INF 2331:
The Future of the Book

Winter 2023

Location: Bissell 507; **Time:** Wednesdays, 1:30 to 4:00 pm

Instructor: [Alan Galey](#); **Teaching Assistant:** [Anna Kalinowski](#)

Contact: Please use regular email (alan.galey@utoronto.ca / annamaria.kalinowski@mail.utoronto.ca) rather than Quercus's messaging system. We will normally respond by the end of the next business day. We don't read or respond to email during evenings, weekends, and stat holidays, and we don't expect students to do so either.

Office hours: Thursdays, 2:30 - 3:30 pm in BL 646, and informally after each class. Anna will post office hours as assignment deadlines approach later in the term.

The University of Calgary's high-density storage facility.

Important Details for the Winter 2023 term

This course will take place entirely in person unless the public health situation takes a turn for the worse. There is no hybrid delivery option for this course, and lectures will not be recorded, though I will make lecture slides available after each class. Please wear a mask in class and make sure your [COVID-19 vaccinations](#) are up to date. If you are feeling sick, do not come to class. However, to alleviate any pressure students may feel to attend class even while sick, I will make every reasonable effort to ensure that students who miss class because of illness can still keep up with the course (e.g. there is no in-person participation grade).

Course Description

This course considers the history and possible futures of books in a digital world. In this course "the book" is interpreted broadly, meaning not just an object with covers and pages, but also an evolving metaphor for conceptual frameworks for knowledge, and a metonym that brings together many different technologies, institutions, and cultural practices. The course introduces students to

interdisciplinary approaches such as book history, textual studies, history of reading, and digital humanities, with an emphasis on balancing theoretical speculation with practical implementation. Readings will survey topics such as the ontology of born-digital artifacts, critical assessment of digitization projects, collaborative knowledge work, reading devices (old and new), e-book interface design, text/image/multimedia relationships, theories and practices of markup, the gendering of technologies, the politics of digital archiving, the materiality of texts, and the epistemology of digital tools.

Course Learning Outcomes

Students who have successfully completed this course should be able to:

- use different disciplinary and theoretical frameworks to understand the changing form of the book from a range of perspectives (assessed through discussion posts);
- understand how specific technologies, such as XML and the EPUB format, affect the design possibilities, implementation choices, and preservation challenges inherent in various forms of digital text (assessed through discussion posts and the reading interface profile);
- situate changes in authorship, publishing, and reading within historical, social, and cultural contexts (assessed through discussion posts);
- apply theoretical and practical knowledge gained in the course to current debates regarding the digitization of print books, the dissemination of e-books, and experimentation with new forms of the book (assessed through discussion posts and the Twine project).

Relationship between Course Learning Outcomes and MI Program Learning Outcomes: The future of the book is a topic that requires students to be able to apply a range of concepts, theories, and practices derived from a range of information-related disciplines (Program Outcome 1). The book's historical centrality to the preservation and dissemination of human knowledge means that the evolving forms of digital books are a core concern for information professionals, especially those who work to ensure access to knowledge (Program Outcome 2). Understanding the changing forms of the book, from manuscript to print to digital text, requires a synthesis of theoretical and practical knowledge, linking theories of interpretation to specific encoding and digitization technologies (Program Outcomes 4 & 5).

Evaluation Structure and Grading Policies

15%   Discussion posts (first assessment)
25%   Discussion posts (second assessment)
25%   Reading interface profile
35%   Twine project and report (group assignment)

Any assignment that does not meet a minimum level of legibility (i.e. the instructor cannot read it because of grammatical errors or other writing problems) may be returned for revision and resubmission with the late penalty in effect. All assignments are evaluated in accordance with (1) the University of Toronto Governing Council's University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy and (2) the Faculty of Information/s Guidelines to Grade Interpretation. The Governing Council policy is available at

http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/grading.pdf. The Faculty of Information's Guidelines to Grade Interpretation supplement that policy and are available at https://www.ischool.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/grade_interpretation_revised_August2020.pdf. See also the guidelines on the Use of INC, SDF, & WDR: https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/policies-guidelines/inc-sdf-wdr/

Late penalty:

Late assignments will be penalized 3% per day (including weekends) for up to two weeks, starting at 5:00 pm EST on the due date. Extensions will only be granted in cases of illness or personal disruptions. Assignments that are more than two weeks late without an extension will not be accepted, and will receive a grade of zero. Late assignments, with or without an extension, may not receive written feedback.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the University is temporarily suspending the need for a doctor's note or medical certificate for absences from academic participation; students should use the Absence Declaration tool on ACORN to declare an absence if they require consideration for missed academic work; students are responsible for contacting instructors to request the academic consideration they are seeking; students should record each day of their absence as soon as it begins, up until the day before they return to classes or other academic activities.

If you are missing a test/assignment or submitting an assignment late due to **accessibility challenges**, please make an appointment to discuss your accommodation needs with your Accessibility Advisor. Your Accessibility Advisor can write directly to your academic advisor with the appropriate supporting information.

