CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Dissemination as cultivation: scholarly communications in a digital age
Authors	O'Sullivan, James;Long, Christopher P.;Mattson, Mark
Publication date	2016
Original Citation	O'Sullivan, J., Long, C. P. and Mattson, M. (2016) 'Dissemination as Cultivation: Scholarly Communications in a Digital Age', in: Cromptopn, C., Lane, R. J. and Siemens, R. (eds.), Doing Digital Humanities: Practice, Training, Research. London and New York: Routlege, pp. 384-397. isbn:9781138899445
Type of publication	Book chapter
Link to publisher's version	https://www.routledge.com/Doing-Digital-Humanities-Practice-Training-Research-1st-Edition/Crompton-Lane-Siemens/p/book/9781138899445
Rights	© 2016 Constance Crompton, Richard J. Lane and Ray Siemens This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge in Doing Digital Humanities: Practice, Training, Research on 01 June 2016 available online: http://www.routledge.com/9781138899438
Download date	2026-11-10 23:42:49
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/8621

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Dissemination as cultivation

Scholarly communications in a digital age

James O'Sullivan, Christopher P. Long and Mark A. Mattson

INDIVIDUAL VOICES IN PARTICIPATORY SPACES

Participatory web platforms have greatly enhanced the means by which students, scholars, and practitioners engage in arts and humanities research. Intuitive interfaces and content delivery systems have brought about paradigm shifts in the ways in which scholars connect and communicate, removing the need for advanced technical expertise when conducting a range of scholarly activities. Collaborative networks of both research and communications are now facilitated across ubiquitous systems that interact to form a transdisciplinary and dynamic interconnection of thought and practice. This chapter introduces readers to the underlying principles of scholarly communications and publishing in the digital age, uncovering the affordances and limitations of online public scholarship. The relationship between form and content is discussed, drawing upon relevant case studies to demonstrate how scholars should consider cultivating the habits and practices of thick collegiality. From here, an overview of relevant platforms is offered, before strategies for social media are detailed, all of which are supplemented by this chapter's corresponding electronic materials.

At the heart of scholarly communication in the digital age is the notion of "open access," which as Martin Paul Eve notes, began as "little more than a quiet murmur in the niche scientific sub-disciplines," but is now something of a "globally mandated revolution" (1). Scholars now have a platform through which they can disseminate

their work across a broad public audience, harnessing participatory models so as to enhance both their process and product with a variety of social components. Openness is fast becoming the defining trait of scholarly transmission, but as the humanities become increasingly public, we must be mindful of the need to protect the core principles of our discipline.

The revolution of which Eve speaks is just that – this is not merely an evolution, for a tension still exists between scholars who wish to see the status quo maintained and those who wish to explode pre-existing academic structures. That is not to say that digital advocates do not cherish the codex, but a willingness to adopt more varied forms and content is not as pervasive as one might think. The network of asymmetric knowledge exchange afforded by platforms such as Twitter is being harnessed by the digital humanities, but as Matthew Kirschenbaum outlines – drawing from Amanda French and Jennifer Howard – the centrality of the tweet to the DH community far surpasses that of the broader arts and humanities. Social media are not just venues for promotion; they are the instruments that have allowed a community to emerge from what Matthew K. Gold has aptly termed the "DH moment," the mechanisms through which our disciplinarily has evolved into a cohort:

> Twitter, along with blogs and other online outlets, has inscribed the digital humanities as a network topology, that is to say lines drawn by aggregates of affinities, formally and functionally manifest in who follows whom, who friends whom, who tweets whom, and who links to what. (Kirschenbaum)

Where the aforementioned have argued the importance of social media to scholarly communities, the emergence of such is effectively an offshoot of openness, which is, as already noted, the central tenant of digital dissemination.

