CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Sharing as CARE and FAIR in the Digital Humanities
Authors	Egan, Patrick;Murphy, Órla
Publication date	2022-11-03
Original Citation	Egan, P. and Murphy, Ó (2022) 'Sharing as CARE and FAIR in the Digital Humanities', in O'Sullivan, J. (ed.) The Bloomsbury Handbook to the Digital Humanities. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing Inc., pp. 267-271.
Type of publication	Book chapter
Link to publisher's version	https://www.bloomsbury.com/us/bloomsbury-handbook-to-the-digital-humanities-9781350232129/
Rights	© 2022, the Authors. Published by Bloomsbury Publishing Inc. All rights reserved.
Download date	2026-11-04 04:03:23
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/14776



UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE

Sharing as CARE and FAIR in the Digital Humanities

PATRICK EGAN AND ÓRLA MURPHY (UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK)

Sharing co-exists with the scholarly primitives as a foundational aspect of digital humanities and cultural heritage. Best practice digitization, representation, dissemination, and preservation of any cultural object necessitate working in interdisciplinary teams as co-equal generators of knowledge work. Spectral engineers, spatial engineers, color scientists, sound engineers, art historians, conservators, information scientists, and subject matter experts must all contribute to how objects are realized on the public's many devices. Contemporary research cultures must move beyond museological confines, encompassing intangible heritages and the communities where they originate and reside as integral to a shared inclusive future (CARE 2021). A profoundly intersectional cultural heritage for digital humanities is one that challenges the canonical acceptance of previous paradigms, hierarchies, elites, and centers. Such a digital humanities will combine CARE principles (Collective Benefit, Authority to Control, Responsibility, Ethics) with FAIR principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable), repudiating "power differentials and historical contexts" and "encouraging open and other data movements to consider both people and purpose in their advocacy and pursuit" (CARE 2021).

Central to this research agenda is the person, and scholars seeking to share cultural heritage must continue to place an increasing amount of focus on connecting with communities where artifacts originate. With music collections, for example, renewed efforts are being made to avoid the ethical tensions about ownership of collected material, but also to improve upon some problematic interactions that arose between collectors and communities in the past. Scholars such as Ní Chonghaile (2021, 11) describe ways to become more balanced in sharing—to disrupt dynamics of power—while others recognize the imperative for professionals to rely upon relationships with the communities that already have procedures for dealing with their cultural materials which are transferred from cultural institutions (Reed 2019, 627). Such shifts, coupled with the slow but steady move towards open publishing, are bringing about truly "community-led" approaches to knowledge sharing (Imbler 2021). As a result, a more engaged attitude to sharing can allow scholars to infuse their research with the needs and expectations of the communities who their materials represent.

Community-led approaches to research are in many ways generous, but there is tension between the ideals of generous thinking (see Fitzpatrick 2021) and the often not-so-generous demands of the academy for researchers to pursue as solo and siloed works of scholarship. Nowhere is such tension more apparent than in how scholars are expected to share—in print, in monographs, with prestige

publishers, rather than openly. The issues that are found in sharing print have also been seen in tangible and intangible cultural heritage work. This occurred initially because of cost and latterly due to infrastructural and sustainability concerns; concerns that are evident with many other digital humanities projects.

Mark Sample argues that the opportunity presented by the digital is in how it transforms how we share: "We are no longer bound by the physical demands of printed books and paper journals, no longer constrained by production costs and distribution friction, no longer hampered by a top-down and unsustainable business model" (2013, 256). Sample's vision for DH is one in which knowledge building and sharing are one and the same. Others agree: "… we should no longer be content to make our work public achingly slowly along ingrained routes, authors and readers alike delayed by innumerable gateways limiting knowledge production and sharing" (Gold 2011).

A variety of digital humanities projects have reconfigured some of our old ways of sharing—and thus seeing—cultural heritage, publishing full-color plates of Blake,[1] taking 3D scans of manuscript pages (Endres 2020), and working with galleries, libraries, archives, and museums to make our understanding of a great many artworks more accessible (Kenderdine 2015, 22–42). Cultural heritage institutions were amongst the first to share photographic archives, ephemera, and sound. However, the primacy of print modes delayed the onset of the integration of cultural heritage with the digital humanities more broadly. Where scholars wrote about songs, they did not hear the music from the printed page, nor had they a sense of a sculpture's volume when shown a single flat image intended to illustrate a written point. Cultural heritage encounters in digital humanities move beyond the page, allowing interactive experiences that are far less limited.

Cultural heritage operates in a scholarly space that is at the interstices of disciplinary cultures that often do not share the same language but must acquire a lingua franca to work together. FAIR provides such a framework, advocating that research models prioritize findable, accessible, interoperable, and re-usable practices (FORCE11 2016). Standards-based approaches like the International Image Interoperability Format (IIIF) exemplify these ideals, exhorting us to "break down silos with open APIs" (IIIF 2021). In Europe, open access has become integral to funding success, not just in terms of the publication of traditional papers, articles, and books, but in terms of the research data and the digital objects at the core of the work.