Grade appeals:

If students feel any assignment grade is unfair, or simply have questions about it, I am happy to discuss it with them. However, students should not email me or the TA about their grade until at least 24 hours have passed, to ensure that no emails are sent in the heat of the moment. Also, before we will discuss any grade appeals we expect you to do **four** things: 1) re-read the Faculty of Information's Grade Interpretation Guidelines; 2) re-read the assignment instructions in full; 3) re-read your own submitted assignment in full; and 4) re-read our feedback, which may include marginal notes on your returned assignment document. These steps are to ensure that discussions about grades are based on evidence, not just expectations or initial reactions.

Accommodations

Students with diverse learning styles and needs are welcome in this course. In particular, if you have a disability/health consideration that may require accommodations, please feel free to approach me and/or the Accessibility Services Office as soon as possible. Accessibility Services staff are available by appointment to assess specific needs, provide referrals and arrange appropriate accommodations. The sooner you let us know your needs, the quicker we can assist you in achieving your learning goals in this course.

To book an appointment with an Accessibility Advisor, please connect with the Accessibility Services front desk via email at *accessibility.services@utoronto.ca* or call (416) 978-8060. Consultation appointments are available to discuss any questions about the Accessibility Services registration process and/or potential accommodation support. The on-location Accessibility Advisor at the Faculty of Information is Michael Mercer (michael.mercer@utoronto.ca).

Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

The University of Toronto is committed to equity, human rights and respect for diversity. All members of the learning environment in this course should strive to create an atmosphere of mutual respect where all members of our community can express themselves, engage with each other, and respect one another's differences. U of T does not condone discrimination or harassment against any persons or communities.

The Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Unit (EDIU) at the School of Information, in collaboration with U of T community members, works to promote and encourage an equitable and inclusive work and classroom environment, free from discrimination and/or harassment based on any of the code grounds. The EDI Unit is responsible for developing and delivering EDI programs and services, works with all stakeholders, and provides confidential services. Key areas of services include:

- Training and educational opportunities
- Community building and engagement
- Systemic change initiatives
- Providing confidential advice/consultations
- Supports with resolving concerns of discrimination and/or harassment

EDIU Complaints Resolution Assistance Process:

- Meet with individuals (all stakeholders) to listen and discuss concerns or questions related to any of the human rights protected grounds
- A complaint is not necessary to approach the EDI Director with questions or to seek information
- Talk about options available for resolution assistance, including informal and formal complaint options
- Provide referrals or liaise with other departments or stakeholders where necessary
- Maintain confidentiality of queries that people bring forward as legally required. **Limitations to confidentiality are discussed if safety is raised**
- No steps are taken to address a complaint without consent

Please note, there will be changes to this process in the near future; however, if you do have any questions/concerns, feel free to reach out to ediu.ischool@utoronto.ca

Writing Support

As stated in the Faculty of Information's Grade Interpretation Guidelines, "work that is not well written and grammatically correct will not generally be considered eligible for a grade in the A range, regardless of its quality in other respects." With this in mind, please make use of the writing support provided to

graduate students by the SGS Graduate Centre for Academic Communication. The services are designed to target the needs of both native and non-native speakers and all programs are free. Please consult the current SGS Workshops Schedule for more information.

The Faculty of Information Learning Hub can support your learning in this course in a range of ways. They offer programs, workshops, and services to support your learning, as well as a physical place – on the 4th floor of Bissell – for gathering, seeking help, finding resources, studying, creative making, relaxing, playing and collaborating. Additionally, they provide an Virtual Learning Hub that provides resources and sign ups for services and events. Below are an abbreviated list of our services:

Cite it Right: All incoming students must complete the Cite it Right online workshop and quiz within the month of September. Cite it Right, with its focus on academic integrity, was designed to familiarize students with the University's *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* and, more generally, help them build confidence as they work with sources. Both the workshop and quiz are located in the Virtual Learning Hub. Please note that the Dean's Office monitors the completion of these modules, as well as quiz scores.

iSkills Workshops: The iSkills co-curricular workshop series is an expansive program that addresses scholarly, professional, and technical competencies aligned with Faculty of Information academic programs. Rosters are built every term to reflect students' current needs along with trends in the information and heritage professional worlds. View the current roster of workshops and learn more about the program on our iSkills site.

Tutors: The Learning Hub offers one-on-one tutoring services to support writing, research, and technical skills. You can learn more about our tutors' specific areas of expertise, how they can support you, and sign up for individual tutoring on our Writing, Research & Technical Skills Support page. They can help you with assignments for this course at any stage – conceptualizing and planning, drafting, refining, and even after you have received your mark, to help you understand your instructor's comments and plan for your next assignment.

Library Support: The University of Toronto Libraries (UTL) provides a liaison to the Faculty of Information, who is familiar with the specific needs of our students. Yoonhee Lee can connect you to UTL resources, services, and tools, as well as support you with research projects, citation management, and other research-related tasks.

Academic Integrity

Please consult the University's site on Academic Integrity. The Faculty of Information has a zero-tolerance policy on plagiarism as defined in section B.I.1.(d) of the University's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (PDF). You should acquaint yourself with the Code. Please review the material in Cite it Right and if you require further clarification, consult the site How Not to Plagiarize (PDF).