When we speak of openness, it is not just a case of liberating publications of economic barriers, it is about sharing, in the broadest sense: social media present scholars with an opportunity to share knowledge, in all of its various forms, be that a 140-character epiphany, or a 6,000-word peer-reviewed research article on an esoteric subject matter. Be it tweeting, blogging, or otherwise, the Web provides a home for ideas that, while not quite developed to the point where they are suitable for peer-reviewed venues, deserve more than a place in the graveyard of one's filesystem:

> Blogging has brought new vitality to a folder full of work that otherwise would have remained stagnant on my computer, in a folder that by all rights I should have titled "Phantom Zone" (after *Superman II*) – given the hours of research and academic labour that I'd cast in there never to see the light of day again. (Gaertner)

Melissa Terras goes further and demonstrates the direct impact of such platforms on the dissemination of peer-reviewed scholarship. For Terras, discovery can be

achieved through adherence to a simple formula: “If (social media interaction is often) then (open access + social media = increased downloads).”

Yet, harnessing the digital for the purposes of scholarly communications must be critical and robust, and conscious of the many constraints that one encounters – often covertly – when interacting with a particular technology. Kathleen Fitzpatrick, referencing Jay David Bolter, aptly states: “Social and institutional structures develop new technologies to serve their purposes, but the design of those technologies can have effects that are often unforeseen” (54). Academics, as educators and public servants, have a duty to explore the scholarly potential offered through the many new publishing mechanisms presented by contemporaneity’s obsession with mass communications, but remain responsible for ensuring that, where the process might change, the product, even when re-envisioned, retains its scholarly value. Value is essential, and the retention of that value is the responsibility of scholars, and we use “scholars” in the broadest sense of the term. Publishing is an inherent part of our identity as academics, in that it is the mechanism through which we give voice to ideas, and ideas are the currency of our field. A transformation in distribution means a transformation in reception (see Davidson, for example), so we must be conscious of any repercussions that might accompany shifts in disseminative and communicative trends.

The need for possessing an awareness of the consequences of any such shift goes beyond the inherent issues in the reinvention of those processes by which we facilitate the transfer of knowledge – even the criteria by which we select new mechanisms can be problematic. Typically, platforms achieve disciplinary adoption through barometers such as intuitiveness and sustainability, but we must also account for the inherent biases in any product. One such issue is raised by Dorothy Kim in her timely piece, “Social Media and Academic Surveillance,” who accepts that Twitter is “a multivalent, rhizomatic platform with voices that form communities,” but warns against the potential for this “panopticon”-like structure becoming a source of data. The excuse that “Twitter is public,” she argues, is insufficient justifica- tion for academics using the “digital bodies” that constitute this space as “data points or experimental cells in a petri dish.” As a community of scholars, we encourage, and indeed, at gatherings such as the Digital Humanites Summer Institute, even teach, the use of social media for the purposes of scholarly commu- nications and dissemination. If we are to continue this trend, we must be as mindful of the dangers as we are of the opportunities, being as critical of the screen as we have been of the page, so that the repercussions of any transformation in the transaction between creator and receiver are fully comprehended and expressed.

FORM MATTERS AS MATTER INFORMS

The question of the relationship between form and content lies at the most ancient roots of the humanities. The dactylic hexameter through which ancient rhapsodies

told and developed what has been handed down as Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* determined the content of the stories and provided the structure by which finite human memory could preserve them. The aphorisms of Heraclitus were not empty obscurantism, but an attempt to give voice to the enigmatic nature of human existence. The dialogues of Plato were not simply ways to dress up dry pedantic arguments, but a recognition that the attempt to seek wisdom and justice is always bound up with lived relationships within a community.

Despite all of this, of course, there is a tendency, as ancient as the examples just mentioned, to prioritize form over matter, structure over content. This tendency can already be heard in book two of Aristotle's *Physics* where form, *eidos*, the look of a thing, is identified with its nature, and the four causes are reduced to two, with "form" encompassing the "first," "formal," and "final" causes.[1] Even in a text as seminal and influential as Aristotle's *Physics*, form does not reign supreme; for matter does not succumb to its authority. And there is good reason for this: form matters, and matter informs. The one cannot be reduced to the other, nor can a privileging of one be permitted to eclipse the power of the other – meaning itself is the dynamic interplay of the two.