Sample has called for a similar ethos to be adopted in the digital humanities, where instead of just writing, classrooms would be filled with students who are both "making" *and* "sharing" with each other and the world outside the academy. From the perspective of the university lecturer, Sample saw this as a "critical intervention into the enclosed experience most students have in higher education" (2011). In this type of DH, opening research to communities outside of the academy becomes less of a perceived nod to "outreach" activity for the common good, but instead initiates a more engaged commitment to truly sharing research, building openness to research publication from the outset.[2] Unfortunately, there is still a long way to go before scholarship in the digital humanities becomes truly open and engaged (see Davis and Dombrowski 2011).

Sharing culture needs to also be sustainable. How many digital projects can guarantee sustainability beyond five years? In terms of time and effort, what is the return on this investment for the scholar in engaging with the digital potentialities for their research beyond a traditional focus and methodology? When the work is complete, where will it reside, and how long will it be accessible? If Sketchfab closes, where will the 3D models live? The perceived impermanence of digital objects becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy when a haphazard approach or funding opportunity prevails over a solid foundation with workflows based on FAIR and CARE principles, accessibility, and

sound research data management. Simply put, there is a greater chance that an object will survive if created in an open form, amongst a shared community of researcher practitioners, ideally with a stable URI or DOI.

This is also at the heart of the persistent "how to evaluate a digital humanist for tenure" debate. When is a digital humanities website not a digital humanities website? When it fails to build FAIR content. A short-term website for news or for a short-term project is not the same as a serious digital humanities endeavor with sharing and sustainability as core values—one is marketing, the other knowledge creation.

Many scholars have sought to coalesce projects in the digital humanities and share practice and insight. Discussing the now-retired Project Bamboo, a cyberinfrastructure initiative for the arts and humanities, Quinn Dombrowski explains:

> Bamboo brought together scholars, librarians, and technologists at a crucial moment for the emergence of digital humanities. The conversations that ensued may not have been what the Bamboo program staff expected, but they led to relationships, ideas, and plans that have blossomed in the years that followed (e.g. DiRT and TAPAS project), even as Bamboo itself struggled to find a path forward.
>
> (2014)

Writing in 2014, Dombrowski was hopeful for the future, for the "growth of large-scale collaborative efforts," in initiatives and infrastructures that would address the "shared technical needs" of the "community" (2014). Sadly, many of the projects that attempted to realize such hopes have not survived, and are now subject to the jibe of being ephemeral, not a monograph.

It was this vision of the web as a shared knowledge environment that prompted Tim Berners-Lee's "Information Management: A Proposal" (1989), born of a desire to communicate expert knowledge. However, directories or platforms that achieve this scholarly communication for cultural heritage—for symphonies, for paintings, for sculpture, for installations, for large-scale cultural heritage buildings and landscapes—are difficult to build, fund, and maintain.

There have been many false infrastructural dawns. In the US, from Project Bamboo to DiRT, Dombrowski and others have grappled with "the difficult decisions that fall-out from the 'directory paradox', where the DH community's praise of directories is wildly incommensurate with the interest or resources available for sustaining them" (see Papaki 2021). Dombrowski's "Cowboys and Consortia" talk for DARIAH beyond Europe explores that dichotomy of the solo maverick builder and the sustainability capacity of consortia without a long-term home (2019). Theirs is a prescient reflection that is a macrocosm of the dichotomies at play between the digital project within the infrastructure, and the scholar within the traditional discipline. How may a cowboy's work of building an infrastructure survive to be sustained within a long-term consortium solution? What work might a persistent, integrated research infrastructure do for the scholarly community and society? Sustainability and visibility are critical to success in the longer term. "If you can't see it, you can't be it" is as useful a saying for digital humanities students as for aspiring sports stars—deprecated sites with dead and decaying links are not much use to the DH future.

But hope remains. Integrated examples of European Research Infrastructure Consortia (ERICs) include the Digital Research Infrastructure for the Arts and Humanities in Europe, DARIAH-EU, which proffers a holistic suite of solutions.[3] These include APIs, discovery portals, training, national cultural heritage aggregators, standardization tools, data repositories, analysis, and enrichment tools,

amongst a long list. DARIAH-EU is building itself into a uniquely transdisciplinary international and sustainable infrastructure for digital humanities activities. This comprehensive vision includes the European Research Infrastructure for Heritage Science (HS) that similarly engages with the open agenda and promotes sharing within the field of cultural heritage. It builds on decades of work in projects like ARIADNE, CARARE, and 3D Icons that created a network of scholarship in archaeology, conservation, curation, architecture, preservation, and art history. Intrinsic to many of these pan-European projects were open concepts around linked open data ecosystems with the aim of building linked projects capable (albeit metaphorically), via semantic technologies, of organic growth instead of the static databases of previous scholarly instances positing a viable open future. Put simply, in Europe if your work is not going to be made openly shared and sustainable, it will not be funded. The cultural heritage community as a whole has more than embraced this paradigm shift. Exemplary institutions include the Rijksmuseum with its totally open data policy.[4]

