular
w/	with
w.c.?	word choice?

We also use **check marks** to indicate that the writer has made an especially good point. **Wavy lines** indicate that usage or reasoning is suspect.

GRADING

Grades for this class include:

A+	Extraordinarily high achievement	not recognized by the University
A	Superior	4.00
A-	Excellent	3.67
B+	Good	3.33
B	Satisfactory	3.00
B-	Barely satisfactory	2.67
C+	Unsatisfactory	2.33
C	Unsatisfactory	2.00
C-	Unsatisfactory	1.67
F	Unacceptable and failing.	0.00.

See the memorandum from former Dean Brooke Sheldon dated August 13, 1991, and the notice in the School of Information student orientation packet for explanations of this system. Consult the iSchool Web site (http://www.ischool.utexas.edu/programs/general_info.php) and the *Graduate School Catalogue* (e.g., <http://registrar.utexas.edu/catalogs/grad07-09/ch01/ch01a.grad.html#The-Nature-and-Purpose-of-Graduate-Work> and <http://registrar.utexas.edu/catalogs/grad07-09/ch01/ch01b.grad.html#Student-Responsibility>) for more on standards of work. While the University does not accept the grade of A+, the instructors may assign the grade to students whose work is extraordinary.

The grade of B signals acceptable, satisfactory performance in graduate school. The instructors reserve the grade of A for students who demonstrate not only a command of the concepts and techniques discussed but also an ability to synthesize and integrate them in a professional manner and communicate them effectively, successfully informing the work of other students.

The grade of incomplete (X) is reserved for students in extraordinary circumstances and must be negotiated with the instructors before the end of the semester. See the former Dean's memorandum of August 13, 1991, available from the main iSchool office.

We use points to evaluate assignments, not letter grades. Points on any assignment are determined using an arithmetic – not a proportional – algorithm. For example, 14/20 points on an assignment does NOT translate to 70% of the credit, or a D. Instead 14/20 points is roughly equivalent to a B. If any student's semester point total ≥ 90 (is equal to or greater than 90), then s/he will have earned an A of some kind. If the semester point total ≥ 80 , then s/he will have earned at least a B of some kind. Whether these are A+, A, A-, B+, B, or B- depends upon the comparison of point totals for all students. For example, if a student earns a total of 90 points and the highest point total in the class is 98, the student would earn an A-. If, on the other hand, a student earns 90 points and the highest point total in the class is 91, then the student would earn an A. This system will be further explained throughout the semester.

TEXTS AND OTHER TOOLS

There are **two required** texts for this class, and both can be purchased at the University Coop on Guadalupe. Many of the other readings are available online, and many readings are available in the Course Documents section of the course Blackboard site. As many of the required readings as possible will be on Reserve at PCL.

These are the **required** texts:

Lerman, Nina E., Oldenziel, Ruth, & Mohun, Arwen P. (2003a). *Gender & technology: A reader*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

Wajcman, Judy. (2004). *TechnoFeminism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

We **recommend** these books for your further study of gender, technology, and information:

Latour, Bruno, & Woolgar, Steve. (1986). *Laboratory life: The construction of scientific facts*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

Nye, David E. (1994). *American technological sublime*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Pursell, Carroll. (Ed.). (2001a). *American technology*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Reinharz, Shulamit. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University.

Spain, Daphne. (1992). *Gendered spaces*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina.

Wajcman, Judy. (1991b). *Feminism confronts technology*. University Park, PA: Penn State.

We strongly recommend:

Manoff, Marlene. (2007). Science and technology Web sites. Available at <http://libraries.mit.edu/humanities/WomensStudies/Tech2.html>

This site is part of the material gathered by the Women's Studies Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries (WSS, ACRL). You may especially want to look at the link there to Miscellaneous Resources, particularly the Gender-Related Electronic For[a] (<http://userpages.umbc.edu/~korenman/wmst/forums.html>).

LIST OF ASSIGNMENTS

The instructors will provide additional information about each assignment. Written assignments should be word-processed and double-spaced in 10- or 12-point font, with 1" margins. Assignments are due in class unless otherwise indicated.