The great affordance of the digital humanities as an endeavor is the opportunity to engage this dynamic relationship between form and matter in sophisticated ways that open new insights into their capacity to make meaning. Every attempt to craft a meaningful life, be it through art or science, engineering or agriculture, is caught up in the complex relationship between form and matter, so the opportunity to engage it in a substantive way is not the exclusive purview of this field. And yet, the emergence of new, more dynamic and public modes of digital communication requires us to think critically about and reflect imaginatively on the manner in which form matters, and matter informs.

One area of digital humanities scholarship that has taken up this issue in substantive and potentially transformative ways is that of digital scholarly communications. This makes sense, of course, because the dynamics of scholarship and communication have been substantively altered by the emergence of digital technology that enables academic content to be easily and widely shared. This has brought to the forefront an area of scholarship focused on the affordances and limitations of the technologies of scholarship and scholarly communication. This field is not new – it can arguably be traced back to the debates between Plato and Isocrates about the value of rhetoric and its relationship to philosophy, and it certainly was at the root of the rich explosion of scholarly communication in the Middle Ages. Still, scholars such as Fitzpatrick and N. Katherine Hayles have brought new energy to the question, raising important concerns about and suggesting the transformative possibilities of what Clay Shirky has termed the "publish then filter" model (98).

Indeed, at its root, the emerging emphasis on design in the digital humanities indicates that scholars are increasingly concerned with and interested in the dynamic and complex relationship between form and matter as it is recast in a

digital age. For example, Cheryl Ball and Douglas Eyman rightly understand design as rhetoric, reminding us that style "is an integral element of all rhetorical communication, and the question is not whether we want style or substantive but what kind of style we want to deploy as a component of substance" (68). The ancient emphasis on the rhetorical importance of *tropos*, the manner in which something is expressed, is rooted in the recognition that style is rhetoric. However, when Ball and Eyman insist that design is an "enactment of rhetorical practice" (68), they are highlighting the performative dimension of all communication.

Scholarship has always been performance. From the earliest conversations in which an idea germinates, to the conference presentations through which professional scholarship has, for the past few hundred years, been developed, to the genres through which new work is published, scholarship is performative. What has changed is that the advent of the web marked a qualitative leap in the nature of performative scholarship. No longer are ideas limited by space and accessibility; rather, they are, in principle at least, public in a wider sense than has heretofore been possible and at a scale that is difficult to comprehend.

New affordances in dynamic modes of digital scholarly communications have enabled authors to tailor the content of their texts to the forms in which they appear in public. The diversity of ways it is now possible to perform the argument for a text in its mode of digital publication is one of the most exciting dimensions of digital scholarship. This is not least because of the manner in which it blurs the traditional boundary between theory and practice in order to more explicitly allow practice to be animated by theory, and theory embodied by practice. The rigid distinction between theory and practice has long permitted authors to write one thing and live another. The boundary has in this way opened a space for hypocrisy that scholars have too often been tempted to exploit for their own expedience. Performative publishing requires authors to reflect upon how their arguments and ideas are best set into action. If publication is the manner in which ideas become effective in the world, publishing has always been a kind of performance.

Whatever else the emergence of digital modes of communication inhibits or enables, it opens unforeseen new opportunities for scholars to collaborate and to engage a wide public. Publication here becomes more explicitly what it has always been: a way of creating publics (Joy 13). If, however, we take the community-creating capacity of publishing seriously, we need to cultivate habits and practices that enable us to establish and nourish scholarly publics that enrich the relationships and expand the scholarship at its root. As a practice of community building, the practices of digital publishing need to attend to the cultivating of certain habits, what the ancients called virtues: excellences. These are ways of relating to one another that enrich the world and open new possibilities of connection.