Cite it Right covers relevant parts of the U of T Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (1995). It is expected that all Faculty of Information students take the Cite it Right workshop and the online quiz. Completion of the online Cite it Right quiz should be made prior to the second week of classes as the workshop is now interactive. To review and complete the workshop, visit the Orientation e-Workshops on the Virtual Inforum.

As an anti-plagiarism measure, prior to returning a grade on an assignment the instructor or TA may require the student to meet with them to discuss the submitted work. The purpose of the meeting is to determine whether the student actually wrote the work they submitted. Submitting academic work as one's own when it was actually written by someone else—including an AI—is a type of fraud, and will be subject to the plagiarism policies linked above. However, please note that being asked to discuss your submitted assignment is not an accusation of plagiarism; it is simply due diligence on the part of your instructors, who are responsible for ensuring fairness to all students in the course.

General Assignment Guidelines

Please make sure to review these guidelines before you begin work on each assignment. The grade will be lowered for assignments that don't follow these guidelines.

Your Digital Artifact Profile and Twine Project Report must be written in formal academic English, and submitted in 12-point serif font (such as Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins. A-level assignments will be almost entirely free of writing errors. Be sure to proofread your work carefully before submitting, and consult the writing resources mentioned in the syllabus for extra help.

The American Psychological Association (APA) citation style is the most commonly used one in academic writing in the social sciences, while Chicago and MLA (Modern Language Association) are the most common in the humanities (at least in North America). **For this course, all formal written assignments must use Chicago's notes + bibliography format** , as it is the referencing system most suited to disciplines that work with non-standard sources like the digital artifacts we study in this course. Be aware that the Chicago Style guide also includes an author-date system, but the notes + bibliography system is different, and is the one you should use for this course. It is documented in the *Chicago Manual of Style Online*, which is also an excellent reference for grammar, usage, and other writing conventions in addition to citation. A quick reference can be found here: www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide/citation-guide-1.html. I recommend bookmarking both links in your browser's toolbar.

If it helps to have a model to follow for Chicago Style, I recommend the Cordell article from our course readings (but please use footnotes, not endnotes).

Students are welcome and encouraged to make use of images, including screenshots, in their written assignments within the following guidelines:

1. Images may be included as appendixes or integrated into the body of the text, whichever you prefer; all images must be accompanied by a caption that includes the image's source. It's a good idea to number your images (e.g. "Figure 1") for ease of reference in your text.

2. Assignments will be read digitally, not printed, so students are welcome to use colour images. However, please be sure to use an image editing program such as *Gimp* (www.gimp.org) or Preview for macOS (Tools -> Adjust size...) to reduce the image file sizes so that the PDF files you submit **don't exceed 10MB**.

3. Students may include copyrighted images in their assignments and discussion board posts without acquiring permission as long as they follow the Canadian Copyright Act's current

exceptions for fair dealing, in that the images must only be used for the purposes of criticism or review, and each image must be accompanied by: 1) the source; and 2) the name of the creator.

Discussion Group Assignment

Due dates for 7 required posts throughout the term: Jan. 20, Jan. 30, Feb. 13 (first assessment after this post), Feb. 27, March 13, March 27, April 11
Required posts in response to assigned questions should be 500-800 words

Discussion with other students is an important part of this course. For the duration of the course, students will be part of a discussion group of about five people. Your group membership is pre-assigned, and you can find your group in the "People" section, linked in the left-hand menu, and under the "Groups" tab. Within these group discussion spaces, you will contribute original posts approximately every two weeks in response to questions set by the professor for the whole class (for a total of seven required posts). The questions will be shared well ahead of the due dates for posts, and designed to let you explore the topic and draw in your own interests, responses to class material, and research for your assignments.

Group members are expected to interact with each other, commenting or replying to each other's contributions to create an ongoing dialogue about different aspects of the course topic. Also, to help you get to know your group members, you'll also be working with them whenever we have in-class exercises. Students are welcome to go beyond the assigned questions and use their group blogs to generate new lines of discussion, provided they're somehow related to the course topic.

In your discussion board posts, links, media, and block quotations are welcome, but these should never stand alone; they should always be accompanied by discussion of contents and an explanation of why they are included. Quotations and references should be indicated either with a link or more formal citation, depending on the material. (The test of any citation is that another reader should be able to follow your trail back to the same point in your source.) If Chicago Notes + Bibliography proves awkward for this medium, you can use an author-date format like APA, but in that case please avoid dropped-in citations (Galey, 2022) that don't actually engage with the cited material in a specific way. For discussion posts, quality of engagement with secondary sources from the course (and beyond) matters more than quantity.

The writing can be informal and conversational (like a blog), and your posts will not be graded as though they were mini-essays—though grammatical or other writing errors that affect clarity will lower the grade.

Your discussion group posts will be reviewed and graded twice over the course of the term, once during the first half of the semester (with grade and feedback returned prior to the drop date), and once during the second half. For the first assessment, we will be grading your answers to the first three discussion questions and any comments you've posted until the end of the day on **Thursday, February 16** (i.e. three days after post #3 is due). Similarly, we will begin the second assessment after **Friday, April 14**, giving you three days after the last post's due date to add any comments.