Assignment	Date Due	Percent of Grade
Preparation and participation	---	10%
DQ's on theories of technology	FEB 8	5
Research methods paper (3-4 pp.)	MAR 1	10
Response paper (4 pp.)	MAR 22	15
Topic for final paper on gender, technology, and information	MAR 22	---
Annotated bibliography for final paper	MAR 29	10
Choice of final paper to review	APR 5	---
Two-page abstract of final paper	APR 12	---
Draft of paper on gender, technology, and information (≥ 10 pp.)	APR 19	---
Peer review of another student's draft of final paper (3-4 pp.)	APR 26	10
Public presentation on final paper	APR 26, MAY 3	
Instructors' evaluation		10
Classmates' evaluation		5
Final paper on gender, technology, and information (20 pp.)	MAY 3	25

All assignments must be handed in on time, and the instructors reserve the right to issue a course grade of F if any assignment is not completed. Late assignments will be accepted only if:

1. At least 24 hours before the date due, the instructors give explicit permission to the student to hand the assignment in late.
2. At the same time, a specific date and time are agreed upon for the late submission.
3. The assignment is then submitted on or before the agreed-upon date and time.

The first criterion can be met only in the most serious of health, family, or personal situations. All of your assignments should adhere to the standards for written work; should be clear, succinct, and specific; and should be explicitly grounded in the readings, class discussions, and other sources as appropriate. You will find it particularly useful to write multiple drafts of your papers.

OUTLINE OF COURSE

Meeting	Date	Topics
<u>UNIT I: INTRODUCTION TO TECHNOLOGY AND GENDER STUDIES</u>		
1	JAN 25	Introduction to the course Review of the syllabus Students' specific research interests Exploring technology (1): Definitions, metaphors, and theories
2	FEB 1	Exploring technology (2): Definitions, metaphors, and theories Thinking and writing
<u>UNIT II: A GENDERED LOOK AT TECHNOLOGY</u>		
3	FEB 8	Feminism and science and technologies studies • DUE: Discussion question (DQ) on theories of technology (5%)
4	FEB 15	An overview of research methods
5	FEB 22	Masculinities and technologies (1): Introduction
6	MAR 1	Masculinities and technologies (2): Continued • DUE: Research methods paper (3-4 pp.) (10%)
7	MAR 8	Reproductive and sexual technologies
	MAR 15	NO CLASS – SPRING BREAK
8	MAR 22	Digital and communication technologies (1): Introduction • DUE: Response paper (4 double-spaced pp.) (15%) • DUE: Topic for final paper
9	MAR 29	Digital and communication technologies (2): Continued • DUE: Annotated bibliographies (10%)
10	APR 5	Digital and communication technologies (3): Telephony Book clubs and reading

- **DUE: Choice of final paper to review**

11 APR 12 Design and architecture
Domestic technologies

- **DUE: Two-page abstract for final paper (2 pp.)**

12 APR 19 Research methods round table

- **DUE: Draft due – final paper (≥ 10 pp.)**

UNIT III: STUDENTS' RESEARCH

13 APR 26 **Students' presentations (10/5%)**

- **DUE: Review of another student's draft of final paper (3-4 pp.) (10%)**

14 MAY 3 **Students' presentations (10/5%)**
Course evaluation
Course summary

- **DUE: Final paper (20 pp.) (25%)**

SCHEDULE

The schedule is tentative and may be adjusted as we progress through the semester. Readings from *Gender and Technology: A Reader* are indicated as *A Reader*. Some readings are in the course documents section of Blackboard (**CD**), while many other required readings are available **online** as indicated. Some of the readings require you to be logged in with your UTEID through the UT libraries.

DATE TOPICS, ASSIGNMENTS, AND REQUIRED READINGS

UNIT I: INTRODUCTION TO TECHNOLOGY AND GENDER STUDIES

- JAN 25 Introduction to the course
 Review of the syllabus
 Students' specific research interests
- Exploring technology (1): Definitions, metaphors, and theories
- READ: Lerman et al. (2003b) – *A Reader*
 Ingold (2005) **online**
 Van Zoonen (1992) **online**
 O'Day & Nardi (2003) **CD**
 Pursell (2001b) **CD**
- FEB 1 Exploring technology (2): Definitions, metaphors, and theories
- READ: Herzig (2003) – *A Reader*
 Latour (1991) **CD**
 McGaw (1989) **online as part of an e-book**
 Pacey (1992/1974) **CD**
 Pickering (1995) **CD**
 Elbow (2000a and 2000b)
 Haraway (2004) **CD**

UNIT II: A GENDERED LOOK AT TECHNOLOGY

- FEB 8 Feminism and science and technologies studies
- READ: McGaw (2003) – *A Reader*
 Wajcman (2004), 1 and 2
 Barad (1999/1998) **CD**
 Keller (1999/1987) **CD**
 Lury (1993) **CD**
 Rose (1997) **CD**
- **DUE: Discussion question (DQ) on theories of technology (5%)**
- FEB 15 An overview of research methods
- READ: Reinharz (1992), 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, and 9 **CD**
- FEB 22 Masculinities and technologies (1): Introduction
- READ: Brandth & Haugen (2005) **online**
 Lohan & Faulkner (2005) **online**
 Kleif & Faulkner (2003) **CD and online**