As part of their Mellon-funded project to create the *Public Philosophy Journal* as an ecosystem of scholarly community and communication, Mark Fisher and Christopher P. Long have sought to articulate a thick conception of collegiality

capable of creating a rich and enriching community of scholarship online. As one would expect, there has been no end to appeals to collegiality in discussions of online communication and behavior. Such appeals, often in the name of increased "civility," amount to little more than an attempt to police what is and is not legitimate to say and, more significantly, which voices are and are not legitimately to be included in the conversation. Often this insistence is couched in terms of "tone" and invoked to exclude or undermine the authority of a particular position. The "collegiality" to which such rhetoric appeals is thin: it is neither rooted in a relation of mutual respect nor animated by a shared endeavor.

The thick spirit of collegiality that the *Public Philosophy Journal* ecosystem of scholarly communication seeks to cultivate takes its cue from the etymology of the word itself. "Collegiality" comes from the Latin *coll ė ga*, one chosen along with another, a partner in office, etc. It derives from the prefix, "*col-*," together and "*lege˘ re*," to choose. In the context of DH performative publishing, what is together chosen is the shared attempt to develop and improve the scholarly artifacts under consideration, be they written articles, video documentaries, podcasts, or other modes of scholarly expression.

To paraphrase Aristotle, one comment or one review does not thick collegiality make. Collegiality thickens over time as partners choose one another again and again in their shared endeavor to create something rich in meaning. The challenge, of course, is how to cultivate the thickening of collegiality in a digital environment that often seems to reward the snarky witticism over the thoughtful, well-formulated critique that pushes the work to new, more interesting, and richer depths. Thick collegiality might best be rooted in three dimensions of scholarly encounter:

1. hermeneutic empathy: the ability to accurately describe what animates the scholarship under review;
2. hermeneutic generosity: the willingness to invest expertise, experience, insight, and ideas to improving the scholarship under review;
3. hermeneutic transformation: the ability to engage the community in ways that enrich the scholarship we are producing together.

Drawing on the important work done by the team at ELI Review to create a helpfulness score in peer assessment at the undergraduate level, the *Public Philosophy Journal* is developing ways to computationally identify phrases and formulations that signal that one or another of these dimensions of thick collegiality is at play in a given review or comment. When the machines identify moments of possible collegiality, human members of the community can focus their attention on those sites of exchange, bringing their own judgment to bear on the dynamics of the interaction.

Cultivating the habits and practices of thick collegiality is made more difficult when the institutional context in which DH scholars are evaluated and rewarded do not

adequately consider or recognize the significance of the scholarship that unfolds in the dynamic online interactions described here. Traditional humanities scholarship has long been willing to turn a blind eye to the important scholarship that unfolds in the blind peer-review process.[2] By making that work more public and by cultivating the habits and practices that enable us to do it well, DH publishing should be able both to document effectively the quality of the work being done, but also, to enrich the community of scholars doing the work.

INNOVATIVE FORMATS WITH A FAMILIAR FEEL

The emerging frameworks for knowledge sharing that inform humanistic modes of dissemination in the digital age may, upon initial examination, appear foreign, but once users become acclimated to the new formats, the traditional pillars of scholarly communication at the foundation of these frameworks provide a sense of the familiar. The traditional facets of scholarly communication – publishing, peer-review, discovery, and professional networks – have all moved, in their own ways, into the digital sphere and have been expanded upon and shaped by new digital modes; still, the virtues and principles of these constants remain intact. Scholars in the digital world continue to seek the most relevant resources, the effective dissemination of knowledge, the most strategic avenues for building and maintaining scholarly prestige, and the most advantageous methods for connecting and collaborating with their colleagues. With this in mind, then, the consideration of several of the most prevalent new platforms, networks, and organizations which enable the emerging knowledge-sharing frameworks becomes more accessible.