Your grade for this assignment will be based on the consistency and relevance of your individual contributions to the discussion group. Here, "consistency" means that contributions—both original posts

and comments—reflect a timely, ongoing engagement with weekly readings, materials, research, etc. "Relevance" means that the contribution contains one or more of the following: familiarity with course readings and other materials (lectures, class discussions, etc.), as demonstrated through the use of specific examples, author names or theoretical concepts; inclusion of themes and points that have a clear and direct relevance to the course topic; discussion of literature, problems, ideas, examples and current events that pertain directly to your assignments, which includes consideration of the course readings and themes. Commenting on other group members' posts is also expected, and the frequency and quality of your engagement with others' posts will be taken into consideration in the grading. Students who only post and do not comment on other posts will not receive a grade in the A range on this assignment.

Reading Interface Profile

1,000-1,200 words, excluding notes, bibliography, and images
Due as PDF submitted to Quercus by 5:00 pm EST on Thursday, February 16

Students must advised to email the instructor with at least one idea for their reading interface profile by 5:00 pm EST on Monday, January 30 (late penalty will apply)

For this assignment you will select an example of a reading interface and write a descriptive profile of it, drawing mainly on the Johanna Drucker readings assigned for our Week 3 class (in which we'll discuss this assignment in detail). The primary purpose of the assignment is to help you achieve one of the course learning outcomes: the ability to understand how specific technologies affect the design possibilities, implementation choices, and preservation challenges inherent in various forms of digital text. A secondary purpose of the assignment is connected to another of the learning outcomes: the ability to apply theoretical and practical knowledge gained in the course to current debates regarding the digitization of print books, the dissemination of e-books, and experimentation with new forms of the book.

Most of all, this is an assignment about description. Developing the skills that enable you to slow down, read an interface with a critical eye, and describe its salient points is especially important—and difficult—in the analysis of reading interfaces because reading is such a naturalized, ubiquitous activity. This assignment challenges you to regard a familiar activity with different eyes.

Structure

For this assignment, you will write a structured descriptive and analytical profile. This will involve some of the same kinds of thinking you would employ in a traditional essay, but it is important to remember that this is not an essay. Unlike a research essay, the emphasis in your writing should be on description rather than argumentation, and your focus should be your chosen example of a reading interface rather than secondary sources (though they will still play a role). Feel free to give your profile a title, but it's not required. Secondary sources don't play a major role in this assignment beyond the Drucker articles and other readings from Week 3. You should include a bibliography for any sources you cite (including your chosen reading interface), but it will help to remember that you're not writing a critical analysis of Drucker or the other course readings, as you would in an essay.

The profile should have three parts of roughly equal length:

1. *Overview of your chosen reading interface example.* This serves as your introduction. Lay out the most important details of the interface you've chosen. (Think of the first paragraph or two of a good Wikipedia article.) What context does an unfamiliar reader need to know about it? Has the interface changed in any important ways over its history? What did you choose to read in this interface as a test-case? If it's a digital reading interface, specify any relevant software/hardware context (e.g. did you experience it on a smartphone screen or desktop PC with multiple monitors? what were the operating system and web browser?). If you have space, you can also tell us why you chose this particular reading interface for the assignment. Is it an interface that you use often or one that's new to you?

2. *Formal description of the reading interface.* This section is the main descriptive part of your profile. How is the reading interface organized? What features does it offer to the reader? More specifically, what affordances (i.e. opportunities for action) and constraints does it entail? If applicable, what are the relationships between text and paratext? (On the term *paratext*, see the McCracken reading assigned for Week 6 and my article assigned for Week 10.) If the interface permits external references (i.e. citations or links) or user annotation, those features would be worth focusing on. Also, are there useful things you can do with the interface that the designers may not have anticipated? Don't forget that some of the most important design elements may not draw attention to themselves (e.g. the use of negative space, like a margin or gutter).

   The suggestions above are just suggestions; you don't have to answer all of these questions, nor are you limited to them. You will almost certainly run out of space to include everything you've noticed in this section, so you'll need to be selective. Including images may help you to stay under the word limit.

3. *Analysis.* In this final section, which serves as your conclusion, follow Drucker's lead (in "Humanities Approaches to Interface Theory") by considering how the features you've described in the previous section encourage certain kinds of reading experiences — and potentially discourage others. To use Drucker's constructivist language, consider how the interface, as a "dynamic space of relations" (p. 3), may produce certain kinds of reading subjects (in the sense of subjectivities, or subject positions). To put it another way, in this final section you should attempt to answer a deceptively simple question: what kinds of readers does this interface lead us to become? Your analysis in this section will inevitably be speculative, at least in part, but it should be grounded in the evidence you've assembled in section 2.

   Note that this analysis isn't the same as evaluating how well the interface is designed, or how efficiently it enables readers to accomplish tasks. You're not simply reviewing the interface, as you might in the comments section in an online app store. Rather, this is more like ideological analysis, where you're paying attention to subtext and effects, not simply decoding the intentions and biases of the designers (those they may be relevant, to the extent we can determine what they are/were).

