

CHAPTER THIRTY-SEVEN

Digital Humanities Futures, Open Social Scholarship, and Engaged Publics

ALYSSA ARBUCKLE, RAY SIEMENS
(UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA), AND THE INKE PARTNERSHIP

Are academics alone responsible for the evolution of the digital humanities, and its future? Will the future of digital humanities be shaped by pieces in collections such as this, typically written for other academics? We think not, or at least, not entirely. Rather, we begin with the premise that, while the exact future of the digital humanities is ultimately unknowable, it will be shaped by a number of current and emerging forces—academic, individual, institutional, social, societal, and infrastructural among them. More than an academic thought experiment, the impact and influence of these broader forces draw on the interrelation of theory, praxis, and extra-academic involvement, and necessitate the involvement of all those who have a stock in that future. In this context, we are increasingly invested in the concept of *open social scholarship*, and how the digital humanities embraces, and may one day even fully embody, such a concept. Originating in partnered consultations among a group representing these broader perspectives, the term *open social scholarship* refers to academic practice that enables the creation, dissemination, and engagement of open research by specialists and non-specialists in accessible and significant ways.¹ Our contribution to the present volume suggests that open social scholarship supports many possible futures for the digital humanities, especially as its foundation incorporates a shift from notions of audience *for* academic work to publics engaged *by* and *in* that work.

CONTEXT: FROM SPEAKING TO AUDIENCES TO ENGAGING WITH PUBLICS

We understand the digital humanities as an evolving field. In what follows we highlight the influx of digital humanities engagement with open access, social media, public humanities, and other activities that deviate from earlier, more conventional forms of scholarly communication. In doing so, we

Our thinking in this chapter is influenced to some degree by our situation in pragmatic structures of the North American academic context, although we recognize that there are similarities across other geographic areas too. It is also informed at heart by our work with the community-based Implementing New Knowledge Environments (INKE) Partnership (inke.ca). Some elements of the thinking behind this work are drawn from Siemens' Alliance of Digital Humanities Organizations Zampolli Prize Lecture at the University of Lausanne on July 2, 2014 (Siemens 2016).

align with a conception of the digital humanities as a point of intersection between the concerns of the humanities, and all they might encompass, and computational methods. We perceive digital humanities as an accumulation of 1) computationally modeling humanistic data, 2) processes that provide tools to interact with that data (within humanistic frameworks), and 3) communication of resultant work on that data with those processes. All three of these areas have seen fast-paced development, adoption, and change over recent years. One of the most significant areas of change has been in and around how digital humanities practitioners encounter and communicate the work of the field.

What academics have typically called the *audience* for their work has changed alongside evolving points of academic interest in the humanities and is still changing in ways important to our community of practice in the digital humanities (Siemens 2016). Typically, audience has been implied rather than clearly articulated in the academic work of a field. Like a ghost, audience is both there and not there; persistent as an imagined receiver of address, but ambiguous in shape, size, and detail. In many ways, the primary audience of the digital humanities—like most fields—is understood to be other practitioners of the field. Perhaps a digital humanities scholar has a specific subset or group of people in mind as they undertake their digital scholarship (project- or publication-based), but often these audience members are still academics—as much as they may have differing opinions on the history, scope, and priorities of the field. There is also a presumption that this audience would somehow benefit from the work in question as a contribution to the field.

The notion of *publics* can be separated from that of *audience*, and in doing so presents a stronger, more useful way to talk about our connection with those served by, implicated in, and involved with our work. An elusive concept in some ways, *publics* may still be more useful to consider in the context of digital humanities futures. “Publics have become an essential fact of the social landscape, but it would tax our understanding to say exactly what they are” (2002, 413), Michael Warner considers in his piece “Publics and Counterpublics.” He concludes that a public is constituted by virtue of its address, as well as by giving attention to the addressor. A public shows up and listens, passively or actively, and the active involvement of *publics* stems from the shift from a one-to-many discourse (one academic to an audience of many, for instance) to a collaborative relationship where multiple actors with a shared interest form a public through mutual investment and interaction. In this way, there is the potential for *publics* to be more involved than *audiences*.

