Exercise 3 Scribe Notes

Group 1a - A

- Finding/Amassing
  - Create knowledge
  - Find source materials
  - Read source materials
  - Learn languages
  - Aggregate critical editions
  - Collecting data
  - Amass a body of knowledge
- Management
  - Complete a project
  - Write a grant proposal
  - Plan future work
  - Supervise grants
- Disseminating
  - Present prizewinning speech
  - Publish research
  - Disseminate knowledge of tools, methods
  - Tailor a syllabus
  - Write a conference paper
  - Think laterally
- Creating/Performing
  - Assign/create metadata
  - Annotate documents
  - Create new media
  - Tailor a syllabus
  - Collaboration/Networking
  - Collaborate with peers
  - Discover social networks
  - Collaborate on research
  - Build networks
- Exploring tools/process
  - Develop tools
  - Explore new tools
- Archiving
  - Digitize collections
  - Produce a local archive
- Analyzing
  - Find patterns
  - Discover relationships
  - Analyze data
  - Represent texts
  - Analyze linguistics
  - Dating materials
  - Understanding consensus within available sources
  - Identify causal relationships
  - Identify state of the art
  - Identify stylistic patterns
  - Detect named entities
  - Analyze media
- Annotating/Documenting
  - Annotate documents
- Reflecting
  - Reflect on our own practices
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Group 1a - B
• Publishing
  o Sending e-mail to online dictionary
  o Produce a book or work
  o Write a book
  o Scanning documents
  o Acquired digital animation representation
• Networking
  o Networking with colleagues
  o Finding and engaging like-minded colleagues
• Working with primary resources
  o Collecting primary sources
  o Examining primary sources
  o Go through database
  o Translate text
  o Find translations
  o Converting manifestation into another format
• Discovering
  o Acquiring expertise (in a new area)
  o Browsing materials
  o Identifying patterns, relationships
  o Keeping abreast of relevant scholarship
  o Figure out how texts fit together
  o Contextualize the object
  o Conceptualize the text
• Producing/Creating
  o Producing a methodology
  o Remediation of work or data
  o Capture 3D phrase
• Annotate
  o Annotate data
  o Add metadata in many forms
• Manage resources
  o Access technical resources
  o Finding secure place for storage
  o Applying a methodology
  o Assembling panel for conference
• Funding
  o Write successful grant
  o Compiling bio-bibliography
• Gathering feedback
  o Integrating feedback into research
  o Gathering feedback

Group 1a - C

• Ideation, Creation
  o Discover resource
  o Activate resource
  o Ask questions
  o Refine existing questions
  o Coalesce materials which can be organized and interpreted to form an argument
  o Analyze one's own methodology
  o Designing observation strategy
  o Improve technologies
  o Exeriment with revised methodology
  o Searching on net
  o Tracking references from article
  o Identifying new tools available
  o Synthesizing, crystalizing significant contribution, new, original narrative
  o Capturing synthesis in some formal form
• Community/Knowledge generation
  o Discover resource
  o Collect reactions
  o Identifying related ideas and people
  o Assess direction of one's own field and one's own career arc
  o Build relationship
  o Forge partnerships
  o Represent research
  o Build reputation
  o Finding reviewers
  o Finding community
- Marketing work
- Maintaining presence in community
- Updating current dossier of work
  - Organization of ideas, interpretation
- Connect one idea to another
- Store and retrieve personal research
- Relate teaching to research questions
- Correlate outside materials to one's own expertise and research
- Discover most significant themes, questions, etc.
- Recombine one's own research
- Identifying themes suitable for publication
- Collating previous work
- Identify publishable aspects of current work, projects
- Assessing relevance
  - Resources
- Discover resource
- Discover non-intellectual resources
- Activate resource
- Clear copyright
- Transmitting experience
- Store recordings into repository
- Identifying technical issues
- Improve technologies
- Analyze how technology works
- Refine methodology of use of tools
- Secure resources
- Write grants
- Conceptualize fundable activities
- Writing grant applications
- Finding skilled practitioners
  - Present Work
- Write draft or paper
- Represent research
- Develop tools to present research
- Writing articles
- Presenting current work
  - Project Management
- Carve out time
- Break through roadblocks
- Evaluate one's own use of time
- Organizing communication
- Coordinating logistical support for hardware used in research
- Managing SW development processes
- Managing skills mix of team
- Finding skilled practitioners
- Identify publishable aspects of current work, projects
  - Management, collection
- Observing subjects
- Recording observations
  - Data management, analysis
- Annotating Live Capture
- Coding events
- Categorize movement
- Identifying themes suitable for publication
- Store recordings into repository
  - Access/Permission
- Secure access
- Clear copyright
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Group 1a - D
• Formulation
  o Write grant
  o Compile data set
  o Collect resources
  o Articulate purpose
  o Cite scholarly work
• Collaboration
  o Grow scholarly community
  o Synthesize information
  o Manage alliances with other scholars
  o Network with other team members
  o Collaborate with students/colleagues
  o Facilitate collaboration
• Planning
  o Assemble research team
• Exploration
  o Match patterns
  o Perform critical analysis
  o Create opportunities for "structured serendipity"
• Production
  o Coordinate activities
  o Write article or chapter
  o Contextualize research
  o Georeference stuff
  o Choose stuff to study
  o Select stuff to study
  o Filter stuff to study
  o Identify stuff to study
• Sharing
  o Disseminate
  o Preserve digital resources
  o Present paper
  o Publish article or chapter
  o Deliver product of research
  o Perform art
  o Get credit
  o Tell story
  o Create edition
  o Translate text
  o Archive data set
  o Disseminate data set
  o Utilize research results in a pedagogical context
• Data Management
  o Update and maintain software
  o Georeference stuff
• Evaluation
  o Question assumptions
  o Solicit feedback
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Group 1a - E
• Planning
• Research
• Exploration, creating:
  o Creation ends with an artifact. Then next step can look at the products.
• Share things: dissemination: sharing, publishing, releasing, exchanging things: These go together
• Michael Shanks’ on the fly model:
  o Resource extraction ->
  o Design ->
  o Manufacture ->
  o Distribution ->
  o Consumption ->
  o Curation
• Axle’s circle:
  o Create ->
  o Research/observe ->
  o Publish ->
  o (with someone putting evaluate in the middle)
• Attempt to synthesize a set of descriptions that can be communicated externally later:
• Planning/Creation (Genesis) Formulation:
  o Compile a dataset (literature, bibliographies, images, original sources, stories, GIS locs.);
  o Collect resources;
  o Articulate the purpose the scholarly work is meant to address;
  o Write a grant;
  o Cite scholarly work;
  o Grow a community to do research (or assemble a research team);
• Exploration: Synthesize information; match patterns; critical analysis; create opportunities for structured serendipity; choose, select/filter/frame;
• Production: Coordinate activities; write article/chapter; geo-reference;
• Data Management: Curating, preserving; update/maintain software; geo-references
• Evaluation: Solicit feedback on research; question assumptions;
• Share:
• Collaboration: Grow a scholarly community; network w. other team members
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Group 1b - A