Choice of examples

For this assignment you can interpret the term *reading interface* broadly and creatively if you wish. The interface can be digital, print, manuscript, or something else. It could be a medieval book of hours or the Scholars Portal interface through which we access many course readings (e.g. Drucker's chapter in Week 7). It could be something as ordinary as Adobe Reader or as experimental as a work of genre-bending electronic literature.

There are some constraints on your choice of example:

1. the interface must be designed for long-form reading, i.e. reading texts whose length is measured in hundreds of words or more (sorry, no Instagram or Snapchat; maybe Twitter...)
2. Anna and I need to be able to have fairly easy access to the example you choose (ask us if you're not sure)
3. all students must email me their initial idea for a reading interface by the deadline specified above.

Keep in mind that choosing an interface with which you're already familiar, and which you like, may actually put you at a disadvantage. An interface that you find to be difficult or flawed might serve you better for this assignment, given that it's already forced you to think critically about it.

We will discuss some interface ideas in class, which should help anyone who's having difficulty selecting a candidate for their assignment.

Background reading

Another strategy that will help students choose an interface for this assignment, and understand the modes of description and analysis it calls for, is to look at some models for this kind of work. The assigned Drucker articles are both mainly theoretical and don't offer detailed examples. However, in "Humanities Approaches to Interface Theory," Drucker points to Scott McCloud's book *Understanding Comics* (New York: HarperCollins, 1993; see Drucker, pp. 3–6) as a nuanced formal analysis of comics as reading interfaces. McCloud's book is an excellent explanation of how specific formal elements work together in certain kinds of reading experiences, often working so effectively that we don't notice them.

Drucker offers a formal analysis of a specific example of a reading interface in her article "Graphical Readings and the Visual Aesthetics of Textuality," *Text* 16 (2006): 267–276. Beginning on p. 271, she analyses a page from the Kelmscott Press Chaucer (1896) and identifies 19 (!!) distinct functions for white space in the page design. Most importantly, she then works this evidence into a broader interpretation of the book's design — which is what this assignment asks you to do on a smaller scale, and with more focus on the idea of interface.

A third model you could consult is my own recent article "Imagining Marshall McLuhan as a Digital Reader: an Experiment in Applied Joyce," *Textual Practice* 35, no. 9 (2021): 1525–1549. The first part of the article surveys McLuhan's annotation practices in his own reading of books in his personal library (which now resides at the Fisher Rare Book Library). The second half of the article — which is the more

useful part for this assignment — looks at different digital reading interfaces, such as Apple Books and Preview, and analyzes how their annotation features stack up against McLuhan's own annotation techniques on paper. For this assignment, you won't be studying a specific annotating reader like I was, but the analysis of reading interfaces in this article was the inspiration for this assignment, and may be useful to look at.

Finally, another place to find models for this assignment's mode of description and analysis is the Architectures of the Book project. Some collaborators and I created it a few years ago to explore the aspects of historical book design that could inform the design of digital books and reading interfaces. The various entries each discuss different formal elements of historical reading interfaces in ways that are relevant to this assignment. We also published this article, which Draws on the work of Drucker and other interface-oriented book historians: Alan Galey, Jon Bath, Rebecca Niles, and Richard Cunningham, "Imagining the Architectures of the Book: Textual Scholarship and the Digital Book Arts" *Textual Cultures* 7, no. 2 (2012): 20-42.

Grading criteria

Your grade will be assessed according to the appropriateness of your chosen reading interface, the detail, accuracy, and critical judgment displayed in your description, and the insight and strength of your analysis. We will be looking in particular for the analysis to be supported by the evidence you present in the preceding section. Other grading criteria include the quality of the writing and the successful integration of images.

A few tips

- worth repeating: this is isn't an essay (see above)
- there are advantages and disadvantages to choosing a reading interface you know well and use often; a good candidate might be an interface that annoys you, especially if the reasons have patterns in them
- follow Drucker's advice not to think of an interface as a mechanistic *thing*, but as a "dynamic space of relations" ("Humanities Approaches," p. 12)
- remember that interactivity doesn't always mean clickable links or visibly moving parts; some of the most important forms of interaction are cognitive and intellectual, not literal (think of how your eyes roam over Raphael's *School of Athens* painting and pick out details and groupings — that's interactivity, too)
- don't assume you know what reading is, or all of the forms it might take

Twine Project

Twine component: minimum 20 nodes
Critical reflection: 1,000 words, not including notes, bibliography, and any images
Due Thursday, April 6 by 5:00 pm EST

*Students may work individually or in groups, ideally composed of 3-4 people drawn from the same discussion group. Groups of 2 are also welcome. We are willing to consider groups larger than 4, but prospective large groups must email a brief rationale and outline of roles to us no later than March 10 (ideally sooner). All groups, regardless of size, must designate someone to email us with their finalized group membership **by Monday, March 13**. Students who are not part of a group by this point will complete the project individually.*

Twine Component

For this project, your task is to perform a **creative intervention** in a particular critical or creative work we've discussed in the course, or in another work that's clearly related to the course topics. This involves identifying a particular missed opportunity, or blind spot, or wrong turn, or other flaw in a work and correcting it in your own version, using the affordances of the Twine platform.