The real, perceived, and potential relationships that exist between the academy and the broader publics it serves have seen increased attention and articulation. The value of the humanities and of humanities-based approaches to public engagement, for instance, is made evident in the emergence of the public humanities as a field unto itself. Groups like the Visionary Futures Collective take this notion as central to their work. Part of their mission statement reads: “This group believes that the study of human history and cultural expression is essential to a more just and meaningful society” (Visionary Futures Collective n.d.). Moreover, the group states: “We believe that higher education should be for the public good, and that the work of the humanities should be conducted for and with our communities” (n.d.). Kathleen Fitzpatrick emphasizes these ideals in *Generous Thinking: A Radical Approach to Saving the University* (2019), where she explicitly advocates for a values-based approach that surfaces and concretizes ideals of care, empathy, community, and receptivity. Ultimately, Fitzpatrick argues for a more humane academia both inside and out; an academia that understands and values its own community as well as considers and engages with broader communities. In solidifying and conceptualizing these relations, Fitzpatrick underscores that it is

problematic to envision the public as a homogenous monolith and, moreover, as a singular group necessarily apart from academic institutions. As a concept, *publics* may resist simple definition; it is brought into being by processes of engagement, in discourse or otherwise, toward shared ends.

When moving from perceptions of delineated scholarly audience to deliberation with engaged publics, the potential *openness* of academic practice becomes an essential consideration. In practicing openness, scholars can carefully and explicitly consider their relation to and participation in publics, in discursive and collaborative communities. Such communities are not constructed by status (academic or otherwise); rather, they can be considered as collectives that come together with shared interests across the personal/professional continuum—perhaps even as communities of practice with academic, academic-aligned, and non-academic members. These publics embody positive, inclusive, and mutually beneficial relations between academic institutions and so-called *broader society*. Openness appears as a defining characteristic of the successful engagement of publics and, in this vein, public humanities scholars have much to offer the digital humanities. For instance, a key takeaway from public humanities scholars Wendy F. Hsu and Sheila Brennan is that digital humanists should not assume that simply putting research online constitutes public engagement. Brennan writes: “it is important to recognize that projects and research may be available online, but that status does not inherently make the work digital public humanities or public digital humanities” (2016, 384). Hsu argues that professional encounters with non-academic communities need to be understood as collaborative ventures or opportunities to communally share and create knowledge: “using the digital to learn from the public is a listening practice, one that yields more efficacious and engaged public humanities work” (2016, 281), she writes. According to both Brennan and Hsu, digital humanities researchers would be wise to consider publics at the inception of a research project rather than after the fact, or worse, as objectified subjects of examination or mere data points.

ACTION IN CONTEXT: DIGITAL HUMANITIES, ENGAGING ITS PUBLICS

Openness in academic practice is not necessarily a new consideration for the digital humanities community. Indeed, much digital humanities work already engages with publics and with increasing recent focus on critical social issues. According to Alison Booth and Miriam Posner, digital humanities is “most worthwhile if it also *promotes public engagement and humanistic knowledge and understanding*” (2020, 10; emphasis in original). Such a value statement indicates support for more open and more social digital work, rooted in humanities approaches to knowledge creation.

Many digital humanities projects are—at the very least—openly accessible for viewing on the Internet, and others consider *openness* in the context of public engagement and public service more explicitly as a clear part of their mandate. For instance, the *Torn Apart/Separados* project “aggregates and cross-references publicly available data to visualize the geography of Donald Trump’s ‘zero tolerance’ immigration policy in 2018 and immigration incarceration in the USA in general” (n.d.) in order to raise awareness about immigration challenges and persecution.² The *American Prison Writing Archive*, directed by Doran Larson at Hamilton College, is a public database of prison writing that archives and presents submissions from currently and formerly incarcerated people, as well as those who work in the prison system (e.g., correctional officers, staff, administrators, and volunteers).³ In doing so, the project humanizes incarcerated people and offers them a platform