- MAR 1 Masculinities and technologies (2): Continued
- READ: Oldenziel (2003) – *A Reader*
 Edwards (2003) – *A Reader*
 Mellström (2004) **online**
 Noble (1997) **CD**
- **DUE: Research methods paper (3-4 pp.) (10%)**
- MAR 8 Reproductive and sexual technologies
- READ: Maines (2003) – *A Reader*
 Ali (2002) **online**
 Fishman (2004) **online**
 Wajcman (1991c), 3 (“Reproductive Technology: Delivered into Men’s Hands”) **CD**
 Williams (1998/1994) **CD**
 Maines (2001) – and Taylor (2001), Snow (2001), Eberhart (2001), Covey (2001), “Enjoy Life” (2001), and “Further Reading” (2001a) **CD**
 Van House (2003) **CD**
- MAR 15 **NO CLASS – SPRING BREAK**
- MAR 22 Digital and communication technologies (1): Introduction
- READ: Wajcman (2004), 3 and 4
 Haraway (1990) **online**
 O’Brien (1999) **CD**
- **DUE: Response paper (4 double-spaced pp.) (15%)**
 - **DUE: Topic for final paper**
- MAR 29 Digital and communication technologies (2): Continued
- READ: Light (2003) – *A Reader*
 Balka (1997) **online**
 Electronic Privacy Information Center (2004) **online**
 Shade (1998a) **online**
 Stanworth (2000) **online**
- AS: Oudshoorn et al. (2004) **online**
- **DUE: Annotated bibliographies (10%)**
- APR 5 Digital and communication technologies (3): Telephony
 Book clubs and reading
- READ: Fischer (1988) **online**
 Flint (2006) **online**
 Green (1995) **online**
 Long (2003a) **CD**
- **DUE: Choice of final paper to review**
- APR 12 Design and architecture

Domestic technologies

READ: Kline (2003) – *A Reader*
Parr (2003) – *A Reader*
Wajcman (2004), 5
Wajcman (1991a), 5 (“The Built Environment: Women’s Place, Gendered Space”) **CD**
Nickles (2002) **online**
McGaw (2001) **CD**
Kleinegger (2001) – and “Social and Labor Needs,” Tripp (2001), Sims (2001), and “Further Reading” (2001b) **CD**

- **DUE: Two-page abstract for final paper (2 pp.)**

APR 19 Research methods round table

- **DUE: Draft due – final paper (≥ 10 pp.)**

UNIT III: STUDENTS’ RESEARCH

APR 26 **Students’ presentations (10/5%)**

- **DUE: Review of another student’s draft of final paper (3-4 pp.) (10%)**

MAY 3 **Students’ presentations (10/5%)**
Course evaluation
Course summary

READ: Lerman, Mohun, & Oldenziel (2003) – *A Reader*
Star & Griesemer (1989) **online**
Oldenziel (1996) **CD**
Winner (1980) **CD**

- **DUE: Final paper (20 pp.) (25%)**

ASSIGNMENTS

Discussion questions – Due February 7/8 (5%)

There is a large and complex set of literatures about science and technology studies (STS), and we have the opportunity to study some parts of that set this semester. Using whatever of the readings we have done for the classes on January 25 and February 1, please address this question:

Why study technology?

Each student will prepare a one-page (250-word) response to this question and submit that response to the appropriate Blackboard forum no later than 12:00 N **Sunday, February 7**, and bring it to class in print form on Monday, February 8.

Be sure to read all of your classmates' responses and come prepared to discuss them in class. This assignment is worth 5% of your course grade.

Research methods paper – Due March 1 (10%)

Choose any paper or chapter by an author you consider to have done "feminist research," whether from readings we have done as a class or from any other source. Identify the author's research method or methods. Then analyze and discuss the success (or not) of the work as a piece of research and a piece of writing. Comment on at least the following:

- The author's approach to researching his/her subject
- The appropriateness of the method to the goals of the investigation
- The success of the approach as a way of investigating the particular research questions
- The success of the presentation - what are some of the writing strategies by which the author brings you along through his/her argument?
- What research approach do you plan to take to the subject of your term paper? Would you consider that approach "feminist"?

This paper is worth 10% of your final grade and should be 3-4 double-spaced pp. long.

This assignment is intended to demonstrate your critical faculty and your ability to engage in discourse about research methodology and its relation to scholarly argumentation, eventually ... your own argumentation.