Perhaps the most intuitive transition into the digital world of scholarly communications is in the transformation of the proven mechanisms of scholarly publishing; journals, monographs, and published conference proceedings. A 2013 study by the University of Tennessee and the CIBER Research Group found that “peer reviewed journals were the most trusted source [of scholarly material] by a huge margin” (Tenopir *et al.*); this, when coupled with the fact that access to journals has largely moved into the digital realm, suggests that the shift in the mode of transmission from “traditional” to digital has not diminished their utility. In their digital form, these publishing tools have both the familiar look and feel that mimics the pre-digital world, while also enabling previously unimaginable possibilities. The ability to embed accompanying media and data into a digital text, along with the ability to link out to other relevant additional resources, while allowing the reader’s active participation, has led to exciting and innovative scholarly publishing projects.

There exist myriad platforms and systems for the creation and dissemination of traditional scholarly communication tools in the digital space; far more than can be mentioned in a single chapter. Accordingly, it is important that the needs of any project are fully considered when choosing a digital solution. Some of the more

common tools for online journal and conference proceedings publishing are Open Journal Systems, Bepress, WordPress, and Open Conference Systems. All of these platforms provide a system on which to digitally publish the cumulative work of multiple contributors and manage the editorial workflow, which are hallmarks of the academic journal. Each platform allows for embedded media, linked supplemental material, and audience engagement through open or moderated commenting. These systems provide both the editorial back-end system and the user-facing "performance" side of the publication.

Monograph publications in the electronic world provide a much broader spectrum of creative possibilities including, but not limited to, multi-linear constructions, multimedia-infused narratives, and interactive-collaborative creations of text. Consequently, the digital-solutions environment provided by both the commercial and free open-source markets is considerably more varied and complex. Each digital tool provides a host of potential benefits and drawbacks, and once again, no single tool can be applied as the solution for every project. Representative of this type of digital solution is The Alliance for Networking Visual Culture's Scalar platform ("About Scalar"). Scalar is billed as:

> a free, open-source authoring and publishing platform that [is] designed to make it easy for authors to write long-form, born-digital scholarship online . . . [and] gives authors tools to structure essay- and book-length works in ways that take advantage of the unique capabilities of digital writing, including nested, recursive, and non-linear formats.

The platform showcases the innovative and creative possibilities that digital publishing can facilitate when traditional publishing tools are re-imagined and reconfigured.

Moving down the spectrum from the well-established and relatively secure positioning of traditional peer-reviewed scholarly communication tools in their digital form, digital self-publishing is undergoing its own redefinition. The anathema of any serious scholar in the pre-digital age, self-publishing has become a prolific, if not respected, form of scholarly communication in the digital era in the form of blogs, whatever form that practice might take. Thanks to the collaborative and interactive nature of digital publishing, the peer-review process, once the key distinction between academic publishing and disdainful self-publishing, has found its place within the self-publishing infrastructure. If appropriately implemented, commenting and other facilities for interaction can now allow for a robust and public peer-review process, and in many cases, even facilitate productive public debate. In a sense, it is scholarship 2.0.

Blogging, vlogging, and microblogging platforms share a common purpose in allowing users to communicate ideas to their targeted audience and to engage readers in public dialogue. While not dedicated exclusively to scholarly communication, popular web tools such as WordPress, Blogger, and Twitter have become important scholarly tools not only in the dissemination of knowledge but also in the

creation of digital spaces for fruitful discussion, which may lead to new insights and conclusions. Unlike traditional dissemination formats such as journals, digital self-publishing benefits from expediency and, by its very nature, a more transparent peer-review process. Most of the self-publishing platforms and services available today are developed to be user-friendly and convenient; however, as mentioned, in order to realize the full potential of digital self-publishing, it is important to understand how the careful selection and/or construction of a platform can shape and influence the resulting discourse.