For example, with a fictional works we've discussed in class, such as *Little Women* (the novel or the 2019 film, or both) or Octave Uzanne's story "The End of Books," you might:

- rewrite an important scene;
- reimagine a scene from a different character's perspective;
- add a new scene;
- make a non-interactive scene interactive by adding choices;
- change the interactivity of an existing scene by altering or removing existing choices.

The same approach could be extended to real-world performances of new reading technologies, such as Steve Jobs's iBooks presentation during the 2010 iPad rollout event (which in our Week 6 class we analyzed as though it were a one-actor stage play); with an example like this or other reading-oriented tech demo, you might:

- rewrite it to introduce some fun and illuminating glitches in the tech demo;
- reframe it from the perspective of someone from the Darnton circuit or Murray and Squire's digital version;
- reimagine it in the near or distant future, with Tony-Stark-style holograms, or set in Margaret Atwood's Gilead.

For a thematically related videogame like *What Remains of Edith Finch* or *Gone Home,* you might:

- reimagine a particular scene or episode as hypertext fiction;
- add a new object to the gameworld (a diary, a letter, a piece of hypertext fiction);
- add a new gameplay mechanic (e.g. Edith Finch doesn't just recover her family history, but can revise it like an author with a manuscript).

If you'd rather perform a creative intervention in a critical work, such as Whitney Trettien's article or Darnton's and others' depictions of communications circuits, you might:

- write accompanying blog post(s), branching subreddit-style comments, or other social media responses (maybe McLuhan initiates a Tweetstorm from the great beyond, or an imaginary self-aware AI authoring-bot has something to say?);
- add new arguments or examples to an existing text;
- alter the interactive affordances of an existing text (i.e., introduce hyperlinks or otherwise remix a critical discussion);
- make your own communications circuit for digitized or born-digital books, in the spirit of Murray and Squires's revision of Darnton, but use Twine somehow instead of a static diagram.

Critical Reflection

The Twine component should be accompanied by a critical reflection on the project, in the form of a short essay. The critical reflection should explain your goals, contextualize your influences and the sources you've drawn upon, and think through any significant insights and/or challenges that emerged in the course of your work. Overall, the purpose of the critical reflection is not simply to describe or summarize your project, but to step back from it and consider what you've learned from the experience. What do you know at the end of the process that you didn't know at the beginning? How do you regard any of our course readings/lectures or other secondary sources differently now that you've worked on the Twine project?

For group projects, the critical reflection must include an appendix with a very brief summary of each group member's contribution to the project as a whole.

It may be pragmatic to write up the critical reflection toward the end of the project, but also to keep running notes in a group document as you undertake the Twine portion. Groups may decide to designate one member as the lead writer for the critical reflection, but we advise against too rigid a division of labour, given that the reflection depends on the insights of those directly involved in the making of the Twine project.

Technical Requirements and Resources

Twine may be accessed through your web-browser or by downloading the program to your computer here: Twinery.org

Your story must use Twine 2 and SugarCube (not Harlowe).

Your story must have a minimum of 20 nodes (we may set that minimum higher for any groups larger than 4).

The first node must be a title page that states that name of the group members (or individual creator) and contains a link to a node with any necessary citations. Both the nodes and the title page will only require you to know how to use Twine's linking features. The linking process is the central feature you will be using to build your Twine. The video here is recommended to get you started in learning about this linking process: Getting Started With Twine 2.1. See also Anna's Twine handout linked from Week 9.

You are more than welcome to create a more elaborate Twine (e.g., with visuals, sound and more extensive node connections), but this is not a requirement. If you do want to explore those options, however, the following resources may help with that:

- Adam Hammond's Total Beginner's Guide to Twine
- Adam Hammond's lecture video on Microsoft Streams (can also be accessed here)
- These lists of CSS colours and web-friendly font families
- Image Baby (for uploading images to import into your Twine)

In our Twine workshop class, we also looked at examples of other CSS resources, including this one (from W3Schools on CSS selectors) and this one (from the Mozilla developer site, on the CSS "font" property).

How to submit your Twine assignment

Groups should designate a single member to submit assignment materials on behalf of the group.

For the critical reflection component, please submit a single PDF file via the "Assignments" link on Quercus. Feel free to incorporate images in your PDF file, but we'd appreciate it if you could keep the total filesize to 10 MB maximum. (The free image editor Gimp is useful for reducing image file sizes.)

If your Twine project is a single standalone HTML file, please submit it via the link in the "Assignments" section. If your project includes other media, such as images or audio files, you won't be able to submit it via Quercus. In that case, please send us a link by email, or include the link in your critical response document (ideally somewhere at the beginning where we can find it easily).

The bottom line: don't worry too much about how to submit your Twine project, and don't let that limit what you try to do; we'll find way to make it work.

Grading Criteria

We are not looking for virtuoso Twine coding -- this assignment doesn't assume any prior knowledge of Twine or of coding generally -- but we are looking for a strong fit between the intellectual and technical sides of your project. In other words, your Twine component doesn't need to be perfect; rather, we'll be looking for evidence that you've used Twine to work through a creative intervention which **couldn't have been made in a traditional linear essay**.