Response paper – Due March 22 (15%)

Please use this assignment to engage any aspect of the two textbooks for the course, Lerman et al. (2003a) or Wajcman (2004). Choose any elements of these books to engage, e.g., a theme in a particular chapter, a comparison of any two or more chapters/readings, discussion of the introductions, and so on.

Please write a paper of **four double-paced pages (4 pp.)** addressing these texts. The paper may be related to the topic you choose for your final paper or address concerns that complement or even contradict the thesis of your major paper. If your topic for the final paper does not encompass much of what we read, the response paper will allow you to explore some of those often compelling ideas.

Paper on gender, technology, and information – Different parts due various dates

Every student's final paper of the semester will report on a topic of the student's choice about gender, technology, and information. Each student should consider this final paper as an opportunity to advance her own current and evolving research program. While the topic for the final paper must be determined in negotiation with the instructors, students are especially encouraged to consult with their classmates about their topics.

The topic should be sufficiently narrow that the student can apply the concepts, literatures, and other class resources in order to engage a substantial topic in the intersection of gender, technology, and information in **20 double-spaced pp.** from a perspective informed by our work together this semester. It is imperative that students keep their topics narrowly focused and that their papers be succinct and clear.

Topic – Each student will clear the proposed topic with the instructors by **March 22**. Each student must provide a **clear statement of his topic** by that date, preferably before.

In addition to their own research interests and professional work, students may find a number of resources of value in identifying a topic for the paper: discussion with the instructors and colleagues (both inside and outside of the class), review of the supplemental parts of the references in the class syllabus, bibliographies, mailing lists, the mass media, class readings, general and specific Web and other Internet sources, and the bibliographies of what the class reads. The instructors will create a list of students and topics to be distributed online and in class.

Annotated bibliography – Due March 29 (10%) – each student will create an annotated bibliography of **ten (10)** sources pertinent to the student's final paper for the class. The annotations should be about 3-4 sentences long and should be very specific about the sources' value to the paper's topic. The student should distribute a paper copy of the annotated bibliography to each member of the class and give **two** paper copies to the instructors. Students will also post their annotated bibliographies to the appropriate forum in Blackboard as instructed.

Choice of paper to review – Due April 5. Each student will choose another student's paper to review no later than April 5. The choices will generally be on a first-come, first-served basis, although the instructors reserve the right to assign students to particular drafts keeping in mind such criteria as students' genders, research interests, education, employment, native languages, and the like.

Abstract – Due April 12. Each student will submit a **two-page abstract** of her final paper specifying how the final paper will address the topic.

Draft – Due April 19. Each student will submit an initial draft of her final paper on April 19. The draft will be at least **10 double-spaced pp.** long, will have a **one-page abstract**, will indicate how the rest of the paper will develop, and will have a substantial part of the bibliography identified and complete in APA format. Students will submit three copies of this draft -- one for the student peer editor and two for the instructors.

Review of another student's draft – Due April 26 (10%). Each student will review the draft of another student's final paper and submit two copies of a **three- to four-page, double-spaced** critique of the paper. One copy will go to the student who wrote the draft and two to the instructors. Be specific in the critique -- what works in the draft? What does not? Why or why not? What specific suggestions can you offer for improvement to the paper, whether about the topic, the argument, definitions, sources, composition, citations, lay-out, and so on? The major criterion used to evaluate these reviews will be how valuable each one is in helping the author to improve her work.

Presentation – April 26 and May 3 (10% for instructors' evaluation and 5% for students' evaluations) – each student will make a **20- minute oral presentation** related to her final paper. This will be a public presentation to which a few other persons with an interest in gender, technology, and information will be invited, particularly faculty members with advisees in the class.

Every student should use the computer and projection device available, as well as prepare an appropriate handout with, at the least, an outline of the presentation (this handout may include copies of PowerPoint slides if the student is using PowerPoint) and a short list of appropriate sources. Students will present in each half of class, with questions saved for 15-20 minutes at the end of each half of class. This arrangement parallels one common in professional conferences. Each student peer editor will act as the initial respondent to any one paper.

The dates for the presentations are April 26 and May 3. The instructors and the class TA will organize the presentation sessions and announce the schedule on the class and other email lists no later than April 12.

Final draft – Due May 3 (30%). This is a final paper of **20 double-spaced pages** that engages a topic of the student's choice about gender, technology, and information. This final paper may help the student prepare presentations, grant proposals, master's theses, conference papers, and dissertation chapters. This final version, like the first draft, will have a **one-page abstract** outlining the topic, methods of discussion and analysis used in the paper, and other pertinent elements of the paper.