Another recent digital innovation related to self-publishing is the proliferation of online digital repositories. Often sponsored by an institution or group of institutions, online digital repositories provide scholars with an additional venue for self-publishing scholarly works and offer the possibility of making open access versions of traditionally published works available. Institutional repositories, such as Penn State's ScholarSphere, and subject-specific repositories such as ArXiv, provide both a venue for self-publication and a point of discovery for researchers. By allowing for sufficient public peer-oversight through feedback and commenting mechanisms, online repositories can be of critical importance to research communities in that they facilitate the sharing of large complex data sets, a facet of the publishing process which was often more unwieldy or less timely with traditional publishing tools. The development of these repositories may be, in part, a response to the proliferation of mandates issued by funding bodies which require open access to resulting publications as well as its associated data. Some examples of these types of mandates and policies are those of the National Institute of Health in the United States, the Indian Council of Agriculture, the Research Council of Norway, the Canadian Cancer Society, the National Natural Science Foundation of China, the European Research Council, UNESCO, the Australian Research Council, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.[3]

Similar to the significant shift in modes and dissemination in self-publishing, the introduction of digital instruments into academia has had an unprecedented impact on the degree to which scholars are able to network and collaborate. The larger trend of digital technology's impact on the interpersonal interactions within society is mirrored in academic circles in that it easily accommodates inter-institutional, international, and interdisciplinary networking. It is worth remembering, however, that "ease" is a relative term, and that we must be mindful of cultural contexts where such technical affordances are not so readily available. Most of the traditional scholarly networks such as scholarly societies, institutional networks, annual conferences, and discourses facilitated through print publications have, at least in some aspects, considered the creation of a digital presence; consequently, new scholarly infrastructural frameworks have been developed as a result of employing digital tools in publishing.

New scholarly digital networking tools such as ORCID, LinkedIN, Academia.edu, Zotero, and ResearchGate are competing with non-specialized tools such as Facebook, Google+, and Twitter to become the digital "home" of scholars and

those interested in their scholarly output. In reality, a dynamic mix of digital solutions is being used by modern scholars to supplement traditional scholarly networking infrastructure. The main difference between new digital structures and traditional constructs is to be found in their scope and rate of dissemination. In the digital network, the scope becomes global and the rate of dissemination accelerates exponentially. This is not to say that the organizations and establishments which make up the traditional infrastructure are now obsolete; rather, many such institutions have taken advantage of recent networking technologies and incorporated them into their culture, utilizing tools from listservs and Twitter to web conferencing and podcasts.

Having reviewed some of the most prevalent new platforms, networks, and organizations which enable emerging frameworks for knowledge sharing, it is clear that the virtues and essences of the traditional facets of scholarly communication – publishing, peer-review, discovery, and professional networks – remain intact in the digital era. Likewise, the institutions and organizations which have long supported the infrastructure that supports scholarly communications – libraries, presses, researchers, funding agencies, and scholarly societies – have not been replaced by digital technologies and tools, but have instead adapted to the new reality of scholarly communication and continue to play their crucial cultural, pragmatic, and economic roles. In today's digitally oriented environment, scholars are not entering into a strange new territory devoid of familiar landmarks, but instead moving through a well-worn and familiar landscape which happens to be rapidly evolving. As the traditional blends with the technical in the publishing world, academia continues to evolve as it questions and explores the benefits that digital technologies bring, and the scholarly process and its associated ecosystem.

SCHOLARLY STRATEGIES FOR SOCIAL MEDIA

It is strange to think that almost a decade has passed since Aimée Morrison defined the blog as "a relatively new genre in digital literary studies." Even stranger is the fact that there was a time when blogging was considered "a relatively new" practice. Morrison's remarks from 2008 have never been more cogent. She notes that the "landscape of blogging is changing rapidly as new users come to write and read in this medium," pre-empting much of the commentary that has been offered in recent years:

Academic bloggers face . . . personal and professional pressures when they blog, but are drawn to the form for compelling reasons, among them the opportunities to network with scholars they might not otherwise meet, to avoid academic isolation if theirs is an arcane subspecialty, to test new ideas on a willing expert audience in an informal manner, to ask for help from this same audience, and to keep abreast of colleagues and research.