These vicissitudes of survival and opportunity are replicated globally and locally as traditional computer centers in universities, and funding bodies are trapped in old project models that militate against innovative forms of open sharing of cultural heritage resources in more sustainable ways. Collaboration to leverage change is possible (see Chang 2021). Multi-layered scholarship of many dimensions exists as our communities have gathered together over decades, many with shared principles of excellent scholarship to communicate expert knowledge rendered in ever newly emerging digital representations. Privileging and using principles such as FAIR and CARE with our knowledges in a multiplicity of forms enriches our shared humanity, our songs and our stories, our haptic responses to 3D sculpture, our immersive experiences that enable meaning-making and understanding. Those of us in a position to further such enrichment must advocate for research and education practices that encourage innovation, CARE-ing and thinking beyond the page, and make evident the possibilities for excellent scholarship and excellent science inherent in new representations of knowledge work.

NOTES

1. See http://blakearchive.org/.
2. For example, see the Domain of One's Own model (Wired Insider 2012).
3. See dariahopen.hypotheses.org.
4. See rijksmuseum.nl/en/research/conduct-research/data/policy.

REFERENCES

Berners-Lee, Tim. 1989. "Information Management: A Proposal." CERN. https://cds.cern.ch/record/1405411/files/ARCH-WWW-4-010.pdf.

CARE. 2021. "CARE Principles of Indigenous Data Governance — Global Indigenous Data Alliance." https://www.gida-global.org/care/.

Chang, Tao (2021) "Arts and humanities infrastructure enabling knowledge with impact." UK Research and Innovation Blog. https://beta.ukri.org/blog/arts-and-humanities-infrastructure-enabling-knowledge-with-impact/.

Chonghaile, Deirdre Ní. 2021. *Collecting Music in the Aran Islands: A Century of History and Practice*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Davis, Rebecca Frost and Quinn Dombrowski. 2011. "Divided and Conquered: How Multivarious Isolation Is Suppressing Digital Humanities Scholarship." National Institute for Technology in Liberal Education.

Dombrowski, Quinn. 2014. "What Ever Happened to Project Bamboo?" *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 29 (3): 326–39. https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqu026.

Dombrowski, Quinn. 2019. *Cowboys and Consortia: Thoughts on DH Infrastructure*. YouTube. Stanford University. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0vkHutf_UxY.

Endres, Bill. 2020. *Digitizing Medieval Manuscripts: The St Chad Gospels, Materiality, Recoveries, and Representation in 2D & 3D*. Kalamazoo, MI: ARC Humanities Press.

Fitzpatrick, Kathleen. 2021. *Generous Thinking: A Radical Approach to Saving the University*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

FORCE11. 2016. "FAIR Principles. FORCE11 | The future of research communications and e-scholarship." https://force11.org/info/the-fair-data-principles/.

Gold, Matthew K. 2011. "Introduction: The Digital Humanities Moment." Debates in the Digital Humanities. https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/projects/debates-in-the-digital-humanities/.

IIIF. 2021. "IIIF -International Image Operability Framework." Break down silos with open APIs. https://iiif.io/.

Imbler, Sabrina. 2021. "Training the Next Generation of Indigenous Data Scientists." *New York Times*, June 29. https://www.nytimes.com/2021/06/29/science/indigenous-data-microbiome-science.html.

Kenderdine, Sarah. 2015. "Embodiment, Entanglement, and Immersion in Digital Cultural Heritage." In *A New Companion to Digital Humanities*, edited by Susan Schreibman, Ray Siemens, and John Unsworth, 22–41. Wiley Online Library. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118680605.ch2

Papaki, Eliza. 2021. "DARIAH » Who Needs Directories: A Forum on Sustaining Discovery Portals Large and Small." https://www.dariah.eu/2020/07/30/who-needs-directories-a-forum-on-sustaining-discovery-portals-large-and-small/.

Reed, Trevor. 2019. "Reclaiming Ownership of the Indigenous Voice: The Hopi Music Repatriation Project." In *Oxford Handbook of Musical Repatriation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sample, Mark. 2011. "Oct 18: DH in the Classroom." https://cunydhi.commons.gc.cuny.edu/2011/10/13/oct-18-dh-in-the-classroom-shannon-mattern-mark-sample/.

Sample, Mark. 2013. "The Digital Humanities Is Not about Building, It's about Sharing." In *Defining Digital Humanities: A Reader*, edited by Melissa Terras, Julianne Nyhan, and Edward Vanhoutte, 255–57. Farnham: Ashgate.

Wired Insider. 2012. "A Domain of One's Own." Wired. https://www.wired.com/insights/2012/07/a-domain-of-ones-own/.