to share their voices and experiences. *The Digital Oral Histories for Reconciliation* project, led by Kristina Llewellyn, employs virtual reality in the service of reconciliation. Currently, the project is partnered with the Nova Scotia Home for Colored Children Restorative Inquiry to shed light on a residential school targeted at Black Nova Scotian children in the twentieth century (Philpott 2020).⁴ Gretchen Arnold's *Nuisance Laws and Battered Women* project draws together research and interviews of domestic violence victims evicted from their homes under nuisance laws, with an aim of informing lawmakers who might consider changing legal practices.⁵ Michelle Swartz and Constance Crompton lead the *Lesbian and Gay Liberation in Canada* project, which "is an interactive digital resource for the study of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) history in Canada from 1964 to 1981" (n.d.).⁶ *Lesbian and Gay Liberation in Canada* draws attention to the long history of queer activism, advocacy, and expression in Canada that is often overlooked. *The Atikamekw Knowledge, Culture and Language in Wikimedia Project* is a community-based project to develop a version of Wikipedia in the Atikamekw language, and in doing so, to increase the presence of Indigenous knowledge, culture, and language in the Wikimedia ecosystem.⁷ These are a handful of examples, among many, of digital humanities projects that center and create publics around specific, evolving community concerns.⁸

Notably, the public-facing projects referenced above align with recent socially focused, critical calls for transition in our thinking about digital humanities in and of itself, and how we understand its assumptions, structures, and positions in varying publics. In 2012, Alan Liu encapsulated community discussions by asking "Where Is Cultural Criticism in the Digital Humanities?" at the same time as Tara McPherson posited "Why Are the Digital Humanities So White?" More recently, Roopika Risam has considered the idea of *locus*, arguing that digital humanities must shift its power centers from Global North locales like Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom in order to facilitate actual diversity and inclusion (2016). Risam calls for local or regional concerns to be centered in digital humanities work, which will lead to "its global dimensions [being] outlined through an assemblage of the local" (2016, 359). David Gaertner has focused on the intersection between Indigenous literature and digital humanities, or rather the lack thereof.⁹ On a similar note, Posner urges that calls to diversify the field and consider more seriously issues of race and gender are crucial, but not enough. "It is not only about shifting the focus of projects so that they feature marginalized communities more prominently," she writes, "it is about ripping apart and rebuilding the machinery of the archive and database so that it does not reproduce the logic that got us here in the first place" (2016, 35). Safiya Umoja Noble amplifies and extends these positions by foregrounding the social context of the digital humanities and suggests "if ever there were a place for digital humanists to engage and critique, it is at the intersection of neocolonial investments in information, communication, and technology infrastructures: investments that rest precariously on colonial history, past and present" (2018, 28). As Noble writes, the very positionality of the digital humanities—sitting, as it does, at the crossroads of humanistic inquiry and technology—comes with responsibility. These scholars, among many others, reflect a close-eye, critical consideration of the foundational concepts of the digital humanities, including its tools and technological contexts.¹⁰

The turn to more critical considerations reflects significant forces in the ongoing evolution of the digital humanities, including the shift from audience-thinking to publics-thinking. Rather than objectifying participants into delineated roles of either speaker or mass, imagined addressee, publics-thinking recognizes all as potentially participating, embodied subjects in a shared social

plane. Such a transition requires a contextual understanding of and care for contemporary social, political, and economic conditions, including how such conditions affect different communities in different ways.