The pressures to which Morrison refers are sometimes institutional in origin, with the merits of public scholarship often dismissed by promotion boards; but they can also be personal, as for many academics, the idea of making public a treatise or thought process that has not undergone the validation of peer-review can be a frightening experience. But if scholars are to avail of digital scholarly communications for the benefit of their work – be that in blogging or otherwise – then they must face up to this fear by familiarizing themselves with the technologies and strategies necessary to accomplish the potentialities outlined by Morrison.

As discussed earlier, dissemination as cultivation, in essence, is a matter of striking the right balance between form and content. Typically, the content is something with which most scholars will be more familiar, as that rarely undergoes much by way of evolution, though digital materials should strive to be media-rich if they are to be compelling. As content creators – and this can be difficult for people who have written on a paper surface throughout the entirety of their careers – scholars must not seek to impose the restrictions of the pre-digital upon the screen. Digital scholarly communications should adhere to the same values as any critical argument. The very nature of the form is such that the readership will most likely be broader, so there is a case to present information in as compelling and intuitive a manner as possible. Doing so is not about aspiring to popular acclaim, but rather, about ensuring that voices have clarity in an environment where there is often more noise than there is knowledge. Clarity does not necessarily mean readership, but for scholars, market saturation is not the objective – the aim is to penetrate a community of like-minded scholars, practitioners, and enthusiasts, whatever the size of that community.

Everything you disseminate should be a reflection of your identity as an academic – if anything else, digital platforms are an opportunity to tell your own research story. In this respect, content is not just about clicks, it is about taking control of your scholarly profile. By failing to do so, as Kelli Marshall warns, “you are allowing Google, Yahoo, and Bing to create your identity for you.” In this respect, Marshall offers a sound framework for cultivation:

1. Take control.
2. Build a network.
3. Practice uniformity.
4. Monitor yourself.

Scholars should seek to direct search engines to relevant and compelling content that is frequently maintained; visible to their students and peers; ideologically, biographically, and professionally consistent; and conscious of the public space in which it resides.

There are also rules which, while not enforced, should be respected. Oftentimes, the academic context will be pedagogical, and when such is the case, the stakes are only higher (see Kim, “The Rules of Twitter”). But rules are not only concerned with ethics; there are conventions with which one must conform, and scholars should familiarize themselves with these conventions before adopting a platform. This is not just about ensuring the appropriate citation of fellow tweeters; it is about ensuring the use of hashtags to disseminate and propagate content; using handles in a manner that will allow the community to efficiently begin, enter, and expand conversations.

Form can present more of a barrier to users looking to bring those trends found across the digital humanities to bear upon their own research and scholarly communications. The issue one is faced with is the same issue that was present when consolidation of our field was still very much in its infancy: “Different media serve different content types more or less effectively; it’s important to recognize what a medium is best suited for” (Jensen). Overcoming this challenge involves gaining familiarity with multiple technologies, but most tools are now sufficiently intuitive so as to allow non-technical individuals to develop the necessary competencies. Identifying a form appropriate to the content in question is a matter of recognizing the implementation potential of any platform. Blogging, for example, is a practice, not a platform, and offerings such as WordPress are not simply blogging software, but rather, content management systems which can be adapted to a range of purposes, whether that be hosting blog posts, or developing a fully fledged scholarly profile or digital project. The flexibility that one finds in open-source platforms is such that the chief concern is no longer functionality, but rather, usability and support. Adopters need to account for system requirements and institutional restrictions, and in the case of open-source software, the size of the community from which they can draw support.