- [ ] our themes
  - [ ] brainspace mgmt
    - [ ] up to date on research, news, events
    - [ ] don’t record or chronicle but create a piece of knowledge
    - [ ] clear brain of clutter to think better
    - [ ] organize primary material, including images & film
    - [ ] realize a key insight or technique
    - [ ] keep my stuff organized so I can find & use it
    - [ ] ideosyncratic ways of organizing
  - [ ] intellectual networking
    - [ ] share & discuss pre-pub
    - [ ] converse with divergent communities
    - [ ] collaboration -- find collaborators
    - [ ] find & form invisible colleges
    - [ ] talking about/giving feedback about research
    - [ ] organize/share research
    - [ ] engage in thoughtful writing & conversation with colleagues
    - [ ] participate in several interest groups
  - [ ] explore
    - [ ] identify a commonality or connection
    - [ ] discover a new resource
    - [ ] identify material
    - [ ] find/create/use digital collections
  - [ ] ongoing dissemination
    - [ ] develop & release scholarly tools
    - [ ] recognition
    - [ ] work is connected with and used by appreciative audience
    - [ ] solutions
    - [ ] distribute/promote knowledge important to me
- [ ] our chosen table topics
  - [ ] discover unimagined resource (uncommon)
  - [ ] writing as intrinsic to humanities research process (uncommon)
  - [ ] intellectual networking (common)
  - [ ] define "authorship" and "scholarship" (common)
Group 1b - B

networking/collaboration
delivering (works, talks, reviews, performances)
discovering (people, ideas, funding)
simplifying (parsimony) vs. enriching
building tools
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Group 1b - C

• Tools and Infrastructure
  o Build concordances [NEW PRACTICE]
  o Identifying scholars' needs
  o We need bibliographic file management that fits idiosyncratic workflows
    • E.g., Linking new technologies with scholarly needs
    • Marshalling data into a database
  • Discovery
    o Discovering new knowledge and data
  • Immersing yourself in new knowledge
  • Staying current with discourse in your field
  • Finding validated or trustworthy primary data on a research subject
  • Enjoying serendipitous discoveries
  • Analyze
    o Analyzing / synthesizing / digesting research results
    o Identifying promising problems
    o Identifying plausible publishers
  • Marshalling data into a database
  • Discovery
  • Identifying scholars' needs

• E.g., Linking new technologies with scholarly needs
• Marshalling data into a database
• Discovery

• Analyze
  o Analyzing / synthesizing / digesting research results
  o Identifying promising problems
  o Identifying plausible publishers
  o Scoping a project, designing a workplan/timeline
• Mapping the state of extant knowledge
• Dissemination
  o Planning a syllabus that reflects/communicates research knowledge
  o Representing research for the scholarly audience
  o Communicating knowledge derived from research (teaching)
  o Developing classroom exercises that engage students and communicate ideas
• Communities of Practice
  o Creating online communities
  o Catalyze creative collisions
  o Becoming known in your field
  o Building a formal/informal community of readers, commentators, advisors
  o Leveling the ground (equalizing research opportunities among researchers with different levels of resources)
  o Credit for depositing data when developing research
  o Limiting the "Matthew Effect" (prominent researchers get more credit)
  o Becoming known in your field; creating/maintaining a reputation
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Group 1b - D

Discussion:
Since the group had already organized their activities into verbs and actions, and then abstracted up, it was a short skip to categories. They defined common versus uncommon as what as a group they shared and did not share. They ended up with 3 common categories:
1) Foraging
  reading, searching, seeing, posting on list serves, conversing, brainstorming
2) Creating
  Writing, editing
3) Sense-making
  Networking, annotating, teaching, conferences

Uncommon:
1) Using non roman-script languages
2) Political Action
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Group 1b - E

Common Themes:
  Competition-Collaboration
  Create New Validated Tangible Knowledge
Uncommon Themes:
Intellectual Property
Money

What/Why:
Competiton-Collaboration: Faculty and IT and Library all have the same tension of wanting
to work together even as individual gains propel one further in their careers.