All of this considered, does our own thinking about publics and public engagement align, as fully as is ideal, with the products of our scholarship? Are digital humanities practitioners making the best use of open and accessible methods to engage broader, more diverse publics? Despite exemplary forays into public engagement, and at times transformative exploration and advancement of alternative practices to date, the digital humanities community can still be quite beholden to (and still perpetuates) a traditional model of audience-focused humanities academic publishing—replete with earlier assumptions about means, methods, and utility. This model of academic publishing relies on existing scholarly communication infrastructure: journals and monographs, largely, and the intellectual constructs they represent. Many digital humanists still follow the practice of producing a work of scholarship, publishing it in a standard, toll-access peer-reviewed journal, and passively waiting for this scholarship to reach an audience of other academics who have access to such specialized publication products. There is irony in upholding traditional publication norms that do not accurately reflect our own field's actual, evolving concerns and practices. Booth and Posner elaborate:

While [digital humanities] may yield a peer-reviewed article, essay collection or journal, or single-author monograph, these are often based on datasets, programming, documentation of method and results, visualizations, and user interfaces, all of which are hard to encompass in one reading for review, not to mention that they remain living artifacts created by many hands, seldom finished or preserved on one publication date.

(2020, 10)¹¹

Beyond the disconnect between digital humanities *work* and digital humanities *publication*, it is necessary to draw attention to how conventional publishing practices delimit knowledge creation and sharing, especially within the context of public engagement. “Enabling access to scholarly work,” Fitzpatrick argues, “does not just serve the goal of undoing its commercialization or removing it from a market-driven, competition-based economy, but rather is a first step in facilitating public engagement with the knowledge that universities produce” (2019, 148). With toll-access publishing there is little consideration for the publics who do *not* accept that it is reasonable for publicly funded research to be inaccessible. Moreover, there is little thought of publics whose own information consumption and knowledge creation activities occur in spaces very different than a proprietary and for-cost academic journal platform. As Fitzpatrick asserts: “If we hope to engage the public with our work, we need to ensure that it is open in the broadest possible sense: open to response, to participation, to more new thought, more new writing, and more kinds of cultural creation by more kinds of public scholars” (2019, 138).

Upholding a narrow scholarly communication focus limits the possibilities of the digital humanities, now and in future. Limitations do not stem only or even primarily from publication modalities, though. We believe that the digital humanities can more fully transition from a one-to-many mode of knowledge sharing to interaction done in-relation and in-community. Indeed, many digital humanities practitioners are already well embedded in publics that extend beyond and are not defined by the Ivory Tower, as noted above and evident in para-academic, academic-aligned, or non-academic partnerships.

As digital humanities practitioners look to the futures of our work, we suggest that a fuller embrace of open scholarship could ensure that digital humanists lead and further develop a collaborative and publicly responsive trajectory. In doing so, digital humanities could evolve more fully as a shared academic practice that enables the creation, dissemination, and engagement of open research by specialists and non-specialists in accessible and significant ways. This mode of engagement encapsulates the pursuit of more open, and more social, scholarly activities through knowledge mobilization, community training, public engagement, and policy recommendations in order to understand and address digital scholarly communication challenges. And it involves more publics in its pursuits—both those directly involved in and impacted by these areas.

In keeping with the many current and future paths for the digital humanities to take, open social scholarship manifests in many forms as well. Underlining open social scholarship is a commitment to sharing research in open access formats, the value of which Martin Paul Eve writes on earlier in this collection—even if there are challenges and even controversies around implementation to date. But open social scholarship is larger than open access publishing; it is an action-oriented approach to broadening the purview of the university, and to identifying, facilitating, and engaging with publics. In what follows we will focus on a subset of open social scholarship concerns our partnership has articulated as areas of interventionist activity—the commons, policy, training, and praxis—and reference how the INKE Partnership is engaging with these areas of development in digital and in-person contexts.

INTERVENTION: OPEN SOCIAL SCHOLARSHIP AND THE DIGITAL HUMANITIES

Responding to this context, our pragmatic and active intervention emanates from a long-standing, partnered community in and around the INKE Partnership.¹² This community involves digital humanities-focused academics from a number of areas and career paths. Community members share both a vested interest in the future of academic knowledge and its conveyance and a common belief that this future is aligned with engaging broad publics. Together, our partnership situates open social scholarship as a positive, conceptual intervention squarely within this larger context.

