

Syllabus

Global451: Access, Security, and Intercultural Context of Global Communication

Instructor: Prof. Tae-seop Lim (Johnston 230, tslim@uwm.edu, 229-6819)

Course Description

This course provides in-depth analyses of the study of informational technology in intercultural and global contexts. It is designed to enhance students' understanding of the impacts of culture on (1) the use of and attitudes towards information technology, (2) the design of web pages and (3) access to and security of networks, and (4) policy on IT. The course also discusses the consequences of globalization or diffusion of information technology.

Course Objectives

1. To understand the impact of culture on human behavior
2. To be aware of the relativity of culture, and the diversity of the ways of living
3. To learn the key theories of cross-cultural communication.
4. To understand the impact of culture on the use of information technology..
5. To understand cultural differences in web page and network design.
6. To enhance competence in global information technology and communication
7. To understand the issues of digital divide and equity
8. To understand the relationship between culture and policies on Internet technology..

Textbook

There is no textbook for this course. All the readings will be posted on the Internet.

Evaluation

Your final grade will be based on two examinations, Mid-term (30%) and Final (30%), a research project (30%), and participation (10%). The exams, which are objective and non-cumulative, will be given in the midterm and finals week. The participation will be

graded based on the activities in discussion forum. There will be no curving of the grades either up or down.

94-100% A	90-93.9 A-	87-89.9 B+	84-86.9 B	80-83.9 B-	77-79.9 C+
74-76.9 C	70-73.9 C-	67-69.9 D+	64-66.9 D	60-63.9 D-	0-59.9 F

Research Project

The research project is a comparison between two or more countries or global regions on (1) digital divide or equity of access problem, (2) information technology policy or (3) the security/privacy issue.

Students should submit (1) prospectus or proposal (2) mid-term report, and (3) final report. A prospectus lays out the basic plan for the project, reporting (1) countries/regions to compare (2) the specific issue to be researched, and (3) the method of research. A mid-term report provides the current status of the project, specifying how much data has been collected and what has been found. A final report is the completed research report.

Participation

There will be 14 discussion forums open over the course of semester. In a normal week, one forum will open on Monday and close on Sunday. There will be no forums in 8th and 16th week when exams are scheduled.

On each forum, the instructor will post one or two questions by Monday morning. Students are required to post an initial response to each question by Wednesday, and then read others' postings and respond to them as much as possible. Initial responses posted late will be accepted with a significant deduction of credit.

Participation is graded just like face-to-face class participation. I set up the minimum level requirements - one good initial response for each forum, reading most initial responses by others, and occasional responses to others' responses - and follow how the forums progress.

After observing several forums, I identify the most active participants and the median

group who are not really active but steadily and reliably participate in the forums. The minimal participants get 70%, the most active ones get 100%, the median group gets 85%, and those who fall in between these groups get the grades based on their relative position. In my earlier classes, the median group posted about 3-4 messages per forum and read about 80% of others' messages. I grade based on the overall participation, but the overall participation here does not mean the average but the overall tendency. If, for example, you post 3, 4, 4, 3, 3, 2, 4 messages for the first 7 forums, then you belong to the median group; but if you post 1, 9, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1 message(s), then I would consider you a minimal participant who occasionally post responses to others. The forum grades will be posted twice: at the end of each half.

Every missed forum will cost you about 1/14 of the forum grade.

This is my general recommendations and expectations:

1. First of all, don't miss any forum. Completely missing a forum will hurt your participation grade badly.
2. If you post single message each day, you will get 75%.
3. If you post an initial response each day, read some of others' postings, and post a response to others postings every other day, you will receive 80%.
4. If you post 2 messages each forum and read about half of others' postings, you will get 85%.
5. If you post 3 messages each forum and read a significant proportion of others' postings, you will receive 88%.
6. If you post 5 messages each forum and read most of others' postings, you will get 92%.
7. If you post 7 messages each forum and read all of others' postings, you will get 97%.
8. If you post 10 messages each forum and read others messages constantly (read and re-read to respond again and again), you will receive 100%.
9. This, however, is a basic guideline. The grade is also dependent on the quality of your postings.

Participation by Students with Disabilities

If you need special accommodations in order to meet any of the requirements of this course,

please contact me as soon as possible.