Create New Validated Tangible Knowledge: Whether a book, an article, a database or a
website, everyone has to create new knowledges that is validated and is tangible.

Intellectual Property: Faculty and IT/Library have very different ideas of sharing.
Money: Again, faculty and IT/Library have divergent needs to raise/spend $.
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Group 1b - F

Common Themes (2x):  
Connections: i.e. social connections, connecting & introducing people and resources to each
other.

Engaging w/primary materials: pattern recognition, “junk filter” (i.e. filtering out the things
you’re not interested in, looking for differences), inductive/deductive relation of evidence and
hypothesis.

Uncommon Themes (2x):

Recreating past methodologies: i.e. rediscovering historical ways of looking at what is now
primary material.

Reconceptualization: i.e. mapping scholarly practices to IT methodologies & going through a
process of mutual translations & transformations to make it fit.
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Group 1c - A
3. Exercise 3

3.1. Common

3.1.1. G6

- 3.1.1.1. One thing that scholars do is identify genres
- 3.1.1.2. Learning through embodied practices. Literally, learning how to do things with the body.
- 3.1.1.3. Divide labor: who can/will do what

3.1.2. G3

- 3.1.2.1. Identify issues
- 3.1.2.2. Communicate in any number of ways
- 3.1.2.3. Dissemination of findings, both to colleagues and academics, and to those whom he studies. Disseminate to diverse constituencies. (“publics, communities”)

3.1.3. G7

- 3.1.3.1. Talk and communicate within and across communities
- 3.1.3.2. Rely on information in multiple forms
- 3.1.3.3. Use technology. Support technology, use it to communicate, use collaboration tools.

3.1.4. G8

- 3.1.4.1. Gather data
- 3.1.4.2. Assimilate information
- 3.1.4.3. Communicate a more (publish) or less (looking for feedback) complete knowledge.

3.1.5. G2

- 3.1.5.1. Identification of what makes a difference
- 3.1.5.2. Identification of where a contribution can be made
- 3.1.5.3. Identify to whom it makes a difference

3.1.6. G4

- 3.1.6.1. Forming relationships to achieve a goal
- 3.1.6.2. Get feedback. How are other people thinking about somewhat formulated concepts.
- 3.1.6.3. Give back. Similar to dissemination, but different. Pay subject for time and work. Useful to own research career, too. Give back in negotiated value.

3.1.7. G9

- 3.1.7.1. Forming networks

3.1.8. G5

- 3.1.8.1. Write & publish papers & books
- 3.1.8.2. Analyze data and information, eliciting.
- 3.1.8.3. Reading stuff.

3.1.9. G9

- 3.1.9.1. Think about what to do next.
- 3.1.9.2. Disseminate to diverse constituencies.
- 3.1.9.3. Negotiate value, roles, & relationships.
- 3.1.9.4. * Question categories and meaning of data.
- 3.1.9.5. * Challenge assumptions, hypotheses, and meanings.

3.1.10. G5

- 3.1.10.1. G9: “Essential to constantly question categories, meaning of data.”
- 3.1.10.2. G5: “To generalize, part of research process is challenging assumptions, hypotheses, and meanings.”
- 3.1.10.3. Negotiations are different in collaborative research.
- 3.1.10.4. Some people are here because of engagement in research; others are more of audience for work.
- 3.1.10.5. Anthropology is very personal, direct: of course I do all the research myself. Never crossed my mind that someone else would be invested in keeping people communicating.
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Group 1c - B

- Ways to name common/uncommon, what are the themes? - Facilitating
- Acquire primary materials
  - Changing role of a librarian in an increasingly digital world.
  - Acquisition as a broad theme
  - Complementing that is Creation.
  - Those in the humanities believe they are creating materials that will then be acquired.
  - Creation as opposed to Publication, being a broader theme.
- Dissemination of information?
  - Three strands of triple helix in university:
    - Teaching
    - Learning
    - Knowledge transfer
- Dissemination of knowledge
  - Does this make it a common theme?
  - How is this different from teaching and learning?
  - It extends to bodies external to the university as well.
  - Is it more broad than teaching and learning?
  - Humanities is about interpreting, it's not about transferring knowledge.
If an institution is involved in teaching and learning, the old school is dissemination in lecture hall. New school is open-ended on the web.

- Double helix instead of a triple one.
- Is teaching and learning necessarily in a closed environment?
- Knowledge transfer generally ends up referring to external agencies.
- Some of these activities might end up under teaching, learning and/or research.
- There is a difference in practice for external knowledge transfer.
- Point of emphasis if not a theme or practice.

- Discursive.

- Linking with the outside world is something foreign to the humanities, when science tends to link to commercial realms more often.
- Continuing education, or connections to external mechanisms, are more difficult in humanities.
- What are the processes coming from the outside world that can welcome the humanities?
  - How does industry respond to the humanities?
  - Way knowledge is transferred in the university might be changing.
  - Knowledge transfer appropriately broad for teaching and learning, publication (web and print), or is it too broad? Perhaps not a single theme... or are their multiple.
  - Or is it too narrow? It's a science oriented concept, that may not work in the humanities since human sciences are more about interpretation than knowledge.