Action Area: Open Scholarship Commons

Academic conferences and events bring thousands of researchers together to share findings, refine ideas, and build collaborations. But these crucial events usually occur only once a year, and location, timing, expense, travel, and environmental concerns mean that such gatherings do not include all who could benefit from involvement. More and more scholarship is moving online, but researchers, partners, students, and members of the engaged public have varying levels of access to digital materials and the conversations around them—never mind comfort level and skill in navigating such materials.¹³ The confluence of social, sharing technologies with evolving academic practice presents an opportunity to enrich digital humanities research, engagement, and impact for all those who participate in and are served by this valuable work.

The online research commons, for instance, is a chief avenue for facilitating more findable and usable academic research. An online research commons is a virtual space for a delineated community to connect, share, and collaborate. US-based new media, scholarly communication, and copyright

scholars have researched and argued in favor of commons-based models for years and have reflected on the relative disadvantages of the corporate control of culture versus a decentralized system of commons-based knowledge production (Benkler 2006; Boyle 2008). Currently, commercial American sites like academia.edu and ResearchGate are the most popular platforms for sharing research—purportedly because of their social media style interfaces. But several scholars take issue with these for-profit models (Adema and Hall 2015; Duffy and Pooley 2017; Tennant 2017; Pooley 2018; Fitzpatrick 2020). Information scholars such as Julia Bullard also argue that the conscientious design of such systems is both critical and often overlooked (2019). She probes, in regard to platform design and construction: “what are the acceptable trade-offs regarding the intensity of labour in designing and maintaining a system consistent with open values and Canadian scholarship?” (2019). Regardless, Christine Borgman advocates for the commons as a viable open scholarly communication system in *Scholarship in the Digital Age: Information, Infrastructure, and the Internet* (2007), and John Willinsky even suggests the commons is an ideal model for scholarly communication when we consider research as a public good, to be shared widely for everyone’s benefit in *The Access Principle: The Case for Open Access to Research and Scholarship* (2006). According to Peter Suber, an open access research commons avoids the *tragedy of the commons* (i.e., people taking more than their share, and not contributing back) because online research products are non-rivalrous: they do not diminish with access or use (2011). Of note, within the context of these discussions, the INKE Partnership’s *Connection* cluster is currently developing an online research commons called the *Canadian Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS) Commons* (Winter et al. 2020): an in-development, national-scale, bilingual (French and English) network for HSS researchers in Canada to share, access, re-purpose, and develop scholarly projects, publications, educational resources, data, and tools.¹⁴

Action Area: Open Scholarship Policy

Many open access and open data policies are forward-looking but have proven challenging to implement in ways that meet the needs of all users and stakeholders. In part, this is due to the fast-paced nature and rapid evolution of open scholarship worldwide, and the mass of information, research, policies, and news media generated on the topic. The growing prominence of open scholarship developments and accessibility of the Internet presents an opportunity to streamline information processing and decision-making. An economy of scale approach where the scholarly community works together toward a shared understanding of open scholarship policy and best practices for finding, organizing, and presenting relevant information could harness such an opportunity. In response to these possibilities, the INKE Partnership’s *Policy* cluster is collaborating on the *Open Scholarship Policy Observatory*, which collects research, tracks findings and national and international policy changes, and facilitates understanding of open social scholarship across Canada and internationally.¹⁵

Action Area: Open Scholarship Training

There are few training opportunities related to open scholarship or social knowledge creation, although millions of people engage with socially generated information daily. Training is required for academic specialists to learn how to share their research more broadly, as well as for engaged publics to increase their digital literacy and discover how to access and work with

open scholarship. Emerging scholars also need training in how to use technology to engage with publics in meaningful ways. Dedicated, high-level open scholarship training could ensure that all who engage in socially created knowledge do so in productive and beneficial ways. The INKE Partnership engages these issues through the *Training* cluster and its *Open Social Scholarship Training Program*.