The paper should be both analytic and holistic, using the texts and other general material read for the course, as well as that material more focused on students' own disciplines. Students should remember to consult the syllabus on standards for written work both before and after they write and provide **two copies** of their final papers in the last class on Monday, May 3. They will also post the final drafts in the appropriate forum in the class Blackboard space.

REFERENCES

Many required readings are available online, as indicated below and in the class schedule. Some of the course readings are in the Course Documents section of the Blackboard site (CD).

Some of the readings, on the other hand, require you to be logged in with your UT EID through the UT libraries. Those journals are usually available online for only part of their publication run; further, UT often has more than one arrangement through which to get these journals online, so there may be more than one URL for each journal. Feel free to explore the various online journal packages – the more familiar you are with such arrangements, the better researcher you will be.

Sources in the class schedule

Ali, Kamran Asdar. (2002). Faulty deployments: Persuading women and constructing choice in Egypt. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 44(2), 370-394. Also available at <http://journals.cambridge.org.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/action/displayIssue?jid=CSS&decade=2000&volumeId=44&issueId=02&iid=106864>

Balka, Ellen. (1997). Participatory design in women's organizations: The social world of organizational structure and the gendered nature of expertise. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 4(2), 99-115. Also available at <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/loi/gwao?>

Barad, Karen. (1999). Agential realism: Feminist interventions in understanding scientific practices. In Mario Biagioli (Ed.), *The science studies reader* (pp. 1-11). New York: Routledge. (Original work published 1998) CD

Brandth, Berit, & Haugen, Marit S. (2005). Text, body, and tools: Changing mediations of rural masculinity. *Men and Masculinities*, 8(2), 148-163. Also available at <http://jmm.sagepub.com/>

Ceruzzi, Paul. (1991). When computers were human. *Annals of the History of Computing*, 13(3), 237-244. CD

Covey, A. Dale. (2001). Profitable office specialties. In Carroll Pursell (Ed.), *American technology* (pp. 140-141). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. (Original work published c. 1912) CD

Crow, Barbara. (2005). Gendering surveillance: Mobile masculinities. Paper presented at the International Communications Studies Association, New York, May 28.

Eberhart, Noble M. (2001). A brief guide to vibratory technique. In Carroll Pursell (Ed.), *American technology* (pp. 135-140). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. (Original work published c. 1910) CD

Edwards, Paul N. (2003). Industrial genders: Soft/hard. In Nina E. Lerman, Ruth Oldenziel, & Arwen P. Mohun (Eds.), *Gender & technology: A reader* (pp. 177-203). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins. (Original published 1990)

Elbow, Peter. (2000a). Freewriting and the problem of wheat and tares. In *Everyone can write: Essays toward a hopeful theory of writing and teaching writing* (pp. 85-92). Oxford, UK: Oxford University. CD

Elbow, Peter. (2000b). Illiteracy at Oxford and Harvard: Reflections on the inability to write. In *Everyone can write: Essays toward a hopeful theory of writing and teaching writing* (pp. 5-27). Oxford, UK: Oxford University. CD

Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC). (2004). Gender and electronic privacy. Available at <http://www.epic.org/privacy/gender/default.html>

Enjoy life. (2001). In Carroll Pursell (Ed.), *American technology* (p. 142). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. (Original work published 1913) CD