Accommodation for Religious Observances

Students will be allowed to complete examinations or other requirements that are missed because of a religious observance. (Form UWM Faculty Document #1853)

Academic Misconduct

The university has a responsibility to promote academic honesty and integrity and to develop procedures to deal effectively with instances of academic dishonesty. Students are responsible for the honest completion and representation of their work, for the appropriate citation of sources, and for respect of others' academic endeavors.

A more detailed description of Student Academic Disciplinary Procedures may be found in Regents Policy Statements, UWS Chapter 14 and UWM Faculty Document #1686.

Complaint Procedures

Students may direct complaints to the head of the academic unit or department in which the complaint occurs. If the complaint allegedly violates a specific university policy, it may be directed to the head of the department or academic unit in which the complaint occurred or to the appropriate university office responsible of reinforcing the policy.

Grade Appeal Procedures

A student may appeal a grade on the grounds that it is based on capricious or arbitrary decision of the course instructor. Such an appeal shall follow the established procedures adopted by the department, college, or school in which the course resides. These procedures are available in writing form the respective department chairperson or the Academic Dean of the College/School.

On certain occasions students may experience actions on the part of a faculty member, GTA, or other instructional staff member assigned to the course that cause the student to consider filing a grievance or grade appeal. The College of Letters and Science Undergraduate Grievance/Grade Appeal Procedure can be found at http://www.uwm.edu/letsci/pdf/grievance_procedure.pdf. Please note that the student has 30 working days from the date of the instructor's action to initiate a formal appeal.

Weekly Topics and Reading Assignments

Week	Topics	Assignment Due
	1. Culture and Information Technology	
	2. Edward T. Hall and Theory of Context	
	3. Geertz Hofstede and Cultural Dimensions	Prospectus Due
	4. Impacts of Culture on the Use	
	5. Culture and Computer-Mediated Communication	
	6. High/Low Context and Web Design	
	7. Cultural Dimensions and Web Design	
	8. Culture and Instructional Web Design	Mid-term examination
	9. Culture and Web Developer/Designer	
	10. Culture, IT, and Corporation	Mid-term Report Due
	11. Culture and eCommerce/eBusiness	
	12. Culture and Diffusion of IT	
	13. Gender and Information Technology	
	14. Unification/Globalization of IT	
	15. Equity and Access	Final Report Due
	16. IT policy	Final Examination

Reading List

Week 1. Culture and Information Technology

1. Steve Jones (1998). Understanding Micropolis and Compunity. C. Ess and F. Sudweeks (eds), Proceedings Cultural Attitudes Towards Communication and Technology '98, University of Sydney, Australia, 21-33.

http://www.it.murdoch.edu.au/~sudweeks/catac98/pdf/02_jones.pdf

2. Gregory E. Kersten, Stan Matwin, Sunil J. Noronha and Mik A. Kersten (2000). The Software for Cultures and the Cultures in Software. H.R. Hansen, M. Bichler and H. Harald (Eds.), Proceedings of the 8th European Conference on Information System ECIS2000, Vienna, Austria, Vol. 1, 2000, (509-514).

<http://csrc.lse.ac.uk/asp/aspecis/20000076.pdf>

3. Heidi Walsh, Cultural differences. Award Article.

<http://www.website-awards.net/articles/article44.htm>

Week 2. Edward T. Hall and Theory of Context

1. Institute for the Study of Human Knowledge. The grip of culture: Edward T. Hall.

<http://www.ishkbooks.com/hall.pdf>

2. Lailawati Mohd Salleh (2005). High/Low Context Communication: The Malaysian Malay Style. Proceedings of the 2005 Association for Business communication Annual Convention.

<http://www.businesscommunication.org/conventions/Proceedings/2005/PDFs/09ABC05.pdf>

Week 3. Geertz Hofstede and Cultural Dimensions

1. ClearlyCultural: making sense of cross-cultural communication, "Geert Hofstede Cultural Dimensions."

<http://www.clearlycultural.com/geert-hofstede-cultural-dimensions/>

2. Ole Christian Enger (2004). Decision making across cultures.

3. Tana George (2006). Why offshoring fails. IT Manager's Journal.
<http://www.itmanagersjournal.com/feature/10536>

Week 4. Impacts of Culture on the Use

1. Sabine Köszegi, Rudolf Vetschera, and Gregory E. Kersten. National Cultural Differences in the Use and Perception of Internet-based NSS -Does High or Low Context Matter? InterNeg Research Papers INR 09/03
<http://interneg.concordia.ca/interneg/research/papers/2003/09.pdf>