Action Area: Open Scholarship Praxis

Digital humanities projects have significant potential to facilitate closer collaboration between humanities and social sciences researchers and broader publics. Current digital humanities projects and initiatives can be found across the exclusive–inclusive spectrum; some are individually focused and others are much more social. This range from closed to open scholarship begs the question: which models for collaborative, open scholarly practices can effectively meet the interests and needs of engaged publics, and why? The INKE Partnership’s *Community* cluster researches and develops public digital scholarship prototypes and initiatives in order to explore open publishing, scholarly communication, and citizen scholarship.

Action Areas in Sum

Taken together, these four areas—the commons, policy, training, and praxis—can increase positive impact by welcoming and fostering publics around humanities and social sciences work. Digital humanities research, prototyping, and publishing could be geared toward open, social approaches in order to produce knowledge output more effectively and with wider benefit. For instance, collaborating with communities to build interactive archival or storytelling experiences can facilitate and support publics over shared areas of interest. Modeling new ways to process, structure, and share digitized material brings digital humanities strengths to the access to and reuse of cultural material. Broadening the impact of academic interventions for multiple publics can diversify discursive communities in productive ways. This collection of action-oriented approaches, among others, suggest a future for the digital humanities that aligns with the values and promises of open social scholarship.

CONCLUSION: BROAD, REFLECTIVE SHIFTS TOWARD OPEN SOCIAL SCHOLARSHIP

By creating knowledge openly and socially, digital humanities researchers can address broader societal issues in relevant and timely ways and do so in relation with various publics. In recent times, there have been significant calls for more publicly oriented work in the humanities, and by extension, in the digital humanities. Internationally, many governments now require universities to justify their value and worthiness of public support, and education funding policy reflects this. In response, the potential for academic/public collaboration is substantial, but there is little understanding across academia of how exactly to implement such engagement with both efficacy and success. In fact, many hiring, tenure, and promotion guidelines still discourage the embrace of open scholarship practices (Alperin et al. 2019). Regardless, such a public commitment will lead to more citizen/scholar collaborations and an academic world that responds more directly to

the publics it serves. Open social scholarship can open the door for specialists and non-specialists to interact with cultural materials and undertake digital humanities-based public engagement creatively.

As an evolving field, the digital humanities has already demonstrated its flexibility, reflexivity, and openness to expansion and growth. We consider the general commitment to open access, engagement with social media, and embrace of public humanities as evidence of an open, social trajectory for the field—especially as notions of audience change. Many digital humanities practitioners are committed, through their work, to openness, public engagement, and critical social issues. We believe such commitment allies and aligns with the theoretical undertones and pragmatic outcomes of open social scholarship. Where narrow research, development, and publishing practices necessarily delimit the scope of digital humanities work, engaging with networked, open knowledge creation provides more opportunities for collaboration, exploration, and growth.

Infrastructural, cultural, and institutional practices are interwoven with each other as well as enmeshed in the past, present, and future of an academic field. The challenges they bear are complex. Academic scholars will not be able to tackle and resolve these challenges on their own; this requires a holistic, strategic approach to revisioning the larger academic ecosystem. Open social scholarship activities may generate a more diverse, networked environment for creating and engaging with scholarship, diminishing perceived gaps between publics and the institutionalized research community, and increasing social engagement and broad access to scholarly outputs. Overall, this approach brings together communities of academics, experts, stakeholders, and publics around critical research, information, and policies. Situated in this context, we advocate that part of the approach to wide-scale change and evolution is for the digital humanities to continue to move from audience-thinking to publics-thinking; that is, for the digital humanities to embody open, social futures.