- Fischer, Claude S. (1988). "Touch someone": The telephone industry discovers sociability. *Technology and Culture*, 29(1), 32-61. Also available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/i356086>
- Fishman, Jennifer R. (2004). Manufacturing desire: The commodification of female sexual dysfunction. *Social Studies of Science*, 34(2), 187-218. Also available at <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/browse/03063127/sp040018?frame=noframe&userID=80533f16@utexas.edu/01c0a8347400504e5e9&dpi=3&config=jstor>
- Flint, Kate. (2006). Women and reading. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 31(2), 511-536. Also available at <http://www.journals.uchicago.edu.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/Signs/journal/available.html>
- Further reading. (2001a). In *American technology* (p. 143). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. **CD**
- Further reading. (2001b). In *American technology* (p. 207). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. **CD**
- Gere, Anne Ruggles. (1994). Common properties of pleasure: Texts in nineteenth century women's clubs. In Martha Woodmansee & Peter Jaszi (Eds.), *The construction of authorship: Textual appropriation in law and literature* (pp. 383-400). Durham, NC: Duke University. **CD**
- Given, Lisa M. (2005). Social positioning. In Karen Fisher, Sanda Erdelez, & Lynne (E.F.) McKechnie (Eds.), *Theories of information behavior* (pp. 334-338). Medford, NJ: Information Today. **CD**
- Green, Venus. (1995). Race and technology: African American women in the Bell system, 1945-1980. *Technology and Culture*, 36(2), S101-S144. Supplement: *Snapshots of a Discipline: Selected Proceedings from the Conference on Critical Problems and Research Frontiers in the History of Technology*, Madison, WI, October 30 - November 3, 1991. Also available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3106692> [also in Carroll Pursell (Ed.). (2001). *American technology* (pp. 254-288). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.]
- Haraway, Donna. (1990). A manifesto for cyborgs: Science, technology, and socialist feminism in the 1980s. In Linda J. Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/postmodernism* (pp. 190-233). New York: Routledge. Also available at <http://www.stanford.edu/dept/HPS/Haraway/CyborgManifesto.html>
- Haraway, Donna. (2004). There are always more things going on than you thought! Methodologies as thinking technologies. Part II of an interview with Donna Haraway by Nina Lykke, Randi Markussen, and Finn Olesen. In *The Haraway reader* (pp. 332-342). New York: Routledge. **CD**
- Herzig, Rebecca. (2003). Situated technology: Meanings. In Nina E. Lerman, Ruth Oldenziel, & Arwen P. Mohun (Eds.), *Gender & technology: A reader* (pp. 72-97). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- Ingold, Cindy. (2005). Women and gender studies Internet reference resources: A critical overview. *Journal of Library Administration*, 43(3/4), 103-117. Also available at <http://www.haworthpress.com/Store/E-Text/ViewLibraryEText.asp?s=J111&m=0>
- Jones, Alice Hanson. (2001). American colonial wealth: Documents and methods. In Carroll Pursell (Ed.), *American technology* (pp. 32-38). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. (Original work published 1977)
- Keller, Evelyn Fox. (1999). The gender/science system: Or, is sex to gender as nature is to science? In Mario Biagioli (Ed.), *The science studies reader* (pp. 234-242). New York: Routledge. (Original work published 1987) **CD**

- Kleif, Tine, & Faulkner, Wendy. (2004). "I'm no athlete [but] I can make this thing dance!" – Men's pleasure in technology. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 28(2), 296-325. **CD**
- Kleinegger, Christine. (2001). Out of the barns and into the kitchens: Transformations in farm women's work in the first half of the twentieth century. In Carroll Pursell (Ed.), *American technology* (pp. 170-188). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. (Original work published 1987) **CD**
- Kline, Ronald R. (2003). Home ideologies: Progress? In Nina E. Lerman, Ruth Oldenziel, & Arwen P. Mohun (Eds.), *Gender & technology: A reader* (pp. 392-423). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins. (Original work published 1997)
- Latour, Bruno. (1991). Technology is society made durable. In John Law (Ed.), *A sociology of monsters: Essays on power, technology and domination* (pp. 103-131). London: Routledge. **CD**
- Latour, Bruno, & Woolgar, Steve. (1986). *Laboratory life: The construction of scientific facts*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Lerman, Nina E., Mohun, Arwen P., & Oldenziel, Ruth. (2003). The shoulders we stand on/The view from here: Historiography and directions for research. In Nina E. Lerman, Ruth Oldenziel, & Arwen P. Mohun (Eds.), *Gender & technology: A reader* (pp. 425-449). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- Lerman, Nina E., Oldenziel, Ruth, & Mohun, Arwen P. (2003a). *Gender & technology: A reader*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- Lerman, Nina E., Oldenziel, Ruth, & Mohun, Arwen P. (2003b). Introduction: Interrogating boundaries. In Nina E. Lerman, Ruth Oldenziel, & Arwen P. Mohun (Eds.), *Gender & technology: A reader* (pp. 1-9). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- Light, Jennifer. (2003). Programming. In Nina E. Lerman, Ruth Oldenziel, & Arwen P. Mohun (Eds.), *Gender & technology: A reader* (pp. 295-326). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins. (Original published 1999)
- Lohan, Maria, & Faulkner, Wendy. (2005). Masculinities and technologies: Some introductory remarks. *Men and Masculinities*, 8(2), 319-329. Also available at <http://jmm.sagepub.com/>
- Long, Elizabeth. (2003a). Between past and present: Introductory reflections on the changing nature of women's reading groups. In *Book clubs: Women and the uses of reading in everyday life* (pp. 59-73 and 230-231). Chicago: University of Chicago. **CD**
- Lury, Celia. (1993). Technologies of culture and gender. In *Cultural rights: Technology, legality, and personality* (pp. 177-206). London: Routledge. **CD**
- Maines, Rachel. (2001). Socially camouflaged technologies: The case of the electromechanical vibrator. In Carroll Pursell (Ed.), *American technology* (pp. 117-130). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, 8(2), 3-11, 23. Also available <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpl/tocresult.jsp?isYear=1989&isnumber=1367&Submit32=Go+To+Issues> (Original work published 1989) **CD**
- Maines, Rachel P. (2003). Situated technology: Camouflage. In Nina E. Lerman, Ruth Oldenziel, & Arwen P. Mohun (Eds.), *Gender & technology: A reader* (pp. 98-119). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- McGaw, Judith A. (1989). No passive victims, no separate spheres: A feminist perspective on technology's history. In Stephen Cutcliffe & Robert Post (Eds.), *In context: History and the history of technology, Essays in honor of Melvin Kranzberg, Research in Technology Studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 172-191). Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University. Available as an e-book in the UT Libraries catalogue.