2. Martin Graff, Jo Davies and Maggy McNorton (2004). Cognitive Style and Cross Cultural Differences in Internet Use and Computer Attitudes. European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning.
http://www.eurodl.org/materials/contrib/2004/Graff_Davies_McNorton.html

3. Daniel Pargman (1998). Reflections on cultural bias and adaptation. C. Ess and F. Sudweeks (eds), Proceedings Cultural Attitudes Towards Communication and Technology '98, University of Sydney, Australia, 81-98.
http://www.it.murdoch.edu.au/~sudweeks/catac98/pdf/06_pargman.pdf

4. Jerome Heath (1998). Cultural attitudes and technology. C. Ess and F. Sudweeks (eds), Proceedings Cultural Attitudes Towards Communication and Technology '98, University of Sydney, Australia, 202-204
http://www.it.murdoch.edu.au/~sudweeks/catac98/pdf/17_heath.pdf

Week 5. Culture and Computer-Mediated Communication

1. Charles Ess and Fay Sudweeks. Culture and computer-mediated communication: Toward new understandings. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11(1), article 9.
<http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue1/ess.html>

2. Hermeking, M. (2005). Culture and Internet consumption: Contributions from cross-cultural marketing and advertising research. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11(1), article 10.

<http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue1/hermeking.html>

3. Heejin Lee and Richard Varey (1998). Analysing cultural impacts of computer-mediated communication in organization. C. Ess and F. Sudweeks (eds), Proceedings Cultural Attitudes Towards Communication and Technology '98, University of Sydney, Australia, 321-326.

http://www.it.murdoch.edu.au/~sudweeks/catac98/pdf/27_lee.pdf

4. Satinder Gill (1998). The cultural interface: The role of self. C. Ess and F. Sudweeks (eds). Proceedings Cultural Attitudes Towards Communication and Technology '98, University of Sydney, Australia, 246-251.

http://www.it.murdoch.edu.au/~sudweeks/catac98/pdf/20_gill.pdf

5. Paul F. Tully (1998). Cross-cultural issues affecting information technology use in logistics. C. Ess and F. Sudweeks (eds). Proceedings Cultural Attitudes Towards Communication and Technology '98, University of Sydney, Australia, 317-320.

http://www.it.murdoch.edu.au/~sudweeks/catac98/pdf/26_tully.pdf

6. Bauer C, Chin KL, Chang V (2000) Web-Based Learning: Aspects of Cultural Differences. In Proceedings of the Eighth European Conference on Information Systems (Hansen HR, Bichler M, Mahrer H eds.), 1396-1402, Vienna.

<http://csrc.lse.ac.uk/asp/aspecis/20000068.pdf>

Week 6. High/Low Context and Web Design

1. Würtz, E. (2005). A cross-cultural analysis of websites from high-context cultures and low-context cultures. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11(1), article 13.

<http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue1/wuertz.html>

2. Lorna Heaton (1998). Preserving communication context: Virtual workspace and interpersonal space in Japanese CSCW. C. Ess and F. Sudweeks (eds). Proceedings Cultural Attitudes Towards Communication and Technology '98, University of Sydney, Australia, 207-230.

http://www.it.murdoch.edu.au/~sudweeks/catac98/pdf/18_heaton.pdf

Week 7 Cultural Dimensions and Web Design

1. Aaron Marcus and Emilie W. Gould. Cultural dimensions and global web user-interface design: What? So what? Now What?.

http://www.amanda.com/resources/hfweb2000/AMA_CultDim.pdf

2. Housahng Shahnava. Cultural differences. Encyclopaedia of occupational health and safety: 4th edition.

<http://www.ilo.org/encyclopedia/?doc&nd=857400307&nh=0>

Week 8 Culture and Instructional Web Design

1. Callahan, E. (2005). Cultural similarities and differences in the design of university websites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11(1), article 12.

<http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue1/callahan.html>

2. McLoughlin, C. and Oliver, R. Instructional design for cultural difference: A case study of the indigenous online learning in a tertiary context. Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education. The 16th Annual Conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education. 1999 Brisbane. <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/brisbane99/papers/mcloughlinoliver.pdf>

Week 9 Culture and Web Developer/Designer

1. Adrie Stander (1998). Bridging the gap: Issues in the design of computer user interfaces for multicultural communities. C. Ess and F. Sudweeks (eds). *Proceedings Cultural Attitudes Towards Communication and Technology '98*, University of Sydney, Australia, 255-260.

http://www.it.murdoch.edu.au/~sudweeks/catac98/pdf/21_standar.pdf

2. Kankanhalli, A., B.C.Y. Tan, K.K. Wei, and M.C. Holmes (2004), "Cross-cultural Differences and Information Systems Developer Values", *Decision Support Systems*, 38(2), 183-195..