- Dissemination or outreach? Dissemination is not interactive enough.

- Technologies might allow for dissemination of new materials, or new representations - like a VRML model, or broadcasting documentary footage on a website.

- Economy?
  - Having an effect on economy? Is this a scholarly practice? Or is it a consequence of scholarly practice?
  - Effects on economies should be something for economists.
  - Effects on the discipline?
  - Impact of one's research, and its effects, are things we're often asked to report on.
  - More pressure to come up with ways to report effects.
  - New ways of reporting this would be something important to find.
  - Most will be reluctant about finding new ways, though there's more pressure to do this.
  - Administered by questionnaire that will sometimes query motives.

- Assessing impact of scholarly activity.
  - This type of activity seems to be common, but is it a theme?
  - Important to scholars, to funder.
  - Fundamental to sustainability.
  - Common themes thus far:
    - Acquisition
    - Creation
    - Dissemination and outreach
    - Assessing impact of scholarly activity
    - What will Bamboo deliver?
  - Infrastructure for tracking and cutting across many tools.
  - Danger that it will turn humanities academics against the project because of the idea that they'll be monitored.

- Any given humanities scholar would hopefully come down on both sides of the question
  - Good to know impact, while at the same time not wanting to feel "watched" or "tracked".
  - Uncommon activity example:
    - Example of creation in the visual arts
      - A virtual sculpture from Goldsmith's College London
      - Perceived by wearing glasses, leading to perception of checkerboard floor with a cuboid sculpture that appeared wherever one was looking.
      - Innovative and had the possibility to be viewed in one's field of vision wherever.
      - Actually installed in the toilet.
      - It can be seen remotely/streamed.
  - These technologies are increasingly part of the normal stock and trade of people in the visual arts, and a range of areas.
  - It applies to conservation of materials, since nothing raw is being used.
  - More often used in archaeology or architecture
  - Looking at buildings, as it appears before you virtually.
  - Interactive virtual reality or digital modeling as scholarly activity?
  - Or visualization?
  - Modeling and visualization?
  - Uncommon theme

- Visualization - though perhaps more common than we'd think.

- What's innovative is the fact that it's being used in the humanities, making it somewhat uncommon.
  - Enabling technology for humanities scholars
  - From bauhaus to the outhouse.
  - Idea of completion/virtual unification solving cultural restitution issues.
  - Virtual unification of artifacts.

- Visualizing dialogue
• People don’t want to look through everything, so a visualization of structure
• Compendium being built by University of Manchester, visualizes dialogue in non-linear way
• Video search tool in development.
• Finalizing modeling and visualization as a theme.

Common themes
• Acquisition
• Creation
• Dissemination and outreach
• Assessment of scholarly impact

Uncommon theme
• Visualization and modeling
  o Perhaps common theme, but with uncommon practices and tasks.
  o Interface is different, but the theme can be common.

  • Common themes as chosen seem to define a generic research cycle.
  o Perhaps driving up to a meta-theme is beyond the scope of this exercise.
  o Need to remain at the level of granularity of discrete scholarly practices.
• Perhaps resequence common themes:
  o Creation
  o Dissemination and Outreach
  o Acquisition
  o Assessment of impact

More uncommon themes?
• Contextualization?
  o Common among archaeologists to annotate available contexts in order to make sense of material.
  o Perhaps this is common to architecture.
  o Contextualizing finds in archaeology is a very particular practice that could benefit from an infrastructure of annotation.
• Text mining?
• Making experience available in ways, while contextualizing the experience of watching a film.
  o How subjectivity plays into contextualization?
  • Idea of building a narrative within context being created.
  o Can create narrative but that create content.
  o "Sense-making"
  o Different from context, but still making sense of content
• Interpretation.
  o Can make a big pile of stuff, but narrative is the added value of the researcher.
  o Interpretation?
  o Basic scholarly practice, all is about interpretation.
  o In a sense, it’s analysis.
  o Making sense of things is something we do, somehow - the tools that support the "taking apart", the analysis that’s noteworthy.