NOTES

1. This definition was first developed and articulated by the INKE Partnership and is cited on the “About INKE” page of the current website (n.d.). It is also referenced by Daniel Powell, Aaron Mauro, and Alyssa Arbuckle (2017).
2. See <http://xpmethod.columbia.edu/torn-apart/>; *Torn Apart/Separados* started as a collaboration between xpMethod, Borderlands Archives Cartography, Linda Rodriguez, and Merisa Martinez, with Moacir P. de Sá Pereira as lead developer.
3. See DHI, American Prison Writing at Hamilton College, <http://apw.dhinitiative.org/>.
4. See the DOHR website, <http://www.dohr.ca/>.
5. See <http://nuisancelaws.org/>.
6. See <https://lgc.ca/>.
7. See https://ca.wikimedia.org/wiki/Atikamekw_knowledge,_culture_and_language_in_Wikimedia_projects/.
8. Many of these projects have been recognized by Canadian Social Knowledge Institute (C-SKI) Open Scholarship Awards. For more on C-SKI, see <https://c-ski.ca/>.
9. Gaertner writes: “Indigenous [literature] scholars resist DH because the concerns Indigenous communities have about the expropriation of data have not been taken seriously. Those concerns will not be taken seriously until decolonial critique is actively installed at the foundations of DH theory and methodology and settler scholars need to start taking up some of this labour” (2017).
10. Additional notable sources here include Wendy Hui Kyong Chun’s *Discriminating Data: Correlation, Neighborhoods, and the New Politics of Recognition* (2021), Catherine D’Ignazio and Lauren F. Klein’s

Data Feminism (2020), and Noble's *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism* (2018), all of which take up this work comprehensively.

11. Moreover, Booth and Posner suggest, such practices are not endemic to the digital humanities only, nor are they new to the broader meta-discipline of the humanities: "Creating and sharing such datasets may seem unprecedented in the humanities, though bibliographers, folklorists, musicologists, and others have collected and taxonomized in similar modes in the past" (2020, 20).
12. See Arbuckle et al. (Forthcoming) for a fuller engagement with the current and future directions of the INKE Partnership.
13. At the time of writing (2021), the Covid-19 pandemic's impact on how communities connect has shone an even brighter light on this situation.
14. See the prototype at hsscommons.ca, which is currently being developed in partnership with the Canadian Social Knowledge Institute, CANARIE, the Compute Canada Federation, the Electronic Textual Cultures Lab, the Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, the Modern Language Association's Humanities Commons, and others.
15. See Open Scholarship Policy Observatory, <https://ospolicyobservatory.uvic.ca>.

REFERENCES

- Adema, Janneke and Gary Hall. 2015. *Really, We're Helping To Build This... Business: The Academia.edu Files*. http://liquidbooks.pbworks.com/w/page/106236504/The%20Academia_edu%20Files.
- Alperin, Juan Pablo, Carol Muñoz Nieves, Lesley A. Schimanski, Gustavo E. Fischman, Meredith T. Niles, and Erin C. McKiernan. 2019. "How Significant are the Public Dimensions of Faculty Work in Review, Promotion, and Tenure Documents?" *eLife*.
- Arbuckle, Alyssa, and Ray Siemens, with Jon Bath, Constance Crompton, Laura Estill, Tanja Niemann, Jon Saklofske, Lynne Siemens, and the INKE Partnership. Forthcoming. "An Open Social Scholarship Path for the Humanities." *Journal of Electronic Publishing*.
- Benkler, Yochai. 2006. *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press.
- Booth, Alison, and Miriam Posner. 2020. "Introduction: The Materials at Hand." *PMLA* 135 (1): 9–22.
- Borgman, Christine. 2007. *Scholarship in the Digital Age: Information, Infrastructure, and the Internet*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Boyle, James. 2008. *The Public Domain: Enclosing the Commons of the Mind*. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press.
- Brennan, Sheila A. 2016. "Public, First." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2016*, edited by Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein, 384–9. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bullard, Julia. 2019. "Knowledge Organization for Open Scholarship." *Pop! Public. Open. Participatory* 1(1).
- Chun, Wendy Hui Kyong. 2021. *Discriminating Data: Correlation, Neighborhoods, and the New Politics of Recognition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- D'Ignazio, Catherine and Lauren F. Klein. 2020. *Data Feminism*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Duffy, Brooke Erin and Jefferson D. Pooley. 2017. "Facebook for Academics: The Convergence of Self-Branding and Social Media Logic on Academia.edu." *Social Media and Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305117696523>.
- Fitzpatrick, Kathleen. 2019. *Generous Thinking: A Radical Approach to Saving the University*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Fitzpatrick, Kathleen. 2020. "Not All Networks: Toward Open, Sustainable Research Communities." In *Reassembling Scholarly Communications*, edited by Martin Paul Eve and Jonathan Gray, 351–9. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gaertner, David. 2017. "Why We Need to Talk about Indigenous Literature and the Digital Humanities." *Novel Alliances: Allied Perspectives on Literature, Art, and New Media*, January 26. <https://novelalliances.com/2017/01/26/indigenous-literature-and-the-digital-humanities/>.