<http://www.comp.nus.edu.sg/~atreysi/papers/ISdev.pdf>

3. Kankanhalli, A., B.C.Y. Tan, and K.K. Wei (2007), "Conflict and Performance in Global Virtual Teams", *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 23(3), 237-274

<http://www.comp.nus.edu.sg/~atreyi/papers/GVTconflict.pdf>

4. Georgios Dafoulas and Linda Maculay. Investigating cultural differences in Virtual Software Teams. *EJISDC* (2001) 7, 4, 1-14

<http://www.cs.ucy.ac.cy/courses/EPL011/readings/v7r4.pdf>

Week 10. Culture, IT, and Corporation

1. Tony Van kerckhoven. The influence of cultural differences on Corporate Internet Reporting in three Western European countries: a preliminary study

http://www.ua.ac.be/download.aspx?c=*TEWHI&n=14358&ct=009824&e=21263

<http://ideas.repec.org/p/ant/wpaper/2002028.html>

2. Skok, W., and Doeringer, H (2002) Potential Impact of Cultural Differences on Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Projects. *Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Nations*. 7. 5. 1-8.

[http://www.peoplesoft-planet.com/Potential-Impact-of-Cultural-Differences-on-Enterprise-Resource-Planning-\(ERP\)-Projects.html](http://www.peoplesoft-planet.com/Potential-Impact-of-Cultural-Differences-on-Enterprise-Resource-Planning-(ERP)-Projects.html)

Week 11. Culture and eCommerce/eBusiness

1. Gregory E. Kersten (2001). Embedding culture in e-business systems. *InterNeg Research Papers*.

<http://interneg.concordia.ca/interneg/research/papers/2001/03.pdf>

2. Kumiko Aoki (2000). Cultural differences in E-Commerce: A comparison between the US and Japan. *First Monday*, Volume 5, Number 11 — November 5th 2000.

http://www.firstmonday.org/issues/issue5_11/aoki/index.html#author

3. Manfred Davidmann. Style of management and leadership. (supplemental).

<http://www.solhaam.org/articles/clm2.html>

Week 12. Culture and Diffusion of IT

1. Carleen Maitland (1998). Global diffusion of interactive networks: The impact of culture. C. Ess and F. Sudweeks (eds). *Proceedings Cultural Attitudes Towards*

Communication and Technology '98, University of Sydney, Australia, 268-286.
http://www.it.murdoch.edu.au/~sudweeks/catac98/pdf/24_maitland.pdf

2. Amel Ben Zakour (2004). Cultural differences and information technology acceptance. Proceedings of the 7th Conference of the Southern Association for Information Systems.
<http://sais.aisnet.org/2004/2004proceedings.pdf>
<http://sais.aisnet.org/2004/Zakour.pdf>

3. Mark Srite (2006). Culture as an explanation of technology acceptance differences: An empirical investigation of Chinese and US users. Australasian Journal of Information Systems Volume 14 Number 1 Nov 2006.
<http://dl.acs.org.au/index.php/ajis/article/view/4/2>

Week 13. Gender and Information Technology

1. Gefen, D. and Straub, D. "Gender Difference in the Perception and Use of E-Mail: An Extension to the Technology Acceptance Model," MIS Quarterly (21:4, December), 1997, pp. 389-400.
<http://www.cis.gsu.edu/~dstraub/Papers/Resume/Gefen&Straub1997.pdf>

2. Hiroshi Ono and Madeline Zavodny (2004). Gender differences in information technology usage: A US-Japan comparison. Federal Reserve Bank of America Working Paper Series.
<http://www.sidos.ch/method/RC28/abstracts/Madeline%20Zavodny.pdf>

3. Wong, S. L., & Hanafi, A. (2007). Gender Differences in Attitudes towards Information Technology among Malaysian Student Teachers: A Case Study at Universiti Putra Malaysia. Educational Technology & Society, 10 (2), 158-169.
http://www.ifets.info/journals/10_2/14.pdf

4. Susan Herring (1994). GENDER DIFFERENCES IN COMPUTER-MEDIATED COMMUNICATION:BRINGING FAMILIAR BAGGAGE TO THE NEW FRONTIER
http://www.eff.org/Net_culture/Gender_issues/cmc_and_gender.article