Common/uncommon to share
• Visualization and modeling as uncommon
• Assess impact as uncommon
  o Since we’re discussing it in the arts/humanities it becomes uncommon
• Including tenure review and career promotion?
  o No, return to economic discussion.
  o Economic success can have effects on tenure and career promotion.
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Group 1c - C
- [ ] 3 themes
- [ ] build networks of practitioners? Or does this assume a solution, and the theme is social vs solitary scholarship
  - [ ] question of value
  - [ ] time inputs
- [ ] tools don't care (how you use them)
  - [ ] might be uses that are surprising to the toolmaker
- [ ] people come in with preconceptions
- [ ] finding & comparing
  - [ ] raw materials
  - [ ] metadata
  - [ ] quality? do we care?
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Group 1c - D
Electronic as a substitution for paper—treating it as analog objects, then we print them out.
Underlying message: not that scholars should move out of this into some other world of
digital resources, but if anyone's going to use anything besides databases as hyped up way
of finding material, has to be a convincing reason to answer intellectual question that you
couldn't answer otherwise
- COMMON: DIFFICULTY BARRIER FOR TOOLS
- COMMON: INSTINCT/JUDGMENT
- I don't have the two years to mark it up in xml and find a programmer to do the dateline, etc.
- I'd love to take my primary materials and dump it into something that would do more for
me.
- Most sophisticated, advanced, etc. interface for humanistic scholarship: where human
/computer are merged or brought together in ways that leverage different strengths of both,
rather than trying to substitute computer judgment for human judgment
- COMMON: INSTINCT/JUDGMENT > CROSS-CHECK/VALIDATION
- Different domains of scholarship/different questions need different heuristics
- Not that machines can't support them, but it can't pick (meta-heuristics)
- Could I just dump my Word files into something and do data mining on it?
- We have a lot of data in digital form, but we can't get beyond doing searches on your
hard drive
- It's context more often than not; brittleness of tools
- Towards more flexible/interactive; machine surfaces set of information; preliminary filter
pass
- By the time I did all the text encoding, I would've figured it out already
- It's not just time - I'm not quite sure what's out there
- I can see how colleagues who can't do the other bits (i.e. go to Sourceforge); it may not
be great but it gets the job done
- When I create a tool, that's ok, but not when I have to write a biography.
- COMMON: UNCERTAINTY - RISK MANAGEMENT
- When I look for a tool, I see what other people say about it
- Maybe there's too few people using it, or writing it up because that takes time
- COMMON: NEEDLE IN HAYSTACK/NEEDLE IN CONTEXT
- Lots of databases - don't understand context at all
- Now you do it by photocopying, but you can imagine a technology more sensitive to the
need for this, to provide something more valuable
- Difficulty barriers for tools; uncertainty - risk management
- I know a sorting tool that'd be ideal, but it would take me ages to code my data and put it
into those formats
- Think of all people who use e-mails for document management.
- It's hard to build reliable, intuitive scholarly tools
- Developing tools, but not for public - documentation to make it publicly available is time-
consuming
- Would use Microsoft because you know it, it's easy, will get what you want, even if
there's better things out there
- 90% of tools built used only by person who built them
- I print out my notes and put them in the same data order as timelines that way
- To do anything besides paper would be huge amount of work
- COMMON: MAINTAINING CONTENT
- Even national libraries, there's a competitive struggle for resources
- People come to us all the time - importance of particular resource to scholarship in a
particular field
- Without defending on that basis, we definitely won't give it; even if you do, it has to be
weighed
- UNCOMMON: HYBRID MATERIALS
- Will we ever digitize the backlog?
- Notion of artifact to an extent (more resources in one area than another) and don't want
research to be skewed like that
- Archeologists used to work in railroad car lots, now we do it with toothbrushes
- Papyrus is papyrus if you study it that way
- Part of what you have to determine is whether technology is introducing intrinsic biases
- UNCOMMON: DOES TECHNOLOGY INTRODUCE BIAS? WILL ALGORITHM/DATA
SOURCE MESS YOU UP?
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**Group 1d - A**

9 - coming from different perspectives, yet a commonality emerged: having a trained person
asking "the right question"

6 - ongoing idea: the critical thought. 1. define research problem. 2. execution of research 3.
presentation of findings/results as an article, book, etc.

10 - challenging and interrogation of ideas and research question;

8 - you must have interest and/or motivation

5 - the personal stake the researcher/scholar has in doing research
10 - the scholarly stake
7 - the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to do research
10 - the pressure to get to the finish line
6 - having research at different stages in the pipeline. How do you manage and orchestrate everything?
10 - the research problem and the community (IT, peers, students, etc) that supports the research
9 - the scholar is to the artifact as the IT person is to the scholar. The tools itself can help to define the problem.
7 - is there consistent workflow among the various scholars
8 - sometimes the challenges are directly related to the scholarship, other times they are not
5 - students provide a lot of the fresh ideas within the ecosystem
11 - research exists and occurs within a ecosystem---a system formed by the interaction of a community of organisms with their physical environment
6 - thinking freshly when working with graduate students
5 - the institution as either a supporter or inhibitor
3 - output is likely to be defined during the planning phase, when the research question(s) is (are) formulated
1 - the variation and differences in how workflow
7 - the deliverable varies,
1 - the intentional versus unintentional audience
9 - some research is expected to have a short time life versus extreme longevity
7 - data life--the shelf life of the data
8 - tools fitting an audience, meeting the needs of the audience
10 - the university is specialized but finding technologies that meet the general needs
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Group 1d - B

Common and uncommon themes

T1 nominate the themes,
discovery. everyone used the internet to discover research materials to investigate; discover other people; discover object's internal structure; identify the research question; discover questions that we couldn't ask before because we couldn't conceptualize it; discovery include search and access - search is finding a resource but access is being able to actually get it.
collaboration. Having conversations about the research questions, the publications your producing; expanding the type of people with whom you might collaborate - from different places, technology people, non-scholars; collaboration become a form of peer review, becoming a substitute for publication; becomes a foundation for authority; collaboration as a form of discovery; the medium/venue of collaboration
scholarly communication - publishing; includes collaboration; self publication, wikis, online media
sustainability; planning for lifecycle; maintaining access to objects; distinguishing between materials for preservation vs ephemera; planning for persistence
J1 Refine these - make #3 more about publication/dissemination. Both formal and informal.

W1 don't think that's valid. There's no division between the collaboration and production. It's artificial to distinguish between them; it's a graduated process.

D1 if we were in the 18th century, the Federalist Papers would be a blog.