Assignments will be graded on their identification of a worthwhile creative intervention, how well their intervention is carried out using Twine's capabilities, the clarity and insight of the critical reflection, and the effective use of relevant scholarly sources from the course readings and beyond.

When grading, we'll be asking the following questions:

- Does your project clearly identify a perceived flaw or shortcoming in the work you've chosen to alter? Do you cite the text in outlining this shortcoming? Does your critical reflection provide compelling reasons for regarding this as a flaw or shortcoming?
- Do you develop an original and insightful manner of correcting this flaw or shortcoming in your creative intervention? Does your critical reflection provide a lucid and persuasive account of how you correct this flaw or shortcoming?
- Does your project meet the technical requirements outlined above? Does it follow the general assignment guidelines for things like writing and citations?

Some helpful examples and resources

- An online collection of student made games for ENG279 at UTM.
- This is mental health resource Twine. It incorporates a lot of secondary information and outside links for further information to access resources. Shows how information and sources can be integrated beyond the Twine itself.
- my father's long, long legs - a classic horror twine. It doesn't include secondary sources and is very simple/linear at first glance, but develops in a unique way to show off the strengths in subtlety achieved with Twine.
- You Will Select a Decision overtly integrates and showcases the "choose your own adventure" format. Good to look at to see how branching paths can work and for those who don't have familiarity with Twine but do have experience with the paper based adventure texts.
- Anna's little twine that shows how images can be integrated to depict different decisions and choices (for those who feel adventurous and want to incorporate visuals!)

Acknowledgement: thanks to Adam Hammond for sharing his Twine assignment, which Alan Galey and Anna Kalinowski adapted for this version.

Due Dates at a Glance

All assignments are due via Quercus by 5:00 pm EST on the due date.

Friday, January 20	Discussion post #1
Monday, January 30	Discussion post #2, send assignment 1 idea
Monday, February 13	Discussion post #3
Thursday, February 16	Reading interface profile
Monday, February 27	Discussion post #4
Monday, March 13	Discussion post #5, finalize your Twine group
Monday, March 27	Discussion post #6
Thursday, April 6	Twine project
Tuesday, April 11	Discussion post #7

Weekly class schedule and readings

Before joining class, it's a good idea to have this page open in your browser. Any materials you need for class (e.g. PDF files, web links) will appear below.

Jan. 11 **Week 1 — Introduction**

Before class:

- read Simon Gikandi, "The Work of the Book in the Age of Electronic Reproduction," *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 127, no. 2 (2012): 201-211 [link]

After class:

- check the Discussions section and make a note of your discussion group number
- post a note introducing yourself in your group's discussion board
- start thinking about your response to discussion question #1
- read the syllabus and assignment instructions, start thinking ahead to the first assignment

Jan. 18   **Week 2 — Disciplinary and Theoretical Contexts**

Before class:

- read Simone Murray, "Introduction: What Is 'Print Culture'?", in
  Introduction to Contemporary Print Culture: Books as Media (New York:
  Routledge, 2021): 1–13
- read Matthew G. Kirschenbaum and Sarah Werner, "Digital Scholarship and
  Digital Studies: the State of the Discipline," *Book History* 17 (2014): 406–58

After class:

- explore the chapters in Murray's book that catch your interest

Jan. 25   **Week 3 – Reading Interfaces**

Before class:

- read Johanna Drucker, "Reading Interface," *Publications of the Modern
  Language Association* 128, no. 1 (2013): 213–220
- read Johanna Drucker, "Humanities Approaches to Interface Theory,"
  Culture Machine 12 (2011): 1–20

After class:

- explore the website Architectures of the Book. Some collaborators and I
  created it a few years ago to explore the aspects of historical book design
  that could inform the design of digital books and reading interfaces. We
  also published this article, which Draws on the work of Drucker and other
  design-oriented book historians:
  - Alan Galey, Jon Bath, Rebecca Niles, and Richard Cunningham,
    "Imagining the Architectures of the Book: Textual Scholarship and
    the Digital Book Arts" *Textual Cultures* 7, no. 2 (2012): 20-42

Feb. 1   **Week 4 — Digitization and the Prehistory of Digital Books**

Before class:

- read Ryan Cordell, "'Q i-jtb the Raven': Taking Dirty OCR Seriously," *Book
  History* 20 (2017): 188–225 [https://muse-jhu-
  edu.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/article/674968]
- read Whitney Anne Trettien, "A Deep History of Electronic Textuality: the
  Case of *English Reprints Jhon Milton Areopagitica*," *Digital Humanities
  Quarterly* 7, no. 1 (2013):
  http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/7/1/000150/000150.html

Feb. 8 **Week 5 — Files, Formats, and Format Theory**

Before class:

- read Matthew G. Kirschenbaum, "Editing the Interface: Textual Studies and First Generation Electronic Objects," *Text* 14 (2002): 15-51
- read Meredith L. McGill, "Format," *Early American Studies* 16, no. 4 (2018), 671-677
- read Jonathan Sterne, "Format Theory," in *MP3: the Meaning of a Format* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012), 1–31
    - o this introduction to Sterne's book is fairly long, and much of it is specific to the history of the MP3 format; feel free to read this piece selectively, but pay special attention to Sterne's discussion of format theory from p. 7 onward

Feb. 15 **Week 6 — Ebooks and the EPUB Format**

Before class:

- read Ellen McCracken, "Expanding Genette's Epitext/Peritext Model for Transitional Electronic Literature: Centrifugal and Centripetal Vectors on Kindles and iPads," *Narrative* 21, no. 1 (2013): 105–124
- read John W. Maxwell, "E-Book Logic: We Can Do Better," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Canada* 51, no. 1 (2013): 29-47

After class:

- Further reading on ebooks:
    - o read Simone Murray, "Digital Books," in *Introduction to Contemporary Print Culture: Books as Media* (New York: Routledge, 2021): 201–219
    - o Simon Rowberry, "Ebookness," *Convergence: the International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 23, no. 3 (2017): 289–305
    - o Daniel Punday, "Ebooks, Libraries, and Feelies," in *Computing as Writing* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015), 76–97

Feb. 22 **Reading Week**

No class this week, but to prepare for the next segment of the course, read Matthew Kirschenbaum, et al., *Books.Files:Preservation of Digital Assets in the Contemporary Publishing Industry* (College Park, MD, and New York, NY: University of Maryland and the Book Industry Study Group, 2020). It's about 50 pages, but hopefully not too dense.

I will hold my office hour as usual this week.

Mar. 1 **Week 7 — Literary Apps, Audiobooks, and Multimodality**

Before class:

- read Johanna Drucker, "Modeling Functionality: From Codex to E-book," in *SpecLab: Digital Aesthetics and Projects in Speculative Computing* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 165-75
- read (or listen to) Matthew Rubery, "Caedmon's Third Dimension," in *The Untold Story of the Talking Book* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), 185–216; this title is, of course, also available as an audiobook (though not from UTL, at least for now)
- review the McCracken article from Week 6

Mar. 8 **Week 8 — Field Trip to the Fisher Rare Book Library**

Before class:

- review the Fisher Rules and Regulations.pdf
- read Seth Lerer, "Bibliographical Theory and the Textuality of the Codex: Toward a History of the Premodern Book," in *The Medieval Manuscript Book: Cultural Approaches*, ed. Michael Johnston and Michael Van Dussen (Cambridge University Press, 2015), 13–33

Mar. 15 **Week 9 – AI and the Future of Writing / Creating Digital Narratives with Twine**

Before class:

- on AI:
  - read Peter Stallybrass, "Against Thinking," *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 122, no. 5 (2007): 1580–1587. Note: this short article is part of a cluster of responses to a piece in the same journal issue by Ed Folsom on databases and narrative. We may or may not explore that larger context in class, but in any case the Stallybrass response is readable on its own, and is newly relevant to the topic of AI and writing. If you explore the other contributions to the article cluster, I recommend the responses by Jerome McGann and Katherine Hayles, which are particularly good.
  - read N. Katherine Hayles, "Human and Machine Cultures of Reading: a Cognitive-Assemblage Approach," *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 133, no. 5 (2018): 1225–1242
- on Twine:
  - read Adam Hammond's Twine tutorial

Mar. 22 **Week 10 — Books and Games, Part 1: Text and Paratext**

Before class:

- read William Uricchio, "Interactivity and the Modalities of Textual Hacking: From the Bible to Algorithmically Generated Stories," in *The Politics of Ephemeral Digital Media: Permanence and Obsolescence in Paratexts*, ed. Sara Pesce and Paolo Noto (New York: Routledge, 2016), 155–69
- read (sorry) Alan Galey, "Behind the Scenes at ApertureScience.com: *Portal and Its Paratexts,"* *Games and Culture* (2022): 1–25
  - you can find an emulated version of the original ApertureScience.com website(s) at The Valve Archive: https://valvearchive.com/web_archive/aperturescience.com/

Mar. 29 **Week 11 — Books and Games, Part 2: *Gone Home***

Before class:

- read Adam Hammond, "Books in Videogames," in *The Unfinished Book*, ed. Alexandra Gillespie and Deidre Lynch (Oxford University Press, 2021), 332–44
- read Henry Jenkins, "Game Design as Narrative Architecture," in *First Person: New Media as Story, Performance, and Game*, ed. Pat Harrigan and Noah Wardrip-Fruin (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004), 118-30
- (optional) play *Gone Home* (Fullbright, 2013); the game takes 2-3 hours to complete and doesn't require any prior knowledge of videogames, but if you have any difficulty you can opt to watch gameplay videos instead

April 5 **Week 12 — Books of Futures Past**

Before class:

- read Robert Coupland Harding, "A Hundred Years Hence," *Typo* 8 (27 January 1894): 1. [http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-corpus-typo.html]
- read Octave Uzanne, "The End of Books." *Scribner's Magazine* 26 (July-December 1894): 221-31 [Uzanne - end of books.pdf]