- Hsu, Wendy. 2016. "Lessons on Public Humanities from the Civic Sphere." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2016*, edited by Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein, 280–6. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Implementing New Knowledge Environments (INKE) Partnership. n.d. "About INKE." <https://inke.ca/about-inke/>.
- Lesbian and Gay Liberation in Canada. n.d. "About." <https://lglc.ca/about>.
- Liu, Alan. 2012. "Where Is Cultural Criticism in the Digital Humanities?" In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold, 490–509. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- McPherson, Tara. 2012. "Why Are the Digital Humanities So White?" In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold, 139–60. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Noble, Safiya Umoja. 2018. *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Philpott, Wendy. 2020. "Collaboration Brings Stories of Institutional Racism and Abuse to Light." *Waterloo News*, February 12. <https://uwaterloo.ca/news/collaboration-brings-stories-institutional-racism-and-abuse>.
- Pooley, Jefferson D. 2018. "Metrics Mania: The Case against Academia.edu." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 7. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/metrics-mania/>.
- Posner, Miriam. 2016. "What's Next: The Radical, Unrealized Potential of Digital Humanities." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2016*, edited by Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein, 32–41. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Powell, Daniel J., Aaron Mauro, and Alyssa Arbuckle. 2017. "Introduction." In *Social Knowledge Creation in the Humanities*, vol. 1, edited by Alyssa Arbuckle, Aaron Mauro, and Daniel J. Powell, 1–28. Arizona: Iter Academic Press and Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.
- Risam, Roopika. 2016. "Navigating the Global Digital Humanities: Insights from Black Feminism." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2016*, edited by Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein, 359–67. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Siemens, Ray. 2016. "Communities of Practice, the Methodological Commons, and Digital Self-Determination in the Humanities." (Text of the Zampolli Prize Lecture, University of Lausanne, July 2.) *Digital Studies/Le Champ Numérique*. Reprinted in Constance Crompton, Richard Lane, and Ray Siemens, eds., *Doing Digital Humanities*. London: Routledge.
- Suber, Peter. 2011. "Creating an Intellectual Commons through Open Access." In *Understanding Knowledge as a Commons*, edited by Charlotte Hess and Elinor Ostrom, 171–208. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tennant, Jonathan. 2017. "Who Isn't Profiting off the Backs of Researchers?" *Discover Magazine*, February 1. <https://www.discovermagazine.com/technology/who-isnt-profiting-off-the-backs-of-researchers>.
- Torn Apart/Separados. n.d. "Textures." <http://xpmethod.columbia.edu/torn-apart/volume/2/textures.html>.
- Visionary Futures Collective. n.d. "Visionary Futures Collective." <https://visionary-futures-collective.github.io/>.
- Warner, Michael. 2002. "Publics and Counterpublics (Abbreviated Version)." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* (88) 4: 413–25.
- Willinsky, John. 2006. *The Access Principle: The Case for Open Access to Research and Scholarship*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Winter, Caroline, Tyler Fontenot, Luis Meneses, Alyssa Arbuckle, Ray Siemens, and the ETCL and INKE Research Groups. 2020. "Foundations for the Canadian Humanities and Social Sciences Commons: Exploring the Possibilities of Digital Research Communities." *Pop! Public. Open. Participatory* 2. doi: 10.48404/pop.2020.05.