A "collaborative dissertation" is an uncommon thing; often in performing arts.
Another form of uncommon collaboration is "taking control" of dissemination, through
graduated levels of access - from "core" participants to the public. Stands in contrast to
ceding control over dissemination to traditional publishing process. "Community lead release
of information."

More prevalent in some fields than in others.

Blogs can be an example of this. But questions surround how this stuff can be used or
referred to; authority of the information.

Digital scriptorium  http://www.scriptorium.columbia.edu/
Can spend a lot of time & money on an image collection, but can't search the text

Group 1d - C

Common and Uncommon

From Exercise 2:
Developing successful contacts between those who need help and those can provide it
Unrestricted or minimally restricted information through sharing of materials, drawing on a
wider range of sources and media (including people and places previously not considered
authoritative)
technologically mediated approach where the relationship between the user and the raw
data is a seamless as possible

Collaboration
M2 -- common practice, under resourced, under advertised, limited to certain domains,
SERVICE INTEGRATION -- intra-institutional
M1 -- common on an institutional level, but not on the level of individual scholars (most
scholarly collaboration is inter-institutional)
Bamboo can function inter or intra-institutionally
Need a Rewards Structure that moves across domains as well as through and between
institutions
J1 - does collaboration cross the "ivory tower wall"
what about METHODOLOGICAL COLLABORATION -- between say engineers and
historians
sharing research notes? -- project resource management
J2 -- sees the digital environment as pushing towards collaboration
H1 -- need a rewards structure to validate this collaboration in the career path towards peer
review, job hiring, tenure track, etc.
P1 -- what people do needs to be supported and shared -- THAT CAN BE DONE WITHIN
BAMBOO

J2 -- moving from text to database sets as the primary resource of humanities scholarship
and it has a far reaching impact

2 facets of collaboration: substantive and methodological
methodological is a common goal (perhaps uncommon in practice)
substantive is uncommon, although researchers have been sharing with each other for
centuries, it would be unusual to move it back further into the research process

Identify best practices and then implement them in a tool set
gives scholars a roadmap
gives IT people a set of practices and tools to deploy/develop on behalf/ in collaboration with
scholars
finding commonalities on the "what do I want to know"

Structured data as a work in of itself is the real revolution in scholarship

Themes
2 types of collaboration
structured data as a publication in of itself

Group 1d - D
COMMON: Language and national collaboration

F1: Problem of language/translation
- For me, international collaboration is very interesting and important; I haven't heard it come up very much
- Our project would profit from an expansion in collaboration/partnerships with colleagues in other countries

R1: An issue for searching across languages
- How do you avoid the digital world becoming an English-only world
- The humanities have a lot more linguistic nationalism at work
- Less than a quarter century ago, but more than in physics or biology; won't go away anytime soon
- Language and national boundaries are two sides to the same coin

D1: Humanities is more human-labor-intensive
- Astronomy data curation project has machines that can pull in a lot of data and operate on those > doesn't require legions of transcribers

D2: Medieval manuscripts have text and image embedded together, archaeological objects with text on them, etc.
- Involves human interpretation
- How do we index things conceptually? That can't be automated.

R1: Even digitization is more labor-intensive > fragility of materials

T1: Have you found issues where "if we had done this digitization today, it'd be better/more usable"? It's happened to me.
- Librarians say "We won't digitize again unless you give us a really good reason why; we're not going to keep doing it - this stuff is fragile."
- If you're going to do it, do it right

R1: We spent a year developing standards in hopes of getting something that won't be obsolete

D2: Amazon Books making recommendations; I find the recommendations totally off base a lot of the time
- "No, I didn't mean that! I meant the thing I wrote!"
- Has to be automated in some way, but human judgments have to be made at some point

R1: These tools are very early versions; most of the time they don't know me
- If you build an identity, the system accumulates more knowledge about you and can figure it out better

S1: There are cameras now that outperform 35 mm, similarly, technologies will improve over time
- People who design technology are learning a great deal from these early versions
- Speech recognition reveals things linguists didn't understand before
- When Google figures out how to figure out what you're interested in, it'll have figured out a lot about thinking
- Take a pragmatic, capitalist motive to get all these people working on a problem with ramifications for scholarship

T1: Scholars have to build on commercial systems in particular ways
- Amazon gives general user recommendations
- We've had users saying "we don't want social tagging, it's done by non-experts"
- Social tagging has to be modified in ways that don't make money
- "If you guys were using MathML in your browsers, it'd be a lot easier." > Mozilla did it, Microsoft said the community is too small, so forget it."

COMMON: Using tools that pick up associations

C1: The more tools we can give researchers to make judgments, the better off we'll be
- It's almost impossible to do simple searches to get what you want

T1: Systems where scholars can join a small group and see their recommendations, define it specifically, have been successful

S1: Catalogs of canonical information on people/places/things that are web accessible

R1: Authority files

S1: They exist, but you have to write to Getty

T1: Can do individual searches, but can't do it in bulk

R1: These may be keys to following threads, solving multilingual issue

T1: Making formal controlled vocabularies more useful by doing text mining against primary resources

R1: How can communities maintain and support controlled vocabulary lists? Who's in charge? Without authoritarian structure?

T1: Not authoritarian, authority control.

R1: Uncontrolled control.

R1: Key issue for Bamboo as a whole: how do you get commonality without top-down management
- Felt there was an inconsistency between the goal and what the method is going to be after the community planning process > more managerial, less open-source in the end than I think is a good match
- I'm someone who's working on projects that do try to control people, but this is a fundamental problem
- Want to avoid having something that's funnel-shaped
Some people were trying to build an image information database.