Week 14. Unification/Globalization of IT

1. Kim Nayer (2001). Globalization of information: Intellectual property Law implication. First Monday.
http://www.firstmonday.org/issues/issue7_1/nayer/#n4
2. Spennemann, Dirk H.R., Birckhead, Jim, Green, David G. & Atkinson, John S. (1996) "The electronic colonisation of the Pacific". Computer Mediated Communications Magazine Vol.3(2).
<http://www.december.com/cmcmag/1996/feb/spen.html>
3. Cultural imperialism – The Internet. M/Cyclopedia of New Media
http://wiki.media-culture.org.au/index.php/Cultural_Imperialism_-_The_Internet#Introduction#Introduction
4. Zhouying Jin, Robert M. Mason and Peter P. Yim. Bridging US-China cross-cultural differences using Internet and groupware technologies. Paper presented at the 7th International Association for Management of Technology Annual Conference (IAMOT'98), Feb. 1998 in Orlando, FL. The text above is the edited version as published in "Cahiers du MoT" (notebooks of MoT), a publication of Groupe ESC - Grenoble, France in summer 1998.
http://www.cim-oem.com/bridge_8c18c.html
5. Maged Ali and Sarmad Alshawi. Cultural universality versus particularity within eCRM systems: A special case of information systems.
<http://www.iseing.org/emcis/EMCIS2005/pdfs/EMCIS05-Alshawi.pdf>

Week 15. Equity and Access

1. Rosalía Cortés & Gabriel Kessler (2003) Globalization and equity in Latin America. Paper presented at Fourth Annual Global Development Conference "Globalization and Equity" Cairo, January 14-21 2003.
http://www.gdnet.org/pdf/Fourth_Annual_Conference/parallels1/LatinAmerica/Kesler_and_Cortes_Paper.pdf

2. Gülsün KURUBACAK. Accomplishing Access & Equity in Education: Using the Web to Design and Deliver Courses Online. Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE October 2002 ISSN 1302-6488 Volume:3 Number:4 <http://tojde.anadolu.edu.tr/tojde8/articles/equityineducation.htm>

Week 16 IT policy

1. LaRose, R., Lai, Y.-J., Lange, R., Love, B., and Wu, Y. (2005). Sharing or piracy? An exploration of downloading behavior. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11(1), article 1. <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue1/larose.html>

2. Backroad Connections Pty Ltd 2003, Privacy issues in online teaching and learning (Version 1.00), Australian Flexible Learning Framework Quick Guides series, Australian National Training Authority. <http://flexiblelearning.net.au/guides/privacy.pdf>

3. Francesca Primerano. Multicultural Australia, Information Technology and Online Dispute Resolution (ODR). <http://www.odr.info/unforum2004/Primerano.HTM>

Research Project Assignment

1. The purpose of the assignment
 - 1) To motivate students to acquire knowledge on global communication for themselves.
 - 2) To lead students to learn about those topics that are not covered in class.

2. Your job
 - 1) Pick two or more countries or regions
 - 2) Pick one of the following research topics/issues:
 - i. Digital divide
 - ii. Equity of access (to IT technology)
 - iii. Information Technology policy
 - iv. Stance on security and/or privacy issues (regarding the use of network)
 - 3) Compare and evaluate the two countries/regions on the selected issue.

3. Assignments (30% of the final grade)
 - 1) Prospectus: 5%
 - i. A report of the basic plan for the project, including (1) countries/regions to compare (2) the specific issue to be researched, and (3) the method of research.
 - ii. Due: midnight, September 23rd.
 - iii. Grading criteria
 1. Including of all information required
 2. Likelihood of executing the project
 3. Understanding of the overall project assignment.
 - 2) Mid-term report: 15%
 - i. A report providing the current status of the project, specifying how much data has been collected and what has been found.
 - ii. Due: midnight, November 11th.
 - iii. Grading criteria (Specific criteria will be provided later)
 1. The amount of data researched.
 2. The amount of relevant data collected.
 3. The amount of effort made to find relevant resources.

- 3) Final report: 80%
- i. A completed research report.
 - ii. Due: midnight, December 16th.
 - iii. Grading Criteria (Specific criteria will be provided later)
 1. Richness and comprehensiveness of information researched.
 2. The amount of effort invested in the research.
 3. The accuracy of analysis.
 4. The degree to which the original plan is accomplished.
 5. Organization and writing.