- McGaw, Judith A. (2001). "So much depends upon a red wheelbarrow": Agricultural tool ownership in the eighteenth-century mid-Atlantic. In Carroll Pursell (Ed.), *American technology* (pp. 12-31). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. (Original work published 1994) **CD**
- McGaw, Judith A. (2003). Why feminine technologies matter. In Nina E. Lerman, Ruth Oldenziel, & Arwen P. Mohun (Eds.), *Gender & technology: A reader* (pp. 13-36). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins. (Original published 1996)
- Mellström, Ulf. (2004). Machines and masculine subjectivity: Technology as an integral part of men's life experiences. *Men and Masculinities*, 6(4), 368-382. Also available at <http://jmm.sagepub.com/>
- Nickles, Shelley. (2002). "Preserving women": Refrigerator design as social process in the 1930s. *Technology and Culture*, 43(4), 693-727. Also available at http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/journals/technology_and_culture/
- Noble, David F. (1997). A masculine millennium: A note on technology and gender. In *The religion of technology: The divinity of man and the spirit of invention* (pp. 209-228 and 256-259). New York: Knopf. **CD**
- Nye, David E. (1994). *American technological sublime*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- O'Brien, Jodi. (1999). Writing in the body: Gender (re)production in online interaction. In Marc A Smith & Peter Kollock (Eds.), *Communities in cyberspace* (pp. 76-104). London: Routledge. **CD**
- O'Day, Vicki L., & Nardi, Bonnie A. (2003). An ecological perspective on digital libraries [excerpt]. In Ann Peterson Bishop, Nancy Van House, & Barbara P. Battenfield (Eds.), *Digital library use: Social practice in design and evaluation* (pp. 66-71). Cambridge, MA: MIT. **CD**
- Oldenziel, Ruth. (1996). Objection/ions: Technology, culture, and gender. In W. David Kingery (Ed.), *Learning from things: Methods and theory of material culture studies* (pp. 55-69). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution. **CD**
- Oldenziel, Ruth. (2003). Why masculine technologies matter. In Nina E. Lerman, Ruth Oldenziel, & Arwen P. Mohun (Eds.), *Gender & technology: A reader* (pp. 37-71). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins. (Original work published 1997)
- Olson, Hope A. (2001). Patriarchal structures of subject access and subversive *techniques* for change. *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*, 26(2/3), 1-29. Also available at [http://ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&bquery=\(JN+%22Canadian+Journal+of+Information+%26+Library+Sciences%22+and+DT+20010601\)\)&type=1&site=ehost-live](http://ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&bquery=(JN+%22Canadian+Journal+of+Information+%26+Library+Sciences%22+and+DT+20010601))&type=1&site=ehost-live)
- Pacey, Arnold. (1992). Idealistic trends in twentieth-century technology. In *The maze of ingenuity: Ideas and idealism in the development of technology* (2nd ed., pp. 242-266 and 281-286). Cambridge, MA: MIT. (Original work published 1974) **CD**
- Parr, Joy. (2003). Economics and homes: Agency. In Nina E. Lerman, Ruth Oldenziel, & Arwen P. Mohun (Eds.), *Gender & technology: A reader* (pp. 329-358). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- Pickering, Andrew. (1995). Technology: Numerically controlled machine tools. In *The mangle of practice: Time, agency, & science* (pp. 157-176). Chicago: University of Chicago. **CD**
- Pursell, Carroll W. (Ed.). (2001a). *American technology*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Pursell, Carroll. (2001b). Introduction. In *American technology* (pp. 1-10). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. **CD**