In essence, bringing scholarship into the public realm via digital means is about awareness – awareness of the affordances, limitations, and repercussions of juxtaposing technology with those critical and creative practices so crucial to the arts and humanities. The importance of the latter should not be diluted by the former, in that technology should always be harnessed *in support* of the human; it should enable rather than dictate our purpose as scholars and practitioners of disciplines which are conscious of the cultural, the critical and creative. Potential always comes at a cost, so we must be conscious of that cost, but also, willing to seek the benefits. We do not need to change what it is that we are saying; technology merely presents an opportunity to say it in new ways, to new people, drawing new responses and insights, which, in turn, create new knowledge. The transaction between reader and writer is no less significant; it has simply undergone a transformation of sorts, and it is our responsibility to oversee this transformation so that it continues to benefit those scholarly values which we have for centuries held so dear.

NOTES

1 In the *Physics*, Aristotle is concerned to articulate and identify the principles of things capable of moving and changing themselves – *ta physika*. This is the context in which the priority of form begins to emerge (see Aristotle 193b19 and 198a24–8). The more complicated and interesting story about the emergence of the priority of form is told by Long in "The Hegemony of Form and the Resistance of Matter," Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal 21.2 (1999): 21–46.

2 For a good articulation of the importance of review as a scholarly activity and, indeed, as a teachable and learnable one, see Hart-Davidson, William, Michael McLeod, Christopher Klerkx, and Michael Wojcik, "A Method for Measuring Helpfulness in Online Peer Review" in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Design of Communication*, 115–121.

3 For more information about open access mandates and policies, see the Registry of Open Access Repository Mandates and Policies (ROARMAP) at roarmap.eprints.org.

REFERENCES

"About Scalar." *The Alliance for Networking Visual Culture*. N.p., n.d. Web. 8 August 2015.

Ball, Cheryl, and Douglas Eyman. "Digital Humanities Scholarship and Electronic Publication." *Rhetoric and the Digital Humanities*. Ed. William Hart-Davidson and Jim Rodolfo. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 2015. 65–79. Print.

Davidson, Cathy. *Now You See It: How the Brain Science of Attention Will Transform the Way We Live, Work, and Learn*. New York: Viking, 2011. Print.

Eve, Martin Paul. *Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts, Controversies and the Future*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. CrossRef. Web. 5 March 2015.

Fitzpatrick, Kathleen. *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy*. New York: NYU Press, 2011. Print.

Gaertner, David. "To Blog, or Not to Blog?: Social Media as Academic Practice." *Novel Alliances*. N.p., n.d. Web. 3 March 2015.

Jensen, Michael. "Intermediation and Its Malcontents: Validating Professionalism in the Age of Raw Dissemination." *A Companion to Digital Humanities*. Ed. Susan Schreibman, Ray Siemens, and John Unsworth. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004. Web.

Joy, Eileen. "A Time for Radical Hope." *Chiasma: A Site for Thought* 1.1 (2014): 10–23. Print.

Kim, Dorothy. "Social Media and Academic Surveillance: The Ethics of Digital Bodies." *Model View Culture*. N.p., 7 October 2014. Web. 26 August 2015.

Kim, Dorothy . "The Rules of Twitter." *Hybrid Pedagogy*. N.p., 4 December 2014. Web. 3 March 2015.

Kirschenbaum, Matthew. "What Is Digital Humanities and What's It Doing in English Departments?" *Debates in the Digital Humanities*. Ed. Matthew K. Gold. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012. Web.

Marshall, Kelli. “How to Curate Your Digital Identity as an Academic.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. N.p., n.d. Web. 3 March 2015.

Morrison, Aimée. “Blogs and Blogging: Text and Practice.” *A Companion to Digital Literary Studies*. Ed. Susan Schreibman and Ray Siemens. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008. Web.

Shirky, Clay. *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations*. New York: Penguin Press, 2008. Print.

Tenopir, Carol *et al. Trust and Authority in Scholarly Communications in the Light of the Digital Transition: Final Report*. University of Tennessee and CIBER Research Ltd, 2013. Web. 8 August 2015.

Terras, Melissa. “The Impact of Social Media on the Dissemination of Research: Results of an Experiment.” *Journal of Digital Humanities* 1.3 (2012): n. pag. Web. 3 March 2015.