- They should be putting an index pointer to a canonical database! Don't copy it, point to it.

- Basic database design principal

R1: We're creating these references that you can then use; you put the record, and the record has both

T1: The better library catalogs are doing that now

D2: Controlled vocabulary being used in a flexible fashion

R1: What tools do people need to create that kind of pointing?

T1: These are also the tools to say "this resource is about Michelangelo, however you're going to spell it."

- Making authority files more flexible

- Connecting authoritative names and ID's to resources they should be connected to

- We know how to do authority control files, but we don't know how to tie things together

S1: Should Bamboo support creation of universal authoritative database that anyone can point to?

T1: There might be an identity you could point to, but the specific information would depend on your discipline (identifying people/place names/concepts canonically)

D1: Everything sounds like a subcategory of "using tools that make associations"

- Are we getting away from the task at hand? Aren't we supposed to be characterizing Humanities scholarship?

R1: "Theme" opens the door to almost anything

- This is different; it's something that allows tools to make associations work

COMMON: Authority files/controlled vocabulary

D1: Humanities scholarly practice clusters around text and images rather than numbers

- This affects the tools we build, the things we do, etc.

R1: As someone who does a lot of quantitative history, I don't really agree

S1: Your numbers are counts of things that appear in text, etc.

SM: The fundamental materials are texts/images/multimedia, rather than numbers

D2: Fundamental materials are things people have created

R1: From human imagination

CJ: Humanists have to deal with a variety of materials

T1: We've done a lot of data mining with numbers, they're trying to do the same principles applied to texts, and you come up with different problems

D2: This informs our approach, it distinguishes humanities from the sciences

S1: We've solved the problems of how to encode numbers a long time ago, but encoding humanities material is an ongoing issue

- Still no standard format for film

- New versions of MPEG every year, no standard for music encoding

- Difficult to build tools

- A question of representation of humanities objects

T1: Problem with text is you have to deal with synonyms/homonyms/alternative spelling

C1: Fields like astronomy have agreed on a standard way to do things; progress will be made when fields decide "this is how we're going to do X"

I1: Semantics are understood when scientists use numbers: a count of something, a spectrum, etc.

- Nothing is inherent about the semantics of Humanities texts

C1: Hate to limit things to just text

T1: How do you agree images are similar?

S1: At least with scientists, everyone agrees on how you represent "133": different ways of capturing and representing art

F1: When you're talking about texts, text is in a historical context - a particular point in time

- Important to see it in a continuum of time and evolution

C1: Has to be room for multiple interpretations

I1: Ambiguity, which you try not to have in science

COMMON: Focus on text/image/audio > representation of these

D1: Common across Humanities, uncommon in relation to science

FOR SHARING:

- Using tools that make associations (closely related to controlled vocab?)

- Controlled vocab/authority files

- Focus on text/image/audio

Back to top.
Bamboo needs to take into account interdisciplinary work and how this changes the process, the people one needs to engage with, the dissolution of institutional boundaries, etc. What does collaboration in research mean? What tools are needed? We have experimented with Sakai and others - could these be developed further to support "collaborative research." What I observed is a group of people, with common purpose or interest that pull together data, manuscripts, whatever (content) and then there is a conversation around the set of content they’ve pulled together which leads to new chunks of content to be added in. Then there are uncommon practices - those with big bodies of text might want to apply tools to linguistic analysis while others might want to do statistical work (e.g. need unit level census data to analyze the impact of fasting on health in Indonesia).

We should consider building social networking tools that enable people to articulate needs among others with an interest to be able to point or volunteer to build/create.

Let’s talk about the “publics” we are serving as well. How do we bridge communities effectively? We need to engage those infrastructure, policies, and practices. This also raises DRM implications.

Why is there limited awareness of tools and projects today? Zotero as an example?

Preservation is an important theme as well. What's the role in the process?

How do we account for divergences? Where are they? One is relationships and engagement with the public - this is more fundamental to some fields than others (anthropology, ethnomusicology, etc.)

Back to top.

Group 1d - F

"themes"

P1: "reading at two extremes", scanning vs. close reading, translation

T1: production vs. consumption

M1: "lifecycle management” digital curation, resource building

S1: use, reading, vs. creation

consultation, creation, dissemination, sharing

P1: scholarship in hum. is seen as cumulative. tool building and use which is not cumulative is problematic.

P1: publishing was in two forms, books and articles. now there’s creation of databases. story of a colleague with db of 5000 women writers in china, with references to the writings. new librarian decides “we don’t want to support this”. what’s the clearinghouse to support dissemination if a project loses support? we need to solve the dissemination problem.

T1: used to be the case with print that withdrawal of support would cease production. in digital existing effort can disappear.

M1: what kind of sustainability?

N1: sustainability leads into problem of credit. if i make a copy, original site can’t track usage. example of one copy going to blackboard, 500 untracked copies go out...

A1: reading as a theme, a broad term to cover a spectrum of tasks. second broad category is lifecycle.

T1: exercise is aimed at scholarly primitievs but discussion has revolved around hybrid digital /nonD state. problem of trying to bridge gap without resources is at core of what bamboo should worry about. how do i make scholarly practices work in areas where the digital is hard?

filtering

P1: difference b/w context for digital vs. physical reading. we know what it means to scan a page; we use indexes, but when we scan we’re looking for important words. in digital, light reading changes.