- Reinharz, Shulamit. (1992). Chapters 1-4 and 8-9. In *Feminist methods in social research*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University. **CD**
- Rose, Hilary. (1997). Goodbye truth, hello trust. In Mary Maynard (Ed.), *Science and the construction of women* (pp. 15-36). London: UCL Press. **CD**
- Shade, Leslie Regan. (1998a). A gendered perspective on access to the information infrastructure. *Information Society*, 14(1), 33-44. Also available at <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/routledg/utis/1998/00000014/00000001/art00004;jsessionid=21ljenuqvijo.victoria>
- Sims, Newell Leroy. (2001). The farm house. In Carroll Pursell (Ed.), *American technology* (pp. 203-207). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. (Original work published 1928) **CD**
- Sinclair, Bruce. (2001). Local history and national culture: Notions on engineering professionalism in American culture. In Carroll Pursell (Ed.), *American technology* (pp. 145-154). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Snow, M.L.H. Arnold. (2001). Mechanical vibration and its therapeutic application. In Carroll Pursell (Ed.), *American technology* (pp. 134-135). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. (Original work published 1904) **CD**
- Social and labor needs. (2001). In Carroll Pursell (Ed.), *American technology* (pp. 189-200). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. (Original work published 1915) **CD**
- Spain, Daphne. (1992). *Gendered spaces*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina. **CD**
- Stanworth, Celia. (2000). Women and work in the information age. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 7(1), 20-32. Also available at <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/loi/gwao?cookieSet=1>
- Star, S. Leigh, & Griesemer, James R. (1989). Institutional ecology, "translations" and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907-39. *Social Studies of Science*, 19(3), 387-420. Also available at <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/browse/03063127/ap010058?frame=noframe&userID=80533f16@utexas.edu/01c0a8347400504e5e9&dpi=3&config=jstor>
- Star, Susan Leigh, & Strauss, Anselm. (1999). Layers of silence, arenas of voice: The dialogues between visible and invisible work. *Journal of Computer-Supported Cooperative Work*, 8(1-2), 9-30. Also available at <http://www.kluweronline.com/article.asp?PIPS=161888&PDF=1>
- Suchman, Lucy. (1996). Supporting articulation work. In Rob Kling (Ed.), *Computerization and controversy: Value conflicts and social choices* (2nd ed., pp. 407-423). San Diego, CA: Academic. **CD**
- Suchman, Lucy. (2007). *Human-machine reconfigurations: Plans and situated actions* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.
- Taylor, George H. (2001). Improvement in medical rubbing apparatus. In Carroll Pursell (Ed.), *American technology* (pp. 131-133). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. (Original work published 1876) **CD**
- Tenner, Edward. (1997). The computerized office: The revenge of the body. In *Why things bite back: Technology and the revenge of unintended consequences* (pp. 206-234 and 392-396). New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1996) **CD**
- Tripp, Guy E. (2001). Power on the farm. In Carroll Pursell (Ed.), *American technology* (pp. 201-203). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. (Original work published 1926) **CD**
- Van House, Nancy A. (2003). Science and technology studies and information studies. In Blaise Cronin (Ed.), *Annual review of information science and technology* (Vol. 38, pp. 3-86). Medford, NJ: Information Today. **CD**

- van Zoonen, Liesbet. (1992). Feminist theory and information technology. *Media, Culture & Society*, 14(1), 9-30. Also available at XXXX
- Wajcman, Judy. (1991a). The built environment: Women's place, gendered space. In *Feminism confronts technology* (pp. 110-136). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University. **CD**
- Wajcman, Judy. (1991b). *Feminism confronts technology*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.
- Wajcman, Judy. (1991c). Reproductive technology: Delivered into men's hands. In *Feminism confronts technology* (pp. 54-80). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University. **CD**
- Wajcman, Judy. (2004). *TechnoFeminism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Williams, Rosalind. (1998). The political and feminist dimensions of technological determinism. In Merritt Roe Smith & Leo Marx (Eds.), *Does technology drive history?: The dilemma of technological determinism* (pp. 217-235). Cambridge, MA: MIT. **CD**
- Winner, Langdon. (1980). Do artifacts have politics? *Daedalus*, 109(1), 121-136. **CD**

Selected important journals

Cultural Studies

differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies

Feminist Theory

Gender and History

Gender & Society

Gender, Work & Organization

History and Technology

Journal of Gender Studies

Journal of Material Culture

Knowledge and Society: The Anthropology of Science and Technology

Men and Masculinities

Minerva

Science and Technology Review

Science and Technology Studies

Science Studies

Science, Technology, & Human Values

Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society

Social Studies of Science

Technology and Culture

Women's Studies International Forum

Women's Studies Quarterly