K1: to students: i can research quickly, you get bogged down in one tool or one resource

M1: how can we train grad students to research more quickly in the digital world?
K1: students find things quicker on the web than I do

T1: more material is going to be surfaced, summarized automatically in response to searches, user profiles, on the basis of materials that's being aggregated and mined. Structured references are being leveraged into resources. It's interesting to see what google books surfaces next to a given resource. Next generation will enter college accustomed to having information ordered for them.

Commercial interests around filtering, aggregating, linking, takes us away from the "hard yard" of light reading at large scale. It's not in google's interests to make everything available.

T1: Eventually it'll all be available. Stuff that's been on shelves 100 years not hurting anybody is about to come roaring back to the tops of the search fields. What formats, approaches can we disseminate in that seed the bots?

A1: Google hasn't touched Arabic texts.

P1: Google can link up Chinese terms with romanizations of those terms.

P1: What changes between digital and physical worlds? Search algorithms change. How to make full use of Google books?

A1: Algorithm changes every two weeks.

N1: Took 3 years grad school to learn to read like a historian. Tools for light reading are quite simple but don't have digital analogs. Useful tool is a pdf reader called Skim (macOS) which displays highlighted text next to the current page. Simple concept of laying different pieces of a text next to each other very useful, not available with adobe's tools. "Digital equivalent of the post-it note"
A1: part of the answer.
K1: Problem begins w video... Finalcut Pro allows all types of fields as you log in material.
When I've handed on, they are aghast at what I've written. Full of notes to myself of what may be useful, becomes thin in terms of what might be useful to the botanist. Extra time to envisage what might be useful to someone else.
C1: Is the collaborative opportunity - Studio Code is collaborative - can mashup. Final cut doesn't do that.
T1: Identifying tools for description resistant data.
C1: An outcome of Bamboo should be an online clearinghouse of this kind of dialogue.
Online community that makes sense.
C2: Connex back to the process, it's working over description resistant material. The work of scholarship is to describe this -- iterative process, past acad practice has involved certain kinds of collaboration that re much slower. That process is changing.
T1: Museum professionals and archivists deal w/ this stuff - might not be a film but an artifact.
G1: Ideally what we would have from the process is an inductive approach to categories... allowing categories to emerge including uses of the data when we gathered the data. Emergent categorization rather than inductive categories. Taxonomies are incredibly important to not lock everything down.
S1: Best practices - seems in conflict. Hard to imagine it capturing the processes we are talking about. How do we build best practices? How do you distill it into a best practice?
C2: Tension bw algorithms and heuristics? Not codifiable.
G1: For the heuristic quality - to provoke rather than disclose.
T1: Relates to exposing - exposing process. Don't have short research notes, like they do in the sciences. We don't have that. We need a whole narrative, an argument. When we do delineate they are in 25 pg white papers for funders which no one wants to read.
G1: Wiki has talk-thru pages where people haggle what goes into an article. We don't have a space where we can talk about the process in process. It's what doesn't get spoken; wrestling w/ the parts of the process.
C1: That's where the vetting occurs.
C2: The blogosphere is one extreme of that. Need a place where you can throw out, where the annealing starts, where the argument takes form.
T1: The balance now in humanities is toward darkness.
C2: We want shadowy place in between, the crepuscular.
R1: Priorities for the larger group?
C2: Processing descriptive resistant material.
A1: Music, for example, libraries full of info but something not described, not discursive. How do we deal w/ that?
G1: Categorizations or classifications that we have to allow to evolve.
T1: Sifting, elaborating, annotating - esp the resistant.
G1: Research mgmt.
T1: Creating a workflow that allows this to happen.
A1: Disincentive to making this happen.

Summary

Grand Narrative of Humanities Scholarship

"Condensing meaning from vapor of nuance"

Processing descriptive resistant material
Increasingly a more science-like process
Shoveling
Sifting
Annealing
Elaborating
Exposing

Process of research management

Back to top.

Group 1d - H

Two: common and uncommon.

Goal: find norms.

Reading in another language

Back to ambiguity and interpretation. Contextual information management. Annotation, or cross-reference. "Every architecture needs to allow for conflicting statements about things".

Building authors list.

Text drill-down: whole text, down to specific point. Need to cite down that far, at that granularity. Other media? Yes. Crane: "everything needs to be rethought" (!). Ontologies - we consider the attempts to build them, but recognize that they are problematic.
Public scholarship and the long tail. Audience: broad, public scholarship is uncommon; narrow, internal-to-discipline work is the common.

Importance of content export, the exit strategy. History of preservation strategies. Moving stuff between contexts. What about doing something new: connected to OCA, easier to upload. Such a project needs resources LACs don’t have. What object? Digital surrogates for physical texts vs born-digital materials. Cost of migration: loss of functionality and/or loss of perspectives. How do we define our objects? Could Bamboo take this on? No. Can Bamboo facilitate communities which engage a data curation conversation towards defining digital objects?

Building tools; for one project, one scholar, a boutique; versus tools for general use.

Project planning need is common. Marketing should be part of that.

“Some of us are not shiny people.”

Problem with timescale differences between a faculty’s research timeline, versus technology different, versus technology curation

Summa:
1. ambiguity!
2. Infrastructure for disagreement needed
3. Narrow/broad audience
4. exit strategy, mobility of info

Back to top.
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